

Estimation in Semiparametric Quantile Factor Models

Shujie Ma

Oliver Linton

University of California at Riverside*

University of Cambridge

Jiti Gao

Monash University[†]

March 7, 2024

Abstract

We propose an estimation methodology for a semiparametric quantile factor panel model. We provide tools for inference that are robust to the existence of moments and to the form of weak cross-sectional dependence in the idiosyncratic error term. We apply our method to daily stock return data.

Keywords: Cross-Sectional Dependence; Fama-French Model; Inference; Sieve Estimation

JEL classification: C14; C21; C23; G12

*Ma's research was partially supported by NSF grants DMS 1306972 and DMS 1712558.

[†]Gao's research was supported by the Australian Research Council Discovery Grants Program for its support under Grant numbers: DP150101012 & DP170104421.

1 Introduction

Factor models are widely used to capture the co-movement of a large number of time series and to model covariance matrices. They provide useful dimensionality reduction in many applications from climate modelling to finance. Perhaps the current state of the art for factor modelling is Fan, Liao, and Micheva (2013), which allowed the idiosyncratic covariance matrix to be non-diagonal but sparse, and used thresholding techniques (Cai and Liu, 2011) to impose sparsity and thereby obtain a better estimator of the covariance matrix and its inverse in this big-data setting. The usual approach ignores covariate information that can sometimes be informative. Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012) developed a semiparametric factor regression methodology that introduces covariate information into the factor loading parameters. This model is well motivated in finance applications where it can be understood as a properly formulated version of the popular Fama-French (1992) approach to modelling returns with observable characteristics. The model also makes sense in other contexts where covariate information is available. Their application was to monthly stock returns, which is where the finance literature was focussed. Moreover, Fan, Liao and Wang (2016) proposed a Projected-PCA approach which employs principal component analysis to the projected data matrix onto a linear space spanned by covariates. It is worth noting that most existing works in the literature of factor models require at least four moments to establish their theoretical properties. See, for instance, Bai and Ng (2002), Bai and Li (2012), Lam and Yao (2012), Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012), Fan, Liao, and Micheva (2013), Fan, Liao and Wang (2016), Li et al. (2017), among others. This may not be a binding restriction for monthly stock returns, but for daily stock returns this is a bit strong.

Quantile methods are widely used in statistics. They have the advantage of being robust to large observations. They can also provide more information about the conditional distribution away from the centre, which is relevant in many applications. In this paper, we propose estimation and inferential methodology for the quantile version of the Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012) model. Our contribution is summarized as follows.

First, we propose an estimation algorithm for this model. We use sieve techniques to obtain preliminary estimators of the nonparametric beta functions, see Chen (2011) for a review, and use these to estimate the factor return vector at each time period. We then update the loading functions and factor returns sequentially. We compute the estimator in two steps for computational reasons. We have $J \times T$ unknown factor return parameters as well as $J \times K_N$ sieve parameters to estimate, and simultaneous estimation of these parameters without penalization would be challenging. Penalization of the factor returns here is not well motivated so we do not pursue this. Instead we first estimate the unrestricted additive quantile regression function for each time period and then impose the factor structure in a

sequential fashion.

Second, we derive the limiting properties of our estimated factor returns and factor loading functions under the assumption that the included factors all have non zero mean and under weak conditions on cross-section and temporal dependence. A key consideration in the panel modelling of stock returns is what position to take on the cross sectional dependence in the idiosyncratic part of stock returns. Early studies assumed iid in the cross section, but this turns out to be not necessary. More recent work has allowed for cross sectional dependence in a variety of ways. Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012) imposed a known industry cluster/block structure where the number of industries goes to infinity as do the number of members of the industry. Under this structure one obtains a CLT and inference can be conducted by estimating only the intra block covariances. Robinson and Thawornkaiwong (2012) considered a linear process structure driven by independent shocks. Dong, Gao and Peng (2015) introduced a spatial mixing structure to accommodate both serial correlation and cross-sectional dependence for a general panel data setting. Conley (1999) studied that under a lattice structure or some observable or estimable distance function that determines the ordering, one can consistently estimate the asymptotic covariance matrix. However, this type of structure is hard to justify for stock returns, and in that case their approach does not deliver consistent inference. Connor and Koraczyk (1993) considered a different cross-sectional dependence structure, namely, they supposed that there was an ordering of the cross sectional units such that weak dependence of the alpha mixing variety was held. They do not assume knowledge of the ordering as this was not needed for their main results. We adopt and generalize their structure. In fact, we allow for weak dependence simultaneously in the cross-section and time series dependence. This structure affects the limiting distribution of the estimated factor returns in a complicated fashion, and the usual Newey–West type of standard errors can’t be adapted to account for the cross-sectional dependence here because the ordering is not assumed to be known. To conduct inference we have to take account of the correlation structure. We use the so-called fix-b asymptotics to achieve this, namely, we construct a test statistic based on an inconsistent fixed-b estimator of the correlation structure, as in Kiefer and Vogelsang (2002), and show that it has a pivotal limiting distribution that is a functional of a Gaussian process.

Third, our estimation procedure only requires that the time series mean of factor returns be non zero. A number of authors have noted that in the presence of a weak factor, regression identification strategies can break down (Bryzgalova, 2015). In view of this we provide a test of whether a given factor is present or not in each time period.

Fourth, we apply our procedure to CRSP daily data and show how the factor loading functions vary nonlinearly with state. The median regression estimators are comparable to

those of Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012) and can be used to test asset pricing theories under comparable quantile restrictions, see for example, Bassett, Koenker and Kordas (2004), and to design investment strategies. The lower quantile estimators could be used for risk management purposes. The advantage of the quantile method is its robustness to heavy tails in the response distribution, which may be present in daily data. Indeed our theory does not require any moment conditions.

The organization of this paper is given as follows. Section 2 proposes the main model and then discusses some identification issues. An estimation method based on B-splines is then proposed in Section 3. Section 4 establishes an asymptotic theory for the proposed estimation method. Section 5 discusses a covariance estimation problem and then considers testing for the factors involved in the main model. Section 6 gives an empirical application of the proposed model and estimation theory to model the dependence of daily returns on a set of characteristic variables. Section 7 concludes the paper with some discussion. All the mathematical proofs of the main results are given in an appendix and on-line supplemental materials.

2 The model and identification

We introduce some notations which will be used throughout the paper. For any positive numbers a_n and b_n , let $a_n \asymp b_n$ denote $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = c$, for a positive constant c , and let $a_n \gg b_n$ denote $a_n^{-1}b_n = o(1)$. For any vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote $\|\mathbf{a}\| = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2)^{1/2}$. For any symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A}_{s \times s}$, denote its L_2 norm as $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \max_{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^s, \zeta \neq \mathbf{0}} \|\mathbf{A}\zeta\| \|\zeta\|^{-1}$. We use $(N, T) \rightarrow \infty$ to denote that N and T pass to infinity jointly.

We consider the following model for the τ^{th} conditional quantile function of the response y_{it} for the i^{th} asset at time t given as

$$Q_{y_{it}}(\tau|X_i, f_t) = f_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(X_{ji})f_{jt}, \quad (2.1)$$

i.e., we suppose that

$$y_{it} = f_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(X_{ji})f_{jt} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (2.2)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$, where y_{it} is the excess return to security i at time t ; f_{ut} and f_{jt} are factor returns, which are unobservable; $g_j(X_{ji})$ are the factor betas, which are unknown but smooth functions of X_{ji} , where X_{ji} are observable security characteristics, and X_{ji} lies in a compact set \mathcal{X}_{ji} . Let $X_i = (X_{1i}, \dots, X_{Ji})^\top$ and $f_t = (f_{ut}, f_{1t}, \dots, f_{Jt})^\top$. The error terms ε_{it} are the asset-specific or idiosyncratic returns and they satisfy that the conditional τ^{th} quantile of ε_{it} given (X_i, f_t) is zero. The factors f_{ut} and f_{jt} and the factor betas $g_j(\cdot)$ should be τ specific. For notational simplicity, we suppress the τ subscripts. For model identifiability, we assume that:

ASSUMPTION A0. For some probability measures P_j we have $\int g_j(x_j)dP_j(x_j) = 0$ and $\int (g_j(x_j))^2 dP_j(x_j) = 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Furthermore, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt}/T \right| > 0$ for each j .

The case where $\tau = 1/2$ corresponds to the conditional median, and is comparable to the conditional mean model used in Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012). The advantage of the median over the mean is its robustness to heavy tails and outliers, which is especially important with daily data. The case where $\tau = 0.01$, say, might be of interest for the purposes of risk management, since this corresponds to a standard Value-at-Risk threshold in which case (2.1) gives the conditional Value-at-Risk given the characteristics and the factor returns at time t . To obtain an ex-ante measure we should have to employ a forecasting model for the factor returns.

Suppose that the τ^{th} conditional quantile function $Q_{y_{it}}(\tau|X_i = x)$ of the response y_{it} at time t given the covariate $X_i = x$ is additive

$$H_t(\tau|x) = h_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J h_{jt}(x_j), \quad (2.3)$$

where $h_{jt}(\cdot)$ are unknown functions without loss of generality satisfying $\int h_{jt}(x_j)dP_j(x_j) = 0$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ (Horowitz and Lee, 2005). Under the factor structure (2.1), we have for all j

$$\int \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}(x_j) \right)^2 dP_j(x_j) = \int g_j(x_j)^2 dP_j(x_j) \times \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt} \right)^2. \quad (2.4)$$

Provided $\sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt} \neq 0$, we can identify $g_j(x_j)$ by

$$g_j(x_j) = \frac{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}(x_j)}{\sqrt{\int \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}(x_j) \right)^2 dP_j(x_j)}}. \quad (2.5)$$

We will use this as the basis for the proposal of the estimation method in Section 3 below.

3 Estimation

3.1 Factor returns and characteristic-beta functions

We propose an iterative algorithm to estimate the factor returns and the characteristic-beta functions. The algorithm makes use of the structure in (2.2) so that it circumvents the “curse of dimensionality” (Bellman, 1961) while retaining flexibility of the nonparametric regression. The right hand side of (2.1) is bilinear in unknown quantities, so it seems difficult to avoid such an algorithmic approach.

To estimate $g_j(\cdot)$, we first approximate them by B-spline functions described as follows. Let $b_j(x_j) = \{b_{j,1}(x_j), \dots, b_{j,K_N}(x_j)\}^\top$ be a set of normalized B-spline functions of order m (see, for example, de Boor (2001)), where $K_N = L_N + m$, and L_N is the number of interior knots satisfying $L_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We adopt the centered B-spline basis functions $B_j(x_j) = \{B_{j,1}(x_j), \dots, B_{j,K_N}(x_j)\}^\top$, where

$$B_{jk}(x_j) = \sqrt{K_N} \left[b_{j,k}(x_j) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N b_{j,k}(X_{ji}) \right],$$

so that $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B_{jk}(X_{ji}) = 0$ and $\text{var}\{B_{jk}(X_{ji})\} \asymp 1$. We first approximate the unknown functions $g_j(x_j)$ by B-splines such that $g_j(x_j) \approx B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = (\lambda_{j,1}, \dots, \lambda_{j,K_N})^\top$ are spline coefficients. Hence $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = 0$. Denote $f_t = \{f_{ut}, (f_{jt}, 1 \leq j \leq J)^\top\}^\top$. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_J^\top)^\top$ and let $\rho_\tau(u) = u(\tau - I(u < 0))$ be the quantile check function. The iterative algorithm is described as follows:

1. Find the initial estimates $\hat{f}^{[0]}$ and $\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(\cdot)$.
2. For given $\hat{f}^{[i]}$, we obtain

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[i+1]} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{JK_N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau \left(y_{it} - \hat{f}_{ut}^{[i]} - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \hat{f}_{jt}^{[i]} \right).$$

Let $\hat{g}_j^{*[i+1]}(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^{[i+1]}$. The estimate for $g_j(x_j)$ at the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ step is

$$\hat{g}_j^{[i+1]}(x_j) = \frac{\hat{g}_j^{*[i+1]}(x_j)}{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{g}_j^{*[i+1]}(X_{ji})^2}}.$$

3. For given $\hat{g}_j^{[i+1]}(x_j)$, we obtain for $t = 1, \dots, T$

$$\hat{f}_t^{[i+1]} = \arg \min_{f_t \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau \left(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_j^{[i+1]}(X_{ji}) f_{jt} \right).$$

We repeat steps 2 and 3, and consider that the algorithm converges at the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ step when $\|\hat{f}^{[i+1]} - \hat{f}^{[i]}\| < \epsilon$ and $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[i+1]} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[i]}\| < \epsilon$ for a small positive value ϵ . Then the final estimates are $\hat{f}_t = \hat{f}_t^{[i+1]}$ and $\hat{g}_j(x_j) = \hat{g}_j^{[i+1]}(x_j)$. Our experience in numerical analysis suggests that the proposed method converges well and rapidly using the consistent initial values proposed in Section 3.2. The algorithm stops after a finite number of iterations by using the consistent initial values.

3.2 Initial estimators

We first approximate the unknown functions $h_{jt}(x_j)$ by B-splines such that $h_{jt}(x_j) \approx B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_{jt}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{jt} = (\theta_{jt,1}, \dots, \theta_{jt,K_N})^\top$ are spline coefficients. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1t}^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Jt}^\top)^\top$. Then the estimators $(\tilde{h}_{ut}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t^\top)^\top$ of $(h_{ut}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^\top)^\top$ are obtained by minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau(y_{it} - h_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_{jt})$$

with respect to $(h_{ut}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{JK_N+1}$. As a result, the estimator of $h_{jt}(x_j)$ is $\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{jt}$. We then obtain the initial estimators of $g_j(x_j)$

$$\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j) = \frac{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j)}{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) \right)^2}}. \quad (3.1)$$

The initial estimator of f_t is

$$\hat{f}_t^{[0]} = \arg \min_{f_t \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_j^{[0]}(X_{ji}) f_{jt}) \quad (3.2)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$.

4 Asymptotic theory of the estimators

We suppose that there is some relabelling of the cross-sectional units i_{l_1}, \dots, i_{l_N} , whose generic index we denote by i^* , such that the cross sectional dependence decays with the distance $|i^* - j^*|$. This assumption has been made in Connor and Korajczyk (1993) and Lee and Robinson (2016). Our estimation procedure does not need to know the ordering of the data. However, to develop a robust inference procedure that accounts for heteroscedasticity and cross-sectional correlation (HAC), we need to order the data across i . As discussed in Lee and Robinson (2016), in some economic applications, data may be ordered according to some explanatory variables. Such considerations are pursued in our real data analysis with detailed discussions given in Section 6. For notational simplicity, we denote the indices as $\{i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ after the ordering.

