

Statistical Inference for Local Granger Causality

Yan Liu*

Institute for Mathematical Science, Waseda University

Masanobu Taniguchi†

Institute for Science and Engineering, Waseda University

and

Hernando Ombao‡

Statistics Program,

King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

January 17, 2021

Abstract

Granger causality has been employed to investigate causality relations between components of stationary multiple time series. Here, we generalize this concept by developing statistical inference for local Granger causality for multivariate locally stationary processes. Thus, our proposed local Granger causality approach captures time-evolving causality relationships in nonstationary processes. The proposed local Granger causality is well represented in the frequency domain and estimated based on the parametric time-varying spectral density matrix using the local Whittle likelihood. Under regularity conditions, we demonstrate that the estimators converge weakly to a Gaussian process. Additionally, the test statistic for the local Granger

*The author gratefully acknowledge *JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 17K12652 and JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 20K11719*

†The author gratefully acknowledge *JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) 18H05290*

‡The author gratefully acknowledge *the KAUST Research Fund*

causality is shown to be asymptotically distributed as a quadratic form of a multivariate normal distribution. The finite sample performance is confirmed with several simulation studies for multivariate time-varying VAR models. For practical demonstration, the proposed local Granger causality method uncovered new functional connectivity relationships between channels in brain signals. Moreover, the method was able to identify structural changes of Granger causality in financial data.

Keywords: local Granger causality, multivariate locally stationary processes, time-varying spectral density matrix, local Whittle likelihood, brain signals.

1 Introduction

Statistical inference for cause and effect remains at the forefront of many studies including biology, medicine, physical systems, environmental science, public health, policy and finance. However, there remain challenges on inference because causality is notoriously difficult to establish. Granger causality, proposed in Granger (1963) and Granger (1969), is a milestone of causal inference in dynamic models. In broad terms, Granger causality from a time series $\{Y_t\}$ to another series $\{X_t\}$ measures the predictive ability from the series $\{Y_t\}$ to $\{X_t\}$. If there is no difference between the predictive abilities of either past $(X_s, Y_s)_{s < t}$ or only past $(X_s)_{s < t}$ on the time series $\{X_t\}$ itself, then the conclusion is that there is “no Granger causal relationship” from the series $\{Y_t\}$ to $\{X_t\}$. Thus, Granger causality analysis is important for determining whether or not a set of variables contains useful information for improving the prediction of another set of variables.

Geweke (1982) and Geweke (1984) considered measures of linear dependence and feedback between components of a multivariate time series in both time and frequency domains. Hosoya (1991) proposed a refinement of the above measures, which also has a well-defined representation in the frequency domain. For nonstationary vector autoregressive (VAR) models, Sims et al. (1990) considered the Wald’s statistic for the hypothesis testing prob-

lem and elucidated its nonstandard asymptotic distribution. Granger causality for nonstationary bivariate cointegrated processes has also been considered in Granger & Lin (1995), among others. A thorough treatment of the Granger causality for multivariate time series is discussed in Lütkepohl (2005).

In this paper, we propose a local Granger causality measure based on locally stationary processes. A locally stationary process has a Cramér-like representation but its transfer function is allowed to change over time. Formal models for the time-varying spectra of nonstationary processes have been developed since this concept was introduced in Priestley (1965). A more theoretically rigorous framework for multivariate locally stationary processes have been formulated in Dahlhaus (2000). To estimate the time-varying spectral density of a locally stationary process, Neumann & von Sachs (1997) developed a wavelet estimator based on the pre-periodogram. The parameter estimation for an evolutionary spectral is discussed in Dahlhaus & Giraitis (1998). Local inference for locally stationary time series was investigated in Dahlhaus (2009). Moreover, Dahlhaus & Polonik (2009) provided a theory for the weak convergence of the empirical spectral processes. To our best knowledge, despite the recent progress on models that capture nonstationary behavior, local Granger causality has not yet been developed. To address this limitation, this paper undertakes the task of developing this local concept because many time series phenomenon display Granger causality behavior that changes over the course of time (e.g., electroencephalograms and stock market indices). Thus, the contribution of this paper is a rigorous framework for statistical inference for local Granger causality.

We focus on multivariate locally stationary processes to develop the statistical inference for local Granger causality. Statistical inference for multivariate stationary processes has been discussed in Hannan (1970), Taniguchi & Kakizawa (2000), Shumway & Stoffer

(2000) and references therein. Taniguchi et al. (1996) developed a nonparametric method to test the cross-relationships between multiple time series. Sakiyama & Taniguchi (2004) discussed the discriminant analysis for multivariate locally stationary processes based on the likelihood ratio. Huang et al. (2004) proposed a SLEX model to develop a discriminant scheme that can extract local features of time series. Ombao et al. (2001) and Ombao et al. (2005) developed models for bivariate and multivariate nonstationary data using the SLEX basis which consists of well-localized Fourier-like waveforms.

As noted, the goal of this paper is to develop statistical inference for local Granger causality for multivariate locally stationary processes. In particular, local Granger causality is expressed in the frequency domain using the foundational ideas on Granger causality for stationary processes. We develop procedure for parameter estimation based on the local Whittle likelihood and theory for the weak convergence of the empirical time-varying spectral matrices. Under regularity conditions, the estimates are shown to converge weakly to a Gaussian process. Parametric Granger causality, however, converges to a Gaussian process or a random vector asymptotically independently distributed as a quadratic form of Gaussian random variables, which depends on the gradient of the causality measure. Several simulation studies were conducted to evaluate the finite sample performance for multivariate time-varying VAR models. To illustrate the potential impact of the proposed work, we analyzed the log-returns of the financial data and multichannel electroencephalogram data. Using the proposed method, the local Granger causality analyses produced new insightful results in the data analyses.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, Granger causality for stationary processes is reviewed and a local Granger causality for locally stationary processes is proposed. In Section 3, we develop statistical inference for local Granger causality

based on the theory of the local Whittle estimation for multivariate locally stationary processes. Results of our investigation on finite sample performance of our estimator and local causality test statistic are reported in Section 4. In Section 5, we apply the proposed local Granger causality to EEG data and financial data. The proofs of the theoretical results are relegated to Section 7 in Supplementary Material (I). Moreover, technical results for the weak convergence of the time-varying spectral density matrices are shown in Supplementary Material (II).

1.1 Notations

\mathbb{S}^p denotes the positive semidefinite cone; vec denotes the vec operator; $O_{m \times M}$ denotes a $m \times M$ zero matrix; \rightsquigarrow denotes the weak convergence in functional space. $\Lambda = [-\pi, \pi]$; I_p denotes the $p \times p$ identity matrix; $|A|$ denotes the determinant of a square matrix A . $\|A\|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}|$ for any square matrix A . Additionally, define l be a function such that

$$l(j) := \begin{cases} 1, & |j| \leq 1, \\ |j| \log^{1+\kappa}|j|, & |j| > 1, \end{cases}$$

for some constant $\kappa > 0$.

2 Local Granger Causality

In this section, we introduce the concept of local Granger causality (LGC) within the framework of locally stationary processes. Let $\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = (X_{t,T}^{(1)}, \dots, X_{t,T}^{(p)})^\top$ be a sequence of

multivariate stochastic processes

$$\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} A_{t,T}(j) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-j}, \quad (1)$$

where the sequences $\{A_{t,T}(j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy the following conditions: there exists a positive constant C_A such that

$$\sup_{t,T} \|A_{t,T}(j)\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)},$$

and there exists a sequence of functions $A(\cdot, j) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (i) $\sup_u \|A(u, j)\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)}$;
- (ii) $\sup_j \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| A_{t,T}(j) - A\left(\frac{t}{T}, j\right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_A$;
- (iii) $V\left(\|A(\cdot, j)\|_{\infty}\right) \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)}$,

where $V(f)$ is the total variation of the function f on the interval $[0, 1]$, i.e., V is defined as

$$V(f) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})|; 0 \leq x_0 < \dots < x_m \leq 1, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

The process (1) is usually referred to as the multivariate locally stationary process.

Assumption 2.1. For the process in (1), let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ be independent and identically distributed with $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \mathbf{0}$ and $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{\top} = K$, where the matrix K exists and all elements are bounded by C_K . Furthermore, the moments of order r of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ exist, and all elements are bounded by $C_{\epsilon}^{(r)}$ for all $r \geq 3$.

The time-varying ARMA (tvARMA) process is a well-known example of the multivariate locally stationary processes.

Example 1 (tvARMA(r, s) process). Suppose A_i^\sharp ($i = 0, \dots, r$), B_j^\sharp ($j = 0, \dots, s$), Σ are matrix-valued curves, i.e., $A_i^\sharp : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $B_j^\sharp : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\Sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$, where $A_0^\sharp(\cdot)$, $B_0^\sharp(\cdot) = I_p$. A tvARMA(r, s) process is defined as

$$\sum_{i=0}^r A_i^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \mathbf{X}_{t-i, T} = \sum_{j=0}^s B_j^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \Sigma^{1/2}\left(\frac{t-j}{T}\right) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-j}, \quad (2)$$

where $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \mathbf{0}$ and $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^\top = I_p$. For the process (2), we introduce the backshift operator $L\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{X}_{t-1}$. Then the process has the expression

$$A_{t, T}^\sharp(L) \mathbf{X}_{t, T} = B_{t, T}^\sharp(L) \Sigma^{1/2}\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t, T}^\sharp(L) &= I_p + A_1^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right)L + \dots + A_r^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right)L^r; \\ B_{t, T}^\sharp(L) &= I_p + B_1^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right)L + \dots + B_s^\sharp\left(\frac{t}{T}\right)L^s. \end{aligned}$$

In a nutshell, the process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t, T}\}$ can be approximated by a stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}^*(u)\}$ in the neighborhood of any fixed time point $u := t/T$. The stationary process is defined by

$$\sum_{j=0}^r A_j^\sharp(u) \mathbf{X}_{t-j}^*(u) = \sum_{k=0}^s B_k^\sharp(u) \Sigma^{1/2}(u) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-k}. \quad (3)$$

For the stationary process in (3), there exists a spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} A^\sharp(u, \lambda)^{-1} B^\sharp(u, \lambda) \Sigma(u) B^\sharp(u, -\lambda)^\top A^\sharp(u, -\lambda)^{-1 \top}, \\ A^\sharp(u, \lambda) &= \sum_{j=0}^r A_j^\sharp(u) \exp(ij\lambda), \quad B^\sharp(u, \lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^s B_k^\sharp(u) \exp(ik\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

which is called the time-varying spectral density matrix.

Now, we introduce the novel concept of local Granger causality based on the framework of multivariate locally stationary processes defined in (2). There is a long list of reference for the inference of the Granger causality (See Lütkepohl (2005) and the references therein). In the following, we consider the locally stationary setting to develop a new set of results. Let $p = m + M$ and $\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = \left(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)\top}, \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)\top} \right)^\top$ such that $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. The backshift operators $A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)$ and $B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)$ are now decomposed into

$$A_{t,T}^\sharp(L) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{11} & A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{12} \\ A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{21} & A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{t,T}^\sharp(L) = \begin{pmatrix} B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{11} & B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{12} \\ B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{21} & B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{11}, B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{12}, B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times M}, \\ A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{21}, B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times m}, \quad A_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{22}, B_{t,T}^\sharp(L)_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}.$$

With an abuse of the notation “ \cdot ”, let $H(\tau_1, \tau_2)$, $H(\tau_1, \cdot)$, $H(\cdot, \tau_2)$ be the linear closed subspace generated by $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}, t \leq \tau_1; \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau_2\}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}, t \leq \tau_1\}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau_2\}$, respectively. To see the causal effect from $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ to an univariate process $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ (i.e., $m = 1$), Granger (1963) and Granger (1969) introduced his famous causality measure based on the difference of the variances of the following prediction errors:

$$\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1} = \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, \cdot))] - \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, t-1))]. \quad (4)$$

Note that the so-called measure (4) is nonnegative, but it does not satisfy the mathematical conditions for being a metric.

Geweke (1982) provided a natural extension of the measure (4) as

$$\text{GM}^{2 \rightarrow 1} := \log \frac{\det \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, \cdot))]}{\det \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, t-1))]}, \quad (5)$$

which we shall call the Geweke measure. The drawback of the Geweke measure is that it does not take into account the information on the one-step-ahead prediction error $\Sigma(u)$.

A natural refinement was proposed in Hosoya (1991), which considered the effect from $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} | H(t, t-1))\}$ instead of $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$. To illustrate this idea, define

$$\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)} = \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} | H(t, t-1)), \quad (6)$$

and $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}(\tau)$ to be the linear closed subspace generated by $\{\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau\}$. The Granger causality from $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ to $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ in Hosoya (1991) is rephrased as

$$\text{HM}^{2 \rightarrow 1} := \log \frac{\det \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, \cdot))]}{\det \text{var}[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | \sigma\{H(t-1, \cdot) \cup \mathcal{H}^{(2)}(t-1)\})]}, \quad (7)$$

which we shall call the Hosoya measure. The representation in the frequency domain of the Hosoya measure is elucidated in (1.1) in Hosoya (1991).

Remark 2.1. Note that the term ‘‘Hosoya measure’’ first coined in Granger & Lin (1995).

The Hosoya measure accounts for the correlation between the one-step-ahead-prediction errors of both processes $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$. Moreover, both the Hosoya and Geweke measures are identical under the following conditions:

- (i) if the joint process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ is an autoregressive process; or
- (ii) if $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ does not cause $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ in the Granger sense.

