

Simultaneous Decorrelation of Matrix Time Series*

Yuefeng Han Rong Chen Cun-Hui Zhang

Department of Statistics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, U.S.A.
 yuefeng.han@rutgers.edu rongchen@stat.rutgers.edu czhang@stat.rutgers.edu

Qiwei Yao

Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, London, WC2A 2AE, U.K.
 q.yao@lse.ac.uk

Abstract

We propose a contemporaneous bilinear transformation for matrix time series to alleviate the difficulties in modelling and forecasting large number of time series together. More precisely the transformed matrix splits into several small matrices, and those small matrix series are uncorrelated across all times. Hence an effective dimension-reduction is achieved by modelling each of those small matrix series separately without the loss of information on the overall linear dynamics. We adopt the bilinear transformation such that the rows and the columns of the matrix do not mix together, as they typically represent radically different features. As the targeted transformation is not unique, we identify an ideal version through a new normalization, which facilitates the no-cancellation accumulation of the information from different time lags. The non-asymptotic error bounds of the estimated transformation are derived, leading to the uniform convergence rates of the estimation. The proposed method is illustrated numerically via both simulated and real data examples.

Some key words: Decorrelation transformation; Eigenanalysis; Matrix time series; Forecasting; Uniform convergence rates.

1 Introduction

Data recorded in a sequence of matrices are increasingly common in this information age, due to the demand to solve practical problems from, among others, signal processing, medical imaging, social networks, IT communication, genetic linkages, industry production and distribution, economic activities and financial markets. Extensive developments on statistical inference for matrix data under i.i.d. settings can be found in [Negahban and Wainwright \(2011\)](#), [Rohde and Tsybakov \(2011\)](#), [Xia and Yuan \(2019\)](#), and the references therein. Many matrix sequences are recorded over time, exhibiting significant serial dependence which is valuable for modelling and future prediction. Consequently there is a growing interest in analyzing matrix time series, see,

*Han was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant IIS-1741390. Chen was supported in part by National Science Foundation grants DMS-1503409, DMS-1737857 and IIS-1741390. Zhang was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1721495, IIS-1741390 and CCF-1934924. Yao was supported in part by the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council.

for example, a matrix factor model based on the Tucker decomposition for tensors (Chen and Chen, 2019, Chen et al., 2019a, 2020a, 2019b, Han et al., 2020b,c, Wang et al., 2019), a bilinear autoregressive model (Chen et al., 2020b, Xiao et al., 2021), and a matrix factor model based on the tensor CP decomposition (Chang et al., 2021).

A common feature in the aforementioned approaches is dimension-reduction, as the so-called ‘curse-of-dimensionality’ is more pronounced in modelling time series than i.i.d. observations, which is exemplified by the limited practical usefulness of vector ARMA (i.e. VARMA) models. Note that a unregularized VAR(1) model with dimension p involves at least p^2 parameters. Hence finding an effective way to reduce the number of parameters is of fundamental importance in modelling and forecasting high dimensional time series. In the context of vector time series, most available approaches may be divided into three categories: (i) regularized VAR or VARMA methods incorporating LASSO or alternative penalties (Basu and Michailidis, 2015, Gao et al., 2019, Ghosh et al., 2019, Guo et al., 2016, Hall et al., 2018, Han et al., 2020a, Lin and Michailidis, 2017, 2020, Zhou and Raskutti, 2018), (ii) factor models of various forms (Bai and Ng, 2002, Forni et al., 2005, Lam and Yao, 2012, Pena and Box, 1987), (iii) various versions of independent component analysis (Back and Weigend, 1997, Chang et al., 2018, Huang and Tsay, 2014, Matteson and Tsay, 2011, Tiao and Tsay, 1989). Note that the literature in each of the three categories is large, it is impossible to list all the relevant references here.

In this paper we propose a new dimension-reduction method for modelling and forecasting matrix time series. Our proposal is in the spirit of independent component analysis. It transform a $p \times q$ matrix series into the new series of the same size by a contemporaneous bilinear transformation (i.e. the values at different time lags are not mixed together). The new matrix series is divided into many submatrix series and those submatrix series are uncorrelated across all time lags. Hence we achieve an effective dimension-reduction as those submatrix series can be modelled separately without the loss of information on the overall linear dynamics. This is particularly advantageous for forecasting future values: cross serial correlations among different component series are valuable for future prediction. However the gain from incorporating those cross serial correlations directly in a moderately high dimension model is typically not enough to offset the error resulted from estimating the large number of parameters. This is why forecasting a large number of time series together based on a joint time series model can be worse than that forecasting each component series separately by ignoring cross serial correlations completely. See Chang et al. (2018) and also Section 4.2 below. The proposed transformation channels all cross serial correlations into the transformed submatrix series and those subseries are uncorrelated with each other across all time lags. Hence the relevant information can be used effectively in future forecasting within each small models. Note that the transformation is one-to-one, therefore the good forecasting performance of the transformed series can be easily transformed back to the forecasting for the original matrix series. Empirical evidence also indicates that the decorrelation improves the inference efficiency (Chang et al., 2017).

The basic idea of the proposed transformation is similar to the so-called principal component analysis for time series (PCA-TS) of Chang et al. (2018). Actually one might be tempted to stack a $p \times q$ matrix series into a $(pq) \times 1$ vector time series, and apply PCA-TS directly. This requires to search for a $(pq) \times (pq)$ transformation matrix, which is almost prohibited for p and q of the size a few thousands. In contrast, the proposed bilinear transformation is facilitated by two matrices of size, respectively, $p \times p$ and $q \times q$. Perhaps more importantly the bilinear transformation does not mix rows and columns together, as they may represent radically different features in the data

(see, e.g., the example in 4.2).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The proposed model is presented in Section 2. We introduce a new normalization under which the required bilinear transformation consists of two orthogonal transformations. The orthogonality allows us to accumulate the information from different time lags without cancellation. The estimation of the proposed bilinear transformation boils down to the eigenanalysis of two positive-definite matrices of sizes $p \times p$ and $q \times q$ respectively. Hence the computation can be carried out on a laptop/PC with p and q equal to a few thousands. Theoretical properties of the proposed estimation are presented in Section 3. More precisely the non-asymptotic error bounds of the estimated transformation are derived based on some concentration inequalities (e.g., Merlevède et al. (2011), Rio (2000)); further leading to the uniform convergence rates of the estimation. The consistency of the proposed latent uncorrelated blocks selection method is also presented. Numerical illustration with both simulated and real data is reported in Section 4, which shows superior performance in forecasting over the methods without transformation. Once again it reinforces the fact that the across serial correlations are important and useful information for future prediction for a large number of time series, and, however, it is necessary to adopt appropriate dimension-reduction techniques, such as the proposed decorrelation transformation, in order to use the information effectively (Chang et al., 2018). All technical proofs are relegated to an Appendix.

2 Settings and methodology

2.1 Model

Let $X_t = (X_{t,i,j})$ be a $p \times q$ matrix time series, i.e. there are pq recorded values at each time from, for example, p individuals and over q indices or variables. We assume that X_t is weakly stationary in the sense that all the first two moments are finite and time-invariant. With available observations X_1, \dots, X_T , the ultimate goal is to build a dynamic model for X_t and to forecast the future values X_{T+1}, X_{T+2}, \dots . With moderately large p and q , any direct attempts based on ARMA framework are unlikely to be successful due to overparametrization. We assume that X_t admits a latent segmentation structure

$$X_t = BU_tA^\top, \tag{1}$$

where A and B are unknown $q \times q$ and $p \times p$, respectively, invertible constant matrices, and random matrix U_t is unobservable and is of a block structure

$$U_t = \begin{pmatrix} U_{t,1,1} & U_{t,1,2} & \cdots & U_{t,1,n_c} \\ U_{t,2,1} & U_{t,2,2} & \cdots & U_{t,2,n_c} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ U_{t,n_r,1} & U_{t,n_r,2} & \cdots & U_{t,n_r,n_c} \end{pmatrix} \tag{2}$$

in which $U_{t,i,j}$ is a $p_i \times q_i$ matrix with unknown p_i and q_i , $\sum_{i=1}^{n_r} p_i = p$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{n_c} q_j = q$. Furthermore, $U_{t+\tau,i_1,j_1}$ and U_{t,i_2,j_2} , for any $(i_1, j_1) \neq (i_2, j_2)$, are uncorrelated for any integer τ . Note that the rows and the columns of U_t are linear combinations of, respectively, the rows and the columns of X_t .

One would be tempted to stack all the elements of X_t into a long vector and to apply PCA-TS of Chang et al. (2018) directly. This requires to search for the $(pq) \times (pq)$ decorrelation transformation

matrix Φ such that $\text{vec}(X_t) = \Phi \text{vec}(U_t)$. The proposed model (1) is effectively to impose a low-dimension structure $\Phi = A \otimes B$, where \otimes denotes the matrix Kronecker product. Also note that simpler models are more likely to be applicable to smaller matrix series. For example, the bilinear AR models of Chen et al. (2020b) with small orders are more plausible for $U_{t,i,j}$ than for X_t , the factor models of Wang et al. (2019) or Chang et al. (2021) with small number of factors are more appropriate for $U_{t,i,j}$ than for X_t .

The structure in (2) may be too rigid in the sense that both n_r and n_c may be small or very small in practice. One can apply again the proposed method to each submatrix series $U_{t,i,j}$; leading to a finer segmentation with irregularly sized small blocks.

2.2 Normalization and identification

To simplify the statement, let $E(X_t) = 0$. This amounts to centre the data by the sample mean first, which will not affect the asymptotic properties of the estimation under the stationarity assumption. Thus $E(U_t) = 0$.

The terms A, B and U_t on the RHS of (1) are not uniquely defined, and any A, B and U_t satisfying the required condition will serve the dimension-reduction purpose. Therefore we can take the advantage from this lack of uniqueness to identify the ‘ideal’ A and B to improve the estimation effectiveness. More precisely, by applying a new normalization, we identify A and B to be orthogonal, which facilitates the accumulation of the information from different lags without cancellation. To this end, we first list some basic facts as follows.