Let $g_j^0(\cdot)$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$ and $f_t^0 = (f_{ut}^0, f_{1t}^0, \dots, f_{Jt}^0)^\top$ be the true factor betas and factor returns in model (2.2). For model identifiability, assume $E\{g_j^0(X_{ji})\} = 0$ and $E\{g_j^0(X_{ji})\}^2 = 1$. Let \mathbb{N} denote the collection of all positive integers. We use a ϕ -mixing coefficient to specify the dependence structure. Let $\{W_{it} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$, where $W_{it} = (X_i^\top, f_t^\top, \varepsilon_{it}^\top)^\top$ and $\varepsilon_{it} = y_{it} - f_{ut}^0 - \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) f_{jt}^0$. For $S_1, S_2 \subset [1, \dots, N] \times [1, \dots, T]$, let

$$\phi(S_1, S_2) \equiv \sup\{|P(A|B) - P(A)| : A \in \sigma(W_{it}, (i, t) \in S_1), B \in \sigma(W_{it}, (i, t) \in S_2)\},$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes a σ -field. Then the ϕ -mixing coefficient of $\{W_{it}\}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$\phi(k) \equiv \sup\{\phi(S_1, S_2) : d(S_1, S_2) \geq k\},$$

where

$$d(S_1, S_2) \equiv \min\{\sqrt{|t-s|^2 + |i-j|^2} : (i, t) \in S_1, (j, s) \in S_2\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{X}_{ji} = [a, b]$. Denote $h_t^0(x) = \{h_{jt}^0(x_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}^\top$, where $h_{jt}^0(\cdot)$ are the true unknown functions in (2.3) and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_J)^\top$. Let $G_i^0(X_i) = \{1, g_1^0(X_{1i}), \dots, g_J^0(X_{Ji})\}^\top$. We make the following assumptions.

- (C1) $\{W_{it}\}$ is a random field of ϕ -mixing random variables. The ϕ -mixing coefficient of $\{W_{it}\}$ satisfies $\phi(k) \leq K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 k}$ for $K_1, \lambda_1 > 0$. For each given i , $\{W_{it}\}$ is a strictly stationary sequence.
- (C2) The conditional density $p_i(\varepsilon | x_i, f_t)$ of ε_{it} given (x_i, f_t) satisfies the Lipschitz condition of order 1 and $\inf_{1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq t \leq T} p_i(0 | x_i, f_t) > 0$. For every $1 \leq j \leq J$, the density function $p_{X_{ji}}(\cdot)$ of X_{ji} is bounded away from 0 and satisfies the Lipschitz condition of order 1 on $[a, b]$. The density function $f_{X_i}(\cdot)$ of X_i is absolutely continuous on $[a, b]^J$.
- (C3) The functions g_j^0 and h_{jt}^0 are r -times continuously differentiable on its support for some $r > 2$. The spline order satisfies $m \geq r$.
- (C4) There exist some constants $0 < c_h \leq C_h < \infty$ such that $c_h \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt}^0\right)^2 \leq C_h$ for all j with probability tending to one.
- (C5) The eigenvalues of the $(J+1) \times (J+1)$ matrix $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E(G_i^0(X_i)G_i^0(X_i)^\top)$ are bounded away from zero.
- (C6) Let Ω_N^0 be the covariance matrix of $N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))$. The eigenvalues of Ω_N^0 are bounded away from zero and infinity.

We allow that $\{W_{it}\}$ are weakly dependent across i and t , but need to satisfy the strong mixing condition given in Condition (C1). Moreover, Condition (C1) implies that $\{X_i\}$ is marginally cross-sectional mixing, and $\{f_t\}$ is marginally temporally mixing. Similar assumptions are used in Gao, Lu and Tjøstheim (2006) for an alpha-mixing condition in a spatial data setting, and Dong, Gao and Peng (2016) for introducing a spatial mixing condition in a panel data setting. Conditions (C2) and (C3) are commonly used in the nonparametric smoothing literature, see for example, Horowitz and Lee (2005), and Ma, Song and Wang (2013). Conditions (C4) and (C5) are similar to Conditions A2, A5 and A7 of Connor, Matthias and Linton (2012).

Define

$$\Lambda_{Nt}^0 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E\{p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\}.$$

and

$$\Sigma_{Nt}^0 = \tau(1 - \tau)(\Lambda_{Nt}^0)^{-1} \Omega_N^0 (\Lambda_{Nt}^0)^{-1}. \quad (4.1)$$

The theorem below presents the asymptotic distribution of the final estimator \hat{f}_t . Define

$$\phi_{NT} = \sqrt{K_N/(NT)} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{-r}. \quad (4.2)$$

Let d_{NT} be a sequence satisfying

$$d_{NT} = O(\phi_{NT}). \quad (4.3)$$

Theorem 1. Assume that Conditions (C1)-(C5) hold, and $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$. Suppose that the algorithm in Section 3.1 converges within a finite number of iterations. Then, for any t there is a stochastically bounded sequence $\delta_{N,jt}$ such that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{N}(\Sigma_{Nt}^0)^{-1/2}(\hat{f}_t - f_t^0 - d_{NT}\delta_{N,t}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{J+1}),$$

where $\delta_{N,t} = (\delta_{N,jt}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top$, d_{NT} is given in (4.3), and \mathbf{I}_{J+1} is the $(J+1) \times (J+1)$ identity matrix.

The next theorem establishes the rate of convergence of the final estimator $\hat{g}_j(x_j)$.

Theorem 2. Suppose that the same conditions as given in Theorem 1 hold. Then, for each j ,

$$\left[\int \{\hat{g}_j(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)\}^2 dx_j \right]^{1/2} = O_p(\phi_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \quad (4.4)$$

where ϕ_{NT} is given in (4.2).

Remark 1: The orders $\sqrt{K_N/(NT)}$ and K_N^{-r} are from the noise and bias terms for nonparametric estimation, respectively, and the order $K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}$ from the approximation of the Bahadur representation in the quantile regression setting. This says that if the order $K_N \asymp (NT)^{1/(2r+1)}$ is chosen, and $T = O(N^\alpha)$, where $\alpha < 1/2 - 3/(2r+3)$, then the rate of ϕ_{NT} is $O_P((NT)^{-r/(2r+1)})$, which is optimal, see for example, Chen and Christensen (2015).

Remark 2: By using the asymptotic normality provided in Theorem 1, we can conduct inference for f_t^0 for each t , such as constructing the confidence interval. Note that in the asymptotic distribution in Theorem 1, there is a bias term $d_{NT}\delta_{N,t}$ involved. Let $K_N \asymp (NT)^{1/(2r+1)}$ and $T \asymp N^\alpha$, where $1/(2r) < \alpha < 1/2 - 3/(2r+3)$ and $r > 3$. Then the asymptotic bias is negligible and thus we have

$$\sqrt{N}(\Sigma_{Nt}^0)^{-1/2}(\hat{f}_t - f_t^0) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{J+1}). \quad (4.5)$$

Remark 3. It is possible to develop inferential results for g_j following Chen and Liao (2012) and Chen and Pouzo (2015). As is usual in nonparametric estimation, the weak cross-sectional and temporal dependence does not affect the limiting distribution, and so standard techniques can be applied. In fact, one may conclude the estimation algorithm with a kernel step and demonstrate the oracle efficiency property, see Horowitz and Mammen (2011).

5 Covariance estimation and hypothesis testing for the factors

In order to construct the confidence interval given in (4.5) we need to estimate Ω_N^0 and Λ_{Nt}^0 , since they are unknown. For estimation of Λ_{Nt}^0 , if we use its sample analogue, the conditional density $p_i(0|X_i, f_t)$ needs to be estimated. Instead of using this direct way, we use the Powell's kernel estimation idea in Powell (1991), and estimate Λ_{Nt}^0 by

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt} = (Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N K \left(\frac{y_{it} - \hat{f}_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_j(X_{ji}) \hat{f}_{jt}}{h} \right) \hat{G}_i(X_i) \hat{G}_i(X_i)^\top, \quad (5.1)$$

where $\hat{G}_i(X_i) = \{1, \hat{g}_1(X_{1i}), \dots, \hat{g}_J(X_{Ji})\}^\top$, while $K(\cdot)$ is the uniform kernel $K(u) = 2^{-1}I(|u| \leq 1)$ and h is a bandwidth.

First, we show that the estimator $\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt}$ is a consistent estimator of Λ_{Nt}^0 given in the theorem below.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that the same conditions as given in Theorem 1 hold, and $h \rightarrow 0$, $h^{-1}\phi_{NT} = o(1)$, $h^{-1}N^{-1/2} = O(1)$, where ϕ_{NT} is given in (4.2). Then, we have $\|\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$.*

Moreover, the exact form of Ω_N^0 defined in Condition (C6) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_N^0 &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)) \right\}^\top \right] \\ &= \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E \{ G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top \} + (NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \neq j}^N E(v_{it} v_{jt}^\top), \end{aligned}$$

where $v_{it} = G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. To estimate Ω_N^0 , its sample analogue is not consistent. Kernel-based robust estimators that account for HAC are developed (Conley, 1999), and are shown to be consistent under a variety of sets of conditions. It requires to use a truncation lag or “bandwidth”, which tends to infinity at a slower rate of N . As pointed out by Kiefer and Vogelsang (2005), this is a convenient assumption mathematically to ensure consistency, but it is unrealistic in finite sample studies. Adopting the idea in Kiefer and Vogelsang (2005), we let the bandwidth M be proportional to the sample size N , i.e., $M = bN$ for $b \in (0, 1]$, and then we derive the fixed- b asymptotics (Kiefer and Vogelsang; 2005) for the HAC estimator of Ω_N^0 under the quantile setting. The HAC estimator is given as $\hat{\Omega}_{N,M} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\Omega}_{Nt,M}$, where

$$\hat{\Omega}_{Nt,M} = \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{G}_i(X_i) \hat{G}_i(X_i)^\top + N^{-1} \sum_{i \neq j}^N K^* \left(\frac{i-j}{M} \right) \hat{v}_{it} \hat{v}_{jt}^\top, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\hat{v}_{it} = \hat{G}_i(X_i)(\tau - I(\hat{\varepsilon}_{it} < 0))$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\hat{\varepsilon}_{it} = y_{it} - \hat{f}_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_j(X_{ji}) \hat{f}_{jt}$, $K^*(u)$ is a symmetric kernel weighting function satisfying $K^*(0) = 1$, and $|K^*(u)| \leq 1$, and M

trims the sample autocovariances and acts as a truncation lag. Consistency of $\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M}$ needs that $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $M/N \rightarrow 0$. The following theorem provides the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN}$ when $M = bN$ for $b \in (0, 1]$.

Next, we will show asymptotic theory for the HAC covariance estimator under a sequence where the smoothing parameter M equals to bN . Let $\Omega^0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_N^0$, and Ω^0 can be written as $\Omega^0 = \Upsilon \Upsilon^\top$, where Υ is a lower triangular matrix obtained from the Cholesky decomposition of Ω^0 .

Theorem 4. *Suppose that the same conditions as given in Theorem 1 hold, and $\phi_{NT} N^{1/2} = o(1)$, and $K^{*''}(u)$ exists for $u \in [-1, 1]$ and is continuous. Let $M = bN$ for $b \in (0, 1]$. Then as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Upsilon \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_{J+1}(r) B_{J+1}(s)^\top dr ds \Upsilon^\top,$$

where $B_{J+1}(r) = W_{J+1}(r) - rW_{J+1}(1)$ denotes a $(J+1) \times 1$ vector of standard Brownian bridges, and $W_{J+1}(r)$ denotes a $(J+1)$ -vector of independent standard Wiener processes where $r \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 4 establishes the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN}$, although $\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN}$ is an inconsistent estimator of Ω^0 . However, it can be used to construct asymptotically pivotal tests involving f_t^0 .

Consider testing the null hypothesis $H_0: Rf_t^0 = r$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_1: Rf_t^0 \neq r$, where R is a $q \times (J+1)$ matrix with rank q and r is a $q \times 1$ vector. We construct an F -type statistic given as

$$F_{Nt,b} = N(R\widehat{f}_t - r)^\top \{R\tau(1-\tau)\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt}^{-1}\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN}\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt}^{-1}R^\top\}^{-1}(R\widehat{f}_t - r)/q.$$

When $q = 1$, we can construct a t -type statistic:

$$T_{Nt,b} = \frac{N^{1/2}(R\widehat{f}_t - r)}{\sqrt{R\tau(1-\tau)\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt}^{-1}\widehat{\Omega}_{N,M=bN}\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt}^{-1}\}^{-1}R^\top}.$$

The limiting distributions of $F_{Nt,b}$ and $T_{Nt,b}$ under the null hypothesis are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that the same conditions as given in Theorem 1 hold, and $\phi_{NT} N^{1/2} = o(1)$, and $K^{*''}(u)$ exists for $u \in [-1, 1]$ and is continuous. Let $M = bN$ for $b \in (0, 1]$. Then under the null hypothesis $H_0: Rf_t^0 = r$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$F_{Nt,b} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \{\tau(1-\tau)\}^{-1} W_q(1)^\top \left\{ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_q(r) B_q(s)^\top dr ds \right\}^{-1} W_q(1)/q.$$

If $q = 1$, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$T_{Nt,b} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \frac{W_1(1)}{\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \sqrt{\int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_1(r) B_1(s) dr ds}}.$$

Let $\Lambda_t^0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_{Nt}^0$. The limiting distributions of $F_{Nt,b}$ and $T_{Nt,b}$ under the alternative hypothesis $H_1: Rf_t^0 = r + cN^{-1/2}$ are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let $\Upsilon_t^* = (R\Lambda_t^{-1}\Omega^0\Lambda_t^{-1}R^\top)^{1/2}$. Suppose that the same conditions as given in Theorem 1 hold, and $\phi_{NT}N^{1/2} = o(1)$, and $K^{*''}(u)$ exists for $u \in [-1, 1]$ and is continuous. Let $M = bN$ for $b \in (0, 1]$. Then under the alternative hypothesis $H_1: Rf_t^0 = r + cN^{-1/2}$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$F_{Nt,b} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \{\tau(1-\tau)\}^{-1} \{\Upsilon_t^{*-1}c + W_q(1)\}^\top \times \left\{ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_q(r) B_q(s)^\top dr ds \right\}^{-1} \{\Upsilon_t^{*-1}c + W_q(1)\}/q.$$

If $q = 1$, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$T_{Nt,b} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \frac{\Upsilon_t^{*-1}c + W_1(1)}{\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \sqrt{\int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_1(r) B_1(s) dr ds}}.$$

Remark. If $K^*(x)$ is the Bartlett kernel, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''} \left(\frac{r-s}{b} \right) B_q(r) B_q(s)^\top dr ds \\ &= \frac{2}{b} \int_0^1 B_q(r) B_q(r)^\top dr - \frac{1}{b} \int_0^{1-b} \{B_q(r+b) B_q(r)^\top + B_q(r) B_q(r+b)^\top\} dr. \end{aligned}$$

These results allow one to test whether the factors are zero in a particular time period or not. Our tests are robust to the form of the cross-sectional dependence in the idiosyncratic error.

