

Varying Coefficient Panel Data Model with Interactive Fixed Effects

Sanying Feng¹, Gaorong Li², Heng Peng³, Tiejun Tong³

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, China

²Beijing Institute for Scientific and Engineering Computing, Beijing University of Technology, Beijing 100124, China

³Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a varying coefficient panel data model with unobservable multiple interactive fixed effects that are correlated with the regressors. We approximate each coefficient function by B-spline, and propose a robust nonlinear iteration scheme based on the least squares method to estimate the coefficient functions of interest. We also establish the asymptotic theory of the resulting estimators under certain regularity assumptions, including the consistency, the convergence rate and the asymptotic distribution. Furthermore, we develop a least squares dummy variable method to study an important special case of the proposed model: the varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects. To construct the pointwise confidence intervals for the coefficient functions, a residual-based block bootstrap method is proposed to reduce the computational burden as well as to avoid the accumulative errors. Simulation studies and a real data analysis are also carried out to assess the performance of our proposed methods.

Key words: Varying coefficient model; Panel data; Interactive fixed effect; Bootstrap; Least squares dummy variable method; B-spline

1 Introduction

Panel data models typically incorporate individual and time effects to control the heterogeneity in the cross-section and across the time-periods. Panel data analysis has attracted considerable attention in the literature. The methodology for parametric panel data analysis is quite mature, see, for example, Arellano (2003), Hsiao (2003), Baltagi (2005) and the references therein. The individual and time effects may enter the model additively, or they can interact multiplicatively that leads to the so-called interactive effects or a factor structure. Panel data models with interactive fixed effects are useful modelling paradigm. In macroeconomics, incorporating the interactive effects can account for the heterogeneous impact of unobservable common shocks, while the regressors can be input such as labor and capital. Panel data models with interactive fixed effects are used to incorporate unmeasured skills or unobservable characteristics, or to study the individual wage rate (see details in Su and Chen (2013)). In finance, a combination of unobserved factors and observed covariates can explain the excess returns of assets. Bai (2009) considered the linear panel data model with interactive fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \lambda_i^T F_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (1)$$

where X_{it} is a $p \times 1$ vector of observable regressors, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of unknown coefficients, λ_i is an $r \times 1$ vector of factor loadings, F_t is an $r \times 1$ vector of common factors so that $\lambda_i^T F_t = \lambda_{i1} F_{1t} + \dots + \lambda_{ir} F_{rt}$, and ε_{it} are idiosyncratic errors. In this model, λ_i , F_t and ε_{it} are all unobserved. We also assume that the dimension r of the factor loadings does not depend on the cross section size N or the time series length T .

A number of researchers have developed statistical methods to study panel data models with interactive fixed effects. For example, Holtz-Eakin et al. (1988) estimated model (1) by quasi-differencing and using lagged variables as instruments. Their approach, however, ruled out time constant regressors. Coakley et al. (2002) studied model (1) by augmenting the regression of Y on X with the principal components of the ordinary least squares residuals. Pesaran (2006) showed that the method of Coakley et al. (2002) is inconsistent unless the correlation between X_{it} and λ_i tends to be uncorrelated or fully correlated as N tends to infinity. As an alternative, Pesaran (2006) developed a correlated common ef-

fects (CCE) estimator, in which model (1) is augmented by the cross-sectional averages of X_{it} . Although Pesaran's estimator is consistent, it does not allow for time-invariant individual regressors. Ahn et al. (2001) developed a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator for model (1). Their estimator is more efficient than the least squares estimator under a fixed T . However, the identification of their estimator requires that X_{it} is correlated with λ_i , and it is impossible to make testing for the interactive random effects assumption. Bai (2009) studied the identification, consistency, and limiting distribution of the principal component analysis (PCA) estimators and demonstrated that these estimators are \sqrt{NT} consistent. Bai and Li (2014) investigated the maximum likelihood estimation of model (1). Wu and Li (2014) conducted several tests for the existence of individual effects and time effects of model (1). Li et al. (2016) studied the estimation and inference of common structural breaks in panel data models with interactive fixed effects using Lasso-type methods. More studies can be found in Moon and Weidner (2017), Lee et al. (2012), Su and Chen (2013), Moon and Weidner (2015), Lu and Su (2016), and many others.

Note that the aforementioned papers have focused on the linear specification of regression relationship in panel data models with interactive fixed effects. A natural extension of model (1) is to consider the varying coefficient panel data model with interactive fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}^T \beta(U_{it}) + \lambda_i^T F_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2)$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of unknown coefficient functions to be estimated. We allow for $\{X_{it}\}$ and/or $\{U_{it}\}$ to be correlated with $\{\lambda_i\}$ alone or with $\{F_t\}$ alone, or simultaneously correlated with $\{\lambda_i\}$ and $\{F_t\}$, or correlated with an unknown correlation structure. In fact, X_{it} can be a nonlinear function of λ_i and F_t . Hence, model (2) is a fixed effects model, and assumes an interactive fixed effects linear model for each fixed time t but allows the coefficients to vary with the covariate U_{it} . This model is attractive because it has an intuitive interpretation, meanwhile it retains the unobservable multiple interactive fixed effects, the general nonparametric characteristics, and the explanatory power of the linear panel data model.

Model (2) is fairly general and it encompasses various panel data models as special cases. If $X_{it} \equiv 1$ and $p = 1$, model (2) reduces to the nonparametric panel data model with

interactive fixed effects, which has received much attention in recent years. Huang (2013) studied the local linear estimation of nonparametric panel data models with interactive fixed effects. Su and Jin (2012) extended the CCE method of Pesaran (2006) from a linear model to a nonparametric model via the method of sieves. Jin and Su (2013) constructed a nonparametric test for poolability in nonparametric regression models with interactive fixed effects. Su et al. (2015) proposed a consistent nonparametric test for the linearity in large dimensional panel data model with interactive fixed effects.

If $r = 1$ and $F_t \equiv 1$, model (2) reduces to the fixed individual effects panel data varying coefficient model:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}^T \beta(U_{it}) + \lambda_i + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

This model has also been widely studied in the literature. For example, Sun et al. (2009) considered the estimation using the local linear regression and the kernel-based weights. Li et al. (2011) considered a nonparametric time varying coefficient model with fixed effects under the assumption of cross-sectional independence, and proposed two methods to estimate the trend function and the coefficient functions. Rodriguez-Poo and Soberon (2014) proposed a new technique to estimate the varying coefficient functions based on the first-order differences and the local linear regression. Rodriguez-Poo and Soberon (2015) investigated the model by using the mean transformation technique and the local linear regression. Li et al. (2015) considered the variable selection for the model using the basis function approximations and the group nonconcave penalized functions. Malikov et al. (2016) considered the problem of varying coefficient panel data model in the presence of endogenous selectivity and fixed effects. In addition, if $\lambda_i \equiv 0$ or $F_t \equiv 0$, model (2) reduces to the varying coefficient model with panel data. For the development of this model, one may refer to, for example, Chiang et al. (2001), Huang et al. (2002), Huang et al. (2004), Xue and Zhu (2007), Cai (2007), Cai and Li (2008), Wang et al. (2008), Wang and Xia (2009), and Noh and Park (2010). We note, however, that most of these papers were dealing with the “large N small T ” setting.

Despite the rich literature in panel data models with interactive fixed effects, to the best of our knowledge, there is little work on the varying coefficient panel data models with interactive fixed effects. Inspired by this, the main goals of this paper are to estimate the

coefficient functions $\beta(\cdot) = (\beta_1(\cdot), \dots, \beta_p(\cdot))^\tau$ and to establish the asymptotic theory for the varying coefficient panel data models with interactive fixed effects when both N and T tend to infinity. To achieve these goals, we first apply the B-spline expansion to estimate the smooth functions in model (2) due to its simplicity. We then introduce a novel iterative least squares procedure to estimate the coefficient functions and the factor loadings, and derive some asymptotic properties for the proposed estimators. Nevertheless, the existence of the unobservable interactive fixed effects in the model will make the estimation procedure and the asymptotic theory much more complicated than those in Huang et al. (2002). To apply the asymptotic normality for constructing the pointwise confidence intervals for the coefficient functions, we need some consistent estimators of the asymptotic variances. To reduce the computational burden and to avoid the accumulative errors, we propose a residual-based block bootstrap procedure to construct the pointwise confidence intervals of the coefficient functions. Numerical results in Section 6 confirm that our proposed estimation procedure works well in a wide range of settings.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose an estimation procedure for the coefficient functions and provide a robust iteration algorithm under the identification restrictions. In Section 3, we establish the asymptotic theory of the resulting estimators under some regularity assumptions as both N and T tend to infinity. In Section 4, as an important special case, we study the varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects. To solve it, we propose a least squares dummy variable method to estimate the coefficient functions, that avoids the estimation of the unobserved fixed effects. In Section 5, a residual-based block bootstrap procedure is developed to construct the pointwise confidence intervals for the coefficient functions. In Section 6, a data-driven procedure is proposed to choose the smoothing parameters, and numerical studies are carried out to demonstrate the efficacy of our proposed methods. In Section 7, a real dataset is analyzed to augment the derived theoretical results. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 8 with some remarks. Technical details are given in the Appendices.

2 Methodology

To estimate the coefficient functions $\beta_k(\cdot)$ for $1 \leq k \leq p$, we consider the widely used B-spline approximations. Let $B_k(u) = (B_{k1}(u), \dots, B_{kL_k}(u))^T$ be the $(m+1)$ th order B-spline basis functions, where $L_k = l_k + m + 1$ is the number of basis functions in approximating $\beta_k(u)$, l_k is the number of interior knots for $\beta_k(\cdot)$, and m is the degree of the spline. The interior knots of the splines can be either equally spaced or placed on the sample number of observations between any two adjacent knots. With the above basis functions, the coefficient functions $\beta_k(u)$ can be approximated by

$$\beta_k(u) \approx \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl} B_{kl}(u), \quad k = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3)$$

where γ_{kl} are the coefficients, and L_k represent the smoothing parameters and they will be selected by the “leave-one-subject-out” cross validation.

Substituting (3) into model (2), we have the following approximation:

$$Y_{it} \approx \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl} X_{it,k} B_{kl}(U_{it}) + \lambda_i^T F_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (4)$$

Model (4) is a standard linear regression model with the interactive fixed effects. As each coefficient function $\beta_k(u)$ in model (2) is characterized by $\gamma_k = (\gamma_{k1}, \dots, \gamma_{kL_k})^T$, model (4) cannot be estimated directly due to the unobservable multiple interactive fixed effects term. In what follows, we propose a robust nonlinear iteration scheme based on the least squares method to estimate the coefficient functions and to deal with those fixed effects.

