

# The Incidental Parameters Problem in Testing for Remaining Cross-section Correlation \*

Artūras Juodis <sup>†1</sup> and Simon Reese <sup>‡2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Groningen

<sup>2</sup>University of Southern California

January 18, 2022

## Abstract

In this paper we consider the properties of the Pesaran (2004, 2015a) CD test for cross-section correlation when applied to residuals obtained from panel data models with many estimated parameters. We show that the presence of period-specific parameters leads the CD test statistic to diverge as length of the time dimension of the sample grows. This result holds even if cross-section dependence is correctly accounted for and hence constitutes an example of the Incidental Parameters Problem. The relevance of this problem is investigated both for the classical Time Fixed Effects estimator as well as the Common Correlated Effects estimator of Pesaran (2006). We discuss approaches for re-establishing standard normal inference under the null hypothesis. Given the widespread use of the CD test statistic to test for remaining cross-section correlation, our results have far reaching implications for empirical researchers.

**Keywords.** Incidental Parameters Problem, Panel Data, Cross-section Dependence, CD test, Factor Model, U-statistic.

**JEL Classifications.** C12, C23, C33.

---

\*We would like to thank participants at the Asian Meeting of Econometric Society (Seoul, 2018), the International Panel Data Conference (Seoul, 2018), IAAE annual conference (Montreal, 2018), and seminar participants at Erasmus University Rotterdam, KU Leuven and the University of Southern California. We express special thanks to Geert Dhaene, Cheng Hsiao, Roger Moon, Andreas Pick, Geert Ridder, Vasilis Sarafidis, Peter Schmidt, Vanessa Smith, and Joakim Westerlund for helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. a.juodis@rug.nl. Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen, The Netherlands. Financial support from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) is gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>‡</sup>sreese@usc.edu. USC Dornsife-INET, University of Southern California, USA.

# 1 Introduction

Given that economic agents rarely act entirely independently of each other, modeling cross-section dependence plays a prominent role in panel data econometrics. Time fixed effects are probably the simplest way of addressing this issue, allowing for a common trend that enters the model additively, having a homogenous effect across units. During the last decade, interactive fixed effects models have become a popular, more general alternative that assume the presence of a factor error structure, i.e. a small number of unobserved common trends interacted with entity-specific slope coefficients. Using either of the two modeling possibilities begs the question whether cross-section dependence is adequately accounted for.

In this paper, we show that the application of tests for cross-section dependence to regression residuals obtained from two-way fixed effects models or interactive effects models is problematic. We use the popular CD test statistic of Pesaran (2004, 2015a) as an example and show that the inclusion of period-specific parameters introduces a bias term of order  $\sqrt{T}$  into the CD test statistic. In order to avoid erroneous rejection of the null hypothesis of no unaccounted cross-section dependence, we suggest an adjusted test statistic based on a general weighting of cross-section covariances. This weighted CD test statistic is asymptotically standard normal and has very good size under appropriate regularity conditions on the chosen weights.

The issue of cross-section dependence in panel data has stirred attention to the degree that now most advanced modern textbooks on panel data analysis dedicate at least one chapter to the consequences of ignoring cross-section correlation as well as the econometric techniques that have been developed to account for it, see e.g. Hsiao (2014), and Pesaran (2015b). Especially in panel data studies using macro-economic data, considerable effort has been exerted in estimating and testing appropriate model specifications capable of capturing most of cross-sectional dependence, with the methods of Pesaran (2006) and Bai (2009) being the most prominent.

Recently, applied econometricians have begun to use tests for cross-section dependence as an ex-post diagnostic tool, applied to residuals from a regression model that explicitly allows for cross-section dependence.<sup>1</sup> For example, Holly et al. (2010), Everaert and Pozzi (2014), Bailey et al. (2016), Eberhardt and Presbitero (2015), Mastromarco et al. (2016), and Chudik et al. (2017) (among others) apply the CD test of Pesaran (2004, 2015a) to residuals obtained from estimation of their model with Pesaran's (2006) Common Correlated Effects (CCE) estimator. In some applications, the CD test statistic is explicitly used as a model-selection tool, interpreting a reduction in the absolute value of the CD test statistic as an indication of a *better* model. In other cases, only specifications not rejected by the CD test statistic (given some significance level) were considered. For example, Eberhardt et al. (2013, p. 444) partially motivate the choice of the empirical specification by noting that "[...] *curiously the residual CD tests for cross-*

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, as implemented by the `xtcd`/`xtcdf` commands in Stata.

*section independence seem to reject in case of CCEP estimators. [...] The CCEP models fail to address the concerns for which they were developed, namely to account for all cross-section dependencies."*

In microeconomic applications, the dominant modeling strategy has long been to consider a two-way fixed effects model. An example of the current practice is given by the earning dynamics literature which predominantly uses data from The Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) (see e.g. Bonhomme and Robin 2010, Arellano et al. 2017, among others). Rather than analyzing the raw earnings data, empirical studies focus on the properties of residuals from a linear regression of log wages on a rich set of regressors and year specific time dummies. The post-estimation analysis is based on the implicit assumption that the model specification is sufficiently general to account for all sorts of cross-section dependence. While this assumption is (so far) rarely tested, the validity of two-way fixed effects models in applied microeconometrics and the policy evaluation literature has recently been called into question. For example, Hsiao et al. (2012b) and Gobillon and Magnac (2016) have recently emphasized the relevance of considering interactive fixed effects models rather than more restrictive time fixed effects or two-way fixed effects models when using difference-in-differences for treatment effect analysis. This sets the stage for an application of tests for cross-section dependence to residuals from two-way fixed effects models.

To the best of our knowledge, there are currently no theoretical results in the literature that could justify the use of tests for cross-section dependence as a misspecification test for regression models that account for cross-section dependence. Furthermore, this issue is usually completely ignored in any of the large scale Monte Carlo studies integral to theoretical and empirical papers in the field. Only very recently, Mao (2018) reported the size of three tests for cross-section dependence in a subset of his simulation experiments. However, despite clear evidence of excessive over-rejections, these results are neither discussed nor investigated theoretically. Therefore, this study is the first one to investigate the properties of the cross-section dependence tests applied to residuals, i.e. as a post-estimation diagnostic tool. In particular, given its popularity in the applied panel data literature, we restrict our attention to the CD test statistic of Pesaran (2004, 2015a). Our interest lies in the class of residuals obtained from the models that characterize cross-section dependence driven by a small number of unobservable factors, entering the model either as time fixed effects in an additive error component model or in terms of a multifactor error structure, interacted with unit-specific slope coefficients. The results that we obtain are summarized as follows:

1. The application of the CD test to residuals obtained from a model where common factors enter either as time fixed effects or through a multifactor error structure renders the test statistic biased for any fixed  $T$ , and divergent as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .
2. In addition to the mean of the CD test statistic, even its variance may be affected. This can result in an asymptotically degenerate distribution of the test statistic.
3. The rate under which the CD test statistic diverges under the alternative hypothesis of

unaccounted cross-section correlation is  $\sqrt{T}$  which is a reduction by a factor of  $N$  relative to applications in regression models without common factors.

4. The diverging bias can be eliminated by constructing the CD test statistic from specifically weighted covariances rather than cross-section correlation coefficients. This circumvents some problems associated with standard methods for bias correction and exhibits good size properties in simulations.

The degeneracy of the CD statistics can be seen as a manifestation of the Incidental Parameters Problem (IPP) of Neyman and Scott (1948). In this respect, this paper contributes to this branch of the literature. So far, major focus in the panel data literature has been related to the IPP stemming from estimated individual specific effects. Our paper is the first one documenting non-trivial impact of estimated time specific common parameters on asymptotic properties. Furthermore, since the CD statistic can be seen as a time-series average of second degree (*degenerate*) U-statistics, our results shed some light on the potential impact of the IPP beyond simple cross-sectional averages. Lastly, while this article only considers linear models, the average correlation approach to testing for cross-section dependence was extended to nonlinear and nonparametric panel data models by Hsiao et al. (2012a) and Chen et al. (2012), respectively. Hence, problems documented in this paper carry over to post-estimation properties of non-linear models discussed in e.g. Chen et al. (2014), Fernández-Val and Weidner (2016), or Boneva and Linton (2017).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the testing problem. In Sections 3 we present asymptotic results for stylized models with additive and multifactor error structure. In Section 4 we discuss standard approaches for bias correction and propose a weighted CD test statistic that achieves this goal. Sections 5 and 6 illustrate the problem documented in this paper by means of simulated and real data. Section 7 concludes.

**Notation:**  $I_m$  denotes an  $m \times m$  identity matrix and the subscript is sometimes disregarded from for the sake of simplicity.  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes a vector of zeros while  $\mathbf{O}$  stands for a matrix of zeros.  $s_m$  denotes a selection vector all of whose elements are zero except for element  $m$  which is one.  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector entirely consisting of ones. The dimension of these latter vectors and matrices is generally suppressed for the sake of simplicity and needs to be inferred from context. For a generic  $m \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}'$  projects onto the space spanned by the columns of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{A}$ . Furthermore,  $\text{rk}(\mathbf{A})$  denotes the rank of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$  its trace and  $\|\mathbf{A}\| = (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}))^{1/2}$  the Frobenius norm of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For a set of  $m \times n$  matrices  $\{\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N\}$ ,  $\overline{\mathbf{A}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{A}_i$ .  $\delta$  and  $M$  stand for a small and large positive real number, respectively. For two real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ . Lastly,  $\mathcal{O}_P(\cdot)$  and  $o_P(\cdot)$  express stochastic order relations.

## 2 The testing problem

Let  $z_i$  be a  $T$ -dimensional data vector observed over  $N$  cross-sectional units indexed by  $i$ . Combining all  $z_i$  we obtain a two-dimensional data array of longitudinal, or panel, data. In empirical research it is common to investigate whether  $z_i$  can be regarded as independent over  $i$ , in order to develop a model that can properly characterize the statistical properties of the data. Most often  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  contain residuals obtained from a regression model that does not allow for cross-section dependence, e.g. an entity fixed effects model or plain OLS.

By far the most widely used test for cross-section dependence is the CD test of Pesaran (2004, 2015a), which is based on a simple rescaled sum of all pairwise cross-section correlation coefficients,<sup>2</sup> formally denoted

$$CD = \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \hat{\rho}_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{TN(N-1)}{2}} \bar{\rho}. \quad (1)$$

Here,

$$\hat{\rho}_{ij} = \frac{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (z_{i,t} - \bar{z}_i)(z_{j,t} - \bar{z}_j)}{\sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (z_{i,t} - \bar{z}_i)^2} \sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (z_{j,t} - \bar{z}_j)^2}}$$

is the pairwise sample correlation coefficient between units  $i$  and  $j$ . Obviously, computing the CD test statistic involves obtaining  $N(N-1)/2$  parameter estimates, each of which converges to the true parameter value at rate  $\sqrt{T}$  only. These circumstances are reminiscent of the panel data setup considered in e.g. Phillips and Moon (1999), Hahn and Kuersteiner (2002), where estimation of many incidental parameters in linear regression models turns out to have distributional effects on the asymptotic properties of common parameters. That is, they cause the incidental parameter problem. By contrast, the asymptotic distribution of the CD test statistic is unaffected by the estimation of all  $N(N-1)/2$  cross-section correlation coefficients involved in its construction. In fact, applied to the residuals of a linear regression model with strictly exogenous regressors, and individual specific means, the CD test statistic is asymptotically normal as long as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  (see Pesaran, 2015, Theorem 2). Hence, the IPP in the original setup disappears very rapidly as both dimensions increase. In short, for the setup of Pesaran (2004, 2015a) the CD test statistic does not suffer from the (first order) IPP. However, as shown below, this result does not hold when the model specification includes period-specific parameters.

### 2.1 Additive error components

Consider a linear model where cross-section dependence is due to unobserved heterogeneity that enters the model additively. That is the relation between the  $T \times 1$  vector  $y_i$  and the  $T \times m$

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that the CD test is designed for testing correlation, and not dependence in general. Only under assumption of joint normality these two concepts coincide.

matrix  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is formally denoted

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\tau} + \boldsymbol{\iota}\mu_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\mu_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  denote an entity-specific intercept and a  $T \times 1$  vector of time-specific common parameters  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ , respectively.  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$  is a vector of idiosyncratic error terms, independent across cross-sectional units. In the example of a Difference-in-Difference framework,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  is the common trend affecting both treated and untreated individuals while the treatment indicator as well as other covariates are contained in  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . For the sake of simplicity, we assume  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  and  $\mu_i$  to be known, so that  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mu_i = 0 \forall i$  can be imposed without loss of generality. This highly restrictive assumption leaves the leading terms in the analysis below unaffected and is hence innocuous for the expository purpose of this section. Model (2) trivially reduces to

$$y_{i,t} = \tau_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (3)$$

and we additionally assume that the variance of  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is known and fixed to  $\sigma_i^2 = 1$ . In this setup,  $y_{i,t}$  are clearly cross-sectionally dependent because of  $\tau_t$ ; however we are interested in testing whether  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  are cross-sectionally uncorrelated. Given that  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  are unobserved, the common effects  $\tau_t$  need to be estimated. The most natural approach is to estimate  $\tau_t$  by OLS so that  $\hat{\tau}_t = \bar{y}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_{i,t}$ . Using the residuals

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = y_{i,t} - \hat{\tau}_t, \quad (4)$$

the CD test statistic is given by

$$\begin{aligned} CD &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \right)^2 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Given this definition,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = \sum_{i=1}^N y_{i,t} - \sum_{i=1}^N y_{i,t} = 0,$$

implying that the first term in (5) cancels out. The expression  $\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2$  in the second term is nothing more than the Sum of Squared Residuals (SSR) of the estimated model, a statistic that is of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(NT)$ . Consequently,

$$CD = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$$

even though  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  are cross-sectionally independent. Hence, the procedure commonly used by practitioners is prone to finding spurious cross-sectional dependence in the data. While the CD

statistic is misleading, the underlying average correlation coefficient  $\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \hat{\rho}_{ij}$ , or alternatively each  $\hat{\rho}_{ij}$  individually, can be informative about the underlying phenomenon. To see this observe how (1) implies that

$$\bar{\rho} = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}),$$

i.e. it converges in probability to the correct population value of 0. We will come back to the topic of using  $\bar{\rho}$  in Section 3.3.

## 2.2 Multifactor error structure

The results shown for a model with additive unobserved heterogeneity are not coincidental. In fact, they carry over to a model where cross-section dependence is generated by a multifactor error structure. Consider the  $T \times 1$  vector  $\mathbf{y}_i$  and the  $T \times m$  matrix  $\mathbf{X}_i$  defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_i &= \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{F} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ \mathbf{X}_i &= \mathbf{F} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i + \mathbf{E}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The most popular estimator designed to estimate the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  in this specific model is the CCE estimator of Pesaran (2006) which amounts to augmenting a linear regression model with cross-section averages of potentially all variables available to the researcher in order to account for the effect of unobservable common factors. While the CCE estimator is agnostic about the true number of factors that affect the data, it has been shown that consistent estimation of the parameters of interest requires that the number of cross-section averages is at least as large as the true number of factors that drive the data (Westerlund and Urbain 2013).<sup>3</sup> For this reason, an empirical practice of reporting the CD test statistic applied to CCE residuals has recently emerged, aimed at providing evidence on the amount of remaining cross-section dependence that is not accounted for by including cross-section averages into the model specification.

In the homogeneous coefficients setup we consider the Pooled Common Correlated Effects (CCE) estimator which is given by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{CCE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{X}_i \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{y}_i \right)$$

with

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{y}} & \bar{\mathbf{X}} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \mathbf{F} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} & \bar{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} & \bar{\mathbf{E}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{F} \bar{\mathbf{C}} + \bar{\mathbf{U}}.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>An exception is the special case where the slope coefficients on the unobserved, common factors are random and uncorrelated.

The CCE estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal under appropriate assumptions, see e.g. Pesaran (2006). Moreover, even though the factor estimates are effectively *generated regressors*, asymptotic inference about the true value of  $\beta$  is not affected since the effect of having to estimate the unobserved true factors is negligible as the sample size increases. More specifically,

$$\hat{f}_t - \overline{C}' f_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_{i,t} = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$$

holds for each row of  $\hat{F}$  by application of an appropriate Central Limit Theorem (CLT). However, despite not being a problem for testing hypotheses about the values of  $\beta$  in model (6), this result leads the CD test statistic, constructed from CCE residuals, to diverge at rate  $\sqrt{T}$ . To appreciate this result, note that the residuals obtained from CCE estimation of model (6) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varepsilon}_i &= M_{\hat{F}} y_i - M_{\hat{F}} X_i \hat{\beta}^{CCE} \\ &= \varepsilon_i - P_{\hat{F}} \varepsilon_i - (P_{\hat{F}} - P_F) F \lambda_i - M_{\hat{F}} X_i (\hat{\beta}^{CCE} - \beta_0). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This representation involves two terms that are exclusively due to the fact that the model of interest is augmented with estimates of the unobserved common factors. The first of these two terms is a projection of the true errors onto the space spanned by the estimated factors. Given that the estimated factors are a consistent estimator of a rotation of the true common factors, and knowing that  $F$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  are independent by standard assumptions in the literature,  $P_{\hat{F}} \varepsilon_i$  is asymptotically negligible.

The same reasoning can be applied to  $(P_{\hat{F}} - P_F) F \lambda_i$ , the direct impact of the true factors on  $y_i$  that remains because only an imperfect estimate of the factors can be used to account for their effect. Again, pointwise consistency of  $\hat{F}$  suggests that this term is asymptotically negligible. However, the rate of convergence of  $\hat{F}$  to  $F\overline{C}$  is not fast enough to ensure asymptotic negligibility of this term when constructing a test statistic for cross-section dependence. In particular, the CD test statistic (1) contains a term of the form

$$\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} T^{-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma_i} \right)' F' (P_{\hat{F}} - P_F) F \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\sigma_j} \right).$$

This term can be equivalently written

$$\sqrt{T} \operatorname{tr} \left[ \left( T^{-1} F' (P_{\hat{F}} - P_F) F \right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{2}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\sigma_j} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma_i} \right)' \right) \right].$$

Since the second component in parentheses is general of order  $\mathcal{O}_p(N)$ ,<sup>4</sup> the whole expression converges to zero only if the middle term

$$T^{-1} F' (P_{\hat{F}} - P_F) F = T^{-1} F' P_{\hat{F}} F - T^{-1} F' F \quad (8)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>Here we implicitly use the standard assumption of independently and identically distributed loadings with non-zero mean.



is of order  $o_p(N^{-1}T^{-1/2})$ . However, since  $\hat{F}$  converges to  $F\bar{C}$  pointwise at rate  $\sqrt{N}$ , it is reasonable to conjecture that the order of the difference (8) is not smaller than  $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ . Hence, the CD test statistic diverges at rate  $\mathcal{O}_p(\sqrt{T})$ . As in the model with additive time effects, this is a materialization of the IPP due to the presence of  $T$  unknown parameters that converge at the relatively slow rate of  $\sqrt{N}$  each.

The heuristic exposition in this section will be complemented with formal results in the next section.

### 3 Asymptotic Results

In this section we provide formal asymptotic results for CD statistic based on the residuals obtained from either the two-way FE model or a model with multifactor error structure. For the sake of simplicity, we continue to assume that  $\beta$ ,  $\mu_i$  and  $\sigma_i$  are known, without imposing homogeneity of the individual-specific error variances, though. The heuristic discussion in Section 2 suggests that these assumptions, while being highly restrictive, do not affect the theoretical results presented in this section. To appreciate this claim, note the following two points: First, if individual fixed effects were unknown, they would be estimated via time averages of each cross-section. In contrast to cross-section averages, which eliminated the leading term of the CD test statistic (5), time averages do not interfere with any of its components. Second, if the vector of slope coefficients  $\beta$  were unknown, its estimator would converge to the true parameter value at the conventional rate  $\sqrt{NT}$ . By contrast, the documented effects on the first two moments of the CD test statistic resulted from the fact that estimates of common, period-specific parameters converge at a rate *slower* than  $\sqrt{NT}$ . Hence, effects similar to those arising from the estimation of time effects or latent common factors are not to be expected.

