

# On the edge eigenvalues of the precision matrices of nonstationary autoregressive processes

Junho Yang \*

Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica

April 23, 2024

## Abstract

This paper investigates the structural changes in the parameters of first-order autoregressive models by analyzing the edge eigenvalues of the precision matrices. Specifically, edge eigenvalues in the precision matrix are observed if and only if there is a structural change in the autoregressive coefficients. We demonstrate that these edge eigenvalues correspond to the zeros of some determinantal equation. Additionally, we propose a consistent estimator for detecting outliers within the panel time series framework, supported by numerical experiments.

*Keywords and phrases:* Autoregressive processes, empirical spectral distribution, edge eigenvalues, and structural change model.

## 1 Introduction and main results

Let  $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a mean-zero time series with the recursion:

$$y_t = \rho_t y_{t-1} + z_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.1)$$

where the initial value is set to  $y_0 = 0$  and  $\{z_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is white noise process with unit variance, i.e.,  $\text{var}(z_t) = 1$ . The above recursive model is known as the autoregressive (AR) model of order one, denoted as AR(1). In the special scenario where  $\{\rho_t\}$  are constants with an absolute value less than one, the process  $\{y_t\}$  converges to a causal stationary AR process. Consequently, we refer to this model as a stationary AR(1) process.

---

\*Email: junhoyang@stat.sinica.edu.tw

Given a realization of AR(1) process, our focus lies in the structure of its AR coefficients. To establish the asymptotic theory, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we observe a time series  $\underline{y}_n = (y_{1,n}, \dots, y_{n,n})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with the following recursive relationship:

$$y_{t,n} = \rho_{t,n} y_{t-1,n} + z_{t,n}, \quad t \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $y_{0,n} = 0$  is the initial value and the AR coefficients are such that:

$$\rho_{t,n} = \rho + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon_j I_{E_{j,n}}(t), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here,  $\rho \in (-1, 1)/\{0\}$  denotes the baseline AR coefficient,  $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  is the number of breakpoints, and for positive  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^m$  represent nonzero perturbations,  $\{E_{j,n}\}_{j=1}^m$  denote disjoint intervals on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $I_A(t)$  denotes the indicator function. In (1.3), we adopt the convention  $\sum_{j=1}^0 = 0$ . Consequently, when  $m = 0$ , we have a stationary AR(1) model, referred to as the *null model*. However, for  $m > 0$ , the associated AR(1) process is no longer stationary due to structural changes in the AR coefficients. Consequently, we denote the case  $m > 0$  as the *Structural Change Model* (SCM) or the alternative model. We refer interested readers to Ding and Zhou (2023) for a general class of time-varying structures of nonstationary time series and its global approximation by AR processes.

Statistical inference for  $H_0 : m = 0$  against  $H_A : m > 0$  was initially developed by Page (1955) using the cumulative sum (CUSUM) method. While the original CUSUM procedure was intended to detect changes in the mean structure of independent samples, its approach was soon extended to time series data (see, e.g., Bagshaw and Johnson (1977); Davis et al. (1995); Lee et al. (2003); Gombay (2008); Gombay and Serban (2009) and Aue and Horváth (2013)). The test procedures outlined in the aforementioned literature rely on likelihood ratio or Kolmogorov-Smirnov type tests, necessitating the assumption

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |E_{j,n}|/n = \tau_j \in (0, 1), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

to distinguish the asymptotic behaviors of the test statistics under the null and alternative models.

However, in many real-world applications, particularly those from economic data, changes often occur sporadically, thus,  $|E_{j,n}| = o(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In extreme cases, one may have  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |E_{j,n}| < \infty$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . To detect such abrupt changes, Fox (1972) considered outliers in Gaussian autoregressive moving average (ARMA) models and proposed a likelihood ratio test. See also, Hillmer et al. (1983); Chang et al. (1988); Tsay (1988). In

these outlier models, the time series  $\{Y_t\}$  takes the form

$$Y_t = \omega_0 \frac{\omega(B)}{\delta(B)} e_t^{(d)} + Z_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\{Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  represents an unobserved Gaussian ARMA process,  $\omega_0$  denotes the scale,  $\omega(\cdot)$  and  $\delta(\cdot)$  are polynomials,  $B$  is a backshift operator, and  $e_t^{(d)} = I_d(t)$ . However, there is no clear connection between the SCM in consideration and the outlier model in (1.4).

The aim of this article is to propose a new approach to characterize structural changes in parameters when  $|E_{j,n}| = o(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, within the framework in consideration, conventional likelihood-based approaches are not suitable. Instead, our focus shifts towards defining

$$A_n = [\text{var}(\underline{y}_n)]^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.5)$$

which is the inverse covariance matrix (often referred to as the precision matrix) of  $\underline{y}_n$ . Given that  $\text{Var}(\underline{y}_n)$  is symmetric and positive definite, so is  $A_n$ . Consequently, we define the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of  $A_n$  as

$$\mu_{A_n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i(A_n)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.6)$$

where  $\delta_x$  denotes the point mass at  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\lambda_1(A_n) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A_n) > 0$  denote the positive eigenvalues of  $A_n$  arranged in decreasing order. To motivate the behavior of the ESD, we consider the following two scenarios regarding the AR coefficients:

$$\text{Null} : \rho_{t,1000} = 0.3 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SCM} : \rho_{t,1000} = 0.3 + 0.2I_{\{50\}}(t), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}. \quad (1.7)$$

Therefore, there is one and only one change occurs at  $t = 50$  in SCM. Figure 1 shows a realization of the time series under both the null model (left panel) and the SCM (right panel). A vertical line in the right panel denotes the occurrence of the structural change. It is worth noting from these plots that it is hardly distinguish the presence of a structural change in SCM.

In contrast, Figure 2 compares the ESDs of the null model (left panel) and the SCM (right panel). It is evident that:

- (i) The ESDs of the two models are almost identical.
- (ii) Under the SCM, two outliers (indicated by crosses) are observed, which are separated from the bulk spectrum.

Hence, it becomes apparent that spectral statistics may offer an important means to characterize the behaviors of the SCM. We also mention that the second observation resembles the




Figure 1: *Time series trajectories for the null model (left) and the SCM (right). Vertical dashed line indicates the time of the structural change in the SCM.*

spiked models in the random matrix literature (refer to Baik and Silverstein (2006); Ding (2021) for a review).




Figure 2: *Empirical spectral distributions of the precision matrices. Left: null model, right: the SCM. Crosses on the right panel indicate the outliers.*

To rigorously argue the first observation, we study of the limiting spectral distribution (LSD) of  $\mu_{A_n}$  under both the null model and SCM. Let  $\mu_\rho$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  depends solely on  $\rho \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$  in (1.3) with distribution

$$F_{\mu_\rho}(t) = \mu_\rho((-\infty, t]) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} I_{(-\infty, t]}(1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos x) dx, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.8)$$

Our result, corresponding to the first observation, is as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $A_n$  be the precision matrix of an AR(1) model, where the AR coefficients adhere to (1.3) (including the case  $m = 0$ ). Furthermore, we assume*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |E_{j,n}|/n = 0, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\}. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, we have  $\mu_{A_n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu_\rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$  denotes weak convergence. Moreover, the LSD  $\mu_\rho$  is compactly supported.

The above theorem asserts that under the condition (1.9), the ESDs of both the null model and SCM converge to the same distribution.

Now, we turn our attention to the second observation. Given a sequence of compactly supported probability measures  $\{\mu_{A_n}\}$ , let  $out(\{A_n\})$  be the set of outliers of  $\{\mu_{A_n}\}$ , precisely defined in Definition 3.1. Intuitively,  $out(\{A_n\})$  are the limiting edge eigenvalues of  $A_n$  that are away from the bulk spectrum. The following theorem addresses the outliers of the null model.

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $\{A_{0,n}\}$  be a sequence of the precision matrices of the null model. Then,*

$$out(\{A_{0,n}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, as anticipated in the left panel of Figure 2, the ESD of the null model does not encompass an outlier.

Next, we focus on the outliers of the SCM. In Sections 3.2–3.4, we prove that under mild conditions,

$$out(\{A_n\}) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for all SCM.}$$

This assertion holds even for the SCM with a single change as exemplified in (1.7). Furthermore, we also show that  $out(\{A_n\})$  can be completely determined by the zeros of a determinantal equation, thus the numerical evaluation of entries in  $out(\{A_n\})$  is possible. In the simplest scenario where  $m = 1$  and  $|E_{1,n}| = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we derive the closed form solution for the two (and only two) outliers, as observed in the right panel of Figure 2. Please see Theorem 3.1 for details.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. In Section 2.1, we introduce most of the notation used in this article and present a preliminary result concerning the expression of  $A_n$  in (1.5). Section 2.2 investigates the LSD of both the null model and SCM and proves Theorem 1.1. In Section 3, we define the outliers of  $\{A_n\}$  and show the absence of outliers in the null model (Section 3.1). Sections 3.2–3.4 explore the outliers of the SCM, encompassing a single structural change model (Section 3.2), single-interval structural change model (Section 3.3), and general structural change model (Section 3.4). Section 4 studies the identifiability of parameters in the SCM. In Section 5, we propose a consistent estimator of  $out(\{A_n\})$  within the panel time series framework and demonstrate the efficacy of our estimator through numerical experiments. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 3.1 which derives a closed form expression for the two outliers of the single structural change model.

Lastly, additional properties of the LSD, additional proofs, and technical lemmas are

provided in the Appendix.

## 2 Limiting spectral distribution of $\mu_{A_n}$

### 2.1 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the notation and terminology used in the article and provide a preliminary result. For the SCM, we denote the disjoint intervals  $\{E_{j,n}\}_{j=1}^m$  as

$$E_{j,n} = [k_{j,n}, k_{j,n} + h_{j,n} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

where we have an ordering

$$1 \leq k_{1,n} < k_{1,n} + h_{1,n} - 1 < k_{2,n} < \dots < k_{m,n} < k_{m,n} + h_{m,n} - 1 \leq n.$$

Here, we denote  $m$  as the *number of changes*,  $k_j$  as the  $j$ th *breakpoint*,  $h_j$  as the  $j$ th *length of change*, and  $\varepsilon_j$  as the  $j$ th *magnitude of change*. In particular, when  $m = 1$  and  $h_{1,n} = 1$ , we omit the subscript "1" in  $k_{1,n}$  and  $\varepsilon_1$  and express

$$\rho_{t,n} = \rho + \varepsilon I_{k_n}(t), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (2.1)$$

We refer to (2.1) as the single structural change model (single SCM).

Let  $A_n$  be a general precision matrix of an AR(1) process. Sometimes, it is necessary to differentiate between the null model ( $m = 0$ ) and SCM ( $m > 0$ ). In such cases, we denote  $A_{0,n}$  and  $B_n$  as the precision matrices for the null model and SCM, respectively. For a real symmetric matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\text{spec}(A) = \{\lambda_i(A)\}_{i=1}^n$  denotes the spectrum of  $A$ . Lastly,  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  denote the minimum and maximum operations, respectively.

The following lemma provides an explicit form of the entries of  $A_n$ .

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $A_n$  be a precision matrix of AR(1) model. Then,  $A_n$  is an  $n \times n$  symmetric tri-diagonal matrices with entries*

$$[A_n]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j = n. \\ 1 + \rho_{i+1,n}^2, & i = j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \\ -\rho_{i \vee j, n}, & |i - j| = 1. \\ 0, & o.w. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\underline{z}_n = (z_{1,n}, \dots, z_{n,n})^\top$ , where  $\{z_{t,n}\}$  are as defined in (1.2). Then,  $\text{var}(\underline{z}_n) = I_n$ , an identity matrix of order  $n$ . Using the recursive formula in (1.2), we readily obtain the

following linear equation

$$\underline{z}_n = L_n \underline{y}_n, \quad \text{where} \quad L_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -\rho_{2,n} & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\rho_{n,n} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

Taking the variance on each side above and using the fact that  $A_n = L_n^\top [\text{var}(\underline{z}_n)]^{-1} L_n$ , we obtain (2.2).  $\square$

## 2.2 LSDs of the null model and SCM and proof of Theorem 1.1

Let  $A_{0,n}$  be the precision matrix of the null model with the constant AR coefficient  $\rho \in (-1, 1) \setminus 0$ . Then, according to Lemma 2.1,  $A_{0,n}$  can be explicitly written as

$$A_{0,n} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -\rho & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -\rho & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.3)$$

For technical reasons, we define the slightly perturbed matrix

$$\tilde{A}_{0,n} = A_{0,n} + \rho^2 E_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $E_n = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Since  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  is a tri-diagonal Toeplitz matrix, one can derive explicit expressions for the entire set of eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors of  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  (cf. Strooker (1983), Proposition 2). Specifically, for  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , the  $k$ th smallest eigenvalue is given by

$$\lambda_{n+1-k}(\tilde{A}_{0,n}) = 1 - 2\rho \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{n+1}\right) + \rho^2, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (2.5)$$

and the corresponding normalized eigenvector is  $\tilde{u}_{n+1-k} = (\tilde{u}_{1,n+1-k}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{n,n+1-k})^\top$ , where

$$\tilde{u}_{j,n+1-k} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n+1}} \sin\left(\frac{kj\pi}{n+1}\right), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (2.6)$$

In the case when  $\rho \in (-1, 0)$ , the eigenstructure has a similar expression but is arranged in reverse order. Now, since  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  is a Toeplitz matrix, we can directly apply the Szegö limit

theorem to  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  (cf. Grenander and Szegö (1958), Chapter 5).