1. (B, U_t, A^\top) in (1) can be replace by $(BD_1, D_1^{-1}U_tD_2^{-1}, D_2A^\top)$ for any invertible block diagonal matrices D_1 and D_2 with the block sizes, respectively, (p_1, \dots, p_{n_r}) and (q_1, \dots, q_{n_c}) .
2. The q columns of BU_t can be divided into n_c uncorrelated blocks of sizes (q_1, \dots, q_{n_c}) , i.e. the columns of BU_t resemble the same pattern of the uncorrelated blocks as those of U_t . Thus $\Sigma_1^{(u)} \equiv E(U_t^\top B^\top BU_t)/p$ is a block diagonal matrix with the block sizes (q_1, \dots, q_{n_c}) . In the same vein, $\Sigma_2^{(u)} = E(U_t AA^\top U_t^\top)/q$ is a block diagonal matrix with the block sizes (p_1, \dots, p_{n_r}) .
3. Put $B = (B_1, \dots, B_{n_r})$ and $A = (A_1, \dots, A_{n_c})$, where B_i is $p_i \times q$ and A_i is $q_i \times p$. Then linear spaces $\mathcal{M}(B_1), \dots, \mathcal{M}(B_{n_r})$ and $\mathcal{M}(A_1), \dots, \mathcal{M}(A_{n_c})$ are uniquely defined by (1), though B and A are not, where $\mathcal{M}(G)$ denotes the linear space spanned by the columns of matrix G . Note that for any invertible $q \times q$ matrix Σ_1 and $p \times p$ matrix Σ_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 A &= (\Sigma_1 A_1, \dots, \Sigma_1 A_{n_c}), & \mathcal{M}(A_i) &= \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_1 A_i) \quad i = 1, \dots, n_c, \\ \Sigma_2 B &= (\Sigma_2 B_1, \dots, \Sigma_2 B_{n_r}), & \mathcal{M}(B_i) &= \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_2 B_i) \quad i = 1, \dots, n_r. \end{aligned}$$

Put $\Sigma_1^{(x)} = E(X_t^\top X_t)/p$ and $\Sigma_2^{(x)} = E(X_t X_t^\top)/q$. Proposition 1 below indicates that if we replace X_t in (1) by a normalized version $\{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} X_t \{\Sigma_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2}$, we can treat both A and B in (1) as orthogonal matrices. This orthogonality plays a key role in combining together the information from different time lags in our estimation (see the proof of Proposition 2 in the appendix).

Proposition 1. *Let both $\Sigma_1^{(x)}$ and $\Sigma_2^{(x)}$ be invertible. Then model (1) can be written as*

$$X_t = \{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{1/2} B_* U_t^* A_*^\top \{\Sigma_1^{(x)}\}^{1/2}, \quad (3)$$

where U_t^* admits the same decomposition as (2) with $p \times q$ uncorrelated blocks, and A_* and B_* are, respectively, $q \times q$ and $p \times p$ orthogonal matrices. More precisely,

$$U_t^* = \{\Sigma_2^{(u)}\}^{-1/2} U_t \{\Sigma_1^{(u)}\}^{-1/2}, \quad A_* = \{\Sigma_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} A \{\Sigma_1^{(u)}\}^{1/2}, \quad B_* = \{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} B \{\Sigma_2^{(u)}\}^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

The proof of Proposition 1 is almost trivial. First note that both $\Sigma_1^{(u)}$, $\Sigma_2^{(u)}$ are invertible. Then (3) follows from (1) and (4) directly. The orthogonality of, e.g., B_* follows from equality $E[\{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} X_t X_t^\top \{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2}] / q = I_p$, (3) and (4). Also note that $\{\Sigma_2^{(u)}\}^{-1/2}$ and $\{\Sigma_1^{(u)}\}^{-1/2}$ are of the same block diagonal structure as, respectively, $\Sigma_2^{(u)}$ and $\Sigma_1^{(u)}$. This implies that U_t^* admits the decomposition in the form of (2).

Note that (B_*, U_t^*, A_*^\top) in (3) are (still) not uniquely defined, as they can be replaced by $(B_* D_1, D_1^\top U_t^* D_2^\top, D_2 A_*^\top)$ for any orthogonal block diagonal matrices D_1 and D_2 with appropriate block sizes. Proposition 2 below shows that we can take the orthonormal eigenvectors of two properly defined positive definite matrices as the columns of A_* and B_* . With A_* and B_* specified, the segmented U_t^* can be solved from (3) directly. Let

$$V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} = \{\Sigma_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} E(X_{t+\tau}^\top E_{i,j} X_t) \{\Sigma_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2}, \quad V_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)} = \{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} E(X_{t+\tau} E_{i,j} X_t^\top) \{\Sigma_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2},$$

where $E_{i,j}$ is the unit matrix with 1 at position (i, j) and 0 elsewhere, and $E_{i,j}$ is $p \times p$ in the first equation, and $q \times q$ in the second equation. For a prespecified integer $\tau_0 \geq 1$, put

$$W^{(1)} = \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} (V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)})^\top}{p^2}, \quad W^{(2)} = \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{V_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)} (V_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)})^\top}{q^2}. \quad (5)$$

Proposition 2. *Let both $\Sigma_1^{(x)}$ and $\Sigma_2^{(x)}$ be invertible, and all the eigenvalues of $W^{(i)}$ be distinct, $i = 1, 2$. Then the q orthonormal eigenvectors of $W^{(1)}$ can be taken as the columns of A_* , and the p orthonormal eigenvectors of $W^{(2)}$ can be taken as the columns of B_* .*

The proposition above does not give any indication on how to arrange the columns of A_* and B_* , which should be ordered according to the latent uncorrelated block structure (2). We address this issue in Section 2.3 below.

Remark 1. In case that $W^{(i)}$ has tied eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors across different blocks, Proposition 2 no longer holds. To avoid the tied eigenvalues, we may use different values of τ_0 , or even different forms of $W^{(i)}$ if necessary. For example, we may replace $W^{(1)}$ by

$$W^{(1,f)} = \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{f(V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)\top})}{p^2}.$$

where $f(V)$ is a function of a symmetric matrix V in which $f(V) = \Gamma D^{(f)} \Gamma^\top$, $V = \Gamma D \Gamma^\top$ is the eigen-decomposition for V , and $D^{(f)} = \text{diag}(f(d_1), \dots, f(d_q))$ is the diagonal-element-wise transformation of the diagonal matrix D of the eigenvalues.

Remark 2. In practice, we need to specify integer τ_0 . In principle any τ_0 can be used to estimate A_* and B_* , as $V_{\tau,i,j}^{(k)} (V_{\tau,i,j}^{(k)})^\top$ is non-negative definite, there is no information cancellation from different time lags. Since autocorrelation is typically at its strongest at small lags, a relatively small τ_0 , such as $\tau_0 = 5$, is often sufficient (Chang et al., 2018, Chen et al., 2019b, Lam et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2019).

2.3 Estimation

The estimation for A_* and B_* is based on the eigenanalysis of the sample versions of matrices defined in (5). To this end, let

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)} = \frac{1}{Tp} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t^\top X_t, \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)} = \frac{1}{Tq} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t X_t^\top, \quad (6)$$

$$\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} = \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \frac{X_{t+\tau}^\top E_{i,j} X_t}{T-\tau} \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)} = \{\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \frac{X_{t+\tau} E_{i,j} X_t^\top}{T-\tau} \{\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}\}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (7)$$

$$\widehat{W}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} (\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)})^\top, \quad \widehat{W}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)} (\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(2)})^\top. \quad (8)$$

Performing the eigenanalysis for $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$, and arranging the resulting q orthonormal eigenvectors by the algorithm below, we take the ordered eigenvectors as the columns of \widehat{A}_* . The estimator \widehat{B}_* is obtained in the same manner via the eigenanalysis for $\widehat{W}^{(2)}$. Then by (3), we obtain the transformed matrix series

$$\widehat{U}_t^* = \widehat{B}_*^\top \{\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} X_t \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} \widehat{A}_*. \quad (9)$$

Note that the estimation for A_* and that for B_* are carried out separately. They do not interfere with each other.

Now we present an algorithm to arrange the order of the columns for \widehat{A}_* . By (3), the columns of $Z_t \equiv X_t \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} A_*$ are divided into the n_c uncorrelated blocks. Define

$$\widehat{Z} \equiv (\widehat{z}_{t,i,j}) = X_t \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} (\widehat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \widehat{\gamma}_q), \quad (10)$$

where $\widehat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \widehat{\gamma}_q$ are the q orthonormal eigenvectors of $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$. We divide the columns of \widehat{Z} into some uncorrelated blocks according to the maximum pairwise correlations between the columns, i.e. the correlation between the k -th and ℓ -th column is measured by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell} &= \max_{1 \leq i,j \leq p, |\tau| \leq \tau_1} |\widehat{\text{Corr}}(\widehat{z}_{t+\tau,i,k}, \widehat{z}_{t,j,\ell})| \\ &= \max_{1 \leq i,j \leq p, |\tau| \leq \tau_1} \frac{|\widehat{\gamma}_k^\top \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell|}{\{\widehat{\gamma}_k^\top \widehat{V}_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^\top \widehat{V}_{0,j,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell\}^{1/2}}, \quad 1 \leq k < \ell \leq q, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The second equality above follows from (7), (8) and (10). In the above expression, $\tau_1 \geq 1$ is a sufficiently large integer, for example, between 10 and 20, in the spirit of the rule of thumb of [Box and Jenkins \(1970\)](#). Instead of conducting a multiple test for all $q_0 = q(q-1)/2$ pair columns, we propose a ratio-based statistic to single out those significantly correlated pairs. To this end, we rearrange $\widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}$, $1 \leq k < \ell \leq q$ in the descending order: $\widehat{\rho}_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq \widehat{\rho}_{(q_0)}$. Define

$$\widehat{r} = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq 0.75q_0} \widehat{\rho}_{(j)} / \widehat{\rho}_{(j+1)}. \quad (12)$$

We take the \widehat{r} pair columns corresponding to $\widehat{\rho}_{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{\rho}_{(\widehat{r})}$ as correlated pairs. The intuition behind this approach is as follows. Suppose among in total q_0 pair columns of Z_t there are r cross correlated

pairs only. Arrange the true maximum absolute cross correlations in the descending order: $\rho_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq \rho_{(q_0)}$. Then $\rho_{(r)} > 0$, $\rho_{(q_0)} = 0$, and the ratio $\rho_{(j)}/\rho_{(j+1)}$ takes value ∞ at $j = r$. See [Chang et al. \(2018\)](#) for the application of the same idea in TS-PCA. Similar ideas have also been used in determining the number of factors in [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#), [Ahn and Horenstein \(2013\)](#) and [Han et al. \(2020c\)](#). Instead of using 0.75 in (12), we may choose $c_r \in (0, 1)$, to avoid the fluctuations due to the ratios of extremely small values.