For the sake of convenience, we use vectors and matrices to present the model and perform the analysis. Let

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \begin{pmatrix} Y_{i1} \\ Y_{i2} \\ \vdots \\ Y_{iT} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} F_1^T \\ F_2^T \\ \vdots \\ F_T^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{i1} \\ \varepsilon_{i2} \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_{iT} \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N)^\tau$ be an $N \times r$ matrix. We also define

$$\mathbf{B}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11}(u) & \cdots & B_{1L_1}(u) & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & & \vdots & & & & \vdots & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & B_{p1}(u) & \cdots & B_{pL_p}(u) \end{pmatrix},$$

$R_{it} = (X_{it}^\tau \mathbf{B}(U_{it}))^\tau$, and $\mathbf{R}_i = (R_{i1}, \dots, R_{iT})^\tau$. Let also $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1^\tau, \dots, \gamma_p^\tau)^\tau$, where $\gamma_k = (\gamma_{k1}, \dots, \gamma_{kL_k})^\tau$. With the above notations, model (4) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{Y}_i \approx \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Due to potential correlations between the unobservable effects and the regressors, we treat F_t and λ_i as the fixed effects parameters to be estimated. To ensure the identifiability of the coefficient functions $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\cdot) = (\beta_1(\cdot), \dots, \beta_p(\cdot))^\tau$, we follow Bai (2009) and impose the following identification restrictions:

$$\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F} / T = I_r \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^\tau \Lambda = \text{diagonal}. \quad (5)$$

These two restrictions can uniquely determine Λ and \mathbf{F} . We then define the objective function as

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}, \Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{F} \lambda_i)^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{F} \lambda_i) \quad (6)$$

subject to the constraint (5). Taking partial derivatives of (6) with respect to λ_i and setting them equal to zero, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i = (\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F})^{-1} \mathbf{F}^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = T^{-1} \mathbf{F}^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}). \quad (7)$$

Replacing λ_i into (6) by (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{F} \tilde{\lambda}_i)^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{F} \tilde{\lambda}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_N)^\tau$, and $M_{\mathbf{F}} = I_T - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F})^{-1} \mathbf{F}^\tau = I_T - \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}^\tau / T$ is a projection matrix. For each given \mathbf{F} , if $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i$ is invertible, the least squares estimator of γ can be uniquely obtained by minimizing $Q(\gamma, \mathbf{F})$ as follows:

$$\hat{\gamma}(\mathbf{F}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{Y}_i. \quad (8)$$

Since the least squares estimator (8) of γ depends on the unknown common factors \mathbf{F} , the final solution of γ can be obtained by iteration between γ and \mathbf{F} using the following nonlinear equations:

$$\hat{\gamma} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{Y}_i, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}} V_{NT} = \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma})(\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma})^\tau \right] \hat{\mathbf{F}}, \quad (10)$$

where V_{NT} is a diagonal matrix consisting of the r largest eigenvalues of the matrix $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma})(\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma})^\tau$ arranged in decreasing order. As noted by Bai (2009), the iterated solution is somewhat sensitive to the initial values. Bai (2009) proposed using either the least squares estimator of γ or the principal components estimate of \mathbf{F} to start with. From the numerical studies in Section 6, we find that the procedure is more robust when the principal components estimator of \mathbf{F} is used as the initial values. Generally, the poor initial values will result in an exceptionally large number of iterations. By (7), (9) and (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Lambda} &= (\hat{\lambda}_1, \hat{\lambda}_2, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_N)^\tau \\ &= T^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \hat{\gamma}), \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_2 - \mathbf{R}_2 \hat{\gamma}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\mathbf{Y}_N - \mathbf{R}_N \hat{\gamma}) \right)^\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Once we obtain the estimator $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}_1^\tau, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_p^\tau)^\tau$ of γ with $\hat{\gamma}_k = (\hat{\gamma}_{k1}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{kL_k})^\tau$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$, we can estimate $\beta_k(u)$ subsequently by

$$\hat{\beta}_k(u) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \hat{\gamma}_{kl} B_{kl}(u), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

In what follows, we present a robust iteration algorithm for estimating the parameters

$(\gamma, \mathbf{F}, \Lambda)$.

Step 1. Obtain an initial estimator $(\hat{\mathbf{F}}, \hat{\Lambda})$ of (\mathbf{F}, Λ) .

Step 2. Given $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}$, compute

$$\hat{\gamma}(\hat{\mathbf{F}}, \hat{\Lambda}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (\mathbf{Y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{F}} \hat{\lambda}_i).$$

Step 3. Given $\hat{\gamma}$, compute $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ according to (10) (multiplied by \sqrt{T} due to the restriction that $\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} / T = I_r$) and calculate $\hat{\Lambda}$ using formula (11).

Step 4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 until $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{F}}, \hat{\Lambda})$ satisfy the given convergence criterion.

3 Regularity assumptions and asymptotic properties

To derive some asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators we let $\mathcal{F} \equiv \{\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} / T = I_r\}$ and

$$D(\mathbf{F}) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i - \frac{1}{T} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_j a_{ij} \right],$$

where $a_{ij} = \lambda_i^T (\Lambda^T \Lambda / N)^{-1} \lambda_j$. To obtain the unique estimator of γ with probability tending to one, we require that the first term of $D(\mathbf{F})$ on the right-hand side is positive definite when \mathbf{F} is observable. The presence of the second term is because of the unobservable \mathbf{F} and Λ . The reason for this particular form is the nonlinearity of the interactive effects (see details in Bai (2009)).

3.1 Regularity assumptions

In this section, we introduce a definition and present some regularity assumptions for establishing the asymptotic theory of the resulting estimators.

DEFINITION 1. Let \mathcal{H}_d define the collection of all functions on the support \mathcal{U} whose m th order derivative satisfies the Hölder condition of order ν with $d \equiv m + \nu$, where $0 < \nu \leq 1$.

That is, for each $h \in \mathcal{H}_d$, there exists a constant $M_0 \in (0, \infty)$ such that $|h^{(m)}(u) - h^{(m)}(v)| \leq M_0|u - v|^\nu$, for any $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$.

(A1) The random variable X_{it} is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) cross the N individuals, and there exists a positive M such that $|X_{it,k}| \leq M < \infty$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p$. The eigenvalues $\rho_1(u) \leq \dots \leq \rho_p(u)$ of $\Omega(u) = E(X_{it}X_{it}^T|U_{it} = u)$ are bounded away from 0 and ∞ uniformly over $u \in \mathcal{U}$, that is, there exist positive constants ρ_0 and ρ^* such that $0 < \rho_0 \leq \rho_1(u) \leq \dots \leq \rho_p(u) \leq \rho^* < \infty$ for $u \in \mathcal{U}$.

(A2) The observation variables U_{it} are chosen independently according to a distribution F_U on the support \mathcal{U} . Moreover, the density function of U , $f_U(u)$, is uniformly bounded away from 0 and ∞ , and continuously differentiable uniformly over $u \in \mathcal{U}$.

(A3) $\beta_k(u) \in \mathcal{H}_d$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p$.

(A4) Let u_{k1}, \dots, u_{kl_k} be the interior knots of the k th coefficient function over $u \in \mathcal{U} = [U_0, U_1]$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Furthermore, let $u_{k0} = U_0$ and $u_{k(l_k+1)} = U_1$. There exists a positive constant C_0 such that

$$\frac{h_k}{\min_{1 \leq i \leq l_k} h_{ki}} \leq C_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{1 \leq k \leq p} h_{ki}}{\min_{1 \leq k \leq p} h_{ki}} \leq C_0,$$

where $h_{ki} = u_{ki} - u_{k(i-1)}$ and $h_k = \max_{1 \leq i \leq (l_k+1)} h_{ki}$.

(A5) Suppose that $\inf_{\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}} D(\mathbf{F}) > 0$.

(A6) $E\|F_t\|^4 \leq M$ and $\sum_{t=1}^T F_t F_t^T / T \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_F > 0$ for some $r \times r$ matrix Σ_F , as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

(A7) $E\|\lambda_i\|^4 \leq M$ and $\Lambda^T \Lambda / N \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_\Lambda > 0$ for some $r \times r$ matrix Σ_Λ , as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

(A8) (i) Suppose that ε_{it} are independent of X_{js} , U_{js} , λ_j and F_s for all i, t, j and s with zero mean and $E(|\varepsilon_{it}|^8) \leq M$.

(ii) $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_N$ are independent of each other with $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^T) = \Omega_i$, where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iT})^T$ and the smallest and largest eigenvalues of Ω_i are bounded uniformly for all i and t .

(A9) $\limsup_{N, T} (\max_k L_k / \min_k L_k) < \infty$.

Assumptions (A1)–(A4) are mild conditions that can be validated in many practical situations. These conditions have been widely assumed in the context of varying coefficient models with repeated measurements, such as Huang et al. (2002), Huang et al. (2004) and Wang et al. (2008). Assumption (A5) is an identification condition for γ . If $D(\mathbf{F})$ is positive definite, γ can be uniquely determined by (9). If \mathbf{F} is observable, the identification condition for γ would be that the first term of $D(\mathbf{F})$ on the right hand side is positive definite. The presence of the second term is because of the unobservable \mathbf{F} and Λ . Assumptions (A6) and (A7) imply the existence of r factors. In this paper, whether F_t or λ_i has zero mean is not crucial since they are treated as parameters to be estimated. Assumption (A8) is similar to that used in Bai (2009), in which the serial correlation and heteroskedasticity are allowed. Assumption (A9) can also be found in Noh and Park (2010), and this condition is used for the system of general basis functions B_{kl} including orthonormal bases, non-orthonormal bases and B-spline.

Let $\|a\|_{L_2} = \{\int_{\mathcal{U}} a^2(u)du\}^{1/2}$ be the L_2 norm of any square integrable real-valued function $a(u)$ on \mathcal{U} , and let $\|A\|_{L_2} = \{\sum_{k=1}^p \|a\|_{L_2}^2\}^{1/2}$ be the L_2 norm of $A(u) = (a_1(u), \dots, a_p(u))^T$, where $a_k(u)$ are real-valued functions on \mathcal{U} (see details in Huang et al. (2002)). We define $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ to be a consistent estimator of $\beta_k(\cdot)$ if $\lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot) - \beta_k(\cdot)\|_{L_2} = 0$ holds in probability. Define $\delta_{NT} = \min[\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T}]$, and $L_N = \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} L_k$, which tend to infinity as N or T tends to infinity. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(X_{it}, U_{it}, \lambda_i, F_t), i = 1, \dots, N, t = 1, \dots, T\}$. We use $E_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\text{Var}_{\mathcal{D}}$ to denote the expectation and variance conditional on \mathcal{D} , respectively.

3.2 Asymptotic properties

With an appropriate choice of L_k to balance the bias and variance, our proposed estimators have the asymptotic properties including the consistency, the convergence rate and the asymptotic distribution.

THEOREM 1. *Suppose that assumptions (A1)–(A9) hold. If $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then*

- (i) $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot), k = 1, \dots, p$, are uniquely defined with probability tending to one.
- (ii) The matrix $\mathbf{F}^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T$ is invertible and $\|\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{F}}\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, where “ \xrightarrow{P} ” denotes the convergence in probability and $\mathbf{P}_A = A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T$ for a given matrix A .