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  be defined as in (2.5). Let  $\mu_\rho$  be the probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  with distribution (1.8). Then,*

$$\mu_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu_\rho, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.7)$$

Furthermore,  $\mu_\rho$  has a support of form  $[a_\rho, b_\rho] \subset \mathbb{R}$ , where

$$a_\rho = \inf(\text{supp}(\mu_\rho)) = (1 - |\rho|)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad b_\rho = \sup(\text{supp}(\mu_\rho)) = (1 + |\rho|)^2. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.* Since the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  are provided in (2.5), (2.7) follows immediately by the Szegö limit theorem together with (1.8). (2.8) is also clear since the range of  $(1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos x)$  in (1.8) is  $[(1 - |\rho|)^2, (1 + |\rho|)^2]$ .  $\square$

From the lemma above, we observe that a slightly perturbed matrix of the null model has an LSD  $\mu_\rho$ . Next, we explore the LSDs (if they exist) of the null model and SCM. Note that the null model is a special case of (1.3) by setting  $m = 0$ , thus, it suffices to examine the LSD of the general SCM based on (1.3).

The following theorem is key to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $A_n$  be a precision matrix of an AR(1) model where the AR coefficients satisfy (1.3), allowing the case  $m = 0$ . Let  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |E_{j,n}|/n = \tau_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Furthermore, we assume  $|\rho + \varepsilon_j| < 1$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Then,*

$$\mu_{A_n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \tau_j\right) \mu_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^m \tau_j \mu_{\rho + \varepsilon_j}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.9)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B.1.  $\square$

Using the above theorem, we now can prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Since  $\tau_j = 0$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  due to (1.9), the assertion immediately follows from (2.9). Moreover, the compact supportedness of  $\mu_\rho$  is directly available in Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

### 3 Outliers of the SCM

In this section, we define the “outliers” of the sequence of Hermitian matrices and study the outliers of the null model and SCM. Throughout the section, we assume that  $|E_{j,n}| = h_{j,n} = h_j$  is fixed for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , thus immediately satisfying (1.9). Then, by Theorem 1.1, the LSD of  $\{A_{0,n}\}$  (corresponding to the null model) and  $\{B_n\}$  (corresponding to the SCM) are the

same, which equals  $\mu_\rho$ . However, this does not imply that the null model and SCM are indistinguishable. Figure 2 shows that all eigenvalues of  $A_{0,n}$  lie within the bulk spectrum, whereas the two eigenvalues of  $B_n$  are distinct from the bulk spectrum. Keeping this in mind, we define the outliers of  $\{A_n\}$ .

**Definition 3.1** *Let  $A_n$  be a precision matrix of an AR(1) model, where the AR coefficients satisfy (1.3), allowing the case  $m = 0$ . Furthermore, we assume (1.9), thus  $\mu_{A_n}$  converges weakly to  $\mu_\rho$ . Let  $S_\mu = [a_\rho, b_\rho]$  be the support of  $\mu_\rho$  given in (2.8). Then,  $x \notin [a_\rho, b_\rho]$  is called an outlier of the sequence  $\{A_n\}$  (or  $\{\mu_{A_n}\}$ ) if there exists  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j(A_n) = x \text{ or } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n+1-j}(A_n) = x. \quad (3.1)$$

We denote  $\text{out}(A_n)$  as the set of all outliers of  $\{A_n\}$  (or  $\{\mu_{A_n}\}$ ). Moreover, we define the sets of left and right outliers by

$$\text{out}_L(\{A_n\}) = \text{out}(\{A_n\}) \cup (-\infty, a_\rho) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{out}_R(\{A_n\}) = \text{out}(\{A_n\}) \cap (b_\rho, \infty).$$

Heuristically, the outliers of  $\{A_n\}$  are the limit points of the spectrum of  $A_n$  that are not contained in the bulk spectrum. The remaining parts of this section are devoted to the outliers of  $\{A_{0,n}\}$  and  $\{B_n\}$ .

### 3.1 Outlier behavior of the null model and proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we study the outliers of the null model. The following lemma states the behavior of the edge eigenvalues of  $A_{0,n}$ .

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $A_{0,n}$  be as defined in (2.3) and let  $a_\rho$  and  $b_\rho$  be as defined in (2.8). Then, for fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n+1-j}(A_{0,n}) = a_\rho \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j(A_{0,n}) = b_\rho.$$

*Proof.* We will only prove the lemma for  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  and the  $j$ th smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda_{n+1-j}(A_n)$ . The cases when  $\rho \in (-1, 0)$  and  $\lambda_j(A_{0,n})$  can be treated similarly. Let  $\alpha_{jn} = \lambda_{n+1-j}(A_{0,n}) - 1 - \rho^2/(2\rho) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, we have  $\alpha_{jn} \in (\cos \frac{(n-j+1)\pi}{n}, \cos \frac{(n-j+1)\pi}{n+1})$  due to Stroecker (1983), Proposition 1. Therefore, for fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{jn} = -1$ , in turn,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n+1-j}(A_n) = 1 - 2\rho + \rho^2 = a_\rho$ . Thus, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

The above lemma shows that under the null model, the  $j$ th smallest (resp. largest) eigenvalue of  $A_{0,n}$  converges to the lower (resp. upper) bound of the support of the LSD of  $A_{0,n}$ . Consequently, we can prove Theorem 1.2, which states that there are no outliers in the null model.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* The assertion is immediately followed by Lemma 3.1 and the definition of the outliers.  $\square$

### 3.2 Outliers of the single SCM

In this section, we investigate the outliers of the single SCM given by (2.1). To obtain the explicit form of the outliers, we require the following condition on the breakpoint:

The breakpoint  $k = k_n$  of the single SCM is such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n - k_n) = \infty$ . (3.2)

Next, let

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \frac{\rho\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho) - \sqrt{\rho^2\varepsilon^2(\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4\rho^2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2}}{2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2} \\ \text{and } t &= \frac{\rho\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho) + \sqrt{\rho^2\varepsilon^2(\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4\rho^2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2}}{2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

be the zeros of the quadratic equation

$$(\varepsilon + \rho)^2 x^2 - \rho\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho)x - \rho^2 = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

The following theorem provides the closed form solution of  $\text{out}(\{B_n\})$  under single SCM.

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $\{B_n\}$  be the precision matrix of the single SCM. Furthermore, we assume the breakpoint  $k_n$  satisfies (3.2) and  $\rho(\rho + \varepsilon) > 0$ . Then, the following two assertions hold.*

- If  $|\rho| \geq |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , then  $\text{out}_L(\{B_n\}) = \emptyset$ .
- If  $|\rho| < |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , then  $\text{out}_L(\{B_n\}) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$  and  $\text{out}_R(\{B_n\}) = \{\mathfrak{M}\}$ , where

$$(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{M}) = \begin{cases} (1 + \rho^2 - \rho(s + s^{-1}), 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(t + t^{-1})), & \rho \in (-1, 0). \\ (1 + \rho^2 - \rho(t + t^{-1}), 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(s + s^{-1})), & \rho \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* See Section 6.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1** (i) *The dichotomy in Theorem 3.1 shows that if the modulus of the AR coefficient at the breakpoint is smaller than the baseline AR coefficient, then we cannot detect the outlier. In the case when  $|\rho + \varepsilon| > |\rho|$ , we observe exactly two outliers one on the left and another on the right.*

(ii) *Suppose the breakpoint  $k_n = k$  is fixed so that the condition (3.2) is not satisfied. Furthermore, we assume  $\rho(\rho + \varepsilon) > 0$  and  $|\rho| < |\rho + \varepsilon|$ . Then, there exists  $c \in (0, 1)$*

which depends only on  $\rho$  such that

$$|out_L(\{B_n\}) - \mathfrak{m}| \leq c^k \quad \text{and} \quad |out_R(\{B_n\}) - \mathfrak{M}| \leq c^k,$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{M}$  are given in (3.5). The proof of the above can be found in Section 6, [step 7]. In practice,  $k$  greater than or equal to 5 is sufficiently large to approximate  $out(\{B_n\}) \approx \{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{M}\}$ .

### 3.3 Outliers of the single interval SCM

As an intermediate step, we consider a slight generalization of the single SCM, where the AR coefficients are given by

$$\rho_{t,n} = \rho + \varepsilon I_{[k_n, k_n+h-1]}(t), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, there is one (and only one) change in the SCM with the fixed length of change  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ . We refer to the above model as the single “interval” SCM. Note that the single interval SCM for  $h = 1$  is equal to the single SCM. Now, we investigate the outliers of the single interval SCM. To do so, we define some functions and values. First, let

$$f(z) = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(z + z^{-1}), \quad z \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Then, it is easily seen that  $f$  is a bijective mapping from  $(-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$  to  $[a_\rho, b_\rho]^c$ , with  $a_\rho$  and  $b_\rho$  as in (2.8). Let  $f^{-1} : [a_\rho, b_\rho]^c \rightarrow (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$  be the inverse mapping of  $f$ . Next, consider the functions  $\alpha(x)$ ,  $\beta(x)$ , and  $\gamma(x)$  defined as follows:

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{\rho x^{-1} + \varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho)}{\varepsilon + \rho}, \quad \beta(x) = \frac{\rho(x + x^{-1}) + \varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho)}{\varepsilon + \rho}, \quad \gamma(x) = \frac{\rho x^{-1}}{(\varepsilon + \rho)}. \quad (3.8)$$

By using the aforementioned definitions, we introduce the sequence of tri-diagonal matrix functions  $M_{h+1}(z)$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ , on  $[a_\rho, b_\rho]^c$  by

$$M_2(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(f^{-1}(z)) & -1 \\ -1 & \gamma(f^{-1}(z)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

and for  $h \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ ,

$$M_{h+1}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(f^{-1}(z)) & -1 & & & \\ & -1 & \beta(f^{-1}(z)) & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \beta(f^{-1}(z)) & -1 \\ & & & & -1 & \gamma(f^{-1}(z)) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+1) \times (h+1)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Below, we establish a connection between the outliers  $(\mathbf{m}, \mathfrak{M})$  of the single SCM (corresponding to  $h = 1$ ) and  $M_2$ .

**Proposition 3.1** *Let  $\mathbf{m}, \mathfrak{M}$  be defined as in (3.5). Then,  $\mathbf{m}, \mathfrak{M}$  are the solutions of the determinantal equation  $\det M_2(z) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By simple algebra, it is easily seen that the solutions to  $\det M_2(f(x)) = \alpha(x)\gamma(x) - 1 = 0$  coincide with those of the quadratic equation in (3.4). By definition, the zeros of (3.4) are  $s$  and  $t$  in (3.3), implying that the roots of  $\det M_2(z) = 0$  are  $f(s)$  and  $f(t)$ . Therefore, the proposition holds for the specified  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathfrak{M}$  in (3.5).  $\square$

The above proposition asserts that the two outliers of the single SCM indeed coincide with the solutions of the determinantal equation  $\det M_2(z) = 0$ . Below, we show that this analogous relationship also holds for the outliers of the single interval SCM.