Once we have identified \hat{r} correlated pair columns of \hat{Z}_t , the grouping can be performed as follows:

- (i) Start with q groups with one column in each group.
- (ii) Merge two groups together if two correlated columns are split over the two groups.
- (iii) Repeat Step (ii) above until all the correlated columns are within one group. The number of the final groups is the estimated value for n_c .

The finite sample performance of the above algorithm can be improved by prewhitening each column time series of \hat{Z} . This makes $\hat{\rho}_{k,\ell}$, for different (k, ℓ) , more comparable. See Remark 2(iii) of [Chang et al. \(2018\)](#). In practice the prewhitening can be carried out by fitting each column time series an VAR model with the order between 0 and 5 determined by AIC. The resulting residual series is taken as a prewhitened series.

The ordering for columns of \hat{B}_* is arranged, in the same manner as above, by examining the pairwise correlations among the columns of

$$X_t^\top \{\hat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} (\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_p),$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_p$ are now the p orthonormal eigenvectors of $\hat{W}^{(2)}$.

3 Theoretical properties

To gain more appreciation of the methodology, we will show the consistency of the proposed detection method of uncorrelated components.

Denote by $X_{t,i}$, the i -th row of X_t , and $X_{t,i,j}$ the (i, j) -th element of X_t . For matrix $V = (V_{ij})$, let $\|V\|_{op}$ denote the spectrum norm, and $\|V\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |V_{ij}|$. To facilitate the theoretical analysis, we impose the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. Assume exponentially decay coefficients of the strong α -mixing condition,

$$\alpha(k) \leq \exp(-c_0 k^{r_1})$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$ and $0 < r_1 \leq 1$, where

$$\alpha(k) = \sup_t \left\{ \left| \Pr(A \cap B) - \Pr(A)\Pr(B) \right| : A \in \sigma(X_s, s \leq t), B \in \sigma(X_s, s \geq t+k) \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Here for any random variable/vector/matrix X , $\sigma(X)$ is understood to be the σ -field generated by X . Assumption 1 allows a very general class of time series models, including causal ARMA processes with continuously distributed innovations; see also [Bradley \(2005\)](#), [Fan and Yao \(2003\)](#), [Rosenblatt \(2012\)](#), [Tong \(1990\)](#), [Tsay \(2005\)](#), [Tsay and Chen \(2018\)](#), among others. The restriction $r_1 \leq 1$ is introduced only for presentation convenience.

As $|\text{pr}(A \cap B) - \text{pr}(A)\text{pr}(B)| \leq 1/4 \leq e^{-1}$ for all event pairs $\{A, B\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_t \left\{ \left| \text{pr}(A \cap B) - \text{pr}(A)\text{pr}(B) \right| : A \in \sigma(X_{s+\tau} \otimes X_s, s \leq t, \tau \leq \tau_0), B \in \sigma(X_{s+\tau} \otimes X_s, s \geq t+k) \right\} \\ & \leq \sup_t \left\{ \left| \text{pr}(A \cap B) - \text{pr}(A)\text{pr}(B) \right| : A \in \sigma(X_s, s \leq t+\tau_0), B \in \sigma(X_s, s \geq t+k) \right\} \\ & \leq \exp \left[-\max\{1, c_0(k-\tau_0)^{r_1}\} \right] \\ & \leq \exp \left[-c_0(1+c_0^{1/r_1}\tau_0)^{-r_1}k^{r_1} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product for matrices. Thus, the quadratic process $(X_{t+\tau} \otimes X_t, 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0)$ also satisfies the α -mixing condition with c_0 in Assumption 1 replaced by the smaller $c_0(1+c_0^{1/r_1}\tau_0)^{-r_1}$.

Assumption 2. There exist certain finite constants c_*, c^* , such that

$$\sup_{i \leq p, \|u\|_2=1} \text{var} \left(X_{t,i}^\top u \right)^2 \leq c^*, \quad \inf_{\|u\|_2=1} \text{E} \|X_t u\|_2^2 / p \geq c_*. \quad (14)$$

Note that $\sup_{\|u\|_2=1} \text{var} \left(X_{t,i}^\top u \right)^2 = \|\Sigma_{0,i,i}^{(x)}\|_{op}$ and $\text{E} \|X_t u\|_2^2 / p = u^\top \Sigma_1^{(x)} u$. Assumption 2 on the eigenvalues is a common assumption in the high dimensional setting, for instance, Bickel et al. (2008a,b), Xia et al. (2018). It rules out the possibility of latent factor structure in X_t . As the ultimate goal is forecasting, for ultra high dimensional matrix time series, we suggest to de-correlate the estimated latent processes after doing factor analysis first.

Assumption 3. For any $x > 0$,

$$\max_t \max_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q} \text{pr} (|X_{t,i,j}| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2 x^{r_2}),$$

for some constant $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $0 < r_2 \leq 2$.

Assumption 3 requires that the tail probability of each individual series of X_t decay exponentially fast. In particular, when $r_2 = 2$, each $X_{t,i,j}$ is sub-Gaussian.

The following theorem provides the non-asymptotic bounds for $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} := \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} X_{t+\tau}^\top E_{ij} X_t / (T-\tau)$, $\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq q$ under both exponential decay α mixing condition and exponential tail condition of X_t .

Theorem 1. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3 hold with constants c_*, c^*, r_1, r_2 , and τ_0 is a finite constant. Let $1/\beta_1 = 1/r_1 + 2/r_2$ and $1/\beta_2 = 1/r_1 + 1/r_2$. Then,

$$\left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \right\|_{op} \leq q \left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \right\|_{\max} \leq \eta_{T,p,q}^*, \quad \forall 1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0, 1 \leq i, j \leq p \quad (15)$$

in an event Ω_T with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$, where

$$\eta_{T,p,q}^* = C_1 q \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(pq/\epsilon_T)}{T}} + \frac{[\log(Tpq/\epsilon_T)]^{1/\beta_1}}{T} + \frac{[\log(Tpq/\epsilon_T)]^{2/\beta_2}}{T^2} \right),$$

for some positive constant C_1 depending on r_1, r_2 . Moreover, if $\eta_{T,p,q}^* \leq c_*/2$, then

$$\left\| \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \right\|_{op} \leq \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}, \quad \left\| \widehat{W}^{(1)} - W^{(1)} \right\|_{op} \leq \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}, \quad (16)$$

in the same event Ω_T with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$, where $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} = C_2 \eta_{T,p,q}^*$ for a constant C_2 depending on c_*, c^* only.

When the decays of the α mixing coefficients and the tail probabilities of X_t are slower than Assumptions 1 and 3, we impose the following Assumptions 4 and 5. These conditions ensure the Fuk-Nagaev-type inequalities for α -mixing processes; see also Rio (2000), Liu et al. (2013), Wu and Wu (2016) and Zhang and Wu (2017).

Assumption 4. Assume algebraically decay coefficients of the strong α -mixing condition

$$\alpha(k) \leq c_0 k^{-r_1},$$

where $\alpha(k)$ is defined in (13), $c_0 > 0$ and $r_1 > 1$.

Assumption 5. For any $x > 0$,

$$\max_t \max_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q} \text{pr}(|X_{t,i,j}| \geq x) \leq c_1 x^{-2r_2},$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$ and $r_2 > 1$.

Theorem 2 below presents the uniform convergence rate for $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}$, $\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq q$. It is intuitively clear that the rate is much slower than that in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Suppose Assumptions 2, 4, 5 hold with constants c_*, c^*, r_1, r_2 , and τ_0 is a finite constant. Let $\beta_3 = r_2(r_1 + 1)/(r_1 + r_2) > 1$. Then, (15) holds in an event Ω_T with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$, where

$$\eta_{T,p,q}^* = C_1 q \left(\frac{(Tpq/\epsilon_T)^{1/\beta_3}}{T} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(pq/\epsilon_T)}{T}} \right),$$

for some positive constant C_1 depending on r_1, r_2 . Similarly, if $\eta_{T,p,q}^* \leq c_*/2$, then (16) holds in the same event Ω_T .

