

Inference on Functionals of Set-Identified Parameters Defined by Convex Moments

(Preliminary and incomplete. All comments are welcome.)

Thomas M. Russell*

University of Toronto

January 9, 2022

Abstract

Many inference procedures in the literature on partial identification are designed for when the inferential object of interest is the entire (partially identified) vector of parameters. However, when the researcher's inferential object of interest is a subvector or functional of the parameter vector, these inference procedures can be highly conservative, especially when the dimension of the parameter vector is large. This paper considers uniformly valid inference for continuous functionals of partially identified parameters in cases where the identified set is defined by convex (in the parameter) moment inequalities. We use a functional delta method and propose a method for constructing uniformly valid confidence sets for a (possibly stochastic) convex functional of a partially identified parameter. The proposed method amounts to bootstrapping the Lagrangian of a convex optimization problem, and subsumes subvector inference as a special case. Unlike other proposed subvector inference procedures, our procedure does not require the researcher to repeatedly invert a hypothesis test. Finally, we discuss sufficient conditions on the moment functions to ensure uniform validity.

Keywords: Functional Delta-Method, Stochastic Programming, Subvector Inference, Partial Identification

1 Introduction

This paper proposes a uniformly valid inference procedure for a convex functional ψ of a partially identified parameter vector θ in models with convex (in θ) moment functions. In particular, the paper proposes a functional delta method to approximate the distribution of the endpoints of the projected identified set, and discusses primitive conditions under which the procedure is uniformly valid.

I am grateful to Victor Aguirregabiria, JoonHwan Cho, Bulat Gafarov, Christian Gourieroux, Ismael Mourifie, Jeffrey Negrea, Stanislav Volgushev and Yuanyuan Wan for helpful comments and discussion. All errors are my own.

*Thomas Russell, Department of Economics, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5S3G7, Canada. Email: thomas.russell@mail.utoronto.ca. As this is a working paper, all questions and comments are welcome.

The main idea is to use results from the Operations Research literature that allow the researcher to approximate the distribution of the value functions in convex programs with stochastic constraints using a functional delta method. The contribution of this paper is to show how this functional delta method for stochastic programs can be used to construct uniformly valid confidence sets for subvectors or functionals of the identified set in partially identified econometric models. Intuitively, bounding a convex, continuous functional over an identified set defined by convex moment functions amounts to solving two convex optimization problems: one maximization problem for the upper bound, and one minimization problem for the lower bound. Thus, the endpoints of the identified set for a functional of a partially-identified parameter can be viewed as *value functions* of two “stochastic programs.” An inference procedure is then constructed by relating perturbations in the constraint functions of these stochastic programs to the perturbations in the optimal value functions. By the envelope theorem, perturbations in the constraints are related to the value functions through the Lagrange multipliers. The total effect of perturbations in the constraints on the value function is then given by a weighted sum of the perturbations in all binding constraints, where the weights are determined by the Lagrange multipliers. Through this mechanism, we can relate the distribution of the binding moment functions to the distribution of the value function of a stochastic program.

To use the relevant functional delta method requires noticing that, under weak conditions, the value functions in convex stochastic programs are *Hadamard directionally differentiable* with respect to perturbations in the underlying probability measure. However, this form of differentiability is not sufficient for the functional delta method to deliver *uniformly* valid confidence sets. This result relates to [Kasy \(2015\)](#), who emphasizes that failures of uniformity often result as failures of the uniform versions of the delta method. We demonstrate the conditions under which the value functions of a convex stochastic program satisfy the natural definition of *uniform* Hadamard directional differentiability with respect to perturbations in the underlying probability measure. This uniform differentiability is sufficient to apply the extended continuous mapping theorem and deduce a uniform delta method. We then propose a simple uniformly valid bootstrap procedure to estimate the confidence set for a functional of interest. Interestingly, the method does not explicitly require the use of a *generalized moment selection* (GMS) procedure (c.f. [Andrews and Soares \(2010\)](#)), but instead uses the properties of Lagrange multipliers to regularize the problem. In particular, continuity of the Lagrange multipliers with respect to the underlying probability measure ensures that “drifting-to-binding” sequences of data generating processes (DGPs) do not generate discontinuities in the distribution of the value functions in asymptopia. This allows us to avoid the conservative distortion introduced by using GMS regularization procedures.

Subvector inference, or inference on functionals of the identified set, has recently been a topic of considerable interest in the partial identification literature. The earlier papers of [Andrews and Guggenberger \(2009\)](#) and [Andrews and Soares \(2010\)](#) propose to project confidence sets constructed for the entire parameter vector in order to obtain confidence sets for a particular subvector of interest. While these procedures are uniformly valid, they can be highly conservative when the dimension of the partially identified parameter vector is large

(see the discussion in [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#)). Both [Romano and Shaikh \(2008\)](#) and [Bugni et al. \(2017\)](#) consider inverting profiled test statistics in order to construct confidence sets for subvectors or functionals, where [Romano and Shaikh \(2008\)](#) construct critical values using subsampling and where [Bugni et al. \(2017\)](#) derive the asymptotic distribution for their profile test statistic for a large class of test functions. [Bugni et al. \(2017\)](#) show that their test dominates projection-based procedures in terms of asymptotic power, and they derive conditions under which it dominates the subsampling-based approach of [Romano and Shaikh \(2008\)](#). [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#) provide a “calibrated projection” inference method for functionals of a partially identified parameter. Intuitively, this procedure suitably relaxes the model’s moment inequalities, and then solves two optimization problems subject to the relaxed constraints in order to obtain the endpoints of the confidence interval for the functional of interest. The relaxation of the constraints requires the correct calibration of a relaxation parameter in order to obtain uniformly correct coverage. [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#) first linearize any non-linear moment functions, and then propose an efficient algorithm to calibrate the relaxation parameter. This allows their procedure to be computationally attractive relative to other methods in nonlinear models. Similar to the method proposed here, the method of [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#) does not invert a test statistic. The work in this paper is also related to work by [Gafarov et al. \(2018\)](#), who show how to use an analogous delta-method procedure to construct confidence sets for set-identified SVARS. However, the confidence set and procedure proposed in [Gafarov et al. \(2018\)](#) for inference on structural parameters in SVARs is very different from the one proposed here. In addition, [Gafarov et al. \(2018\)](#) show that their procedure is pointwise consistent in level, but not necessarily uniformly consistent.

The overall approach to constructing confidence sets in this paper is closely related to the approach in [Gafarov \(2018\)](#), who shows how to construct both pointwise and uniformly valid confidence sets for linear functionals of a partially identified parameter in an optimization framework. However, the optimization problems used to perform functional inference may have non-unique solutions, and it is well known from [Hirano and Porter \(2012\)](#) that it is impossible to obtain a locally unbiased estimator of the value function when the value function is non-differentiable. To address these problems, [Gafarov \(2018\)](#) proposes including a regularization term in the objective function to ensure a unique optimal solution is selected, and then proposes a bias correction procedure that ensures uniform validity. This paper derives results for the general convex case, while [Gafarov \(2018\)](#) focuses on the linear case, and the approaches to proving uniformity are also different.

Finally, we also note some close connections with the work of [Kaido and Santos \(2014\)](#). The work in this paper might be seen as a first-step exploration of the conditions under which the procedure Lagrangian procedure in [Kaido and Santos \(2014\)](#) is uniformly valid for functional inference. While some of the assumptions given in the current paper for uniform validity of the approach of [Kaido and Santos \(2014\)](#) are admittedly high-level, we hope to replace these assumptions with more primitive conditions in future drafts.

The main proofs of this paper uses results from [Shapiro et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Fang and Santos \(2014\)](#). The main result used from [Shapiro et al. \(2009\)](#) is the proof of Hadamard directional differentiability of value

functions for stochastic programs. However, we extend this result by showing the conditions under which the value functions for a stochastic program satisfy uniform Hadamard directional differentiability, which is sufficient to derive a uniform delta-method result. Next, while we use some of the results in [Fang and Santos \(2014\)](#) related to bootstrap consistency and Hadamard directional differentiability, our main focus is on inference for the true parameter θ_0 in partially identified models using stochastic programs, which is not considered in [Fang and Santos \(2014\)](#).

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a simplified overview of the main results, and examples to motivate the need for functional inference procedures in partially identified models. Section 3 develops the methodology in detail and contains the main results of this paper. Section 4 provides sufficient conditions for some of the main assumptions. Section 5 concludes. A catalogue of the notation required in this paper is provided in Appendix A, and the proofs of all of the main results are provided in Appendix B. Furthermore, Appendix C provides some useful examples and counterexamples in functional inference problems with partial identification, and Appendix D provides a brief background on VC classes, which may be useful to understand the primitive conditions given in Section 4 for one of the high-level assumptions in this paper.

Throughout the paper we use notation standard in empirical process theory; in particular, the expectation of a random element $(\omega, t) \rightarrow X(\omega, t)$ with respect to a measure P is given by $PX(\cdot, t)$. The random variables W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n are assumed to be coordinate projections from the product space $(\mathcal{W}^n, \mathcal{A}^n, P^{\otimes n})$, where $P^n = P \otimes P \otimes \dots \otimes P$, and we will denote $(\mathcal{W}^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, P^\infty)$ as the infinite product space. The empirical measure is represented by \mathbb{P}_n , which is implicitly a function of the generating measure P_n at sample size n . We index estimated quantities by the empirical distribution; for example, rather than $\hat{\theta}$, we may write either $\theta(\mathbb{P}_n)$ or $\hat{\theta}(\mathbb{P}_n)$. This is done to emphasize the underlying measure relevant to the construction of the parameter, and becomes useful in both the discussion and the proofs of the main results. We will avoid issues of measurability as much as possible in the main text, although in the proofs we use the definition of weak convergence in the sense of [Hoffmann-Jørgensen \(1991\)](#), where the outer measure is denoted with a superscript $*$ (c.f. [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) Chapters 1.1 and 1.2).

2 Overview of Results and Motivating Examples

2.1 Main Ideas

This subsection will discuss simplified versions of the main ideas in the paper before the technical details are introduced in the next section. Our main motivation is to construct uniformly valid confidence sets for the expectation of the random objective function $\psi(W, \theta)$, where $W \in \mathcal{W}$ denotes the relevant finite-dimensional vector of random variables in the model, and where $\theta \in \Theta_I(P) \subset \Theta$ is only partially identified, and constrained to lie in the identified set.

To this end, we suppose the identified set for $\theta \in \Theta$ is defined by k moment (in)equalities where the

moment function $m_j(\cdot, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex in $\theta \in \Theta$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. In this case, the identified set $\Theta_I(P)$ —indexed here by the true asymptotic distribution P — is compact and convex, and so the image of $\Theta_I(P)$ under the expectation of any continuous functional $P\psi(\cdot, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will be an interval $\Psi_I(P) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)]$. In this framework, the endpoints of the interval $\Psi_I(P)$ can be determined by solving two convex optimization problems:

- (i) minimize $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ over $\theta \in \Theta_I(P)$ to determine $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)$,
- (ii) maximize $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ over $\theta \in \Theta_I(P)$ to determine $\Psi_I^{ub}(P)$.

Seen in this way, $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)$ and $\Psi_I^{ub}(P)$ are the *value functions* in two stochastic convex optimization problems. Now let $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ denote the true value of the parameter, and consider the problem of constructing a confidence set $CS_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ that asymptotically covers $P\psi(\cdot, \theta_0)$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha$ uniformly over $(\theta, P) \in \Theta_I(P) \times \mathcal{P}$, where \mathcal{P} is some large class of DGPs. In particular, we wish to construct a confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\{(\psi, P) : \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}} P(\psi \in CS_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

where $\psi_0(P) := P\psi(\cdot, \theta_0)$. To construct such a set, we will approximate the distribution of the endpoints $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ of the identified set $\Psi_I(P)$ using a functional delta method. In particular, let \mathcal{M} denote the class of moment functions and let \mathcal{M}_0 denote the class of functions containing $\psi(\cdot, \theta)$. Setting $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_0$, we show that under a constraint qualification condition, for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converging to a measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$ in an appropriate sense (to be made precise), there exist continuous functionals $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P, (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \times \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \quad (2.1)$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbb{G}_P \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ is the limit of the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_{P_n, n} := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n) \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, and $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n))$ are suitable estimates of the value functions. Moreover, we show that the functions $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P, (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \times \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ have the known expressions:

$$(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) = \mathbb{G}_P\psi(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}^* \mathbb{G}_P m_j(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) \quad (2.3)$$

$$(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) = -\mathbb{G}_P\psi(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^* \mathbb{G}_P m_j(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) \quad (2.4)$$

where $\theta_{\ell b}^*(P)$ and $\theta_{ub}^*(P)$ are the optimal solutions in the lower and upper bounding problems at $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\{\lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(P)\}_{j=1}^k$ and $\{\lambda_{ub, j}^*(P)\}_{j=1}^k$ are the Lagrange multipliers in the lower and upper bounding problems at

$P \in \mathcal{P}$. Finally, we show that the distributions of (2.3) and (2.4) can be approximated uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$ by the bootstrap distributions:

$$(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) = \mathbb{G}_n^b \psi(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}(\mathbb{P}_n) \mathbb{G}_n^b m_j(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \quad (2.5)$$

$$(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) = -\mathbb{G}_n^b \psi(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \mathbb{G}_n^b m_j(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathbb{G}_n^b := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^b - \mathbb{P}_n)$, where \mathbb{P}_n^b is the empirical bootstrap distribution, and where $\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ are the estimated optimal solutions in the lower and upper bounding problems, and $\{\lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{j=1}^k$ and $\{\lambda_{ub, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{j=1}^k$ are the estimated Lagrange multipliers for the lower and upper bounding problems. From here, our proposed confidence set takes the form:

$$CS_n^\psi(1 - \alpha) := \left[\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)}{\sqrt{n}}, \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) + \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)}{\sqrt{n}} \right]$$

where the quantiles $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)$ and $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)$ are selected from the bootstrap approximation to the distributions of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ in order to guarantee uniform correct coverage. After presenting some motivating examples, the next sections develop this methodology rigorously.

2.2 Examples

We now present some motivating examples that illustrate why inference procedures for functionals of partially identified parameters are needed.

Example 1 (Missing Data). *Consider the simple missing data example as presented, for example, in [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#). In this example the researcher observes a sample $\{Y_i D_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For simplicity, suppose that $Y_i, D_i \in \{0, 1\}$. The parameter of interest is the unconditional average of the outcome variable:*

$$P\psi(W, \theta) = \psi(\theta) = \sum_y \sum_d \theta_{yd} \cdot y$$

where $\theta_{yd} := P(Y = y, D = d)$. The constraints imposed by the observed distribution $\mathbb{P}_n(YD, D)$ on the latent distribution $\theta_{yd} = P(Y = y, D = d)$ are given by:

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 0, D = 1) = \theta_{01} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 1, D = 1) = \theta_{11} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 0, D = 0) = \theta_{00} + \theta_{10} \quad (2.9)$$

It is straightforward to see that point-identification of θ occurs only when $\mathbb{P}_n(D = 0) = 0$. The identified set

for our function of interest, $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)]$ can be obtained by solving the problems:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta) \quad (2.10)$$

where $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is the set of θ_{yd} satisfying the constraints (2.7)-(2.9). Note that the optimization problems in (2.10) are linear programs. This paper will attempt to exploit the structure of the optimization problems in (2.10) to propose an inference procedure that is easy to use for functionals of partially identified parameters. Here, note that ψ is a functional of the partially identified parameter θ , where the identified set for θ is given by $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$.