6 Application

In a series of important papers, Fama and French (hereafter denoted FF), demonstrated that there have been large return premia associated with size and value, which are observable characteristics of stocks. They contended that these return premia can be ascribed to a rational asset pricing paradigm in which the size and value characteristics proxy for assets' sensitivities to pervasive sources of risk in the economy. FF (1993) used a simple portfolio sorting approach to estimating their factor model. Connor, Hagmann, and Linton (2012) used kernel-based semiparametric regression methodology to capture the same phenomenon.

In our data analysis, we use all securities from Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP) which have complete daily return records from 2005 to 2013, and have two-digit Standard Industrial Classification code (from CRSP), market capitalization (from Compustat) and book value (from Compustat) records. We use daily returns in excess of the risk-free

return of 347 stocks. We consider the same four characteristic variables as given in Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012), and Fan, Liao and Wang (2016), which are size, value, momentum and volatility. Connor, Hagmann and Linton (2012) provided some detailed descriptions of these characteristics. They are calculated using the same method as described in Fan, Liao and Wang (2016).

We fit the quantile factor model (2.1) for each year, so that there are $T = 251$ observations. By taking the same strategy as He and Shi (1996), we select the number of interior knots L_N by minimizing the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) given as

$$\text{BIC}(L_N) = \log\{(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - \hat{f}_{it} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_j(X_{ji})\hat{f}_{jt})\} + \frac{\log(NT)}{2NT} J(L_N + m).$$

For the estimator $\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt}$ given in (5.1), the optimal order for the bandwidth h is in the order of $N^{-1/5}$. We let $h = \kappa N^{-1/5}$ in our numerical analysis and take different values for κ . For the estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN}$ given in (5.2), we use different values for b , and use the Bartlett kernel as suggested in Kiefer and Vogelsang (2005).

Figures 1-3 show the plots of the four estimated loading functions for the year of 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 at different quantiles $\tau = 0.2, 0.5$ and 0.8 . We observe that the estimated loading functions have similar shapes for these four years. Moreover, for the size, value and momentum characteristics, the estimated functions show a clear nonlinear pattern, and at different quantiles, the curves are different for the same characteristic. For example, for the size characteristic, the estimated loading function fluctuates around zero and it has a sharp drop after the value of size variable exceeds certain value at the quantiles $\tau = 0.2$ and 0.8 . However, it has a smooth decreasing pattern for the median with $\tau = 0.5$. For the momentum characteristic, the estimated function shows different curves at the three quantiles.

Next, we let $\kappa = 0.5, 1, 1.5$ and $b = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6$, respectively, for calculation of $\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt}$ and $\hat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN}$. For obtaining the robust estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN}$, the data need to be ordered across i . We consider two different orderings. First, we take the same strategy as Lee and Robinson (2016) by ordering the data according to firm size, since firms of similar size may be subject to similar shocks. Second, we use the information of the four explanatory variables by ordering the data according to the first principal component of the covariate matrix. Using the year of 2012, we test for the statistical significance of each factor at each time point, based on the proposed t -type statistic and its distribution given in Theorem 5. Then for each factor, we find the percentage of the t -type statistics that are significant at a 95% confidence level across the 251 time periods. Based on the two different ordering strategies, Tables 1 and 2, respectively, show the annualized standard deviations of the factor returns, the percentage of significant t -type statistics for each factor, and the median p-value at $\tau = 0.5$. We can see that the results are consistent for different values of κ and b and for the two different

Figure 1: The plots of the estimated loading functions for the year of 2009 (dotted-dashed red lines), 2010 (dotted magenta lines), 2011 (dashed blue lines), and 2012 (solid black lines) at $\tau = 0.2$.




Figure 2: The plots of the estimated loading functions for the year of 2009 (dotted-dashed red lines), 2010 (dotted magenta lines), 2011 (dashed blue lines), and 2012 (solid black lines) at $\tau = 0.5$.





Figure 3: The plots of the estimated loading functions for the year of 2009 (dotted-dashed red lines), 2010 (dotted magenta lines), 2011 (dashed blue lines), and 2012 (solid black lines) at $\tau = 0.8$.



orderings of the data. Moreover, all five factors are statistically significant with the median p-value smaller than 0.05.

7 Conclusions and discussion

We have taken for granted that the J factors are present in the sense that

$$\text{p} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{jt}^0 \neq 0 \quad (7.1)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, J$. For the factors in our application this is quite a standard assumption, but in some cases one might wish to test this because if this condition fails, then the right hand side of (2.4) is close to zero and this equation cannot identify $g_j^0(x_j)$. We outline below a test of the hypothesis (7.1) based on the unstructured additive quantile regression model (2.3). A more limited objective is to test whether for a given time period t , $f_{jt} = 0$.

We are interested in testing the hypothesis that

$$H_{0_{A_j}} : \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}(x_j) = 0 \text{ for all } x_j, \quad (7.2)$$

against the general alternative that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}(x_j) = \mu_j(x_j)$ with $\int \mu_j(x_j)^2 dP_j(x_j) > 0$. We also may be interested in a joint test $H_0 = \cap_{j \in I_J} H_{0_{A_j}}$, where I_J is a set of integers, which is a subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, J\}$. These are tests of the presence of a factor.

We let

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,N,T} = \frac{\int \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{h}_{jt}(x_j) \right)^2 dP_j(x_j) - a_{N,T}}{s_{N,T}},$$

where $\hat{h}_{jt}(\cdot)$ is an estimator of the additive component function $h_{jt}(\cdot)$ from the quantile additive model at time t , while $a_{N,T}$ and $s_{N,T}$ are constants to be determined. Under the null hypothesis (7.2) we may show that

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,n,T} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

while under the alternative we have $\hat{\tau}_{j,n,T} \rightarrow \infty$ with probability approaching one. To ensure that $\hat{\tau}_{j,n,T}$ has an asymptotic distribution, we may need a two-step estimator for the additive functions $h_{jt}(\cdot)$ as given in Horowitz and Mammen (2011) or Ma and Yang (2011). This interesting and challenging technical problem deserves further investigation, and it can be a good future research topic.

Table 1: Factor return statistics at $\tau = 0.5$ for the year of 2012 when the data are ordered according to the firm size.

(κ, b)		Intercept	Size	Value	Momentum	Volatility
(0.5, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.024	0.023	0.025	0.025	0.029
	% Periods significant	92.43	65.34	62.95	64.54	74.10
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.010	0.016	0.009	0.001
(0.5, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.020	0.020	0.022	0.022	0.026
	% Periods significant	91.63	58.17	57.20	58.17	66.93
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.020	0.019	0.020	0.010
(0.5, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.018	0.019	0.019	0.020	0.023
	% Periods significant	90.84	55.78	56.40	55.38	66.93
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.032	0.028	0.023	0.006
(1.0, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.026	0.026	0.027	0.027	0.032
	% Periods significant	92.03	62.95	63.60	62.15	71.31
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.014	0.019	0.011	0.002
(1.0, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.022	0.023	0.023	0.024	0.028
	% Periods significant	90.44	55.20	56.40	55.98	65.74
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.036	0.030	0.033	0.011
(1.0, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.019	0.022	0.021	0.021	0.025
	% Periods significant	89.24	56.20	55.40	58.80	62.95
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.032	0.032	0.026	0.016
(1.5, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.027	0.028	0.029	0.029	0.034
	% Periods significant	92.03	59.76	55.38	61.75	70.12
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.021	0.032	0.015	0.003
(1.5, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.023	0.025	0.025	0.026	0.031
	% Periods significant	90.44	56.57	55.94	55.94	63.75
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.030	0.030	0.036	0.014
(1.5, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.020	0.019	0.022	0.022	0.026
	% Periods significant	88.44	58.14	56.80	56.00	61.75
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.027	0.028	0.024	0.018

Table 2: Factor return statistics at $\tau = 0.5$ for the year of 2012 when the data are ordered according to the first principal component of the covariate matrix.

(κ, b)		Intercept	Size	Value	Momentum	Volatility
(0.5, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.023	0.027	0.025	0.025	0.027
	% Periods significant	94.02	62.15	62.55	67.73	75.30
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.023	0.018	0.011	< 0.001
(0.5, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.019	0.024	0.022	0.021	0.023
	% Periods significant	92.43	57.60	54.20	58.96	70.92
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.023	0.032	0.019	0.001
(0.5, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.016	0.021	0.020	0.019	0.020
	% Periods significant	92.83	55.60	56.40	61.60	71.31
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.028	0.028	0.018	0.004
(1.0, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.025	0.031	0.027	0.027	0.030
	% Periods significant	93.23	56.18	58.96	66.14	73.71
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.036	0.023	0.014	0.002
(1.0, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.020	0.026	0.024	0.024	0.025
	% Periods significant	92.03	54.80	56.20	59.60	71.20
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.030	0.030	0.019	0.002
(1.0, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.016	0.024	0.022	0.022	0.022
	% Periods significant	92.80	56.20	55.40	56.80	68.80
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.027	0.031	0.029	0.002
(1.5, 0.2)	Annualized volatility	0.027	0.030	0.029	0.028	0.032
	% Periods significant	92.03	56.00	54.40	68.00	74.00
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.033	0.032	0.013	0.002
(1.5, 0.4)	Annualized volatility	0.021	0.028	0.026	0.026	0.026
	% Periods significant	92.03	56.60	55.90	55.20	68.00
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.028	0.028	0.030	0.002
(1.5, 0.6)	Annualized volatility	0.018	0.025	0.024	0.023	0.024
	% Periods significant	92.03	58.10	54.80	56.00	67.60
	Overall p-value	< 0.001	0.027	0.030	0.029	0.003

8 Acknowledge

Ma's research was partially supported by NSF grants DMS 1306972 and DMS 1712558. Gao's research was supported by the Australian Research Council Discovery Grants Program for its support under Grant numbers: DP150101012 & DP170104421.

9 Appendix

We first introduce some notations which will be used throughout the Appendix. Let $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ denote the largest and smallest eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} , respectively. For an $m \times n$ real matrix \mathbf{A} , we denote $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{ij}|$. For any vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i|$. We first study the asymptotic properties of the initial estimators $\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j)$ of $g_j^0(x_j)$. The following proposition gives the convergence rate of $\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j)$ that will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

Proposition 1. *Let Conditions (C1)-(C4) hold. If, in addition, $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$, then for every $1 \leq j \leq J$,*

$$\sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)| = O_p(K_N/\sqrt{NT} + K_N^2 N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{-r}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

$$\left[\int \{\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)\}^2 dx_j \right]^{1/2} = O_p(\sqrt{K_N/(NT)} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{-r}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

9.1 Proof of Proposition 1

According to the result on page 149 of de Boor (2001), for h_{jt}^0 satisfying the smoothness condition given in (C2), there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{jt}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n}$ such that $h_{jt}^0(x_j) = \tilde{h}_{jt}^0(x_j) + b_{jt}(x_j)$

$$\tilde{h}_{jt}^0(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{jt}^0 \text{ and } \sup_{j,t} \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |b_{jt}(x_j)| = O(K_N^{-r}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Denote $\tilde{h}_t^0(x) = \{\tilde{h}_{jt}^0(x_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}^{\top}$, and

$$b_t(x) = \sum_{j=1}^J h_{jt}^0(x_j) - B(x)^{\top} \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^0,$$

where $B(x) = \{B_1(x_1)^{\top}, \dots, B_J(x_J)^{\top}\}^{\top}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t^0 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1t}^{0\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Jt}^{0\top})^{\top}$. Then by (A.1), we have

$$\sup_{x \in [a,b]^J} |b_t(x)| = O(K_N^{-r}).$$

Then $\mathbb{B}(x)(\tilde{h}_{ut}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t^{\top})^{\top} = (\tilde{h}_{ut}, \tilde{h}_t(x)^{\top})^{\top}$ and $\mathbb{B}(x)(h_{ut}^0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^{0\top})^{\top} = (h_{ut}^0, \tilde{h}_t^0(x)^{\top})^{\top}$, where

$$\mathbb{B}(x) = [\text{diag}\{1, B_1(x_1)^{\top}, \dots, B_J(x_J)^{\top}\}]_{(1+J) \times (1+JK_N)}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$\tilde{h}_t(x) = \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}^{\top}$, and $\tilde{h}_{jt}(\cdot)$ are the estimators given in Section 3.2. We first give the Bernstein inequality for a ϕ -mixing sequence, which is used through our proof.

Lemma 1. Let $\{\xi_i\}$ be a sequence of centered real-valued random variables. Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$. Suppose the sequence has the ϕ -mixing coefficient satisfying $\phi(k) \leq \exp(-2ck)$ for some $c > 0$ and $\sup_{i \geq 1} |\xi_i| \leq M$. Then there is a positive constant C_1 depending only on c such that for all $n \geq 2$

$$P(|S_n| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{C_1 \varepsilon^2}{v^2 n + M^2 + \varepsilon M (\log n)^2}\right),$$

where $v^2 = \sup_{i > 0} (\text{var}(\xi_i) + 2 \sum_{j > i} |\text{cov}(\xi_i, \xi_j)|)$.

Proof. The result of Lemma 1 is given in Theorem 2 on page 275 of Merlevéde, Peligrad and Rio (2009) when the sequence $\{\xi_i\}$ has the α -mixing coefficient satisfying $\alpha(k) \leq \exp(-2ck)$ for some $c > 0$. Thus, this result also holds for the sequence having the ϕ -mixing coefficient satisfying $\phi(k) \leq \exp(-2ck)$, since $\alpha(k) \leq \phi(k) \leq \exp(-2ck)$. \square

Denote $B(X_i) = \{B_1(X_{1i})^\top, \dots, B_J(X_{Ji})^\top\}^\top$ and $Z_i = [\{1, B(X_i)^\top\}^\top]_{(1+JK_N) \times 1}$. Denote $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t = (h_{ut}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^\top)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 = (h_{ut}^0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^{0\top})^\top$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} G_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) &= [\tau - I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)\}] Z_i, \\ G_{tN,i}^*(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) &= [\tau - F_i[\{Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)\} | X_i, f_t]] Z_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $F_i(\varepsilon | X_i, f_t) = P(\varepsilon_{it} \leq \varepsilon | X_i, f_t)$, and $\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) = G_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) - G_{tN,i}^*(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t)$. Let $d(N) = (1 + JK_N)$.

Let $\Psi_{Nt} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) Z_i Z_i^\top$. By the same reasoning as the proofs for (ii) of Lemma A.7 in Ma and Yang (2011), we have with probability approaching 1, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, there exist constants $0 < C_1 \leq C_2 < \infty$ such that

$$C_1 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Psi_{Nt}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Psi_{Nt}) \leq C_2, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

uniformly in $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Next lemma presents the Bahadur representation for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t = (\tilde{h}_{ut}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t^\top)^\top$ using the results in Lemmas S.1-S.3 given in the Supplemental Materials.