Especially in the case $s = 0$, both the Geweke and Hosoya measures are equivalent. However, if $s > 0$, then the subspaces generated by $H(t-1, \cdot)$ and $H(\cdot, t-1)$ may not, in general, be orthogonal. In other words, the one-step-ahead prediction error terms may be correlated to each other. This is illustrated from Figure 1. We remark that the Hosoya

measure is a natural refinement of the Geweke measure in the sense that the former accounts for the correlation between prediction errors.




Figure 1: (Left) Subspaces generated by $H(t-1, \cdot)$ and $H(\cdot, t-1)$. Red arrows show the subspace perpendicular to $H(t-1, \cdot)$. (Right) The subspace $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}(t-1)$ taken in the Hosoya measure instead of $H(\cdot, t-1)$.

The terms in the Geweke and Hosoya measures are shown in Figure 2. Note that the prediction errors $[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, \cdot))]$ are shown in blue; the prediction error $[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, t-1))]$ (resp. $[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | \sigma\{H(t-1, \cdot) \cup \mathcal{H}^{(2)}(t-1)\})]$) is shown in red. They coincide when $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ does not cause $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ in the Granger sense (Figure 3).




Figure 2: Geweke measure (left) and Hosoya measure (right).




Figure 3: The case when $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ does not cause $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}$ in the Granger sense.

The Hosoya measure has a natural formulation in the frequency domain. For multivariate locally stationary processes $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ in (1), the time-varying spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} A(u, \lambda) K A(u, -\lambda)^\top, \quad (8)$$

where $A(u, \lambda) := \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} A(u, j) \exp(ij\lambda)$. Decomposing the time-varying spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ of the process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ leads to the following block matrix

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

such that the processes $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$ are locally stationary with the time-varying spectral densities $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}$ and $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}$, respectively, and the cross-spectral density $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} =$

$\mathbf{f}(u, -\lambda)_{21}^T$. In addition, the one-step-ahead prediction error $\Sigma(u)$ has the following decomposition

$$\Sigma(u) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma(u)_{11} & \Sigma(u)_{12} \\ \Sigma(u)_{21} & \Sigma(u)_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

We are now in position to present the expression of the Hosoya measure (7) in the frequency domain. The expression contains two different spectral densities $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ and $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$, where $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ is the time-varying spectral density of the process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ and $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ is the time-varying spectral density of the process $\{(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)T}, \mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)T})^T\}$, where $\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)}$ is defined in (6). Similarly, let $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ be a $p \times p$ matrix defined to be

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

such that both processes $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$ are locally stationary with the time-varying spectral densities $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}$ and $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}$, respectively, and the cross-spectral density $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} = \mathbf{f}(u, -\lambda)_{21}^T$. Now, we propose the local Granger causality measure

$$\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{FGC}(u, \lambda) d\lambda, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\text{FGC}(u, \lambda) = \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22}^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} \right|}$$

and $\tilde{\Sigma}(u)$ is an $(M \times M)$ -matrix

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} = \Sigma(u)_{22} - \Sigma(u)_{21} \Sigma(u)_{11}^{-1} \Sigma(u)_{12}. \quad (13)$$

Here, $\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}$ is the representation of the Hosoya measure in the frequency domain for locally stationary processes, based on (1.1) in Hosoya (1991). It is straightforward to see that (13) is the orthogonalization term for the one-step-ahead prediction error.

3 Statistical Inference for Local Granger Causality

In this section, we develop the foundations for statistical inference for local Granger causality. The proofs of the theoretical results are relegated to Section 7 in Supplementary Material.

3.1 Local Whittle estimation

Let $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ be the multivariate locally stationary process defined by (1) with the time-varying spectral density $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ defined by (8). The starting point is local estimation by fitting a certain parametric spectral density model $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}(u) \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $u \in [0, 1]$.

Consider the observation stretch $(\mathbf{X}_{1,T}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{T,T})$ and define $\mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda)$ to be the pre-periodogram matrix

$$\mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l: 1 \leq [uT+1/2+l/2] \leq T} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2+l/2], T} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2-l/2], T}^\top \exp(-i\lambda l). \quad (14)$$

Note that the pre-periodogram $\mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda)$ was first introduced in Neumann & von Sachs (1997).

The local Whittle likelihood $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right) d\lambda. \quad (15)$$

Let $u_k := k/T$. For any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$, define the local Whittle estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)$ to be

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) := \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u), \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{L}_T is the sample analogue of \mathcal{L} , which is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K \left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T} \right) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right) d\lambda. \quad (17)$$

To investigate the asymptotic properties of the local Whittle estimator (16), the following assumptions are imposed on the class of the time-varying spectral densities and the kernel estimators.

Assumption 3.1.

- (i) The time-varying spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to u for $u \in (0, 1)$.
- (ii) $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative, bounded symmetric continuous function of bounded variation with a compact support $[-1, 1]$ satisfying $\int K(x) dx = 1$. Let

$$K_b(x) := \frac{1}{b} K\left(\frac{x}{b}\right),$$

where $b := b_T \rightarrow 0$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

We now specify the regularity conditions for the parametric model $\mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)$ and the local parameter $\theta(u)$. For the brevity, let $\theta := \theta(u)$ when u does not matter.

Assumption 3.2.

- (i) For any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$, $\theta(u) \in \Theta$, where Θ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d .
- (ii) If $\theta^{(1)} \neq \theta^{(2)}$, then $\mathbf{f}_{\theta^{(1)}} \neq \mathbf{f}_{\theta^{(2)}}$ on a set of positive Lebesgue measure;
- (iii) The parametric spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)$ is bounded away from 0 for each component, and is continuously differentiable with respect to λ for $\lambda \in (-\pi, \pi)$.
- (iv) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, \mathbf{f}_θ is positive definite and it is twice continuously differentiable with respect to θ ;
- (v) For any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$,

(v-a) $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u) \in \Theta$ is the unique minimizer of $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ and lies in the interior of Θ ;

(v-b) the matrices

$$M_I^u = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda) \right\} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) \right] d\lambda$$

and

$$M_f^u = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right\} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) \right] d\lambda$$

are both positive definite.

First, let us consider the local Whittle likelihood estimation function $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$. Let $l^\infty([0, 1])$ be the set of all uniformly bounded, real-valued functions $z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|z\|_{[0,1]} = \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |z(u)| < \infty.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2 hold. If $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, then we have*

$$\sqrt{T b_T} (\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)) \rightsquigarrow \zeta(u) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]),$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\zeta(u)$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\zeta(u^{(j)}), \zeta(u^{(k)})) = & \\ & 4\pi \delta(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \int_{-1}^1 K(v)^2 dv \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right) d\lambda \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r,t,u,v=1}^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{rt}(\lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{uv}(\lambda) \tilde{\gamma}_{rtuv}(u^{(j)}; -\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) \right) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right), \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

Remark 3.2. From the proof of Theorem 3.1, that the main order of bias is $O(T^{1/2}b_T^{5/2})$ and the asymptotic variance is of order $O(T^{-1}b_T^{-1})$. The optimal order of the bandwidth b_T can be determined by equating squared bias and variance. Thus, we obtain the optimal order $b_T = O(T^{-1/3})$ and the mean square error is $O(T^{-2/3})$. This optimal order is similar to the one derived in Künsch (1989) in the context of time series analysis.

Let $M_{f,0}^u$ be

$$M_{f,0}^u = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right\} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) \right]_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} d\lambda.$$

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2 hold. If $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, then we have*

$$\sqrt{Tb_T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)) \rightsquigarrow (M_{f,0}^u)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0(u) := \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]), \quad (19)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_0(u)$ is a zero-mean multivariate Gaussian process with covariance matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\zeta_0^{(a)}(u^{(j)}), \zeta_0^{(b)}(u^{(k)})) &= 4\pi \delta(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \int_{-1}^1 K(v)^2 dv \\ &\quad \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_a} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right\} \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_b} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right\} \right] d\lambda \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r,t,u,v=1}^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_a} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{rt}(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_b} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{uv}(\lambda) \tilde{\gamma}_{rtuv}(u^{(j)}; -\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) \right) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right), \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

($a, b = 1, \dots, d$), where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

3.2 Inference for causality measures

In this subsection, we develop the statistical inference for the local Granger causality measure (12). With the parametric model $\{\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}(u) \in \Theta\}$, like (9) and (10), the parametric

spectral density matrix and the covariance matrix of one-step-ahead prediction error of the process are decomposed as follows

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),11} & \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),12} \\ \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),21} & \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22} \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively.

Assumption 3.3. For any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$,

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log |\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda > -\infty.$$

Remark 3.4. Assumption 3.3 is usually referred to as the maximal rank condition. Under Assumption 3.3, $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$ is non-degenerate a.e. and $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$ is positive definite for any $u \in [0, 1]$.

Now we specify the corresponding time-varying spectral matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ in (11) by $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$ and $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$ admits a decomposition

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

With an abuse of notation, under Assumption 3.3, $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$, defined on the unit disk \mathcal{D} in the complex plane, can be factorized as

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(z) \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(z)^*, \quad z \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (22)$$

Especially, as shown in Rozanov (1967), it holds that

$$\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(0)\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(0)^*. \quad (23)$$

From Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 in Hosoya (1991), we have

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}, \quad \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21}^*, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} -\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),21}\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),11}^{-1} & I_M \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(0)\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(e^{i\lambda})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} \\ \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{22} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22} - \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),21}\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),11}^{-1}\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),12} \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Intuitively, the parametric Hosoya measure for (7) is

$$\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda) \, d\lambda, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda) = \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21} \right|}.$$

The relation (27) is established by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.5 (Hosoya (1991), Theorem 2.2). *Under Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3, we have*

$$\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda) \, d\lambda.$$

Remark 3.6. The local linear dependence, Hosoya's causality measures from $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$ to $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ and from $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ to $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$, and local instantaneous linear feedback are

$$\text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}| |\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)|} \, d\lambda, \quad (28)$$

$$\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11}|} d\lambda \quad (29)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} \right|} d\lambda,$$

$$\text{GC}^{(1 \rightarrow 2)}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22}|} d\lambda \quad (30)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} - 2\pi \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{21} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12} \right|} d\lambda,$$

$$\text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11}| |\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)|} d\lambda, \quad (31)$$

respectively. The deviations of (28) – (31) can be found in Subsection 7.1 in Supplementary Material (I). It always holds true that, for $u \in [0, 1]$,

$$\text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u) = \text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u) + \text{GC}^{(1 \rightarrow 2)}(u) + \text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u). \quad (32)$$

We now introduce the parametric Hosoya measure $\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, the parametric local linear dependence $\text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, and the parametric local instantaneous feedback $\text{GC}^{(1 \rightarrow 2)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta})$. They correspond to each true quantities in (32). To conduct statistical inference for the Granger causality, we consider the plug-in estimator $\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T)$ in the following, but the approach is not restricted to the causality measure $\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}$. The statistical inference is also possible to be applied to the local linear dependence (28) or local linear feedback (31). In view of this aspect, we use the notation $\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}$ for its utility.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. If we have, for some $i = 1, \dots, d$,*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(\cdot)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} \neq 0, \quad \text{for some } \lambda \in (-\pi, \pi], \quad (33)$$

uniformly in $u \in [0, 1]$, and if $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, then we have

$$\sqrt{T b_T} \left(\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \rightsquigarrow \zeta_0^{\text{GC}}(u) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]).$$

Here $\zeta_0^{\text{GC}}(u)$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance matrices

$$\text{Cov}(\zeta_0^{\text{GC}}(u^{(j)}), \zeta_0^{\text{GC}}(u^{(k)})) = \left(\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u^{(j)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \mathbb{V}(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \left(\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^\top,$$

where $\mathbb{V}(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)})$ is the covariance matrices of the process $\tilde{\zeta}_0(u)$ in Theorem 3.3,

$$\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0), \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_d} \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^\top$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^{(\cdot)}(\lambda) \, d\lambda. \quad (34)$$

There are situations when condition (33) may not be satisfied. That is, for some $u = u_1, \dots, u_m \in [0, 1]$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(\cdot)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{a.e. } \lambda. \quad (35)$$

In this case, define $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)$ as $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u) := \mathbb{V}(u, u)$ in Theorem 3.7, and

$$\text{CGC}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) := \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0). \quad (36)$$

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. In addition, assume (35) but for $u = u_1, \dots, u_m \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathcal{H}(u, \lambda) := \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(\cdot)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} \neq O_{d \times d}, \quad \text{for some } \lambda \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H}(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathcal{H}(u, \lambda) \, d\lambda.$$

Then if $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, the following result holds

$$Tb_T \left(2 \text{CGC}^{(\cdot)}(u_1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T), \dots, 2 \text{CGC}^{(\cdot)}(u_m; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \\ \xrightarrow{d} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u_1)^\top \mathcal{H}(u_1) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u_1), \dots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u_m)^\top \mathcal{H}(u_m) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u_m) \right), \quad (37)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u)$ is the Gaussian process defined in Theorem 3.3. In particular, if $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)^{-1/2} \mathcal{H}(u) \tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)^{-1/2}$ is an idempotent matrix, then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u)^\top \mathcal{H}(u) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_0(u)$ has a chi-squared distribution χ_ν^2 with the degrees of freedom

$$\nu = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)^{-1/2} \mathcal{H}(u) \tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)^{-1/2}).$$

Example 2 (Local Granger causality). Let the time-varying spectral density $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)$ be

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} (I_2 + A^\sharp(u) \exp(i\lambda))^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{12} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} (I_2 + A^\sharp(u)^\top \exp(-i\lambda))^{-1},$$

where $A^\sharp(u) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11}(u) & \alpha_{12}(u) \\ \alpha_{21}(u) & \alpha_{22}(u) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\alpha_{12}(u) \equiv 0$.

