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ABSTRACT. We study the construction of theoretical foundation of model comparison for ergodic stochastic differential equation (SDE) models and an extension of applicable scope of the conventional Bayesian information criterion. Different from previous studies, we suppose that the candidate models are possibly misspecified models, and we consider both Wiener and a pure-jump Lévy noise driven SDE. Based on the asymptotic behavior of the marginal quasi-log likelihood, the Schwarz type statistics and stepwise model selection procedure are proposed. We also prove the model selection consistency of the proposed statistics with respect to an optimal model. We conduct some numerical experiments and they support our theoretical findings.

1. INTRODUCTION

We suppose that the data-generating process $X$ is defined on the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, F_t, P)$ and it is the solution of the one-dimensional stochastic differential equation written as:

$$dX_t = A(X_t)dt + C(X_{-})dZ_t,$$

where:

- The coefficients $A$ and $C$ are Lipschitz continuous.
- The driving noise $Z$ is a standard Wiener process or pure-jump Lévy process satisfying that for any $q > 0$,

$$E[Z_1] = 0, \quad E[Z_2] = 1, \quad E[|Z_1|^q] < \infty.$$
- The initial variable $X_0$ is independent of $Z$, and $F_t = \sigma(X_0) \vee \sigma(Z_s; s \leq t)$

As the observations from $X$, we consider the discrete but high-frequency samples $(X_{\tau_j}^n)_{j=0}^n$ with

$$\tau_j^n := jh_n, \quad T_n := nh_n \to \infty, \quad nh_n^2 \to 0.$$

For $(X_{\tau_j}^n)_{j=0}^n$, $M_1 \times M_2$ candidate models are supposed to be given. Here, for each $m_1 \in \{1, \ldots, M_1\}$ and $m_2 \in \{1, \ldots, M_2\}$, the candidate model $M_{m_1,m_2}$ is expressed as:

$$dX_t = a_{m_2}(X_t, \alpha_{m_2})dt + c_{m_1}(X_{-}, \gamma_{m_1})dZ_t,$$

and the functional form of $(c_{m_1}(\cdot, \cdot), a_{m_2}(\cdot, \cdot))$ is known except for the $p_{m_2}$- and $p_{m_2}$-dimensional unknown parameters $\gamma_{m_1}$ and $\alpha_{m_2}$ being elements of the bounded convex domains $\Theta_{\gamma_{m_1}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_{m_1}}$ and $\Theta_{\alpha_{m_2}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_{m_2}}$. The main objective of this paper is to give a model selection procedure for extracting an “optimal” model $M_{m_1,m_2}$ among $\mathcal{M} := \{M_{m_1,m_2} | m_1 \in \{1, \ldots, M_1\}, m_2 \in \{1, \ldots, M_2\}\}$ which reflects the feature of $X$ well.

For selecting an appropriate model from the data in hand quantitively, information criteria are one of the most convenient and powerful tools, and have widely been used in many fields. Their origin dates back to Akaike information criterion (AIC) introduced in [1] which puts an importance on prediction, and after that, various kinds of criteria have been produced up to the present, for their comprehensive overview, see [3], [4], and [11]. Among them, this paper especially sheds light on Bayesian information criterion (BIC) introduced by [13]. It is based on an approximation up to $O_p(1)$-term of log-marginal likelihood, and its original form is as follows:

$$\text{BIC}_n = -2l_n(\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{MLE}}) + p \log n,$$

