

# FNETS: Factor-adjusted network estimation and forecasting for high-dimensional time series

Matteo Barigozzi<sup>1</sup> and Haeran Cho<sup>2</sup> and Dom Owens<sup>3</sup>

November 20, 2023

## Abstract

We propose FNETS, a methodology for network estimation and forecasting of high-dimensional time series exhibiting strong serial- and cross-sectional correlations. We operate under a factor-adjusted vector autoregressive (VAR) model which, after accounting for pervasive co-movements of the variables by *common* factors, models the remaining *idiosyncratic* dynamic dependence between the variables as a sparse VAR process. Network estimation of FNETS consists of three steps: (i) factor-adjustment via dynamic principal component analysis, (ii) estimation of the latent VAR process via  $\ell_1$ -regularised Yule-Walker estimator, and (iii) estimation of partial correlation and long-run partial correlation matrices. In doing so, we learn three networks underpinning the VAR process, namely a directed network representing the Granger causal linkages between the variables, an undirected one embedding their contemporaneous relationships and finally, an undirected network that summarises both lead-lag and contemporaneous linkages. In addition, FNETS provides a suite of methods for forecasting the factor-driven and the idiosyncratic VAR processes. Under general conditions permitting tails heavier than the Gaussian one, we derive uniform consistency rates for the estimators in both network estimation and forecasting, which hold as the dimension of the panel and the sample size diverge. Simulation studies and real data application confirm the good performance of FNETS.

*Keywords:* vector autoregression, network estimation, forecasting, dynamic factor modelling.

## 1 Introduction

Vector autoregressive (VAR) models are popularly adopted for time series analysis in economics and finance. Fitting a VAR model to the data enables inferring dynamic interdepen-

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Economics, Università di Bologna. Email: [matteo.barigozzi@unibo.it](mailto:matteo.barigozzi@unibo.it). Supported by MIUR (PRIN 2017, Grant 2017TA7TYC).

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Bristol. Email: [haeran.cho@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:haeran.cho@bristol.ac.uk). Supported by the Leverhulme Trust (RPG-2019-390).

<sup>3</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Bristol. Email: [dom.owens@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:dom.owens@bristol.ac.uk).

dence between the variables as well as forecasting the future. VAR models are particularly appealing for network analysis since estimating the non-zero elements of the VAR parameter matrices, a.k.a. transition matrices, recovers directed edges between the components of vector time series in a Granger causality network. In addition, by estimating a precision matrix (inverse of the covariance matrix) of the VAR innovations, we can also define a network capturing contemporaneous linear dependencies. For the network interpretation of VAR modelling, see e.g. Dahlhaus (2000); Eichler (2007); Billio et al. (2012); Ahelegbey et al. (2016); Barigozzi and Brownlees (2019); Guðmundsson and Brownlees (2021); Uematsu and Yamagata (2023a). Estimation of VAR models quickly becomes a high-dimensional problem as the number of parameters grows quadratically with the dimensionality. There is a mature literature on estimation of high-dimensional VAR models under the sparsity (Hsu et al., 2008; Song and Bickel, 2011; Basu and Michailidis, 2015; Han et al., 2015; Kock and Callot, 2015; Barigozzi and Brownlees, 2019; Nicholson et al., 2020) and low-rank plus sparsity (Basu et al., 2019) assumptions, see also De Mol et al. (2008) and Bańbura et al. (2010) for Bayesian approaches. In all above, either explicitly or implicitly, the spectral density of the time series is required to have eigenvalues which are uniformly bounded over frequencies. Indeed, this condition is crucial for controlling the deviation bounds involved in theoretical investigation of regularised estimators.




Figure 1: Left: The two largest eigenvalues ( $y$ -axis) of the long-run covariance matrix estimated from the volatility panel analysed in Section 5.3 (March 2008 to March 2009,  $n = 252$ ) with subsets of cross-sections randomly sampled 100 times for each given dimension  $p \in \{5, \dots, 46\}$  ( $x$ -axis). Right: logged and truncated  $p$ -values (truncation level chosen by Bonferroni correction with the significance level 0.1) from fitting a VAR(5) model to the same dataset using ridge regression and generating  $p$ -values corresponding to each coefficient as described in Cule et al. (2011). For each pair of variables (corresponding tickers given in  $x$ - and  $y$ -axes), the minimum  $p$ -value over the five lags is reported.

Lin and Michailidis (2020) observe that for VAR processes, this assumption restricts the parameters to be either dense but small in their magnitude (which makes their estimation using the shrinkage-based methods challenging) or highly sparse, while Giannone et al. (2021) note the difficulty of identifying sparse predictive representations in many economic applications. Moreover, some datasets typically exhibit strong serial and cross-sectional correlations and

violate the bounded spectrum assumption. The left panel of Figure 1 provides an illustration of this phenomenon; with the increase of dimensionality, a volatility panel dataset (see Section 5.3 for its description) exhibits a linear increase in the leading eigenvalue of the estimate of its spectral density matrix at frequency 0 (i.e. long-run covariance). The right panel visualises the outcome from fitting a VAR(5) model to the same dataset without making any adjustment of the strong correlations (see the caption for further details), from which we cannot infer meaningful, sparse pairwise relationship.

In this paper, we propose to model high-dimensional time series by means of a factor-adjusted VAR approach, which simultaneously accounts for strong serial and cross-sectional correlations attributed to factors, as well as sparse, idiosyncratic correlations among the variables that remain after factor adjustment. We take the most general approach to factor modelling based on the generalised dynamic factor model, where factors are dynamic in the sense that they are allowed to have not only contemporaneous but also lagged effects on the variables (Forni et al., 2000). We propose FNETS, a suite of tools accompanying the model for estimation and forecasting with a particular focus on network analysis, which addresses the challenges arising from the latency of the VAR process as well as high dimensionality.

We make the following methodological and theoretical contributions.

- (a) We propose an  $\ell_1$ -regularised Yule-Walker estimation method for estimating the factor-adjusted, idiosyncratic VAR, while permitting the number of non-zero parameters to slowly grow with the dimensionality. Estimating the VAR parameters and the inverse of the innovation covariance, and then combining them allow us to define three networks underlying the latent VAR process, namely a direct network representing Granger causal linkages, an undirected one underpinning their contemporaneous relationships, as well as an undirected network summarising both. Under general conditions permitting weak factors and heavier tails than the sub-Gaussian one, we show the consistency of FNETS in estimating the edge sets of these networks, which holds uniformly over all  $p^2$  entries of the networks (Propositions 3.3 and 3.5).
- (b) We provide new consistency rates for the estimation and forecasting approaches considered by Forni et al. (2005, 2017), which hold uniformly for the entire cross-sections of  $p$ -dimensional time series (Propositions 4.1 and B.2). In doing so, we establish uniform consistency of the estimators of high-dimensional spectral density matrices of the factor-driven and the idiosyncratic components, extending the results of Zhang and Wu (2021) to the presence of latent factors.

Our approach differs from the existing ones for factor-adjusted regression problems (Fan et al., 2020, 2021, 2023; Krampe and Margaritella, 2021), as: (i) it allows for the presence of dynamic factors, thus including all possible dynamic linear co-dependencies, and (ii) it relies only on the estimators of the autocovariances of the latent idiosyncratic process, and avoids estimating the entire latent process and controlling the errors arising from such a step, which increase with the sample size. The price to pay for the generality of the factor modelling in (i),

is an extra term appearing in the rate of consistency which represents the bandwidth for spectral density estimation required for factor-adjustment in the frequency domain. We make explicit the role played by this bandwidth in the theoretical results, and also present the results under a more restricted static factor model for ease of comparison. We mention two more differences between this paper and Fan et al. (2021, 2023). First, they additionally consider the problem of testing hypotheses on the idiosyncratic covariance and the adequacy of factor/sparse regression, while we focus on network estimation. Secondly, their methods accommodate models for the idiosyncratic component other than VAR.

FNETS is another take at the popular low-rank plus sparsity modelling framework in the high-dimensional learning literature. Also, it is in line with a frequently adopted practice in financial time series analysis where factor-driven common components representing the systematic sources of risk, are removed prior to inferring a network structure via (sparse) regression modelling and identifying the most central nodes representing the systemic sources of risk (Diebold and Yilmaz, 2014; Barigozzi and Brownlees, 2019). We provide a rigorous theoretical treatment of this empirical approach by accounting for the effect of the factor-adjustment step on the second step regression.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the factor-adjusted VAR model. Sections 3 and 4 describe the network estimation and forecasting methodologies comprising FNETS, respectively, and provide their theoretical consistency. In Section 5, we demonstrate the good estimation and forecasting performance of FNETS on a panel of volatility measures. Section 6 concludes the paper, and all the proofs and complete simulation results are presented in Supplementary Appendix. The R software `fnets` implementing FNETS is available from CRAN (Barigozzi et al., 2023).

**Notations.** By  $\mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{O}$  and  $\mathbf{0}$ , we denote an identity matrix, a matrix of zeros and a vector of zeros whose dimensions depend on the context. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} = [a_{ii'}, 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq i' \leq n]$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{A}^\top$  its transpose. The element-wise  $\ell_\infty$ ,  $\ell_0$ ,  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$ -norms are denoted by  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \max_{1 \leq i' \leq n} |a_{ii'}|$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{i'=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{a_{ii'} \neq 0\}}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{i'=1}^n |a_{ii'}|$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{i'=1}^n |a_{ii'}|^2}$ . The Frobenius, spectral, induced  $L_1$  and  $L_\infty$ -norms are denoted by  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \|\mathbf{A}\|_2$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\Lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})}$  (with  $\Lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\Lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$  denoting its largest and smallest eigenvalues in modulus),  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq i' \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ii'}|$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{i'=1}^n |a_{ii'}|$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}_{i\cdot}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k}$  denote the  $i$ -th row and the  $k$ -th column of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For two real numbers, set  $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$  and  $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$ . Given two sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$ , we write  $a_n = O(b_n)$  if, for some finite constant  $C > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  such that  $|a_n| |b_n|^{-1} \leq C$  for all  $n \geq N$ ; we denote by  $O_P$  the stochastic boundedness. We write  $a_n \asymp b_n$  when  $a_n = O(b_n)$  and  $b_n = O(a_n)$ . Throughout,  $L$  denotes the lag operator and  $\iota = \sqrt{-1}$ . Finally,  $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$  if the event  $\mathcal{A}$  takes place and 0 otherwise.

## 2 Factor-adjusted vector autoregressive model

Consider a zero-mean, second-order stationary  $p$ -variate process  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{1t}, \dots, X_{pt})^\top$ ,  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , which is decomposed into the sum of two latent components: a factor-driven, *common* component  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = (\chi_{1t}, \dots, \chi_{pt})^\top$ , and an *idiosyncratic* component  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\xi_{1t}, \dots, \xi_{pt})^\top$  modelled as a VAR process. That is,  $\mathbf{X}_t = \boldsymbol{\chi}_t + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  where

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = \mathcal{B}(L)\mathbf{u}_t = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \quad \text{with } \mathbf{u}_t = (u_{1t}, \dots, u_{qt})^\top, \quad \text{and} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(L)\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \boldsymbol{\xi}_t - \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_\ell \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-\ell} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon_{1t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{pt})^\top. \quad (2)$$

In (1), the latent random vector  $\mathbf{u}_t$ , referred to as the vector of *common factors* or *common shocks*, is assumed to satisfy  $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbf{I}_q$ , and are loaded on each  $\chi_{it}$  via square summable, one-sided filters  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} B_{\ell,ij} L^\ell$ , where  $\mathbf{B}_\ell = [B_{\ell,ij}, 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ . This defines the generalised dynamic factor model (GDFM) proposed by Forni et al. (2000) and Forni and Lippi (2001), which provides the most general approach to high-dimensional time series factor modelling.

In (2), the idiosyncratic component  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  is modelled as a VAR( $d$ ) process for some finite positive integer  $d$ , with innovations  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$  where  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  is some positive definite matrix and  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2}$  its symmetric square root matrix, and  $\mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t) = \mathbf{I}_p$ . We assume that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  is causal (see Assumption 2.3 (i) below), i.e. it admits the Wold representation:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \mathcal{D}(L)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}_\ell \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell} \quad \text{with } \mathcal{D}(L) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}(L), \quad (3)$$

such that  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$  is seen as a vector of *idiosyncratic shocks* loaded on each  $\xi_{it}$  via square summable, one-sided filters  $\mathcal{D}_{ik}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} D_{\ell,ik} L^\ell$  where  $\mathbf{D}_\ell = [D_{\ell,ik}, 1 \leq i, k \leq p]$ . After accounting for the dominant cross-sectional dependence in the data (both contemporaneous and lagged) by factors, it is reasonable to assume that the dependences left in  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  are weak and, therefore, that the VAR structure is sufficiently sparse. Discussion on the precise requirement on the sparsity of  $\mathbf{A}_\ell$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq d$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{-1}$  is deferred to Section 3.

*Remark 2.1.* A special case of the GDFM is the popularly adopted static factor model where the factors are loaded only contemporaneously (see e.g. Stock and Watson, 2002; Bai, 2003; Fan et al., 2013). This is formalised in Assumption 4.1 below, where we consider forecasting under a static representation. A sufficient condition to obtain a static representation from the GDFM in (1), is to assume  $\mathcal{B}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^s \mathbf{B}_\ell L^\ell$  for some finite integer  $s \geq 0$ . For example, if  $s = 0$ , the model reduces to  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{u}_t$  while if  $s > 0$ , it can be written as  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}_t$  with  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = [\mathbf{B}_\ell, 0 \leq \ell \leq s]$  and  $\mathbf{F}_t = (\mathbf{u}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{t-s}^\top)^\top$ . Under the static factor model,  $\mathbf{X}_t$  admits a

factor-augmented VAR representation (see Remark 4.1 below).

In the remainder of this section, we list the assumptions required for identification and estimation of (1)–(2). Since  $\mathbf{X}_t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  are latent, some assumptions are required to ensure their (asymptotic) identifiability which are made in the frequency domain. Denote by  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x(\omega)$  the spectral density matrix of  $\mathbf{X}_t$  at frequency  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , and  $\mu_{x,j}(\omega)$  its dynamic eigenvalues which are real-valued and ordered in the decreasing order. We similarly define  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega)$ ,  $\mu_{\chi,j}(\omega)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi(\omega)$  and  $\mu_{\xi,j}(\omega)$ .

**Assumption 2.1.** *There exist a positive integer  $p_0 \geq 1$ , constants  $\rho_j \in (3/4, 1]$  with  $\rho_1 \geq \dots \geq \rho_q$ , and pairs of continuous functions  $\omega \mapsto \alpha_{\chi,j}(\omega)$  and  $\omega \mapsto \beta_{\chi,j}(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$  and  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , such that for all  $p \geq p_0$ ,*

$$\beta_{\chi,1}(\omega) \geq \frac{\mu_{\chi,1}(\omega)}{p^{\rho_1}} \geq \alpha_{\chi,1}(\omega) > \dots > \beta_{\chi,q}(\omega) \geq \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}(\omega)}{p^{\rho_q}} \geq \alpha_{\chi,q}(\omega) > 0.$$

Under the assumption, if  $\rho_j = 1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , then we are in presence of  $q$  factors that are equally pervasive for the whole cross-section. The left panel of Figure 1 depicts the case when  $\rho_1 = 1$ . If  $\rho_j < 1$  for some  $j$ , we permit the presence of ‘weak’ factors and our theoretical analysis explicitly reflects this; see De Mol et al. (2008), Onatski (2012), Freyaldenhoven (2021) and Uematsu and Yamagata (2023b) for estimation under static factor models permitting weak factors. When weak factors are present, the ordering of the variables becomes important as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , whereas the case of linearly diverging factor strengths is compatible with completely arbitrary cross-sectional ordering. The requirement that  $\rho_j > 3/4$  is a minimal one, and generally larger values of  $\rho_j$  are required as the dimensionality increases and heavier tails are permitted as discussed later.

Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 are made to control the serial dependence in  $\mathbf{X}_t$ .

**Assumption 2.2.** *There exist some constants  $\Xi > 0$  and  $\varsigma > 2$  such that for all  $\ell \geq 0$ ,*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\mathbf{B}_{\ell,i}|_2 \leq \Xi(1 + \ell)^{-\varsigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \sum_{j=1}^q |\mathbf{B}_{\ell,j}|_\infty^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \Xi(1 + \ell)^{-\varsigma}.$$

**Assumption 2.3.** (i)  $d$  is a finite positive integer and  $\det(\mathcal{A}(z)) \neq 0$  for all  $|z| \leq 1$ .  
(ii) There exist some constants  $0 < m_\varepsilon \leq M_\varepsilon$  such that  $\|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\| \leq M_\varepsilon$  and  $\Lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) \geq m_\varepsilon$ .  
(iii) There exist a constant  $m_\xi > 0$  such that  $\inf_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\xi,p}(\omega) \geq m_\xi$ .  
(iv) There exist some constants  $\Xi > 0$  and  $\varsigma > 2$  such that for all  $\ell \geq 0$ ,

$$|D_{\ell,ik}| \leq C_{ik}(1 + \ell)^{-\varsigma} \quad \text{with} \quad \max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^p C_{ik}, \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{k=1}^p C_{ik}, \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^p C_{ik}^2} \right\} \leq \Xi.$$

Assumption 2.3 (i) and (ii) are standard in the literature (Lütkepohl, 2005) and imply that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$

is causal and has finite and non-zero covariance. Under Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 (iv) (imposed on the Wold decomposition of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  in (3)), the serial dependence in  $\mathbf{X}_t$  decays at an algebraic rate. Further, we obtain a uniform bound for  $\mu_{\xi,j}(\omega)$  under Assumption 2.3 (iv):

**Proposition 2.1.** *Under Assumption 2.3, uniformly over all  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , there exists some constant  $B_\xi > 0$  depending only on  $M_\varepsilon$ ,  $\Xi$  and  $\varsigma$ , defined in Assumption 2.3 (iii) and (iv), such that  $\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\xi,1}(\omega) \leq B_\xi$ .*

*Remark 2.2.* Proposition 2.1 and Assumption 2.3 (iii) jointly establish the uniform boundedness of  $\mu_{\xi,1}(\omega)$  and  $\mu_{\xi,p}(\omega)$ , which is commonly assumed in the literature on high-dimensional VAR estimation via  $\ell_1$ -regularisation. A sufficient condition for Assumption 2.3 (iii) is that  $\max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,i}|_1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}|_1 \right\} \leq \Xi$  for some constant  $\Xi > 0$  (Basu and Michailidis, 2015). Further, when e.g.  $d = 1$ , Assumption 2.3 (iv) follows if  $|\mathbf{A}_1|_\infty \leq \gamma < 1$  since  $\max(\|\mathbf{D}_\ell\|_1, \|\mathbf{D}_\ell\|_\infty) \leq \Xi \gamma^\ell$  with  $\mathbf{D}_\ell = \mathbf{A}_1^\ell$ .

The two latent components  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ , and the number of factors  $q$ , are identified thanks to the large gap between the eigenvalues of their spectral density matrices, which follows from Assumption 2.1 and Proposition 2.1. Then by Weyl's inequality, the  $q$ -th dynamic eigenvalue  $\mu_{x,q}(\omega)$  diverges almost everywhere in  $[-\pi, \pi]$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , whereas  $\mu_{x,q+1}(\omega)$  is uniformly bounded for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega$ . This property is exploited in the FNETS methodology as later described in Section 3.2. It is worth stressing that Assumption 2.1 and Proposition 2.1 jointly constitute both a necessary and sufficient condition for the process  $\mathbf{X}_t$  to admit the dynamic factor representation in (1), see Forni and Lippi (2001).

Finally, we characterise the common and idiosyncratic innovations.

**Assumption 2.4.** (i)  $\{\mathbf{u}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of zero-mean,  $q$ -dimensional martingale difference vectors with  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbf{I}_q$ , and  $u_{it}$  and  $u_{jt}$  are independent for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq q$  with  $i \neq j$  and all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

(ii)  $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of zero-mean,  $p$ -dimensional martingale difference vectors with  $\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t) = \mathbf{I}_p$ , and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  and  $\varepsilon_{jt}$  are independent for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq p$  with  $i \neq j$  and all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

(iii)  $\mathbb{E}(u_{jt}\varepsilon_{it'}) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq q$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

(iv) There exist some constants  $\nu > 4$  and  $\mu_\nu > 0$  such that

$$\max \{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \mathbb{E}(|u_{jt}|^\nu), \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \mathbb{E}(|\varepsilon_{it}|^\nu) \} \leq \mu_\nu.$$

Assumption 2.4 (i) and (ii) allow the common and idiosyncratic innovations to be sequences of martingale differences, relaxing the assumption of serial independence found in Forni et al. (2017). Condition (iii) is standard in the factor modelling literature. Under (iv), we require that the innovations have  $\nu > 4$  moments, which is considerably weaker than the Gaussianity assumed in the literature on VAR modelling of high-dimensional time series (Basu and Michailidis, 2015; Han et al., 2015). In Appendix E, we separately consider the case when  $\mathbf{u}_t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$  are Gaussian for the sake of comparison.

### 3 Network estimation via FNETS

#### 3.1 Networks underpinning factor-adjusted VAR processes

Under the latent VAR model in (2), we can define three types of networks underpinning the interconnectedness of  $\mathbf{X}_t$  after factor adjustment (Barigozzi and Brownlees, 2019).

Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, p\}$  denote the set of vertices representing the  $p$  time series. Firstly, the transition matrices  $\mathbf{A}_\ell = [A_{\ell, ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ , encode the directed network  $\mathcal{N}^G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^G)$  representing Granger causal linkages, with

$$\mathcal{E}^G = \{(i, i') \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : A_{\ell, ii'} \neq 0 \text{ for some } 1 \leq \ell \leq d\} \quad (4)$$

as the set of edges. Here, the presence of an edge  $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}^G$  indicates that  $\xi_{i', t-\ell}$  Granger causes  $\xi_{it}$  at some lag  $1 \leq \ell \leq d$ .

The second network contains undirected edges representing contemporaneous dependence between VAR innovations  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{N}^C = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^C)$ ; we have  $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}^C$  iff the partial correlation between the  $i$ -th and  $i'$ -th elements of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$  is non-zero. Specifically, letting  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Delta} = [\delta_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ , the set of edges is given by

$$\mathcal{E}^C = \left\{ (i, i') \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : i \neq i' \text{ and } -\frac{\delta_{ii'}}{\sqrt{\delta_{ii} \cdot \delta_{i'i'}}} \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Finally, we summarise the aforementioned lead-lag and contemporaneous relations between the variables in a single, undirected network  $\mathcal{N}^L = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^L)$  by means of the long-run partial correlations of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = [\omega_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$  denote the long-run partial covariance matrix of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ , i.e.  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi(0))^{-1} = 2\pi \mathcal{A}^\top(1) \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathcal{A}(1)$  under (2). Then, the set of edges of  $\mathcal{N}^L$  is

$$\mathcal{E}^L = \left\{ (i, i') \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : i \neq i' \text{ and } -\frac{\omega_{ii'}}{\sqrt{\omega_{ii} \cdot \omega_{i'i'}}} \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Generally,  $\mathcal{E}^L$  is greater than  $\mathcal{E}^G \cup \mathcal{E}^C$ , see Appendix C for a sufficient condition for the absence of an edge  $(i, i')$  from  $\mathcal{N}^L$ . In the remainder of Section 3, we describe the network estimation methodology of FNETS which, consisting of three steps, estimates the three networks while fully accounting for the challenges arising from not directly observing the VAR process  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ , and investigate its theoretical properties.

#### 3.2 Step 1: Factor adjustment via dynamic PCA

As described in Section 2, under our model (1)–(2), there exists a large gap in  $\mu_{x,j}(\omega)$ , the dynamic eigenvalues of the spectral density matrix of  $\mathbf{X}_t$ , between those attributed to the factors ( $j \leq q$ ) and those which are not ( $j \geq q+1$ ). With the goal of estimating the autocovariance (ACV) matrix of the latent VAR process  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ , we exploit this gap in the factor-



adjustment step based on dynamic principal component analysis (PCA); see Chapter 9 of Brillinger (1981) for the definition of dynamic PCA and Forni et al. (2000) for its use in the estimation of GDFM. Throughout, we treat  $q$  as known and refer to Hallin and Liška (2007) for its consistent estimation under (1).

Denote the ACV matrices of  $\mathbf{X}_t$  by  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}_{t-\ell}\mathbf{X}_t^\top)$  for  $\ell \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) = \mathbf{\Gamma}_x^\top(-\ell)$  for  $\ell \leq -1$ , and analogously define  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell)$  and  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell)$  with  $\chi_t$  and  $\xi_t$  replacing  $\mathbf{X}_t$ , respectively. Then,  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_x(\omega)$  and  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell)$  satisfy  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_x(\omega) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) \exp(-i\ell\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ . Motivated by this, we estimate  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_x(\omega)$  by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_x(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=-m}^m K\left(\frac{\ell}{m}\right) \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) \exp(-i\ell\omega), \quad (7)$$

with the sample ACV  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) = n^{-1} \sum_{t=\ell+1}^n \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell}\mathbf{X}_t^\top$  when  $\ell \geq 0$ , and  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) = \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x^\top(-\ell)$  for  $\ell < 0$ , and the kernel bandwidth  $m = \lfloor n^\beta \rfloor$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . We adopt the Bartlett kernel as  $K(\cdot)$  which ensures positive semi-definiteness of  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_x(\omega)$  (see Appendix E.2.4). Then, we evaluate  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_x(\omega)$  at the  $2m+1$  Fourier frequencies  $\omega_k$ ,  $-m \leq k \leq m$  ( $\omega_k = 2\pi k/(2m+1)$  for  $0 \leq k \leq m$ , and  $\omega_k = -\omega_{|k|}$  for  $-m \leq k \leq -1$ ), and estimate  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega_k)$  by retaining the contribution from the  $q$  largest eigenvalues and eigenvectors only. That is, we obtain  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\chi(\omega_k) = \sum_{j=1}^q \widehat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega_k) \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j}(\omega_k) (\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j}(\omega_k))^*$  (with  $*$  denoting the transposed complex conjugate), where  $\widehat{\mu}_{x,1}(\omega) \geq \dots \geq \widehat{\mu}_{x,q}(\omega)$ , denote the  $q$  leading eigenvalues of  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_x(\omega)$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j}(\omega)$  the associated (normalised) eigenvectors. From this, an estimator of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell)$  at a given lag  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , is obtained via inverse Fourier transform as  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\chi(\ell) = 2\pi(2m+1)^{-1} \sum_{k=-m}^m \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\chi(\omega_k) \exp(i\ell\omega_k)$  and finally, we estimate the ACV matrices of  $\xi_t$  with  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\xi(\ell) = \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) - \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\chi(\ell)$ , by virtue of Assumption 2.4 (iii).

### 3.3 Step 2: Estimation of VAR parameters and $\mathcal{N}^G$

Recalling the VAR( $d$ ) model in (2), let  $\beta = [\mathbf{A}_\ell, 1 \leq \ell \leq d]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(pd) \times p}$  denote the matrix collecting all the VAR parameters. When  $\xi_t$  is directly observable,  $\ell_1$ -regularised least squares or maximum likelihood estimators have been proposed for  $\beta$ , see the references given in Introduction. In the context of factor-adjusted regression modelling where the aim is to estimate the regression structure in the latent idiosyncratic process, it has been proposed to apply the  $\ell_1$ -regularisation methods after estimating the entire latent process by, say,  $\widehat{\xi}_t$  (Fan et al., 2020, 2021, 2023; Krampe and Margaritella, 2021). However, such an approach possibly suffers from the lack of statistical efficiency due to having to control the estimation errors in  $\widehat{\xi}_t$  uniformly for all  $1 \leq t \leq n$ . Instead, we make use of the Yule-Walker (YW) equation  $\beta = \mathbb{G}^{-1}\mathbf{g}$ , where

$$\mathbb{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(0) & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(-1) & \dots & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(-d+1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(d-1) & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(d-2) & \dots & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(0) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(d) \end{bmatrix},$$

with  $\mathbb{G}$  being always invertible since  $\Lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{G}) \geq 2\pi m_\xi > 0$  by Assumption 2.3 (iii). We propose to estimate  $\beta$  as a regularised YW estimator based on  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ , which are obtained by replacing  $\Gamma_\xi(\ell)$  with  $\hat{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell)$  derived in Step 1 of FNETS via dynamic PCA, in the definitions of  $\mathbb{G}$  and  $\mathbf{g}$ , respectively.

To handle the high dimensionality, we consider an  $\ell_1$ -regularised estimator for  $\beta$  which solves the following  $\ell_1$ -penalised  $M$ -estimation problem

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{pd \times p}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{M}^\top \hat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{M} - 2\mathbf{M}^\top \hat{\mathbf{g}} \right) + \lambda |\mathbf{M}|_1 \quad (8)$$

with a tuning parameter  $\lambda > 0$ . Note that the matrix  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  is guaranteed to be positive semi-definite (see Appendix E.2.4), thus the problem in (8) is convex with a global minimiser. We note the similarity between (8) and the Lasso estimator, but our estimator is specifically tailored for the problem of estimating the parameters for the latent VAR process  $\xi_t$  by means of second-order moments only, and thus differs fundamentally from the Lasso-type estimators proposed for high-dimensional VAR estimation. In Appendix A, we propose an alternative estimator based on a constrained  $\ell_1$ -minimisation approach closely related to the Dantzig selector (Candes and Tao, 2007).

Once the VAR parameters are estimated, we propose to estimate the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^G$  in (4) by the set of indices of the non-zero elements of a thresholded version of  $\hat{\beta}$ , denoted by  $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{t}) = [\hat{\beta}_{ij} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{|\hat{\beta}_{ij}| > \mathbf{t}\}}]$ , with some threshold  $\mathbf{t} > 0$ .

### 3.4 Step 3: Estimation of $\mathcal{N}^C$ and $\mathcal{N}^L$

Recall that the edge sets of  $\mathcal{N}^C$  and  $\mathcal{N}^L$  defined in (5)–(6), are given by the supports of  $\Delta$  and  $\Omega$ . Given  $\hat{\beta}$  in (8) which estimates  $\beta$ , a natural estimator of  $\Gamma$  arises from the YW equation  $\Gamma = \Gamma_\xi(0) - \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_\ell \Gamma_\xi(\ell) = \Gamma_\xi(0) - \beta^\top \mathbf{g}$ , as  $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{\Gamma}_\xi(0) - \hat{\beta}^\top \hat{\mathbf{g}}$ . Then, we propose to estimate  $\Delta = \Gamma^{-1}$  via constrained  $\ell_1$ -minimisation as

$$\check{\Delta} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}} |\mathbf{M}|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left| \hat{\Gamma} \mathbf{M} - \mathbf{I} \right|_\infty \leq \eta, \quad (9)$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a tuning parameter. This approach has originally been proposed for estimating the precision matrix of independent data (Cai et al., 2011), which we extend to time series settings. Since  $\check{\Delta} = [\check{\delta}_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, j \leq p]$  is not guaranteed to be symmetric, a symmetrisation step is performed to obtain  $\hat{\Delta} = [\hat{\delta}_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$  with  $\hat{\delta}_{ii'} = \check{\delta}_{ii'} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{|\check{\delta}_{ii'}| \leq |\check{\delta}_{i'i}|\}} + \check{\delta}_{i'i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{|\check{\delta}_{i'i}| < |\check{\delta}_{ii'}|\}}$ . Then, the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^C$  in (5) is estimated by the support of the thresholded estimator  $\hat{\Delta}(\mathbf{t}_\delta) = [\hat{\delta}_{ii'} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{|\hat{\delta}_{ii'}| > \mathbf{t}_\delta\}}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$  with some threshold  $\mathbf{t}_\delta > 0$ .