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T = (\hat{\alpha}_{11}(u), \hat{\alpha}_{12}(u), \hat{\alpha}_{21}(u), \hat{\alpha}_{22}(u), \hat{\sigma}_{11}, \hat{\sigma}_{12}, \hat{\sigma}_{22})^\top$ be the local Whittle estimator and we adopt the parametric spectral density

$$\mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(I_2 + \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix} \exp(i\lambda) \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{12} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix} \left(I_2 + \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}^\top \exp(-i\lambda) \right)^{-1},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{22}, s_{11}, s_{12}, s_{22})^\top$.

In this case, we have

$$\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} -\log \left| 1 - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{21} \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{11}^{-1} \right| d\lambda.$$

Thus, $\text{FGC}_\theta^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda)$ is

$$\text{FGC}_\theta^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) = -\log \left| 1 - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{21} \mathbf{f}_\theta(\lambda)_{11}^{-1} \right|.$$

A straightforward computation leads to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) \Big|_{a_{12}=0} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

In addition, it holds that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_{12}^2} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} = \frac{2(\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} - \sigma_{12}^2)^2}{\sigma_{11}^4} \frac{|1 - \alpha_{11}(u) \exp(i\lambda)|^2}{|1 - \alpha_{22}(u) \exp(i\lambda)|^2} > 0;$$

and for all $\lambda \in (-\pi, \pi]$,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} = 0, \quad \text{for } \theta_i \neq a_{12} \text{ or } \theta_j \neq a_{12}.$$

Applying Theorem 3.8, we obtain

$$Tb_T \frac{\sigma_{11}^4 \left(\int_{-1}^1 K(v)^2 dv \right)^{-1}}{(1 + \alpha_{11}(u)^2 - 2\alpha_{11}(u)\alpha_{22}(u))(\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} - \sigma_{12}^2)^2} \text{CGC}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) \xrightarrow{d} \chi_1^2, \quad (38)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(u)_{22} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_{12}^2} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{2(1 + \alpha_{11}(u)^2 - 2\alpha_{11}(u)\alpha_{22}(u))(\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} - \sigma_{12}^2)^2}{(1 - \alpha_{22}(u)^2)\sigma_{11}^4} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)_{22} = (1 - \alpha_{22}(u)^2) \int_{-1}^1 K(v)^2 dv.$$

3.3 Hypothesis testing for causality measures

We now address the hypothesis testing problem for the local measures $\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}$. Recall that $\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}$ contains the measures of local linear dependence, local causality and local instantaneous linear feedback between $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$. For clarity and focus, we will study in detail only the local causality measures $\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}$.

Suppose that we want to test for local causality at a particular rescaled time $u \in [0, 1]$. Define the local hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)}$ to be

$$H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = c. \quad (39)$$

Here we only consider the case $c = 0$. For some purpose, the case $c > 0$ may be of interest. We attached the consideration for case $c > 0$ to Supplementary Material (IV).

Note that

$$\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{11}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{21} \right|} d\lambda,$$

and thus, $\text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ if and only if

$$|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{11}| = \left| \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{21} \right|. \quad (40)$$

Here, $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{11}$ and $2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{21}$ are both Hermitian. Thus, the equality (40) holds if

$$2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{21} = O_{m \times m}.$$

It follows that $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} = O_{m \times M}$, since $\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, 22} \right)^{-1}$ is positive definite. Since $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)_{12} = O_{m \times M}$, it is straightforward to see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(\lambda) = \mathbf{0},$$

which is the case we considered in Theorem 3.8.

Accordingly, for the local hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = 0$, we take

$$S^\dagger(u) := 2T b_T \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T)$$

as the test statistic. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Under the null hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = 0$, if $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, it holds that*

$$S^\dagger(u) \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{\zeta}_1^{\text{GC}}(u)^\top \mathcal{H}(u) \tilde{\zeta}_1^{\text{GC}}(u).$$

where $\tilde{\zeta}_1^{\text{GC}}(u)$ is defined in Theorem 3.8.

Remark 3.10. In practice, the matrix $\mathcal{H}(u)$ should be replaced with its plug-in version

$$\mathcal{H}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \text{FGC}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(\cdot)}(\lambda) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u)} d\lambda$$

to construct an asymptotic $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence interval for $\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u)$. Instead, in some situation, for instance, as a continuation of Example 2, if we take

$$\tilde{S}^\dagger(u) := T b_T \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{11}^4 \left(\int_{-1}^1 K(v)^2 dv \right)^{-1}}{\left(1 + \hat{\alpha}_{11}(u)^2 - 2\hat{\alpha}_{11}(u)\hat{\alpha}_{22}(u) \right) \left(\hat{\sigma}_{11}\hat{\sigma}_{22} - \hat{\sigma}_{12}^2 \right)^2} \text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T)$$

as a sample version of the left hand side in (38), then the confidence interval is $[0, \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2]$, where $\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2$ denotes the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of the chi-squared distribution with 1 degree of freedom. It is straightforward to see that the test by $\tilde{S}^\dagger(u)$ is consistent. If the null hypothesis is rejected, then the conclusion is that at level α there is sufficient evidence to suggest that there exists local Granger causality from one series to another at rescaled time $u \in [0, 1]$.

4 Numerical Simulations

In this section, we investigate the finite sample performance of our proposed local Whittle estimation and the hypothesis testing for non-causality of multiple time series.

4.1 Finite sample performance of local Whittle estimation

of the local Whittle estimation. Let $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ be a multivariate locally stationary process defined by

$$\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = A\left(\frac{t}{T}\right)\mathbf{X}_{t-1,T} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t, \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_2). \quad (41)$$

We consider two examples for the time-varying coefficient matrix $A(\cdot)$. Let $A^{(i)}(u)$ and $A^{(ii)}(u)$ be

$$A^{(i)}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & a_{12}(u) \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A^{(ii)}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 7/10 & a_{12}(u) \\ 0 & 3/10 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a_{12}(u)$ is defined as

$$a_{12}(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq u \leq 1/\pi, \\ \pi(u - 1/\pi)/2, & 1/\pi \leq u \leq 2/\pi, \\ 1/2, & 2/\pi \leq u \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that a_{12} is a piecewise continuous function. Additionally, a_{12} is not differentiable at $1/\pi$ and $2/\pi$, but $a_{12}(t/T)$ does not take values on those points since they are irrational. Thus, a_{12} could be replaced by a differentiable function to be refined.

To study the finite sample performance of the local Whittle estimation, define $\mathbf{f}_\theta^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{f}_\theta^{(ii)}$ to be

$$\mathbf{f}_\theta^{(\bullet)}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} A_\theta^{(\bullet)}(\lambda)^{-1} \left(A_\theta^{(\bullet)}(-\lambda)^T \right)^{-1}, \quad \bullet = (i) \text{ or } (ii),$$

where $A_\theta^{(i)}(u, \lambda)$ and $A_\theta^{(ii)}(u, \lambda)$ are

$$A_\theta^{(i)}(u, \lambda) = I_2 - \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & \theta \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \exp(-i\lambda), \quad A_\theta^{(ii)}(u, \lambda) = I_2 - \begin{pmatrix} 7/10 & \theta \\ 0 & 3/10 \end{pmatrix} \exp(-i\lambda).$$

The local Whittle likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_T(u)$ is defined as in (16), where the Epanechnikov kernel is used with the bandwidth $b_T = 4T^{1/3}$. The procedure was examined from 100 time series datasets where $T = 50$, and also 100 datasets where $T = 100$.

Define $\hat{\theta}_T^{(j)}(u)$ to be the estimate from the j th dataset where $j = 1, \dots, 100$. The numerical results of the mean, 5th and 95th percentile of the estimates $\{\hat{\theta}_T^{(j)}(u)\}$ are shown in Figure 4. Both results for Examples (i) and (ii) are similar. In this finite sample performance, our estimates $\hat{\theta}_T^{(j)}(u)$ has some bias from the true function $a_{12}(u)$, but they capture the general form of the true function. Moreover, we note that the estimation is asymptotically unbiased from the theoretical results. Compared with the case when $T = 50$, the confidence interval has narrower widths with the same coverage probability when $T = 100$. These observations can be justified by our theoretical results.




Figure 4: Example (i) (left) and Example (ii) (right). The function a_{12} is shown in red; The mean, 5th and 95th percentile of the estimates when $T = 50$ are shown in blue; The mean, 5th and 95th percentile of the estimates when $T = 100$ are shown in orange.

4.2 Testing for non-causality

Using model (41) with $A(u)$ as in Example (i), but $a_{12}(u)$ is

$$a_{12}(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq u \leq \frac{5}{2\pi}, \\ \frac{\pi}{2}(u - \frac{5}{2\pi}), & \frac{5}{2\pi} \leq u \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

In this simulation study, we tested the local hypothesis

$$H_0^{(2 \rightarrow 1)} : GC^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u) = 0. \quad (43)$$

for the following values of rescaled time $u = 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9$. The null hypothesis is rejected whenever

$$\tilde{S}^\dagger(u) > \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2, \quad (44)$$

which the details for have been considered in Remark 3.10.

The rejection probabilities of the test (44) based on 1000 simulations are reported in Table 1. The rejection probabilities when $u = 0.1$ is very close to the nominal significance level α . However, the rejection probabilities when $u = 0.3, 0.5, 0.7$ seem conservative compared with the nominal significance level. This stems from the different asymptotic distributions between $\alpha_{12} = 0$ and $\alpha_{12} \neq 0$ (see Theorems 3.7 and 3.8). Table 1 confirms that the local power for testing the null hypothesis (43) increase with u , because of the feature of the function a_{12} in the model (41). In summary, the testing for non-local Granger causality can be seen as a methodology to find a predictive sign to detect the structural change of a dynamic model.

Table 1: Rejection probabilities of the test (44) for the model (41) with a_{12} in (42).

α	$u = 0.1$	$u = 0.3$	$u = 0.5$	$u = 0.7$	$u = 0.9$
1%	0.007	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.019
5%	0.043	0.020	0.015	0.030	0.065
10%	0.096	0.053	0.037	0.081	0.123
15%	0.152	0.085	0.071	0.111	0.186

5 Analysis of Epileptic Seizure Data

In this section, we apply local Granger causality to electroencephalogram (EEG) data. Due to space limitations, the numerical results for financial data are shown in Supplementary Material (III), which reveals that the financial data have different topological structures of causality before and after the financial crisis.

5.1 EEG data

We provide a brief description of the data. The EEG signals are sampled at the rate of 100 Hertz. The recordings are taken from channels the central channels (C3, C4, Cz), parietal channels (P3, P4) and the temporal channels (T3, T4, T5) which correspond roughly to the central, parietal and temporal brain cortical regions (See Figure 8 in Supplementary Material (III)). The original dataset has 32680 time points for each channel (i.e., the period of the observation is 326.8 seconds). This dataset was previously analyzed in Ombao et al. (2005) and Schröder & Ombao (2019). However, none of these two papers addressed the very important issue of causality. This is first paper that examined local Granger causality features in this data.

Local Granger causality was estimated and tested at every rescaled time point $u_k = 2.1k/326.8$ and $u_k = 4.2k/326.8$, due to the computational cost of the local Whittle estimation. This is equivalent to estimating and testing every 2.1 and 4.2 seconds respectively. We refer to these partial data as one at regular intervals of 2.1 seconds and 4.2 seconds. In Figure 5, we show the logarithm of local Granger causality between two specific channels P3 (left parietal) and T3 (left temporal). These two channels are of primary interest because the patient suffered from left temporal lobe epilepsy - though the precise location is quite close to the parietal lobe. Thus the seizure focus is the left temporal lobe and any

abnormalities in the EEG are captured in the T3 and P3 channels. The 95% confidence intervals are shown below: the dashed one is computed from the data at regular intervals of 4.2 seconds; the dotted one is computed from the data at regular intervals of 2.1 seconds.




Figure 5: The logarithm of local Granger causality (LLGC) from the channel T3 to P3 (left) and that from the channel P3 to T3 (right) during the rescaled time $u \in [0, 1]$. The LLGC for data at regular intervals of 4.2 seconds is shown in black and that for those of 2.1 seconds are shown in orange. The dashed red line shows the 95% confidence levels computed from the data at regular intervals of 4.2 seconds, while the dotted red line shows the 95% confidence levels computed from the data at regular intervals of 2.1 seconds.

The partial data at regular intervals of 2.1 seconds and 4.2 seconds share a very similar move of the logarithm of local Granger causality and the 95% confidence intervals are also very similar. In general, the higher temporal resolution the sampling is, theoretically more accurate the estimates are. In our simulation results, the estimates from the data at regular intervals of 2.1 seconds are as good as that of 4.2 seconds. The analysis suggests that T3 does not cause P3 in the Granger sense, but P3 causes T3 in the Granger sense at latest after the rescaled time $u = 0.15$. This is a quite interesting finding because previous analyses have focused on the T3 channel because of the distinctly large amplitudes immediately post-seizure onset. However, the novel finding here is that the direction of Granger causality actually flows from P3 to T3. This suggests that, despite the relatively lower amplitude

changes in P3, it still explains the future large amplitude fluctuations in T3.




