

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

(Preliminary and incomplete. All comments are welcome.)

JoonHwan Cho*

Thomas M. Russell†

University of Toronto

University of Toronto

December 18, 2021

Abstract

This paper considers uniformly valid (over a class of data generating processes) inference for convex functionals of partially identified parameters in cases where the identified set is defined by convex (in the parameter) moment inequalities. We propose a bootstrap procedure for constructing uniformly valid confidence sets for a convex functional of a partially identified parameter. The proposed method amounts to bootstrapping the value functions 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, and is extremely computationally efficient. Finally, we discuss sufficient conditions on the moment functions to ensure uniform validity, and show that our assumptions are in fact satisfied by a large class of data generating processes.

Keywords: Stochastic Programming, Subvector Inference, Partial Identification

1 Introduction

This paper proposes a uniformly valid (over a large class of data generating processes) 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 bootstrap procedure to approximate the distribution of the endpoints of the projected identified set, and discusses primitive conditions under which the procedure is uniformly valid.

We are grateful to Victor Aguirregabiria, Bulat Gafarov, Christian Gourieroux, Ismael Mourifie, Jeffrey Negrea, Brennan Thompson, Stanislav Volgushev and Yuanyuan Wan for helpful comments and discussion. We are also grateful to participants at the 7th Annual Doctoral Workshop in Applied Econometrics at the University of Toronto. This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. All errors are our own.

*JoonHwan Cho, Department of Economics, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5S3G7, Canada.

†Thomas M. Russell, Department of Economics, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5S3G7, Canada. Email: thomas.russell@mail.utoronto.ca.

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 use these results for stochastic programs as a proof device to show the uniform validity of a simple bootstrap procedure for constructing 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 decomposing perturbations in the optimal value function into perturbations arising from the objective function and perturbations arising from the constraint 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 prove the validity of our procedure requires noticing that, under some 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 *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 for us to prove the validity of 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. Furthermore, the use of Lagrange multipliers allows us to avoid rescaling the moment conditions by their sample standard deviations in our procedure. This is in contrast to other comparable methods. Intuitively, any rescaling of the moment functions is countered by an equivalent (but opposite) rescaling of the Lagrange multipliers. This ensures our bootstrap procedure remains a sequence of convex—and thus easy to solve—optimization problems.

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. \(2017\)](#)). 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. \(2017\)](#) 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. \(2017\)](#) first linearize any nonlinear 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. \(2017\)](#) does not invert a test statistic. The overall approach to constructing confidence sets in this paper is also 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 nonunique 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 nondifferentiable. 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. The approaches to proving uniformity are also different. Finally, we also note some close connections with the work of [Kaido and Santos \(2014\)](#).

The main proofs of this paper uses results from [Shapiro et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Fang and Santos \(2018\)](#). 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 \(2018\)](#) related to bootstrap consistency and Hadamard directional differentiability, our main focus is on inference for the functional ψ of the true parameter θ_0 in partially identified models using stochastic programs, which is not considered in [Fang and Santos \(2018\)](#).

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 X_t with respect to a measure P is given by PX_t . If the random element X_t is a vector, then the expectation is interpreted element-wise. The random variables W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n are assumed to be coordinate projections from the product space $(\mathcal{W}^n, \mathcal{A}^n, P^n)$, 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. Finally, we use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the euclidean norm throughout. For the most part, 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 θ 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 $m_j(W, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 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 $P\psi(W, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will be an interval $\Psi_I(P) = [\Psi_I^{lb}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)]$. In this framework, the endpoints of the interval $\Psi_I(P)$ can be determined by solving two convex optimization problems:

- (i) minimize $P\psi(W, \theta)$ over $\theta \in \Theta_I(P)$ to determine $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)$,
- (ii) maximize $P\psi(W, \theta)$ 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* of 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 $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ that asymptotically covers $P\psi(W, \theta_0)$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha$ uniformly over $(\theta, P) \in \{(\theta, P) : \theta \in \Theta_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}$, 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

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

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 $\Psi_I(P)$. In particular, let \mathcal{F} denote the relevant class of functions (we define this class more precisely in Section 3). 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 $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P, (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P : \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 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 $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n) \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, and $(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n))$ are suitable estimates of the value functions. Moreover, we show conditions under which:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P), \quad (2.4)$$

uniformly over \mathcal{P} , where \mathbb{P}_n^b is the empirical bootstrap distribution. From here, our proposed confidence set takes the form:

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

where the quantiles $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}$ and $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}$ are selected from the bootstrap approximation to the distributions of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ given by (2.3) and (2.4) in order to guarantee uniformly 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:

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 0, D = 1) = \theta_{01}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 1, D = 1) = \theta_{11}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_n(YD = 0, D = 0) = \theta_{00} + \theta_{10}. \quad (2.7)$$

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:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad (2.8)$$

where $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is the set of θ_{yd} satisfying the constraints (2.5)-(2.7). Note that the optimization problems in (2.8) are linear programs. This paper will attempt to exploit the structure of the optimization problems in (2.8) 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 (Linear Regression with Interval-Valued Dependent Variable). *Consider the example of linear regression with interval-valued dependent variable. We will follow closely the exposition in [Kaido et al. \(2017\)](#) appendix C. In this example the model is given by $Y = X \cdot \theta + \varepsilon$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with R points of support. However, it is assumed that the dependent variable is interval-valued in the following way: although the value of Y is never observed, there exists two observable random variables Y^* and Y_* such that $P(Y_* \leq Y \leq Y^*) = 1$. The objective is then to construct bounds on the parameter θ given that researcher observes a sample $\{Y_i^*, Y_{*i}, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and never directly observes the value of Y . Denoting the support points of X as $\{x_1, \dots, x_r, \dots, x_R\}$, as in [Kaido et al. \(2017\)](#) the identified set is given by:*

$$\Theta_I(P) := \{\theta : \mathbb{E}[Y_* | X = x_r] - x_r \cdot \theta \leq 0, \ x_r \cdot \theta - \mathbb{E}[Y^* | X = x_r] \leq 0, \ r = 1, \dots, R\}.$$

We now suppose that the researcher is interested in conducting inference only on the first component θ_1 of

the parameter vector θ . Then in our notation we can set $\psi(W, \theta) = \psi(\theta) = \theta_1$. Under some weak conditions we will have that the identified set for the functional ψ is an interval $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n), \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)]$ with the endpoints determined by the program:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad (2.9)$$

where $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ is the estimate of the identified set obtained by replacing the moment conditions with their sample analogs. Note that since all moment conditions defining the identified set are linear in θ , the optimization problems in (2.9) are linear programs. Again, this paper will propose an inference procedure for functionals of partially identified parameters that uses the special structure of the optimization problems in (2.9) that characterizes the functional bounding problem.