**Theorem 3.2** *Let  $B_n$  be the precision matrix of the single interval SCM with the change length  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, we assume that the breakpoint  $k_n$  satisfies (3.2). Then, the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $z \in \text{out}(\{B_n\})$ .
- (ii)  $\det M_{h+1}(z) = 0$  for some  $z \notin [a_\rho, b_\rho]$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix B.2.  $\square$

### 3.4 Outliers of the general SCM

We now turn our attention to the outliers of the general SCM described by (1.3). Recall the ordered disjoint intervals  $\{E_{j,n} := [k_{j,n}, k_{j,n} + h_{j-1,n}]\}_{j=1}^m$ , where  $k_1 < \dots < k_m$ . Furthermore, we assume the length of change  $h_{j,n} = h_j \in \mathbb{N}$  is fixed for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

To explore the outliers of the general SCM, we introduce the concept of submodels. For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we define  $B_n^{(j)}$  as the precision matrix of the single interval SCM, with

the corresponding AR coefficients  $\rho_{t,n}^{(j)}$  are given by

$$\rho_{t,n}^{(j)} = \rho + \varepsilon_j I_{[k_{j,n}, k_{j,n} + h_j - 1]}(t), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Thanks to Theorem 3.2,  $\text{out}(\{B_n^{(j)}\})$  can be fully determined by the solution to a determinantal equation. For the general SCM, it is anticipated that the outliers comprise the union of outliers of the submodels. To substantiate this, we require the following assumption on the spacing of breakpoints.

**Assumption 3.1** *For  $j \in \{1, \dots, m+1\}$ , let  $\Delta_{j,n} = k_{j,n} - k_{j-1,n}$ , where we set  $k_{0,n} = 0$  and  $k_{m+1,n} = n$ . Then, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{1 \leq j \leq m+1} \Delta_{j,n} = \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

*It is worth noting that when  $m = 1$ , Assumption 3.1 is equivalent to condition (3.2).*

The following theorem address the outliers of the general SCM model.

**Theorem 3.3** *Let  $B_n$  be the precision matrix of the SCM as in (1.3), where there are  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  number of changes. Moreover, assume Assumption 3.1 holds. Then,*

$$\text{out}(\{B_n\}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \text{out}(\{B_n^{(j)}\}). \quad (3.13)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B.3. □

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3.

**Corollary 3.1** *Suppose the same set of assumptions in Theorem 3.3 hold. Furthermore, for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $h_j = 1$ ,  $\rho(\varepsilon_j + \rho) > 0$ , and  $|\rho + \varepsilon_j| > |\rho|$ . Then, we have*

$$\text{out}_L(\{B_n\}) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{out}_R(\{B_n\}) = \{\mathfrak{M}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_m\},$$

*where for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the outlier pair  $(\mathfrak{m}_j, \mathfrak{M}_j)$  are as in Theorem 3.1, but replacing  $\varepsilon$  with  $\varepsilon_j$ .*

## 4 Parameter identification

Let  $\rho \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\underline{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m)$ ,  $\underline{k}_n = (k_{1,n}, \dots, k_{m,n})$ , and  $\underline{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$  be a set of parameters of the SCM. In this section, our focus lies in the identifiability of  $\text{out}(\{B_n\})$  given by those parameters. Given that the baseline AR coefficient  $\rho$  can be

readily estimated using classical methods such as the Yule-Walker estimator, and considering that the outliers are independent of the breakpoints  $\underline{k}_n$  due to Theorem 3.3, we confine our parameter of interest to  $\theta = (m, \underline{\varepsilon}, \underline{h})$ .

Let  $\sigma \in S_m$  be a permutation on  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , and let  $\underline{\varepsilon}_\sigma = (\varepsilon_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \varepsilon_{\sigma(m)})$ .  $\underline{h}_\sigma$  is defined similarly. Then, it is easily seen from Theorem 3.3 that

$$\text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}, \underline{h})) = \text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_\sigma, \underline{h}_\sigma)), \quad \sigma \in S_m,$$

where  $\text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}, \underline{h}))$  is the outliers of the SCM given parameters  $m$ ,  $\underline{\varepsilon}$ , and  $\underline{h}$  (assuming  $\rho$  is known and  $\underline{k}_n$  satisfies Assumption 3.1). Therefore, the set of outliers remains unchanged under permutations of  $(\underline{\varepsilon}, \underline{h})$ . Below, we demonstrate that in the particular scenario where  $\underline{h} = (1, \dots, 1)$ , the parameters  $m$  and  $\underline{\varepsilon}$  are identifiable up to permutations.

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose the same set of assumptions as in Theorem 3.3 hold. Additionally, we assume the length of changes are all equal to 1. Define  $\mathcal{E}_\rho = (0, \infty)$  for  $\rho > 0$  or  $\mathcal{E}_\rho = (-\infty, 0)$  for  $\rho < 0$ . Now, suppose there exist  $(m_i, \underline{\varepsilon}_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots\} \times \mathcal{E}_\rho^{m_i}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , such that*

$$\text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m_1, \underline{\varepsilon}_1, \underline{h})) = \text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m_2, \underline{\varepsilon}_2, \underline{h})).$$

*Then, we have  $m_1 = m_2$  and  $\underline{\varepsilon}_2 = (\underline{\varepsilon}_1)_\sigma$  for some permutation  $\sigma \in S_{m_1}$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.1, the equality  $\text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m_1, \underline{\varepsilon}_1, \underline{h})) = \text{out}(\{B_n\} | (m_2, \underline{\varepsilon}_2, \underline{h}))$  implies  $m_1 = m_2 = m$ .

Let  $\text{out}_L(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_1, \underline{h})) = \text{out}_L(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_2, \underline{h})) = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_m\}$  and let  $\text{out}_R(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_1, \underline{h})) = \text{out}_R(\{B_n\} | (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_2, \underline{h})) = \{\mathfrak{M}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_m\}$ , where  $0 < \mathbf{m}_1 \leq \dots \leq \mathfrak{M}_m < a_\rho$  and  $b_\rho < \mathfrak{M}_m \leq \dots \leq \mathfrak{M}_1$ . Then, by Proposition 3.1, there exists a permutation  $(j_1, \dots, j_m) \in S_m$ , such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{E}_\rho$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mathbf{m}_i)$  and  $f^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}_{j_i})$  are the zeros of the quadratic equation

$$-(\varepsilon_i + \rho)^2 z^2 + \varepsilon_i \rho (\varepsilon_i + 2\rho) z + \rho^2 = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

We denote  $\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{m}(\varepsilon_i)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}_{j_i} = \mathfrak{M}(\varepsilon_i)$  to indicate the dependence on  $\varepsilon_i$ . After some algebra, for  $\rho > 0$ , it can be shown that  $\mathbf{m}(\varepsilon)$  is a decreasing function and  $\mathfrak{M}(\varepsilon)$  is an increasing function of  $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}_\rho$ . Hence, if  $\mathbf{m}_1 \leq \dots \leq \mathfrak{M}_m$ , then  $\varepsilon_1 \geq \dots \geq \varepsilon_m$ , leading to  $\mathfrak{M}_{j_1} \geq \dots \geq \mathfrak{M}_{j_m}$ . Consequently, we have  $(j_1, \dots, j_m) = (1, 2, \dots, m)$ . Similarly, for  $\rho < 0$ , it can also be shown that  $(j_1, \dots, j_m) = (1, \dots, m)$ .

Lastly, given a outlier pair  $(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathfrak{M}_i)$ , the magnitude of change  $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{E}_\rho$  is uniquely determined by (4.1). Consequently, the sets  $\underline{\varepsilon}_1$  and  $\underline{\varepsilon}_2$  are identical up to some permutation. Thus, we obtain the desired results.  $\square$

**Remark 4.1 (Conjecture on the general case)** *Although we lack a formal proof yet, we conjecture that the aforementioned theorem is also true for the general length of changes  $\underline{h}$ . To state, let  $\theta = (m, \underline{\varepsilon}, \underline{h})$ , and for  $\sigma \in S_m$ , let  $\theta_\sigma = (m, \underline{\varepsilon}_\sigma, \underline{h}_\sigma)$ . Suppose there exist  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  such that  $\text{out}(\{B_n\}|\theta_1) = \text{out}(\{B_n\}|\theta_2)$ . Then, we conjecture that  $m_1 = m_2$  and there exists a permutation  $\sigma \in S_{m_1}$  such that  $\theta_2 = (\theta_1)_\sigma$ .*

## 5 Outlier detection of a panel time series

In this section, we leverage the theoretical results established in Section 3 within the context of a panel time series. Consider the panel autoregressive model:

$$y_{j,t,n} = \rho_{t,n} y_{j,t-1,n} + z_{j,t,n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, B\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Here, we assume  $y_{j,0,n} = 0$ ,  $\{z_{j,t,n}\}$  are *i.i.d.* random variables with mean zero and variance one, and  $\{\rho_{t,n}\}$  are the common AR coefficients across  $j$  that follow the SCM as in (1.3).

Let  $\underline{y}_{j;n} = (y_{j,1,n}, \dots, y_{j,n,n})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the  $j$ th observed time series with a common variance  $\text{var}(\underline{y}_{j;n}) = \Sigma_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Let  $\Omega_n = (\Sigma_n)^{-1}$ . Our objective is to construct a consistent estimator for  $\text{out}(\{\Omega_n\})$ . To achieve this, we investigate the consistent estimator of  $\Omega_n$ . A natural plug-in estimator for  $\Sigma_n$  is

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{n,B} = B^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^B (\underline{y}_{j;n} - \bar{y}_{j,n} \mathbf{1}_n)(\underline{y}_{j;n} - \bar{y}_{j,n} \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\bar{y}_{j,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{j,t,n}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_n$  is a column vector of ones. However, as stated in Wu and Pourahmadi (2009), when  $n$  increases at the same rate as  $B$  increases,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{n,B}$  no longer consistently estimates  $\Sigma_n$ . To achieve consistent estimation of  $\Sigma_n$  and  $\Omega_n$  in the high-dimensional regime (that corresponds to  $n \gg B$ ), one typically needs to assume some sparsity condition on  $\Omega_n$ , which, thanks to Lemma 2.1, holds in our framework. Therefore, we implement an estimator using a constrained  $\ell_1$  minimization method proposed by Cai et al. (2011). Specifically, let  $\tilde{\Omega}_1$  be the solution to the following minimization problem

$$\min |\Omega|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left| \hat{\Sigma}_{n,B} \Omega - I_n \right|_\infty \leq \lambda_n,$$

where, for  $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ ,  $|A|_1 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}|$ ,  $|A|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |a_{ij}|$ , and  $\lambda_n \in (0, \infty)$  is the tuning parameter. Let  $\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}$  be a symmetrization of  $\tilde{\Omega}_1$  given by

$$(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B})_{i,j} = (\tilde{\Omega}_1)_{i,j} \wedge (\tilde{\Omega}_1)_{j,i}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Next, we require the following mild assumptions on the tail behavior of  $y_{j,t,n}$ .

**Assumption 5.1**  $y_{1;n}$  satisfies the exponential-type tail condition as described in Cai et al. (2011), i.e., there exist  $\eta \in (0, 1/4)$  and  $K \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\log n/B \leq \eta$  and

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E} \exp(ty_{1,i,n}^2) \leq K, \quad t \in [-\eta, \eta].$$

Note that the Gaussian innovations satisfy these conditions.

The following theorem gives a concentration inequality between  $\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}$  and  $\Omega_n$ .

**Theorem 5.1** Let  $\{y_{j,t,n}\}$  be a sequence of panel time series governed by the recursion (5.1), where the common AR coefficients follow the form in (1.3). Furthermore, we assume Assumption 5.1. Then, for all  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists  $C_\tau \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$P \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) - \lambda_i(\Omega_n)| \leq C_\tau \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{B}} \right) \geq 1 - 4n^{-\tau}.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 2.1,  $\Omega_n$  is a tri-diagonal matrix and there exists a constant  $T \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $|\Omega_n|_{L1} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n |(\Omega_n)_{i,j}| \leq T$ . Therefore, we have  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{U}(q=0, s_0(n)=3)$ , where  $\mathcal{U}(q, s_0(n))$  denotes the uniformity class as defined in Cai et al. (2011), Section 3.1.

Now, for  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ , let  $C_0 = 2\eta^{-2}(2+\tau+\eta^{-1}e^2K^2)^2$ , where  $\eta$  and  $K$  are from Assumption 5.1. Then, by utilizing Cai et al. (2011), Theorem 1(a), we obtain

$$P \left( \|\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B} - \Omega_n\|_2 \leq 144C_0T^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{B}} \right) \geq 1 - 4n^{-\tau},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the spectral norm.

Lastly, since  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) - \lambda_i(\Omega_n)| \leq \|\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B} - \Omega_n\|_2$  due to Lemma C.5 below, we obtain the desired result with  $C_\tau = 144C_0T^2$ .  $\square$

From the above theorem, we conclude that  $\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}$  is positive definite and consistently estimates  $\Omega_n$  with high probability, provided the number of panels  $B = B(n)$  is chosen such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log n/B(n) = 0$ . Now, we proceed to estimate the outliers of  $\{\Omega_n\}$  using a consistent estimator  $\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}$  (with high probability). To accomplish this, let  $\hat{\rho}_n$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) be the consistent estimator of the baseline AR coefficient  $\rho$  (e.g., Yule-Walker estimator). Let

$$\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) = \text{spec}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) \cap [a_{\hat{\rho}_n}, b_{\hat{\rho}_n}]^c, \quad (5.4)$$

where  $a_{\hat{\rho}_n}$  and  $b_{\hat{\rho}_n}$  are defined as in (2.8), but replacing  $\rho$  with  $\hat{\rho}_n$ . For sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , let

$$d_H(X, Y) = \max\left\{\sup_{x \in X} \inf_{y \in Y} |x - y|, \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} |x - y|\right\}$$

be the Hausdorff distance between  $X$  and  $Y$ .