Additionally, the case of known slope coefficients nests the case where  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$  is known, turning the models (4) and (6) into pure (restricted) factor models. An application of the CD test statistic on residuals of these pure factor models can be found in Cesa-Bianchi et al. (2018, Section 7.2) and is suggested as a general diagnostic technique by Bailey et al. (2016, p.255). The issue is also of relevance in the context of PANIC panel unit root tests (Bai and Ng 2004)<sup>5</sup> which investigate the common and the idiosyncratic components of the data separately. Given the problems that are associated with the use of information criteria for the number of common factors, an applied researcher might be tempted to use tests for cross-section dependence on the idiosyncratic errors of an estimated factor model in first differences and to increase the number of factors as long as remaining cross-section dependence is detected in the model residuals. The results reported below suggest that this method will not provide reliable information as to whether the factor model is correctly specified or not.

---

<sup>5</sup>Or alternatively the related PANICCA framework of Reese and Westerlund (2016).

### 3.1 Additive error components

As in Section 2.1 we assume that the true model is given by equation (2). Additionally, we make the following assumptions on the model errors.

**Assumption 1** (Errors).

1. Let  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sigma_i \eta_{i,t}$  where  $\eta_{i,t}$  is independently and identically distributed across both  $i$  and  $t$  with  $E[\eta_{i,t}] = 0$ ,  $E[\eta_{i,t}^2] = 1$  and  $E[\eta_{i,t}^8] < M$  for some  $M < \infty$ .
2.  $\sigma_i$  is defined over an interval  $[\delta; M]$  with  $0 < \delta < M < \infty$ . It is independently and identically distributed across  $i$ , and  $\sigma_i$  is independent of  $\eta_{i,t}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ .

For the technical reasons, we assume that all stochastic variables in this paper have a finite eight moment. This is a sufficient condition, which facilitates proving joint convergence of the test statistics considered in this paper, see also Demetrescu and Hogg (2016). Assumption (1) is general enough to cover several models of conditional heteroscedasticity in  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ .<sup>6</sup> For example, natural examples for  $\sigma_i$  are either a standard exponential skedastic function

$$\sigma_i = \exp(\alpha + \gamma \mu_i), \quad (9)$$

or a location-scale model with

$$\sigma_i = \alpha + \gamma \mu_i. \quad (10)$$

Both satisfy the required restrictions, e.g. if  $\mu_i$  has a bounded support. Furthermore, we denote different cross-sectional averages of  $\sigma_i$  by  $\overline{\sigma^k} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^k$  for  $k = \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$ , and the corresponding population quantities by  $E[\sigma_i^k]$ . Assumption 1 guarantees that these quantities are well defined for all finite  $k$ .

Using these definitions the CD test statistic obtained from a model with unknown period-specific effects can be characterized as follows:

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that the model parameters  $\beta$ ,  $\mu_i$  and  $\sigma_i$  are known. Under Assumption 1,

$$CD = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) + \sqrt{T} \Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T} \Xi_2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}). \quad (11)$$

where

$$\Xi_1 = \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2,$$

---

<sup>6</sup>Alternatively this assumption can be formulated in terms of unconditional variances, where  $\sigma_i$  are fixed numbers. However such an approach has severe conceptual shortcomings as discussed in Gagliardini et al. (2016).

and

$$\Xi_2 = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{NT} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_i^{-1} (\varepsilon_{i,t})^2 + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\sigma_i^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t})^2 \right).$$

Furthermore, let  $\Omega = \left( 1 - 2 \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] + \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2] (\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}])^2 \right)^2$ . Then,

$$CD - \sqrt{T} (\Xi_1 - 2\Xi_2) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega) \quad (12)$$

as  $N$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in any order.

Theorem 1 shows that the inclusion of time fixed effects into the model specification has an asymptotically non-negligible effect on the first two moments of the CD test statistic. Via expansion with appropriate functions of  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$ , it can be shown that the two terms  $\Xi_1$  and  $\Xi_2$  in Theorem 1 indicate the presence of a deterministic bias of order  $\sqrt{T}$ . Abstracting from this bias, (12) is dominated by an expression that reflects the CD test statistic obtained from the true model errors but imposing an incorrect normalization.

The behavior of the CD test statistic in a model with time fixed effects can be seen as an example of the incidental parameters problem (IPP) of Neyman and Scott (1948),<sup>7</sup> since the bias of the CD test statistic is due to the estimation of  $T$  period-specific intercepts  $\tau_t$ . Interestingly, in the context of estimating linear dynamic panel data models, estimation of the time effects  $\tau_t$  does not introduce any asymptotic bias into the FE estimator with strictly or weakly exogenous regressors (see e.g. Hahn and Moon 2006). In non-linear models, estimation of the time effects  $\tau_t$  affects the asymptotic mean of the estimator for slope parameters associated with explanatory variables (see e.g. Fernández-Val and Weidner 2016) with the corresponding bias being proportional to  $\sqrt{TN^{-1}}$ . In this sense, our result adds new insights into the literature in that it highlights a scenario where the inclusion of time fixed effects into the model has non-standard implications for the asymptotic distribution of the statistic of interest.

The results of Theorem 1 suggest that asymptotically standard normal inference can be recovered by bias-correcting and rescaling (11). Before considering this remedy in Section 4, it is important to emphasise the following special case:

**Corollary 1.** *Under Assumption 1 and given  $P(\sigma_i = \sigma) = 1$ ,*

$$CD = -\sqrt{\frac{(N-1)T}{2N}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma^2} - 1 \right) \right) + o_P(N^{-1/2})$$

Corollary 1 provides more intuition about the approximate value of the bias term  $\sqrt{T}(\Xi_1 - 2\Xi_2)$ , suggesting that it should be reasonably close to  $-\sqrt{T/2}$ . More importantly, the result reveals that the leading stochastic component in the CD test statistic, the first term on the

---

<sup>7</sup>See also Lancaster (2000).

right-hand side of equation (11), cancels out when error variances are homogeneous across  $i$ . Instead, random variation around the bias term  $-\sqrt{\frac{(N-1)T}{2N}}$  is of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2})$ , rendering the distribution of a modified version of the test statistic asymptotically degenerate.

The special case of homogeneous error variances hence entails consequences for the CD test statistic that are qualitatively different from those in the more general case where  $\sigma_i$  may differ across  $i$ . Again, it would be possible to allow for asymptotically normal inference by adequately rescaling the modified test statistic. However, the resulting statistic would be of little practical use since the main source of variation is not related to error covariances across cross-sections, but is simply driven by variance of the idiosyncratic components.

### 3.2 Multifactor error structure

Similarly to most of our previous results in what follows we assume that  $\beta$  is given (known), such that the last component of (7) is zero. Following Pesaran (2006) and Juodis et al. (2017), the estimation error  $\hat{\beta}^{CCE} - \beta_0$  is of order  $\mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ . This rate is in general fast enough to ensure that any terms present in CD involving  $\hat{\beta}^{CCE} - \beta_0$ , are asymptotically negligible. In this paper we will not attempt to prove this claim formally, but rely on Monte Carlo results of Section 5 to support this conjecture.

Given that the matrix  $\hat{F} = [\bar{y}, \bar{X}]$  is constructed based on observed data, restrictions on the DGP of both  $y_{i,t}$  and  $x_{i,t}$  need to be imposed.

#### Assumption 2.

1. Let  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sigma_i \eta_{i,t}$  where  $\eta_{i,t}$  is independently and identically distributed across both  $i$  and  $t$  with  $E[\eta_{i,t}] = 0$ ,  $E[\eta_{i,t}^2] = 1$  and  $E[\eta_{i,t}^8] < M$  for some  $M < \infty$ .
2.  $\sigma_i$  is defined over an interval  $[\delta; M]$ . It is independently and identically distributed across  $i$ .
3. The  $m \times 1$  random vector  $e_{i,t}$  is independently distributed across both  $i$  and  $t$  with  $E[e_{i,t}] = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $E[e_{i,t}e'_{i,t}] = \Sigma$  with the latter being a positive definite matrix and  $E[\|e_{i,t}\|^8] < M$ .

**Assumption 3.**  $f_t$  is a covariance stationary  $r \times 1$  random vector with positive definite covariance matrix  $\Sigma_F$ , absolutely summable autocovariances and  $E[\|f_t\|^4] < M$ .

**Assumption 4.**  $\lambda_i$  is iid over  $i$  with  $E[\lambda_i] = \mu_\lambda$  and  $E[\|\lambda_i\|^4] < \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\Lambda_i$  is iid over  $i$  with  $E[\Lambda_i] = \mu_\Lambda$  and  $E[\|\Lambda_i\|^4] < \infty$ .

**Assumption 5.**  $f_t, \{\lambda_i, \Lambda_i\}, \eta_{i',t'}, e_{i'',t''}$  and  $\sigma_{i''''}$  are mutually independent for all  $i, i', i'', i''', t, t'$  and  $t''$

**Assumption 6.**  $\text{rk}([\mu_\lambda, \mu_\Lambda]) = r = m + 1$ .

This set of assumptions above are a slightly more restrictive version of the framework considered in Pesaran (2006). For example, the assumption of common  $\Sigma$  can be straightforwardly relaxed. However, unlike  $\sigma_i$ ,  $\Sigma$  plays no major role for asymptotic results of this paper. Most importantly, we rule out the presence of serial correlation as this is in line with the assumptions made for the CD test to work. Furthermore, we restrict ourselves to a classical panel data regression model instead of considering heterogeneous slope coefficients. Moreover, any higher-order dependence between  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  and  $e_{i,t}$  is assumed away in order to allow for a tractable proof of the main theoretical result in this paper. Lastly, the fact that we assume  $\text{rk}([\mu_\lambda, \mu_A]) = r = m + 1$  to hold, suggest that our we consider an ideal setup where none of the rank condition related problems documented in Karabiyik et al. (2017), or Juodis et al. (2017) apply.

We begin our asymptotic analysis, by noting that in the model with assumed (known) homogeneous  $\sigma$  the result follows directly as in the model with time effects only. In particular, while it is not generally emphasized in the CCE literature, the residuals from CCE estimation satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = 0. \quad (13)$$

In that respect, the standard two-way error component FE estimator is similar to CCE estimator. More formally we formulate the following result

**Proposition 1.** *Under Assumptions 2–6 and  $P(\sigma_i = \sigma) = 1$ :*

$$CD = -\sqrt{\frac{(N-1)T}{2N}} + \mathcal{O}_P(R_{N,T}), \quad R_{N,T} = (N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2} \vee N^{-1}\sqrt{T}).$$

Proposition 1 shows that the result we derived previously for additive model in Corollary 1 continues to hold for models with a factor error structure, as long as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that remainder terms in Proposition 1 are  $o_P(1)$  only if both  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ . This approximation error is a direct by-product of the CCE approach, as the idiosyncratic component  $e_{i,t}$  enters the equation of interest indirectly via the factor proxies (see also Theorem 2).

It is worth mentioning that the above order effect is only valid if  $\hat{F}$  contains cross-sectional averages of the regressand as well as all regressors. If either of those variables is omitted (without affecting the rank condition in Assumption 6), the zero mean residual condition in (13) is violated, and consequently the CD test will have a  $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$  term. However, this result is of limited empirical importance as in most cases researchers include all available cross-sectional averages. While this practice ensures that the estimator is invariant to  $\beta_0$ , inclusion of too many cross-sectional averages can potentially have detrimental effects on the asymptotic properties of the estimator, see the corresponding discussion in Juodis et al. (2017).

In the homoscedastic case additive and multiplicative error component models have similar asymptotic effects on CD test statistic. The conclusions of the next theorem, which is the

main result of this paper, indicate that this equivalence does not hold in the heteroscedastic case. In order to proceed, we introduce some useful notation. For  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , let

$$(\overline{\mathcal{C}}')^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{f}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{i,t}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\psi_{i,t} = (\overline{\mathcal{C}}')^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i,t}$  is the influence function of the corresponding factor estimator, in this case cross-section averages of  $y_{i,t}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ . Generally, the influence function depends on the joint process  $[y_{i,t}, \mathbf{x}_{i,t}]'$ , as long as all observed variables are used to form cross-sectional averages. Equipped with this notation we formulate the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumptions 2–6,*

$$CD = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_{iN,t} \zeta_{jN,t} + \sqrt{T} \Phi_1 - 2\sqrt{T} \Phi_2 + \mathcal{O}_P(R_{N,T}),$$

where

$$\zeta_{iN,t} = \sigma_i^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right)' \psi_{i,t},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right)' \left( \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} \psi_{i,t}' \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right), \\ \Phi_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right)' \left( \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} \sigma_i^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, as previously,  $R_{N,T} = (N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2} \vee N^{-1} \sqrt{T})$ . In line with all previous results, the CD test statistic in this setup has two diverging components. However, unlike all previous results, in particular Theorem 1, these bias terms are not solely non-linear functions of  $\sigma_i$ . Instead, they are also influenced by the first (scaled) moments of factor loading in  $y_{i,t}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ , as well as corresponding variances of the idiosyncratic components in  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ . Thus the influence function  $\psi_{i,t}$  directly alters distributional properties of the CD statistic. The result is qualitatively similar to any parametric two-step estimation procedure with a plug-in first-step estimator. Thus by including cross-sectional averages as factor proxies, one is implicitly testing that both  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  and  $\psi_{i,t}$  are jointly cross-sectionally uncorrelated.<sup>8</sup>

**Remark 1.** One can easily see that expressions for  $\zeta_{iN,t}$ ,  $\Phi_1$ ,  $\Phi_2$  are the same if one assumes that  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$  is known. Thus it is only the influence function of common factors, and not those of factor loadings, that has an impact on the asymptotic properties of the test statistic. This conclusion is the same as in the additive model.

---

<sup>8</sup>While  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is usually assumed to be uncorrelated over  $t$ , the same is not true for  $\mathbf{u}_{i,t}$ , e.g. if  $x_{i,t} = y_{i,t-1}$ . Thus if Assumption 2 is appropriately relaxed, then  $\zeta_{iN,t}$  will be serially correlated.

As alluded in Proposition 1, the leading  $\mathcal{O}_p(1)$  is degenerate if  $\sigma_i = \sigma$ , as in this case:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{iN,t} = 0, \quad \forall t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (15)$$

One can easily see that the expressions for  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  derived for CCE coincide with the corresponding terms of Theorem 1 (up to a negligible remainder term), upon setting  $\lambda_i = 1$  (thus  $\overline{C}^{-1} = 1$ ), and  $\psi_{i,t} = \varepsilon_{i,t}$ . This situation is equivalent to using  $\hat{f}_t = \bar{y}_t - \bar{x}_t' \beta_0$  as factor proxies.<sup>9</sup>

Recall that result in Theorem 2 considers only the CCE setup where the number of observable factor proxies equals the number of the true factors. If Assumption 6 is relaxed and there are more observables than factors, then following Karabiyik et al. (2017) and Juodis et al. (2017), one can show that the expressions for  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  will contain additional terms related to this discrepancy. In particular,  $\Phi_1$ ,  $\Phi_2$ , and  $\xi_{iN,t}$  are functions of an unknown rotation matrix, which cannot be consistently estimated from the data.<sup>10</sup> We will come back to this issue in Section 4.1. Finally, our results remain completely silent on the behavior of the test statistic where  $m + 1 \rightarrow \infty$ , a scenario for which the CCE estimator for panel data models with heterogeneous coefficients has been studied by Chudik and Pesaran (2015) and Chudik et al. (2017).

**Remark 2.** Given that the asymptotic bias of the CD test statistic is driven by estimated time specific variables  $\tau_t$  (or  $f_t$ ), and not by individual specific variables, it is natural to expect that the same type of results also applies to group-specific estimates of  $\tau_t$  estimated at rate  $\sqrt{N}$ , e.g. as in Bonhomme and Manresa (2015), Su et al. (2016), or Bonhomme et al. (2017). Analogous results can also be derived for the CD test statistic applied to residuals obtained using the interactive fixed effects estimator of Bai (2009). Similarly, analogous results can be derived for test statistic based on Principal Components based residuals based on PC as in Bai (2009) or Westerlund and Urbain (2015). The expressions in Theorem 2 can be modified accordingly based on corresponding influence functions  $\psi_{i,t}$  in each setup. Appendix A.1 provides an informal discussion of these extensions.

**Remark 3.** As it was discussed previously, our results are informative about general properties of the second degree U-statistics. In particular, given that the LM test statistic as in Baltagi et al. (2012), is also a U-statistic of the same degree, similar divergence patterns can be expected. Similarly, more powerful versions of CD, as recently proposed by Demetrescu and Homm (2016) and Mao (2016), share similar asymptotic properties.

### 3.3 Implications for model comparisons

Theorems 1 and 2 in the previous two subsections indicated that the CD test statistic is not suited to test for specification of models that include unknown common, period-specific pa-

<sup>9</sup>E.g. as suggested by Westerlund et al. (2017) in the context of predictability testing with cross-sectional dependence.

<sup>10</sup>For the above reason Juodis et al. (2017) suggest the use of non-parametric bias correction procedure for CCE estimator.

rameters. This result holds certainly for samples whose time dimension is large since the leading bias term, which is close to  $-\sqrt{T/2}$ , leads the CD test to erroneously reject the correct null hypothesis already for panels with  $T = 8$ . Additionally the fact that the asymptotic distribution of  $CD$  is derived under large- $N$ , large- $T$  asymptotics precludes its application in classical microeconomic panel datasets whose time dimension is very small.

However, the CD test statistic is no longer exclusively used as a means of formally testing a high-dimensional set of restrictions on the cross-section correlation matrix of the variable of interest. An increasing number of studies (see e.g. Cesa-Bianchi et al. 2018, p.39, Baltagi et al. 2017, p.868) uses the value taken by the CD test statistic as a measure of the degree of cross-section dependence. On this basis, a certain model is considered a *better* representation of the data relative to other models because the CD test statistic obtained from residuals of the former model is closer to zero. In principle, the CD test statistic may indeed provide some indication of the degree of cross-section dependence since it consists merely of the average pair-wise cross-section correlation coefficient times a factor of  $\sqrt{TN(N-1)/2}$ . Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that all models under consideration are only an approximation of the true data-generating process and that this leads the CD test statistic to generally reject the null hypothesis of no cross-section correlation in the model residuals. For this reason, it is instructive to characterize the behavior of the CD test statistic applied to either two-way fixed effects- or CCE residuals when none of the corresponding two models can account for all sources of cross-section dependence.