Example 3 (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 $X := (X_0, \dots, X_T)$ 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 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 $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, \dots, y_T)'$. Finally, let $\mathbf{X} = (x_0, \dots, x_T)'$. [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:

$$\mathbb{P}_n(Y = \mathbf{y}, X = \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\mathbf{y})} \theta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}}. \quad (2.10)$$

[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 instrumental variable (MIV) constraints and monotone treatment selection (MTS) constraints. All of these constraints 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 (2.10). 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:

$$\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)} \psi(\theta), \quad (2.11)$$

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 4 (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:

$$\Psi_{lb}^A(P) = \inf_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [g_0(x) + h^A(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x))] P(X = x), \quad (2.12)$$

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

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:

$$\Psi_{lb}^{AB}(P) = \inf_{(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} h^{AB}(x) (g_1(x) - g_0(x)) P(X = x), \quad (2.14)$$

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

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 (2.12) and (2.13), or (2.14) and (2.15), 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 $\Theta_I(P)$ is defined by moment equalities and inequalities that are satisfied at the true parameter θ_0 :

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 the following class of functions:

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ (\psi(W, \theta), m_1(W, \theta), \dots, m_k(W, \theta))^T : \theta \in \Theta \right\}. \quad (3.7)$$

A typical element of \mathcal{F} will then be the vector-valued function:

$$f(W, \theta) = \left[\psi(W, \theta), m_1(W, \theta), \dots, m_k(W, \theta) \right]^T.$$

Furthermore, we will equip this class of functions with a semimetric that depends on the probability measure P :

$$\rho_P(\theta, \theta') := \left\| \text{diag}(V_P(f(W, \theta) - f(W, \theta'))^{1/2}) \right\|, \quad (3.8)$$

for $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$.¹ This semimetric was also considered in Bugni et al. (2015). Furthermore, define the class:

$$\mathcal{F}' := \{f - f' : f, f' \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

and let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}' \cup (\mathcal{F}')^2$. Throughout the text, we will interpret the statement $P_n \rightarrow P$ as meaning $\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow 0$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}}$ represents the sup-norm over the class of functions \mathcal{G} . This is the relevant notion of the convergence of probability measures for the results in this paper; see Sheehy and Wellner (1992) and Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996) section 2.8.3. Throughout the article we will switch freely between considering uniform convergence over \mathcal{P} and convergence over any convergent data-generating sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in the sense described above.

Let \mathcal{P} denote the collection of all probability measures on \mathcal{W} . We now impose the following assumptions:

¹Recall 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.

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) Each distribution $P \in \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfies:
 - (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 $P \in \mathcal{P}$.
- (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 \(2014\)](#) Section 10.4); 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:

$$\Theta_I(P) = \{\theta \in \Theta : Pm_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (3.9)$$

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

$$\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) = \{\theta \in \Theta : \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq c_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (3.10)$$

where we will allow $c_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ to be a deterministic sequence², and where \mathbb{P}_n denotes the empirical measure for the first n observations:

$$\mathbb{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{W_i}, \quad (3.11)$$

where δ_{W_i} is the Dirac delta function. 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 $m_j(W, \theta) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are convex and continuously differentiable in θ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.*

Remark 3.2. *Note that restricting the moment functions $m_j(W, \theta)$ to be convex implies that all moment functions corresponding to moment equalities must necessarily be linear in θ .*

²For example, $c_n = \log(n)/n$. The researcher can also set $c_n = 0$ for all n .

Denote the identified set for $P\psi(W, \theta)$ to be $\Psi_I(P)$, and note that the identified set for $P\psi(W, \theta)$ is the projection of $\Theta_I(P)$ on the manifold generated by $P\psi(W, \theta)$. As such, under standard conditions (see Lemma B.4(ii)) the projection estimator $\Psi_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$ will be a consistent estimator of $\Psi_I(P)$. Moreover, since $P\psi(W, \theta)$ 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:

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

$$\Psi_I^{ub}(P) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P\psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Pm_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k. \quad (3.13)$$

However, since P is not known, the programs (3.12) and (3.13) will be approximated using the empirical distribution \mathbb{P}_n by replacing the population moment conditions and objective function with their sample counterparts:

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

$$\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq c_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.15)$$

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

Remark 3.3. For sake of simplicity, we will set $c_n = 0$ for the remainder 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.

After an estimate of the identified set 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 (3.12) and (3.13), we will approximate the distributions of $\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P))$ and $\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ by a simple bootstrap procedure, and will be particularly interested in proving the procedure is valid *uniformly over* \mathcal{P} .

Remark 3.4. 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 $P \in \mathcal{P}$ (i.e. $\mathcal{P}_+ = \text{span}(\mathcal{P}, \{\delta_w\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}})$, 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

We will begin by showing that the value functions satisfy an appropriate level of differentiability with respect to the underlying probability measure. Since the underlying probability measure is a possibly 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 $(\Psi_I^{lb}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P))$ 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*

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

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 an inference procedure in stochastic programs for a fixed data-generating measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$ (c.f. [Shapiro \(1991\)](#)), it is not sufficient to construct an inference procedure for stochastic programs that is valid *uniformly* over \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*

$$\frac{\phi(\zeta_n + t_n h_n) - \phi(\zeta_n)}{t_n} \rightarrow \phi'_\zeta(h), \tag{3.16}$$

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”). It also 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 $(\zeta, h) \mapsto \phi'_\zeta(h)$ 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, under some conditions the value functions of a stochastic program are differentiable in the sense of Definition 3.2. Our first main result requires the existence of Lagrange multipliers, and that strong

(convex) duality holds in the programs (3.12) and (3.13). 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 $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} > 0$ such that for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\} \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a point $\theta_P \in \Theta$ (possibly depending on P) and an integer $N \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $P_n m_j(W, \theta_P) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, and $P_n m_j(W, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}$ for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2$. Denote the set of all $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$ satisfying this latter requirement as \mathcal{P}^\dagger .*

Assumption 3.3 is a uniform version of *Slater’s constraint qualification*, and is instrumental in ensuring the existence of Lagrange multipliers, and that strong duality hold in the programs (3.12) and (3.13) 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 3.4, as well as the collection \mathcal{P}^\dagger defined in the assumption.

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 $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\} \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ to be the constant sequence $P \in \mathcal{P}$ —is that 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.³ 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 when 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 nonempty 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 nonempty w.p.a. 1

³Note 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.

(see Lemma B.4(iii) 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.

Finally, 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.