The follow theorem gives a consistent results of the outlier estimator.

**Theorem 5.2** *Suppose the same set of assumptions as in Theorem 5.1 hold. Furthermore, we assume  $B = B(n)$  is such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log n / B(n) = 0$ . Then,*

$$d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\{\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}\}), out(\{\Omega_n\})\right) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.5)$$

where  $\xrightarrow{P}$  denotes the convergence in probability.

*Proof.* See Appendix B.4. □

## 5.1 Numerical experiment

To validate our proposed outlier estimator, we conduct a simple numerical experiment. For the true model, we consider the single SCM as given in (2.1), where the length of the time series is  $n = 100$  and the breakpoint is  $k_n = 50$ . We set the baseline AR coefficient  $\rho$  to take values in  $\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ , and the magnitude of change  $\varepsilon/\rho$  to take values in  $\{0.5, 1, 2\}$  for each given  $\rho$ . For each model, we vary the panel size  $B \in \{100, 500, 1000, 5000\}$ .

For the given parameter values in the single SCM, we generate the panel time series  $\{y_{j,t,n}\}$  as in (5.1), where  $\{z_{j,t,n}\}$  are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Let  $\Omega_n$  be the true precision matrix of  $\underline{y}_{1,n}$  and let  $\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}$  be its estimator as in (5.3). According to Theorem 3.1, the single SCM has two outliers  $out(\{\Omega_n\}) = \{\lambda_L, \lambda_R\}$ , where the explicit expressions of  $\lambda_L < a_\rho < b_\rho < \lambda_R$  are provided in the same theorem. As an estimator, we use

$$\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) = \{\hat{\lambda}_L, \hat{\lambda}_R\}, \quad \text{where } \hat{\lambda}_L = \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}) \text{ and } \hat{\lambda}_R = \lambda_n(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}).$$

All simulations are conducted with 1000 replications, and for each simulation, we calculate the outliers  $(\hat{\lambda}_{L,i}, \hat{\lambda}_{R,i})$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}$ . To assess the performance of our estimator, we compute the mean absolute error (MAE)

$$MAE_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( |\hat{\lambda}_{L,i} - \lambda_L| + |\hat{\lambda}_{R,i} - \lambda_R| \right), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}, \quad (5.6)$$

which is an equivalent norm of the Hausdorff norm.

Table 1 displays the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the MAE for

each parameter setting under consideration. In all simulations, as the panel size  $B$  increases,

$\rho$	$\varepsilon/\rho$	$B$			
		100	500	1000	5000
0.1	0.5	0.15 <sub>(0.03)</sub>	0.05 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.03 <sub>(0.01)</sub>	0.01 <sub>(0.00)</sub>
	1	0.13 <sub>(0.03)</sub>	0.05 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.03 <sub>(0.01)</sub>	0.01 <sub>(0.01)</sub>
	2	0.10 <sub>(0.03)</sub>	0.03 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.03 <sub>(0.01)</sub>	0.01 <sub>(0.01)</sub>
0.3	0.5	0.09 <sub>(0.05)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.02 <sub>(0.01)</sub>	0.02 <sub>(0.01)</sub>
	1	0.13 <sub>(0.04)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.02 <sub>(0.01)</sub>
	2	0.22 <sub>(0.08)</sub>	0.08 <sub>(0.04)</sub>	0.06 <sub>(0.04)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>
0.5	0.5	0.20 <sub>(0.08)</sub>	0.07 <sub>(0.04)</sub>	0.07 <sub>(0.03)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>
	1	0.23 <sub>(0.10)</sub>	0.12 <sub>(0.07)</sub>	0.10 <sub>(0.05)</sub>	0.06 <sub>(0.03)</sub>
	2	0.39 <sub>(0.19)</sub>	0.21 <sub>(0.11)</sub>	0.17 <sub>(0.09)</sub>	0.09 <sub>(0.04)</sub>
0.7	0.5	0.28 <sub>(0.15)</sub>	0.08 <sub>(0.04)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.02)</sub>	0.03 <sub>(0.02)</sub>
	1	0.39 <sub>(0.20)</sub>	0.09 <sub>(0.05)</sub>	0.07 <sub>(0.05)</sub>	0.05 <sub>(0.03)</sub>
	2	0.67 <sub>(0.31)</sub>	0.17 <sub>(0.10)</sub>	0.15 <sub>(0.10)</sub>	0.10 <sub>(0.06)</sub>
0.9	0.5	0.48 <sub>(0.22)</sub>	0.13 <sub>(0.07)</sub>	0.07 <sub>(0.05)</sub>	0.04 <sub>(0.03)</sub>
	1	0.55 <sub>(0.29)</sub>	0.14 <sub>(0.08)</sub>	0.09 <sub>(0.07)</sub>	0.05 <sub>(0.04)</sub>
	2	0.54 <sub>(0.33)</sub>	0.26 <sub>(0.18)</sub>	0.18 <sub>(0.12)</sub>	0.07 <sub>(0.06)</sub>

Table 1: The average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the mean absolute error of the single SCM for each combination of  $(\rho, \varepsilon, B)$ .

the MAE decreases and tends to zero. Moreover, the finite sample bias of  $\hat{\lambda}_L$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_R$  due to  $n$  and  $k$  are negligible for moderate baseline AR coefficients (i.e.,  $\rho \in \{0.1, 0.3\}$ ) and reasonably small for larger  $\rho \in \{0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ . These observations align with Remark 3.1(ii), which states that the bias due to the breakpoint  $k$  is bounded by  $c^k$  for some  $c \in (0, 1)$ , where  $c = c(\rho)$  approaches one as  $|\rho|$  approaches one, leading to a larger bias. However, the effect of the magnitude of change  $\varepsilon$  is not consistent. For  $\rho \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ , the bias tends to increase as  $\varepsilon/\rho$  increases. Conversely the opposite trend is observed for  $\rho = 0.1$ .

## 6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

This section contains the proof of Theorem 3.1. For brevity, we primarily focus on the case  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . The proof for  $\rho \in (-1, 0)$  can be treated similarly. The proof strategy is motivated by that of Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi (2011), Theorem 2.1. To prove the theorem, it suffices to show the following four statements:

- In case when  $|\rho| \leq |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , there exists  $c \in (0, 1)$  such that for any fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

(A)  $\lambda_1(B_n) = M + O(c^k)$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(B)  $\lambda_n(B_n) = m + O(c^k)$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(C)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{j+1}(B_n) = b_\rho$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n-j}(B_n) = a_\rho$ .

- In case when  $|\rho| > |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , for any fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

(D)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j(B_n) = b_\rho$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n+1-j}(B_n) = a_\rho$ .

The proof of (A)–(D) consists of seven steps which we will briefly summarize below:

**Step 1** We show that there are at most two outliers in  $\{B_n\}$ , one each from the left and right.

**Step 2** Using spectral decomposition, we obtain  $3 \times 3$  matrix, where zeros of the determinant of this matrix are the possible outliers.

**Step 3** We show that the matrix from [Step2] is a block diagonal matrix with the block sizes 1 and 2.

**Step 4** We show that the  $1 \times 1$  block of [step3] do not have a zero on the possible range. Thus, the possible outliers are the zeros of the determinant of  $2 \times 2$  submatrix.

**Step 5** We show that if  $|\rho| > |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , then, there is no zeros of the determinant of  $2 \times 2$  in the possible range.

**Step 6** We show that if  $|\rho| < |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , then, there are exactly two zeros and we derive an explicit form of zeros.

**Step 7** We calculate the approximation errors due to the breakpoint  $k$ .

Now, we give details on each step.

**Step 1.** Let  $A_{0,n}$  and  $B_n$  be the precision matrices under the null and single SCM, respectively, and let  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  be defined as in (2.4). Define  $P_n = B_n - A_{0,n}$  and  $\tilde{P}_n = B_n - \tilde{A}_{0,n}$ . Utilizing Lemma 2.1, we have

$$[P_n]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho), & (i,j) = (k-1, k-1), \\ -\varepsilon, & (i,j) \in \{(k-1, k), (k, k-1)\} \\ 0, & o.w. \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{P}_n = P_n - \rho^2 E_n, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $E_n = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Therefore, provided that  $\varepsilon \neq 0$ ,  $P_n$  has exactly two nonzero eigenvalues which are the solutions of the quadratic equation

$$z^2 - (\varepsilon^2 + 2\rho\varepsilon)z - \varepsilon^2 = 0.$$

We denote these two nonzero eigenvalues as  $\alpha < \beta$ . Since  $\alpha\beta = -\varepsilon^2 < 0$ , we have  $\alpha < 0 < \beta$ . Therefore, the eigenvalues of  $P_n$  are given by  $\lambda_1(P_n) = \beta$ ,  $\lambda_n(P_n) = \alpha$ , and  $\lambda_2(P_n) = \dots =$

$\lambda_{n-1}(P_n) = 0$ . Next, by applying Lemma C.3 below, we have

$$\lambda_{j+1}(A_{0,n}) \leq \lambda_j(B_n) \leq \lambda_{j-1}(A_{0,n}), \quad j \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Therefore by Lemma 3.1 and the sandwich property, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{j+1}(B_n) = b_\rho \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n-j}(B_n) = a_\rho, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This proves (C) and part of (D). Next, by Theorem 2.1, since  $\mu_{B_n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu_\rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we conclude that the possible outliers of  $\{B_n\}$  are the limiting points of  $\lambda_1(B_n)$  or  $\lambda_n(B_n)$ .

**Step 2.** Let  $\tilde{A}_{0,n} = U_n \Lambda_n U_n^\top$  be an eigen-decomposition, where  $U_n = (u_1^{(n)}, \dots, u_n^{(n)})$  is the orthonormal matrix and  $\Lambda_n = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(\tilde{A}_{0,n}), \dots, \lambda_n(\tilde{A}_{0,n}))$  is the diagonal matrix (explicit expressions of  $U_n$  and  $\Lambda_n$  are given in (2.5) and (2.6), respectively). For the sake of convenience, we omit the index  $n$  and write  $u_i = u_i^{(n)}$  and  $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(\tilde{A}_{0,n})$ .

Next, let  $\tilde{P}_n = V_n \Theta_r V_n^\top$  be a spectral decomposition of  $\tilde{P}_n$ , where  $r$  is the rank of  $\tilde{P}_n$ ,  $\Theta_r$  is a diagonal matrix of nonzero eigenvalues of  $\tilde{P}_n$ , and  $V_n$  is an  $n \times r$  matrix with columns consisting of  $r$  orthogonal eigenvectors. Since the explicit form of  $\tilde{P}_n$  is given in (6.1), we can fully determine the elements in the spectral decomposition of  $\tilde{P}_n$  by

$$r = 3, \quad V_n = (a_1 e_{k-1} + b_1 e_k, a_2 e_{k-1} + b_2 e_k, e_n), \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_r = \text{diag}(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3), \quad (6.2)$$

where  $e_k$  is the  $k$ th canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\theta_1 = \varepsilon \frac{(\varepsilon + 2\rho) - \sqrt{(\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4}}{2}, \quad \theta_2 = \varepsilon \frac{(\varepsilon + 2\rho) + \sqrt{(\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4}}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_3 = -\rho^2,$$

and  $(a_1, b_1)^\top$  and  $(a_2, b_2)^\top$  are the two orthonormal eigenvectors of the matrix

$$\varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon + 2\rho & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, the corresponding eigenvalues of  $(a_1, b_1)^\top$  and  $(a_2, b_2)^\top$  are  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  above, respectively. Since  $U_n$  is orthogonal, we have

$$B_n = \tilde{A}_{0,n} + \tilde{P}_n = U_n (\Lambda_n + U_n V_n \Theta_r V_n^\top U_n^\top) U_n^\top.$$

Therefore,  $\text{spec}(B_n) = \text{spec}(\Lambda_n + S_n \Theta_r S_n^\top)$  where

$$S_n = U_n V_n = (a_1 u_{k-1} + b_1 u_k, a_2 u_{k-1} + b_2 u_k, u_n). \quad (6.3)$$

Next, by using Arbenz et al. (1988), Theorem 2.3,  $z \in [a_\rho, b_\rho]^c \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$  is an eigenvalue of  $B_n$  (thus, an eigenvalue of  $\Lambda_n + S_n \Theta_r S_n^\top$ ) if and only if  $\det(I_r - S_n^\top (zI_n - \Lambda_n)^{-1} S_n \Theta_r) = 0$ . Therefore, we conclude that  $z$  is an eigenvalue of  $B_n$  but not  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$ , if and only of the matrix

$$M_{n,r} = I_r - S_n^\top (zI_n - \Lambda_n)^{-1} S_n \Theta_r \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \quad (6.4)$$

is singular.