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix A. Part (i) of Theorem 1 implies that, with probability tending to one, we can obtain the unique estimators $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ for the unknown coefficient functions $\beta_k(\cdot)$ under some regularity assumptions, no matter whether there exist unobservable multiple interactive fixed effects in model (2). Part (ii) of Theorem 1 indicates that the spaces spanned by $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ and \mathbf{F} are asymptotically consistent. This is a key result to guarantee that the estimators $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ have good asymptotic properties including the optimal convergence rate and consistency and asymptotic normality.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that assumptions (A1)-(A9) hold. If $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then*

$$\|\hat{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)\|_{L_2}^2 = O_P \left(\frac{L_N}{NT} + \frac{L_N}{T^2} + \frac{L_N}{N^2} + L_N^{-2d} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

Theorem 2 gives the convergence rate of $\hat{\beta}_k(u)$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p$, and hence establishes the consistency of our proposed estimators under the condition $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously. From the proof of Theorem 2 in Appendix A, we note that the first term in the convergence rate $O_P \left(\frac{L_N}{NT} + \frac{L_N}{T^2} + \frac{L_N}{N^2} + L_N^{-2d} \right)$ is caused by the stochastic error, the second and third terms are caused by the estimation error of the fixed effects \mathbf{F} and the presence of the serial correlation and heteroskedasticity, and the last term is the error due to the basis approximation. If we take the appropriate relative rate $T/N \rightarrow c > 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then we have a more accurate convergence rate as

$$\|\hat{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)\|_{L_2}^2 = O_P \left(\frac{L_N}{NT} + L_N^{-2d} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

Furthermore, if we take $L_N = O((NT)^{1/(2d+1)})$, then

$$\|\hat{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)\|_{L_2}^2 = O_P \left((NT)^{-2d/(2d+1)} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

This leads to the optimal convergence rate of order $O_P \left((NT)^{-2d/(2d+1)} \right)$ that holds for i.i.d. data in Stone (1982).

Let

$$\mathbf{Z}_i = M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_j.$$

By Appendix A, under some appropriate relative rate for T and N and some assumptions, we have

$$\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma} = \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^T \mathbf{Z}_i \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + o_P(1),$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is defined in (A.1) in Appendix A. As $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, the variance-covariance matrix $\Phi = \text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}|\mathcal{D})$ of $\hat{\gamma}$ conditioning on \mathcal{D} is the limit in probability of

$$\Phi^* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^T \mathbf{Z}_i \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^T \Omega_i \mathbf{Z}_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^T \mathbf{Z}_i \right)^{-1}.$$

The variance-covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)$ conditioning on \mathcal{D} is $\mathbf{B}(u)\Phi\mathbf{B}(u)^T$. Let ϖ_k denote the unit vector in \mathbb{R}^p with 1 in the k th coordinate and 0 in all other coordinates for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Then the conditional variance of $\hat{\beta}_k(u)$ is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D}) = \varpi_k^T \text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)|\mathcal{D}) \varpi_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

Let $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u) = (\check{\beta}_1(u), \dots, \check{\beta}_p(u))^T$, where $\check{\beta}_k(u) = E(\hat{\beta}_k(u))$ is the mean of $\hat{\beta}_k(u)$ conditioning on \mathcal{D} . With the proofs in Appendix A, we have the following asymptotic results including the asymptotic normality.

THEOREM 3. *Suppose that assumptions (A1)-(A9) hold. If $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ and $L_N T/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then*

$$\{\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)|\mathcal{D})\}^{-1/2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u) - \check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)) \xrightarrow{L} N(\mathbf{0}, I).$$

In particular, we have

$$\{\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D})\}^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_k(u) - \check{\beta}_k(u)) \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1), \quad k = 1, \dots, p,$$

where “ \xrightarrow{L} ” denotes the convergence in distribution.

THEOREM 4. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3, if $L_N^{2d+1}/NT \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then*

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left| \{\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D})\}^{-1/2}(\check{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)) \right| = o_P(1), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

For the varying coefficient model (2) with unobservable multiple interactive fixed effects, Theorems 3 and 4 establish the asymptotic normality for the estimators $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ of the coefficient functions $\beta_k(\cdot)$ if $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ and $L_N T/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously. Note that the results in Theorems 3 and 4 are very similar to the results in Huang et al. (2004). From the proof of Theorem 4, we can find that the bias terms of the estimators $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ are asymptotically negligible in comparison with the variance terms when $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously. Hence, if we can obtain a consistent estimator $\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D})$ of $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D})$, the asymptotic pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta_k(u)$ can be constructed by

$$\hat{\beta}_k(u) \pm z_{\alpha/2} \{\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D})\}^{-1/2}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

4 Additive fixed effects model

In this section, we consider an important special case of model (2). By letting $\lambda_i = (\mu_i, 1)^\tau$ and $F_t = (1, \xi_t)^\tau$, model (2) reduces to the varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}^\tau \beta(U_{it}) + \mu_i + \xi_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (12)$$

Similar to (5), for the purpose of identification, we assume that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t = 0. \quad (13)$$

Invoking (3), we have

$$Y_{it} \approx \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl} X_{it,k} B_{kl}(U_{it}) + \mu_i + \xi_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (14)$$

Note that, if we further assume that $\sum_{t=1}^T \xi_t^2 = T$, then γ can be estimated by the iteration procedure described in Section 2. However, we need to estimate the fixed effects F_t and λ_i , where $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$. In order to avoid estimating the fixed effects F_t and λ_i , we propose to remove the unknown fixed effects by a least squares dummy variable method based on the identification condition (13). The estimation procedure is described in what follows.

Let $\mathbf{1}_N$ denote an $N \times 1$ vector with all elements being ones, $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_1^\tau, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_N^\tau)^\tau$, $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{R}_1^\tau, \dots, \mathbf{R}_N^\tau)^\tau$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1^\tau, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_N^\tau)^\tau$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)^\tau$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_T)^\tau$. By the identification condition (13), we have

$$\mathbf{D} = [-\mathbf{1}_{N-1} \ I_{N-1}]^\tau \otimes \mathbf{1}_T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{1}_N \otimes [-\mathbf{1}_{T-1} \ I_{T-1}]^\tau,$$

where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. Then model (14) can be rewritten as the matrix form:

$$\mathbf{Y} \approx \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\xi} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}.$$

Next, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\xi}} (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\xi})^\tau (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\xi}). \quad (15)$$

Taking partial derivatives of (15) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, and setting them equal to zero, we have

$$\mathbf{D}^\tau (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0,$$

$$\mathbf{S}^\tau(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0.$$

By a simple calculation, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} &= (\mathbf{S}^\tau \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\tau (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma}), \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} &= (\mathbf{D}^\tau \mathbf{D})^{-1} \mathbf{D}^\tau [\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S}^\tau \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\tau (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma})].\end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ in (15) by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ respectively, the parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ can be estimated by minimizing $(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\tau \boldsymbol{\Gamma} (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\gamma})$, where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \mathbf{H}(I_{NT} - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S}^\tau \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\tau)$ and $\mathbf{H} = I_{NT} - \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D}^\tau \mathbf{D})^{-1} \mathbf{D}^\tau$. Specifically, the least squares estimator of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is

$$\check{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\mathbf{R}^\tau \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\tau \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{Y}.$$

Then with the estimator $\check{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\check{\gamma}_1^\tau, \dots, \check{\gamma}_p^\tau)^\tau$ of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, where $\check{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k = (\check{\gamma}_{k1}, \dots, \check{\gamma}_{kL_k})^\tau$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$, we can estimate $\beta_k(u)$ by

$$\check{\beta}_k(u) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \check{\gamma}_{kl} B_{kl}(u), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

THEOREM 5. *Suppose that assumptions (A1)-(A4) and (A8)-(A9) hold. If $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously, then*

$$\|\check{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)\|_{L_2}^2 = O_P(L_N/NT + L_N^{-2d}), \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

As it is not needed to estimate the fixed effects F_t and λ_i using the least squares dummy variable method, the second and third terms of the convergence rate in Theorem 2 vanish in Theorem 5 for the varying coefficient panel data model (12) with additive fixed effects. The estimators achieve the optimal convergence rate of order $O_P((NT)^{-2d/(2d+1)})$ if we take $L_N = O((NT)^{1/(2d+1)})$.

5 A residual-based block bootstrap procedure

In theory, we can construct the pointwise confidence intervals for the coefficient functions $\beta_k(\cdot)$ by Theorems 3 and 4. But doing so, we need to derive the consistent estimators of the asymptotic variances of the estimators $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Nevertheless, as the asymptotic variances involve the unknown fixed effects \mathbf{F} and the covariance matrices Ω_i of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$, it is difficult to obtain the consistent and efficient estimators of the asymptotic variances even if the plug-in method is used to estimate the asymptotic variances of $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot)$. In addition, the standard nonparametric bootstrap procedure cannot be applied to construct the pointwise confidence intervals directly because there exist the serial correlations within the group in the varying coefficient panel data model (2) with interactive fixed effects. They will not only increase the computational burden and cause the accumulative errors, but also make it more difficult to construct the pointwise confidence intervals. To overcome the limitations, we hereby propose a residual-based block bootstrap procedure to construct the pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta_k(\cdot)$ with the detailed algorithm as follows.

Step 1. Fit the varying coefficient panel data model (2) with interactive fixed effects using the proposed methods in Section 2, and estimate the residuals ε_{it} by

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{it} = Y_{it} - \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \hat{\gamma}_{kl} X_{it,k} B_{kl}(U_{it}) + \hat{\lambda}_i^T \hat{F}_t, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

Step 2. Generate the bootstrap residuals ε_{it}^* by $\hat{\varepsilon}_{it}$ using the block bootstrap method by a two-step procedure: (i) Similar to the average block length in Inoue and Shintani (2006), the block length l is chosen by $l = cT^{1/3}$ for some $c > 0$. (ii) To generate the bootstrap samples, the blocks can be overlapping or non-overlapping. According to Lahiri (1999), there is little difference in the performance for these two methods. We hence adopt the non-overlapping method for simplicity and divide the error data into $m = T/l$ blocks. Then for the $N \times T$ matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$, we generate the bootstrap samples $N \times T$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^*$ by resampling with replacement the m blocks of columns of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$.

Step 3. We generate the bootstrap sample Y_{it}^* by the following model:

$$Y_{it}^* = \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \hat{\gamma}_{kl} X_{it,k} B_{kl}(U_{it}) + \hat{\lambda}_i^\tau \hat{F}_t + \varepsilon_{it}^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_{kl}$, \hat{F}_t and $\hat{\lambda}_i$ are the respective estimators of γ_{kl} , F_t and λ_i using the estimation procedure in Section 2. Based on the bootstrap sample $\{(Y_{it}^*, X_{it}, U_{it}), i = 1, \dots, N, t = 1, \dots, T\}$, we calculate the bootstrap estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}(\cdot)$ also by the estimation procedure in Section 2.

Step 4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 for B times to get a size B bootstrap estimators $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}(u)$, $b = 1, \dots, B$. The bootstrap estimator $\text{Var}^*(\hat{\beta}(u)|\mathcal{D})$ of $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}(u)|\mathcal{D})$ is taken as the sample variance of $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}(u)$. Finally, we construct the asymptotic pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta_k(u)$ by

$$\hat{\beta}_k(u) \pm z_{\alpha/2} (\text{Var}^*(\hat{\beta}_k(u)|\mathcal{D}))^{1/2}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

6 Numerical studies

6.1 Choice of smoothing parameters

We develop a data-driven procedure to choose the smoothing parameters L_k for $k = 1, \dots, p$, where L_k control the smoothness of $\beta_k(u)$. In practice, various smoothing methods can be applied to select the smoothing parameters, such as the cross validation (CV), the generalized cross validation or the Bayesian information criterion. Following Huang et al. (2002), we propose a modified “leave-one-subject-out” CV to automatically select the smoothing parameters L_k by minimizing the following CV score:

$$\text{CV} = \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(-i)})^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^{(-i)}} (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(-i)}), \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(-i)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{F}}^{(-i)}$ are the estimators defined by solving the nonlinear equations (9) and (10) from data with the i th subject deleted. In fact, the CV score in (16) can also be

viewed as a weighted estimate of the true prediction error. The performance of the modified “leave-one-subject-out” CV procedure will be evaluated in the next section.