Finally, we estimate  $\Omega = 2\pi(\mathcal{A}(1))^\top \Delta \mathcal{A}(1)$  by replacing  $\mathcal{A}(1)$  and  $\Delta$  with their estimators. We adopt the thresholded estimator  $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{t}) = [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1(\mathbf{t}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_d(\mathbf{t})]^\top$ , to obtain  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}(1) = \mathbf{I} - \sum_{\ell=1}^d \hat{\mathbf{A}}_\ell(\mathbf{t})$  and set  $\hat{\Omega} = 2\pi(\hat{\mathcal{A}}(1))^\top \hat{\Delta} \hat{\mathcal{A}}(1)$ . Analogously, the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^L$  in (6) is obtained by thresholding  $\hat{\Omega} = [\hat{\omega}_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$  with some threshold  $\mathbf{t}_\omega > 0$ , as the support

of  $\widehat{\Omega}(\mathbf{t}_\omega) = [\widehat{\omega}_{ii'} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\omega}_{ii'}| > \mathbf{t}_\omega\}}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ .

### 3.5 Theoretical properties

We prove the consistency of FNETS in network estimation by establishing the theoretical properties of each of its three steps in Sections 3.5.1–3.5.3. Then in Section 3.5.4, we present the results for a special case where  $\chi_t$  admits a static representation,  $n \asymp p$  and  $\mathbb{E}(|X_{it}|^\nu) < \infty$  for  $\nu > 8$ , for ease of comparing our results to the existing ones.

Hereafter, we define

$$\psi_n = \left( \frac{m}{n^{1-2/\nu}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{m \log(m)}{n}} \right) \text{ and } \vartheta_{n,p} = \left( \frac{m(np)^{2/\nu} \log^{7/2}(p)}{n} \vee \sqrt{\frac{m \log(mp)}{n}} \right), \quad (10)$$

where the dependence of these quantities on  $\nu$  is omitted for simplicity.

#### 3.5.1 Factor adjustment via dynamic PCA

We first establish the consistency of the dynamic PCA-based estimator of  $\Gamma_\chi(\ell)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 are met. Then, for any finite positive integer  $s \leq d$ , as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\ell: |\ell| \leq s} \frac{1}{p} \left\| \widehat{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell) - \Gamma_\chi(\ell) \right\|_F &= O_P \left( qp^{2(1-\rho_q)} \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right), \\ \max_{\ell: |\ell| \leq s} \left| \widehat{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell) - \Gamma_\chi(\ell) \right|_\infty &= O_P \left( qp^{2(1-\rho_q)} \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.1.* (a) Theorem 3.1 is complemented by Proposition E.15 in Appendix which establishes the consistency of the spectral density matrix estimator  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega)$  uniformly over  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$  in both Frobenius and  $\ell_\infty$ -norms.

(b) Both  $\psi_n$  and  $\vartheta_{n,p}$  in (10) increase with the bandwidth  $m$ . It is possible to find  $m$  that minimises e.g.  $(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1})$  which, roughly speaking, represents the bias-variance trade-off in the estimation of the spectral density matrix  $\Sigma_x(\omega)$ . For example, in light-tailed settings with large enough  $\nu$ , the choice  $m \asymp (n \log^{-1}(np))^{1/3}$  leads to the minimal rate in  $\ell_\infty$ -norm  $(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1}) \asymp (\log(np)/n)^{1/3}$  which nearly matches the optimal non-parametric rate when using the Bartlett kernel as in (7) (Priestley, 1982, p. 463).

(c) Consistency in Frobenius norm depends on  $\psi_n$  which tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  without placing any constraint on the relative rate of divergence between  $n$  and  $p$ . Consistency in  $\ell_\infty$ -norm is determined by  $\vartheta_{n,p}$  which depends on the interplay between the dimensionality and the tail behaviour. Generally, the estimation error worsens as weaker factors are permitted ( $\rho_q < 1$  in Assumption 2.1) and as  $p$  grows, and also when  $\nu$  is small such that heavier tails are permitted. Consider the case when all factors are strong (i.e.  $\rho_j = 1$ ). If  $p \asymp n$ , then  $\ell_\infty$ -

consistency holds with an appropriately chosen  $m = n^\beta$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , that leads to  $\vartheta_{n,p} = o(1)$ , provided that  $\nu > 4$ . When all moments of  $u_{jt}$  and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  exist, we achieve  $\ell_\infty$ -consistency even in the ultra high-dimensional case where  $\log(p) = o(n)$ .

From Theorem 3.1, the following proposition immediately follows.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 3.1 are met and let Assumption 2.1 hold with  $\rho_j = 1$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ . Then,  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n,p}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ , where*

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,p} = \left\{ \max_{-d \leq \ell \leq d} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\xi(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell) \right|_\infty \leq C_\xi \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

for some constant  $C_\xi > 0$ .

From Proposition 3.2, we have  $\ell_\infty$ -consistency of  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\xi(\ell)$  in the presence of strong factors. Although it is possible to trace the effect of weak factors on the estimation of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell)$  (see Corollary E.17), we make this simplifying assumption to streamline the presentation of the theoretical results of the subsequent Steps 2–3 of FNETS.

*Remark 3.2.* In Appendix E.2.8, we show that if  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t$  admits the static representation discussed in Remark 2.1, the rate in Proposition 3.2 is further improved as

$$\max_{\ell: |\ell| \leq d} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\xi(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell) \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \widetilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \text{ with } \widetilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} = \left( \frac{p^{2/\nu} \log^3(p)}{n^{1-2/\nu}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \right). \quad (12)$$

The term  $\widetilde{\vartheta}_{n,p}$  comes from bounding  $\max_{\ell: |\ell| \leq d} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell)|_\infty$ . Hence, the improved rate in (12) is comparable to the rate attained when we directly observe  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  apart from the presence of  $p^{-1/2}$ , which is due to the presence of latent factors; similar observations are made in Theorem 3.1 of Fan et al. (2013).

### 3.5.2 Estimation of VAR parameters and $\mathcal{N}^G$

We measure the sparsity of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  by  $s_{0,j} = |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_0$ ,  $s_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p s_{0,j}$  and  $s_{\text{in}} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{0,j}$ . When  $d = 1$ , the quantity  $s_{\text{in}}$  coincides with the maximum in-degree per node of  $\mathcal{N}^G$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose that  $C_\xi s_{\text{in}}(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2}) \leq \pi m_\xi / 16$ , where  $m_\xi$  is defined in Assumption 2.3 (iii). Also, set  $\lambda \geq 4C_\xi(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + 1)(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$  in (8). Then, conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$  defined in (11), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_2 &\leq \frac{6\sqrt{s_{\text{in}}}\lambda}{\pi m_\xi}, \quad \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_1 \leq \frac{24s_{\text{in}}\lambda}{\pi m_\xi} \quad \text{and} \\ \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_\infty &\leq \min \left( 4\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda, \frac{6\sqrt{s_{\text{in}}}\lambda}{\pi m_\xi} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Following Loh and Wainwright (2012), the proof of Proposition 3.3 proceeds by showing that, conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , the matrix  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$  meets a restricted eigenvalue condition (Bickel et al., 2009)

and the deviation bound is controlled as  $|\widehat{\mathbb{G}}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}|_\infty \leq \lambda/4$ . Then, thanks to Proposition 3.2, as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ , the estimation errors of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  in  $\ell_2$ ,  $\ell_1$ - and  $\ell_\infty$ -norms, are bounded as in Proposition 3.3 with probability tending to one.

*Remark 3.3.* As noted in Remark 2.2, the boundedness of  $\mu_{\xi,j}(\omega)$  follows from that of  $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}|_1$ , in which case  $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1$  appearing in the assumed lower bound on  $\lambda$ , does not inflate the rate of the estimation errors. In the light-tailed situation, with the optimal bandwidth  $m \asymp (n \log^{-1}(np))^{1/3}$  as specified in Remark 3.1 (b), it is required that  $s_{\text{in}} = O((n \log^{-1}(np))^{1/3} \wedge \sqrt{p})$ , which still allows the number of non-zero entries in *each* row of  $\mathbf{A}_\ell$  to grow with  $p$ . Here, the exponent  $1/3$  in place of  $1/2$  often found in the literature, comes from adopting the most general approach to time series factor modelling which necessitates selecting a bandwidth for frequency domain-based factor adjustment.

For sign consistency of the Lasso estimator, the (almost) necessary and sufficient condition is the so-called irrepresentable condition (Zhao and Yu, 2006), which is known to be highly stringent (Tardivel and Bogdan, 2022). Alternatively, Medeiros and Mendes (2016) propose an adaptive Lasso estimator with data-driven weights for high-dimensional VAR estimation when  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  is directly observed. Instead, we propose to additionally threshold  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and obtain  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{t})$ , whose support consistently estimates the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^G$ .

**Corollary 3.4.** *Suppose that the conditions of Proposition 3.3 are met. If*

$$\min_{(i,j): |\beta_{ij}| > 0} |\beta_{ij}| > 2\mathbf{t} \quad (13)$$

*with  $\mathbf{t} = \min(4\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda, 6\sqrt{s_{\text{in}}}\lambda/(\pi m_\xi))$ , then  $\text{sign}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{t})) = \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ .*

### 3.5.3 Estimation of $\mathcal{N}^C$ and $\mathcal{N}^L$

Let  $s_\delta(\varrho) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{i'=1}^p |\delta_{ii'}|^\varrho$ ,  $\varrho \in [0, 1)$ , denote the (weak) sparsity of  $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = [\delta_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ . Also, define  $s_{\text{out}} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}|_0$  which, complementing  $s_{\text{in}}$ , represents the sparsity of the out-going edges of  $\mathcal{N}^G$ . Analogously as in Proposition 3.3, we establish deterministic guarantees for  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$  conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *Suppose that the conditions in Propositions 3.3 are met, and set  $\eta = Cs_{\text{in}}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + 1)(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$  in (9), with  $C$  depending only on  $C_\xi$  and  $m_\xi$ . Then, conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$  defined in (11), we have:*

- (i)  $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} - \boldsymbol{\Delta}|_\infty \leq 4\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \eta$  and  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} - \boldsymbol{\Delta}\| \leq 12s_\delta(\varrho)(4\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \eta)^{1-\varrho}$ .
- (ii) If also  $s_{\text{out}}\mathbf{t} \leq \|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1$  with  $\mathbf{t}$  chosen as in Corollary 3.4, then,

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega} \right|_\infty \leq 4\pi \|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1 (3\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_{s_{\text{out}}}\mathbf{t} + 16\|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \eta).$$

Together with Assumption 2.3 (ii), Proposition 3.5 (i) indicates asymptotic positive definiteness of  $\hat{\Delta}$  provided that  $\Delta$  is sufficiently sparse, as measured by  $\|\Delta\|_1$  and  $s_\delta(\varrho)$ . By definition,  $\mathcal{N}^L$  combines  $\mathcal{N}^G$  and  $\mathcal{N}^C$  and consequently, its sparsity structure is determined by the sparsity of the other two networks, which is reflected in Proposition 3.5 (ii). Specifically, the term  $\|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1$  is related to the out-going property of  $\mathcal{N}^G$ , and satisfies  $\|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1 \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}|_1$ , where the boundedness of the right-hand side is sufficient for the boundedness of  $\mu_{\xi,j}(\omega)$  (Remark 2.2). Also,  $\|\Delta\|_1$  reflects the sparsity of the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^C$ , and the tuning parameter  $\eta$  depends on the sparsity of the in-coming edges of  $\mathcal{N}^G$  through  $\|\beta\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}|_1$  and  $s_{\text{in}}$ .

Similarly as in Corollary 3.4, we can show the consistency of the thresholded estimators  $\hat{\Delta}(\mathbf{t}_\delta)$  and  $\hat{\Omega}(\mathbf{t}_\omega)$  in estimating the edge sets of  $\mathcal{N}^C$  and  $\mathcal{N}^L$ , respectively.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Suppose that conditions of Proposition 3.5 are met. Conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ :*

- (i) *If  $\min_{(i,i'): |\delta_{ii'}| > 0} |\delta_{ii'}| > 2\mathbf{t}_\delta$  with  $\mathbf{t}_\delta = 4\|\Delta\|_1\eta$ , we have  $\text{sign}(\hat{\Delta}(\mathbf{t}_\delta)) = \text{sign}(\Delta)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\min_{(i,i'): |\omega_{ii'}| > 0} |\omega_{ii'}| > 2\mathbf{t}_\omega$  with  $\mathbf{t}_\omega = 4\pi\|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1(3\|\Delta\|_{s_{\text{out}}}\mathbf{t} + 16\|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1\|\Delta\|_1\eta)$ , we have  $\text{sign}(\hat{\Omega}(\mathbf{t}_\omega)) = \text{sign}(\Omega)$ .*

### 3.5.4 The case of the static factor model

For ease of comparing the performance of FNETS with the existing results, we focus on the static factor model setting discussed in Remark 2.1, and assume that  $n \asymp p$  and  $\max(\|\beta\|_1, \|\mathcal{A}(1)\|_1) = O(1)$ . Then, from Remark 3.2 and the proof of Proposition 3.3, we obtain  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\hat{\beta}_{\cdot j} - \beta_{\cdot j}|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_{\text{in}} \log(n)/n})$  provided that  $\nu > 8$ , such that the condition in (13) is written with  $\mathbf{t} \asymp \sqrt{s_{\text{in}} \log(n)/n}$ . That is,  $\hat{\beta}$  and its thresholded counterpart proposed for the estimation of the latent VAR process, perform as well as the benchmark derived under independence and Gaussianity in the Lasso literature (van de Geer et al., 2011). In this same setting, the factor-adjusted regression estimation method of Fan et al. (2021), when applied to the problem of VAR parameter estimation, yields an estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  which attains  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\hat{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{FARM}} - \beta_{\cdot j}|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_{\text{in}} n^{-1/2+5/\nu}})$  under strong mixingness, see their Theorem 3. Here, the larger  $O_P$ -bound compared to ours stems from that  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  requires the estimation of  $\xi_{it}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ , the error from which increases with  $n$  as well as  $p$ . This demonstrates the efficacy of adopting our regularised YW estimator.

Continuing with the same setting, Propositions 3.5 implies that

$$|\hat{\Delta} - \Delta|_\infty = O_P\left(\|\Delta\|_1^2 s_{\text{in}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}}\right) \text{ and } |\hat{\Omega} - \Omega|_\infty = O_P\left((s_{\text{out}} \vee \|\Delta\|_1^2 \sqrt{s_{\text{in}}}) \sqrt{\frac{s_{\text{in}} \log(n)}{n}}\right).$$

The former is comparable (up to  $s_{\text{in}}$ ) to the results in Theorem 4 of Cai et al. (2011) derived for estimating a sparse precision matrix of independent random vectors.

## 4 Forecasting via FNETS

### 4.1 Forecasting under the static factor model representation

For given time horizon  $a \geq 0$ , the best linear predictor of  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{n+a}$  based on  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{n-\ell}$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ , is

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}_{n+a|n} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{\ell+a} \mathbf{u}_{n-\ell}. \quad (14)$$

under (1). Following Forni et al. (2005), we consider a forecasting method for the factor-driven component which estimates  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{n+a|n}$  under a *restricted* GDFM that admits a static representation of finite dimension. We formalise the static factor model discussed in Remark 2.1 in the following assumption.

**Assumption 4.1.** (i) *There exist two finite positive integers  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  such that  $m_1 + 1 \geq m_2$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = \mathcal{M}^{(1)}(L)\mathbf{f}_t$  and  $\mathbf{f}_t = \mathcal{M}^{(2)}(L)\mathbf{u}_t$  where  $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m_1} \mathbf{M}_{\ell}^{(1)} L^{\ell}$  with  $\mathbf{M}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m_2} \mathbf{M}_{\ell}^{(2)} L^{\ell}$  with  $\mathbf{M}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  and  $\det(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(z)) \neq 0$  for all  $|z| \leq 1$ .*

(ii) *Let  $\mu_{\chi,j}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , denote the  $j$ -th largest eigenvalue of  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\chi}(0)$ . Then, there exist a positive integer  $p_0 \geq 1$ , constants  $\varrho_j \in (7/8, 1]$  with  $\varrho_1 \geq \dots \geq \varrho_r$ , and pairs of positive constants  $(\alpha_{\chi,j}, \beta_{\chi,j})$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , such that for all  $p \geq p_0$ ,*

$$\beta_{\chi,1} \geq \frac{\mu_{\chi,1}}{p^{\varrho_1}} \geq \alpha_{\chi,1} > \beta_{\chi,2} \geq \frac{\mu_{\chi,2}}{p^{\varrho_2}} \geq \dots \geq \alpha_{\chi,r-1} > \beta_{\chi,r} \geq \frac{\mu_{\chi,r}}{p^{\varrho_r}} \geq \alpha_{\chi,r} > 0.$$

In part (i),  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t$  admits a static representation with  $r = q(m_1 + 1)$  factors:  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}_t$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = [\mathbf{M}_{\ell}^{(1)}, 0 \leq \ell \leq m_1]$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_t = (\mathbf{f}_t^{\top}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{t-m_1}^{\top})^{\top}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_t = \mathcal{M}^{(2)}(L)\mathbf{u}_t$ . The condition that  $m_1 + 1 \geq m_2$  is made for convenience, and the proposed estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{n+a|n}$  can be modified accordingly when it is relaxed.

*Remark 4.1.* Under Assumption 4.1 (i), the  $r$ -vector of static factors,  $\mathbf{F}_t$ , is driven by the  $q$ -dimensional common shocks  $\mathbf{u}_t$ . If  $q < r$ , Anderson and Deistler (2008) show that  $\mathbf{F}_t$  always admits a VAR( $h$ ) representation:  $\mathbf{F}_t = \sum_{\ell=1}^h \mathbf{G}_{\ell} \mathbf{F}_{t-\ell} + \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}_t$  for some finite positive integer  $h$  and  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q}$ . Then,  $\mathbf{X}_t$  has a factor-augmented VAR representation:

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \sum_{\ell=1}^h \mathbf{G}_{\ell} \mathbf{F}_{t-\ell} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}_t + \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-\ell} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d \vee h} \mathbf{C}_{\ell} \mathbf{F}_{t-\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell} + \boldsymbol{\nu}_t,$$

with  $\mathbf{C}_{\ell} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{G}_{\ell} \mathbb{I}_{\{\ell \leq h\}} - \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbb{I}_{\{\ell \leq d\}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_t = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{u}_t + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ . This model is a generalisation of the factor augmented forecasting model considered by Stock and Watson (2002) where only the factor-driven component is present, and it is also considered by Fan et al. (2021).

It immediately follows from Proposition 2.1 that  $\|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\xi}(0)\| \leq 2\pi B_{\xi}$ . This, combined with Assumption 4.1 (ii), indicates the presence of a large gap in the eigenvalues of  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(0)$ , which allows the asymptotic identification of  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  in the time domain, as well as that of the

number of static factors  $r$ . Throughout, we treat  $r$  as known, and refer to e.g. Bai and Ng (2002); Onatski (2010); Ahn and Horenstein (2013); Trapani (2018), for its estimation.

Let  $(\mu_{\chi,j}, \mathbf{e}_{\chi,j})$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , denote the pairs of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(0)$  ordered such that  $\mu_{\chi,1} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{\chi,r}$ . Then,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(0) = \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{\mathcal{M}}_{\chi} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}^{\top}$  with  $\mathbf{\mathcal{M}}_{\chi} = \text{diag}(\mu_{\chi,j}, 1 \leq j \leq r)$  and  $\mathbf{E}_{\chi} = [\mathbf{e}_{\chi,j}, 1 \leq j \leq r]$ . Under Assumption 4.1 (i), we have  $\chi_{n+a|n}$  in (14) satisfy  $\chi_{n+a|n} = \text{Proj}(\chi_{n+a} | \mathbf{F}_{n-\ell}, \ell \geq 0) = \text{Proj}(\chi_{n+a} | \mathbf{F}_n) = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{\mathcal{M}}_{\chi}^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}^{\top} \chi_n$ , where  $\text{Proj}(\cdot | \mathbf{z})$  denotes the linear projection operator onto the linear space spanned by  $\mathbf{z}$ . When  $a = 0$ , we trivially have  $\chi_{t|n} = \chi_t$  for  $t \leq n$ . Then, a natural estimator of  $\chi_{n+a|n}$  is

$$\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(-a) \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} \hat{\mathbf{\mathcal{M}}}_{\chi}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_n, \quad (15)$$

where  $(\hat{\mu}_{\chi,j}, \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\chi,j})$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , denote the pairs of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(0)$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(\ell)$ ,  $\ell \in \{0, a\}$ , are estimated as described in Section 3.2. As a by-product, we obtain the in-sample estimator by setting  $a = 0$ , as  $\hat{\chi}_t^{\text{res}} = \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_t$  for  $1 \leq t \leq n$ .

*Remark 4.2.* Our proposed estimator  $\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}}$  differs from that of Forni et al. (2005), as they estimate the factor space via generalised PCA on  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(0)$ . This in effect replaces  $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}$  in (15) with the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(0)$  where  $\mathbf{W}$  is a diagonal matrix containing the estimators of the sample variance of  $\xi_t$ . Such an approach may gain in efficiency compared to ours in the same way a weighted least squares estimator is more efficient than the ordinary one in the presence of heteroscedasticity. However, since we investigate the consistency of  $\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}}$  without deriving its asymptotic distribution, we do not explore such approach in this paper.

In Appendix B, we present an alternative forecasting method that operates under an *unrestricted* GDFM, i.e. it does not require Assumption 4.1. Referred to as  $\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{unr}}$ , we compare its performance with that of  $\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}}$  in numerical studies.

Once VAR parameters are estimated by  $\hat{\beta} = [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_d]^{\top}$  as in (8), we produce a forecast of  $\xi_{n+a}$  given  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ,  $t \leq n$ , by estimating the best linear predictor  $\xi_{n+a|n} = \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \xi_{n+1-\ell|n}$  (with  $\xi_{t|n} = \xi_t$  for  $t \leq n$ ), as

$$\hat{\xi}_{n+a|n} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\max(1,a)-1} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\ell} \hat{\xi}_{n+a-\ell|n} + \sum_{\ell=\max(1,a)}^d \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\ell} \hat{\xi}_{n+a-\ell}. \quad (16)$$

When  $a \leq d$ , the in-sample estimators appearing in (16) are obtained as  $\hat{\xi}_t = \mathbf{X}_t - \hat{\chi}_t$ ,  $n + a - d \leq t \leq n$ , with either  $\hat{\chi}_t^{\text{res}}$  or  $\hat{\chi}_t^{\text{unr}}$  as  $\hat{\chi}_t$ .

## 4.2 Theoretical properties

Proposition 4.1 establishes the consistency of  $\hat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}}$  in estimating the best linear predictor of  $\chi_{n+a}$ , where we make it explicit the effects of the presence of weak factors, both dynamic



(as measured by  $\mu_{\chi,j}(\omega)$  in Assumption 2.1) and static (as measured by  $\mu_{\chi,j}$  in Assumption 4.1 (ii)), and the tail behaviour (through  $\psi_n$  and  $\vartheta_{n,p}$  defined in (10)).

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 3.1 are met and, in addition, we assume that Assumption 4.1 holds. Then, for any finite  $a \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\left| \widehat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}} - \chi_{n+a|n} \right|_{\infty} = O_P \left( p^{4-2\rho_q-2\varrho_r} \left( \psi_n \vee p^{\varrho_r-1} \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

As noted in Remark 3.1 (c), weaker factors and heavier tails impose a stronger requirement on the dimensionality  $p$ . If all factors are strong ( $\varrho_r = 1$ ), the rate becomes  $(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ . When  $a = 0$ , Proposition 4.1 provides in-sample estimation consistency for any given  $t \leq n$ . The next proposition accounts for the irreducible error in  $\chi_{n+a|n}$ , with which we conclude the analysis of the forecasting error  $|\widehat{\chi}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}} - \chi_{n+a|n}|_{\infty}$  when  $a \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 and 2.4 hold. Then for any finite  $a \geq 1$ ,  $|\chi_{n+a|n} - \chi_{n+a}|_{\infty} = O_P(q^{1/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{1/\nu} \log^{1/2}(p))$ .*

Recall the definition of  $s_{\text{in}}$  given in Section 3.5. The next proposition investigates the performance of  $\widehat{\xi}_{n+a|n}$  when  $a = 1$ , which can easily be extended to any finite  $a \geq 2$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that the in-sample estimator of  $\xi_t$  and  $\widehat{\beta}$  satisfy*

$$\left| \widehat{\xi}_{n+1-\ell} - \xi_{n+1-\ell} \right|_{\infty} = O_P(\bar{\zeta}_{n,p}) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq d \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_1 = O_P(s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p}). \quad (17)$$

Also, let Assumptions 2.3 and 2.4 hold. Then,

$$\left| \widehat{\xi}_{n+1|n} - \xi_{n+1} \right|_{\infty} = O_P \left( s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p} \left( \log^{1/2}(p) p^{1/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{1/\nu} + \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} \right) + \|\beta\|_1 \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} + p^{1/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{1/\nu} \right).$$

Either of the in-sample estimators  $\widehat{\chi}_t^{\text{res}}$  (described in Section 4.1) or  $\widehat{\chi}_t^{\text{unr}}$  (Appendix B), can be used in place of  $\widehat{\chi}_t$ . Accordingly, the rate  $\bar{\zeta}_{n,p}$  in (17) is inherited by that of  $\widehat{\chi}_t^{\text{res}}$  (given in Proposition 4.1) or  $\widehat{\chi}_t^{\text{unr}}$  (Proposition B.2 (iii)). From the proof of Proposition 3.3, we have  $\zeta_{n,p} \asymp (\|\beta\|_1 + 1)(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$  in (17).

## 5 Numerical studies

### 5.1 Tuning parameter selection

We briefly discuss the choice of the tuning parameters for FNETS. For full details, see Owens et al. (2023).

**Related to  $\chi_t$ .** We set the kernel bandwidth at  $m = \lfloor 4(n/\log(n))^{1/3} \rfloor$  based on the case when sufficiently large number of moments exist and  $n \asymp p$  (Remark 3.1 (b)). In simulation

studies reported in Appendix D, we treat the number of factors  $q$  (required for Step 1 of FNETS) known, and also treat the number of static factors  $r$  (for generating the forecast) as known if it is finite; when  $\mathbf{x}_t$  does not admit a static factor model (i.e.  $r = \infty$ ), we use the value returned by the ratio-based estimator of Ahn and Horenstein (2013). In real data analysis reported in Section 5.3, we estimate both  $q$  and  $r$ , the former with the estimator proposed in Hallin and Liška (2007), the latter as in Ahn and Horenstein (2013).

**Related to  $\xi_t$ .** We select the tuning parameter  $\lambda$  in (8) jointly with the VAR order  $d$ , by adopting cross validation (CV); in time series settings, a similar approach is explored in Wang and Tsay (2022). For this, the data is partitioned into  $M$  consecutive folds with indices  $\mathcal{I}_l = \{n_l + 1, \dots, n_{l+1}\}$  where  $n_l = \min(l\lceil n/M \rceil, n)$ ,  $0 \leq l \leq M$ , and each fold is split into  $\mathcal{I}_l^{\text{train}} = \{n_l + 1, \dots, \lceil (n_l + n_{l+1})/2 \rceil\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_l^{\text{test}} = \mathcal{I}_l \setminus \mathcal{I}_l^{\text{train}}$ . Then with  $\hat{\beta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu, b)$  obtained from  $\{\mathbf{X}_t, t \in \mathcal{I}_l^{\text{train}}\}$  with the tuning parameter  $\mu$  and the VAR order  $b$ , we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CV}(\mu, b) = \sum_{l=1}^M \text{tr} \Big( & \hat{\Gamma}_{\xi, l}^{\text{test}}(0) - (\hat{\beta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu, b))^\top \hat{\mathbf{g}}_l^{\text{test}}(b) - (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_l^{\text{test}}(b))^\top \hat{\beta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu, b) \\ & + (\hat{\beta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu, b))^\top \hat{\mathbf{G}}_l^{\text{test}}(b) \hat{\beta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu, b) \Big), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\Gamma}_{\xi, l}^{\text{test}}(\ell)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_l^{\text{test}}(b)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_l^{\text{test}}(b)$  are generated analogously as  $\hat{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ , respectively, using the test set  $\{\mathbf{X}_t, t \in \mathcal{I}_l^{\text{test}}\}$ . The measure  $\text{CV}(\mu, b)$  approximates the prediction error while accounting for that we do not directly observe  $\xi_t$ . Minimising it over varying  $\mu$  and  $b$ , we select  $\lambda$  and  $d$ . In simulation studies, we treat  $d$  as known while in real data analysis, we select it from the set  $\{1, \dots, 5\}$  via CV. For selecting  $\eta$  in (9), we adopt the Burg matrix divergence-based CV measure:

$$\text{CV}(\mu) = \sum_{l=1}^M \text{tr} \left( \hat{\Delta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu) \hat{\Gamma}_l^{\text{test}} \right) - \log \left| \hat{\Delta}_l^{\text{train}}(\mu) \hat{\Gamma}_l^{\text{test}} \right| - p.$$

For both CV procedures, we set  $M = 1$  in the numerical results reported below. In simulation studies, we compare the estimators with their thresholded counterparts in estimating the network edge sets with the thresholds  $\mathbf{t}$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_\delta$  and  $\mathbf{t}_\omega$  selected according to a data-driven approach motivated by Liu et al. (2021).

## 5.2 Simulations

In Appendix D, we investigate the estimation and forecasting performance of FNETS on-datasets simulated under a variety of settings, from Gaussian innovations  $\mathbf{u}_t$  and  $\varepsilon_t$  with (E1)  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$  and (E2)  $\Delta \neq \mathbf{I}$ , to (E3) heavy-tailed ( $t_5$ ) innovations with  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$ , and when  $\mathbf{x}_t$  is generated from (C1) fully dynamic or (C2) static factor models. In addition, we consider the ‘oracle’ setting (C0)  $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{0}$  where, in the absence of the factor-driven component, the results obtained

can serve as a benchmark. For comparison, we consider the factor-adjusted regression method of Fan et al. (2021) and present the performance of their estimator of VAR parameters and forecasts.

