arXiv:2208.02925v4 [econ.EM] 26 Feb 2024

Factor Network Autoregressions *

Matteo Barigozzi
University of Bologna, Italy

Giuseppe Cavaliere
University of Bologna, Italy
& Exeter Business School, UK

Graziano Moramarco
University of Bologna, Italy

March 18, 2024

Abstract

We propose a factor network autoregressive (FNAR) model for time series with complex network structures. The coefficients of the model reflect many different types of connections between economic agents ("multilayer network"), which are summarized into a smaller number of network matrices ("network factors") through a novel tensor-based principal component approach. We provide consistency and asymptotic normality results for the estimation of the factors and the coefficients of the FNAR. Our approach combines two different dimension-reduction techniques and can be applied to ultra-high-dimensional datasets. Simulation results show the goodness of our approach in finite samples. In an empirical application, we use the FNAR to investigate the cross-country interdependence of GDP growth rates based on a variety of international trade and financial linkages. The model provides a rich characterization of macroeconomic network effects.

Keywords: Networks, factor models, principal components, VAR, tensor decomposition.

*We thank for useful comments and suggestions participants at the 3rd Italian Workshop of Econometrics and Empirical Economics (Rimini, 20-21 January 2022), the Workshop on Dimensionality Reduction and Inference in High-Dimensional Time Series (Maastricht, 13-14 June 2022), the Waseda Workshop (Tokyo, 7 February 2023), the 10th Italian Congress of Econometrics and Empirical Economics (Cagliari, 26-28 May 2023), the 13th Workshop in Time Series Econometrics (Zaragoza, 16-17 March 2023), the Barcelona Summer Forum (Barcelona, 12-13 June, 2023), the ECARES@30 Workshop (Bruxelles 30 June, 2023), the Joint Statistical Meetings (Toronto, 5-10 August 2023), as well as seminar participants at ITAM (24 March 2023) and Lund (28 March 2023). We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (PRIN 2017, Grant 2017TA7TYC).

1 Introduction

Network models are key tools for analyzing interconnected systems and are increasingly used in many areas of research. Classic applications involve social networks, where a high number of agents are connected along several dimensions (e.g., Zhu et al. 2017), or economic networks, which are usually applied to evaluate spillover effects between agents, geographical regions and economic sectors (e.g., Acemoglu et al. 2015; Diebold and Yilmaz 2014; Billio et al. 2012). From an empirical perspective, the analysis of networks calls for the development of novel statistical techniques that are able to account for complex interactions and handle large datasets, possibly recorded over time.

Several approaches have been proposed to integrate network structures into well-established time series models; the network autoregression (NAR) by Zhu et al. (2017) or the global vector autoregressive (GVAR) model by Pesaran et al. (2004) are two leading examples. These models are generally designed to deal with one type of connection at a time between the agents or "nodes" of a network. For example, in GVAR models countries are typically assumed to be linked by aggregate import/export flows. In the words of network theory, these models characterize networks in the form of a single *adjacency matrix*; i.e., a matrix whose ij-th element represents a link between node i and node j.

The assumption of a single adjacency matrix, however, appears in general restrictive. In fact, modern economies or social networks are complex systems, in which agents interact through many different channels. For instance, countries are simultaneously linked not only by international trade flows, but also by financial linkages, multinational firms' activities, migration flows, etc.

Accordingly, models of *multilayer networks*, i.e., networks where nodes are linked through multiple types of connections (Kivelä et al. 2014), have important applications in many different areas, such as international economics and financial (systemic) risk assessment. The statistical and econometric research on these networks is still limited and faces substantial methodological challenges. In particular, problems of overparametrization become even more serious when dealing with large networks with many nodes and many layers at the same time.

In this paper, we fill this gap in the extant literature by proposing a novel factor network autoregres-

sive (FNAR) model for the analysis of time series within large multilayer networks. The FNAR model is a vector autoregression (VAR) whose coefficients depend on many types of network connections between nodes. Such connections are driven by a smaller number of unobserved matrices, called *network factors*. By representing a multilayer network as a tensor (i.e., a multidimensional array), we develop a novel, tensor-based principal component analysis (PCA) approach to estimate the network factors.

A key feature of our approach is that, in contrast to recent contributions on tensor factors (in particular, Lam 2021, Zhang et al. 2022, and Barigozzi et al. 2023) where all modes of the tensor are assumed to have a factor structure, we focus only on a specific mode of a given tensor, i.e., the one representing the layers of a network. This allows us to interpret the estimated tensor factors as networks common to all layers of the multilayer network.

Our model is particularly suitable for use in ultra-high-dimensional contexts, as it exploits two different types of dimension-reduction techniques. Specifically, consider a generic multilayer network with N nodes and m layers, and a vector autoregressive model for N variables, one per node. First, by assuming, as in Zhu et al. (2017), that the network effects are homogeneous across nodes (or across groups of nodes), the number of unknown parameters in our multilayer network VAR is at most linear in the number of networks considered, instead of being proportional to N^2 as is the case for ordinary VARs. This is because between-variable effects are expressed as multiples of some given network matrices. Second, since the FNAR is based on the extraction of network factors common across the layers, the number of parameters does not grow with the number of network layers m, which can be arbitrarily large.

In terms of statistical theory, by extending Zhu et al. (2017) to the multilayer framework, we first provide sufficient conditions such that the FNAR admits a (weakly) stationary and causal solution. Importantly, not only we allow the number of nodes N and the sample size T to grow to infinity, but we also allow for the number layers m to diverge. In terms of estimation theory, we provide sufficient conditions such that our estimator of the factor loadings is consistent and asymptotically normal. In addition, we can provide estimators of the network factors and of the FNAR coefficients which are consistent and asymptotically normal. Crucially, the estimator of the FNAR coefficients we propose is

consistent even when the FNAR errors admit cross-sectional correlation, due to the presence of node specific factors, as well as serial correlation. Finally, the number of network factors can be determined by an eigenvalue ratio approach, similar to the one recently proposed by Barigozzi et al. (2023).

Our approach is especially related to the network autoregression (NAR) model by Zhu et al. (2017), the community network autoregression (CNAR) model by Chen et al. (2023) and the group network autoregression (GNAR) model by Zhu et al. (2022). Differently to these papers, our main contribution is to integrate a large multilayer network into a VAR model by representing multilayer networks as a superposition of uncorrelated common networks. Our paper is also closely related to the recent statistical literature on factor analysis of tensor time series which builds on tensor decomposition methods (Kolda and Bader 2009); see also Chen et al. (2022), Han et al. (2020, 2021, 2022) and Chang et al. (2023). In contrast to these works, where factors account for all the dynamics, we allow for serial dependence in the idiosyncratic tensor. This reflects the assumption, commonly made in the literature on factor modeling of economic data, that factors account for the cross-sectional variation of time series (Stock and Watson 2002, Bai 2003, in the vector case).

We also contribute to two further strands of literature. First, to the literature on factor and factor-augmented models (e.g., Stock and Watson 2002, Bernanke et al. 2005, Bai and Ng 2006, Forni et al. 2009) by developing a new framework where factors are matrices rather than vectors, and enter a factor-augmented autoregression by multiplying (weighting) the lagged vector of endogenous variables, rather than being included directly as regressors. Second, to two important streams of the literature on network econometrics, that is: (i) works that investigate the properties of observed networks, such as production networks (see, e.g., Acemoglu et al. 2012, Carvalho et al. 2020), trading networks in financial and interbank markets (Adamic et al. 2017, Denbee et al. 2021) and social networks (Zhu et al. 2017), and (ii) works concerned with the estimation of network links from the data (e.g., Diebold and Yilmaz 2014, Billio et al. 2012, Barigozzi and Brownlees 2019). Our approach combines these two streams of research together: on the one hand, we use data on a large number of observed economic networks; on the other hand, we estimate unobserved common network factors driving them.

Finally, we also include an empirical application from economics, where we use the FNAR model to study the dynamics of GDP growth rates in a network of 24 countries with 25 different layers, reflecting international trade flows for different categories of goods and services, and a variety of cross-border financial linkages. The model allows to capture the complexity of cross-country macroeconomic interdependence and to disentangle different spillover effects.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 illustrates the model, Section 3 presents the estimation approach, Section 4 introduces the assumptions and the asymptotic properties of the estimators, Section 5 evaluates the finite sample performance of our estimators by means of Monte Carlo simulations, Section 6 presents the empirical application, and Section 7 concludes. All proofs are in the accompanying Supplement Material, which also contains additional possible estimators, further simulation results and details on the empirical application.

NOTATION. The *order* of a tensor is the number of dimensions, also known as *modes*. We deal only with order-3 tensors. The mode-q matricization, or unfolding, of a tensor, denoted as $\text{mat}_{(q)}(\mathcal{T})$ or, equivalently, $\mathcal{T}_{(q)}$, is a matrix in which the first dimension corresponds to the q-th mode of the tensor and the second dimension is obtained by collapsing all the remaining modes into a single one, preserving their ordering. Thus, for a generic order-3 tensor $\mathcal{T}$ of dimensions $d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3$, the mode-1 matricization is a $d_1 \times (d_2 d_3)$ matrix, the mode-2 matricization is a $d_2 \times (d_1 d_3)$ matrix and the mode-3 matricization is a $d_3 \times (d_1 d_2)$ matrix. Finally, for a generic tensor $\mathcal{T}$ of dimensions $d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3$ and its mode-q matricization $\mathcal{T}_{(q)}$, we denote the mode-q multiplication of tensor $\mathcal{T}$ by a matrix X of size $p \times d_q$ as $\mathcal{T} \times_q X$, which is a tensor of size p in the q-th dimension and the same size as $\mathcal{T}$ in the other dimensions. For more properties of tensor calculus, see Kolda and Bader (2009).

2 MODEL

2.1 MULTILAYER NETWORKS AND NETWORK FACTORS

We consider a multilayer network with N nodes (e.g., individuals, firms, countries) and m layers capturing different types of connections between nodes (e.g., import/export of different goods), observed

at different points in time $t = 1, \dots, T$. A multilayer network is then made of m adjacency matrices of dimensions $N \times N$, each denoted as $W_{k,t}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$. Here we consider weighted networks, and the generic (i, j)-th element of $W_{k,t}$ represents the weight of node j for node i in terms of the k-th type of relationship at time t. The network is *directed*; i.e., the weight of node j for node i is generally not the same as the weight of node i for node j. We make the usual assumptions that the elements along the diagonal of $W_{k,t}$ are equal to zero; i.e., there are no self-loops in the network. Furthermore, without loss of generality it is convenient to assume that the weights are normalized in such a way that the elements in each row of $W_{k,t}$ sum to N (see Section 3.1 for specific comments on this aspect).

As an example, consider a network of N countries that trade with each other in m different types of goods. Then, the (i, j)-th entry of the network may represent the share of imports of country i from country j in a specific product category at time t, conveniently rescaled so that the rows of the network sum to N.

The m weight matrices can be collected into a tensor, providing a compact representation of the multilayer network. Specifically, we define the *weight tensor* as the tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$ of size $N \times N \times m$ that includes all weight matrices. The tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$ is therefore an order-3 tensor, where we can think of the weight matrices as the *frontal slices* of the tensor.

In applications, the number m of layers can be very large (e.g., for trade data we can geft to about 100 products); hence, we have to deal with a high-dimensional tensor time series $\mathcal{W}_t$ of size $N \times N \times m$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, where not only N and T, but also m, can be large, hence worsening the potential issues due to overparametrization. In order to reduce the dimensionality of the problem, we assume – and this is a key feature of our approach – that the layers of the multilayer network have a factor structure. In particular, we assume that the time-varying weight tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$\mathcal{W}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 U + \mathcal{E}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t$ is a $N \times N \times r$ tensor containing r *network factors*, each of dimensions $N \times N$, which are "common" across all nodes, U is a $m \times r$ matrix of factor loadings determining how each layer of the original network loads on the network factors, and $\mathcal{E}_t$ is an $N \times N \times m$ tensor of *idiosyncratic networks*,

which are assumed to be (i) uncorrelated with the factors, (ii) weakly cross-correlated along the third dimension, and (iii) autocorrelated over time. Throughout, we assume that $r \ll m$. We refer to Section 4 for more rigorous assumptions. Finally, the mode-3 matricization of (2.1) gives:

$$\mathcal{W}_{(3)t} = U\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} + \mathcal{E}_{(3)t} \quad t = 1, \ldots, T. \tag{2.2}$$

This expression resembles a conventional factor model, with the major difference that each of the r factors is no longer a scalar but a vector of size N^2, containing up to $N(N-1)$ non-zero elements (as there are no self-interactions in the network).

2.2 FNAR

Consider a vector $y_t = (y_{1t}, \ldots, y_{Nt})'$ containing a variable of interest y_{it} for the i-th node ($i = 1, \ldots, N$) of the network at time t ($t = 1, \ldots, T$). A VAR model for y_t suffers inevitably from the curse of-dimensionality if N is large, and its estimation by least-squares becomes unfeasible. Here we propose a VAR model for y_t in which the dynamics depends on multiple network matrices linking its N components. Specifically, we introduce the *factor network autoregressive* (FNAR) model, which is given by:

$$y_t = \beta_1 \frac{F_{1,t-1}}{N} y_{t-1} + \ldots + \beta_r \frac{F_{r,t-1}}{N} y_{t-1} + \rho y_{t-1} + \alpha + \nu_t, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\beta := (\beta_1 \cdots \beta_r)'$ is an r-dimensional vector, ρ and α are scalars and $F_{k,t} := \text{mat}_{(1)}(\mathcal{F}_{\cdot,\cdot,k,t})$, $k = 1, \ldots, r$, denote the $N \times N$ matrices which are the layers of $\mathcal{F}_t$. Notice that the network factors are explicitly rescaled by N in agreement with our normalization assumption on the observed networks.

The term ν_t is an N-dimensional vector, which we assume to have a factor structure capturing the contemporaneous cross-sectional dependence among the N nodes:

$$\nu_t = \Lambda_1 G_{1t} + \ldots + \Lambda_q G_{qt} + \epsilon_t = \Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t, \tag{2.4}$$

where $G_t := (G_{1t}, \cdots, G_{qt})'$ is a q-dimensional vector of node-specific factors, $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \cdots, \Lambda_q)$ is the $N \times q$ matrix of loadings, and ϵ_t is the N-dimensional vector of zero mean innovations, which are assumed to be serially and cross-sectionally uncorrelated (hence, with a diagonal covariance matrix).

We call the term $\sum_{k=1}^{r} \beta_k N^{-1} F_{k,t-1} y_{t-1}$ the *network effect*, where the coefficients capture the strength of dynamic network effects between nodes, exerted through different types of relationships which are summarized by means of few network factors. We call the term ρy_{t-1} the *momentum effect*, which captures the direct dynamic interaction of a node with itself. Last, we call the term α the *nodal effect*. This can be generalized to include a random effect by adding a term $Z_{t-1}\gamma$, where γ is a K-dimensional parameter vector, common to all nodes, and Z_t is a $N \times K$ matrix of node-specific exogenous variables. Because of the factor structure in the innovations, the network nodes are correlated with each other not only through the network relationship, but also through the common factors which characterize the cross-sectional dependence at a global level.

When we deal with a single network, so that $m = 1$ and $N^{-1}\mathcal{W}_t$ is just a row-normalized matrix which coincides with $N^{-1}\mathcal{F}_t$, the specification in (2.3) becomes the network autoregressive (NAR) model by Zhu et al. (2017), with the exception that, following Chen et al. (2023), we also allow for cross-sectional dependence in the error vector, in the form of a factor structure, and, moreover, those errors might even be autocorrelated.

As previously mentioned, the FNAR model provides two forms of dimension reduction, which makes it particularly suitable for ultra-high-dimensional contexts. First, following the NAR approach, we assume that the β_k coefficients are homogeneous across nodes and that, accordingly, all the heterogeneity in network effects between nodes derives from different bilateral weights; i.e., from the structure of the network. Thus, for example, two countries with exactly the same international network should experience the same spillovers from abroad. Second, we extract a small number of factors from the complete set of weight matrices, which reduces the number of β_k parameters to be estimated from m to r. Summing up, while estimation of a VAR(1) requires estimating N^2+N parameters, a NAR with m networks requires estimating $m+2$ parameters, and the FNAR requires estimating just $r+2$ parameters.

A limitation of the FNAR as well as of the NAR models is the assumption that both the momentum and nodal coefficients are homogeneous across nodes. This assumption can be relaxed by considering the case in which we allow for just K groups, so having α_k and ρ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. If we treat K as a

fixed constant and the group structure as known, all our theoretical results (see Section 4) are unchanged. Extensions to the case of an unknown group structure, where the number of groups K can grow with the number of nodes N, could be considered by adapting the works by Chen et al. (2023) and Zhu et al. (2022) to the FNAR framework; we leave such extensions to further research.

3 Estimation

Estimation of the FNAR model requires two distinct steps. The first involves estimation of the r network factors, as well as the associated loadings. This is done in Section 3.1 below. The second step involves fitting the FNAR equation (2.3), taking into account the estimation error arising in the first step. This is done in Section 3.2. Finally, since the numbers r and q of network and node factors are usually unknown in applications, in Section 3.3 we discuss the problem of their determination.

3.1 Network factors and loadings

To estimate $\mathcal{F}_t$ and U, we develop a novel approach which extends PCA to tensors. Estimation is based on the three following steps.

1. We compute the cross-layer sample $m \times m$ inner product of $\mathcal{W}_t$:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}} := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{W}_{(3)t}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)t}. \tag{3.1}$$

2. Let $\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}$ be the $m\times r$ matrix whose j-th column is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the j-th largest eigenvalue, $\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}$, of $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}$, and $\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}$ is the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix with $\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}$ as its j-th diagonal entry. Then, we estimate the loadings matrix U as:

$$\widehat{U} := \frac{1}{N}\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{1/2}. \tag{3.2}$$

3. We estimate the mode-3 matricization of the network factors as the PCs of $\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}$, i.e., by linear projection of $\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}$ onto $\widehat{U}$: $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} := (\widehat{U}'\widehat{U})^{-1}\widehat{U}'\mathcal{W}_{(3)t} = N(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{-1/2}\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}\prime}\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}$, which implies

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t := \mathcal{W}_t \times_3 [N(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U})^{-1}\widehat{U}'] = \mathcal{W}_t \times_3 [N(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{-1/2}\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}\prime}]. \tag{3.3}$$

and $\widehat{F}_{k,t} := \text{mat}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\cdot,\cdot,k,t})$, $k = 1, \ldots, r$.

Like in ordinary PCA, the key intuition is that by exploiting the cross-sectional variation we can estimate the space spanned by the factors. In this case, the relevant cross-sectional dimension is the dimension of the layers in a network; i.e., the third dimension of the weight tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$. The rescaling by N in estimating the loadings reflects that fact that no dimension reduction is applied to the first and second modes of $\mathcal{W}_t$.

Notice that the estimated loadings and factor tensor are such that they satisfy the identifying conditions: $m^{-1}\widehat{U}'\widehat{U} = m^{-1}N^{-2}\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}$, which is a diagonal matrix by construction, and

$$\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_{(3)t} = (\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{-1/2}\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}\prime}\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{-1/2} = I_r, \tag{3.4}$$

so that the r rows of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t}$ are the classical normalized PCs of the m rows of $\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}$.

There are two main differences between our approach and the one proposed by Chen et al. (2022) for estimating common tensor factors from tensor times series admitting a Tucker decomposition. First, we estimate factors using covariances instead of the long run covariances, thus allowing the idiosyncratic tensor to be also autocorrelated. The second difference is that we extract factors along a single dimension of the tensor, namely the dimension of the network layers. This implies that the extracted factors still have a network interpretation; i.e., they are common network layers.

Last, we notice that our estimated network factors have two important features, which allow us to interpret the results. First, they ensure that the estimated factor matrices $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$, $k = 1, \ldots, r$, have zeros along the main diagonal, thus preserving their interpretation as network matrices. Second, all the rows of any k-th factor matrix $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$ sum to the same value, which is constant for all t, but varies across factors and is in general lower than N. In particular, since the k-th row of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t}$, for any $k = 1, \ldots, r$, corresponds to the vectorization of the factor matrix $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$, the sum of squares of $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$ is equal to N^2 on average across the T time periods, because of (3.4). Equivalently, the average row sum of squares of $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$, calculated across both the N rows and the T time periods, is equal to N. Hence, the average row sum of absolute values must be comprised between $\sqrt{N}$ (when only one node of the network has non-zero weight) and N (when

all nodes have equal absolute weights).

To preserve such properties, we do not standardize nor demean the elements in $\mathcal{W}_t$ along the time dimension. Indeed, our variables are all expressed in the same unit of measurement and standardization would eliminate the fundamental interpretation of $\mathcal{W}_t$ as a network, as centering would affect the zero diagonal entries. The same strategy is adopted by Chen et al. (2022, Remark 11).

Our estimators in (3.2) and (3.3) are defined consistently with the assumption that the observed networks have rows summing to N. This implies that the estimated network factors in (3.3) have variance growing with N, as shown in (3.4), and they must be rescaled before being used in the FNAR defined in (2.3) to ensure the scale of the estimated network effects β_j does not depend on N. Clearly, we could equivalently work with row normalized observed networks and then no rescaling by N would be needed anywhere, although this would imply that, as the number of nodes N grows, the entries of $\mathcal{W}_t$ would have to become smaller and smaller.

3.2 FNAR COEFFICIENTS

We now describe an estimators of the FNAR coefficients which is robust to the presence of autocorrelated node factors G_t, so that FNAR errors ν_t are both cross-sectionally and serially correlated. To this end, we introduce an algorithm similar to the one proposed by Chen et al. (2023), who in turn adapted the approach by Bai (2009) to the NAR setting. The OLS and GLS estimators are considered in Appendices 9 and 10, respectively, under the assumption of no autocorrelation in the node factors.

Let $y =: (y_1, \cdots, y_T)' = (y_1, \cdots, y_N)$ and $\epsilon =: (\epsilon_1, \cdots, \epsilon_T)' = (\epsilon_1, \cdots, \epsilon_N)$ which are $T \times N$ matrices, $G := (G_1, \cdots, G_T)'$ which is a $T \times q$ matrix, and $\Lambda := (\Lambda_1, \cdots, \Lambda_N)'$ which is an $N \times q$ matrix. Define also the $(r+2)$-dimensional vector of coefficients $\theta := (\beta', \rho, \alpha)'$.

Then, define the order-3 tensor $\mathcal{X}$ of dimensions $T \times N \times (r+2)$ having in each of the first r layers one of the r matrices $\mathsf{F}_k := (N^{-1}F_{k,0}y_0, \cdots, N^{-1}F_{k,T-1}y_{T-1})'$, $k = 1, \ldots, r$, each of size $T \times N$, in layer $(r+1)$ it has the $T \times N$ matrix $y_{(-1)} := (y_0, \cdots, y_{T-1})'$ and in layer $(r+2)$ it has a $T \times N$ matrix of ones, denotes as $1_{T \times N}$. Then, $\mathcal{X}_{(1)} := \text{mat}_{(1)}\mathcal{X}$ is a $T \times N(r+2)$ matrix having as t-th row $\text{vec}(X_t)'$ and $\mathcal{X}_{(2)} := \text{mat}_{(2)}\mathcal{X}$ is a $N \times T(r+2)$ matrix having as i-th row $\text{vec}(X_i)'$, where

$X_t := (\mathsf{F}_{1,t-1,\cdot}, \cdots, \mathsf{F}_{r,t-1,\cdot}, y_{t-1}, \iota_N)$ and $X_i := (\mathsf{F}_{1,\cdot,i}, \cdots, \mathsf{F}_{r,\cdot,i}, y_i, \iota_T)$, with ι_N and ι_T being N and T dimensional vectors of ones, respectively, $\mathsf{F}_{k,t-1,\cdot}$ and $\mathsf{F}_{r,\cdot,i}$ being the tth row and ith column of F_k, respectively. Then, the FNAR can be equivalently rewritten as:

$$y_t = X_t\theta + \Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t \quad \text{or} \quad y_i = X_i\theta + G\Lambda_i + \epsilon_i. \tag{3.5}$$

By stacking all T or N equations in (3.5) the FNAR can be written as:

$$y = \mathcal{X} \times_3 \theta' + G\Lambda' + \epsilon = \mathcal{X}_{(1)}(\theta \otimes I_N) + G\Lambda' + \epsilon = (\theta' \otimes I_T)\mathcal{X}'_{(2)} + G\Lambda' + \epsilon. \tag{3.6}$$

Clearly, given $\mathcal{X}$ and G, an unfeasible OLS estimator of θ is obtained by applying the Frisch-Waugh theorem to partial out the effect of G or of Λ:

$$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{FW,G}} \otimes I_N = \left(\mathcal{X}'_{(1)} M_G \mathcal{X}_{(1)}\right)^{-1} \left(\mathcal{X}'_{(1)} M_G\, y\right) \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{\theta}^{\text{FW},\Lambda} \otimes I_T = \left(\mathcal{X}'_{(2)} M_\Lambda \mathcal{X}_{(2)}\right)^{-1} \left(\mathcal{X}'_{(2)} M_\Lambda\, y'\right),$$

where $M_G := I_T - G(G'G)^{-1}G'$ and $M_\Lambda := I_N - \Lambda(\Lambda'\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda'$ are the $T \times T$ and $N \times N$ linear projectors onto the spaces orthogonal to the factors and loadings spaces, respectively.