6.2 Simulation studies

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to assess the finite sample performance of our proposed methods. The data are generated from the following model:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_1(U_{it}) + X_{it}\beta_2(U_{it}) + \lambda_i^\tau F_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (17)$$

where $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{i1}, \lambda_{i2})^\tau$, $F_t = (F_{t1}, F_{t2})^\tau$, $\beta_1(u) = 2 - 5u + 5u^2$, $\beta_2(u) = \sin(u\pi)$, $U_{it} = \omega_{it} + \omega_{i,t-1}$, and ω_{it} are i.i.d. random errors from the uniform distribution on $[0, 1/2]$. As the regressors X_{it} are correlated with λ_i , F_t and their product $\lambda_i^\tau F_t$, we generate them according to

$$X_{it} = 1 + \lambda_i^\tau F_t + \iota^\tau \lambda_i + \iota^\tau F_t + \eta_{it},$$

where $\iota = (1, 1)^\tau$, the effects λ_{ij} , F_{tj} , $j = 1, 2$, and η_{it} are all independently from $N(0, 1)$. Lastly, the regression error ε_{it} are generated i.i.d. from $N(0, 4)$.

As a standard measure of the estimation accuracy, the performance of the estimator $\hat{\beta}(\cdot)$ will be assessed by the integrated squared error (ISE):

$$\text{ISE}(\hat{\beta}_k) = \int \{\hat{\beta}_k(u) - \beta_k(u)\}^2 f(u) du, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

We further approximate the ISE by the average mean squared error (AMSE):

$$\text{AMSE}(\hat{\beta}_k) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T [\hat{\beta}_k(U_{it}) - \beta_k(U_{it})]^2, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (18)$$

Throughout the simulations, we use the cubic B-spline as the basis functions. Thus $L_k = l_k + m + 1$, where l_k is the number of interior knots and $m = 3$ is the degree of the spline. For simplicity, we use the equally spaced knots for all numerical studies. To implement the estimation procedure in Section 2, we select L_k by minimizing the modified “leave-one-subject-out” CV score in (16). For comparison, we compute the AMSEs in (18) by

three estimation procedures, and report their numerical results in Table 1 based on 1000 repetitions. The column with label “IE” denotes the infeasible estimators, which are obtained by assuming observable F_t . The column with label “IFE” denotes the interactive fixed effects estimators obtained by our proposed procedure in Section 2. Finally, the column with label “LSDVE” denotes the least squares dummy variable estimators, which are obtained under the false assumption with additive fixed effects in model (17) by applying the least squares dummy variable method in Section 4.

Table 1: Finite sample performance of the estimators for model (17).

N	T	IE		IFE		LSDVE	
		AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)
100	15	0.0091	0.0092	0.0102	0.0103	0.0947	0.0918
100	30	0.0045	0.0044	0.0047	0.0048	0.0878	0.0909
100	60	0.0021	0.0020	0.0022	0.0022	0.0844	0.0829
100	100	0.0012	0.0012	0.0013	0.0013	0.0830	0.0822
60	100	0.0020	0.0020	0.0021	0.0022	0.0848	0.0838
30	100	0.0043	0.0042	0.0047	0.0048	0.0864	0.0873
15	100	0.0082	0.0083	0.0102	0.0102	0.0946	0.0910

From Table 1, we note that both the infeasible estimators and the interactive fixed effects estimators are consistent, and the results of the latter are gradually closer to those of the former as both N and T increase. However, the least squares dummy variable estimators of the coefficient functions are biased and inconsistent. One possible reason is that the interactive fixed effects are correlated with the regressors and cannot be removed by the least squares dummy variable method. In addition, AMSEs decrease significantly as both N and T increase for the infeasible estimators and the interactive fixed effects estimators.

Figure 1 presents the estimated curves of $\beta_1(\cdot)$ and $\beta_2(\cdot)$ from a typical sample, in which the typical sample is selected such that its AMSE is equal to the median of the 1000 replications. It is also found that the infeasible estimators and the interactive fixed effects estimators are close to the true coefficient functions, whereas the least squares dummy variable estimators are biased.

To construct the 95% pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta_1(\cdot)$ and $\beta_2(\cdot)$ using the residual-based block bootstrap procedure in Section 5, we generate 1000 bootstrap samples based on




Figure 1: Simulation results for model (17) when $N = 100$, $T = 60$. In each plot, the solid curves are for the true coefficient functions, the dash-dotted curves are for the interactive fixed effects estimators (IFE), the dashed curves are for the infeasible estimators (IE), the dotted curves are for the least squares dummy variable estimators (LSDVE).

the typical sample, and we choose the block length l by the criterion $l = T^{1/3}$. The 95% bootstrap pointwise confidence intervals of $\beta_1(\cdot)$ and $\beta_2(\cdot)$ are given in Figure 2. Overall, the proposed residual-based block bootstrap procedure works quite well.




Figure 2: 95% pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta(\cdot)$ when $N = 100$, $T = 60$. In each plot, the solid curves are for the true coefficient functions, the dashed curves are for the interactive fixed effects estimators, the dash-dotted curves are for the 95% pointwise confidence intervals based on bootstrap procedure.

Our next study is to investigate the performance of our proposed methods when the fixed effects are additive. Letting $\lambda_i = (\mu_i, 1)^\tau$ and $F_t = (1, \xi_t)^\tau$, we have $\lambda_i^\tau F_t = \mu_i + \xi_t$. We then consider the following varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_1(U_{it}) + X_{it}\beta_2(U_{it}) + \mu_i + \xi_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (19)$$

where $\beta_1(u)$, $\beta_2(u)$, U_{it} and ε_{it} are the same as those in model (17). The regressors X_{it} are generated according to

$$X_{it} = 2 + 2\mu_i + 2\xi_t + \eta_{it},$$

where $\eta_{it} \sim N(0, 1)$, and the fixed effects are generated by

$$\mu_i \sim N(0, 1), \quad i = 2, \dots, N \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1 = -\sum_{i=2}^N \mu_i,$$

$$\xi_t \sim N(0, 1), \quad t = 2, \dots, T \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_1 = -\sum_{t=2}^T \xi_t.$$

With 1000 repetitions, we report the simulation results in Table 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively. To be specific, Table 2 presents the finite sample performance of the estimators for model (19) with additive fixed effects, Figure 3 displays the estimated curves of the three estimators for the coefficient functions, and Figure 4 displays the 95% bootstrap pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta_1(\cdot)$ and $\beta_2(\cdot)$ when $N = 100$ and $T = 60$.

Table 2: Finite sample performance of the estimators for model (19) with additive fixed effects.

N	T	IE		IFE		LSDVE	
		AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_1$)	AMSE($\hat{\beta}_2$)
100	15	0.0102	0.0102	0.0267	0.0260	0.0083	0.0083
100	30	0.0048	0.0048	0.0224	0.0216	0.0040	0.0040
100	60	0.0022	0.0023	0.0192	0.0198	0.0020	0.0019
100	100	0.0013	0.0013	0.0171	0.0176	0.0011	0.0011
60	100	0.0022	0.0022	0.0214	0.0226	0.0019	0.0019
30	100	0.0046	0.0045	0.0271	0.0281	0.0040	0.0040
15	100	0.0089	0.0090	0.0340	0.0343	0.0083	0.0083

Table 2 and Figure 3 show that the infeasible estimators, the interactive fixed effects estimators, and the least squares dummy variable estimators are all consistent. Our proposed interactive fixed effects estimators remain valid even for the varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects. However, they are less efficient than the least squares dummy variable estimators. Finally, the 95% bootstrap pointwise confidence intervals for




Figure 3: Simulation results for model (19) with additive fixed effects when $N = 100$, $T = 60$. In each plot, the solid curves are for the true coefficient functions, the dash-dotted curves are for the interactive fixed effects estimators, the dashed curves are for the infeasible estimators, the dotted curves are for the least squares dummy variable estimators.

the typical estimates of $\beta_1(\cdot)$ and $\beta_2(\cdot)$ in Figure 4 demonstrate the validity and effectiveness of our proposed methods.




Figure 4: 95% pointwise confidence intervals for $\beta(\cdot)$ when $N = 100$, $T = 60$. In each plot, the solid curves are for the true coefficient functions, the dashed curves are for the interactive fixed effects estimators, the dash-dotted curves are for the 95% pointwise confidence intervals based on bootstrap procedure.

7 Application to a real dataset

We apply our proposed methods to a real dataset from the UK Met Office that contains the monthly mean maximum temperatures (in Celsius degrees), the mean minimum temperatures (in Celsius degrees), the days of air frost (in days), the total rainfall (in millimeters), and the total sunshine duration (in hours) from 37 stations. For this dataset, one main goal

is to investigate the impact of other factors on the mean maximum temperatures across different stations. Li et al. (2011) analyzed the effect of the total rainfall and the sunshine duration on the mean maximum temperatures. By contrast, we take into account the days of air frost. Data from 21 stations during the period of January 2005 to December 2014 are selected while, as the record values for the other stations missed too much, we drop them from further analysis.

Because there exists the seasonal variation in this dataset, our first step is to remove the seasonality from the observations. We impose the additive decomposition on time series objects and then subtract the seasonal term from the corresponding time series objects. Let Y_{it} be the seasonally adjusted monthly mean maximum temperatures in the t th month in station i , $X_{it,1}$ be the seasonally adjusted monthly days of air frost, $X_{it,2}$ be the seasonally adjusted monthly total rainfall, and $X_{it,3}$ be the seasonally adjusted monthly total sunshine duration. To analyze the dataset, we consider the following varying coefficient panel data model with interactive fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it,1}\beta_1(t/T) + X_{it,2}\beta_2(t/T) + X_{it,3}\beta_3(t/T) + \lambda_i^\tau F_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (20)$$

where $1 \leq i \leq 21$, $1 \leq t \leq 120$, and the multi-factor error structure $\lambda_i^\tau F_t + \varepsilon_{it}$ is used to control the heterogeneity and to capture the unobservable common effects.

Note that the objectives of the study are to estimate the trend effects of the days of air frost, the monthly total rainfall and the sunshine duration over time. To achieve the goals, we fit model (20) using the cubic splines with equally spaced knots, and select the numbers of interior knots for the unknown coefficient functions by minimizing the modified “leave-one-subject-out” CV score in (16). To determine the number r of the factors, we adopt the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) in Li et al. (2016):

$$\text{BIC}(r) = \ln(V(r, \hat{\gamma}_r)) + r \frac{(N+T) \sum_{k=1}^p L_k}{NT} \ln \left(\frac{NT}{N+T} \right), \quad (21)$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_r$ is the estimator of γ , and $V(r, \hat{\gamma}_r)$ is defined as

$$V(r, \hat{\gamma}_r) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{\varrho=r+1}^T \mu_{\varrho} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma}_r)(\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \hat{\gamma}_r)^\tau \right). \quad (22)$$

In (22), $\mu_\varrho(A)$ denotes the ϱ -th largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix A by counting multiple eigenvalues multiple times. We set $r_{\max} = 8$, and choose the number r of the factors by minimizing the objective function $\text{BIC}(r)$ in (21), that is, $\hat{r} = \arg \min_{0 \leq r \leq r_{\max}} \text{BIC}(r)$. The estimated curves and 95% bootstrap pointwise confidence intervals of $\beta_1(\cdot)$, $\beta_2(\cdot)$ and $\beta_3(\cdot)$ are plotted in Figure 5 based on the proposed methods.