Write the eigenvalue decomposition of $W^{(1)}$ as

$$W^{(1)} = \Gamma^{(1)} D (\Gamma^{(1)})^\top,$$

where $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q)$ gives the eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$ and $\Gamma^{(1)} = (\gamma_1^{(1)}, \dots, \gamma_q^{(1)})$ gives the corresponding eigenvectors. For any group $G \subset \{1, \dots, q\}$, define the eigengap as

$$\Delta_G = \min \left\{ |\lambda_j - \lambda_k| : j \in G, k \notin G \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Let $\Gamma_G^{(1)} = (\gamma_j^{(1)})_{j \in G}$. We say that the group G is *identifiable* if $\Delta_G > 0$ as the column space of $\Gamma_G^{(1)}$ would then be the span of $|G|$ eigenvectors for all versions of $\Gamma^{(1)}$. Let $\widehat{\Gamma}^{(1)} = (\widehat{\gamma}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{\gamma}_q^{(1)})$ be the eigenmatrix of $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$ in the eigenvalue decomposition

$$\widehat{W}^{(1)} = \widehat{\Gamma}^{(1)} \widehat{D} (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(1)})^\top,$$

where $\widehat{D} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_q)$ gives the corresponding eigenvalues with $\widehat{\lambda}_1 \geq \dots \geq \widehat{\lambda}_q$. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. Suppose conditions of Theorem 1 or 2 hold and $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} < \Delta_G/2$ for a certain $G \subset \{1, \dots, q\}$ with the $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}$ in (16). Let $P_G = \Gamma_G^{(1)} \left(\Gamma_G^{(1)} \right)^\top$ be the orthogonal projection to the corresponding eigenspace, and $\widehat{P}_G = \widehat{\Gamma}_G^{(1)} \left(\widehat{\Gamma}_G^{(1)} \right)^\top$ the sample version. Then, in the event Ω_T given in Theorem 1 with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$,

$$\left\| \widehat{P}_G - P_G \right\|_{op} \leq \eta_{T,p,G}^{**}, \text{ with } \eta_{T,p,G}^{**} = \frac{\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}}{\Delta_G - \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}} < 1. \quad (18)$$

In particular, if $2\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} \leq \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}$, then in the event Ω_T

$$\left\| \widehat{P}_{\{1, \dots, j\}} - P_{\{1, \dots, j\}} \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} - \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}} < 1.$$

By the structure assumption in (2), there exists a group structure $G_c = \{G_1, \dots, G_{n_c}\}$, such that the groups

$$X_t \left(\Sigma_1^{(1)} \right)^{-1/2} \Gamma_{G_i}^{(1)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_c, \quad (19)$$

are uncorrelated across all time lags. Let G be one of the G_i or a union of several G_i . It follows from Theorem 3 that when the group G is identifiable with a sufficiently large eigengap Δ_G , it would be consistent with the eigenvalue decomposition of the estimator $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$, even in the presence of tied eigenvalues within G or within G^c .

The decomposition (19) is not unique. An alternative decomposition

$$X_t \left(\Sigma_1^{(x)} \right)^{-1/2} \Pi_{H_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_c, \quad (20)$$

based on an orthonormal matrix $\Pi = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q)$ and a partition $\{H_1, \dots, H_{n_c}\}$ of $\{1, \dots, q\}$ is equivalent to (19) if and only if

$$\Pi_{H_i} \Pi_{H_i}^\top = \Gamma_{G_i}^{(1)} \left(\Gamma_{G_i}^{(1)} \right)^\top, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_c.$$

This includes rotation of the basis vectors within the group and also permutation of indices of the basis vectors. We say that a group G_{i_0} in (19) is *inseparable* at level $\rho^* > 0$ if for every equivalent decomposition (20), there exists a connected graph (H_{i_0}, E_{i_0}) with edges E_{i_0} such that

$$\rho_{k,\ell} = \max_{i,j,\tau} \frac{|\langle \gamma_k, V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \gamma_\ell \rangle|}{\left\{ \langle \gamma_k, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \gamma_k \rangle \langle \gamma_\ell, V_{0,j,j}^{(1)} \gamma_\ell \rangle \right\}^{1/2}} \geq \rho^*, \quad \forall (k, \ell) \in E_{i_0}. \quad (21)$$

Under a proper identifiability condition on the eigengap $\Delta_{G_{i_0}}$ (e.g., $\Delta_{G_{i_0}} > 2\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}$), such inseparable group can be detected with the test

$$\widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} = \max_{i,j,\tau} \frac{|\langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)} \rangle|}{\left\{ \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle \langle \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{0,j,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)} \rangle \right\}^{1/2}} \geq \rho_0 \quad (22)$$

with suitable $\rho_0 = \rho_{0,T} > 0$, where $\widehat{\gamma}_j^{(1)}$ are the eigenvectors of $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$. This is done by building a graph $(\{1, \dots, q\}, E)$ with edges $E = \{(k, \ell) : \widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} \geq \rho_0\}$. This graph is split into connected

subgraphs $(\widehat{G}_j, \widehat{E}_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, \widehat{g}_1$, which are not connected with each other. We say that a group G_{i_0} in (19) is *detected* if

$$\widehat{G}_j = G_{i_0}, \quad (23)$$

for some $1 \leq j \leq \widehat{g}_1$. The following theorem spells out the regularity conditions required for (23) in our analysis.

Theorem 4. *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3 hold with $G = G_{i_0}$ and that the minimum eigenvalue of $V_{0,j}^{(1)}$ is not smaller than a constant $\phi_* > 0$, for all $1 \leq j \leq q$. Suppose $(2\sqrt{2}c^*\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/c_*) \vee \eta_{T,p,q}^{**} < \phi_*$ with the c^* and c_* defined in Assumption 2, $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}$ in (16) and $\eta_{T,p,G}^{**}$ in (18). Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{G_{i_0}}^+ &= \frac{\rho^* - (\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} + 2\sqrt{2}c^*\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/c_*)}{(1 + 2\sqrt{2}c^*\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/(c_*\phi_*))(1 + \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*)}, \\ \rho_{G_{i_0}}^- &= \frac{\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} + 2\sqrt{2}c^*\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/c_*}{(1 - 2\sqrt{2}c^*\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/(c_*\phi_*))(1 - \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the following holds in the event Ω_T ,

$$\min_{k,\ell \in G_{i_0}} \widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} \geq \rho_{G_{i_0}}^+, \quad \max_{k \in G_{i_0}, \ell \notin G_{i_0}} \widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} \leq \rho_{G_{i_0}}^-.$$

In particular, when (21) holds and $\rho_{G_{i_0}}^+ > \rho_0 > \rho_{G_{i_0}}^-$, the group G_{i_0} in (19) is detected by the test (22) in the sense of (23) with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$.

Remark 3. The decomposition can be further refined with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{W}^{(1,f)} &= \sum_{\tau=0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{f(\widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)\top})}{p^2}, \\ \widehat{\Gamma}^{(1,f)} &= \text{the eigenmatrix of } \widehat{W}^{(1,f)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f(V)$ be a function of the $q \times q$ matrix inputs V , as defined in Remark 1. Then all the above theorems still hold.

Remark 4. Theorem 4 establishes the consistency of the maximum cross correlation method in Section 2.3, whereas the property of its sample version is not presented in Chang et al. (2018). Our theoretical results require that the minimum eigen-gap satisfies $\Delta_G > 2\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}$, where the estimation error bound $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}$ is defined in (16) and Δ_G is defined in (17).

4 Numerical properties

4.1 Simulation

We illustrate the proposed decorrelation method with three simulated examples. We always set $\tau_0 = 5$ in (8), and $\tau_1 = 15$ in (11). The prewhitening, as stated at the end of Section 2.3, is

always applied in determining the orders of the columns of \widehat{A}_* and \widehat{B}_* . As the true transformation matrices A_* and B_* defined in (4) cannot be computed easily even for simulated examples, we use the following proxies instead

$$A_* = \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} A \{\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(u)}\}^{1/2}, \quad B_* = \{\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}\}^{-1/2} B \{\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(u)}\}^{1/2},$$

where $\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)}$, $\widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)}$ are given in (6), and

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(u)} = \frac{1}{Tp} \sum_{t=1}^T U_t^\top B^\top B U_t, \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_2^{(u)} = \frac{1}{Tq} \sum_{t=1}^T U_t A A^\top U_t^\top.$$

To abuse the notation, we still use A_* , B_* to denote their proxies in this section since the true A_* , B_* never occur in our computation. For each setting, we replicate the simulation 1000 times.

Example 1. We consider model (1) in which all the component series of U_t are independent and ARMA(1, 2) of the form:

$$z_t = bz_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + a_1\epsilon_{t-1} + a_2\epsilon_{t-2}, \quad (24)$$

where b is drawn randomly from the uniform distribution on $(-0.98, -0.5) \cup (0.5, 0.98)$, a_1, a_2 are drawn independently from the uniform distribution on $(-0.98, -0.3) \cup (0.3, 0.98)$, and ϵ_t are independent and $N(0, 1)$. The elements of A and B are drawn independently from $U(-1, 1)$. For this example, we assume that we know $p_i = q_i = 1$, $n_r = p$ and $n_c = q$ in (2). The focus is to investigate the impact of p and q on the estimation for B and A .

Performing the eigenanalysis for $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{W}^{(2)}$ defined in (8), we take the resulting two sets of orthonormal eigenvectors as the columns of \widehat{A}_* and \widehat{B}_* respectively. To measure the estimation error, we define

$$D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*) = \frac{1}{2q(\sqrt{q} - 1)} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\frac{1}{\max_i |d_{i,j}|} + \frac{1}{\max_i |d_{j,i}|} - 2 \right),$$

where $d_{i,j}$ is the (i, j) -th element of matrix $\widehat{A}_*^\top A_*$. Note that $D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$ is always between 0 and 1, and $D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*) = 0$ if \widehat{A}_* is a column permutation of A_* . $D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$ is defined in the same manner.

We set $T = 100, 500, 1000, 5000$, and $p, q = 4, 8, 16, 32, 100$. The means and standard errors of $D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$ and $D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$ over the 1000 replications are reported in Table 1. As expected, the estimation errors decrease as T increases. Furthermore the error in estimating A_* increases as q increases, and that in estimating B_* increases as p increases. Also noticeable is the fact that the quality of the estimation for A_* depends on q only and that for B_* depends on p only, as $D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$ is about the same for $(q, p) = (4, 4)$ and $(q, p) = (4, 8)$, and $D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$ is about the same for $(q, p) = (4, 8)$ and $(q, p) = (8, 8)$. When $(q, p) = (32, 32)$, each A and B contains 1024 unknown parameters. The quality of their estimation with $T = 100$ is not ideal, but not substantially worse than that for $(q, p) = (16, 16)$, and the estimation is very accurate with $T = 5000$. For $(q, p) = (100, 16)$, matrix time series X_t contains 1600 component series. The estimation for A_* is not accurate enough as $q = 100$, while the estimation for B_* remains as good as that for $(q, p) = (16, 16)$, and is clearly better than that for $(q, p) = (32, 32)$.