Since both the network and node factors are unobserved, estimation of (3.6) is unfeasible. So in $\mathcal{X}$ we replace the network factors $F_{j,t}$ with their estimates $\widehat{F}_{j,t}$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$, and, for given θ and $\mathcal{X}$, the estimators of Λ and G are the usual PC estimators applied to the FNAR errors $\nu := y - \mathcal{X} \times_3 \theta'$.

In this way, we can compute two equivalent estimators of θ, given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}^{\dagger} &:= \left(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{X}'_i M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger} \widehat{X}_i\right)^{-1} \left(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{X}'_i M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger} y_i\right) \\ \widehat{\theta}^{*} &:= \left(\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{X}'_t M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} \widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1} \left(\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{X}'_t M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} y_t\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and, letting $\widehat{\nu}^\dagger := y - \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \times_3 \widehat{\theta}^{\dagger\prime}$ and $\widehat{\nu}^* := y - \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \times_3 \widehat{\theta}^{*\prime}$, we have (see also Appendix 8)

$$\widehat{G}^\dagger := \widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^\dagger}\sqrt{T}, \quad \widehat{\Lambda}^* := \widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}(\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}^*})^{1/2}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^\dagger}$ is the $T \times q$ matrix of normalized eigenvectors of $N^{-1}\widehat{\nu}^\dagger\widehat{\nu}^{\dagger\prime}$, and $\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}$ is the $q \times q$ diagonal of eigenvalues of $T^{-1}\widehat{\nu}^{*\prime}\widehat{\nu}^*$ with corresponding normalized eigenvectors being the columns of the $N \times q$

matrix $\widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}$. Notice that $\widehat{\theta}^\dagger$ and $\widehat{\theta}^*$ are such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}^\dagger &= \arg\min_\theta \tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - X_i\theta - G\Lambda_i)'(y_i - X_i\theta - G\Lambda_i), \\ \widehat{\theta}^* &= \arg\min_\theta \tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - X_t\theta - \Lambda G_t)'(y_t - X_t\theta - \Lambda G_t). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

By iterating between (3.7) and (3.8), we solve such minimization and compute the final estimator of θ.

Finally, notice that, obviously, if we use $\widehat{\theta}^\dagger$ we can also estimate the loadings Λ by linear projection of $\widehat{G}^\dagger$ onto $\widehat{\nu}^\dagger$, and if we use $\widehat{\theta}^*$ we can also estimate the node factors G by linear projection of $\widehat{\Lambda}^*$ onto $\widehat{\nu}^*$. These, however, are not needed for estimating θ.

3.3 Number of factors

We estimate the number of network factors, r, by means of the eigenvalue ratio approach. Letting $\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, be the j-th largest eigenvalue of $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}$ defined in (3.1), we consider the criterion:

$$\widehat{r} := \underset{j=1,\ldots,r_{\max}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}/\widehat{\mu}_{j+1}^{\mathcal{W}}), \tag{3.10}$$

where $r_{\max}$ is a predefined maximum number of network factors such that $r_{\max} < \min\{m, T, N^2\}$. This is the criterion proposed by Barigozzi et al. (2023), which generalizes the approach proposed by Han et al. (2022) to the tensor factor model with autocorrelated idiosyncratic components.

Likewise, letting $\widehat{\mu}_j^{\widehat{\nu}}$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$, be the j-th largest eigenvalue of $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\widehat{\nu}}$ defined in (8.1), the number of factors in the FNAR errors, q, is determined by means of the criterion:

$$\widehat{q} := \underset{j=1,\ldots,q_{\max}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\widehat{\mu}_j^{\widehat{\nu}}/\widehat{\mu}_{j+1}^{\widehat{\nu}}), \tag{3.11}$$

where $q_{\max}$ is a predefined maximum number of network factors such that $q_{\max} < \min\{T, N\}$; see Ahn and Horenstein (2013). Alternative approaches are possible, see, e.g. Bai and Ng (2002).

4 Theory

4.1 Assumptions on the network factor model

In the following, we allow for the number of layers m to grow to infinity. Therefore, all our assumptions are stated for the infinite sequence of $N \times N$ networks $W_{i,t} := \text{mat}_{(1)}(\mathcal{W}_{\cdot,\cdot,i,t})$ with $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Equivalently, we could state the assumptions for $i = 1, \dots, m$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, all assumptions are stated contemplating the possibility that also the number of nodes N and the sample size T grow to infinity.

Assumption 1 (Common component of multilayer network).

(i) $\lim_{m\to\infty} \|m^{-1}U'U - \Sigma_U\| = 0$ *where* Σ_U *is* $r \times r$ *finite and positive definite, and, for all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|U_{k\cdot}\| \leq M_U$ *for some finite* M_U *independent of* k.

(ii) For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}} := \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}]$ *is* $r \times r$ *positive definite, and such that* $\left\|N^{-2}\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}\right\| \leq M_{\mathcal{F}}$ *for some finite* $M_{\mathcal{F}}$ *independent of* N.

(iii) For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|N^{-1}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\right\|^4\right] \leq K_{\mathcal{F}}$ *for some finite* $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ *independent of* t *and* N.

(iv) For all $i, j = 1, \dots, r$ *and all* $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\{\mathcal{F}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)tj\cdot} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)tj\cdot}\right]\right\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{F}}$ *for some finite* $C_{\mathcal{F}}$ *independent of* $i, j, T,$ *and* N.

(v) There exists an integer $\overline{M}$ *such that for all* $m > \overline{M}$, r *is a finite positive integer, independent of* m.

(vi) For all $i = 1, \dots, r$ *and all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\#\{\mathcal{F}_{(3)tij} \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, N^2\} \geq \kappa$ *for some positive integer* $\kappa \leq N(N-1)$.

Assumptions 1(i) and 1(ii) imply that we consider only pervasive, or strong, factors. In other words, the network factors are loaded by most or all the network layers. Notice that the factor tensors have dimension $N \times N \times r$, hence their first two modes have diverging dimensions. This is the reason for the rescaling introduced in Assumption 1(ii).

Under Assumption 1(ii) , the 2nd order moments of the process $\{N^{-1}\text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are finite and independent of time, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by Assumptions 1(iii) and 1(iv) imply that, given the

factors, we can consistently estimate $\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}} := \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}]$, as proved in Lemma 12.6(i). This implies that the network factors have variance growing with N. Therefore, given the loadings, we can also consistently estimate $\Gamma^{\chi} := U\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}]U'$.

Assumption 1(v) simply states that the number of factors is finite for all $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and that in order to find such factors we need m to be large enough.

Finally, Assumption 1(vi) simply requires that at least κ out of $N(N-1)$ entries of each network factor should be non-zero. It follows that for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, the entries of the network factors are bounded accordingly to $\max_{j=1,\dots,N^2} \left|\mathcal{F}_{(3)tij}\right| \leq 1/\sqrt{\kappa}$. This allows us to give a meaning to the scale of the entries in the estimated network factors. It is reasonable to think that a network is common across layers if we have at least $\kappa = 2$.

Assumption 2 (Idiosyncratic component of multilayer network).

(i) *For all* $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\right] = 0_{m\times N^2}$ *and* $\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}} := \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}]$ *is* $m\times m$ *positive definite.*

(ii) *For all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, *all* $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, *and all* $i, j = 1, \dots N^2$, $N^{-\alpha}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{N^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right| \leq \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{|t-s|}M_{ij}$ *and, for all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, *all* $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, *and all* $i, j, k = 1, \dots, N^2$, $N^{-\alpha}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right| \leq \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{|t-s|}M_{ij}$ *for some* $\alpha \in [0, 2]$ *and some finite* $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ *and* M_{ij} *independent of* t, s, k *and* N *such that* $0 \leq \rho_{\mathcal{E}} < 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m} M_{ij} \leq M_{\mathcal{E}}$ *and* $\sum_{j=1}^{m} M_{ij} \leq M_{\mathcal{E}}$, *for some finite* $M_{\mathcal{E}}$ *independent of* i, j *and* m.

(iii) *For all* $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{(3)tij}|^4] \leq K_{\mathcal{E}}$ *for some finite* $K_{\mathcal{E}}$ *independent of* i, j, t.

(iv) *For all* $m, T, N \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $j = 1, \dots, N^2$ *and all* $s = 1, \dots, T$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{N^2}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjk} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjk}\right]\right\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{E}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{N^2}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sik} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sik}\right]\right\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{E}}$$

for some finite $C_{\mathcal{E}}$ *independent of* j, s, m, T, N *and some* $\alpha \in [0, 2]$.

(v) For all $m, T, N \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $j = 1, \dots, N^2$ *and all* $s = 1, \dots, T$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjh} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjh}\right]\right\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{E}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sih} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sih}\right]\right\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{E}}$$

for some finite $C_{\mathcal{E}}$ *independent of* j, s, m, T, N *and some* $\alpha \in [0, 2]$.

This assumption controls the serial and cross-sectional dependence of the entries of the idiosyncratic tensor. In particular, according to Assumption 2(ii), the dependence across time and layers is controlled in a standard way; hence, the classical summability of covariances (Bai, 2003) holds. The dependence across nodes instead is made of N^4 terms but we assume it to scale as N^α for some $\alpha \in [0, 2]$. If $\alpha = 2$, the dependence across nodes is of the same kind as the weak dependence as across layers, while for smaller values of α the dependence is even weaker. Values of $\alpha < 2$ mean that $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjh}\right] = 0$ for some values of h. This assumption accounts for the fact that, since we do not have any factor structure along the first two modes of $\mathcal{W}_t$, then the network factors already capture most of the dependence across nodes.

Finally, Assumptions 2(iii), 2(iv), and 2(v) imply that, $\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t} - \frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}\right)$, i.e., given the idiosyncratic tensor we can consistently estimate $m^{-1}N^{-2}\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}$, for any $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$, as proved in Lemma 12.6(ii).

Assumption 3 (Independence). *For all* $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$, *the tensor processes* $\{\mathcal{E}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *and* $\{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *are mutually independent, and, for all* $m, N, T \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mN^\alpha T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)ti\cdot}\right\|^2\right] \leq C_{\mathcal{FE}}$ *for some finite* $C_{\mathcal{FE}}$ *independent of* m, N, *and* T.

Define the $m \times m$ matrix $\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}} := \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)t}]$ and let Γ^{χ} be as previously defined. Denote the eigenvalues of Γ^{χ} as μ_j^{χ}, $j = 1, \dots, r$, in decreasing order. Then, as established by Lemma 12.2(i), we have that $\mu_j^{\chi} \asymp mN^2$; i.e., the eigenvalues of the factor component are diverging as $m, N \to \infty$. Furthermore, in Lemma 12.2(iv) we show that our assumptions imply that the largest eigenvalue of $\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}$ diverges as N^α, i.e., $\left\|N^{-\alpha}\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\|$ is finite for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. As a consequence, by Assumption 3 and Weyl's

inequality, the matrix $\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}} = \Gamma^{\chi} + \Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}$ is characterized by an eigengap between the r-th and the $(r+1)$-th largest eigenvalues which widens as $m \to \infty$, and if $\alpha < 2$ it widens also as $N \to \infty$. This is the property that allows us to identify the number of factors and it is the rationale for the eigenvalue ratio criterion for estimating r defined in (3.10). This also means that the network factor model in (2.2) is always identified as long as $m \to \infty$.

In general, the network factors and their loadings are not identified unless we impose further restrictions. To this end we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 4 (Identification of network factors and loadings).

(i) *For all* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m^{-1}U'U$ *is diagonal with distinct entries.*

(ii) *For all* $N, T \in \mathbb{N}$, $N^{-2}T^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t} = I_r$.

Under Assumption 4 the columns of the loadings matrix U and the layers of the tensor factor $\mathcal{F}_t$ are identified up to a sign multiplication. This assumption has three important implications. First, $\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}/N^2 = I_r$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., the network factors are orthonormal. Second, $m^{-1}N^{-2}\Gamma^{\chi} = m^{-1}UU'$; thus, $\Sigma_U = \lim_{m,N\to\infty} m^{-1}N^{-2}M^{\chi}$, where M^{χ} is the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix of the r largest eigenvalues of Γ^{χ}, hence Σ_U is diagonal with distinct entries. Third, the r non-zero eigenvalues of Γ^{χ} are distinct and therefore the corresponding eigenvectors are uniquely identified. This identification scheme is a classical one adopted for example by Forni et al. (2009) in the vector factor model case.

Assumption 5 (CLTs).

(i) *For any given* $i = 1, \dots, m$, *as* $N, T \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{\alpha}T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_r, \Phi_i)$, *where* $\Phi_i := \lim_{N,T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{\alpha}T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t\cdot i}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{\alpha}T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t\cdot i}\right)'\right]$.

(ii) *For any given* $t = 1, \dots, T$ *and* N *fixed, as* $m \to \infty$, $\operatorname{vec}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^{\alpha}}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{rN^2}, \Pi_t)$, *where* $\Pi_t := \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{vec}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^{\alpha}}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\right)\operatorname{vec}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^{\alpha}}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\right)'\right]$.

(iii) *For any given* $t = 1, \dots, T$ *and* $j = 1, \dots, N^2$, *as* $m \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)tij} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_r, \Pi_{tj})$, *where* $\Pi_{tj} := \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)tij}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)tij}\right)'\right]$.

Assumption 5(i) is standard in the vector factor model case; i.e., when $N = 1$, where it is satisfied for example by strong-mixing processes (Bai, 2003, Assumption F4). Assumption 5(ii) is stated for a fixed N. If we allowed for $N \to \infty$, we would have to state a CLT for the N^2-dimensional vector $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\}$, and finding primitive conditions for such result is not trivial, as the summands are not independent and being cross-sectional units (layers of a multinetwork) no natural ordering exists. Thus, we directly assume a cross-sectional CLT, which is a standard approach in the vector factor model case (Bai, 2003, Assumption F3). This last remark applies also to Assumption 5(iii).

4.2 Assumptions for the FNAR

We first state the assumptions characterizing the factor model for the FNAR errors ν_t as given in (2.4).

Assumption 6 (FNAR errors).

(i) $\lim_{N\to\infty} \|N^{-1}\Lambda'\Lambda - \Sigma_\Lambda\|$ *where* Σ_Λ *is* $q \times q$ *finite and positive definite, and, for all* $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\Lambda_{i\cdot}\| \leq M_\Lambda$ *for some finite* M_Λ *independent of* i.

(ii) For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}[G_t] = 0_q$, $\Gamma^G := \mathbb{E}\left[G_t G_t'\right]$ *is* $q \times q$ *positive definite, and such that* $\left\|\Gamma^G\right\| \leq M_G$ *for some finite* M_G *independent of* t.

(iii) For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}[\|G_t\|^4] \leq K_G$ *for some finite* K_G *independent of* t.

(iv) For all $i, j = 1, \ldots, q$ *and all* $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \{G_{it}G_{jt} - \mathbb{E}\left[G_{it}G_{jt}\right]\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_G$ *for some finite* C_G *independent of* $i, j,$ *and* T.

(v) There exists an integer $\underline{N}$ *such that for all* $N > \underline{N}$, q *is a finite positive integer, independent of* N.

(vi) For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2] = \sigma_i^2$ *such that* $\sigma_i^2 \geq \underline{M}_\epsilon$ *and* $\sigma_i^2 \leq \overline{M}_\epsilon$ *for some finite* $\underline{M}_\epsilon$ *and* $\overline{M}_\epsilon$ *independent of* i *and* t.

(vii) For all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{js}\right] = 0$ *if* $i \neq j$ *and* $\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{is}\right] = 0$ *if* $t \neq s$.

(viii) For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^4] \leq K_\epsilon$ *for some finite* K_ϵ *independent of* i *and* t.

(ix) *For all* $N, T \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\{\epsilon_{it}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]\}\right|^2\right] \leq C_\epsilon$ *for some finite* C_ϵ *independent of* N *and* T.

This assumption is similar to the usual set of assumptions for the vector factor model (Bai, 2003). The comments to these assumptions are analogous to those made for the network factors in the previous Section and are therefore omitted.

Concerning the idiosyncratic components, we follow Chen et al. (2023) and assume zero correlations both in time and across units. Given that we are considering a factor for the FNAR errors, this assumptions is not very restrictive, as most of the correlations are likely to be already captured by the lagged terms in the FNAR and by the common factors G_t. Nevertheless, it is possible to develop the following theory by allowing for the usual kind of weak cross- and autocorrelations between the components of ϵ_t.

Assumption 7 (Independence of network and node factors). *For all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, *the processes* $\{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\{\epsilon_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, *and* $\{G_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *are mutually independent.*

Because of Assumptions 6(i), 6(ii), 6(vi), 6(vii), and 7, the FNAR errors have covariance matrix $V = \Lambda\Gamma^G\Lambda' + S$, which is positive definite for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This also implies that V^{-1} is finite for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, V has the usual eigengap property; i.e., its largest q eigenvalues diverge at rate N, while the remaining $N-q$ stay bounded for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that the factor model in (2.4), and therefore the number of factors q, is always identified as $N \to \infty$. This is the rationale for the eigenvalue ratio criterion for estimating q defined in (3.11).

Assumption 8 (Identification of node factors and loadings).

(i) *For all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N^{-1}\Lambda'\Lambda$ *is diagonal with distinct entries.*

(ii) *For all* $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $T^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{T} G_t G_t' = I_q$.

Under Assumption 8 the columns of the loadings matrix Λ and the factors G_t are identified up to a sign multiplication. This assumption also implies that Σ_Λ is diagonal with distinct entries and $\Gamma^G = I_q$.

Turning to the FNAR defined in (2.3), we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 9 (Stability of FNAR).

(i) For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\det\left(I_N - \rho I_N - N^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\beta_j \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t}]\right) \neq 0$.

(ii) For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and all* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\det\left(\rho^2 I_{N^2} + N^{-2}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\beta_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t} \otimes F_{j,t}] - zI_{N^2}\right) = 0$ *has roots* $z_j^* \in \mathbb{C}$, $j = 1, \ldots, N^2$, *such that* $|z_j^*| \leq C_S$ *for some finite* $C_S < 1$ *independent of* j, t, *and* N.

This assumption is a generalization to the case of random multivariate AR models of the usual stability conditions for a VAR. As shown below it implies, together with Assumptions 1(ii) and 7, that the FNAR has a stationary solution for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that Assumption 9(i) is stated for the general case in which $\mathbb{E}[F_{j,t}] \neq 0$, otherwise the condition needed to ensure the existence of the mean is simply $|\rho| < 1$.

Finally, recalling that the FNAR can also be written as in (3.5), we make the following assumption.

Assumption 10 (Moment conditions). *For all* $m, N, T \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1+\alpha/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}(y_{t-1} \otimes X_t)\right\|^2\right] \leq \mathfrak{K}_1,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1+\alpha/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}(y_{t-1} \otimes \nu_t)\right\|^2\right] \leq \mathfrak{K}_2,$$

for some finite $\mathfrak{K}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{K}_2$ *independent of* m, N, *and* T.

This assumption is rather technical. To get an intuition of it, consider the $m \times N$ matrix process $\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}(y_{t-1} \otimes X_t)\}$. We are saying that this process is weakly correlated along the time dimension, which is a standard requirement, but it is also weakly correlated across its m rows. The latter requirement is fulfilled by the idiosyncratic terms $\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}$ via Assumption 2(ii), and here is extended to the case in which $\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}$ is multiplied by $y_{t-1} \otimes X_t$ which is independent of $\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}$ because of Assumption 3. The denominator $N^{1+\alpha/2}$ is the natural rescaling to bound the N^2 rows of $y_{t-1} \otimes X_t$ and the N^2 columns of $\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}$ under Assumption 2(ii). A similar reasoning applies to the m-dimensional vector process $\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}(y_{t-1} \otimes \nu_t)\}$.

4.3 Stationarity

In order to develop the theory for the FNAR, we first discuss under which conditions equation (2.3) admits a stationary causal solution. Given the difficulty of the problem we limit ourselves to consider

weakly stationary solutions. This poses two issues. First, the FNAR is defined for an N-dimensional vector y_t where we allow $N \to \infty$. Second, the FNAR is an autoregressive model with stochastic time-varying coefficients. Regarding the former issue, we adopt the definition proposed by Zhu et al. (2017).

DEFINITION 4.1. *Let $\{y_t\}$ be an N-dimensional stochastic process with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $W := \{\omega := (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_N)' \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{i=1}^N |\omega_i| < \infty, N \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then, $\{y_t\}$ is weakly stationary if for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any given $\omega \in W$, $y_t^w := \lim_{N\to\infty} w' y_t$ exists almost surely and $\{y_t^w\}$ is weakly stationary and causal.*

Turning to the second problem, we have the following result.

PROPOSITION 4.1 (Stationarity of FNAR). *Under Assumptions 1(ii), 6(vi), 7, and 9, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the FNAR has a unique weakly stationary and causal solution.*

4.4 Asymptotic properties of network factors and loadings

Consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimated network factor loadings is given next.

THEOREM 4.1 (Consistency and asymptotic normality of loadings).

(i) Under Assumptions 1-4, as $m, N, T \to \infty$,

$$\left\| \frac{\widehat{U} - UJ}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right),$$

where J is a $r \times r$ diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are equal to ± 1.

(ii) Under Assumptions 1-5, for any given $i = 1, \ldots, m$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, if $N^{\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}/m \to 0$,

$$N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}\left(\widehat{u}_i' - u_i' J\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_r, \Phi_i\right),$$

where $\widehat{u}_i'$ and u_i' are the i-th rows of $\widehat{U}$ and U, respectively, Φ is defined in Assumption 5(i), and J is defined in part (i).

Theorem 4.1 shows that when applying PCA to a given mode of the tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$ the dimensions of all other modes contribute to a faster convergence rate, hence allowing for more degrees of freedom. This is an advantage with respect to the vector case, since even for moderately small values of T we can still have

good estimates of the loadings matrix and therefore of the factor network. In particular, if we consider the least favorable case in which $\alpha = 2$, we see that the estimated loadings vector $\widehat{u}_i$ has a consistency rate $\min(m, N\sqrt{T})$ and is asymptotically normal if $N\sqrt{T}/m \to 0$. This is the generalization to the multinetwork case (i.e., to order-3 tensors) of the usual vector case, which corresponds to setting $N = 1$ (see Bai, 2003, Theorem 2).

Next we prove consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimated network factors.

THEOREM 4.2 (Consistency and asymptotic normality of network factors).

(i) Under Assumptions 1-4, for any given $t = 1, \dots, T$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$,

$$\left\| \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} \right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}} \right) \right),$$

where J is defined in Theorem 4.1(i).

(ii) Under Assumptions 1-5, for any given $t = 1, \dots, T$ and N fixed, as $m, T \to \infty$, if $\sqrt{m}/T \to 0$,

$$\sqrt{m}\left(\mathrm{vec}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t}) - \mathrm{vec}(J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_{rN^2}, (I_{N^2} \otimes \Sigma_U^{-1})\Pi_t(I_{N^2} \otimes \Sigma_U^{-1}) \right),$$

where Π_t is defined in Assumption 5(ii) and J is defined in Theorem 4.1(i).