Figure 5: The estimated curves and 95% pointwise confidence intervals of $\beta_1(\cdot)$, $\beta_2(\cdot)$ and $\beta_3(\cdot)$. In each plot, the solid curves are for the interactive fixed effects estimators, the dash-dotted curves are for the least squares dummy variable estimators. The dashed and dotted curves denote the 95% pointwise confidence intervals, respectively.

From Figure 5, it is evident that the estimated curves of $\beta_1(\cdot)$, $\beta_2(\cdot)$ and $\beta_3(\cdot)$ are all oscillating over time. Specifically, the effect of the monthly total sunshine duration is obviously above zero, which shows that the monthly total sunshine duration has an overall positive effect on the monthly mean maximum temperatures. By contrast, we note that the effect of the days of air frost is generally below zero, which indicates that there is an overall negative relationship between the monthly mean maximum temperatures and the days of air frost.

8 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we use the B-spline approximations to study the varying coefficient panel data model with interactive fixed effects. With an appropriate choice of the smoothing parameters, we propose a robust nonlinear iteration scheme based on the least squares method to estimate the coefficient functions, and then establish the asymptotic theory for the resulting estimators under some regularity assumptions, including the consistency, the convergence rate and the asymptotic distribution. For the special varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects, we also develop the least squares dummy variable method to avoid estimating the fixed effects. In addition, to deal with the serial correlations within our model that will increase the computational burden and cause the accumulative errors, we propose the residual-based block bootstrap procedure to construct the pointwise confidence intervals for the coefficient functions. Simulation studies are also carried out to demonstrate the satisfactory performance of our proposed methods in practice and to also support the derived theoretical results.

We note, however, that there still remain two limitations in our paper. First, we assume the cross-sectional independence that has significantly simplified the theoretical analysis. Second, our proposed interactive fixed effects estimators are less efficient than the least squares dummy variable estimators for the varying coefficient panel data model with additive fixed effects. In our future study, we plan to overcome these two limitations by considering the case with cross-sectional dependence, and by testing the additive fixed effects against the interactive fixed effects for the given model.

Acknowledgements

Sanying Feng's research was supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (No. 11501522), the Startup Research Fund of Zhengzhou University (No. 1512315004), Excellent Youth Foundation of Zhengzhou University (No. 32210452). Gaorong Li's research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11471029) and the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (No. 1182003). Heng Peng's research was supported by CERG grants from the Hong Kong Research Grants Council (HKBU 201610 and HKBU 201809), FRG grants from Hong Kong Baptist University (FRG/08-09/II-33) and the Na-

tional Nature Science Foundation of China (10871054). Tiejun Tongs research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China grant (No. 11671338), and the Hong Kong Baptist University grants FRG1/16-17/018 and FRG2/16-17/074.

Appendix A: Proofs of main results

We provide the proofs of Theorems 1–5 in Appendix A. To save space, Lemmas 1–7 and their proofs are provided in Appendix B.

For the ease of the presentation, let C denote some positive constants not depending on N and T , but which may assume different values at each appearance. In the proof, we use the following properties of B-spline (see de Boor (2001)): (1) $B_{kl}(u) \geq 0$ and $\sum_{l=1}^{L_k} B_{kl}(u) = 1$ for $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $k = 1, \dots, p$. (2) There exist constants $0 < M_1, M_2 < \infty$, not depending on L_k , such that

$$M_1 L_k^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl}^2 \leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl} B_{kl}(u) \right]^2 du \leq M_2 L_k^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \gamma_{kl}^2$$

for any sequence $\{\gamma_{kl} \in \mathbb{R} : l = 1, \dots, L_k\}$.

From Assumptions (A1)–(A4) and Corollary 6.21 in Schumaker (1981), there exists a constant M such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k(u) &= \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \tilde{\gamma}_{kl} B_{kl}(u) + Re_k(u), \\ \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |Re_k(u)| &\leq M L_k^{-d}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Let $\mathbf{e}_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iT})^\tau$ with $e_{it} = \sum_{k=1}^p Re_k(U_{it}) X_{it,k}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\tilde{\gamma}_1^\tau, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_p^\tau)^\tau$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k = (\tilde{\gamma}_{k1}, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_{kL_k})^\tau$. Then $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{R}_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} + \mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. We use the following facts throughout the paper: $\|\mathbf{F}\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$, $\|\mathbf{R}_i\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$ for all i , and $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2 = O_P(1)$. Note that $\|\hat{\mathbf{F}}\| = T^{1/2} \sqrt{r}$. For ease of notation, we define $\delta_{NT} = \min[\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T}]$ and $\zeta_{Ld} = \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^{-2d}$. Following the notation of Huang et al. (2004), we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if both a_n and b_n are positive and a_n/b_n and b_n/a_n are bounded for all n .

Proof. We only give the proof of $\|\mathbf{R}_i\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$, and omit the proofs of $\|\mathbf{F}\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$

and $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2 = O_P(1)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2) &= E\left(\text{tr}(\mathbf{R}_i \mathbf{R}_i^T)\right) = E\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|X_{it}^T \mathbf{B}(U_{it})\|^2\right) \\
&= E\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} X_{it,k}^2 B_{kl}^2(U_{it})\right) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} E\left(X_{it,k}^2 B_{kl}^2(U_{it})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption (A1), we have $E\left(X_{it,k}^2 B_{kl}^2(U_{it})\right) \leq CE\left(B_{kl}^2(U_{it})\right)$. Moreover, by the properties of B-spline, we can get that

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L_k} B_{kl}^2(u) \leq \left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_k} B_{kl}(u)\right)^2 = 1.$$

Then we have $E(\|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2) = O(T)$, which implies that $\|\mathbf{R}_i\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$ for all i .

Proof of Theorem 1. Without loss of generality, assume that $\beta(\cdot) = 0$, then $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{F}\lambda_i + \varepsilon_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. By Lemma 2 in Appendix B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma})^T M_{\mathbf{F}} (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{R}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i \right) \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}}{N} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{NT} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i - \frac{2}{NT} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \varepsilon_i \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^T \mathbf{F}^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \varepsilon_i \\
&=: \tilde{Q}_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) + o_P(1)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over bounded $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and over \mathbf{F} such that $\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}/T = I$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i \right) \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{NT} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \text{vec}(M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{F})$, and

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i, \quad A_2 = \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \otimes I_T \right), \quad A_3 = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i^\tau \otimes M_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{R}_i).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau A_1 \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^\tau A_2 \boldsymbol{\eta} - 2\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau A_3^\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau (A_1 - A_3^\tau A_2^{-1} A_3) \boldsymbol{\gamma} + (\boldsymbol{\eta}^\tau - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau A_3^\tau A_2^{-1}) A_2 (\boldsymbol{\eta} - A_2^{-1} A_3 \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \\ &=: \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\tau D(\mathbf{F}) \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau A_2 \boldsymbol{\theta},\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\eta} - A_2^{-1} A_3 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. By Assumption (A5), $D(\mathbf{F})$ is a positive definite matrix and A_2 is also a positive definite matrix, which show that $\tilde{Q}_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F}) \geq 0$. By the similar argument as in Bai (2009), it is easy to show that $\tilde{Q}_{NT}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{F})$ achieves its unique minimum at $(0, \mathbf{F}H)$ for any $r \times r$ invertible matrix H . Thus, $\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot), k = 1, \dots, p$, are uniquely defined. This completes the proof of part (i).

The proof of (ii) is similar to that of Proposition 1 (ii) in Bai (2009). To save space, we do not present the detailed proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Since $\hat{\beta}_k(u) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \hat{\gamma}_{kl} B_{kl}(u)$ and $\tilde{\beta}_k(u) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} \tilde{\gamma}_{kl} B_{kl}(u)$, by the properties of B-spline and (A.1), we have

$$\|\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot) - \beta_k(\cdot)\|_{L_2}^2 \leq 2\|\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot) - \tilde{\beta}_k(\cdot)\|_{L_2}^2 + ML_k^{-2d}$$

and

$$\|\hat{\beta}_k(\cdot) - \tilde{\beta}_k(\cdot)\|_{L_2}^2 = \|\hat{\gamma}_k - \tilde{\gamma}_k\|_H^2 \asymp L_k^{-1} \|\hat{\gamma}_k - \tilde{\gamma}_k\|^2, \quad k = 1, \dots, p, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\|\gamma_k\|_H^2 = \gamma_k^\tau \mathbf{H}_k \gamma_k$, and $\mathbf{H}_k = (h_{ij})_{L_k \times L_k}$ is a matrix with entries $h_{ij} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} B_{ki}(u) B_{kj}(u) du$. Summing over k for (A.2), we obtain that

$$\|\hat{\beta}(\cdot) - \tilde{\beta}(\cdot)\|_{L_2}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^p \|\hat{\gamma}_k - \tilde{\gamma}_k\|_H^2 \asymp L_N^{-1} \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2.$$

By (9) and $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{R}_i \tilde{\gamma} + \mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have

$$\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \mathbf{e}_i),$$

or equivalently,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i \right) (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We first deal with the third term of the right hand in (A.3). By Assumption (A1) and (A.1), and using the similar proofs to Lemma A.7 in Huang et al. (2004), and Lemmas 2 and 3 in Appendix B, it is easy to show that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_i \right\|^2 = O_P \left(L_N^{-1} \zeta_{Ld} \right). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

For the first term of the right hand in (A.3), by noting that $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} = 0$, we have $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} = M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1})$. By (B.2) in Appendix B, we have

$$\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} = -(B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_{15}) G, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $H = (\Lambda^\tau \Lambda / N) (\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T) V_{NT}^{-1}$, $G = (\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T)^{-1} (\Lambda^\tau \Lambda / N)^{-1}$ is a matrix of fixed dimension and does not vary with i , and B_1, \dots, B_{15} are defined in (B.2) of Appendix B. By (A.5),

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1}) \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_{15}) G \lambda_i \\
&=: J_1 + J_2 + \cdots + J_{15}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that J_1 — J_{15} depend on B_1 — B_{15} respectively. For J_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_j (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \lambda_j^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right] \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_j) \left[\lambda_j^\tau \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i \right] (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}) \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_j a_{ij} \right] (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{ij} = \lambda_i^\tau (\Lambda^\tau \Lambda / N)^{-1} \lambda_j$. For J_1 , we have

$$J_1 = -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (B_1) G \lambda_i = o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|).$$

For J_3 , we have

$$J_3 = \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) G \lambda_i (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}).$$

By Lemma 3 in Appendix B and some elementary calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} &= T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F} H + T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) \\
&= O_P(T^{-1/2}) + T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P\left(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Using the above result and the similar argument as the proof of Lemma 2 in Appendix B, it is easy to verify that $J_3 = o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|)$. Similarly, we can obtain that $J_5 = o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|)$.