**Step 3.** The  $(i, j)$ th  $(i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\})$  component of  $M_{n,r}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [M_{n,r}]_{i,j} &= \delta_{i=j} - \sum_{\ell=1}^n [S_n^\top]_{i,\ell} [(zI_n - \Lambda_n)^{-1}]_{\ell,\ell} [S_n]_{\ell,j} [\Theta_n]_{j,j} = \delta_{i=j} - \theta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,i} [S_n]_{\ell,j}}{z - \lambda_\ell(\tilde{A}_{0,n})} \\ &= \delta_{i=j} - \theta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,i} [S_n]_{\ell,j}}{2\rho \cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + (z - (1 + \rho^2))}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

We make an approximation of the above term. Let  $a = (z - (1 + \rho^2))/(2\rho)$ . Therefore, if  $z > b_\rho = (1 + \rho)^2$ , then  $a > 1$ ; if  $z < (1 - \rho)^2$ , then  $a < -1$ . From (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,1} [S_n]_{\ell,3}}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} \\ &= \frac{2a_1}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\sin\left(\frac{n\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} + \frac{2b_1}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\sin\left(\frac{n\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{(k+1)\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} \\ &= \frac{2a_1}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{\ell+1} \sin\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} + \frac{2b_1}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{\ell+1} \sin\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{(k+1)\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are from (6.2). Therefore, by using Lemma C.1 below, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{\ell+1} \sin\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2\pi}{n+1} \sum_{\ell: \text{ odd}}^n \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} \\ &\quad - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2\pi}{n+1} \sum_{\ell: \text{ even}}^n \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (G(1, k) - G(1, k)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $G(1, k)$  is from Lemma C.1. This indicates that,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [M_{n,r}]_{1,3} = 0$ . Let  $M_r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_{n,r}$ . Then, by using similar calculations above with help of Lemma C.1,  $M_r$  is

written as

$$M_r = \begin{pmatrix} p & q & 0 \\ q & r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A \end{pmatrix}$$

for some  $p, q, r, A$  which we will elaborate in the next step. Therefore, the singularities of  $M_r$  comes from either solving  $A = 0$  or solving  $pr - q^2 = 0$ .

**Step 4.** First, we will calculate  $A$ . Using Lemma C.1 again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,3}[S_n]_{\ell,3}}{\cos \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1} + a} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\sin^2 \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}}{\cos \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1} + a} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin^2 x}{\cos x + a} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin^2 x}{\cos x + a} dx = G(1, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (6.5), we have  $A = 1 - \theta_3 G(1, 1)/(2\rho) = 1 + \rho G(1, 1)/2$ . Let  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  and let  $z < a_\rho$ . Since  $z < a_\rho$ , we have  $a = (z - (1 + \rho^2))/(2\rho) \in (-\infty, -1)$ . Let

$$z_1 = -a - \sqrt{a^2 - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = -a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1}.$$

Then, by Lemma C.1 again, we have

$$G(1, 1) = \frac{2}{z_1 - z_2} (1 - z_1^2) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 - 1}} (1 - (-a - \sqrt{a^2 - 1})^2) = 2(a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1}).$$

Therefore,  $G(1, 1)$  is a decreasing function of  $a$  on the domain  $(-\infty, -1)$ , thus  $G(1, 1) > -2$ . This indicates  $A = 1 + \rho G(1, 1)/2 > 1 - \rho > 0$ . Therefore we conclude there is no  $z \in (-\infty, a_\rho)$  such that  $A = A(z) = 0$ . Similarly, we can show that there is no  $z \in (b_\rho, \infty)$  such that  $A(z) = 0$ .

By using similar techniques with help of Lemma C.1, elements in  $[M_r]_{1,1}$ ,  $[M_r]_{2,2}$ , and  $[M_r]_{1,2}$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,1}[S_n]_{\ell,1}}{\cos \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1} + a} &= \frac{2a_1^2}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin(kx) \sin(kx)}{\cos x + a} dx + \frac{2b_1^2}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin((k+1)x) \sin((k+1)x)}{\cos x + a} dx \\ &\quad + \frac{2a_1 b_1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin(kx) \sin((k+1)x)}{\cos x + a} dx \\ &= a_1^2 G(k, k) + b_1^2 G(k+1, k+1) + 2a_1 b_1 G(k, k+1), \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,2}[S_n]_{\ell,2}}{\cos \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1} + a} &= a_2^2 G(k, k) + b_2^2 G(k+1, k+1) + 2a_2 b_2 G(k, k+1), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,1} [S_n]_{\ell,2}}{\cos \frac{\ell\pi}{n+1} + a} = a_1 a_2 G(k, k) + b_1 b_2 G(k+1, k+1) + (a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1) G(k, k+1).$$

Furthermore, by using Lemma C.1 again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\rho} G(k, k) &\approx \frac{|a|}{a} \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 - 1}} = \frac{|a|}{a} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z - a_\rho)(z - b_\rho)}} =: G(z), \\ \frac{1}{2\rho} G(k, k+1) &\approx \frac{z_2}{2\rho(z_2 - z_1)} = \tilde{G}(z) \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

and the approximation errors above are of order  $O(|z_1|^k \wedge |z_2|^k)$  as  $k = k(n) \rightarrow \infty$ . By (6.6) and Lemma C.2(a,b), the  $2 \times 2$  submatrix of  $M_r$  limits to

$$\widetilde{M}_{r-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \theta_1 (G(z) + 2a_1 b_1 \tilde{G}(z)) & \theta_2 (a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1) \tilde{G}(z) \\ \theta_1 (a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1) \tilde{G}(z) & 1 - \theta_2 (G(z) + 2a_2 b_2 \tilde{G}(z)) \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.7)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det \widetilde{M}_{r-1} &= (1 - \theta_1 G)(1 - \theta_2 G) - 2((1 - \theta_2 G)\theta_1 a_1 b_1 + (1 - \theta_1 G)\theta_2 a_2 b_2) \tilde{G} \\ &\quad + 4\theta_1 \theta_2 a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2 \tilde{G}^2 - \theta_1 \theta_2 (a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1)^2 \tilde{G}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by using Lemma C.2(b)–(g),  $\det \widetilde{M}_{r-1}$  can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \det \widetilde{M}_{r-1} &= (1 - \theta_1 G)(1 - \theta_2 G) - 2(\theta_1 a_1 b_1 + \theta_2 a_2 b_2) \tilde{G} - \theta_1 \theta_2 \tilde{G}^2 \\ &= (1 - \theta_1 G)(1 - \theta_2 G) + 2\varepsilon \tilde{G} + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{G}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

We note that since we use an approximation (6.6), the exact determinant of the submatrix of  $M_r$  (which is  $pr - q^2$ ) is not identical to  $\det \widetilde{M}_{r-1}$  above. However, by using the approximation error as in (C.2), we

$$pr - q^2 = \det \widetilde{M}_{r-1} + O\left(\frac{z_2^{4k+2}}{(1 - z_2^2)^2}\right), \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.9)$$

**Step 5.** We first show that if  $|\rho + \varepsilon| < |\rho|$ , then  $\det \widetilde{M}_{r-1}$  does not have zero in  $[a_\rho, b_\rho]^c$ . Let  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , thus,  $\varepsilon \in (-\rho, 0)$ . Moreover, we only consider the case when  $z > b_\rho$ , or equivalently  $a > 1$ . The case when  $z < a_\rho$  can be treated similarly. By using (1)  $\theta_1 + \theta_1 = \varepsilon^2 + 2\rho\varepsilon$  and

(2)  $\theta_1\theta_2 = -\varepsilon^2$ , we have

$$f_z(\varepsilon) = \det \widetilde{M}_{r-1} = (\widetilde{G}^2 - G^2 - G)\varepsilon^2 + 2(\widetilde{G} - \rho G)\varepsilon + 1. \quad (6.10)$$

Recall

$$G = \frac{2}{2\rho(z_2 - z_1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z - a_\rho)(z - b_\rho)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{G} = \frac{2z_2}{2\rho(z_2 - z_1)} = \frac{z_2}{\sqrt{(z - a_\rho)(z - b_\rho)}}.$$

Since  $z_2 \in (-1, 0)$ , we have  $\widetilde{G}(z) < 0 < -\widetilde{G}(z) < G(z)$ . Therefore, the leading coefficient of  $f_z(\varepsilon)$  is negative. Since  $f_z(0) > 0$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} f_z(\cdot) \text{ does not have a solution in } \varepsilon \in (-\rho, 0) \\ \iff f_z(-\rho) = (\widetilde{G}^2 - G^2 + G)\rho^2 - 2\widetilde{G}\rho + 1 > 0, \quad z > b_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we parametrize  $z_2 = \cos x$  for  $x \in (\pi/2, \pi)$  (since  $z_2 \in (-1, 0)$ ). For the simplicity, let  $C = \cos x$  and let  $S = \sin x$ . Then, we have

$$G = \frac{2}{2\rho(z_2 - 1/z_2)} = -\frac{C}{\rho S^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{G} = \frac{2z_2}{2\rho(z_2 - 1/z_2)} = -\frac{C^2}{\rho S^2}. \quad (6.11)$$

Substitute (6.11) into  $f_z(-\rho)$  and multiply  $S^2$ , we have

$$S^2 f_z(-\rho) = -C^2 + \rho C + 2C^2 + S^2 = 1 + \rho C > 0.$$

Therefore, when  $|\rho + \varepsilon| < |\rho|$ , there is no solution for  $\det \widetilde{M}_{r-1} = 0$ , thus conclude that eigenvalues of  $B_n$  do not have outlier. This completes the proof of (D).

**Step 6.** Consider the case  $|\rho| < |\rho + \varepsilon|$  and assume  $0 < \rho < \rho + \varepsilon$ . In this case, we can find the solution for (6.10).

**case 1:**  $z > b_\rho$ . Using the same parametrization as in (6.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_z(\varepsilon) &= \left( \frac{C^4}{\rho^2 S^4} - \frac{C^2}{\rho^2 S^4} + \frac{C}{S^2} \right) \varepsilon^2 + 2 \left( -\frac{C^2}{\rho S^2} + \frac{C}{S^2} \right) \varepsilon + 1 = 0 \\ \iff &-(\varepsilon + \rho)^2 C^2 + \varepsilon \rho (\varepsilon + 2\rho) C + \rho^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho) > 0$  (here we the condition  $0 < \rho < \rho + \varepsilon$ ), solution  $C \in (-1, 0)$  of (6.12) is given by

$$C = z_2 = \frac{\rho \varepsilon (\varepsilon + 2\rho) - \sqrt{\rho^2 \varepsilon^2 (\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4\rho^2 (\varepsilon + \rho)^2}}{2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2}. \quad (6.12)$$

Recall  $z_2 = -a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1}$  and  $a = (z - (1 + \rho^2))/(2\rho)$ . Thus, the solution  $z \in (b_\rho, \infty)$  is

$$\mathfrak{M} = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(C + C^{-1}).$$

**case 2:**  $z < a_\rho$ . In this case,  $a = (z - (1 + \rho^2))/(2\rho) < -1$ , thus

$$G = \frac{2}{2\rho(z_1 - z_2)} = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{(z - a_\rho)(z - b_\rho)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{G} = \frac{2z_1}{2\rho(z_1 - z_2)} = \frac{-z_1}{\sqrt{(z - a_\rho)(z - b_\rho)}}.$$

Since  $0 < z_1 < 1 < z_2$ , we use parametrize  $z_1 = \cos x = C'$  for some  $x \in (0, \pi/2)$ . Then, equation (6.12) remains the same but our solution is on  $(0, 1)$ . Thus

$$C' = z_1 = \frac{\rho\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2\rho) + \sqrt{\rho^2\varepsilon^2(\varepsilon + 2\rho)^2 + 4\rho^2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2}}{2(\varepsilon + \rho)^2}. \quad (6.13)$$

Using similar argument above, the solution  $z \in (-\infty, a_\rho)$  is

$$\mathfrak{m} = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(C' + (C')^{-1}).$$

To conclude, when  $|\rho| < |\rho + \varepsilon|$ , we show that there are exactly two outliers, one on the right ( $= \mathfrak{M}$ ) and the other on the left ( $= \mathfrak{m}$ ). This prove (A).