(iii) Under Assumptions 1-5, for any given $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $j = 1, \dots, N^2$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, if $\sqrt{m}/(N^2T) \to 0$,

$$\sqrt{m}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t\cdot j} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t\cdot j} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_r, \Sigma_U^{-1}\Pi_{tj}\Sigma_U^{-1} \right),$$

where Π_{tj} is defined in Assumption 5(iii) and J is defined in Theorem 4.1(i).

Theorem 4.2(i) proves consistency of the whole network factor tensor. Theorem 4.2(ii) proves asymptotic normality for the network factor when N is fixed. While for $N \to \infty$ such result is not trivial to prove (see the remark after Assumption 5), from the proof of Theorem 4.2(i) we can conjecture that any such CLT would hold with a rate $\sqrt{m/N^\alpha}$; hence, requiring $N^\alpha/m \to 0$. Theorem 4.2(iii) proves asymptotic normality of any given column of $\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}$, which is equivalent to asymptotic normality of any of the N^2 entries of each of the r layers of the multinetwork factor $\mathcal{F}_t$. Finally, notice that Theorem 4.2(i)

in the least favorable case $\alpha = 2$, and Theorem 4.2(ii) are the natural generalizations to the multinetwork case of the usual vector case, i.e., when $N = 1$ (see Bai, 2003, Theorem 1).

To get an intuition for the results in Theorem 4.2, first notice that a factor tensor $\mathcal{F}_t$ of size $N \times N \times r$ provides a "perfect fit" of the first two dimensions of $\mathcal{W}_t$, so that the terms $\mathcal{E}_t$ are idiosyncratic only in relation to the third mode. Second, by virtue of Theorem 4.1, the factor estimation error rescaled by N is essentially given by $\mathcal{W}_t \times_3 [(NU'U)^{-1}U'] - N^{-1}\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{E}_t \times_3 [(NU'U)^{-1}U'] \asymp \mathcal{E}_t \times_3 (m^{-1}N^{-2})U'$. Therefore, if the cross-sectional correlation of $\mathcal{E}_t$ along the third mode is limited (Assumption 2(ii)) and the common factors are pervasive along the third mode (Assumptions 1(i) and 1(ii)), by the Law of Large Numbers, the estimation errors is $o_p(1)$, as $m \to \infty$; i.e., equation (3.3) defines a consistent estimator of the factors for any N.

4.5 Asymptotic properties of FNAR coefficients

We introduce the following assumptions, which are similar to the conditions in Bai (2009, Assumptions A and E).

Assumption 11 (CLT for FNAR).
Let $Z_i := M_G X_i - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\Lambda_k) M_G X_k$ *such that* $Z_i := (Z_{i1} \cdots Z_{iT})'$ *is* $T \times (r+2)$ *and* $W_t := M_\Lambda X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)M_\Lambda X_s$ *such that* $W_t := (W_{1t} \cdots W_{Nt})'$ *is* $N \times (r+2)$. *Then, as* $N, T \to \infty$,

(i) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i'\epsilon_i \xrightarrow{d} N(0, D_1)$, *where* $D_1 := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left[Z_{it}Z_{it}'\right]\sigma_i^2$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

(ii) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i'Z_i \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma_{ZZ}$, *where* $\Sigma_{ZZ} := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}[Z_{it}Z_{it}']$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

(iii) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} W_t'\epsilon_t \xrightarrow{d} N(0, D_2)$, *where* $D_2 := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left[W_{it}W_{it}'\right]\sigma_i^2$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

(iv) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} W_t'W_t \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma_{WW}$, *where* $\Sigma_{WW} := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}[W_{it}W_{it}']$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

Notice that, we do not rule out autocorrelation in the node factors, as only the node specific idiosyncratic components are required to have no correlation for the above CLTs to hold, and this is ensured by Assumption 6(vii).

Hereafter, let

$$\bar{J} := \begin{bmatrix} J & 0_{r\times 2} \\ 0_{2\times r} & I_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.1}$$

with J as in Theorem 4.1(i). Then, we analyze the properties of the estimators $\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}$ and $\widehat{\theta}^{*}$ by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}^{\dagger} - \bar{J}\theta &= \left(\tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widehat{X}_i' M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} \widehat{X}_i\right)^{-1} \left(\tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widehat{X}_i' M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} (G\Lambda_i + \epsilon_i) + \tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widehat{X}_i' M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} u_i\right) \\ \widehat{\theta}^{*} - \bar{J}\theta &= \left(\tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*}} \widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1} \left(\tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*}} (\Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t) + \tfrac{1}{NT}\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*}} u_t\right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $u_i := (X_i\bar{J} - \widehat{X}_i)\bar{J}\theta$ and $u_t := (X_t\bar{J} - \widehat{X}_t)\bar{J}\theta$, and recall that $\theta := (\beta', \rho, \alpha)'$.

The following theorem holds.

THEOREM 4.3 (CLT for FNAR coefficients estimated by iterative OLS). *Under Assumptions 1-10, and 11, and if* $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, *as* $m, N, T \to \infty$, *then:*

(i) if $T/N \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, *we have*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger} - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} D_1 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1}),$$

where D_1 *and* Σ_{ZZ} *are defined in Assumptions 11(i) and 11(ii), and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1);

(ii) if $\sqrt{T}/N \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$ *and* $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, N$, *we have*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger} - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \sigma^2 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1}),$$

where Σ_{ZZ} *is defined in Assumption 11(ii), and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1);

(iii) if $T/N \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, *we have*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{*} - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \Sigma_{WW}^{-1} D_2 \Sigma_{WW}^{-1}),$$

where D_2 *and* Σ_{WW} *are defined in Assumptions 11(iii) and 11(iv), and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1);

(iv) if $\sqrt{T}/N \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$ *and* $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, N$*, we have*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \sigma^2 \Sigma_{WW}^{-1}),$$

where Σ_{WW} *is defined in Assumption 11(iv), and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1)*;*

Parts (i) and (ii) extend Theorem 2 in Bai (2009) to the FNAR case. The interesting cases are parts (i) and (iii) where we do not impose homoskedastic idiosyncratic components in the FNAR errors. Notice that the network effects, β_j, $j = 1, \ldots, r$, which are the first r elements of θ, are consistently estimated only up to a sign, due to the indeterminacy in the identification of the network factors.

Three important comments about this result follow. First, the proof is based on showing that if $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, then the network factors can be treated as observed; i.e., the generated regressors bias is asymptotically negligible (see Proposition 10.1). In the least favorable case, i.e., $\alpha = 2$, we must have that $\sqrt{NT}/m \to 0$ and $N/m \to 0$. Under these conditions, and if also $T/N \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, the iterative estimators are $\sqrt{NT}$-consistent.

Second, if the node factors are not autocorrelated we can also compare the iterative estimators with the OLS and the GLS estimators studied in Appendix 9 and 10, respectively. In this case, the GLS is also $\sqrt{NT}$-consistent since, similarly to the iterative estimator, it rescales X_t by the FNAR error covariance matrix V, which is $O(N)$ by Assumption 6. For the same reason the OLS estimator is just $\sqrt{T}$-consistent since it does not control for the FNAR errors covariance, and it would be $\sqrt{NT}$-consistent only if V were a diagonal matrix, i.e., when no node factor is present, as assumed by Zhu et al. (2017). The same results on OLS and GLS are obtained by Chen et al. (2023) for the case of observed networks.

Third, and last, we should view Theorem 4.3 as giving the asymptotic distribution of the theoretical estimator minimizing (3.9). This is the same point of view adopted by Bai (2009). In practice, it might be important to investigate how the initialization of the algorithm affects such convergence. In the simpler case of a panel regression having errors with a factor structure, Jiang et al. (2021, Theorem 3) show that any initial estimator could still lead to a consistent iterated estimator, depending on the structure of the regressors which can be quite general. However, the estimator computed in practice might have a slower

convergence rate if the initial estimator is not consistent. We do not explore this aspect further here, but we limit to notice that in our numerical exercises of Sections 5 and 6, convergence is always achieved in few steps and the iterated estimator works well even in presence of weak serial correlation of the node factors.

Estimators of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of $\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}$ and $\widehat{\theta}^{*}$ estimator under the assumptions in parts (i) and (iii) are (see also Bai, 2009):

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}\left[\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}-\bar{J}\theta)\right]=\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{Z}_i'\widehat{Z}_i\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{Z}_i'\widehat{Z}_i\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{\epsilon}_{it}^{2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{Z}_i'\widehat{Z}_i\right)^{-1},$$

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}\left[\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{*}-\bar{J}\theta)\right]=\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{W}_t'\widehat{W}_t\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{W}_t'\widehat{W}_t\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{\epsilon}_{it}^{2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{W}_t'\widehat{W}_t\right)^{-1},$$

where $\widehat{Z}_i := M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}}\widehat{X}_i - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}_i^{\dagger\prime}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{\dagger\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^{\dagger}}{N}\right)^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}_k^{\dagger}\right)M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}}\widehat{X}_k$, and $\widehat{W}_t := M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*}}\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(\widehat{G}_t^{*\prime}\widehat{G}_s^{*})M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*}}\widehat{X}_s$.

5 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section, we use Monte Carlo (MC) simulations to evaluate the finite sample performance of the estimators for network factors $\mathcal{F}_t$, network factor loadings U, and FNAR parameters θ.

We generate artificial time series of y_t and $\mathcal{W}_t$, for $t = 1, \ldots, T$, according to the model equations (2.1), (2.3), and (2.4). We fix $r = 1$ and $q = 1$, i.e., one network factor and one node-specific factor. We also fix the values of FNAR parameters $\beta = 0.5$, $\rho = 0.3$, and $\alpha = 0.2$. We consider $N \in \{10, 20, 50\}$ nodes, $m \in \{20, 50, 100\}$ layers, and $T \in \{50, 100\}$ time periods. Also, for each value of the pair (N, m), we randomly generate the entries of the loading vectors U and Λ once (and independently) from $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$, and then we keep them fixed across MC iterations (see Chen et al. 2023). All other quantities are generated at each MC iteration. Full details on the data generating process are in Appendix 13.1.

Table 1: Monte Carlo RMSEs - case II: dependent $\mathcal{E}_t$

		$T=50$						$T=100$					
		$N=10$		$N=20$		$N=50$		$N=10$		$N=20$		$N=50$	
		RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE
$m=20$	β	0.084	16.9%	0.078	15.6%	0.077	15.4%	0.056	11.1%	0.056	11.2%	0.055	11.0%
	ρ	0.045	14.9%	0.031	10.2%	0.021	7.1%	0.031	10.2%	0.022	7.2%	0.014	4.6%
	α	0.084	41.8%	0.043	21.6%	0.029	14.4%	0.056	28.0%	0.029	14.5%	0.020	10.1%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.206	21.7%	0.211	21.7%	0.214	21.7%	0.206	21.7%	0.211	21.7%	0.214	21.7%
	U	0.085	3.9%	0.079	3.6%	0.078	3.5%	0.081	3.7%	0.078	3.6%	0.078	3.5%
$m=50$	β	0.090	17.9%	0.078	15.6%	0.073	14.6%	0.064	12.9%	0.055	11.0%	0.054	10.9%
	ρ	0.047	15.8%	0.032	10.7%	0.020	6.7%	0.031	10.3%	0.021	7.0%	0.014	4.7%
	α	0.068	34.1%	0.045	22.4%	0.030	15.2%	0.048	24.0%	0.032	15.8%	0.019	9.6%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.132	13.9%	0.135	13.9%	0.137	13.9%	0.132	13.9%	0.135	13.9%	0.137	13.9%
	U	0.037	2.1%	0.029	1.6%	0.027	1.5%	0.032	1.8%	0.027	1.5%	0.026	1.5%
$m=100$	β	0.086	17.1%	0.081	16.1%	0.078	15.6%	0.060	12.1%	0.056	11.3%	0.054	10.8%
	ρ	0.047	15.6%	0.031	10.3%	0.021	7.0%	0.030	10.0%	0.022	7.4%	0.014	4.5%
	α	0.087	43.6%	0.044	22.1%	0.027	13.6%	0.059	29.4%	0.030	15.1%	0.018	8.8%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.093	9.8%	0.096	9.8%	0.097	9.8%	0.093	9.8%	0.096	9.8%	0.097	9.8%
	U	0.026	1.6%	0.016	1.0%	0.013	0.8%	0.020	1.3%	0.014	0.9%	0.012	0.8%

Here we report results under case II which corresponds to idiosyncratic terms $\mathcal{E}_t$ having serial and cross-layer correlation and using the Bai (2009) iterative estimator. Additional results for the case of uncorrelated idiosyncratic terms are in Appendix 13.2. Tables 1 reports the RMSE and Relative RMSE (ReRMSE) of the estimates. The tables show that, as predicted by the theory, the accuracy of estimates for β, ρ and α improves with both N and T, and the RMSE of network factors and loadings decreases when the number of layers m increases. Furthermore, as shown in Appendix 13.3, the MC distributions of the estimated network effect are all strongly centered around the true value $\beta = 0.5$ and become narrower as T and N increase.

Last, in Appendix 13.4 we compare our estimates of the loadings U with those obtained using the TOPUP and TIPUP estimation methods proposed by Chen et al. (2022). As expected our approach improves over those estimators in presence of serial idiosyncratic correlations.

6 Empirical application

In this section, we present an application of the FNAR for studying cross-country macroeconomic interdependence determined by global trade flows and cross-border financial relationships.

DATA. For a sample of $N = 24$ countries, we use $m = 25$ networks constructed using bilateral import/export flows for different good (layers 1–9) and services (10–19) categories, bilateral financial positions for different types of financial claims (20–23) and cross-border mergers and acquisitions classified by sector of economic activity (24–25). The list of countries and network layers, including details on how the networks are built, are given in Appendix 14.1.

NETWORK FACTOR ANALYSIS. Due to data limitations in the time series of financial positions, we collect data for the networks at the annual frequency from 2001 to 2019, so the factor analysis is conducted on a sample of length $T_1 = 19$.[1] Although this is a short time span, we recall that in tensor PCA the effective sample size when estimating the loadings space is $N^{3-\alpha/2}T_1$ which is large enough for our asymptotic results to hold (see Theorem 4.1). As for the factors, the effective sample size is $mN^{1-\alpha/2}$.

The main premise of our approach is that the different layers of the network are driven by common factor networks. As a preliminary analysis, it is therefore useful to assess the degree of similarity between the observed layers. As suggested by Bargigli et al. (2015), we consider cosine similarity as measure of layer similarity for weighted networks. Results are given in Table 7 in Appendix 14.2, which reports the cosine similarity coefficients between all layers of our network. The average cosine similarity across layers is 0.68, thus providing evidence of comovments between layers. The average correlation coefficient between layers is 0.61.

We then extract the common network factors from the 25 layers of the network, and we set $\widehat{r} = 6$ network factors, as in Chen et al. (2022). From Figures 6-9 in Appendix 14.2 we can interpret the six network factors as follows. The first network factor conveys approximately the average country weights across all layers of the network. In particular, the factor values are very close to the average weights (scaled by a constant), and the loading coefficients are almost the same for all layers. The countries with the largest factor weights for the US are its major economic partners: Canada, UK, Mexico, China, Japan and Germany.

The second factor captures a difference between financial relationships and trade in goods. The factor

[1] We have few missing values over this period. In these cases, we use the previous year's value or the closest available year' value.

loadings for financial layers have opposite sign (positive) compared to the loadings for trade-in-goods layers (negative). Recall that factors are identified up to a sign. The largest positive weights are assigned to economies having relatively large financial sectors with global reach: UK, US, and Hong Kong. In the case of the US connections, a large positive weight is assigned to the UK, whose tight economic links with the US are mostly concentrated in the financial sector, and large negative weights are assigned to Canada, Mexico, and China, i.e., the US biggest trade partners.

The third factor distinguishes between equity and debt relationships, being the only factor where equity, on the one hand, and debt, on the other hand, show loadings with opposite signs. The fourth factor is strongly associated with M&A relationships. The fifth factor is mainly drive by agricultural/extractive goods (positive weights, especially for vegetable fuels, oils, fats, and waxes). It also loads trade in manufacturing goods (negative weights). Positive weights are assigned to countries with strong trade links with the US in non-manufacturing sectors, such as Canada, Saudi Arabia, and Italy, while negative weights are associated with large manufacturing partners, like China. This factor also distinguishes between stocks of portfolio holdings and flows associated with M&A deals and banking. Finally, the sixth factor captures a distinction between good-sector M&A integration and service-sector integration.

Next, in line with conventional PCA, we evaluate the fraction of variance in network layers explained by each factor. With $v^{(k)}$ denoting the fraction of variance explained by the k-th factor (computed as in Appendix 14.2), we have $v^{(1)} = 0.68$, $v^{(2)} = 0.07$, $v^{(3)} = 0.03$, $v^{(4)} = 0.03$, $v^{(5)} = 0.02$, and $v^{(6)} = 0.02$. Thus, overall the 6 factors explain about 85% of the total variance of $\mathcal{W}$. However, the importance of different factors varies greatly across countries; see Table 8 in Appendix 14.2.

FNAR ESTIMATION. The endogenous vector y_t, $t = 1, \ldots, T$, collects (quarterly) real GDP growth rates for all N considered countries and for the sample 2001Q1-2019Q4; i.e., $T_2 = 76$ (data source: IMF International Financial Statistics). To address heterogeneity of nodal and momentum effects, we split the countries into two groups: (1) OECD countries ($N_1 = 15$), and (2) non-OECD countries ($N_2 = 9$) and the vector y_t is partitioned accordingly as $y_t = (y^{(1)\prime}\ y^{(2)\prime})'$.

We consider the following FNAR, for $t = 1, \dots, T$,

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j \frac{\widetilde{F}_{j,t-1}}{N} y_{t-1} + \rho^{(1)} \begin{pmatrix} y_{t-1}^{(1)} \\ 0_{N_2} \end{pmatrix} + \rho^{(2)} \begin{pmatrix} 0_{N_1} \\ y_{t-1}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} + \alpha^{(1)} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{N_1} \\ 0_{N_2} \end{pmatrix} + \alpha^{(2)} \begin{pmatrix} 0_{N_1} \\ \iota_{N_2} \end{pmatrix} + \nu_t, \quad (6.1)$$

where $\widetilde{F}_{j,t} = \widehat{F}_{j,\tau}$ for $4(\tau-1)+1 \leq t \leq 4\tau$, $\tau = 1, \dots, T_1$. In other words, the network factors $F_{k,t}$, $t = 1, \dots, T_1$, which are computed on a yearly basis, are treated as constant throughout all quarters of a given year. Hereafter, we let $\theta := (\beta', \rho^{(1)}, \rho^{(2)}, \alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)})'$.

First, we estimate the FNAR in (6.1) by OLS as described in Appendix 9 and we compute the residuals $\widehat{\nu}_t := y_t - \widehat{X}_t \widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}}$. By means of the criterion defined in (3.11) we find evidence of one common node factor, i.e., $\widehat{q} = 1$. We then estimate the model by GLS as described in Appendix 10. Last, we consider the iterative estimators $\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}$ or $\widehat{\theta}^{*}$ defined in (3.7) and we initialize the algorithm by using the GLS estimator and the estimated node loadings, $\widehat{\Lambda}$, and factor, $\widehat{G}_t$, computed by PCA on the GLS residuals as described in Appendix 8. Since these residuals do not display significant autocorrelation, we are confident that the GLS estimator is $\sqrt{NT}$-consistent and, based on the results of Jiang et al. (2021) we conjecture that Theorem 4.3 holds for our iterated estimators. Convergence is reached in 8 or 4 iterations for $\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}$ or $\widehat{\theta}^{*}$, respectively.

Table 2 reports the estimated coefficients and their standard errors with significance reported according to the usual Z-test. The coefficients on $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{1,t-1}y_{t-1}$ and $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{5,t-1}y_{t-1}$ are always strongly significant, while there is mixed evidence regarding the coefficients on $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{2,t-1}y_{t-1}$, $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{4,t-1}y_{t-1}$, and $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{6,t-1}y_{t-1}$ which are mildly significant and not for all estimates.

Based on the interpretation of the first network factor, the coefficient on $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{1,t-1}y_{t-1}$ captures a general network effect operating through aggregate economic linkages. Given the loadings of factor 5 in Figure 7, the coefficient on $N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{5,t-1}y_{t-1}$ indicates that trade in mineral fuels and in animal and vegetable oils (major inputs of chemical industry) has the main impact on GDP growth. Moreover, trade linkages tend to generate larger spillovers in manufacturing sectors (layers 6-9) than in non-manufacturing sectors (layers 1-3), and financial linkages tend to generate larger spillovers when they take the form of M&A or flows of banking assets (rather than portfolio holdings).

Table 2: FNAR coefficients estimates and standard errors.

	$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}}$	$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}}$	$\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger}$	$\widehat{\theta}^{*}$
network effects				
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{1,t-1}y_{t-1}$	1.1641***	1.0805***	1.0005***	1.0012***
	(0.1220)	(0.0877)	(0.1088)	(0.1088)
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{2,t-1}y_{t-1}$	-0.3529**	0.0348	0.1156	0.1158
	(0.1889)	(0.1163)	(0.1133)	(0.1133)
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{3,t-1}y_{t-1}$	-0.1217	0.0385	0.0164	0.0162
	(0.1919)	(0.1369)	(0.1442)	(0.1442)
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{4,t-1}y_{t-1}$	-0.0597	0.0977	0.1605*	0.1607*
	(0.1911)	(0.1093)	(0.1098)	(0.1098)
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{5,t-1}y_{t-1}$	0.8145***	0.3700***	0.5506***	0.5506***
	(0.1893)	(0.1154)	(0.1128)	(0.1128)
$N^{-1}\widehat{F}_{6,t-1}y_{t-1}$	0.2669**	0.0042	0.1050	0.1051
	(0.1552)	(0.0974)	(0.1118)	(0.1118)
momentum effects				
$y^{(1)}_{t-1}$	0.0658*	0.1504***	0.0802**	0.0802**
	(0.0424)	(0.0306)	(0.0350)	(0.0350)
$y^{(2)}_{t-1}$	0.2407***	0.3365***	0.3119***	0.3121***
	(0.0348)	(0.0328)	(0.0277)	(0.0277)
nodal effects				
const. group 1	0.0023***	0.0875*	0.0021***	0.0021***
	(0.0007)	(0.0548)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)
const. group 2	0.0054***	0.2741***	0.0049***	0.0049***
	(0.0010)	(0.0729)	(0.0006)	(0.0006)

Finally, based on these estimates, we can approximate the network effects associated with the original layers of the network, by appropriately rescaling the estimated network effect coefficients β. Specifically, given the definition of estimated loadings in (3.2) and the properties of tensor multiplication, for a given estimate $\widehat{\beta}$, we have that:


$$\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}}{N} \times_2 y'_{t-1} \times_3 \widehat{\beta}' = \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}}{N} \times_2 y'_{t-1} \times_3 \left(\widehat{\beta}'(\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\mathcal{W}}})^{-1}\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}N^2\right) = \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{t-1}}{N} \times_2 y'_{t-1} \times_3 \left(N^2\widehat{U}(\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\mathcal{W}}})^{-1}\widehat{\beta}\right)'.$$

Thus, $N^2\widehat{U}(\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\mathcal{W}}})^{-1}\widehat{\beta}$ is the vector of network effects in terms of the row-normalized tensor $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{t-1}/N$ and its entries are shown in Figure 1, when computed using the iterated estimator $\widehat{\theta}^{*}$. The figure confirms a substantial heterogeneity of effects across layers, reflecting their different loadings on the network factors.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we have introduced a factor network autoregression for time series characterized by multiple network effects. Factors take the form of matrices linking different nodes of a network, they summarize a large number of network layers, i.e., different types of relationships between nodes, and determine cross-variable effects in a large VAR. Estimation of the model is feasible regardless of the size of

Figure 1: Network effects by original layer.