Example 2 (Nonparametric State Dependence). Consider the model of Nonparametric State Dependence given in [Torgovitsky \(2016\)](#). In this model, the researcher observes a realization of a random sequence $Y := (Y_0, \dots, Y_T)$ for each individual for T periods. As in [Torgovitsky \(2016\)](#), we consider for simplicity that each outcome Y_t is binary, so that $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{T+1}$. The sequence of observed outcomes Y are related to a sequence of unobserved potential outcomes $U(0) := (U_1(0), \dots, U_T(0))$ and $U(1) := (U_1(1), \dots, U_T(1))$ through the equation:

$$Y_t = Y_{t-1}U_t(0) + (1 - Y_{t-1})U_t(1)$$

The researcher may also have access to a sequence of covariates $X \in (X_0, \dots, X_T)$ for each individual. The object of interest for the researcher is assumed to be treatment effect parameters that depend on the unobserved potential outcomes $(U_t(0), U_t(1))$ at time $1 \leq t \leq T$. Examples of such treatment effect parameters include the average treatment effect, given by $ATE_t = P(U_t(0) = 0, U_t(1) = 1) - P(U_t(0) = 1, U_t(1) = 0)$, or the voting criterion given by $P(U_t(0) = 0, U_t(1) = 1)$ (or $P(U_t(0) = 1, U_t(1) = 0)$).

To see how to bound these parameters, define the vector

$$\mathbf{u} := (u_0, u_1(0), \dots, u_T(0), u_1(1), \dots, u_T(1))'$$

where \mathbf{u}_0 is the initial (period 0) potential outcome. In addition, let $U := (U_0, U(0), U(1))'$, and let

$$\mathcal{U}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}) := \{\mathbf{u} : u_0 = y_0, y_t = y_{t-1}u_t(0) + (1 - y_{t-1})u_t(1), \forall t\},$$

which is the set of all vectors \mathbf{u} of potential outcomes that could rationalize an observed vector of outcomes $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_T)'$. Finally, let $\mathbf{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_T)'$. [Torgovitsky \(2016\)](#) shows that without any additional restrictions, the sharp set of constraints on the unobserved joint distribution $\theta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}} := P(U = \mathbf{u}, X = \mathbf{x})$ is given by:

$$\mathbb{P}_n(Y = \mathbf{y}, X = \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\mathbf{y})} \theta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}} \quad (2.11)$$

[Torgovitsky \(2016\)](#) shows how additional restrictions can also be imposed on the unobserved joint distribution $\theta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}}$, such as monotone treatment response (MTR) constraints, stationarity (ST) constraints, monotone

instrument variable (MIV) constraints and monotone treatment selection (MTS) constraints. All of these constraint can be imposed on the optimization problem as “moment-inequality” constraints. Let $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ denote the set of all joint distributions θ satisfying the imposed constraints as well as the observational equivalence condition (2.11). Proposition 1 in [Torgovitsky \(2016\)](#) shows that if $\psi : \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous treatment effect parameter, then the identified set for ψ can be estimated by $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)]$, and can be obtained by solving the problems:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta) \quad (2.12)$$

Note that when T is large, there can be a large number of constraints defining the set $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$, and the partially identified parameter θ can be high-dimensional.

Example 3 (Inference on Counterfactual Policies). In the setting of [Kasy \(2016\)](#), the researcher is interested in ranking counterfactual policies “A” and “B” which represent two competing proposals of assigning individuals to some treatment based on covariate values. It is assumed that individual potential outcomes are fixed (i.e. individual i ’s potential outcomes are the same under each policy) and that the policy maker only has knowledge of the partially-identified parameters $g_0(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y_0|X]$ and $g_1(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y_1|X]$, where Y_d is the partially-observed potential outcome for treatment state $D = d$.

We assume that the researcher’s object of interest is the linear functional $\psi := \psi(f^A, f^B)$ where f^A is the distribution of the random variable Y^A representing the observed outcome under policy A, and f^B is the distribution of the random variable Y^B representing the observed outcome under policy B. Furthermore, let D^A be the random variable representing treatment assignment under policy A, and let D^B be the random variable representing treatment under assignment B, and assume that $D^A, D^B \perp (Y_0, Y_1)|X$. Some simple objective functions include $\psi^A := \mathbb{E}[Y^A]$ (or $\psi^B := \mathbb{E}[Y^B]$), which measures the average outcome under policy A, or $\psi^{AB} := \mathbb{E}[Y^A - Y^B]$, which measures the difference in average outcomes between policies A and B. Let \mathcal{G}_d denote the identified set for $g_d(X)$. Note that the objective function ψ^A can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^A &= \mathbb{E}[Y^A] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y^A|D^A = 1, X] P(D^A = 1|X) + \mathbb{E}[Y^A|D^A = 0, X] (1 - P(D^A = 1|X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_0|X] + P(D^A = 1|X) (\mathbb{E}[Y_1|X] - \mathbb{E}[Y_0|X])] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g_0(X) + h^A(X) (g_1(X) - g_0(X))] \end{aligned}$$

where $h^A(X) = P(D^A = 1|X)$. Since $g_0(\cdot)$ and $g_1(\cdot)$ are only partially-identified, ψ^A will also be partially identified. Let $\Psi_I^A(P) = [\Psi_{\ell b}^A(P), \Psi_{ub}^A(P)]$ denote the identified set for $\psi^A = \mathbb{E}[Y^A]$, where the endpoints of Ψ_I^A are determined by:

$$\Psi_{\ell b}^A(P) = \inf_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [g_0(x) + h^A(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x))] P(X = x), \quad (2.13)$$

$$\Psi_{ub}^A(P) = \sup_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [g_0(x) + h^A(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x))] P(X = x), \quad (2.14)$$

where $P(X = x)$ is the probability $X = x$ in the target population. Similarly, as in [Kasy \(2016\)](#), the objective function ψ^{AB} can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{AB} &= \mathbb{E} [Y^A - Y^B] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [(h^A(X) - h^B(X)) (Y_1 - Y_0)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [h^{AB}(X)g(X)] \end{aligned}$$

where $h^{AB}(X) = h^A(X) - h^B(X)$, $h^A(X) = P(D^A = 1|X)$, $h^B(X) = P(D^B = 1|X)$ and $g(X) = g_1(X) - g_0(X)$. Since $g(X)$ is only partially identified, the objective function ψ^{AB} will also only be partially identified. Let $\Psi_I^{AB}(P) = [\Psi_{lb}^{AB}(P), \Psi_{ub}^{AB}(P)]$ denote the identified set for ψ^{AB} , where the endpoints of Ψ_I^{AB} are given by:

$$\Psi_{lb}^{AB}(P) = \inf_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} h^{AB}(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x)) P(X = x), \quad (2.15)$$

$$\Psi_{ub}^{AB}(P) = \sup_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} h^{AB}(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x)) P(X = x), \quad (2.16)$$

where $P(X = x)$ is the probability $X = x$ in the target population. In this example, note that the partially identified parameter is $\theta = (g_0, g_1)$ and the identified set is $\Theta_I(P) = \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1$.

Remark 2.1. In practice, the probabilities $P(X = x)$ in the optimization problems (2.13) and (2.14), or (2.15) and (2.16), may need to be estimated, meaning that the objective functions in these optimization problems contain sampling uncertainty that must be accounted for when performing inference on either Ψ_I^A or Ψ_I^{AB} in addition to the sampling uncertainty inherent in the estimation of the sets \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 . Currently, we are unaware of any uniformly valid inference procedure in partially identified models that can handle these cases.

3 Methodology

In this section, we develop the ideas introduced in the previous section. We consider a setting when the identified set Θ_I is defined by moment equalities and inequalities that are satisfied at the true parameter θ_0 :

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_0) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, r_1 \quad (3.1)$$

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_2 \quad (3.2)$$

Note that we can always convert these moment equalities/inequalities defined above into $k = 2r_1 + r_2$ equivalent moment inequalities given by:

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, r_1 \quad (3.3)$$

$$-Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, r_1 \quad (3.4)$$

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_2 \quad (3.5)$$

Thus, we will assume throughout most of the exposition that the model is defined only by k moment inequalities:

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k \quad (3.6)$$

Only on rare occasions will it be necessary to know which of the moment inequalities correspond to moment equalities; in these cases we will simply refer back to the original formulation in (3.1) and (3.2).

We assume that the researcher is interested in bounding the expected value of a functional $\psi : \mathcal{W} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define $\mathcal{M} := \{m_j(\cdot, \theta) : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta \in \Theta, j = 1, \dots, k\}$, $\mathcal{M}_0 := \{\psi(\cdot, \theta) : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta \in \Theta\}$, and let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_0$, $\mathcal{F}' := \{f - g : f, g \in \mathcal{F}\}$, and $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup (\mathcal{F}')^2$. Furthermore, let \mathcal{P} denote the collection of all probability measures on \mathcal{W} . Finally, for $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ define:

$$\|Q\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |Qf|, \quad \|Q\|_{\mathcal{G}} := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{G}} |Qf|.$$

Throughout the article we will switch freely between considering uniform convergence over $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and convergence over any data-generating sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$; these two notions of convergence are equivalent. We also use the following notion of convergence for a sequence of probability measures $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$:

$$\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.7)$$

Note that this is the appropriate level of convergence of probability measures when considering weak convergence over “drifting sequences” $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$; see, for example, [Sheehy and Wellner \(1992\)](#). We now impose the following assumptions:

Assumption 3.1. *The parameter space $\Theta \times \mathcal{P}$ satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_{\theta}}$ is convex and compact.
- (ii) \mathcal{F} is a measurable class of functions.
- (iii) All distributions $P \in \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfy:
 - (a) $Pm_j(W, \theta_0) \leq 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$.
 - (b) In a sample $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$, W_i are independent and identically distributed according to $P \in \mathcal{P}$.
 - (c) $\sigma_{P,j}(\theta)^2 := \text{Var}_P(m_j(W, \theta)) \in (0, \infty)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.
- (iv) There exists a bounded envelope function F for the class \mathcal{F} such that for some $a > 0$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P|F(W)|^{2+a} < \infty$$

Remark 3.1. In Assumption 3.1(ii), we call \mathcal{F} measurable if \mathcal{F} is P -measurable in the sense of Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996) Definition 2.3.3 for all probability measures $P \in \mathcal{P}$. We will see in Section 4 that this assumption is redundant given the other assumptions we will impose on \mathcal{F} . Indeed, Assumption 3.1(ii) holds for any class \mathcal{F} of functions that is image-admissible Suslin (c.f. Dudley (1984) Section 10.3); in Section 4 we show that the other assumptions imposed in this paper (namely, Assumption 3.1(i) and 3.2) will imply that \mathcal{F} is image-admissible Suslin.

Note that we can write the identified set $\Theta_I(P)$ as:

$$\Theta_I(P) = \{\theta \in \Theta : Pm_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k\} \quad (3.8)$$

Now let $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ denote the estimate of the identified set:

$$\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) = \{\theta \in \Theta : \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq c_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k\} \quad (3.9)$$

where we will allow $c_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ to be a deterministic sequence¹, and where \mathbb{P}_n denotes the empirical measure for the first n observations:

$$\mathbb{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{W_i} \quad (3.10)$$

We restrict attention to a certain class of functionals of the identified set.

Assumption 3.2. The functional of interest $\psi(w, \theta) : \mathcal{W} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and continuously differentiable in θ , and is continuous in $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Furthermore, the functions $m_j(\cdot, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are convex and continuously differentiable in θ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Denote the identified set for $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ to be $\Psi_I(P)$, and note that the identified set for $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ is the projection of $\Theta_I(P)$ on the manifold generated by $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$. As such, under standard conditions (to be made precise) the projection estimator $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ will be a consistent estimator of $\Psi_I(P)$. Moreover, since $P\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ is continuous and $\Theta_I(P)$ is convex and compact, the identified set $\Psi_I(P)$ is an interval — $\Psi_I(P) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)]$ — with endpoints determined by:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} P\psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Pm_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\Psi_I^{ub}(P) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P\psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Pm_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.12)$$

However, since P is not known, the programs (3.11) and (3.12) will be approximated using the empirical distribution \mathbb{P}_n by replacing the population moment conditions and objective function with their sample counterparts:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq c_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.13)$$

¹For example, $c_n = \log(n)/n$. The researcher can also set $c_n = 0$ for all n .

$$\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq c_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.14)$$

where again $c_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ is a deterministic sequence.

Remark 3.2. *For sake of simplicity, we will set $c_n = 0$ for the remained of the paper and in the proofs; this is without loss of generality, since under the assumptions presented later related to rates of convergence we can always redefine the sample moment conditions as $\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) - c_n$ without affecting any of the asymptotic results.*

Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and mild conditions on the moment functions, the estimator $[\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)]$ will be a consistent estimate of the identified set. After such an estimator is obtained, interest will lie in constructing uniformly valid confidence sets for the true parameter $\psi_0 := P\psi(W, \theta_0)$. To perform inference on the true parameter using the optimal values $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ in programs (3.11) and (3.12), we will recover the distributions of $(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)), \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P)))$ using a functional delta method. However, we will be particularly interested in a functional delta-method procedure that is valid *uniformly* over $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Remark 3.3. *As a technical note, the functions $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot), \Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot))$ will be seen as maps from \mathcal{P}_+ to \mathbb{R} , where \mathcal{P}_+ is defined as the collection of all measures \mathcal{P} as well as all finite empirical measures \mathbb{P}_n generated by a $P_n \in \mathcal{P}$ (i.e. the $\mathcal{P}_+ = \text{span}(\mathcal{P}, \{\delta_w\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}})$, where $\{\delta_w\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}}$ is any finite collection of point masses). It will be useful to distinguish between the collections \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}_+ throughout.*

3.1 Value Function Differentiability

To use a functional delta method will require showing that the value functions satisfy an appropriate level of differentiability with respect to the underlying probability measure. Since the underlying probability measure is an infinite-dimensional object, we must use a form of differentiability that is valid between metrizable topological spaces. In particular, it is well-known (e.g. Shapiro (1990), Shapiro (1991)) that under some conditions the functions $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ are *Hadamard directionally differentiable*. To introduce the differentiability concepts used in this paper in general form, let (\mathbb{D}, d_D) and (\mathbb{E}, d_E) be metric spaces.

Definition 3.1 (Hadamard Directional Differentiability). *A map $\phi : \mathbb{D}_\phi \subseteq \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ is called Hadamard Directionally Differentiable at $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}_\phi$ if there is a linear map $\phi'_\zeta : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ such that*

$$\frac{\phi(\zeta + t_n h_n) - \phi(\zeta)}{t_n} \rightarrow \phi'_\zeta(h), \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

for converging sequences $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ with $t_n \downarrow 0$ and $h_n \rightarrow h$ such that $\zeta + t_n h_n \in \mathbb{D}_\phi$ for every n . In addition, we say ϕ is Hadamard directionally differentiable tangential to a set $\mathbb{D}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ if we also require that the limit $h \in \mathbb{D}_0$ in the above.