For J_4 , we have

$$J_4 = -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_j (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) G \lambda_i.$$

Noting that $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} = M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1})$, and using Lemma 3 (i) in Appendix B, that is, $T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1}\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$, we can obtain that $J_4 = o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|)$. For J_6 , noting that G is a matrix of fixed dimension and does not vary with i , and by $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} = M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_6 &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) G \lambda_i \\ &= -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1}) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) \right) G \lambda_i. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.6) and Lemma 3 in Appendix B, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \mathbf{F} H + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) \\ &= O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + (TN)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(N^{-1}) \\ &\quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \\ &= O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + O_P(N^{-1}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) \\ &\quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3 (v) in Appendix B, then

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).$$

Moreover, the matrix G does not depend on i and $\|G\| = O_P(1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
J_6 &= \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&\quad \times \left[O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + O_P(N^{-1}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&= o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + o_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + N^{-1} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-4}) \\
&\quad + N^{-1} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}).
\end{aligned}$$

For J_7 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_7 &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \lambda_j^T \left(\frac{\Lambda^T \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \right] \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j,
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{ij} = \lambda_i^T (\Lambda^T \Lambda / N)^{-1} \lambda_j$. For J_8 , by Assumption (A8), and the same argument as in the Proposition A.2 of Bai (2009), and Lemma 5 in Appendix B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_8 &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \Omega_j \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i - \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
&=: A_{NT} + O_P(1/(T\sqrt{N})) + (NT)^{-1/2} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For J_9 and J_{10} , which depend on $\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}$. Using the same argument, it is easy to prove that J_9 and J_{10} are bounded in the Euclidean norm by $o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|)$. For J_{11} , using $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} = M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1})$ again, and letting $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_j = \mathbf{e}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T$ and $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_j\| = \|\mathbf{e}_j\| \sqrt{r} / \sqrt{T} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$, and

using Lemma 3 (v) in Appendix B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{11} &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_j \left(\frac{\mathbf{e}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) G \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\mathbf{F} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1}) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \left(\frac{\mathbf{e}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) \right) G \lambda_i \\
&= O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For J_{12} , similar to (A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{12} &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{e}_j \lambda_j^T \left(\frac{\Lambda^T \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \right] \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_j \\
&= O_P(L_N^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{ij} = \lambda_i^T (\Lambda^T \Lambda / N)^{-1} \lambda_j$. Using the similar argument, it is easy to see that $J_{13} = (NT)^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$.

For J_{14} , by (A.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{14} &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) G \lambda_i \\
&= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T \mathbf{F} H}{T} \right) G \lambda_i \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_j \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^T (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H)}{T} \right) G \lambda_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that the first term of the above equation is bounded by $T^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$.

For the second term, by a similar argument and Lemma 4 in Appendix B, we can prove that the second term is bounded above by

$$O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \left[T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2}) \right].$$

For J_{15} , by $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} = 0$ and some simple calculations, we have

$$J_{15} = -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{e}_j \mathbf{e}_j^T}{T} \right) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i = o_P(\zeta_{Ld}).$$

Summarizing the above results, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i &= J_2 + J_7 + A_{NT} + o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + o_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}}\right) \\ &\quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P\left(T^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right) + O_P\left(L_N^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i + o_P(1) \right) (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}) - J_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + J_7 + A_{NT} + o_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}}\right) \\ &\quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P\left(T^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right) + O_P\left(L_N^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying $L_N(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}))^{-1}$ on each side of the above equation, and by Lemma 6 in Appendix B,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma} &= \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \frac{L_N}{T} \Lambda_{NT} \\ &\quad + \frac{L_N}{N} \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} \xi_{NT}^* + \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} o_P\left(L_N (NT)^{-1/2} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} O_P\left(\frac{L_N}{T\sqrt{N}} \right) + L_N N^{-1/2} \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) \\ &\quad + \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} O_P\left(L_N T^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \right) + \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} O_P\left(L_N^{1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi_{NT}^* = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{(\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{V}_i)^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda^T \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{jt} \right) = O_P(1)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{NT} = - \left(L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \Omega \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i$$

with $\Omega = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \Omega_j$ and $\Omega_j = E(\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau)$. By Lemmas 1 and 7 in Appendix B, it can be shown that $D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) = D(\mathbf{F}) + o_P(1)$ and the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of $L_N D(\hat{\mathbf{F}})$ are bounded with probability tending to 1. In addition, by Lemma 1 in Appendix B and Lemma A.6 in Bai (2009), it is easy to verify that $\Lambda_{NT} = O_P(1)$. Using the same argument for Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| D(\mathbf{F})^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \right] \varepsilon_i \right\|^2 \\ & \asymp \left\| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \right] \varepsilon_i \right\|^2 \\ & = O_P(L_N^2 (NT)^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for \mathbf{F} . By the above results, together with Lemma 1 and $\delta_{NT}^{-2} L_N \log L_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| &= O_P(L_N (NT)^{-1/2}) + O_P(L_N T^{-1}) + O_P(L_N N^{-1}) \\ &\quad + O_P(L_N T^{-1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) + O_P(L_N^{1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\tilde{\gamma} = E(\hat{\gamma}|\mathcal{D})$. Using the similar proof to Theorem 4.1 in Huang (2003), and invoking Lemma A.8 in Huang et al. (2004) and the proof of Theorem 2 in Wang et al. (2008), we obtain that, for any vector c_n with dimension $\sum_{k=1}^p L_k$ and whose components are not all zero,

$$\{c_n^\tau \Phi c_n\}^{-1/2} c_n^\tau (\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}) \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1).$$

For any p -vector a_n whose components are not all zero, letting $c_n = \mathbf{B}(u)^\tau a_n$, we have

$$\{a_n^\tau \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}(u)|\mathcal{D})a_n\}^{-1/2} a_n^\tau (\hat{\beta}(u) - \check{\beta}(u)) \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1),$$

which in turn yields the desired result. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Note that

$$\check{\beta}(u) - \beta(u) = \mathbf{B}(u)^\tau (\check{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}) + \mathbf{B}(u)^\tau \tilde{\gamma} - \beta(u).$$

By (A.1), we have $\|\mathbf{B}(u)^\tau \tilde{\gamma} - \beta(u)\|_\infty = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$. Furthermore, a simple calculation yields

$$\check{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \mathbf{e}_i).$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma A.9 in Huang et al. (2004), it is easy to show that

$$\left\| \left(\frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{R}_i \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \leq C.$$

Next, since $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}$ is an idempotent matrix, and invoking Lemma A.6 in Huang et al. (2004) and (A.1), by a simple calculation, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_i \right|_\infty = \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T R_{it}^\tau (M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_i)_t \right|_\infty \\ & \leq \max_{k,l} \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T X_{ik}(u_{it}) B_{kl}(u_{it}) (\mathbf{e}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{e}_i)^{1/2} \right| \\ & \leq \max_{k,l} \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T X_{ik}(u_{it}) B_{kl}(u_{it}) \|\mathbf{e}_i\| \right| \\ & \leq L_N \max_k \sup_u |X_{ik}(u)| \max_{k,l} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T B_{kl}(u_{it}) \right) O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By $M_{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{F} = 0$ and (B.8) in Appendix B, and Assumptions (A6) and (A7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \right|_\infty \\
&= \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - M_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \right|_\infty = \left| \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \right|_\infty \\
&= O_P \left(L_N^{1/2} \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Assumptions (A1) and (A8) (ii), Lemma 1 in Appendix B, and the properties of B-spline, similar to the proof of Corollary 1 in Huang et al. (2004), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varpi_k^\tau \mathbf{B}(u) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^\tau \mathbf{Z}_i \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^\tau \Omega_i \mathbf{Z}_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i^\tau \mathbf{Z}_i \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(u)^\tau \varpi_k \\
&\gtrsim C \frac{L_N}{NT} \sum_{l=1}^{L_k} B_{kl}^2(u) \gtrsim \frac{L_N}{NT}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Theorem 4. □

Proof of Theorem 5. Note that

$$(\mathbf{D}^\tau \mathbf{D})^{-1} = \frac{1}{T} \left(I_{N-1} - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_{N-1} \mathbf{1}_{N-1}^\tau \right), \quad (\mathbf{S}^\tau \mathbf{S})^{-1} = \frac{1}{N} \left(I_{T-1} - \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{1}_{T-1} \mathbf{1}_{T-1}^\tau \right).$$

By a simple calculation, we can get that

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = I_{NT} - \frac{1}{T} I_N \otimes \mathbf{1}_T \mathbf{1}_T^\tau - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^\tau \otimes I_T + \frac{2}{NT} \mathbf{1}_{NT} \mathbf{1}_{NT}^\tau.$$

Hence, similar to the proof of Theorem 2 in Huang et al. (2004) and the proof of Theorem 2.2 in Ai et al. (2014), applying the standard method, we can show that Theorem 5 holds.

□

Appendix B: Some lemmas and their proofs

This appendix contains Lemmas 1–7 and their proofs.

LEMMA 1. *Let ρ_{\min} and ρ_{\max} be the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of $L_N D(\mathbf{F})$ respectively. Then there exist positive constants M_3 and M_4 such that $M_3 \leq \rho_{\min} \leq \rho_{\max} \leq M_4$.*

The proof of Lemma 1 follows the same lines as Lemma A.3 in Huang et al. (2004), Lemma 3.2 in He and Shi (1994), and Lemma 3 in Tang and Cheng (2009). We hence omit the proof of Lemma 1.

LEMMA 2. *Assume that assumptions (A1), (A2), (A4)–(A8) hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \right\| &= o_P(1), \\ \sup_{\mathbf{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^T \mathbf{F}^T M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \right\| &= o_P(1), \\ \sup_{\mathbf{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^T P_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \right\| &= o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using $P_{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}^T / T$, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T P_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i.$$

By Assumptions (A1) and (A8), together with the properties of B-spline, it is easy to show that $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) = o_P(1)$. Now we show that $\sup_{\mathbf{F}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T P_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = o_P(1)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T P_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \right\| &= \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right\| \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

By $T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{F}\| = \sqrt{r}$, we have $T^{-1} \|\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}\| \leq T^{-1} \|\mathbf{R}_i\| \|\mathbf{F}\| = \sqrt{r} T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{R}_i\|$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (B.1) is bounded above by

$$\sqrt{r} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|R_{it}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By $T^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{R}_i\| = O_P(1)$, the first term of the above expression is of order $O_P(1)$. Similar to the proof of Lemma A.1 in Bai (2009), it is easy to show that the order of the second term is $o_P(1)$ uniformly in \mathbf{F} .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \varepsilon_{it} \right\|^2 &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T F_t F_s^\tau \varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is} \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T F_t F_s^\tau [\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is} - E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is})] \right) \\ &\quad + \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T F_t F_s^\tau \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|F_t\|^2 = \|\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F} / T\| = r$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Assumption (A8), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T F_t F_s^\tau [\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is} - E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is})] \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \|F_t\|^2 \|F_s\|^2 \right)^{1/2} N^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N [\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is} - E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is})] \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= r N^{-1/2} O_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T F_t F_s^\tau \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is}) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \|F_t\|^2 \|F_s\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is}) \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= r T^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{is}) \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= r O(T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T M_{\mathbf{F}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \right\| = O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) = o_P(1).$$