The figure plots the estimated network effects associated with the original (and row-normalized) layers of the network computed as $N^2\widehat{U}(\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\mathcal{W}}})^{-1}\widehat{\beta}$, when using the iterated estimator. The vertical lines separate layers related to trade in goods (1-9), layers related to trade in services (10-19) and financial layers (20-25). See Table 6 for the complete list of layers. The estimation sample is 2001Q1-2019Q4.

the network, since the number of unknown parameters linking different variables in the VAR is fixed with respect to the number of nodes and the number of layers. To estimate factors, we have developed a new principal component approach for network time series. We have also developed a novel estimation method of our FNAR model when the errors are autocorrelated and have a factor structure.

In an empirical application we have characterized the network effects driving international GDP dynamics and operating through a variety of cross-country economic and financial linkages, such as trade flows for different categories of goods and services, cross-border financial assets and liabilities, and integration between companies located in different countries. The results show that the model can be an important tool for the analysis of large dimensional network data.

Factor Network Autoregressions

Supplementary material

Matteo Barigozzi Giuseppe Cavaliere Graziano Moramarco

This supplemental material contains several appendices to our paper. In Appendix 8 we describe how to estimate the node factors by Principal Components Analysis (PCA) on the FNAR residuals. In Appendix 10, we introduce a GLS-type estimator which generalizes the OLS estimator of the FNAR considered in Section 3.2. In Appendix 11, we provide the proofs for Propositions and Theorems. In Appendix 12, we provide and prove all auxiliary results. In Appendix 13 we provide additional simulation results. Finally, in Appendix 14 we describe how the networks used in our empirical application are built.

8 Estimation of node factors

Once we compute the OLS estimator, let $\widehat{\nu} := (\widehat{\nu}_1 \cdots \widehat{\nu}_T)'$ be the $T \times N$ matrix of residuals of the FNAR such that $\widehat{\nu}_t := y_t - \widehat{X}_t \widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}}$, $t = 1, \dots, T$. Then, the node factors G_t and their loadings Λ can be estimated by PCA in two equivalent ways. Specifically, consider either the $N \times N$ or $T \times T$ sample covariance matrices

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{\widehat{\nu}} := \frac{\widehat{\nu}'\widehat{\nu}}{T}, \qquad \widetilde{\Gamma}^{\widehat{\nu}} := \frac{\widehat{\nu}\widehat{\nu}'}{N}. \tag{8.1}$$

Then, letting $\widehat{G} := (\widehat{G}_1, \cdots, \widehat{G}_T)'$ and $\widetilde{G} := (\widetilde{G}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{G}_T)'$ be the estimated $T \times r$ matrices of factors, the PC estimators are given by:

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\Lambda} := \widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}} (\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}})^{1/2}, \\ \widehat{G} := \widehat{\nu}\widehat{\Lambda}(\widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{\Lambda})^{-1}, \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \widetilde{G} := \widetilde{V}^{\widehat{\nu}} \sqrt{T}, \\ \widetilde{\Lambda} := \widehat{\nu}'\widetilde{G}(\widetilde{G}'\widetilde{G})^{-1}, \end{cases} \tag{8.2}$$

where $\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}}$ is the $q \times q$ diagonal of eigenvalues of $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\widehat{\nu}}$ with corresponding normalized eigenvectors being the columns of the $N \times q$ matrix $\widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}}$, and $\widetilde{V}^{\widehat{\nu}}$ is the $T \times q$ matrix of normalized eigenvectors of $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\widehat{\nu}}$. It is easy to verify that, regardless the choice made in (8.2), $\widehat{G}\widehat{\Lambda}' = \widetilde{G}\widetilde{\Lambda}'$.

Notice that the estimated loadings and factors are such that $\widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{\Lambda}/N$ and $\widetilde{\Lambda}'\widetilde{\Lambda}/N$ are diagonal and

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{G}_t\widehat{G}_t' = I_q, \quad \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widetilde{G}_t\widetilde{G}_t' = I_q$$

so that the estimated factors are orthonormal.

9 OLS ESTIMATOR AND ITS ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES

The OLS estimator of θ is given by:

$$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} := \left(\sum\nolimits_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left(\sum\nolimits_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'y_t\right). \tag{9.1}$$

This is the estimator proposed by Zhu et al. (2017) and Chen et al. (2023) for the case in which the network is observed and, respectively, when the FNAR errors are either uncorrelated or have a factor structure with serially uncorrelated node factors.

We start by making the following standard assumption.

ASSUMPTION 12 (CLTs for FNAR - OLS).

(i) *For all* $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ *with* $t \neq s$, $\mathbb{E}[G_tG_s'] = 0$.

(ii) *As* $N, T \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\nu_t \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega_0)$, *where* $\Omega_0 := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N^2}\mathbb{E}\left[X_t'VX_t\right]$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

(iii) *As* $N, T \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'X_t \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma_{XX}$, *where* $\Sigma_{XX} := \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}[X_t'X_t]$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

Because of Assumptions 12(i), 6(vii), and 7, we have that the FNAR errors $\{\nu_t\}$ are not autocorrelated. This is necessary for the CLT in the next part of this assumption to hold. Assumption 12(ii) is also found in Bai and Ng (2006). In fact, Assumptions 12(ii) and 12(iii) are made for simplicity and could be proved in a similar way as in Chen et al. (2023, Theorem 4.1 in the degenerate case of just one community, i.e., $K = 1$ therein).

The OLS estimator in (9.1) satisfies:

$$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\nu_t\right) + \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'u_t\right)\right\}. \tag{9.2}$$

The asymptotic properties of the terms of (9.2) are given in the following Proposition.

PROPOSITION 9.1. *Under Assumptions 1-10 and 12, as* $m, N, T \to \infty$,

(i) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'u_t = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

(ii) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\nu_t = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

(iii) $\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'X_t\bar{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

The next theorem follows.

THEOREM 9.1 (CLT for FNAR coefficients estimated by OLS). *Under Assumptions 1-10 and 12, if* $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$, *as* $m, N, T \to \infty$,

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\Omega_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}),$$

where Ω_0 *and* Σ_{XX} *are defined in Assumptions 12(ii) and 12(iii), respectively, and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1).

From Proposition 9.1, we see that if $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, then the network factors can be treated as observed. And, by virtue of Assumptions 12(ii) and 12(iii), the OLS estimator is $\sqrt{T}$-consistent and asymptotically normal. Notice that in the least favorable case, i.e., when $\alpha = 2$, we need $\sqrt{T}/m \to 0$ for Theorem 9.1 to hold, as found in the vector case by Bai and Ng (2006).

An estimator of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of the OLS estimator is then given by (see Bai and Ng, 2006, Theorem 1):

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}\left[\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta)\right] = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{\nu}_t\widehat{\nu}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}.$$

10 GLS ESTIMATOR AND ITS ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES

A GLS extension of the OLS estimator of the FNAR considered in Section 3.2 can be computed by means of the following procedure, initially proposed by Chen et al. (2023) for the special case where the network is observed.

Once we estimate the node factors and their loadings as described in Appendix 8, let $\widehat{\epsilon} := \widehat{\nu} - \widehat{G}\widehat{\Lambda}' = \widehat{\nu} - \widetilde{G}\widetilde{\Lambda}'$ and $\widehat{S}$ be the diagonal matrix with entries the diagonal entries of $T^{-1}\widehat{\epsilon}'\widehat{\epsilon}$. We can estimate the covariance matrix V of ν_t as $\widehat{V} := \widehat{\Lambda}\widehat{\Lambda}' + \widehat{S}$ and, by applying the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, its inverse as:

$$\widehat{V}^{-1} := \widehat{S}^{-1} - \widehat{S}^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}(I_q + \widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{S}^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda})^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{S}^{-1}, \tag{10.1}$$

where $\widehat{S}^{-1}$ is a diagonal matrix and hence easy to compute.

The GLS estimator of θ is then given by:

$$\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}} := \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}y_t\right). \tag{10.2}$$

To study the asymptotic properties of the GLS estimator, we make two more assumptions. First, we extend Assumptions 12(ii) and 12(iii) to the following.

ASSUMPTION 13 (CLTs for FNAR - GLS).

(i) *For all* $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ *with* $t \neq s$, $\mathbb{E}[G_t G_s'] = 0$.

(ii) *As* $N, T \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t'V^{-1}\nu_t \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega_1)$, *where* $\Omega_1 := \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}\left[X_t'V^{-1}X_t\right]$ *is an* $(r+2)\times(r+2)$ *positive definite matrix.*

(iii) *As* $N, T \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t'V^{-1}X_t \xrightarrow{p} \Omega_1$, *where* Ω_1 *is defined in part (ii).*

Because of Assumptions 13(i), 6(vii), and 7, we have that the FNAR errors $\{\nu_t\}$ are not auto-correlated. This is necessary for the CLT in the next part of this assumption to hold. Assumptions 13(ii) and 13(iii) follow directly from 12(ii) and 12(iii) since we know that V^{-1} is finite for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Notice, however, the different role of N in the definition of Ω_0 and Ω_1, indeed, as $N \to \infty$ we have $X_t' V X_t = O_p(N^2)$, but $X_t' V^{-1} X_t = O_p(N)$, since $X_t = O_p(\sqrt{N})$, $V = O(N)$ and $V^{-1} = O(1)$.

Second, to study the properties of the GLS estimator (10.2) we need to prove consistency of estimated inverse of the FNAR errors covariance $\widehat{V}^{-1}$ defined in (10.1). This is not an easy task, for at least three reasons: first, the FNAR errors are estimated and not observed; second, the matrix V is $N \times N$ so it is a high-dimensional one; third, to study $\widehat{V}^{-1}$, we need uniform consistency over all N^2 entries of the estimated covariance $\widehat{V}$. These difficulties are reduced if we assume that all considered random variables are sub-gaussian, which is a classical assumption in high-dimensional statistics (see, e.g., Vershynin, 2018, Chapter 2).

Assumption 14 (Sub-gaussianity).

(i) *For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, all $j = 1, \dots, r+2$, and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathrm{P}(|X_{ijt} - \mathbb{E}[X_{ijt}]| > s) \leq 2\exp(-s^2/c_1^2)$ for some finite c_1 independent of i, j, and t.*

(ii) *For all $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathrm{P}(|\mathcal{E}_{tijk}| > s) \leq 2\exp(-s^2/c_2^2)$ for some finite c_2 independent of i, j, k, and t.*

(iii) *For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathrm{P}(|\epsilon_{it}| > s) \leq 2\exp(-s^2/c_3^2)$ for some finite c_3 independent of i and t.*

This approach is similar to the one adopted in a vector factor model context by Fan et al. (2013). Instead, Chen et al. (2023) assume a set of moment conditions on the regressors matrix X_t, which amount to bound up the 8th order cross-cumulants (in addition, they also make use of Hanson-Wright concentration inequalities which are based on the assumption of sub-Gaussianity).

The GLS estimator in (10.2) satisfies:

$$\widehat{\theta}^{\mathrm{GLS}} - \bar{J}\theta = \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' \widehat{V}^{-1} \widehat{X}_t \right)^{-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' \widehat{V}^{-1} \nu_t \right) + \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{X}_t' \widehat{V}^{-1} u_t \right) \right\}. \tag{10.3}$$

The asymptotic properties of the terms of (10.3) are then given in the following Proposition.

Proposition 10.1. *Under Assumptions 1-10, 13, and 14, if $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$,*

(i) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}u_t = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

(ii) $\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\nu_t = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

(iii) $\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}X_t\bar{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$.

The next theorem follows.

THEOREM 10.1 (CLT for FNAR coefficients estimated by GLS). *Under Assumptions 1-10, 13, and 14, if* $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ *and* $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, *as* $m, N, T \to \infty$,

$$\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}} - \bar{J}\theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_{r+2}, \Omega_1^{-1}),$$

where Ω_1 *is defined in Assumptions 13(ii) and* $\bar{J}$ *is defined in* (4.1).

For observed network factors, the GLS estimator has a faster rate of convergence than the OLS estimator and it is more efficient; see also Chen et al. (2023, Theorem 4.3). The different rates depend on the different scaling needed for Assumptions 12(ii) and 13(ii) to hold. Indeed, on the one hand $\mathbb{E}\left[X_t'VX_t\right] = O(N^2)$, while, on the other hand $\mathbb{E}\left[X_t'V^{-1}X_t\right] = O(N)$. This is because, by Assumption 6, $\|V\| = O(N)$ but $\|V^{-1}\| = O(1)$.

Now, from Proposition 10.1, we see that the conditions $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$ allow us to treat the factors as observed. These conditions are stronger than in the OLS case; indeed, in the least favorable case, i.e., $\alpha = 2$, we must have that $\sqrt{NT}/m \to 0$ and $N/m \to 0$.

An estimator of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of the GLS estimator is then given by:

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}\left[\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}} - \bar{J}\theta)\right] = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1},$$

where $\widehat{V}^{-1}$ is defined in (10.1). Alternatively, to address possible residual cross-correlation of the node idiosyncratic components, we could use:

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}\left[\sqrt{NT}(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}} - \bar{J}\theta)\right] = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{\nu}_t\widehat{\nu}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}.$$

11 Proofs of the main results

11.1 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof. First, let $A_t := N^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j F_{j,t-1} + \rho$ and notice that (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$y_t = \alpha + A_t y_{t-1} + \nu_t. \tag{11.1}$$

Thus, for any given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, letting $y_{-\infty} = 0$, if there exists a causal solution it is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \left\{\prod_{k=0}^{\ell}(\alpha + A_{t-k})\right\} y_{t-\ell-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell}\left\{\prod_{k=0}^{j-1}(\alpha + A_{t-k})\right\}\nu_{t-j} + \nu_t \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\{\prod_{k=0}^{j-1}(\alpha + A_{t-k})\right\}\nu_{t-j} + \nu_t. \end{aligned} \tag{11.2}$$

To this end first notice that since by Assumption 7, $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ is independent of $\{\nu_t\}$, for any given $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[y_t] = \alpha + \rho\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}] + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t-1}]\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}]$$

hence, a stationary solution must have mean

$$\mathbb{E}[y_t] = \left(I_N - \rho I_N - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t}]\right)^{-1}\alpha,$$

which is finite and independent of t because of Assumptions 1(ii) and 9(i). Clearly if $\alpha = 0$ then $\mathbb{E}[y_t] = 0$ and viceversa.

Let then $\alpha = 0$ for simplicity and define $\Sigma_{t,s} := \mathbb{E}[y_t y_s']$ and recall that $V := \mathbb{E}[\nu_t \nu_t']$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{vec}(\Sigma_{t,t}) &= \rho^2 \mathrm{vec}(\Sigma_{t-1,t-1}) + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t-1}\otimes F_{j,t-1}]\mathrm{vec}(\Sigma_{t-1,t-1}) + \mathrm{vec}(V) \\ &= \left\{\rho^2 I_{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t-1}\otimes F_{j,t-1}]\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\Sigma_{t-1,t-1}) + \mathrm{vec}(V) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\ell}\left\{\rho^2 I_{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t-1}\otimes F_{j,t-1}]\right\}^k \mathrm{vec}(V) \\ &+ \left\{\rho^2 I_{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F_{j,t-1}\otimes F_{j,t-1}]\right\}^{\ell+1} \mathrm{vec}(\Sigma_{t-\ell-1,t-\ell-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{11.3}$$

Notice also that V is positive definite, indeed its smallest eigenvalue is such that, by Weyl's inequality,

$$\mu_N(V) \geq \mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') + \mu_N(S) = \min_{i=1,\ldots,N} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2] \geq \underline{M}_\epsilon,$$

since $\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') = 0$ and because of Assumption 6(vi) and where $\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') = 0$, $\mu_N(V)$, and $\mu_N(S)$ are the smallest eigenvalues of $\Lambda\Lambda'$, V, and S, respectively, and $\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') = 0$.

Hence, letting $\ell \to \infty$ we see that $\text{vec}(\Sigma_{t,t})$ is finite and independent of t, because of Assumptions 1(ii) and 9(ii), and since V is positive definite, see also Theorem 2.1 in Nicholls and Quinn (1981).

To show that the above arguments imply that also $y_t^w = \lim_{N\to\infty} w'y_t$ exists almost surely and is stationary and causal it is enough to follow the same steps as in Theorem 2 by Zhu et al. (2017). □

11.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. The proof of part (i) follows directly from Lemmas 12.12(ii) and 12.14.

For part (ii), from (12.5) in the proof of Lemma 12.12(i) and Lemma 12.14(i), if $N^{\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}/m \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}\left(\widehat{u}_i' - u_i'J\right) &= \frac{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}.\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}'\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}u_ju_j'\right)\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}J + o_p(1)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^\alpha T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}.\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}'\Sigma_U\left(\frac{M^\chi}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}J + o_p(1)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^\alpha T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}.\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}'J + o_p(1)\\
&\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_r, J_0\Phi_iJ_0),
\end{aligned}$$

because of Assumption 4(i) and Lemma 12.7(iii), Assumption 5(i), and Slutsky's Theorem, and where $J_0 = \text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty} J$. Notice that $J\Phi_iJ = \Phi_i$. This proves part (ii). □

11.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. For part (i), consider the estimated factors $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)}$. We have that:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t = \mathcal{W}_t \times_3 \left(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}\right)^{-1}\widehat{U}'$$

$$= (\mathcal{F}_t \times_3 U + \mathcal{E}_t) \times_3 \left(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}\right)^{-1} \widehat{U}'$$
$$= \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 \left(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}\right)^{-1} \widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J + \widehat{U}J\right) + \mathcal{E}_t \times_3 \left(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}\right)^{-1} \left(U - \widehat{U}J + \widehat{U}J\right)',$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} = \left(\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}\right)^{-1} \left[\widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J + \widehat{U}J\right) \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\right] + \left(\widehat{U} - UJ + UJ\right)' \mathcal{E}_{(3)t}$$
$$= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{\widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J\right)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t} + \frac{\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}}{m} J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} + \frac{\left(\widehat{U} - UJ\right)'}{mN} \mathcal{E}_{(3)t} + \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m}\right].$$

Thus, because of Lemma 12.8(iv),

$$\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} = \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{\widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J\right)}{mN} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t} + \frac{\left(\widehat{U} - UJ\right)'}{mN} \mathcal{E}_{(3)t} + \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN}\right]$$
$$= O_p(1)\left[A + B + C\right]. \tag{11.4}$$

For term a, given (12.11) in the proof of Lemma 12.14 when $\widehat{H} = J$ and Lemma 12.5(ii)

$$\left\| \frac{\widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J\right)}{mN} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t} \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{\widehat{U}' \left(U - \widehat{U}J\right)}{m} \right\| \left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right). \tag{11.5}$$

For term (B), from (12.4) in the proof of Lemma 12.12(i) with $\widehat{H} = J$, we have

$$\frac{\left(\widehat{U} - UJ\right)' \mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN} = \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J \frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T} + \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J \frac{U'U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T}$$
$$+ \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J \frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T}$$
$$+ \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} (\widehat{U} - UJ)' \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T} + \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} (\widehat{U} - UJ)' \frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T}$$
$$+ \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} (\widehat{U} - UJ)' \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m^2N^3T}$$
$$= III_a + III_b + III_c + III_d + III_e + III_f.$$

Then, because of Lemma 12.5(i), 12.5(iii), and 12.8(iv), and using (12.10) and $\|J\| = O(1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|III_a\| &\leq \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \|J\| \left\| \frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N} \right\| \\ &= O_p(1)O(1)O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}} \right) O_p(1)O\left(\frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha/2}} \right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{3-\alpha}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

By Assumptions 2(iv) and 3, and Lemmas 12.1 and 12.2(ii)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN^3T} \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN^3T} \right\|_F^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{1}{mN^3T} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)s}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)si\cdot}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \right\|_F^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2N^6T^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2} \mathcal{F}_{(3)s\cdot h}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tik} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m^2N^6T^2} \sum_{l=1}^{r} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2} \mathcal{F}_{(3)slh}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tik} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{r}{m^2N^6T^2} \max_{l=1,\ldots,r} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2} \mathcal{F}_{(3)slh}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tik} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{r^2}{m^2N^6T^2} \sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{m}\sum_{s_1,s_2=1}^{T}\sum_{\substack{h_1,k_1=1\\h_2,k_2=1}}^{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)s_1lh_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_1i_1h_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_1k_1}\mathcal{F}_{(3)s_2lh_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_2i_2h_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_2k_2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{r^2}{m^2N^6T^2} \left(\max_{s_1,s_2=1,\ldots,T} \max_{l=1,\ldots,r} \max_{h_1,h_2=1,\ldots,N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)s_1lh_1}\mathcal{F}_{(3)s_2lh_2} \right] \right) \times \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{m}\sum_{s_1,s_2=1}^{T}\sum_{\substack{h_1,k_1=1\\h_2,k_2=1}}^{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_1i_1h_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_1k_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_2i_2h_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_2k_2} \right] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{r^2}{\kappa m^2N^6T^2} \left(\sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{m}\sum_{s_1,s_2=1}^{T}\sum_{\substack{h_1,k_1=1\\h_2,k_2=1}}^{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_1i_1h_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_1k_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_2i_2h_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_2k_2} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_1i_1h_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_1k_1} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_2i_2h_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_2k_2} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{r^2}{\kappa m^2N^6T^2} \left(\sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{m}\sum_{s_1,s_2=1}^{T}\sum_{\substack{h_1,k_1=1\\h_2,k_2=1}}^{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_1i_1h_1}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_1k_1} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)s_2i_2h_2}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti_2k_2} \right] \right)\end{aligned}$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{mTN^{6-2\alpha}}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{mTN^{6-\alpha}}\right).$$

Then,

$$\|III_b\| \leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \|J\| \left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN^3T}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{3-\alpha}}\right).$$

Because of Lemma 12.5(i), 12.5(iii), and Lemma 12.11(ii), 12.8(iv), and since $\|J\| = O(1)$,

$$\|III_c\| \leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \|J\| \left\|\frac{U\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T}\right\| \left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{3-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{mN^{3(1-\alpha/2)}}\right)\right).$$

Next, notice that, by Assumption 1(i) and Lemma 12.2(iii)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN}\right\|^2\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN}\right\|_F^2\right] = \frac{1}{m^2N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|u'_k\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\right\|^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{m^2N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}U_{ik}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\right)^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{r}{m^2N^2}\max_{k=1,\dots,r}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\sum_{l=1}^{N^2}|U_{ik}||U_{jk}|\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjl}\right]\right| \\
&\leq \frac{rM_U^2}{m^2N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{h=1}^{N^2}\sum_{l=1}^{N^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjl}\right]\right| \leq \frac{rM_U^2M_{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^{2-\alpha}} \qquad (11.6)
\end{aligned}$$

since $M_{\mathcal{E}}$ does not depend on t. Therefore, by Theorem 4.1(i), Lemma 12.11(i), 12.8(iv), and using (11.6) and $\|J\| = O(1)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|III_d\| &\leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \left\|\frac{\widehat{U}-UJ}{\sqrt{m}}\right\| \left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T}\right\| \left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN}\right\| \\
&= O_p(1)O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right) O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right) O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right) \\
&= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{5-3\alpha/2}T\sqrt{m}}, \frac{1}{N^{5-2\alpha}m^{3/2}\sqrt{T}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the term III_d is clearly dominated by III_a. Analogously, III_e and III_f are dominated by III_b and III_c, respectively. Thus, (B) is $O_p(1/(\sqrt{mT}N^{3-\alpha}, mN^{3-3\alpha/2}))$, hence it is dominated by term a.

For term (C), using (11.6)

$$\left\| \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN} \right\| \leq \|J\| \left\| \frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN} \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}} \right). \tag{11.7}$$

By noticing that

$$\max\left(\frac{1}{\xi}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}} \right) = \max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}} \right),$$

we prove part (i).