Remark 3.5. *Assumption 3.1 gives the existence of an envelope function for the class of functions \mathcal{F} with uniformly bounded (over \mathcal{P}) 2 + a moment for some $a > 0$. This uniform bound can be extended to hold uniformly over \mathcal{P}^\dagger since $\mathcal{P}^\dagger \setminus \mathcal{P}$ are all empirical measures generated by some law $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Next, we have the following assumption:

Assumption 3.4. *The optimal solutions and Lagrange multipliers in (3.12) and (3.13) are unique for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Note that for the main result below, it is necessary to restrict the solutions to (3.12) and (3.13) to be unique for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. To understand why, note that if the problems (3.12) and (3.13) 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 $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot)$ and $\Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot)$ 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 often be verified directly by the researcher. We discuss this assumption further in Section 4.

The final assumption relates to the gradient of the objective function and the moments:

Assumption 3.5. *The gradients $\{\nabla_\theta P\psi(W, \theta), \{\nabla_\theta Pm_j(W, \theta)\}_{j=1}^k\}$ are uniformly bounded over \mathcal{P}^\dagger .*

This assumption is required only to show that the Lagrange multipliers are uniformly bounded over \mathcal{P}^\dagger . Any other assumption that implies uniform boundedness of the Lagrange multipliers might then be safely substituted for Assumption 3.5.

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

$$\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F}) = \{v \in UC_b(\mathcal{F}, \rho_P) : \forall t_n \downarrow 0, \forall \{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}, \exists \{Q_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty \text{ s.t. } t_n^{-1}(Q_n - P_n) \rightarrow v\}, \quad (3.17)$$

where $UC_b(\mathcal{F}, \rho_P) \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the space of bounded, and uniformly continuous functions with respect to the semimetric ρ_P defined in (3.8). 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

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 the perturbation parameters. In our context, the perturbation parameter is represented by the operator \mathbb{P}_n .

$f \mapsto \mathbb{G}_P(\omega, f)$ will be uniformly continuous; see Addendum 1.5.8 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#). We now have the following result:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.5 hold, and consider $\Psi_I^{\ell b}, \Psi_I^{ub} : \mathcal{P}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the programs (3.12) and (3.13). Then $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\cdot), \Psi_I^{ub}(\cdot)$ are uniformly Hadamard directionally differentiable tangential to $\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$. In particular, for all converging sequences $P_n \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ 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:*

$$(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} = h_1 \psi(W, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{\ell b, j}^*(P) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)), \quad (3.18)$$

$$(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(h) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{ub}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)}{t_n} = -h_1 \psi(W, \theta_{ub}^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ub, j}^*(P) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta_{ub}^*(P)), \quad (3.19)$$

where $h_j f_j$ is the j^{th} component of $h f$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\theta_{\ell b}^*(P)$ 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 $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\} \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$. 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 relate this result to inference on the optimal value functions. This is exactly what is done in Lemma 3.1 in the next subsection.

3.2 From Differentiability to Weak Convergence

We now consider the asymptotic distribution of the properly rescaled and recentered value functions given in (3.14) and (3.15), which will make use of the uniform differentiability property given in Theorem 3.1. To cover the case of a drifting sequence of data-generating processes, which will be necessary to show uniformity, we impose additional assumptions.

Assumption 3.6. *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 over \mathcal{P} ; that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

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

where ρ_P is as in (3.8).

(ii) The semimetric ρ_P satisfies:

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

(iii) Let $\mathcal{A}(\theta, P) \subseteq \{r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2\}$ denote the binding moment inequalities at (θ, P) . One of the following holds for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and some constants $M > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$:

(a) Let:

$$\mathbf{C}_P(\theta) := \text{Corr} \left(\{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1}, \{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)} \right),$$

then

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} \text{eig}(\mathbf{C}_P(\theta)) > \delta. \quad (3.20)$$

(b) The functions $m_j(W, \theta)$ are defined on $\Theta^\epsilon := \{\theta \in \Theta : d_H(\theta, \Theta) \leq \epsilon\}$. There exists $\tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq \tilde{r}_2 \leq r_2/2$ and measurable functions $t_j : \mathcal{W} \times \Theta^\epsilon \rightarrow [0, M]$ for $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}} = \{r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + \tilde{r}_2\}$, such that for each $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$:

$$m_{j+\tilde{r}_2}(W, \theta) = -m_j(W, \theta) - t_j(W, \theta).$$

For each $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)$ and any choice of $\ddot{m}_j(W, \theta) \in \{m_j(W, \theta), m_{j+\tilde{r}_2}(W, \theta)\}$, let:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_P(\theta) := \text{Corr} \left(\{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1}, \{\ddot{m}_j(W, \theta)\}_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)}, \{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta, P) \setminus \{r_1+1, \dots, r_1+2\tilde{r}_2\}} \right),$$

then

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta_I(P)} \text{eig}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_P(\theta)) > \delta. \quad (3.21)$$

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

Sufficient conditions for Assumption 3.6(i) will be discussed in Section 4. For now, suffice it to say that 3.6(i) is required to apply a uniform central limit theorem to the class of functions \mathcal{F} . Assumption 3.6(ii) is also required to prove the class of functions \mathcal{F} is uniformly Donsker over any sequence in \mathcal{P} . Assumption 3.6(iii) is derived from Assumption 4.3 in Kaido et al. (2017), 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 (3.18) and (3.19).⁵ We refer readers to Kaido et al. (2017) for a discussion of this assumption. Finally, Assumption 3.6(iv) is the partial identification condition given in Chernozhukov et al. (2007), equation (4.5), and is used to establish

⁵In Appendix C we show that when Assumption 3.6(iii) is violated, the counterexample provided in appendix F.2 of Kaido et al. (2017) also applies to our method.

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 3.6, we have the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.6 hold. Then for any sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ 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:*

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P), \quad (3.22)$$

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

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. When combined with Theorem 3.1, Lemma 3.1 shows that the properly recentered 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 \mathbb{G}_P , along any converging sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfying Assumptions 3.1-3.6. The next section shows that the objects on the right side of (3.22) and (3.23) can be approximated uniformly using a nonparametric bootstrap procedure.

3.3 The Bootstrap Version

This section proposes a bootstrap procedure that 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 following approximations:

$$\text{Lower Approximation: } \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)), \quad (3.24)$$

$$\text{Upper Approximation: } \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)). \quad (3.25)$$

We will use the distribution of (3.24) to approximate the distribution of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$, and we will use the distribution of (3.25) to approximate the distribution of $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$.