where $l_n$, $\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{MLE}}$, and $p$ stand for the log-likelihood function, maximum likelihood estimator, and dimension of the parameter including the subject model. However, since the closed form of the transition
density of \( X \) is unavailable in general, to conduct some feasible statistical analysis, we cannot rely on its genuine likelihood; this implies that the conventional likelihood based (Bayesian) information criteria are impractical in our setting. Such a problem often occurs when discrete time observations are obtained from a continuous time process, and to avoid it, the replacement of a genuine likelihood by some quasi-likelihood is effective not only for estimating parameters included in a subject model but also for constructing (quasi-)information criteria, for instance, see [13], [9], [6] (ergodic diffusion model), [17] (stochastic regression model), and [11] (CARMA process). Especially, [9] used the Gaussian quasi-likelihood in place of the genuine likelihood, and derived quasi-Bayesian information criterion (QBIC) under the conditions: the driving noise is a standard Wiener process, and for each candidate model, there exist \( \gamma_{m1,0} \in \Theta_{m1} \) and \( \alpha_{m2,0} \in \Theta_{m2} \) satisfying \( c_{m1}(x,\gamma_{m1,0}) \equiv C(x) \) and \( a_{m2}(x,\alpha_{m2,0}) \equiv A(x) \), respectively. Moreover, by using the difference of the small time activity of the drift and diffusion terms, the paper also gave two-step QBIC which selects each term separately, and reduces the computational load. In the paper, the model selection consistency of the QBIC is shown for nested case.

However, regarding the estimation of the parameters \( \gamma_{m1} \) and \( \alpha_{m2} \), the Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood estimator (GQMLE) works well for a much broader situation: the driving noise is a standard Wiener process or pure-jump Lévy process with [12], and either or both of the drift and scale coefficients are misspecified. For the technical account of the GQMLE for ergodic SDE models, see [19], [10], [15], [16], [12], and [13]. These results naturally provide us an insight that the aforementioned QBIC is also theoretically valid for the broader situation, and has the model selection consistency even if a non-nested model is contained in candidate models. In this paper, we will show that the insight is true. More specifically, we will give the QBIC building on the stochastic expansion of the log-marginal Gaussian quasi-likelihood. Although the convergence rate of the GQMLE differs in the Lévy driven or misspecified case, the form is the same as the correctly specified diffusion case. We will also show the model selection consistency of the QBIC.

The rest of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides the notations and assumptions used throughout this paper. In Section 3, the main result of this paper is given. Section 4 exhibits some numerical experiments. The technical proofs of the main results are summarized in Appendix.

2. Notations and Assumptions

For notational convenience, we previously introduce some symbols used in the rest of this paper.

- \( \partial_x \) is referred to as a differential operator with respect to any variable \( x \).
- \( x_n \lesssim y_n \) implies that there exists a positive constant \( C \) being independent of \( n \) satisfying \( x_n \leq Cy_n \) for all large enough \( n \).
- For any set \( S \), \( \bar{S} \) denotes its closure.
- We write \( Y_j = Y_{t_j} \) and \( \Delta_j Y := Y_j - Y_{j-1} \) for any stochastic process \( (Y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \).

In the next section, we will first give the stochastic expansion of the log-marginal Gaussian quasi-likelihood for the following model:

\[
dX_t = a(X_t, \alpha)dt + c(X_{t-}, \gamma)dZ_t.
\]

Below, we table the assumptions for our main result.

**Assumption 2.1.** \( Z \) is a standard Wiener process, or a pure-jump Lévy process satisfying that: \( E[Z_1] = 0 \), \( E[Z_1^2] = 1 \), and \( E[|Z_1|^q] < \infty \) for all \( q > 0 \).

**Assumption 2.2.**

1. The coefficients \( A \) and \( C \) are Lipschitz continuous and twice differentiable, and their first and second derivatives are of at most polynomial growth.
2. The drift coefficient \( a(\cdot, \alpha^*) \) and scale coefficient \( c(\cdot, \gamma^*) \) are Lipschitz continuous, and \( c(x, \gamma) \neq 0 \) for every \( (x, \gamma) \).
3. For each \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( k \in \{0, \ldots, 5\} \), the following conditions hold:
   - The coefficients \( a \) and \( c \) admit extension in \( C(\mathbb{R} \times \Theta) \) and have the partial derivatives \( \partial_x^i \partial_{\alpha}^k a, \partial_x^i \partial_{\gamma}^k c \) possessing extension in \( C(\mathbb{R} \times \Theta) \).
   - There exists nonnegative constant \( C_{i,k} \) satisfying
   \[
   \sup_{(x, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Theta} \frac{1}{1 + |x|^p} \left\{ |\partial_x^i \partial_{\alpha}^k a(x, \alpha)| + |\partial_x^i \partial_{\gamma}^k c(x, \gamma)| + |c^{-1}(x, \gamma)| \right\} < \infty.
   \]