For part (ii), from (11.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} &= N\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right) + \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{mN} \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}T} \right) + \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{11.8}$$

because of part (i). Therefore, from (11.8), as $m, N, T \to \infty$, if $\sqrt{m}/(N^2T) \to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{m}{N^\alpha}} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} \right) &= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[\sqrt{\frac{m}{N^\alpha}} \frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{m} \right] + O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{N^\alpha}} \frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}T} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[\frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{mN^\alpha}} \right] + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}}{N^2T} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[\frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{mN^\alpha}} \right] + o_p(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \left[\frac{JU'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{mN^\alpha}} \right] + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{11.9}$$

because Lemma 12.7(iii). From (11.9), if N is fixed, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{m}\left(\text{vec}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t} \right) - \text{vec}\left(J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} \right) \right) &= \left(I_{N^2} \otimes \left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} J \right) \text{vec}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \right) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_{rN^2}, \left(I_{N^2} \otimes \Sigma_U^{-1} \right) \Pi_t \left(I_{N^2} \otimes J\Sigma_U^{-1} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

because of Assumptions 4(i) and 5(ii) and Slutsky's theorem. This proves part (ii).

For part (iii), for any given $j = 1, \ldots, N^2$, following the same reasoning as in part (i), we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t\cdot j} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t\cdot j} = N\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} J \left[\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t\cdot j}}{mN} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^3T} \right) \right].$$

Moreover,

$$\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t\cdot j}}{m}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

Therefore, if $\sqrt{m}/(N^2T) \to 0$ as $m, N, T \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{m}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t\cdot j} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t\cdot j}\right) &= \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J\left[\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)t\cdot j}}{\sqrt{m}}\right] + o_p(1)\\ &= \Sigma_U^{-1} J\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)tij}\right] + o_p(1)\\ &\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_r, \Sigma_U^{-1}J_0\Pi_{tj}J_0\Sigma_U^{-1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

because of Assumption 4(i), Lemma 12.7(iii), Assumption 5(iii), and Slutsky's theorem, and $J_0 = \text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty} J$. Notice that $\Sigma_U^{-1}J_0\Pi_{tj}J_0\Sigma_U^{-1} = \Sigma_U^{-1}\Pi_{tj}\Sigma_U^{-1}$. This proves part (iii). □

11.4 Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof. First, notice that

$$\left\|M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\right\| = \left\|I_T - \widehat{G}^\dagger\widehat{G}^{\dagger\prime}/T\right\| = O(1), \qquad \left\|M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\right\| = \left\|I_N - \widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}\widehat{V}^{\widehat{\nu}^{*\prime}}\right\| = O(1) \tag{11.10}$$

since $\left\|\widehat{G}^\dagger\right\| = O_p(\sqrt{T})$ and eigenvectors are normalized. Then, because of (11.10) and by the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 10.1(i), we have

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{X}_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}u_i\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right), \tag{11.11}$$

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}u_t\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right). \tag{11.12}$$

Moreover,

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{X}_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\widehat{X}_i - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\bar{J}\widehat{X}_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\widehat{X}_i\bar{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right), \tag{11.13}$$

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{X}_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\widehat{X}_t\bar{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right), \tag{11.14}$$

because of (11.10) and following Proposition 10.1(iii). And also,

$$\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widehat{X}_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\left[G\Lambda'+\epsilon\right]=\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\bar{J}X_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\left\{G\Lambda_i+\epsilon_i\right\}$$
$$+\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\widehat{X}_i'-\bar{J}X_i'\right)M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}\left\{G\Lambda_i+\epsilon_i\right\}=:A+B, \tag{11.15}$$

$$\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\Lambda G_t+\epsilon_t\right]=\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left\{\Lambda G_t+\epsilon_t\right\}$$
$$+\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}_t'-\bar{J}X_t'\right)M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left\{\Lambda G_t+\epsilon_t\right\}=:C+D,. \tag{11.16}$$

Then, because of (11.11), (11.12), (11.13), and (11.14)

$$\|B\|=O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T},\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right), \tag{11.17}$$

$$\|D\|=O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T},\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right). \tag{11.18}$$

Consider first part (i). If $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha})\to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2})\to 0$, as $m,N,T\to\infty$, by substituting (11.17) into (11.15), from (4.2) we get:

$$\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^\dagger-\bar{J}\theta\right)=\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\bar{J}X_i'M_{\widehat{G}^\dagger}X_i\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left(\sqrt{NT}\,A\right)+o_p(1)=:I+o_p(1). \tag{11.19}$$

By similar arguments to those used in (11.13),

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(y_i-\widehat{X}_i\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)\left(y_i-\widehat{X}_i\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)'-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(y_i-X_i\bar{J}\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)\left(y_i-X_i\bar{J}\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)'\right\|$$
$$=O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T},\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right). \tag{11.20}$$

Thus, from (11.20) and the definition of $\widehat{G}^\dagger$ in (3.8) it is clear that, if $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha})\to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2})\to 0$, as $m,N,T\to\infty$, it solves

$$\left\{\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(y_i-X_i\bar{J}\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)\left(y_i-X_i\bar{J}\widehat{\theta}^\dagger\right)'+o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)\right\}\widehat{G}^\dagger=\widehat{G}^\dagger\frac{\widehat{M^{\nu^\dagger}}}{T}, \tag{11.21}$$

where $\widehat{M^{\nu^\dagger}}$ is the $q\times q$ diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of $N^{-1}\widehat{\nu}^\dagger\widehat{\nu}^{\dagger\prime}$.

Now, define the $T \times (r+2)$ matrices:

$$\widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger} := \left\{ M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} X_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \right) M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} X_k \right\},$$
$$Z_i := \left\{ M_G X_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \right) M_G X_k \right\}.$$

Then, following the same steps as in Bai (2009, Proposition A.2, Lemma A.8, Corollary A.1, and Lemma A.9), if $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, we have that I in (11.19) is such that

$$\begin{aligned}
I = & \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger\prime} \widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger} \bar{J} \right)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger} \epsilon_i \right. \\
& \left. - \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_k \epsilon_k'] \right) \widehat{G}^{\dagger} \left(\frac{G'\widehat{G}^{\dagger}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \right] \right\} + o_p(1) \\
= & \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger\prime} \widehat{Z}_i^{\dagger} \bar{J} \right)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i \epsilon_i \right. \\
& - \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' M_{\widehat{G}^{\dagger}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_k \epsilon_k'] \right) \widehat{G}^{\dagger} \left(\frac{G'\widehat{G}^{\dagger}}{T} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \right] \\
& \left. - \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \left(X_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \right) X_k \right)' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \epsilon_{jt} \epsilon_{it} \right) \right] \right\} + o_p(1) \\
= & \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i' Z_i \bar{J} \right)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i \epsilon_i \right. \\
& - \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' M_G \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_k \epsilon_k'] \right) G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \right] \\
& \left. - \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \left[\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \left(X_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \right) X_k \right)' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{jt} \epsilon_{it}] \right) \right] \right\} \\
& + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{N} \right) + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right) + o_p(1) \\
=: & \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i' Z_i \bar{J} \right)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i \epsilon_i + \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} I_a + \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} I_b \right\} \\
& + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{N} \right) + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right) + o_p(1). \qquad (11.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Since by Assumptions 6(vi) and 6(vii), $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_k \epsilon_k'] = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{kt}^2] I_T = \sigma_k^2 I_T$ and since $M_G G = 0_{T\times q}$, we have $I_a = 0_{r+2}$. Moreover, since we assumed $T/N \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, as $N, T \to \infty$, by using (11.22) into (11.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\dagger} - \bar{J}\theta\right) &= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i' Z_i \bar{J}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} Z_i \epsilon_i\right) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{N}\left(0_{r+2}, \bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 D_1 \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0\right), \end{aligned} \tag{11.23}$$

because of Assumptions 11(i) and 11(ii), and Slutsky's theorem and where $\bar{J}_0 := \text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty} \bar{J}$. We complete the proof by noticing that $\bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 D_1 \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0 := \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} D_1 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1}$.

For part (ii), notice that if $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, then in (11.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_b &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_k\right) X_k' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{k=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_k' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \Lambda_i \Lambda_i' \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_i' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_i \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{k=1}^{N} \bar{J} X_k' G \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right) \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \Lambda_k \sigma^2 \\ &= 0_{r+2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof then follows as in part (i) and by noticing that in this case $\bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 D_1 \bar{J}_0 \bar{J}_0 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1} \bar{J}_0 = \sigma^2 \Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1}$.

For part (iii). By similar arguments to those used in (11.13),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(y_t - \widehat{X}_t \widehat{\theta}^*\right)\left(y_t - \widehat{X}_t \widehat{\theta}^*\right)' - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(y_t - X_t \bar{J} \widehat{\theta}^*\right)\left(y_t - X_t \bar{J} \widehat{\theta}^*\right)' \right\| \\ &\qquad = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{11.24}$$

Thus, from (11.24) and the definition of $\widehat{\Lambda}^*$ in (3.8) it is clear that, if $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, it solves

$$\left\{\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(y_t - X_t \bar{J} \widehat{\theta}^*\right)\left(y_t - X_t \bar{J} \widehat{\theta}^*\right)' + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)\right\} \widehat{\Lambda}^* = \widehat{\Lambda}^* \frac{\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}}{N}, \tag{11.25}$$

where $\widehat{M}^{\widehat{\nu}^*}$ is the $q \times q$ diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of $T^{-1}\widehat{\nu}^{*\prime}\widehat{\nu}^*$. Moreover, since $y_t - X_t \bar{J} \widehat{\theta}^* =$

$X_t\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*) + \Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t$, from (11.25) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Lambda}^* \frac{\widehat{M^{\nu^*}}}{N} &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J}X_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)G_t'\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^* \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)\epsilon_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Lambda G_t(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J}X_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \epsilon_t(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J}X_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Lambda G_t\epsilon_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \epsilon_t G_t'\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^* \\
&+ \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \epsilon_t\epsilon_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^* + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Lambda G_t G_t'\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^* \\
&=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6 + I_7 + I_8 + \Lambda\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

since $T^{-1}G'G = I_q$ by Assumption 8(ii). So,

$$\widehat{\Lambda}^* \frac{\widehat{M^{\nu^*}}}{N}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} - \Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{8} I_j\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right), \tag{11.26}$$

and notice that

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\| = O_p(1), \tag{11.27}$$

because of (12.17) in Lemma 12.15 (where $\widehat{\Lambda}^*$ is simply denoted as $\widehat{\Lambda}$) and Assumption 6(i). It follows that,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}^* \frac{\widehat{M^{\nu^*}}}{N}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} - \Lambda\right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{8}\|I_j\|\left\|\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\| + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right). \tag{11.28}$$

Now,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_1\| \leq \left\|\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{\|X_t\|^2}{N}\left\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right\|^2 = o_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right), \tag{11.29}$$

because of (12.17) in Lemma 12.15 and Assumption 6(i), and because

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{\|X_t\|^2}{N}\right)^2\right] = \frac{1}{T^2N^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\|X_t\|^2\|X_s\|^2\right] \leq \frac{1}{N^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\|X_t\|^4\right] = \frac{1}{N^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}X_{it}^2\right)^2\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}[X_{it}^2 X_{jt}^2] \leq \mathcal{K}_X, \tag{11.30}$$

for some finite $\mathcal{K}_X$ independent of N, i, and t, due to Assumptions 1(iii), 6(iii), and 6(viii).

Similarly to (11.29) we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_2\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_3\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_4\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_5\| = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right), \tag{11.31}$$

Furthermore, by Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 3)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_6\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_7\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|I_8\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right), \tag{11.32}$$

and, by Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 8)

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{M^{\widehat{\nu}^*}}}{N}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} - J\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{11.33}$$

By substituting (11.27), (11.29), (11.31), (11.32), and (11.33) into (11.28) and since we assumed $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$ as $N, T \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right\| = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right). \tag{11.34}$$

From (11.30) and (11.34), it follows also that

$$\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}(\Lambda - \widehat{\Lambda}^* J) = O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right). \tag{11.35}$$

Now, from (11.26) and (11.33), and noticing that $M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\widehat{\Lambda}^* = 0_{r\times r}$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\Lambda G_t &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}(\Lambda - \widehat{\Lambda}^* J)G_t + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\{I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6 + I_7 + I_8\}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \\
&\quad + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right) + o_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right) \\
&=: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + J_5 + J_6 + J_7 + J_8 + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{11.36}$$

Then, for J_1 by (11.29) we have

$$\|J_1\| = \left\| -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} I_1 \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \right\| \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\|\bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\|}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{\|I_1\|}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} \right\| \|G_t\|$$
$$= O_p(1) \left\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right\|^2 = o_p(1) \left\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right\|, \tag{11.37}$$

since $\|J\| = 1$, $\|M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\| = 1$ (it is a projector), $\|G_t\| = O_p(1)$ due to Assumption 6(ii), and because of (11.27) and (11.30). For J_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} I_2 \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \\ &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} \left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} X_s \bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*) G_s' \frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right] \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \\ &= \frac{1}{NT^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} X_s \bar{J} G_s' G_t (\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{11.38}$$

For J_3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} I_3 \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \\ &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} \left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T} X_s \bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*) \epsilon_s' \widehat{\Lambda}^*\right] \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \\ &= \frac{1}{NT^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} X_s \bar{J} \left[\frac{\epsilon_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}\right] (\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta) \\ &= o_p(1)(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta), \end{aligned} \tag{11.39}$$

since, by Assumption 6(vii) and (11.34),

$$\frac{\epsilon_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} = \frac{\epsilon_s'\Lambda J}{N} + \frac{\epsilon_s'(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)}{N} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right) + O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right).$$

For J_4, because of (11.35), we have

$$J_4 = -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} I_4 \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t$$

$$= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\Lambda G_s(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J}X_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t$$
$$= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}T^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\frac{(\Lambda-\widehat{\Lambda}^*J)}{\sqrt{N}}G_s(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J}\frac{X_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t$$
$$= o_p(1)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta). \tag{11.40}$$

Likewise, because of (11.31), for J_5 we have

$$J_5 = -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}I_5\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t = o_p(1)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta). \tag{11.41}$$

Then, for J_6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_6 &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}I_6\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\\ &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\Lambda G_s\epsilon_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\\ &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}(\Lambda-\widehat{\Lambda}^*J)\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\frac{\epsilon_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\\ &= o_p(\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta)+o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{11.42}$$

because of (11.35) and since from Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3) and (11.34) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\frac{\epsilon_s'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} &= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\frac{\epsilon_s'\Lambda J}{N}+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\frac{\epsilon_s'(\widehat{\Lambda}^*-\Lambda J)}{N}\\ &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)+O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)\left\{O_p(\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta)+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

For J_7 we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_7 &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}I_7\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\\ &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\epsilon_sG_s'\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\\ &= -\frac{1}{NT^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s'G_t\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\epsilon_s.\end{aligned} \tag{11.43}$$

Finally, for J_8 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_8 &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}I_8\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t \\
&= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s'] + \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}\widehat{\Lambda}^*\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t \\
&= -\frac{1}{N^2T^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\widehat{\Lambda}^*\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}\widehat{\Lambda}^*\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t \\
&= A_{NT} - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}\widehat{\Lambda}^*\right]\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t \\
&= A_{NT} + o_p(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right), \qquad (11.44)
\end{aligned}$$

since, by Barigozzi (2022, Lemmas 3 and 4) and (11.34),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}\widehat{\Lambda}^* &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}\Lambda J + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s\epsilon_s' - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right\}(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J) \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)O_p(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by substituting (11.37), (11.38), (11.39), (11.40), (11.41), (11.42), (11.43), and (11.44) into (11.36) we get

$$\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\Lambda G_t = J_2 + J_7 + A_{NT} + o_p(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \qquad (11.45)$$

Now, if $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/(\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}) \to 0$, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, by substituting (11.18) into (11.16), from (4.2) we get:

$$\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}X_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}C + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right). \qquad (11.46)$$

Thus, from (11.45) and (11.46) and given the definition of C in (11.16),

$$\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}X_t\bar{J} + o_p(1)\right)\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) - J_2$$

$$= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\epsilon_t + J_7 + A_{NT} + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{11.47}$$

Then, define the $T \times (r+2)$ matrices:

$$\widehat{W}_t^* := \left\{ M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(G_t'G_s\right) M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}X_s \right\},$$
$$W_t := \left\{ M_{\Lambda}X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(G_t'G_s\right) M_{\Lambda}X_s. \right\}.$$

Using these definitions, by multiplying (11.47) by $\sqrt{NT}$, from (11.38), (11.43) we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\widehat{W}_t^*\bar{J} + o_p(1)\right)\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\epsilon_t + \sqrt{NT}A_{NT} + o_p(1),$$

which implies

$$\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) =: II + o_P(1). \tag{11.48}$$

Now, by the the definition of A_{NT} in (11.44) term II is such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
II = &\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\widehat{W}_t^*\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\epsilon_t\right. \\
&\left.-\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right)\widehat{\Lambda}^*\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\right]\right\} + o_p(1) \\
= &\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\widehat{W}_t^*\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'\epsilon_t\right. \\
&-\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right)\widehat{\Lambda}^*\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\right] \\
&\left.-\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^{T}G_u\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}\right)\right]\right\} + o_p(1) \\
= &\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'W_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'\epsilon_t\right. \\
&\left.-\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\Lambda}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right)\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\right]\right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^{T}G_u\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}]\right)\right]\Bigg\}\\
&+O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{T}\right)+O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{N}\right)+o_p(1)\\
=:&\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'W_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'\epsilon_t+\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}II_a+\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}II_b\right\}\\
&+O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{T}\right)+O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{N}\right)+o_p(1). \qquad (11.49)
\end{aligned}
$$

To derive (11.49) in the first step we used Lemma 12.16 and the fact that $\sqrt{N}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|^2)$ and $O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|)$ are dominated by $\sqrt{NT}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|)$, and $\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right)=o_p(1)$ since $\sqrt{N}/T\to 0$, as $N,T\to\infty$, by assumption. Furthermore, in the second step we used Lemma 12.17(i) for the denominator, Lemma 12.18(i) for the second term at the numerator and Lemma 12.18(ii) for the third term at the numerator.

Since by Assumptions 6(vi) and 6(vii), $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}]=\sigma_i^2\mathbb{I}(t=u)$ letting $\bar{\sigma}^2=N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sigma_i^2$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
II_b&=-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\bar{\sigma}^2\\
&=-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\bar{\sigma}^2+-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t'G_sG_t\bar{\sigma}^2\\
&=-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\bar{\sigma}^2+-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_s'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}G_tG_t'G_s\bar{\sigma}^2\\
&=-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\bar{\sigma}^2+-\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_s'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}G_s\bar{\sigma}^2=0_{r+2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, since we assumed $T/N\to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/T\to 0$, as $N,T\to\infty$, by using (11.49) into (11.48) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\right)&=\left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'W_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t\epsilon_t\right)+o_p(1)\\
&\xrightarrow{p}\mathcal{N}\left(0_{r+2},\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0D_2\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\right), \qquad (11.50)
\end{aligned}
$$

because of Assumptions 11(iii) and 11(iv), and Slutsky's theorem and where $\bar{J}_0:=\text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty}\bar{J}$. We

complete the proof by noticing that $\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0D_2\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0 = \Sigma_{WW}^{-1}D_2\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}$.

For part (iv), if $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, then in (11.49) we have $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s'] = \sigma^2 I_N$ and since $M_\Lambda\Lambda = 0_{N\times q}$, we have $II_a = 0_{r+2}$. The proof then follows as in part (iii) and by noticing that in this case $\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0D_2\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}\bar{J}_0 = \sigma^2\Sigma_{WW}^{-1}$. This completes the proof. □

11.5 Proof of Proposition 9.1

Proof. First, consider part (i). We have

$$\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'u_t = \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'u_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t'\right)u_t = a + b. \tag{11.51}$$

Then, notice that we can write

$$u_t = (X_t\bar{J} - \widehat{X}_t)\bar{J}\theta = \text{mat}_1\left(N^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1})\times_2 y_{t-1}'\times_3\beta' J\right).$$

For term a, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a\| &= \left\|\bar{J}X_t'\text{mat}_1\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_2 y_{t-1}'\times_3\beta' J\right)\right\| \\
&= \left\|\text{mat}_1\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1\bar{J}X_t'\times_2 y_{t-1}'\times_3\beta' J\right)\right\| \\
&= \left\|\text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1\bar{J}X_t'\times_2 y_{t-1}'\times_3\beta' J\right)'\right\| \\
&= \left\|\beta' J\text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1\bar{J}X_t'\times_2 y_{t-1}'\right)\right\| \\
&\leq \|\beta J\|\cdot\left\|\text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1\bar{J}X_t'\times_2 y_{t-1}'\right)\right\| \\
&= \|a_1\|\cdot\|a_2\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{11.52}$$

Clearly, $\|a_1\| = O(1)$. As for $\|a_2\|$, let us first define $z_t := y_{t-1}\otimes X_t\bar{J}$. Then, recall that for a generic tensor $\mathcal{Z}$ and matrices A, B, and C such that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}\times_1 A\times_2 B\times_3 C$, we have $\text{mat}_3(\mathcal{Z}) =$

$C\text{mat}_3(\mathcal{X})\,(B\otimes A)'$. Therefore, by using also (11.4), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_2 =& \text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}-\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1 \bar{J}X_t'\times_2 y_{t-1}'\right)\\
=& \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\text{mat}_3\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}-\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\left(y_{t-1}'\otimes \bar{J}X_t'\right)'\\
=& \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1}-J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)\left(y_{t-1}\otimes X_t\bar{J}\right)\\
=& \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1}-J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)z_t\\
=& \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{\widehat{U}'\left(U-\widehat{U}J\right)}{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}z_t\right.\\
&+\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{\left(\widehat{U}-UJ\right)'}{m}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}z_t\\
&\left.+\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{J'U'}{m}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}z_t\right\}\\
=& \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\{a_I+a_{II}+a_{III}\}. \qquad (11.53)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, because of (12.11) in the proof of Lemma 12.14 when $\widehat{H}=J$, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a_I\| &= \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{\widehat{U}'\left(U-\widehat{U}J\right)}{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}z_t\right\|_F\\
&\le \left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}'\left(U-\widehat{U}J\right)}{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\right\|_F^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\|z_t\|_F^2\right)^{1/2}\\
&\le \sqrt{r}\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}'\left(U-\widehat{U}J\right)}{m}\right\|\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\|\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\right\|_F^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\|z_t\|_F^2\right)^{1/2} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right), \qquad (11.54)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi=\min\left(\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}, N^{3-\alpha/2}T, m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}, mN^{2-\alpha}\right)$, and since

$$\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\right\|_F^2\right]=\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)tji}^2\right]\le r\max_{t=1,\dots,T}\max_{i=1,\dots,N^2}\max_{j=1,\dots,r}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)tji}^2\right]=rO(1),$$

because of Assumption 1(ii), and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\|z_t\|_F^2\right] &= \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^{r+2}\mathbb{E}\left[z_{ijt}^2\right] \leq \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{r+2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[y_{it}^4\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X_{jkt}^4\right]} \\ &\leq (r+2)\max_{t=1,\dots,T}\max_{i,j=1,\dots,N}\max_{k=1,\dots,r+2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[y_{it}^4\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_{jkt}^4]} \\ &= (r+2)O(1)O(1),\end{aligned}$$

following from Assumptions 1(iii), the MA representation (11.2) of the FNAR, and Assumptions 6(iii), 6(viii), and 7.