### 5.3 Application to a panel of volatility measures

We investigate the interconnectedness in a panel of volatility measures and evaluate its out-of-sample forecasting performance using FNETS. For this purpose, we consider a panel of  $p = 46$  stock prices retrieved from the Wharton Research Data Service, of US companies which are all classified as ‘financials’ according to the Global Industry Classification Standard; a list of company names and industry groups are found in Appendix F. The dataset spans the period between January 3, 2000 and December 31, 2012 (3267 trading days). Following Diebold and Yilmaz (2014), we measure the volatility using the high-low range as  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 0.361(p_{it}^{\text{high}} - p_{it}^{\text{low}})^2$  where  $p_{it}^{\text{high}}$  and  $p_{it}^{\text{low}}$  denote, respectively, the maximum and the minimum log-price of stock  $i$  on day  $t$ , and set  $X_{it} = \log(\sigma_{it}^2)$ ; Brownlees and Gallo (2010) support this choice of volatility measure over more sophisticated alternatives.

#### 5.3.1 Network analysis

We focus on the period 03/2006–02/2010 corresponding to the Great Financial Crisis. We partition the data into four segments of length  $n = 252$  each (corresponding to the number of trading days in a single year) and on each segment, we apply FNETS to estimate the three networks  $\mathcal{N}^G$ ,  $\mathcal{N}^C$  and  $\mathcal{N}^L$  described in Section 3.1.

Each row of Figure 2 plots the heat maps of the matrices underlying the three networks of interest. From all four segments, the CV-based approach described in Section 5.1 returns  $d = 1$  from the candidate VAR order set  $\{1, \dots, 5\}$ . Hence in each row, the left panel represents the estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 = \hat{\beta}^\top$ , and the middle and the right show the (long-run) partial correlations from the corresponding  $\hat{\Delta}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}$  (with their diagonals set to be zero). Locations of the non-zero elements estimate the edge sets of the corresponding networks, and the hues represent the (signed) edge weights.

Prior to March 2007, all networks exhibit a low degree of interconnectedness but the number of edges increases considerably in 03/2007–02/2008 due mainly to an overall increase in dynamic co-dependencies and a prominent role of banks (blue group) not only in  $\mathcal{N}^G$  but also in  $\mathcal{N}^C$ . In 03/2008–02/2009, the companies belonging to the insurance sector (red group) play a central role and in 03/2009–02/2010, the companies become highly interconnected with two particular firms having many outgoing edges in  $\mathcal{N}^G$ . Also, while most edges in  $\mathcal{N}^L$ , which captures the overall long-run dependence, have positive weights across time and companies, their weights become negative in this last segment. We highlight that FNETS is able to capture the aforementioned group-specific activities although this information is not supplied to the estimation method.




Figure 2: Heat maps of the estimators of the VAR transition matrices  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ , partial correlations from  $\hat{\Delta}$  and long-run partial correlations from  $\hat{\Omega}$  (left to right), which in turn estimate the networks  $\mathcal{N}^G$ ,  $\mathcal{N}^C$  and  $\mathcal{N}^L$ , respectively, over three selected periods. The grouping of the companies according to their industry classifications are indicated by the axis label colours. The heat maps in the left column are in the scale of  $[-0.81, 0.81]$  while the others are in the scale of  $[-1, 1]$ , with red hues denoting large positive values and blue hues large negative values.

### 5.3.2 Forecasting

We perform a rolling window-based forecasting exercise on the trading days in 2012. Starting from  $T = 3016$  (the first trading day in 2012), we forecast  $\mathbf{X}_{T+1}$  as  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}(n) = \hat{\chi}_{T+1|T}(n) + \hat{\xi}_{T+1|T}(n)$ , where  $\hat{\chi}_{T+1|T}(n)$  (resp.  $\hat{\xi}_{T+1|T}(n)$ ) denotes the forecast of  $\chi_{T+1}$  (resp.  $\xi_{T+1}$ ) using

Table 1: Mean, median and standard errors of  $\text{FE}_{T+1}^{\text{avg}}$  and  $\text{FE}_{T+1}^{\text{max}}$  on the trading days in 2012 for  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}(n)$  in comparison with AR and FarmPredict (Fan et al., 2021) forecasts. The smallest entry in each row is highlighted in bold.

		FNETS		AR	FarmPredict
		$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1 T}^{\text{res}}(n)$	$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1 T}^{\text{unr}}(n)$		
$\text{FE}^{\text{avg}}$	Mean	<b>0.7258</b>	0.7466	0.7572	0.7616
	Median	<b>0.6029</b>	0.6412	0.6511	0.6243
	SE	0.4929	<b>0.3748</b>	0.4162	0.4946
$\text{FE}^{\text{max}}$	Mean	<b>0.8433</b>	0.8729	0.879	0.8745
	Median	<b>0.7925</b>	0.8088	0.8437	0.8259
	SE	0.2331	0.2246	<b>0.2169</b>	0.2337

the preceding  $n$  data points  $\{\mathbf{X}_t, T - n + 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ . We set  $n = 252$ . After the forecast  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}(n)$  is generated, we update  $T \leftarrow T + 1$  and repeat the above procedure until  $T = 3267$  (the last trading day in 2012) is reached.

For  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}(n)$ , we consider the forecasting methods derived under the static factor model (Section 4.1, denoted by  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{res}}(n)$ ) and unrestricted GDFM (Appendix B,  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{unr}}(n)$ ). Following the analysis in Section 5.3.1, we set  $d = 1$  when producing  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}(n)$ . Additionally, we report the forecasting performance of FarmPredict (Fan et al., 2021), which first fits an AR model to each of the  $p$  series ('AR'), projects the residuals on their principal components, and then fits VAR models to what remains via Lasso. Combining the three steps gives the final forecast  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{FARM}}(n)$ . The forecast produced by the first step univariate AR modelling, denoted by  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{AR}}(n)$ , is also included for comparison.

We evaluate the performance of  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}$  using two measures of errors  $\text{FE}_{T+1}^{\text{avg}} = |\mathbf{X}_{T+1}|_2^{-2} \cdot |\mathbf{X}_{T+1} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}|_2^2$  and  $\text{FE}_{T+1}^{\text{max}} = |\mathbf{X}_{T+1}|_\infty^{-1} \cdot |\mathbf{X}_{T+1} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}|_\infty$ , see Table 1 for the summary of the forecasting results. Among the forecasts generated by FNETS, the one based on  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{res}}(n)$  performs the best in this exercise, which outperforms  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{AR}}(n)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{FARM}}(n)$  according to both  $\text{FE}^{\text{avg}}$  and  $\text{FE}^{\text{max}}$  on average. As noted in Appendix D.2.2, the forecast based on  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{unr}}(n)$  shows instabilities and generally is outperformed by the one based on  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1|T}^{\text{res}}(n)$ , but nonetheless performs reasonably well. Given the high level of co-movements and persistence in the data, the good performance of FNETS is mainly attributed to the way we forecast the factor-driven component, which is based on the estimators derived under GFDM that fully exploit all the dynamic co-dependencies (see also the results obtained by Barigozzi and Hallin, 2017 on a similar dataset).

## 6 Conclusions

We propose and study the asymptotic properties of FNETS, a network estimation and forecasting methodology for high-dimensional time series under a dynamic factor-adjusted VAR model. Our estimation strategy fully takes into account the latency of the VAR process of

interest via regularised YW estimation which, distinguished from the existing approaches, brings in methodological simplicity as well as theoretical benefits. We investigate the theoretical properties of FNETS under general conditions permitting weak factors and heavier tails than sub-Gaussianity commonly imposed in the high-dimensional VAR literature, and provide new insights into the interplay between various quantities determining the sparsity of the networks underpinning VAR processes, factor strength and tail behaviour, on the estimation of those networks. Simulation studies and an application to a panel of financial time series show that FNETS is particularly useful for network analysis as it is able to discover group structures as well as producing accurate forecasts for highly co-moving and persistent time series such as log-volatilities. The R software `fnets` implementing FNETS is available from CRAN (Barigozzi et al., 2023).

## References

- Ahelegbey, D. F., Billio, M., and Casarin, R. (2016). Bayesian graphical models for structural vector autoregressive processes. *J. Appl. Econom.*, 31(2):357–386.
- Ahn, S. C. and Horenstein, A. R. (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica*, 81:1203–1227.
- Alessi, L., Barigozzi, M., and Capasso, M. (2010). Improved penalization for determining the number of factors in approximate static factor models. *Stat. Probab. Lett.*, 80:1806–1813.
- Anderson, B. D. and Deistler, M. (2008). Generalized linear dynamic factor models – a structure theory. In *47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 1980–1985.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica*, 71(1):135–171.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70:191–221.
- Bañbura, M., Giannone, D., and Reichlin, L. (2010). Large Bayesian vector auto regressions. *J. Appl. Econom.*, 25(1):71–92.
- Barigozzi, M. and Brownlees, C. (2019). NETS: Network estimation for time series. *J. Appl. Econom.*, 34:347–364.
- Barigozzi, M., Cho, H., and Owens, D. (2023). *fnets: Factor-Adjusted Network Estimation and Forecasting for High-Dimensional Time Series*. R package version 0.1.1.
- Barigozzi, M. and Hallin, M. (2017). Generalized dynamic factor models and volatilities: estimation and forecasting. *J. Econom.*, 201(2):307–321.
- Basu, S., Li, X., and Michailidis, G. (2019). Low rank and structured modeling of high-dimensional vector autoregressions. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 67:1207–1222.
- Basu, S. and Michailidis, G. (2015). Regularized estimation in sparse high-dimensional time series models. *Ann. Stat.*, 43:1535–1567.

- Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of Lasso and Dantzig selector. *Ann. Stat.*, 37(4):1705–1732.
- Billio, M., Getmansky, M., Lo, A. W., and Pelizzon, L. (2012). Econometric measures of connectedness and systemic risk in the finance and insurance sectors. *J. Financ. Econ.*, 104(3):535–559.
- Brillinger, D. R. (1981). *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory*. SIAM.
- Brownlees, C. and Gallo, G. (2010). Comparison of volatility measures: a risk management perspective. *J. Financial Econ.*, 8(1):29–56.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Luo, X. (2011). A constrained  $\ell_1$  minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 106(494):594–607.
- Candes, E. and Tao, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when  $p$  is much larger than  $n$ . *Ann. Stat.*, 35(6):2313–2351.
- Cule, E., Vineis, P., and De Iorio, M. (2011). Significance testing in ridge regression for genetic data. *BMC Bioinform.*, 12(1):1–15.
- Dahlhaus, R. (2000). Graphical interaction models for multivariate time series. *Metrika*, 51(2):157–172.
- De Mol, C., Giannone, D., and Reichlin, L. (2008). Forecasting using a large number of predictors: Is Bayesian shrinkage a valid alternative to principal components? *J. Econom.*, 146(2):318–328.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. (2014). On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *J. Econom.*, 182(1):119–134.
- Eichler, M. (2007). Granger causality and path diagrams for multivariate time series. *J. Econom.*, 137(2):334–353.
- Fan, J., Ke, Y., and Wang, K. (2020). Factor-adjusted regularized model selection. *J. Econom.*, 216(1):71–85.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Mincheva, M. (2013). Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Methodol.*, 75(4):603–680.
- Fan, J., Lou, Z., and Yu, M. (2023). Are latent factor regression and sparse regression adequate? *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* (*in press*).
- Fan, J., Masini, R., and Medeiros, M. C. (2021). Bridging factor and sparse models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11341*.
- Forni, M., Giovannelli, A., Lippi, M., and Soccorsi, S. (2018). Dynamic factor model with infinite-dimensional factor space: Forecasting. *J. Appl. Econom.*, 33(5):625–642.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., and Reichlin, L. (2000). The Generalized Dynamic Factor Model: identification and estimation. *Rev. Econ. Stat.*, 82:540–554.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., and Reichlin, L. (2005). The generalized dynamic factor model: one-sided estimation and forecasting. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 100(471):830–840.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., and Zaffaroni, P. (2015). Dynamic factor models with

- infinite-dimensional factor spaces: One-sided representations. *J. Econom.*, 185:359–371.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., and Zaffaroni, P. (2017). Dynamic factor models with infinite-dimensional factor space: Asymptotic analysis. *J. Econom.*, 199:74–92.
- Forni, M. and Lippi, M. (2001). The Generalized Dynamic Factor Model: representation theory. *Econom. Theory*, 17:1113–1141.
- Freyaldenhoven, S. (2021). Factor models with local factors – determining the number of relevant factors. *J. Econom.*, 229(1):80–102.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *J. Stat. Softw.*, 33(1):1–22.
- Giannone, D., Lenza, M., and Primiceri, G. E. (2021). Economic predictions with big data: The illusion of sparsity. ECB Working Paper 2542, European Central Bank.
- Guðmundsson, G. S. and Brownlees, C. (2021). Detecting groups in large vector autoregressions. *J. Econom.*, 225:2–26.
- Hallin, M. and Liška, R. (2007). Determining the number of factors in the general dynamic factor model. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 102(478):603–617.
- Han, F., Lu, H., and Liu, H. (2015). A direct estimation of high dimensional stationary vector autoregressions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 16(97):3115–3150.
- Hörmann, S. and Nisol, G. (2021). Prediction of singular VARs and an application to generalized dynamic factor models. *J. Time Ser. Anal.*, 42(3):295–313.
- Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. (1985). *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hsu, N.-J., Hung, H.-L., and Chang, Y.-M. (2008). Subset selection for vector autoregressive processes using lasso. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 52(7):3645–3657.
- Kock, A. B. and Callot, L. (2015). Oracle inequalities for high dimensional vector autoregressions. *J. Econom.*, 186(2):325–344.
- Krampe, J. and Margaritella, L. (2021). Dynamic factor models with sparse VAR idiosyncratic components. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07149*.
- Lin, J. and Michailidis, G. (2020). Regularized estimation of high-dimensional factor-augmented vector autoregressive (FAVAR) models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:1–51.
- Liu, B., Zhang, X., and Liu, Y. (2021). Simultaneous change point inference and structure recovery for high dimensional gaussian graphical models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(274):1–62.
- Loh, P.-L. and Wainwright, M. J. (2012). High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity. *Ann. Stat.*, 40(3):1637–1664.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2005). *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*. Springer, Berlin.
- McLeod, A. I. and Jimenez, C. (1984). Nonnegative definiteness of the sample autocovariance function. *Am. Stat.*, 38(4):297–298.
- Medeiros, M. C. and Mendes, E. F. (2016).  $\ell_1$ -regularization of high-dimensional time-series models with non-gaussian and heteroskedastic errors. *J. Econom.*, 191(1):255–271.



- Nicholson, W. B., Wilms, I., Bien, J., and Matteson, D. S. (2020). High dimensional forecasting via interpretable vector autoregression. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(166):1–52.
- Onatski, A. (2010). Determining the number of factors from empirical distribution of eigenvalues. *Rev. Econ. Stat.*, 92:1004–1016.
- Onatski, A. (2012). Asymptotics of the principal components estimator of large factor models with weakly influential factors. *J. Econom.*, 168(2):244–258.
- Owens, D., Cho, H., and Barigozzi, M. (2023). fnets: An R Package for Network Estimation and Forecasting via Factor-Adjusted VAR Modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11675*.
- Priestley, M. (1982). *Spectral Analysis and Time Series*. Academic Press.
- Song, S. and Bickel, P. J. (2011). Large vector auto regressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.3915*.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2002). Forecasting using principal components from a large number of predictors. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 97(460):1167–1179.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2016). Dynamic factor models, factor-augmented vector autoregressions, and structural vector autoregressions in macroeconomics. In *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, volume 2, pages 415–525. Elsevier.
- Tardivel, P. J. and Bogdan, M. (2022). On the sign recovery by least absolute shrinkage and selection operator, thresholded least absolute shrinkage and selection operator, and thresholded basis pursuit denoising. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 49(4):1636–1668.
- Trapani, L. (2018). A randomized sequential procedure to determine the number of factors. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 113(523):1341–1349.
- Uematsu, Y. and Yamagata, T. (2023a). Discovering the network granger causality in large vector autoregressive models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15158*.
- Uematsu, Y. and Yamagata, T. (2023b). Estimation of sparsity-induced weak factor models. *J. Bus. Econ. Stat.*, 41(1):213–227.
- van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., and Zhou, S. (2011). The adaptive and the thresholded Lasso for potentially misspecified models. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 5:688–749.
- Wang, D. and Tsay, R. S. (2022). Rate-optimal robust estimation of high-dimensional vector autoregressive models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.11002*.
- Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 102(40):14150–14154.
- Yu, Y., Wang, T., and Samworth, R. J. (2015). A useful variant of the Davis–Kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102:315–323.
- Zhang, D. and Wu, W. B. (2021). Convergence of covariance and spectral density estimates for high-dimensional locally stationary processes. *Ann. Stat.*, 49(1):233–254.
- Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:2541–2563.

## A Estimation of VAR parameters and $\mathcal{N}^G$ via Dantzig selector estimator

Recalling the notations in Section 3.3, we consider the following constrained  $\ell_1$ -minimisation approach closely related to the Dantzig selector proposed for high-dimensional linear regression (Candes and Tao, 2007), for the estimation of  $\beta = [\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_d]^\top$ :

$$\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{pd \times p}} \|\mathbf{M}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\mathbf{M} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \right|_\infty \leq \lambda^{\text{DS}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\lambda^{\text{DS}} > 0$  is a tuning parameter.

To investigate the theoretical properties of  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$ , we measure the (weak) sparsity of  $\beta$  by  $s_0(\varrho) = \sum_{j=1}^p s_{0,j}(\varrho)$  with  $s_{0,j}(\varrho) = \sum_{\ell=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^p |A_{\ell,jk}|^\varrho$  for some  $\varrho \in [0, 1)$ . In particular, when  $\varrho = 0$ , they coincide with the sparsity measures defined in the main text, as  $s_{0,j} = s_{0,j}(0) = |\beta_{\cdot,j}|_0$ ,  $s_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p s_{0,j}$  and  $s_{\text{in}} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{0,j}$ .

**Proposition A.1.** *Set  $\lambda^{\text{DS}} \geq C_\xi(\|\beta\|_1 + 1)(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$  in (A.1). Then on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$  defined in (11), for any  $\varrho \in [0, 1)$ , conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$  defined in (11), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot,j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\cdot,j} \right|_2 &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{s_{\text{in}} \lambda^{\text{DS}}}}{\pi m_\xi}, \quad \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot,j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\cdot,j} \right|_1 \lesssim \frac{s_{\text{in}} \lambda^{\text{DS}}}{\pi m_\xi}, \\ \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot,j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\cdot,j} \right|_\infty &\lesssim \min \left( \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}}, \frac{\sqrt{s_{\text{in}} \lambda^{\text{DS}}}}{\pi m_\xi} \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \left| \hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}} - \beta \right|_1 &\leq 6s_0(\varrho) \left( \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}} \right)^{1-\varrho}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition A.1 shows that  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  achieves consistency when  $\beta$  is only weakly sparse with  $\varrho > 0$ , but the estimation error involves a multiplicative factor  $\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1$ . This is linked to the sparsity of the ACV matrices of  $\xi_t$  which is related to, but is not fully captured by, the sparsity of  $\beta$ . For example, Han et al. (2015) show that when  $\mathbb{G}$  is strictly diagonally dominant (Horn and Johnson, 1985, Definition 6.1.9) with  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \min_{1 \leq k \leq d} (2|\gamma_{\xi,ii}(0)| - \sum_{\ell=-d+k}^{k-1} \sum_{i'=1}^p |\gamma_{\xi,ii'}(\ell)|) \geq \gamma_\circ > 0$  (where  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell) = [\gamma_{\xi,ii'}(\ell)]_{i,i'=1}^p$ ), we have  $\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \leq \gamma_\circ^{-1}$ .

**Corollary A.2.** *Suppose that the conditions of Proposition A.1 are met. If*

$$\min_{(i,j) \in \text{supp}(\beta)} |\beta_{ij}| > 2\mathfrak{t}$$

*with  $\mathfrak{t} = 2\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}}$ , we have  $\text{sign}(\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}(\mathfrak{t})) = \text{sign}(\beta)$  on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ .*

## B Forecasting the factor-driven component under unrestricted GDFM

In this section, we present an alternative method for estimating the best linear predictor (14) of the common component without the restrictive assumption made in Section 4.1. The estimator, denoted by  $\chi_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}}$ , has been proposed by Forni et al. (2017), and we provide a new theoretical result that establishes the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm consistency of this estimator.

We first make a mild assumption that the filter  $\mathcal{B}(L)$  in (1) is rational:

**Assumption B.1.** *Each filter  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} B_{\ell,ij} L^\ell$  is a ratio of finite-order polynomials in  $L$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}(L) = (\mathcal{B}_{ij}^{(2)}(L))^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{ij}^{(1)}(L)$  with  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}^{(k)}(L) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{s^{(k)}} B_{\ell,ij}^{(k)} L^\ell$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $1 \leq j \leq q$  with  $s^{(1)}, s^{(2)} \in \mathbb{N}$  not dependent on  $i$  and  $j$ . Moreover,*

(i)  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq s^{(1)}} |B_{\ell,ij}^{(1)}| \leq B_\chi^{(1)}$  for some constant  $B_\chi^{(1)} > 0$ , and

(ii) for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , we have  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}^{(2)}(z) \neq 0$  for all  $|z| \leq 1$ .

Forni et al. (2015) establish that for generic values of the parameters  $B_{\ell,ij}^{(1)}$  and  $B_{\ell,ij}^{(2)}$  defined in Assumption B.1 (i.e. outside a countable union of nowhere dense subsets),  $\chi_t$  admits a blockwise VAR representation. Supposing that  $p = N(q+1)$  with some integer  $N$  for convenience, each  $(q+1)$ -dimensional block  $\chi_t^{(h)} = (\chi_{(q+1)(h-1)+i,t}, 1 \leq i \leq q+1)^\top$ ,  $1 \leq h \leq N$ , admits a singular, *finite-order* VAR representation with  $\mathbf{u}_t$  as the  $q$ -dimensional innovations. We formally impose this genericity result as an assumption.

**Assumption B.2** (Blockwise VAR representation).

(i)  $\chi_t$  admits a blockwise VAR representation

$$\mathcal{A}_\chi(L) \chi_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_\chi^{(1)}(L) & \mathbf{O} & \dots & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathcal{A}_\chi^{(2)}(L) & \dots & \mathbf{O} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \dots & \mathcal{A}_\chi^{(N)}(L) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \chi_t^{(1)} \\ \chi_t^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \chi_t^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{R}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{R}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_t =: \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}_t \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where, for each  $h = 1, \dots, N$ :

(a)  $\mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(L) = \mathbf{I} - \sum_{\ell=1}^{s_h} \mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)} L^\ell$  with  $\mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+1) \times (q+1)}$  is of degree  $s_h \leq qs^{(1)} + q^2 s^{(2)}$  and  $\det(\mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(z)) \neq 0$  for all  $|z| \leq 1$ . Then, we define  $\mathcal{A}_\chi(L) = \mathbf{I} - \sum_{\ell=1}^s \mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell} L^\ell$  with  $s = \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} s_h$  where  $\mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)} = \mathbf{O}$  for  $\ell \geq s_h + 1$ .

(b)  $\mathbf{R}^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+1) \times q}$  is of rank  $q$  with  $[\mathbf{R}^{(h)}]_{ij} = B_{0,ij}^{(1)}$ .

(c) The VAR representation in (B.1) is unique, i.e. if  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{(h)}(L) \chi_t = \tilde{\mathbf{R}}^{(h)} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_t$ , the degree of  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{(h)}(L)$  does not exceed  $s$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_t$  is  $q$ -dimensional white noise, such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{(h)}(L) = \mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(L)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}^{(h)} = \mathbf{R}^{(h)} \mathbf{O}^\top$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_t = \mathbf{O} \mathbf{u}_t$  for some orthogonal matrix  $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ .

(ii) For  $h = 1, \dots, N$ , define  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(\ell) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{t-\ell}^{(h)}(\mathbf{x}_t^{(h)})^\top)$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} = [(\mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(\ell))]^\top$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq s_h$  and

$$\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(0) & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(-1) & \dots & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(-s_h + 1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(s_h - 1) & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(s_h - 2) & \dots & \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi^{(h)}(0) \end{bmatrix},$$

such that  $\mathbf{A}_\chi^{(h)} = [\mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)}, 1 \leq \ell \leq s_h] = \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)}(\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1}$ . Then, there exists a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that  $\min_{1 \leq h \leq N} \det(\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)}) > c_0$ .

Non-singularity of  $\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)}$  is implied by Assumption B.2 (i) but the condition (ii) is imposed to ensure the boundedness of  $\|\mathbf{A}_\chi^{(h)}\|$ . Let  $\mathbf{Z}_t = \mathcal{A}_\chi(L)\mathbf{X}_t$  such that under (B.1),

$$\mathbf{Z}_t = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}_t + \mathcal{A}_\chi(L)\boldsymbol{\xi}_t =: \mathbf{V}_t + \mathbf{W}_t. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Then,  $\mathbf{Z}_t$  admits a static factor representation with  $\mathbf{u}_t$  as (static) factors. Let  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_z$  denote the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{Z}_t$  and  $\mu_{z,j}$  its  $j$ -th largest eigenvalue, and similarly define  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_v$ ,  $\mu_{v,j}$ ,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_w$  and  $\mu_{w,j}$ . As a consequence of Assumption 2.3, the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_w$  are bounded as below.

**Proposition B.1.** *Under Assumptions 2.2, 2.3, E.1 and B.2, there exists some constant  $B_w > 0$  such that  $\mu_{w,1} \leq B_w$ .*

The following assumption, imposed on the strength of the factors in (B.2) similarly as in Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 (ii), enables asymptotic identification of  $\mathbf{V}_t$  and  $\mathbf{W}_t$ . Due to the complexity associated with theoretical analysis under the model (B.1), we consider the case of strong factors only.

**Assumption B.3.** *There exist a positive integer  $p_0 \geq 1$  and pairs of positive constants  $(\alpha_{v,j}, \beta_{v,j})$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , such that for all  $p \geq p_0$ ,*

$$\beta_{v,1} \geq \frac{\mu_{v,1}}{p} \geq \alpha_{v,1} > \beta_{v,2} \geq \frac{\mu_{v,2}}{p} \geq \dots \geq \alpha_{v,q-1} > \beta_{v,q} \geq \frac{\mu_{v,q}}{p} \geq \alpha_{v,q} > 0.$$

We propose to perform in-sample estimation and forecasting of the common component by directly utilising the expression of  $\mathbf{x}_{t+a|t}$  in (14), following the method proposed in Forni et al. (2017) that makes use of the outcome of the dynamic PCA step outlined in Section 3.2.

**Step 1:** Estimate  $\mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(L)$  with  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{(h)}(L) = \mathbf{I} - \sum_{\ell=1}^{s_h} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)} L^\ell$  via Yule-Walker estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi^{(h)} = [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)}, 1 \leq \ell \leq s_h] = \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\chi^{(h)}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1}$ , where  $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_\chi^{(h)}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)}$  are defined analogously as  $\mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)}$ , with  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_\chi(\ell)$  defined in Section 3.2 replacing  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell)$ . Let  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_\chi(L) = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{(h)}(L), 1 \leq h \leq N)$ .

**Step 2:** Obtain the filtered process  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_t = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_\chi(L)\mathbf{X}_t$  for  $s+1 \leq t \leq n$ , and let  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z = (n-s)^{-1} \sum_{t=s+1}^n \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_t \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^\top$ , and denote by  $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z = \sum_{j=1}^{p \wedge (n-s)} \hat{\mu}_{z,j} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z,j} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z,j}^\top$  its eigendecomposition. Then,

set  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}} = [\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{z,j} \sqrt{\widehat{\mu}_{z,j}}, 1 \leq j \leq q] = \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{z,1:q}^{1/2}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{z,1:q}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t$  where  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{z,1:q} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\mu}_{z,j}, 1 \leq j \leq q)$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} = [\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{z,j}, 1 \leq j \leq q]$ .

**Step 3:** Denoting by  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\ell$  the coefficient matrix multiplied to  $L^\ell$  in expanding  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_\chi^{-1}(L)\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$ , with some truncation lag  $K$ , we estimate  $\chi_{t+a|t}$  by

$$\widehat{\chi}_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^K \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\ell+a} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-\ell}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

*Remark B.1.* (a) In our numerical studies reported in Section 5.2 and Appendix D.2, we apply the Schwarz criterion (Lütkepohl, 2005, Chapter 4) to each block for selecting the order  $s_h$  of the blockwise VAR model (see Assumption B.2). Also, we set the truncation lag at  $K = 20$  in (B.3) and the number of cross-sectional permutations to be 30 by default.

(b) The cross-sectional ordering of the panel has an impact on the selection of the diagonal blocks when estimating  $\mathcal{A}_\chi(L)$ . Each cross-sectional permutation of the panel leads to distinct estimators, all sharing the same asymptotic properties. Using a Rao-Blackwell-type argument, Forni et al. (2017) advocates the aggregation of these estimators into a unique one by simple averaging (after obvious reordering of the cross-sections). Although averaging over all  $p!$  permutations is infeasible, as argued by Forni et al. (2017) and empirically verified by Forni et al. (2018), a few of them are enough in practice to deliver stable averages.

(c) When  $p$  is not an integer multiple of  $(q+1)$ , we can consider  $\lfloor p/(q+1) \rfloor - 1$  blocks of size  $(q+1)$  along with a block of the remaining  $(q+1) + p - \lfloor p/(q+1) \rfloor(q+1)$  variables. All the theoretical arguments used in Forni et al. (2017) and in this paper apply to any partition of the cross-section into blocks of size  $(q+1)$  or larger (but finite).

(d) It is known that as the VAR order  $s_h$  increases, the estimation of a singular VAR via Yule-Walker methods might become unstable since it requires inverting  $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)}$ , a Toeplitz matrix of dimension  $s_h(q+1) \times s_h(q+1)$ . To address potential issues arising from this, Hörmann and Nisol (2021) propose a regularised approach aimed at stabilising the estimate of  $\mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(L)$ . Empirically, such an approach leads to better performance and can be taken when  $s_h$  is large. Let us denote the matrix collecting all the transition matrices involved in the blockwise VAR model in (B.1) by  $\mathbf{A}_\chi = [\mathbf{A}_{\chi,1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{\chi,s}] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times ps}$  and its estimated counterpart by  $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi$ . Then, the estimators from the above procedure satisfy the following.

**Proposition B.2.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 3.1 are met, including Assumption 2.1 which is satisfied with  $\rho_j = 1, 1 \leq j \leq q$ . Further let Assumptions B.2–B.3 hold.*

(i) *Denoting by  $\varphi_i$  a vector of zeros except for its  $i$ -th element being set to one, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi - \mathbf{A}_\chi \right\|_F = O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi - \mathbf{A}_\chi \right) \right|_2 = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right),$$

where  $\psi_n$  and  $\vartheta_{n,p}$  are defined in (10) and (E.1).