While Hadamard directional differentiability can be used to justify a delta-method procedure in stochastic programs for a fixed data-generating measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$ (c.f. [Shapiro \(1991\)](#)), it is not sufficient to establish a delta-method procedure for stochastic programs that is valid *uniformly* over all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. It is natural to wonder whether stochastic programs are uniformly Hadamard directionally differentiable, which is defined in the following:

Definition 3.2 (Uniform Hadamard Directional Differentiability). *Let $\phi : \mathbb{D}_\phi \subseteq \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$, $\mathbb{D}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{D}$, and $\mathbb{D}_\zeta \subseteq \mathbb{D}_\phi$. The map $\phi : \mathbb{D}_\phi \subseteq \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ is called Uniformly Hadamard Directionally Differentiable in $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}_\zeta$ if there is a continuous map $\phi'_\zeta : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{\phi(\zeta_n + t_n h_n) - \phi(\zeta_n)}{t_n} - \phi'_\zeta(h) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.15)$$

for all converging sequences $\zeta_n \rightarrow \zeta \in \mathbb{D}_\zeta$, $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ with $t_n \downarrow 0$, and $h_n \rightarrow h$ such that $\zeta_n + t_n h_n \in \mathbb{D}_\phi$ for every n . In addition, we say ϕ is Uniformly Hadamard directionally differentiable tangential to a set $\mathbb{D}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ if we also require that the limit $h \in \mathbb{D}_0$ in the above.

This definition is analogous to the extension of Hadamard differentiability to uniform Hadamard differentiability presented in [Belloni et al. \(2017\)](#), although our definition restricts $t_n \rightarrow 0$ from above (providing a “direction”), allows the spaces involved to be metric spaces rather than normed linear spaces, and allows the derivative map ϕ'_ζ to be continuous rather than linear. In addition, reflecting more the definition in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) p.379, we do not explicitly require that the derivative map $(\zeta, h) \rightarrow \phi'_\zeta(h)$ be continuous at every (ζ, h) , as is done in the extension of Hadamard differentiability to uniform Hadamard differentiability in [Belloni et al. \(2017\)](#). However, similar to [Belloni et al. \(2017\)](#), we will use the flexibility provided by the above definition to allow ζ_n to lie outside \mathbb{D}_ζ .

As we will see, the value functions of a stochastic program are generally differentiable in the sense of Definition 3.2. We will then show that a uniform delta method can be successfully applied to the value functions of the stochastic programs in (3.11) and (3.12).

Our first main result requires the existence of Lagrange multipliers, and that strong (convex) duality holds in the programs (3.11), (3.12). To guarantee these properties will require that a “uniform constraint qualification” holds for the convex programs. We impose such a constraint qualification in the following assumption:

Assumption 3.3. *There exists a $\varepsilon_P > 0$ such that for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a point $\theta_P \in \Theta$ (possibly depending on P) and an integer $N \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $P_n m_j(\cdot, \theta_P) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, and $P_n m_j(\cdot, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_P$ for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_2$.*

Assumption 3.3 is a uniform (over \mathcal{P}) version of *Slater’s constraint qualification*, and is instrumental in ensuring the existence of Lagrange multipliers, and that strong duality hold in the programs (3.11) and (3.12) in the tails of any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty$. Assumption 3.3 deserves some discussion. It will be important in the interpretation of Assumption 3.3 to recall the difference between \mathcal{P}_+ and \mathcal{P} discussed in Remark 3.3.

First note that Assumption 3.3 is one of the rare cases where it is useful to distinguish between moment equalities as in (3.1) and moment inequalities as in (3.2), since the assumption imposes different conditions on the two types of moments.

Next note that a direct consequence of Assumption 3.3 —taking the sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$ to be the constant sequence $P \in \mathcal{P}$ — is that there exists a $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} > 0$ such that for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a $\theta_P \in \Theta$ (possibly depending on P) satisfying $Pm_j(\cdot, \theta_P) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, and $Pm_j(\cdot, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}$ for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_2$. In other words, for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there must be at least one interior point of the set defined by the moment inequalities at which all moment equalities are satisfied. The major restriction imposed by this implication is that the moment inequalities evaluated at the limiting $P \in \mathcal{P}$ cannot point-identify the parameter of interest.² This condition is reminiscent of condition 4 in Theorem 2.1 in Shi and Shum (2015), and its discussion on page 499 of Shi and Shum (2015). Similar to their discussion, we note that in many cases this assumption will fail because two inequality constraints become equivalent, in which case the inequality constraints can be combined to form an equality constraint so that the assumption still holds.

Next, note that, beyond the content of the previous point, Assumption 3.3 also requires that a constraint qualification holds for the tail of any sequence $\{P_n\} \subset \mathcal{P}_+ \setminus \mathcal{P}$ converging to $P \in \mathcal{P}$. In other words, all but finitely many of the elements of the sequence $\{P_n\} \subset \mathcal{P}_+ \setminus \mathcal{P}$ converging to $P \in \mathcal{P}$ must satisfy the conditions of the assumption. This implication of the assumption allows for sequences where the constraint qualification is not satisfied by at most finitely many terms of the sequence, although it must become satisfied by all terms as n tends to infinity. This can occur, for example, when the moment inequalities dictated by the underlying economic model theoretically have non-empty interior, but the set defined by the moment inequalities is empty, or contains only a single point, in finite sample for some empirical measure $\mathbb{P}_n \in \mathcal{P}_+$. In this sense, the assumption is flexible. However, note that this assumption implies that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is non-empty w.p.a. 1 (see Lemma B.4(ii) in Appendix B.2), so that emptiness of the identified set in large samples may be seen as an indication that this assumption is violated.

Next, note that this assumption is sufficient for our method to be uniformly valid, but is not necessary. However, the assumption is the most primitive assumption we are currently aware of, as it connects to the highly used constraint qualification assumptions in optimization literature while imposing minimal constraints on any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty$ required for uniformity.

Finally, we make the important remark that, under the assumption that the moment inequalities are correctly specified, the condition in Assumption 3.3 can be made to hold *artificially* by introducing an infinitesimal slackness parameter for the moment inequalities, say $\eta_P > 0$, and redefining the relevant system of moment conditions as:

$$Pm_j(W, \theta) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, r_1 \quad (3.16)$$

²Note also that this condition rules out the case that the moment inequalities define an empty region. However, we do not consider this a “major restriction” of our method, since if the true identified set is empty then computing functionals over the identified set becomes a dubious exercise.

$$P\tilde{m}_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_2 \quad (3.17)$$

where $P\tilde{m}_j(W, \theta_0) \leftarrow Pm_j(W, \theta_0) - \eta_P$. Taking $\varepsilon_P < \eta_P$, we have:

$$P\tilde{m}_j(W, \theta) < -\varepsilon_P \iff Pm_j(W, \theta) < (\eta_P - \varepsilon_P)$$

and since $(\eta_P - \varepsilon_P) > 0$, using $P\tilde{m}_j(W, \theta)$ in place of $Pm_j(W, \theta)$ at most will introduce a conservative distortion as it widens the identified sets $\Theta_I(P)$ and $\Psi_I(P)$ infinitesimally (the latter statements holding by Assumption 3.2). In practice, this will be our recommended procedure, since it ensures that Assumption 3.3 holds for a correctly specified model and will introduce at most an infinitesimal conservative distortion for our proposed inference procedure.³

Next, we have the following assumption:

Assumption 3.4. *The optimal solutions and Lagrange multipliers in (3.11) and (3.12) are unique for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$*

Note that for the main result below, it is necessary to restrict the solutions to (3.11) and (3.12) to be unique for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. To understand why, note that if the problems (3.11) and (3.12) admit multiple solutions there may be differences between the sets representing “the limiting optimal solutions” (over the sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$), and the sets representing “the optimal solutions at the limit” ($P \in \mathcal{P}$).⁴ In this case it is possible to show that the value functions $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot), \Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot)$ are Hadamard directionally differentiable, but not necessarily *uniformly* Hadamard directionally differentiable. While Assumption 3.4 may restrict the set of functionals ψ to which our procedure applies, it can be verified directly by the researcher. We discuss sufficient conditions for this assumption in Section 4.

Finally, as a piece of technical machinery, we define the tangent cone as:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{F}) = \{v \in UC_b(\mathcal{F}, \rho) : \forall t_n \downarrow 0, \forall \{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{G} P \in \mathcal{P}, \exists \{Q_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty \text{ s.t. } t_n^{-1}(Q_n - P_n) \rightarrow v\} \quad (3.18)$$

where $UC_b(\mathcal{F}, \rho) \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the space of bounded, and uniformly continuous functions with respect to the semimetric ρ .⁵ While restricting the tangent cone to be a subset of $UC_b(\mathcal{F}, \rho_P)$ might appear to be restrictive, under the Donsker-type assumptions to be introduced later almost all paths $f \mapsto \mathbb{G}_P(\omega, f)$ of our limiting empirical process \mathbb{G}_P will have sample paths that are almost all uniformly continuous; see

³If Assumption 3.3 did not hold then, even when combined with our other assumptions, our procedure would allow for the length of the identified set Ψ_I to drift towards zero along certain sequences. Managing this case, for example using the methods of Stoye (2009), induces asymptotic dissimilarity along certain sequences anyways. In our case, when Assumption 3.3 is combined with Assumptions 3.2 and 3.4, we rule out the possibility of the length of the identified set drifting to zero. Although the slackness parameter $\eta_P > 0$ will induce asymptotic dissimilarity along all sequences, the researcher is aware of the dissimilarity by construction. In addition, as we will see in Remark 3.5, the existence of Lagrange multipliers guaranteed by Assumption 3.3 allows us to avoid using a GMS procedure, which also typically induces dissimilarity along certain sequences.

⁴This is related to the Theorem of the Maximum, and the fact that the Theorem of the Maximum guarantees only that the solution correspondence is upper hemicontinuous, but not lower hemicontinuous (and thus, not continuous) with respect to perturbation parameters. In our context, the perturbation parameter is given by the probability measure P .

⁵Recall a semimetric satisfies (i) $\rho(f, f) = 0$, (ii) $\rho(f, g) \leq \rho(f, h) + \rho(h, g)$ and (iii) $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$. However, unlike a metric, a semimetric can be equal to zero when evaluated at two distinct elements.

Addendum 1.5.8 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#). We now have the following result:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose assumptions 3.1-3.4 hold, and consider $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot), \Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot) : \mathcal{P}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the programs (3.11) and (3.12). Then $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot), \Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot)$ are uniformly Hadamard directionally differentiable tangent to $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$. In particular, for all converging sequences $P_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ with $t_n \downarrow 0$, and $h_n \rightarrow h \in \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ such that $P_n + t_n h_n \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for every n , we have:*

$$(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_\zeta(h) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} := h\psi(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(P) hm(\cdot, \theta) \quad (3.19)$$

$$(\Psi_I^{ub})'_\zeta(h) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{ub}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)}{t_n} := -h\psi(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^*(P) hm(\cdot, \theta) \quad (3.20)$$

where $\theta_{\ell b}^*(P)$ and $\theta_{ub}^*(P)$ are the optimal solutions in the lower and upper bounding problems at $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\{\lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(P)\}_{j=1}^k$ and $\{\lambda_{ub, j}^*(P)\}_{j=1}^k$ are the Lagrange multipliers in the lower and upper bounding problems at $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

The uniform component of this Theorem lies in the fact that it is valid over any generating sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$. This uniform version of differentiability turns out to be sufficient to apply the extended continuous mapping theorem (Theorem 1.11.1 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)) in order to deduce a uniform delta method. This is exactly what is done in Lemma 3.1 in the next subsection.

3.2 A Uniform Delta Method

We now consider the asymptotic distribution of the properly rescaled and re-centred value functions given in (3.13) and (3.14), which will make use of the uniform differentiability property given in Theorem 3.1. Define the semimetric:

$$\rho_P(f, g) := \left(\int |f - g|^2 dP \right)^{1/2} \quad (3.21)$$

for $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. To cover the case of a drifting sequence of data-generating processes, which will be necessary to show uniformity, we impose additional assumptions.

Assumption 3.5. *The collections \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{P} satisfy the following:*

- (i) *The empirical process $\mathbb{G}_{n, P} := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P)$ is asymptotically equicontinuous uniformly in $P \in \mathcal{P}$, that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{\rho_P(f, g) < \delta} |\mathbb{G}_{n, P}(f) - \mathbb{G}_{n, P}(g)| > \varepsilon \right) = 0$$

where $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ are arbitrary elements, and ρ_P is as in (3.21).

(ii) For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the covariance kernel $\mathbf{V}_P(\theta, \theta') : \Theta \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$ for the vector of moment functions $(\psi(\cdot, \theta), m_1(\cdot, \theta), \dots, m_k(\cdot, \theta))'$ satisfies:

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{\|(\theta_1, \theta'_1) - (\theta_2, \theta'_2)\| < \delta} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \|\mathbf{V}_P(\theta_1, \theta'_1) - \mathbf{V}_P(\theta_2, \theta'_2)\| = 0$$

(iii) Let $\mathcal{A}(\theta, P) \subseteq \{r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2\}$ denote the binding moment inequalities at (θ, P) , and let:

$$\mathbf{C}_P(\theta) := \text{Corr}(P\psi(\cdot, \theta), \{Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1}, \{Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)})$$

Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfy:

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} \text{eig}(\mathbf{C}_P(\theta)) > \delta \quad (3.22)$$

(iv) There exist positive constants $C, \delta > 0$ such that $\max_{j=r+1, \dots, k} |Pm_j(W, \theta)| \geq C \min(\delta, d(\theta, \Theta_I(P)))$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$.

Sufficient conditions for assumption 3.5(i) will be discussed in section 4. For now, suffice it to say that 3.5(i) is required to apply a uniform central limit theorem to the general class of functions \mathcal{F} . Assumption 3.5(ii) is also required to prove the class of functions \mathcal{F} is uniformly Donsker over any sequence in \mathcal{P} . Assumption 3.5(iii) is derived from Assumption 4.3 in [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#), and implies that the objective function and binding moment conditions together do not have a singular covariance kernel. Intuitively, this assumption is required in our method in order to ensure that perturbations in the objective function and moment conditions do not annihilate each other, which may erroneously produce a degenerate distribution for (3.19) and (3.20).⁶ Finally, Assumption 3.5(iv) is the partial identification condition given in [Chernozhukov et al. \(2007\)](#), equation (4.5), and is used to establish the Hausdorff consistency and the rate of convergence of the estimated identified set to the true identified set.

In the following Lemma, for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converging to the Borel probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n) \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ denote the empirical process indexed by P_n . Adding Assumption 3.5, we have the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose assumptions 3.1-3.5 hold. Then for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ where \mathbb{G}_P is a tight Borel measurable element in $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$, and:*

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \quad (3.23)$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \quad (3.24)$$

Remark 3.4. *This result follows from the extended continuous mapping theorem (Theorem 1.11.1 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)) in combination with the result of Theorem 3.1.*

⁶In Appendix C we show that when Assumption 3.5(iii) is violated, the counterexample provided in Appendix F.2 of [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#) also applies to our method.

When combined with Theorem 3.1, Lemma 3.1 shows that the properly re-centered and rescaled value functions converge in distribution to $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ evaluated at the limiting empirical process:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P \psi(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(P) \mathbb{G}_P m(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) \quad (3.25)$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow -\mathbb{G}_P \psi(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^*(P) \mathbb{G}_P m(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) \quad (3.26)$$

along any converging sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfying Assumptions 3.1-3.5. The next section shows that the objects on the right side of (3.25) and (3.26) can be approximated uniformly using a nonparametric bootstrap procedure.