Lemma 2. Under Conditions (C1)-(C3), and $K_N^3 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^2 N^{-1} (\log NT)^2 (\log N)^8 = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-r+1} (\log T) = o(1)$,

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 = D_{Nt,1} + D_{Nt,2} + R_{Nt}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Nt,1} &= \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} \left[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)) \right], \\ D_{Nt,2} &= \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} \left[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \{p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jt}(X_{ji})\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

uniformly in t , and the remaining term R_{Nt} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}\| &= O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r} + N^{-1/2} K_N^{-r/2+1/2} \sqrt{\log K_N T}) \\ &= O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma S.3 in the Supplemental Materials, we have

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 = N^{-1} \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) Z_i b_t(X_i) - \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} G_{tN,i}^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) + R_{Nt}^*.$$

Moreover,

$$\Psi_{Nt}^{-1} G_{tN,i}^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) = \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} G_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) - \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} [\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) - \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)].$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 = \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) + \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) Z_i b_t(X_i) + R_{Nt}^{**}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$R_{Nt}^{**} = -\Psi_{Nt}^{-1} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) + \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) - \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)] + R_{Nt}^*. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By Lemmas S.1 and S.2 in the Supplemental Materials and (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}^{**}\| &\leq \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\Psi_{Nt}^{-1}\| \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t)\| \\ &\quad + \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\Psi_{Nt}^{-1}\| \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t) - \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)]\| + \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}^*\| \\ &= O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} + (K_N^2 N)^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r}). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) = \{\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} \leq 0)\} Z_{i,\ell}$ and $\overline{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) = \{\overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0), 1 \leq \ell \leq d(N)\}$. Then $E\{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\} = 0$. Moreover,

$$E\{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}^2 \leq E[I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq -b_t(X_i)\} - I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq 0\} Z_{i,\ell}]^2 \leq CK_N^{-r}$$

for some constant $0 < C < \infty$, and by Condition (C1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E\{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\} \{\tilde{G}_{tN,i'\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i'\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\} \\ &\leq 2 \times 4^2 \{\phi(|i' - i|)\}^{1/2} [E\{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}^2 E\{\tilde{G}_{tN,i'\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i'\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C' K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 |i' - i|/2} K_N^{-r}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the above results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}^2] \\ &\leq N^{-1} CK_N^{-r} + N^{-2} \sum_{i \neq i'} C' K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 |i' - i|/2} K_N^{-r} \\ &\leq CN^{-1} K_N^{-r} + C' K_1 N^{-2} N(1 - e^{-\lambda_1/2})^{-1} K_N^{-r} \leq C'' N^{-1} K_N^{-r}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < C'' < \infty$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} E\|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}\|^2 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{d(N)} E[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\tilde{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}^2] \\ &\leq C''(1 + JK_N) N^{-1} K_N^{-r}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the Bernstein's inequality in Lemma 1 and the union bound of probability, following the same procedure as the proof for Lemma S.1 given in the Supplemental Materials, we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - \overline{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\}\| = O_p(N^{-1/2} K_N^{-r/2+1/2} \sqrt{\log K_N T}). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Therefore, by (A.6), (A.7) and (A.8), we have $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 = D_{Nt,1} + D_{Nt,2} + R_{Nt}$, where

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}\| = O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} + (K_N^2 N)^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r} + N^{-1/2} K_N^{-r/2+1/2} \sqrt{\log K_N T}).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1. Let $\mathbf{1}_l$ be the $(J+1) \times 1$ vector with the l^{th} element as “1” and other elements as “0”. By (A.4) in Lemma 2, we have

$$\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - \tilde{h}_{jt}^0(x_j) = \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) (D_{Nt,1} + D_{Nt,2}) + \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) R_{Nt},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) R_{Nt})^2\}^{1/2} &\leq \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}\| [\lambda_{\max}\{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B_j(X_{ji}) B_j(X_{ji})^\top\}]^{1/2} \\ &= O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x \in [a,b]^J} |\mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) R_{Nt}| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in [a,b]^J} \|\mathbb{B}(x)^\top \mathbf{1}_{j+1}\| \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|R_{Nt}\| \\ &= O(K_N^{1/2}) O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1/2-2r} + N^{-1/2} K_N^{-r/2+1/2} \sqrt{\log K_N T}) \\ &= O_p(K_N^2 N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} + K_N^{1-2r}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

by the assumption that $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $r > 2$. Since $h_{jt}^0(x_j) = \tilde{h}_{jt}^0(x_j) + b_{jt}(x_j)$, then we have

$$\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j) = \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) (D_{Nt,1} + D_{Nt,2}) - b_{jt}(x_j) + \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) R_{Nt}.$$

Also by (A.1), we have $\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x \in [a,b]^J} |\mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) D_{Nt,2}| = O_p(K_N^{-r})$. Then $\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j)$ can be written as

$$\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j) = \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) D_{Nt,1} + \eta_{N,jt}(x_j), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the remaining term $\eta_{N,jt}(x_j)$ satisfies

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} [N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji})\}^2]^{1/2} = O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left\{ \int \eta_{N,jt}(x_j)^2 dx_j \right\}^{1/2} &= O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \\ \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\eta_{N,jt}(x_j)| &= O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^2 N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Moreover, by Bernstein's inequality and following the same procedure as the proof for Lemma S.1, we have $\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|D_{Nt,1}\| = O_p(\sqrt{K_N/N} \sqrt{\log K_N T})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x \in [a,b]^J} |1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) D_{Nt,1}| &= O_p(\sqrt{\log K_N T} K_N / \sqrt{N}), \\ \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) D_{Nt,1})^2\}^{1/2} &= O_p(\sqrt{\log K_N T} \sqrt{K_N/N}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Therefore, by (A.9), (A.10), (A.11) and (A.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) - h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\}^2 &= O_p((\log K_N T) K_N / N + N^{-2r}), \\ \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j)| &= O_p(\sqrt{\log K_N T} K_N N^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Moreover, by Conditions (C3) and (C4), we have with probability approaching 1, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$c_h \leq N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji}))^2 \leq C_h, \quad c_h \leq N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}))^2 \leq C_h. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Hence, this result together with (A.9) leads to that with probability approaching 1, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| 1/\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}))^2} - 1/\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji}))^2} \right| \\ &= \left| M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) - h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) + h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\} \right| \\ &= |2M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) - h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\} \{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\} \\ &\quad + M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}) - h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\}^2| \\ &\leq \left| 2M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T [1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) D_{Nt,1} \{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\} + \varrho_{it}] \right| \\ &\quad + 2M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) D_{Nt,1}\}^2 + \eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji}) \\ &\quad + 2M_{NT} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji})\}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

for M_{NT} satisfying $M_{NT} \in (c', C')$ for some constants $0 < c' < C' < \infty$, where $\varrho_{it} = \eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji}) \{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji})\}$. Moreover by (A.10), there exists a constant $C^* \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varrho_{it}| &\leq C^* \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |\eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji})| \\ &\leq C^* \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} [N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji})\}^2]^{1/2} \\ &= O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

and

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\eta_{N,jt}(X_{ji})\}^2 = O_p(K_N^{-2r}) + O_p(K_N^3 N^{-3/2} \log(NT)) + o_p(N^{-1}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Define $\psi_{it} = \{\psi_{it,\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^{d(N)} = \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} Z_i(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))$. Then $E(\psi_{it,\ell}) = 0$. Moreover, $E\|\psi_{it}\|^2 \leq c_1 K_N$ for some constant $0 < c_1 < \infty$, and by Condition (C1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E(\psi_{it}^\top \psi_{js})| &\leq 2\{\phi(\sqrt{|i-j|^2 + |t-s|^2})\}^{1/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d(N)} \{E(\psi_{it,\ell})^2 E(\psi_{js,\ell})^2\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \{\phi(\sqrt{|i-j|^2 + |t-s|^2})\}^{1/2} (E\|\psi_{it}\|^2 + E\|\psi_{js}\|^2) \\ &\leq 2c_1 K_N \{\phi(\sqrt{|i-j|^2 + |t-s|^2})\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Condition (C1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}\|^2 &= (NT)^{-2} \sum_{t,t'} \sum_{i,i'} E(\psi_{it}^\top \psi_{i't'}) \leq 2c_1 K_N (NT)^{-2} \sum_{t,t'} \sum_{i,i'} \{\phi(\sqrt{|i-j|^2 + |t-s|^2})\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2c_1 K_1 K_N (NT)^{-2} \sum_{t,t'} \sum_{i,i'} e^{-\lambda_1 \sqrt{|i-i'|^2 + |t-t'|^2}/2} \\ &\leq 2c_1 (NT)^{-2} K_1 K_N \sum_{t,t'} \sum_{i,i'} e^{-(\lambda_1/2)(|i-i'| + |t-t'|)} \\ &\leq 2c_1 K_1 K_N (NT)^{-2} (NT) \left(\sum_{k=0}^T e^{-(\lambda_1/2)k}\right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^N e^{-(\lambda_1/2)k}\right) \\ &\leq 2c_1 K_1 K_N (NT)^{-2} (NT) \{1 - e^{-(\lambda_1/2)}\}^{-2} = 2c_1 K_1 K_N \{1 - e^{-(\lambda_1/2)}\}^{-2} (NT)^{-1} = O\{K_N (NT)^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Markov's inequality,

$$\|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}\| = O_p[\{K_N (NT)^{-1}\}^{1/2}]. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Moreover, by the definition of $D_{Nt,1}$ given in (A.5), we have $D_{Nt,1} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T 1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) D_{Nt,1}| &= |N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N 1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) (NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}| \\ &\leq \|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}\| [\lambda_{\max}\{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B_j(X_{ji}) B_j(X_{ji})^\top\}]^{1/2} = O_p[\{K_N (NT)^{-1}\}^{1/2}]. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.12) and $\log(K_N T) K_N N^{-1/2} = o(1)$, we have

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{1_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(X_i) D_{Nt,1}\}^2 = \{O_p(\sqrt{\log K_N T} \sqrt{K_N/N})^2\} = o_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, the above results together with (A.15), (A.16) and (A.17) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| 1/\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}))^2} - 1/\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji}))^2} \right| \\ &= O_p[\{K_N (NT)^{-1}\}^{1/2}] + O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\varpi_{NT} = \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{h}_{jt}(X_{ji}))^2}$ and $\varpi_{NT}^0 = \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(X_{ji}))^2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j)/\varpi_{NT} - h_{jt}^0(x_j)/\varpi_{NT}^0\} \\ &= T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j)/\varpi_{NT} - h_{jt}^0(x_j)/\varpi_{NT}\} + T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{h_{jt}^0(x_j)/\varpi_{NT} - h_{jt}^0(x_j)/\varpi_{NT}^0\} \\ &= T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j)\}/\varpi_{NT} + T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(x_j)\{1/\varpi_{NT} - 1/\varpi_{NT}^0\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the above result and Condition (C3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T h_{jt}^0(x_j)\{1/\varpi_{NT} - 1/\varpi_{NT}^0\}| \\ &= O_p[\{K_N(NT)^{-1}\}^{1/2}] + O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (A.9) leads to that with probability approaching 1, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \{\tilde{h}_{jt}(x_j) - h_{jt}^0(x_j)\}/\varpi_{NT} \\ &= T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}_{j+1}^\top \mathbb{B}(x) D_{Nt,1}/\varpi_{NT} + T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{N,jt}(x_j)/\varpi_{NT} = \Phi_{NTj,1}(x_j) + \Phi_{NTj,2}(x_j). \end{aligned}$$

By (A.11) and (A.14),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\Phi_{NTj,2}(x_j)| = O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^2 N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \\ & \left\{ \int \Phi_{NTj,2}(x_j)^2 dx_j \right\}^{1/2} = O_p(K_N^{-r}) + O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By (A.14) and (A.18),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\Phi_{NTj,1}(x_j)| \leq c_h^{-1} \{ \|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}\|^2 \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} \|B_j(x_j)\|^2 \}^{1/2} \\ &= O_p\{K_N(NT)^{-1/2}\}, \\ & \left\{ \int \Phi_{NTj,1}(x_j)^2 dx_j \right\}^{1/2} \leq c_h^{-1} C_2 \{ \|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{it}\|^2 \}^{1/2} = O_p\{K_N^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the results in Proposition 1 follow from the above results directly. \square

9.2 Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

We first present the following several lemmas that will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. We define the infeasible estimator $f_t^* = \{f_{ut}^*, (f_{jt}^*, 1 \leq j \leq J)^\top\}^\top$ as the minimizer of

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) f_{jt}). \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Lemma 3. *Under Conditions (C1), (C2), (C4), (C5) and (C6), we have as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{N}(\Sigma_{Nt}^0)^{-1/2}(f_t^* - f_t^0) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{J+1}),$$

where Σ_{Nt}^0 is given in (4.1).

Proof. By Bahadur representation for the ϕ -mixing case (see Babu (1989)), we have

$$f_t^* - f_t^0 = \Lambda_{Nt}^{-1} \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))\} + v_{Nt}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

and $\|v_{Nt}\| = o_p(N^{-1/2})$ for every t , where $\Lambda_{Nt} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top$. By Conditions (C2) and (C5), we have that the eigenvalues of Λ_{Nt}^0 are bounded away from zero and infinity. By similar reasoning to the proof for Theorem 2 in Lee and Robinson (2016), we have $\|\Lambda_{Nt}^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$ and $\|\Lambda_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$. Thus, the asymptotic distribution in Lemma 3 can be obtained directly by Condition (C6). \square

Recall that the initial estimator $\hat{f}_t^{[0]}$ given in (3.2) is defined in the same way as f_t^* with $g_j^0(X_{ji})$ replaced by $\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(X_{ji})$ in (A.19). Then we have the following result for $\hat{f}_t^{[0]}$.

Lemma 4. *Let Conditions (C1)-(C5) hold. If, in addition, $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$, then for any t there is a stochastically bounded sequence $\delta_{N,jt}$ such that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{f}_t^{[0]} - f_t^* - d_{NT}\delta_{N,t}) = o_p(1),$$

where $\delta_{N,t} = (\delta_{N,jt}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top$ and d_{NT} is given in (4.3).