Figure 6: Plots of the logarithms of local Granger causality from the channels C3, Cz, C4 in the column to the channels C3, Cz, C4 in the row. The 95% confidence intervals are below the dashed red lines; The dashed black lines show the logarithms of local Granger causalities.

Next, we further investigate the local causalities between the central channels C3, Cz and C4 at regular intervals of 4.2 seconds. Figure 6 represents the numerical results of the causality from the column to the row. For example, the middle plot in the first row shows the causality from the channel C3 to Cz. Still, the 95% confidence intervals are below the dashed red lines and the logarithms of local Granger causalities are shown by the dashed black lines. From Figure 6, the conclusion is that channel the left central channel C3 does not cause central channel Cz. Moreover, the right central channel C4 does not cause channels C3 and Cz - in the local Granger sense. In other cases, local Granger causality changes across the evolution of the epileptic seizure which confirms the dynamic activity of the brain. This is a new finding since all previous analyses were limited to modeling dependence using only coherence which accounts for contemporaneous dependence; that

is, there was no phase or lead-lag analysis. Moreover, this novel finding is quite interesting because a change in the causality structure was captured even before the onset of the epileptic seizure, which was approximately at $u = 0.5$.




Figure 7: Plots of the logarithms of local Granger causality from the channels T3, T5, T4 in the column to the channels T3, T5, T4 in the row. The 95% confidence intervals are below the dashed red lines; The dashed black lines show the logarithms of local Granger causalities.

Similarly, we studied the causalities between the temporal channels T3, T5, T4 at regular intervals of 4.2 seconds. The plots of the numerical results are shown in Figure 7. Remember that the channels T3 and T4 are symmetrically located at both the left and right temporal cortical regions, respectively. The plots suggest that T3 and T4 do not cause each other in the local Granger sense. Furthermore, the channel T5, also on the left temporal cortical region, uniformly causes T3 in the data which is another interesting novel finding. It is already known to the neurologist that the patient has left temporal lobe epilepsy and that seizure events are generally initiated in the "left temporal" region (which is the area covered by the T3 and T5 channels). Using the novel proposed concept

of local Granger causality, the analysis produced a highly specific result of brain functional connectivity, that is, the direction goes from T5 to T3 and not the other way around. As an additional result, P3 and P4 do not cause each other uniformly in the local Granger sense at 95% confidence level.

6 Conclusion

The primary contribution of this paper is statistical inference for local Granger causality for multivariate time series under the framework of multivariate locally stationary processes. Our proposed concept of local Granger causality is a generalization of Geweke's measure and Hosoya's measure - both of which were developed only for stationary processes. Our proposed generalization is well characterized in the frequency domain and has the advantage of being able to capture time-evolving causality relationships. We developed a procedure for hypothesis testing for the existence of the local Granger causality from a parametric point of view. We demonstrate, through the analysis of real data, the efficiency and efficacy of this procedure to find the time-evolving aspects of the local Granger causality, which could be overlooked by the existing method for causality analysis.

In summary, we proposed a consistent method to detect the time change of the local Granger causality. While our proposed method is nonparametric, we note that a procedure for stationary processes was developed in Taniguchi et al. (1996). This could serve as an inspiration for constructing a nonparametric method for locally stationary processes to test for the local Granger causality, and compare the performance of both approaches. For multiple time series, to investigate the time change of the local Granger causality also suffers from the curse of dimensionality. There are many remaining challenges including dimension reduction in terms of causality between each component of multiple time series. In addition

to the Lasso method in Tibshirani (1996), most penalized estimation procedures could be added to our parametric approach to shrink some minor causality between components. A frequency-specific local causality approach will also be elucidated in our future work.

References

- Brillinger, D. R. (1981), *Time series: data analysis and theory*, Vol. 36, SIAM.
- Dahlhaus, R. (2000), ‘A likelihood approximation for locally stationary processes’, *The Annals of Statistics* **28**(6), 1762–1794.
- Dahlhaus, R. (2009), ‘Local inference for locally stationary time series based on the empirical spectral measure’, *Journal of Econometrics* **151**(2), 101–112.
- Dahlhaus, R. & Giraitis, L. (1998), ‘On the optimal segment length for parameter estimates for locally stationary time series’, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **19**(6), 629–655.
- Dahlhaus, R. & Polonik, W. (2009), ‘Empirical spectral processes for locally stationary time series’, *Bernoulli* **15**(1), 1–39.
- Fasy, B. T., Lecci, F., Rinaldo, A., Wasserman, L., Balakrishnan, S. & Singh, A. (2014), ‘Confidence sets for persistence diagrams’, *The Annals of Statistics* **42**(6), 2301–2339.
- Geweke, J. (1982), ‘Measurement of linear dependence and feedback between multiple time series’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **77**(378), 304–313.
- Geweke, J. F. (1984), ‘Measures of conditional linear dependence and feedback between time series’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **79**(388), 907–915.

- Giné, E., Koltchinskii, V., Zinn, J. et al. (2004), ‘Weighted uniform consistency of kernel density estimators’, *The Annals of Probability* **32**(3B), 2570–2605.
- Granger, C. W. (1969), ‘Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods’, *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* **37**(3), 424–438.
- Granger, C. W. J. (1963), ‘Economic processes involving feedback’, *Information and Control* **6**(1), 28–48.
- Granger, C. W. & Lin, J.-L. (1995), ‘Causality in the long run’, *Econometric Theory* **11**(3), 530–536.
- Hannan, E. J. (1970), *Multiple time series*, Vol. 38, John Wiley & Sons.
- Hosoya, Y. (1991), ‘The decomposition and measurement of the interdependency between second-order stationary processes’, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **88**(4), 429–444.
- Hosoya, Y. & Taniguchi, M. (1982), ‘A central limit theorem for stationary processes and the parameter estimation of linear processes’, *The Annals of Statistics* **10**(1), 132–153.
- Huang, H.-Y., Ombao, H. & Stoffer, D. S. (2004), ‘Discrimination and classification of nonstationary time series using the slex model’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **99**(467), 763–774.
- Kato, K. (2009), ‘Asymptotics for argmin processes: Convexity arguments’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **100**(8), 1816–1829.
- Keenan, D. M. (1987), ‘Limiting behavior of functionals of higher-order sample cumulant spectra’, *The Annals of Statistics* **15**(1), 134–151.

- Koltchinskii, V. & Sakhanenko, L. (2000), Testing for ellipsoidal symmetry of a multivariate distribution, in ‘High Dimensional Probability II’, Springer, pp. 493–510.
- Künsch, H. R. (1989), ‘The jackknife and the bootstrap for general stationary observations’, *The Annals of Statistics* **17**(3), 1217–1241.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2005), *New introduction to multiple time series analysis*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Magnus, J. R. & Neudecker, H. (2007), *Matrix differential calculus with applications in statistics and econometrics*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Neumann, M. H. & von Sachs, R. (1997), ‘Wavelet thresholding in anisotropic function classes and application to adaptive estimation of evolutionary spectra’, *The Annals of Statistics* **25**(1), 38–76.
- Nolan, D. & Pollard, D. (1987), ‘U-processes: rates of convergence’, *The Annals of Statistics* **15**(2), 780–799.
- Ombao, H. C., Raz, J. A., von Sachs, R. & Malow, B. A. (2001), ‘Automatic statistical analysis of bivariate nonstationary time series’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**(454), 543–560.
- Ombao, H., von Sachs, R. & Guo, W. (2005), ‘Slex analysis of multivariate nonstationary time series’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100**(470), 519–531.
- Priestley, M. B. (1965), ‘Evolutionary spectra and non-stationary processes’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **27**(2), 204–229.

- Rozanov, I. A. I. A. (1967), *Stationary random processes*, Holden-Day series in time series analysis, Holden-Day, San Francisco.
- Sakiyama, K. & Taniguchi, M. (2004), ‘Discriminant analysis for locally stationary processes’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **90**(2), 282–300.
- Schröder, A. & Ombao, H. (2019), ‘Fresped: Frequency-specific change-point detection method in multi-channel epileptic seizure eeg data’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**, 115–128.
- Shumway, R. H. & Stoffer, D. S. (2000), *Time series analysis and its applications*, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sims, C. A., Stock, J. H. & Watson, M. W. (1990), ‘Inference in linear time series models with some unit roots’, *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* **58**(1), 113–144.
- Taniguchi, M. (1982), ‘On estimation of the integrals of the fourth order cumulant spectral density’, *Biometrika* **69**(1), 117–122.
- Taniguchi, M. & Kakizawa, Y. (2000), *Asymptotic theory of statistical inference for time series*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Taniguchi, M., Puri, M. L. & Kondo, M. (1996), ‘Nonparametric approach for non-gaussian vector stationary processes’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **56**(2), 259–283.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), ‘Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **58**(1), 267–288.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. & Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak convergence*, Springer.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL (I)

Title: Proofs. (PDF)

7 Proofs

We provide proofs in Supplementary Material (I). Some fundamental results for multivariate locally stationary processes in Sections A and B of Supplementary Material (II) are used.

7.1 Proof for Remark 3.6

Remember that $H(\tau_1, \tau_2)$, $H(\tau_1, \cdot)$, $H(\cdot, \tau_2)$ are the linear closed subspace generated by $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}, t \leq \tau_1; \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau_2\}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}, t \leq \tau_1\}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau_2\}$, respectively. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(1)} &= \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | H(t-1, t)), \\ \mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)} &= \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} - E(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} | H(t, t-1)).\end{aligned}$$

Also, let $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}(\tau)$, $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}(\tau)$ be the linear closed subspace generated by $\{\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(1)}, t \leq \tau\}$, $\{\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(2)}, t \leq \tau\}$ respectively. In addition, let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Z}_{t,T}^{(1)} &= \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} - E[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)} | \mathcal{H}^{(2)}(\infty)], \\ \mathbf{Z}_{t,T}^{(2)} &= \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} - E[\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)} | \mathcal{H}^{(1)}(\infty)].\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)$ is the time-varying spectral density matrix of $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{t,T}^{(1)\top}, \mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)\top})^\top\}$, such that

$$\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, we have $\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{22} = \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}$, $\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{21} = \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12}^*$,

$$\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} I_m & -\Sigma(u)_{12}\Sigma(u)_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, 0)\mathbf{\Lambda}(u, e^{i\lambda})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{11} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \{ \Sigma(u)_{11} - \Sigma(u)_{12}\Sigma(u)_{22}^{-1}\Sigma(u)_{21} \},$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}(u, z)$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{f}(u, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, z)\mathbf{\Lambda}(u, z)^*, \quad z \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Now if we denote the joint time-varying spectral density of $\{(\mathbf{Z}_{t,T}^{(1)\top}, \mathbf{Z}_{t,T}^{(2)\top})^\top\}$ by

$$\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11} & \mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

then combining Corollary 2.1 and Theorem 4.3 in Hosoya (1991), we obtain the following expression:

$$\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11} = \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21}, \quad (46)$$

$$\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22} = \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12}, \quad (47)$$

$$\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{12} = \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} - 2\pi \mathbf{h}(u, \lambda) \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12} \quad (48)$$

$$- 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{k}(u, \lambda)$$

$$+ 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} \right)^{-1} (\Sigma(u)_{21} -$$

$$\Sigma(u)_{21}\Sigma(u)_{11}^{-1}\Sigma(u)_{12}\Sigma(u)_{22}^{-1}\Sigma(u)_{21}) \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12},$$

and $\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{21} = \mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{12}^*$, where

$$\mathbf{h}(u, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} \end{pmatrix}^* \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, e^{i\lambda})^{*-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, 0)^* \begin{bmatrix} I_m & -\Sigma(u)_{12}\Sigma(u)_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^*,$$

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} -\Sigma(u)_{21}\Sigma(u)_{11}^{-1} & I_M \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, 0)\mathbf{\Lambda}(u, e^{i\lambda})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Especially, it holds that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h}(u, \lambda)^* & \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{21} \\ \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} & \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_m & -\Sigma(u)_{12}\Sigma(u)_{22}^{-1} \\ -\Sigma(u)_{21}\Sigma(u)_{11}^{-1} & I_M \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}(u, 0)\mathbf{\Lambda}(u, e^{i\lambda})^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda).$$

In summary, local linear dependence, the Hosoya causality measures from $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$ to $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ and from $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(1)}\}$ to $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(2)}\}$, and local instantaneous linear feedback are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}| |\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)|} d\lambda, \\ \text{GC}^{(2 \rightarrow 1)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11}|} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{21} \right|} d\lambda, \\ \text{GC}^{(1 \rightarrow 2)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22}|} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{\left| \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{22} - 2\pi \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{21} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}(u)_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{g}(u, \lambda)_{12} \right|} d\lambda, \\ \text{GC}^{(1,2)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{11}| |\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)_{22}|}{|\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)|} d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

7.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. From equations (15) and (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) &= \\
&\left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T}\right) - 1 \right\} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) \, d\lambda + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right) \, d\lambda \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T}\right) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda) - \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right\} \, d\lambda \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T}\right) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda) - \mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda) \right) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda) \right\} \, d\lambda \\
&= L_1 + L_2 + L_3, \quad (\text{say}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since K is a function of bounded variation, applying Lemma P5.1 in Brillinger (1981), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T}\right) - 1 &= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - v}{b_T}\right) \, dv - 1 + O(T^{-1}) \\
&= \int_{\frac{u-1}{b_T}}^{\frac{u}{b_T}} K(x) \, dx - 1 + O(T^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $L_1 = O(T^{-1})$, since the kernel K has a compact support.