3.3 The Bootstrap Version

This section shows that plugging-in the empirical process bootstrap $\mathbb{G}_n^b := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^b - \mathbb{P}_n)$ for \mathbb{G}_P in the representations given in (3.25) and (3.26)—and replacing $\theta_{\ell b}^*(P)$, $\theta_{ub}^*(P)$, $\lambda_{\ell b}^*(P)$, and $\lambda_{ub}^*(P)$ with $\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$, and $\lambda_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ —will allow us to consistently estimate the distributions of the value functions $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} . In particular, we propose the approximations:

$$(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) = \mathbb{G}_n^b \psi(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \mathbb{G}_n^b m(\cdot, \theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \quad (3.27)$$

$$(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) = -\mathbb{G}_n^b \psi(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \mathbb{G}_n^b m(\cdot, \theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \quad (3.28)$$

where $\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\theta_{ub}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ are the estimated optimal solutions in the lower and upper bounding problems, and $\{\lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{j=1}^k$ and $\{\lambda_{ub, j}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{j=1}^k$ are the estimated Lagrange multipliers for the lower and upper bounding problems. In particular, we will use the distribution of (3.27) to approximate the distribution of (3.25), and we will use the distribution of (3.28) to approximate the distribution of (3.26).

Remark 3.5. Typically test statistics in moment inequality models will be a function of both a empirical process and a “re-centering” statistic.⁷ At first glance it may be surprising that the approximations to (3.25)

⁷Indeed, the need for this re-centering can be seen by expanding the rescaled sample moment inequality $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) \leq 0$:

$$\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) - P m_j(\cdot, \theta)) + \sqrt{n}P m_j(\cdot, \theta) = \mathbb{G}_n m(\cdot, \theta) + \sqrt{n}P m_j(\cdot, \theta)$$

Thus, to construct a uniform bootstrap approximation to the distribution of $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta)$ will require a consistent estimate of $\sqrt{n}P m_j(\cdot, \theta)$. Since typically this parameter cannot be estimated consistently in a uniform sense, it is usually replaced with the term $\varphi_j(\xi_{j, n}(\theta))$, where $\xi_{j, n}(\theta) := \kappa_n^{-1} \sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta)$, with κ_n a thresholding sequence satisfying $\kappa_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\kappa_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\varphi_j(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x > -1 \\ -\infty, & \text{if } x \leq -1 \end{cases} \quad (3.29)$$

which is a GMS function, as in Andrews and Soares (2010).

and (3.26) given in (3.27) and (3.28) do not include the usual approximation to the re-centering statistic. However, recall that if the moment inequality $\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) \leq 0$ is slack in the stochastic program (3.13) (or (3.14)), then its associated Lagrange multiplier will be zero, and it will not contribute to the distribution of $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ (or $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$). On the other hand, if the moment inequality $\mathbb{P}_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) \leq 0$ is binding in the stochastic program (3.13) (or (3.14)), then its associated Lagrange multiplier will be non-negative, and it may contribute to the distribution of $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ (or $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$). In the latter case, continuity of the Lagrange multipliers with respect to the underlying sequence of data-generating measures ensures that drifting-to-binding moment inequalities affect the left-hand side of (3.27) and (3.28) in a continuous manner. Lemma B.2 in Appendix B.2 provides the exact sense in which this statement is true. In this way, the Lagrange multipliers are performing the regularization for the problem needed to guarantee uniform convergence. This regularization property of the Lagrange multipliers has also been previously noticed by [Kaido and Santos \(2014\)](#).⁸

We must be precise about the conditions under which the law of $((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b), (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b))$ conditional on the data $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ can approximate the unconditional law of $((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P), (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} . Let $\{\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n : b = 1, \dots, B\}$ denote the bootstrap samples. We maintain the following assumptions:

Assumption 3.6. *The bootstrap sample $\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n$ for $b = 1, \dots, B$, satisfies the following:*

- (i) $\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent of $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$.
- (ii) $f(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ is a measurable function of $\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n$ outer almost surely in $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ for any continuous bounded $f : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We construct the bootstrap empirical process \mathbb{G}_n^b by

$$\mathbb{G}_P^b m_j(\cdot, \theta) := \sqrt{n} (\mathbb{P}_n^b - \mathbb{P}_n) m_j(\cdot; \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_j(W_i^b; \theta) - \bar{m}_j(\theta)) \quad (3.30)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, k$. For any fixed sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$, denote:

$$(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\cdot) := \begin{bmatrix} (\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\cdot) \\ (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\Psi_I)'_P(\cdot) := \begin{bmatrix} (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\cdot) \\ (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\cdot) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.31)$$

The following theorem, which is necessary for our main result, shows that the proposed bootstrap procedure is uniformly valid:

Theorem 3.2. *Under assumptions 3.1-3.6:*

$$\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left((\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \right) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] - \mathbb{E} [f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))] \right| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$$

so that the conditional law of $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ converges to the law of $(\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} .

⁸We thank Bulat Gafarov for bringing this to our attention.

Remark 3.6. *Theorem 3.2 shows that the conditional law of $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ converges to the law of $(\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ in the bounded Lipschitz metric d_{BL} uniformly in probability. This metric d_{BL} is a metric for weak convergence: for a sequence of Borel measures P_n , we have $P_n \rightsquigarrow P$ if and only if $d_{BL}(P_n, P) \rightarrow 0$ (c.f. [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) chapter 1.12).⁹*

A confidence set for the true parameter $\psi(\theta_0)$ can then be constructed using the quantiles of the bootstrapped distributions of $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ and $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$. In particular, the confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ with asymptotic coverage probability of $1 - \alpha$ can be constructed as:

$$C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha) := \left[\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)}{\sqrt{n}}, \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) + \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \quad (3.32)$$

where the pair $(\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b))$ minimize the length of the confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ subject to the constraints:

$$\mathbb{P}_n^b \left((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), \quad -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad (3.33)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_n^b \left((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) - \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), \quad -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad (3.34)$$

where Δ is the length of the identified set. Note that under assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, we rule out cases where length of the identified set can be drifting towards zero, and thus we avoid issues of uniformity that occur in this scenario (see [Stoye \(2009\)](#)).

Finally, we require the following continuity assumption on the distributions of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$:

Assumption 3.7. *The distribution of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ is continuous at its α quantile, and the distribution of $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ is continuous at its $1 - \alpha$ quantile.*

This assumption allows us to equate statements on weak convergence with statements on convergence at continuity points of the distributions of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$. The following result verifies that under our assumptions, the confidence set given in (3.32) is uniformly asymptotically valid:

Theorem 3.3. *Under assumptions 3.1 - 3.7,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\{(\psi, P): \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}} P(\psi \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (3.35)$$

where $\psi_0 := P\psi(\cdot, \theta_0)$ and $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ is as in (3.32).

⁹Define the set of Lipschitz functionals $f : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the metric space (\mathbb{D}, d) as:

$$BL_1(\mathbb{D}) := \{f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : |f(d)| \leq 1 \text{ and } |f(d) - f(d')| \leq \|d - d'\|_{\mathbb{D}} \text{ for all } d, d' \in \mathbb{D}\}$$

Then the Lipschitz distance between two measures P_1 and P_2 is given by:

$$d_{BL}(P_1, P_2) := \sup_{f \in BL_1(\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}))} \left| \int f dP_1 - \int f dP_2 \right|$$

The confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ is both conceptually simple and easy to implement. Indeed, computing the confidence set amounts to bootstrapping the Lagrangian for the optimization problems that define the endpoints of the set $\Psi_I(\cdot)$. Calibrating the critical values $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)$ and $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)$ is then easily done once the bootstrap distribution has been recovered. Importantly, computation of the confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ can be done in many cases without the need to grid over the parameter space.

4 Discussion

4.1 Uniqueness of Solutions

Note that under either strict convexity or strict monotonicity of the objective function $\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ with respect to $\theta \in \Theta_I(\cdot)$, the optimal solutions in (3.11) or (3.12) will be unique. A relevant example of this occurs in subvector inference, when the objective function $\psi(\cdot, \theta) = \theta_\ell$, the ℓ^{th} component of the vector θ , the objective function is strictly monotone and so will achieve a unique maximum and minimum over the identified set.

However, in general it can be more cumbersome to verify that the Lagrange multipliers are unique. Sufficient conditions are related to the *constraint qualifications* satisfied by the optimization problem. Wachsmuth (2013) shows that the weakest constraint qualification under which the set of Lagrange Multipliers $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\cdot)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(\cdot)$ are *a priori* singletons is the *linear independence constraint qualification*.

Definition 4.1 (Linear Independence Constraint Qualification). *Let $\mathcal{A}(\theta^*, P) \subseteq \{r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2\}$ denote the set indexing the binding moment inequalities in the minimization problem (3.11) (or (3.12)) at some arg min value θ^* for some probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ) is satisfied at (θ^*, P) if the gradients $\{\nabla_\theta P m_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1} \cup \{\nabla_\theta P m_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta^*, P)}$ are linearly independent.*

This constraint qualification implies, but is not implied by, the constraint qualification in Assumption 3.3. There are some cases where it may be easy to directly verify that the LICQ is satisfied. For example, we will say a moment function $P m_j(\cdot, \theta)$ is *linearly separable in θ* if the moment function can be expressed as $P m_j(\cdot, \theta) = P \tilde{m}_j(\cdot) + a_j' \theta$, where \tilde{m}_j is a function of the random variable $W \in \mathcal{W}$, and $a_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector. For cases when all the moment functions are linearly separable in θ —which is the case, for instance, in examples 1 and 2—it is easy to directly check whether the LICQ holds by verifying if the Jacobian of the moment functions (w.r.t. θ) has full column rank. However, we emphasize again that the LICQ condition is sufficient but not necessary. Indeed, we find in many examples using direct calculation that the Lagrange multipliers are unique even when the LICQ is violated.

As a final remark, note that Assumption 3.4 is not a high-level assumption in the sense that it can be verified by direct calculation. Even when direct calculation can be cumbersome in nonlinear examples, there is mathematical software that can solve the optimization problems symbolically so that the researcher need

only program the optimization problem and then interpret the result.¹⁰ Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that in our simulation exercises unique Lagrange multipliers is by far the most common case.

4.2 Primitive Conditions for Uniform Asymptotic Equicontinuity

Among all the assumptions, the uniform asymptotic equicontinuity assumption 3.5(i) is perhaps the most high-level. This subsection aims to provide a primitive condition for the class of functions \mathcal{F} to satisfy this assumption. The primitive condition we provide is that this class satisfy a certain measurability condition, and that the class of function \mathcal{F} be a Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) class. Although this section will not review VC theory in detail, we will review results that show the primitive condition we provide is both necessary and sufficient for the weak convergence $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ for any converging sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$. Further background on VC classes can be found in Appendix D. In particular, the definition of a VC class is given in Definition D.1, and the definition of a VC subgraph class is given by Definition D.2.

First we present the required measurability assumption. Consider the following definition from Dudley (2014):

Definition 4.2 (Image Admissible Suslin, Dudley (2014) pg. 230). *If (Ω, \mathcal{A}) is a measurable space and \mathcal{F} a set, then a real-valued function $X : (f, \omega) \rightarrow X(f, \omega)$ will be called image admissible Suslin via (Y, \mathcal{S}, T) iff (Y, \mathcal{S}) is a Suslin measurable space,¹¹ T is a function from Y onto \mathcal{F} , and $(y, \omega) \rightarrow X(T(y), \omega)$ is jointly measurable on $Y \times \Omega$.*

Note that by assumption 3.1(i) we have that $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is a compact subset of a Polish space, and thus it is trivially a Suslin measurable space with respect to the Borel σ -algebra. Furthermore, partition \mathcal{M} into k disjoint classes $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{M}_j$, where $\mathcal{M}_j := \{m : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : m(w) = m_j(w, \theta), \theta \in \Theta\}$, and recall that \mathcal{M}_0 is defined as $\mathcal{M}_0 := \{\psi(\cdot, \theta) : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta \in \Theta\}$. Then for each \mathcal{M}_j we have a map $\theta \rightarrow m_j(\cdot, \theta)$ (or $\theta \mapsto \psi(\cdot, \theta)$ when $j = 0$) from Θ onto \mathcal{M}_j . Denote this map for class \mathcal{M}_j by T_j .

It remains only to show that the maps $(\omega, \theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_P(\omega)(T_j(\theta))$ is jointly measurable in (f, ω) for $f \in \mathcal{M}_j$ for each $j = 0, \dots, k$. Given separability of Θ , continuity of the map $T_j : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_j$, and continuity of $\mathbb{G}(\omega)(\cdot) : \mathcal{M}_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, joint measurability of $(\omega, \theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_P(\omega)(T_j(\theta))$ follows from Aliprantis and Border (2006) Lemma 4.51 (p. 153) given measurability of $\mathbb{G}_P(\cdot)(f) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to (Ω, \mathcal{A}) .

To show the importance of this measurability assumption and VC classes, consider the following result:

Result 4.1. *Suppose that a class of functions \mathcal{G} is image-admissible Suslin on the measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. Then \mathcal{G} is uniformly Donsker if and only if \mathcal{G} is a VC (subgraph) class.*

This is stated as a result, since it is taken directly from discussions in Dudley (2014). In particular, the forward direction of this result follows from Dudley (2014) Theorem 10.26, and the reverse follows from Theorems 6.1 and 6.15 (see the discussion in Section 6.4 on page 260).

¹⁰This is possible, for example, using Maple.

¹¹A measurable space (Y, \mathcal{S}) is called a Suslin space if and only if there exists a Polish space X and a Borel measurable map from X onto Y . A Polish space is a complete and separable metric space.

While Result 4.1 shows that uniform Donsker classes have a close connection to VC classes, in general it can be difficult to verify whether a class of functions is VC. While references on VC classes, or VC subgraph-classes in the empirical process literature are difficult to find, VC classes are extensively taught and used in the statistical learning literature.¹² References in the statistical learning literature with examples of VC classes, or VC subgraph classes include Mohri et al. (2012), Vapnik (2013), and Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014), to name a few. Notable examples of VC subgraph classes include any finite-dimensional vector space of functions (see Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996) Lemma 2.6.15), or strictly monotonic functions composed with any real-valued function (exercise 10.1 in Mohri et al. (2012)). See Lemma 2.6.18 in Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996) for how to perform operations with multiple VC classes.

5 Conclusion

This paper proposes a simple procedure for constructing confidence intervals for (possibly stochastic) functionals of a partially identified parameter vector. The procedure is analogous to approximating the distribution of the upper and lower bounds of the identified set for the functional of interest through a bootstrap procedure. Uniform validity of the procedure is proven by making connections to results in the Operations Research literature on stochastic programming, and using a uniform functional delta-method procedure.

¹²In the statistical learning literature, the VC index is called the “VC-dimension,” and the VC index of the subgraph of a collection of real-valued functions is called the “pseudo-dimension.”

Appendix A Notation

A.1 Measures and Operators

\mathbb{P}_n = The empirical distribution operator.

\mathbb{P}_n^b = The bootstrap distribution operator.

P_n = A drifting sequence of DGPs in \mathcal{P} , indexed by n and converging to P .

P = The limit of the sequence of measures $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$.

$\mathbb{G}_{n,P_n} = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n)$, the empirical process indexed by $P_n \in \mathcal{P}$.

\mathbb{G}_P = The limiting version of \mathbb{G}_{n,P_n} , a separable and Borel measurable element of $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$.

$\mathbb{G}_n^b = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^b - \mathbb{P}_n)$, the bootstrap empirical process.

A.2 Sets, Collections and Spaces

Θ = The parameter space for θ .

$\Theta_I(P)$ = The identified set for θ at the measure P .

\mathcal{P} = The collection of probability measures.

$\mathcal{P}_+ = \mathcal{P}$ combined with empirical measures generated by \mathcal{P} ; see remark 3.3.

$\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ = The space of uniformly bounded functions on \mathcal{F} .

$\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ = The tangent cone; see (3.18).

$\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$ = The subset of linear operators in the tangent cone, used in the proofs..