Remark 3.6. *Typically test statistics in moment inequality models will be a function of both an empirical process and a “recentering” statistic.⁶ At first glance it may be surprising that the approximations to $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ given in (3.24) and (3.25) do not include the usual approximation to the recentering statistic. However, recall that if the moment inequality $\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq 0$ is slack in the stochastic program (3.14) (or (3.15)), then its associated Lagrange multiplier will be zero, and it will not contribute to*

⁶Indeed, the need for this recentering can be seen by expanding the rescaled sample moment inequality $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq 0$:

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

the distribution of (3.24) (or (3.25)). On the other hand, if the moment inequality $\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq 0$ is binding in the stochastic program (3.14) (or (3.15)), then its associated Lagrange multiplier will be nonnegative, and it may contribute to the distribution of (3.24) or (3.25). 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 (3.24) and (3.25) in a continuous way. 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.⁷

Remark 3.7. Note, unlike typical inference procedures, we do not standardize the moment conditions by their sample standard deviations. However, our procedure is still invariant to rescaling of the moment conditions by the fact that any rescaling will be reflected in the procedure as an equivalent (but opposite) rescaling of the Lagrange multipliers.

We must be precise about the conditions under which the law of the approximations (3.24) and (3.25), conditional on the data $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$, can approximate the unconditional law of $(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ and $(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P)$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} . Let $\{\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n : b = 1, \dots, B\}$ denote the bootstrap samples. We maintain the following assumption:

Assumption 3.7. The bootstrap samples $\{W_i^b\}_{i=1}^n$ for $b = 1, \dots, B$, are drawn i.i.d. with replacement from the original sample $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

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

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we have that, uniformly over \mathcal{P} , $\mathbb{G}_n^b \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_P$ where \mathbb{G}_P is a tight random element in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$. Then under Assumptions 3.1-3.7:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P),$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P).$$

A confidence set for the true parameter ψ_0 can then be constructed using the quantiles of the bootstrapped distributions of (3.24) and (3.25). In particular, the confidence set $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ with asymptotic coverage

Thus, to construct a uniform bootstrap approximation to the distribution of $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)$ will require a consistent estimate of $\sqrt{n}Pm_j(W, \theta)$. 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 $\xi_{j,n}(\theta) := \kappa_n^{-1} \sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)$, with κ_n a thresholding sequence satisfying $\kappa_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\kappa_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\varphi_j(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x > -1 \\ -\infty, & \text{if } x \leq -1 \end{cases} \quad (3.26)$$

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

⁷This regularization property of the Lagrange multipliers has also been previously noticed by Kaido and Santos (2014), albeit in a slightly different context. We thank Bulat Gafarov for bringing this to our attention.

probability of $1 - \alpha$ can be constructed as:

$$C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha) := \left[\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}}{\sqrt{n}}, \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) + \frac{\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}}{\sqrt{n}} \right], \quad (3.27)$$

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

$$P_n^b \left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (3.28)$$

$$P_n^b \left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) - \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (3.29)$$

where P_n^b is the bootstrap distribution and Δ is the length of the identified set. Note that under Assumption 3.3, 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 3.8. *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 (3.27) is uniformly asymptotically valid:

Theorem 3.2. *Under Assumptions 3.1-3.8,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\{(\psi, P): \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}} P(\psi \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (3.30)$$

where $C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ is as in (3.27).

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 value functions for the optimization problems that define the endpoints of the set $\Psi_I(\cdot)$. Calibrating the critical values $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}$ and $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}$ 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 Primitive Conditions for Uniform Asymptotic Equicontinuity

Among all the assumptions, the uniform asymptotic equicontinuity Assumption 3.6(i) is one of 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 satisfies a certain measurability condition, and that the class of functions \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 4.1 (Image-Admissible Suslin, [Dudley \(2014\)](#) pg. 230). *If (Ω, \mathcal{A}) is a measurable space and \mathcal{F} a set, then a real-valued map $(f, \omega) \mapsto X(f, \omega)$ will be called image-admissible Suslin via $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{S}, T)$ iff $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{S})$ is a Suslin measurable space,⁸ T is a function from \mathcal{Y} onto \mathcal{F} , and $(y, \omega) \mapsto X(T(y), \omega)$ is jointly measurable on $\mathcal{Y} \times \Omega$.*

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, recall that \mathcal{F} is defined as:

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ (\psi(W, \theta), m_1(W, \theta), \dots, m_k(W, \theta))^T : \theta \in \Theta \right\}.$$

Thus the map $\theta \mapsto f(W, \theta)$ is a map from Θ onto \mathcal{F} . Denote this map by T .

It remains only to show that the map $(\omega, \theta) \mapsto \mathbb{G}_P(\omega)(T(\theta))$ is jointly measurable in (ω, θ) . Given separability of Θ , continuity of the map $T : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, and continuity of $\mathbb{G}_P(\omega)(\cdot) : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, joint measurability of $(\omega, \theta) \mapsto \mathbb{G}_P(\omega)(T(\theta))$ follows from [Aliprantis and Border \(2006\)](#) Lemma 4.51 (p. 153) given measurability of each component of $\mathbb{G}_P(\cdot)(T(\theta)) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ with respect to (Ω, \mathcal{A}) .⁹

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).

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 there are some references on VC classes, or VC subgraph-classes in the empirical process literature (e.g. [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)), VC classes are extensively taught and used in the statistical learning literature.¹⁰ References in the statistical learning

⁸A measurable space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{S})$ is called a Suslin space if and only if there exists a Polish space \mathcal{X} and a Borel measurable map from \mathcal{X} onto \mathcal{Y} . A Polish space is a complete and separable metric space.

⁹By separability of \mathbb{R}^{k+1} , the Pettis Theorem shows that measurability of each component of a vector-valued function is sufficient to establish measurability of the function itself.

¹⁰In 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.”

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. \(2012\)](#)). Also, see Lemma 2.6.18 in [Van Der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) for how to perform operations with multiple VC classes.

4.2 Constraint Qualifications and Uniqueness of Lagrange Multipliers

Note that under either strict convexity or strict monotonicity of the objective function $\psi(W, \theta)$ with respect to $\theta \in \Theta_I(\cdot)$, the optimal solutions in (3.12) or (3.13) will be unique (with the exception of cases when objective function is exactly parallel to a binding constraint). A relevant example of this occurs in subvector inference, when the objective function $\psi(W, \theta) = \theta_\ell$, 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 Lagrange multipliers are guaranteed to be unique is the *linear independence constraint qualification*.