Moreover,

$$\|a_{III}\| \leq \|J\|\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}z_t\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right), \tag{11.55}$$

since

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}u_i\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}z_t\right\|^2\right] \leq \frac{\mathfrak{K}_1N^{2+\alpha}}{mTN^4} = \frac{\mathfrak{K}_1}{mTN^{2-\alpha}},$$

because of Assumption 10. Finally, term a_{II} is dominated by term a_{III} because of Theorem 4.1(i). Therefore, by using (11.54) and (11.55) into (11.53), and since by Lemma 12.8(iv), $\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| = O_p(1)$, we have

$$\|a\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\xi}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right) = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right).$$

As for term b, by analogy with term a above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|b\| \leq& \|\beta J\|\cdot\left\|\text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}-\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\times_3 J\right)\times_1\left(\widehat{X}_t'-\bar{J}X_t'\right)\times_2 y_{t-1}'\right)\right\| \\ =& \|\beta J\|\cdot\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1}-J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)\left(y_{t-1}\otimes\left(\widehat{X}_t'-\bar{J}X_t'\right)\right)\right\| \\ =& \|\beta J\|\cdot\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1}-J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)(\widehat{z}_t-z_t)\right\| \\ =& \|b_1\|\cdot\|b_2\|.\end{aligned} \tag{11.56}$$

Now, b_1 is the same as a_1 defined before, while b_2 is like a_2 but with $\widehat{z}_t - z_t = y_{t-1}\otimes(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J})$ replacing z_t.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J} &= \left(\text{mat}_1\left(\frac{1}{N}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \times_3 J) \times_2 y'_{t-1}\right), 0_N, 0_N\right) \\ &= \left(\text{mat}_3\left(\frac{1}{N}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1} - \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \times_3 J) \times_2 y'_{t-1}\right)', 0_{N\times 2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{N}\left(y_{t-1} \otimes I_N\right)'\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)', 0_{N\times 2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{11.57}$$

Thus, from term a_{III} in (11.53) we see that the leading term in b_2 is given by

$$\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\left(y_{t-1} \otimes \{y_{t-1} \otimes I_N\}' \frac{\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t-1}U}{mN}\right), \tag{11.58}$$

which is dominated by term a_{III} because of (11.7) in the proof of Theorem 4.2(i). Therefore, b_2 is dominated by a_2. By combining (11.51), (11.52), and (11.56), we complete the proof of part (i).

Next, consider part (ii). We have

$$\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}'_t\nu_t = \frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X'_t\nu_t + \frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}'_t - \bar{J}X'_t\right)\nu_t = A + B. \tag{11.59}$$

By Assumption 12(ii),

$$\|A\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

As for term B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|B\| = \left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}'_t - \bar{J}X'_t\right)\nu_t\right\| &= \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\text{mat}_1((\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t - \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 J) \times_2 y'_{t-1}), 0_{N\times N}, 0_{N\times N}\right)'\nu_t\right\| \\ &= \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\text{mat}_1\left((\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t - \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 J) \times_1 \nu'_t \times_2 y'_{t-1}\right), 0_{N\times 2N}\right)'\right\| \\ &= \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\text{mat}_3\left((\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t - \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 J) \times_1 \nu'_t \times_2 y'_{t-1}\right)', 0_{N\times 2N}\right)'\right\| \\ &= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

The proof is similar to that of term a_2 defined in part (i), with ν_t replacing X_t.

Finally, consider part (iii). We have that

$$\left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}'_t\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X'_tX_t\bar{J}\right\| \le 2\left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}'_t - \bar{J}X'_t)X_t\bar{J}\right\| + \left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}'_t - \bar{J}X'_t)(\widehat{X}'_t - \bar{J}X_t)\right\|$$

$$= I + II. \tag{11.60}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\|I\| &= 2\left\| \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\text{mat}_3\left((\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t - \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 J)\times_1 \bar{J}X_t' \times_2 y_{t-1}'\right)', 0_{N\times 2N}\right)'\right\| \\ &= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

following the same steps as in the proof for term a_2 in part (i). Moreover, II is clearly dominated by I. This completes the proof. □

11.6 Proof of Theorem 9.1

Proof. From (9.2), Proposition 9.1, Assumptions 12(ii) and 12(iii), and Slutsky's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{T}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) &= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\nu_t\right) + \left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'u_t\right)\right\} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'\nu_t\right) + \left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t - \bar{J}X_t)'\nu_t\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'u_t\right)\right\} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'X_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'\nu_t\right) + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_{r+2}, \bar{J}_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_0\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\right),\end{aligned}$$

since we assumed $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and where and $\bar{J}_0 := \text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty}\bar{J}$. Notice, finally that $\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_0\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\bar{J}_0 = \Sigma_{XX}^{-1}\Omega_0\Sigma_{XX}^{-1}$. This completes the proof. □

11.7 Proof of Proposition 10.1

Proof. First of all, notice that from Assumption 6(vi) and by Weyl's inequality,

$$\left\|V^{-1}\right\| = \frac{1}{\mu_N(V)} \leq \frac{1}{\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') + \mu_N(S)} = \frac{1}{\min_{i=1,\ldots,N}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]} \leq \frac{1}{\underline{M}_\epsilon}, \tag{11.61}$$

where $\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') = 0$, $\mu_N(V)$, and $\mu_N(S)$ are the smallest eigenvalues of $\Lambda\Lambda'$, V, and S, respectively, and $\mu_N(\Lambda\Lambda') = 0$.

Consider part (i). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}u_t &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}u_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t'\right)V^{-1}u_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})u_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t'\right)(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})u_t \\ &= a + b + c + d.\end{aligned}$$

Because of (11.61), term a behaves like term a in (11.51) in the proof of Proposition 9.1(i), thus:

$$\|a\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right).$$

Likewise, term b behaves like term b in the proof of Proposition 9.1(i), thus term b is dominated by term a. Moreover, because of Lemma 12.15, terms c and d are dominated by terms a and b, respectively. This proves part (i).

For part (ii), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\nu_t &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'V^{-1}\nu_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})\nu_t \\ &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}\nu_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J})'V^{-1}\nu_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})\nu_t + \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J})'(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})\nu_t. \\ &= A + B + C + D.\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 13(ii):

$$\|A\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right).$$

Term B, because of (11.61), behaves like term B in (11.59) in the proof of Proposition 9.1(ii), i.e., it

behaves like term A in part (i):

$$\|B\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right).$$

Terms C and D are dominated by terms A and B, respectively, because of Lemma 12.15. This proves part (ii).

For part (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t - \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}X_t\bar{J}\right\| \leq\; & 2\left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t')V^{-1}X_t\bar{J}\right\| \\
& + \left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t')V^{-1}(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t)\right\| \\
& + \left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})X_t\bar{J}\right\| \\
& + 2\left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t')(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})X_t\bar{J}\right\| \\
& + \left\|\frac{1}{TN}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t')(\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1})(\widehat{X}_t' - \bar{J}X_t')\right\| \\
=\; & I + II + III + IV + V.
\end{aligned}$$

Because of (11.61), terms I and II behave like terms I and II in (11.60) in the proof of Proposition 9.1(iii), thus

$$\|I\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right),$$

while II is dominated by I. Then, by Lemma 12.15, we have

$$\|III\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right).$$

Finally, terms IV and V are dominated by terms I and II, respectively, by Lemma 12.15. This completes the proof. □

11.8 Proof of Theorem 10.1

Proof. From (10.3), Proposition 10.1, Assumptions 13(ii) and 13(iii), and Slutsky's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{GLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) &= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\widehat{X}_t\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}\nu_t\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{X}_t'\widehat{V}^{-1}u_t\right)\right\} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}X_t\bar{J}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'V^{-1}\nu_t\right) \\
&\quad + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right) + o_p(1) \\
&\quad \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0_{r+2}, \bar{J}_0\Omega_1^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_1\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_1^{-1}\bar{J}_0\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since we assumed $\sqrt{NT}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{N}/\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2} \to 0$ and where and $\bar{J}_0 := \text{plim}_{m,N,T\to\infty}\bar{J}$. Notice that $\bar{J}_0\Omega_1^{-1}\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_1\bar{J}_0\bar{J}_0\Omega_1^{-1}\bar{J}_0 = \Omega_1^{-1}$. This completes the proof. □

12 Auxiliary lemmata

We start with some notation. Let $\chi_t := U\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}$ and recall the definition of the $m \times m$ matrices:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}} := \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{W}_{(3)t}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)t},$$

$$\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}} := \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{W}_{(3)t}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)t}\right],$$

$$\Gamma^{\chi} := U\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\right]U',$$

$$\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}} := \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right],$$

with j largest eigenvalues $\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}$, $\mu_j^{\mathcal{W}}$, μ_j^{χ}, and $\mu_j^{\mathcal{E}}$, respectively.

Lemma 12.1. *Under Assumption 1, for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$,*

$$\max_{j=1,\ldots,N^2} \left|\mathcal{F}_{(3)tij}\right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$$

Proof. The proof follows directly from Assumption 1(ii) and (vi) □

Lemma 12.2. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2:*

(i) for all $j = 1, \ldots, r$, $\underline{C}_j < \liminf_{m,N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_j^{\chi}}{mN^2} \leq \limsup_{m,N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_j^{\chi}}{mN^2} < \overline{C}_j$ for some finite $\underline{C}_j$ and $\overline{C}_j$ independent of m and N.

(ii) For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{mN^{\alpha}T}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2}\sum_{t,s=1}^{T}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right| \leq M_{2\mathcal{E}}$$

for some finite $M_{2\mathcal{E}}$ independent of m, N, T and some $\alpha \in [0, 2]$.

(iii) For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{mN^{\alpha}}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right| \leq M_{3\mathcal{E}}$$

for some finite $M_{3\mathcal{E}}$ independent of m, N, T and some $\alpha \in [0, 2]$.

(iv) Let $\mu_1^{\mathcal{E}}$ denote the largest eigenvalue of $\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}$. Then, $\frac{\mu_1^{\mathcal{E}}}{N^\alpha} \leq M_{\mathcal{E}}$ for some $\alpha \in [0,2]$ and some finite $M_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Proof. For part (i), by Merikoski and Kumar (2004) (Theorem 7), for all $j = 1, \ldots, r$, we have

$$\frac{\mu_r(U'U)}{m}\frac{\mu_j(\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}})}{N^2} \leq \frac{\mu_j^{\chi}}{mN^2} \leq \frac{\mu_j(U'U)}{m}\frac{\mu_1(\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}})}{N^2},$$

where $\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}]$ and $\mu_j(\cdot)$ denotes the j-th eigenvalues of the matrix in parenthesis. The proof follows from Assumption 1(i) which, by continuity of the eigenvalues, implies that, for any $j = 1, \ldots, r$, as $m \to \infty$

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\mu_j(U'U)}{m} = \mu_j(\Sigma_U),$$

with

$$0 < m_U^2 \leq \mu_r(\Sigma_U) \leq \mu_1(\Sigma_U) \leq M_U^2 < \infty,$$

and by Assumption 1(ii), which implies that $\frac{\mu_r(\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}})}{N^2}$ and $\frac{\mu_1(\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}})}{N^2}$ are both finite and bounded away from zero.

For part (ii), by Assumption 2(ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{mN^\alpha T}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2}\sum_{t,s=1}^{T}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right| &= \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2}\sum_{l=-(T-1)}^{T-1}\left(1-\frac{|l|}{T}\right)\frac{\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)sjk}\right]\right|}{N^\alpha} \\ &\leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty}\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{|l|}M_{ij} \leq \frac{M_{\mathcal{E}}(1+\rho_{\mathcal{E}})}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{E}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for part (iii),

$$\frac{1}{mN^\alpha}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\sum_{h,k=1}^{N^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}_{(3)tjk}\right]\right| \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}M_{ij} \leq M_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

For part (iv),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N^\alpha}\mu_1^{\mathcal{E}} &= \frac{1}{N^\alpha}\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right]\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^\alpha}\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}'_{(3)ti}.\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t\cdot j}\right]\right|\end{aligned} \tag{12.1}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{N^\alpha} \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left| \sum_{h=1}^{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)thj}\right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N^\alpha} \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{h=1}^{N^2} \left| \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)tih}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)thj}\right] \right| \\
&\leq M_{\mathcal{E}},
\end{aligned}
$$

following from Assumption 2(ii) □

LEMMA 12.3. *Under Assumption 3,*

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t} \right\| = O_p(1).
$$

Proof. From Assumption 3,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mTN^\alpha} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t} \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mTN^\alpha} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t} \right\|_F^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mN^\alpha T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)ti\cdot} \right\|^2 \right] \leq C_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{E}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

LEMMA 12.4. *Under Assumptions 1 and 4,*

(i) $U = V^\chi (M^\chi)^{1/2} N^{-1}$.

(ii) $\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} = N(M^\chi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} V^{\chi\prime} \chi_t$.

where V^χ is the $m \times r$ matrix whose j-th column is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the j-th largest eigenvalue μ_j^χ of the matrix $\Gamma^\chi = E(\chi_t \chi_t')$, and M^χ is the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix with μ_j^χ as its entry (j, j).

Proof. For part (i), Assumption 1(i) implies $\frac{\Gamma^\chi}{N^2} = UU'$. Therefore, since the non-zero eigenvalues of $\frac{\Gamma^\chi}{mN^2}$ are the same as the r eigenvalues of $\frac{U'U}{m}$, which is diagonal by Assumption 4(i). Then, we must have, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
\frac{U'U}{m} = \frac{M^\chi}{mN^2}.
$$

Since $\Gamma^\chi = V^\chi M^\chi V^{\chi\prime}$, it must be that

$$UK = \frac{V^\chi (M^\chi)^{1/2}}{N},$$

for some $r \times r$ invertible K. By multiplying on the right both sides by their transposed:

$$K'U'UK = \frac{M^\chi}{N^2},$$

since eigenvectors are normalized. Thus, we must have $K = I_r$. This proves part (i).

For part (ii), since $\chi = U\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}$, then by linear projection of U onto χ_t, and using part (i), for $t = 1, \ldots, T$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{(3)t} = (U'U)^{-1} U'\chi_t = N(M^\chi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} V^{\chi\prime}\chi_t.$$

This proves part (ii). □

LEMMA 12.5. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for all $t = 1, \ldots, T$ and all $m, N, T \in \mathbb{N}$,*

(i) $\left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| = O(1)$.

(ii) $\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} \right\| = O_p(1)$ *and* $\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{T}N} \right\| = O_p(1)$.

(iii) $\left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N} \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)$ *and* $\left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{mT}N} \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)$.

Proof. By Assumption 1(i), which holds for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\|^2 \leq \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\|_F^2 = \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_{ij}^2 \leq \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \|u_i\|^2 \leq M_U^2,$$

since M_U is independent of i. This proves part (i).

For part (ii), by Assumption 1(ii)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{t=1,\ldots,T} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{t=1,\ldots,T} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N} \right\|_F^2 \right] \\
&= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{t=1,\ldots,T} \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}}{N^2} \right) \right] \\
&= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{t=1,\ldots,T} \operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t} \right] \right) = r.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{T}N}\right\|^2\right] &\leq \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{T}N}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}}{N}\right\|_F^2\right] = r.\end{aligned}$$

For part (iii), by Lemma 12.2(iv)

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N}\right\|^2\right] &\leq \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}}{mN^2}\right)\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\frac{1}{mN^2}\operatorname{tr}\left(\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{M_{\mathcal{E}}N^{\alpha}}{N^{2-\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{mT}N}\right\|^2\right] &\leq \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}}{\sqrt{mT}N}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ &= \sup_{N,T\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{t=1,\ldots,T}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}}{\sqrt{m}N}\right\|_F^2\right] \leq \frac{M_{\mathcal{E}}N^{\alpha}}{N^{2-\alpha}},\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.6. *Under Assumptions 1-2, for all $m, N, T \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\alpha \in [0, 2]$,*

(i) $\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t} - \frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\right)$.

(ii) $\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t} - \frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}\right)$.

Proof. For part (i), because of Assumption 1(iv),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}-\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right\|^2\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}-\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right\|_F^2\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\{\mathcal{F}_{(3)tj\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)ti\cdot}-\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{(3)tj\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)ti\cdot}]\}\right)^2\right]\\ &\leq \frac{r^2C_{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2T}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves part (i).

For part (ii), because of Assumption 2(v),

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}-\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\|^2\right]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{mN^{4-\alpha}T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}-\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}\right]\right\}\right)^2\right]\\ &\leq \frac{C_{\mathcal{E}}}{N^{4-\alpha}T},\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.7. *Under Assumptions 1-4, for all* $m, T, N \in \mathbb{N}$

(i) $\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\right)$.

(ii) $\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right)$.

(iii) $\frac{1}{mN^2}\left|\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}-\mu_j^{\chi}\right| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right)$. *for all* j

(iv) $\left\|\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}-V^{\chi}J\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right)$, *where* $\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}$ *is the* $m\times r$ *matrix whose* j*-th column is the normalized (unit-modulus) eigenvector corresponding to the* j*-th largest eigenvalue of* $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}$, V^{χ} *is the* $m\times r$ *matrix whose* j*-th column is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the* j*-th largest eigenvalue of* Γ^{χ}, *and* J *is a* $r\times r$ *diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are* ± 1.

Proof. For part (i), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2}\left(\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}}\right)\right\| &\leq \left\|\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\{U\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}\right)U'+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\}\right\| \\ &+\left\|\frac{2}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{1}{TN^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}-\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right\|+\left\|\left(\frac{1}{mTN^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}-\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right)\right\| \\ &+\left\|\frac{2}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 12.5(i), 12.6(i) and 12.6(ii), the first two terms are $O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\right)$. By Lemma 12.3,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2N^4T^2}\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right\|^2\right]=O\left(\frac{1}{mTN^{4-\alpha}}\right),$$

so

$$\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t}\right\|=O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right).$$

This proves part (i).

For part (ii), under Assumption 3, we have that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}=\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}}+\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}\right\| &= \frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\mathcal{W}}\right\|+\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\| \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\right)+O_p\left(\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

following from part (i) and Lemma 12.2(iv), since $\left\|\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\|$ is bounded by $\mu_1^{\mathcal{E}}$.

For part (iii), given Weyl's inequality,

$$\left|\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}}-\mu_j^{\chi}\right|\leq\mu_1\left(\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}\right)=\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}\right\|,$$

so, given part (ii),

$$\frac{1}{mN^2}\left|\widehat{\mu}_j^{\mathcal{W}} - \mu_j^{\chi}\right| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right).$$

Last, for part (iv), given part (i), Lemma 12.2(i), and Theorem 2 in Yu et al. (2015), which is a special case of Davis-Kahn Theorem

$$\left\|\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}} - V^{\chi}J\right\| \leq \frac{\left\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}} - \Gamma^{\chi}\right\|}{\mu_r^{\chi}} = \frac{N^2 m O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)}{O(N^2 m)} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right),$$

and this completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.8. *Under Assumptions 1-4, for all* $m, T, N \in \mathbb{N}$

(i) $\left\|\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right\| = O(1)$.

(ii) $\left\|\left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| = O(1)$.

(iii) $\left\|\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right\| = O_p(1)$.

(iv) $\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| = O_p(1)$.

Proof. Parts (i) and (ii) follow directly from Lemma 12.2, indeed,

$$\left\|\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right\| = \frac{\mu_1^{\chi}}{mN^2} \leq \overline{C}_1,$$

and

$$\left\|\left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right)\right\| = \frac{mN^2}{\mu_r^{\chi}} \leq \underline{C}_r.$$

Both statements hold for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ since the eigenvalues are an increasing sequence in m and N.

For part (iii), because of Lemma 12.7(iii),

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right\| \leq \left\|\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} - \frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right\| \leq \overline{C}_1 + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right).$$

For part (iv), just notice that, because of Lemma 12.7(iii) and part (ii), then $\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}$ is positive definite with probability tending to one as $m, N, T \to \infty$. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.9. *Under Assumptions 1-4, for any given* $i = 1, \ldots, m$ *and* $m, T \to \infty$

(i) $\frac{1}{mN^2}\left\|\varepsilon_i'\left(\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}-\Gamma^{\chi}\right)\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{2-\alpha}m}}\right)\right)$.

(ii) $\|\sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi}\| = O_p(1)$.

(iii) $\left\|\sqrt{m}\,\widehat{v}_i^{\mathcal{W}'}-\sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi\prime}J\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)$.

Proof. Part (i) follows directly from Lemma 12.7(ii). For part (ii) notice that for all $i=1,\ldots,m$, since $N^{-2}\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}=I_r$ because of Assumption 4(ii), we must have

$$\frac{\text{Var}(\chi_{it})}{N^2} = u_i'u_i \leq M_U^2, \tag{12.2}$$

which is finite for all i and t. Then, by Lemma 12.2(i)

$$\begin{aligned}\lim\inf_{m\to\infty}\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\text{Var}(\chi_{it}) &= \lim\inf_{m\to\infty}\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j^{\chi}\left|V_{ij}^{\chi}\right|^2 \geq \lim\inf_{m\to\infty}\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\mu_r^{\chi}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\left|V_{ij}^{\chi}\right|^2\\ &\geq \underline{C}_r mN^2\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\|v_i^{\chi}\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

and by (12.2) we must have

$$\underline{C}_r mN^2\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\|v_i^{\chi}\|^2 \leq M_U^2N^2,$$

which implies

$$m\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\|v_i^{\chi}\|^2 \leq \frac{M_U^2}{\underline{C}_r}.$$

This proves part (ii).

For part (iii) we follow the same approach as in the proof of Lemma 12.7(iv) but using part (i).

□

LEMMA 12.10. *Under Assumptions 1-4, for* $m,T\to\infty$

(i) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\left\|\widehat{U}-UJ\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha}m}\right)\right)$.

(ii) for any given $i=1,\ldots,m$, $\left\|\widehat{u}_i'-u_i'J\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{2-\alpha}m}}\right)\right)$.

Proof. For part (i), first notice that $\text{rk}\left(\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right)=r$ for all m, since $\text{rk}\left(\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right)=r$ by Assumption 1(ii) and $\text{rk}\left(\frac{\Gamma^{\chi}}{m}\right)=r$ by Lemma 12.2(i). Indeed, $\text{rk}\left(\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{mN^2}\right)\leq\min\left(\text{rk}\left(\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{F}}}{N^2}\right),\text{rk}\left(\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right)\right)$. This holds for all $m>\overline{m}$

and since eigenvalues are an increasing sequence in m. Therefore, $\left(\frac{U'U}{m}\right)^{-1}$ is well defined for all m and U admits a left inverse.

Now, because of Lemma 12.7(iii), 12.7(iv), 12.8(i), using (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}-UJ}{\sqrt{m}}\right\| &= \left\|\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{1/2} - V^{\chi}\left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right)^{1/2} J\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}} - V^{\chi}J\right\|\left\|\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right\| + \left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N}\left\{\left(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}\right)^{1/2} - (M^{\chi})^{1/2}\right\}\right\|\|V^{\chi}\| \\
&+ \left\|\widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}} - V^{\chi}J\right\|\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N}\left\{\left(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}\right)^{1/2} - (M^{\chi})^{1/2}\right\}\right\| \\
&= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For part (ii), because of Lemmas 12.7(iii), 12.8(iii), 12.9(ii), and 12.9(iii)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{u}_i' - u_i'J\| &= \left\|\sqrt{m}\,\widehat{v}_i^{\mathcal{W}'}\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{1/2} - \sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi'}J\left(\frac{M^{\chi}}{mN^2}\right)^{1/2}\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\sqrt{m}\,\widehat{v}_i^{\mathcal{W}'} - \sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi'}J\right\|\left\|\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right\| + \left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\left\{\left(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}\right)^{1/2} - (M^{\chi})^{1/2}\right\}\right\|\|\sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi}\| \\
&+ \left\|\sqrt{m}\,\widehat{v}_i^{\mathcal{W}'} - \sqrt{m}v_i^{\chi'}J\right\|\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^2}}\left\{\left(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}\right)^{1/2} - (M^{\chi})^{1/2}\right\}\right\| \\
&= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mN^{2-\alpha}}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 12.11. *Under Assumptions 1-4, for all* $m, N, T \in \mathbb{N}$

(i) $\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)}'}{\sqrt{m}N^2T}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right)$.

(ii) $\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)}'}{mN^2T}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right)$ *and* $\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)}'}{m^{3/2}N^2T}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right)$.

(iii) $\left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| = O(1)$.

Proof. Part (i) follows directly from Assumption 3. For part (ii), by Lemma 12.6(ii) and Lemma 12.2(iv)

$$\left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)}'}{mN^2T}\right\| \leq \left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}_{(3)}'}{mN^2T} - \frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\|$$

$$= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right).$$

Similarly, by Lemma 12.2(iv) and Lemma 12.5(i)

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T}\right\| &\leq \left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T} - \frac{U\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{m^{3/2}N^2}\right\| + \left\|\frac{U'}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\left\|\frac{\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^2}\right\| \\ &= \left\|\frac{U\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T} - \frac{U\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{m^{3/2}N^2}\right\| + O\left(\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then, because of Assumption 2(v),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T} - \frac{U\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{m^{3/2}N^2}\right\|^2\right] \leq& \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T} - \frac{U\Gamma^{\mathcal{E}}}{m^{3/2}N^2}\right\|_F^2\right] \\ =& \sum_{k=1}^{r}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{m^{3/2}N^2T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}U_{ik}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} - U_{ik}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}\right]\right|^2\right] \\ \leq& \frac{rM_U^2 m}{m^2N^{4-\alpha}T}\max_{j=1,\ldots,m}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}\right]\right|^2\right] \\ \leq& \frac{rM_U^2C_{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^{4-\alpha}T}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves part (ii).