**Step 7.** Lastly, we consider the effect of the break point  $k$  and prove Remark 3.1(ii). Let  $X(z) = -(\varepsilon + \rho)^2 z^2 + \varepsilon\rho(\varepsilon + 2\rho)z + \rho^2$ . Then, it is easy to check  $X(1) < 0 < X(\rho)$ . Therefore, there exists  $\tilde{z} \in (\rho, 1)$  such that  $X(\tilde{z}) = 0$ . Moreover, it is easy to check that  $\tilde{z}$  is not a multiple root. Therefore, around  $z = \tilde{z}$ ,  $X(z)$  changes its sign. By (6.9),

$$(pr - q^2)(\tilde{z}) = \underbrace{X(\tilde{z})}_{=0} + O\left(\frac{(\tilde{z})^{4k+2}}{(1 - (\tilde{z})^2)^2}\right).$$

Therefore, for a sufficiently large  $k$ , there exists  $c \in (0, 1)$  and an interval  $I(\tilde{z}) = [\tilde{z} - c^k, \tilde{z} + c^k] \subset (-1, 0)$  such that  $(pr - q^2)(z)$  has a zero in  $I(\tilde{z})$ . Let the solution be  $\hat{z}$ . Then,  $\hat{\mathfrak{m}} = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(\hat{z} + \hat{z}^{-1})$  is the “true” outlier, and  $\mathfrak{m} = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(\tilde{z} + \tilde{z}^{-1})$  is an approximation solution as described in [Step 6]. Since  $|\hat{z} - \tilde{z}| = O(c^k)$ , we can show  $|\hat{\mathfrak{m}} - \mathfrak{m}| = O(|c|^k)$ . Similarly, we have  $|\hat{\mathfrak{M}} - \mathfrak{M}| = O(c^k)$ .  $\square$

## 7 Concluding remark and extension

In this article, we study the structural changes in nonstationary AR(1) processes when the change period of the AR coefficients is very short. Therefore, traditional CUSUM-type

approaches, which assume that the length of the changes grows at the same speed as the length of the time series, are not applicable. Instead, we focus on the edge eigenvalues of the precision matrix of the observed time series. We show that under the null of no structural change, all eigenvalues of the precision matrix lie within the bulk spectrum with the distribution described explicitly in (1.8). On the other hand, under the alternative of structural change, we show that there exist outliers (edge eigenvalues) that are apart from the same bulk spectrum as in the null case. These edge eigenvalues can be computed by numerically solving a determinantal equation of the matrix-valued function of the form (3.10).

The problem under consideration in this article is specific to AR processes of order 1. We discuss the possible extension of our results to nonstationary AR processes of general order  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ . To do so, similar to (1.2), suppose we observe  $\underline{y}_n = (y_{1,n}, \dots, y_{n,n})^\top$  with recursion  $y_{t,n} = \sum_{j=1}^p \phi_{t,n}^{(j)} y_{t-j,n} + z_{t,n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Analogous to (1.3), we assume  $\underline{\phi}_{t,n} = (\phi_{t,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \phi_{t,n}^{(p)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$  satisfies  $\underline{\phi}_{t,n} = \underline{\phi} + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon_j I_{E_{j,n}}(t)$ ,  $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Here, the baseline AR( $p$ ) coefficient  $\underline{\phi} = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_p)^\top$  is such that  $\phi(z) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \phi_j z^j$  does not have zero on and inside the unit circle. Then, by using similar techniques used in the proof of Theorem 1.1, one can show that  $\mu_{A_n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu_{\underline{\phi}}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , provided (1.9) holds. Here, the LSD  $\mu_{\underline{\phi}}$  is the probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  with distribution

$$F_{\mu_{\underline{\phi}}}(t) = \mu_{\underline{\phi}}((-\infty, t]) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} I_{(-\infty, t]}(|\phi(e^{-ix})|^2) dx, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

However, generalizing the outlier results stated in Section 3 to higher-order AR processes, even for  $p = 2$ , seems challenging. This is because when calculating the outliers of the AR(1) SCM, we need to compute the explicit expression of  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_{n,r} = M_r$ , where  $M_{n,r}$  is as in (6.4). Deriving expressions of  $M_r$  for  $p = 1$  involves detailed calculations, and finding the general expression of  $M_r$  for general  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^m$  seems intractable. However, we conjecture that for nonstationary AR( $p$ ) models, Theorem 1.2 holds and outliers are observed when the structural change occurs. This will be investigated in future research.

## Acknowledgement

The author's research was supported by Taiwan's National Science and Technology Council (grant 110-2118-M-001-014-MY3). The research was partially conducted while the author was affiliated with Texas A&M University and was partly supported by NSF grant DMS-1812054. The author acknowledges Professor Suhasini Subba Rao for fruitful discussions. Additionally, the author wishes to thank the two anonymous referees and editors for their valuable comments and corrections, which have significantly enhanced the quality of the

article in all aspects.

## A Properties of $\mu_\rho$

For a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , we define the Stieltjes transform of  $\mu$  as

$$G_\mu(z) = \int_{\text{supp}(\mu)} \frac{1}{z-x} d\mu(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu),$$

where  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is a support of  $\mu$ . The Stieltjes transform plays an important role in characterizing the behavior of the random measure since, under certain regularity conditions, we have

$$G_\mu(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{m_k(\mu)}{z^k}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $m_k(\mu) = \int x^k d\mu(x)$  is the  $k$ th moment of  $\mu$ . In general, it is unwieldy to obtain an explicit form of the Stieltjes transform of given  $\mu$ . However, within our framework, we have a simple analytic form for  $G_{\mu_\rho}$ , where  $\mu_\rho$  has a density function as in (1.8).

**Theorem A.1** *Let  $\mu_\rho$  be defined as in (1.8), and let  $a_\rho$  and  $b_\rho$  be defined as in (2.8), which are the lower and upper bounds of the support of  $\mu_\rho$ , respectively. Then, for any  $z \notin [a_\rho, b_\rho]$ , the Stieltjes transform of  $\mu_\rho$*

$$G_{\mu_\rho}(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}}, & z > b_\rho. \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}}, & z < a_\rho. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{\mu_n\}$  be a sequence of compactly supported measures taking values on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, it is well-known that  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu$  if and only if  $G_{\mu_n}(z) \rightarrow G_\mu(z)$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$ . Combining this fact together with Lemma 2.2, it is enough to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_{\mu_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}}(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}}, & z > b_\rho, \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}}, & z < a_\rho, \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  is defined as in (2.4). By definition, we have

$$G_{\mu_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}}(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{z - \lambda_i(\tilde{A}_{0,n})}, \quad z \in [a_\rho, b_\rho]^c.$$

Let  $g_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}(x) = (1 + \rho^2) - 2\rho \cos x$  be the generating function of the Toeplitz matrix  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$ . Then, by apply Szegő limit theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(\tilde{A}_{0,n})) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(g_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}(x)) dx \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for any continuous function  $f : [a_\rho, b_\rho] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In particular set  $f_z(x) = (z-x)^{-1}$  for  $z \notin [a_\rho, b_\rho]$ , then  $f_z$  is continuous and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_{\mu_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}}(z) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_z(\lambda_i) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f_z(g_{\tilde{A}_{0,n}}(x)) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\rho \cos x + (z - (1 + \rho^2))} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}} & z > b_\rho. \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-a_\rho)(z-b_\rho)}} & z < a_\rho. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The last identity can be proved using a similar techniques in Lemma C.1 below (we omit the details).  $\square$

The following corollary provides an expression of the moments of  $\mu_\rho$ .

**Corollary A.1** *The  $k$ -th moment of  $\mu_\rho$  is*

$$m_k(\mu_\rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos x)^k dx, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Proof.* The assertion is immediately followed by (A.2) by setting  $f(x) = x^k$ .  $\square$

## B Additional proofs of the main results

This section contains addition proofs in the main paper. For brevity, we mainly focus on the case  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . The proof for  $\rho \in (-1, 0)$  can be treated similarly.

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We only prove the results when  $m = 1$ , and the general case when  $m \geq 2$  can be treated similarly. Let  $A_{0,n}$  and  $B_n$  be the precision matrices under the null and SCM, respectively. We will first show (2.9) for  $|E_{1,n}| = 1$ , then extend the result to  $|E_{1,n}| \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ .

**case 1:**  $|E_{1,n}| = 1$ . Suppose we have shown the following:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(B_n^j) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(A_{0,n}^j) = m_j(\mu_\rho), \quad j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where  $m_j(\mu_\rho)$  is the  $j$ th moment of  $\mu_\rho$ . Then, by Lemma C.4 together with Billingsley (2008), Theorem 30.2, we get  $\mu_{B_n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu_\rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, it suffice to show (B.1).

Let  $R_n = B_n - A_{0,n}$ . Then, from (2.2), entries of  $R_n$  are zero except for a  $2 \times 2$  submatrix. Next, by using linearity, we have

$$\text{tr}(B_n^j) = \text{tr}((A_{0,n} + R_n)^j) = \sum_{\alpha_i \in \{\circ, *\}} \text{tr}(X_n^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots X_n^{(\alpha_j)}), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where  $X_n^{(\circ)} = A_{0,n}$  and  $X_n^{(*)} = R_n$ . Observe that  $R_n$  has nonzero elements on  $[R_n]_{i,j}$  for  $(i, j) \in \{(k-1, k-1), (k-1, k), (k, k-1)\}$ , where  $k = k_n$  is the breakpoint. Therefore, for any matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , the columns of  $XR_n$  are zero vectors except for the  $(k-1)$ th and  $k$ th columns. Next, using commutativity of the trace operator, we get

$$\text{tr}(X_n^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots X_n^{(\alpha_j)}) = \text{tr}(A_{0,n}^{n_1} R_n^{m_1} \cdots A_{0,n}^{n_t} R_n^{m_t}), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

for some orders  $(n_1, \dots, n_t, m_1, \dots, m_t)$ . Observe that  $A_{0,n}^{n_p} R_n^{m_p}$  has at most two nonzero columns (on  $(k-1)$ th and  $k$ th), so does the product. Therefore,  $X_n^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots X_n^{(\alpha_j)}$  has at most two nonzero diagonal elements unless all  $X_n^{(\alpha_i)}$  are  $A_{0,n}$ . Therefore, we can find a constant  $B_j \in (0, \infty)$  that does not depend on  $n$  such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| [X_n^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots X_n^{(\alpha_j)}]_{i,i} \right| < B_j, \quad \text{for all } \alpha_i\text{-s that are not all equal to } \circ.$$

By using the above bound, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left| \text{tr}(B_n^j) - \text{tr}(A_{0,n}^j) \right| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (2^j - 1) \times \frac{2B_j}{n} = 0, \quad j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}.$$

This proves (2.9) for  $|E_{1,n}| = 1$ . □

**case 2:**  $|E_{1,n}| > 1$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |E_{1,n}|/n = \tau = 0$ . By using similar method above, there exists  $\tilde{B}_j \in (0, \infty)$  that does not depend on  $n$  such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \left| \text{tr}(B_n^j) - \text{tr}(A_{0,n}^j) \right| \leq \frac{2^j}{n} (|E_{1,n}| + 1) \tilde{B}_j, \quad j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}.$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |E_{1,n}|/n = \tau = 0$ , the right hand side above converges to zero, thus shows (2.9). □

**case 3:**  $|E_{1,n}| > 1$  and  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ . Let structural change occurs on  $\{k, \dots, k+h-1\}$  for

some  $h \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ . Define  $n \times n$  matrix

$$(P_n)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} -\rho_{k-1}^2, & (i, j) = (k-2, k-2). \\ \rho_k, & (i, j) = (k-1, k), (k, k-1). \\ -\rho_{k+h-1}^2, & (i, j) = (k+h-2, k+h-2). \\ \rho_{k+h}, & (i, j) = (k+h-1, k+h), (k+h, k+h-1). \\ 0, & o.w. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Then,  $\text{rank}(P_n) \leq 4$ , thus  $P_n$  has at most four nonzero eigenvalues. Let  $\tilde{B}_n = B_n + P_n$ . Then, it is easily seen that  $\tilde{B}_n$  is a block diagonal matrix of form

$$\tilde{B}_n = \text{diag}(\tilde{B}_{1,n}, \tilde{B}_{2,n}, \tilde{B}_{3,n}),$$

where  $\tilde{B}_{i,n}$  forms the inverse Toeplitz matrix of the null model but with different baseline AR coefficients. Specifically,  $\tilde{B}_{1,n}$  and  $\tilde{B}_{3,n}$  correspond to the precision matrices of the null model with the baseline AR coefficient  $\rho$ , and  $\tilde{B}_{2,n}$  corresponds to the null model with the baseline AR coefficient  $\rho + \varepsilon$ . Since  $P_n$  has a finite number of nonzero eigenvalues, by using the same proof techniques as above, the LSD of  $B_n$  and  $\tilde{B}_n$  are the same. Moreover,  $\tilde{B}_n$  is a block diagonal matrix. This indicates that for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_n^j) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left( \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_{1,n}^j) + \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_{2,n}^j) + \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_{3,n}^j) \right) = \tau m_j(\mu_{\rho+\varepsilon}) + (1 - \tau) m_j(\mu_\rho).$$

Thus, we get the desired results.  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We only prove for the case  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , and the case when  $\rho \in (-1, 0)$  can be treated similarly. The proof of the theorem is similar to that of Theorem 3.1, so we only sketch the proof.