Definition 4.2 (Linear Independence Constraint Qualification). *Let $\mathcal{A}(\theta^*, P) \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ denote the set indexing the binding moment inequalities in the minimization problem (3.12) (or maximization problem (3.13)) at some argmin value θ^* (or argmax value θ^*) for some probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ) is satisfied at (θ^*, P) if the gradients $\{\nabla_\theta P m_j(W, \theta^*)\}_{j=1}^{r_1} \cup \{\nabla_\theta P m_j(W, \theta^*)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta^*, P)}$ are linearly independent. We say that the LICQ holds uniformly over \mathcal{P} if this condition holds for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

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.¹¹ However, in other cases it can be more difficult.

In this section we show that the cases in which the LICQ is not satisfied are somewhat pathological, or “non-generic,” in a sense to be made precise shortly. We show this by appealing to the Transversality Theorem.¹² To state the result we first convert all moment inequalities into equivalent moment equalities by adding slackness variables. That is:

$$P m_j(W, \theta) \leq 0 \iff P m_j(W, \theta) + s_j = 0, \quad s_j \geq 0, \quad j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2,$$

¹¹For example, if the moment functions can be expressed as $P m_j(W, \theta) = P \tilde{m}_j(W) + a_j' \theta$, 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, then it suffices to verify the Jacobian of the moment functions (w.r.t. θ) has full column rank.

¹²We are grateful to Victor Aguirregabiria for this suggestion.

where $s_j \geq 0$ represents the slackness of moment j . We will now introduce the mapping $M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon) : \Theta \times \mathbb{R}^{r_2} \times \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ as:

$$M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon) := \begin{bmatrix} Pm_1(W, \theta) + \epsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ Pm_{r_1}(W, \theta) + \epsilon_{r_1} \\ Pm_{r_1+1}(W, \theta) + s_{r_1+1} + \epsilon_{r_1+1} \\ \vdots \\ Pm_{r_1+r_2}(W, \theta, \epsilon) + s_{r_1+r_2} + \epsilon_{r_1+r_2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

Here the vector $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{r_1+r_2})^T \in \mathcal{E}$ is a $(r_1 + r_2) \times 1$ “perturbation parameter” that is added to the initial moment conditions under the map $M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon)$. We will take \mathcal{E} to be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ for simplicity. We will also equip \mathcal{E} with a probability measure P_ϵ that is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We now have the following result:

Proposition 4.1 (Transversality). *The $(r_1 + r_2) \times (d_\theta + r_2)$ matrix $\nabla_{\theta,s} M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon)$ has rank $r_1 + r_2$ P_ϵ -almost surely.*

Proof. By Proposition 17.D.3 in [Mas-Colell et al. \(1995\)](#), we have that if the $(r_1 + r_2) \times (d_\theta + r_1 + 2r_2)$ matrix $\nabla_{\theta,s,\epsilon} M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon)$ has rank $r_1 + r_2$ whenever $M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon) = 0$, then P_ϵ -almost surely, the $(r_1 + r_2) \times (d_\theta + r_2)$ matrix $\nabla_{\theta,s} M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon)$ has rank $r_1 + r_2$.

Now note that by the additive nature of each perturbation ϵ_j , the $(r_1 + r_2) \times (d_\theta + r_1 + 2r_2)$ matrix $\nabla_{\theta,s,\epsilon} M(\theta, s, P, \epsilon)$ must always have rank $r_1 + r_2$. ■

From this we deduce the following insightful corollary:

Corollary 4.1. *Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{r_1+r_2})^T \in \mathcal{E}$ be a random perturbation with probability law P_ϵ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, consider the moment conditions:*

$$Pm_j(W, \theta) + \epsilon_j = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_1, \quad (4.2)$$

$$Pm_j(W, \theta) + \epsilon_j \leq 0, \quad j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2. \quad (4.3)$$

Then at any $\theta^ \in \Theta$ satisfying (4.2) and (4.3), the LICQ holds for the moments in (4.2) and (4.3) P_ϵ -almost surely.*

Proof. Transform the moment inequality constraints to moment equality constraints by adding slackness parameters $s_{r_1+1}, \dots, s_{r_1+r_2}$. Then verifying the LICQ from Definition 4.2 holds P_ϵ -almost surely amounts to verifying that the matrix $\nabla_{\theta,s} M(\theta^*, s, P, \epsilon)$ has rank $r_1 + r_2$ at any θ^* satisfying $M(\theta^*, s, P, \epsilon) = 0$ P_ϵ -almost surely. This follows from Proposition 4.1. ■

This result shows that even if the initial moment conditions do not satisfy the LICQ uniformly over \mathcal{P} , with probability 1 we can restore the LICQ property at any $P \in \mathcal{P}$ at which it fails by introducing an

arbitrarily small random perturbation to each moment condition. This illustrates that cases where LICQ fails are truly “knife-edge” cases. In the optimization literature, these results are referred to as genericity results, since they show that “generic” (or P_ϵ -almost all) convex programs satisfy properties like the LICQ. Since the uniform LICQ in Definition 4.2 implies Assumptions 3.3 and 3.4, these results should give the researcher some assurance that the set of data-generating processes satisfying these assumptions is “large” compared to the set of data-generating processes where the assumptions fail.

Remark 4.1. *The above results suggest that if a researcher adds a small perturbation ϵ to the moment conditions, then the high-level Assumptions 3.3 and 3.4 can be made to hold P_ϵ -almost surely. While this is a possible approach, for practical implementation, we emphasize that adding such a perturbation is not necessary. This is because the perturbation can be taken to be so small as to not affect any results up to an arbitrarily large (but finite) number of decimal places.*

Remark 4.2. *We do not claim that the analysis above makes checking the LICQ condition for a particular application a redundant exercise. On the contrary, it is still important to ensure the LICQ holds in a particular application, since there are cases where it can fail by construction.*

5 Conclusion

This paper proposes a simple procedure for constructing confidence intervals for functionals of a partially identified parameter vector. The procedure approximates the distribution of the upper and lower bounds of the identified set for the functional of interest through a simple bootstrap procedure. Uniform validity of the procedure is proven by making connections to results in the Operations Research literature on stochastic programming.

Appendix A Some 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_n^b = The bootstrap distribution.

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 satisfying our assumptions.

\mathcal{P}_+ = \mathcal{P} combined with empirical measures generated by \mathcal{P} ; see Remark 3.4.

\mathcal{P}^\dagger = A subset of \mathcal{P}_+ Assumption 3.3.

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

$\mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$ = The tangent cone; see (3.17).

$C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)$ = A $1 - \alpha$ confidence set for ψ_0 ; see (3.27).

$\Theta_{\ell b}(P) :=$ Set of optimal solutions to (3.12) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Theta_{ub}(P) :=$ Set of optimal solutions to (3.12) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Lambda_{\ell b}(P) :=$ Set of Lagrange multipliers for problem (3.12) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$\Lambda_{ub}(P) :=$ Set of Lagrange multipliers for problem (3.12) at $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

A.3 Parameters and Estimators

θ = A vector of model parameters.