**Assumption 2.3.**

1. There exists a probability measure \( \pi_0 \) such that for every \( q > 0 \), we can find constants \( a > 0 \) and \( C_q > 0 \) for which
   \[
   \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \exp(at)\|P_t(x, \cdot) - \pi_0(\cdot)\|_{h_q} \leq C_qh_q(x),
   \]
for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ where $h_q(x) := 1 + |x|^q$.

(2) For any $q > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} E[|X_t|^q] < \infty.$$

Let $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ be the prior densities for $\gamma$ and $\alpha$, respectively.

**Assumption 2.4.** The prior densities $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ are continuous, and fulfill that

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Theta_\gamma} \pi_1(\gamma) \vee \sup_{\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha} \pi_2(\alpha) < \infty.$$

We define an optimal value $\theta^* := (\gamma^*, \alpha^*)$ of $\theta$ in the following manner:

$$\gamma^* \in \text{argmax}_{\gamma \in \Theta_\gamma} G_1(\gamma), \quad \alpha^* \in \text{argmax}_{\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha} G_2(\alpha),$$

for $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions $G_1(\cdot)$ (resp. $G_2(\cdot)$) on $\Theta_\gamma$ (resp. $\Theta_\alpha$) defined by

$$G_1(\gamma) := -\int_\mathbb{R} \left(\log c^2(x, \gamma) + \frac{C^2(x)}{c^2(x, \gamma)}\right) \pi_0(dx),$$

$$G_2(\alpha) := -\int_\mathbb{R} c(x, \gamma^*)^{-2}(A(x) - a(x, \alpha))^2 \pi_0(dx),$$

Recall that $\Theta := \Theta_\gamma \times \Theta_\alpha$ is supposed to be a bounded convex domain. Then, we assume that:

**Assumption 2.5.**

• $\theta^*$ is unique and is in $\Theta$.

• There exist positive constants $\chi_\gamma$ and $\chi_\alpha$ such that for all $(\gamma, \alpha) \in \Theta$,

$$G_1(\gamma) - G_1(\gamma^*) \leq -\chi_\gamma |\gamma - \gamma^*|^2,$$

$$G_2(\alpha) - G_2(\alpha^*) \leq -\chi_\alpha |\alpha - \alpha^*|^2.$$

Define the $p_\gamma \times p_\gamma$-matrix $I_\gamma$ and $p_\alpha \times p_\alpha$-matrix $I_\alpha$ by:

$$I_\gamma = 4 \int_\mathbb{R} \frac{(\partial_x c(x, \gamma^*))^{\otimes 2}}{c^2(x, \gamma^*)} C^2(x) \pi_0(dx) - 2 \int_\mathbb{R} \frac{\partial^{\otimes 2}(c(x, \gamma^*) c(x, \gamma^*) )}{c^2(x, \gamma^*)} (C^2(x) - C^2(x, \gamma^*)) \pi_0(dx),$$

$$I_\alpha = 2 \int_\mathbb{R} \frac{(\partial_x a(x, \alpha^*))^{\otimes 2}}{c^2(x, \gamma^*)} \pi_0(dx) - 2 \int_\mathbb{R} \frac{\partial^{\otimes 2} a(x, \alpha^*)}{c^2(x, \gamma^*)} (A(x) - a(x, \alpha^*)) \pi_0(dx).$$