Proof. Denote $g = \{g_j(\cdot), 1 \leq j \leq J\}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Nt}(f_t, g) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(X_{ji}) f_{jt}) \\ &\quad - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut}^0 - \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(X_{ji}) f_{jt}^0), \end{aligned}$$

so that f_t^* and $\hat{f}_t^{[0]}$ are the minimizers of $L_{Nt}(f_t, g^0)$ and $L_{Nt}(f_t, \hat{g}^{[0]})$, respectively, where $\hat{g}^{[0]} = \{\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(\cdot), 1 \leq j \leq J\}$ and $g^0 = \{g_j^0(\cdot), 1 \leq j \leq J\}$. According to the result on page 149 of de Boer (2001), for g_j^0 satisfying the smoothness condition given in (C2), there exists $\lambda_j^0 \in R^{K_n}$ such that $g_j^0(x_j) = \tilde{g}_j^0(x_j) + r_j(x_j)$,

$$\tilde{g}_j^0(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \lambda_j^0 \text{ and } \sup_j \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |r_j(x_j)| = O(K_N^{-r}).$$

By Proposition 1, there exists $\lambda_{j,NT} \in R^{K_N}$ such that $\hat{g}_j^{[0]}(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \lambda_{j,NT}$ and $\|\lambda_{j,NT} - \lambda_j^0\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2})$. Let d'_{NT} be a sequence satisfying $d'_{NT} = o(N^{-1/2})$ and let $d_{NT}^* = d_{NT} + d'_{NT}$. In the following, we will show that

$$\tilde{f}_t - f_t^0 - d_{NT}\delta_{N,t} = \Lambda_{Nt}^{-1} \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.21})$$

uniformly in $\|\lambda_j - \lambda_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C} d_{NT}^*$ for some constant $0 < \tilde{C} < \infty$, where \tilde{f}_t is the minimizer of $L_{Nt}(f_t, g)$ and $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \lambda_j$. Hence the result in Lemma 4 follows from (A.20) and (A.21).

We have $\|\tilde{f}_t - f_t^*\| = o_p(1)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_{Nt}(f_t, g) - L_{Nt}(f_t, g^0)| \\ & \leq 2N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |\sum_{j=1}^J \{g_j(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\} f_{jt}| + 2N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |\sum_{j=1}^J \{g_j(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\} f_{jt}^0| \\ & \leq C_L \tilde{C} \{d_{NT} + o(N^{-1/2})\} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < C_L < \infty$, where the first inequality follows from the fact that $|\rho_\tau(u - v) - \rho_\tau(u)| \leq 2|v|$. Thus $\|\tilde{f}_t - f_t^0\| = o_p(1)$. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_N)^\top$, $G_i(X_i) = \{1, g_1(X_{1i}), \dots, g_J(X_{Ji})\}^\top$ and $\mathbf{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_T\}^\top$. Let

$$\psi_\tau(\varepsilon) = \tau - I(\varepsilon < 0).$$

For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \in R^{K_n}$ satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and f_t in a neighborhood of f_t^0 , write

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Nt}(f_t, g) &= E\{L_{Nt}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\} - (f_t - f_t^0)^\top \{W_{Nt,1} - E(W_{Nt,1}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})\} \\ &\quad + W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}), \end{aligned} \tag{A.22}$$

where $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$, and

$$W_{Nt,1} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i(X_i) \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)), \tag{A.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^\top G_i(X_i)) - \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)) \\ &\quad + (f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i) \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i))\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.24}$$

In Lemma S.4 in the Supplemental Materials, we show that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E\{L_{Nt}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\} = -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top E(W_{Nt,1}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}(f_t - f_t^0)^\top \Lambda_{Nt}^0(f_t - f_t^0) + o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2),$$

uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$, where ϖ_N is any sequence of positive numbers satisfying $\varpi_N = o(1)$. Substituting this into (A.22), we have with probability approaching 1,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Nt}(f_t, g) &= -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top W_{Nt,1} + \frac{1}{2}(f_t - f_t^0)^\top \Lambda_{Nt}^0(f_t - f_t^0) \\ &\quad + W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + o(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

In Lemma S.5 in the Supplemental Materials, we show that

$$W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) = o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2 + N^{-1}),$$

uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$. Thus, we have $\tilde{f}_t - f_t^0 = (\Lambda_{Nt}^0)^{-1} W_{Nt,1} + o_p(N^{-1/2})$. Since $\|(\Lambda_{Nt}^0)^{-1} - (\Lambda_{Nt})^{-1}\| = o_p(1)$, we have

$$\tilde{f}_t - f_t^0 = \Lambda_{Nt}^{-1} W_{Nt,1} + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \tag{A.25}$$

In Lemma S.6 in the Supplemental Materials, we show that for any t there is a stochastically bounded sequence $\delta_{N,jt}$ such that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$W_{Nt,1} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}) + d_{NT} \delta_{N,t} + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where $\delta_{N,t} = (\delta_{N,jt}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top$ and $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$, uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C} d_{NT}^*$. Hence, result (A.21) follows from (A.25) and (A.26) directly. Then the proof is complete. \square

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_J^\top)^\top$. For given $\hat{f}^{[0]}$, we obtain

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_1^{[1]\top}, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_J^{[1]\top})^\top = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \{ (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - \hat{f}_{it}^{[0]} - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \hat{f}_{jt}^{[0]}) \}.$$

Let $\hat{g}_j^{*[1]}(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^{[1]}$. The estimator for $g_j(x_j)$ at the 1st step is

$$\hat{g}_j^{[1]}(x_j) = \hat{g}_j^{*[1]}(x_j) / \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{g}_j^{*[1]}(X_{ji})^2}.$$

We define the infeasible estimator of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ as

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^{*\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_J^{*\top})^\top = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \{ (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{it}^0 - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j f_{jt}^0) \}.$$

Let $g_j^*(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^*$ and $\tilde{g}_j^*(x_j) = g_j^*(x_j) / \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j^*(X_{ji})^2}$.

Lemma 5. *Let Conditions (C1)–(C5) hold. If, in addition, $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$, then for every $1 \leq j \leq J$,*

$$\left[\int \{ \tilde{g}_j^*(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j) \}^2 dx_j \right]^{1/2} = O_p(K_N^{1/2} (NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r}), \quad (\text{A.27})$$

and

$$\int \{ \hat{g}_j^{[1]}(x_j) - \tilde{g}_j^*(x_j) \}^2 dx_j = O_p(d_{NT}^2) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Therefore, for every $1 \leq j \leq J$,

$$\int \{ \hat{g}_j^{[1]}(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j) \}^2 dx_j = O_p(d_{NT}^2) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.29})$$

Proof. Denote $\tilde{g}^0(x) = \{\tilde{g}_j^0(x_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}^\top$ and $g^*(x) = \{g_j^*(x_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}^\top$. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^{0\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_J^{0\top})^\top$. Let $\mathbb{B}^*(x) = [\text{diag}[B_1(x_1)^\top, \dots, B_J(x_J)^\top]]_{J \times JK_N}$. Then $\mathbb{B}^*(x) \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = g^*(x)$ and $\mathbb{B}^*(x) \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = \tilde{g}^0(x)$. Let $Q_{it}^0 = \{B_j(X_{ji})^\top f_{jt}^0, 1 \leq j \leq J\}^\top$,

$$\Psi_{NT} = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T f_\varepsilon(0 | X_i, f_t) Q_{it}^0 Q_{it}^{0\top}, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

and $r_{j,it}^* = r_j(X_{ji}) f_{jt}^0$. Moreover, define

$$\begin{aligned} U_{NT,1} &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T Q_{it}^0 (\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)), \\ U_{NT,2} &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T Q_{it}^0 f_\varepsilon(0 | X_i, f_t) \left(\sum_{j=1}^J r_{j,it}^* \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

By the same procedure as the proof of Lemma 2, for $K_N^4(\log(NT))^2(NT)^{-1} = o(1)$, we obtain the Bahadur representation for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0$ as

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = \Psi_{NT}^{-1}(U_{N,1} + U_{N,2}) + R_{NT}^*, \quad (\text{A.32})$$

and the remaining term R_{NT}^* satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{NT}^*\| &= O_p(K_N^{3/2}(NT)^{-1} + K_N^{3/2}(NT)^{-3/4}\sqrt{\log(NT)} + K_N^{1/2-2r} + (NT)^{-1/2}K_N^{-r/2+1/2}) \\ &= O_p(K_N^{3/2}(NT)^{-3/4}\sqrt{\log(NT)} + K_N^{1/2-2r}) + o_p((NT)^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By (A.32) and following the same reasoning as the proof for (A.13), we have $\sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |g_j^*(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)| = O_p(K_N(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r})$, $[\int \{g_j^*(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)\}^2 dx_j]^{1/2} = O_p(K_N^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r})$, and $[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{g_j^*(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\}^2]^{1/2} = O_p(K_N^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r})$. Therefore, we have

$$\{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j^*(X_{ji})^2}\}^{-1} - \{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j^0(X_{ji})^2}\}^{-1} = O_p(K_N^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r}),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x_j \in [a,b]} |\tilde{g}_j^*(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)| &= O_p(K_N(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r}), \\ [\int \{\tilde{g}_j^*(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)\}^2 dx_j]^{1/2} &= O_p(K_N^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2} + K_N^{-r}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the result (A.27) is proved. Define

$$\begin{aligned} L_{NT}^*(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j f_{jt}) \\ &\quad - (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \sum_{j=1}^J B_j(X_{ji})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0 f_{jt}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ are the minimizers of $L_{NT}^*(\widehat{f}^{[0]}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $L_{NT}^*(f^0, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, respectively. In Lemma S.7 in the Supplemental Materials, we show that

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 - \Psi_{NT}^{-1}U_{N,1}\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Hence, by (A.32), (A.33) and $\|\Psi_{NT}^{-1}U_{N,2}\| = O(K_N^{-r})$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Then we have $\int \{\widehat{g}_j^{*[1]}(x_j) - g_j^*(x_j)\}^2 dx_j = O_p(d_{NT}^2) + o_p(N^{-1})$ and $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\widehat{g}_j^{*[1]}(X_{ji}) - g_j^*(X_{ji})\}^2 = O_p(d_{NT}^2) + o_p(N^{-1})$. Thus,

$$\{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{g}_j^{*[1]}(X_{ji})^2}\}^{-1} - \{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j^*(X_{ji})^2}\}^{-1} = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, the result (A.28) follows from the above results directly. \square

Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Based on (A.29) in Lemma 5, the result in Lemma 4 holds for $\widehat{f}_t^{[1]}$ with a different bounded sequence. Then the result (A.29) in Lemma 5 holds for $\widehat{g}_j^{[2]}(x_j)$. This process can be continued for any finite number of iterations. By assuming that the algorithm in Section 3.1 converges at the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ step for any finite number i , the results in Lemmas 4 and 5 hold for $\widehat{f}_t = \widehat{f}_t^{[i+1]}$ and $\widehat{g}_j = \widehat{g}_j^{[i+1]}(x_j)$. Hence, Theorem 1 for \widehat{f}_t follows from Lemmas 3 and 4, directly, and Theorem 2 for \widehat{g}_j is proved by using Lemma 5. \square

9.3 Proofs of Theorem 3

Proof. We prove the consistency of $\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt}$. Define

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} = (Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N K \left(\frac{y_{it} - (f_{ut}^0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) f_{jt}^0)}{h} \right) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top,$$

and

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} = (Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N K \left(\frac{y_{it} - (\widehat{f}_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{g}_j(X_{ji}) \widehat{f}_{jt})}{h} \right) \widehat{G}_i(X_i) \widehat{G}_i(X_i)^\top.$$

We will show $\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt}\| = o_p(1)$ and $\|\widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$, respectively. Let $\widehat{d}_{it}(X_i) = \{\widehat{f}_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{g}_j(X_{ji}) \widehat{f}_{jt}\} - \{f_{ut}^0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) f_{jt}^0\}$. Then,

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} = D_{Nt,1} + D_{Nt,2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Nt,1} &= (2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h) - I(|\varepsilon_{it} - \widehat{d}_{it}(X_i)| \leq h)\} G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top, \\ D_{Nt,2} &= (2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N I(|\varepsilon_{it} - \widehat{d}_{it}(X_i)| \leq h) \{\widehat{G}_i(X_i) \widehat{G}_i(X_i)^\top - G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since there exist some constants $0 < c_f, c_1 < \infty$ such that with probability approaching 1,

$$E\{\widehat{d}_{it}(X_i)\}^2 = \int \widehat{d}_{it}^2(x) f_{X_i}(x) dx \leq c_f \int \widehat{d}_{it}^2(x) dx \leq c_1 \phi_{NT}^2 + o(N^{-1}),$$

where ϕ_{NT} is given in (4.2), and the last inequality follows from the result in Theorem 2, then there exists some constant $0 < c < \infty$ such that with probability approaching 1,

$$\begin{aligned} E\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt}\| &\leq c(2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E|\widehat{d}_{it}(X_i)| \times \|G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\| \\ &\leq c(2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E\{\widehat{d}_{it}(X_i)\}^2 E\|G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\|^2\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq cc_1^{1/2} (2Nh)^{-1} (\sqrt{K_N/(NT)} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log N} + K_N^{-r}) \times \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^N \{E\|G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\|^2\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Condition (C3), we have $\sup_{x_j \in [a, b]} |g_j^0(x_j)| \leq C'$ for all j , for any vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^{J+1}$ and $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}^\top G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top \mathbf{a} &= \{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) a_j\}^2 \leq (J+1) \{a_0^2 + g_j^0(X_{ji})^2 a_j^2\} \\ &\leq (J+1) \{a_0^2 + (C')^2 a_j^2\} \leq C_a \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < C_a < \infty$. Hence, $\|G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\| \leq C_a$, and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt}\| &\leq cc_1^{1/2} (2Nh)^{-1} (\phi_{NT} + o(N^{-1/2})) \sum_{i=1}^N C_a \\ &= 2^{-1} cc_1^{1/2} C_a h^{-1} (\phi_{NT} + o(N^{-1/2})) = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by the assumption that $h^{-1}\phi_{NT} = o(1)$ and $h^{-1}N^{-1/2} = O(1)$. Hence, we have $\|D_{Nt,1}\| = o_p(1)$. Moreover, for any vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^{J+1}$ and $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 = 1$, we have with probability approaching 1, there exists a constant $0 < C < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{a}^\top D_{Nt,2} \mathbf{a}| &\leq (2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |\{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{g}_j(X_{ji}) a_j\}^2 - \{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) a_j\}^2| \\ &\leq C(2Nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J |\{\widehat{g}_j(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\} a_j| \\ &\leq C(2h)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\widehat{g}_j(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\}^2 a_j^2\}^{1/2} \\ &= O(h^{-1}) \{O(\phi_{NT}) + o(N^{-1/2})\} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $\|D_{Nt,2}\| = o_p(1)$. Therefore, $\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt}\| \leq \|D_{Nt,1}\| + \|D_{Nt,2}\| = o_p(1)$. Next, we will show $\|\widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &|E\{(2h)^{-1} I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h) - p_i(0|X_i) | X_i, f_t\}| \\ &= |(2h)^{-1} h \{p_i(h^*|X_i, f_t) + p_i(-h^{**}|X_i, f_t)\} - p_i(0|X_i, f_t)| \\ &= |2^{-1} [\{p_i(h^*|X_i, f_t) - p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\} + \{p_i(-h^{**}|X_i, f_t) - p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\}]| \leq c'h \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < c' < \infty$, where h^* and h^{**} are some values between 0 and h , and the last inequality follows from Condition (C2), then by the above result and Condition (C5),

$$\begin{aligned} \|E(\widetilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0)\| &= \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E[\{(2h)^{-1} I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h) - p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\} G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top]\| \\ &\leq c'h \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E Q_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top\| = O(h) = o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