Part ((iii) follows from Lemma 12.5(i), since

$$\left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| \leq \left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|^2 \leq M_U^2.$$

□

Lemma 12.12 (Consistency of loadings). *Under Assumptions 1-4*

(i) $\left\|\widehat{u}'_i - u'_i\widehat{H}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right)$, *where* $\widehat{H} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{N^2T}\frac{U'\widehat{U}}{m}\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}$.

(ii) $\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}-U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right)$.

Proof. Substituting

$$\mathcal{W}_{(3)}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)} = U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U' + U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)} + \mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U' + \mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}$$

into

$$\frac{\mathcal{W}_{(3)}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\widehat{U} = \widehat{U}\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2},$$

where $\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{W}_{(3)}\mathcal{W}'_{(3)}/T$, we get:

$$\frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} + \frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} = \widehat{U}\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}.$$

Define

$$\widehat{H} := \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{N^2T}\frac{U'\widehat{U}}{m}\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}. \tag{12.3}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H} &= \left(\frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'\widehat{U}}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}\widehat{U}}{mN^2T}\right)\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'U}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U}{mN^2T}\right)J\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'}{mN^2T} + \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\right)\left(\widehat{U} - UJ\right)\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{12.4}$$

Taking the i-th row of (12.4), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\widehat{u}'_i - u'_i\widehat{H}\right) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{mN^2T}u'_i\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u'_j + \frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\sum_{j=1}^{m}u_ju'_j + \frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u'_j\right) \\
&\times J\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{mN^2T}u'_i\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}(\widehat{u}'_j - u'_jJ) + \frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\sum_{j=1}^{m}u_j(\widehat{u}'_j - u'_jJ)\right. \\
&\left. + \frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}(\widehat{u}'_j - u'_jJ)\right)\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \\
&= (a+b+c)J\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} + (d+e+f)\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{12.5}$$

First consider part (i). For term a, by Assumption 1(i),

$$\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}u_i'\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u_j'\right\| \leq \|u_i\|\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u_j'\right\| \leq M_U\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u_j'\right\|,$$

for any $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Then, by Assumption 1(i) and Lemma 12.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u_j'\right\|^2\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}u_j'\right\|_F^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{m^2N^4T^2}\sum_{h=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}[U_{jh}]\right\|_F^2\right] \\
&= \max_{h=1,\ldots,r}\frac{r}{m^2N^4T^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}[U_{jh}]\right\|_F^2\right] \\
&= \frac{rM_U^2}{m^2N^4T^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot}\right\|_F^2\right] \\
&= \frac{rM_U^2}{mN^{4-\alpha}T}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mN^\alpha T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}_{(3)t}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)ti\cdot}\right\|^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{rM_U^2C_{\mathcal{FE}}}{mN^{4-\alpha}T} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{mTN^{4-\alpha}}\right). \qquad (12.6)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, term a is $O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}})$.

For term b, for any $i = 1, \ldots, m$, because of Lemma 12.5(i)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\sum_{j=1}^{m}u_ju_j'\right\| &= \left\|\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}(U'U)\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\right\|\left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|^2 \\
&\leq \left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\right\|M_U^2. \qquad (12.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Assumption 3 with $m = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{1}{N^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\right\| &= \frac{\sqrt{m}}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{\alpha/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)t}\right\| \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{m}}{N^{2-\alpha/2}\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\right). \qquad (12.8)
\end{aligned}$$

By substituting (12.8) into (12.7), we prove that term b is $O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}})$

For term c, for any $i = 1, \ldots, m$, because of Assumption 1(i),

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} u'_j \right\| &= \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} U_{jk} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{r} M_U \left| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{r} M_U \left| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right] \right| \\ &+ \sqrt{r} M_U \left| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right] \right\} \right|.\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2(ii),

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right] \right| &\leq \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left| \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} M_{ij} N^{\alpha} \leq \frac{M_{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^{2-\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Assumption 2(v)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left| \frac{1}{mN^2T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{(3)ti\cdot} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)tj\cdot} \right] \right\} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{\mathcal{E}}}{mN^{4-\alpha}T}.$$

Hence, term c is $O_p\left(\frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}} \right)$.

Given Lemma 12.10(ii), the terms d, e, and f are dominated, since they are similar to a, b, and c, but with $(\widehat{u}'_j - u'_j J)$ replacing u'_j. This completes the proof of part (i).

Second, consider part (ii). From (12.4)

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \leq & \left(\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\|^2 + \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)} \mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U'U}{m} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \right) \|J\| \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \\ & + \left(\left\| \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)} \mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)} \mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T} \right\| \right) \left\| \frac{\widehat{U} - UJ}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \\ = & O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right),\end{aligned}$$

following from Lemma 12.5(i), 12.10, 12.11(i), 12.11(ii), 12.11(iii), 12.8(iv) and $\|J\| = O(1)$. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.13. *Under Assumptions 1-4, as* $m, N, T \to \infty$, $\left\|\widehat{H}\right\| = O(1)$.

Proof. By Lemmas 12.5, 12.8 and 12.12

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{H}\right\| &\leq \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{N^2T}\right\|\left\|\frac{U'\widehat{U}}{m}\right\|\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \leq \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{N\sqrt{T}}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{N\sqrt{T}}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\|J\|\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}}{N\sqrt{T}}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}-U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}}\right\|\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \\
&= O_p(1) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 12.14. *Under Assumptions 1-4, as* $m, N, T \to \infty$

(i) $\left\|\widehat{H} - J\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right) = o_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$,

(ii) $\left\|\widehat{H}^{-1} - J\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right) = o_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right)$,

where $\xi = \min\left(\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}, N^{3-\alpha/2}T, m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}, mN^{2-\alpha}\right)$.

Proof. For part (i), using (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\widehat{U}'U\widehat{H}}{m} &= \frac{\widehat{U}'\widehat{U}}{m} + \frac{\widehat{U}'(U\widehat{H} - \widehat{U})}{m} \\
&= \frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} + \frac{\widehat{U}'(U\widehat{H} - \widehat{U})}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\frac{\widehat{U}'(U\widehat{H} - \widehat{U})}{m} = \frac{(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})'U\widehat{H}}{m} + \frac{(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})'(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})}{m}.$$

Then,

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{U}'(U\widehat{H} - \widehat{U})}{m}\right\| \leq \left\|\frac{(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})'U\widehat{H}}{m}\right\| + \left\|\frac{(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})'(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})}{m}\right\| = I + II.$$

First, consider I. From (12.4)

$$\begin{aligned}
I =& \frac{(\widehat{U} - U\widehat{H})'U\widehat{H}}{m} \\
=& \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J\frac{U'U}{m}\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U\widehat{H}}{mN^2T} + \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\frac{U'U\widehat{H}}{m} + \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} J\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U\widehat{H}}{m^2N^2T} \\
&+ \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{(\widehat{U} - UJ)'}{\sqrt{m}}\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}U'}{mN^2T}\frac{U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}} + \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{(\widehat{U} - UJ)'}{\sqrt{m}}\frac{U\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\frac{U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}} \\
&+ \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{(\widehat{U} - UJ)'}{\sqrt{m}}\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\frac{U\widehat{H}}{\sqrt{m}} \\
=& I_a + I_b + I_c + I_d + I_e + I_f.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, given (12.6),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U}{mN^2T}\right\|^2\right] = O\left(\frac{1}{mTN^{4-\alpha}}\right). \tag{12.9}$$

Therefore, by Assumption 1(i), Lemma 12.8(iv), Lemma 12.13 and using $\|J\| = O(1)$ and (12.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I_a\| &\leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \|J\| \left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| \left\|\frac{\mathcal{F}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}U}{mN^2T}\right\| \left\|\widehat{H}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right) \\
\|I_b\| &\leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \|J\| \left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T}\right\| \left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| \left\|\widehat{H}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, because of Lemma 12.5(i), 12.11(ii), Lemma 12.8(iv), Lemma 12.13 and $\|J\| = O(1)$,

$$\|I_c\| \leq \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \|J\| \left\|\frac{U}{\sqrt{m}}\right\| \left\|\frac{U'\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{m^{3/2}N^2T}\right\| \left\|\widehat{H}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right).$$

Similarly, because of Lemma 12.10, Lemma 12.5(i), 12.11(i) and (iii), Lemma 12.8(iv) and 12.13,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I_d\| \leq& \left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)^{-1}\right\| \left\|\frac{\widehat{U} - UJ}{\sqrt{m}}\right\| \left\|\frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T}\right\| \left\|\frac{U'U}{m}\right\| \left\|\widehat{H}\right\| \\
=& O_p(1)\ O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right)\ O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha/2}}\right) O_p(1)O_p(1) \\
=& O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|I_e\| \leq \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{\widehat{U} - UJ}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{F}'_{(3)}}{\sqrt{m}N^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\|^2 \left\| \widehat{H} \right\|$$
$$= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right),$$

and, because of Lemma 12.10, Lemma 12.5(i), 12.11(ii), Lemma 12.8(iv) and 12.13

$$\|I_f\| \leq \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{\widehat{U} - UJ}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_{(3)}\mathcal{E}'_{(3)}}{mN^2T} \right\| \left\| \frac{U}{\sqrt{m}} \right\| \left\| \widehat{H} \right\|$$
$$= O_p(1)\ O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{mN^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right)\ O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}} \right) O_p(1)O_p(1)$$
$$= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{m^{3/2}\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\|I\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}}, \frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}} \right) \right). \tag{12.10}$$

Second, consider II. From Lemma 12.12(ii)

$$\|II\| \leq \frac{1}{m}\left\| \widehat{U} - U\widehat{H} \right\|^2 = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{4-\alpha}T}, \frac{1}{m^2N^{4-2\alpha}}, \right) \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{\widehat{U}'\left(U - \widehat{U}\widehat{H} \right)}{m} \right\| \leq \|I\| + \|II\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right). \tag{12.11}$$

Recall that $\xi = \min\left(\sqrt{mT}N^{2-\alpha/2}, N^{3-\alpha/2}T, m\sqrt{T}N^{2-\alpha}, mN^{2-\alpha} \right)$. Because of (12.11), using (3.2),

$$\frac{\widehat{U}'U\widehat{H}}{m} = \frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right).$$

Or, equivalently,

$$\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{\widehat{U}'U}{m} = \widehat{H}^{-1} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right).$$

Using this in (12.3) and using Assumption 4 we have

$$\widehat{H}' = \left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{\widehat{U}'U}{m} = \widehat{H}^{-1} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right).$$

Therefore, as $m, T, N \to \infty$, $\widehat{H}$ is an $r \times r$ orthogonal matrix, thus it has eigenvalues ± 1.

Moreover, because of (12.10)

$$\frac{\widehat{U}'U}{m} = \frac{(\widehat{U}' - U\widehat{H} + U\widehat{H})'U}{m} = \frac{\widehat{H}'\widehat{U}'U}{m} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right). \tag{12.12}$$

And from (12.12) it follows that

$$\left(\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}\right)\widehat{H}' = \widehat{H}'\frac{U'U}{m} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right).$$

So, because of (eq. above), as $m, N, T \to \infty$, the columns of $\widehat{H}$ are the eigenvectors of $\frac{U'U}{m}$ with eigenvalues $\frac{\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}}}{mN^2}$. The eigenvectors are normalized since $\widehat{H}$ is orthogonal, as $m, N, T \to \infty$. Moreover, under Assumption 4 (i), $\frac{U'U}{m}$ is diagonal so, as $m, N, T \to \infty$, $\widehat{H}$ must be diagonal with eigenvalues ± 1. This proves part (i). Part (ii) follows from the fact that $\widehat{H}$ is orthogonal, as $m, N, T \to \infty$. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.15. *Under Assumptions 1-10, 13, and 14, if* $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$, *as* $m, N, T \to \infty$

$$\left\|\widehat{V}^{-1} - V^{-1}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right).$$

Proof. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\nu}_t := y_t - \widehat{X}_t\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} &= y_t - \left(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J} + X_t\bar{J}\right)\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta + \bar{J}\theta\right) \\
&= y_t - X_t\bar{J}\bar{J}\theta - X_t\bar{J}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) - \left(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J}\right)\bar{J}\theta - \left(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J}\right)\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) \\
&= \nu_t - X_t\bar{J}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) - \left(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J}\right)\bar{J}\theta - \left(\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J}\right)\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right) \\
&= \nu_t + \delta_t + \eta_t + \zeta_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{12.13}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{\widehat{X}_t - X_t\bar{J}}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\|\left(\frac{1}{N}\left(y_{t-1} \otimes I_N\right)'\left(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}\right)', 0_{N\times 2N}\right)'\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\frac{y_{t-1}}{\sqrt{N}}\right\|\left\|\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(3)t-1} - J\mathcal{F}_{(3)t-1}}{N}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{12.14}$$

because of Theorem 4.2(i) and since

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{y_{t-1}}{\sqrt{N}}\right\|^2\right] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}[y_{it}^2] = O(1),$$

because of stationarity (see Proposition 4.1). Likewise $\|X_t\| = O_p(\sqrt{N})$. Obviously $\|\theta\| = O(1)$ and $\|\bar{J}\| = 1$. Thus, because of Theorem 9.1 and (12.14):

$$\left\|\frac{\delta_t}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad \left\|\frac{\eta_t}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right). \tag{12.15}$$

From (12.13) and (12.15), it follows that,

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{\nu}_t - \nu_t}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}, \frac{1}{N^{3-\alpha/2}T}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N^{1-\alpha/2}}\right)\right).$$

Now, from (12.13) and (2.4), we also have that

$$\widehat{\nu}_t = \Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t + \delta_t + \eta_t + \zeta_t. \tag{12.16}$$

Recall, the PC estimators $\widehat{\Lambda}$ and $\widehat{G}_t$ or $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ and $\widetilde{G}_t$ defined in Barigozzi (2022) or Bai (2003), depending on the choice of the sample covariance matrix (see (8.2)) and for simplicity of notation write $\widehat{\Lambda}$ and $\widehat{G}_t$ to indicate both sets of estimators. Then, since

$$\|\eta_t\| = o_p(\|\delta_t\|) \text{ and } \|\zeta_t\| = o_p(\|\delta_t\|),$$

because $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$, from Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 3) or Bai and Ng (2020, Proposition 1), we have

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{\Lambda} - \Lambda\mathfrak{J}}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right), \tag{12.17}$$

and for any given $i = 1, \ldots, N$ (see Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 4) or Bai (2003, Theorem 2))

$$\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot} - \Lambda_{i\cdot}\mathfrak{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right), \tag{12.18}$$

where $\mathfrak{J}$ is a $q \times q$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries ± 1. Moreover, from Barigozzi (2022, Proposition

6) or Bai (2003, Theorem 1), for any given $t = 1, \ldots, T$, we have

$$\left\|\widehat{G}_t - \mathfrak{J}G_t\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right). \tag{12.19}$$

Notice the term $1/\sqrt{T}$, coming from δ_t, which is slower than the usual $1/T$ due to estimation of ν_t. By steps analogous to Bai and Ng (2006, Lemma A.1), from (12.17) and (12.19), we get

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\|\widehat{G}_t - \mathfrak{J}G_t\right\|^2 = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{12.20}$$

And, from (12.18) and Chen et al. (2023, Corollary B.13),

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot} - \Lambda_{i\cdot}\mathfrak{J}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right). \tag{12.21}$$

Let, $\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} = \widehat{\nu}_{it} - \widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot}\widehat{G}_t$ and recall that $\epsilon_{it} = \nu_{it} - \Lambda_{i\cdot}G_t$. Hence, from (12.16)

$$|\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}| = \left|\Lambda_{i\cdot}G_t - \widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot}\widehat{G}_t + \delta_{it} + \eta_{it} + \zeta_{it}\right|. \tag{12.22}$$

From (12.22) it follows that (see also Chen et al., 2023, Corollary B.14):

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}|^2 \leq{}& \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left|\Lambda_{i\cdot}G_t - \widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot}\widehat{G}_t\right|^2 \\
&+ \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\delta_{it}|^2 + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\eta_{it}|^2 + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\zeta_{it}|^2 \\
&\leq 8\max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\|\Lambda_{i\cdot}\mathfrak{J}\|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\|\widehat{G}_t - \mathfrak{J}G_t\right\|^2 + 8\max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}_{i\cdot} - \Lambda_{i\cdot}\mathfrak{J}\right\|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\|\mathfrak{J}G_t\|^2 \\
&+ \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\delta_{it}|^2 + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\eta_{it}|^2 + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\zeta_{it}|^2 \\
={}& O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{\log N}{T}\right)\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\log N}{N^{6-\alpha}T^2}, \frac{\log N}{m^2N^{4-\alpha}}, \frac{\log N}{mN^{2-\alpha}T}\right)\right) \\
={}& O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{\log N}{T}\right)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{12.23}$$

because we assumed $\sqrt{T}/(mN^{2-\alpha}) \to 0$. Indeed, the first term in the second last line of (12.23) is due to (12.20) and (12.21). As for the second term in the second last line of (12.23), we have

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}|\delta_{it}|^2 \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\|X_{i\cdot t}\|^2\left\|\bar{J}\left(\widehat{\theta}^{\text{OLS}} - \bar{J}\theta\right)\right\|^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)O_p\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right),$$

by Theorem 9.1 and since, by Assumption 14(i) and Bonferroni inequality, for any $s > 0$ and all $j = 1, \ldots, r+2$,

$$\mathrm{P}\left(\left|\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} X_{ijt}^2 - \mathbb{E}[X_{ijt}^2]\right| > s\right) \leq 2N\exp\left(-cTs^2\right),$$

for some finite c independent of j, N, and T. Similarly, by Assumptions 10 and 14(ii) we have

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\eta_{it}|^2 \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{2}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left\|\widehat{X}_{i\cdot t} - X_{i\cdot t}\right\|^2 \|\theta\|^2 = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{\log N}{N^{6-\alpha}T^2}, \frac{\log N}{m^2N^{4-\alpha}}, \frac{\log N}{mN^{2-\alpha}T}\right)\right),$$

since the error in estimating X_t is function of

$$\frac{1}{mN^2T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j \mathcal{E}_{(3)tji}\left(y_{t-1} \otimes \{y_{t-1} \otimes I_N\}' \frac{\mathcal{E}'_{(3)t-1}U}{mN}\right)_{i\cdot}, \tag{12.24}$$

see (11.57) and (11.58) in the proof of Proposition 9.1.

Moreover, (see also Chen et al., 2023, Corollary B.14):

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}||\epsilon_{it}| \leq & \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}|^2 \left\{\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_{it}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]\right\}\right)^{1/2} \\
& + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}|^2 \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]\right)^{1/2} \\
= & O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right) O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{12.25}$$

by Assumptions 6(vi), 6(ix), and 14(iii) and following the same reasoning as in (12.23).

Therefore, from (12.23) and (12.25), and Assumption 6(ix),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{S} - S\right\| \leq & \max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}|^2 + 2\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{it} - \epsilon_{it}||\epsilon_{it}| + \max_{i=1,\ldots,N}\left|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_{it}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]\right\}\right| \\
= & O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{\log N}{T}\right)\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \\
= & O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{12.26}$$

And from (12.26) and Assumption 6(vi)

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\widehat{S}^{-1}-S^{-1}\right\| &\leq \|S^{-1}\|\left\|\widehat{S}-S\right\|\left\|\widehat{S}^{-1}\right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\min_{i=1,\ldots,N}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{it}^2]}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right)\frac{1}{\min_{i=1,\ldots,N}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_{it}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{M}_\epsilon}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right)\frac{1}{\underline{M}_\epsilon+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right)} \\ &= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.27}$$

Thus, from (12.17) and (12.27)

$$\left\|\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{S}^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}-\Lambda'S^{-1}\Lambda}{N}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right). \tag{12.28}$$

Furthermore, recalling the definition of $\widehat{V}^{-1}$ in (10.1)

$$\widehat{V}^{-1}=\widehat{S}^{-1}-\widehat{S}^{-1}\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}}{\sqrt{N}}\left(\frac{I_N}{N}+\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}'\widehat{S}^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}'}{\sqrt{N}}\widehat{S}^{-1},$$

and since we can always write

$$V^{-1}=S^{-1}-S^{-1}\frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{N}}\left(\frac{I_N}{N}+\frac{\Lambda'S^{-1}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{\Lambda'}{\sqrt{N}}S^{-1},$$

we have

$$\left\|\widehat{V}^{-1}-V^{-1}\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{T}}\right)\right), \tag{12.29}$$

because of (12.17), (12.27), and (12.28). This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.16. *Under Assumptions 1-10, as $N,T\to\infty$, if $\sqrt{N}/T\to 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{W}_t^{*\prime}\epsilon_t = &\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}W_t'\epsilon_t+\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\xi_{NT}^* \\ &+\sqrt{N}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|^2)+O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\xi^*_{NT} := -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\sum_{u=1}^{T}G_u\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}\right).$$

Proof. First note that $M_\Lambda - M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} = P_\Lambda - P_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}$, where $P_\Lambda = \Lambda(\Lambda'\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda'$ and $P_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} = \widehat{\Lambda}^*(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^*)^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'(M_\Lambda - M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*})\epsilon_t &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\widehat{\Lambda}^*(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^*)^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\epsilon_t - \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\Lambda(\Lambda'\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)(J\Lambda'\Lambda J)^{-1}J\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)(J\Lambda'\Lambda J)^{-1}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\Lambda J(J\Lambda'\Lambda J)^{-1}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^* - J\Lambda'\Lambda J\right)^{-1}J\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^* - J\Lambda'\Lambda J\right)^{-1}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\Lambda J\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^* - J\Lambda'\Lambda J\right)^{-1}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right)'\epsilon_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'\Lambda J\left(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\widehat{\Lambda}^* - J\Lambda'\Lambda J\right)^{-1}J\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\
&=: a + b + c + d + e + f + g. \qquad (12.30)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, since $\left(\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i'J\right)(J\Lambda'\Lambda J)^{-1}J\lambda_j$ is a scalar,

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}X_{it}\left(\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i'J\right)\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}J\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_j\epsilon_{jt} \\
&= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i'J\right)\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}J\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_jX_{it}\epsilon_{jt}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$\|a\| \leq \left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i'J\right\|^2\right]^{1/2}\left\|\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\|\|J\|\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_jX_{it}\epsilon_{jt}\right)\right\|^2\right]^{1/2}$$

$$= \left[O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \right) \right] O_p(1), \tag{12.31}$$

because of (11.34), Assumption 6(i), and Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_{it} \left(\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i' J \right) \left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{\lambda}_j^* - J\lambda_j \right) \epsilon_{jt} \\ &= \sqrt{N} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i' J \right) \left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\widehat{\lambda}_j^* - J\lambda_j \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_{it}\epsilon_{jt} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\| &\leq \sqrt{N} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \widehat{\lambda}_i^{*\prime} - \lambda_i' J \right\|^2 \right) \left\| \left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_{it}\epsilon_{jt} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{N} \left[O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|^2 \right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T} \right) \right) \right] O_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{12.32}$$

because of (11.34), Assumption 6(i), and Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 2). Then, consider

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t' \Lambda J \left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \left(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J \right)' \epsilon_t \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{NT}}{T} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{s=1}^{T} \frac{X_t' \Lambda J}{N} \left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} \right)^{-1} G_s \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{is} \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + \sqrt{N} O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T} \right) \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \psi_{NT} + O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + \sqrt{N} O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

And it easily seen that $\|\psi_{NT}\| = O_p(1)$ so $\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\psi_{NT}$ dominates $\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right)$, since $\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| = o_p(1)$ as shown in (12.40) in the proof of Lemma 12.17(i). Finally, d, e, and f are dominated by a, b, and c, respectively, and g behaves as a.