(ii) For any given  $t$ , we have

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{R}}\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}_t \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

(iii) For any fixed  $a \geq 0$  and  $t$ , we have

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}} - \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t+a|t} \right|_\infty = O_P \left( K M_\chi^K \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) + \log^{1/2}(p) K^{-\varsigma+1} \right),$$

where  $M_\chi > 0$  is a constant. Further, when  $p = O(n^\kappa)$  for some  $\kappa > 0$ , we can select  $K = K_n = \lfloor c \log(n) \rfloor$  with a small enough  $c > 0$  such that  $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}} - \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t+a|t} \right|_\infty = o_P(1)$ .

Proposition B.2 (iii), combined with Proposition 4.2, concludes the analysis of the forecasting error  $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}} - \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t+a|t} \right|_\infty$ .

*Remark B.2.* (a) In Proposition B.2, we assume a stronger factor structure given by Assumption 2.1 with  $\rho_j = 1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , and Assumption B.3 for ease of presentation; as noted in Remark 3.1 (c), weaker factor strength would imply worse estimation and forecasting performance.

(b) Proposition B.2 (i) extends Proposition 9 of Forni et al. (2017) that considers the consistency of  $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi$  for a given single block. The result in (ii) indicates that we can consistently recover  $\mathbf{V}_t = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}_t$  and hence the static factor space. Moreover, parts (i) and (ii) imply that we can consistently recover the space spanned by  $\mathbf{u}_t$  and their associated impulse response functions  $\mathcal{B}(L) = \mathcal{A}_\chi^{-1}(L)\mathbf{R}$  for finitely many lags up to a linear transformation. This is particularly useful in empirical macroeconomic literature where typically,  $\mathbf{u}_t$  carries a specific economic implication (e.g. shocks related to monetary policy, fiscal policy, demand, supply, technology and oil, to name a few). Indeed, it is a common practice to use the above estimation method to recover the space spanned by these shocks and then to identify their dynamic effect  $\mathcal{B}(L)$  by imposing *ad hoc* economic based restrictions; see, e.g. Stock and Watson (2016), for a review of this approach.

(c) In Proposition B.2 (iii), the constant  $M_\chi$  is associated with the operator norm of the transition matrix involved in the VAR(1) representation of (B.1) and, provided that the maximum VAR order  $s = \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} s_h \geq 2$ , we have  $M_\chi \geq 1$  (see Appendix E of Basu and Michailidis, 2015). The  $O_P$  bound in (iii) can be made to converge to zero as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$  by selecting an appropriate truncation lag  $K$ , but it is at a slower rate compared to the  $O_P$  bound derived for  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_t^{\text{res}}$  studied in Section 4.1 when comparable strong factors are assumed ( $\rho_j = 1$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ ,

in Assumption 2.1 and  $\varrho_j = 1$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , in Assumption 4.1 (ii)). This shows the advantage of working under a more restrictive factor model in Section 4.1 when it comes to forecasting.

## C Sparsity structure of $\mathcal{N}^L$

Recall that  $\mathbf{\Omega} = [\omega_{ii'}]$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta} = [\delta_{ii'}]$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}(1) = [a_{ii'}]$ . Also, define  $g_{i,i'} = 1$  if  $i = i'$  and  $g_{i,i'} = 0$  otherwise. Recall that  $a_{ii'} = g_{i,i'} - \sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ii'}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi}\omega_{ii'} &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p a_{hi}\delta_{hk}a_{ki'} = a_{ii} \sum_k \delta_{ik}a_{ki'} + \sum_h \sum_k a_{hi}\delta_{hk}a_{ki'}(1 - g_{h,i}) \\
&= a_{ii} \sum_{\ell} \delta_{i\ell}a_{\ell i'} + a_{i'i'} \sum_{\ell} a_{\ell i}\delta_{\ell i'}(1 - g_{\ell,i}) + \sum_h \sum_k a_{hi}\delta_{hk}a_{ki'}(1 - g_{h,i})(1 - g_{k,i'}) \\
&= a_{ii}\delta_{ii'}a_{i'i'} + a_{i'i'}\delta_{i'i'}a_{i'i} + a_{ii}\delta_{ii}a_{ii'} + a_{ii} \sum_{\ell} \delta_{i\ell}a_{\ell i'}(1 - g_{\ell,i})(1 - g_{\ell,i'}) + \\
&\quad a_{i'i'} \sum_{\ell} a_{\ell i}\delta_{\ell i'}(1 - g_{\ell,i})(1 - g_{\ell,i'}) + \sum_{\ell} a_{\ell i}\delta_{\ell\ell}a_{\ell i'}(1 - g_{\ell,i})(1 - g_{\ell,i'}) + \\
&\quad \sum_h \sum_k a_{hi}\delta_{hk}a_{ki'}(1 - g_{h,i})(1 - g_{k,i'})(1 - g_{h,k}). \tag{C.1}
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\omega_{ii'} = 0$  if none of the following holds: (i) variables  $i$  and  $i'$  are partially correlated, i.e.  $\delta_{ii'} \neq 0$  (from the first term in (C.1)); (ii)  $i$  Granger causes  $i'$  in the long run, i.e.  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ii'} \neq 0$  (from the second term); (iii)  $i'$  Granger causes  $i$  in the long run, i.e.  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ii'} \neq 0$  (from the third term); (iv) there exists a variable  $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, i'\}$  such that  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ji} \neq 0$  and  $\delta_{i'j} \neq 0$ , or  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ji'} \neq 0$  and  $\delta_{ij} \neq 0$ , or  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ji} \neq 0$  and  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ji'} \neq 0$  (from the fourth, the fifth and the sixth terms); or (v) there exist a pair of variables  $j, j' \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, i'\}$  such that  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,ji} \neq 0$ ,  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d A_{\ell,j'i'} \neq 0$  and  $\delta_{jj'} \neq 0$  (from the last term). As such, the edge set  $\mathcal{E}^L$  is typically larger than  $\mathcal{E}^G \cup \mathcal{E}^C$ .



## D Simulation studies

### D.1 Set-up

We apply FNETS to datasets simulated under a variety of settings, from Gaussian innovations  $\mathbf{u}_t$  and  $\varepsilon_t$  with (E1)  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$  and (E2)  $\Delta \neq \mathbf{I}$ , to (E3) heavy-tailed ( $t_5$ ) innovations with  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$ , and when  $\chi_t$  is generated from (C1) fully dynamic or (C2) static factor models. In addition, we consider the ‘oracle’ setting (C0)  $\chi_t = \mathbf{0}$  where, in the absence of the factor-driven component, the results obtained can serve as a benchmark. We also include the factor-adjusted regression method of Fan et al. (2021) which is referred to as FARM, and present the performance of their estimator  $\widehat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  of VAR parameters and forecasts (see Appendix D.1 for full descriptions). For each setting, 100 realisations are generated.

The idiosyncratic component is generated as a VAR(1) process. Let  $\mathcal{N}^G$  denote a directed Erdős-Rényi random graph on  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, p\}$  with the link probability  $1/p$ . Then, the entries of  $\mathbf{A}_1$  are  $A_{1,ii'} = 0.275$  when  $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}^G$  and  $A_{1,ii'} = 0$  otherwise. The innovations are generated according to the following three scenarios:

(E1) Gaussian with  $\Gamma = \mathbf{I}$ .

(E2) Gaussian with  $\Gamma = \Delta^{-1}$ , where  $\delta_{ii} = 1.5$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $\delta_{ii'} = -1/\sqrt{d_i d_{i'}}$  if  $(i, i') \in \mathcal{E}^C$  and  $\delta_{ii'} = 0$  otherwise. Here,  $\mathcal{N}^C$  is an undirected Erdős-Rényi random graph on  $\mathcal{V}$  with the link probability  $1/p$ , and  $d_i$  denotes the degree of the  $i$ -th node in  $\mathcal{E}^C$ . This model is taken from Barigozzi and Brownlees (2019).

(E3) Heavy-tailed with  $\sqrt{5/3} \cdot \varepsilon_{it} \sim_{\text{iid}} t_5$  (such that  $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_{it}) = 1$ ) and  $\Gamma = \mathbf{I}$ .

We consider two models for the generation of factor-driven common component:

(C1) Taken from Forni et al. (2017),  $\chi_{it}$  is generated as sum of  $q$  AR processes  $\chi_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^q a_{ij}(1 - \alpha_{ij}L)^{-1}u_{jt}$ , where  $a_{ij} \sim_{\text{iid}} \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$  and  $\alpha_{ij} \sim_{\text{iid}} \mathcal{U}[-0.8, 0.8]$  with  $\mathcal{U}[a, b]$  denoting a uniform distribution. This model does not admit a static factor model representation, and we consider  $q = 2$ .

(C2)  $\chi_{it}$  admits a static factor model representation as  $\chi_{it} = a_i \sum_{\ell=1}^2 \lambda_{i\ell}^\top \mathbf{f}_{t-\ell+1}$  with  $\mathbf{f}_t = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{f}_{t-1} + \mathbf{u}_t$ ; here,  $\mathbf{F}_t = (\mathbf{f}_t^\top, \mathbf{f}_{t-1}^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^r$  denotes the static factor with  $r = 2q$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_t \in \mathbb{R}^q$  the dynamic factor and  $\mathbf{u}_t = (u_{1t}, \dots, u_{qt})^\top$  the common shocks. The entries of the loadings  $\lambda_{i\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^q$  are generated i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , and  $\mathbf{D} = 0.7 \cdot \mathbf{D}_0 / \Lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{D}_0)$  where the off-diagonal entries of  $\mathbf{D}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  are generated i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{U}[0, 0.3]$  and its diagonal entries from  $\mathcal{U}[0.5, 0.8]$ . The multiplicative factor  $a_i$  is chosen for each realisation to keep sample estimate of  $\text{Var}(\chi_{it})/\text{Var}(\xi_{it})$  at one. We fix  $q = 2$  (such that  $r = 4$ ).

Additionally, we consider the following ‘oracle’ setting:

(C0)  $\chi_t = 0$ , i.e. the idiosyncratic VAR process is directly observed as  $\mathbf{X} = \xi_t$ .

We vary  $(n, p) \in \{(100, 50), (100, 100), (200, 50), (200, 100), (500, 100), (500, 200)\}$ . According to the distribution of  $\varepsilon_t$ , we also vary the distribution of  $\mathbf{u}_t$ ; under (E1) or (E2),  $u_{jt} \sim_{\text{iid}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  while under (E3),  $\sqrt{5/3} \cdot u_{jt} \sim_{\text{iid}} t_5$ .

## D.2 Results

### D.2.1 Network estimation

Throughout, we refer to the estimator in (8) by  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$ , and report the results from both  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  obtained as in (A.1). Also,  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  denote the estimators of  $\Omega$  obtained with  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$ , respectively see Section 3.4. For comparison, we consider the FARM methodology of Fan et al. (2021): we implement their factor-adjustment step under a static factor model with the information criterion-based factor number estimator of Alessi et al. (2010) and, to the residuals from removing factors, we apply the Lasso to estimate the VAR parameters using the R package `glmnet` (Friedman et al., 2010). The resultant estimator is referred to as  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$ . In Tables D.1–D.3, we report the estimation errors of  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  in estimating  $\beta$ , and in Tables D.2–D.4, those of  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  in estimating  $\Omega$  averaged over 100 realisations, and the corresponding standard errors. We also report the results from estimating  $\Delta$  by  $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{DS}}$  in Table D.5.

With a matrix  $\gamma$  as an estimand we measure the estimation error of its estimator  $\hat{\gamma}$  using the (scaled) matrix norms:

$$L_F = \frac{\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_F}{\|\gamma\|_F} \quad \text{and} \quad L_2 = \frac{\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|}{\|\gamma\|}.$$

To assess the performance of  $\hat{\gamma}$  in recovering the support of  $\gamma = [\gamma_{ii'}]$ , i.e.  $\{(i, i') : \gamma_{ii'} \neq 0\}$ , we generate receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of true positive rate (TPR) against false positive rate (FPR), averaged over 100 realisations for each setting:

$$\text{TPR} = \frac{|\{(i, i') : \hat{\gamma}_{ii'} \neq 0 \text{ and } \gamma_{ii'} \neq 0\}|}{|\{(i, i') : \gamma_{ii'} \neq 0\}|} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{FPR} = \frac{|\{(i, i') : \hat{\gamma}_{ii'} \neq 0 \text{ and } \gamma_{ii'} = 0\}|}{|\{(i, i') : \gamma_{ii'} = 0\}|}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

see Figures D.2–D.3. We additionally report the results of the TPR value when FPR is set at 0.05, with and without thresholding the estimators as described in Section 5.1, in Tables D.1–D.5.

Overall, we observe that with increasing  $n$ , the performance of all estimators improve according to all metrics regardless of the data generating processes while increasing  $p$  has an adverse effect. Generally, whether the factor-driven component admits a static representation as in (C2) or not as in (C1), FNETS produces estimators of  $\beta$  that perform as well as those applied under the oracle setting of (C0) with  $\chi_t = \mathbf{0}$ . Also  $\hat{\beta}$  outperforms  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  in all settings, particularly in estimating the support of  $\beta$  (i.e. the edge set of  $\mathcal{N}^G$ ) even without

any thresholding in all scenarios. FARM tends to produce highly sparse estimators with low TPR, see Figure D.1 (averaged ROC curves are not necessarily monotonic as it contains pointwise average TPR at given FPR). This is attributed to the accumulation of errors from estimating  $\xi_t$ ,  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , which possibly leads to low signal-to-noise ratio when estimating the VAR parameters via Lasso. This difference vanishes as both  $n$  and  $p$  increase. As noted in Introduction, FNETS and FARM have distinctive objectives, and FNETS is specifically proposed for network estimation under the proposed factor-adjusted VAR model. When  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$  (as in (E1) and (E3)), FNETS estimates  $\Omega$  with accuracy regardless of the tail behaviour of  $\varepsilon_t$  and  $\mathbf{u}_t$ . When  $\Delta \neq \mathbf{I}$ , it tends to incur larger errors in estimating  $\Omega$  compared to when  $\Delta = \mathbf{I}$ , which is more noticeable in terms of support recovery (see Figure D.4). This possibly stems from the performance of  $\hat{\Delta}$  (see Table D.5) rather than  $\hat{\beta}$ , which becomes worse when  $\Delta \neq \mathbf{I}$ . Since the support of  $\Omega$  depends on those of  $\beta$  and  $\Delta$  in a complex way (see Proposition 3.5 (ii) and Appendix C), its estimation tends to be more challenging.




Figure D.1: ROC curves of TPR against FPR for  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  in recovering the support of  $\beta$  when  $\chi_t$  is generated under (C1)–(C2) and  $\xi_t$  is generated under (E1) with varying  $n$  and  $p$ , averaged over 100 realisations. Vertical lines indicate FPR = 0.05. For comparison, we also plot the corresponding curves (from  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$ ) obtained under (C0) i.e. when  $\chi_t = \mathbf{0}$ .




Figure D.2: ROC curves of TPR against FPR for  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  in recovering the support of  $\beta$  when  $\chi_t$  is generated under (C1) and  $\xi_t$  is generated under (E1)–(E3) with varying  $n$  and  $p$ , averaged over 100 realisations. Vertical lines indicate FPR = 0.05.




Figure D.3: ROC curves of TPR against FPR for  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  in recovering the support of  $\Omega$  when  $\chi_t$  is generated under (C1)–(C2) and  $\xi_t$  is generated under (E1) with varying  $n$  and  $p$ , averaged over 100 realisations. Vertical lines indicate FPR = 0.05. For comparison, we also plot the corresponding curves obtained under (C0) i.e. when  $\chi_t = \mathbf{0}$ .




Figure D.4: ROC curves of TPR against FPR for  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  in recovering the support of  $\Omega$  when  $\chi_t$  is generated under (C1) and  $\xi_t$  is generated under (E1)–(E3) with varying  $n$  and  $p$ , averaged over 100 realisations. Vertical lines indicate FPR = 0.05.

Table D.1: Errors of  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{FARM}}$  in estimating  $\beta$  measured by  $L_F$  and  $L_2$  averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C0)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the TPR when FPR = 0.05 without and with thresholding for  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method	$L_F$		$L_2$		TPR (5%)			
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Without		With	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C0)	100	50	Lasso	0.633	0.177	0.68	0.163	0.836	0.243	0.815	0.262
			DS	0.613	0.072	0.679	0.082	0.94	0.105	0.893	0.125
	100	100	Lasso	0.854	0.142	0.88	0.129	0.517	0.27	0.466	0.283
			DS	0.669	0.076	0.738	0.079	0.892	0.16	0.839	0.159
	200	50	Lasso	0.421	0.048	0.473	0.059	0.999	0.004	0.997	0.009
			DS	0.532	0.071	0.589	0.084	0.989	0.019	0.982	0.024
	200	100	Lasso	0.454	0.034	0.52	0.056	0.999	0.004	0.996	0.008
			DS	0.58	0.044	0.654	0.066	0.982	0.018	0.966	0.031
	500	100	Lasso	0.402	0.034	0.441	0.041	1	0	0.987	0.020
			DS	0.29	0.074	0.308	0.085	1	0.001	0.998	0.008
	500	200	Lasso	0.425	0.034	0.47	0.048	1	0.001	0.986	0.024
			DS	0.46	0.128	0.493	0.15	0.999	0.002	0.98	0.021
(C1)	100	50	Lasso	0.805	0.094	0.875	0.111	0.757	0.216	0.681	0.252
			DS	0.815	0.084	0.883	0.107	0.748	0.19	0.684	0.209
			FARM	0.914	0.047	0.954	0.088	0.404	0.127	-	-
	100	100	Lasso	0.863	0.077	0.925	0.098	0.66	0.228	0.561	0.257
			DS	0.848	0.071	0.924	0.09	0.701	0.209	0.608	0.223
			FARM	0.927	0.026	0.96	0.086	0.361	0.086	-	-
	200	50	Lasso	0.613	0.075	0.708	0.111	0.973	0.038	0.951	0.089
			DS	0.617	0.083	0.715	0.119	0.969	0.052	0.951	0.070
			FARM	0.804	0.057	0.871	0.135	0.726	0.106	-	-
	200	100	Lasso	0.647	0.08	0.794	0.094	0.963	0.062	0.936	0.094
			DS	0.643	0.072	0.776	0.102	0.971	0.039	0.941	0.079
			FARM	0.794	0.045	0.841	0.095	0.733	0.098	-	-
	500	100	Lasso	0.461	0.054	0.657	0.094	0.999	0.003	0.996	0.015
			DS	0.48	0.057	0.665	0.107	0.999	0.004	0.998	0.006
			FARM	0.625	0.037	0.725	0.124	0.961	0.03	-	-
	500	200	Lasso	0.501	0.058	0.763	0.083	0.999	0.003	0.996	0.008
			DS	0.518	0.066	0.813	0.107	0.999	0.003	0.961	0.176
			FARM	0.611	0.035	0.704	0.122	0.969	0.021	-	-
(C2)	100	50	Lasso	0.721	0.118	0.756	0.116	0.819	0.236	0.805	0.246
			DS	0.704	0.057	0.759	0.074	0.888	0.08	0.837	0.094
			FARM	0.857	0.046	0.888	0.071	0.534	0.137	-	-
	100	100	Lasso	0.868	0.084	0.886	0.089	0.572	0.251	0.517	0.274
			DS	0.749	0.08	0.786	0.077	0.826	0.216	0.766	0.214
			FARM	0.882	0.031	0.894	0.071	0.483	0.085	-	-
	200	50	Lasso	0.503	0.04	0.551	0.065	0.996	0.01	0.994	0.012
			DS	0.575	0.051	0.635	0.077	0.988	0.02	0.971	0.034
			FARM	0.737	0.057	0.774	0.093	0.821	0.089	-	-
	200	100	Lasso	0.53	0.05	0.559	0.057	0.995	0.019	0.99	0.026
			DS	0.568	0.042	0.625	0.062	0.987	0.015	0.973	0.023
			FARM	0.726	0.046	0.722	0.064	0.83	0.078	-	-
	500	100	Lasso	0.374	0.026	0.417	0.042	1	0	1	0.000
			DS	0.448	0.05	0.494	0.064	1	0.001	0.994	0.016
			FARM	0.551	0.043	0.566	0.089	0.99	0.018	-	-
	500	200	Lasso	0.383	0.023	0.425	0.035	1	0	1	0.000
			DS	0.478	0.033	0.528	0.045	1	0.001	0.995	0.018
			FARM	0.559	0.033	0.551	0.046	0.988	0.012	-	-

Table D.2: Errors of  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  in estimating  $\Omega$  measured by  $L_F$  and  $L_2$ , averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C0)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the TPR when FPR = 0.05 without and with thresholding.

	$n$	$p$	Method	$L_F$		$L_2$		TPR (5%)			
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Without		With	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C0)	100	50	Lasso	0.452	0.087	0.587	0.105	0.789	0.18	0.704	0.236
			DS	0.456	0.042	0.593	0.048	0.896	0.092	0.721	0.111
	100	100	Lasso	0.587	0.095	0.738	0.1	0.583	0.17	0.411	0.195
			DS	0.467	0.054	0.624	0.056	0.846	0.113	0.658	0.106
	200	50	Lasso	0.373	0.026	0.488	0.038	0.993	0.016	0.854	0.090
			DS	0.423	0.043	0.553	0.058	0.979	0.042	0.755	0.134
	200	100	Lasso	0.376	0.022	0.507	0.03	0.991	0.016	0.839	0.064
			DS	0.444	0.024	0.593	0.03	0.98	0.021	0.727	0.069
	500	100	Lasso	0.327	0.02	0.453	0.029	1	0.001	0.784	0.040
			DS	0.236	0.045	0.328	0.064	1	0.002	0.975	0.067
	500	200	Lasso	0.328	0.017	0.466	0.029	1	0.001	0.77	0.029
			DS	0.336	0.059	0.473	0.09	0.999	0.003	0.845	0.123
(C1)	100	50	Lasso	0.486	0.057	0.652	0.154	0.697	0.148	0.578	0.169
			DS	0.488	0.064	0.662	0.18	0.691	0.129	0.545	0.162
	100	100	Lasso	0.515	0.069	0.696	0.099	0.641	0.127	0.475	0.153
			DS	0.503	0.062	0.687	0.137	0.662	0.118	0.498	0.155
	200	50	Lasso	0.474	0.723	0.812	2.66	0.876	0.106	0.769	0.145
			DS	0.403	0.052	0.563	0.123	0.872	0.089	0.769	0.131
	200	100	Lasso	0.416	0.046	0.573	0.071	0.898	0.071	0.728	0.149
			DS	0.417	0.048	0.572	0.066	0.91	0.059	0.737	0.130
	500	100	Lasso	0.33	0.033	0.488	0.068	0.992	0.014	0.881	0.089
			DS	0.337	0.037	0.495	0.065	0.989	0.019	0.864	0.096
	500	200	Lasso	0.348	0.04	0.523	0.055	0.995	0.008	0.841	0.088
			DS	0.35	0.046	0.535	0.062	0.992	0.018	0.828	0.103
(C2)	100	50	Lasso	0.433	0.067	0.576	0.093	0.696	0.159	0.666	0.195
			DS	0.433	0.033	0.584	0.044	0.768	0.098	0.668	0.108
	100	100	Lasso	0.526	0.084	0.68	0.102	0.595	0.133	0.446	0.199
			DS	0.458	0.06	0.617	0.065	0.727	0.138	0.617	0.130
	200	50	Lasso	0.349	0.03	0.48	0.046	0.915	0.068	0.843	0.077
			DS	0.399	0.034	0.541	0.043	0.96	0.047	0.769	0.097
	200	100	Lasso	0.334	0.027	0.471	0.042	0.917	0.054	0.838	0.078
			DS	0.391	0.03	0.544	0.038	0.966	0.03	0.76	0.066
	500	100	Lasso	0.287	0.019	0.413	0.032	1	0.001	0.884	0.080
			DS	0.321	0.043	0.456	0.058	0.998	0.008	0.819	0.086
	500	200	Lasso	0.292	0.022	0.428	0.028	1	0.001	0.889	0.067
			DS	0.34	0.021	0.491	0.034	1	0.002	0.775	0.050

Table D.3: Errors of  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}}$  in estimating  $\beta$  measured by  $L_F$  and  $L_2$  averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the TPR when  $\text{FPR} = 0.05$  without and with thresholding.

	$n$	$p$	Method	TPR (5%)							
				$L_F$		$L_2$		Without		With	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Lasso	0.814	0.088	0.898	0.229	0.787	0.161	0.727	0.188
			DS	0.82	0.092	0.908	0.199	0.753	0.185	0.677	0.230
	100	100	Lasso	0.883	0.063	0.963	0.099	0.636	0.216	0.536	0.234
			DS	0.889	0.074	0.983	0.143	0.662	0.228	0.552	0.244
	200	50	Lasso	0.655	0.068	0.753	0.105	0.959	0.053	0.941	0.079
			DS	0.651	0.082	0.743	0.111	0.959	0.052	0.932	0.086
	200	100	Lasso	0.694	0.07	0.842	0.086	0.948	0.07	0.904	0.116
			DS	0.697	0.081	0.849	0.108	0.941	0.08	0.893	0.143
	500	100	Lasso	0.519	0.062	0.73	0.109	0.998	0.004	0.996	0.009
			DS	0.524	0.06	0.755	0.111	0.999	0.004	0.997	0.007
	500	200	Lasso	0.549	0.055	0.83	0.088	0.997	0.004	0.993	0.010
			DS	0.557	0.05	0.907	0.092	0.997	0.006	0.993	0.014
(E3)	100	50	Lasso	0.813	0.092	0.867	0.111	0.745	0.183	0.676	0.218
			DS	0.829	0.09	0.893	0.111	0.709	0.225	0.649	0.247
	100	100	Lasso	0.857	0.078	0.936	0.104	0.654	0.201	0.558	0.223
			DS	0.864	0.08	0.946	0.126	0.635	0.234	0.538	0.270
	200	50	Lasso	0.617	0.07	0.701	0.095	0.972	0.048	0.95	0.086
			DS	0.617	0.075	0.699	0.094	0.97	0.037	0.949	0.060
	200	100	Lasso	0.668	0.078	0.808	0.1	0.948	0.066	0.909	0.122
			DS	0.655	0.087	0.796	0.11	0.953	0.07	0.918	0.122
	500	100	Lasso	0.474	0.055	0.648	0.095	0.999	0.004	0.998	0.007
			DS	0.474	0.062	0.653	0.118	0.999	0.003	0.998	0.006
	500	200	Lasso	0.489	0.055	0.766	0.085	0.999	0.002	0.998	0.005
			DS	0.516	0.053	0.811	0.11	0.999	0.003	0.988	0.082



Table D.4: Errors of  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}^{\text{DS}}$  in estimating  $\Omega$  measured by  $L_F$  and  $L_2$ , averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the TPR when FPR = 0.05 without and with thresholding.

	$n$	$p$	Method	$L_F$		$L_2$		TPR (5%)			
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Without		With	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Lasso	0.582	0.055	0.732	0.155	0.407	0.071	0.329	0.086
			DS	0.582	0.054	0.726	0.105	0.396	0.076	0.323	0.099
	100	100	Lasso	0.615	0.061	0.756	0.059	0.352	0.065	0.25	0.071
			DS	0.621	0.059	0.765	0.064	0.35	0.066	0.243	0.078
	200	50	Lasso	0.504	0.066	0.649	0.157	0.513	0.072	0.454	0.080
			DS	0.502	0.038	0.638	0.06	0.514	0.065	0.452	0.087
	200	100	Lasso	0.522	0.047	0.658	0.067	0.515	0.06	0.392	0.080
			DS	0.525	0.048	0.669	0.064	0.518	0.063	0.392	0.089
	500	100	Lasso	0.442	0.042	0.61	0.149	0.646	0.06	0.524	0.079
			DS	0.436	0.042	0.594	0.135	0.635	0.058	0.53	0.085
	500	200	Lasso	0.457	0.039	0.608	0.066	0.674	0.043	0.484	0.059
			DS	0.447	0.038	0.598	0.063	0.659	0.041	0.493	0.064
(E3)	100	50	Lasso	0.495	0.057	0.652	0.113	0.684	0.125	0.546	0.171
			DS	0.502	0.056	0.655	0.097	0.661	0.147	0.525	0.168
	100	100	Lasso	0.519	0.055	0.696	0.082	0.645	0.125	0.46	0.148
			DS	0.521	0.058	0.696	0.081	0.628	0.145	0.47	0.161
	200	50	Lasso	0.4	0.048	0.541	0.073	0.882	0.071	0.763	0.122
			DS	0.403	0.045	0.547	0.067	0.885	0.066	0.763	0.132
	200	100	Lasso	0.429	0.05	0.586	0.074	0.893	0.073	0.69	0.160
			DS	0.423	0.049	0.571	0.071	0.895	0.074	0.72	0.154
	500	100	Lasso	0.338	0.039	0.499	0.064	0.992	0.016	0.856	0.109
			DS	0.336	0.039	0.499	0.067	0.989	0.019	0.867	0.094
	500	200	Lasso	0.349	0.04	0.522	0.056	0.996	0.009	0.849	0.087
			DS	0.357	0.042	0.542	0.061	0.995	0.009	0.825	0.082

Table D.5: Errors of  $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{DS}}$  in estimating  $\Delta$  measured by  $L_F$  and  $L_2$ , averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E1)–(E2) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the TPR when  $\text{FPR} = 0.05$  without and with thresholding.