Moreover, by Conditions (C1), we have $E\{I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h)\} \leq 2C^*h$ for some constant $C^* \in (0, \infty)$, and then for any vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^{(J+1)}$ with $\|\mathbf{a}\| = 1$, by Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3),

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{var}(\mathbf{a}^\top \tilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} \mathbf{a}) \\
&= (2Nh)^{-2} \text{var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h) \{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) a_j\}^2 \right) \\
&\leq (2Nh)^{-2} \sum_{i,i'} 2\{\phi(|i-i'|)\}^{1/2} \times \\
&\quad \left(E \left[I(|\varepsilon_{it}| \leq h) \{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) a_j\}^4 \right] \right)^{1/2} \left(E \left[I(|\varepsilon_{i't'}| \leq h) \{a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji'}) a_j\}^4 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq (J+1)^2 \{a_0^2 + C'^2 a_j^2\} (2Nh)^{-2} (2C^*h)^2 \sum_{i,i'} 2\{\phi(|i-i'|)\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq (J+1)^2 \{a_0^2 + C'^2 a_j^2\} N^{-2} 2C^{*2} K_1 \sum_{i,i'} e^{-(\lambda_1/2)(|i-i'|)} \\
&\leq (J+1)^2 \{a_0^2 + C'^2 a_j^2\} 2C^{*2} K_1 N^{-1} \{1 - e^{-(\lambda_1/2)}\} = O(N^{-1}) = o(1). \tag{A.36}
\end{aligned}$$

By (A.35) and (A.36), we have $\|\tilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$. Hence, $\|\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| \leq \|\hat{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \tilde{\Lambda}_{Nt}\| + \|\tilde{\Lambda}_{Nt} - \Lambda_{Nt}^0\| = o_p(1)$. \square

9.4 Proofs of Theorem 4

Proof. Let $S_{[rN]t} = \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))$, where $[a]$ denotes the largest integer no greater than a . Let $M = bN$. Define $\Lambda_{Nt}(r) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} p_i(0|X_i, f_t) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top$, $F_{Nt}(r) = N^{-1/2} S_{[rN]t}$, and

$$D_{bN}(r) = N^2 \left(K^* \left(\frac{[rN] + 1}{bN} \right) - K^* \left(\frac{[rN]}{bN} \right) \right) - \left(K^* \left(\frac{[rN]}{bN} \right) - K^* \left(\frac{[rN] - 1}{bN} \right) \right).$$

Denote $K_{ij}^* = K^* \left(\frac{i-j}{bN} \right)$, and $\hat{w}_{Nt} = \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{G}_i(X_i) \hat{G}_i(X_i)^\top - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{v}_{it} \hat{v}_{it}^\top$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Omega}_{Nt,N} &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{v}_{it} K_{ij}^* \hat{v}_{jt}^\top + \hat{w}_{Nt} \\
&= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{v}_{it} \sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij}^* \hat{v}_{jt}^\top) + \hat{w}_{Nt}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $\hat{S}_{nt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_{it}$. By the assumptions in Theorem 1, $\phi_{NT} N^{1/2} = o(1)$ and by the results in Lemmas 3-5, we have

$$\hat{f}_t - f_t^0 = \Lambda_{Nt}^{-1} \{ N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)) \} + o_p(N^{-1/2}), \tag{A.37}$$

$$\sup_{x_j \in \mathcal{X}_j} |\hat{g}_j(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)| = O_p(\phi_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}) = o_p(N^{-1/2}). \tag{A.38}$$

Let $r \in (0, 1]$. Let $\tilde{S}_{[rN]t} = \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\hat{\varepsilon}_{it}^0 < 0))$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_{it}^0 = y_{it} - \{\hat{f}_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji}) \hat{f}_{jt}\}$. By Lemma S.6, we have

$$\|N^{-1/2} \hat{S}_{[rN]t} - N^{-1/2} \tilde{S}_{[rN]t}\| = o_p(1). \tag{A.39}$$

For any given $f_t \in R^{J+1}$, define $S_{[rN]t}(f_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it}(f_t) < 0))$, where $\varepsilon_{it}(f_t) = y_{it} - \{f_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J g_j^0(X_{ji})f_{jt}\}$. Following similar arguments to the proof in Lemma S.8, we have

$$\sup_{\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})} \|N^{-1/2}[S_{[rN]t}(f_t) - S_{[rN]t}(f_t^0) - E[\{S_{[rN]t}(f_t) - S_{[rN]t}(f_t^0)\}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}]]\| = o_p(1).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-1/2} E[\{S_{[rN]t}(f_t) - S_{[rN]t}(f_t^0)\}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} G_i^0(X_i) E[(I(\varepsilon_{it}(f_t^0) < 0) - I(\varepsilon_{it}(f_t) < 0))|X_i, f_t], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.40})$$

and thus by Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|N^{-1/2} E[\{S_{[rN]t}(f_t) - S_{[rN]t}(f_t^0)\}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}] \\ & - N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} p_i(0|X_i, f_t) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top (f_t^0 - f_t)\| = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Hence, by (A.39), (A.40) and (A.41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1/2} \widehat{S}_{[rN]t} &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0)) \\ &- N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{[rN]} p_i(0|X_i, f_t) G_i^0(X_i) G_i^0(X_i)^\top (\widehat{f}_t - f_t^0) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

This result, together with (A.37), implies

$$N^{-1/2} \widehat{S}_{[rN]t} = F_{Nt}(r) - \Lambda_{Nt}(r) \{\Lambda_{Nt}(1)\}^{-1} F_{Nt}(1) + o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.42})$$

Thus, $N^{-1/2} \widehat{S}_{Nt} = o_p(1)$. By following the argument above again, we have $\|N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{v}_{jt} K_{jN}^* - N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{jt} K_{jN}^*\| = O_p(1)$. Also $\|N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{jt} K_{jN}^*\| = O_p(1)$ by the weak law of large numbers. Hence, $\|N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{v}_{jt} K_{jN}^*\| = O_p(1)$. Therefore

$$N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{v}_{jt} K_{jN}^* \widehat{S}_{Nt}^\top = O_p(1) o_p(1) = o_p(1).$$

By (A.37) and (A.38), $\widehat{w}_{Nt} = o_p(1)$. By this result and also applying the identity that $\sum_{l=1}^N a_l b_l = (\sum_{l=1}^{N-1} (a_l - a_{l+1}) \sum_{j=1}^l b_j) + a_N \sum_{l=1}^N b_l$ to $\sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij}^* \widehat{v}_j^\top$ and then again to the sum over i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN} &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} N^2 ((K_{ij}^* - K_{i,j+1}^*) - (K_{i+1,j}^* - K_{i+1,j+1}^*)) N^{-1/2} \widehat{S}_{it} N^{-1/2} \widehat{S}_{jt}^\top \\ &+ N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{v}_{jt} K_{jN}^* \widehat{S}_{Nt}^\top + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} ((K_{ij}^* - K_{i,j+1}^*) - (K_{i+1,j}^* - K_{i+1,j+1}^*)) \frac{\widehat{S}_{it}}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{\widehat{S}_{jt}^\top}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &+ o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

Moreover,

$$N^2((K_{ij}^* - K_{i,j+1}^*) - (K_{i+1,j}^* - K_{i+1,j+1}^*)) = -D_{bN}\{(i-j)/N\}. \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Also $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} D_{bN}(r) = \frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''}(\frac{r}{b})$, $\|\Lambda_{Nt}(r) - r\Lambda_t^0\| = o_p(1)$, where $\Lambda_t^0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_{Nt}^0$ and $F_{Nt}(r) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} W_{J+1}(r)\Upsilon^\top$. Thus,

$$(\Lambda_{Nt}(r), F_{Nt}(r)^\top, D_{bN}(r)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \left(r\Lambda_t^0, \Upsilon W_{J+1}(r)^\top, \frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''}\left(\frac{r}{b}\right) \right). \quad (\text{A.45})$$

Hence, by (A.42), (A.43), and (A.44), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_{Nt, M=bN} &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -D_{bN}(r-s)[F_{Nt}(r) - \Lambda_{Nt}(r)\{\Lambda_{Nt}(1)\}^{-1}F_{Nt}(1)] \\ &\quad \times [F_{Nt}(s) - \Lambda_{Nt}(s)\{\Lambda_{Nt}(1)\}^{-1}F_{Nt}(1)]^\top dr ds + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

By the continuous mapping theorem,

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{N, M=bN} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Upsilon \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''}\left(\frac{r-s}{b}\right) \{W_{J+1}(r) - rW_{J+1}(1)\} \{W_{J+1}(s) - sW_{J+1}(1)\}^\top dr ds \Upsilon^\top.$$

Then the proof is completed. \square

9.5 Proofs of Theorems 5 and 6

Proof. By (A.37), $\widehat{f}_t - f_t^0 = N^{-1/2}\Lambda_{Nt}(1)^{-1}F_{Nt}(1) + o_p(N^{-1/2})$. Then under H_0 , we have

$$N^{1/2}(\widehat{Rf}_t - r) = R\Lambda_{Nt}(1)^{-1}F_{Nt}(1) + o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.47})$$

It directly follows from (A.45), (A.46) and (A.47) that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Nt,b} &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \{R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)\}^\top \{R\tau(1-\tau)\Lambda_t^{0-1} \\ &\quad \times (\Upsilon \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{*''}\left(\frac{r-s}{b}\right) B_{J+1}(r) B_{J+1}(s)^\top dr ds \Upsilon^\top) \Lambda_t^{0-1} R^\top\}^{-1} \\ &\quad \times R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)/q. \end{aligned}$$

Since $R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)$ is a $q \times 1$ vector of normal random variables with mean zero and variance $R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon\Upsilon^\top\Lambda_t^{0-1}R^\top$, $R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)$ can be written as $\Upsilon_t^* W_q(1)$, where $\Upsilon_t^* \Upsilon_t^{*\top} = R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon\Upsilon^\top\Lambda_t^{0-1}R^\top$. Then replacing $R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)$ by $\Upsilon_t^* W_q(1)$ and canceling Υ_t^* in the above equation, we have the result in Theorem 5. Moreover, under the alternative that H_1 : $Rf_t^0 = r + cN^{-1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{1/2}(\widehat{Rf}_t - r) &= N^{1/2}(Rf_t^0 - r) + R\Lambda_{Nt}(1)^{-1}F_{Nt}(1) + o_p(1) \\ &= c + R\Lambda_{Nt}(1)^{-1}F_{Nt}(1) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (A.45), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{Nt,b} &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \{c + R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)\}^\top \{R\tau(1-\tau)\Lambda_t^{0-1} \\
&\times (\Upsilon \int_0^1 \int_0^1 -\frac{1}{b^2} K^{**}(\frac{r-s}{b}) B_{J+1}(r) B_{J+1}(s)^\top dr ds \Upsilon^\top) \Lambda_t^{0-1} R^\top\}^{-1} \\
&\times \{c + R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1)\}/q.
\end{aligned}$$

Also $c + R\Lambda_t^{0-1}\Upsilon W_{J+1}(1) \equiv c + \Upsilon_t^* W_q(1) = \Upsilon_t^* (\Upsilon_t^{*-1} c + W_q(1))$. Then the result in Theorem 6 follows from the above results. The proof is completed. \square

References

- [1] Angrist, J., and Pischke, J. (2009): “Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist’s Companion,” 1st Edition, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- [2] Babu, G. J. (1989): “Strong Representations for LAD Estimators in Linear Models,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 83, 547-558.
- [3] Bai, J. and Li, K. (2012): “Statistical Analysis of Factor Models of High Dimension,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 40,436-465.
- [4] Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002): “Determining the Number of Factors in Approximate Factor Models,” *Econometrica*, 70,191-221.
- [5] Banz, R.W. (1981): “The Relationship between Return and Market Value of Common Stocks,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 9, 3-18.
- [6] Bassett., G.W., Koenker, R. and Kordas, G. (2004): “Pessimistic Portfolio Allocation and Choquet Expected Utility,” *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 2, 477-492.
- [7] Basu, S. (1977): “The Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to Their Price to Earnings Ratio: a Test of the Efficient Markets Hypothesis,” *Journal of Finance*, 32, 663-682.
- [8] Bellman, R. E. (1961): “Adaptive Control Processes,” Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J..
- [9] Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., and Fernandez-Val, I. (2016): “Conditional Quantile Processes based on Series or Many Regressors,” Available at arXiv:1105.6154v1.
- [10] Boneva, L., Linton, O. and Vogt, M. (2015): “The Effect of Fragmentation in Trading on Market Quality in the UK Equity Market,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jae.2438>
- [11] Bosq, D. (1998): “Nonparametric Statistics for Stochastic Processes,” New York: Springer-Verlag.

- [12] Brown, S. J. (1989): “The Number of Factors in Security Returns,” *Journal of Finance*, 44, 1247-1262.
- [13] Bryzgalova, S. (2015): “Spurious Factors in Linear Asset Pricing Models. Working Paper.
- [14] Cai, T. and Liu, W. (2011): “Adaptive thresholding for sparse covariance matrix estimation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 672-684.
- [15] Chen, X. (2011): “Penalized Sieve Estimation and Inference of Semi-Nonparametric Dynamic Models: A Selective Review,” Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper No. 1804.
- [16] Chen, X., and Christensen, T. (2015): “Optimal Uniform Convergence Rates and Asymptotic Normality for Series Estimators under Weak Dependence and Weak Conditions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 188, 447-465.
- [17] Chen, X., and Liao, Z. (2012): “Asymptotic Properties of Penalized M Estimators with Time Series Observations,” In *Causality, Prediction and Specification Analysis: Essays in Honour of Halbert White* (eds. X. Chen and N. Swanson). Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [18] Chen, X., and Pouzo, D. (2015): “Sieve Quasi-Likelihood Ratio Inference on Semi-Nonparametric Conditional Moment Models,” *Econometrica*, 83, 1013-1079.
- [19] Conley, T. G. (1999): “GMM Estimation with Cross-Sectional Dependence,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 92, 1-45.
- [20] Connor, G., and Korajczyk, R.A. (1993): “A Test for the Number of Factors in an Approximate Factor Model,” *Journal of Finance*, 48, 1263-1288.
- [21] Connor, G., and Linton, O. (2007): “Semiparametric Estimation of a Characteristic-Based Factor Model of Stock Returns,” *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 14, 694-717.
- [22] Connor, G., Hagmann, M., and Linton, O. (2012): “Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of the Fama-French Model and Extensions,” *Econometrica*, 80, 713-754.
- [23] Daniel, K., and Titman, S. (1997): “Evidence on the Characteristics of Cross-sectional Variation in Stock Returns,” *Journal of Finance*, 52, 1-34.
- [24] Davis, J. (1994): “The Cross-Section of Realized Stock Returns: the pre-Compustat Evidence,” *Journal of Finance*, 49, 1579-1593.
- [25] de Boor, C. (2001): *A Practical Guide to Splines*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 27, New York: Springer.
- [26] Demko, S. (1986): “Spectral Bounds for $|a^{-1}|_{\infty}$,” *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 48, 207-212.