Example 2. To examine the performance of the proposed method for identifying uncorrelated blocks, we consider now a only column-segmentation model

$$X_t = U_t A^\top,$$

Table 1: Example 1 – Means and standard errors (SD) of $D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$ and $D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$ in a simulation with 1000 replications.

T	(q, p)	$D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$		$D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$		(q, p)	$D(\widehat{A}_*, A_*)$		$D(\widehat{B}_*, B_*)$	
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE		Mean	SE	Mean	SE
100	(4, 4)	0.135	0.103	0.116	0.094	(4, 8)	0.124	0.096	0.169	0.056
500		0.081	0.080	0.052	0.065		0.074	0.078	0.089	0.047
1000		0.048	0.062	0.050	0.063		0.057	0.066	0.056	0.037
5000		0.021	0.042	0.020	0.042		0.019	0.039	0.032	0.027
100	(8, 8)	0.172	0.057	0.172	0.055	(16, 16)	0.204	0.031	0.206	0.032
500		0.098	0.048	0.086	0.044		0.132	0.032	0.131	0.031
1000		0.074	0.045	0.070	0.041		0.097	0.027	0.093	0.026
5000		0.034	0.029	0.035	0.030		0.041	0.017	0.042	0.018
100	(32, 32)	0.224	0.018	0.225	0.018	(100, 16)	0.251	0.006	0.187	0.032
500		0.162	0.019	0.161	0.020		0.212	0.008	0.127	0.031
1000		0.127	0.018	0.125	0.018		0.185	0.009	0.099	0.028
5000		0.058	0.013	0.058	0.013		0.106	0.008	0.044	0.019

where X_t, U_t are $p \times q$ matrix time series. Note that adding the row transformation matrix B in the model entails the application of the same method twice without adding any new insights on the performance of the method, as the estimation for A_* and that for B_* are performed separately. See Section 2.3.

The transformation matrix A in the above model is generated in the same way as in Example 1 above. All the element time series of U_t , except those in columns 2, 3 and 5, are simulated independently from ARMA(1,2) model (24). Denoted by $U_{t,j}$ the j -th column of U_t , we let

$$U_{t,2} = U_{t+1,1}, \quad U_{t,3} = U_{t+2,1}, \quad U_{t,5} = U_{t+1,4}.$$

Hence the first three columns of U_t forms one block of size 3, columns 4 and 5 forms a block of size 2, and the rest of the columns are uncorrelated with each other, and are uncorrelated to the first two blocks.

We set $T = 100, 500, 1000, 5000$. For each sample size, we set $(p, q) = (3, 6), (6, 6), (6, 10)$ and $(10, 10)$. Hence the number of groups is $n_c = 3, 3, 7$ and 7 , respectively. For each setting, we perform the eigenanalysis for $\widehat{W}^{(1)}$ defined as (8). We then apply the algorithm in Section 2.3 to arrange the orders of the q resulting orthonormal eigenvectors to form estimator \widehat{A}_* , for which the number of the correlated pairs of columns is determined by (12). Table 2 reports the relative frequencies of the correct specification of all the n_c uncorrelated blocks. We also report the relative frequencies of two types of wrong segmentation: (a) Merging with $\widehat{n}_c = n_c - 1$, i.e. $n_c - 2$ blocks are correctly specified, and the remaining two blocks are put into one; (b) Splitting with $\widehat{n}_c = n_c + 1$, i.e. $n_c - 1$ blocks are correctly specified, and the remaining block incorrectly splits into two. Table 2 indicates that the relative frequency of the correct specification increases as the sample size T increases, and it decreases as q increases while the performance is much less sensitive to the increase of p . It is noticeable that the probability of the event $\{\widehat{n}_c = n_c + 1\}$ is very small especially when T is large. With $q = 6$, the probability for the correct specification is not smaller than 64% with $T = 500$, and is greater than 70% with $T = 1000$. Furthermore the probability for $\widehat{n}_c = n_c$ or $n_c - 1$ is over 92%

for $T \geq 500$. Note that when $\hat{n}_c = n_c - 1$, an effective dimension reduction is still achieved in spite of missing a split.

For the instances with the correct specification, we also calculate the estimation errors for the n_c subspaces. More precisely, put $A_* = (A_1, \dots, A_{n_c})$ and $\hat{A}_* = (\hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_{n_c})$. We measure the estimation error by

$$D_1(\hat{A}_*, A_*) = \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\text{rank}(A_j)} \text{trace}(A_j A_j^\top \hat{A}_j \hat{A}_j^\top) \right\}.$$

Then $\{\text{rank}(A_j)\}^{-1} \text{trace}(A_j A_j^\top \hat{A}_j \hat{A}_j^\top)$ is always between 0 and 1. Furthermore it is equal to 1 if $\mathcal{M}(A_j) = \mathcal{M}(\hat{A}_j)$, and 0 if the two spaces are perpendicular with each other; see, for example, [Stewart and Sun \(1990\)](#) and [Pan and Yao \(2008\)](#). The boxplots of $D_1(\hat{A}_*, A_*)$ presented in Figure 1 indicate that the estimation errors decrease when T increases, and the errors with large q are greater than those with small q .

Table 2: Example 2 – Relative frequencies correct and incorrect segmentation in a simulation with 1000 replications.

(q, p)		$T = 100$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$	$T = 5000$
(6, 3)	Correct	0.369	0.659	0.721	0.837
	Merging	0.274	0.237	0.220	0.142
	Splitting	0.299	0.056	0.031	0.008
	Other	0.058	0.048	0.028	0.013
(6, 6)	Correct	0.371	0.639	0.706	0.815
	Merging	0.207	0.218	0.219	0.156
	Splitting	0.208	0.071	0.030	0.011
	Other	0.214	0.072	0.045	0.018
(10, 6)	Correct	0.103	0.323	0.369	0.542
	Merging	0.087	0.148	0.227	0.248
	Splitting	0.270	0.141	0.086	0.014
	Other	0.540	0.388	0.318	0.196
(10, 10)	Correct	0.116	0.299	0.363	0.495
	Merging	0.091	0.195	0.218	0.269
	Splitting	0.249	0.116	0.067	0.019
	Other	0.544	0.390	0.352	0.217

Example 3. In this example we examine the gain in post-sample forecasting due to the decorrelation transformation. Now in model (1) all the elements of A and B are drawn independently from $U(-1, 1)$, with (p, q) equal to (6, 6), (6, 8), (8, 8) and (10, 10). For each (p, q) combination, the first three rows (or columns) form one block, the next two rows (or columns) form a second block, and all the other row (or column) is independent of the rest of the rows (or columns). Table 3 shows the configuration of U_t for $(p, q) = (8, 8)$.

Each univariate block of U_t (e.g. $U_{t,6,6}$) is an AR(1) process with the autoregressive coefficient drawn from the $U[0.1, 0.3]$ and independent and $N(0, 1)$ innovations. For each block of size (3, 1), (1, 3), (2, 1) and (1, 2), a vector AR(1) model is used. All elements of the coefficient matrix is drawn




Figure 1: Example 2 – boxplots of $D_1(\hat{A}_*, A_*)$ in a simulation with 1000 replications.

independently from $U[0, 1]$, then normalized so its singular values are within $[0.1, 0.3]$. The vector innovations consist of independent and $N(0, 1)$ random variables. Each of the remaining four blocks follow a matrix AR(1) (i.e. MAR(1)) model of [Chen et al. \(2020b\)](#), i.e.

$$U_{t,i,j} = \lambda_{i,j} \Phi_{1,i,j} U_{t-1,i,j} \Phi_{2,i,j}^\top + E_{t,i,j}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \quad (25)$$

where $\Phi_{1,i,j}$ and $\Phi_{2,i,j}$ are the coefficient matrices with unit spectral norm, all elements of $E_{t,i,j}$ are independent and $N(0, 1)$. Matrices $\Phi_{1,i,j}$ and $\Phi_{2,i,j}$ are constructed such that their singular values are all one and the left and right singular matrices are orthonormal, and the scalar coefficient $\lambda_{i,j}$ controls the level of auto-correlation and its values for the four blocks are marked in [Table 3](#).

We set sample sizes $T = 500, 1000, 2000, 5000$, and $(p, q) = (6, 6), (8, 6), (8, 8), (10, 10)$. For each

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1								
2		.81		.64				
3								
4								
5		.25		.25				
6								
7								
8								

Table 3: Example 3: Block configuration of U_t for the case of $(p, q) = (8, 8)$

setting, we simulate a matrix time series of length $T + M$ with $M = 10$. To perform one-step ahead post-sample forecasting, for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, M - 1$, we use the first $T + i$ observations for identifying the uncorrelated blocks and for computing \hat{A}_* , \hat{B}_* and \hat{U}_t^* defined in (9). Depending on its shape/size, we fit each identified block in \hat{U}_t^* with an MAR(1), VAR(1) or AR(1) model. The fitted models are used to predict U_{T+i+1}^* . The predicted value for X_{T+i+1} is then obtained by

$$\hat{X}_{T+i+1} = (\hat{\Sigma}_2^{(x)})^{1/2} \hat{B}_* \hat{U}_{T+i+1}^* \hat{A}_*^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_1^{(x)})^{1/2}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, M - 1. \quad (26)$$

We then compute the mean squared error:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{pqM} \sum_{s=T+1}^{T+M} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q (\hat{X}_{s,i,j} - \mu_{s,i,j})^2, \quad (27)$$

where $\hat{X}_{s,i,j}$ denote the one-step ahead predicted value for the (i, j) -th element $X_{s,i,j}$ of X_s , and $\mu_{s,i,j} = \text{E}(X_{s,i,j} | X_{s-1}, X_{s-2}, \dots)$. We compare $\hat{X}_{s,i,j}$ with $\mu_{s,i,j}$, instead of $X_{s,i,j}$, to remove the impact of the noise in $X_{s,i,j}$. We report overall the mean and the standard deviation of MSE over 1000 replications. In addition we also report the mean and the standard deviation over the replications with the completely correct segmentation of the uncorrelated blocks in U_t^* , over those with nearly correct segmentation (i.e. either $\hat{n}_r = n_r - 1$ or $\hat{n}_c = n_c - 1$), and over all the other cases.