**Assumption 2.6.** $I_\gamma$ and $I_\alpha$ are positive definite.

### 3. Main Results

In this paper, we consider the stepwise Gaussian quasi-likelihood functions $G_{1,n}$ and $G_{2,n}$ on $\Theta_\gamma$ and $\Theta_\alpha$, respectively. They are defined by the following manner:

$$G_{1,n}(\gamma) = -\frac{1}{h_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left( h_n \log c_{j-1}^2(\gamma) + \frac{(\Delta_j X)^2}{c_{j-1}^2(\gamma)} \right),$$

$$G_{2,n}(\alpha) = -\frac{n}{h_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{(\Delta_j X - h_0 \alpha_{j-1}(\alpha))^2}{h_n c_{j-1}^2(\gamma_j)} \right).$$

For such functions, we consider the maximum likelihood-type estimators $\hat{\gamma}_n$ and $\hat{\alpha}_n$, that is,

$$\hat{\gamma}_n \in \text{argmax}_{\gamma \in \Theta_\gamma} G_{1,n}(\gamma),$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_n \in \text{argmax}_{\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha} G_{2,n}(\alpha).$$

Building on the stepwise Gaussian quasi-likelihood $G_{1,n}$ and $G_{2,n}$, the next theorem gives the stochastic expansion of the log-marginal quasi-likelihood:

**Theorem 3.1.**

\[
\log \left( \int_{\Theta_\gamma} \exp (G_{1,n}(\gamma)) \, d\gamma \right) = G_{1,n}(\hat{\gamma}_n) - \frac{1}{2} p_\gamma \log n + \log \pi_1(\gamma^*) + \frac{p_\gamma}{2} \log 2 \pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \det I_\gamma + o_p(1),
\]

\[
\log \left( \int_{\Theta_\alpha} \exp (G_{2,n}(\alpha)) \, d\alpha \right) = G_{2,n}(\hat{\alpha}_n) - \frac{1}{2} p_\alpha \log T_\alpha + \log \pi_2(\alpha^*) + \frac{p_\alpha}{2} \log 2 \pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \det I_\alpha + o_p(1).
\]
By ignoring the $O_p(1)$ terms in each expansion, we define two-step quasi-Bayesian information criteria (QBIC) by

\[
\begin{align*}
QBIC_{1,n} &= G_{1,n}(\gamma_n) - \frac{1}{2}p_1 \log n, \\
QBIC_{2,n} &= G_{2,n}(\alpha_n) - \frac{1}{2}p_2 \log (T_n).
\end{align*}
\]

Next, we consider model selection consistency of the proposed information criteria. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1-2.6 hold for the all candidate models and that these exists Theorem 3.2.

\[
\gamma_{m_1} \in \Theta_{\gamma_{m_1}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_{m_1}} \text{ for any } m_1 \leq M_1 \text{ and } \alpha_{m_2} \in \Theta_{\alpha_{m_2}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_{m_2}} \text{ for any } m_2 \leq M_2.
\]

Then, each candidate model $M_{m_1,m_2}$ is defined in a similar manner as the previous section. We assume that the model indexes $m_1^*$ and $m_2^*$ are uniquely given as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_{m_1^*} &= \argmin_{m_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} \dim(\Theta_{\gamma_{m_1}}), \\
\alpha_{m_2^*} &= \argmin_{m_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2} \dim(\Theta_{\alpha_{m_2}}),
\end{align*}
\]

where $\mathcal{M}_1 = \argmax_{1 \leq m_1 \leq M_1} G_{1,n}(\gamma_{m_1})$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 = \argmax_{1 \leq m_2 \leq M_2} G_{2,n}(\alpha_{m_2})$. Then, we say that $M_{m_1^*,m_2^*}$ is the optimal model. That is, the optimal model consists of the elements of optimal model sets $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ which have the smallest dimension. The following theorem means that the proposed criteria and model selection method have the model selection consistency.