To simplify the discussion, we disregard from the effect of covariates on the variable of interest  $y_{i,t}$  and assume that the true model is given by a pure static factor model, amounting to model (6) with  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ . Extending our results to the case of general  $\beta$  is possible, although formally cumbersome.<sup>11</sup> In a first instance, suppose that a researcher erroneously assumes cross-section dependence to stem from time fixed effects. Consequently we can write the deviations of the data from their cross-section averages as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_{i,t} &= y_{i,t} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N y_{i,t} \\ &= \mathbf{f}_t' \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t}\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$  and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = \varepsilon_{i,t} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t}$ . For the sake of simplicity, we continue to assume that  $\sigma_i$  is known and used to standardize regression residuals when constructing the CD test statistic. This greatly simplifies the proofs of the following propositions while leaving the main results of this section unaffected. We confirm this conjecture with corresponding simulations in Section 5, allowing for both unknown error variances and unknown,

---

<sup>11</sup>To appreciate this point note that, even if the unobserved heterogeneity driving the data is misspecified, least squares estimates of  $\beta$  are consistent for the pseudo-true parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \text{plim}_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i' \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i' \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i \right) \right]$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i$  being orthogonal to estimates of the assumed sources of unobserved heterogeneity.



general slope coefficients  $\beta$ . Given our current setup, let the CD test statistic constructed from  $\hat{v}_{i,t}$  be expressed by

$$CD_{\mathbb{H}_1} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_i^{-1} \hat{v}_{i,t} \hat{v}_{j,t} \sigma_j^{-1}.$$

The properties of this test statistic are characterized as follows:

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that the true model is given by (6) with  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$  and that its components satisfy Assumptions 2–6. Let the CD test statistic  $CD_{\mathbb{H}_1}$  be constructed from the cross-sectionally demeaned data (16). Then,*

$$CD_{\mathbb{H}_1} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}).$$

The rate of divergence obtained for  $CD_{\mathbb{H}_1}$  is interesting in comparison with the equivalent rate obtained in Pesaran (2015a) for models without estimated time fixed effects. Considering only the case of strong factors (i.e.  $\alpha = 1$  in Pesaran's notation), the leading term of the CD test statistic, denoted by equations (56)-(57) in the aforementioned article, is  $\mathcal{O}_P(N\sqrt{T})$ . Consequently, cross-sectional demeaning of the data, necessary to account for the effect of assumed time-specific effects, reduces the rate at which  $CD$  diverges under the alternative hypothesis by a factor of  $N$ . Implications for model comparisons guided by the difference of  $CD$  to zero are obvious: If a considerable reduction of the CD test statistic applied to model residuals is observed when switching from an entity fixed effects models to a two-way fixed effects model, this does not necessarily imply that the second model managed to purge most sources of cross-section dependence in the residuals. Instead, the reduction is mostly due to that fact that residual cross-section dependence leads the CD test statistic to diverge to a lower degree after the data have been cross-sectionally demeaned.

The observations made for models that assume an additive error component structure apply almost identically for mis-specified common latent factor models. A mis-specified latent common factor model can be characterized by equation (6) such that Assumptions 2–5 as well as the following Assumption 7 hold.

**Assumption 7.**  $\text{rk}([\mu_\lambda, \mu_A]) = m + 1 < r$ .

Assumption 7 enforces a failure of the rank condition set up by Pesaran (2006) to ensure that the space spanned by factor estimates can be consistent for the space spanned by the true factors. Under failure of the rank condition, a fraction of the common variation affecting the dependent variable  $y_{i,t}$  remains asymptotically unaccounted for. As proved in Lemma 1 in the appendix, we can assume without loss of generality that accounted and unaccounted sources of cross-section dependence are due to two uncorrelated sets of unobserved factors. Formally, we decompose

$$F\lambda_i = F^{(1)}\lambda_i^{(1)} + F^{(2)}\lambda_i^{(2)}, \quad (17)$$

where a rotation of the  $m + 1$  factors  $\mathbf{F}^{(1)}$  is consistently estimated by cross-section averages  $\hat{\mathbf{F}} = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{X}}]$  whereas the remaining  $r - m - 1$  factors  $\mathbf{F}^{(2)}$  are asymptotically orthogonal to  $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ .

Among other things this decomposition implies that  $E[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)}] = \mathbf{0}$ . We can accordingly express the defactored data as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_i &= \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{y}_i \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(1)} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i.\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

where Assumption 7 and Lemma 1 ensure that  $\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)}$  does not vanish as the sample size increases. Again, we assume a pure static factor model for  $y_{i,t}$  by imposing the restriction  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ . The order in probability of the CD test statistic can then be characterized as follows.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that the true model is given by (6) with  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$  and that its components satisfy Assumptions 2–5 and 7 as well as the simplifying assumptions stated in Lemma 1. Let the CD test statistic  $CD_{\mathbb{H}_1}$  be constructed from CCE residuals (18). Then,*

$$CD_{\mathbb{H}_1} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}).$$

The remarks made concerning Proposition 2 apply in an identical fashion to Proposition 3. That is, a reduction of the CD test statistic applied to CCE residuals relative to that applied to entity fixed effects residuals does not reliably indicate the degree to which cross-section dependence has been accounted for by the former model. By contrast, a considerable part of the reduction is due to a difference in the rate at which CD diverges under a violation of the null hypothesis. As in the two-way fixed effects model, this decrease results from a cross-sectional demeaning of the unaccounted common variation in the data. However, in contrast to the case of additive error components, demeaning in the case of a multifactor error structure is achieved via projection rather than subtraction of cross-section averages.

**Remark 4.** It is crucial to note that the zero mean property of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)}$  is an explicit consequence of  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}_i$  being one of the columns of  $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ . If  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  is left out, this removes the restriction on  $E[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)}]$  which also implies that  $CD_{\mathbb{H}_1}$  would diverge at rate  $N\sqrt{T}$  in this case. A higher divergence rate can also be observed in when our restrictions on  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  are to be discarded if cross-section averages of any covariate whose true slope coefficient is unequal zero are left out of  $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ .<sup>12</sup>

A number of studies (see e.g. Foerster et al. 2011, Moscone and Tosetti 2010) report the average pairwise cross-section correlation coefficient  $\bar{\rho}_N$  as an indicator of the degree of cross-section dependence rather than (or in addition to) employing the CD test statistic. The conclusions drawn from Propositions 2 and 3 have direct implications also for  $\bar{\rho}_N$ . In Section 2.1 we

---

<sup>12</sup>The key driving mechanism here is whether the equality  $\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}\bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} = \bar{\mathbf{U}}$  is violated. When any covariate  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}$  that affects  $\mathbf{y}_i$  is left out of  $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$  this is the case since an additional term arises due to the presence of  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(\ell)}\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(\ell)}$  in  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ . This term will then entail a higher rate of divergence if the corresponding explanatory variable is driven by any unaccounted factor.

argued that despite the fact that the CD statistic diverges under the null hypothesis,  $\bar{\rho}_N \xrightarrow{p} 0$  continues to hold. However, given that  $\bar{\rho}_N = (N(N-1)T)^{-1/2} CD$ , the average cross-section correlation of a variable that has been demeaned or defactored with its own cross-section average will be of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$  even under alternative hypothesis of Propositions 2 and 3. This holds irrespective of whether any of these two methods of accounting for cross-section dependence eliminates all sources of common variation or not. By contrast, the average cross-section correlation coefficient for the same variable without adjustment need not converge to zero if unaccounted cross-section dependence is present.

The changing order in probability of the average cross-section correlation of a variable before versus after accounting for cross-section dependence makes it a questionable indicator of remaining common variation. In this regard, it needs to be noted that the problems discussed in this paragraph are a direct consequence of averaging over *all* possible pairs of two cross-sections. Individual cross-section correlation coefficients should still be consistent as long as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e.

$$\hat{\rho}_{ij} = \rho_{ij} + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}), \quad (19)$$

for all pairs  $i, j$ . Thus, other statistics whose construction involves  $\sqrt{T}\hat{\rho}_{ij}$  can potentially detect some deviations from the null hypothesis since their asymptotic distribution will differ with regards to whether unaccounted cross-section dependence is present or not.

## 4 Re-establishing standard normal inference

The diverging bias in the CD test statistic applied to residual from models with common, period-specific parameters is fundamentally problematic for its use in the context of testing for remaining cross-section correlation. Still, the literature review in Section 1 suggests that the underlying question of correct model specification is of high relevance for empirical researchers. For this reason it is relevant not to discard completely the CD test statistic but instead to discuss possible modifications aimed at ensuring an asymptotically standard normal inference under null hypothesis. Thus methods aimed at addressing the IPP detailed in Sections 2 and 3 need to be considered.

### 4.1 Bias correction

The most natural approach to recovering asymptotically unbiased estimators and/or test statistics is given by bias-correction, for which several approaches have been suggested in the large- $N$ , large- $T$  panel data literature (see e.g. Hahn and Newey 2004, Dhaene and Jochmans 2015). However, most existing contributions address cases in which the bias is proportional to  $\sqrt{TN^{-1}}$  or  $\sqrt{NT^{-1}}$  and which differ to the bias terms derived in Section 3 in two regards: First,

the bias we analyzed is unaffected by the number of cross-sections in the dataset. Second, there is no path along which  $N$  and  $T$  both diverge to infinity that would lead the bias to disappear.

Given that expressions for the bias terms could be derived in Theorems 1 and 2, parametric bias correction can be conducted by subtracting plug-in estimators of the bias terms  $\Xi_1$  and  $\Xi_2$  (or  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ ) from  $CD$ . For example, in the case of the CD test statistic applied to time fixed effects residuals, a modified statistic that also normalizes the variance of  $CD$  to one is given by

$$\widetilde{CD} = \Omega_N^{-1/2} \left( CD - \sqrt{T}\hat{\Xi}_1 + 2\sqrt{T}\hat{\Xi}_2 \right), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Xi}_1 &= \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2, \\ \hat{\Xi}_2 &= \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_i^{-1} \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Omega_N = \left( 1 - 2\overline{\sigma}\overline{\sigma^{-1}} + \overline{\sigma^2} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 \right)^2.$$

The first two terms are estimates of the bias terms with  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  replaced with  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = \varepsilon_{i,t} - \bar{\varepsilon}_t$ , while  $\Omega_N$  is the plug-in estimator of  $\Omega$ . A similar bias-corrected test statistic can be formulated using expressions provided in Theorem 2. We disregard from discussing the CCE case in detail since the problems associated with the use of a parametric bias correction contain the ones already given in the fixed effects case.<sup>13</sup>

Despite the presence of a fairly simple way to conduct parametric bias-correction, this strategy becomes problematic as soon as the assumption of known error variances is relaxed. To appreciate this point, note that each of the  $N$  parameters  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$  is estimated using only the  $T$  residuals corresponding to the cross-section in question. This entails that error variance estimates converge to their true value at rate  $\sqrt{T}$  which is identical to the factor with which the bias expressions  $\Xi_1$  and  $\Xi_2$  are scaled up. It is true that the bias terms involve *averages* over  $N$  and in the case of  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^2$  it is straightforward to show that the rate of convergence to a cross-section average of the true error variances is  $\sqrt{NT}$ .

Still, it is highly questionable whether this result continues to hold for averages of non-linear functions of  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$ , especially in the case of  $\bar{\sigma}$  and  $\overline{\sigma^{-1}}$  where a square root is involved. Consequently, the use of estimated error variances will lead to the emergence of additional terms which have an asymptotically non-negligible effect on the CD test statistic. Given

---

<sup>13</sup>Bias-correction of the CD test statistic applied to CCE residuals encounters additional problems related to the estimation of the unknown factor loadings  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ . As noted earlier, consistent estimation of the loadings is not possible in the empirically very relevant case where the number of latent factors is strictly smaller than the true number of factors that affect the observed data. This is due to dependence on unknown rotation matrices which cannot be estimated from the data.

that the extra terms arise from the estimation of individual-specific parameters, they amount to yet another manifestation of the IPP, here related to an attempt of solving this problem in a different instance. Moreover, due to the non-linear fashion in which the true error variances enter  $\Xi_1$  and  $\Xi_2$ , expressions for the bias arising from estimating the true values of  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$  are hard to obtain, hence rendering parametric bias-correction infeasible.

An alternative strategy for bias correction is the use of non-parametric approaches. For instance, proportionality of the bias to  $\sqrt{T}$  implies that a test statistic of the form

$$\widetilde{CD}_N = CD_N - 0.5(CD_{1N} + CD_{2N}), \quad (21)$$

is not divergent. Here  $CD_{1N}$  and  $CD_{2N}$ , are the CD test statistics calculated from the first  $i = 1, \dots, N/2$  and the remaining  $j = N/2 + 1, \dots, N$  observations respectively.<sup>14</sup> This construction turns  $\widetilde{CD}_N$  into a simple jackknife version of the original test statistic. While this approach achieves the main objective of obtaining a non-divergent test statistic, it has two clear shortcomings: i) it inflates the variance (unlike Hahn and Newey (2004) or Dhaene and Jochmans (2015)); ii) Under any divergent alternative it also removes all components divergent at any rates  $\mathcal{O}(T^\delta)$  (for any  $\delta > 0$ ).

Rather than splitting data over the cross-sectional dimension, it is possible to use subsample information over the time-series dimension. For example, the test statistic

$$\widetilde{CD}_N = CD_N - \sqrt{2}CD_{1T}, \quad (22)$$

should be non-divergent and removes any terms divergent at the rate  $\sqrt{T}$ , but not at rates proportional to  $T^\delta$  for  $\delta \neq 1/2$ . However, as shown in Propositions 2 and 3, a violation of the null hypothesis does not change the rate at which  $CD$  diverges. Consequently, successful non-parametric elimination of the bias term comes at the cost of rendering the modified test statistic inconsistent.

The discussion above has emphasized that neither parametric bias correction nor the naive jackknife are remedies against the bias of the CD test statistic when applied to time fixed effects or CCE residuals. For this reason we consider a third alternative, consisting of reconsidering the individual-specific weighting applied to model residuals when constructing the test statistic.

## 4.2 A weighted statistic for cross-section dependence

From a general perspective, the cross-section correlation estimator

$$\hat{\rho}_{ij} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_j^2 \right)^{-1/2} \quad (23)$$

---

<sup>14</sup>Here we ignore that there is no natural ordering in the cross-sectional dimension.

is merely a unit-specific weighting of  $\widehat{\text{cov}} \left[ \varepsilon'_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \right]$  with advantageous properties: Under the assumptions made in Pesaran (2004), it ensures that the CD test statistic has unit variance under the null hypothesis of no cross-section correlation, allowing for standard normal inference without the need to obtain a variance estimate. However, the case is different in models with unknown, period-specific parameters. As shown in Theorems 1 and 2, studentization of the model residuals fails to ensure a test statistic with a variance of one, even when the true error variances are known. For this reason, it is valid to fundamentally question the use of (estimated) error variances as a means of standardizing cross-section covariance estimates.

In fact, criteria for alternative standardizations that reduce the bias in CD to an asymptotically negligible term are easily derived. For this purpose, we define a weighted CD test statistic

$$CD_W = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (w_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t})(w_j \hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t}) \quad (24)$$

which is a function of a generic set of weights  $w_1, \dots, w_N$  and which coincides with the CD test statistic of Pesaran (2004) for  $w_i = \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1} \forall i$ .<sup>15</sup> For the sake of providing a clear exposition, the weights are preliminarily assumed to have the following properties:

**Assumption 8.**  $w_i$  is independently and identically distributed across  $i$  with  $\sigma_w^2 = \text{var}[w_i] > 0$  and  $E[w_i^8] < \infty$ . Furthermore,  $w_i$  is independent of  $\eta_{i,t}$  and  $e_{i,t}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ .

Given weights that satisfy these assumptions, we can generalize the results of Theorem 1.

**Corollary 2.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 and weights that satisfy Assumption 8, we have

$$CD_W = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} (w_i - \bar{w})(w_j - \bar{w}) + \sqrt{T} \tilde{\Xi}_{1,W} - 2\sqrt{T} \tilde{\Xi}_{2,W} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Xi}_{1,W} &= \left( (\bar{w})^2 - N^{-1} \overline{w^2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 \\ \tilde{\Xi}_{2,W} &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} (NT)^{-1} \left( \bar{w} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 w_i + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t} w_i)^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 8, we can state that the leading terms in the two expressions above are functions of the average weight  $\bar{w}$ . Hence, choosing a set of weights with  $E[w_i] = 0$  reduces the order in probability of the leading bias terms, leaving only terms of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$  in  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W}$ .

<sup>15</sup>Note that the weighted CD statistic should not be confused with the “local CD” statistic discussed in Pesaran (2015b). In the latter case, the weights are pair specific, i.e.  $w_{ij}$ , and are usually motivated using the spatial (distance) structure of the data, see e.g. Robinson (2008). In our case the spatial structure is not needed, thus the weighted test is global and not local.

For  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W}$  the resulting order in probability is merely  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W} = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2})$ , since  $E[\sigma_i^2 w_i]$  may be non-zero. Thus for  $T/N \rightarrow c > 0$  this bias term can be non-negligible. However, a simple remedy to this shortcoming is manually demeaned weights  $\tilde{w}_i = w_i - \bar{w}$ . These weights ensure  $\bar{w} = 0$  for any  $N$  so that the leading bias terms in both  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W}$  and  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W}$  are eliminated entirely.

The results obtained for the model with additive fixed effects can be generalized to models with a multifactor error structure. Theorem 2 can be extended to cover arbitrary weights  $w_i$ :

**Corollary 3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 and weights that satisfy Assumption 8, we have*

$$CD_W = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \xi_{iN,t} \xi_{jN,t} + \sqrt{T} \tilde{\Phi}_{1,W} - 2\sqrt{T} \tilde{\Phi}_{2,W} + \mathcal{O}_P(R_{N,T})$$

where

$$\xi_{iN,t} = w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i \right)' \psi_{i,t},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_{1,W} &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i \right)' \left( \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} \psi_{i,t}' \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i \right) \\ \tilde{\Phi}_{2,W} &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i \right)' \left( \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The generality of model (6) relative to the simpler time fixed effects or two-way fixed effects models makes complete elimination of the leading bias terms infeasible. Given that unobserved factors affect the dependent variable  $y_{i,t}$  with individual-specific loadings, the bias expressions are not simple functions of  $\bar{w}$  as they were in Corollary 2. Using a set of weights that add to zero will hence not imply that  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,W} = 0$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W} = 0$ . This result can only be achieved by choosing an  $N$ -dimensional vector of weights which is orthogonal to the columns of the  $N \times r$  matrix  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)'$ . The latter matrix being unobserved, there is no feasible way of ensuring that the weighted average  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i$  is *exactly* zero. Still, choosing a set of weights with  $E[w_i] = 0$  may achieve bias reduction. To appreciate this point, observe that if  $\lambda_i$  and  $w_i$  are uncorrelated:

$$E \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i \right] = E[w_i] \mu_\lambda = \mathbf{0}.$$

In that case, the order in probability of  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \lambda_i$  is determined by its covariance matrix, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i w_i \right] &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N E[w_i^2 \lambda_i \lambda_i'] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the use of zero mean random weights reduces the order in probability of the weighted average over all factor loadings by a factor of  $\sqrt{N}$  so that  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,W} = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$ . This conclusion holds as long as  $\lambda_i$  are uncorrelated from  $w_i$ . Additionally, the term  $\xi_{iN,t}$ , which constitutes the leading stochastic component of  $CD_W$ , is affected in that the impact of  $\psi_{i,t}$  vanishes as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Previous simple restriction on weights is not sufficient to reduce the order of  $\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W}$ . For this component to be of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$  it necessary to assume that  $w_i$  are uncorrelated from both  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  and  $\psi_{i,t}$ , leading to:

$$\text{var} \left[ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} \right] = \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}).$$

The conditions for bias reduction in the CCE case make it fairly difficult to find an admissible set of weights in practice. Among other things, weights required to be mean independent of  $\lambda_i$  and to have an expected value of zero. Additionally, to ensure that  $\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W}$  is of lower stochastic order,  $w_i$  needs to be, or needs at least to converge sufficiently fast to, a random variable independent of the model errors. The combination of restrictions on the dependence of  $w_i$  on both idiosyncratic variation in  $y_{i,t}$  as well as the slope coefficients on common factors precludes the use of (estimated) model components as weights. For example, the use of model residuals as weights violates independence of model errors and weights. Weights derived from the estimated common component of  $y_{i,t}$  cannot be used neither as these would be correlated with the true factor loadings. But if neither estimated idiosyncratic nor estimated common components can be used as weights for the CD test statistic, candidates for  $w_i$  have to be supplied from outside the model.

The optimal choice of weights for a weighted CD test statistic, either in the case of a time fixed effects model or a factor-augmented regression, requires an investigation of its implications for the  $CD_W$  under the alternative hypothesis in order to evaluate whether there is some choice that maximizes power. Any effort in this area is out of the scope of this article, since our interest lies primarily in documenting the challenges to be faced under the null hypothesis of no remaining cross-section correlation and in discussing possible modifications that result in an unbiased test statistic.