The proofs of the second and third results are similar to the proof of the first one, and hence are omitted. \square

LEMMA 3. Assume that assumptions (A1)–(A9) hold. For ease of notation, let $H = (\Lambda^\tau \Lambda / N)(\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T) V_{NT}^{-1}$. We have

- (i) $T^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H\| = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$
- (ii) $T^{-1} \mathbf{F}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$
- (iii) $T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$
- (iv) $T^{-1} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \text{ for all } j,$
- (v) $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$
- (vi) $HH^\tau - (T^{-1} \mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F})^{-1} = O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).$

Proof. (i) From (10), (A.1) and $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{R}_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} + \mathbf{F} \lambda_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have the

following expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{F}}V_{NT} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \lambda_i^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \varepsilon_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{F} \lambda_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \varepsilon_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i \lambda_i^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \mathbf{e}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \mathbf{e}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i \lambda_i^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i \mathbf{e}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i \varepsilon_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \lambda_i^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} \\
&=: B_1 + B_2 + B_3 + \cdots + B_{16},
\end{aligned}$$

where $B_{16} = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{F} \lambda_i \lambda_i^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{F}(\Lambda^\tau \Lambda / N)(\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T)$. This leads to

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H = (B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_{15})V_{NT}^{-1}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Noting that $T^{-1/2}\|\hat{\mathbf{F}}\| = \sqrt{r}$ and $\|\mathbf{R}_i\| = O_P(T^{1/2})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{-1/2}\|B_1\| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2}{T} \right) \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2 \sqrt{r} = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2) = o_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|), \\
T^{-1/2}\|B_2\| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{R}_i\|}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \|\lambda_i\| \|\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument, it is easy to show that $T^{-1/2}\|B_l\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|)$ for $l = 3, 4$ and 5 , and $T^{-1/2}\|B_l\| = O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1})$ for $l = 6, 7$ and 8 . For B_9 , using the same argument, and by (A.1) and Assumption (A1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{-1/2}\|B_9\| &\leq T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{R}_i\|}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \left(\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{F}}\|}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} \\
&\leq O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) \cdot M_{\zeta_{Ld}}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that $T^{-1/2}\|B_{10}\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) \cdot M\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}$. For B_{11} , we have

$$T^{-1/2}\|B_{11}\| \leq T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{F}\|}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \|\lambda_i\| \sqrt{r \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).$$

Similarly, it yields that $T^{-1/2}\|B_{12}\| = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$. For B_{13} , we have

$$T^{-1/2}\|B_{13}\| \leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\varepsilon_i\| \sqrt{r \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \delta_{NT}^{-1}).$$

Similarly, it yields that $T^{-1/2}\|B_{14}\| = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \delta_{NT}^{-1})$. For B_{15} , we have

$$T^{-1/2}\|B_{15}\| \leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2 \right) \sqrt{r} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}).$$

Following the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition A.1 in Bai (2009), together with the above results, we have

$$T^{-1/2}\|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).$$

(ii) By (B.2), we have the following decomposition:

$$T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau(B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_{15})V_{NT}^{-1}.$$

Invoking the similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma A.3 (i) in Bai (2009s) to the first eight terms, we can obtain that

$$T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau(B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_8)V_{NT}^{-1} = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}).$$

For the other terms, we can show that $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_9 V_{NT}^{-1}$ and $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{10} V_{NT}^{-1}$ are of order $O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$, $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{11} V_{NT}^{-1}$ and $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{12} V_{NT}^{-1}$ are of order $O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$, $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{13} V_{NT}^{-1}$ and $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{14} V_{NT}^{-1}$ are of order $O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} \delta_{NT}^{-1})$, and $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau B_{15} V_{NT}^{-1} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld})$. This finishes the proof of (ii).

(iii) By (i) and (ii) and some elementary calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|T^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)\| &\leq T^{-1}\|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H\|^2 + \|H\|T^{-1}\|\mathbf{F}^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)\| \\ &= O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).\end{aligned}$$

(iv) The proof of (iv) is similar to that for (ii), and hence is omitted.

(v) Noting that $M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} = I_T - \hat{\mathbf{F}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau/T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_j^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2.\end{aligned}$$

Since I_1 is an average of $\frac{1}{T} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)$ over j , it is easy to verify that $I_1 = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$. For I_2 , by (iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|I_2\| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_j\|}{\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{r} \|T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)\| \\ &= O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (v).

(vi) By (ii), we have

$$\mathbf{F}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T - (\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}/T)H = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By (iii) and the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T = I_r$, we have

$$I_r - (\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau \mathbf{F}/T)H = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Left-multiplying by H^τ in (B.3), and using the transpose for (B.4), we have

$$I_r - H^\tau(\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}/T)H = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$$

which shows that (vi) holds. □

LEMMA 4. Assume that assumptions (A1)–(A9) hold. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) \\
& \quad + O_P\left(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2}\right) \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, N, \\
\text{(ii)} \quad & \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) \\
& \quad + O_P(N^{-1/2}) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P\left(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right), \\
\text{(iii)} \quad & \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = (TN)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(N^{-1}) \\
& \quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P\left(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) By (B.2), we have

$$T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H) = T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_{15}) V_{NT}^{-1}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Invoking the similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma A.4 (i) in Bai (2009s) to the first eight terms, we can obtain that

$$T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau(B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_8) V_{NT}^{-1} = T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}).$$

For the other terms in (B.5), similar to the proof of (i) in Lemma 3, we only need to show that the dominant terms $T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau B_{11} V_{NT}^{-1}$ and $T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau B_{12} V_{NT}^{-1}$ are the same order as $O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2})$. For $T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau B_{11} V_{NT}^{-1}$, we have

$$\left\| T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau B_{11} V_{NT}^{-1} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F}\|}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i\| \|V_{NT}^{-1}\| \sqrt{r \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} = O_P\left(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2}\right).$$

This leads to $T^{-1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F}\| = O_P(1)$. Similarly, $\|T^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau B_{12} V_{NT}^{-1}\| = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2} T^{-1/2})$. Thus, we finish the proof of (i).

(ii) By (A.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} - \mathbf{F}) &= \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau (B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_{15}) G \\ &=: a_1 + \cdots + a_{15}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we derive the orders of the fifteen terms, respectively. For the first four terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_1\| &\leq T^{-1/2} \|G\| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} R_{it} \right\| \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2}{T} \right) \right) \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2 \\ &= T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2), \\ a_2 &= \frac{1}{NT} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{R}_i (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \lambda_i^\tau \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T R_{it} \varepsilon_{jt} (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma}) \lambda_i^\tau \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \\ &= T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|), \\ \|a_3\| &\leq T^{-1/2} \|G\| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} R_{it} \right\| \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i\|^2}{T} \right) \right) \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \\ &= T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|), \\ \|a_4\| &\leq T^{-1/2} \|G\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} F_t^\tau \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right) \right\| \|\lambda_i\| \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \\ &= T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|). \end{aligned}$$

For a_5 , let $\mathbf{W}_i = \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T$. It is easy to verify that $\|\mathbf{W}_i\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2 / T = O_P(1)$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} a_5 &= \frac{1}{NT} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{W}_i G \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \varepsilon_{jt} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{it} (\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\gamma})^\tau \mathbf{W}_i \right) G \\ &= N^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|). \end{aligned}$$

For a_6 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_6 &= \frac{1}{NT^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \\
&= \frac{1}{NT^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\tau \mathbf{F} H G + \frac{1}{NT^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) G \\
&=: a_{6.1} + a_{6.2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the proof of Lemma A.4 in Bai (2009s), $a_{6.1} = O_P(T^{-1}N^{-1/2})$. Also,

$$a_{6.2} = T^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} F_t^\tau \right) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) G.$$

By (i) of Lemma 3 and some elementary calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a_{6.2}\| &\leq T^{-1/2} O_P(1) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i\| \|T^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i\| \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H\|}{\sqrt{T}} \|G\| \\
&= T^{-1/2} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since a_7 and a_8 have the same structures as a_7 and a_8 in Bai (2009s), we can prove that $a_7 = O_P(N^{-1/2})$ and $a_8 = O_P(T^{-1}) + O_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + N^{-1/2} [O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})]$.

For a_9 , by (A.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a_9\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} R_{it} \right\| T^{-1/2} \sqrt{r \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} \|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \|G\| \\
&= T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $a_{10} = T^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\| \zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$. For a_{11} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a_{11}\| &\leq T^{-1/2} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{jt} F_t^\tau \right\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\lambda_i\| T^{-1/2} \sqrt{r \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2} \|G\| \\
&= T^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For a_{12} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau \mathbf{e}_i \lambda_i^\tau \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \varepsilon_{jt} \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{it} \lambda_i^\tau \right) \right] \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \\
&= O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For a_{13} , let $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T$. Then we have $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_i\| = \|\mathbf{e}_i\| \sqrt{r}/\sqrt{T} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{13} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \varepsilon_{jt} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{it} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_i \right) \right] G \\
&= N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can obtain that

$$a_{14} = N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{15} = O_P(\zeta_{Ld}).$$

Summarizing the above results, we finish the proof of (ii).

(iii) Part (iii) follows immediately from (ii) by noting that $N^{1/2}$ is a constant and that the presence of λ_k does not alter the results. \square

LEMMA 5. *Assume that assumptions (A1)–(A9) hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
&= O_P(1/(T\sqrt{N})) + (NT)^{-1/2} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Some elementary calculations yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}(\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
= & \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
& - \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau}{T} \right) (\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} G \lambda_i \\
= & I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, by some basic calculations we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \mathbf{F} H G \lambda_i \\
&+ \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (\varepsilon_j \varepsilon_j^\tau - \Omega_j) (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F} H) G \lambda_i \\
= & I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma A.2 (i) in Bai (2009), we have $I_1 = O_P(1/(T\sqrt{N}))$. Let

$$a_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T R_{it} [\varepsilon_{jt} \varepsilon_{js} - E(\varepsilon_{jt} \varepsilon_{js})] = O_P(1).$$

Then we have

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_s (\hat{F}_s - F_s H)^\tau G \lambda_i.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3 (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_s (\hat{F}_s - F_s H) \right\| &\leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \|a_s\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \|\hat{F}_s - F_s H\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$I_2 = (NT)^{-1/2} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right].$$

For the second term, by the similar proof of Lemma A.2 (ii) in Bai (2009), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|II\| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right\| \|G\lambda_i\| \left\| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\| \\ &= O_P(1) \left\| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\tau (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^\tau - \Omega_j) \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\| \\ &= O_P(1/(T\sqrt{N})) + (NT)^{-1/2} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing the above results, we finish the proof of Lemma 5. □

LEMMA 6. *Assume that assumptions (A1)–(A9) hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\mathbf{R}_i^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j^\tau M_{\mathbf{F}} \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + N^{-1} \xi_{NT}^* + N^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2) \\ &\quad + (NT)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi_{NT}^* = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{(\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{V}_i)^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{jt} \right) = O_P(1)$$

with $\mathbf{V}_i = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j$.