- [27] Dong, C., Gao, J. and Peng, B. (2015): “Semiparametric Single-Index Panel Data Models with Cross-Sectional Dependence,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 188, 301–312
- [28] Fama, E.F., and French, K.R. (1992): “The Cross-Section of Expected Stock Returns,” *Journal of Finance*, 47, 427-465.
- [29] Fama, E.F., and French, K.R. (1993): “Common Risk Factors in the Returns to Stocks and Bonds,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33, 3-56.
- [30] Fama, E.F., and French, K.R. (1995): “Size and Book to Market Factors in Earnings and Returns,” *Journal of Finance*, 50, 131-156.
- [31] Fama, E.F., and French, K.R. (1996): “Multifactor Explanations of Asset Pricing Anomalies,” *Journal of Finance*, 51, 55-84.
- [32] Fama, E.F., and French, K.R. (1998): “Value versus Growth: the International Evidence,” *Journal of Finance*, 53, 1975-2000.
- [33] Fan, J., Liao, Y. and, Micheva, M. (2013): “Large Covariance Estimation by Thresholding Principal Orthogonal Complements (with Discussion),” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 75, 603–680.
- [34] Fan, J., Liao, Y. and Wang, W. (2016): “Projected Principal Component Analysis in Factor Models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 44, 219-254.
- [35] Gao, J., Lu, Z., and Tjøstheim, D. (2006): “Estimation in Semiparametric Spatial Regression,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 34, 1395-1435.
- [36] Haugen, R. (1995): “The New Finance: the case against Efficient Markets,” New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- [37] He, X. and Shi, P. (1996): “Bivariate tensor-product B-splines in a partly linear model,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 58, 162-181.
- [38] Hodrick, R., Ng, D., and Sengmueller, P. (1999): “An International Dynamic Asset Pricing Model,” *International Taxation and Public Finance*, 6, 597-620.
- [39] Horowitz, J. L., and Lee, S. (2005): “Nonparametric Estimation of an Additive Quantile Regression Model,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 1238-1249.
- [40] Horowitz, J. L., and Mammen, E. (2011): “Oracle-Efficient Nonparametric Estimation of an Additive Model with an Unknown Link Function,” *Econometric Theory*, 27, 582–608.

- [41] Kiefer, N. M., and Vogelsang, T. J. (2002): “Heteroskedasticity–Autocorrelation Robust Standard Errors using the Bartlett Kernel without Truncation,” *Econometrica*, 70, 2093-2095.
- [42] Kiefer, N. M., and Vogelsang, T. J. (2005): “A New Asymptotic Theory for Heteroskedasticity–Autocorrelation Robust Tests,” *Econometric Theory*, 21, 1130-1164.
- [43] Knight, K. (1998): “Limiting Distribution for L_1 Regression Estimators under General Conditions,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 26, 755-770.
- [44] Koenker, R., and Bassett, G. (1978): “Regression Quantiles,” *Econometrica*, 46, 33-50.
- [45] Lakonishok, J., Shleifer, A., and Vishny, R.W. (1994): “Contrarian Investment, Extrapolation and Risk,” *Journal of Finance*, 49, 1541-1578.
- [46] Lam, C. and Yao, Q. (2012): “Factor Modeling for High-dimensional Time Series: Inference for the Number of Factors,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 40, 694-726.
- [47] Lee, J., and Robinson, P. M. (2016): “Series Estimation under Cross–Sectional Dependence,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 190, 1–17.
- [48] Lewellen, J. (1999): “The Time–Series Relations among Expected Return, Risk, and Book to Market Value,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 54, 5-44.
- [49] Li, Q., Cheng, G., Fan, J., and Wang, Y. (2017): “Embracing Blessing of Dimensionality in Factor Models,” *Journal of American Statistical Association*, forthcoming.
- [50] Ma, S., Song, Q., and Wang, L. (2013): “Simultaneous Variable Selection and Estimation in Semiparametric Modelling of Longitudinal/clustered Data,” *Bernoulli*, 19, 252-274.
- [51] Ma, S., and Yang, L. (2011): “Spline–Backfitted Kernel Smoothing of Partially Linear Additive Model,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 14, 204-219.
- [52] MacKinlay, A.C. (1995): “Multifactor Models do not Explain Deviations from the CAPM,” *Journal of Finance*, 38, 3-23.
- [53] Merlevède, Peligrad, F., M., and Rio, E. (2009): “Bernstein Inequality and Moderate Deviations under Strong Mixing Conditions,” *IMS Collections, High Dimensional Probability V: The Luminy Volume*, 5, 273-292.
- [54] Pesaran, M.H. (2006): “Estimation and Inference in Large Heterogeneous Panels with a Multifactor Error Structure,” *Econometrica*, 74, 967-1012.

- [55] Powell, J. L. (1991): “Estimation of Monotonic Regression Models under Quantile Restrictions,” In W. Barnett, J. Powell, G. Tauchen (Eds.), *Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models in Econometrics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [56] Robinson, P.M., and Thawornkaiwong, S. (2012): “Statistical Inference on Regression with Spatial Dependence,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 167, 521-542.
- [57] Rosenberg, B. (1974): Extra-Market Components of Covariance Among Security Prices,” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 9, 263-274.
- [58] Rosenberg, B., Reid, K., and Lanstein, R. (1985): “Persuasive Evidence of Market Inefficiency,” *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 11, 9-17.

10 Supplementary Material

In this supplement, we present Lemmas S.1-S.3 which are used to prove Lemma 2 in Section 9.1. We also give Lemmas S.4-S.6 which are used in the proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4, and Lemmas S.7-S.8 which are used in the proofs of Lemma 5 in Section 9.2.

Lemma S.1. *Under Conditions (C1) and (C2), and $K_N^2 N^{-1} (\log NT)^2 (\log N)^8 = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1} = o(1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0\| \leq CK_N^{1/2} N^{-1/2}} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \\ &= O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $B_N = \{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t : \|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0\| \leq CK_N^{1/2} N^{-1/2}\}$. By taking the same strategy as given in Lemma A.5 of Horowitz and Lee (2005), we cover the ball B_N with cubes $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})\}$, where $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})$ is a cube containing $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)$ with sides of $C\{d(N)/N^5\}^{1/2}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} \in B_N$. Then the number of the cubes covering the ball B_N is $V = (2N^2)^{d(N)}$. Moreover, we have $\|(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - (\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \leq C\{d(N)/N^{5/2}\}$ for any $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0 \in \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})$, where $v = 1, \dots, V$. First we can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t \in B_N} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} \sup_{(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) \in \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})\| \\ & \quad + \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \\ & = \Delta_{tN,1} + \Delta_{tN,2} \end{aligned} \tag{S.1}$$

Let $\gamma_N = C\{d(N)/n^{5/2}\}$. By the same argument as given in the proof of Lemma A.5 in Horowitz and Lee (2005), we have

$$\Delta_{tN,1} \leq \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,1v}| + \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,2v}|, \quad (\text{S.2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{tN,1v} &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Z_i\| [F_i[Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i) + \|Z_i\|\gamma_N|X_i, f_t] \\ &\quad - F_i[Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i) - \|Z_i\|\gamma_N|X_i, f_t]], \\ \Gamma_{tN,2v} &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_{tN,2v,i} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Z_i\| [I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i) + \|Z_i\|\gamma_N\} \\ &\quad - F_i\{Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i) + \|Z_i\|\gamma_N|X_i, f_t\}] \\ &\quad - [I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)\} - F_i\{Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)|X_i, f_t\}]. \end{aligned}$$

By Condition (C2), we have that there are some constants $0 < c', c'' < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,1v}| \leq c' \gamma_N \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|Z_i\| \|Z_i\| \leq c'' \{d(N)/N^{5/2}\} K_N = O(K_N^2 N^{-5/2}). \quad (\text{S.3})$$

Next we will show the convergence rate for $\max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,2v}|$. It is easy to see that $E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i}) = 0$. Also $|\Gamma_{tN,2v,i}| \leq 4\|Z_i\| \leq c_1 K_N^{1/2}$ for some constant $0 < c_1 < \infty$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|Z_i\| I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i) + \|Z_i\|\gamma_N\} - I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)\}]^2 \\ \asymp E\{\|Z_i\|^2 \|Z_i\|\gamma_N\} \leq c_2^* \gamma_N K_N^{1/2} \leq c_2 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $0 < c_2^* < c_2 < \infty$. Hence $E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i})^2 \leq c_2 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2}$. By Condition (C1), we have for $i \neq j$,

$$|E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i} \Gamma_{tN,2v,j})| \leq 2\phi(|j - i|)^{1/2} \{E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i}^2) E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,j}^2)\}^{1/2} \leq 2c_2 \phi(|j - i|)^{1/2} K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i})^2 + 2 \sum_{j>i} |E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i} \Gamma_{tN,2v,j})| \\ \leq c_2 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2} + 4c_2 \sum_{k=1}^N K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 k/2} K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2} \\ \leq c_2 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2} (1 + 4K_1 (1 - e^{-\lambda_1/2})^{-1}) = c_3 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_3 = c_2(1 + 4K_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1/2})^{-1})$. By Condition (C1), for each fixed t , the sequence $\{(X_i, f_t, \varepsilon_{it}), 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ has the ϕ -mixing coefficient $\phi(k) \leq K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 k}$ for $K_1, \lambda_1 > 0$. Thus, by the Bernstein's inequality given in Lemma 1, we have for N sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(|\Gamma_{tN,2v}| \geq a K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} (\log NT)^3\right) \\ \leq \exp\left(-\frac{C_1 (a K_N^{3/2} (\log NT)^3)^2}{c_3 K_N^{3/2} N^{-5/2} N + c_1^2 K_N + a K_N^{3/2} (\log NT)^3 c_1 K_N^{1/2} \log(N)^2}\right) \leq (NT)^{-c_4 a^2 K_N} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < c_4 < \infty$. By the union bound of probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,2v}| \geq aK_N^{3/2} N^{-1} (\log NT)^3 \right) \\ \leq (2N^2)^{d(N)} T (NT)^{-c_4 a^2 K_N} \leq 2^{d(N)} N^{2(1+JK_N) - c_4 a^2 K_N} T^{1 - c_4 a^2 K_N}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking a large enough, one has

$$P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,2v}| \geq aK_N^{3/2} N^{-1} (\log N)^3 \right) \leq 2^{K_N} N^{-K_N} T^{-K_N}.$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \max_{1 \leq v \leq V} |\Gamma_{tN,2v}| = O_p \{ K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} (\log NT)^3 \}. \quad (\text{S.4})$$

Next we will show the convergence rate for $\Delta_{tN,2}$. Let $\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})$ be the ℓ^{th} element in $\tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}) - \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, d(N)$. It is easy to see that $E\{\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})\} = 0$. Also $|\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})| \leq 4|Z_{i\ell}| \leq c_1 K_N^{1/2}$ for some constant $0 < c_1 < \infty$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[[I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq Z_i^\top(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) - b_t(X_i)\} - I\{\varepsilon_{it} \leq -b_t(X_i)\}] Z_{i\ell} \right]^2 \\ \leq c'_1 \|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0\| K_N^{1/2} \leq c'_1 C K_N^{1/2} N^{-1/2} K_N^{1/2} = c'_1 C K_N N^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < c'_1 < \infty$. Hence $E(\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}))^2 \leq c'_1 C K_N N^{-1/2}$. By Condition (C1), we have for $i \neq j$,

$$|E(\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}) \tilde{g}_{tN,j,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}))| \leq 4\phi(|j - i|)^{1/2} \{E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,i}^2) E(\Gamma_{tN,2v,j}^2)\}^{1/2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E(\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}))^2 + 2 \sum_{j>i} |E(\tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}) \tilde{g}_{tN,j,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}))| \\ \leq c'_1 C K_N N^{-1/2} + 4 \sum_{k=1}^N K_1 e^{-\lambda_1 k/2} c'_1 C K_N N^{-1/2} \\ \leq c'_1 C K_N N^{-1/2} (1 + 4K_1 (1 - e^{-\lambda_1/2})^{-1}) = c_2 K_N N^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_2 = c'_1 C (1 + 4K_1 (1 - e^{-\lambda_1/2})^{-1})$. Thus, by the Bernstein's inequality given in Lemma 1 and $K_N^2 N^{-1} (\log NT)^2 (\log N)^8 = o(1)$, we have for N sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})| \geq aK_N N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} \right) \\ \leq \exp \left(- \frac{C_1 (aK_N N^{1/4} \sqrt{\log NT})^2}{c_2 K_N N^{-1/2} N + c_1^2 K_N + aK_N N^{1/4} (\log NT)^{1/2} c_1 K_N^{1/2} (\log N)^2} \right) \leq (NT)^{-c_3 a^2 K_N} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < c_3 < \infty$. By the union bound of probability, we have

$$P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{1 \leq \ell \leq d(N)} |N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{g}_{tN,i,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v})| \geq aK_N N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} \right) \leq d(N) T (NT)^{-c_3 a^2 K_N}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{t,v}) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \geq aK_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} \right) \\ \leq d(N)T(NT)^{-c_3 a^2 K_N}. \end{aligned}$$

By the union bound of probability again, we have

$$P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\Delta_{tN,2}| \geq aK_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} \right) \leq (2N^2)^{d(N)} d(N)T(NT)^{-c_3 a^2 K_N}.$$

Hence, taking a large enough, one has

$$P \left(\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\Delta_{tN,2}| \geq aK_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT} \right) \leq 2^{K_N} K_N N^{-K_N} T^{-K_N}.$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\Delta_{tN,2}| = O_p\{K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}\}. \quad (\text{S.5})$$

Therefore, by (S.1), (S.2), (S.3), (S.4) and (S.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t \in B_N} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{G}_{tN,i}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0)\| \\ = O_p\{K_N^2 N^{-5/2} + K_N^{3/2} N^{-1} (\log NT)^3 + K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}\} \\ = O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-3/4} \sqrt{\log NT}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma S.2. Under Conditions (C1) and (C2), $\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{tN,i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_t)\| = O_p(K_N^{3/2} N^{-1})$.

Lemma S.3. Under Conditions (C2) and (C3), as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\Psi_{Nt}^{-1} G_{tN,i}^*(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t) = -(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0) + N^{-1} \Psi_{Nt}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i(0 | X_i, f_t) Z_i b_t(X_i) + R_{Nt}^*,$$

where $\|R_{Nt}^*\| \leq C^* \{K_N^{1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_t^0\|^2 + K_N^{1/2-2r}\}$ for some constant $0 < C^* < \infty$, uniformly in t .