For the sake of illustrating the potential of a weighted test statistic, we choose to sample  $w_1, \dots, w_N$  independently from a known distribution. Despite the usual concerns related to *randomized tests*, independently drawn weights ensure that all requirements for bias reduction in the case of a CD test statistic applied to CCE residuals are met. Draws from distributions with nonzero expected value can easily be demeaned before being used in the construction of a weighted CD test statistic. Furthermore, random weights are a unified way of considering valid weights in both the time fixed effects and the common correlated effects case. Formally we define the properties of random weights as follows:



**Assumption 9 (Weights).**  $w_i$  is independently and identically distributed across  $i$  with  $E[w_i] = 0$ ,  $\sigma_w^2 = \text{var}[w_i] > 0$  and  $E[w_i^8] < \infty$ . Furthermore,  $w_i$  is independent of  $\lambda_i$ ,  $\sigma_i$ ,  $\eta_{i,t}$  and  $e_{i,t}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ .

Assuming that  $\sigma_w^2 = \text{var}[w_i] > 0$  rules out the case where the distribution of  $w_i$  is a point mass at some constant since this would lead to results identical to those in Corollary 1. The requirements of Assumption 9 can also be used to contemplate the validity of external observed data as weights since in some cases the empirical context itself suggests an appropriate choice of  $w_i$ . For example, exogenous information about the size, connectedness or other quantitative characteristic of the cross-section units can be exploited to construct individual weights  $w_i$ . Given our definition of random weights, we can characterize the results of the weighted CD test statistic constructed from either time fixed effects or CCE residuals in a unifying statement:

**Theorem 3.** Consider the weighted CD test statistic

$$\widetilde{CD}_W = \left( \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 \right)^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} w_j \hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t} \right)$$

and assume that either of the following two points hold.

1. The data are generated by the time fixed effects model (2) such that Assumption 1 holds.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}$  is given by (4).
2. The data are generated by the latent common factor model (6) such that Assumptions 2-6 hold.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}$  is defined by (7).

Under either of the two sets of assumptions above as well as Assumption 9, it holds that

$$\widetilde{CD}_W \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

as  $N$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in any order subject to the condition  $N^{-1}\sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$ .

Theorem 3 is appealing for our illustrative purpose since there is no need to consider different weighted CD test statistics to test for remaining cross-section dependence in either the residuals of a time fixed effects model or those of resulting from CCE estimation. Instead, there exists a single solution to establishing asymptotically standard normal inference in both cases.<sup>16</sup>

## 5 Monte carlo study

We investigate the properties of the CD test as well as its weighted alternatives in a small set of simulation experiments. Following the exposition of Section 3.2, we simulate the common

---

<sup>16</sup>Or more generally to any set of residuals, irrespective of the influence function  $\psi_{i,t}$ .

latent factor model

$$y_{i,t} = \beta x_{i,t} + \lambda_i' \mathbf{f}_t + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (25)$$

$$x_{i,t} = \mathbf{A}_i' \mathbf{f}_t + e_{i,t}. \quad (26)$$

The model errors  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  are defined  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sqrt{\sigma_{i,y}^2} \varepsilon_{i,t}^*$  where  $\varepsilon_{i,t}^*$  are drawn independently over  $i$  and  $t$  from a standardized  $\chi^2(2)$  distribution that has zero mean and unit variance.<sup>17</sup> The scalar random variable  $e_{i,t}$  is generated in the same way as  $\varepsilon_{i,t}^*$ . Error variances are obtained via  $\sigma_{i,y}^2 = c_\sigma \left( \varsigma_{i,y}^2 - 2 \right) / 4 + 1$  where  $\varsigma_{i,y}^2 \sim \chi^2(2)$  and where the parameter  $c_\sigma$  is chosen manually as discussed below. This construction entails that  $E \left[ \sigma_{i,y}^2 \right] = 1$  and  $\text{var} \left[ \sigma_{i,y}^2 \right] = c_\sigma^2$ . Finally, we set  $\beta = 1$  without any loss of generality.

The  $r$  elements of  $\lambda_i$  are drawn from  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ . Element  $\Lambda^{(r')}$  of the  $r \times 1$  vector  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is drawn from  $U(-0.5, 0.5)$  if  $r' = 1$  and from  $U(0.5, 1.5)$  otherwise. Concerning the latent factors, we let  $\mathbf{f}_t \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_r)$ . When considering the two-way fixed effects model instead of the common latent factor model, we set  $r = 2$  and define  $\mathbf{f}_t = \left[ f_t^{(1)}, 1 \right]'$  as well as  $\lambda_i = \left[ 1, \lambda_i^{(2)} \right]'$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i = \left[ 1, \Lambda_i^{(2)} \right]'$  with the construction of  $f_t^{(1)}$ ,  $\lambda_i^{(2)}$  and  $\Lambda_i^{(2)}$  being unchanged.

In all following simulations we extend our theoretical framework and assume that  $\beta$  is unknown and needs to be estimated. If the fixed effects estimator is estimated, individual fixed effects are assumed to be unknown as well so that a within transformation for the two-way fixed effects model is applied. Lastly, whenever model residuals are studentized, this is done using estimated error variances instead of their true values.

## 5.1 Standard CD statistic

As a first scenario, we consider that the true model is a two-way fixed effects model which we estimate correctly using a fixed effects estimator that allows for both time and entity fixed effects. The CD test statistic of Pesaran (2004) is obtained from the model residuals of each simulated dataset and its mean as well as its variance are reported in Table 1. We do this considering the parameter values  $c_\sigma \in \{0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5\}$  in order to control the degree of heterogeneity among the individual-specific error variances. In accordance with our theoretical predictions, the CD test statistic has a bias term that diverges towards  $-\infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and a variance that is considerably below 1. The bias term is reasonably close to the benchmark value of  $-\sqrt{T/2}$  indicated by Proposition 1 but tends towards zero as heterogeneity among the individual-specific error variances is amplified.

The same observation holds for the CD test statistic obtained from the residuals of a correctly specified estimated model with factor error structure. Simulating model (25)–(26) with

---

<sup>17</sup>The results reported in this section are robust to the choice of more conventional distributions for the idiosyncratic variation in both explained and explanatory variables, such as a standard normal distribution or Student's  $t$ -distribution with 9 degrees of freedom. The  $\chi^2(2)$  distribution is chosen to provide simulation results under more challenging circumstances.

Table 1: Sample moments of CD test statistic applied to two-way FE residuals.

True model is two-way FE.									
		Mean				Variance ( $\times 100$ )			
$c_\sigma$ :		0.1	0.5	1	1.5	0.1	0.5	1	1.5
N	T								
25	25	-3.35	-3.30	-3.15	-2.83	1.35	2.04	4.57	11.36
25	50	-4.91	-4.85	-4.66	-4.25	0.53	0.95	2.75	8.12
25	100	-7.08	-7.00	-6.75	-6.20	0.22	0.51	1.88	6.18
25	200	-10.11	-10.00	-9.65	-8.91	0.1	0.37	1.64	5.73
50	25	-3.30	-3.25	-3.09	-2.72	1.01	1.43	3.35	9.52
50	50	-4.85	-4.79	-4.58	-4.11	0.36	0.65	2.01	6.66
50	100	-7.00	-6.92	-6.63	-6.00	0.13	0.33	1.34	5.09
50	200	-10.00	-9.88	-9.49	-8.63	0.06	0.24	1.19	4.77
100	25	-3.28	-3.22	-3.03	-2.58	0.84	1.24	3.14	10.53
100	50	-4.83	-4.76	-4.52	-3.94	0.26	0.49	1.7	6.96
100	100	-6.96	-6.87	-6.55	-5.78	0.09	0.24	1.14	5.44
100	200	-9.95	-9.82	-9.38	-8.32	0.04	0.16	0.94	4.98
200	25	-3.27	-3.21	-3.04	-2.66	0.74	1.07	2.51	7.46
200	50	-4.81	-4.74	-4.52	-4.03	0.21	0.41	1.36	4.98
200	100	-6.95	-6.85	-6.56	-5.92	0.07	0.19	0.85	3.66
200	200	-9.92	-9.79	-9.39	-8.52	0.02	0.11	0.66	3.15

Notes.  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sqrt{\sigma_{i,y}^2} \varepsilon_{i,t}^*$ ;  $\varepsilon_{i,t}^*$  and  $e_{i,t}$  are standardized  $\chi^2(2)$ .  $\sigma_{i,y}^2 = c_\sigma (\varsigma_{i,y}^2 - 2) / 4 + 1$ ;  $\varsigma_{i,y}^2$  is  $\chi^2(2)$ . Entity FE  $\lambda_i$  and  $\Lambda_i$  drawn from  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ . Time FE  $f_t$  drawn from  $N(0, 1)$ .

$r = 2$  but without the restrictions that would imply a two-way fixed effects model, we obtain the average and the sample variance of CD test statistics obtained from CCE residuals and report them in Table 2. Even though the number of observable variables is sufficient to account for all sources of cross-section dependence in the simulated data, the CD test statistic exhibits the same patterns as seen in the two-way fixed effects case. Despite the additional heterogeneity implied by entity-specific loadings on the unobserved factors, the CD test statistic is on average fairly close to the benchmark value of  $-\sqrt{T/2}$ .

As argued in Section 3.3, one of the striking consequences of including common, period-specific parameters into the model specification is a reduction in the rate at which the CD test statistic diverges when not all sources of cross-section correlation are accounted for. To provide an indication concerning the values one can expect the CD test statistic to have under the alternative hypothesis, we simulate a model with a factor error structure and three factors so that neither two-way fixed effects nor common correlated components account for all sources of co-movement across cross-sections. The mean and variance of the CD test statistic applied to residuals of either of the two models are reported in Table 3, keeping the degree of heterogeneity in error variances across cross-section fixed by setting  $c_\sigma = 1$ . In order to provide confirmatory evidence that the simplifying assumptions of Propositions 2 and 3 do not affect

Table 2: Sample moments of CD test statistic applied to CCE residuals.

True model is a latent common factor model with two factors.									
N	$c_\sigma$ : T	Mean				Variance ( $\times 100$ )			
		0.1	0.5	1	1.5	0.1	0.5	1	1.5
25	25	-3.26	-3.20	-2.99	-2.50	2.32	3.55	8.37	22.06
25	50	-4.88	-4.79	-4.50	-3.84	0.83	1.56	4.76	15.12
25	100	-7.07	-6.95	-6.55	-5.64	0.28	0.81	3.36	12.67
25	200	-10.10	-9.94	-9.40	-8.14	0.12	0.58	2.87	11.82
50	25	-3.08	-3.04	-2.88	-2.54	2.96	3.91	7.39	17.02
50	50	-4.77	-4.71	-4.51	-4.05	0.8	1.29	3.31	9.59
50	100	-6.97	-6.89	-6.62	-6.00	0.23	0.51	1.81	6.43
50	200	-9.99	-9.88	-9.50	-8.64	0.07	0.28	1.36	5.53
100	25	-2.81	-2.74	-2.54	-2.13	4.19	5.5	10.21	22.48
100	50	-4.65	-4.56	-4.31	-3.77	0.94	1.58	4.05	11.36
100	100	-6.90	-6.79	-6.44	-5.72	0.2	0.51	1.95	7.09
100	200	-9.92	-9.77	-9.29	-8.30	0.06	0.27	1.35	5.72
200	25	-2.28	-2.21	-1.97	-1.40	7.16	8.99	16.32	39.88
200	50	-4.44	-4.35	-4.04	-3.28	1.37	2.13	5.54	18.53
200	100	-6.81	-6.69	-6.28	-5.25	0.26	0.6	2.38	10.51
200	200	-9.87	-9.71	-9.14	-7.74	0.06	0.23	1.35	7.39

Notes.  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sqrt{\sigma_{i,y}^2} \varepsilon_{i,t}^*$ ;  $\varepsilon_{i,t}^*$  and  $e_{i,t}$  are standardized  $\chi^2(2)$ .  $\sigma_{i,y}^2 = c_\sigma (\varsigma_{i,y}^2 - 2) / 4 + 1$ ;  $\varsigma_{i,y}^2$  is  $\chi^2(2)$ . Loadings  $\lambda_i$  drawn from  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ .  $\mathbf{A}_i$  from  $U(-0.5, 0.5)$ , except for first element which is  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ . Factors  $\mathbf{f}_t$  drawn from  $N(0, 1)$ .

the properties of the CD test statistic, its mean and variance are reported for a simple setup and a standard setup. The standard setup uses the model parameterization described above and requires estimating the unknown values of  $\beta$  and  $\sigma_i \forall i = 1, \dots, N$  from the mis-specified model. By contrast, the simple setup reflects the assumptions made in Section 3.3, namely a model with known slope coefficient  $\beta = 0$  and known error variances  $\sigma_i^2 = E[\varepsilon_{i,t}^2]$  whose inverse square roots are used to weight estimated error cross-section covariances. As reported in Table 3, the means and variances obtained for these two setups are nearly identical, suggesting that the additional assumptions made in Section 3.3 are innocuous. Furthermore, the values obtained for the first two moments bear a striking resemblance to those seen in Tables 1 and 2, thus suggesting that the CD test statistic behaves very similarly both under the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. This observation emphasizes existing concerns about the value of the CD test statistic as a measure of remaining cross-section correlation.

## 5.2 Weighted CD statistic

Having documented the first two moments of the CD test statistic, we proceed with investigating the properties of our modified, weighted CD test statistic. For these simulations we con-

Table 3: Sample moments of CD test statistic under  $\mathbb{H}_1$ .

True model is a latent common factor model with three factors.

Model: N    T		Mean				Variance ( $\times 100$ )			
		2WFE		CCE		2WFE		CCE	
		simple	standard	simple	standard	simple	standard	simple	standard
25	25	-3.29	-3.30	-3.16	-3.16	2.11	2.16	4.44	4.46
25	50	-4.79	-4.80	-4.71	-4.72	1.46	1.47	2.32	2.34
25	100	-6.88	-6.89	-6.81	-6.82	1.25	1.27	1.83	1.83
25	200	-9.81	-9.81	-9.74	-9.74	1.32	1.34	1.41	1.42
50	25	-3.23	-3.24	-2.97	-2.97	1.90	1.92	6.23	6.26
50	50	-4.73	-4.73	-4.54	-4.55	1.13	1.13	2.89	2.90
50	100	-6.79	-6.79	-6.63	-6.63	0.91	0.92	1.98	1.99
50	200	-9.67	-9.68	-9.49	-9.49	0.92	0.93	1.61	1.61
100	25	-3.21	-3.21	-2.78	-2.78	1.61	1.62	6.14	6.16
100	50	-4.68	-4.68	-4.48	-4.48	0.95	0.96	2.36	2.37
100	100	-6.73	-6.73	-6.61	-6.61	0.75	0.75	1.24	1.24
100	200	-9.59	-9.59	-9.50	-9.51	0.80	0.80	0.98	0.98
200	25	-3.21	-3.21	-2.36	-2.36	1.24	1.24	9.57	9.60
200	50	-4.68	-4.68	-4.31	-4.31	0.76	0.76	2.87	2.88
200	100	-6.72	-6.72	-6.52	-6.52	0.66	0.66	1.23	1.23
200	200	-9.58	-9.58	-9.43	-9.43	0.60	0.61	0.78	0.78

Notes.  $\varepsilon_{i,t} = \sqrt{\sigma_{i,y}^2} \varepsilon_{i,t}^*$ ;  $\varepsilon_{i,t}^*$  and  $e_{i,t}$  are standardized  $\chi^2(2)$ .  $\sigma_{i,y}^2 = c_\sigma (\varsigma_{i,y}^2 - 2) / 4 + 1$ ;  $\varsigma_{i,y}^2$  is  $\chi^2(2)$ . Loadings  $\lambda_i$  drawn from  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ .  $\mathbf{A}_i$  from  $U(-0.5, 0.5)$ , except for first element which is  $U(0.5, 1.5)$ . Factors  $\mathbf{f}_i$  drawn from  $N(0, 1)$ .  $c_\sigma = 1$ . Setup standard means  $\beta$ ,  $\sigma_i^2$  are estimated.  $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{v}_{i,t}$ .  $\hat{v}_{i,t}$  are (misspecified) regression residuals. Setup simple means  $\beta$  and true error variances  $\sigma_i$  are known.

sider only  $c_\sigma = 1$ . The random weights suggested in Section 4.2 are drawn from  $U(-0.5, 0.5)$ . In addition we report results using a hybrid between the weighted CD test statistic and its original version: As in the original CD test statistic we use the square root of estimated error variances to weight the model residuals. But following the motivation of our weighted test statistic, we demean  $(\hat{\sigma}_i^2)^{-1/2}$  with its cross-section average before using it as a weight. Table 4 reports rejection rates for the weighted CD test statistic with these two sets of weights as well as the standard CD test statistic obtained from two-way fixed effects residuals. Rejection rates for the latter are clearly driven by its diverging bias term. Irrespective of whether the true model is two-way fixed effects or a latent common factor model, the test statistic always rejects. Rejection rates are much closer to the nominal level of 5% for the weighted test statistics. Whereas weighting with the estimated inverse error standard deviation leads to under-rejection of the null hypothesis, random weights ensure rejection rates very close to the nominal rate unless  $T$  is substantially larger than  $N$ . Simulation results under the alternative hypothesis reveal that the weighted test statistic has almost no power and that rejection rates increase in  $T$  only. However, elimination of the leading bias term via the use of demeaned weights is not the primary cause for this outcome. In fact, Proposition 2 suggests that it is the use of cross-section

demeaning during model estimation that greatly reduces the rate at which  $CD_W$  can diverge under the alternative hypothesis. Neither can one make random weights accountable for the low rejection frequencies in our power study. Rejection rates for the hybrid weighted CD test statistic, which weights with demeaned inverses of the estimated error standard deviation, are at approximately the same level.

Table 4: Rejection rates for CD test statistic and weighted modified CD test statistic.

		Test on FE residuals					
Test:	Weights:	Size			Power		
		CD	$\widetilde{CD}_W$		CD	$\widetilde{CD}_W$	
N	T	-	$\{w^{(1)}\}$	$\{w^{(2)}\}$	-	$\{w^{(1)}\}$	$\{w^{(2)}\}$
25	25	100	6.3	3.2	100	9.1	4.4
25	50	100	6.2	3.6	100	10.0	5.2
25	100	100	6.7	5.0	100	13.6	8.6
25	200	100	6.8	6.2	100	20.0	15.4
50	25	100	5.3	2.9	100	6.5	4.2
50	50	100	6.0	3.0	100	9.2	6.0
50	100	100	6.3	4.5	100	12.3	9.9
50	200	100	6.0	5.1	100	19.3	14.0
100	25	100	4.6	2.8	100	7.5	4.1
100	50	100	5.5	3.9	100	9.8	6.1
100	100	100	5.3	4.5	100	14.9	9.4
100	200	100	4.7	5.5	100	21.5	14.1
200	25	100	4.8	2.7	100	7.2	4.4
200	50	100	5.1	4.2	100	8.8	6.1
200	100	100	5.6	4.5	100	12.1	9.2
200	200	100	5.4	4.9	100	18.0	14.2

Notes  $\{w_i^{(1)}\}$ :  $w_i \sim U(-0.5, 0.5)$ .  $\{w_i^{(2)}\}$ :  $w_i = (\hat{\sigma}_i^2)^{-1/2} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\sigma}_i^2)^{-1/2}$ . Size: True model is two-way FE. Power: True model is common factors with  $r = 2$ .

Rejection rates observed when testing for remaining cross-section correlation in CCE residuals look mostly similar to those seen in the two-way fixed effects case. Simulation results reported in Table 5 show that again the original CD test statistic is grossly oversized. As previously, the weighted CD test statistic with random weights has good size but suffers from very low power. In contrast to previous results our variation on the weighted CD test statistic, using deviations of inverse estimated error standard errors from their cross-section average, has excessive size distortions when  $N > T$ . This result reflects the concerns expressed in Section 4.2 with the use of components from the estimated regression model as weights in  $CD_W$ .

Table 5: Rejection rates for CD test statistic and weighted modified CD test statistic.