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

$(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)) =$ The lower and upper endpoints of the identified set for $P\psi(W, \theta_0)$ for $P \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

$(\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) =$ See (3.18).

$(\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) =$ See (3.19).

$\Psi_I(P) = [\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)]$, the identified set for $\psi(\theta)$.

$m_j(W, \theta) =$ the j^{th} moment function.

$\mathbf{C}_P(\theta) = \text{Corr}(\{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j=1}^{r_1}, \{m_j(W, \theta)\}_{j \in \mathcal{A}(\theta, P)})$

$\Delta(P) = \Psi_I^{ub}(P) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)$, the length of the identified set for $P\psi(W, \theta)$.

$W_i^b =$ The i^{th} resampled value in bootstrap sample b .

A.4 Tuning Parameters

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

Appendix B Proofs

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

- $X_n = o_{\mathcal{P}}(a_n)$ is used to denote uniform (over \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 \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 $n \geq N$.

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

Fact B.1. Suppose that $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+\}_{n=1}^\infty \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$. 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

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

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 (3.12) and (3.13), and $\Lambda_{lb}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ denote the set of Lagrange multipliers for (3.12) and (3.13).

B.1 Proof of Results in Main Text

Remark B.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. The proof of uniformity follows namely from (i) the assumption $h_n \rightarrow h$ in the sup norm (and thus uniformly) where h is an operator that is uniformly continuous with respect to θ (the latter is provided by Lemma B.5), (ii) boundedness of the Lagrangian (given by Lemma B.3) and (iii) continuity of the optimal solutions and Lagrange multipliers (given by Lemma B.2).*

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We can focus on the lower bound, since the upper bound can be treated analogously. Consider any converging sequences $P_n \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\{h_n\} \subset \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ 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:

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

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

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

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

where $P_n + t_n h_n$ is interpreted elementwise. 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 multipliers 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 $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n), \\
& \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n), \lambda^*(P_n + t_n h_n))(P_n), \quad (\text{from (B.8) and (B.9)}) \\
& = t_n h_{n,1} \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) t_n h_{n,j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n)), \quad (\text{by (B.1)}) \\
& = t_n \left(h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n)) \right) + o(t_n), \quad (\text{by (B.10)})
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n + t_n h_n) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n)) \right], \\
& = h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P)). \tag{B.11}
\end{aligned}$$

The last line follows by convergence of $P_n \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t_n \downarrow 0$, by uniform continuity of h with respect to θ from Lemma B.5, and by convergence of the optimal solutions to a unique optimal solution (by Assumption 3.4). 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 nonempty 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 nonempty for all $n \geq N$. Now note for any $\lambda^*(P_n)$ we have:

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

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

It follows that for $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n), \\
& \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n + t_n h_n) - \mathcal{L}(\theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n), \lambda^*(P_n))(P_n), \quad (\text{by (B.12) and (B.13)}) \\
& = t_n h_{n,1} \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) t_n h_{n,j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)), \quad (\text{by (B.1)}) \\
& = t_n \left(h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) \right) + o(t_n), \quad (\text{by (B.10)})
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} \\
& \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P_n) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P_n + t_n h_n)) \right], \\
& = h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P)). \tag{B.14}
\end{aligned}$$

The last line follows by convergence of $P_n \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t_n \downarrow 0$, by uniform continuity of h with respect to θ from Lemma B.5, and by convergence of the optimal solutions to a unique optimal solution (by Assumption 3.4). 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:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n + t_n h_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)}{t_n} = h_1 \psi(W, \theta^*(P)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) h_{j+1} m_j(W, \theta^*(P)). \tag{B.15}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathbb{G}_{n, P_n} = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_n)$. By Lemma D.1(2) in Bugni et al. (2015) we have that, under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.6, \mathcal{F} is Donsker and pre-Gaussian, both uniformly over \mathcal{P} . By Theorem 2.8.7 in Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we have that Assumption 3.1 and 3.6 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 $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P$ be a version of \mathbb{G}_P with all sample paths 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:

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

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

By Theorem 3.1, if $h_n \rightarrow h$ with $h_n \in \mathbb{D}_n$ for every n and $h \in \mathbb{D}_0$, then $g_n(h_n) \rightarrow g(h)$, where $g : \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$. Now note that $\mathbb{G}_{n,P_n} \in \mathbb{D}_n$. Using the fact that $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P$ 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:

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

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

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P$ be a version of \mathbb{G}_P with all sample paths uniformly continuous. Let $\mathbb{D} = \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, $\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathcal{T}_P(\mathcal{F})$, $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}$, and define:

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

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:

$$g_n(h_n) := \sqrt{n} \left(\Psi_I^{\ell b} \left(\mathbb{P}_n + n^{-1/2}h_n \right) - \Psi_I^{\ell b} (\mathbb{P}_n) \right), \quad h_n \in \mathbb{D}_n \quad (\text{B.18})$$

$$g(h) := (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(h), \quad h \in \mathbb{D} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

By Theorem 3.1, if $h_n \rightarrow h$ with $h_n \in \mathbb{D}_n$ for every n and $h \in \mathbb{D}_0$, then $g_n(h_n) \rightarrow g(h)$, where $g : \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$. Now note that $\mathbb{G}_n^b \in \mathbb{D}_n$, and by assumption $\mathbb{G}_n^b | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} . Using the fact that $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P$ 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:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) | \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_P),$$

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

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By definition there exists a sequence $(\psi_n, P_n) \in \{(\psi, P) : \psi \in \Psi_I(P), P \in \mathcal{P}\}$

satisfying:

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

where $\{\psi_n\}$ is a 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:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\Psi_I^{ub}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

We can focus on (B.20) since (B.21) can be treated analogously. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_n(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \in C_n^\psi(1 - \alpha)) \\ &= P_n\left(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}/\sqrt{n} \leq \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n) \leq \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) + \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub}/\sqrt{n}\right), \\ &= P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n))\right), \\ &= P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Decomposing this probability we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right) \\ &= P_n^b\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n)\right) \\ &+ \left[P_n\left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{ub}(P_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - P_n\left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right) \right] \\ &+ \left[P_n\left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(P_n)\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.23})$$

$$-P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \Big] \quad (\text{B.24})$$

$$+ \left[P_n \left((\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq (\Psi_I^{ub})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \right. \\ \left. - P_n^b \left(\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)) \leq \hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{\ell b}, -\hat{\Psi}_\alpha^{ub} \leq \sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n^b) - \Psi_I^{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)) + \sqrt{n}\Delta(\mathbb{P}_n) \right) \right]. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Note by construction we will have for all n :

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

so that it suffices to show that the terms (B.23), (B.24) and (B.25) converge to non-negative values. First consider (B.23). By Lemma 3.1 we have that:

$$\sqrt{n}(\Psi_I^{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n) - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P_n)) \rightsquigarrow (\Psi_I^{\ell b})'_P(\mathbb{G}_P). \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Thus, convergence of (B.23) to zero follows from (B.26), Theorem 1.3.4(vi) in Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996), and Assumption 3.8 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.24) converges to zero, as desired.