**Step 1.** Let  $A_{0,n}$  and  $B_n$  be the precision matrices under the null and single interval SCM, respectively. Let  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  be defined as in (2.4), and  $\tilde{A}_{0,n} := U_n \Lambda_n U_n^\top$  be its eigen-decomposition as described in Section 6, [Step 2]. Let  $M_{n,r}$  be as in (6.4). Then, due to Section 6, [Step 2],  $z$  is an eigenvalue of  $B_n$  but not  $\tilde{A}_{0,n}$  if and only if  $M_{n,r}$  is singular. In the single interval SCM, the rank  $r = h + 2$ , where  $h \in \mathbb{N}$  is the length of change, and we have the following

reduced form  $P_n = B_n - A_{0,n}$  by considering only the nonzero submatrix in (6.1):

$$P_{h+1} = \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon + 2\rho & -1 & & & \\ & -1 & \varepsilon + 2\rho & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \varepsilon + 2\rho & -1 \\ & & & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+1) \times (h+1)}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Let  $P_{h+1} = V_{h+1} \Theta_{h+1} V_{h+1}^\top$  be the spectral decomposition. Then, by similar arguments from Section 6, [Step 3], we have the  $(h+1) \times (h+1)$  leading principal matrix of  $M_{n,r}$ , denotes  $M_{n,h+1} = I_{h+1} - S_{h+1}^\top (zI_n - \Lambda_n)^{-1} S_{h+1} \Theta_{h+1}$  where  $S_{h+1} = (s_1, \dots, s_{h+1})$  for  $s_i = \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} v_{j,i} u_{k+j}$ . Here,  $U_n = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  is as in Section 6, [step2], and  $v_{j,i}$  denotes the  $(j, i)$ th the element of  $V_{h+1} = (v_1, \dots, v_{h+1})$ .

Next define  $M_{h+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_{n,h+1}$ , then the possible outliers of  $B_n$  is the solution of  $\det M_{h+1} = 0$ . Next, by (6.5), the  $(i, j)$ th element of  $M_{h+1}$  is

$$[M_{h+1}]_{i,j} = \delta_{i=j} - \theta_j \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,i} [S_n]_{\ell,j}}{2\rho \cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + (z - (1 + \rho^2))}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{[S_n]_{\ell,i} [S_n]_{\ell,j}}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} &= \sum_{p,q=1}^{h+1} v_{p,i} v_{q,j} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{2}{n+1} \frac{\sin\left(\frac{(k+p)\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{(k+q)\ell\pi}{n+1}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\ell\pi}{n+1}\right) + a} \\ &= \sum_{p,q=1}^{k+h+1} v_{p,i} v_{q,j} G(k+p, k+q) = v_i^\top G_{h+1} v_j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $G_{h+1} = [G(k+i, k+j)]_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+1) \times (h+1)}$  and  $G(k+i, k+j)$  is defined as in (C.2). Therefore, the possible outliers of  $B_n$  satisfy the determinantal equation

$$\det \left( I_{h+1} - \frac{1}{2\rho} V_{h+1}^\top G_{h+1} V_{h+1} \Theta_{h+1} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

**Step 2.** Since  $V_{h+1}^\top V_{h+1} = V_{h+1} V_{h+1}^\top = I_{h+1}$  and  $V_{h+1} \Theta_{h+1} V_{h+1}^\top = P_{h+1}$ , solving (B.6) is equivalent to solve

$$\det \left( I_{h+1} - \frac{1}{2\rho} G_{h+1} P_{h+1} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

For  $z > b_\rho$  ( the case when  $z < a_\rho$  is similar), by Lemma C.1, the explicit form an element of

$G_{h+1}$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}[G_{h+1}]_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2}G(k+p, k+q) = z_2(z_2^2-1)^{-1}(z_2^{|p-q|} - z_2^{p+q+2k}) = z_2(z_2^2-1)^{-1}z_2^{|p-q|} + O\left(\frac{|z_2|^k}{z_2^2-1}\right).$$

Thus, under condition (3.2), the error in the right hand side above vanishes. Next, we observe that the leading term  $\frac{1}{2}[G_{h+1}]_{p,q} = z_2(z_2^2-1)^{-1}z_2^{|p-q|}$  has the same form (up to constant multiplicity) with the covariance matrix of a stationary AR(1) process. Therefore, an explicit form of its inverse is

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}G_{h+1}\right)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{z_2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -z_2 & & & \\ -z_2 & 1+z_2^2 & -z_2 & & \\ & -z_2 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1+z_2^2 & -z_2 \\ & & & -z_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

We also note that  $\det(-\frac{1}{2}G_{h+1}) \neq 0$ . Therefore, solving (B.7) is equivalent to solve  $\det(-(\frac{1}{2}G_{h+1})^{-1} + \frac{1}{\rho}P_{h+1}) = 0$ . Using (B.8), we get

$$-\left(\frac{1}{2}G_{h+1}\right)^{-1} + \rho^{-1}P_{h+1} = \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho}\right) \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -1 & & & \\ -1 & \beta & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \beta & -1 \\ & & & -1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+1) \times (h+1)}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are defined as in (3.8).

Lastly, note that the actual outlier is  $z = 1 + \rho^2 - \rho(z_2 + z_2^{-1})$ . It is easy to check that  $z \notin [a_\rho, b_\rho]$  if and only if (B.9) holds for  $f^{-1}(z) \in (-1, 1)$  where  $f$  is as in (3.7). Thus, this proves the equivalent result in the theorem.

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , let  $P_{h_j+1}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h_j+1) \times (h_j+1)}$  be defined as in (B.5), but replacing  $\varepsilon$  with  $\varepsilon_j$ . Let  $0_r \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  be the zero matrix and let

$$P_n = \text{diag}\left(0_{\Delta_1-2}, P_{h_1+1}^{(1)}, \dots, 0_{\Delta_m-2}, P_{h_m+1}^{(m)}, 0_{n-\ell_m}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

Then, it is easy to show  $P_n = B_n - A_{0,n}$ , where  $A_{0,n}$  is defined as in (2.3). Let  $P_{h+m} = \text{diag}(P_{h_1+1}^{(1)}, \dots, P_{h_m+1}^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+m) \times (h+m)}$ , where  $h = \sum_{j=1}^m h_j$ , be a reduced form of  $P_n$ .

Given  $i \in \{1, \dots, h+m\}$ , let  $\ell(i) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  be the unique index such that  $\sum_{a=1}^{\ell(i)-1} (h_a + 1) < i \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\ell(i)} (h_a + 1)$ . Here, we set  $\sum_{a=1}^0 (h_a + 1) = 0$ . Let  $g(i) = h_{\ell(i)} + \left(i - \sum_{a=1}^{\ell(i)-1} (h_a + 1)\right)$ , then  $g(i)$  is a location of the column of  $P_n$  which is the same as the  $i$ th column of  $P_R$ . Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, [Step 1], the corresponding  $G_{h+m} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+m) \times (h+m)}$  matrix of  $P_R$  is

$$[G_{h+m}]_{i,j} = G(g(i), g(j)) \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq h+m,$$

where  $G(\cdot, \cdot)$  is defined as in (C.2). Therefore, using similar arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.2, [Step 2], we can show there exist  $c \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2}[G_{h+m}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} z_2(z_2^2 - 1)^{-1}z_2^{|i-j|}, & \ell(i) = \ell(j) \\ 0, & \ell(i) \neq \ell(j) \end{cases} + O(c^\Delta), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, under assumption 3.1, the leading term of  $G_{h+m}$  is a block diagonal matrix of form  $\text{diag}(G_{h_1+1}^{(1)}, \dots, G_{h_m+1}^{(m)})$ , where  $G_{h_j+1}^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h_j+1) \times (h_j+1)}$  corresponds to the  $G$  matrix of the  $j$ th submodel defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, [Step 1].

Next, similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, [Step 2], outliers of  $B_n$  are the zeros of the determinantal equation

$$\det \left( I_{h+m} - \frac{1}{2\rho} G_{h+m} P_{h+m} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Since  $G_{h+m}$  and  $P_{h+m}$  are block diagonal matrix, (B.10) is equivalent to solve

$$\prod_{j=1}^m \det \left( I_{h_j+1} - \frac{1}{2\rho} G_{h_j+1}^{(j)} P_{h_j+1} \right) = 0.$$

Lastly, from the proof of Theorem 3.2, zeros of  $\det \left( I_{h_j+1} - \frac{1}{2\rho} G_{h_j+1}^{(j)} P_{h_j+1} \right) = 0$  are indeed the outliers of the  $j$ th submodel. Thus, we have

$$\text{out}(\{B_n\}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \text{out}(\{B_n^{(j)}\}).$$

Thus proves the theorem. □

## B.4 Proof of Theorem 5.2

For set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$\text{out}_L(A) = A \cup (-\infty, a_\rho), \quad \text{out}_R(A) = A \cup (b_\rho, \infty), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{out}(A) = A \cup [a_\rho, b_\rho]^c.$$

We define  $\widehat{out}_L(A)$  and  $\widehat{out}_R(A)$  similarly but replacing  $a_\rho$  and  $b_\rho$  with  $a_{\widehat{\rho}_n}$  and  $b_{\widehat{\rho}_n}$ , respectively. By triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_H \left( \widehat{out}(\widetilde{\Omega}_{n,B}), \widehat{out}(\{\Omega_n\}) \right) &\leq d_H \left( \widehat{out}(\widetilde{\Omega}_{n,B}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n) \right) + d_H \left( \widehat{out}(\Omega_n), out(\Omega_n) \right) \\ &\quad + d_H (out(\Omega_n), out(\{\Omega_n\})). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

The last term in (B.11) is non-random and by the definition of outliers,

$$d_H (out(\Omega_n), out(\{\Omega_n\})) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

We bound the second term in (B.11). Here, we only consider the case when  $out_L(\{\Omega_n\})$  and  $out_R(\{\Omega_n\})$  are nonempty. The case when either sets are empty is straightforward. Let  $a = \sup out_L(\{\Omega_n\})$ , thus  $a < a_\rho$ . Let  $\eta = (a_\rho - a)/2 \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $\delta > 0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) > \delta \right) &= P \left( d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) > \delta \mid |a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta \right) \\ &\quad \times P(|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta) \\ &+ P \left( d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) > \delta \mid |a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| \leq \eta \right) \\ &\quad \times P(|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| \leq \eta). \end{aligned}$$

If  $|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| \leq \eta$ , then for large enough  $n$ ,  $\sup out_L(\Omega_n) < a_{\widehat{\rho}_n}$ . Thus,  $out_L(\Omega_n) = \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n)$  and  $d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) = 0$ . Therefore, for large enough  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) > \delta \right) &= P \left( d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) > \delta \mid |a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta \right) \\ &\quad \times P(|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta) \\ &\leq P(|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by continuous mapping theorem,  $P(|a_{\widehat{\rho}_n} - a_\rho| > \eta) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, we conclude,  $d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Similarly, we can show  $d_H \left( \widehat{out}_R(\Omega_n), out_R(\Omega_n) \right) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Since the left and right outliers are disjoint, we have

$$d_H \left( \widehat{out}(\Omega_n), out(\Omega_n) \right) = d_H \left( \widehat{out}_L(\Omega_n), out_L(\Omega_n) \right) \vee d_H \left( \widehat{out}_R(\Omega_n), out_R(\Omega_n) \right).$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$d_H \left( \widehat{out}(\Omega_n), out(\Omega_n) \right) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Lastly, we bound the first term in (B.11). Let  $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ . Then,

$$P\left(d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) \leq \delta\right) \geq P\left(d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) \leq \delta, |\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)|\right).$$