	$n$	$p$	Method	$L_F$		$L_2$		TPR (5%)			
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Without		With	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E1)	100	50	Lasso	0.244	0.052	0.585	0.217	1	0	0.998	0.007
			DS	0.243	0.052	0.556	0.162	1	0	0.999	0.006
	100	100	Lasso	0.286	0.085	0.692	0.255	1	0	0.998	0.006
			DS	0.274	0.072	0.646	0.219	1	0	0.997	0.007
	200	50	Lasso	0.241	0.413	0.749	3.01	1	0	0.988	0.092
			DS	0.201	0.04	0.471	0.192	1	0	0.999	0.006
	200	100	Lasso	0.222	0.037	0.499	0.095	1	0	0.996	0.008
			DS	0.224	0.04	0.517	0.13	1	0	0.996	0.009
	500	100	Lasso	0.179	0.023	0.455	0.057	1	0	1	0.004
			DS	0.182	0.029	0.462	0.087	1	0	1	0.003
	500	200	Lasso	0.194	0.03	0.512	0.081	1	0	1	0.004
			DS	0.192	0.035	0.497	0.07	1	0	1	0.003
(E2)	100	50	Lasso	0.432	0.053	0.665	0.129	0.583	0.061	0.539	0.047
			DS	0.435	0.054	0.686	0.148	0.584	0.06	0.54	0.045
	100	100	Lasso	0.476	0.071	0.725	0.119	0.551	0.044	0.516	0.032
			DS	0.483	0.069	0.744	0.126	0.545	0.046	0.51	0.033
	200	50	Lasso	0.391	0.096	0.643	0.434	0.692	0.055	0.614	0.066
			DS	0.383	0.029	0.585	0.092	0.69	0.058	0.613	0.071
	200	100	Lasso	0.402	0.038	0.641	0.134	0.66	0.046	0.584	0.048
			DS	0.406	0.04	0.645	0.119	0.656	0.044	0.581	0.048
	500	100	Lasso	0.363	0.05	0.703	0.436	0.743	0.032	0.695	0.050
			DS	0.357	0.045	0.674	0.385	0.743	0.03	0.693	0.044
	500	200	Lasso	0.366	0.031	0.667	0.21	0.736	0.027	0.686	0.046
			DS	0.359	0.029	0.672	0.229	0.736	0.025	0.684	0.043

### D.2.2 Forecasting

We assess the performance of the forecasting methodology of FNETS which estimates the best linear predictors  $\chi_{n+1|n}$  by one of the two estimators,  $\hat{\chi}_{n+1|n}^{\text{res}}$  (Section 4.1) and  $\hat{\chi}_{n+1|n}^{\text{unr}}$  (Appendix B),  $\xi_{n+1|n}$  by  $\hat{\xi}_{n+1|n}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\hat{\xi}_{n+1|n}^{\text{DS}}$  (denoting the estimators of  $\xi_{n+1|n}$  with Lasso and DS estimators of  $\beta$ , respectively) and finally,  $\mathbf{X}_{n+1|n} = \chi_{n+1|n} + \xi_{n+1|n}$  by their combinations. The estimator  $\hat{\xi}_{n+1|n}$  depends on the choice of the in-sample estimator of  $\chi_t$  (which automatically yields the in-sample estimator of  $\xi_t$ ) but we suppress this dependence in the notations. Fan et al. (2021) propose a forecasting methodology based on VAR modelling of the estimated factors, the results from which we report alongside those from FNETS under the heading FARM.

In Tables D.7 (under (E1)) and D.11 (under (E2)–(E3)), we report the estimation errors of a given forecast, say  $\hat{\gamma}_{n+1|n}$ , in estimating  $\gamma_{n+1|n}$  measured as

$$\frac{|\hat{\gamma}_{n+1|n} - \gamma_{n+1|n}|_2^2}{|\gamma_{n+1|n}|_2^2} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

and additionally, report the in-sample estimation errors of  $\hat{\chi}_t = \hat{\chi}_t^{\text{res}}$  and  $\hat{\chi}_t = \hat{\chi}_t^{\text{unr}}$  measured as  $\sum_t |\hat{\chi}_t - \chi_t|_2^2 / (\sum_t |\chi_t|_2^2)$ . Tables D.8 (under (E1)) and Tables D.12 (under (E2)–(E3)) summarise the forecasting errors measured by

$$\frac{|\hat{\gamma}_{n+1|n} - \gamma_{n+1|n}|_\infty}{|\gamma_{n+1|n}|_\infty}, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

which relates to the norm chosen for theoretical analysis in Propositions 4.1 and B.2 and Proposition 4.3. We also report the forecasting errors measured as

$$\frac{|\hat{\gamma}_{n+1} - \gamma_{n+1}|_2^2}{|\gamma_{n+1}|_2^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

$$\frac{|\hat{\gamma}_{n+1} - \gamma_{n+1}|_\infty^2}{|\gamma_{n+1}|_\infty^2}, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

see Tables D.9, D.10 (under (E1)), D.13 and D.14 (under (E2)–(E3)). Additionally, Table D.6 contains results in the above error measures obtained from the benchmark case when  $\mathbf{X}_t = \xi_t$  under (C0) when  $\xi_t$  is generated according to (E1).

For FNETS, the forecasting performance improves as  $n$  increases regardless of the error measures. The estimation error for  $\chi_{n+1|n}$  decreases with  $p$  while it increases for  $\xi_{n+1|n}$ , which is due to that the factor-adjustment step enjoys the blessing of dimensionality while VAR estimation tends to suffer from the increase of the dimensionality. This observation is consistent with Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, and the former tends to offset latter in the estimation error of  $\mathbf{X}_{n+1|n}$ . The forecasting method based on the unrestricted GDFM (Appendix B) exhibits some numerical instabilities due to the instability of the singular VAR equation sys-

tem adopted for this purpose (see Remark B.1 (d)) which, in turn, may be attributed to the possible over-specification of the VAR order (Hörmann and Nisol, 2021). As such, the performance of  $\hat{\chi}_{n+1|n}^{\text{res}}$  is generally superior even when  $\chi_t$  does not admit a static representation (under (C1)), and the gap between the two estimators gets wider when a static representation exists (under (C2)) as  $n$  and  $p$  increase. In general, we do not observe any systematic effect of the innovation distribution on the forecasting performance.

FARM performs reasonably well when  $n \geq 200$ . In particular, when  $\chi_t$  is generated under (C2), the static factor model offers a valid alternative to GDFM such that FARM marginally outperforms FNETS in in-sample estimation and estimating  $\chi_{n+1|n}$ . However, the performance in estimating the VAR parameters carries forward to producing the forecast of  $\xi_{n+1}$ , which sometimes result in slightly worse forecasts of  $\mathbf{X}_{n+1}$ .

Under (C2), occasionally the best linear predictor  $\chi_{n+1|n}$  has all its elements close to zero and the small value of  $|\chi_{n+1|n}|_2$  inflates the relative estimation error measured as in (D.2); this phenomenon is not observed from the forecasting errors measured with (D.4).

Table D.6: Errors in forecasting  $\mathbf{X}_{n+1}$  by the FNETS measured by (D.2)–(D.5) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C0) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ , which serve as a benchmark.

	$n$	$p$	Method	Mean	SD		$n$	$p$	Method	Mean	SD
(D.2)	100	50	Lasso	0.437	0.253	(D.4)	100	50	Lasso	0.898	0.090
			DS	0.378	0.122				DS	0.896	0.077
	100	100	Lasso	0.748	0.208		100	100	Lasso	0.958	0.044
			DS	0.463	0.133				DS	0.913	0.045
	200	50	Lasso	0.176	0.056		200	50	Lasso	0.853	0.078
			DS	0.277	0.092				DS	0.87	0.069
(D.3)	200	100	Lasso	0.207	0.036	(D.5)	200	100	Lasso	0.873	0.054
			DS	0.326	0.054				DS	0.891	0.046
	500	100	Lasso	0.161	0.035		500	100	Lasso	0.876	0.054
			DS	0.095	0.058				DS	0.868	0.065
	500	200	Lasso	0.179	0.032		500	200	Lasso	0.879	0.035
			DS	0.225	0.108				DS	0.884	0.041
(D.3)	100	50	Lasso	0.651	0.221	(D.5)	100	50	Lasso	0.935	0.117
			DS	0.638	0.146				DS	0.94	0.109
	100	100	Lasso	0.873	0.143		100	100	Lasso	0.974	0.051
			DS	0.724	0.149				DS	0.951	0.071
	200	50	Lasso	0.447	0.116		200	50	Lasso	0.93	0.102
			DS	0.556	0.14				DS	0.939	0.091
(D.3)	200	100	Lasso	0.486	0.102	(D.5)	200	100	Lasso	0.929	0.092
			DS	0.599	0.107				DS	0.936	0.078
	500	100	Lasso	0.418	0.073		500	100	Lasso	0.913	0.103
			DS	0.305	0.106				DS	0.906	0.113
	500	200	Lasso	0.468	0.079		500	200	Lasso	0.919	0.081
			DS	0.49	0.146				DS	0.919	0.083

Table D.7: Forecasting errors of FNETS and FARM measured by (D.2) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the errors of restricted and unrestricted in-sample estimators of  $\chi_t$ ,  $1 \leq t \leq n$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		In-sample		$\mathbf{X}_{n+1 n}$		$\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1 n}$		$\mathbf{X}_{n+1 n}$	
			$\boldsymbol{\chi}_t$	$\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C1)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.355	0.095	0.517	0.358	0.732	0.181	0.491	0.206
					Unrestricted	0.37	0.104	0.543	0.309	0.814	0.326	0.491
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.746	0.177	0.493	0.209
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.845	0.33	0.493
			FARM		0.381	0.143	2.88	7.88	1.07	0.482	1.76	2.460
			100	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.279	0.091	0.455	0.28	0.797	0.137
	Unrestricted	0.319					0.094	0.495	0.233	0.924	0.374	0.462
	Restricted	DS			-	-	-	-	0.78	0.128	0.453	0.174
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.899	0.36	0.452
	FARM				0.288	0.119	4.39	9.37	1.08	0.511	3.2	6.150
	200	50			Restricted	Lasso	0.287	0.07	0.517	0.383	0.52	0.186
			Unrestricted	0.391			0.116	0.662	0.543	0.628	0.375	0.456
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.526	0.172	0.409	0.198
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.646	0.456	0.461
			FARM		0.291	0.084	0.574	0.418	0.989	1.01	0.568	0.310
			200	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.215	0.065	0.379	0.307	0.522	0.137
	Unrestricted	0.259					0.086	0.473	0.382	0.651	0.323	0.35
	Restricted	DS			-	-	-	-	0.509	0.119	0.342	0.156
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.637	0.35	0.354
	FARM				0.216	0.072	0.539	0.696	0.873	0.481	0.516	0.452
	500	100			Restricted	Lasso	0.148	0.022	0.224	0.173	0.276	0.08
			Unrestricted	0.274			0.091	0.386	0.231	0.429	0.235	0.262
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.291	0.085	0.207	0.103
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.452	0.259	0.262
FARM			0.148	0.022	0.251	0.231	0.698	0.477	0.318	0.162		
500			200	Restricted	Lasso	0.1	0.016	0.183	0.115	0.278	0.067	0.185
	Unrestricted	0.21				0.099	0.306	0.159	0.452	0.201	0.216	0.091
	Restricted	DS		-	-	-	-	0.297	0.076	0.188	0.077	
				Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.474	0.218	0.22	0.095
	FARM			0.1	0.016	0.207	0.16	0.673	0.373	0.291	0.154	
	(C2)	100		50	Restricted	Lasso	0.165	0.029	0.874	2.77	0.596	0.19
Unrestricted			0.379				0.145	0.639	0.585	0.673	0.226	0.58
Restricted			DS		-	-	-	-	0.565	0.116	0.431	0.296
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.607	0.161	0.569
FARM			0.167		0.031	3.04	18.1	0.846	0.197	0.798	0.992	
100			100		Restricted	Lasso	0.118	0.03	0.573	1.26	0.779	0.132
		Unrestricted		0.333			0.165	0.57	0.628	0.803	0.126	0.611
		Restricted		DS	-	-	-	-	0.619	0.133	0.39	0.257
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.674	0.131	0.558
		FARM		0.118	0.03	4.82	37.9	0.9	0.185	0.917	1.820	
		200		50	Restricted	Lasso	0.125	0.016	0.77	2.43	0.343	0.09
Unrestricted			0.509				0.142	0.667	0.439	0.451	0.218	0.522
Restricted			DS		-	-	-	-	0.405	0.087	0.287	0.244
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.464	0.177	0.541
FARM			0.136		0.029	0.75	2.42	0.668	0.202	0.397	0.357	
200			100		Restricted	Lasso	0.081	0.017	0.333	0.878	0.352	0.082
		Unrestricted		0.271			0.128	0.449	0.42	0.427	0.133	0.385
		Restricted		DS	-	-	-	-	0.378	0.071	0.242	0.198
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.424	0.098	0.392
		FARM		0.081	0.017	0.248	0.507	0.716	0.179	0.326	0.235	
		500		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.057	0.007	0.289	0.903	0.189	0.045
Unrestricted			0.37				0.132	0.536	0.553	0.284	0.142	0.361
Restricted			DS		-	-	-	-	0.244	0.055	0.154	0.116
					Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.329	0.153	0.373
FARM			0.06		0.013	0.323	1.07	0.553	0.239	0.241	0.172	
500	200		Restricted		Lasso	0.036	0.006	0.214	0.517	0.176	0.03	0.108
		Unrestricted		0.214		0.118	0.392	0.485	0.243	0.116	0.262	0.148
		Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.25	0.038	0.132	0.100	
				Unrestricted	-	-	-	-	0.297	0.091	0.286	0.153
		FARM		0.036	0.006	0.202	0.493	0.529	0.182	0.21	0.141	

Table D.8: Forecasting errors of FNETS and FARM measured by (D.3) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1 n}$		$\xi_{n+1 n}$		$\chi_{n+1 n}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C1)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.682	0.277	0.87	0.158	0.654	0.208
			Unrestricted		0.731	0.28	0.929	0.314	0.646	0.208
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.883	0.201	0.653	0.210
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.971	0.354	0.652	0.199
			FARM		1.05	1.03	1.08	0.388	0.984	0.641
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.636	0.288	0.925	0.159	0.594	0.223
			Unrestricted		0.71	0.247	1.04	0.413	0.607	0.199
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.928	0.154	0.602	0.212
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.04	0.412	0.605	0.203
			FARM		1.12	0.872	1.1	0.413	1.09	0.768
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.704	0.357	0.742	0.208	0.633	0.266
			Unrestricted		0.825	0.414	0.866	0.435	0.669	0.246
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.755	0.211	0.635	0.258
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.881	0.456	0.674	0.252
			FARM		0.677	0.318	1.08	0.702	0.725	0.305
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.636	0.355	0.733	0.19	0.557	0.211
			Unrestricted		0.746	0.386	0.917	0.443	0.562	0.205
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.722	0.164	0.554	0.210
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.91	0.452	0.568	0.210
			FARM		0.614	0.359	0.969	0.46	0.619	0.287
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.461	0.22	0.536	0.123	0.449	0.187
			Unrestricted		0.671	0.315	0.8	0.413	0.507	0.199
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.545	0.125	0.447	0.178
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.797	0.427	0.497	0.180
			FARM		0.409	0.22	0.941	0.616	0.548	0.272
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.44	0.201	0.549	0.126	0.432	0.171
			Unrestricted		0.585	0.194	0.863	0.382	0.441	0.157
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.561	0.136	0.439	0.171
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.873	0.37	0.445	0.159
			FARM		0.374	0.224	0.943	0.559	0.501	0.292
(C2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.834	0.801	0.77	0.188	0.666	0.210
			Unrestricted		0.857	0.347	0.805	0.174	0.758	0.199
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.776	0.152	0.665	0.205
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.793	0.147	0.752	0.192
			FARM		1.09	1.66	0.921	0.162	0.865	0.360
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.781	0.665	0.875	0.138	0.745	0.249
			Unrestricted		0.842	0.518	0.882	0.135	0.828	0.178
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.792	0.147	0.685	0.208
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.818	0.161	0.782	0.172
			FARM		1.08	2.54	0.924	0.156	0.873	0.451
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.719	0.727	0.586	0.115	0.498	0.167
			Unrestricted		0.847	0.233	0.641	0.168	0.678	0.177
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.651	0.118	0.543	0.175
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.679	0.147	0.706	0.160
			FARM		0.681	0.676	0.787	0.183	0.624	0.202
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.593	0.553	0.594	0.13	0.514	0.157
			Unrestricted		0.75	0.308	0.638	0.144	0.624	0.161
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.642	0.12	0.549	0.170
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.671	0.123	0.64	0.150
			FARM		0.482	0.35	0.829	0.177	0.647	0.223
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.459	0.382	0.449	0.089	0.384	0.115
			Unrestricted		0.808	0.336	0.526	0.16	0.594	0.148
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.5	0.104	0.414	0.128
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.555	0.149	0.612	0.149
			FARM		0.435	0.397	0.725	0.197	0.563	0.182
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.432	0.385	0.434	0.08	0.352	0.101
			Unrestricted		0.717	0.359	0.484	0.124	0.499	0.132
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.515	0.082	0.397	0.107
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.549	0.112	0.536	0.127
			FARM		0.385	0.329	0.702	0.197	0.516	0.126

Table D.9: Forecasting errors of FNETS and FARM measured by (D.4) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1}$		$\xi_{n+1}$		$\mathbf{X}_{n+1}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C1)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.677	0.316	0.957	0.063	0.79	0.144
			Unrestricted		0.676	0.249	0.972	0.081	0.787	0.129
				DS	-	-	0.962	0.062	0.794	0.145
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.631	0.296	0.97	0.042	0.781	0.146
			Unrestricted		0.662	0.239	0.992	0.078	0.784	0.121
				DS	-	-	0.965	0.046	0.778	0.144
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.721	0.376	0.922	0.074	0.794	0.195
			Unrestricted		0.752	0.327	0.934	0.106	0.799	0.163
				DS	-	-	0.925	0.074	0.795	0.194
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.582	0.285	0.921	0.049	0.755	0.146
			Unrestricted		0.668	0.333	0.942	0.074	0.766	0.130
				DS	-	-	0.922	0.042	0.755	0.148
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.524	0.327	0.882	0.055	0.7	0.160
			Unrestricted		0.612	0.261	0.9	0.064	0.718	0.140
				DS	-	-	0.882	0.055	0.701	0.161
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.509	0.324	0.893	0.035	0.709	0.151
			Unrestricted		0.569	0.246	0.919	0.052	0.714	0.130
				DS	-	-	0.897	0.035	0.711	0.150
	500	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
			Unrestricted		0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
				DS	-	-	0.923	0.057	0.717	0.129
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
			Unrestricted		0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
				DS	-	-	0.923	0.057	0.717	0.129
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
			Unrestricted		0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
				DS	-	-	0.923	0.057	0.717	0.129
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
			Unrestricted		0.517	0.347	0.953	0.07	0.745	0.170
				DS	-	-	0.923	0.057	0.717	0.129
(C2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.728	0.53	0.928	0.074	0.789	0.219
			Unrestricted		0.768	0.278	0.934	0.074	0.839	0.180
				DS	-	-	0.926	0.062	0.787	0.218
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.644	0.367	0.964	0.038	0.794	0.213
			Unrestricted		0.735	0.257	0.967	0.036	0.857	0.167
				DS	-	-	0.943	0.044	0.781	0.211
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.575	0.43	0.887	0.084	0.708	0.214
			Unrestricted		0.749	0.26	0.917	0.108	0.817	0.161
				DS	-	-	0.896	0.068	0.713	0.213
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.513	0.356	0.9	0.052	0.701	0.195
			Unrestricted		0.626	0.266	0.913	0.059	0.769	0.171
				DS	-	-	0.904	0.044	0.705	0.197
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.524	0.352	0.921	0.058	0.741	0.183
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.354	0.877	0.039	0.698	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182
	500	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.354	0.877	0.039	0.698	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.354	0.877	0.039	0.698	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.354	0.877	0.039	0.698	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.354	0.877	0.039	0.698	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.627	0.315	0.89	0.046	0.75	0.148
				DS	-	-	0.887	0.033	0.703	0.182

Table D.10: Forecasting errors of FNETS and FARM measured by (D.5) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the model (E1) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1)–(C2) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1}$		$\xi_{n+1}$		$\mathbf{X}_{n+1}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(C1)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.738	0.257	0.978	0.08	0.838	0.181
			Unrestricted		0.77	0.219	1.01	0.195	0.843	0.168
				FARM	0.983	0.586	1.02	0.147	1.03	0.441
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.982	0.092	0.835	0.179
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.01	0.204	0.84	0.170
				FARM	1.11	0.818	1.03	0.119	1.1	0.586
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.767	0.284	0.96	0.087	0.851	0.202
			Unrestricted		0.835	0.303	0.978	0.141	0.846	0.183
				FARM	0.746	0.264	1	0.166	0.886	0.224
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.961	0.093	0.855	0.203
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.976	0.156	0.847	0.183
				FARM	0.687	0.321	1.01	0.162	0.82	0.234
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.678	0.265	0.963	0.1	0.799	0.171
			Unrestricted		0.793	0.329	0.988	0.16	0.803	0.170
				FARM	0.583	0.249	0.936	0.09	0.751	0.193
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.936	0.086	0.747	0.190
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.951	0.101	0.755	0.179
				FARM	0.535	0.251	1.02	0.213	0.782	0.220
(C2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.222
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.969	0.074	0.888	0.138
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.972	0.08	0.929	0.102
				FARM	0.762	0.262	0.964	0.088	0.874	0.172
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.774	0.289	0.932	0.106	0.838	0.161
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.94	0.11	0.906	0.130
				FARM	0.726	0.221	0.916	0.084	0.856	0.152
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.939	0.089	0.843	0.156
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.089	0.915	0.118
				FARM	0.721	0.235	0.93	0.087	0.84	0.133
(C3)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.222
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.969	0.074	0.888	0.138
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.972	0.08	0.929	0.102
				FARM	0.762	0.262	0.964	0.088	0.874	0.172
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.774	0.289	0.932	0.106	0.838	0.161
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.94	0.11	0.906	0.130
				FARM	0.726	0.221	0.916	0.084	0.856	0.152
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.939	0.089	0.843	0.156
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.089	0.915	0.118
				FARM	0.721	0.235	0.93	0.087	0.84	0.133
(C4)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.222
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.969	0.074	0.888	0.138
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.972	0.08	0.929	0.102
				FARM	0.762	0.262	0.964	0.088	0.874	0.172
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.774	0.289	0.932	0.106	0.838	0.161
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.94	0.11	0.906	0.130
				FARM	0.726	0.221	0.916	0.084	0.856	0.152
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.939	0.089	0.843	0.156
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.089	0.915	0.118
				FARM	0.721	0.235	0.93	0.087	0.84	0.133
(C5)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.222
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.969	0.074	0.888	0.138
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.972	0.08	0.929	0.102
				FARM	0.762	0.262	0.964	0.088	0.874	0.172
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.774	0.289	0.932	0.106	0.838	0.161
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.94	0.11	0.906	0.130
				FARM	0.726	0.221	0.916	0.084	0.856	0.152
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.939	0.089	0.843	0.156
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.089	0.915	0.118
				FARM	0.721	0.235	0.93	0.087	0.84	0.133
(C6)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.222
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.969	0.074	0.888	0.138
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.972	0.08	0.929	0.102
				FARM	0.762	0.262	0.964	0.088	0.874	0.172
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.774	0.289	0.932	0.106	0.838	0.161
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.94	0.11	0.906	0.130
				FARM	0.726	0.221	0.916	0.084	0.856	0.152
		200	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.939	0.089	0.843	0.156
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.089	0.915	0.118
				FARM	0.721	0.235	0.93	0.087	0.84	0.133
(C7)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.839	0.261	0.95	0.097	0.903	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.9	0.16	0.951	0.094	0.928	0.117
				FARM	0.516	0.268	0.992	0.163	0.781	0.217
		100	Restricted	DS	-	-	0.95	0.084	0.902	0.141
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.944	0.084	0.928	0.112
				FARM	0.982	0.543	0.972	0.098	0.963	0.203
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.846	0.24	0.981	0.051	0.9	0.140
			Unrestricted		0.891	0.141	0.984	0.051	0.942	0.102
				FARM	0.951	0.573	0.99	0.069	0.947	0.



Table D.11: Forecasting errors of FNETS measured by (D.2) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ . We also report the errors of restricted and unrestricted in-sample estimators of  $\chi_t$ ,  $1 \leq t \leq n$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		In-sample		$\chi_{n+1 n}$		$\xi_{n+1 n}$		$\chi_{n+1 n}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.344	0.103	0.594	0.52	0.775	0.3	0.509	0.26
			Unrestricted		0.342	0.099	0.582	0.507	0.912	0.75	0.493	0.231
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.764	0.231	0.518	0.266
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.904	0.682	0.502	0.236
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.252	0.1	0.426	0.256	0.821	0.175	0.442	0.189
			Unrestricted		0.302	0.118	0.507	0.245	0.994	0.434	0.452	0.173
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.832	0.194	0.448	0.202
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	1.02	0.433	0.454	0.178
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.271	0.079	0.504	0.524	0.56	0.258	0.377	0.233
			Unrestricted		0.381	0.119	0.604	0.402	0.748	0.452	0.42	0.21
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.55	0.227	0.381	0.225
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.73	0.424	0.422	0.206
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.205	0.097	0.333	0.226	0.572	0.149	0.309	0.142
			Unrestricted		0.248	0.113	0.396	0.248	0.709	0.31	0.303	0.124
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.581	0.154	0.309	0.139
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.709	0.317	0.301	0.127
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.153	0.064	0.211	0.147	0.324	0.092	0.198	0.112
			Unrestricted		0.262	0.106	0.369	0.254	0.603	0.492	0.238	0.118
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.323	0.094	0.196	0.11
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.631	0.573	0.237	0.122
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.102	0.027	0.209	0.16	0.339	0.085	0.198	0.0887
			Unrestricted		0.188	0.09	0.313	0.203	0.555	0.255	0.199	0.0853
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.348	0.099	0.2	0.0877
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.604	0.281	0.198	0.0852
(E3)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.368	0.102	0.602	0.683	0.717	0.185	0.505	0.264
			Unrestricted		0.378	0.096	0.638	0.389	0.836	0.349	0.524	0.231
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.735	0.192	0.518	0.281
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.857	0.342	0.536	0.244
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.295	0.083	0.518	0.373	0.802	0.174	0.529	0.201
			Unrestricted		0.321	0.088	0.554	0.294	0.922	0.396	0.529	0.194
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.831	0.183	0.538	0.203
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.955	0.474	0.542	0.208
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.295	0.073	0.475	0.714	0.497	0.142	0.377	0.19
			Unrestricted		0.379	0.085	0.588	0.459	0.577	0.292	0.418	0.188
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.497	0.144	0.382	0.199
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.587	0.325	0.415	0.19
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.213	0.057	0.374	0.465	0.534	0.144	0.327	0.152
			Unrestricted		0.28	0.107	0.478	0.246	0.692	0.329	0.36	0.138
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.516	0.146	0.322	0.154
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.675	0.314	0.352	0.137
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.156	0.031	0.279	0.224	0.297	0.082	0.228	0.134
			Unrestricted		0.277	0.104	0.444	0.297	0.469	0.51	0.273	0.137
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.294	0.083	0.227	0.135
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.47	0.508	0.271	0.138
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.104	0.021	0.209	0.166	0.288	0.073	0.193	0.0918
			Unrestricted		0.223	0.111	0.352	0.231	0.494	0.386	0.224	0.11
			Restricted	DS	-	-	-	-	0.318	0.082	0.202	0.0986
			Unrestricted		-	-	-	-	0.533	0.352	0.235	0.115

Table D.12: Forecasting errors of FNETS measured by (D.3) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1 n}$		$\xi_{n+1 n}$		$\mathbf{X}_{n+1 n}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.725	0.322	0.874	0.215	0.661	0.270
			Unrestricted		0.751	0.318	0.991	0.504	0.664	0.269
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.863	0.196	0.663	0.261
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.978	0.499	0.668	0.261
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.617	0.284	0.946	0.311	0.617	0.241
			Unrestricted		0.768	0.35	1.08	0.464	0.623	0.214
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.944	0.322	0.619	0.248
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.1	0.429	0.624	0.218
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.668	0.377	0.731	0.21	0.571	0.252
			Unrestricted		0.774	0.351	0.916	0.451	0.619	0.241
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.724	0.196	0.574	0.252
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.901	0.429	0.615	0.237
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.581	0.251	0.786	0.219	0.538	0.214
			Unrestricted		0.65	0.234	0.967	0.4	0.52	0.200
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.789	0.21	0.531	0.206
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.959	0.417	0.511	0.195
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.478	0.234	0.59	0.157	0.456	0.217
			Unrestricted		0.658	0.28	0.936	0.567	0.482	0.192
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.586	0.153	0.455	0.219
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.964	0.598	0.486	0.205
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.473	0.212	0.622	0.151	0.444	0.155
			Unrestricted		0.605	0.244	0.977	0.432	0.426	0.150
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.632	0.179	0.448	0.158
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.04	0.453	0.421	0.158
(E3)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.698	0.431	0.829	0.162	0.632	0.247
			Unrestricted		0.779	0.274	0.944	0.365	0.672	0.225
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.846	0.161	0.649	0.264
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.954	0.357	0.683	0.242
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.702	0.371	0.918	0.211	0.69	0.232
			Unrestricted		0.787	0.309	1.04	0.413	0.708	0.224
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.938	0.22	0.699	0.235
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.06	0.455	0.714	0.236
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.619	0.331	0.687	0.15	0.589	0.232
			Unrestricted		0.77	0.356	0.788	0.336	0.627	0.237
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.692	0.145	0.587	0.239
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.785	0.363	0.618	0.233
	200	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.58	0.291	0.723	0.167	0.532	0.171
			Unrestricted		0.719	0.262	0.925	0.473	0.561	0.171
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.723	0.186	0.536	0.170
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.923	0.475	0.558	0.171
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.527	0.277	0.556	0.145	0.466	0.199
			Unrestricted		0.715	0.353	0.787	0.51	0.515	0.192
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.543	0.134	0.473	0.201
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.782	0.498	0.514	0.197
	500	200	Restricted	Lasso	0.457	0.223	0.572	0.143	0.455	0.184
			Unrestricted		0.639	0.266	0.851	0.451	0.457	0.183
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.599	0.149	0.457	0.187
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.907	0.488	0.468	0.193

Table D.13: Forecasting errors of FNETS measured by (D.4) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1}$		$\xi_{n+1}$		$\chi_{n+1}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.731	0.349	0.962	0.073	0.809	0.172
			Unrestricted		0.7	0.301	0.99	0.164	0.802	0.165
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.958	0.073	0.811	0.177
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.987	0.151	0.803	0.167
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.678	0.318	0.97	0.044	0.791	0.197
			Unrestricted		0.729	0.261	0.994	0.085	0.796	0.166
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.975	0.055	0.793	0.196
			Unrestricted		-	-	1	0.085	0.795	0.164
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.695	0.354	0.929	0.092	0.778	0.208
			Unrestricted		0.749	0.301	0.95	0.12	0.789	0.162
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.929	0.087	0.78	0.208
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.949	0.118	0.79	0.159
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.627	0.299	0.934	0.054	0.773	0.191
			Unrestricted		0.642	0.236	0.957	0.08	0.768	0.167
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.934	0.057	0.771	0.190
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.957	0.084	0.765	0.167
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.492	0.292	0.893	0.061	0.675	0.169
			Unrestricted		0.582	0.302	0.935	0.108	0.689	0.162
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.892	0.064	0.675	0.168
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.935	0.106	0.689	0.166
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.516	0.275	0.901	0.042	0.694	0.165
			Unrestricted		0.575	0.263	0.931	0.06	0.695	0.150
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.901	0.045	0.694	0.165
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.937	0.067	0.694	0.153
(E3)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.761	0.54	0.946	0.064	0.826	0.203
			Unrestricted		0.786	0.349	0.964	0.089	0.829	0.190
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.947	0.061	0.828	0.204
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.967	0.084	0.832	0.190
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.709	0.293	0.968	0.043	0.854	0.180
			Unrestricted		0.718	0.256	0.987	0.082	0.852	0.157
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.971	0.045	0.855	0.178
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.988	0.086	0.851	0.157
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.617	0.315	0.907	0.085	0.767	0.178
			Unrestricted		0.713	0.315	0.914	0.104	0.78	0.144
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.909	0.081	0.77	0.175
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.919	0.1	0.781	0.142
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.593	0.359	0.916	0.059	0.749	0.163
			Unrestricted		0.65	0.244	0.931	0.071	0.748	0.133
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.915	0.061	0.749	0.163
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.932	0.074	0.748	0.132
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.55	0.352	0.886	0.067	0.72	0.191
			Unrestricted		0.633	0.3	0.907	0.088	0.73	0.160
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.886	0.073	0.718	0.190
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.91	0.096	0.73	0.161
		500	Restricted	Lasso	0.483	0.275	0.892	0.045	0.709	0.157
			Unrestricted		0.578	0.267	0.92	0.066	0.726	0.144
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.897	0.041	0.712	0.157
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.928	0.062	0.729	0.144

Table D.14: Forecasting errors of FNETS measured by (D.5) averaged over 100 realisations (also reported are the standard errors) under the models (E2)–(E3) for the generation of  $\xi_t$  and (C1) for  $\chi_t$  with varying  $n$  and  $p$ .