For the comparison purpose, we also include several other models in our simulation: (i) VAR(1) model, i.e. X_t is stacked into a vector of length pq and a VAR(1) is fitted to the vector series directly, and (ii) MAR(1) model of [Chen et al. \(2020b\)](#), i.e. MAR(1) is fitted directly to X_t . In addition, we also include two oracle models: (O1) the true segmentation blocks are used to model \hat{U}_t^* ; and (O2) True $\Sigma_1^{(x)}$, $\Sigma_2^{(x)}$ and true A_* , B_* are used and the true segmentation blocks are used to model \hat{U}_t^* .

The mean and standard deviations (in bracket) of the MSEs are listed in [Table 4](#). It is clear that the forecasting based on the proposed decorrelation transformation is more accurate than those based on MAR(1) and VAR(1) directly. The improvement is often substantial. The only exception is the case of $(p, q) = (6, 6)$ and $T = 5000$: the 36-dimension VAR(1) performs marginally better (i.e. the decrease of 0.002 in MSE) than the transformation based method. On the other hand, the improvement of the transformation based forecast over VAR(1) for sample size $T \leq 2000$ is more significant. The relative poor performance of MAR(1) is due to the substantial discrepancy between MAR(1) model and the data generating mechanism used in this example. Note that there are $(p + q)^2$ free parameters in VAR(1) while there are merely $(p^2 + q^2)$ parameters in MAR(1). With large T , VAR(1) is more flexible than MAR(1).

[Table 4](#) indicates that the oracle model O1 performs only slightly better than segmentation when sample size $T = 500$ or 1000. Oracle Model O2 only deviates from the true model in terms of the estimation error of the coefficients in the AR models, hence performs the best.

4.2 Real data analysis

We now illustrate the proposed decorrelation method with a real data example. The data concerned is a 17×6 matrix time series consisting of the logarithmic daily averages of the 6 air pollutant concentration readings (i.e. PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, SO₂, NO₂, CO, O₃) from the 17 monitoring stations in Beijing and its surrounding areas (i.e. Tianjin and Hebei Province) in China. The sampling

Table 4: Example 3 – One-step ahead post-sample forecasting: means and standard deviations (in bracket) of RMSEs and the proportions of correct segmentation, near correct segmentation and others in a simulation with 1000 replications.

	RMSEs and the proportions of segmentations			
	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$	$T = 2000$	$T = 5000$
$(p, q) = (6, 6)$				
MAR(1)	0.571(0.199)	0.562(0.196)	0.550(0.194)	0.556(0.204)
VAR(1)	0.421(0.083)	0.293(0.082)	0.208(0.059)	0.130(0.039)
segmentation	0.361(0.165)	0.253(0.132)	0.192(0.104)	0.132(0.076)
model O1	0.337(0.136)	0.242(0.096)	0.185(0.096)	0.132(0.088)
model O2	0.106(0.032)	0.073(0.021)	0.052(0.014)	0.033(0.010)
$(p, q) = (6, 8)$				
MAR(1)	0.674(0.196)	0.664(0.192)	0.672(0.201)	0.673(0.202)
VAR(1)	0.540(0.133)	0.385(0.095)	0.277(0.069)	0.186(0.043)
segmentation	0.465(0.175)	0.330(0.152)	0.250(0.122)	0.174(0.107)
model O1	0.457(0.153)	0.322(0.137)	0.264(0.137)	0.193(0.130)
model O2	0.130(0.034)	0.091(0.024)	0.063(0.016)	0.041(0.011)
$(p, q) = (8, 8)$				
MAR(1)	0.685(0.178)	0.674(0.182)	0.681(0.194)	0.668(0.186)
VAR(1)	0.721(0.137)	0.517(0.113)	0.388(0.077)	0.245(0.050)
segmentation	0.566(0.167)	0.441(0.143)	0.342(0.121)	0.234(0.106)
model O1	0.513(0.144)	0.415(0.136)	0.330(0.120)	0.248(0.118)
model O2	0.152(0.034)	0.108(0.024)	0.075(0.017)	0.047(0.010)
$(p, q) = (10, 10)$				
MAR(1)	0.857(0.176)	0.846(0.178)	0.840(0.172)	0.838(0.162)
VAR(1)	1.280(0.171)	0.892(0.135)	0.622(0.095)	0.386(0.062)
segmentation	0.747(0.184)	0.619(0.155)	0.514(0.136)	0.369(0.126)
model O1	0.700(0.150)	0.594(0.149)	0.510(0.133)	0.385(0.129)
model O2	0.192(0.033)	0.136(0.024)	0.095(0.016)	0.061(0.010)

period used in this exercise is January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2016 for a total of $T = 731$ days. Figure 2 displays the time series plot of the $17 \times 6 = 102$ series after removing the seasonal means. The readings of different pollutants at different locations are crossly correlated. Figure 3 shows the cross correlogram of five randomly selected stations for PM_{10} , and Figure 4 displays the cross correlogram of all six pollutants for a station in Beijing.

We first deduct seasonal mean of the 17×6 matrix time series. Setting $\tau_0 = 5$ in (8), we apply the proposed bilinear transformation to discover the uncorrelated block structure. The finding is stable: with $5 \leq \tau_1 \leq 30$ in (11), the transformed matrix series admits $\hat{n}_c = 4$ uncorrelated column blocks with sizes 3, 1, 1, 1 respectively, and $\hat{n}_r = 15$ uncorrelated row blocks with two blocks of size 2 and all the others of size 1.

To check the post-sample forecasting performance, we calculate the rolling one-step, and two-step ahead forecasts for each of the daily readings in the last three months in 2016 (in total 92 days). The methods included in the comparison are the forecasting based on the segmentation derived from the proposed decorrelation transformation by fitting an MAR(1), VAR(1) or AR(1) to each identified block according to its size/shape, MAR(1) for the original 17×6 matrix series, VAR(1) for the vectorized original series, and univariate AR(1) for each of the 17×6 original series. For the segmentation approach, we fix the transformation obtained using data upto September 30, 2016. In addition to the identified segmentation with 15×4 blocks, we also compute the forecasts based on 14×3 blocks, and 16×5 blocks. The former is obtained by merger two single row blocks together and two single column blocks together. The latter is obtained by splitting a block with two rows into two and splitting the block with 3 columns into two blocks. This will reveal the impact of ‘imperfect’ segmentation on forecasting performance.

The means and the standard deviations of MSE (see (27)) of one-step and two-step ahead post-sample forecasts for the readings in the last 92 days are listed in Table 5. The prediction based on the decorrelation transformation (even using imperfect segmentations) is clearly more accurate than those without transformation. Using the imperfect segmentation deteriorates the performance only slightly, indicating that a partial (instead of total) decorrelation still leads to significant gain in prediction. Also note that fitting each of the original 17×6 time series with a univariate AR(1) separately leads to a better performance than those from fitting MAR(1) and VAR(1) to the original matrix series jointly. This indicates that the cross serial correlation is useful and important information for future forecasting. However to make efficient use of the information, it is necessary to adopt some effective dimension-reduction techniques such as the proposed decorrelation transformation.

To further evaluate the forecasting stability, we calculate the rolling MSPE for one-step ahead post-sample forecasts based on, respectively, the segmentation, MAR(1), VAR(1) and univariate AR models. We plot the weekly averages of the rolling MSPE in Figure 5. It shows that the forecast based on the proposed segmentation almost always outperforms the other three methods.

References

- Ahn, S. C. and Horenstein, A. R. (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica*, 81(3):1203–1227.
- Back, A. D. and Weigend, A. S. (1997). A first application of independent component analysis to extracting structure from stock returns. *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 8(04):473–484.




Figure 2: Time series plot of 17 by 6 air pollution data




Figure 3: Cross correlogram of logarithmic daily PM₁₀ readings at five randomly selected monitoring stations in Beijing, Tianjin and Hebei




Figure 4: Cross correlogram of logarithmic daily readings of all six pollutants for a station in Beijing

Table 5: One-step and two-step ahead post-sample forecasting for the air pollution data: means and standard deviations (in bracket) of MSPE

Method	One-step forecast	Two-step forecast
MAR(1)	0.351 (0.208)	0.516 (0.303)
VAR(1)	0.400 (0.272)	0.717 (0.406)
Univariate AR	0.346 (0.205)	0.501 (0.286)
Segmentation with 15×4 blocks	0.315 (0.182)	0.435 (0.246)
Segmentation with 14×3 blocks	0.319 (0.185)	0.446 (0.256)
Segmentation with 16×5 blocks	0.318 (0.183)	0.443 (0.247)




Figure 5: Weakly averaged one-step forecast errors of four selected methods

- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70(1):191–221.
- Basu, S. and Michailidis, G. (2015). Regularized estimation in sparse high-dimensional time series models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1535–1567.
- Bickel, P. J., Levina, E., et al. (2008a). Covariance regularization by thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(6):2577–2604.
- Bickel, P. J., Levina, E., et al. (2008b). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(1):199–227.
- Box, G. E. P. and Jenkins, G. M. (1970). *Times series analysis. Forecasting and control*. Holden-Day, San Francisco, Calif.-London-Amsterdam.
- Bradley, R. C. (2005). Basic properties of strong mixing conditions. a survey and some open questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2:107–144.
- Chang, J., Guo, B., and Yao, Q. (2018). Principal component analysis for second-order stationary vector time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46:2094–2124.
- Chang, J., He, J., and Yao, Q. (2021). Modelling matrix time series via a tensor cp-decomposition. *Under preparation*.
- Chang, J., Yao, Q., and Zhou, W. (2017). Testing for high-dimensional white noise using maximum cross-correlations. *Biometrika*, 104(1):111–127.