Test on CCE residuals							
Test: Weights: N T		Size			Power		
		CD	$\widetilde{CD}_W$ $\{w^{(1)}\}$	$\{w^{(2)}\}$	CD	$\widetilde{CD}_W$ $\{w^{(1)}\}$	$\{w^{(2)}\}$
25	25	99.4	6.0	5.5	99.8	6.6	7.1
25	50	100	5.6	5.9	100	8.6	6.6
25	100	100	5.7	6.4	100	11.3	7.9
25	200	100	7.5	6.5	100	15.9	11.2
50	25	99.2	6.0	23.3	99.6	7.3	14.8
50	50	100	6.5	10.6	100	8.4	8.9
50	100	100	6.5	6.6	100	12.1	7.6
50	200	100	5.9	6.5	100	15.0	9.4
100	25	94.6	5.3	62.7	99.6	6.7	60.0
100	50	100	5.2	25.7	100	7.5	27.3
100	100	100	5.1	8.9	100	9.9	13.5
100	200	100	5.5	7.0	100	13.8	12.1
200	25	54.4	6.1	98.1	89.7	7.1	98.1
200	50	100	5.0	68.8	100	7.9	72.8
200	100	100	5.7	21.5	100	10.2	27.0
200	200	100	5.3	8.1	100	13.9	11.8

Notes.  $\{w_i^{(1)}\}$ :  $w_i \sim U(-0.5, 0.5)$ .  $\{w_i^{(2)}\}$ :  $w_i = (\hat{\sigma}_i^2)^{-1/2} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\sigma}_i^2)^{-1/2}$ . Size (Power): True model is common factors with  $r = 2$  ( $r = 3$ ).

## 6 Empirical illustration

In this section we illustrate the applicability of the standard and the weighted CD statistics by means of two empirical examples: i) R&D investments data of Eberhardt et al. (2013); ii) PSID earnings dynamics data. In both cases serial correlation is important from an economic point of view. For this reason in Appendix A.2 we outline how the CD statistic can be modified to account for serial correlation, given a set of known weights  $w_i$ .

### 6.1 R& D investments

In Eberhardt et al. (2013) authors question whether R&D can be estimated in a standard Griliches-type “knowledge production function” framework ignoring the potential presence of knowledge spillovers between cross-sectional units as well as other cross-section dependencies. Among other things they document a “[...] strong evidence for cross-sectional dependence and the presence of a common factor structure in the data, which we interpret as indicative for the presence of knowledge spillovers and additional unobserved cross-sectional dependencies” (Eberhardt et al. 2013, p.437). Cross-sectional dependence was measured by means of a CD test.

The original dataset used information on up to twelve manufacturing industries in ten countries<sup>18</sup> over a time period of up to 26 years from 1980 to 2005. All of the results presented assume the country-industry as the unit of analysis (panel group member  $i$ ), of which we have  $N = 119$ . This panel is unbalanced where for Germany, Portugal, and Sweden the length of the available time-series is substantially shorter than for other countries.

Some of our results can be extended to cover unbalanced setups. However in order to simplify our analysis we disregard from using the observations for Germany, Portugal, Sweden in the construction of the test statistics. Additionally, we remove two sectors from the Great Britain where observations for  $t = 2004, 2005$  are missing. This way we are left with  $N = 82$  and  $T = 25$ .

In this section we will primarily revisit some of the results in Table 5 of Eberhardt et al. (2013) for pooled (static) production function estimates. Our goal is to investigate how the divergent properties of the CD test statistic might have influenced the choice between the First Difference (FD) estimator with yearly dummies and Pooled CCE (CCEP) estimators, as presented in columns 3 and 4, respectively, of the table mentioned above. Which of the two models is considered to be correctly specified has important consequences for the conclusions that can be drawn from the entire table. With regard to the coefficient of private R&D investments, Eberhardt et al. (2013) report that a significance test for the corresponding slope coefficient cannot reject the null hypothesis in the FD model while it can in the CCE model.

Table 6: Cross-sectional dependence testing for R& D data

Estimator	Serial Correlation	5%	Median	95%	$CD_{\hat{\delta}}$
FD	No	-0.98	0.80	3.21	1.6
	Yes	-0.78	0.73	2.89	1.5
CCEP	No	-1.98	-0.36	3.25	-1.16
	Yes	-1.08	-0.20	1.75	-0.67

Notes. All results are obtained for Weighted Covariance Bias-corrected CD statistic based on 200 draws of  $w_i$ .  $CD_{\hat{\delta}}$  denotes the bias-corrected CD statistic using  $w_i = \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1}$  as weights. Serial Correlation with "Yes" option stands for the adjusted test statistic robust to the serial correlation, as described in Appendix A.2.

Neglecting the possibility of serial correlation in the true model errors, the results in Table 6 suggest that for a quite substantial combination of different weights  $w_i$ , the weighted CD statistic rejects the null hypothesis both for the FD model with time-effects as well as the common latent factor model. This result is in line with those given by the original CD test statistic whose value is  $CD = -1.89$  ( $CD = -2.95$ ) if applied to FD (CCE) residuals. The picture changes if we correct the variance of our weighted CD test statistic to account for serial correlation in the true model errors. The corresponding results in Table 6 reveal that only for the CD

<sup>18</sup>Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the US.



test statistic applied to FD residuals there is a substantial set of weights that would lead the researcher to reject the null hypothesis. Finally, the absolute value of a weighted CD statistic  $CD_{\hat{\sigma}}$ , constructed using the specific weights  $w_i = \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1}$ , is somewhat smaller than the statistic without any corrections, leading to the conclusion that one cannot reject the null hypothesis of no cross-section correlation for both sets of residuals.

Note that difference in terms of the corresponding conclusions if one followed the approach where the preferred model is selected based on the *absolute* value of the CD statistic. In particular, while in the setup without any corrections one prefers the FD estimator, this conclusion reverses if one uses either median of random weights or the  $CD_{\hat{\sigma}}$  statistic.

## 6.2 Earnings dynamics

In this section, we analyze the extent to which OLS residuals commonly used to study earning dynamics using PSID can be assumed to be cross-sectionally independent. For this purpose, we use the data of Botosaru and Sasaki (2018) for the years 1977 – 1989. The data is a balanced panel with a cross-sectional sample size of  $N = 659$ , and cover 1977 – 1989.<sup>19</sup>

Following the literature on income dynamics, we are interested in the OLS residuals from a regression of log wages on education, age, geographic characteristics, race dummy, and year dummies. It is customary to decompose the dynamics of log-earning residuals  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  into a sum of transitory ( $\tau_{i,t}$ ) and permanent components ( $p_{i,t}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{i,t} &= \tau_{i,t} + p_{i,t}, \\ p_{i,t} &= \alpha p_{i,t-1} + \pi_{i,t},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_{i,t}$  and  $\pi_{i,t}$  are mutually independent. As long as  $\alpha \neq 0$  OLS residuals are likely to be serially correlated, hence the use of the variance estimator outlined in Section A.2 is justified. Following Bonhomme and Robin (2010) we assume that  $\alpha = 1$  such that  $p_{i,t}$  really captures the permanent unit root component, and in that case it is only appropriate to based analysis on  $\Delta\varepsilon_{i,t}$ . For this reason the effective length of the panel is  $T = 12$ . Instead in Table 7 we provide results for the weighted modified CD statistic based on random weights.

For this dataset the value of the original CD statistic without any adjustments is  $CD = 2.7$ .<sup>20</sup> Thus one could potentially naively conclude that time effects are not sufficient to completely wipe out cross-sectional dependence from the PSID data. However, as discussed above this result is spurious by construction. This conclusion is highlighted in Table 7 where we provide results for weighted bias-corrected CD statistic using random weights.

Based on results in Table 7 we find little evidence for remaining cross-sectional dependence in data after cross-sectional demeaning. For most combinations of  $w_i$  the test statistic is inside

<sup>19</sup>Note some discrepancies with Bonhomme and Robin (2010).

<sup>20</sup>Similar results are obtained if we consider data in levels.

Table 7: Cross-sectional dependence testing for PSID residuals

Input Variable	Serial Correlation	5%	Median	95%	$CD_{\hat{\sigma}}$
$\varepsilon_{i,t}$	No	-1.95	-0.83	3.75	1.23
$\varepsilon_{i,t}$	Yes	-0.83	-0.34	1.65	0.53
$\Delta\varepsilon_{i,t}$	No	-1.43	-0.24	2.03	0.52
$\Delta\varepsilon_{i,t}$	Yes	-1.23	-0.21	1.79	0.44

Notes. See the notes to Table 6.

the non-rejection region. On the other hand, based on finite sample evidence presented in Section 5 we know that for  $T = 12$ , test lacks power as cross-sectional dimension is not informative about possible model misspecification. Finally, for comparison purposes only we included the bias-corrected test statistic using standard weights  $w_i = \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-1}$ , with all values being small in absolute value.<sup>21</sup>

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper we document how the estimation of common time-specific parameters using panel data leads to a complete breakdown of the CD test of Pesaran (2004, 2015a). Using commonly used additive and multiplicative specifications for individual- and time-specific components in the model errors, we show that the CD test statistic applied to residuals of adequately specified regression models is divergent under null hypothesis of cross-sectional independence. Furthermore, we find that the rate of divergence under the alternative hypothesis of unaccounted cross-section correlation is reduced considerably. The results documented in this article are interpreted as a manifestation of the incidental parameter problem (IPP) since they ultimately follow from the estimation of  $T$  period-specific parameters. Our main theorems illustrate the pervasive nature of the IPP in this setup, given that the consequences of estimating time specific parameters do not disappear as the sample size increases.

Our analyzed weighted CD test statistic achieves our primary goal of re-establishing asymptotic standard normal inference and hence constitutes an alternative to popular bias correction methods which circumvents the problems these approaches have in the present context. Our results have far reaching implications for empirical panel data analysis, where CD test has been widely used as a model selection/diagnostic tool. An illustration of how our theoretical results translate into applications is given via simulations and real datasets.

Finally, in this paper we assumed that the parameters in the linear model are estimated using a least squares objective function. If one deviates from this setup, and instead uses an (over-identified) GMM criterion function to estimate parameters, the usual GMM J-statistic is readily available for the purpose of testing residual cross-sectional correlation. Examples in

<sup>21</sup>Note that our theoretical results do not provide asymptotic justification for this set of weights.

a fixed- $T$  framework are given by Sarafidis et al. (2009), Ahn et al. (2013), and Juodis (2018) among others. In the large  $N, T$  setup average J-statistic as a model specification tool was explicitly used e.g. by Everaert and Pozzi (2014) for the CCE-GMM estimator. Hence given the scale of the problems with CD statistic documented in this paper, these alternative procedures (if applicable) are more appropriate .

## Notation

Extending the paragraph on notation in introduction in the main text, we will use the following notation in this appendix.

- $\mathbf{I}_m$  denotes an  $m \times m$  identity matrix and the subscript is sometimes disregarded from for the sake of simplicity.  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes a column vector of zeros while  $\mathbf{O}$  stands for a matrix of zeros.  $\mathbf{s}_m$  denotes a selection vector all of whose elements are zero except for element  $m$  which is one.  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector entirely consisting of ones. The dimension of these latter vectors and matrices is generally suppressed for the sake of simplicity and needs to be inferred from context.
- For a generic  $m \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}'$  projects onto the space spanned by the columns of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{A}$ .  $\dim(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\text{col}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\ker(\mathbf{A})$  refer to the dimension, column space and kernel of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Moreover,  $\text{rk}(\mathbf{A})$  denotes the rank of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$  its trace and  $\|\mathbf{A}\| = (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}))^{1/2}$  the Frobenius norm of  $\mathbf{A}$ .
- For a set of  $m \times n$  matrices  $\{\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N\}$ ,  $\overline{\mathbf{A}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{A}_i$ . Multiple sums are generally abbreviated, so that  $\sum_{i,j}^N$  is shorthand notation for  $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N$ .
- $\delta$  and  $M$  stand for a small and large positive real number, respectively. For two real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ .
- For some random variable  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ ,  $\kappa_4[\varepsilon_{i,t}]$  denotes its fourth-order cumulant. Moreover,  $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{o}(\cdot)$  express order of magnitude relations whereas  $\mathcal{O}_P(\cdot)$  and  $\text{o}_P(\cdot)$  denote stochastic order relations (see e.g. White 2001, Definitions 2.5 and 2.33).

## A Additional results and discussion

### A.1 Group effects and principal components

#### Group effects

The idea put forward in Bonhomme and Manresa (2015) is that all individuals  $i = 1, \dots, N$  are associated with an unobserved group membership variable  $g_i \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ . Regressors aside their model is given by:

$$y_{i,t} = \tau_{g_i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\tau_{g_i,t}$  are the group-specific unobservable effects. Following Theorem 2 in Bonhomme and Manresa (2015) we know that  $g_i$  can be estimated with high probability as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , thus the estimation error from  $\hat{g}_i - g_i$  can be ignored when evaluating the estimators of  $\tau_{g_i,t}$ . Note that if  $g_i$  is known

then  $\hat{\tau}_{g,t}$  is simply given by:

$$\hat{\tau}_{g,t} - \tau_{g,t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_g I(g_i = g) \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (28)$$

where  $\pi_g = N/N_g$  with  $N_g = \sum_{i=1}^N I(g_i = g)$ . The model in (27) admits an alternative representation as a factor model with  $G$  factors:

$$y_{i,t} = \lambda_i' \mathbf{f}_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (29)$$

with  $\lambda_i = (I(g_i = 1), \dots, I(g_i = G))'$  and  $\mathbf{f}_t = (\tau_{1,t}, \dots, \tau_{G,t})$ . Thus the influence function  $\psi_{i,t}$  for  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$  is simply given by:

$$\psi_{i,t} = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1 I(g_i = 1) \varepsilon_{i,t} \\ \vdots \\ \pi_G I(g_i = G) \varepsilon_{i,t} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

Next consider the residuals in this model

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_{i,t} - \lambda_i' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t) = \bar{\varepsilon}_t - \bar{\lambda}' \bar{\psi}_t = \bar{\varepsilon}_t - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{g=1}^G I(g_i = 1) \varepsilon_{i,t} = 0, \quad (31)$$

as  $\sum_{g=1}^G I(g_i = 1) = 1$ . This conclusion is analogous to the simple model with additive time effects only, i.e.  $G = 1$ .

### Principal components

As in the main text we consider an exact factor model

$$y_{i,t} = \lambda_i' \mathbf{f}_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (32)$$

with an unrestricted vector  $\lambda_i$ . If  $\lambda_i$  are assumed to be known then  $\mathbf{f}_t$  can be estimated by least squares:

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{f}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{i,t}, \quad \psi_{i,t} = \left( N^{-1} \lambda_i \lambda_i' \right)^{-1} \lambda_i \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (33)$$

Estimation of  $\lambda_i$  implies that  $\mathbf{f}_t$  can only be introduced up to a rotation (see e.g. Bai (2003) Theorem 1) via principal components:

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{f}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{i,t} + o_P(1), \quad \psi_{i,t} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \lambda_i \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (34)$$

where for precise definitions of  $\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}$ , as well as restrictions on  $N, T$  the interested reader is referred to Bai (2003, Theorem 1 and Proposition 1). Note that unlike all previous estimation techniques, the residuals obtained after PC estimation of factors are not zero on average for each  $t$  (in general).

## A.2 Serial correlation

The original CD test of Pesaran (2004, 2015a) assumes that error terms are serially uncorrelated, an assumption that can be difficult to justify in the case of economic data. While this problem is mostly ignored in practice, Baltagi et al. (2016) have very recently proposed a modification of the CD test statistic which ensures that the test statistic is asymptotically standard normal as long as  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is a stationary short memory process. In particular, under this type of assumption it can be shown that asymptotic variance in Proposition 3 is given by:

$$\Omega = \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ E[(w_i - E[w_i])^2 \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t-s}] \right]^2. \quad (35)$$

The above quantity is non-standard, as it not a function of the long-run variance of  $(w_i - E[w_i])\varepsilon_{i,t}$ . In particular, one can use data which is over-differenced in the construction of the CD statistic.

In the context of our testing problem the natural plug-in estimator of  $\Omega$  is given by

$$\hat{\Omega}_N = \frac{2}{TN(N-1)} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j<i}^N (l_i l_j)^2. \quad (36)$$

Here  $l_i = (w_i - \bar{w})\hat{e}_i$  is constructed using residuals  $\hat{e}_i$ . It can be expected that under reasonable regularity conditions on the memory properties of  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  as well as appropriate restrictions on  $N, T$  estimator  $\hat{\Omega}_N$  is consistent in our setup. However, we do not attempt to prove this conjecture as it does not add to the main message of this paper.

Note that Baltagi et al. (2016) use mean adjustment variance estimate of Chen and Qin (2010), which is motivated by the need to obtain an unbiased (not only consistent) estimator of  $\Omega$ . However, as in our setting  $x_i$  are correlated by construction, any theoretical justification for including  $\bar{l}_{(i,j)}$  under null hypothesis is lost. Also note that a factor of 2 is missing in Baltagi et al. (2016).

## B Proofs: Additive model

### *Proof of Theorem 1.*

At first we show how the test statistic in this case can be expressed in terms of three U statistics, and three additional terms that contribute to the bias. First, let

$$\begin{aligned} CD_\varepsilon &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t}; \\ CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t}}{\sigma_i \sigma_j}; \\ CD_{\varepsilon+} &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} (\sigma_i^{-1} + \sigma_j^{-1}); \\ CD_{\varepsilon++} &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} (\sigma_i^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}]) (\sigma_j^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^{-1}]). \end{aligned}$$

Let us further denote by  $k_{N,T} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}}$ . Observe that the original test statistic can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} CD &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{(\varepsilon_{i,t} - \bar{\varepsilon}_t)(\varepsilon_{j,t} - \bar{\varepsilon}_t)}{\sigma_i \sigma_j} \\ &= k_{N,T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\varepsilon_{i,t} - \bar{\varepsilon}_t)}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 - k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t} - \bar{\varepsilon}_t}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 \\ &= I - II. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider each term separately.

$$\begin{aligned} I &= k_{N,T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 - 2k_{N,T} \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t} \right) \right] + k_{N,T} (\overline{\sigma^{-1}})^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t} \right)^2 \\ &= CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} CD_{\varepsilon+} + (\overline{\sigma^{-1}})^2 CD_\varepsilon \\ &\quad + k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 - 2k_{N,T} \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_i \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 + k_{N,T} (\overline{\sigma^{-1}})^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t})^2 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the second term:

$$\begin{aligned} II &= k_{N,T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 - 2k_{N,T} N^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t} \right) \right] + k_{N,T} N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t} \right)^2 \\ &= -N^{-1} CD_{\varepsilon+} + N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} CD_\varepsilon \\ &\quad + k_{N,T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 - 2k_{N,T} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 + k_{N,T} N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two expressions together:

$$\begin{aligned}
CD &= I - II \\
&= CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - 2 \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} - N^{-1} \right) CD_{\varepsilon+} + \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) CD_{\varepsilon} \\
&\quad - 2k_{N,T} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i} + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right) + k_{N,T} \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 1,  $\sigma_i$  are bounded, thus all averages involving  $\sigma_i$  are in general of order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . Under our assumptions it can be straightforwardly shown that all U-statistics  $CD_{\varepsilon}, CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma}, CD_{\varepsilon+}$  are of order  $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$ , and are asymptotically normal element-wise from Lemma 2. The joint convergence can be also established. Note that strictly speaking Lemma 2 does not apply to  $CD_{\varepsilon+}$ , however it can be straightforwardly extended to accommodate the specific structure of the U-statistic in  $CD_{\varepsilon+}$ .

Combining these observations we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned}
CD &= CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - 2\overline{\sigma^{-1}}CD_{\varepsilon+} + \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 CD_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}) + \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2 \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}) + \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_1 &= \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T^2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2, \\
\Xi_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T^2N(N-1)}} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i} + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider these two bias terms in detail. In particular:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 &= T \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t}^2 - \sigma_i^2) = NT\overline{\sigma^2} + \sqrt{NT} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t}^2 - \sigma_i^2) \\
&= NT\overline{\sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{NT}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $\mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{NT})$  order result follows directly from bounded  $\sigma_i$  and the application of Theorem 3 in Phillips and Moon (1999) for that term (here we set  $C_i = 1$  in the notation of that paper).