	$n$	$p$	Method		$\chi_{n+1}$		$\xi_{n+1}$		$\chi_{n+1}$	
			$\chi_t$	$\xi_t$	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(E2)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.789	0.295	0.99	0.078	0.859	0.185
			Unrestricted		0.802	0.303	1.04	0.23	0.858	0.185
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.98	0.081	0.856	0.181
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.03	0.22	0.851	0.182
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.71	0.265	0.973	0.066	0.805	0.189
			Unrestricted		0.789	0.26	0.996	0.114	0.818	0.174
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.985	0.068	0.806	0.190
			Unrestricted		-	-	1.01	0.112	0.817	0.176
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.742	0.279	0.974	0.147	0.806	0.170
			Unrestricted		0.813	0.298	1	0.176	0.827	0.182
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.978	0.127	0.804	0.173
			Unrestricted		-	-	1	0.166	0.827	0.183
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.674	0.186	0.961	0.089	0.805	0.173
			Unrestricted		0.749	0.222	0.998	0.155	0.805	0.181
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.956	0.085	0.802	0.174
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.995	0.16	0.801	0.181
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.578	0.217	0.937	0.107	0.722	0.200
			Unrestricted		0.701	0.271	0.987	0.183	0.727	0.196
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.935	0.102	0.718	0.199
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.987	0.181	0.726	0.199
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.574	0.228	0.945	0.075	0.745	0.172
			Unrestricted		0.668	0.254	0.988	0.139	0.744	0.172
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.952	0.078	0.75	0.172
			Unrestricted		-	-	1	0.155	0.748	0.172
(E3)	100	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.787	0.373	0.974	0.07	0.875	0.191
			Unrestricted		0.845	0.276	0.994	0.104	0.885	0.183
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.972	0.07	0.878	0.195
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.995	0.104	0.886	0.182
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.781	0.287	0.991	0.059	0.908	0.174
			Unrestricted		0.824	0.25	1.01	0.107	0.911	0.159
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.985	0.056	0.907	0.171
			Unrestricted		-	-	1	0.103	0.909	0.156
	200	50	Restricted	Lasso	0.679	0.267	0.97	0.105	0.847	0.186
			Unrestricted		0.803	0.274	0.971	0.135	0.857	0.178
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.97	0.108	0.849	0.187
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.978	0.149	0.858	0.180
		100	Restricted	Lasso	0.662	0.308	0.974	0.071	0.825	0.176
			Unrestricted		0.77	0.246	0.972	0.073	0.838	0.169
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.975	0.074	0.826	0.179
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.976	0.083	0.837	0.171
	500	100	Restricted	Lasso	0.643	0.303	0.963	0.073	0.842	0.182
			Unrestricted		0.771	0.286	0.972	0.096	0.852	0.164
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.961	0.08	0.843	0.181
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.975	0.105	0.852	0.167
		200	Restricted	Lasso	0.576	0.289	0.974	0.071	0.856	0.162
			Unrestricted		0.715	0.284	0.99	0.102	0.868	0.157
			Restricted	DS	-	-	0.975	0.066	0.858	0.160
			Unrestricted		-	-	0.992	0.104	0.869	0.154

## E Proofs

In what follows, for a random variable  $X$  and  $\nu \geq 1$ , we denote  $\|X\|_\nu = (\mathbb{E}|X|^\nu)^{1/\nu}$ .

We work under the following assumption which extends Assumption 2.4 by considering the special case of Gaussianity separately.

**Assumption E.1.** (i)  $\{\mathbf{u}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of zero-mean,  $q$ -dimensional martingale difference vectors with  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbf{I}_q$ , and  $u_{it}$  and  $u_{jt}$  are independent for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq q$  with  $i \neq j$  and all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Also,  $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of zero-mean,  $p$ -dimensional martingale difference vectors with  $\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t) = \mathbf{I}_p$ , and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  and  $\varepsilon_{jt}$  are independent for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq p$  with  $i \neq j$  and all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

(ii) The common and idiosyncratic shocks are uncorrelated, i.e.  $\mathbb{E}(u_{jt}\varepsilon_{it'}) = 0$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$  and  $t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

(iii) Either one of the following conditions holds.

(a) There exists  $\nu > 4$  such that  $\max\{\max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \|u_{jt}\|_\nu^\nu, \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|\varepsilon_{it}\|_\nu^\nu\} \leq \mu_\nu$  for some constant  $\mu_\nu > 0$ .

(b)  $\mathbf{u}_t \sim_{\text{iid}} \mathcal{N}_q(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim_{\text{iid}} \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ .

Accordingly, we define  $\psi_n$  and  $\vartheta_{n,p}$  as in (10) under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a), while

$$\psi_n = \sqrt{\frac{m \log(m)}{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta_{n,p} = \sqrt{\frac{m \log(mp)}{n}} \quad (\text{E.1})$$

under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b).

### E.1 Proof of Proposition 2.1

Let  $\mathcal{D}(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}_\ell z^\ell$ . Under Assumption 2.3, we can find a constant  $B_\xi > 0$  which depends only on  $M_\varepsilon$ ,  $\Xi$  and  $\varsigma$  such that, uniformly over  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\xi,1}(\omega) &= \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi(\omega)\| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \|\mathcal{D}(e^{-i\omega}) \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathcal{D}^*(e^{-i\omega})\| \leq \frac{M_\varepsilon}{2\pi} \|\mathcal{D}(e^{-i\omega})\|_1 \|\mathcal{D}(e^{-i\omega})\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{M_\varepsilon}{2\pi} \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} |D_{\ell,ij}| \right) \left( \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} |D_{\ell,ij}| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{M_\varepsilon}{2\pi} \left( \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{C_{ij}}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma} \right) \left( \max_j \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{C_{ij}}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma} \right) \leq \frac{\Xi^2 M_\varepsilon}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma} \right)^2 \leq B_\xi. \end{aligned}$$

### E.2 Results in Section 3.5

#### E.2.1 Preliminary lemmas

In the following lemmas, we operate under Assumptions 2.2, 2.1, 2.3 and E.1.

Zhang and Wu (2021) extend the functional dependence measure introduced in Wu (2005) for high-dimensional time series. Denote by  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{(\mathbf{u}_v, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_v), v \leq t\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot) = (g_1(\cdot), \dots, g_p(\cdot))^\top$  a  $\mathbb{R}^p$ -valued measurable function such that  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and  $X_{it} = g_i(\mathcal{F}_t)$ . Also let  $\mathcal{F}_{t,\{0\}} = \sigma\{(\mathbf{u}_{-1}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{-1}), (\mathbf{u}'_0, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_0), (\mathbf{u}_1, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1)^\top, \dots, (\mathbf{u}_t, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t)\}$  denote a coupled version of  $\mathcal{F}_t$  with an independent copy  $(\mathbf{u}'_0, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_0)$  replacing  $(\mathbf{u}_0, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)$ . Then, the element-wise functional dependence measure is defined as

$$\delta_{t,\nu,i} = \|g_i(\mathcal{F}_t) - g_i(\mathcal{F}_{t,\{0\}})\|_\nu,$$

the uniform functional dependence measure as

$$\delta_{t,\nu} = \|\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}_t) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}_{t,\{0\}})\|_\infty\|_\nu,$$

the dependence adjusted norms as

$$\|\mathbf{X}_i\|_{\nu,\alpha} = \sup_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell + 1)^\alpha \sum_{t=\ell}^{\infty} \delta_{t,\nu,i} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_\infty\|_{\nu,\alpha} = \sup_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell + 1)^\alpha \sum_{t=\ell}^{\infty} \delta_{t,\nu},$$

and the overall and the uniform dependence adjusted norms as

$$\Psi_{\nu,\alpha} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^p \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_{\nu,\alpha}^{\nu/2} \right)^{2/\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\nu,\alpha} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_{\nu,\alpha}.$$

**Lemma E.1.** Let  $\alpha \leq \varsigma - 1$ .

(i) Under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a), we have

$$\Psi_{\nu,\alpha} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} p^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_\infty\|_{\nu,\alpha} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(p) p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$$

for some constant  $C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} > 0$  depending only on  $\nu$  and  $\varsigma$  (varying on each occasion).

(ii) Under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a)–(b), we have  $\Phi_{\nu,\alpha} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$  for any  $\nu$  for which  $\|u_{jt}\|_\nu$  and  $\|\varepsilon_{it}\|_\nu$  exist.

*Proof.* By Minkowski inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{t,\nu,i} &= \|\mathbf{B}_{t,i} \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{D}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\nu \leq \|\mathbf{B}_{t,i} \mathbf{u}_0\|_\nu + \|\mathbf{D}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\nu, \quad \text{and} \\ \delta_{t,\nu} &= \|\mathbf{B}_t \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{D}_t \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu \leq \|\mathbf{B}_t \mathbf{u}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu + \|\mathbf{D}_t \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Due to independence of  $u_{jt}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , assumed in Assumption E.1 (i), Assumption 2.2 and Lemma D.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), there exists  $C_\nu > 0$  depends only on  $\nu$  (varying from

one instance to another) such that

$$\|\mathbf{B}_{t,i} \mathbf{u}_0\|_\nu = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^q B_{t,ij} u_{j0} \right\|_\nu \leq C_\nu \left( \sum_{j=1}^q \|B_{t,ij} u_{j0}\|_\nu^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C_\nu \|\mathbf{B}_{t,i}\|_2 \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \leq C_\nu \Xi (1+t)^{-\varsigma} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , and

$$\|\|\mathbf{B}_t \mathbf{u}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu \leq C_\nu \log^{1/2}(p) \left( \sum_{k=1}^q \|\mathbf{B}_{t,k}\|_\infty^2 \right)^{1/2} q^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \leq C_\nu \log^{1/2}(p) \Xi (1+t)^{-\varsigma} q^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}.$$

Similarly, from Assumption 2.3 and independence of  $\varepsilon_{it}$  assumed in Assumption E.1 (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}_{t,i} \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\nu &\leq C_\nu \|\mathbf{D}_{t,i} \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2}\|_2 \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \|\mathbf{D}_{t,i}\|_2 \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \\ &\leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \left( \sum_{k=1}^p C_{ik}^2 \right)^{1/2} (1+t)^{-\varsigma} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \Xi (1+t)^{-\varsigma} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Then,

$$\|\|\mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu^\nu \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \|\mathbf{D}_{t,i} \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\nu^\nu \leq p (C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \Xi (1+t)^{-\varsigma})^\nu \mu_\nu \quad (\text{E.2})$$

such that  $\|\|\mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0\|_\infty\|_\nu \leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \Xi (1+t)^{-\varsigma} p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$ . Then, for some constant  $C_{\nu,\Xi} > 0$ ,

$$\delta_{t,\nu,i} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} (1+t)^{-\varsigma} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}, \quad \delta_{t,\nu} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(p) (1+t)^{-\varsigma} p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$$

and setting  $\alpha \leq \varsigma - 1$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\nu,\alpha} &\leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}, \quad \Psi_{\nu,\alpha} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} p^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \quad \text{and} \\ \|\|\mathbf{X}_\cdot\|_\infty\|_{\nu,\alpha} &\leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(p) p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma E.2.** Denote by  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) = [\gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell), 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ . Then, there exists some constant  $C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon}$  depending only on  $\Xi, \varsigma$  defined in Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 (iv) and  $M_\varepsilon$ , such that  $\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell) \leq C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon} (1 + |\ell|)^{-\varsigma}$  and consequently,  $\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sum_{|\ell| > m} \gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell) = O(m^{-\varsigma+1}) = o(m^{-1})$ .

*Proof.* By Assumption E.1 (ii), we have  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) = \mathbf{\Gamma}_\chi(\ell) + \mathbf{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell)$  for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and define  $\gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)$

and  $\gamma_{\xi,ii'}(\ell)$  analogously as  $\gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell)$ . From Assumption 2.2, for some  $h \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_{\chi,ii'}(h)| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{\ell, \ell'=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j, j'=1}^q B_{\ell,ij} B_{\ell',i'j'} u_{j,t-\ell-h} u_{j',t-\ell'} \right) \right| = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j=1}^q B_{\ell,ij} B_{\ell+h,i'j} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{B}_{\ell,i\cdot}\|_2 \|\mathbf{B}_{\ell+h,i'\cdot}\|_2 \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Xi^2}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma (1+\ell+h)^\varsigma} \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Xi^2}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma (1+h)^\varsigma} \leq C_{\Xi,\varsigma} (1+h)^{-\varsigma} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.3})$$

uniformly in  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$  for some  $C_{\Xi,\varsigma} > 0$  depending only on  $\Xi$  and  $\varsigma$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{|\ell|>m} |\gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)| \leq 2C_{\Xi,\varsigma} \sum_{\ell>m} \ell^{-\varsigma} = O(m^{-\varsigma+1})$ . Similarly, from Assumption 2.3 (iv),

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_{\xi,ii'}(h)| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{\ell, \ell'=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{D}_{\ell,i} \cdot \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell-h}) (\mathbf{D}_{\ell',i'} \cdot \mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell'}) \right) \right| = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left| \mathbf{D}_{\ell,i} \cdot \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{D}_{\ell+h,i'}^\top \right| \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{\Gamma}\| \|\mathbf{D}_{\ell,i\cdot}\|_2 \|\mathbf{D}_{\ell+h,i'\cdot}\|_2 \leq M_\varepsilon \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Xi^2}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma (1+\ell+h)^\varsigma} \\ &\leq M_\varepsilon \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Xi^2}{(1+\ell)^\varsigma (1+h)^\varsigma} \leq C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon} (1+h)^{-\varsigma} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

uniformly in  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$  for some  $C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon} > 0$  depending only on  $\Xi$ ,  $\varsigma$  and  $M_\varepsilon$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{|\ell|>m} |\gamma_{\xi,ii'}(\ell)| = O(m^{-\varsigma+1})$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma E.3.** Denote by  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x(\omega) = [\sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega), 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ . Then, there exists a constant  $B_\sigma > 0$  such that  $\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega) \leq B_\sigma$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma E.2, we can find  $B_\sigma$  that depends only on  $\Xi$ ,  $\varsigma$  and  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  such that

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell)| \leq \frac{C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon}}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+|\ell|)^\varsigma} \leq B_\sigma. \quad \square$$

**Lemma E.4.** For all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ , the functions  $\omega \mapsto \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)$  possess derivatives of any order and are of bounded variation, i.e. there exists  $B'_\sigma > 0$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^N |\sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_{k-1})| \leq B'_\sigma$  uniformly in  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any partition of  $[-\pi, \pi]$ ,  $-\pi = \omega_0 < \omega_1 < \dots < \omega_N = \pi$ .

*Proof.* From Lemma E.2,  $\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)| \leq C_{\Xi,\varsigma} (1+|\ell|)^{-\varsigma}$  for all  $\ell$ , which implies that

$$\sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell) e^{-i\omega\ell}$$



has derivatives of all orders. Moreover,

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\omega} \sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega) \right| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| (-i\ell) \gamma_{\chi, ii'}(\ell) e^{-i\omega\ell} \right| \leq \frac{C_{\Xi, \varsigma}}{\pi} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ell}{(1+\ell)^{\varsigma}} \leq C'_{\Xi, \varsigma}$$

for some constant  $C'_{\Xi, \varsigma} > 0$  not depending on  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$  or  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , which entails the bounded variation of  $\sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma E.5.** Let  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell) = [\gamma_{x, ii'}(\ell)]_{i, i'=1}^p$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) = [\widehat{\gamma}_{x, ii'}(\ell)]_{i, i'=1}^p$ . For some fixed  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following holds.

- (i)  $p^{-1} \max_{-s \leq \ell \leq s} \|\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell)\|_F = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ .
- (ii)  $\max_{-s \leq \ell \leq s} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell)|_{\infty} = O_P(\widetilde{\vartheta}_{n,p})$  where

$$\widetilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} = \begin{cases} \frac{p^{2/\nu} \log^3(p)}{n^{1-2/\nu}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b),} \end{cases}$$

see also (12).

*Proof.* In Lemma E.1, for  $\varsigma > 2$ , we can always set  $\alpha = \varsigma - 1 > 1/2 - 2/\nu$ . By Proposition 3.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), there exist universal constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  and constants  $C_{\alpha}, C_{\nu, \alpha} > 0$  that depend only on their subscripts, such that for any  $z > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{-s \leq \ell \leq s} |\widehat{\gamma}_{x, ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{x, ii'}(\ell)| > z \right) &\leq \\ &\begin{cases} \frac{C_{\nu, \alpha} n s^{\nu/4} \Phi_{\nu, \alpha}^{\nu}}{(nz)^{\nu/2}} + C_1 s \exp \left( -\frac{nz^2}{C_{\alpha} \Phi_{4, \alpha}^4} \right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ 2s \exp \left[ -C_2 \min \left( \frac{nz^2}{\Phi_{2,0}^4}, \frac{nz}{\Phi_{2,0}^2} \right) \right] & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b).} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, due to Lemma E.1, the finiteness of  $s$  and since  $\nu > 4$  under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a), there exists some constant  $C > 0$  not dependent on  $i, i'$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \max_{-s \leq \ell \leq s} |\widehat{\gamma}_{x, ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{x, ii'}(\ell)|^2 \right) \leq \frac{C}{n} \quad (\text{E.5})$$

and (i) follows by Chebyshev's inequality (see also Remark E.1). By the same proposition and Lemma E.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{-s \leq \ell \leq s} \|\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell)\|_{\infty} > z \right) &\leq \\ &\begin{cases} \frac{C_{\nu, \alpha} n s^{\nu/4} (\log(p)) \|\mathbf{X}_{\cdot}\|_{\infty} \|\Psi_{\nu, \alpha}\|_{\nu}^{\nu}}{(nz)^{\nu/2}} + C_1 s p^2 \exp \left( -\frac{nz^2}{C_{\alpha} \Phi_{4, \alpha}^4} \right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ 2s p^2 \exp \left[ -C_2 \min \left( \frac{nz^2}{\Phi_{2,0}^4}, \frac{nz}{\Phi_{2,0}^2} \right) \right] & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b),} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

from which (ii) follows.  $\square$

In what follows, we assume that  $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = [\widehat{s}_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$  is an estimator of a Hermitian, positive semi-definite matrix  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$  of a finite rank  $q < p$ . In addition, we have  $\|\mathbf{S}\|_\infty = O(1)$ . Denoting the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{S}$  by  $(\mu_j, \mathbf{e}_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , we assume that there exist pairs of constants  $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$  and constants  $\rho_j \in (0, 1]$  with  $\rho_1 \geq \dots \geq \rho_q$  satisfying

$$\beta_1 \geq \frac{\mu_1}{p^{\rho_1}} \geq \alpha_1 > \beta_2 \geq \frac{\mu_2}{p^{\rho_2}} \geq \alpha_2 > \dots > \beta_q \geq \frac{\mu_q}{p^{\rho_q}} \geq \alpha_q > 0. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Also, we assume that there exist a (deterministic) matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} = [\widetilde{s}_{ii'}, 1 \leq i, i' \leq p]$ , a constant  $C > 0$  not dependent on  $i, i'$  and  $\zeta_{n,p}, \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n, p \rightarrow 0$ , such that

$$\|\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| = O(1), \quad (\text{E.7})$$

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{s}_{ii'} - \widetilde{s}_{ii'})^2] \leq C(\zeta_{n,p})^2, \quad (\text{E.8})$$

$$\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\widehat{s}_{ii'} - \widetilde{s}_{ii'}| = O_P(\bar{\zeta}_{n,p}). \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Finally, we assume that  $p^{1-\rho_q} \zeta_{n,p} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ . Denoting the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{S}$  by  $(\widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_j)$ ,  $j \geq 1$ , let  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}} = [\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_j, 1 \leq j \leq q]$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{M}} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\mu}_j, 1 \leq j \leq q)$  and analogously define  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  with  $(\mu_j, \mathbf{e}_j)$ .

**Lemma E.6.** There exists a unitary, diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$  such that

$$\frac{\mu_q}{p} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O} \right\|_F = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

*Proof.* By (E.7), (E.8) and Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{p} \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| \leq \frac{1}{p} \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}\| + \frac{1}{p} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| \leq \frac{1}{p} \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}\|_F + \frac{1}{p} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right). \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Then by Theorem 2 of Yu et al. (2015), there exist such  $\mathbf{O}$  satisfying

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O}\|_F \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2q} \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\|}{\min(\mu_1 - \mu_2, \mu_q)}$$

which, combined with (E.10), concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma E.7.**

$$\frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathbf{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P \left( q \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right),$$

$$\frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathcal{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

*Proof.* As a consequence of (E.10) and Weyl's inequality, for all  $1 \leq j \leq q$ ,

$$\frac{1}{p} |\widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j| \leq \frac{1}{p} \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right). \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Also from (E.6), there exists  $\alpha_q$  such that  $p^{-1}\mu_q \geq p^{\rho_q-1}\alpha_q$  and thus  $p^{-1}\widehat{\mu}_q \geq p^{\rho_q-1}\alpha_q + O_P(\zeta_{n,p} \vee p^{-1}) = p^{\rho_q-1}\alpha_q(1 + o_P(1))$ , which implies that the matrix  $p^{-1}\mathcal{M}$  is invertible and the inverse of  $p^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$  exists for large enough  $n$  and  $p$ . Therefore,

$$\left\| \left( \frac{\mathcal{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| = \frac{p}{\mu_q} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| = \frac{p}{\widehat{\mu}_q} = \frac{1}{p^{-1}\mu_q(1 + o_P(1))}.$$

Then from (E.11), we have

$$\left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathcal{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = \sqrt{p^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{\widehat{\mu}_j} - \frac{1}{\mu_j} \right)^2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{p^{-1}|\widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j|}{p^{-1}\widehat{\mu}_j \cdot p^{-1}\mu_j} = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\mu_q^2} \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right).$$

The second claim follows similarly.  $\square$

**Lemma E.8.** Let  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i$  denote the  $p$ -vector whose  $i$ -th element is one and the rest are set to be zero. Then, with  $\mathbf{O}$  defined in Lemma E.6,

(i) uniformly for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$  (in the sense described in Remark E.1),

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O} \right) \right|_2 = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

(ii) In addition,

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O} \right) \right|_2 = O_P \left( \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

*Proof.* By (E.7), (E.8) and Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}) \right|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}) \right|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \quad (\text{E.12})$$

uniformly in  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Then, by (E.12), (E.6), Lemmas E.6–E.7 and the finiteness of the

elements of  $\mathbf{S}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O}) \right|_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left[ \widehat{\mathbf{S}}\widehat{\mathbf{E}} \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \mathbf{S}\mathbf{E} \left( \frac{\mathbf{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{O} \right] \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\mu_q^2}{p^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}) \right|_2 \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{S} \right|_2 \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{M}}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathbf{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{S} \right|_2 \left\| \left( \frac{\mathbf{M}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{E}} - \mathbf{E}\mathbf{O} \right\| \right\} = O_P \left( \zeta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , and thus (i) follows. The claim (ii) follows analogously, except that (E.12) is replaced by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}) \right|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}) \right|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}\| = O_P \left( \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right),$$

where the inequality follows from (E.7) and (E.9).  $\square$

### E.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In what follows, by  $\mathbf{e}_{x,j}(\omega)$ , we denote the eigenvectors of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x(\omega)$  corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\mu_{x,j}(\omega)$ , and we similarly define  $\mathbf{e}_{\chi,j}(\omega)$  and  $\mathbf{e}_{\xi,j}(\omega)$ .

Recall the decomposition of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega)$  as

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega) = \mathbf{E}_\chi(\omega) \mathbf{M}_\chi(\omega) \mathbf{E}_\chi^*(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_{\chi,j}(\omega) \mathbf{e}_{\chi,j}(\omega) \mathbf{e}_{\chi,j}^*(\omega),$$

where  $\mathbf{M}_\chi(\omega)$  denotes the diagonal matrix with  $\mu_{\chi,1}(\omega) \geq \dots \geq \mu_{\chi,q}(\omega)$ , the  $q$  eigenvalues of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\chi(\omega)$ , on its diagonal, and  $\mathbf{E}_\chi(\omega) = [\mathbf{e}_{\chi,j}(\omega), 1 \leq j \leq q]$  the matrix of the normalised eigenvectors associated with  $\mu_{\chi,j}(\omega)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ . In what follows, we assume the conditions made in Theorem 3.1 are met and prove a series of results. Then, Theorem 3.1 is a direct consequence of Proposition E.16 (ii).

**Proposition E.9.** There exists a constant  $C > 0$  not dependent on  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega) \right|^2 \right) \leq C \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* Noting that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{\omega} \left| \widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega) \right|^2 \right)$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2 \right) + 2 \sup_{\omega} |\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega)) - \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega)|^2, \quad (\text{E.13})$$

we first address the first term in the RHS of (E.13). In Lemma E.1, for  $\varsigma > 2$ , we can always set  $\alpha = \varsigma - 1 > 1/2 - 2/\nu$ . Then, from the finiteness of  $\Phi_{\nu,\alpha}$  shown therein and by Proposition 4.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), there exist universal constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  and constants  $C_\alpha, C_{\nu,\alpha} > 0$  that depend only on their subscripts, such that for any  $z > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))| > z \right) &\leq \\ &\begin{cases} \frac{C_{\nu,\alpha} n m^{\nu/2} \Phi_{\nu,\alpha}^\nu}{(nz)^{\nu/2}} + C_1 m \exp \left( -\frac{nz^2}{C_\alpha m \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4} \right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ C_2 m \exp \left[ -C_3 \min \left( \frac{nz^2}{m \Phi_{2,0}^4}, \frac{nz}{m \Phi_{2,0}^2} \right) \right] & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b).} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

Noting that for any positive random variable  $Y$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}(Y) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Y > y) dy$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}(\sup_{\omega} |\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2) \leq C \psi_n^2$  for some constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $i, i'$  (see Remark E.1). Turning our attention to the second term in the RHS of (E.13),

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sup_{\omega} 2\pi |\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega)) - \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega)| \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sum_{\ell=-m}^m \frac{|\ell|}{m} |\gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell)| + \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sum_{|\ell| > m} |\gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell)| = I + II. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma E.2 and that  $\varsigma > 2$ , there exists a constant  $C'_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon} > 0$  such that

$$I \leq 2C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{\ell}{m(1+\ell)^\varsigma} \leq \frac{2C_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon}}{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{(1+\ell)^{\varsigma-1}} \leq \frac{C'_{\Xi,\varsigma,\varepsilon}}{m}$$

and  $II = O(m^{-\varsigma+1})$ , thus  $I + II = O(m^{-1})$  uniformly in  $i, i'$  and  $\omega$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark E.1.* All the probabilistic statements leading to the Frobenius norm bound in Theorem 3.1 are due to Proposition E.9, which allows for deriving non-asymptotic bounds. As in Forni et al. (2017), in what follows, we state that  $|a_{i,i'}| = O_P(\psi_n)$  uniformly in  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$  when for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\eta(\epsilon) > 0$  independent of  $i, i'$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\psi_n^{-1} |a_{i,i'}| > \eta(\epsilon)) < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } n \text{ and } p.$$

Then, since  $\psi_n^{-2} \mathbb{E}(|a_{i,i'}|^2) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\psi_n^{-2} |a_{i,i'}|^2 > z) dz$ , we interchangeably write that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $i, i'$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(|a_{i,i'}|^2) \leq C \psi_n^2$  for all  $n$  and  $p$ . To see this, let  $t = C \psi_n$  with  $\psi_n$  defined as in Theorem 3.1. Then, under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),

there exists large enough constants  $C, C' > 0$  that do not depend on  $i, i'$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2 \right) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2 \geq z \right) dz \\
&= \int_0^{t^2} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2 \geq z \right) dz + \int_{t^2}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))|^2 \geq z \right) dz \\
&\leq t^2 + \int_{t^2}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} |\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_{x,ii'}(\omega))| \geq \sqrt{z} \right) dz \\
&\leq t^2 + \int_{t^2}^\infty \frac{C_{\nu,\alpha} n m^{\nu/2} \Phi_{\nu,\alpha}^\nu}{(n\sqrt{z})^{\nu/2}} dz + \int_{t^2}^\infty C_1 m \exp \left( -\frac{nz}{C_\alpha m \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4} \right) dz \\
&= t^2 + \left[ -\frac{C_{\nu,\alpha} n^{1-\nu/2} m^{\nu/2} \Phi_{\nu,\alpha}^\nu}{(\nu/4-1)} z^{-\nu/4+1} \right]_{t^2}^\infty + \left[ -\frac{C_1 C_\alpha \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4 m^2}{n} \exp \left( -\frac{nz}{C_\alpha m \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4} \right) \right]_{t^2}^\infty \\
&\leq \left( 1 + \frac{C_{\nu,\alpha} \Phi_{\nu,\alpha}^\nu}{(\nu/4-1) C^{\nu/2}} + \frac{C_1 C_\alpha \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4 m^{1-C^2/(C_\alpha \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4)}}{C^2 \log(m)} \right) t^2 \leq C' t^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use (E.14) and that  $t = C(mn^{-1+2/\nu} \vee \sqrt{m \log(m)/n})$  under the assumption. The case under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b) is handled analogously. In the remainder of the paper, we continue to write the boundedness in mean square interchangeably with the  $O_P$  bound where similar arguments apply due to the upper bound on the tail probability.