$L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ = The bounded linear functionals from \mathcal{F} to \mathbb{R} , used in the proofs.

$CS_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ = A $1 - \alpha$ confidence set for $\psi(\theta_0)$; see (3.32).

$\Theta_{\ell b}(P) :=$ Set of optimal solutions to (3.11) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Theta_{ub}(P) :=$ Set of optimal solutions to (3.11) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Lambda_{\ell b}(P) :=$ Set of Lagrange multipliers for problem (3.11) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Lambda_{ub}(P) :=$ Set of Lagrange multipliers for problem (3.11) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

A.3 Parameters and Estimators

θ = A vector of model parameters.

ψ = A continuous functional $\psi : \mathcal{W} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)) &= \text{The lower and upper endpoints of the identified set for } \psi(\theta). \\
(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) &= \text{See (3.27).} \\
(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) &= \text{See (3.28).} \\
(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) &= \text{See (3.19).} \\
(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) &= \text{See (3.20).} \\
(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\cdot) &:= (\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\cdot) \text{ and } (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\cdot) \text{ combined in a vector; see (3.31).} \\
(\Psi_I)'_P(\cdot) &:= (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\cdot) \text{ and } (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\cdot) \text{ combined in a vector; see (3.31).} \\
(\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)) &= \begin{cases} \text{The calibrated quantiles of } (\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \text{ and } (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b); \text{ see (3.33) and} \\ \text{(3.34).} \end{cases} \\
\Psi_I(P) &= [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)], \text{ the identified set for } \psi(\theta). \\
m_j(\cdot, \theta) &= \text{the } j^{th} \text{ moment function.} \\
\bar{m}_j(\theta) &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n m_j(W_i, \theta), \text{ the } j^{th} \text{ sample average moment.} \\
\mathbf{V}_P(f, f) &= \text{The covariance kernel for } \mathbb{G}_P \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \\
\mathbf{C}_P(\theta) &= \text{Corr}(P\psi(\cdot, \theta), \{Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1}, \{Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)}) \\
\Delta(P) &= \Psi_I^{ub}(P) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \text{ the length of the identified set for } P\psi(\cdot, \theta). \\
W_i^b &= \text{Resampled value for } W_i \text{ in bootstrap sample } b.
\end{aligned}$$

A.4 Tuning Parameters

$c_n = A o(n^{-1/2})$ sequence used to relax the moment inequality conditions in finite sample.

η_P = An infinitesimal moment slackness parameter; see (3.16) and (3.17) and surrounding discussion.

Appendix B Proofs

Table 1: A brief description of the main results in this paper.

Theorem 3.1	Under Assumptions 3.1 - 3.4, establishes the identified set endpoints $\Psi_I^{\ell b}$ and Ψ_I^{ub} are uniformly Hadamard directionally differentiable.
Theorem 3.2	Under Assumptions 3.1 - 3.6, establishes uniform (over $P \in \mathcal{P}$) validity of the bootstrap procedure.
Theorem 3.3	Under Assumptions 3.1 - 3.7, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\{(\psi, P): \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}} P \left(\psi \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha$
Lemma 3.1	Suppose Assumptions 3.1 - 3.5 hold. Then for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P$, $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ and: $\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ $\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$
Lemma B.1	Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, $\Theta_I(P)$, $\Theta_{\ell b}(P)$, $\Theta_{ub}(P)$, $\Lambda_{\ell b}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are non-empty for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ are non-empty with probability approaching 1.
Lemma B.2	Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, the correspondences $\Theta_{\ell b}(\cdot)$, $\Theta_{ub}(\cdot)$, $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\cdot)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(\cdot)$ are upper-hemicontinuous, compact-valued and closed at any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and that the value functions $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot)$, $\Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot)$ are continuous.
Lemma B.3	Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, the Lagrange multipliers and the Lagrangian function (before taking expectations) are uniformly bounded (w.r.t. \mathcal{P}).
Lemma B.4	Under Assumptions 3.1-3.5, establishes (uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$) rate of convergence of $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \xrightarrow{H} \Theta_I(P)$, that $\Theta_I(P) \subset \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ w.p.a.1, and convergence of optimal solutions and Lagrange multipliers.
Lemma B.5	Under Assumptions 3.1 - 3.5, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\left (\Psi_I)'(\mathbb{P}_n, f) - (\Psi_I)'(P, f) \right > \varepsilon \right) = 0$ for $f \in \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$.
Lemma B.6	Under Assumptions 3.1 - 3.5, for every compact set $K \subseteq \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$, and every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have: $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{g \in K^\delta} \left (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(g) - (\Psi_I)'(P, g) \right > \varepsilon \right) = 0$ where $K^\delta := \{a \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) : \inf_{b \in K} \ a - b\ _\infty < \delta\}$ is the “ δ -expansion” of K .
Lemma B.7	If $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$, then under Assumptions 3.1-3.6: $\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left E \left[f \left((\Psi_I)'_P \left(\mathbb{G}_n^b \right) \right) X_i \right] - E \left[f \left((\Psi_I)'_P \left(\mathbb{G}_P \right) \right) \right] \right = o_P(1)$

Throughout this appendix we use the following notation: if X_n, X are maps in a metric space (\mathbb{D}, d) then:

- $X_n = o_P(a_n)$ is used to denote uniform (over $P \in \mathcal{P}$) convergence in probability of the random element

$|X_n/a_n|$ to 0; i.e. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^*(|X_n/a_n| > \varepsilon) = 0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

- $X_n = O_{\mathcal{P}}(a_n)$ is used to denote uniform (over $P \in \mathcal{P}$) stochastic boundedness of the random element $|X_n/a_n|$; i.e. the fact that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite M and an N such that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^*(|X_n/a_n| > M) < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N$.
- $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} X$ is used to denote uniform (over $P \in \mathcal{P}$) weak convergence of the random element X_n to a tight, Borel-measurable element X ; i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{D})} |E_P f(X_n) - E_P f(X)| = 0$.

We will also rely on the following facts which are not proven here, but for which references are provided.

Fact B.1. Suppose that $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$. Under assumption [3.1](#), [3.2](#) and [3.3](#), there exists an N such that for all $n \geq N$ strong duality holds for $P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+$; that is, if $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n)$ is the Lagrangian at probability measure P , then

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n)$$

and

$$\Psi_I^{ub}(P) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P) = \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P)$$

This result is called *Lagrangian Duality in convex optimization*; see, for example, [Borwein and Lewis \(2010\)](#) Theorem 4.3.7.

Fact B.2. At any $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$ at which the constraint qualification given in Assumption [3.3](#) is satisfied, the set of Lagrange multipliers is nonempty. See [Wachsmuth \(2013\)](#) Theorem 1(ii).

Before the next fact, some definitions:

Definition B.1 (Upper Hemicontinuity). For metric spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , a correspondence $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be upper hemicontinuous at $x \in \mathcal{X}$ if for every open subset S of \mathcal{Y} with $G(x) \subseteq S$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $G(B_\delta(x)) \subseteq S$.

Definition B.2 (Compact-Valued). For metric spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , a correspondence $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be compact-valued if $G(x)$ is a compact subset of \mathcal{Y} for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition B.3 (Closed at x). For metric spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , a correspondence $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be closed at x if for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ with $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $y_n \rightarrow y$ we have that $y \in G(x)$ whenever $y_n \in G(x_n)$ for all n .

Fact B.3 (Proposition E.2 in [Ok \(2007\)](#)). Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be two metric spaces and $\Gamma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ a correspondence. If Γ is compact-valued and upper hemicontinuous at $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then for any sequence $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\{y_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ with $x_m \rightarrow x$ and $y_m \in \Gamma(x_m)$ for each m , there exists a subsequence $\{y_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $y_{m_k} \rightarrow y \in \Gamma(x)$.

Finally, note from Appendix A that $\Theta_{lb}(P)$ and $\Theta_{ub}(P)$ denote the set of optimal solutions to (3.11) and (3.12), and $\Lambda_{lb}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ denote the set of Lagrange multipliers for (3.11) and (3.12). These will be important for some results where we do not that these sets are singletons; i.e., some results will not require Assumption 3.4.




Figure 1: A map relating the main results in this paper.

B.1 Proof of Results in Main Text

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The following proof follows similar steps to the proof of Theorem 7.24 in Shapiro et al. (2009), which shows Hadamard directional differentiability. However, the proof here establishes that this property holds “uniformly” over \mathcal{P} under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1.

We can focus on the lower bound, since the upper bound can be treated analogously. Consider any converging sequences $P_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\{h_n\} \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ and $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ with $t_n \downarrow 0$ and $h_n \rightarrow h \in \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ such that $P_n + t_n h_n \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for all $n \geq 1$. Recall the Lagrangian at a probability measure P_n is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n) := P_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j P_n m_j(\cdot, \theta) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)' \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k$ is a vector of Lagrange multipliers. Denote the “unperturbed” and “perturbed” programs respectively as:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n + t_n h_n) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By Fact B.1 we have by Assumption 3.3 that there exists an N such that for all $n \geq N$:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n) = \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n + t_n h_n) = \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P_n + t_n h_n) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Under Assumption 3.3, there exists an optimal $\theta^*(P_n)$ for each $n \geq N$. Now consider the sequence $\{\theta^*(P_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ with $\theta^*(P_n)$ optimal for each $n \geq N$, and conclude:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) = \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda)(P_n) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda)(P_n + t_n h_n) \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where (B.6) follows from strong duality, and (B.7) follows from the fact that $\theta^*(P_n)$ is optimal for program (B.2) but not necessarily program (B.3).

Under Assumption 3.3, by fact B.2 we have that there exists a optimal vector of Lagrange multiplier in (B.7) for $n \geq N$. Let $\{\lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence with $\lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n)$ optimal for each $n \geq N$. For any such sequence, note from (B.6) and (B.7) we have for all $n \geq N$:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Finally, also note that since $h_n \rightarrow h \in \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ by assumption, we have that:

$$h_n = h + o(1) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Thus, for all $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \\ & \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n), \quad (\text{from (B.8) and (B.9)}) \\ & = t_n h_n \psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) t_n h_n m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)), \quad (\text{by def. (B.2) and (B.3)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= t_n \left(h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)) \right) + o(t_n) \quad (\text{by (B.10)})$$

where the final line follows from uniform boundedness of the Lagrangian from Lemma B.3(ii). Thus for any sequence $\theta^*(P_n) \in \Theta_{\ell b}(P_n)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n)) \right] \\ & = h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

The last line follows by convergence of $P_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t_n \downarrow 0$, by uniform continuity of h with respect to the variance semimetric, by continuity of $\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ and $m_j(\cdot, \theta) \forall j$ with respect to θ (Assumption 3.2), and by convergence of the optimal solutions to a unique optimal solution. This latter fact follows from continuity of the optimal solution set $\Theta_{\ell b}(\cdot)$ and optimal Lagrange multiplier set $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\cdot)$, which follows from Lemma B.2.

For the reverse inequality, recall the “unperturbed” and “perturbed” problems given in (B.2) and (B.3) respectively. By Assumption 3.3, the set of optimal solutions to program (B.3) is non-empty for all $n \geq N$. Thus, let $\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)$ be a sequence of optimal solutions to program (B.3). Furthermore, by Assumption 3.3 and fact B.2, the set of optimal Lagrange multipliers to program (B.2) is non-empty for all $n \geq N$. Now note for any $\lambda^*(P_n)$ we have:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n) \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) \quad (\text{B.13})$$

It follows that for $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \\ & \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n), \quad (\text{by (B.12) and (B.13)}) \\ & = t_n h_n \psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) t_n h_n m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)), \quad (\text{by def. (B.2) and (B.3)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= t_n \left(h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) \right) + o(t_n) \quad (\text{by (B.10)})$$

where the final line follows from uniform boundedness of the Lagrangian from Lemma B.3(ii). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} \\ & \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) \right] \\ & = h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) h m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The last line follows by convergence of $P_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t_n \downarrow 0$, by uniform continuity of h with respect to the variance semimetric, by continuity of $\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ and $m_j(\cdot, \theta) \forall j$ with respect to θ (Assumption 3.2), and by convergence of the optimal solutions to a unique optimal solution. This latter fact follows from continuity of the optimal solution set $\Theta_{\ell b}(\cdot)$ and optimal Lagrange multiplier set $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\cdot)$, which follows from Lemma B.2.

Finally, combining inequalities we obtain:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} = h\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j h m_j(\cdot, \theta) \quad (\text{B.15})$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n)$. By Theorem 2.8.7 in Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we have that Assumption 3.1 and 3.5 imply that $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, which is a tight Gaussian process with sample paths that are almost all uniformly continuous. Let $\mathbb{D} = \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, $\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$, $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}$, and define:

$$\mathbb{D}_n = \{h : P_n + n^{-1/2}h \in \mathcal{P}_+\},$$

Then $\mathbb{D}_n \subset \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D}_0 \subset \mathbb{D}$. Now consider the maps $g_n : \mathbb{D}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ and $g : \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ defined as:

$$g_n(h_n) := \sqrt{n} \left\{ \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + n^{-1/2}h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \right\}, \quad h_n \in \mathbb{D}_n \quad (\text{B.16})$$

$$g(h) := (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(P, h), \quad h \in \mathbb{D} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Then for every sequence $\{h_n\}$ with $h_n \in \mathbb{D}_n$ satisfying $h_n \rightarrow h \in \mathbb{D}_0$, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that

$|g_n(h_n) - g(h)| = o(1)$. Now note that $\mathbb{G}_{n,P_n} \in \mathbb{D}_n$. Using the fact that \mathbb{G}_P is a tight (and thus separable) Borel element with values in \mathbb{D}_0 , combined with the extended continuous mapping theorem (Theorem 1.11.1 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)), we conclude that:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$$

as desired. An identical proof can be completed for the upper bound. Thus, this completes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark B.1 (Remark for Proof of Theorem 3.2). *The proof follows a nearly identical format to the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [Fang and Santos \(2014\)](#), with the exception that it shows uniform weak convergence. Let $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}) \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ denote the set of bounded linear operators from \mathcal{F} to \mathbb{R} , and throughout the proof keep in mind that \mathbb{G}_n^b and \mathbb{G}_P are elements of $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$; see Remark B.2 for additional details on why $\mathbb{G}_P \in L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$. In addition, note that by a variation of Tietze's extension Theorem, given by [McShane \(1934\)](#) Theorem 1, for every P there exists a (Lipschitz) continuous extension of $(\Psi_I)'_P$ from the subset of linear operators in the tangent cone, $\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$, to $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$. Thus, abusing notation, $(\Psi_I)'_P$ will be thought of as the extension to $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ throughout the proof, so that $(\Psi_I)'_P(h)$ is well-defined when $h \in L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$. See the proof of Lemma B.7 for details on how such an extension is used.*

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Using Assumptions 3.1 and 3.5 we can invoke Lemma D.2.8 in [Bugni et al. \(2015\)](#) and conclude that $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ unconditionally in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$, where again \mathbb{G}_P is a tight Gaussian process with sample paths that are almost all uniformly continuous. Now fix arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. By tightness of \mathbb{G}_P , there exists a compact set $K_0 \subset L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ such that:

$$P(\mathbb{G}_P \notin K_0) < \frac{\eta\varepsilon}{24}$$

Applying the fact that $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ unconditionally uniformly over \mathcal{P} , along with [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) Theorem 1.3.4(iii) (Portmanteau), we have that for any $\delta > 0$:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^*(\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta) \leq P(\mathbb{G}_P \notin K_0^\delta) < \frac{\eta\varepsilon}{24} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