Such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_1 &= \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T^2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 \\
&= \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)} \overline{\sigma^2}} + \left( \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 - N^{-1} \overline{\sigma^{-2}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T(N-1)}} \mathcal{O}_P(1) \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 \overline{\sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}) \\
&= \sqrt{0.5} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 \overline{\sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For  $\Xi_2$  the derivations follow analogously. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i} &= T \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2 - \sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i} \right) = NT\overline{\sigma} + \sqrt{NT} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2 - \sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i} \right) \\
&= NT\overline{\sigma} + \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{NT}).
\end{aligned}$$

Second,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i^2} = NT + \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{NT})$$

by the same decomposition. Thus  $\Xi_2$  has an expansion of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T^2N(N-1)}} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i} + N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \right) \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \overline{\sigma} + N^{-1} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T(N-1)}} \mathcal{O}_P(1) \\
&= \sqrt{0.5} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \overline{\sigma} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these observations we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned}
CD &= CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - 2\overline{\sigma^{-1}}CD_{\varepsilon+} + \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 CD_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}) + \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2 \\
&= CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - 2\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}]CD_{\varepsilon+} + \left( \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] \right)^2 CD_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2 \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] \right) \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^{-1}] \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 - 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second line follows from the fact that all U-statistics in the first line are  $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$  by Lemma 2, together with the standard Lindeberg-Levy CLT and the CMT applied to

$$\overline{\sigma^{-1}} = \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}).$$

Rearranging the above expression:

$$CD - \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 + 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2 = CD_{\epsilon++} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}).$$

Now set  $a_{i,t} = \varepsilon_{i,t}(\sigma_i^{-1} - E[\sigma_i^{-1}])$ , and  $q_i = \sigma_i(\sigma_i^{-1} - E[\sigma_i^{-1}])$ , then we can apply Lemma 2 to  $CD_{\epsilon++}$  to conclude that:

$$CD - \sqrt{T}\Xi_1 + 2\sqrt{T}\Xi_2 \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega), \quad (37)$$

where  $\Omega = (E[q_i^2])^2 = \left(E[(1 - \sigma_i E[\sigma_i^{-1}])^2]\right)^2$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.**

We can use the same result as in (5) but for a general value of  $\sigma^2$

$$CD = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2. \quad (38)$$

Given that the first component is 0 by construction, we can further expand:

$$\begin{aligned} CD &= \frac{1}{N} CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \frac{N-1}{2N} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} - \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{2N^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma} \right)^2 - 1 \right) - \sqrt{\left( T - \frac{T}{N} \right) / 2}, \\ &= -\sqrt{\left( T - \frac{T}{N} \right) / 2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2N}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma} \right)^2 - 1 \right) + o_P(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

where  $CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma}$  is the usual CD test statistic based on raw error terms  $\varepsilon_{i,t}/\sigma$  and where Lemma 2 allows to conclude that  $CD_{\varepsilon/\sigma} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ . The final result follows after observing that an appropriate double index CLT for iid data (e.g. Theorem 3 in Phillips and Moon (1999)) implies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}}{\sigma} \right)^2 - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N (\eta_{i,t}^2 - 1) = \mathcal{O}_P(1), \quad (39)$$

given  $E[\eta_{i,t}^8] < \infty$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 2.**

Given the definition of  $v_{i,t}$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} CD_{H_1} &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \tilde{\lambda}'_i \mathbf{f}_t \mathbf{f}'_t \tilde{\lambda}_j \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} + \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,t} \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \tilde{\lambda}'_i \mathbf{f}_t \tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,t} \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} \\ &= A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \end{aligned}$$

The properties of  $A_2$  are analogous to those of the  $CD$  test statistic under  $\mathbb{H}_0$ , meaning that  $A_2 = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . Concerning  $A_1$ , we can without loss of generality assume that  $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_t \mathbf{f}_t' = \mathbf{I}_r$ . This is an innocuous assumption since  $\mathbf{f}_t$  is not identified separately from the loadings associated to this vector.  $A_1$  can then be written

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i,j}^N \tilde{\lambda}_i' \tilde{\lambda}_j \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} - \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\lambda}_i' \tilde{\lambda}_i \sigma_i^{-2} \\ &= A_{11} - A_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider  $A_{11}$  first. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \tilde{\lambda}_i' &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] \right) (\lambda_i' - \mu_\lambda') - N^{1/2} \left( \overline{\sigma^{-1}} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] \right) (\bar{\lambda}' - \mu_\lambda') \\ &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^{-1}] \right) (\lambda_i' - \mu_\lambda') + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

by application of Chebyshev's inequality. Consequently,  $A_{11} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . After expanding  $A_{12}$  and applying Lindeberg-Levy CLT to all terms, it can be shown that  $A_{12} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$  as well. Lastly, consider  $A_3$ , which can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &= \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) (\lambda_i' - \mu_\lambda') \mathbf{f}_t \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \tilde{\lambda}_i' \mathbf{f}_t \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \\ &= A_{31} - A_{32}. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{31}| &= \sqrt{\frac{2N}{(N-1)}} \left| N^{-1} T^{-1/2} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) (\lambda_i' - \mu_\lambda') \mathbf{f}_t \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2N}{(N-1)}} \left\| N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sigma_i^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) (\lambda_i' - \mu_\lambda') \right\| \left\| (NT)^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \mathbf{f}_t \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \right\| \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2N}{(N-1)}} \mathcal{O}_P(1) \left( (NT)^{-1} \sum_{j,j'}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \left( \sigma_{j'}^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \varepsilon_{j',t'} \mathbf{f}_{t'}' \mathbf{f}_t \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations to the remaining term, we note that  $\varepsilon_{j,t}$  are serially uncorrelated and that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_t] = r$ , thus arriving at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ (NT)^{-1} \sum_{j,j'}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \left( \sigma_{j'}^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \varepsilon_{j',t'} \mathbf{f}_{t'}' \mathbf{f}_t \varepsilon_{j,t} \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right) \right] &= r N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \sigma_j^2 \left( \sigma_j^{-1} - \overline{\sigma^{-1}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

From this result it follows that  $A_{31} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ . Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ (A_{32})^2 \right] &= \frac{2T}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\lambda}_i' \tilde{\lambda}_i \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left( N^{-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $A_{32} = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$ . Our results on  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $A_3$  suggest that the order in probability of  $CD_{H_1}$  is  $\mathcal{O}_p(\sqrt{T})$ , from which it follows that the rate of divergence of this statistic is at most  $\sqrt{T}$ .  $\square$

***Proof of Corollary 2.***

The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1 and follows directly as by Assumption 9,  $w_i$  are iid and have a finite eighth moment. Thus the sufficient conditions of Lemma 2 are satisfied.  $\square$

***Proof of Theorem 3 (Time fixed effects part).***

The decomposition of  $\widetilde{CD}_W$  provided in Corollary 2 continues to hold and we consider the two bias terms  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W}$  and  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W}$ . With regards to  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W}$ , we note that  $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 = \mathcal{O}_p(1)$  by Markov's inequality and uniform boundedness of the error variances. If the set of chosen weights  $\{w_i\}$  is demeaned,  $(\bar{w})^2 = 0$  by construction and it follows that  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W} = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ . If  $\{w_i\}$  is not manually demeaned but if the weights still have an expected value of zero,  $(\bar{w})^2 = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$  by a Lindeberg-Levy CLT. The order in probability of  $\tilde{\Xi}_{1,W}$  is hence unaffected.

Concerning  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W}$ , manual demeaning of the weights ensures that  $\bar{w} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} w_i = 0$ . If only  $\mathbb{E}[w_i] = 0$ , the order in probability of this term is  $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$  by a Lindeberg-Levy CLT on  $\bar{w}$  and application of Chebyshev's inequality on the double sum. Furthermore, given that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ N^{-2} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t} w_i)^2 \right] = \mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$$

we can state that  $\tilde{\Xi}_{2,W} = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ . Hence, the impact of the two bias terms on  $\widetilde{CD}_W$  is asymptotically negligible if  $N^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ .

We continue with the leading stochastic term in  $\widetilde{CD}_W$ , given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} (w_i - \bar{w}) (w_j - \bar{w}) \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} w_i w_j \\
&\quad - (\bar{w} - N^{-1}) \left( \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} (w_i + w_j) \right) \\
&\quad + (\bar{w}^2 - N^{-1} \bar{w}^2) \left( \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Given that  $E[w_i] = 0$ , the second and third components are of orders  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$ , respectively. This follows from the application of Lemma 2 on corresponding U-statistics. The remaining non-negligible term is of the form:

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} w_i w_j.$$

From Lemma 2 it follows that:

$$\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} w_i w_j \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega) \quad (40)$$

as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  jointly, where  $\Omega = E[\sigma_i^2 w_i^2]^2$ . The last step in this proof is to show consistency of the standard deviation estimator  $\hat{\Omega} = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2$  so that convergence in law of  $\widetilde{CD}_W$  to a standard normal distribution follows by Slutsky's Theorem. Note here that an equivalent expression is given by term II in the proof of Theorem 1. Drawing from the results in this theorem, we conclude that

$$(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}).$$

whereas the second term on the right-hand side above is asymptotically negligible under the established restrictions on the relative expansion rate of  $N$  and  $T$ , we need to show convergence of the first term to  $\Omega$ . This is done by using Corollary 1 in Phillips and Moon (1999), letting  $Q_{i,T} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 w_i^2$ ,  $Q_i = \sigma_i^2 w_i^2$  as well as  $C_i = 1$ . Sufficient conditions of that Lemma are satisfied given the existence of the eight moments of  $\eta_{i,t}$ ,  $\sigma_i$  and  $w_i$ . It follows that  $\widetilde{CD}_W \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$

□

## C Proofs: CCE

The proofs in this section frequently employ the rotation and rescaling matrix

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1, & \mathbf{0}' \\ \beta, & I_m \end{bmatrix}$$

which relates the  $T \times (m+1)$  matrix  $[y_i, X_i]$  (or alternatively the average over all  $i$ ) to common and idiosyncratic variation affecting each of the observed variables directly. This relation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [y_i, X_i] &= \left( F [\lambda_i, A_i] + [\varepsilon_i, E_i] \right) B \\ &= FC_i + U_i \end{aligned}$$

In the following, it is assumed that  $\beta$  is bounded so that  $\|B\| < \infty$ . Furthermore,  $B$  is non-singular by construction, implying that  $B^{-1}$  exists. Given these properties, it trivially follows from the properties of  $\lambda_i$  and  $A_i$  that  $\|\overline{C}\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  and  $\|\overline{C}^{-1}\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ . The same holds for the matrix  $\overline{C}^{(1)}$  which is considered in the proof of Proposition 3 and Theorem 3. We will take these results as known and refrain from explicitly mentioning them in the following.

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose that the true model is (6) and that Assumptions 2–5 and 7 hold. Also, assume that the factor estimator  $\hat{F}$  is given by  $\hat{F} = [\bar{y}, \bar{X}]$ . Then we can without loss of generality assume that the true factors and loadings can be partitioned into*

$$f_t = \begin{bmatrix} f_t^{(1)} \\ f_t^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i^{(1)} \\ \lambda_i^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_i = \begin{bmatrix} A_i^{(1)} \\ A_i^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}$$

such that  $E[f_t^{(1)} f_t^{(2)'}] = \mathbf{O}$ ,  $E[\lambda_i^{(2)}] = \mathbf{0}$  and  $E[A_i^{(2)}] = \mathbf{O}$ . It holds that  $f^{(1)}$  and  $f^{(2)}$  are  $(m+1) \times 1$  and  $(r-m-1) \times 1$ , respectively.  $\lambda_i^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_i^{(2)}$  are  $(m+1) \times 1$  and  $(r-m-1) \times 1$ . Lastly,  $A_i^{(1)}$  and  $A_i^{(2)}$  are  $(m+1) \times m$  and  $(r-m-1) \times m$ .

**Proof of Lemma 1.**

Under a violation of the rank condition, cross-section averages of all variables will only identify the  $m+1$ -dimensional linear combination  $f_t^{(1)} = C_0' f_t$  of the  $r$  true common factors. The  $r \times (m+1)$  matrix  $C_0$  is given by

$$C_0 = [E[\lambda_i], E[A_i]] B.$$

Now define the  $r \times (m+1)$  matrix  $\Phi_1 = E[f_t f_t^{(1)'}] \left( E[f_t^{(1)} f_t^{(1)'}] \right)^{-1}$  and the  $r \times 1$  vector  $f_t^\perp = f_t - \Phi_1 f_t^{(1)}$  and note that by construction it holds that  $E[f_t^\perp f_t^{(1)'}] = \mathbf{O}$ . Using these two expressions, we can decompose

$$\lambda_i' f_t = \lambda_i' \Phi_1 f_t^{(1)} + \lambda_i' f_t^\perp. \tag{41}$$

The expression above decomposes the common component of a random variable that has a factor structure into the variation due to the  $(m + 1)$ -dimensional linear combination of the  $r$  true factors that is identified by a cross-section average-based factor estimator and residual common variation that is not picked up. This residual source of common variation is bound to be part of the error term in a mis-specified factor model.

Next, consider the product of  $C'_0$  and  $f_t^\perp$

$$\begin{aligned} C'_0 f_t^\perp &= C'_0 f_t - C'_0 E \left[ f_t f_t^{(1)'} \right] \left( E \left[ f_t^{(1)} f_t^{(1)'} \right] \right)^{-1} f_t^{(1)} \\ &= f_t^{(1)} - E \left[ C'_0 f_t f_t^{(1)'} \right] \left( E \left[ f_t^{(1)} f_t^{(1)'} \right] \right)^{-1} f_t^{(1)} \\ &= f_t^{(1)} - f_t^{(1)} \\ &= \mathbf{O}, \end{aligned}$$

In order to appreciate the implications of this result, let  $\text{col}(C_0)$  denote the column space of  $C_0$  and  $\ker(C'_0)$  the kernel of  $C'_0$ . The result reported in the last sequence of equations above states that  $f_t^\perp \in \ker(C'_0)$ . Note now that  $\dim(\text{col}(C_0)) + \dim(\ker(C'_0)) = r$  (see e.g. Abadir and Magnus 2005, Exercise 4.3(c)) and that  $\dim(\text{col}(C_0)) = \dim(\text{col}(C'_0))$  (Abadir and Magnus 2005, Exercise 4.5(a)). As a result of the rank condition on  $C_0$ , we have  $\dim(\text{col}(C'_0)) = m + 1$  and hence  $\dim(\ker(C'_0)) = r - m - 1$ . Consequently,  $f_t^\perp$  is an element in the  $s = r - m - 1$ -dimensional vector space orthogonal to  $C_0$ . This implies that, given an arbitrary basis for  $\ker(C'_0)$ , here denoted by the  $r \times s$ -dimensional matrix  $\Phi_2$ , we can express  $f_t^\perp$  as  $f_t^\perp = \Phi_2 f_t^{(2)}$  where  $f_t^{(2)}$  is some  $s \times 1$  vector of coordinates. Plugging this expression into (41) results in

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_i f_t &= \lambda'_i \Phi_1 f_t^{(1)} + \lambda'_i \Phi_2 f_t^{(2)} \\ &= \lambda'_i \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1 & \Phi_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_t^{(1)} \\ f_t^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i^{(1)'} & \lambda_i^{(2)'} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_t^{(1)} \\ f_t^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

From the previously mentioned result  $E \left[ f_t^\perp f_t^{(1)'} \right] = \mathbf{O}$  it follows that  $E \left[ f_t^{(2)} f_t^{(1)'} \right] = \mathbf{O}$ . Furthermore, given that  $E[\lambda_i] = C_0 B^{-1} [1, \mathbf{0}']'$  and that  $\lambda_i^{(2)'} = \lambda'_i \Phi_2$  where  $\Phi_2$  is a basis for  $\ker(C'_0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \lambda_i^{(2)} \right] &= \Phi_2' C_0 B^{-1} [1, \mathbf{0}']' \\ &= \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we can define  $[\Lambda_i^{(1)'}, \Lambda_i^{(2)'}]' = \Lambda'_i [\Phi_1, \Phi_2]$  where  $E \left[ \Lambda_i^{(2)} \right] = \mathbf{O}$  by the same reasoning as above.

Consequently, whenever the factor estimates include cross-section averages of the dependent variable  $Y$ , we can rewrite the common component as being generated by a linear combination of the true factors and the true loadings such that the two moment conditions above are satisfied. The matrix  $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$  which links the loadings  $\lambda_i'$  ( $\Lambda_i'$ ) and  $[\lambda_i^{(1)'} , \lambda_i^{(2)'}]$  ( $[\Lambda_i^{(1)'} , \Lambda_i^{(2)'}]$ ) is of full rank by the rank assumptions on  $E[f_t f_t']$  as well as  $C_0$ . Hence,  $\Phi$  is an invertible rotation and we can write  $[\lambda_i^{(1)'} , \lambda_i^{(2)'}] [f_t^{(1)'} , f_t^{(2)'}]' = \lambda_i' \Phi \Phi^{-1} f_t$ . Now note that in factor models it is only the common component  $\lambda_i' f_t$  that is identified whereas the loadings  $\lambda_i$  and factors  $f_t$  are identified only up to an invertible rotation. As argued above, the matrix  $\Phi$  is invertible. Hence, irrespective of the true values of  $\lambda_i$ ,  $\Lambda_i$  and  $f_t$  (subject to the assumptions we make on them), we can assume that the data are generated by  $\Phi' \lambda_i$ ,  $\Phi' \Lambda_i$  and  $\Phi^{-1} f_t$  instead.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 1.**

Let as previously denote by  $k_{N,T} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}}$ , the corresponding scaling in front of the CD statistic. The CD test statistic is given by

$$\begin{aligned} CD_W &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} 2k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_j = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} k_{N,T} \sum_{i,j} \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_j - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= I - II. \end{aligned}$$

Next we prove that  $I = 0$ . Observe how:

$$\sum_{i,j} \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_j = \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} \right)^2.$$

Note that for each time period  $t$  the sum of residuals can be expressed as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = N \left( \bar{y}_t - \bar{\lambda}' \hat{f}_t \right), \quad (42)$$

at the same time:

$$\bar{\lambda} = \left( \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t \hat{f}_t' \right)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t \bar{y}_t = \left( \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t \hat{f}_t' \right)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t \hat{f}_t' [1, \mathbf{0}_m']' = [1, \mathbf{0}_m']', \quad (43)$$

such that  $\bar{\lambda}' \hat{f}_t = \bar{y}_t$ . Combining these results we conclude:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = N \left( \bar{y}_t - \bar{\lambda}' \hat{f}_t \right) = 0, \quad (44)$$



therefore also  $I = 0$ . Next, we show that  $II = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . From the corresponding proof in Corollary 3 we know that:

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= k_{N,T} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}) \\
&= NT \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(N-1)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{i,t}^2 - 1 \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}), \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{TN}{2(N-1)}} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}), \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{(N-1)T}{2N}} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2} \vee T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second line follows from Theorem 3 Phillips and Moon (1999) applied to the sequence  $\eta_{i,t}^2 - 1$ . Combining both expressions we conclude:

$$CD = -\sqrt{\frac{(N-1)T}{2N}} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}). \quad (45)$$

As desired.  $\square$

### *Proof of Theorem 2.*

Theorem 2 is merely a special case of Corollary 3, given the chosen weights  $w_i = \sigma_i^{-1} \forall i$ . For this reason, the proof below applies.  $\square$

### *Proof of Corollary 3.*

For a general set of weights  $w_i$  the CD test statistic is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
CD_W &= 2k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_j w_i w_j = k_{N,T} \sum_{i,j} \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_j w_i w_j - k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i' \hat{\varepsilon}_i w_i^2 \\
&= I - II,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\varepsilon}_i &= M_{\hat{F}} (F \lambda_i + \varepsilon_i) \\
&= M_{\hat{F}} \hat{\varepsilon}_i - M_{\hat{F}} (\hat{F} - F \overline{C}) (\overline{C}^{-1}) \lambda_i \\
&= M_{\hat{F}} \varepsilon_i - M_{\hat{F}} \overline{U} (\overline{C}^{-1}) \lambda_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i,j}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' \left( \varepsilon_j - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_j \right) w_i w_j \\
&\quad - k_{N,T} \sum_{i,j}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_j \right) w_i w_j \\
&= I_1 - I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, analogous to how we proceeded in the time fixed effects model, we write