**Theorem 3.2.** Suppose that Assumptions 2.1-2.6 hold for the all candidate models and that these exists $M_{m_1^*,m_2^*}$ is the optimal model. Let $m_1 \in \{1, \ldots, M_1\} \setminus \{m_1^*\}$ and $m_2 \in \{1, \ldots, M_2\} \setminus \{m_2^*\}$. Then the model selection consistency of the proposed QBIC hold in the following senses.

\[
\begin{align*}
\lim_{n \to \infty} P\left(QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_1^*)} - QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_1)} > 0\right) &= 1, \\
\lim_{n \to \infty} P\left(QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_2^*)|\hat{m}_1,n} - QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_2)|\hat{m}_1,n} > 0\right) &= 1.
\end{align*}
\]
4. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present simulation results to observe finite-sample performance of the proposed QBIC. We use the R package `yuima`(see [2]) for generating data. In the examples below, all the Monte Carlo trials are based on 1000 independent sample paths, and the simulations are done for \((h_n,T_n) = (0.01,10),(0.005,10),(0.01,50),\) and \((0.005,50)\). We simulate the model selection frequencies by using proposed QBIC and compute the model weight \(w_{m_1,m_2}\) ([3] Section 6.4.5) defined by

\[
 w_{m_1,m_2} = \frac{\exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} (\text{QBIC}^{(m_1)}_{1,n} - \text{QBIC}^{(m_1,n)}_{1,n}) \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^{M_1} \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} (\text{QBIC}^{(k)}_{1,n} - \text{QBIC}^{(m_1,n)}_{1,n}) \right\}} \times \frac{\exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} (\text{QBIC}^{(m_2|m_1)}_{2,n} - \text{QBIC}^{(m_2,n|m_1)}_{2,n}) \right\}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{M_2} \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} (\text{QBIC}^{(\ell|m_1)}_{2,n} - \text{QBIC}^{(m_2,n|m_1)}_{2,n}) \right\}} \times 100.
\]

The model weight can be used to empirically quantify relative frequency (percentage) of the model selection from a single data set. The model which has the highest \(w_{m_1,m_2}\) value is the most probable model. Because of the \((4.2)\), \(w_{m_1,m_2}\) satisfies the equation \(\sum_{k=1}^{M_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{M_2} w_{k,\ell} = 1\).

Suppose that we have a sample \(X_n = (X_t)_{j=0}^n\) with \(t_j = jh_n\) from the true model

\[
dX_t = \frac{1}{2} X_t dt + dw_t, \quad t \in [0,T_n], \quad X_0 = 0,
\]

where \(T_n = nh_n\), and \(w\) is a one-dimensional standard Wiener process. We consider the following diffusion(Diff) and drift(Drift) coefficients:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Diff 1} & : c_1(x, \gamma_1) = \exp \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_1.x + x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 2} & : c_2(x, \gamma_2) = \exp \left\{ \frac{\gamma_2 + \gamma_2.x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 3} & : c_3(x, \gamma_3) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + \gamma_3.x + \gamma_3.x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 4} & : c_4(x, \gamma_4) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + \gamma_4.x + \gamma_4.x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 5} & : c_5(x, \gamma_5) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + \gamma_5.x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 6} & : c_6(x, \gamma_6) = \exp \left\{ \frac{\gamma_6.x^2 + x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\}; \\
\text{Diff 7} & : c_7(x, \gamma_7) = \exp \left\{ \frac{x + \gamma_7.x^2}{1 + x^2} \right\},
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\text{Drift 1} : a_1(x, \alpha_1) = -\alpha_1(x - 1); \quad \text{Drift 2} : a_2(x, \alpha_2) = -\alpha_2 x - 1; \quad \text{Drift 3} : a_3(x, \alpha_3) = -\alpha_3.\]

Each candidate model is given by a combination of diffusion and drift coefficients; for example, in the case of Diff 1 and Drift 1, we consider the statistical model

\[
\text{std}X_t = -\alpha_1(X_t - 1) dt + \exp \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 X_t + X_t^2}{1 + X_t^2} \right\} dw_t.
\]