- Chen, E. Y. and Chen, R. (2019). Modeling dynamic transport network with matrix factor models: with an application to international trade flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00769*.
- Chen, E. Y., Tsay, R. S., and Chen, R. (2019a). Constrained factor models for high-dimensional matrix-variate time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–37.
- Chen, E. Y., Yun, X., Chen, R., and Yao, Q. (2020a). Modeling multivariate spatial-temporal data with latent low-dimensional dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.01305*.
- Chen, R., Xiao, H., and Yang, D. (2020+b). Autoregressive models for matrix-valued time series. *Journal of Econometrics*. To appear. arXiv:1812.08916.
- Chen, R., Yang, D., and Zhang, C.-h. (2019b). Factor models for high-dimensional tensor time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07530*.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear time series: Nonparametric and parametric methods*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., and Reichlin, L. (2005). The generalized dynamic factor model: one-sided estimation and forecasting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(471):830–840.
- Gao, Z., Ma, Y., Wang, H., and Yao, Q. (2019). Banded spatio-temporal autoregressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(1):211–230.
- Ghosh, S., Khare, K., and Michailidis, G. (2019). High-dimensional posterior consistency in bayesian vector autoregressive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(526):735–748.
- Guo, S., Wang, Y., and Yao, Q. (2016). High-dimensional and banded vector autoregressions. *Biometrika*, page asw046.
- Hall, E. C., Raskutti, G., and Willett, R. M. (2018). Learning high-dimensional generalized linear autoregressive models. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(4):2401–2422.
- Han, Y., Chen, L., and Wu, W. (2020a). Sparse nonlinear vector autoregressive models. *Technical Report*.
- Han, Y., Chen, R., Yang, D., and Zhang, C.-h. (2020b). Tensor factor model estimation by iterative projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02611*.
- Han, Y., Zhang, C.-h., and Chen, R. (2020c). Rank determination in tensor factor model. *arXiv preprint arxiv:2011.07131*.
- Huang, D. and Tsay, R. (2014). A refined scalar component approach to multivariate time series modeling. *Manuscript*.
- Lam, C. and Yao, Q. (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: inference for the number of factors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):694–726.
- Lam, C., Yao, Q., and Bathia, N. (2011). Estimation of latent factors for high-dimensional time series. *Biometrika*, 98(4):901–918.

- Lin, J. and Michailidis, G. (2017). Regularized estimation and testing for high-dimensional multi-block vector-autoregressive models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):4188–4236.
- Lin, J. and Michailidis, G. (2020). Regularized estimation of high-dimensional factor-augmented vector autoregressive (favar) models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(117):1–51.
- Liu, W., Xiao, H., and Wu, W. B. (2013). Probability and moment inequalities under dependence. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1257–1272.
- Matteson, D. S. and Tsay, R. S. (2011). Dynamic orthogonal components for multivariate time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(496):1450–1463.
- Merlevède, F., Peligrad, M., and Rio, E. (2011). A bernstein type inequality and moderate deviations for weakly dependent sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 151(3-4):435–474.
- Negahban, S. and Wainwright, M. J. (2011). Estimation of (near) low-rank matrices with noise and high-dimensional scaling. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1069–1097.
- Pan, J. and Yao, Q. (2008). Modelling multiple time series via common factors. *Biometrika*, 95(2):365–379.
- Pena, D. and Box, G. E. (1987). Identifying a simplifying structure in time series. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 82(399):836–843.
- Rio, E. (2000). *Théorie asymptotique des processus aléatoires faiblement dépendants*, volume 31 of *Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Rohde, A. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2011). Estimation of high-dimensional low-rank matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(2):887–930.
- Rosenblatt, M. (2012). *Markov Processes, Structure and Asymptotic Behavior: Structure and Asymptotic Behavior*, volume 184. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Stewart, G. W. and Sun, J. G. (1990). *Matrix perturbation theory*. Computer Science and Scientific Computing. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Tiao, G. C. and Tsay, R. S. (1989). Model specification in multivariate time series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 51(2):157–195.
- Tong, H. (1990). *Non-linear time series: a dynamical system approach*. Oxford University Press.
- Tsay, R. S. (2005). *Analysis of financial time series*, volume 543. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsay, R. S. and Chen, R. (2018). *Nonlinear time series analysis*, volume 891. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wang, D., Liu, X., and Chen, R. (2019). Factor models for matrix-valued high-dimensional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(1):231–248.
- Wu, W.-B. and Wu, Y. N. (2016). Performance bounds for parameter estimates of high-dimensional linear models with correlated errors. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):352–379.

- Xia, D. and Yuan, M. (2019). Statistical inferences of linear forms for noisy matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00116*.
- Xia, Y., Cai, T., and Cai, T. T. (2018). Multiple testing of submatrices of a precision matrix with applications to identification of between pathway interactions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):328–339.
- Xiao, H., Han, Y., and Chen, R. (2021). Reduced rank autoregressive models for matrix time series. *Technical Report*.
- Zhang, D. and Wu, W. B. (2017). Gaussian approximation for high dimensional time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):1895–1919.
- Zhou, H. H. and Raskutti, G. (2018). Non-parametric sparse additive auto-regressive network models. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(3):1473–1492.

5 Appendix

Proof of Proposition 2. In the following we provide the construction of $A_* = \Gamma^{(1)}$, where the columns of $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is the q orthonormal eigenvectors of $W^{(1)}$ and is a column permutation matrix. Let

$$Z_t^* = BU_t; \quad \Sigma_1^{(u)} = \mathbb{E}(Z_t^{*\top} Z_t^*); \quad Z_t = Z_t^* (\Sigma_1^{(u)})^{-1/2}$$

Clearly, $\Sigma_1^{(u)}$ is block diagonal. Hence, the column of Z_t has same uncorrelated (segmentation) structure as that of Z_t^* .

We have

$$\vec{X}_t := BU_t A^\top (\Sigma_1^{(x)})^{-1/2} = Z_t^* A^\top (\Sigma_1^{(x)})^{-1/2} = Z_t A_1^\top \quad (28)$$

where $A_1 = (\Sigma_1^{(x)})^{-1/2} A (\Sigma_1^{(u)})^{1/2}$. Note that $\mathbb{E}(Z_t^\top Z_t)/p = I_q = \mathbb{E}(\vec{X}_t^\top \vec{X}_t)/p$, where I_q is the $q \times q$ identity matrix. Hence A_1 is orthonormal. Note that B_1 can be similarly defined.

Let the auto-cross-covariance matrices between the i -th and the j -th rows of \vec{X}_t and the corresponding Z_t at lag τ be

$$V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} = \mathbb{E}\{\vec{X}_{t+\tau}^\top E_{i,j} \vec{X}_t\}, \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\tau,i,j}^{(z)} = \mathbb{E}\{Z_{t+\tau}^\top E_{i,j} Z_t\},$$

where $E_{i,j} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is the unit matrix with 1 at position (i, j) and 0 elsewhere. Let

$$W^{(1)} = \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} (V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)})^\top}{p^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad W^{(z)} = \sum_{\tau=-\tau_0}^{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{V_{\tau,i,j}^{(z)} (V_{\tau,i,j}^{(z)})^\top}{p^2}. \quad (29)$$

Since Z_t has a column-wise uncorrelated structure, $V_{\tau,i,j}^{(z)}$ is block diagonal for all i, j . Hence, $W^{(z)}$ is block diagonal as well. Let

$$W^{(z)} = \begin{pmatrix} W_1^{(z)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & W_2^{(z)} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & W_{n_c}^{(z)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

Write the eigenvalue decomposition of each $W_i^{(z)}$ in (30) as

$$W_i^{(z)} = \Gamma_i^{(z)} D_i (\Gamma_i^{(z)})^\top, \quad (31)$$

where $\Gamma_i^{(z)}$ is a $q_i \times q_i$ orthogonal matrix and D_i is a diagonal matrix, consists of the eigenvalues of $W_i^{(z)}$ in descending order $\lambda_{i1} \geq \lambda_{i2} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{iq_i}$. Hence we can write

$$W^{(z)} = \Gamma^{(z)} D (\Gamma^{(z)})^\top, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\Gamma^{(z)} = \text{diag}(\Gamma_1^{(z)}, \dots, \Gamma_{n_c}^{(z)}), \quad D = \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_{n_c}), \quad (33)$$

with $\Gamma^{(z)}$ orthogonal. Let the eigenvalue decomposition of $W^{(z)}$ (as a whole) be

$$W^{(z)} = \Gamma^{(z^*)} D^* (\Gamma^{(z^*)})^\top, \quad (34)$$

where the eigenvalues in the diagonal matrix D^* is in descending order. Comparing (32) and (34), these exists a column permutation matrix such that $\Gamma^{(z^*)} = \Gamma^{(z)\top}$, and $D^* = D^\top$.

Since $\vec{X}_t = Z_t A_1^\top$ in (28), we have $V_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} = A_1 V_{\tau,i,j}^{(z)} A_1^\top$, Hence

$$W^{(1)} = A_1 W^{(z)} A_1^\top = A_1 \Gamma^{(z)} D(\Gamma^{(z)})^\top A_1^\top = A_1 \Gamma^{(z^*)} D^* A_1 (\Gamma^{(z^*)})^\top A_1^\top = \Gamma^{(1)} D^* (\Gamma^{(1)})^\top$$

where $\Gamma^{(1)} = A_1 \Gamma^{(z^*)}$. Since $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is an orthogonal matrix and D^* is a diagonal matrix with descending diagonals, it is clear that D^* contains the eigenvalues of $W^{(1)}$ and $\Gamma^{(1)}$ contains the corresponding eigenvectors.