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right) w_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i w_i - \sum_{i=1}^N U_i \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \lambda_\ell w_\ell \right).$$

Consequently, letting  $\overline{\lambda}_w = N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \lambda_\ell w_\ell$  and  $\zeta_i = \varepsilon_i w_i - U_i \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \overline{\lambda}_w$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i,j}^N \zeta_i' \zeta_j \\
&= 2k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^N \zeta_i' \zeta_j + k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i' \zeta_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i' \zeta_i &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 + k_{N,T} \overline{\lambda}_w' \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right)' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N U_i' U_i \right) \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \overline{\lambda}_w \\
&\quad - 2k_{N,T} \overline{\lambda}_w' \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right)' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N U_i' \varepsilon_i w_i \right)
\end{aligned}$$

is a linear function of asymptotically non-negligible terms. Lemma 4 implies that  $I_2 = o_p(1)$  if both  $\sqrt{T}/N \rightarrow 0$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, proceed to

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right) w_i^2 \\
&\quad - k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right) w_i^2 \\
&= II_1 - II_2.
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Lemma 5,  $II_2$  is  $o_p(1)$ , if  $N^{-1}\sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . For this reason, consider the first term above instead. We can write

$$II_1 = k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 + k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \overline{U} \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right\|^2 w_i^2 - 2k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i' \left( \overline{C}^{-1} \right)' \overline{U}' \varepsilon_i w_i^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1}) \lambda_i \right\|^2 w_i^2 \\
& \leq k_{N,T} \frac{T}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \lambda_i' \lambda_i \text{tr} \left( N/T \bar{U}' \bar{U} \right) \|\bar{C}\|^2 M \\
& = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T})
\end{aligned}$$

by using result (60) and Markov's inequality on  $\frac{1}{N} w_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i' \lambda_i$ . Next,

$$2k_{N,T} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \bar{U}' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 \right| \leq 2k_{N,T} \sqrt{N} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \lambda_i' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \bar{U}' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

As noted above,  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \lambda_i' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ . In order to proceed in with the second term above, we use the identity  $\bar{U} = [\bar{\varepsilon}; \bar{E}] \mathbf{B}$  and write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \bar{U}' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 \right\|^2 \right] & \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|^2 N^{-2} \sum_{i,i',i''}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i',t} \varepsilon_{i'',t'} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] \mathbb{E} [w_i^4] \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{B}\|^2 N^{-2} \sum_{i,i',i''}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i',t} \varepsilon_{i'',t'}] \mathbb{E} [w_i^4] \\
& = \mathcal{O}(T) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1} T^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which follows from combining indexes such that only nonzero expectations remain. Together with uniform boundedness of  $w_i^4$  and boundedness of  $\|\mathbf{B}\|^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2k_{N,T} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \bar{U}' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 \right| & = \sqrt{\frac{2}{TN(N-1)}} \sqrt{N} \mathcal{O}_P(1) \left( \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2} T) \right) \\
& = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can conclude that

$$II_1 = k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i' \varepsilon_i w_i^2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}) \quad (47)$$

Combining the results on  $I_1$ ,  $I_2$ ,  $II_1$  and  $II_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
CD & = I_1 - I_2 - II_1 + II_2 \\
& = 2k_{N,T} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^N \xi_i' \xi_j + k_{N,T} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_w' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{U}_i' \mathbf{U}_i \right) (\bar{C}^{-1}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_w \\
& \quad - 2k_{N,T} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_w' (\bar{C}^{-1})' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{U}_i' \varepsilon_i w_i \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} \sqrt{T}),
\end{aligned}$$

from which the main result to be proven here follows immediately.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 3.**

As noted in the main text, the assumptions made in Proposition 3 ensure that the factor estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$  is consistent for a linear combination of  $\mathbf{F}^{(1)}$ . To appreciate this point, recall that  $\hat{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{F}\overline{\mathbf{C}} + \overline{\mathbf{U}}$  and that

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathbf{C}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, & \overline{\mathbf{A}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1, & 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}, & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(1)} + \overline{\mathbf{A}}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{\beta}, & \overline{\mathbf{A}}^{(1)} \\ \overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(2)} + \overline{\mathbf{A}}^{(2)}\boldsymbol{\beta}, & \overline{\mathbf{A}}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \\ \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Given this partition of  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$  we can conclude that  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t = \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)'} \mathbf{f}_t^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2})$  since the zero mean property of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i^{(2)}$  carries over to  $\mathbf{C}_i^{(2)}$ . This result can be used to substitute out  $\mathbf{F}^{(1)}$  from the expression of the  $T \times 1$  vector of defactored observations  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$ . Analogous to the proof of Corollary 3, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i &= -\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}^{(1)}\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right) \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= -\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \mathbf{F}^{(2)}\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} + \overline{\mathbf{U}} \right) \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right) + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

These results hold for any general  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  and even if our restriction  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$  simplifies the definition of  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$  we are continuing to write the following results in terms of  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)}$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)}$  rather than averages of the loadings in either  $\mathbf{y}_i$  or  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Taking some conflicting notation with regards to the proof of Corollary 2 into account, we write

$$CD_{\mathbb{H}_1} = A_1 + A_2 + A_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}A_1 &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(2)} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}, \\ A_2 &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}, \\ A_3 &= k_{N,T} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

and where  $k_{N,T} = \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}}$ . Using Theorem 2, we can conclude that  $A_2 = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . Next, we can decompose

$$A_1 = A_{11} - A_{12},$$

where

$$A_{11} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \lambda_j^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}$$

$$A_{12} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2}$$

and where additionally

$$A_{11} = A_{111} - A_{112}$$

with

$$A_{111} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \lambda_j^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}$$

$$A_{112} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \left( \lambda_j^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}.$$

Given that both expressions above are non-negative and symmetric, it holds that  $A_{112} \leq A_{111}$  since  $\mathbf{I}_T = \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}}$ . Furthermore, we can write

$$A_{111} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1/2} \sigma_i^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \right\|^2$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{NT}{2(N-1)}} \left( \left\| N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \lambda_i^{(2)} \right\| + \sqrt{N} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \right\| \left\| \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right\| \right)^2$$

$$\times \text{tr} \left( T^{-1} \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \right),$$

where  $\text{tr} \left( T^{-1} \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{F}^{(2)} \right) = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  by Markov's inequality. Proceeding in the same way with regards to the two sums over  $i$ , we obtain  $\left\| N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \lambda_i^{(2)} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  and  $\left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ , where the difference between these two results is due to the zero expected value of  $\lambda_i^{(2)}$ . Due to the same property, it holds that  $\left\| \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2})$ . Consequently,  $A_{111} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$  and accordingly  $A_{11} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . Next, consider

$$A_{12} = A_{121} + A_{122},$$

where

$$A_{121} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2},$$

$$A_{122} = \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2}.$$

Again, the two non-negative expressions above satisfy  $A_{122} \leq A_{121}$ , thus making a separate investigation of  $A_{122}$  redundant. Expressing  $A_{121}$  in terms of the Frobenius norm again, we have

$$A_{121} \leq \sqrt{\frac{NT}{2(N-1)}} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| - \left\| \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(2)} \right\| \left\| \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| \right)^2$$

, where  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(\ell)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\|^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(\ell)'} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(\ell)} \sigma_i^{-2} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  for  $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$  by Markov's inequality. Additionally, we have  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(2)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| \left\| \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the previous order result. It follows that  $A_{121} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$  and thus  $A_{12} = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . Recalling the order in probability of  $A_{11}$  in addition to this last result, we can conclude that  $A_1 = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T})$ . We continue with

$$A_2 = A_{21} + A_{22}$$

whose order in probability is either obtained using Theorem 2 or analogously to the steps used for  $A_1$ . Here,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{21} &= \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j} T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}) \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j} T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{NT}{2(N-1)}} \left( \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N (NT)^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| + \left\| \sqrt{NT} T^{-1/2} \overline{\mathbf{U}} \right\| \left\| \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \sigma_i^{-1} \right\| \right)^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a simple consequence of result (60) given that  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{B}^{-1} (1, \mathbf{0})'$ . In the same way,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{22} &= \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2}. \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{T}) \end{aligned}$$

is a consequence of

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{NT}{2(N-1)}} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \left\| T^{-1/2} \sigma_i^{-1} \varepsilon_i \right\| + \left\| T^{-1/2} \bar{U} \right\| \left\| \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \sigma_i^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right\| \right)^2 \\
& = \mathcal{O}_P \left( \sqrt{T} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the direct terms of the squared sum follow from Markov's inequality while the order in probability of the cross-term is obtained from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the orders of the two direct terms. Lastly, we turn to

$$A_3 = A_{31} - A_{32},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{31} &= \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i,j}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}, \\
A_{32} &= \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_{31}| &\leq \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} T^{-1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \right\| \\
&\quad \times \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_j^{(1)} \right) \sigma_j^{-1} \right\| \\
&= (A_{11})^{1/2} (A_{21})^{1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{O}_P \left( \sqrt{T} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_{32}| &\leq \left( \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \sigma_i^{-1} \left( \lambda_i^{(2)} - \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(2)} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right)' \mathbf{F}^{(2)'} \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left( \frac{k_{N,T}}{2} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{\mathcal{C}}^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right) \sigma_i^{-1} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= (A_{12})^{1/2} (A_{22})^{1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{O}_P \left( \sqrt{T} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

From these last results, it follows that none of the three expressions  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $A_3$  diverges at a rate higher than  $\sqrt{T}$ . The order in probability of  $CD_{H_1}$  is an immediate consequence of this observation.

□

**Proof of Theorem 3 (Multifactor error part).**

Proceeding from the decomposition given in Corollary 3, we consider the two bias terms  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,W}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W}$ . For both terms, it is instructive to note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right\|^2 \right] &= N^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} [w_i w_j] \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i' \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j] \\ &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{var} [w_i] \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i' \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i] \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left( N^{-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1/2} \right). \quad (48)$$

Concerning  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,W}$ , we also need to take into account

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t}' \right\| &\leq (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{u}_{i,t}' \mathbf{u}_{i,t} \left\| \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

which follows from Markov's inequality. Using this result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_{1,W} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t}' \right\| \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider  $\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W}$  where

$$\left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t} w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1/2} \right)$$

by isolating  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}$  from the definition of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t}$  and by using result (62) on the remaining part. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Phi}_{2,W}| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right\| \left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i,t} w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} \right\| \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the two bias terms affecting  $CD_W$  in Corollary 3 are negligible for weights satisfying Assumption 9 as long as  $N^{-1}\sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$ . We continue with the leading stochastic term of the weighted CD test statistic, given by

$$\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \tilde{\zeta}_{iN,t} \tilde{\zeta}_{jN,t}$$



with  $\xi_{iN,t} = \left( w_i \varepsilon_{i,t} - \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N w_\ell \lambda'_\ell \right) \psi_{i,t} \right)$  and  $\psi_{i,t} = \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i,t}$ . Analogous to the time fixed effects part of this proof, we can apply Lemma 2 with  $a_{i,t} = w_i \varepsilon_{i,t}$  and  $q_i = w_i \sigma_i$  to obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} w_i w_j \xrightarrow{d} N(0, (\sigma_w^2 \mathbb{E} [\sigma_i^2])^2)$$

as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  subject to  $N^{-1} \sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$ . Now note that by equation (47) in the proof of Corollary 3,

$$(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon'_i \varepsilon_i w_i^2 + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$$

where  $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon'_i \varepsilon_i w_i^2 \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_w^2 \mathbb{E} [\sigma_i^2]$  as argued in the time fixed effects part of the proof of this theorem. By application of Slutsky's Theorem, it then follows that

$$\left( (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Next, consider the sum

$$\sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{u}_{i,t} \mathbf{u}'_{j,t} = \mathbf{B}' \left( \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{i,t}, \mathbf{e}'_{j,t})' (\varepsilon_{i,t}, \mathbf{e}'_{j,t}) \right) \mathbf{B}. \quad (49)$$

Given that  $\mathbf{e}_{i,t}$  has properties similar to  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ , it can be shown analogously the reasoning leading to (40) that a CLT holds for every element of the  $(m+1) \times (m+1)$  matrix in parentheses in (49) by Lemma 2. This allows us to conclude that the elements of (49) are stochastically bounded. Thus, recalling result (48),

$$\begin{aligned} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N w_\ell \lambda'_\ell \right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} \psi'_{j,t} \right) \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \lambda_\ell w_\ell \right) &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}), \\ \left( \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_{i,t} \psi'_{j,t} \right) \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \lambda_\ell w_\ell \right) &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}), \\ \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N w_\ell \lambda'_\ell \right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t} \right) &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\left( (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}^2 w_i^2 \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T T^{-1} \xi_{iN,t} \xi_{jN,t} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

which leads to the central result of this theorem.  $\square$

## D Auxiliary lemmas

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\{a_{i,t}\}_{t=1}^T$  be a scalar and  $\mathbf{c}_i$   $L$ -dimensional sequences of random variables for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  such that:

- $a_{i,t}, a_{j,s}$  are independent for all  $i \neq j$  and all  $s, t$ .
- $a_{i,t}, a_{i,s}$  are iid conditionally on  $\mathbf{c}_i$  for all  $s, t$ .
- $\mathbb{E}[|a_{i,t}|^8 | \mathbf{c}_i] < M < \infty$ .  $\mathbf{c}_i$  are iid over  $i$ .
- $q_i^k \equiv \mathbb{E}[|a_{i,t}|^k | \mathbf{c}_i]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[a_{i,t} | \mathbf{c}_i] = 0$  for  $k \leq 8$ .
- $\mathbb{E}[|q_i^k|] < \infty$  for  $k \leq 8$ .

Then:

$$U = \sqrt{\frac{2}{NT(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{i,t} a_{j,t} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbb{E}[q_i^2]^2), \quad (50)$$

jointly as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.*

To prove this lemma we use Theorem 3.2 of Hall and Heyde (1980). In particular, express  $U$  as:

$$U = \sum_{t=1}^T \xi_{t,N,T}, \quad \xi_{t,N,T} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{NT(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{i,t} a_{j,t}. \quad (51)$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{C} = \sigma(\{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_N\})$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathbf{c}_i$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T} = \sigma(\mathcal{C}, \xi_{t-1,N,T}, \dots, \xi_{1,N,T})$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\xi_{t-1,N,T}, \dots, \xi_{1,N,T}$ . It is easy to see that  $\{\xi_{t,N,T}, \mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T} : t = 1, \dots, T\}$  is a Martingale Difference Array.

At first we establish the limiting variance of this MDS array. From Corollary 3.1 in Hall and Heyde (1980) the variance is determined from:

$$V_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,N,T}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T}] \xrightarrow{p} \eta^2 \quad (52)$$

By conditional independence of  $a_{i,t}$ , the above result simplifies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,N,T}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T}] &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,N,T}^2 | \mathcal{C}] \\
&= \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{i,t} a_{j,t} \right)^2 | \mathcal{C} \right] \\
&= \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=2}^N a_{i,t} A_{i-1,t} \right)^2 | \mathcal{C} \right] \\
&= \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=2}^N a_{i,t}^2 A_{i-1,t}^2 | \mathcal{C} \right] \\
&= \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=2}^N q_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third line we defined the “integrated” variable  $A_{i-1,t} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{j,t}$ , the fourth line uses the fact that  $a_{i,t} A_{i-1,t}$  is a Martingale Difference Sequence. The last line uses the definition of  $q_i^2$ . After re-arranging elements:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_T &= \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=2}^N q_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \left( N^2 \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N q_i^2 \right)^2 - N \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N q_i^4 \right) \right) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N q_i^2 \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[q_i^2]^2 + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the third and the fourth lines follow from the application of the Kolmogorov’s SLLN to iid sequences  $q_i^2$  and  $q_i^4$ . Thus we can expect that

$$U = \sqrt{\frac{2}{NT(N-1)}} \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{i,t} a_{j,t} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbb{E}[q_i^2]^2). \quad (53)$$

It remains to prove that the sufficient condition for Corollary 3.1 in Hall and Heyde (1980) is satisfied. In particular, it is sufficient to show that  $\xi_{t,N,T}$  is a (conditionally) uniformly integrable sequence:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,N,T}^2 I(|\xi_{t,N,T}| > \varepsilon) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T}] \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (54)$$

Instead of proving uniform integrability, we borrow the idea from Kao et al. (2012) and instead show that conditional Lyapunov's condition:

$$B_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[|\xi_{t,N,T}|^{2+\delta} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1,N,T}] \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad \delta > 0, \quad (55)$$

is satisfied under the maintained assumptions. In what follows we prove that the above condition is satisfied for  $\delta = 2$ . Observe how:

$$B_T = T \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,N,T}^4 | \mathcal{C}] = T^{-1} \frac{N}{4(N-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( N\bar{a}^2 - \bar{a}^2 \right)^4 | \mathcal{C} \right] = T^{-1} \frac{N}{4(N-1)} \|N\bar{a}^2 - \bar{a}^2\|_4^4,$$

where  $\bar{a} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N a_{i,t}$  and similarly for  $\bar{a}^2$ . For the ease of exposition we drop the  $t$  subscript from the definition of the above averages as these quantities are identically distributed over  $t$ . The scaling in front of the expectation is of order  $o(1)$  as long as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . It remains to show that the second component is  $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$ . By Minkowski inequality with respect to the conditional probability measure:

$$\|N\bar{a}^2 - \bar{a}^2\|_4 \leq \|N\bar{a}^2\|_4 + \|\bar{a}^2\|_4. \quad (56)$$

Similarly:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{a}^2\|_4 &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt[4]{\mathbb{E}[a_{i,t}^8 | \mathcal{C}_i]} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt[4]{q_i^8} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt[4]{q_i^8} \right] + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here the first lines from the Minkowski inequality, second line from the definition of the  $\|\cdot\|_4$  norm and the definition of  $q_i^8$ . The final line follows from the application of the Kolmogorov's SLLN.

When it comes to  $\|N\bar{a}^2\|_4$  observe that:

$$\|N\bar{a}^2\|_4^4 = \frac{1}{N^4} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{p=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^N \mathbb{E}[a_{i,t} a_{j,t} a_{k,t} a_{l,t} a_{m,t} a_{n,t} a_{p,t} a_{s,t} | \mathcal{C}]. \quad (57)$$

Because  $a_{i,t}$  are conditionally independent, the expectation is nonzero only if the indices are pairwise equal. This leaves  $\mathcal{O}(N^4)$  non-zero summands. When non-zero each expectation is a function of at most  $q_i^k$ , which we assume is integrable by assumption. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \|N\bar{a}^2\|_4^4 &\leq \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N q_i^2 \right)^4 + o_P(1) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[q_i^2])^4 + o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the Kolmogorov's SLLN and the Continuous Mapping Theorem. Combining all results we showed that:

$$\|N\bar{a}^2 - \bar{a}^2\|_4^4 = \mathcal{O}_P(1), \quad (58)$$

and as a result:

$$B_T = T E[\tilde{z}_{t,N,T}^4 | \mathcal{C}] = T^{-1} \frac{N}{4(N-1)} \|N\bar{a}^2 - \bar{a}^2\|_4^4 = o_P(1).$$

As required. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** Let  $w_i$  denote any stochastic weights that are independent across  $i$  and satisfy  $E[w_i^2] < M$  for all  $i$ . Furthermore, let  $w_i$  be independent of  $\mathbf{f}_t$ ,  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_{i,t}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ . Under Assumptions 2-6,

$$\left(T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}\right)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}_P(1) \quad (59)$$

$$\sqrt{NT} T^{-1/2} \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \mathbf{U}_i' \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1) \quad (60)$$

$$\sqrt{NT} T^{-1/2} \left\| \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \mathbf{U}_i' \right) \mathbf{F} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1) \quad (61)$$

Additionally, under Assumptions 2-6 and given weights  $w_i$  that satisfy Assumption 9, we have

$$\left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{U}_i' \varepsilon_i w_i \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1/2}) \quad (62)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.*

1. *Result (59):* By Pesaran (2006, equation (36)) it holds that

$$T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}' \hat{\mathbf{F}} = \overline{\mathbf{C}}' \left( T^{-1} \mathbf{F}' \mathbf{F} \right) \overline{\mathbf{C}} + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1}),$$

where the function of true factors and true loadings itself converges to a positive definite matrix by assumptions 3 and 4. Hence, Theorem 1 in Karabiyik et al. (2017) applies and equation (59) follows.