Proof. For the term $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (M_{\mathbf{F}} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$, we consider the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\mathbf{F}} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} &= P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}} \\
&= T^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)H^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau + T^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)^\tau \\
&\quad + T^{-1}\mathbf{F}H(\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)^\tau \\
&\quad + T^{-1}\mathbf{F}[HH^\tau - (T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F})^{-1}]\mathbf{F}^\tau
\end{aligned}$$

for any invertible matrix H . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^\tau (M_{\mathbf{F}} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)}{T} H^\tau \mathbf{F}^\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)}{T} (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)^\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}H}{T} (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}H)^\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} [HH^\tau - (T^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F})^{-1}] \mathbf{F}^\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\
&=: s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_4.
\end{aligned}$$

For s_1 , noting that $(\hat{F}_s - H^\tau F_s)^\tau H^\tau F_t$ is scalar, we have

$$s_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T (\hat{F}_s - H^\tau F_s)^\tau H^\tau \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T F_t R_{is} \varepsilon_{it} \right).$$

Further, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|s_1\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \|\hat{F}_s - H^\tau F_s\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \|H\| \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T F_t R_{is} \varepsilon_{it} \right\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] O_P(1) \\
&= o_P((NT)^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can obtain that

$$s_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{F}_s - H^\tau F_s)^\tau (\hat{F}_t - H^\tau F_t) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N R_{is} \varepsilon_{it} \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|s_2\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\hat{F}_t - H^\tau F_t\|^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N R_{is} \varepsilon_{it} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right]^2 O_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For s_3 , by some simple calculations we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_3 &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} H H^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} - \mathbf{F})^\tau \varepsilon_i \\
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} - \mathbf{F})^\tau \varepsilon_i \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \left[H H^\tau - \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \right] (\hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} - \mathbf{F})^\tau \varepsilon_i \\
&=: s_{3.1} + s_{3.2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $Q = H H^\tau - (\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}/T)^{-1}$. By Lemma 4 (iii) and Lemma 3 (vi), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{3.2} &= \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\varepsilon_i^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{F}} H^{-1} - \mathbf{F}) \otimes \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \right] \right) \text{vec}(Q) \\
&= \left[(TN)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(N^{-1}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&\quad \times \left[O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}) \right] \\
&= N^{-1} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + N^{-1} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-4}) + N^{-1} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of c_1 in Lemma A.8 in Bai (2009s), we have

$$s_{3.1} = N^{-1} \psi_{NT} + (NT)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}),$$

where

$$\psi_{NT} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^\tau \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda^\tau \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{jt} \right) = O_P(1).$$

For s_4 , note that $Q = HH^T - (\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}/T)^{-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} s_4 &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^T \mathbf{F} \otimes \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \right] \text{vec}(Q) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \varepsilon_{it} \otimes \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) \right) \text{vec}(Q) \\ &= o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

by the facts that $\text{vec}(Q) = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2})$ and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \varepsilon_{it} \otimes \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right) = O_P(1).$$

In summary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (M_{\mathbf{F}} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= N^{-1} \psi_{NT} + N^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2) + (NT)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) \\ & \quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

Let $\mathbf{V}_i = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \mathbf{R}_j$. Replacing \mathbf{R}_i with \mathbf{V}_i , by the same argument we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{V}_i^T (M_{\mathbf{F}} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= N^{-1} \psi_{NT}^* + N^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|^2) + (NT)^{-1/2} O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) \\ & \quad + N^{-1/2} O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + N^{-1/2} O_P(\zeta_{Ld}^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

where $\psi_{NT}^* = O_P(1)$ is defined as

$$\psi_{NT}^* = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda^T \Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{it} \varepsilon_{jt} \right).$$

Letting $\xi_{NT}^* = \psi_{NT} - \psi_{NT}^*$, and together with (B.6) and (B.7), we finish the proof of Lemma 6. \square

LEMMA 7. Assume that assumption (A1)–(A9) hold. We have

$$D(\hat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1} - D(\mathbf{F})^{-1} = o_P(1).$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma A.7 (ii) in Bai (2009), we can show that

$$\|P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}\| = O_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|) + O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) - D(\mathbf{F}) \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - M_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{R}_i - \frac{1}{T} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (M_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - M_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{R}_j a_{ij} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{R}_i - \frac{1}{T} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{R}_j a_{ij} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The norm of the first term in the above expression is bounded above by

$$\left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{R}_i^T (P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}) \mathbf{R}_i \right\| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{R}_i\|^2}{T} \right) \|P_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} - P_{\mathbf{F}}\| = o_P(1).$$

Similarly, the order of the second term is also $o_P(1)$. Noting that $[D(\hat{\mathbf{F}}) + o_P(1)]^{-1} = D(\hat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1} + o_P(1)$, we complete the proof of Lemma 7. \square

References

- Ahn, S. G., Lee, Y. H. and Schmidt, P. (2001). GMM estimation of linear panel data models with time-varying individual effects, *Journal of Econometrics* **102**: 219–255.
- Ai, C. R., You, J. H. and Zhou, Y. (2014). Estimation of fixed effects panel data partially linear additive regression models, *The Econometrics Journal* **17**: 83–106.
- Arellano, M. (2003). *Panel Data Econometrics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bai, J. S. (2009). Panel data models with interactive fixed effects, *Econometrica* **77**: 1229–1279.
- Bai, J. S. (2009s). Supplement to “panel data models with interactive fixed effects”: technical details and proofs, *Econometrica Supplementary Material* pp. 1–37.
- Bai, J. S. and Li, K. P. (2014). Theory and methods of panel data models with interactive effects, *The Annals of Statistics* **42**: 142–170.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2005). *Econometrics Analysis of Panel Data*, New York: Wiley.
- Cai, Z. W. (2007). Trending time-varying coefficient time series models with serially correlated errors, *Journal of Econometrics* **136**: 163–188.
- Cai, Z. W. and Li, Q. (2008). Nonparametric estimation of varying coefficient dynamic panel data models, *Econometric Theory* **24**: 1321–1342.
- Chiang, C. T., Rice, J. A. and Wu, C. O. (2001). Smoothing spline estimation for varying coefficient models with repeatedly measured dependent variables, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**: 605–619.
- Coakley, J., Fuertes, A.-M. and Smith, R. P. (2002). A principal components approach to cross-section dependence in panels, *No B5-3, 10th International Conference on Panel Data, Berlin, July 5-6* pp. 1–28.
- de Boor, C. (2001). *A Practical Guide to Splines*, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- He, X. M. and Shi, P. D. (1994). Convergence rate of B-spline estimators of nonparametric conditional quantile functions, *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **3**: 299–308.
- Holtz-Eakin, D., Newey, W. and Rosen, H. (1988). Estimating vector autoregressions with panel data, *Econometrica* **56**: 1371–1395.
- Hsiao, C. (2003). *Analysis of Panel Data*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, J. Z. (2003). Local asymptotic for polynomial spline regression, *The Annals of Statistics* **31**: 1600–1635.

- Huang, J. Z., Wu, C. O. and Zhou, L. (2002). Varying-coefficient models and basis function approximations for the analysis of the analysis of repeated measurements, *Biometrika* **89**: 111–128.
- Huang, J. Z., Wu, C. O. and Zhou, L. (2004). Polynomial spline estimation and inference for varying coefficient models with longitudinal data, *Statistica Sinica* **14**: 763–788.
- Huang, X. (2013). Nonparametric estimation in large panels with cross-sectional dependence, *Econometric Reviews* **32**: 754–777.
- Inoue, A. and Shintani, M. (2006). Bootstrapping GMM estimators for time series, *Journal of Econometrics* **133**: 531–555.
- Jin, S. N. and Su, L. J. (2013). A nonparametric poolability test for panel data models with cross section dependence, *Econometric Reviews* **32**: 469–512.
- Lahiri, S. N. (1999). Theoretical comparisons of block bootstrap methods, *The Annals of Statistics* **27**: 386–404.
- Lee, N., Moon, H. R. and Weidner, M. (2012). Analysis of interactive fixed effects dynamic linear panel regression with measurement error, *Economics Letters* **117**: 239–242.
- Li, D. G., Chen, J. and Gao, J. T. (2011). Non-parametric time-varying coefficient panel data models with fixed effects, *The Econometrics Journal* **14**: 387–408.
- Li, D. G., Qian, J. H. and Su, L. J. (2016). Panel data models with interactive fixed effects and multiple structural breaks, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111**: 1804–1819.
- Li, G. R., Lian, H., Lai, P. and Peng, H. (2015). Variable selection for fixed effects varying coefficient models, *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series* **31**: 91–110.
- Lu, X. and Su, L. J. (2016). Shrinkage estimation of dynamic panel data models with interactive fixed effects, *Journal of Econometrics* **190**: 148–175.
- Malikov, E., Kumbhakar, S. C. and Sun, Y. (2016). Varying coefficient panel data model in the presence of endogenous selectivity and fixed effects, *Journal of Econometrics* **190**: 233–251.

- Moon, H. R. and Weidner, M. (2015). Linear regression for panel with unknown number of factors as interactive fixed effects, *Econometrica* **83**: 1543–1579.
- Moon, H. R. and Weidner, M. (2017). Dynamic linear panel regression models with interactive fixed effects, *Econometric Theory* **33**: 158–195.
- Noh, H. S. and Park, B. U. (2010). Sparse varying coefficient models for longitudinal data, *Statistica Sinica* **20**: 1183–1202.
- Pesaran, M. H. (2006). Estimation and inference in large heterogeneous panels with a multifactor error structure, *Econometrica* **74**: 967–1012.
- Rodriguez-Poo, J. M. and Soberon, A. (2014). Direct semi-parametric estimation of fixed effects panel data varying coefficient models, *The Econometrics Journal* **17**: 107–138.
- Rodriguez-Poo, J. M. and Soberon, A. (2015). Nonparametric estimation of fixed effects panel data varying coefficient models, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **133**: 95–122.
- Schumaker, L. L. (1981). *Spline Functions: Basic Theory*, New York: Wiley.
- Stone, C. J. (1982). Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression, *The Annals of Statistics* **10**: 1348–1360.
- Su, L. J. and Chen, Q. H. (2013). Testing homogeneity in panel data models with interactive fixed effects, *Econometric Theory* **29**: 1079–1135.
- Su, L. J. and Jin, S. N. (2012). Sieve estimation of panel data models with cross section dependence, *Journal of Econometrics* **169**: 34–47.
- Su, L. J., Jin, S. N. and Zhang, Y. H. (2015). Specification test for panel data models with interactive fixed effects, *Journal of Econometrics* **186**: 222–244.
- Sun, Y. G., Carroll, R. J. and Li, D. D. (2009). Semiparametric estimation of fixed effects panel data varying coefficient models, *Advances in Econometrics* **25**: 101–129.
- Tang, Q. G. and Cheng, L. S. (2009). B-spline estimation for varying coefficient regression with spatial data, *Science in China Series A: Mathematics* **52**: 2321–2340.

- Wang, H. S. and Xia, Y. C. (2009). Shrinkage estimation of the varying coefficient model, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104**: 747–757.
- Wang, L. F., Li, H. Z. and Huang, J. Z. (2008). Variable selection in nonparametric varying-coefficient models for analysis of repeated measurements, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **103**: 1556–1569.
- Wu, J. H. and Li, J. C. (2014). Testing for individual and time effects in panel data models with interactive effects, *Economics Letters* **125**: 306–310.
- Xue, L. G. and Zhu, L. X. (2007). Empirical likelihood for a varying coefficient model with longitudinal data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102**: 642–652.