**Proposition E.10.**

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left| \hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega) - \Sigma_x(\omega) \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \right).$$

*Proof.* In Lemma E.1, for  $\varsigma > 2$ , we can always set  $\alpha = \varsigma - 1 > 1/2 - 2/\nu$ . Then, by Proposition 4.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), there exist universal constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  and constants  $C_\alpha, C_{\nu,\alpha} > 0$  that depend only on their subscripts, such that for any  $z > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\omega} \left| \hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega)) \right|_\infty > z \right) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C_{\nu,\alpha} n m^{\nu/2} (\log^{5/4}(p)) \|\mathbf{X}\|_\infty \|\Psi_{\nu,\alpha}\|_\infty^\nu}{(nz)^{\nu/2}} + C_1 m p^2 \exp \left( -\frac{nz^2}{C_\alpha m \Phi_{4,\alpha}^4} \right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ C_2 m p^2 \exp \left[ -C_3 \min \left( \frac{nz^2}{m \Phi_{2,0}^4}, \frac{nz}{m \Phi_{2,0}^2} \right) \right] & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b).} \end{cases}$$

Thanks to Lemma E.1, it follows that  $\sup_{\omega} |\hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega))|_\infty = O_P(\vartheta_{n,p})$ . As for the bias term, we apply the arguments analogous to those adopted in the proof of Proposition E.9 and show  $\sup_{\omega} |\mathbb{E}(\hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega)) - \Sigma_x(\omega)|_\infty = O(m^{-1})$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

The following three lemmas follow from Lemmas E.6–E.8 with  $\hat{\mathbf{S}} = \hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega)$  and  $\mathbf{S} = \Sigma_x(\omega)$ , as conditions (E.6)–(E.9) are met by Assumption 2.1 and Propositions 2.1, E.9 and E.10, with

the supremum over  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$  taken where relevant.

**Lemma E.11.** Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) = [\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j}(\omega), j = 1, \dots, q]$ . There exists a unitary, diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{O}(\omega) \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$  for each  $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , such that

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}(\omega)}{p} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathbf{O}(\omega) \right\|_F = O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

**Lemma E.12.** Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) = \text{diag}(\widehat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega), j = 1, \dots, q)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega)}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\chi}(\omega)}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F &= O_P \left( q \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right), \\ \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega)}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\chi}(\omega)}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| &= O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma E.13.** Let  $\varphi_i$  denote the  $p$ -vector whose  $i$ -th element is one and the rest are set to be zero. Then with  $\mathbf{O}(\omega)$  defined in Lemma E.11,

(i) uniformly for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,

$$\sqrt{p} \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left| \varphi_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathbf{O}(\omega) \right) \right|_2 = O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

(ii) In addition,

$$\sqrt{p} \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \varphi_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathbf{O}(\omega) \right) \right|_2 = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

**Lemma E.14.** (i)  $\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \mu_{\chi,j}^{1/2}(\omega) \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |e_{\chi,ij}(\omega)| = O(1)$ .

(ii) If  $\psi_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \widehat{\mu}_{x,j}^{1/2}(\omega) |\widehat{e}_{x,ij}(\omega)| = O_P(1)$  uniformly in  $1 \leq i \leq p$ .

(iii) If  $\vartheta_{n,p} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \widehat{\mu}_{\chi,j}^{1/2}(\omega) \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{e}_{x,ij}(\omega)| = O_P(1)$ .

*Proof.* Note that by Assumption E.1 (ii) and Lemma E.3,  $\sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega) = \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) + \sigma_{\xi,ii'}(\omega)$  and  $\max_{i,i'} \sup_{\omega} \sigma_{x,ii'}(\omega) \leq B_{\sigma} < \infty$ . Then from that  $\sigma_{\chi,ii}(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_{\chi,j}(\omega) |e_{\chi,ij}(\omega)|^2 \leq B_{\sigma}$ , the claim (i) follows. Next, by Proposition E.9,

$$\sup_{\omega} \sum_{j=1}^q \widehat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega) |\widehat{e}_{x,ij}(\omega)|^2 \leq \sup_{\omega} \widehat{\sigma}_{x,ii}(\omega) \leq B_{\sigma} + O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \right)$$

uniformly over  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and (E.11) indicates that  $\hat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$  for  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , from which (ii) follows. Also by Proposition E.10 and Lemma E.3,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sup_{\omega} \sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega) |\hat{e}_{x,ij}(\omega)|^2 \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sup_{\omega} \hat{\sigma}_{x,ii}(\omega) \leq B_{\sigma} + O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \right)$$

which, combined with (E.11), leads to (iii).  $\square$

**Proposition E.15.** (i) Uniformly over  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ ,

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} |\hat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)| = O_P \left( q \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

(ii) In addition,

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\hat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)| = O_P \left( q \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} |\hat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)| = \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \left( \hat{\Sigma}_{\chi}(\omega) - \Sigma_{\chi}(\omega) \right) \varphi_{i'} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left\{ \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \left( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \right) \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}^*(\omega) \varphi_{i'} \right| \right. \\ & \quad + \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \left( \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathcal{M}_{\chi}(\omega) \right) \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}^*(\omega) \varphi_{i'} \right| \\ & \quad \left. + \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \mathcal{M}_{\chi}(\omega) \left( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \right)^* \varphi_{i'} \right| \right\} = I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas E.12, E.13 (i), E.14 (i)–(ii) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega) \hat{e}_{x,i'j}^* \cdot \varphi_i^{\top} \left( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \right) \varphi_{i'} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \cdot \sqrt{p} \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \left( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \mathcal{O}(\omega) \right) \right|_2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\mu}_{x,j}^2(\omega) |\hat{e}_{x,i'j}(\omega)|^2} \\ &= O_P \left( \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega)} \right) = O_P \left( \sqrt{q} \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $i$  and  $i'$ , and  $III$  can be handled analogously. By (E.11) and Lemma E.14 (ii),

$$II \leq \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \sqrt{p} \left| \varphi_i^{\top} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}(\omega) \right|_2 \cdot \frac{1}{p} \left\| \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) - \mathcal{M}_{\chi}(\omega) \right\| \cdot \sqrt{p} \left| \varphi_{i'}^{\top} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{x,1:q}(\omega) \right|_2$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= O_P \left( \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \cdot \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)}{p^2} \sqrt{p \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\mu_{\chi,j}(\omega)} \cdot p \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\widehat{\mu}_{x,j}(\omega)}} \right) \\
&= O_P \left( q \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , which proves (i). As for (ii), we take analogous steps with Lemmas E.13 (ii) and E.14 (iii) replacing Lemmas E.13 (i) and E.14 (ii), respectively.  $\square$

**Proposition E.16.** For  $0 \leq \ell \leq s$  with some fixed  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

(i) uniformly over  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ ,

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_{\chi,ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)} \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

(ii) In addition,

$$\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\widehat{\gamma}_{\chi,ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)} \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{\gamma}_{\chi,ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{\chi,ii'}(\ell)| &= \left| \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^m \widehat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) e^{i\omega_k \ell} - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) e^{i\omega \ell} d\omega \right| \\
&\leq \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^m |\widehat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k)| \\
&+ \left| \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^m \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) e^{i\omega_k \ell} - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) e^{i\omega \ell} d\omega \right| = I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition E.15 (i),

$$I \leq 2\pi \sup_{\omega} |\widehat{\sigma}_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega)} \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

Next, we can find  $\{\omega_k^*\}_{k=-m}^{m-1}$  and  $\{\omega_k^\circ\}_{k=-m}^{m-1}$  with  $\omega_k^*, \omega_k^\circ \in [\omega_k, \omega_{k+1}]$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
II &\leq \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^{m-1} \max_{\omega_k \leq \omega \leq \omega_{k+1}} |\sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) e^{i\omega_k \ell} - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega) e^{i\omega \ell}| \\
&\leq \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^{m-1} \max_{\omega_k \leq \omega \leq \omega_{k+1}} |\sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega_k) - \sigma_{\chi,ii'}(\omega)|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{2\pi \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \sup_{\omega} |\sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega)|}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^{m-1} \max_{\omega_k \leq \omega \leq \omega_{k+1}} \left| e^{i\omega_k \ell} - e^{i\omega \ell} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^{m-1} \left( |\sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_k) - \sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_k^*)| + |\sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_{k+1}) - \sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_k^*)| \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{2\pi B_{\sigma}}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^{m-1} \left( \left| e^{i\omega_k \ell} - e^{i\omega_k^{\circ} \ell} \right| + \left| e^{i\omega_{k+1} \ell} - e^{i\omega_k^{\circ} \ell} \right| \right) = III + IV,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma E.3. Then by Lemma E.4, the functions  $\omega \mapsto \sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega)$  possess derivatives of any order and are of bounded variation such that  $III = O(m^{-1})$ . Also from the finiteness of  $s$  (Assumption B.2 (i)) and as the exponential function has bounded variation,  $IV = O(m^{-1})$  uniformly in  $0 \leq \ell \leq s$ , which completes the proof of (i). As for (ii), by Proposition E.15 (ii),

$$\frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^m \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\hat{\sigma}_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_k) - \sigma_{\chi, ii'}(\omega_k)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi, q}^2(\omega)} \left( \vartheta_{n, p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right),$$

which replaces the above  $I$ . Since  $II$  is deterministic and the bound derived above is uniform over  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

### E.2.3 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Proposition 3.2 is a direct consequence of Corollary E.17.

**Corollary E.17.** For  $0 \leq \ell \leq d$ , the following statements hold.

(i) Uniformly over  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ , we have

$$|\hat{\gamma}_{\xi, ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{\xi, ii'}(\ell)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\chi, q}^2(\omega)} \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

(ii) In addition,

$$\max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} |\hat{\gamma}_{\xi, ii'}(\ell) - \gamma_{\xi, ii'}(\ell)| = O_P \left( \frac{qp^2}{\inf_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \mu_{\chi, q}^2(\omega)} \left( \vartheta_{n, p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* Noting that  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\xi}(\omega) = \hat{\Sigma}_x(\omega) - \hat{\Sigma}_{\chi}(\omega)$  by Assumption E.1 (ii), the result in (i) is an immediate consequence of Lemma E.5 (i) (see also (E.5)) and Proposition E.16 (i). Similarly, (ii) follows from Lemma E.5 (ii) and Proposition E.16 (ii).  $\square$

### E.2.4 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Throughout, we refer to the estimator obtained as in (8) as  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$  and the tuning parameter by  $\lambda^{\text{las}}$ .

The problem in (8) can be solved in parallel as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{pd}} \mathbf{m}^\top \hat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{m} - 2\mathbf{m}^\top \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} + \lambda^{\text{las}} |\mathbf{m}|_1,$$

with  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\text{las}} = [\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}}, 1 \leq j \leq p]$ .

Throughout the proof, we condition our arguments on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ . We first establish the followings:

(C1)  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  is positive semi-definite.

(C2) **Lower restricted eigenvalue:**  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v} \geq \kappa |\mathbf{v}|^2 - \tau |\mathbf{v}|_1^2$  for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{dp}$ , with curvature  $\kappa = 2\pi m_\xi$  and tolerance  $\tau = C_\xi(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ .

(C3) **Deviation bound:**  $|\hat{\mathbf{g}} - \hat{\mathbb{G}}\boldsymbol{\beta}|_\infty \leq C_\xi(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + 1)(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ .

To see (C1), note that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,

$$\mathbf{a}^\top (2\pi \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x(\omega)) \mathbf{a} = \sum_{\ell=-m}^m K\left(\frac{\ell}{m}\right) \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(\ell) \exp(-i\ell\omega) = \mathbf{e}(\omega)^* \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(0) & \dots & \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(m-1) \\ & \ddots & \\ \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(-m+1) & \dots & \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(0) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}(\omega),$$

where  $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(\ell) = n^{-1} \sum_{t=\ell+1}^n (\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell})(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{X}_t)$  and  $\mathbf{e}(\omega) = (e^{-i\omega\ell}/\sqrt{m}, 1 \leq \ell \leq m)^\top$ . From the positive semi-definiteness of the sample autocovariance function  $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{a}}(\cdot)$  (see e.g. McLeod and Jimenez (1984)), that of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x(\omega)$  follows. Then,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\xi(\omega) = \sum_{j>q} \hat{\mu}_{x,j} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{x,j}^*$  is also positive semi-definite. Noting that

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}} = \frac{2\pi}{2m+1} \sum_{k=-m}^m \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 1} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k(d-1)} \\ e^{i\omega_k(-1)} & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k(d-2)} \\ & & \ddots & \\ e^{i\omega_k(1-d)} & e^{i\omega_k(2-d)} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} \end{bmatrix} \otimes \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\xi(\omega_k),$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product, and that for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ,

$$\mathbf{a}^* \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 1} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k(d-1)} \\ e^{i\omega_k(-1)} & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k(d-2)} \\ & & \ddots & \\ e^{i\omega_k(1-d)} & e^{i\omega_k(2-d)} & \dots & e^{i\omega_k \cdot 0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} = \left| \sum_{j=1}^d a_j e^{-i\omega_k j} \right|^2 \geq 0,$$

we have  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  positive semi-definite.

To see (C2), conditional on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , we have

$$\max \left( \left| \hat{\mathbb{G}} - \mathbb{G} \right|_\infty, |\hat{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}|_\infty \right) = \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq d} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_\xi(\ell) - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\xi(\ell) \right|_\infty \leq C_\xi \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right). \quad (\text{E.15})$$

Then, uniformly over  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{dp}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbb{G} \mathbf{v} - \left| \mathbf{v}^\top (\widehat{\mathbb{G}} - \mathbb{G}) \mathbf{v} \right| \geq \Lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{G}) |\mathbf{v}|_2^2 - \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}} - \mathbb{G} \right|_\infty |\mathbf{v}|_1^2$$

such that on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , we can set  $\kappa = \Lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{G}) \geq 2\pi m_\xi$  and  $\tau = C_\xi(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ . Also from (E.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mathbf{g}} - \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \boldsymbol{\beta}|_\infty &\leq |\widehat{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}|_\infty + |(\widehat{\mathbb{G}} - \mathbb{G}) \boldsymbol{\beta}|_\infty \leq |\widehat{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}} - \mathbb{G} \right|_\infty \\ &\leq C_\xi(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + 1) \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that (C3) follows.

Denote by  $\mathbf{v} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}$  and for any vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i, 1 \leq i \leq p)^\top$  and a set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ , we write  $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}} = (a_i \mathbb{I}_{\{i \in \mathcal{A}\}}, 1 \leq i \leq p)^\top$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{S}_j$  denote the support of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}$  such that  $|\mathcal{S}_j| = s_{0,j}$ . Then by construction,

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}})^\top \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - 2(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{g}} + \lambda^{\text{las}} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}}|_1 &\leq \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} - 2\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{g}} + \lambda^{\text{las}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1, \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v} &\leq \lambda^{\text{las}} \left( |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 - |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}}|_1 \right) - 2\mathbf{v}^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \right) \\ &\leq \lambda^{\text{las}} (|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} + \mathbf{v}|_1) + \frac{\lambda^{\text{las}}}{2} |\mathbf{v}|_1 \leq \lambda^{\text{las}} \left( |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 - |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j^c}|_1 \right) + \frac{\lambda^{\text{las}}}{2} |\mathbf{v}|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.16})$$

where the second inequality follows from (C3) and the choice of  $\lambda^{\text{las}}$ , and the last from that

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} + \mathbf{v}|_1 = |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} + \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 + |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j^c}|_1 \geq |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 - |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 + |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j^c}|_1.$$

From the above and (C1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v} \leq \frac{\lambda^{\text{las}}}{2} \left( 3|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 - |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j^c}|_1 \right), \\ \text{i.e. } |\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j^c}|_1 &\leq 3|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 \text{ and } |\mathbf{v}|_1 \leq 4|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_j}|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_{0,j}} |\mathbf{v}|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these observations with (C2) and (E.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 6\lambda^{\text{las}} \sqrt{s_{0,j}} |\mathbf{v}|_2 &\geq 2\pi m_\xi |\mathbf{v}|_2^2 - C_\xi \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) |\mathbf{v}|_1^2 \\ &\geq 2\pi m_\xi |\mathbf{v}|_2^2 \left( 1 - \frac{8C_\xi s_{0,j} (\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})}{\pi m_\xi} \right) \geq \pi m_\xi |\mathbf{v}|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

from the condition imposed on  $s_{\text{in}} \geq s_{0,j}$ . Hence, for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , we have

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_\infty \leq \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_2 \leq \frac{6\sqrt{s_{0,j}} \lambda^{\text{las}}}{\pi m_\xi}, \quad \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_1 \leq \frac{24s_{0,j} \lambda^{\text{las}}}{\pi m_\xi}.$$

Besides, by Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions, we have

$$\mathbf{0} \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}} + \lambda^{\text{las}} \text{sgn}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}})$$

where, defined as

$$\text{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0, \\ -1 & \text{if } x < 0, \\ [-1, 1] & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases}$$

$\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  acts element-wise. It implies that  $\left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \right|_{\infty} \leq \lambda^{\text{las}}$ . Also noting that from (E.16), we have

$$0 \leq |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 - |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \left( |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 + |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}|_1 \right), \quad \text{i.e.} \quad |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq 3|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1.$$

Therefore, we obtain from (C3),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} \right|_{\infty} &= \left| \mathbb{G}^{-1} \left( \mathbb{G}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} + \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} + \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} - \mathbf{g}_{\cdot j} \right) \right|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \left( \left| \mathbb{G} - \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \right|_{\infty} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{las}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} \right|_{\infty} + |\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} - \mathbf{g}_{\cdot j}|_{\infty} \right) \leq 4 \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{las}} \end{aligned}$$

which, together with the trivial bound  $|\mathbf{v}|_{\infty} \leq |\mathbf{v}|_2$ , proves the final claim.

## E.2.5 Proof of Proposition A.1

As in Appendix E.2.4, we condition our arguments on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ . Note that solving (A.1) is equivalent to solving

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{pd}} |\mathbf{m}|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\mathbf{m} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} \right|_{\infty} \leq \lambda^{\text{DS}} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq p,$$

(see e.g. Lemma 1 of Cai et al. (2011)). Then,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a feasible solution to (A.1) from (C3), and therefore  $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}}|_1 \leq |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ . Also, writing  $\mathbf{v} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{v}^{\top} \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v} \leq |\widehat{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{v}|_{\infty} |\mathbf{v}|_1 \leq 2\lambda^{\text{DS}} |\mathbf{v}|_1.$$

Then using (C1)–(C3) and the arguments analogous to those adopted in Appendix E.2.4, we obtain the results with slightly different multiplicative constants. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\cdot j} \right|_{\infty} &= \left| \mathbb{G}^{-1} \left( \mathbb{G}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} + \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} + \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} - \mathbf{g}_{\cdot j} \right) \right|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \left( \left| \mathbb{G} - \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \right|_{\infty} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\mathbb{G}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} \right|_{\infty} + |\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{\cdot j} - \mathbf{g}_{\cdot j}|_{\infty} \right) \leq 2 \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.17})$$

for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ . In fact, without requiring exact sparsity, we can control the estimation error in  $\ell_1$ -norm. Let  $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \infty)$  be a threshold level to be defined later, and denote by

$$\tilde{s}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{pd} \min \left( \frac{|\beta_{ij}|}{\tilde{\lambda}}, 1 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j = \left\{ 1 \leq i \leq pd : |\beta_{ij}| > \tilde{\lambda} \right\}.$$

By definition, it is easily seen that

$$\tilde{s}_j = |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j| + \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c} \frac{|\beta_{ij}|}{\tilde{\lambda}} \geq |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j|. \quad (\text{E.18})$$

Then for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\cdot j} \right|_1 &\leq \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c, j}^{\text{DS}} \right|_1 + \left| \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c, j} \right|_1 + \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j} \right|_1 = \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} \right|_1 - \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} \right|_1 + \left| \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c, j} \right|_1 + \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j} \right|_1 \\ &\leq |\beta_{\cdot j}|_1 - \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} \right|_1 + \left| \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c, j} \right|_1 + \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j} \right|_1 \leq 2 \left| \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j^c, j} \right|_1 + 2 \left| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j, j} \right|_1 \\ &\leq 2\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{s}_j + 4|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j| \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}} \leq 2\tilde{s}_j(\tilde{\lambda} + 2\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from that  $|\hat{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}}|_1 \leq |\beta_{\cdot j}|_1$ , the third from the triangular inequality, the fourth from (E.17), and the last from (E.18). Setting  $\tilde{\lambda} = \|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}}$ , by the definition of  $s_{0,j}(\varrho)$ , we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{s}_j \leq \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{pd} \min \left( \frac{|\beta_{ij}|^e}{\tilde{\lambda}^e}, 1 \right) \leq s_{0,j}(\varrho) \tilde{\lambda}^{1-e}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left| \hat{\beta}^{\text{DS}} - \beta \right|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \left| \hat{\beta}_{\cdot j}^{\text{DS}} - \beta_{\cdot j} \right|_1 \leq 6 \sum_{j=1}^p s_{0,j}(\varrho) \tilde{\lambda}^{1-\rho} = 6s_0(\varrho) (\|\mathbb{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}})^{1-e}.$$

## E.2.6 Proof of Proposition 3.5 (i)

We prove the following proposition from which Proposition 3.5 (i) follows. Throughout, we refer to the estimator obtained as in (8) as  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{las}}$ .

**Proposition E.18.** (i) Suppose that Assumption 2.3 is met and the estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  fulfils

$$\left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_1 \leq C_\beta s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p} \quad (\text{E.19})$$

with some constant  $C_\beta > 0$ . Then on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$  defined in (11), there exists a large enough constant

$C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} - \mathbf{\Gamma} \right|_{\infty} \leq C \phi_{n,p} \quad \text{with} \quad \phi_{n,p} = \left( s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p} \vee \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).$$

(ii) Further, suppose that  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  belongs to the parameter space

$$\mathcal{D}(\varrho, s_{\delta}(\varrho)) = \left\{ \mathbf{M} = [m_{ii'}] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \mathbf{M} \text{ is positive definite, } \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{i'=1}^p |m_{ii'}|^{\varrho} \leq s_{\delta}(\varrho) \right\}$$

for some  $\varrho \in [0, 1)$ , and set  $\eta = C \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_1 \phi_{n,p}$ . Then on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , we have

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Delta}} - \mathbf{\Delta} \right|_{\infty} \leq 4 \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_1 \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{\Delta}} - \mathbf{\Delta} \right\| \leq 12 s_{\delta}(\varrho) (4 \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_1 \eta)^{1-\varrho}.$$

*Remark E.2.* From the proof of Proposition 3.3 and A.1, both  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\text{las}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\text{DS}}$  satisfy (E.19) with  $\zeta_{n,p} = \lambda^{\text{las}}$  and  $\zeta_{n,p} = \|\mathbf{G}^{-1}\|_1 \lambda^{\text{DS}}$ , respectively. Then,  $\phi_{n,p}$  involved in the error bound in Proposition E.18 (i) reduces to  $\phi_{n,p} = s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p}$ .

*Proof of Proposition E.18 (i).* We write  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{\ell} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\xi}(\ell) = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{g}$  and  $\sum_{\ell=1}^d \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\ell} \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\xi}(\ell) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\top} \widehat{\mathbf{g}}$ . Then on  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , we have  $|\widehat{\mathbf{g}}|_{\infty} \leq \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq d} |\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\xi}(\ell)|_{\infty} + C_{\xi}(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2}) \leq C_{\Xi, \varsigma, \varepsilon}$  for a large enough  $C_{\Xi, \varsigma, \varepsilon} > 0$  and by Lemma E.2. Also,

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} - \mathbf{\Gamma} \right|_{\infty} \leq \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\xi}(0) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\xi}(0) \right|_{\infty} + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\top} \widehat{\mathbf{g}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\top} \mathbf{g} \right|_{\infty} =: I + II,$$

where  $I \leq C_{\xi}(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$  and

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq \left| \left( \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right)^{\top} \widehat{\mathbf{g}} \right|_{\infty} + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\top} (\widehat{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}) \right|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right\|_1 \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq d} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\xi}(\ell) \right|_{\infty} + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq d} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\xi}(\ell) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\xi}(\ell) \right|_{\infty} \\ &\leq C \left( s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p} + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for large enough constant  $C > 0$ . □

*Proof of Proposition E.18 (ii).* The proof takes analogous steps as those in the proof of Theorem 6 of Cai et al. (2011). On  $\mathcal{E}_{n,p}$ , by Proposition E.18 (i), we have

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} \mathbf{\Delta} - \mathbf{I} \right|_{\infty} \leq \left| \left( \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} - \mathbf{\Gamma} \right) \mathbf{\Delta} \right|_{\infty} \leq \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_1 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} - \mathbf{\Gamma} \right|_{\infty} \leq \eta = C \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_1 \phi_{n,p},$$

and thus  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  is a feasible solution to (9). Since solving the problem in (9) is equivalent to

solving

$$\check{\Delta}_{\cdot j} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^p} |\mathbf{m}|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left| \widehat{\Gamma} \mathbf{m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_j \right|_{\infty} \leq \eta$$

for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , it follows that  $\|\check{\Delta}\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\check{\Delta}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq \|\Delta\|_1$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\Gamma} (\check{\Delta} - \Delta) \right|_{\infty} &\leq \left| \widehat{\Gamma} \check{\Delta} - \mathbf{I} \right|_{\infty} + \left| (\widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma) \Delta \right|_{\infty} \leq \eta + \|\Delta\|_1 \left| \widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right|_{\infty} \leq 2\eta, \\ \therefore \left| \Gamma (\check{\Delta} - \Delta) \right|_{\infty} &\leq \left| \widehat{\Gamma} (\check{\Delta} - \Delta) \right|_{\infty} + \left| (\widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma) (\check{\Delta} - \Delta) \right|_{\infty} \\ &\leq 2\eta + \|\check{\Delta} - \Delta\|_1 \left| \widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right|_{\infty} \leq 4\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$|\check{\Delta} - \Delta|_{\infty} \leq \|\Delta\|_1 \left| \Gamma (\check{\Delta} - \Delta) \right|_{\infty} \leq 4 \|\Delta\|_1 \eta,$$

and from the definition of  $\widehat{\Delta}$ , the bound on  $|\widehat{\Delta} - \Delta|_{\infty}$  follows.

Next, let  $\varpi = |\widehat{\Delta} - \Delta|_{\infty}$  and define  $\mathbf{h}_j = \widehat{\Delta}_{\cdot j} - \Delta_{\cdot j}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_j^{(1)} = (\widehat{\delta}_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}}, 1 \leq i \leq p)^{\top} - \Delta_{\cdot j}$  and  $\mathbf{h}_j^{(2)} = \mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}$ . By definition, we have  $|\widehat{\Delta}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq |\check{\Delta}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq |\Delta_{\cdot j}|_1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ . Then,

$$|\Delta_{\cdot j}|_1 - |\mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}|_1 + |\mathbf{h}_j^{(2)}|_1 \leq |\Delta_{\cdot j} + \mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}|_1 + |\mathbf{h}_j^{(2)}|_1 = |\widehat{\Delta}_{\cdot j}|_1 \leq |\Delta_{\cdot j}|_1,$$

which implies that  $|\mathbf{h}_j^{(2)}|_1 \leq |\mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}|_1$  and thus  $|\mathbf{h}_j|_1 \leq 2|\mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}|_1$ . The latter is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{h}_j^{(1)}|_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \widehat{\delta}_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} - \delta_{ij} \right|_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \delta_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|\delta_{ij}| < 2\varpi\}} \right|_1 + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \left( \widehat{\delta}_{ij} - \delta_{ij} \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} + \delta_{ij} \left( \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{|\delta_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} \right) \right|_1 \\ &\leq s_{\delta}(\varrho)(2\varpi)^{1-\varrho} + \varpi \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} + \sum_{i=1}^p |\delta_{ij}| \left| \mathbb{I}_{\{|\widehat{\delta}_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{|\delta_{ij}| \geq 2\varpi\}} \right|_1 \\ &\leq s_{\delta}(\varrho)(2\varpi)^{1-\varrho} + \varpi \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{I}_{\{|\delta_{ij}| \geq \varpi\}} + \sum_{i=1}^p |\delta_{ij}| \mathbb{I}_{\{||\delta_{ij}| - 2\varpi| \leq |\widehat{\delta}_{ij} - \delta_{ij}|\}} \\ &\leq s_{\delta}(\varrho) \varpi^{1-\varrho} (1 + 2^{1-\varrho} + 3^{1-\varrho}), \end{aligned}$$

from which we drive that

$$\left\| \widehat{\Delta} - \Delta \right\| \leq \left\| \widehat{\Delta} - \Delta \right\|_1 \leq 12s_{\delta}(\varrho) \varpi^{1-\varrho}.$$

□



### E.2.7 Proof of Proposition 3.5 (ii)

In what follows, we omit the dependence of  $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\ell$  on  $\mathbf{t}$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega} \right|_\infty &\leq \\ &\left| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} \mathcal{A}(1) \right|_\infty + \left| \mathcal{A}^\top(1) \left( \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} - \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right) \mathcal{A}(1) \right|_\infty + \left| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^\top(1) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} \left( \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right) \right|_\infty \\ &:= I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Note that from Corollaries 3.4 and A.2 and the conditions of the proposition,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 &\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \widehat{A}_{\xi, \ell, ij} - A_{\ell, ij} \right|_1 \leq s_{\text{out}} \mathbf{t}, \\ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) \right\|_1 &\leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 + \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \leq 2 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1, \\ \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} \right|_\infty &\leq \left| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right|_\infty + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} - \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right|_\infty \leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Also, for any compatible matrices  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$ , we have  $\left| \mathbf{ABC} \right|_\infty \leq \left\| \mathbf{A} \right\|_\infty \left\| \mathbf{B} \right\|_\infty \left\| \mathbf{C} \right\|_1$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right) \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right) s_{\text{out}} \mathbf{t}, \\ II &\leq 4 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta, \\ III &\leq 2 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right) \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}(1) - \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \leq 2 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right) s_{\text{out}} \mathbf{t}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} I + II + III &\leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left[ 3 \left( \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| + 4 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right) s_{\text{out}} \mathbf{t} + 4 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right] \\ &\leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left( 3 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\| s_{\text{out}} \mathbf{t} + 16 \left\| \mathcal{A}(1) \right\|_1 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Delta} \right\|_1 \eta \right), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

### E.2.8 Proof of Remark 3.2

In this section, we operate under the restricted GDFM in Section 4.1 and use the notations given therein. The proofs arguments are analogous to those adopted in the proof of Proposition E.15 (ii).