Proof. The proofs of Lemmas S.2 and S.3 follow the same procedure as in Lemmas A.4 and A.7 of Horowitz and Lee (2005) by using the results (A.1) and (A.3) which hold uniformly in $t = 1, \dots, T$. □

Lemma S.4. Under Conditions (C2) and (C3),

$$E\{L_{Nt}(f_t, g) | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\} = -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top E(W_{Nt,1} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2} (f_t - f_t^0)^\top \Lambda_{Nt}^0 (f_t - f_t^0) + o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2),$$

uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C} d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$, where $W_{Nt,1}$ is defined in A.26 and $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$.

Proof. By using the identity of Knight (1998) that

$$\rho_\tau(u - v) - \rho_\tau(u) = -v\psi_\tau(u) + \int_0^v (I(u \leq s) - I(u \leq 0))ds,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^\top G_i(X_i)) - \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)) \\ &= -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i) \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)) \\ &+ \int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} (I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq s) - I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq 0)) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.6})$$

By Lipschitz continuity of $p_i(\varepsilon|X_i, f_t)$ given in Condition (C2) and boundedness of f_{jt}^0 in Condition (C3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i)) + s|X_i, f_t\} - F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\} \\ &= sp_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\} + o(s), \end{aligned}$$

where $o(\cdot)$ holds uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{L_{Nt}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\} \\ &= -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top E(W_{Nt,1}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} [F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i)) + s|X_i, f_t\} \\ &- F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\}] ds \\ &= -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top E(W_{Nt,1}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} [sp_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\}] ds \\ &+ o\left[(f_t - f_t^0)^\top \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top\}(f_t - f_t^0)\right] \\ &= -(f_t - f_t^0)^\top E(W_{Nt,1}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}(f_t - f_t^0)^\top \times \\ &\left[N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\} G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top\right] (f_t - f_t^0) \\ &+ o\left[(f_t - f_t^0)^\top \{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top\}(f_t - f_t^0)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.7})$$

Since $\sup_{x_j \in [a, b]} |g_j(x_j) - g_j^0(x_j)| = o(1)$, then $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f_t^{0\top}(G_i(x) - G_i^0(x))| = o(1)$. By similar reasoning to the proof for Theorem 2 in Lee and Robinson (2016), we have

$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N E\{G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top\} + o_p(1)$. Hence, by these results, we have the result in Lemma S.4. \square

Lemma S.5. *Under Conditions (C2) and (C3), we have*

$$W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) = o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2 + N^{-1})$$

uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$, where $W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)$ is defined in (A.24) and $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$.

Proof. By (S.6), we have

$$W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g) = \int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} (I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq s) - I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq 0)) ds,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} E(W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)|X_i, f_t) &= \int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} [F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i)) + s|X_i, f_t\} \\ &\quad - F_i\{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))|X_i, f_t\}] ds. \end{aligned}$$

By following the same reasoning as the proof for (S.7), we have

$$\sup_{X_i \in [a, b]^J} |E(W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)|X_i, f_t) - \frac{1}{2}(f_t - f_t^0)^\top p_i(0|X_i, f_t)G_i(X_i)G_i(X_i)^\top(f_t - f_t^0)| = o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2).$$

Hence with probability approaching 1, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{X_i \in [a, b]^J} |E(W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)|X_i, f_t)| \leq C_W \|f_t - f_t^0\|^2,$$

for some constant $0 < C_W < \infty$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &E\{W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)\}^2 \\ &= E[E\{\int_0^{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)} (I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq s) - I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq 0)) ds\}^2 | X_i, f_t]] \\ &\leq E[E[|I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq (f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)) - I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq 0)| \\ &\quad \times \{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)\}^2 | X_i, f_t]] \\ &= E[E[|I(\varepsilon_{it} \leq f_t^\top G_i(X_i) - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)^0) - I(\varepsilon_{it} \leq f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i(X_i)^0)| \\ &\quad \times \{(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)\}^2 | X_i, f_t]] \\ &\leq C'' E|(f_t - f_t^0)^\top G_i(X_i)|^3 \leq C''' E\|f_t - f_t^0\|^3 \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $0 < C'' < \infty$ and $0 < C''' < \infty$. Therefore, for $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E\{W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})\}^2 \\ &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N E[W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)|X_i, f_t)]^2 \\ &\leq N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N [2E\{W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)\}^2 + 2E[E(W_{Nt,2i}(f_t, g)|X_i, f_t)]^2] \\ &\leq N^{-1} (2C''' E\|f_t - f_t^0\|^3 + 2C_W^2 E\|f_t - f_t^0\|^4) \leq C'''' N^{-1} E\|f_t - f_t^0\|^3, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $0 < C'''' < \infty$. Following the same routine procedure as the proof in Lemma S.1 by applying the Bernstein's inequality, we have

$$\sup_{\|\lambda_j - \lambda_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C} d_{NT}^*, \|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N} \|f_t - f_t^0\|^{-3/2} |W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})| = O_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Hence, we have $|W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})| = O_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^{-3/2} N^{-1/2})$, uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1/2}\|f_t - f_t^0\|^{3/2} &\leq N^{-1}\|f_t - f_t^0\|^{1/2} + \|f_t - f_t^0\|^2\|f_t - f_t^0\|^{1/2} \\ &\leq N^{-1}\varpi_N + \|f_t - f_t^0\|^2\varpi_N, \end{aligned}$$

then we have $W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g) - E(W_{Nt,2}(f_t, g)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) = o_p(\|f_t - f_t^0\|^2 + N^{-1})$, uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$ and $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq \varpi_N$. \square

Lemma S.6. *Under Conditions (C1)-(C3), for any t there is a stochastically bounded sequence $\delta_{N,jt}$ such that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$W_{Nt,1} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}) + d_{NT} \delta_{N,t} + o_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly in $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*$, where $W_{Nt,1}$ is defined in (A.23), $\delta_{N,t} = (\delta_{N,jt}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top$ and $g_j(x_j) = B_j(x_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$.

Proof. Write

$$W_{Nt,1} = W_{Nt,11} + W_{Nt,12} + W_{Nt,13}, \quad (\text{S.8})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{Nt,11} &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i) \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i^0(X_i)), \\ W_{Nt,12} &= (W_{Ntj,12}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i)) \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i^0(X_i)), \\ W_{Nt,13} &= (W_{Ntj,13}, 0 \leq j \leq J)^\top \\ &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i(X_i) \{ \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i)) - \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i^0(X_i)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $E(W_{Ntj,12}) = 0$. Also by the ϕ -mixing distribution condition given in Condition (C1), we have $\text{var}(W_{Ntj,12}) \leq C_{W12} N^{-1} d_{NT}^2$ for some constant $0 < C_{W12} < \infty$, then by following the routine procedure as the proof in Lemma S.1, we have

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*} |W_{Ntj,12}| = o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.9})$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} E(W_{Ntj,13}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j(X_{ji}) E\{I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i^0(X_i) \leq 0) - I(y_{it} - f_t^{0\top} G_i(X_i) \leq 0) | X_i, f_t\} \\ &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j(X_{ji}) \int_{f_t^{0\top}(G_i(X_i) - G_i^0(X_i))}^0 p_i(s|X_i, f_t) ds \\ &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j(X_{ji}) p_i(0|X_i, f_t) f_t^{0\top}(G_i^0(X_i) - G_i(X_i)) + O(d_{NT}^2) + o(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$d_{NT} \delta_{N,jt} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g_j(X_{ji}) p_i(0|X_i, f_t) f_t^{0\top}(G_i^0(X_i) - G_i(X_i)) + O(d_{NT}^2).$$

Since $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{g_j(X_{ji}) - g_j^0(X_{ji})\}^2 \leq (\tilde{C}d_{NT}^*)^2$, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $|d_{NT}\delta_{N,jt}| \leq C_\delta d_{NT}^*$ for some constant $0 < C_\delta < \infty$. Therefore,

$$E(W_{Ntj,13}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) = d_{NT}\delta_{N,jt} + o(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.10})$$

Also by the ϕ -mixing condition given in Condition (C1), we have $E\{W_{Ntj,13} - E(W_{Ntj,13}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})\}^2 \leq C'_\delta N^{-1}d_{NT}$ for some constant $0 < C'_\delta < \infty$. Therefore, by following the procedure as the proof in Lemma S.1, we have

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^0\| \leq \tilde{C}d_{NT}^*} |W_{Ntj,13} - E(W_{Ntj,13}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})| = o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.11})$$

Therefore, the result in Lemma S.6 is proved by (S.8), (S.9), (S.10) and (S.11). \square

Lemma S.7. *Let Conditions (C1)-(C4) hold. If, in addition, $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$, then we have*

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 - \Psi_{NT}^{-1}U_{N,1}\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

where $U_{NT,1}$ is defined in (A.31) and Ψ_{NT} is defined in (A.30).

Proof. By Lemma 4 and (A.20), we have $\|\widehat{f}_t^{[0]} - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$ for some constant $0 < C_f < \infty$. Let $Q_{it} = \{B_j(X_{ji})^\top f_{jt}, 1 \leq j \leq J\}^\top$. Let $f = (f_1^\top, \dots, f_T^\top)^\top$ satisfy that $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} L_{NT}^*(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= E\{L_{NT}^*(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\} - (\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top \{V_{NT,1}(f) - E(V_{NT,1}(f)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})\} \\ &\quad + V_{NT,2}(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) - E(V_{NT,2}(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.12})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{NT,1}(f) &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T Q_{it} \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0\top} Q_{it}), \\ V_{NT,2}(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \{\rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top Q_{it}) - \rho_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0\top} Q_{it}) \\ &\quad + (\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top Q_{it} \psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_{ut} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0\top} Q_{it})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.13})$$

By following the same reasoning as in the proofs of Lemmas S.4 and S.5, we have

$$E\{L_{NT}^*(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\mathbf{X}\} = -(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top E(V_{NT,1}(f)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top \Psi_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) + o_p(\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0\|^2), \quad (\text{S.14})$$

$$V_{NT,2}(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) - E(V_{NT,2}(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}) = o_p(\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0\|^2 + (NT)^{-1}), \quad (\text{S.15})$$

uniformly in $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0\| \leq \varsigma_{NT}$, where ς_{NT} is any sequence of positive numbers satisfying $\varsigma_{NT} = o(1)$. Thus, by (S.12), (S.14) and (S.15), we have

$$L_{NT}^*(f, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = -(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top V_{NT,1}(f) + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0)^\top \Psi_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) + o_p(\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0\|^2 + (NT)^{-1}),$$

uniformly in $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0\| \leq \varsigma_{NT}$. Therefore, we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{[1]} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = \Psi_{NT}^{-1} V_{NT,1}(\widehat{f}^{[0]}) + o_p\{(NT)^{-1/2}\}.$$

By following the same reasoning as the proof for (A.3), as $(N, T) \rightarrow \infty$ with probability approaching 1, we have $\|\Psi_{NT}^{-1}\| \leq C'_\Psi$ for some constant $0 < C'_\Psi < \infty$. In Lemma S.8, we will show that $\|V_{NT,1}(\widehat{f}^{[0]}) - U_{NT,1}\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2})$. Therefore, the result in Lemma S.7 follows from the above results, and thus the proof is completed. \square

Lemma S.8. *Let Conditions (C1)-(C4) hold. If, in addition, $K_N^4 N^{-1} = o(1)$, $K_N^{-r+2}(\log T) = o(1)$ and $K_N^{-1}(\log NT)(\log N)^4 = o(1)$, then we have*

$$\|V_{NT,1}(\widehat{f}^{[0]}) - U_{NT,1}\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

where $V_{NT,1}$ and $U_{NT,1}$ are defined in (S.13) and (A.31), respectively.

Proof. Write

$$V_{NT,1}(f) = V_{NT,11} + V_{NT,12}(f) + V_{NT,13}(f), \quad (\text{S.16})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{NT,11} &= U_{NT,1} = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T Q_{it}^0 \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}), \\ V_{NT,12}(f) &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (Q_{it} - Q_{it}^0) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}), \\ V_{NT,13}(f) &= (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T Q_{it} \{\psi_\tau(y_{it} - f_{it} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0\top} Q_{it}) - \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B(X_i) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it})\| = O_p(N^{-1/2})$, we have with probability approaching 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})} \|V_{NT,12}\| &\leq T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N B(X_i) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it})\| \\ &\times \sup_{\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})} \|f_t - f_t^0\| = O\{N^{-1/2}(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})\} = o(N^{-1/2} + d_{NT}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.17})$$

By following the same procedure as the proof for (A.36), we have for any vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^{K_N J}$ with $\|\mathbf{a}\| = 1$,

$$\text{var}(\mathbf{a}^\top V_{NT,13}(f) \mathbf{a}) = O\{K_N(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})(NT)^{-1}\},$$

uniformly in $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$. Then by the procedure as the proof in Lemma S.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})} \|V_{NT,13}(f) - E\{V_{NT,13}(f)\}\| &= O_p\{K_N^{1/2}(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})^{1/2}(NT)^{-1/2}\} \\ &= o_p(d_{NT}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|V_{NT,13}(\widehat{f}^{[0]}) - E\{V_{NT,13}(\widehat{f}^{[0]})\}\| = o_p(d_{NT}). \quad (\text{S.18})$$

Let

$$\kappa_{it}(f) = f_{ut}^0 - f_{ut} + \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{g}_j^0(X_{ji})(f_{jt}^0 - f_{jt}) + r_{j,it}^*).$$

Then there exist constants $0 < C, C' < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|E\{V_{NT,13}(f)|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}\}\| &\leq C\|E[(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)\{I(\varepsilon_{it} \leq 0) - I(\varepsilon_{it} \leq \kappa_{it}(f))\}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F}]\| \\ &\leq C'\|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)\kappa_{it}(f)p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.19})$$

uniformly in $\|f_t - f_t^0\| \leq C_f(d_{NT} + N^{-1/2})$. Moreover, by (A.20) and Lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)\kappa_{it}(\hat{f}^{[0]})p_i(0|X_i, f_t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\tilde{g}^0(X_i)^\top [\Lambda_N^{-1}\{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))\}] \right\| \\ &= O(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.20})$$

Since $\|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))\| = O_p\{(NT)^{-1/2}\}$, and

$$\|(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\| = O_p(1),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_i(X_i)p_i(0|X_i, f_t)\tilde{g}^0(X_i)^\top [\Lambda_N^{-1}\{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N G_i^0(X_i)(\tau - I(\varepsilon_{it} < 0))\}] \right\| \\ &= O_p\{(NT)^{-1/2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (S.19) and (S.20), we have with probability approaching 1,

$$\|E\{V_{NT,13}(\hat{f}^{[0]}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{F})\}\| = O(d_{NT}) + o(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.21})$$

By (S.18) and (S.21), we have

$$\|V_{NT,13}(\hat{f}^{[0]})\| = O_p(d_{NT}) + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.22})$$

Therefore, the result in Lemma S.8 follows from (S.16), (S.17), and (S.22) directly. \square