In this example, although the candidate models do not include the true model, the optimal parameter \((\gamma_{m_1}^*, \alpha_{m_2}^*)\) and optimal model indexes \(m_1^*\) and \(m_2^*\) can be obtained by the functions

\[
\begin{align*}
G_{1}^{(m_i)}(\gamma_{m_i}) = -\int \log e_{m_i}(x, \gamma_{m_i})^2 + \frac{1}{e_{m_i}(x, \gamma_{m_i})^2} \pi_0(dx), \\
G_{2}^{(m_2|m_1)}(\alpha_{m_2}) = -\int e_{m_1}^{-1}(x, \gamma_{m_1}^*)^{-2} \left\{ \frac{x}{2} - a_{m_2}(x, \alpha_{m_2}) \right\}^2 \pi_0(dx),
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\pi_0(dx) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-x^2/2)dx\). The definition of the optimal model, Tables [1] and [2] provide that the optimal model consists of Diff 1 and Drift 1.

Tables [3] summarizes the comparison results of the model selection frequencies and the mean of \(w_{m_1,m_2}\). The indicator of the optimal model defined by Diff 1 and Drift 1 is given by \(w_{1,1}\). For all cases, the optimal model is selected with high frequency, and the value of \(w_{1,1}\) is the highest. Also observed is that the frequencies that the optimal model is selected and the value of \(w_{1,1}\) become higher as \(n\) increases.
Table 1. The values of $G_{1(m_1)}(\gamma_{m_1}^*)$ for each candidate diffusion coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diff 1</th>
<th>Diff 2</th>
<th>Diff 3</th>
<th>Diff 4</th>
<th>Diff 5</th>
<th>Diff 6</th>
<th>Diff 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G_{1(m_1)}(\gamma_{m_1}^*)$</td>
<td>-1.2089</td>
<td>-1.2822</td>
<td>-1.4833</td>
<td>-1.6225</td>
<td>-1.4833</td>
<td>-1.2602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The values of $G_{2(m_2|m_1)}(\alpha_{m_2}^*)$ for each candidate drift coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drif 1</th>
<th>Drif 2</th>
<th>Drif 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G_{2(m_2</td>
<td>m_1)}(\alpha_{m_2}^*)$</td>
<td>-0.0624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The mean of model weight $w_{m_1,m_2}$ and model selection frequencies for various situations. The optimal model consists of Diff 1 and Drif 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_n$</th>
<th>$h_n$</th>
<th>Drif 1</th>
<th>Drif 2</th>
<th>Drif 3</th>
<th>Drif 4</th>
<th>Drif 5</th>
<th>Drif 6</th>
<th>Drif 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>33.19</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3.1 In the following, we consider the zero-extended version of $G_{1,n}(\gamma)$ and $\pi_1(\gamma)$ just for the simplicity of the following discussion. Applying the change of variable, we have

$$
\log \left( \int_{D_{n,\gamma}} \exp \left( G_{1,n}(\gamma) \right) \pi_1(\gamma) d\gamma \right)
= G_{1,n}(\gamma_n) - \frac{p_n}{2} \log n + \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp \left\{ G_{1,n} \left( \gamma_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - G_{1,n}(\gamma_n) \right\} \pi_1 \left( \gamma_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) dt \right).
$$

Below we show that

$$
\log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp \left\{ G_{1,n} \left( \gamma_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - G_{1,n}(\gamma_n) \right\} \pi_1 \left( \gamma_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) dt \right)
= \log \pi_1(\gamma^*) + \frac{p_n}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \det \mathcal{I} + o_p(1).
$$

For a fixed positive constant $\delta$, we divide $\mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ into

$$
D_{1,n} := \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1} : |t| < \delta n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\},
$$
First we look at the integration on $D_{1,n}$. Taylor’s expansion around $\hat{\gamma}_n$ gives

$$\mathbb{G}_{1,n} \left( \hat{\gamma}_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - \mathbb{G}_{1,n} (\hat{\gamma}_n) = \frac{1}{2n} \partial^2_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n} (\hat{\gamma}_n) \frac{t^2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \partial^3_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n} \left( \hat{\gamma}_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} u \right) du [t, t, t].$$