In addition, since K_0 is a compact set, we have by Lemma B.6 that there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K_0^\delta} \left| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) < \frac{\eta}{3} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Let \mathbb{E}_n^b denote the expectation operator over the bootstrap weights — with respect to the corresponding probability measure \mathbb{P}_n^b — conditional on the observed data $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Note that for any Lipschitz continuous functional f , $f(\cdot)$ will always be a measurable function of the bootstrap weights conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Following identical arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [Fang and Santos \(2014\)](#) we have for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$:

$$\sup_{f \in BL_1} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[f((\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] - \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{f \in BL_1} \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[\left| f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) - f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) \right| \middle| \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[\left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) - (\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \right\| \wedge 2 \middle| \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[2 \times \mathbb{1}\{\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta\} \middle| \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] + \mathbb{E}_n^b \left[\sup_{h \in K_0^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| \middle| \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{P}_n^b(\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n) + \sup_{h \in K_0^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| \tag{B.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that $f \in BL_1$ and so is bounded by 1, and the last inequality follows from the fact that $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$ depends only on $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and not on the bootstrap weights. Now by Markov's inequality applied to the first term of (B.20), we have:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(2 \times \mathbb{P}_n^b(\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n) > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{8}{\varepsilon} P_P^*(\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta) < \frac{\eta}{3} \tag{B.21}$$

where the last line follows from (B.18). Now note from Lemma B.7 we have that:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P \left(\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))] \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) < \frac{\eta}{3} \tag{B.22}$$

where E_P denotes the expectation with respect to the limiting measure P . Thus, combining everything:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P \left(\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))] \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b))] \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\
&\quad + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P \left(\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))] \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left[P_P^* \left(2 \times \mathbb{P}_n^b(\mathbb{G}_n^b \notin K_0^\delta | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n) > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) + P_P^* \left(\sup_{f \in K_0^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(f) - (\Psi_I)'_P(f) \right\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P \left(\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left| \mathbb{E}_n^b[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))] \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\
&< \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \eta$$

so that the result follows since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ were arbitrary. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.3. By definition there exists a sequence $\{\psi_n, P_n\} \in \{(\psi, P) : \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ satisfying:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(\psi, P) \in \Psi_I(P) \times \mathcal{P}} P(\psi \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\psi_n \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha))$$

where $\{\psi_n\}$ is any sequence with $\psi_n \in [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)]$ for each n . For such a sequence, there exists a convergent subsequence indexed by n' such that:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\psi_n \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) = \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} P_{n'}(\psi_{n'} \in C_{n'}^\psi(1 - \alpha))$$

For the remainder of the proof we will argue along this subsequence, and abusing notation we will refer to this subsequence by n rather than n' . Since by construction we have $\psi_n \in [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)]$ for each n , it suffices to establish that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad (\text{B.23})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\Psi_I^{ub}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad (\text{B.24})$$

We can focus on (B.23) since (B.24) can be treated analogously. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_n(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \\ &= P_n\left(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)/\sqrt{n} \leq \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \leq \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) + \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b)/\sqrt{n}\right) \\ &= P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n))\right) \\ &= P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n))\right) \\ &= P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right) \quad (\text{B.25}) \end{aligned}$$

Decomposing this probability we have:

$$P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{P}_n^b \left((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \\
&+ \left[P_n \left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n) \right) \right] \tag{B.26}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \left[P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \right] \tag{B.27}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \left[P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbb{P}_n^b \left((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \right] \tag{B.28}
\end{aligned}$$

Note by construction we will have for all n :

$$\mathbb{P}_n^b \left((\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b), -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) \leq (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

so that it suffices to show that the terms (B.26), (B.27) and (B.28) converge to non-negative values. First consider (B.26). By Lemma 3.1 we have that:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \tag{B.29}$$

Thus, convergence of (B.26) to zero follows from (B.29), Theorem 1.3.4(viii) in Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996), and Assumption 3.7 which ensures continuity of the distribution of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ at its α quantile and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ at its $1 - \alpha$ quantile.

Next, note from Lemma B.4 that $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is Hausdorff consistent for $\Psi_I(P)$ over $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$, which implies consistency of $\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n)$ for $\Delta(P)$. Also note that assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 imply that $\Delta(P) > 0$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, so that $\sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n) \rightarrow \infty$. However, $\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) = \Delta(P) + o_{P_n}(1)$ by Lemma B.4, so that (B.27) converges to zero again by Assumption 3.7, as desired.

Finally, (B.28) converges to zero w.p.a. 1, which follows from bootstrap consistency over the sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ from Theorem 3.2, and again from the continuity Assumption 3.7.

■

B.2 Proofs of Additional Results

Lemma B.1. *Under assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, $\Theta_I(P)$, $\Theta_{lb}(P)$, $\Theta_{ub}(P)$, $\Lambda_{lb}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are nonempty for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, there exists an N such that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{lb}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Lambda_{lb}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ are nonempty for all $n \geq N$.*

Proof. Both claims follow directly from Assumption 3.3. ■

Lemma B.2. *Under assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, we have:*

- (a) $\Theta_{lb}(P)$, $\Theta_{ub}(P)$ are upper-hemicontinuous, compact-valued and closed at P . Thus, if $\Theta_{lb}(P)$ or $\Theta_{ub}(P)$ are singletons, then they are continuous at P .
- (b) $\Lambda_{lb}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are upper-hemicontinuous, compact-valued and closed at P . Thus, if $\Lambda_{lb}(P)$ or $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are singletons, then they are continuous at P .
- (c) $\Psi_I^{lb}(P)$, $\Psi_I^{ub}(P)$ are continuous at P .

Proof. We will prove (a), (b) and (c) simultaneously. Let $\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} = \|\arctan(x) - \arctan(y)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the euclidean norm. Note that $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$, $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}_+^k})$ and (\mathcal{P}, d_{BL}) are all metric spaces. Focus first on the lower bound program in (3.11). By Assumption 3.1(iii)(a), $\Theta_I(\cdot) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \Theta$ is a compact-valued correspondence, and is non-empty by Lemma B.1. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, recall the Lagrangian for problem (3.12):

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P) := P\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)$$

By Assumption 3.2, $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P)$ is continuous in (θ, λ, P) . Define:

$$\Theta^*(\lambda, P) := \arg \max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda, P) : \theta \in \Theta_I(P)\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta^*(\lambda, P) := \max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda, P) : \theta \in \Theta_I(P)\}$$

Note that $\Theta^*(\lambda, P) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{L}_\theta^*(\lambda, P) > -\infty$ by Lemma B.1. By the Theorem of the Maximum (Ok (2007), p. 306) we have that $\Theta^*(\lambda, P)$ is compact-valued, upper-hemicontinuous, and closed, and the profiled-Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_\theta^*(\lambda, P)$ is continuous in (λ, P) . Now define:

$$\Lambda_\theta^*(P) := \arg \min\{\mathcal{L}_\theta^*(\lambda, P) : \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, \lambda}^*(P) := \min\{\mathcal{L}_\theta^*(\lambda, P) : \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k\}$$

Note that $\Lambda_\theta^*(P) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, \lambda}^*(P) < \infty$ by Lemma B.1. Applying the Theorem of the Maximum again, we have that $\Lambda_\theta^*(P)$ is compact-valued, upper-hemicontinuous, and closed, and the profiled-Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, \lambda}^*(P)$

is continuous in P . Similarly, define:

$$\Lambda^*(\theta, P) := \arg \max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda, P) : \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\theta, P) := \max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda, P) : \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k\}$$

$$\Theta_\lambda^*(P) := \arg \min\{\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\theta, P) : \theta \in \Theta_I(P)\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \theta}^*(P) := \min\{\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\theta, P) : \theta \in \Theta_I(P)\}$$

I.e. reverse the order of profiling of the Lagrangian with respect to λ and θ . Note this can be done by strong duality (fact B.1) without affecting the optimal solution sets. Applying Lemma B.1 as above, we conclude that $\Lambda^*(\theta, P) \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\theta, P) > -\infty$, $\Theta_\lambda^*(P) \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \theta}^*(P) < \infty$. Applying the Theorem of the Maximum sequentially as above, we conclude that $\Theta_\lambda^*(P)$ is compact-valued, upper-hemicontinuous, and closed, and the profiled-Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \theta}^*(P)$ is continuous in P . Finally, by strong duality (fact B.1) we conclude $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) = \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \lambda}^*(P) = \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \theta}^*(P)$, $\Lambda_{\ell b}(P) = \Lambda_\theta^*(P)$, and $\Theta_{\ell b}(P) = \Theta_\lambda^*(P)$. Repeating the exercise for the upper bound program, the proof is complete. ■

Lemma B.3. *Under assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3,*

(i) *There exists constants $L_{\ell b}, L_{ub} < \infty$ such that:*

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \|\lambda\| \leq L_{\ell b} \quad (\text{B.30})$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{ub}(P)} \|\lambda\| \leq L_{ub} \quad (\text{B.31})$$

I.e. the Lagrange multipliers are uniformly bounded over \mathcal{P} in both the lower bound and upper bound programs.

(ii) *There exist constants $C_{\ell b}, C_{ub} < \infty$ such that:*

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{\ell b}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \left| \psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j m_j(\cdot, \theta) \right| \leq C_{\ell b} \quad (\text{B.32})$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{ub}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{ub}(P)} \left| \psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j m_j(\cdot, \theta) \right| \leq C_{ub} \quad (\text{B.33})$$

I.e. the Lagrangian is uniformly bounded in both the lower bound and upper bound programs.

Proof. Part (i): We will focus on (B.30) as (B.31) follows analogously. First note that by assumption 3.1(v) there exists a function $F(w)$ such that $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f(w, \theta)| \leq |F(w)|$ for every $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and such that $F(w)$ is bounded and square integrable. By Jensen's inequality, we have that $P|F| < \infty$. Let $C_F < \infty$ denote a positive constant satisfying $P|F| \leq C_F$. Note that necessarily $|\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)| \leq C_F$ uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$ (since by Assumption 3.3 the optimal solution set is nonempty). By fact B.1 we have that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) &= \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P) \\ &= \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} P\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda^*(P)$ is Lagrange multiplier vector with $\|\lambda^*(P)\| < \infty$ (by finiteness of $|\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)|$) that obtains the supremum in the first line (by compactness of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k$). We conclude that for any $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) \leq P\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) Pm_j(\cdot, \theta)$$

By Assumption 3.3 we have there exists a θ^* such that $Pm_j(\cdot, \theta^*) < -\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Thus:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) \leq P\psi(\cdot, \theta^*) - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) \leq C_F - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P)$$

Rearranging we obtain:

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) \leq \frac{C_F - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}} \leq \frac{2C_F}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}} < \infty \quad (\text{B.34})$$

Since $\lambda_j \geq 0$ for each j , and since the right hand side of (B.34) does not depend on P , we conclude the bound $L_{\ell b} = \frac{2C_F}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}}$ holds uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and thus that the Lagrange multipliers are uniformly bounded.

Part (ii): We will focus on (B.32) since (B.33) follows analogously. By assumption 3.1(v) there exists a function $F(w)$ such that $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f(w, \theta)| \leq |F(w)|$ for every $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and such that $F(w)$ is bounded. Let $C'_F < \infty$ be a positive constant satisfying $|F(w)| \leq C'_F$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{\ell b}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \left| \psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j m_j(\cdot, \theta) \right| &\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{\ell b}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \left| C'_F + C'_F \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} C'_F + C'_F \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} C'_F + C'_F \cdot k \cdot \|\lambda\| \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} C'_F + C'_F \cdot k \cdot L_{\ell b} \\ &= C'_F + C'_F \cdot k \cdot L_{\ell b}\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the fourth inequality follows from part (i). Thus, taking $C_{\ell b} = C'_F + C'_F \cdot k \cdot L_{\ell b}$ the proof is complete. \blacksquare

Lemma B.4. *Under assumptions 3.1-3.5, we have that,*

- (i) $d_H(\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n), \Theta_I(P)) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/2})$,
- (ii) $d_H(\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I(P)) = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$,
- (iii) $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \neq \emptyset$ w.p.a. 1,
- (iv) For any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* (||\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)|| > \varepsilon) = 0, \quad (\text{B.35})$$

and the analogous result for $\theta_{ub}^*(\cdot)$.

- (v) For any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* (||\lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P)||_{\mathbb{R}^k} > \varepsilon) = 0. \quad (\text{B.36})$$

and the analogous result for $\lambda_{ub}^*(\cdot)$.

Proof of Lemma B.4. Part (i): We follow closely the proof of Theorem 4.3(II) in [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#). Define the set:

$$\Theta_I^\gamma(P) := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \max_j P m_j(\cdot, \theta) \leq \gamma \right\}$$

for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. First note that by Lemma D.1 in [Bugni et al. \(2015\)](#) assumption 3.5 implies that \mathcal{F} is uniformly Donsker. In particular, we have that $||\mathbb{G}_{n,P}||_{\mathcal{F}} = O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sqrt{n} \max_j |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon}(P)} \sum_j \sqrt{n} |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon}(P)} \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+ \\ &\leq J |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) - \sqrt{n} \varepsilon_n|_+ \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that $\Theta_I^{-\varepsilon_n}(P) \subseteq \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ w.p.a. 1 for $\varepsilon_n = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. Furthermore, by assumption 3.5(iv) we can choose $\delta(\varepsilon_n) > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sqrt{n} \max_j |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ &\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \max_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+ \\ &\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \frac{1}{J} \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+ \\ &\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \frac{1}{J} \sum_j |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) + \sqrt{n} C \min\{\delta(\varepsilon_n), d(\theta, \Theta_I)\}|_+ \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \cap (\Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)) = \emptyset$ w.p.a. 1 for $\varepsilon_n = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. Note that this concludes the proof of part (i).

Part (ii): It suffices to show consistency of the upper and lower bounds; i.e. that $|\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ and that $|\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P)| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. We will focus on the lower bounds, since the upper bound proof is symmetric. First note that since $\psi(\cdot, \theta)$ is continuous with respect to θ by Assumption 3.2, and that Θ is compact by assumption 3.1(i), we have that $\psi(W, \theta)$ is uniformly continuous (w.r.t. θ) on Θ . Thus, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $|\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta')| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta(\varepsilon)$.

Now note that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)| &= \left| \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} P \psi(\cdot, \theta) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) \right| + \left| \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} P \psi(\cdot, \theta) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq d_H(\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n), \Theta_I(P))} |\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta')| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} |\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - P \psi(\cdot, \theta)| \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show the two terms in the last line of the previous array converge to zero in probability uniformly. Note that by part (i) of this Lemma, we have $d_H(\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n), \Theta_I(P)) = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. Thus by uniform continuity of $\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta)$:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq d_H(\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n), \Theta_I(P))} |\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta')| > \varepsilon \right) = 0$$

Also, by the uniform Donsker property:

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} |\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - P \psi(\cdot, \theta)| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot, \theta) - P \psi(\cdot, \theta)| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$$

This completes the proof.

Part (iii): By assumption 3.3 we know that for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a $\varepsilon_P > 0$ and a $\theta_P \in \Theta$ such that:

$$P m_j(\cdot, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_P$$

for $j = 1, \dots, k$. By the uniform Donsker property we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{n} \max_j |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ &\leq \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_n m_j(W, \theta_P) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta_P)|_+ \\ &\leq J |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) - \sqrt{n} \varepsilon_P|_+ \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \neq \emptyset$ w.p.a. 1.