With  $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(0)$  and  $\mathbf{S} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(0)$ , the conditions (E.6)–(E.9) are met by Assumption 4.1 (ii), Propositions 2.1 and E.5 with  $\zeta_{n,p} = 1/\sqrt{n}$  and  $\bar{\zeta}_{n,p} = \tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p}$ . Then applying Lemmas E.6–E.8, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p} \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |\widehat{\mu}_{x,j} - \mu_{\chi,j}| = O_P \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right),$$

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{\mu_{\chi,r}^2}{p^2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x - \mathbf{E}_\chi \boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} \right) \right| = O_P \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$$

with some unitary, diagonal matrix  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ . Also using the arguments in the proof of Lemma E.14, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq r} \mu_{\chi,j}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |e_{\chi,ij}| = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} \hat{\mu}_{\chi,j}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\hat{e}_{x,ij}| = O_P(1). \quad (\text{E.20})$$

Noting that  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_\chi(h) = \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(h) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top$  and that  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\chi(h) = \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(h) \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_\xi(h) - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\xi(h) \right|_\infty &\leq \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(h) - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(h) \right|_\infty + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(h) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top - \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(h) \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right|_\infty \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\xi(h) \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right|_\infty = I + II + III, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I = O_P(\tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee p^{-1/2})$  from Lemma E.5. As for  $III$ , we have

$$III = \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\xi(h) \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i'} \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \frac{r}{\mu_{\chi,r}} \right)$$

from (E.20) and Proposition 2.1. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq \max_{i,i'} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top - \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(h) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i'} \right| + \max_{i,i'} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \left( \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_x(h) - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(h) \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i'} \right| \\ &\quad + \max_{i,i'} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_x(h) \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top - \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right) \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i'} \right| = IV + V + VI. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting the diagonal elements of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}}$  by  $O_{jj}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x - \mathbf{E}_\chi \boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \right|_2 &\leq \max_i \sqrt{\sum_{i'=1}^p \left( \sum_{j=1}^r (\hat{e}_{x,ij} - O_{jj} e_{\chi,ij}) \hat{e}_{x,i'j} \right)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\max_i \sum_{j=1}^r (\hat{e}_{x,ij} - O_{jj} e_{\chi,ij})^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i'=1}^p \hat{e}_{x,i'j}^2} = O_P \left( \frac{rp^{3/2}}{\mu_{\chi,r}^2} \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top - \mathbf{E}_\chi \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right) \right|_2 &\leq \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x - \mathbf{E}_\chi \boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x^\top \right|_2 + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_x - \mathbf{E}_\chi \boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} \right) \mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \right|_2 \\ &= O_P \left( \frac{rp^{3/2}}{\mu_{\chi,r}^2} \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this, (E.20) and Lemma E.5 (i), we have

$$IV = O_P \left( \frac{rp^{3/2}}{\mu_{\chi,r}^2} \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \cdot \frac{p}{\sqrt{\mu_{\chi,r}}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad V = O_P \left( \frac{rp}{\mu_{x,r}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right)$$

(assuming that  $(p/\mu_{\chi,r})^{-5/2}(\tilde{\vartheta}_{n,p} \vee p^{-1/2}) = o(1)$ ), and  $VI$  is similarly handled as  $IV$ . Finally, assuming that the factor strengths are  $\varrho_1 = \dots = \varrho_r = 1$  (in Assumption 4.1 (ii)), the conclusion follows.

### E.3 Results in Section 4 and Appendix B

#### E.3.1 Results in Section 4.1

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* The following three lemmas follow from Lemmas E.6–E.8 with  $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(0)$  and  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_x(0)$ , as conditions (E.6)–(E.9) are met by Assumption 4.1 (ii), Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 3.1.

**Lemma E.19.** There exists an orthonormal, diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  such that

$$\frac{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega) \cdot \mu_{\chi,r}}{p^3} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} - \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{O} \right\| = O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

**Lemma E.20.**

$$\frac{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega) \cdot \mu_{\chi,r}^2}{p^4} \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{M}}_{\chi}}{p} \right)^{-1} - \left( \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\chi}}{p} \right)^{-1} \right\| = O_P \left( \psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

We frequently use that by Lemma E.2 and (E.3)–(E.4), together with Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\|\mathbf{X}_t\| = O_P(\sqrt{p}), \quad \|\boldsymbol{\chi}_t\| = O_P(\sqrt{p}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_t\| = O_P(\sqrt{p}) \quad (\text{E.21})$$

for any given  $t$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_{n+a|n}^{\text{res}} - \boldsymbol{\chi}_{n+a|n} \right|_{\infty} &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{M}_{\chi}^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{\chi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right| \\ &\quad + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\chi}(-a) - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} \widehat{\mathbf{M}}_{\chi}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_n \right| \\ &\quad + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} - \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{O} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{M}}_{\chi}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_n \right| \\ &\quad + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{O} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{M}}_{\chi}^{-1} - \mathbf{M}_{\chi}^{-1} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_n \right| \\ &\quad + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\chi}(-a) \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{M}_{\chi}^{-1} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\chi} - \mathbf{E}_{\chi} \mathbf{O} \right)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_n \right| = I + II + III + IV + V. \end{aligned}$$

By (E.3), Assumption 4.1 (ii) and combining the observation  $\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{E}_\chi^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\| \leq 2\pi B_\xi$  from Proposition 2.1 with Chebyshev's inequality, we have  $I = O_P(\sqrt{p}/\mu_{\chi,r})$ . Using the arguments in the proof of Proposition E.16, the result therein is extended to showing the consistency of  $\widehat{\Gamma}_\chi(a)$  at a given lag  $a$ . Then combined with Lemmas E.20 and (E.21), it leads to

$$II = O_P\left(\frac{p^3}{\inf_\omega \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega) \cdot \mu_{\chi,r}} \cdot \left(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)\right).$$

Next, from (E.3), (E.21) and Lemmas E.19–E.20,

$$III = O_P\left(\frac{p^4}{\inf_\omega \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega) \cdot \mu_{\chi,r}^2} \cdot \left(\psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)\right),$$

and  $V$  is handled analogously. Finally, from (E.3), (E.21) and Lemma E.20,

$$IV = O_P\left(\frac{p^4}{\inf_\omega \mu_{\chi,q}^2(\omega) \cdot \mu_{\chi,r}^2} \cdot \left(\psi_n \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)\right).$$

Putting together the bounds on  $I$ – $V$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square$

We prove the following proposition which includes Proposition 4.2 as a special case.

**Proposition E.21.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 and E.1 hold. Then for any  $a \geq 1$ ,*

$$|\chi_{n+a|n} - \chi_{n+a}|_\infty = \begin{cases} O_P\left(q^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu} \log^{1/2}(p)\right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),} \\ O_P\left(\log^{1/2}(p)\right) & \text{under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b).} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* From (14) and Assumption E.1 (ii),  $\chi_{n+a|n} - \chi_{n+a} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{u}_{n+a-\ell}$  for all  $a \geq 1$ . By Lemma D.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), Assumptions 2.2 and E.1, there exist constants  $C_\nu, C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} > 0$  that depend only on their subscripts such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{u}_{n+a-\ell} \right\|_\infty^2 &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{B}_{\ell,j} u_{j,n+a-\ell} \right\|_\infty^2 \leq C_\nu \log(p) \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \left\| \mathbf{B}_{\ell,j} u_{j,n+a-\ell} \right\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq C_\nu \log(p) \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=1}^q |\mathbf{B}_{\ell,j}|_\infty^2 \left\| \mathbf{u}_{t+a-\ell} \right\|_\infty^2 \leq C_\nu \log(p) \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \Xi^2 (1+\ell)^{-2\varsigma} q^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{2/\nu} \\ &\leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} \log(p) q^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{2/\nu} \end{aligned}$$

under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a), such that by Chebyshev's inequality, we have  $\left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{u}_{n+a-\ell} \right|_\infty = O_P(\log^{1/2}(p) q^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu})$ . When Assumption E.1 (iii) (b) holds, notice that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \mathbf{B}_{\ell,i} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{t+a-\ell} \right) = \max_i \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} |\mathbf{B}_{\ell,i}|_2^2 \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \Xi^2 (1+\ell)^{-\varsigma} < \infty$$

such that by Gaussian maximal inequality, we have  $\left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{u}_{n+a-\ell} \right|_\infty = O_P(\log^{1/2}(p))$ .  $\square$

### E.3.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

Let  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} = \log^{1/2}(p)p^{1/\nu}\mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)} = p^{1/\nu}\mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$  under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a),  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} = \tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)} = \log^{1/2}(p)$  under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b). We first show that for any given  $t$ ,

$$|\boldsymbol{\xi}_t|_\infty = O_P\left(\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t|_\infty = O_P(\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)}),$$

with which we establish

$$\left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1|n} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1} \right|_\infty = O_P\left(s_{\sin\zeta_{n,p}}\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1\bar{\zeta}_{n,p} + p^{1/\nu}\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)}\right). \quad (\text{E.22})$$

Under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a), by (E.2) and Assumption 2.3, we have

$$\left\| \left| \mathbf{D}_\ell \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell} \right|_\infty \right\|_\nu \leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon^{1/2} \Xi (1+\ell)^{-\varsigma} p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$$

such that applying Lemma D.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| |\boldsymbol{\xi}_t|_\infty \right\|_\nu^2 &= \left\| \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}_\ell \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell} \right|_\infty \right\|_\nu^2 \leq C'_\nu \log(p) \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left\| \left| \mathbf{D}_\ell \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-\ell} \right|_\infty \right\|_\nu^2 \\ &\leq C_\nu^2 C'_\nu M_\varepsilon \log(p) p^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{2/\nu} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \Xi^2 (1+\ell)^{-2\varsigma} \leq C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma} M_\varepsilon \log(p) p^{2/\nu} \mu_\nu^{2/\nu} \end{aligned}$$

with  $C_\nu, C'_\nu, C_{\nu,\Xi,\varsigma}$  denoting some positive constants that depend only on their subscripts. Therefore, by Chebyshev's inequality,  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} = \log^{1/2}(p)p^{1/\nu}\mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$ . Similarly, by Assumption 2.3 and Lemma D.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021),

$$\left\| (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2})_{i \cdot} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \right\|_\nu^2 = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2})_{ik} \varepsilon_{kt} \right\|_\nu^2 \leq C_\nu |(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2})_{i \cdot}|_2^2 \mu_\nu^{2/\nu} \leq C_\nu M_\varepsilon \mu_\nu^{2/\nu}$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , such that  $\left\| |\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t|_\infty \right\|_\nu \leq (C_\nu M_\varepsilon)^{1/2} p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$  and with Chebyshev's inequality, we have  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)} = p^{1/\nu} \mu_\nu^{1/\nu}$ .

Under Assumption E.1 (iii) (b), by Gaussian maximal inequality and that  $\mu_{\xi,1} \leq 2\pi B_\xi$  (which indicates that  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \text{Var}(\xi_{it}) \leq 2\pi B_\xi$ ), we have  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} = \log^{1/2}(p)$  and similarly,  $\tilde{\zeta}_p^{(2)} = \log^{1/2}(p)$ .

Next, by construction, we have

$$\left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1|n} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1|n} \right|_\infty \leq \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^d (\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\ell - \mathbf{A}_\ell) \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} \right|_\infty + \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbf{A}_\ell (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell}) \right|_\infty$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^d \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\ell - \mathbf{A}_\ell \right)^\top \right\|_1 \left( \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell} \right|_\infty + |\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell}|_\infty \right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^d \left\| \mathbf{A}_\ell^\top \right\|_1 \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell} \right|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right\|_1 \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq d} \left( \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell} \right|_\infty + |\boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell}|_\infty \right) + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq d} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{n+1-\ell} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1-\ell} \right|_\infty \\
&= O_P \left( s_{\text{in}} \zeta_{n,p} \left( \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} + \tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)} \right) + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \bar{\zeta}_{n,p} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where it is used that  $\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t+1-\ell}|_\infty = O_P(d \tilde{\zeta}_p^{(1)})$  for given  $t$ . This, combined with the observation that  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n+1} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1|n} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1}$ , proves (E.22).

### E.3.3 Results in Section B

*Proof of Proposition B.1.* Let  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_w(\omega)$  denote the spectral density matrix of  $\mathbf{W}_t$ . Then,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_w(\omega) = \mathcal{A}_\chi(e^{-i\omega}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi(\omega) \mathcal{A}_\chi^\top(e^{i\omega})$  and for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^p$  with  $|\mathbf{a}|_2^2 = 1$ , we have

$$\mathbf{a}^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_w(\omega) \mathbf{a} \leq \mu_{\xi,1}(\omega) \mathbf{a}^* \mathcal{A}_\chi(e^{-i\omega}) \mathcal{A}_\chi^\top(e^{i\omega}) \mathbf{a} \leq B_\xi \|\mathcal{A}_\chi(e^{-i\omega}) \mathcal{A}_\chi^\top(e^{i\omega})\|,$$

thanks to Proposition 2.1. Further, by Assumption B.2 (ii) and Lemma E.2, there exists a constant  $B_\chi > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left\| \mathcal{A}_\chi(e^{-i\omega}) \mathcal{A}_\chi^\top(e^{i\omega}) \right\| \leq \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \sup_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \left\| \mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(e^{-i\omega}) (\mathcal{A}_\chi^{(h)}(e^{i\omega}))^\top \right\| \leq B_\chi.$$

Consequently,

$$\mu_{w,1} = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathbf{a}^\top \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_w \mathbf{a} = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathbf{a}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_w(\omega) \mathbf{a} d\omega \leq 2\pi B_\xi B_\chi.$$

□

*Proof of Proposition B.2 (i).* In what follows,  $C_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  denote positive constants not dependent on the indices  $1 \leq i, i' \leq p$ . By Assumption B.2 (i),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi - \mathbf{A}_\chi \right\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{h=1}^N \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F^2, \quad \text{where} \\
\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F &= \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\chi^{(h)} (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} - \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} (\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} \right) (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F + \left\| \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} \left( (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} - (\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right) \right\|_F \\
&\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F + \left\| \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} - (\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F. \tag{E.23}
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\widehat{\gamma}_{\chi, ii'}^{(h)}(\ell) = \widehat{\gamma}_{\chi, (q+1)(h-1)+i, (q+1)(h-1)+i'}(\ell)$  for  $1 \leq i, i' \leq q+1$ , and analogously define  $\gamma_{\chi, ii'}^{(h)}(\ell)$ . Then by Proposition E.16 (i), there exists a constant  $C_1 > 0$  not dependent on  $i, i'$

such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{B}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^s \sum_{i,i'=1}^{q+1} \left( \widehat{\gamma}_{\chi,ii'}^{(h)}(\ell) - \gamma_{\chi,ii'}^{(h)}(\ell) \right)^2 \right) \leq \frac{C_1 s (q+1)^2 q^2 p^4}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^4(\omega)} \left( \psi_n^2 \vee \frac{1}{m^2} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \quad (\text{E.24})$$

and similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{C_1 s^2 (q+1)^2 q^2 p^4}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^4(\omega)} \left( \psi_n^2 \vee \frac{1}{m^2} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right). \quad (\text{E.25})$$

By (E.3), Assumption B.2 (ii) and that the entries of  $(\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1}$  are rational functions of those of  $\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)}$ , we have

$$\max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \max \left( \left\| \mathbf{B}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F, \left\| \mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F \right) \leq C_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| (\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F \leq C_3, \quad (\text{E.26})$$

as well as  $\mathbb{E} \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} - (\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F^2$  bounded as in (E.25). Putting together the above observations into (E.23), and also noting that  $p = (q+1)N$ , we prove the first claim.

For the second claim, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^{\top} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi} - \mathbf{A}_{\chi} \right) \right|_2 \leq \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{B}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F + \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \mathbf{B}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} - (\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition E.16 (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{B}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F^2 \leq (q+1)^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^s \max_{1 \leq i,i' \leq p} |\widehat{\gamma}_{\chi,ii'}^{(h)}(\ell) - \gamma_{\chi,ii'}^{(h)}(\ell)|^2 \\ & = O_P \left( \frac{s q^3 p^4}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^4(\omega)} \left( \vartheta_{n,p}^2 \vee \frac{1}{m^2} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right) \quad \text{and similarly,} \\ & \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F^2 = O_P \left( \frac{s^2 q^3 p^4}{\inf_{\omega} \mu_{\chi,q}^4(\omega)} \left( \vartheta_{n,p}^2 \vee \frac{1}{m^2} \vee \frac{1}{p} \right) \right) \quad (\text{E.27}) \end{aligned}$$

and as before, an analogous bound as in (E.27) holds for  $\max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} - (\mathbf{C}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F$ . Combined with (E.26), we have

$$\max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi}^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_{\chi}^{(h)} \right\|_F = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \quad (\text{E.28})$$

from which the second claim follows.  $\square$

Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} = (n-s)^{-1} \mathbb{X} \mathbb{X}^\top$  and  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} = \mathbf{E}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}})$ , where

$$\mathbb{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{s+1} & \mathbf{X}_{s+2} & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_n \\ & & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{X}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{X}_{n-s} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p(s+1) \times (n-s)}.$$

Then,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} = [\mathbf{\Gamma}_x(\ell - \ell'), 1 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq s+1]$ . Further, we write that  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} = [\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell, \ell'), 1 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq s+1]$  where  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_x(\ell, \ell') = [\widehat{\gamma}_{x,ii'}(\ell, \ell'), 1 \leq i, i' \leq p] = (n-s)^{-1} \sum_{t=s+2-\ell}^{n-\ell+1} \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell'+\ell}^\top$ .

**Proposition E.22.** Under the assumptions made in Proposition B.2 (ii),

$$\frac{1}{p} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z - \mathbf{\Gamma}_z \right\| = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right), \quad \left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z - \mathbf{\Gamma}_z \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).$$

*Proof.* Recall that by Assumption B.2 (i),  $s$  is finite. By definition,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_z = \mathbb{A}_\chi \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{A}_\chi^\top$  where  $\mathbb{A}_\chi = [\mathbf{I}, -\mathbf{A}_\chi] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p(s+1)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z = \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi^\top$  with  $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi = [\mathbf{I}, -\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z - \mathbf{\Gamma}_z \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{p} \left\| (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi - \mathbb{A}_\chi) \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi^\top \right\| + \frac{1}{p} \left\| \mathbb{A}_\chi (\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}}) \mathbb{A}_\chi^\top \right\| + \frac{1}{p} \left\| \mathbb{A}_\chi \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi - \mathbb{A}_\chi)^\top \right\| \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

From the block structure of  $\mathbf{A}_\chi$  and the proof of Proposition B.2 (i),

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi - \mathbb{A}_\chi \right\| = \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi - \mathbf{A}_\chi \right\| \leq s \cdot \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right). \quad (\text{E.29})$$

With  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  given in (E.26), we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{A}_\chi \right\| \leq 1 + s \cdot \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left\| \mathbf{B}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|_F \left\| (\mathbf{C}_\chi^{(h)})^{-1} \right\|_F \leq 1 + s C_2 C_3 < \infty. \quad (\text{E.30})$$

By Proposition 2.3 of Basu and Michailidis (2015), Assumption 2.1 and Proposition 2.1,

$$\frac{1}{p} \left\| \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} \right\| \leq 2\pi \sup_{\omega} \frac{\mu_{x,1}(\omega)}{p} \leq 2\pi \sup_{\omega} \left( \beta_{x,1}(\omega) + \frac{B_\xi}{p} \right) < \infty. \quad (\text{E.31})$$

Also by the arguments analogous to those adopted in the proof of Lemma E.5 (i), there exists a fixed constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \mathbf{E} \left( \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\mathbb{X}} - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbb{X}} \right\|_F^2 \right) = \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{\ell, \ell'=1}^{s+1} \sum_{i, i'=1}^p \mathbf{E} \left( \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{x,ii'}(\ell, \ell') - \gamma_{x,ii'}(\ell - \ell') \right|^2 \right) \leq C \frac{(s+1)^2}{n}. \quad (\text{E.32})$$

Then by (E.29)–(E.32),  $I = O_P(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ , by (E.29)–(E.30) and (E.32),  $II = O_P(n^{-1/2})$  and  $III$  is bounded analogously as  $I$ , such that  $p^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z - \mathbf{\Gamma}_z \right\| = O_P(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ .



For the second claim, we proceed similarly by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\Gamma}_z - \Gamma_z \right|_\infty &\leq \max_{i,i'} \left\| \varphi_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi - \mathbb{A}_\chi \right) \widehat{\Gamma}_\mathbb{X} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi^\top \varphi_{i'} \right\| + \max_{i,i'} \left\| \varphi_i^\top \mathbb{A}_\chi \left( \widehat{\Gamma}_\mathbb{X} - \Gamma_\mathbb{X} \right) \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi^\top \varphi_{i'} \right\| \\ &\quad + \max_{i,i'} \left\| \varphi_i^\top \mathbb{A}_\chi \widehat{\Gamma}_\mathbb{X} \left( \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_\chi - \mathbb{A}_\chi \right)^\top \varphi_{i'} \right\| = IV + V + VI. \end{aligned}$$

From the block structure of  $\mathbf{A}_\chi$ , the second claim of Proposition B.2 (i), Lemmas E.2 and E.5 (ii) and (E.29)–(E.30),  $IV = O_P(\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ , and  $V$  and  $VI$  are bounded analogously.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition B.2 (ii).* Denote the eigendecomposition of  $\Gamma_v$  by  $\Gamma_v = \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{M}_v \mathbf{E}_v^\top$ . With  $\widehat{\Gamma}_z$  as  $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}$  and  $\Gamma_v$  as  $\mathbf{S}$ , (E.6)–(E.9) are met by Assumption B.3, Proposition B.1 and Proposition E.22 with  $\varrho_1 = \dots = \varrho_q = 1$  and  $\omega_{n,p}^{(1)} = \omega_{n,p}^{(2)} = (\vartheta_{n,p} \vee m^{-1} \vee p^{-1/2})$ . Therefore, applying Lemmas E.6 and E.8, there exists a diagonal, orthogonal matrix  $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} - \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{O} \right\| &= O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right), \\ \sqrt{p} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \left| \varphi_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} - \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{O} \right) \right|_2 &= O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Assumptions B.1 and B.2 (i), we have

$$\max_i \text{Var}(V_{it}) = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_{v,j} |e_{v,ij}|^2 = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^q R_{ij}^2 \text{Var}(u_{ij}) \leq q(B_\chi^{(1)})^2 < \infty \quad (\text{E.33})$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_{v,j} = (e_{v,ij}, 1 \leq i \leq p)^\top$  and  $\mathbf{R} = [R_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q]$ , such that  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |e_{v,ij}| = O(p^{-1/2})$  by Assumption B.3. Besides, by (E.28), Lemma E.2 and Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t \right\| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^s (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi,\ell} - \mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}) \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \sum_{\ell=1}^s \left\| [(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)} - \mathbf{A}_{\chi,\ell}^{(h)}) \mathbf{X}_{t-\ell}^{(h)}, 1 \leq h \leq N] \right\| = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for given  $t$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_t^{(h)}$  is defined analogously as  $\chi_t^{(h)}$ . Also, from the finiteness of  $\|\mathbf{A}_\chi\|$  in (E.30) and (E.21), we have  $\|\mathbf{Z}_t\| = O_P(\sqrt{p})$  for a given  $t$ . Finally,  $\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{E}_v^\top \mathbf{W}_t)\| \leq B_w$  by Proposition B.1 such that  $\|\mathbf{E}_v^\top \mathbf{W}_t\| = O_P(1)$  by Chebyshev's inequality. Putting the above observations together,

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{R}} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t - \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}_t \right|_\infty \leq \max_i \left| \varphi_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t - \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{E}_v^\top \mathbf{Z}_t \right) \right| + \max_i \left| \varphi_i^\top \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{E}_v^\top \mathbf{W}_t \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} - \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{O} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t \right| + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{O} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{z,1:q} - \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{O} \right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t \right| \\
&\quad + \max_i \left| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_v \mathbf{E}_v^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t) \right| + O_P \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition B.2 (iii).* We can write each block in (B.1) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\chi}_t^{(h)} \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t-1}^{(h)} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t-s+1}^{(h)} \end{bmatrix} &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\chi,1}^{(h)} & \mathbf{A}_{\chi,2}^{(h)} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{\chi,s-1}^{(h)} & \mathbf{A}_{\chi,s}^{(h)} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{O} & & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ & & \ddots & & \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{O} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)}} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t-1}^{(h)} \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t-2}^{(h)} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t-s}^{(h)} \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_t \\ \mathbf{O} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{O} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathfrak{R}^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_t}, \text{ such that} \\
\boldsymbol{\chi}_t^{(h)} &= \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{I} - \mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)} L)^{-1} \mathfrak{R}^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{J} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell \mathfrak{R}^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell}
\end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{J} = [\mathbf{I}_{q+1}, \mathbf{O}, \dots, \mathbf{O}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+1) \times (q+1)s}$ . Then, defining  $\mathbf{B}_\ell^{(h)}$  that consists of the  $(q+1)$  rows of  $\mathbf{B}_\ell$  to satisfy  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_t^{(h)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_\ell^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell}$  under (1), we have  $\mathbf{B}_\ell^{(h)} = \mathbf{J}(\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell \mathfrak{R}^{(h)}$ . Letting  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_\chi^{(h)}$  denote the estimated counterparts of  $\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}_\chi^{(h)}$ , respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\chi}}_{t+a|t}^{\text{unr}} - \boldsymbol{\chi}_{t+a|t} \right|_\infty &\leq \max_{1 \leq h \leq N} \left| \mathbf{J} \sum_{\ell=0}^K \left[ (\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_\chi^{(h)} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-\ell} - (\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell \mathfrak{R}_\chi^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right] \right|_\infty \\
&\quad + \left| \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{\ell+a} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right|_\infty = I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

From (E.28) and (E.30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_h \left\| (\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell - (\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^\ell \right\| &\leq \max_h \left\| \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)} \right\| \left\| (\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)})^{\ell-1} - (\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^{\ell-1} \right\| \\
&\quad + \max_h \left\| (\mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)})^{\ell-1} \right\| \left\| \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_\chi^{(h)} - \mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)} \right\| = O_P \left( \max_h \left\| \mathfrak{A}_\chi^{(h)} \right\|^{\ell-1} \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by induction for any finite  $\ell$ , while

$$\max_h \left| \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_\chi^{(h)} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-\ell} - \mathfrak{R}_\chi^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right|_\infty = O_P \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$$

by Proposition B.2 (ii). From these observations and (E.33) (in combination with Chebyshev's

inequality), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^K \left\{ \max_h \left| \mathbf{J} \left[ (\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{\ell} - (\mathfrak{A}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{\ell} \right] \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\chi}^{(h)} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-\ell} \right|_{\infty} + \max_h \left| \mathbf{J} (\mathfrak{A}_{\chi}^{(h)})^{\ell} \left( \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\chi}^{(h)} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-\ell} - \mathfrak{R}_{\chi}^{(h)} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right) \right|_{\infty} \right\} \\
&= O_P \left( K \max_h \|\mathfrak{A}_{\chi}^{(h)}\|^K \left( \vartheta_{n,p} \vee \frac{1}{m} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, from Assumption 2.2, there exist constants  $C_{\nu}, C_{\nu, \Xi, \varsigma} > 0$  that depend only on their subscripts such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{\ell+a} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right\|_{\infty, \nu}^2 \leq C_{\nu} \log(p) \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \left\| |\mathbf{B}_{\ell+a, j} u_{j, t-\ell}|_{\infty} \right\|_{\nu}^2 \\
&\leq C_{\nu} \log(p) \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^q |\mathbf{B}_{\ell+a, j}|_{\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_{t-\ell}\|_{\infty, \nu}^2 \leq C_{\nu} \log(p) q^{2/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{2/\nu} \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \Xi^2 (1 + \ell + a)^{-2\varsigma} \\
&\leq C_{\nu, \Xi, \varsigma} \log(p) q^{2/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{2/\nu} (K + a)^{-2(\varsigma-1)},
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma D.3 of Zhang and Wu (2021). Therefore by Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$II = O_P \left( \log^{1/2}(p) q^{1/\nu} \mu_{\nu}^{1/\nu} (K + a)^{-\varsigma+1} \right)$$

under Assumption E.1 (iii) (a). When Assumption E.1 (iii) (b) is met,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{\ell+a, i} \mathbf{u}_{t-\ell} \right) &= \max_i \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} |\mathbf{B}_{\ell+a, i}|_2^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=K+1}^{\infty} \Xi^2 (1 + \ell + a)^{-2\varsigma} \leq C_{\Xi, \varsigma} (K + a)^{-2(\varsigma-1)}
\end{aligned}$$

such that  $II = O_P(\log^{1/2}(p) K^{-\varsigma+1})$ . Combining the bounds on  $I$  and  $II$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square$

## **F Information on the real dataset**

Table F.1 provides the list of the 46 companies included in the application presented in Section 5.3 along with their tickers and industry and sub-industry classifications according to Global Industry Classification Standard.

Table F.1: Tickers, industry and sub-industry classifications of the 46 companies.

Name	Ticker	Industry	Sub-industry
JPMORGAN CHASE & CO	JPM	Banks	Diversified banks
COMERICA INC	CMA	Banks	Regional banks
CITIGROUP INC	C	Banks	Diversified banks
FIFTH THIRD BANCORP	FITB	Banks	Regional banks
REGIONS FINANCIAL CORP	RF	Banks	Regional banks
M & T BANK CORP	MTB	Banks	Regional banks
U S BANCORP	USB	Banks	Diversified banks
HUNTINGTON BANCSHARES	HBAN	Banks	Regional banks
BANK OF AMERICA CORP	BAC	Banks	Diversified banks
WELLS FARGO & CO	WFC	Banks	Diversified banks
PNC FINANCIAL SVCS GROUP INC	PNC	Banks	Regional banks
KEYCORP	KEY	Banks	Regional banks
ZIONS BANCORPORATION NA	ZION	Banks	Regional banks
TRUIST FINANCIAL CORP	TFC	Banks	Regional banks
PEOPLE'S UNITED FINL INC	PBCT	Banks	Regional banks
SVB FINANCIAL GROUP	SIVB	Banks	Regional banks
AMERICAN EXPRESS CO	AXP	Diversified Financials	Consumer finance
BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON CORP	BK	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
FRANKLIN RESOURCES INC	BEN	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
S&P GLOBAL INC	SPGI	Diversified Financials	Financial Exchanges & Data
NORTHERN TRUST CORP	NTRS	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
RAYMOND JAMES FINANCIAL CORP	RJF	Diversified Financials	Investment Banking & Brokerage
STATE STREET CORP	STT	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
MORGAN STANLEY	MS	Diversified Financials	Investment Banking & Brokerage
PRICE (T. ROWE) GROUP	TROW	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
SCHWAB (CHARLES) CORP	SCHW	Diversified Financials	Investment Banking & Brokerage
INVESCO LTD	IVZ	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORP	COF	Diversified Financials	Consumer finance
GOLDMAN SACHS GROUP INC	GS	Diversified Financials	Investment Banking & Brokerage
BLACKROCK INC	BLK	Diversified Financials	Asset Management & Custody Banks
AFLAC INC	AFL	Insurance	Life & Health Insurance
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP	AIG	Insurance	Multi-line Insurance
AON PLC	AON	Insurance	Insurance Brokers
ARTHUR J GALLAGHER & CO	AJG	Insurance	Insurance Brokers
LINCOLN NATIONAL CORP	LNC	Insurance	Life & Health Insurance
LOEWS CORP	L	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
MARSH & MCLENNAN COS	MMC	Insurance	Insurance Brokers
GLOBE LIFE INC	GL	Insurance	Life & Health Insurance
UNUM GROUP	UNM	Insurance	Life & Health Insurance
PROGRESSIVE CORP-OHIO	PGR	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
BERKLEY (W R) CORP	WRB	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
CINCINNATI FINANCIAL CORP	CINF	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
CHUBB LTD	CB	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
ALLSTATE CORP	ALL	Insurance	Property & Casualty Insurance
EVEREST RE GROUP LTD	RE	Insurance	Reinsurance
HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES	HIG	Insurance	Multi-line Insurance