By Lemma 5.1, it can be shown that for large enough  $n$ ,  $|\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)|$  with probability greater than  $(1 - 4n^{-1/2})$ . Therefore, for large enough  $n$  and given  $|\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)| = \ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} |\lambda_{t_i}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}) - \lambda_{t_i}(\Omega_n)| \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}) - \lambda_i(\Omega_n)|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t_1, \dots, t_\ell$  are an index set of eigenvalues which are outliers. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) \leq \delta, |\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)|\right) \\ \geq P\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}) - \lambda_i(\Omega_n)| \leq \delta, |\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)|\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using Lemma 5.1 again, for large enough  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) \leq \delta\right) \\ \geq P\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}) - \lambda_i(\Omega_n)| \leq \delta, |\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)})| = |\widehat{out}(\Omega_n)|\right) > 1 - 8n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B(n)}), \widehat{out}(\Omega_n)\right) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Combining (B.12), (B.13), and (B.14), we get

$$d_H\left(\widehat{out}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n,B}), out(\{\Omega_n\})\right) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, this proves the Theorem. □

## C Technical Lemmas

**Lemma C.1** *Let  $|a| > 1$  be a constant and let*

$$z_1 = -a - \sqrt{a^2 - 1} \quad z_2 = -a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Then, for any  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2}G(k_1, k_2) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin(k_1 x) \sin(k_2 x)}{a + \cos x} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z_2^{|k_1 - k_2|} - z_2^{k_1 + k_2}), & a > 1. \\ \frac{1}{z_1 - z_2} (z_1^{|k_1 - k_2|} - z_1^{k_1 + k_2}), & a < -1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Moreover, we have

$$G(k, k + h) = \frac{a}{|a|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 - 1}} z_1^h (\text{or } z_2^h) + O(|z_1|^k \wedge |z_2|^k), \quad k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover for large  $h$ ,  $G(k, k + h) \approx 0$ .

*Proof.* We will only prove the identities for  $a > 1$ , and  $a < -1$  can be treated similarly. Let  $z = e^{ix}$  where  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ . Then, we have (1)  $dz = iz dx$ , (2)  $\cos x = \frac{1}{2}(z + z^{-1})$ , and (3)  $\sin kx = \frac{1}{2i}(z^k - z^{-k})$ . Let  $C$  be a counterclockwise contour of unit circle on the complex field starts from 1, and  $\oint_C$  denote a cyclic integral along with contour  $C$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin(k_1 x) \sin(k_2 x)}{a + \cos x} dx &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_C \left( \frac{-\frac{1}{4}(z^{k_1} - z^{-k_1})(z^{k_2} - z^{-k_2})}{\frac{1}{2}(z + z^{-1}) + a} \right) \frac{dz}{iz} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)}{z^{k_1 + k_2}(z - z_1)(z - z_2)} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a > 1$ , we have  $|z_2| < 1 < |z_1|$ . Therefore, the poles of  $(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)/(z^{k_1 + k_2}(z - z_1)(z - z_2))$  in the interior of  $C$  is  $z_2$  with mutiplicity 1, and 0 with multiplicity  $(k_1 + k_2)$ . By using Cauchy's integral formula,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)}{z^{k_1 + k_2}(z - z_1)(z - z_2)} dz \\ &= \text{Res} \left( \frac{(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)}{z^{k_1 + k_2}(z - z_1)(z - z_2)}, z_2 \right) + \frac{1}{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)!} a^{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)}(0) \\ &= \frac{(z_2^{k_1} - z_1^{k_1})(z_2^{k_2} - z_1^{k_2})}{z_2 - z_1} + \frac{1}{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)!} a^{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)}(0), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Res}$  is a residue,  $a(z) = \frac{(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)}{(z - z_1)(z - z_2)}$ ,  $a^{(n)}$  is the  $n$ th derivative of  $a$ . For the second equality, we use  $z_2^{-1} = z_1$ . Next, observe that  $|z/z_1|, |z/z_2| < 1$  for  $z$  near the origin, thus we have the following Taylor expansion of  $a(z)$  at  $z = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a(z) &= \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z^{2(k_1 + k_2)} - z^{2k_1} - z^{2k_2} + 1) \left[ \frac{1}{z_1} \left( \frac{1}{1 - z/z_1} \right) - \frac{1}{z_2} \left( \frac{1}{1 - z/z_2} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z^{2(k_1 + k_2)} - z^{2k_1} - z^{2k_2} + 1) \left[ \frac{1}{z_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{z}{z_1} \right)^j - \frac{1}{z_2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{z}{z_2} \right)^j \right]. \quad (\text{C.3}) \end{aligned}$$

With loss of generality, assume  $k_1 \leq k_2$ . Noting that  $\frac{1}{(k_1+k_2-1)!}a^{(k_1+k_2-1)}(0)$  is the coefficient of  $z^{k_1+k_2-1}$  of the power series expansion of  $f(z)$  at  $z=0$ , we have the following two cases.

**case 1:**  $k_1 = k_2 = k$ .

In this case,  $1 \leq k_1 + k_2 - 1 < \{2(k_1 + k_2), 2k_1, 2k_2\}$ , thus the coefficient of  $z^{k_1+k_2-1}$  in (C.3) is

$$\frac{1}{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)!}a^{(k_1+k_2-1)}(0) = \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z_1^{-2k} - z_2^{-2k}) = \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z_2^{2k} - z_1^{2k}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin(k_1 x) \sin(k_2 x)}{a + \cos x} dx &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{(z^{2k_1} - 1)(z^{2k_2} - 1)}{z^{k_1+k_2}(z - z_1)(z - z_2)} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(z_2 - z_1)} [(z_2^k - z_1^k)^2 + (z_2^{2k} - z_1^{2k})] = \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (1 - z_2^{2k}). \end{aligned}$$

**case 2:**  $k_1 < k_2$ .

In this case,  $\{1, 2k_1\} \leq k_1 + k_2 - 1 < \{2(k_1 + k_2), 2k_2\}$ , thus the coefficient of  $z^{k_1+k_2-1}$  in (C.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(k_1 + k_2 - 1)!}a^{(k_1+k_2-1)}(0) &= \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} \left( z_1^{-(k_1+k_2)} - z_1^{-(k_2-k_1)} - z_2^{-(k_1+k_2)} + z_2^{-(k_2-k_1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z_2^{k_1+k_2} - z_1^{k_1} z_2^{k_2} - z_1^{k_1+k_2} + z_1^{k_2} z_2^{k_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin(k_1 x) \sin(k_2 x)}{a + \cos x} dx &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(z_2 - z_1)} \left[ (z_2^{k_1} - z_1^{k_1})(z_2^{k_2} - z_1^{k_2}) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. (z_2^{k_1+k_2} - z_1^{k_1} z_2^{k_2} - z_1^{k_1+k_2} + z_1^{k_2} z_2^{k_1}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} (z_2^{k_2-k_1} - z_2^{k_1+k_2}). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\sin(k_1 x) \sin(k_2 x)}{a + \cos x} dx = \frac{1}{z_2 - z_1} \left( z_2^{|k_1-k_2|} - z_2^{k_1+k_2} \right).$$

Thus proves the lemma. □

**Lemma C.2** Let  $(a_1, b_1)^\top$  and  $(a_2, b_2)^\top$  be the two orthonormal eigenvectors of the matrix

$$\varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon + 2\rho & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the corresponding eigenvalues are  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . Then, the followings hold:

- (a)  $a_1^2 + b_1^2 = a_2^2 + b_2^2 = 1$ , (b)  $a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 = 0$ , (c)  $a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1 = \pm 1$ ,  
(d)  $a_1^2 = b_2^2$ , (e)  $a_2^2 = b_1^2$ , (f)  $\theta_1 a_1 b_1 + \theta_2 a_2 b_2 = -\varepsilon(a_1^2 + a_2^2) = -\varepsilon$ , (g)  $\theta_1 \theta_2 = -\varepsilon^2$ .

*Proof.* The proof is elementary. We omit the details.  $\square$

**Lemma C.3 (Weyl inequalities)** Let  $A_n, B_n$  are  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices and let  $X_n = A_n - B_n$ . Let  $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n$ ,  $\nu_1 \geq \dots \geq \nu_n$ , and  $\xi_1 \geq \dots \geq \xi_n$  be the eigenvalues of  $A_n$ ,  $B_n$ , and  $X_n$ , respectively. Then, for all  $i, j, k, r, s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $r + s - 1 \leq i \leq j + k - n$ ,

$$\nu_j + \xi_k \leq \mu_i \leq \nu_r + \xi_s.$$

**Lemma C.4** A compactly supported probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  is uniquely determined by its moments.

*Proof.* This can be easily proved using Billingsley (2008), Theorem 30.1.  $\square$

**Lemma C.5** Let  $A, B$  are  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices. Then,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(A) - \lambda_i(B)| \leq \|A - B\|_2$$

where  $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_1(AA^*)}$  is the spectral norm.

*Proof.* By using Courant-Fischer min-max theorem, for any  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix  $A$ ,

$$\lambda_i(A) = \sup_{\dim(V)=i} \inf_{v \in V, |v|=1} v^* A v, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Let  $V$  be the subspace with  $\dim(V) = i$ . Then, for all  $v \in V$  with  $|v| = 1$ ,

$$v^*(A + B)v = v^* A v + v^* B v \leq v^* A v + \|B\|_2.$$

Take  $\sup_{\dim(V)=i} \inf_{v \in V, |v|=1}$  on both side above gives  $\lambda_i(A + B) \leq \lambda_i(A) + \|B\|_2$ . Substitute  $A \leftarrow A + B$  and  $B \leftarrow (-B)$  gives  $\lambda_i(A) \leq \lambda_i(A + B) + \|B\|_2$ . Therefore, for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $|\lambda_i(A + B) - \lambda_i(A)| \leq \|B\|_2$ . Lastly, taking  $\max_i$  and substitute  $B \leftarrow (B - A)$ , we get the desired result.  $\square$

## References

- P. Arbenz, W. Gander, and G. H. Golub. Restricted rank modification of the symmetric eigenvalue problem: Theoretical considerations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 104:75–95, 1988.
- A. Aue and L. Horváth. Structural breaks in time series. *J. Time Series Anal.*, 34(1):1–16, 2013.
- M. Bagshaw and R. A. Johnson. Sequential procedures for detecting parameter changes in a time-series model. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 72(359):593–597, 1977.
- J. Baik and J. W. Silverstein. Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 97(6):1382–1408, 2006.
- F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices. *Adv. Math.*, 227(1):494–521, 2011.
- Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and measure*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2008.
- T. Cai, W. Liu, and X. Luo. A constrained  $\ell_1$  minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 106(494):594–607, 2011.
- I. Chang, G. C. Tiao, and C. Chen. Estimation of time series parameters in the presence of outliers. *Technometrics*, 30(2):193–204, 1988.
- R. A. Davis, D. Huang, and Y.-C. Yao. Testing for a change in the parameter values and order of an autoregressive model. *Ann. Statist.*, (1):282–304, 1995.
- X. Ding. Spiked sample covariance matrices with possibly multiple bulk components. *Random Matrices Theory Appl.*, 10(01):2150014, 2021.
- X. Ding and Z. Zhou. Autoregressive approximations to nonstationary time series with inference and applications. *Ann. Statist.*, 51(3):1207–1231, 2023.
- A. J. Fox. Outliers in time series. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 34(3):350–363, 1972.
- E. Gombay. Change detection in autoregressive time series. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 99(3):451–464, 2008.
- E. Gombay and D. Serban. Monitoring parameter change in  $AR(p)$  time series models. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 100(4):715–725, 2009.

- U. Grenander and G. Szegö. *Toeplitz Forms and Their Applications*. University of California Press, Oakland, CA, 1958.
- S. C. Hillmer, R. William, and C. George. Modeling considerations in the seasonal adjustment of economic time series. *Applied Time Series Analysis of Economic Data*, pages 74–100, 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- S. Lee, J. Ha, O. Na, and S. Na. The cusum test for parameter change in time series models. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 30(4):781–796, 2003.
- E. S. Page. A test for a change in a parameter occurring at an unknown point. *Biometrika*, 42(3/4):523–527, 1955.
- R. J. Stroeker. Approximations of the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of a first-order autoregressive process. *J. Econometrics*, 22(3):269–279, 1983.
- R. S. Tsay. Outliers, level shifts, and variance changes in time series. *J. Forecast.*, 7(1):1–20, 1988.
- W. B. Wu and M. Pourahmadi. Banding sample autocovariance matrices of stationary processes. *Statist. Sinica*, 19:1755–1768, 2009.