Under Assumption 3.1 (i), \mathbf{f} is of bounded variation, and again, applying Lemma P5.1 in Brillinger (1981), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - u_k}{b_T}\right) \left(\mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda) - \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right) \\
&= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{b_T} K\left(\frac{u - v}{b_T}\right) \left(\mathbf{f}(v, \lambda) - \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right) \, dv + O(T^{-1}) \\
&= \int_{\frac{u-1}{b_T}}^{\frac{u}{b_T}} K(x) \left(\mathbf{f}(u - b_T x, \lambda) - \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \right) \, dx + O(T^{-1}), \\
&= \int_{\frac{u-1}{b_T}}^{\frac{u}{b_T}} K(x) \left(-b_T x \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) + (b_T x)^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) + O(b_T^3) \right) \, dx + O(T^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since K has a compact support and it is symmetric, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} xK(x) dx = 0,$$

which implies that

$$L_2 = O(b_T^2) + O(T^{-1}).$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. In summary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{Tb_T}L_1 &\rightarrow 0, \\ \sqrt{Tb_T}L_2 &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$.

Finally, we apply Corollary B.11 to L_3 to show

$$\sqrt{Tb_T}(\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)) \rightsquigarrow \zeta(u) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]). \quad (49)$$

In fact, we only have to check Assumptions B.1 and B.2 for

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}(u, \lambda) = K(u)\mathbf{f}_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{-1}(\lambda), \quad (50)$$

or equivalently, $\psi(u, \lambda) = K(u)\mathbf{f}_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{ij}(\lambda)$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, p$, by the Einstein notation. From the definition (8) of the time-varying spectral density matrix, $\mathbf{f}_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{-1}(\lambda)$ is obviously Hermitian. Additionally, Assumption B.1 (ii) is satisfied if both K and $\mathbf{f}_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{-1}(\lambda)$ are bounded functions of bounded variation, which follows Assumptions 3.1 (ii) and 3.2 (iii). As in Remark B.1, the kernel K in Assumption 3.1 satisfies Assumption B.2. Accordingly, (49) holds. Applying Corollary B.11 to (50), we obtain (18). \square

7.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. From Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \cdot) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \cdot) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]).$$

The consequence (19) follows from Theorem 1 of Kato (2009), if the conditions for the theorem, i.e.,

- (i) both $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ are convex in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ for each u and continuous in u for each $\boldsymbol{\theta}$;
- (ii) $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)$ is the unique minimizer of $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ for each $u \in [0, 1]$

are guaranteed.

According to (i), the convexity of $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ follows from Assumption 3.2 (v-b). Especially, note that $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ is a linear combination of $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \det \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda) + \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\lambda)\right) d\lambda$ with nonnegative coefficients, which implies that $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ is convex. The continuity of $\mathcal{L}_T(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, u)$ in u follows from Assumption 3.1, i.e., the continuity of K and $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \lambda)$. According to (ii), it is assumed in Assumption 3.2 (v-a).

Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)$ is the unique minimizer and $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lambda)$ is twice continuously differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, again, (20) follows from Corollary B.11. \square

7.4 Proof of Theorem 3.7

Proof. We only consider $\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T)$ here, and the other cases of $\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T)$ hold similarly. From the definition of $\mathbf{f}^Z(u, \lambda)$ in (45) and its expressions in (46) – (48),

we see that the parametric time-varying spectral density $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11}$ is

$$\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11} - 2\pi \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21},$$

where $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$, $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{12}$, $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21}$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22}$ are given in (21), (24) and (25), and (26), respectively. Accordingly, from the relation (29), $\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is

$$\text{GC}^{2 \rightarrow 1}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log \frac{|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}|}{|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11}|} d\lambda.$$

Note that the domain of the integration is bounded, and under Assumption 3.3, $\log|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}|$ is integrable in λ for $u \in [0, 1]$, which implies that $\log|\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11}|$ is also integrable.

Now if we show $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11}$ are continuously differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, then applying the delta-method to (19) leads to the conclusion.

The continuous differentiability of $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{11}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ directly follows from that of $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$ under Assumption 3.2 (iv). Note that $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u),22}$ is a continuous function of $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$ from (26). Using the expression for $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$ in (23) and the relation in (22), the continuous differentiability of $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ follows from that of $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)$. In addition, this implies the continuous differentiability of $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}(\lambda)_{21}$ from (25), which in turn implies the continuous differentiability of $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(u)}^Z(\lambda)_{11}$. This completes the proof for Theorem 3.7. \square

7.5 Proof of Theorem 3.8

Proof. By Theorem 6.8 of Magnus & Neudecker (2007), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) &= \nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u))^\top \mathcal{H}(u) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)) + o_P\left(\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)\right)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbf{0}$ from (35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T b_T(\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) &= \\ \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{T b_T} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u))^\top \mathcal{H}(u) \sqrt{T b_T} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u)) &+ o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u_1) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u_1)), \dots, (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T(u_m) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0(u_m))$ are pairwise independent from Theorem 3.3. We arrived at the conclusion (37) by the continuous mapping theorem. \square

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL (II)

Title: Technical Results for Multivariate Locally Stationary Processes. (PDF)

In Supplementary Material (II), we provide the fundamental theoretical results for multivariate locally stationary processes. In Section A, we evaluate the higher order cumulants of multivariate locally stationary processes. In Section B, we develop the asymptotic theory for empirical time-varying spectral processes.

A Multivariate locally stationary processes

In Section A, we review the basic properties of the multivariate locally stationary processes. Especially, we show the absolute differences of the covariances and higher order cumulants between a multivariate locally stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ and the approximate stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}^*(u)\}$ in (3).

Let $l(j)$ be

$$l(j) := \begin{cases} 1, & |j| \leq 1, \\ |j| \log^{1+\kappa}|j|, & |j| > 1, \end{cases}$$

for some constant $\kappa > 0$. Let C be a generic constant in Appendix, and the following inequality is repetitively used in the proof.

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l(j)l(j+s)} \leq \frac{C}{l(s)}. \quad (51)$$

Assumption A.1. Suppose the multivariate locally stationary process $\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = (X_{t,T}^{(1)}, \dots, X_{t,T}^{(d)}, \dots, X_{t,T}^{(p)})^\top$ has a representation

$$\mathbf{X}_{t,T} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} A_{t,T}(j) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-j}, \quad (52)$$

where the sequences $\{A_{t,T}(j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy the following conditions: there exists a constant C_A such that

$$\sup_{t,T} \|A_{t,T}(j)\|_\infty \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)}, \quad (53)$$

and there exists a sequence of functions $A(\cdot, j) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (i) $\sup_u \|A(u, j)\|_\infty \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)}$;
- (ii) $\sup_j \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| A_{t,T}(j) - A\left(\frac{t}{T}, j\right) \right\|_\infty \leq C_A$;
- (iii) $V\left(\|A(\cdot, j)\|_\infty\right) \leq \frac{C_A}{l(j)}$,

where $V(f)$ is the total variation of the function f on the interval $[0, 1]$, i.e., V is defined as

$$V(f) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})|; 0 \leq x_0 < \dots < x_m \leq 1, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

In addition, the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ are assumed to be independent and identically distributed with $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \mathbf{0}$ and $E\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^\top = K$, where the matrix K exists and all elements are bounded by C_K . Furthermore, the moments of order r of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ exist, and all elements are bounded by $C_\epsilon^{(r)}$ for all $r \geq 3$.

Remark A.1. Let us consider the time-varying spectral density matrix $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = (\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,p}$ defined in (8), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} A(u, \lambda) K A(u, -\lambda)^\top,$$

where $A(u, \lambda) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} A(u, j) \exp(ij\lambda)$. The autovariance function $\gamma(u, s)$ at u is

$$\gamma(u, s) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda) \exp(i\lambda s) d\lambda = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} A(u, j) K A(u, j+s)^{\top}. \quad (54)$$

Especially, the (a, b) -element of the matrix γ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma(u, s)_{ab}| &\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sup_u \|A(u, j)\|_{\infty} \|K\|_{\infty} \sup_u \|A(u, j+s)^{\top}\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l(j)l(j+s)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{l(s)}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption A.1 (i) and the third inequality follows from (51).

Remark A.2. From (55), we can see that for any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$ and any (a, b) -element of the autovariance matrix, $|\gamma(u, 0)_{ab}|$ is bounded, i.e.,

$$|\gamma(u, 0)_{ab}| \leq C.$$

Thus, the time-varying spectral density $\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{jk}$ ($1 \leq j, k \leq p$) are square-integrable for any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$.

Remark A.3. Under Assumption A.1, the locally stationary processes $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ have the following properties. Let $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(d)}$ be the d th element of the vector $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}$. From (52), $\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(d)}$ has the expression

$$\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(d)} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^p A_{t,T}(j)_{dm} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-j}^{(m)}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{t,T}^{(a)}, \mathbf{X}_{t+s,T}^{(b)}) &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p A_{t,T}(j)_{am} A_{t+s,T}(l)_{bn} \text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-j}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t+s-l}^{(n)}) \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p A_{t,T}(j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{t+s,T}(j+s)_{bn} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

$$= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(A_{t,T}(j) K A_{t+s,T}(j)^\top \right)_{ab}. \quad (57)$$

We first clarify the difference between (54) and (57) on discrete points $u_k = k/T$ in the following.

Lemma A.4. *Under Assumption A.1, we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \left| \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(a)}, \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(b)}) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}(u_k, s)_{ab} \right| \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{l(s)} \right), \quad (58)$$

where C is a generic constant.

Proof. To evaluate (58), we use the expressions (56) and (54). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(a)}, \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(b)}) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}(u_k, s)_{ab} \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left(A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A(u_k, j+s)_{bn} \right) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Considering the first term in the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right) \right| \\
&= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j) - A(u_k, j) \right)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left| \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j) - A(u_k, j) \right)_{am} \right| |K_{mn}| \left| A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C_K C_A^2}{l(j+s)} + \frac{C_K C_A^2}{l(j)l(j+s)} \\
&\leq C C_K C_A^2, \tag{60}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from $|K_{mn}| \leq C_K$, $\left| A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} \right| \leq C_A/l(j+s)$ from (53), and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left| \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j) - A(u_k, j) \right)_{am} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left| \left(A_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}(j) - A([k+1/2-s/2]/T, j) \right)_{am} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \left(A([k+1/2-s/2]/T, j) - A(u_k, j) \right)_{am} \right| \\
&\leq C_A + \frac{C_A}{l(j)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (ii) and (iii) in Assumption A.1.

Also, it holds that

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left(A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s)_{bn} - A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} A(u_k, j+s)_{bn} \right) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{m,n=1}^p A(u_k, j)_{am} K_{mn} \left(A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s) - A(u_k, j+s) \right)_{bn} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left| A(u_k, j)_{am} \right| |K_{mn}| \left| \left(A_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}(j+s) - A([k+1/2+s/2]/T, j+s) \right)_{bn} \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{m,n=1}^p \left| A(u_k, j)_{am} \right| |K_{mn}| \left| \left(A([k+1/2+s/2]/T, j+s) - A(u_k, j+s) \right)_{bn} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C_K C_A^2}{l(j)} + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C_K C_A}{l(j)} \sum_{k=1}^T \|A([k+1/2+s/2]/T, j+s) - A(u_k, j+s)\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq C C_K C_A^2 + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C_K C_A^2}{l(j)l(j+s)} \\
&\leq C C_K C_A^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{l(s)} \right), \tag{61}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (51). Combining (59), (60) and (61), we obtain the desired result. \square

Generally, higher order cumulants of the locally stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ can be approximated by those of the stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}^*(u)\}$ for $u = t/T$ under Assumption A.1 in a similar manner as the autocovariance. To discuss higher order cumulants, we introduce the notation $\mathbf{X}(u; s)$, which means the observation $\mathbf{X}(s)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, of the stationary process $\mathbf{X}^*(u)$.

Let $\gamma_{a_1, \dots, a_q}(u; t_1, \dots, t_{q-1})$ be the joint cumulant function of order q , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{a_1, \dots, a_q}(u; t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}) &:= \text{cum}\{\mathbf{X}^{(a_1)}(u; t+t_1), \mathbf{X}^{(a_2)}(u; t+t_2), \\
&\quad \dots, \mathbf{X}^{(a_2)}(u; t+t_{q-1}), \mathbf{X}^{(a_q)}(u; t)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To discriminate this notation from the autocovariance function, we do not use γ in boldface, although it is an extension of the autocovariance function to higher orders.

Lemma A.5. Under Assumption A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{k+t_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_2, T}^{(a_2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_{q-1}, T}^{(a_{q-1})}, \mathbf{X}_{k, T}^{(a_q)}) - \gamma_{a_1, \dots, a_q}(u_k; t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}) \right| \\ \leq C \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{l(m+t_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^q l(m+t_j)} + \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^q l(m+t_j)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where C is a generic constant and $t_q = 0$.

Remark A.6. Lemma A.4 is a special case of Lemma A.5 when $q = 2$.