Finally, (B.25) converges to zero w.p.a. 1, which follows from bootstrap consistency over the sequence $\{P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ from Lemma 3.2, and again from the continuity Assumption 3.8. ■

B.2 Proofs of Additional Results

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 nonempty for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, there exists an N such that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Theta_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$, $\Lambda_{\ell b}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(\mathbb{P}_n)$ are 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) $\Theta_{\ell b}(P)$, $\Theta_{ub}(P)$ are upper-hemicontinuous, compact-valued and closed at P . Thus, if $\Theta_{\ell b}(P)$ or $\Theta_{ub}(P)$ are singletons, then they are continuous at P .
- (b) $\Lambda_{\ell b}(P)$ and $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are upper-hemicontinuous, compact-valued and closed at P . Thus, if $\Lambda_{\ell b}(P)$ or $\Lambda_{ub}(P)$ are singletons, then they are continuous at P .

(c) $\Psi_I^{\ell b}(P), \Psi_I^{ub}(P)$ are continuous at P .

Proof. We will prove (a), (b) and (c) simultaneously. Let $\|x - y\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k} = \|\arctan(x) - \arctan(y)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the euclidean norm. Note that $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$, $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k, \|\cdot\|_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k})$ and $(\mathcal{P}_+, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}})$ are all metric spaces. Focus first on the lower bound program in (3.12). Take any $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Define:

$$\Theta_I(P_n) := \{\theta \in \Theta : P_n m_j(W, \theta) = 0, j = 1, \dots, r_1, P_n m_j(W, \theta) \leq 0, j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2\}.$$

By Assumption 3.3, for any sequence $P_n \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}$ (possibly with $P_n \in \mathcal{P}_+$) we have that there exists an N such that $\Theta_I(P_n)$ is nonempty for all $n \geq N$. By Assumption 3.1(i), $\Theta_I(\cdot)$ is also a compact-valued correspondence for all $n \geq N$. Recall the Lagrangian for problem (3.12):

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

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

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

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

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:

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

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

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, 3.3 and 3.5,*

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

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \|\lambda\| \leq L_{\ell b}, \quad (\text{B.27})$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{ub}(P)} \|\lambda\| \leq L_{ub}. \quad (\text{B.28})$$

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:*

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{\ell b}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\ell b}(P)} \left| \psi(W, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j m_j(W, \theta) \right| \leq C_{\ell b}, \quad (\text{B.29})$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_{ub}(P)} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{ub}(P)} \left| \psi(W, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j m_j(W, \theta) \right| \leq C_{ub}. \quad (\text{B.30})$$

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

Proof. Part (i): We will focus on (B.27) as (B.28) follows analogously. First note that by Assumption 3.1(v) and Remark 3.5 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 for all $P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$. 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 \mathcal{P}^\dagger (since by Assumption 3.3 the optimal solution set is nonempty). We have that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$ (using Fact B.1 if necessary):

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

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 $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^k$). Since $(\theta^*(P)', \lambda^*(P)')'$ is a saddle point for the Lagrangian, we conclude that for any $\theta \in \Theta$:

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

By Assumption 3.3 we have there exists a θ_P such that $Pm_j(W, \theta_P) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, and $Pm_j(W, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}$ for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2$. From above we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P) &\leq P\psi(W, \theta_P) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^*(P) Pm_j(W, \theta_P) \\ &= P\psi(W, \theta_P) + \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P) Pm_j(W, \theta_P), \\ &\leq P\psi(W, \theta_P) - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P), \\ &\leq C_F - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging we obtain:

$$\sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P) \leq \frac{C_F - \Psi_I^{\ell b}(P)}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}} \leq \frac{2C_F}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}} < \infty. \quad (\text{B.31})$$

Since $\lambda_j^*(P) \geq 0$ for each j , and since the right hand side of (B.31) does not depend on P , we conclude the bound $L_{\ell b}^{(1)} = \frac{2C_F}{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}}$ holds uniformly over \mathcal{P}^\dagger for all the Lagrange multipliers associated with the moment inequalities. Furthermore, from the Kuhn-Tucker programming conditions we have that (θ^*, λ^*) necessarily satisfy:

$$\nabla_{\theta} P\psi(W, \theta^*) + \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \lambda_j^*(P) \nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*) + \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P) \nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*) = 0.$$

Rearranging:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \lambda_j^*(P) \nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*) = -\nabla_{\theta} P\psi(W, \theta^*) - \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \lambda_j^*(P) \nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*).$$

By linearity of $Pm_j(W, \theta^*)$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, we have that $\nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*) = 0$ if and only if $Pm_j(W, \theta)$ imposes a redundant constraint, and we can remove all such constraints without affecting the optimum. Thus it is without loss of generality that we assume each $\nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*)$ for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$ has at least one non-zero element. But then by boundedness of the Lagrange multipliers for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2$ uniformly over \mathcal{P} , and boundedness of the gradients $\nabla_{\theta} P\psi(W, \theta^*)$ and $\nabla_{\theta} Pm_j(W, \theta^*)$ for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2$ uniformly over \mathcal{P}^\dagger from Assumption 3.5, we can have that the previous display holds if and only the Lagrange multipliers

for $j = 1, \dots, r_1$ are also bounded uniformly over \mathcal{P}^\dagger , say with bound $L_{\ell b}^{(2)}$. Taking $L_{\ell b} = \max\{L_{\ell b}^{(1)}, L_{\ell b}^{(2)}\}$, we are done.