Part (iv): Assumption 3.4 implies:

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_n, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| \rightarrow 0 \implies \|\theta_n - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{B.37})$$

for any sequence $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$. Furthermore, continuity of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P)$ with respect to θ (from Assumption 3.2) implies:

$$\|\theta_n - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)\| \rightarrow 0 \implies \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_n, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{B.38})$$

for any sequence $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$. We conclude:

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_n, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| \rightarrow 0 \iff \|\theta_n - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{B.39})$$

Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can construct a $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that:

$$P_P^* \left(\sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_n, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| \leq \delta(\varepsilon) \right) \leq P_P^* (\|\theta_n - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)\| \leq \varepsilon)$$

Thus it suffices to show that:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_n, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| > \delta(\varepsilon) \right) = 0$$

By the uniform Donsker property we have:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$$

which implies:

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P)| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \quad (\text{B.40})$$

Also note that:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) \equiv \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n)$$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} |\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)| \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} (\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} (\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) + \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \left(\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P)| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} (\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n)) + o_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \\
&\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} (\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n)) + o_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \\
&\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(\mathbb{P}_n)| + o_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \\
&= o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we deduce that $\|\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)\| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ from (B.39) and the surrounding discussion. A similar proof holds for the upper bound, which completes the proof.

Part (v): The proof can be completed in a manner identical to the proof of part (iv). ■

Lemma B.5. *Suppose assumptions 3.1-3.5 hold. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$:*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| > \varepsilon \right) = 0 \quad (\text{B.41})$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof of Lemma B.5. Rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'(h) - (\Psi_I)'_{P_n}(h) \right\| > \varepsilon \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\max \left\{ |(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'(h) - (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)|, |(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'(h) - (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(h)| \right\} > \varepsilon \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(|(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h) - (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)| > \varepsilon/2 \right) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(|(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(h) - (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(h)| > \varepsilon/2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We can focus on $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)$ and $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)$ as the analysis for $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'_P(h)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(h)$ is similar. Recall that a continuous function over a compact domain is uniformly continuous. By Assumption 3.2 and definition of $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ the map:

$$\theta \rightarrow h\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j h m_j(\cdot, \theta)$$

has sample paths that are almost all uniformly continuous. This implies that, almost surely, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \delta_1} \left| h\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j h m_j(\cdot, \theta) - h\psi(\cdot, \theta') - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j' h m_j(\cdot, \theta') \right| < \varepsilon/4$$

Furthermore, since the map:

$$\lambda \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j hm(\cdot, \theta)$$

is continuous, and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k$ is compact-valued (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k}$), we conclude that this map is uniformly continuous over $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k$. This implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta_2 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\|\lambda - \lambda'\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k} \leq \delta_2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j hm(\cdot, \theta) - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda'_j hm(\cdot, \theta') \right| < \varepsilon/4$$

Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h) - (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)| \\ & \leq \left| h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(\mathbb{P}_n) hm(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) - h\psi(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) hm(\cdot, \theta^*(P)) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\|} \left| h\psi(\cdot, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbb{P}_n) hm(\cdot, \theta) - h\psi(\cdot, \theta') - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(P) hm(\cdot, \theta') \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\|} |h\psi(\cdot, \theta) - h\psi(\cdot, \theta')| \\ & \quad + \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\|} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbb{P}_n) hm(\cdot, \theta) - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(P) hm(\cdot, \theta') \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\|} |h\psi(\cdot, \theta) - h\psi(\cdot, \theta')| \\ & \quad + \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\|} \left(\sup_{\|\lambda - \lambda'\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k} \leq \|\lambda^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \lambda^*(P)\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j hm(\cdot, \theta) - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda'_j hm(\cdot, \theta') \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now since $\|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ and $\|\lambda^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \lambda^*(P)\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k} = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ by Lemma B.4, we have that for every $\eta > 0$ there exists an N_η such that for all $n \geq N_\eta$ we have:

$$P_P^* (\|\theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta^*(P)\| \leq \delta_1, \|\lambda^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \lambda^*(P)\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k} \leq \delta_2) > 1 - \eta$$

which implies, through uniform continuity and the derivation above, that for all $n \geq N_\eta$:

$$P_P^* \left(|(\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h) - (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h)| > \varepsilon/2 \right) < \eta$$

Since $\eta > 0$ was arbitrary, this concludes the proof.

■

Lemma B.6. Let $\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ denote the subset of elements in $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ that are linear. Under assumptions 3.1-3.5, for every compact set $K \subseteq \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$, and every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have:

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) = 0 \quad (\text{B.42})$$

where $K^\delta := \{a \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) : \inf_{b \in K} \|a - b\|_\infty < \delta\}$ is the “ δ -expansion” of K .

Remark B.2. Under our Donsker assumptions, the limiting process \mathbb{G}_P will be a mean-zero Gaussian process with covariance kernel $Pfg - PfPg$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. By [Dudley \(2014\)](#) Equation (2.4) on page 65, this Gaussian process is linear with probability 1; in particular, for $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{G}_P(cf + g) = c\mathbb{G}_Pf + \mathbb{G}_Pg$. Also, there exists a version of \mathbb{G}_P with bounded sample paths. Furthermore, all finite-sample empirical processes, including the bootstrap empirical process, are linear operators. Thus, in our environment it is with little loss of generality that we restrict ourselves to the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$, although this will help with proving the Lemma. Namely, this is used to show that the collection $\{(\Psi_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$, and $\{(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ are Lipschitz with common Lipschitz constant C_{Lip} . This will imply uniform equicontinuity of $\{(\Psi_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$, and $\{(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$, which is important for the result to hold uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proof of Lemma B.6. First we will show that the vector-valued function $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to $h \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$. Let $L_{\ell b}$ be the constant defined in Lemma B.3 that represents a uniform bound for $\|\lambda\|$. We have from Lemma B.3 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h_1) - (\hat{\Psi}_I^{\ell b})'_P(h_2) \right| \\ &= \left| h_1 \psi(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(\mathbb{P}_n) h_1 m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) - h_2 \psi(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(\mathbb{P}_n) h_2 m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \right| \\ &= \left| (h_1 - h_2) \psi(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(\mathbb{P}_n) (h_1 - h_2) m_j(\cdot, \theta^*(\mathbb{P}_n)) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \|h_1 - h_2\|_\infty + \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \|h_1 - h_2\|_\infty \right) \right| \\ &\leq \|h_1 - h_2\|_\infty + L_{\ell b} \|h_1 - h_2\|_\infty \\ &= C_{Lip} \|h_1 - h_2\|_\infty \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.43})$$

where $C_{Lip} := (1 + L_{\ell b})$. A similar argument as in (B.43) can be repeated for $(\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'(h)$, after which we can infer that the vector-valued function $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$ is Lipschitz continuous. Furthermore, an identical argument can be presented for $(\Psi_I)'_P(h)$ after which we conclude that $(\Psi_I)'_P(h)$ is Lipschitz continuous with the same Lipschitz constant as $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$.

Now, recall from Lemma B.5 that we have:

$$\left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \quad (\text{B.44})$$

The next part of the proof shows that, when combined with (B.44), the Lipschitz continuity for each n of $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$ implies that (B.42) holds. This part of the proof repeats the arguments given in the proof of Lemma A.6 in Fang and Santos (2014), but for the uniform case. In particular, fix any arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and compact $K \subset \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$. Denote $\Pi_K : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow K$ as the projection operator:

$$\Pi_K h = \inf_{a \in K} \|h - a\|_\infty$$

Note that the infimum is obtained by compactness of K . By Lemma A.4 in Fang and Santos (2014) we have by continuity of $(\Psi_I)'_P(h)$ with respect to h that there exists a $\delta_1 > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{f \in K^{\delta_1}} \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(\Pi_K h)\| < \varepsilon \quad (\text{B.45})$$

Now note that since the family of functions $\{(\Psi_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ are all Lipschitz with constant C_{Lip} , we deduce that $\{(\Psi_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ is uniformly equicontinuous, and thus δ_1 can be selected such that it does not depend the probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, taking $\delta_2 < \varepsilon/C_{Lip}$. Then we have:

$$\sup_{h \in K^{\delta_2}} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) \right\| \leq \sup_{h \in K^{\delta_2}} C_{Lip} \|h - \Pi_K h\|_\infty \leq C_{Lip} \delta_2 < \varepsilon$$

Now taking $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{h \in K^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| \\ & \leq \sup_{h \in K^\delta} \left\{ \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) \right\| + \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) \right\| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\| (\Psi_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| \right\} \\ & \leq \sup_{h \in K^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(\Pi_K h) \right\| + 2\varepsilon \\ & = \sup_{h \in K} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| + 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

from which we can conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K^\delta} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| > 5\varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| > 3\varepsilon \right) \\ & = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K} \left\| (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h) \right\| > 3\varepsilon \right) \quad (\text{B.46}) \end{aligned}$$

Now since K is compact and $\{(\Psi_I)'_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ is uniformly equicontinuous, we can fix $\eta > 0$ such that $\|(\Psi_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h')\| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\|h - h'\|_\infty < \eta$, where η depends only on ε . In addition, compactness of K implies

that every η -cover of K has a finite η -subcover. Let $\{h_r\}_{r=1}^R$ denote the finite η -net associated with this subcover, and note that, taking $\eta < \varepsilon/C_{Lip}$, by construction we have:

$$\sup_{h \in K} \min_{1 \leq r \leq R} \max \{C_{Lip} \|h - h_r\|_\infty, \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r)\|\} < \varepsilon$$

Now define $h_r^*(h) \in \{h_r\}_{r=1}^R$ as:

$$h_r^*(h) = \arg \min_{\{h_r\}_{r=1}^R} \max \{C_{Lip} \|h - h_r\|_\infty, \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r)\|\}$$

By Lipschitz continuity of $(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h)$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\| \\ & \leq \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r^*(h))\| \\ & \quad + \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h))\| + \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\| \\ & \leq C_{Lip} \|h - h_r^*(h)\|_\infty + \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h))\| + \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\| \\ & \leq 2 \max \{C_{Lip} \|h - h_r^*(h)\|_\infty, \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\|\} \\ & \quad + \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h))\| \\ & \leq \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r^*(h)) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r^*(h))\| + 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

so that we conclude

$$\sup_{h \in K} \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\| \leq \max_{1 \leq r \leq R} \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r)\| + 2\varepsilon$$

Continuing from (B.46) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\sup_{h \in K} \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h)\| > 3\varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* \left(\max_{1 \leq r \leq R} \|(\hat{\Psi}_I)'_P(h_r) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_r)\| > \varepsilon \right) \\ & = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Lemma B.5. The result then follows since both $\varepsilon > 0$ and K were arbitrary. ■

Lemma B.7. Suppose that conditional on $\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n$ we have that $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ uniformly over $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Then under assumptions [3.1-3.6](#):

$$\sup_{f \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} |\mathbb{E}_n^b [f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[f((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))]| = o_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$$

where \mathbb{E}_n^b denotes the expectation with respect to the bootstrap weights conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and E_P denotes the expectation with respect to the limiting probability measure P .

Remark B.3. Some care is taken in the proof to ensure that the function $(\Psi_I)'_P$ can be extended away from the tangent cone $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ on which it has been implicitly defined in [Theorem 3.1](#). In particular, we use the fact that $(\Psi_I)'_P$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ (see proof of [Lemma B.6](#)) and extend the map $(\Psi_I)'_P$ beyond this set to a function on $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$, all linear functionals on \mathcal{F} , such that the extension is Lipschitz continuous with the same Lipschitz constant.

Proof of Lemma B.7. The following proof is essentially identical to the proof of theorem 10.7 in [Kosorok \(2008\)](#), with the exception that the result is for the uniform case.

By [\(B.43\)](#) in the proof of [Lemma B.6](#), we have that $(\Psi_I)'_P(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous with probability 1 when $h \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$. Without loss of generality, take the Lipschitz constant $C \geq 1$. Then for $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$:

$$|g((\Psi_I)'_P(h_1)) - g((\Psi_I)'_P(h_2))| \leq \|(\Psi_I)'_P(h_1) - (\Psi_I)'_P(h_2)\| \leq C\|h_1 - h_2\|_{\infty}$$

so that $h \mapsto g((\Psi_I)'_P(h))$ lies in $C \cdot BL_1$ when $h \in \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$. Let $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ denote the set of bounded linear operators from \mathcal{F} to \mathbb{R} . Since $\mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F})$ is a closed subset of $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}) \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, and since $(\Psi_I)'_P : \mathcal{T}_P^L(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, we have by a variation of Tietze's extension Theorem, given by [McShane \(1934\)](#) Theorem 1, that for every P there exists a continuous extension of $(\Psi_I)'_P$ to $L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ that preserves Lipschitz continuity with the same Lipschitz constant. Abusing notation, let $(\Psi_I)'_P$ denote such an extension. Since both $\mathbb{G}_n^b \in L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{G}_P \in L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R})$, the values $(\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)$ and $(\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ are thus well defined. Proceeding,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{g \in BL_1(\mathbb{R}^2)} |\mathbb{E}_n^b [g((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_n^b)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[g((\Psi_I)'_P(\mathbb{G}_P))]| \\ & \leq \sup_{g \in C \cdot BL_1(L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}))} |\mathbb{E}_n^b [g(\mathbb{G}_n^b) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[g(\mathbb{G}_P)]| \\ & \leq C \cdot \sup_{g \in BL_1(L(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}))} |\mathbb{E}_n^b [g(\mathbb{G}_n^b) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n] - E_P[g(\mathbb{G}_P)]| \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows by definition of the convergence of the conditional law of $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} . ■

Appendix C Examples and Counterexamples

Example 1. *This example shows a functional inference problem that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.1, but does not deliver a solution correspondence that is lower hemi-continuous with respect to $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $W \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$, and $\Theta = [0, 1]$. Consider the functional $P\psi(\cdot, \theta) = \theta \cdot \mathbb{E}W$. This functional is linear in θ , and so is trivially convex in θ . Suppose the problem is unconstrained (or has moment inequalities that are redundant for our function of interest). The upper bound program is given by:*

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \theta \cdot \mathbb{E}W$$

Now consider the sample analogue program:

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \theta \cdot \overline{W}$$

Note that in the sample analogue program, we have the optimal solution set $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is given by:

$$\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \overline{W} > 0 \\ [0, 1], & \text{if } \overline{W} = 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } \overline{W} < 0 \end{cases}$$

Finally, the asymptotic solution set is given by $\Theta_{ub}(P) = [0, 1]$. Now note that, given continuity of the distribution of W , the event corresponding to $\overline{W} = 0$ occurs with probability 0 for any finite n . Thus, with probability 1 we have $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = 0$ or 1 , but $\Theta_{ub}(P) = [0, 1]$. We conclude that the solution correspondence $\Theta_{ub}(\cdot) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is upper hemicontinuous, but not lower hemicontinuous.

Example 2. *The following counterexample is meant to augment the previous counterexample by showing a case where the objective function is non-stochastic (unlike in the previous example), but still the optimal solution set is not lower hemicontinuous with respect to $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\Theta = [0, 1]$. Consider the piecewise-linear functional:*

$$P\psi(W, \theta) = \psi(\theta) = \begin{cases} 2 - 2\theta, & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and consider the moment inequality $Pm(W, \theta) \leq 0$ where $Pm(W, \theta) = \mathbb{E}W - \theta$. Note that the objective function is convex, and the moment inequality is linear, and thus trivially convex. The optimization problem for the upper bound program is:

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \psi(\theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}W \leq \theta$$

and the sample analogue program is:

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \psi(\theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta \leq \overline{W}$$

Note that in the sample analogue program, we have the optimal solution set $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is given by:

$$\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) := \begin{cases} \overline{W}, & \text{if } \overline{W} < 1/2 \\ [\overline{W}, 1], & \text{if } \overline{W} \geq 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Now suppose the distribution of W is given by $W \sim \text{Uniform}[1/2(1 - 1/n), 1/2]$. Then $\overline{W} \leq 1/2$ for all n but $\overline{W} \rightarrow 1/2$ w.p.a. 1, so that asymptotically the optimal solution set is given by $\Theta_{lb}(P) = [1/2, 1]$. Furthermore, since $\overline{W} < 1/2$ for all n , we have that $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \overline{W}$. This again shows a case where the optimal solution correspondence is not lower hemicontinuous.