Here, for any $t \in D_{1,n}$, the second term of the right-hand-side is bounded by

$$\delta \left| \frac{1}{6n} \int_0^1 \partial^3_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n} \left( \hat{\gamma}_n + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} u \right) du \right| \left| t \right|^2.$$

It follows from [8, THEOREM 2 (d)] that for any subsequence $\{n_j \} \subset \{n \}$, we can pick a subsequence $\{n_{k_j} \} \subset \{n_j \}$ fulfilling that for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

$$\frac{t}{n_{k_j}} \partial^2_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} -\mathcal{I},$$

$$\frac{1}{n_{k_j}} \int_0^1 \partial^3_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} u \right) du \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 < \infty,$$

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Theta} \left| \pi_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \pi_1 (\gamma^*) \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Theta} \left| \mathbb{G}_{n_{k_j}} (\gamma) - \mathbb{G}_n (\gamma) \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

$$\mathbb{G}_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \mathbb{G}_1 \left( \gamma^* + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

We hereafter write the set $E \subset \Omega$ on which these convergence holds. For simplicity, we write

$$R_{n_{k_j}} = \left| \frac{1}{2n_{k_j}} \partial^2_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) \right| \mathcal{I} \left[ t, t \right] + \delta \left| \frac{1}{6n_{k_j}} \int_0^1 \partial^3_\gamma \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + u \left( \gamma^* - \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} \right) \right) du \right|$$

For any $\omega \in E$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we can pick $N(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ and small enough $\zeta (\omega) > 0$ satisfying that for all $n_{k_j} \geq N(\omega)$ and $\delta < \zeta (\omega), R_{n_{k_j}} (\omega) \leq \epsilon$. For any set $A$, we define the indicator function $1_A (\cdot)$ by:

$$1_A (t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \in A, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $\omega \in E$, we can choose $N(\omega) \leq N'(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n_{k_j} \geq N(\omega)$,

$$\exp \left\{ \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} \right) \right\} \pi_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I}_n [t, t] \right) \pi_1 (\gamma^*) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathcal{I}_{D_{1,n_{k_j}}} (t)$$

$$\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I}_n [t, t] \right) \left( \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \pi_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \pi_1 (\gamma^*) \right) + \sup_{\gamma \in \Theta} \pi_1 (\gamma) \exp \left( \left| t \right|^2 R_{n_{k_j}} \right) \leq \epsilon'.$$

From the positive definiteness of $\mathcal{I}_\gamma$ and above estimates, for all large enough $n_{k_j}$, we have

$$\exp \left\{ \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} \right) \right\} \pi_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) \mathcal{I}_{D_{1,n}} (t) \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Theta} \pi_1 (\gamma) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \mathcal{I}_n [t, t] \right\}.$$

almost surely, and the right-hand-side is integrable over $\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma}$. Thus it follows from $D_{1,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma}$ and the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma}} \exp \left\{ \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) - \mathbb{G}_{1,n_{k_j}} \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} \right) \right\} \pi_1 \left( \hat{\gamma}_{n_{k_j}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{k_j}}} \right) \mathcal{I}_{D_{1,n_{k_j}}} (t) dt \right)$$

$$\xrightarrow{a.s.} \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p_\gamma}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I}_n [t, t] \right) \pi_1 (\gamma^*) \right) dt$$