Proof. Under Assumption A.1, there exists a constant $\tilde{C}_\epsilon^{(r)}$ such that all cumulants of order r are all bounded by $\tilde{C}_\epsilon^{(r)}$, since all cumulants can be written in the form of polynomials of moments. Now, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{k+t_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_2, T}^{(a_2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_{q-1}, T}^{(a_{q-1})}, \mathbf{X}_{k, T}^{(a_q)}) - \gamma_{a_1, \dots, a_q}(u_k; t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_q = -\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_q = 1}^p \left(A_{k+t_1, T}(j_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - A(u_k, j_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A(u_k, j_q)_{a_q m_q} \right) \text{cum}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k+t_1-j_1}^{(m_1)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k+t_2-j_2}^{(m_2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k-j_q}^{(m_q)}) \right| \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_\epsilon^{(q)} \sum_{j_q = -\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_q = 1}^p \left| A_{k+t_1, T}(j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A(u_k, j_q)_{a_q m_q} \right| \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_\epsilon^{(q)} \sum_{j_q = -\infty}^{\infty} \| A_{k+t_1, T}(j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \\ & \quad - A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} A_{k+t_2, T}(j_q + t_2)_{a_q m_q} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \|_\infty \\ & \quad + \| A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} A_{k+t_2, T}(j_q + t_2)_{a_2 m_2} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \\ & \quad - A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} A(u_k, j_q + t_2)_{a_2 m_2} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} \|_\infty \\ & \quad + \| A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A_{k, T}(j_q)_{a_q m_q} - A(u_k, j_q + t_1)_{a_1 m_1} \cdots A(u_k, j_q)_{a_q m_q} \|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for $1 \leq i \leq q-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^T \|A_{k+t_i, T}(j_q + t_i) - A(u_k, j_q + t_i)\|_\infty \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\|A_{k+t_i, T}(j_q + t_i) - A(u_{k+t_i}, j_q + t_i)\|_\infty + \|A(u_{k+t_i}, j_q + t_i) - A(u_k, j_q + t_i)\|_\infty \right) \\
& \leq C_A + \frac{C_A}{l(j_q + t_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{k+t_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_2, T}^{(a_2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{k+t_{q-1}, T}^{(a_{q-1})}, \mathbf{X}_{k, T}^{(a_q)}) - \gamma_{a_1, \dots, a_1}(u_k; t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}) \right| \\
& \leq \tilde{C}_\epsilon^{(q)} C_A^q \sum_{j_q=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \frac{l(j_q + t_i)}{l(j_q) \prod_{j=1}^{q-1} l(j_q + t_j)} + \frac{1}{l(j_q) \prod_{j=1}^{q-1} l(j_q + t_j)} + \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} l(j_q + t_j)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain the conclusion if we replace j_q with m and set $t_q = 0$. \square

B Empirical time-varying spectral processes

In Section B, we consider the weak convergence of the empirical multivariate time-varying spectral processes. In the beginning, we give a short description of assumptions. Immediately after the description, we introduce the empirical time-varying spectral processes in (67) below.

Let Ψ be a class of square-integrable functions, where the \mathcal{L}_2 -norm on $\psi \in \Psi$ is defined as

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 = \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi(u, \lambda)^2 d\lambda du < \infty.$$

Let $V_2(\cdot)$ be the total variation of bivariate functions, i.e.,

$$V_2(f) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k,l=1}^{m,n} |f(u_k, \lambda_l) - f(u_{k-1}, \lambda_l) - f(u_k, \lambda_{l-1}) + f(u_{k-1}, \lambda_{l-1})|; \right. \\ \left. 0 \leq u_0 < \dots < u_m \leq 1, 0 \leq \lambda_0 < \dots < \lambda_n \leq \pi; m, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

For any class $\Phi := \{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}; \phi_{ij} \in \Psi \text{ for } i, j = 1, \dots, p\}$, let $\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \infty}$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}}$ and $\tau_{\infty, \infty}$ be

$$\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}} := \tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}(\Phi) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} V(\phi_{ij}(u, \cdot)),$$

$$\tau_{\text{TV}, \infty} := \tau_{\text{TV}, \infty}(\Phi) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \sup_{\lambda \in [0, \pi]} V(\phi_{ij}(\cdot, \lambda)),$$

$$\tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}} := \tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}}(\Phi) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} V_2(\phi_{ij}),$$

$$\tau_{\infty, \infty} := \tau_{\infty, \infty}(\Phi) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \sup_{\substack{u \in [0, 1] \\ \lambda \in [0, \pi]}} |\phi_{ij}|.$$

Assumption B.1. Let Φ be a class of $p \times p$ matrix-valued continuous functions $\phi(u, \cdot)$ on $[-\pi, \pi]$ such that for any $\phi \in \Phi$, it holds that

(i) $\phi(u, \cdot) = \phi^*(u, \cdot)$ for any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$;

(ii) $\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \infty}$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}}$ and $\tau_{\infty, \infty}$ are all finite.

Now, we impose assumptions on Ψ for the entry ϕ_{ij} of the matrices Φ . The covering number $N_{\Psi}(\varepsilon)$ of Ψ with respect to the norm \mathcal{L}_2 is

$$N_{\Psi}(\varepsilon) = \inf \left\{ n \geq 1; \exists \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \Psi \text{ such that} \right.$$

$$\left. \forall \psi \in \Psi, \exists \psi_i (1 \leq i \leq n) \text{ such that } \|\psi - \psi_i\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

For any function $\psi \in \Psi$, let ψ_T be

$$\psi_T(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{b_T} \psi\left(\frac{u}{b_T}, \lambda\right), \tag{62}$$

where $b := b_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Let Ψ_T denotes the function class constituted by ψ_T , i.e.,

$$\Psi_T = \{\psi_T(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{b_T} \psi\left(\frac{u}{b_T}, \lambda\right); \psi \in \mathcal{L}_2\}. \quad (63)$$

Assumption B.2. For any $\psi \in \Psi$, let $\psi(\cdot, \lambda)$ be a positive, symmetric function of bounded variation such that

- (i) $\psi(\cdot, \lambda)$ has a compact support on $[-1, 1]$.
- (ii) $\Psi \subset \Psi^0$, where Ψ^0 is a class of linear span of functions $k^* \geq 0$, where the subgraph of k^* , $\{(u, \lambda, z) : k^*(u, \lambda) \geq z\}$, can be represented as a finite number of Boolean operations among sets of the form

$$\{(u, \lambda, z); p(u, \lambda, z) \geq \eta(u)\},$$

where p is a polynomial on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and η is an arbitrary real function.

Remark B.1. Assumption B.2 is considered in Koltchinskii & Sakhanenko (2000) and Giné et al. (2004). It is shown in Nolan & Pollard (1987) that, the class $\mathcal{F} := \{f_\sigma; \sigma > 0\}$,

$$f_\sigma(x, y, z) = K\left(\frac{x - y}{\sigma} + z\right)$$

satisfies Assumption B.2, and thus, there exists some finite and positive constants A and V such that

$$N_{\mathcal{F}}(\|K\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(P)}\varepsilon) \leq A\varepsilon^{-V},$$

for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Especially, the class \mathcal{F} is called Euclidean, since the covering number behaves like that in the finite-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^V , which is usually considered for a parametric model.

Remark B.2. Note that the class Ψ_T of functions is defined in (63). We here clarify the order of $\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}(\Psi_T)$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \infty}(\Psi_T)$, $\tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}}(\Psi_T)$, $\tau_{\infty, \infty}(\Psi_T)$ and $N_{\Psi_T}(\varepsilon)$. Noting that ψ is a function of bounded variation for each argument or both, we can take the factor b_T^{-1} of (62) outside the operator V or V_2 , so we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}} &= O(b_T^{-1}), & \tau_{\text{TV}, \infty} &= O(b_T^{-1}), \\ \tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}} &= O(b_T^{-1}), & \tau_{\infty, \infty} &= O(b_T^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Next, we evaluate $N_{\Psi_T}(\varepsilon)$. Under Assumption B.2, we have

$$N_{\Psi}(\varepsilon) \leq A\varepsilon^{-V}.$$

Accordingly, the covering number $N_{\Psi_T}(\varepsilon)$ is

$$N_{\Psi_T}(\varepsilon) = N_{\Psi}(b_T\varepsilon) \leq A(b_T\varepsilon)^{-V}. \quad (64)$$

We are now in position to introduce the empirical time-varying spectral processes. Let $\mathcal{A}_T(u)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u)$ be

$$\mathcal{A}_T(u)_{ab} := \mathcal{A}_T(u; \psi)_{ab} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_T(u - u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda)_{ab} d\lambda, \quad (65)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u)_{ab} := \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u; \psi)_{ab} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_T(u - u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda)_{ab} d\lambda. \quad (66)$$

The empirical time-varying spectral process $\xi_T(u)_{ab}$ is

$$\xi_T(u)_{ab} := \xi_T(u; \psi)_{ab} = \sqrt{Tb_T} (\mathcal{A}_T(u; \psi) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u; \psi))_{ab}. \quad (67)$$

We use the first expression in (65), (66) and (67) when there is no confusion with ψ .

B.1 Preliminary Computations

Let $\hat{\psi}$ be

$$\hat{\psi}(u, k) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi(u, \lambda) \exp(-ik\lambda) d\lambda.$$

Lemma B.3. *Let β_T be a sequence of positive numbers such that $\beta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.*

Suppose

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \beta_T \sum_{s=-T}^T \sup_u |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| < \infty. \quad (68)$$

Then, it holds that

$$|E\mathcal{A}_T(u)_{ab} - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u)_{ab}| = O(T^{-1}b_T^{-1}\beta_T^{-1}).$$

Remark B.4. The condition

$$\sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} \sup_u |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| < \infty \quad (69)$$

satisfies (68). However, if $\psi(u, \cdot)$ is only a function of bounded variation, then ψ may not satisfy the condition (69). Under (68), we see that

$$\sum_{s=-T}^T \sup_u |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| = O(\beta_T^{-1}),$$

which we use in the following evaluations.

Proof. From (14), we have

$$\mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda)_{ab} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l:1 \leq [uT+1/2+l/2] \leq T} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2+l/2],T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2-l/2],T}^{(b)} \exp(-i\lambda l). \quad (70)$$

In expression (70), l depends on u , but it can be naturally extended to

$$\mathbf{I}_T(u, \lambda)_{ab} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l=1-T}^{T-1} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2+l/2],T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{[uT+1/2-l/2],T}^{(b)} \exp(-i\lambda l), \quad (71)$$

if we let $\mathbf{X}_{m,T} \equiv 0$ for any $m \leq 0$ or $m \geq T + 1$. We shall use this expression (71) in the following proof.

By Parseval's identity, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |E\mathcal{A}_T(u)_{ab} - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T(u)_{ab}| \\
& \leq \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_T(u - u_k, \lambda) (E\mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda)_{ab} - \mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda)_{ab}) d\lambda \right| \\
& = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi T} \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) \left(E\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(b)} - \gamma(u_k, -s)_{ab} \right) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{|s| \geq T} \hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) \gamma(u_k, -s)_{ab} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2\pi T} \left| \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) \left(\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(a)}, \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(b)}) - \gamma(u_k, -s)_{ab} \right) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2\pi T} \sum_{k=1}^T \left| \sum_{|s| \geq T} \hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) \gamma(u_k, -s)_{ab} \right| \\
& := B_1 + B_2, \quad (\text{say}).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.4, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1 & \leq \frac{1}{2\pi b_T} \sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \sup_u |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(a)}, \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(b)}) - \gamma(u_k, -s)_{ab} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{C}{2\pi b_T T} \sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \sup_u |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| \left(1 + \frac{1}{l(s)} \right) \\
& = O(T^{-1} b_T^{-1} \beta_T^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Further, noting (55), we have

$$B_2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi b_T} \sup_u \sum_{|s| \geq T} |\hat{\psi}(u, -s)| |\gamma(u, -s)_{ab}|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{C}{b_T \beta_T} \sum_{|s| \geq T} \frac{C}{l(s)} \\
&= O(T^{-1} b_T^{-1} \beta_T^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\{l(j)^{-1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a convergent series, and $|l(s)| \geq T$ for $|s| \geq T$. Therefore, we obtain the assertion. \square

Next, we evaluate the higher order cumulants of $\xi_T(u)$. We first clarify the bias between those of the time-varying process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ and those of the approximate stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}(u, t)\}$, and then evaluate the higher order cumulants of the stationary process.

Lemma B.5. *Let β_T be a sequence of positive numbers such that $\beta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose $\psi^{(1)}(\cdot, \lambda), \dots, \psi^{(q)}(\cdot, \lambda)$ are all functions of bounded variation and satisfy Assumption B.2 and*

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \beta_T \sum_{s=-T}^T \sup_u |\hat{\psi}^{(i)}(u, -s)| < \infty, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, q. \quad (72)$$

If $b_T \rightarrow 0$, $Tb_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $T^{-q/2} \beta_T^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, then it holds that

$$\text{cum}(\xi_T(u^{(1)}; \psi^{(1)})_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, \xi_T(u^{(q)}; \psi^{(q)})_{a_q b_q}) = O(T^{1-q/2} b_T^{1-q/2}).$$

Epecially, when $q = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}(\xi_T(u^{(1)}; \psi^{(1)})_{a_1 b_1}, \xi_T(u^{(2)}; \psi^{(2)})_{a_2 b_2}) = \\
&2\pi \delta(u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}) \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, \lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{a_1 a_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{b_1 b_2}} d\lambda \right. \\
&\quad + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, -\lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{a_1 b_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{b_1 a_2}} d\lambda \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda_1) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, -\lambda_2)} dv \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2}(u^{(1)}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right), \quad (73)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

Remark B.6. The sequence β_T is used to alleviate the divergence of the harmonic series. There exists a sequence β_T such that $\beta_T^{-1} = O(\log T)$ (See Remark B.7 below for details). For this sequence, the condition $T^{-q/2}\beta_T^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ always holds true for $q \geq 2$.