Example 3. This counterexample shows why the constraint qualification given in 3.3 is necessary for the validity of the procedure in this paper. This counterexample is adapted from example 7.17 in Sundaram (1996), and it shows that without the constraint qualification it is possible that the Lagrange multipliers do not exist. Let $\Theta = [-1, 1]$, and suppose we are interested in the function $P\psi(W, \theta) = \theta \cdot \mathbb{E}W_1$. Suppose the only constraint defining the identified set is $Pm(W, \theta) \leq 0$ where $Pm(W, \theta) = \mathbb{E}W_2 + \theta^2$. Suppose that $W_1 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$, and $W_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(1, 1)$. Consider the maximization problem for the upper bound:

$$\max_{\theta \in [-1, 1]} \theta \cdot \mathbb{E}W_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}W_2 + \theta^2 \leq 0$$

The sample analogue program is:

$$\max_{\theta \in [-1, 1]} \theta \cdot \overline{W}_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \overline{W}_2 + \theta^2 \leq 0$$

Note that given the parameter space, this moment function will violate assumption 3.3. In particular, notice that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the identified set converges to $\Theta_I(P) = \{0\}$ almost surely; i.e. the only feasible point becomes $\theta = 0$. We will show this implies there are no Lagrange multipliers. Indeed, define the Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda)(P) = P\psi(W, \theta) - \lambda Pm(W, \theta)$$

and recall that the Lagrange multipliers must satisfy:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\theta^*, \lambda)(P)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial P\psi(W, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta} - \lambda \frac{\partial Pm(W, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta} = 0 \quad (\text{C.1})$$

However, notice that in this example, since $\theta^* = 0$, we have:

$$\frac{\partial P\psi(W, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta} = 1, \quad \frac{\partial Pm(W, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta} = 0$$

so that clearly there are no Lagrange multipliers that satisfy (C.1). Without the existence of Lagrange multipliers as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the procedure described in this paper is not guaranteed to provide uniform coverage; see, for example, the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Example 4 (Kaïdo et al. (2016) Counterexample). Kaïdo et al. (2016) provide an example in their Appendix F.2 illustrating the failure of their method (and other competing subvector inference methods) when their

assumption 4.3 —which restricts the moments from being perfectly correlated— is not satisfied. We show here that our procedure also falls victim to their counterexample, which is why we must impose an assumption analogous to their Assumption 4.3 (see Assumption 3.5(iii)).

Consider the moment conditions:

$$\mathbb{E}[m_1(W, \theta)] = \theta_1 + \theta_2 - \mathbb{E}[W_1] \leq 0$$

$$\mathbb{E}[m_2(W, \theta)] = \theta_1 - \theta_2 - \mathbb{E}[W_2] \leq 0$$

Note that this defines a convex identified set. The random variables W_1 and W_2 have distribution:

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} \sim \begin{cases} N\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right), & \text{with probability } 1 - 1/n \\ \delta_{(1,1)} \text{ (degenerate)}, & \text{with probability } 1/n \end{cases}$$

Take $\Theta = [-100, 100]^2$ (or some other large compact set in \mathbb{R}^2), and let the objective function be $\psi(\theta) = \theta_1$, which is trivially convex. Consider the associated stochastic program:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \theta_1 \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_1 + \theta_2 - \mathbb{E}[W_1] \leq 0 \\ & \theta_1 - \theta_2 - \mathbb{E}[W_2] \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The sample analogue program is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \theta_1 \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_1 + \theta_2 - \overline{W}_1 \leq 0 \\ & \theta_1 - \theta_2 - \overline{W}_2 \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrangian function is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda) = \theta_1 - \lambda_1 (\theta_1 + \theta_2 - \overline{W}_1) - \lambda_2 (\theta_1 - \theta_2 - \overline{W}_2)$$

The first-order and complementary slackness conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_1} &= 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_2} &= -\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda_1} &= \theta_1 + \theta_2 - \overline{W}_1 \leq 0 & \lambda_1 &\geq 0 & \lambda_1 \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda_1} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda_2} &= \theta_1 - \theta_2 - \overline{W}_2 \leq 0 & \lambda_2 &\geq 0 & \lambda_2 \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda_2} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

From here we deduce that:

$$\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \{\theta : \theta_1 = (\overline{W}_1 + \overline{W}_2)/2, \theta_2 = (\overline{W}_2 - \overline{W}_1)/2\}$$

$$\Lambda_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \{\lambda : \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1/2\}$$

Thus, the distribution of the upper bound will be determined by:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\Psi}_I^{ub})'(\mathbb{P}_n, \mathbb{G}_n^b) &= \mathbb{G}_n^b \left(\frac{(W_1 + W_2)}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{G}_n^b(W_2 - W_1) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{G}_n^b(W_1 - W_2) \\ &= \mathbb{G}_n^b \left(\frac{(W_1 + W_2)}{2} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

Now note from the data generating process that $\mathbb{E}W_1 = \mathbb{E}W_2 = 1/n$, and:

$$\frac{(W_1 + W_2)}{2} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - 1/n \\ 1, & \text{with probability } 1/n \end{cases}$$

We conclude that the parameter $\theta_1^* \sim X/n$ where $X \sim \text{Binomial}(1/n, n)$. For large n , the distribution of X can be approximated by a Poisson distribution with parameter 1.¹³ Thus, for large n we have that with probability $e^{-1} \approx 37\%$ that $X = 0$, which implies that every sample realization of $(W_1 + W_2)/2$ is identically zero. However, since the empirical distribution of $(\bar{W}_1 + \bar{W}_2)/2$ is degenerate at zero, so is its bootstrap distribution. In this situation, by (C.2), our method produces a one-sided confidence interval of zero length. Furthermore, the coverage of such a confidence interval is bounded above by approximately $e^{-1} \approx 37\%$ (the probability of observing a sequence such that every sample realization of $(W_1 + W_2)/2$ is identically zero). As discussed in Appendix F.2 in [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#), a similar result holds for the methods of [Pakes et al. \(2011\)](#), [Bugni et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Kaido et al. \(2016\)](#).

¹³Recall if $X \sim \text{Binomial}(1/n, n)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} P(X = i) &= \frac{n!}{(n-i)!i!} p^i (1-p)^{n-i} \\ &= \frac{n!}{(n-i)!} \frac{1}{i!} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^i \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-i} \\ &= \frac{n!}{n^i(n-i)!} \frac{1^i}{i!} \frac{(1-1/n)^n}{(1-1/n)^i} \\ &\approx \frac{1^i}{i!} e^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

which is Poisson with parameter 1.

Appendix D Background on VC Classes

This Appendix is meant to serve as a brief introduction to Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) classes, including the introduction of key terminology. We provide additional references for the curious reader. We will borrow heavily from notation in [Dudley \(2014\)](#).

Consider the space \mathcal{W} , and let \mathcal{C} denote a collection of sets in \mathcal{W} . For any subset $A \subset \mathcal{W}$ define:

$$\mathcal{C} \sqcap A := \{C \cap A : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

I.e. $\mathcal{C} \sqcap A$ is the collection of sets that results when intersecting every set in \mathcal{C} with A . If $B \subset A$ and $B \in \mathcal{C} \sqcap A$, then we say that the collection \mathcal{C} *picks out* the set A . Let $2^A := \{B : B \subset A\}$ (i.e. the collection of all subsets of A) and let $|2^A|$ denote the number of sets in 2^A . If \mathcal{C} picks out every subset of A (i.e. if $|\mathcal{C} \sqcap A| = |2^A|$) then we say that the collection \mathcal{C} *shatters* the set A .

Define the following function:

$$V(\mathcal{C}) = \inf \left\{ n : \sup_{A \subset \mathcal{W}, |A|=n} |\mathcal{C} \sqcap A| < 2^n \right\} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

I.e. $V(\mathcal{C})$ *delivers the smallest n such that \mathcal{C} shatters no set of size n .*¹⁴ The value of $V(\mathcal{C})$ is called the *VC-index* of the class \mathcal{C} .

Definition D.1. A collection of set \mathcal{C} is called a *VC class* if $V(\mathcal{C}) < \infty$, i.e. if it has finite VC-index.

The VC-index of a collection \mathcal{C} is related to the complexity of \mathcal{C} : collections with larger VC-index intuitively contain “finer” sets, and collections with smaller VC-index intuitively contain “coarser” sets. Remarkably, the VC-index of a collection of sets can be quite disjoint from the cardinality of \mathcal{C} , as is shown in the following example:

Example 5. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(a, b] : a < b, a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$; I.e. \mathcal{C} is the collection of all half-open intervals on \mathbb{R} . Clearly \mathcal{C} contains an uncountable number of sets. However, \mathcal{C} has a VC-index of 3. To prove this, note that we must show that \mathcal{C} shatters no set of size 3. To this end, let $A = \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ with $w_1 < w_2 < w_3$. Now note that \mathcal{C} picks out every subset of A except for the subset $B = \{x_1, x_3\}$ (there is no set $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \cap B = \{x_1, x_3\}$, since any set that picks out x_1 and x_3 must also pick out x_2). Since A is an arbitrary 3-point set, this shows the VC-index of \mathcal{C} .

To generalize the notion of VC classes from collections of sets \mathcal{C} to collections of real-valued functions \mathcal{F} , we introduce the concept of a VC subgraph class:

Definition D.2. Let \mathcal{D} be a VC class of subsets of $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{R}$. If for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ we have that $\{(w, t) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{R} : t \leq f(w)\} \in \mathcal{D}$, then \mathcal{F} is called a *VC subgraph class*.

¹⁴If we have that:

$$\sup_{A \subset \mathcal{W}, |A|=n} |\mathcal{C} \sqcap A| = 2^n$$

for every n , then set $V(\mathcal{C}) = \infty$.

This definition of a VC subgraph class allows us to extend the notion of VC classes in a useful way, as is shown in the following example:

Example 6. *It can be shown that the VC index of the class \mathcal{C} of two-dimensional half spaces is 3. Since the collection of subgraphs of the class of linear functions $\mathcal{F} = \{f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f(w) = aw + b, \ a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is equal to the collection of half spaces in \mathbb{R}^2 , we have that \mathcal{F} is VC subgraph.*

For further references on VC classes and VC subgraph classes from the empirical process literature, see [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) Chapter 2.6 or [Dudley \(2014\)](#) Chapter 4. For references from the statistical learning literature, see [Mohri et al. \(2012\)](#), [Vapnik \(2013\)](#), or [Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David \(2014\)](#).

References

- Aliprantis, C. D. and Border, K. C. (2006). *A Hitchhiker’s Guide to Infinite dimensional analysis*. Springer.
- Andrews, D. W. and Guggenberger, P. (2009). Validity of subsampling and plug-in asymptotic inference for parameters defined by moment inequalities. *Econometric Theory*, 25(3):669–709.
- Andrews, D. W. and Soares, G. (2010). Inference for parameters defined by moment inequalities using generalized moment selection. *Econometrica*, 78(1):119–157.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I., and Hansen, C. (2017). Program evaluation and causal inference with high-dimensional data. *Econometrica*, 85(1):233–298.
- Borwein, J. and Lewis, A. S. (2010). *Convex analysis and nonlinear optimization: theory and examples*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bugni, F. A., Canay, I. A., and Shi, X. (2015). Specification tests for partially identified models defined by moment inequalities. *Journal of Econometrics*, 185(1):259–282.
- Bugni, F. A., Canay, I. A., and Shi, X. (2017). Inference for subvectors and other functions of partially identified parameters in moment inequality models. *Quantitative Economics*, 8(1):1–38.
- Chen, X., Christensen, T., O’Hara, K., and Tamer, E. (2016). Mcmc confidence sets for identified sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00499*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Hong, H., and Tamer, E. (2007). Estimation and confidence regions for parameter sets in econometric models. *Econometrica*, 75(5):1243–1284.
- Dudley, R. M. (1984). A course on empirical processes. In *Ecole d’été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XII-1982*, pages 1–142. Springer.
- Dudley, R. M. (2014). *Uniform central limit theorems*, volume 142. Cambridge university press.
- Fang, Z. and Santos, A. (2014). Inference on directionally differentiable functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.3763*.
- Gafarov, B. (2018). Inference on scalar parameters in setidentified affine models. *Working Paper*.
- Gafarov, B., Meier, M., and Olea, J. L. M. (2018). Delta-method inference for a class of set-identified svars. *Journal of Econometrics*, 203(2):316–327.
- Hirano, K. and Porter, J. R. (2012). Impossibility results for nondifferentiable functionals. *Econometrica*, 80(4):1769–1790.
- Hoffmann-Jørgensen, J. (1991). *Stochastic processes on Polish spaces*. Various publications series. Aarhus Universitet. Matematisk Institut.

- Kaido, H., Molinari, F., and Stoye, J. (2016). Confidence intervals for projections of partially identified parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.00934*.
- Kaido, H. and Santos, A. (2014). Asymptotically efficient estimation of models defined by convex moment inequalities. *Econometrica*, 82(1):387–413.
- Kasy, M. (2015). Uniformity and the delta method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05731*.
- Kasy, M. (2016). Partial identification, distributional preferences, and the welfare ranking of policies. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98(1):111–131.
- Kosorok, M. R. (2008). *Introduction to empirical processes and semiparametric inference*. Springer.
- McShane, E. J. (1934). Extension of range of functions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 40(12):837–842.
- Mohri, M., Rostamizadeh, A., and Talwalkar, A. (2012). *Foundations of machine learning*. MIT press.
- Ok, E. A. (2007). *Real analysis with economic applications*, volume 10. Princeton University Press.
- Pakes, A., Porter, J., Ho, K., and Ishii, J. (2011). Moment inequalities and their applications, discussion paper, harvard.
- Romano, J. P. and Shaikh, A. M. (2008). Inference for identifiable parameters in partially identified econometric models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 138(9):2786–2807.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Ben-David, S. (2014). *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press.
- Shapiro, A. (1990). On concepts of directional differentiability. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 66(3):477–487.
- Shapiro, A. (1991). Asymptotic analysis of stochastic programs. *Annals of Operations Research*, 30(1):169–186.
- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., and Ruszczyński, A. (2009). *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*. SIAM.
- Sheehy, A. and Wellner, J. A. (1992). Uniform donsker classes of functions. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1983–2030.
- Shi, X. and Shum, M. (2015). Simple two-stage inference for a class of partially identified models. *Econometric Theory*, 31(3):493–520.
- Stoye, J. (2009). More on confidence intervals for partially identified parameters. *Econometrica*, 77(4):1299–1315.

- Sundaram, R. K. (1996). *A first course in optimization theory*. Cambridge university press.
- Torgovitsky (2016). Nonparametric inference on state dependence with applications to employment dynamics.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). Weak convergence. In *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, pages 16–28. Springer.
- Vapnik, V. (2013). *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media.
- Wachsmuth, G. (2013). On licq and the uniqueness of lagrange multipliers. *Operations Research Letters*, 41(1):78–80.