Part (ii): We will focus on (B.29) since (B.30) 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:

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

where last 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 3.1-3.6, 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 $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* (||\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \theta_{\ell b}^*(P)|| > \varepsilon) = 0, \quad (\text{B.32})$$

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

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

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P_P^* (||\lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) - \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P)||_{\mathbb{R}^k} > \varepsilon) = 0. \quad (\text{B.33})$$

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

Proof of Lemma B.4. Part (i): We follows closely the proof of Theorem 4.3(II) in Kaido et al. (2017). Define the set:

$$\Theta_I^\gamma(P) := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \max_{r_1+1 \leq j \leq r_1+r_2} P m_j(W, \theta) \leq \gamma, \quad P m_j(W, \theta) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_1 \right\},$$

for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. First note that by Lemma D.1 in Bugni et al. (2015) Assumption 3.6 implies that \mathcal{F} is uniformly Donsker. In particular, we have that $||\mathbb{G}_{n,P}||_{\mathcal{F}} = O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. This implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sqrt{n} \max_j |P_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sum_j \sqrt{n} |P_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+, \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_I^{-\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+, \\ &\leq r_1 |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)| + r_2 |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) - \sqrt{n} \varepsilon_n|_+, \end{aligned}$$

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 3.6(iv) we can choose $\delta(\varepsilon_n) > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \sqrt{n} \max_j |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+, \\
&= \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \max_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+, \\
&\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \frac{1}{J} \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_{n,P} m_j(W, \theta) + \sqrt{n} P m_j(W, \theta)|_+, \\
&\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \frac{1}{J} [(J-1) \cdot 0 + |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) + \sqrt{n} C \min\{\delta(\varepsilon_n), d(\theta, \Theta_I(P))\}|_+], \\
&= \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)} \frac{1}{J} |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) + \sqrt{n} C \min\{\delta(\varepsilon_n), d(\theta, \Theta_I(P))\}|_+,
\end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that $\Theta_I(\mathbb{P}_n) \cap (\Theta \setminus \Theta_I^{\varepsilon_n}(P)) = \emptyset$ w.p.a. 1 for $\varepsilon_n = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/2})$ (from the first line). 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 $\psi(W, \theta)$ 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 $|\mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta) - \mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta')| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta(\varepsilon)$.

Now note that:

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

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 $\mathbb{P}_n \psi(W, \theta)$:

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

Also, by the uniform Donsker property:

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

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:

$$Pm_j(W, \theta_P) < -\varepsilon_P,$$

for $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2$. By the uniform Donsker property we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{n} \max_j |\mathbb{P}_n m_j(W, \theta)|_+ &\leq \sum_j |\mathbb{G}_n m_j(W, \theta_P) + \sqrt{n} Pm_j(W, \theta_P)|_+, \\ &\leq r_1 |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)| + r_2 |O_{\mathcal{P}}(1) - \sqrt{n} \varepsilon_P|_+, \end{aligned}$$

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

Part (iv) + (v): Using Lemma B.3, we can restrict λ to lie in the set $\Lambda := \{\lambda : \|\lambda\| \leq \max\{L_{\ell b}, L_{ub}\}\}$. Fix any $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$. 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 the following inequalities hold w.p.a. 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) &< \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) + \varepsilon/3, \\ \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) &< \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) + \varepsilon/3, \\ \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) &> \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) - \eta/3, \\ \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(\mathbb{P}_n) &> \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) - \eta/3. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by optimality of $\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ and $\lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) &< \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) + \varepsilon/3, \\ \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(\mathbb{P}_n) &> \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(\mathbb{P}_n) - \eta/3. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities we obtain w.p.a. 1:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) < \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) + \varepsilon \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) + \varepsilon,$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) > \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) - \eta \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) - \eta.$$

Now let B_θ and B_λ be any open balls around $\theta_{\ell b}^*(P)$ and $\lambda_{\ell b}^*(P)$, respectively, and set:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \inf_{\Theta \cap B_\theta^c} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P), \\ \eta &= \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P) - \sup_{\Lambda \cap B_\lambda^c} \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P). \end{aligned}$$

Note by Assumption 3.4, we have that $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$. Combining with the results above we conclude that w.p.a.

1:

$$\sup_{\Lambda \cap B_\lambda^c} \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(P), \lambda)(P) < \mathcal{L}(\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n), \lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n))(P) < \inf_{\Theta \cap B_\theta^c} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda_{\ell b}^*(P))(P).$$

Furthermore at least one of the inequalities in the previous display is violated if either $\theta_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \notin B_\theta$ or $\lambda_{\ell b}^*(\mathbb{P}_n) \notin B_\lambda$, which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma B.5. *Under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.6:*

- (i) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta$ implies $\rho_P(\theta, \theta') < \varepsilon$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*
- (ii) *Any function $h \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ uniformly continuous in the sup-norm with respect to ρ_P is uniformly continuous in the sup-norm with respect to $\|\cdot\|$.*

Proof. Part (i): Recall that under Assumption 3.6 the semimetric ρ_P satisfies:

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

Now take $(\theta_2, \theta'_2) = (\theta'_1, \theta_1)$ and obtain:

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{\|\theta_1 - \theta'_1\| < \delta} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \rho_P(\theta_1, \theta'_1) = 0.$$

Thus, we conclude for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{\|\theta_1 - \theta'_1\| < \delta} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \rho_P(\theta_1, \theta'_1) < \varepsilon.$$

In other words:

$$\{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta : \|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta\} \subseteq \{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta : \rho_P(\theta, \theta') < \varepsilon\}.$$

Part (ii): By uniform continuity of h we have for any $\eta > 0$, there exists a $\varepsilon(\eta, P) > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{\rho_P(\theta, \theta') < \varepsilon(\eta, P)} \|hf(w, \theta) - hf(w, \theta')\| < \eta.$$

However, for any such $\varepsilon(\eta, P) > 0$, by Part (i) there exists a $\delta(\varepsilon(\eta, P)) > 0$ such that:

$$\{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta : \|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta\} \subseteq \{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta : \rho_P(\theta, \theta') < \varepsilon\}.$$

We conclude that for any $\eta > 0$ there exists a $\delta(\eta, P) > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta(\eta, P)} \|hf(w, \theta) - hf(w, \theta')\| \leq \sup_{\rho_P(\theta, \theta') < \varepsilon(\eta, P)} \|hf(w, \theta) - hf(w, \theta')\| < \eta.$$

\blacksquare

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 $P\psi(W, \theta) = \theta \cdot \mathbb{E}W$. 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:

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

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 w.p.1, 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 $W_1 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(1, 1)$, and $W_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$. 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. (2017) Counterexample). Kaïdo et al. (2017) 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 3.6(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. \(2017\)](#), a similar result holds for the methods of [Pakes et al. \(2011\)](#), [Bugni et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Kaido et al. \(2017\)](#).

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. (2014). *Uniform central limit theorems*, volume 142. Cambridge university press.
- Fang, Z. and Santos, A. (2018). Inference on directionally differentiable functions. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(1):377–412.
- Gafarov, B. (2018). Inference on scalar parameters in setidentified affine models. *Working Paper*.
- 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. (2017). 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.
- Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M. D., Green, J. R., et al. (1995). *Microeconomic theory*, volume 1. Oxford university press New York.
- 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.