Now it follows from (28) that

$$\vec{X}_t \Gamma^{(1)} = Z_t A_1^\top A_1 \Gamma^{(z^*)} = Z_t \Gamma^{(z^*)} = Z_t \Gamma^{(z)\top}. \quad (35)$$

Or

$$\vec{X}_t \Gamma^{(1)} = Z_t \Gamma^{(z)}. \quad (36)$$

Since the columns of $Z_t \Gamma^{(z)} = \vec{X}_t \Gamma^{(1)}$ has the same uncorrelated structure as that of Z_t , $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is the desired orthogonal transformation A_* we are looking for. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. As $\|V\|_{op} \leq q\|V\|_{\max}$ for all matrices $V \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$, it suffices to bound the estimation error under the $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ norm.

Define

$$\hat{\mu}_{\tau,+} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} X_{t+\tau}}{T-\tau}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{\tau,-} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} X_t}{T-\tau}, \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} = \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \frac{X_{t+\tau} E_{i,j} X_t}{T-\tau}.$$

Note that $\tilde{e}_k^\top (\tilde{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}) \tilde{e}_l = X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l} - \mathbb{E} X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l}$, where \tilde{e}_k is a $q \times 1$ vector with 1 at k th element and 0 otherwise. Pick $a > 0$ and $u > \mathbb{E} X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{pr} (|X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l} - \mathbb{E} X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l}| > u) \\ &= \text{pr} (|X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l} - \mathbb{E} X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l}| > u, |X_{t+\tau,i,k}| > u^a) + \text{pr} (|X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l} - \mathbb{E} X_{t+\tau,i,k} X_{t,j,l}| > u, |X_{t+\tau,i,k}| \leq u^a) \\ &\leq \text{pr} (|X_{t+\tau,i,k}| > u^a) + \text{pr} (|X_{t,j,l}| > u^{1-a}) \\ &\leq c_1 \exp(-c_2 u^{ar_2}) + c_1 \exp(-c_2 u^{(1-a)r_2}) \\ &\leq 2c_1 \exp(-c_2 u^{r_2/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $1/\beta_1 = 1/r_1 + 2/r_2$ and $1/\beta_2 = 1/r_1 + 1/r_2$. Hence, by Theorem 1 of Merlevède et al. (2011), Bernstein inequality for α strong mixing processes, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} \left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top (\tilde{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}) \tilde{e}_l| \geq x \right) &\leq T \exp \left(-C_1 T^{\beta_1} x^{\beta_1} \right) + \exp \left(-C_2 T x^2 \right), \\ \text{pr} \left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top \hat{\mu}_{\tau,+}^\top E_{ij} \hat{\mu}_{\tau,-} \tilde{e}_l| \geq x \right) &\leq T \exp \left(-C_1 T^{\beta_2} x^{\beta_2/2} \right) + \exp \left(-C_2 T x \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} \left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}) \tilde{e}_l| \geq x \right) &\leq T \exp \left(-CT^{\beta_1} x^{\beta_1} \right) + T \exp \left(-CT^{\beta_2} x^{\beta_2/2} \right) \\ &\quad + \exp \left(-CT x^2 \right) + \exp \left(-CT x \right). \end{aligned}$$

With probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$, for any $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \right\|_{\max} \leq C'_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log(pq/\epsilon_T)}{T}} + C'_1 \frac{[\log(Tpq/\epsilon_T)]^{1/\beta_1}}{T} + C'_1 \frac{[\log(Tpq/\epsilon_T)]^{2/\beta_2}}{T^2}. \quad (37)$$

Then (15) follows. The proof is complete as (16) follows from (15) and (8) directly. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. From Assumption 5, it yields

$$\max_t \max_{i,j,k,l} \Pr(|X_{t\tau,i,k} X_{t\tau,j,l} - \mathbb{E}X_{t\tau,i,k} X_{t\tau,j,l}| > u) \leq c'_1 x^{-r_1}.$$

By the Fuk-Nagaev type inequality stated in Theorem 6.2, or equation (6.19a), of Rio (2000),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top (\widetilde{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}) \tilde{e}_l| \geq x\right) &\leq 4 \exp(-C_1 T x^2) + 4C_2 T (Tx)^{-\frac{(r_1+1)r_2}{r_1+r_2}}, \\ \Pr\left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top \widehat{\mu}_{\tau,+}^\top E_{ij} \widehat{\mu}_{\tau,-} \tilde{e}_l| \geq x\right) &\leq 4 \exp(-C_1 T x^2) + 4C_2 T (Tx)^{-\frac{2(r_1+1)r_2}{r_1+2r_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\Pr\left(|\tilde{e}_k^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)}) \tilde{e}_l| \geq x\right) \leq CT (Tx)^{-\frac{(r_1+1)r_2}{r_1+r_2}} + 8 \exp(-C_1 T x^2).$$

Let $\beta_3 = r_2(r_1 + 1)/(r_1 + r_2) > 1$. With probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$, for any $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} - \Sigma_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \right\|_{\max} \leq C'_1 \frac{(Tpq/\epsilon_T)^{1/\beta_3}}{T} + C'_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log(pq/\epsilon_T)}{T}}. \quad (38)$$

The rest is the same as the proofs in Theorem 1. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Let $U \text{diag}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_r) \widehat{U}^\top$ be the SVD of $P_{G_{i_0}} \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}}$ with $\phi_1 \geq \dots \geq \phi_r$ and $r = |G_{i_0}|$. Define $\Pi_{G_{i_0}} = U \widehat{U}^\top \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)}$. As $\widehat{U} \widehat{U}^\top = \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}} = \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)} (\widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)})^\top$, $\Pi_{G_{i_0}}$ has orthonormal columns. Note that $U U^\top = \Gamma_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)} (\Gamma_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)})^\top$. Moreover,

$$\|\Pi_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)}\|_{op} = \|(U - \widehat{U}) \widehat{U}^\top \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)}\|_{op} \leq \|U - \widehat{U}\|_{op} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} \|(U - \widehat{U}) \mathbf{e}_j\|_2.$$

Let $u_j = U \mathbf{e}_j$ and $\widehat{u}_j = \widehat{U} \mathbf{e}_j$, where \mathbf{e}_j is a $q \times 1$ vector with 1 at j -th element and 0 otherwise. As

$$(P_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}})(u_j, \widehat{u}_j) = (u_j - \widehat{U} \widehat{U}^\top U \mathbf{e}_j, U U^\top \widehat{U} \mathbf{e}_j - \widehat{u}_j) = (u_j - \phi_j \widehat{u}_j, \phi_j u_j - \widehat{u}_j),$$

the span of the columns u_j and \widehat{u}_j forms invariance subspaces of $P_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}}$. Then a linear combination of u_j and \widehat{u}_j forms eigenvectors of $P_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}}$. Elementary calculation shows that $P_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}}$ has eigenvectors $u_j - \phi_j^{-1} (1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \phi_j^2}) \widehat{u}_j$. As

$$0 = \left\langle u_j - \phi_j^{-1} (1 + \sqrt{1 - \phi_j^2}) \widehat{u}_j, u_j - \phi_j^{-1} (1 - \sqrt{1 - \phi_j^2}) \widehat{u}_j \right\rangle = 1 - 2u_j^\top \widehat{u}_j / \phi_j + 1,$$

$\|(U - \widehat{U}) \mathbf{e}_j\|_2^2 = 2(1 - \phi_j)$, so that by Theorem 3

$$\|\Pi_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)}\|_{op}^2 = 2(1 - \phi_r) \leq 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \|P_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{P}_{G_{i_0}}\|_{op}^2}\right) \leq 2(\eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**})^2.$$

For this potentially random $\Pi_{G_{i_0}}$, the inseparability condition provides a graph (G_{i_0}, E_{i_0}) satisfying (21) with $H_{i_0} = G_{i_0}$. As the eigenvalues of $V_{0,j,j}^{(1)}$ are within $[\phi_*, c^*/c_*]$, for $(k, \ell) \in E_{i_0}$ and in an event Ω_T with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle - \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle \right| &\leq \eta_{T,p,q}^{**} \leq (\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*) \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle, \\ \left| \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle - \langle \gamma_k, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \gamma_k \rangle \right| &\leq 2(c^*/c_*) \|\widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} - \gamma_k\|_{op} \leq 2\sqrt{2}(c^*/c_*) \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}, \end{aligned}$$

in view of $\|\widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} - \gamma_k\|_{op} \leq \|\Pi_{G_{i_0}} - \widehat{\Gamma}_{G_{i_0}}^{(1)}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{2} \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} &\geq \frac{\phi_*}{\phi_* + \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}} \max_{i,j,\tau} \frac{|\langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)} \rangle|}{\left\{ \langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)} \rangle \langle \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)}, V_{0,j,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)} \rangle \right\}^{1/2}} \\ &\geq \frac{(1 + 2\sqrt{2}c^* \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/(c_*\phi_*))^{-1}}{1 + \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*} \max_{i,j,\tau} \frac{|\langle \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(1)}, \widehat{V}_{\tau,i,j}^{(1)} \widehat{\gamma}_\ell^{(1)} \rangle|}{\left\{ \langle \gamma_k, V_{0,i,i}^{(1)} \gamma_k \rangle \langle \gamma_\ell, V_{0,j,j}^{(1)} \gamma_\ell \rangle \right\}^{1/2}} \\ &\geq \frac{\rho^* - (\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} + 2\sqrt{2}c^* \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/c_*)}{(1 + 2\sqrt{2}c^* \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/(c_*\phi_*))(1 + \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\widehat{\rho}_{k,\ell}^{(1)} \leq \rho_{G_{i_0}}^- = \frac{\eta_{T,p,q}^{**} + 2\sqrt{2}c^* \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/c_*}{(1 - 2\sqrt{2}c^* \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**}/(c_*\phi_*))(1 - \eta_{T,p,q}^{**}/\phi_*)}$$

for $k \in G_{i_0}$ and $\ell \notin G_{i_0}$. Thus, G_{i_0} is connected through E_{i_0} and separated from $G_{i_0}^c$. Note that $\eta_{T,p,q}^{**}, \eta_{T,p,G_{i_0}}^{**} \rightarrow 0$. \square