Proof. Using the expression (71), we have $\mathcal{A}_T(u)_{ab}$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_T(u)_{ab} = \frac{1}{2\pi T} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(b)}, \quad (74)$$

which is a linear combination of $\mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2+s/2],T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{[k+1/2-s/2],T}^{(b)}$. We apply Lemma A.5 to compute the higher order cumulants. Actually, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cum}(\xi_T(u^{(1)}; \psi^{(1)})_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, \xi_T(u^{(q)}; \psi^{(q)})_{a_q b_q}) \\ &= \text{cum}\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(b_1)}, \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\kappa_2} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2, T}^{(a_2)} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2 - s_2, T}^{(b_2)}, \dots, \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\kappa_q} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q, T}^{(a_q)} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q - s_q, T}^{(b_q)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_q} \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(b_1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q, T}^{(a_q)} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q - s_q, T}^{(b_q)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where for brevity, we let

$$\kappa_1 := [k_1 + 1/2 + s_1/2], \quad \kappa_2 := [k_2 + 1/2 + s_2/2], \quad \dots, \quad \kappa_q := [k_q + 1/2 + s_q/2].$$

To compute higher order cumulants, we have to consider all indecomposable partitions of the following table (See Brillinger (1981), Theorem 2.3.2):

$$\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)} & \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(b_1)} \\ \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2, T}^{(a_2)} & \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2 - s_2, T}^{(b_2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q, T}^{(a_q)} & \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q - s_q, T}^{(b_q)} \end{array}.$$

In view of Lemma A.5 with some tedious computation, all indecomposable partitions can be approximated by those cumulants of the stationary process with a bias of lower order for a fixed $q \geq 2$.

We give a representative example of a partition below. The other partitions can be evaluated in the same manner. Without loss of generality, let q be odd. Suppose we evaluate the following cumulant:

$$\frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_q} \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2, T}^{(a_2)}\right) \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2 - s_2, T}^{(b_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_3 - s_3, T}^{(b_3)}\right) \cdots \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_q, T}^{(a_q)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(b_1)}\right).$$

If we replace variables $\kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_q$ with $\tau_2 := \kappa_2 - \kappa_1, \dots, \tau_q := \kappa_q - \kappa_1$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_q} \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 + \tau_2, T}^{(a_2)}\right) \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 + \tau_2 - s_2, T}^{(b_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 + \tau_3 - s_3, T}^{(b_3)}\right) \cdots \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 + \tau_q, T}^{(a_q)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(b_1)}\right). \quad (75)$$

Applying Lemma A.5, (75) can be approximated by

$$\frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1=1}^T \sum_{\tau_2, \dots, \tau_q} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2)_{a_1 a_2} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_3 - s_3 - \tau_2 + s_2)_{b_2 b_3} \cdots \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, -s_1 - \tau_q)_{a_q b_1}. \quad (76)$$

More precisely, the absolute bias between (75) and (76) is bounded by

$$T^{-q} \sum_{i=1}^q C_i \left(1 + \frac{1}{l(s_i)}\right).$$

Returning back to the expression (74), we see that the full expression of the absolute bias is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2\pi b_T^q} \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_q=1-T}^{T-1} \prod_{i=1}^q \sup_u |\hat{\psi}^{(i)}(u, -s_i)| \left| \frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_q} \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 + \tau_2, T}^{(a_2)}\right) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1+\tau_2-s_2,T}^{(b_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1+\tau_3-s_3,T}^{(b_3)}\right) \cdots \text{cum}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1+\tau_q,T}^{(a_q)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1-s_1,T}^{(b_1)}\right) \\
& - \frac{1}{T^q} \sum_{\kappa_1=1}^T \sum_{\tau_2, \dots, \tau_q} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2)_{a_1 a_2} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_3 - s_3 - \tau_2 + s_2)_{b_2 b_3} \cdots \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, -s_1 - \tau_q)_{a_q b_1} \Big| \\
& = O(T^{-q} b_T^{-q} \beta_T^{-q}).
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, all cumulants of order q for \mathcal{A}_T can be approximated by those of the stationary process with a bias of order $O(T^{-q} b_T^{-q} \beta_T^{-q})$. Thus, the bias in those cumulants for ξ_T is $O(T^{-q/2} b_T^{-q/2} \beta_T^{-q})$. Furthermore, it holds that

$$\text{cum}(\xi_T(u^{(1)}; \psi^{(1)})_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, \xi_T(u^{(q)}; \psi^{(q)})_{a_q b_q}) = O(T^{1-q/2} b_T^{1-q/2}), \quad (77)$$

since $\psi^{(1)}(\cdot, \lambda), \dots, \psi^{(q)}(\cdot, \lambda)$ are all functions of bounded variation. Therefore, the bias is asymptotically negligible. A representative example of (77) is shown below.

Let us consider the case $q = 2$ for ξ_T . Note that q is even now. We have three terms of the type (76), i.e.,

(i) the approximation for $\text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1,T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1-s_1,T}^{(b_1)}) \text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2,T}^{(a_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2-s_2,T}^{(b_2)})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{b_T}{T} \sum_{\kappa_1=1}^T \sum_{s_1, s_2, \tau_2} \hat{\psi}_T^{(1)}(u^{(1)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_1) \hat{\psi}_T^{(2)}(u^{(2)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_2) \\
& \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2)_{a_1 a_2} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2 - s_2 + s_1)_{b_1 b_2}; \quad (78)
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) the approximation for $\text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1,T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2-s_2,T}^{(b_2)}) \text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1-s_1,T}^{(b_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2,T}^{(a_2)})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{b_T}{T} \sum_{\kappa_1=1}^T \sum_{s_1, s_2, \tau_2} \hat{\psi}_T^{(1)}(u^{(1)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_1) \hat{\psi}_T^{(2)}(u^{(2)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_2) \\
& \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2 - s_2)_{a_1 b_2} \gamma(u_{\kappa_1}, \tau_2 + s_1)_{b_1 a_2}; \quad (79)
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) the approximation for $\text{cum}(\mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1, T}^{(a_1)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2 - s_2, T}^{(b_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_1 - s_1, T}^{(a_2)}, \mathbf{X}_{\kappa_2, T}^{(b_1)})$:

$$\frac{b_T}{T} \sum_{\kappa_1=1}^T \sum_{s_1, s_2, \tau_2} \hat{\psi}_T^{(1)}(u^{(1)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_1) \overline{\hat{\psi}_T^{(2)}(u^{(2)} - u_{\kappa_1}, s_2)} \gamma_{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2}(u_{\kappa_1}; -s_1, \tau_2, \tau_2 - s_2). \quad (80)$$

We first explain the term (78). By repeated application of the Parseval equality (see, e.g., the proof of Lemma 2.2 in Hosoya & Taniguchi (1982) for details) and by Lemma P5.1 in Brillinger (1981), the term (78) is equivalent to

$$2\pi b_T \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_T^{(1)}(u^{(1)} - u, \lambda) \overline{\psi_T^{(2)}(u^{(2)} - u, \lambda)} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{a_1 a_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{b_1 b_2}} d\lambda du + O(T^{-1} b_T^{-1}).$$

Under Assumption B.2, if $u^{(1)} \neq u^{(2)}$, we have

$$\int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_T^{(1)}(u^{(1)} - u, \lambda) \overline{\psi_T^{(2)}(u^{(2)} - u, \lambda)} \mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{a_1 b_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u, \lambda)_{b_1 a_2}} d\lambda du = o(b_T^{-1}),$$

since the supports of $\psi^{(1)}$ and $\psi^{(2)}$ are compact. Thus, the term (78) converges to

$$2\pi \delta(u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, \lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{a_1 a_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{b_1 b_2}} d\lambda, \quad (81)$$

where δ is a delta function such that $\delta(a, b) = 1$ if $a = b$, and 0 otherwise. Similarly, the term (79) converges to

$$2\pi \delta(u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, -\lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{a_1 b_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(1)}, \lambda)_{b_1 a_2}} d\lambda. \quad (82)$$

The term (80) converges to

$$2\pi \delta(u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(1)}(v, \lambda_1) \overline{\psi^{(2)}(v, -\lambda_2)} dv \right)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2}(u^{(1)}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2, \quad (83)$$

by repeated application of the Parseval equality. Combining all terms (81), (82) and (83), we obtain the results of Lemma B.5. \square

B.2 Asymptotic Normality

Here, we show the asymptotic normality of the empirical spectral process $\xi_T(\psi)$ in (67). To this goal, we adopt the idea in Dahlhaus & Polonik (2009) to use the Gaussian kernel as the mollifier with the property of being rapidly decreasing. Let G be the Gaussian kernel, that is,

$$G(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x^2\right),$$

and G_b the mollifier

$$G_\beta(x) = \frac{1}{\beta} G\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right),$$

with $\beta := \beta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. From the convolution theorem, the Fourier coefficients $\hat{\psi}^{*T}$ of $\psi^{*T} := \psi * G_\beta$ are

$$\hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, k) = \hat{\psi}(u, k) \hat{G}_\beta(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (84)$$

Remark B.7. The remarkable feature of this manipulation is that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, k)| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}(u, k)|,$$

since for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$|\hat{G}_\beta(k)| = \left| \exp\left(\frac{-\beta^2 k^2}{2}\right) \right| \leq 1.$$

In addition, the following result holds.

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, k)| = O\left(\log(\beta_T^{-1})\right). \quad (85)$$

If we take β_T as $\beta_T = T^{-k}$ for any $k \geq 1$, then we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, k)| = O(\log T).$$

Proof of Remark B.7. For any $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, let $\psi := \phi_{ij} \in \Psi$ as in Assumption B.1. Note that $\psi(u, \cdot)$ is a continuous function of bounded variation.

- (i) Let $k \neq 0$. From Jordan decomposition theorem, there exists a signed measure g_ψ such that

$$\hat{\psi}(u, k) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\exp(-ik\lambda) - 1}{-ik} g_\psi(u, d\lambda),$$

which leads to

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}(u, k)| \leq \frac{C}{|k|} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} V(\psi(u, \cdot)) \leq \frac{C\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}}{|k|}. \quad (86)$$

- (ii) Let $k = 0$.

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}(u, 0)| \leq 2\pi \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \sup_{\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]} \psi(u, \lambda) \leq 2\pi\tau_{\infty, \infty}. \quad (87)$$

Combing (86) and (87) with the relation (84), we obtain

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, k)| \leq C \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|k|} \exp\left(\frac{-\beta^2 k^2}{2}\right) \right) = O\left(\log(\beta^{-1})\right).$$

Thus, the equation (85) is shown. \square

Next result shows that the $\xi_T(u_k)$ converges in finite dimensional distributions for $k \geq 1$.

Theorem B.8. *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and B.1 hold. Let $b_T \rightarrow 0$ and $Tb_T \rightarrow \infty$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$. For any q and $u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(q)} \in [0, 1]$, it holds that*

$$\left(\xi_T(u^{(1)}; \psi^{(1)})_{a_1 b_1}, \dots, \xi_T(u^{(q)}; \psi^{(q)})_{a_q b_q} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, (V_{jk})_{j,k=1, \dots, q}),$$

where V_{jk} is

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{jk} &= 2\pi\delta(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \\
&\quad \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, \lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)_{a_j a_k} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)}_{b_j b_k} d\lambda \right. \\
&\quad + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, -\lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)_{a_j b_k} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)}_{b_j a_k} d\lambda \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda_1) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, -\lambda_2)} dv \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{a_j a_k b_j b_k}(u^{(j)}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

Proof. First we show that

$$\text{var}\left(\xi_T(u; \psi)_{ab} - \xi_T(u; \psi^{*T})_{ab}\right) \rightarrow 0,$$

which, in turn, shows that

$$\xi_T(u; \psi)_{ab} - \xi_T(u; \psi^{*T})_{ab} \rightarrow_P 0. \quad (88)$$

As in Remark B.7, let $\beta_T = T^{-k}$ for any $k \geq 1$. Following this choice, we have $O(\beta_T/b_T) = o(1)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{var}\left(\xi_T(u; \psi)_{ab} - \xi_T(u; \psi^{*T})_{ab}\right) \\
&= Tb_T \text{var}\left(\frac{1}{2\pi T} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{s=1-T}^{T-1} \{\hat{\psi}_T(u - u_k, -s) - \hat{\psi}_T^{*T}(u - u_k, -s)\} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_s} \mathbf{X}_{k+t, T}^{(a)} \mathbf{X}_{k+t+s, T}^{(b)}\right) \\
&\leq b_T^{-1} \left(\sup_u \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{\psi}(u, -s) - \hat{\psi}^{*T}(u, -s)| \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq Cb_T^{-1} \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\exp(-s^2\beta_T^2/2) - 1|^2}{s^2},$$

where the last inequality follows from (84). Since $|\exp(-s^2\beta_T^2/2) - 1| \leq \min(1, s^2\beta_T^2/2)$, the order of the last term is $O(\beta_T/b_T) = o(1)$. Thus, (88) is shown.