2. *Result (60):* Taking the square of the expression of interest, we can write

$$NT^{-1} \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \mathbf{U}_i' \right\|^2 \leq (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t=1}^T w_i w_j (\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} + \mathbf{e}_{i,t}' \mathbf{e}_{j,t}) \|\mathbf{B}\|^2$$

where  $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t=1}^T w_i w_j \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  and  $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t=1}^T w_i w_j \mathbf{e}_{i,t}' \mathbf{e}_{j,t} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  by Markov's inequality and zero correlation of idiosyncratic variation in both  $\mathbf{y}_i$  and  $\mathbf{X}_i$  across  $i$ . Result (60) follows accordingly.

3. *Result (61)*: Analogous to the proof of (60) we take the square of (61) and rearrange to arrive at

$$NT^{-1} \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \mathbf{U}_i' \mathbf{F} \right\|^2 \leq (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T w_i w_j \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_{t'} (\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t'} + \mathbf{e}_{i,t}' \mathbf{e}_{j,t'}) \|\mathbf{B}\|^2.$$

Now taking expectations of the non-negative expression  $(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T w_i w_j \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_{t'} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t'}$  and using uncorrelatedness of  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  across  $i$  and  $t$  as well as  $E(w_i^2) \leq M$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i,j}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T w_i w_j \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_{t'} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{j,t'} \right] &\leq (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T M \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{F}}) E[\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned}$$

An identical result is given for the term involving  $\mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_{t'}$ . Result (61) is then obtained via Markov's inequality.

4. *Result (62)*: Given the definition of  $\mathbf{U}_i$ , we can write

$$E \left[ \left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{U}_i' \varepsilon_i w_i \right\|^2 \right] \leq (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T E[\varepsilon_{i,t} (\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t'} + \mathbf{e}_{i,t}' \mathbf{e}_{i,t'}) \varepsilon_{i,t'}] \operatorname{var}[w_i] \|\mathbf{B}\|^2$$

where we directly use independence of  $w_i$  across  $i$  as well as its zero expected value. Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T E[\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t'} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] &= (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \kappa_4[\varepsilon_{i,t}] + (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T E[\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] E[\varepsilon_{i,t'}^2] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T E[\varepsilon_{i,t} \mathbf{e}_{i,t}' \mathbf{e}_{i,t'} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] &= (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T E[\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left((NT)^{-1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\left\| (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{U}_i' \varepsilon_i w_i \right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1})$$

by Markov's inequality. Taking the square root leads to result (62).

□

**Lemma 4.** *Under Assumptions 2-6 and Assumption 8,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i,j}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_j \right) w_i w_j \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P \left( T^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1} \sqrt{T} \right) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.*

Let  $\bar{\lambda}_w = \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \lambda_\ell w_\ell \right)$  and note that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_i \right) w_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i w_i - U_i (\bar{C}^{-1})' \bar{\lambda}_w \right)$ .

This allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i,j}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_j \right) w_i w_j \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \left( \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{F}' \varepsilon_i w_i \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{F}' U_i \right\| \left\| \bar{C}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \bar{\lambda}_w \right\| \right)^2 \left\| (\hat{F}' \hat{F})^{-1} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

First, note that

$$\left\| \bar{\lambda}_w \right\|^2 = N^{-2} \sum_{i,j}^N w_i w_j \lambda_i' \lambda_j = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$$

since  $E \left[ N^{-2} \sum_{i,j}^N w_i w_j \lambda_i' \lambda_j \right] \leq \left( N^{-2} \sum_{i,j}^N E \left[ w_i^2 w_j^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \left( N^{-2} \sum_{i,j}^N E \left[ \left\| \lambda_i \right\|^2 \left\| \lambda_j \right\|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$  by boundedness of the fourth moments of all stochastic components involved. Next, recall that  $\hat{F} = F\bar{C} + \bar{U}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{F}' U_i \right\| & \leq \sqrt{NT} \left\| \bar{C} \right\| \left\| \sqrt{N/T} F' \bar{U} \right\| + T \left\| \sqrt{N/T} \bar{U} \right\|^2 \\ & = \mathcal{O}_P \left( \sqrt{NT} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(T), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is a consequence of results (60) and (61). Furthermore, since  $\varepsilon_i = U_i B^{-1} [1; \mathbf{0}]'$ , we can proceed analogously for  $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{F}' \varepsilon_i w_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{F}' U_i w_i \right\| \left\| B^{-1} \right\|$  and obtain the same orders in probability as in the last equation above. Additionally using result (59), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i,j}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_j - \bar{U} (\bar{C}^{-1})' \lambda_j \right) w_i w_j \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \left[ \mathcal{O}_P \left( \sqrt{NT} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P(T) \right]^2 \mathcal{O}_P \left( T^{-1} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P \left( T^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}_P \left( N^{-1} \sqrt{T} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes this proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** Under Under Assumptions 2-6 and Assumption 8,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_i - U \left( \bar{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right) w_i^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-2}\sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-3/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.*

Given that  $\|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|^2 \leq 3\|\mathbf{A}_1\|^2 + 3\|\mathbf{A}_2\|^2$  for two arbitrary  $m \times n$  matrices  $\mathbf{A}_1$  and  $\mathbf{A}_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \bar{U} \left( \bar{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right)' P_{\hat{F}} \left( \varepsilon_i - U \left( \bar{C}^{-1} \right) \lambda_i \right) w_i^2 \\ & \leq 3 \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon_i' \hat{F} \right\|^2 \left\| \left( T^{-1} \hat{F}' \hat{F} \right)^{-1} \right\| \\ & + 3 \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \lambda_i' \left( \bar{C}^{-1} \right)' \bar{U}' \hat{F} \right\|^2 \left\| \left( T^{-1} \hat{F}' \hat{F} \right)^{-1} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon_i' \hat{F} \right\|^2 \\ &= 3 \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon_i' \mathbf{F} \right\|^2 \|\bar{C}\|^2 + 3 \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon_i' \bar{U} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the first term on the right-hand side above, we can use Chebyshev's inequality together with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N T^{-2} w_i^2 \varepsilon_i' \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}' \varepsilon_i \right] &= \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T T^{-2} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2] \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i,t'} | \sigma_i]] \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_{t'}] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\sigma_i^2] \mathbb{E} [w_i^2] \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{F}}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

to arrive at  $\sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon_i' \mathbf{F} \right\|^2 \|\bar{C}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$ . Likewise, recalling that  $\mathbf{u}_{i,t} =$



$\mathbf{B}' [\varepsilon_{i,t}; \mathbf{e}'_{i,t}]'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon'_i \bar{\mathbf{U}} \right\|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i,i',i''}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T (NT)^{-2} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2] \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} (\varepsilon_{i',t} \varepsilon_{i'',t'} + \mathbf{e}'_{i',t} \mathbf{e}_{i'',t'}) \varepsilon_{i,t'}] \|\mathbf{B}\| \\
& = \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \left( \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}(T^{-1}) \right) \mathcal{O}(1) \\
& = \mathcal{O}(N^{-2} \sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1} T^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This result is obtained by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
(NT)^{-2} \sum_{i,i',i''}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} \varepsilon_{i',t} \varepsilon_{i'',t'} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] &= (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \kappa_4 [\varepsilon_{i,t}] + (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t'}^2] \\
&+ (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i,i'}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i',t}^2] \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(NT)^{-2} \sum_{i,i',i''}^N \sum_{t,t'}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t} \mathbf{e}'_{i',t} \mathbf{e}_{i'',t'} \varepsilon_{i,t'}] &= (NT)^{-2} \sum_{i,i'}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_{i,t}^2] \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{e}'_{i',t} \mathbf{e}_{i',t}] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(T^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the results obtained up to this point and additionally using (59), we obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \varepsilon'_i \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\|^2 \left\| (T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}' \hat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-2} \sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}). \quad (64)$$

Next, consider

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i (\bar{\mathbf{C}}^{-1})' \bar{\mathbf{U}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\|^2 = \sqrt{\frac{NT}{2(N-1)}} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right) \left\| \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \right\|^2 \left\| T^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{U}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\|^2$$

where  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$  since  $\mathbb{E} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right] \leq \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [w_i^4] \right)^{1/2} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i\|^4] \right)^{1/2}$ . Additionally, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| T^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{U}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\|^2 &\leq \left( \left\| T^{-1} \mathbf{F}' \bar{\mathbf{U}} \right\| + \left\| T^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{U}}' \bar{\mathbf{U}} \right\| \right)^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-3/2} T^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P((NT)^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

with the last step following from (60) and (61). Consequently, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{T}{2N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| T^{-1} w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i' \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \right)' \overline{\mathbf{U}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right\|^2 \left\| \left( T^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}' \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right)^{-1} \right\| \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-2} \sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-3/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-1} T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing the results derived so far, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2TN(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varepsilon_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \right) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right)' \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{F}}} \left( \varepsilon_i - \mathbf{U} \left( \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \right) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i \right) w_i^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-2} \sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}_P(N^{-3/2}) + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. □

## References

- ABADIR, K. M. AND J. R. MAGNUS (2005): *Matrix algebra*, vol. 1 of *Econometric Exercises*, Cambridge University Press.
- AHN, S. C., Y. H. LEE, AND P. SCHMIDT (2013): "Panel Data Models with Multiple Time-varying Individual Effects," *Journal of Econometrics*, 174, 1–14.
- ARELLANO, M., R. BLUNDELL, AND S. BONHOMME (2017): "Earnings and Consumption Dynamics: A Nonlinear Panel Data Framework," *Econometrica*, 85, 693–734.
- BAI, J. (2003): "Inferential Theory for Factor Models of Large Dimensions," *Econometrica*, 71, 135–171.
- (2009): "Panel Data Models With Interactive Fixed Effects," *Econometrica*, 77, 1229–1279.
- BAI, J. AND S. NG (2004): "A PANIC Attack on Unit Roots and Cointegration," *Econometrica*, 72, 1127–1177.
- BAILEY, N., S. HOLLY, AND M. H. PESARAN (2016): "A Two-Stage Approach to Spatio-Temporal Analysis with Strong and Weak Cross-Sectional Dependence," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 249–280.
- BALTAGI, B., C. KAO, AND B. PENG (2016): "Testing Cross-Sectional Correlation in Large Panel Data Models with Serial Correlation," *Econometrics*, 4, –.
- BALTAGI, B. H., Q. FENG, AND C. KAO (2012): "A Lagrange Multiplier Test for Cross-sectional Dependence in a Fixed Effects Panel Data Model," *Journal of Econometrics*, 170, 164 – 177.
- BALTAGI, B. H., R. LAGRAVINESE, F. MOSCONE, AND E. TOSETTI (2017): "Health Care Expenditure and Income: A Global Perspective," *Health economics*, 26, 863–874.
- BONEVA, L. AND O. LINTON (2017): "A Discrete Choice Model for Large Heterogeneous Panels with Interactive Fixed Effects with an Application to the Determinants of Corporate Bond Issuance," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 32, 1226–1243.
- BONHOMME, S., T. LAMADON, AND E. MANRESA (2017): "Discretizing Unobserved Heterogeneity," Mimeo.
- BONHOMME, S. AND E. MANRESA (2015): "Grouped Patterns of Heterogeneity in Panel Data," *Econometrica*, 83, 1147–1184.
- BONHOMME, S. AND J.-M. ROBIN (2010): "Generalized Non-Parametric Deconvolution with an Application to Earnings Dynamics," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 77, 491–533.

- BOTOSARU, I. AND Y. SASAKI (2018): "Nonparametric Heteroskedasticity in Persistent Panel Processes: An Application to Earnings Dynamics," *Journal of Econometrics*, 203, 283–296.
- CESA-BIANCHI, A., M. H. PESARAN, AND A. REBUCCI (2018): "Uncertainty and Economic Activity: A Multi-Country Perspective," Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research, working Paper 24325.
- CHEN, J., J. GAO, AND D. LI (2012): "A New Diagnostic Test for Cross-section Uncorrelatedness in Nonparametric Panel Data Models," *Econometric Theory*, 28, 1144–1163.
- CHEN, M., I. FERNÁNDEZ-VAL, AND M. WEIDNER (2014): "Nonlinear Panel Models with Interactive Effects," Mimeo.
- CHEN, S. X. AND Y.-L. QIN (2010): "A Two-sample Test for High-dimensional Data with Applications to Gene-set Testing," *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 808–835.
- CHUDIK, A., K. MOHADDES, M. H. PESARAN, AND M. RAISSI (2017): "Is There a Debt-Threshold Effect on Output Growth?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99, 135–150.
- CHUDIK, A. AND M. H. PESARAN (2015): "Common Correlated Effects Estimation of Heterogeneous Dynamic Panel Data Models with Weakly Exogenous Regressors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 188, 393–420.
- DEMETRESCU, M. AND U. HOMM (2016): "Directed Tests of No Cross-Sectional Correlation in Large-N Panel Data Models," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 4–31.
- DHAENE, G. AND K. JOCHMANS (2015): "Split-panel Jackknife Estimation of Fixed-Effect Models," *Review of Economic Studies*, 82, 991–1030.
- EBERHARDT, M., C. HELMERS, AND H. STRAUSS (2013): "Do Spillovers Matter When Estimating Private Returns to R&D?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95, 436–448.
- EBERHARDT, M. AND A. F. PRESBITERO (2015): "Public Debt and Growth: Heterogeneity and Non-linearity," *Journal of International Economics*, 97, 45 – 58.
- EVERAERT, G. AND L. POZZI (2014): "The Predictability of Aggregate Consumption Growth in OECD Countries: A Panel Data Analysis," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 29, 431–453.
- FERNÁNDEZ-VAL, I. AND M. WEIDNER (2016): "Individual and Time Effects in Nonlinear Panel Models with Large N, T," *Journal of Econometrics*, 192, 291 – 312.
- FOERSTER, A. T., P.-D. G. SARTE, AND M. W. WATSON (2011): "Sectoral Versus Aggregate Shocks: A Structural Factor Analysis of Industrial Production," *Journal of Political Economy*, 119, 1–38.

- GAGLIARDINI, P., E. OSSOLA, AND O. SCAILLET (2016): "Time-Varying Risk Premium in Large Cross-Sectional Equity Data Sets," *Econometrica*, 84, 985–1046.
- GOBILLON, L. AND T. MAGNAC (2016): "Regional Policy Evaluation: Interactive Fixed Effects and Synthetic Controls," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98, 535–551.
- HAHN, J. AND G. KUERSTEINER (2002): "Asymptotically Unbiased Inference for a Dynamic Panel Model with Fixed Effects When Both N and T are Large," *Econometrica*, 70(4), 1639–1657.
- HAHN, J. AND H. R. MOON (2006): "Reducing Bias of MLE in A Dynamic Panel Model," *Econometric Theory*, 22, 499–512.
- HAHN, J. AND W. NEWEY (2004): "Jackknife and Analytical Bias Reduction for Nonlinear Panel Models," *Econometrica*, 72(4), 1295–1319.
- HALL, P. AND C. C. HEYDE (1980): *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Academic Press.
- HOLLY, S., M. H. PESARAN, AND T. YAMAGATA (2010): "A Spatio-temporal Model of House Prices in the USA," *Journal of Econometrics*, 158, 160 – 173, twenty Years of Cointegration.
- HSIAO, C. (2014): *Analysis of Panel Data*, Econometric Society Monographs, Cambridge University Press, 3 ed.
- HSIAO, C., M. H. PESARAN, AND A. PICK (2012a): "Diagnostic Tests of Cross-section Independence for Limited Dependent Variable Panel Data Models\*," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 74, 253–277.
- HSIAO, C., H. STEVE CHING, AND S. KI WAN (2012b): "A Panel Data Approach For Program Evaluation: Measuring the Benefits of Political and Economic Integration of Hong Kong with Mainland China," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27, 705–740.
- JUODIS, A. (2018): "Pseudo Panel Data Models with Cohort Interactive Effects," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 36, 47–61.
- JUODIS, A., H. KARABIYIK, AND J. WESTERLUND (2017): "On the Robustness of the Pooled CCE Estimator," Mimeo.
- KAO, C., L. TRAPANI, AND G. URGÀ (2012): "Asymptotics for Panel Models with Common Shocks," *Econometric Reviews*, 31, 390–439.
- KARABIYIK, H., S. REESE, AND J. WESTERLUND (2017): "On The Role of The Rank Condition in CCE Estimation of Factor-augmented Panel Regressions," *Journal of Econometrics*, 197, 60–64.

- LANCASTER, T. (2000): "The Incidental Parameter Problem since 1948," *Journal of Econometrics*, 95, 391–413.
- MAO, G. (2016): "Testing for Error Cross-sectional Independence using Pairwise Augmented Regressions," *The Econometrics Journal*, 19, 237–260.
- (2018): "Testing for sphericity in a two-way error components panel data model," *Econometric Reviews*, 37, 491–506.
- MASTROMARCO, C., L. SERLENGA, AND Y. SHIN (2016): "Modelling Technical Efficiency in Cross Sectionally Dependent Stochastic Frontier Panels," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 281–297, jae.2439.
- MOSCONE, F. AND E. TOSETTI (2010): "Health Expenditure and Income in the United States," *Health Economics*, 19, 1385–1403.
- NEYMAN, J. AND E. L. SCOTT (1948): "Consistent Estimation from Partially Consistent Observations," *Econometrica*, 16, 1–32.
- PESARAN, M. H. (2004): "General Diagnostic Tests for Cross Section Dependence in Panels," CESifo Working Paper No. 1229.
- (2006): "Estimation and Inference in Large Heterogeneous Panels with a Multifactor Error Structure," *Econometrica*, 74, 967–1012.
- (2015a): "Testing Weak Cross-Sectional Dependence in Large Panels," *Econometric Reviews*, 34, 1089–1117.
- (2015b): *Time Series and Panel Data Econometrics*, Oxford University Press.
- PHILLIPS, P. C. B. AND H. R. MOON (1999): "Linear Regression Limit Theory for Nonstationary Panel Data," *Econometrica*, 67, 1057–1111.
- REESE, S. AND J. WESTERLUND (2016): "Panicca: Panic on Cross-Section Averages," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 961–981.
- ROBINSON, P. (2008): "Correlation Testing in Time Series, Spatial and Cross-sectional Data," *Journal of Econometrics*, 147, 5 – 16.
- SARAFIDIS, V., T. YAMAGATA, AND D. ROBERTSON (2009): "A Test of Cross Section Dependence for a Linear Dynamic Panel Model with Regressors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 148, 149–161.
- SU, L., Z. SHI, AND P. C. B. PHILLIPS (2016): "Identifying Latent Structures in Panel Data," *Econometrica*, 84, 2215–2264.

- WESTERLUND, J., H. KARABIYIK, AND P. NARAYAN (2017): "Testing for Predictability in Panels with General Predictors," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 32, 554–574.
- WESTERLUND, J. AND J.-P. URBAIN (2013): "On the Estimation and Inference in Factor-augmented Panel Regressions with Correlated Loadings," *Economics Letters*, 119, 247 – 250.
- (2015): "Cross-sectional Averages Versus Principal Components," *Journal of Econometrics*, 185, 372 – 377.
- WHITE, H. (2001): *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians*, Academic Press.