$$= \log \pi_1 (\gamma^*) + \frac{D_\gamma}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \det \mathcal{I}_\gamma.$$
Now we move on to the evaluation on $D_{2,n}$. Since
\[
\frac{1}{n_{kj}} \left( G_{1,n_{kj}} (\gamma_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1,n_{kj}} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}}) \right) \\
\leq 2 \sup_{\gamma \in \Theta_n} \left| \frac{1}{n_{kj}} G_{1,n_{kj}} (\gamma) - G_{1}(\gamma) \right| + G_{1}(\gamma^{*} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1}(\gamma^{*}) \\
+ G_{1}(\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1}(\gamma^{*} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1}(\gamma_{n_{kj}}) + G_{1}(\gamma^{*}).
\]
on $D_{2,\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}}}$, the identifiability condition and the almost sure convergence of each ingredient imply that on $D_{2,\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}}}$ and for all large enough $n_{kj}$, there exists a positive constant $\epsilon''$ satisfying
\[
(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{n_{kj}} \left( G_{1,n_{kj}} (\gamma_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1,n_{kj}} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}}) \right) < -\epsilon'',
\]
amost surely. Thus we arrive at
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p}} \exp \left\{ G_{1,n_{kj}} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) - G_{1,n_{kj}} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}}) \right\} \pi_{1} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) dD_{2,n_{kj}}(t)dt \\
\leq \exp (-n_{kj}\epsilon'') \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p}} \pi_{1} (\hat{\gamma}_{n_{kj}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n_{kj}}}) dt \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.
\]
Again applying the converse of [8, Theorem 2(d)], we get the convergence in probability, and in turn the almost surely.

**Proof of Theorem 3.2** For proof of Theorem 3.2 we consider the nested model selection case and non-nested model selection case. The (non-)nested model means that the candidate models (do not)include the optimal model. In a similar way as [5, Theorems 3.3] and [6, Theorems 5.5], we can prove that Theorem 3.2 is established for the nested model. Below, we will deal with the non-nested model selection case.

In the non-nested model selection case, because of the definition of the optimal model, we have $G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) > G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*})$ a.s. for every $m_{1} \neq m_{1}^{*}$. Further, the sufficient conditions (3) to (5) give the equations
\[
\frac{1}{n} G_{1,n}(\hat{\gamma}_{m_{1},n} - \gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) = \frac{1}{n} G_{1,n}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) + o_{p}(1) = G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) + o_{p}(1),
\]
\[
\frac{1}{n} G_{1,n}(\hat{\gamma}_{m_{2},n} - \gamma_{m_{2}}^{*}) = \frac{1}{n} G_{1,n}(\gamma_{m_{2}}^{*}) + o_{p}(1) = G_{1}^{(m_{2})}(\gamma_{m_{2}}^{*}) + o_{p}(1).
\]
Hence, for any $m_{1} \in \{1, \ldots, M_{1}\}\backslash\{m_{1}^{*}\}$,
\[
P \left( QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_{1})} - QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_{1})} > 0 \right) = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left( G_{1,n}(\hat{\gamma}_{m_{1},n}) - G_{1,n}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) \right) > p_{m_{1}} - p_{m_{1}} \log \frac{n}{n} \right\} \\
= \mathbb{P} \left\{ G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) - G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) > o_{p}(1) \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) - G_{1}^{(m_{1})}(\gamma_{m_{1}}^{*}) > 0 \right\} + o(1) \\
\xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 1.
\]
As with (5.2), we can show that for any $m_{2} \in \{1, \ldots, M_{2}\}\backslash\{m_{2}^{*}\}$,
\[
P \left( QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_{2})} - QBIC_{1,n}^{(m_{2})} > 0 \right) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 1.
\]
From (5.2) and (5.3), we have
\[
P \left( QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{1},n)} - QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{1},n)} > 0 \right) = P \left( QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{1},n)} - QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{2},n)} > 0, \hat{m}_{1,n} = m_{1}^{*} \right) \\
+ P \left( QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{1},n)} - QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{2},n)} > 0, \hat{m}_{1,n} \neq m_{1}^{*} \right) \\
\leq P \left( QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{1},n)} - QBIC_{2,n}^{(m_{2},n)} > 0 \right) + P (\hat{m}_{1,n} \neq m_{1}^{*})
\]

\[ \begin{align*}
&= P \left( \text{QBIC}_{2,n}^{(m_2^1|m_1^1)} - \text{QBIC}_{2,n}^{(m_2| m_1^1)} > 0 \right) \\
&\quad + P \left( \text{QBIC}_{1,n}^{(m_1^1)} < \text{QBIC}_{1,n}^{(m_1^1)} \right) \\
&\rightarrow 1 + 0 = 1.
\end{align*} \]

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete.
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