Now, we only have to consider the finite distributions of $\xi_T(u; \psi^{*T})$. However, from Remark B.7, we find that the condition (72) is satisfied and thus the covariance matrix of $\xi_T(u; \psi^{*T})$ can be expressed in the form of (73). Therefore, the proof is completed. \square

B.3 Weak Convergence of Time-varying Spectral Processes

We elucidate the weak convergence of time-varying spectral processes $\xi_T(u) (= \xi_T(u; \psi))$. For the proof, we adopt the maximal inequality obtained in Dahlhaus & Polonik (2009). To accommodate it with our proof for the local estimation, we adjust the scale in their result to the following one.

Lemma B.9 (Dahlhaus & Polonik (2009), Theorem 2.9). *Under Assumption A.1, there exist a set B_T (independent of Ψ_T) with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P(B_T) = 1$, a constant L (independent of Ψ_T and T), and some positive constants c_1 and c_2 (independent of T), such that for all η satisfying*

$$\eta \geq 26L \max(\tau_{\infty, \text{TV}}(\Psi_T), \tau_{\text{TV}, \infty}(\Psi_T), \tau_{\text{TV}, \text{TV}}(\Psi_T), \tau_{\infty, \infty}(\Psi_T)) \sqrt{\frac{b_T}{T}} (\log T)^3, \quad (89)$$

and

$$\eta \geq \sqrt{b_T} \frac{72}{c_2^2} \int_0^\alpha (\log N_{\Psi_T}(s))^2 ds, \quad \log N_{\Psi_T}(\alpha) := \frac{c_2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\sup_{\psi \in \Psi_T} \|\psi_T\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}}, \quad (90)$$

it holds that

$$P\left(\sup_{\psi \in \Psi} |\xi_T(u)| > \eta, B_T\right) \leq 3c_1 \exp\left(-\frac{c_2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}}\right).$$

Let $l^\infty([0, 1] \times \Psi)$ be the set of all uniformly bounded, real-valued functions $z : [0, 1] \times \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|z\|_{[0,1] \times \Psi} = \sup_{u \in [0,1], \psi \in \Psi} |z(u; \psi)| < \infty.$$

Theorem B.10. *Suppose Assumptions A.1, B.1 and B.2 hold. If $b_T = o(1)$ and $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$, then it holds that*

$$\xi_T(\cdot; \cdot)_{ab} \rightsquigarrow \xi(\cdot; \cdot)_{ab} \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1] \times \Psi),$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\xi(\cdot; \cdot)_{ab}$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\xi(u^{(j)}; \psi^{(j)})_{a_1 b_1}, \xi(u^{(k)}; \psi^{(k)})_{a_2 b_2}) &= 2\pi \delta(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \\ &\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, \lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)_{a_1 a_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)}_{b_1 b_2} d\lambda \right. \\ &+ \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, -\lambda)} dv \right) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)_{a_1 b_2} \overline{\mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda)}_{b_1 a_2} d\lambda \\ &\left. + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda_1) \overline{\psi^{(k)}(v, -\lambda_2)} dv \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2}(u^{(j)}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

Proof. We only have to show the asymptotic tightness of $\xi_T(u; \psi)_{ab}$, since the convergence of $(\xi_T(u^{(j)}; \psi^{(j)})_{ab})_{j=1, \dots, q}$ in finite dimensional distributions has been shown in Theorem B.8.

To prove the asymptotic tightness, let us introduce a natural norm

$$\|(u, \psi)\|_s = |u| + \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{L}_2},$$

for $(u, \psi) \in [0, 1] \times \Psi$. The metric d_s on this space $[0, 1] \times \Psi$ can be induced by the norm $\|(u, \psi)\|_s$. We show the asymptotic continuity of the process $\xi_T(\cdot; \cdot)$, i.e., for any positive

η and ε , there exists a positive constant δ such that

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\sup_{d_s((u^{(j)}, \psi^{(j)}), (u^{(k)}, \psi^{(k)})) < \delta} \left| \xi_T(u^{(j)} - u^{(k)}; \psi^{(j)} - \psi^{(k)})_{ab} \right| > \eta \right) < \varepsilon,$$

which is a necessary and sufficient condition. (See Theorem 1.5.6 in Van Der Vaart & Wellner (1996)).

To this end, we apply Lemma B.9, where with $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$, η is supposed to be any positive constant independent of T . First, we evaluate the right hand side of (89) and (90). From Remark B.2, the right hand side of (89) is of order $O(T^{-1/2}b_T^{-1/2}(\log T)^3)$. From Lemma 14 in Nolan & Pollard (1987),

$$N_{[0,1] \times \Psi_T}(4\varepsilon) \leq N_{[0,1]}(\varepsilon)N_{\Psi_T}(\varepsilon) \leq Ab_T^{-V}\varepsilon^{-V+1}, \quad (91)$$

where the last inequality follows from (64). Note that $\alpha_T := \alpha$ depends on T , and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\alpha_T} (\log N_{[0,1] \times \Psi_T}(s))^2 ds &= \int_0^{\alpha_T} (-(V+1)\log s - V\log b_T + \log A)^2 ds \\ &= O(\alpha_T(\log b_T)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Again, from (90) and the relation (91), we find α_T satisfies

$$-(V+1)\log(\alpha_T) - V\log b_T + \log A = \frac{c_2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\sup_{\psi \in \Psi_T} \|\psi_T\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}}. \quad (92)$$

Note that under Assumption B.2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_T\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 &= \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1}{b_T^2} \psi\left(\frac{u}{b_T}, \lambda\right)^2 d\lambda du \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1}{b_T} \psi(v, \lambda)^2 d\lambda dv \\ &= O(b_T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

After arranging the terms in (92), we see that

$$\log(\alpha_T) = \log\left(b_T^{-\frac{V}{V+1}}\right) + C_1 b_T^{1/4} + C_2,$$

which in turn shows that $\alpha_T = O(b_T^{-V/(V+1)})$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_0^{\alpha_T} (\log N_{[0,1] \times \Psi_T}(s))^2 ds = o(1).$$

In summary, if $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$, then the equations (89) and (90) are always satisfied for T large enough.

We notice that, if $d_s((u^{(j)}, \psi^{(j)}), (u^{(k)}, \psi^{(k)})) < \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi^{(j)}(u^{(j)} - \cdot, \cdot) - \psi^{(k)}(u^{(k)} - \cdot, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\psi^{(j)}(u^{(j)} - u, \lambda) - \psi^{(k)}(u^{(k)} - u, \lambda))^2 d\lambda du < C_0 \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where C_0 is a positive constant. Actually,

$$\int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi^{(j)}(u^{(j)} - u, \lambda) d\lambda du = \int_{\max(u^{(j)}-1, 0)}^{\min(u^{(j)}, 1)} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda) d\lambda dv,$$

and thus, without loss of generality, suppose $1 < u^{(j)} < u^{(k)}$, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi^{(j)}(u^{(j)} - \cdot, \cdot) - \psi^{(k)}(u^{(k)} - \cdot, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\ & \leq \|\psi^{(j)} - \psi^{(k)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \int_{u^{(j)}-1}^{u^{(k)}-1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi^{(j)}(v, \lambda)^2 d\lambda dv \\ & \quad + 2 \sup_{u, \lambda} \psi^{(k)}(u, \lambda) \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\psi^{(j)}(u^{(j)} - u, \lambda) - \psi^{(j)}(u^{(k)} - u, \lambda)| d\lambda du \\ & < C_0 \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $|u^{(j)} - u^{(k)}| < \delta$, and $\psi^{(j)}$ is a function of bounded variation on a compact support, and thus a Lipschitz function.

Applying Lemma B.9, we see that, for any positive η and ε , if we take δ as small as enough, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\sup_{d_s((u^{(j)}, \psi^{(j)}), (u^{(k)}, \psi^{(k)})) < \delta} \left| \xi_T(u^{(j)} - u^{(k)}; \psi^{(j)} - \psi^{(k)})_{ab} \right| > \eta \right) \\ & \leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\sup_{\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} < C_0 \delta} \left| \xi_T(u^{(j)} - u^{(k)}; \psi)_{ab} \right| > \eta, B_n \right) + o(1) \\ & \leq 3c_1 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{C_0 \delta}} \right\} < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes this theorem. \square

Finally, remembering the matrix ϕ satisfies Assumption B.1, let us define $\mathcal{A}_T^\circ(u)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_T^\circ(u)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_T^\circ(u) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \phi_T(u - u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{I}_T(u_k, \lambda) \, d\lambda, \\ \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T^\circ(u) &:= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \phi_T(u - u_k, \lambda) \mathbf{f}(u_k, \lambda) \, d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and let $\zeta_T(u)$ be

$$\zeta_T(u) = \sqrt{T b_T} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{A}_T^\circ(u) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_T^\circ(u)). \quad (93)$$

Corollary B.11. Suppose Assumptions A.1, B.1 and B.2 hold. If $b_T = o(1)$ and $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$, then it holds that

$$\zeta_T(u) \rightsquigarrow \zeta(u) \quad \text{in } l^\infty([0, 1]),$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\zeta(u)$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance matrices

$$\operatorname{Cov}(\zeta(u^{(j)}), \zeta(u^{(k)})) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& 4\pi\delta(u^{(j)}, u^{(k)}) \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \boldsymbol{\phi}(v, \lambda) \mathbf{f}(u^{(j)}, \lambda) \boldsymbol{\phi}(v, \lambda) \, dv \right) \, d\lambda \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r,t,u,v=1}^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_{rt}(v, \lambda_1) \phi_{uv}(v, \lambda_2) \right. \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \tilde{\gamma}_{rtuv}(u^{(j)}; -\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_2) \, dv \right) \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2 \right), \quad (94)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the fourth-order spectral density of the process.

Proof. From the definition of $\zeta_T(u)$ in (93), we see that $\zeta(u)$ is a linear combination of the processes $\xi_T(u)$ in (67). With a similar computation to the latter part in Lemma A.3.3. in Hosoya & Taniguchi (1982), we obtain (94). \square

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL (III)

Title: EEG Channels and Data Analysis for Stock Market Data. (PDF)

In Supplementary Material (III), we provide the information for EEG data and the data analysis for stock market data.

C EEG Channels




Figure 8: EEG channels.

D Stock market data

The dataset is the weekly log-returns of the closing stock prices of two financial groups (Mitsubishi and Mizuho) in the Nikkei index. For brevity, two financial groups are denoted by A and B here. The weekly data are from 2006 January 1st to 2010 December 26th, so the length of the data is $T = 260$.

In our data analysis, we compute local Granger causality $GC^{A \rightarrow B}(u)$ and $GC^{B \rightarrow A}(u)$ for rescaled time $u = 1/T, 2/T, \dots, 1$. In general, Granger causality is not symmetric (e.g.,

the analysis of EEG data) and we regard

$$\left\{ \left(\text{GC}^{\text{A} \rightarrow \text{B}}(u), \text{GC}^{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{A}}(u) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \right\}_{u=\frac{1}{T}, \frac{2}{T}, \dots, 1} \quad (95)$$

as a point cloud in \mathbb{R}^2 . We separate local Granger causality in (95) into two parts: (1) from 2006 January 1st to 2008 June 29th; (2) from 2008 July 6th to 2010 December 26th. The part (1) and part (2) have the same length, i.e., the length of each part is 130.

We apply computational topology tools, *persistence diagram*, *persistence barcode*, *persistence landscape*, to capture the feature of these data points of local Granger causality (See, e.g. Fasy et al. (2014), for the details of the persistence diagram and persistence barcode). The plots of the persistence diagram and the persistence barcode are shown in Figure 9. The permutation test is applied to the point clouds (1) and (2) to test for equal topologies of the point clouds (1) and (2). In other words, the null hypothesis is no statistical difference between the persistence landscapes of local Granger causality. The result is statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01. It is known that there is a financial crisis between 2007 and 2008. Through the analysis of local Granger causality, we detected the structural change of the causality between these two financial data. A theoretical justification of this approach will be left as future work.







Figure 9: (Above) the persistence diagram of local Granger causality (left); and the persistence barcode of local Granger causality (right) during the period (1). (Below) the persistence diagram of local Granger causality (left); and the persistence barcode of local Granger causality (right) during the period (2).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL (IV)

Title: The local hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = c, c > 0$.

In Supplementary Material (IV), we consider the hypothesis testing problem for the local hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = c, c > 0$.

For the case $c > 0$, we use the Wald type test statistic $S^*(u)$, i.e.,

$$S^*(u) = Tb_T \left(\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - c \right) \left[\left(\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) \right) \tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u) \left(\nabla \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) \right)^\top \right]^{-1} \left(\text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T) - c \right). \quad (96)$$

Theorem D.1. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Under the null hypothesis $H_0^{(\cdot)} : \text{GC}^{(\cdot)}(u) = c$ ($c > 0$), if $b_T^{-1} = o(T(\log T)^{-6})$ and $b_T = o(T^{-1/5})$, we have*

$$S^*(u) \xrightarrow{d} \chi_d^2,$$

where χ_d^2 is a chi-squared distribution with the degrees of freedom d .

Remark D.2. The covariance matrix $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(u)$ in (36) or (96) is usually unknown. We may construct a consistent estimator $\hat{\mathbb{V}}(u)$. If the multivariate locally stationary process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ is Gaussian, then in view of Theorem B.8, we develop an estimator $\hat{\mathbb{V}}(u)$. If the process $\{\mathbf{X}_{t,T}\}$ is non-Gaussian, we have to take the fourth-order spectral density of the process into account. This will be constructed following Keenan (1987) or Taniguchi (1982).