Therefore, from (12.30) and Lemma 12.19(iv) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_t' (M_\Lambda - M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}) \epsilon_t &= \frac{\sqrt{NT}}{T} \psi_{NT} \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\| \right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{12.33}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sqrt{N}\left[O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|^2\right)+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right)\right]\\
&+O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|\right)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right)\\
&=\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{T}\psi_{NT}+O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|\right)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|^2\right)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\psi_{NT}:=\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{X_t'\Lambda J}{N}\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}G_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{is}\right).
$$

Let now $V_t:=\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(G_s'G_t)X_t$. Then, replacing X_t with V_t in (12.30) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}V_t'(M_\Lambda-M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*})\epsilon_t \qquad (12.34)\\
&\quad=\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{T}\psi_{NT}^*+O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|\right)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^*-\bar{J}\theta\|^2\right)+\sqrt{N}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\psi_{NT}^*:=-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{V_t'\Lambda J}{N}\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}G_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{is}\right).
$$

By combining (12.33) and (12.34) we complete the proof. □

LEMMA 12.17. *Let* $D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*):=\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\widehat{JW}_t^{*\prime}\widehat{W}_t^*\bar{J}$ *and* $D(\Lambda):=\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'W_t\bar{J}$. *Under Assumptions 1-10, as* $N,T\to\infty$,

(i) $\left\|D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)^{-1}-D(\Lambda)^{-1}\right\|=o_p(1)$.

(ii) $\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\left\|D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)^{-1}-D(\Lambda)^{-1}\right\|=o_p(1)$ *if* $\sqrt{T}/N\to 0$.

(iii) $\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left\|D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)^{-1}-D(\Lambda)^{-1}\right\|=o_p(1)$ *if* $\sqrt{N}/T\to 0$.

Proof. For part (i), notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)-D(\Lambda)=&\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t'(M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}-M_\Lambda)X_t\\
&-\frac{1}{N}\left[\frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}X_t'(M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}-M_\Lambda)X_s(G_t'G_s)\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Then the proof follows from the fact that by (11.34) and Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 5)

$$\left\|M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} - M_\Lambda\right\|^2 = 2\text{tr}\left(I_q - \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*'}\Lambda(\Lambda'\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^{*'}}{N}\right) = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \quad (12.35)$$

which follows from

$$\frac{1}{N}\Lambda'(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J) = \frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} - \frac{\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N} = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right),$$
$$\frac{1}{N}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*'}(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J) = \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*'}\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} - \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*'}\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N} = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\|D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*) - D(\Lambda)\right\| = O_p\left(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \quad (12.36)$$

This proves part (i).

For part (ii), from (11.48) and the second step (11.49) (which does not use this lemma), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) &= \left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'\epsilon_t\right. \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right)\widehat{\Lambda}^*\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t\right] \\
&\quad \left.-\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^{T}G_u\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}\right)\right]\right\} + o_p(1) \\
&= \left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}W_t'\epsilon_t + \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\zeta_{NT} + \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\xi_{NT} + o_p(1), \quad (12.37)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\zeta_{NT} := -\left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}X_t'M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s\epsilon_s']\right)\widehat{\Lambda}^*\left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1}G_t, \quad (12.38)$$

and

$$\xi_{NT} := -\left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\bar{J}\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\Lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^{T}G_u\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}\right). \quad (12.39)$$

It is easily seen that $\|\xi_{NT}\| = O_p(1)$ and $\|\zeta_{NT}\| = O_p(1)$. Moreover, by Assumptions 11(iii) and 11(iv), we

also have $\left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J} W_t' \epsilon_t = O_p(1)$. Therefore, from (12.37)

$$\sqrt{NT}\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\right) + O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{12.40}$$

By (12.36) and (12.40) we have

$$\left\|D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*) - D(\Lambda)\right\| = O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right).$$

The proof of parts (ii) and (iii) follows immediately. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.18. *Under Assumptions 1-10, as $N, T \to \infty$,*

(i) if $\sqrt{T}/N \to 0$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\|\zeta_{NT} - \zeta_{NT}^0\| = o_p(1),$$

where

$$\zeta_{NT}^0 := -\left(D(\Lambda)\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J} X_t' M_\Lambda \left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s \epsilon_s']\right) \Lambda \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t,$$

and ζ_{NT} is defined in (12.38) in the proof of Lemma 12.17.

(ii) if $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\|\xi_{NT} - \xi_{NT}^0\| = o_p(1),$$

where

$$\xi_{NT}^0 := -\left(D(\Lambda)\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J}\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)' \Lambda \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \sum_{u=1}^{T} G_u \left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}]\right),$$

and ξ_{NT} is defined in (12.39) in the proof of Lemma 12.17.

Proof. For part (i), we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J} X_t' M_{\widehat{\Lambda}^*} \left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s \epsilon_s']\right) \widehat{\Lambda}^* \left(\frac{\Lambda'\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t - \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \bar{J} X_t' M_\Lambda \left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s \epsilon_s']\right) \Lambda \left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} G_t \right\|$$

$$= O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right),$$

by (12.35) and (12.40) in the proof of Lemma 12.17. Thus, since $\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right) = o_p(1)$ if $\sqrt{T}/N \to 0$, by using Lemma 12.17(iii), we prove part (i).

For part (ii), by Lemma 12.17(iii), if $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left(\xi_{NT} - \xi_{NT}^0\right) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left(\left(D(\widehat{\Lambda}^*)\right)^{-1}\xi_{NT}^* - \xi_{NT}^0\right) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left(\left(D(\Lambda)\right)^{-1}\xi_{NT}^* - \xi_{NT}^0\right) + o_p(1), \quad (12.41)$$

where ξ_{NT}^* is defined in Lemma 12.19, and since $\|\xi_{NT}^*\| = O_p(1)$. Moreover, let

$$A_{tu} := G_u' \otimes \left[\left(X_t - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(G_t'G_s)X_s\right)'\frac{\Lambda}{N}\right],$$

which is such that $\|A_{tu}\| = O_p(1)$. Then, since $\left\|\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\| = O_p(1)$ by Assumption 6(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(D(\Lambda)\right)^{-1}\xi_{NT}^* - \xi_{NT}^0 &= -\left(D(\Lambda)\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{u=1}^{T}A_{tu}\left\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it} - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{iu}\epsilon_{it}]\right\}\text{vec}\left(\left(\frac{\Lambda'\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\right)\\ &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \quad (12.42)\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 6(ix). Thus, by substituing (12.42) into (12.41), we have $\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}}\left(\xi_{NT} - \xi_{NT}^0\right) = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 12.19. *Under Assumptions 1-10, as $N, T \to \infty$,*

(i) $\left\|\frac{1}{N}(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)\epsilon_t\right\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)$.

(ii) $\left\|\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)\epsilon_t\right\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)$.

(iii) $\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}G_t'(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)\epsilon_t\right\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + \frac{1}{T}O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)$.

(iv)

$$\left\|\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\frac{X_t'\Lambda J}{N}\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)\epsilon_t - \frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{X_t'\Lambda J}{N}\left(\frac{J\Lambda'\Lambda J}{N}\right)^{-1}G_s\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{is}\right)\right\|$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + \frac{1}{T} O_p(\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\|) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Part (i) follows from (11.34) and Barigozzi (2022, Proposition 5).

For part (ii), using (11.26) and (11.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} G_t'(\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J)\epsilon_t &= \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \left\{\sum_{j=1}^{8} I_j\right\}' \epsilon_t + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right) \\ &=: A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5 + A_6 + A_7 + A_8 + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.43}$$

For A_1 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^{T} \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime} X_s}{N} \right\| \bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J} \frac{X_s'\epsilon_t}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \right\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left\| \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{\sqrt{N}} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{s=1}^{T} \bar{J} X_s' \epsilon_t \right\| \frac{\|X_s\|}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^* \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} O_p\left(\left\| \bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^* \right\| \right) O_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{12.44}$$

by (11.27), (11.29), and Assumption 11(iii). Similarly, for A_2 in (12.43), we have

$$A_2 = \frac{1}{NT} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{s=1}^{T} G_s(\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J} X_s' \epsilon_t.$$

Thus,

$$\|A_2\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} O_p\left(\left\| \bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^* \right\| \right). \tag{12.45}$$

And by the same arguments, for A_3 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_3\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^{T} \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime} \epsilon_s}{N} (\bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^*)'\bar{J} \frac{X_s'\epsilon_t}{\sqrt{NT}} \right\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1} \right\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left\| \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^*}{\sqrt{N}} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{s=1}^{T} \bar{J} X_s' \epsilon_t \right\| \frac{\|\epsilon_s\|}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| \bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^* \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} O_p\left(\left\| \bar{J}\theta - \widehat{\theta}^* \right\| \right) O_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{12.46}$$

by Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 2).

For A_4 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}X_s\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*})G_s'\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}X_s\bar{J}}{N}\right)(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*})\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}G_s'\Lambda'\epsilon_t\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Assumption 12(iii), (11.27) and Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3),

$$\|A_4\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\left\|\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*}\right\|\right). \tag{12.47}$$

For A_5 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}X_s\bar{J}(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*})\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}X_s\bar{J}}{N}(\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*})\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\epsilon_{ks}\right\}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_{kt}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Assumptions 6(vii) and 12(iii), and (11.27)

$$\|A_5\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\left\|\bar{J}\theta-\widehat{\theta}^{*}\right\|\right). \tag{12.48}$$

For A_6 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_6 &= \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\epsilon_sG_s'\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}J\Lambda'\epsilon_sG_s'\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Lambda'\epsilon_t+\frac{1}{N^2T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}-J\Lambda')\epsilon_sG_s'\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Lambda'\epsilon_t \\ &=: A_{6,1}+A_{6,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{12.49}$$

Then, by (11.27) and Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3),

$$A_{6,1} = \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}J\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\Lambda'\epsilon_sG_s'\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Lambda'\epsilon_t\right) = O_p\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\right). \tag{12.50}$$

Similarly, by (11.27), (11.34), and Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3),

$$\begin{aligned} A_{6,2} &= \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}-J\Lambda')\epsilon_s G_s'\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Lambda'\epsilon_t\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\{O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^{*}-\bar{J}\theta\right)+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right)\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^{*}-\bar{J}\theta\right)+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.51}$$

By substituting (12.50) and (12.51) into (12.49)

$$\|A_6\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^{*}-\bar{J}\theta\right)+O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N},\frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{12.52}$$

For A_7 in (12.43), we have

$$A_7 = \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{s=1}^{T}G_s\epsilon_s'\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_t\right). \tag{12.53}$$

Thus, by Barigozzi (2022, Lemmas 2 and 3),

$$\|A_7\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right). \tag{12.54}$$

Finally, for A_8 in (12.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_8 &= \frac{1}{N^2T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\epsilon_s\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}J\Lambda'\epsilon_s\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}-J\Lambda')\epsilon_s\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t \\ &=: A_{8,1}+A_{8,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{12.55}$$

Then, by (11.27), Barigozzi (2022, Lemma 3), and Assumptions 6(vii) and 6(ix),

$$\begin{aligned} A_{8,1} = &\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}J\Lambda'\epsilon_s\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t-\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t]\right)\right\} \\ &+\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}J\Lambda'\epsilon_s\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t]\right)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right). \tag{12.56}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{8,2} =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime} - J\Lambda')\epsilon_s}{N}\left\{\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t]\right\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\frac{(\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime} - J\Lambda')\epsilon_s}{N}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t] \\ =:& A_{8,2,1} + A_{8,2,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{12.57}$$

By (11.27), (11.34), and Barigozzi (2022, Lemmas 2 and 3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{8,2,1}\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\|\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left\{\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t]\right\}\right\|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\frac{\|\epsilon_s\|^2}{N}\right)^{1/2}\frac{\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right\|}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left\{O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right)\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.58}$$

And, by the same arguments, and Assumption 6(vii)

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{8,2,2}\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\frac{\left\|\widehat{\Lambda}^* - \Lambda J\right\|}{\sqrt{N}}\left\|\left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}^{*\prime}\Lambda}{N}\right)^{-1}\right\|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_s'\epsilon_t]\frac{\|\epsilon_s\|}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\left\{O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right)\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.59}$$

Therefore, from (12.58) and (12.59), we have

$$\|A_{8,2}\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{12.60}$$

By substituting (12.56) and (12.60) into (12.55) we obtain:

$$\|A_8\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}O_p\left(\widehat{\theta}^* - \bar{J}\theta\right) + O_p\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{T}\right)\right). \tag{12.61}$$

Summing up, by substituting (12.44), (12.45), (12.46), (12.47), (12.48), (12.52), (12.54), and (12.61)

into (12.43), we prove part (ii).

For part (iii) just divide part (ii) by $\sqrt{T}$ and notice that $\|G_t\| = O_p(1)$ because of Assumption 6(ii).

For part (iv) just replace in part (iii) G_t with $X_t'\Lambda J(J\Lambda'\Lambda J)^{-1}$ which is also $O_p(1)$ and the second term on the right-hand-side of the statement comes from the $O_p(T^{-1})$ term in part (iii) (see also the expression of A_7 in (12.53)). □

13 Monte Carlo simulations

13.1 Data generating process

We assume $r = 1$ and $q = 1$, i.e., one network factor and one node-specific factor. We then generate artificial time series of y_t and $\mathcal{W}_t$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$, according to the three model equations:

$$y_t = \beta \frac{F_{t-1}}{N} y_{t-1} + \rho y_{t-1} + \alpha + \nu_t$$

$$\nu_t = \Lambda G_t + \epsilon_t$$

$$\mathcal{W}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \times_3 U + \mathcal{E}_t$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t$ here has size $N \times N \times 1$, U is a column vector of length m, G_t is a scalar and Λ is the N-dimensional column vector of node-specific factor loadings.

The MC simulations are implemented as follows. We consider $N \in \{10, 20, 50\}$, $m \in \{20, 50, 100\}$, and $T \in \{50, 100\}$. First of all, we fix the values of FNAR parameters $\beta = 0.5$, $\rho = 0.3$, and $\alpha = 0.2$. Also, for each value of the pair (N, m), we randomly generate the entries of the loading vectors U and Λ once (and independently) from $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$, and then we keep them fixed across MC iterations (see Chen et al. 2023).

Then, at each MC iteration:

- For all $t = 1, \dots, T$, we generate the entries of the network factor matrix $F_{1,t}$ from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, except for the diagonal elements, which are set to zero to ensure the interpretation of $F_{1,t}$ as a network.
- For the multi-network of idiosyncratic terms $\mathcal{E}_t$, which is $N \times N \times m$, we consider two cases.

I $\mathcal{E}_t$ has zero autocorrelation and zero cross-layer correlation.

II $\mathcal{E}_t$ is serially and cross-layer correlated. Specifically, we generate $\mathcal{E}_t$ according to the equation

$$\mathcal{E}_{ij\cdot,t} = \rho_{\mathcal{E}}\mathcal{E}_{ij\cdot,t-1} + \mathcal{N}(0_m, \Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}^{(m)}), \quad i,j = 1,\ldots,N.$$

Where $\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = 0.5$ and the (i,j)th element of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}^{(m)}$ is given by $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}^{|i-j|}$ if $|i-j| < d$, and 0 otherwise. We set $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}$ to 0.5 and d to 5.

In both case I and case II, we assume no cross-correlation in the first two dimensions of $\mathcal{E}_t$. Also, we set all diagonal elements of each $N \times N$ layer $\mathcal{E}_{\cdot\cdot k,t}$ to zero, $k = 1,\ldots,m$ and $t = 1,\ldots,T$.

- To keep the noise-to-signal ratio in check, we choose to rescale the simulated elements of $\mathcal{E}_t$ so that the (iteration-specific) sample variance across all the elements in the $N \times N \times m \times T$ tensor of idiosyncratic components $\mathcal{E}$ is equal to half the sample variance across all the elements in the $N \times N \times m \times T$ tensor of common components $\mathcal{F} \times_3 U$.
- We simulate the node factor G_t according to $G_t = \rho_G G_{t-1} + \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ where $\rho_G = 0.2$. This allows us to study the iterated estimator under serially correlated FNAR errors, i.e., when the OLS and GLS are not consistent.
- The N node-specific idiosyncratic terms in vector ϵ_t are generated from independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Then, to control the noise-to-signal ratio in the FNAR errors ν_t, we rescale the simulated elements of ϵ_t so that the sample variance of $\text{vec}((\epsilon_1 \cdots \epsilon_T))$ is half the sample variance of $\text{vec}((\Lambda G_1 \cdots \Lambda G_T))$.
- We simulate y_t and $\mathcal{W}_t$ according to the previous steps.
- Next, we re-estimate $\mathcal{F}_t$, U, β_1, ρ and α on the simulated y_t and $\mathcal{W}_t$. When estimating $\mathcal{F}_t$ and U, we implement a small-N adjustment to our tensor principal component estimator. In particular, recall that the $N \times N$ network matrices (slices) composing the $N \times N \times m$ weight tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$ have zero diagonal elements. Accordingly, the number of elements of each network matrix that are effectively used to calculate the inner product $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{W}}$, used for PC estimation, is not N^2, but $N^2 - N$. Of course, this is not an issue for large N, and asymptotic results for $N \to \infty$ are derived by simply considering N^2 elements in each network matrix, since the term N is dominated by N^2 and is

therefore asymptotically negligible. However, for small values of N, estimation improves by taking into account the presence of zeros along the diagonals. For this reason, in the MC imulations, we introduce the following adjustment to estimated loadings and factors, replacing N^2 with $N^2 - N$:

$$\widehat{U} := \widehat{V}^{\mathcal{W}}(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{1/2}(N^2 - N)^{-1/2}.$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t := \mathcal{W}_t \times_3 [(N^2 - N)(\widehat{M}^{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}\widehat{U}'].$$

To estimate the FNAR parameters, we use the Bai (2009) iterative estimator, given the serial correlation assumed in the node-specific factor G_t. Recall that factors, loadings and the FNAR parameter β_1 are consistently estimated only up to a sign. To address this issue, we change the signs of $\widehat{U}$ to ensure that $\widehat{U}'U$ is positive, then $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t$ and $\widehat{\beta}_1$ are adjusted accordingly.

For different values of T, N, and m, we report the MC root mean squared errors of the estimates, both in absolute terms (*RMSE*) and relative to the true parameter values (*ReRMSE*). Let us index the MC iterations by $s = 1, \ldots, S$. Let us define $\mathcal{F}^{mc}$ as the $N \times N \times 1 \times T \times S$ tensor storing all simulated tensors $\mathcal{F}_t$ for all t and all MC iterations, and let us define $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{mc}$ analogously for factor estimates. Also, let us define $\widehat{U}^{mc}$ as the $N \times 1 \times S$ tensor storing all estimated loadings $\widehat{U}$ for all MC iterations, and U^{mc} the tensor of same dimension obtained by repeating the true U a number of times S. Then, in the case of network factors and loadings, the relative RMSE is calculated as $||\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{mc} - \mathcal{F}^{mc}||_F / ||\mathcal{F}^{mc}||_F$ and $||\widehat{U}^{mc} - U^{mc}||_F / ||U^{mc}||_F$, respectively.

Finally, we also report the MC distribution of the estimated network effect $\widehat{\beta}_1$.

13.2 Additional results - RMSEs and Histograms - case I

Tables 3 and 4 report the *RMSE* e *ReRMSE* of parameter estimates for $T = 50$ and $T = 100$, respectively, under case I. Figures 2 and 3 show the histograms of the MC estimates of β, for different combinations of N, m, T, under case I.


Table 3: Monte Carlo RMSEs - $T = 50$, case I

		$N = 10$		$N = 20$		$N = 50$	
		RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE
	β	0.083	16.6%	0.078	15.5%	0.077	15.4%
	ρ	0.044	14.8%	0.031	10.2%	0.021	7.1%
$m = 20$	α	0.083	41.6%	0.043	21.5%	0.029	14.4%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.149	15.7%	0.153	15.7%	0.155	15.7%
	U	0.043	1.9%	0.032	1.4%	0.028	1.3%
	β	0.089	17.9%	0.078	15.6%	0.073	14.6%
	ρ	0.047	15.7%	0.032	10.7%	0.020	6.7%
$m = 50$	α	0.068	34.1%	0.045	22.4%	0.030	15.2%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.095	10.0%	0.097	10.0%	0.099	10.0%
	U	0.028	1.6%	0.016	0.9%	0.010	0.6%
	β	0.085	17.1%	0.081	16.1%	0.078	15.6%
	ρ	0.047	15.6%	0.031	10.3%	0.021	7.0%
$m = 100$	α	0.087	43.6%	0.044	22.1%	0.027	13.6%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.068	7.1%	0.069	7.1%	0.070	7.1%
	U	0.024	1.5%	0.012	0.8%	0.006	0.4%

Table 4: Monte Carlo RMSEs - $T = 100$, case I

		$N = 10$		$N = 20$		$N = 50$	
		RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE	RMSE	ReRMSE
	β	0.055	11.0%	0.055	11.0%	0.053	10.7%
	ρ	0.031	10.2%	0.022	7.2%	0.014	4.6%
$m = 20$	α	0.056	28.1%	0.029	14.4%	0.020	10.1%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.149	15.7%	0.153	15.7%	0.155	15.7%
	U	0.036	1.6%	0.029	1.3%	0.028	1.3%
	β	0.064	12.9%	0.055	11.0%	0.054	10.8%
	ρ	0.031	10.3%	0.021	7.0%	0.014	4.7%
$m = 50$	α	0.048	24.0%	0.032	15.8%	0.019	9.6%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.095	10.0%	0.097	10.0%	0.099	10.0%
	U	0.021	1.2%	0.013	0.7%	0.010	0.5%
	β	0.060	12.1%	0.056	11.3%	0.054	10.8%
	ρ	0.030	10.0%	0.022	7.4%	0.014	4.5%
$m = 100$	α	0.059	29.3%	0.030	15.1%	0.018	8.8%
	$\mathcal{F}$	0.067	7.1%	0.069	7.1%	0.070	7.1%
	U	0.017	1.1%	0.009	0.6%	0.005	0.3%

Figure 2: Monte Carlo histograms of the network effect $\widehat{\beta}$ - $T = 50$, case I




(a) $N = 10, m = 20$ (b) $N = 20, m = 20$ (c) $N = 50, m = 20$

(d) $N = 10, m = 50$ (e) $N = 20, m = 50$ (f) $N = 50, m = 50$

(g) $N = 10, m = 100$ (h) $N = 20, m = 100$ (i) $N = 50, m = 100$

Note: the true value is $\beta = 0.5$.

Figure 3: Monte Carlo histograms of the network effect $\widehat{\beta}$ - $T = 100$, case I



(a) $N = 10, m = 20$ (b) $N = 20, m = 20$ (c) $N = 50, m = 20$

(d) $N = 10, m = 50$ (e) $N = 20, m = 50$ (f) $N = 50, m = 50$


(g) $N = 10, m = 100$ (h) $N = 20, m = 100$ (i) $N = 50, m = 100$

Note: the true value is $\beta = 0.5$.

13.3 Additional results - Histograms - case II

Figures 4 and 5 show the histograms of the MC estimates of β_1, for different combinations of N, m, T, under case II.

Figure 4: Monte Carlo histograms of the network effect $\widehat{\beta}$ - $T = 50$, case II




(a) $N = 10, m = 20$ (b) $N = 20, m = 20$ (c) $N = 50, m = 20$

(d) $N = 10, m = 50$ (e) $N = 20, m = 50$ (f) $N = 50, m = 50$

(g) $N = 10, m = 100$ (h) $N = 20, m = 100$ (i) $N = 50, m = 100$

Note: the true value is $\beta = 0.5$.

Figure 5: Monte Carlo histograms of the network effect $\widehat{\beta}$ - $T = 100$, case II



(a) $N = 10, m = 20$ (b) $N = 20, m = 20$ (c) $N = 50, m = 20$

(d) $N = 10, m = 50$ (e) $N = 20, m = 50$ (f) $N = 50, m = 50$

(g) $N = 10, m = 100$ (h) $N = 20, m = 100$ (i) $N = 50, m = 100$

Note: the true value is $\beta = 0.5$.

13.4 Additional results - Comparison with TOPUP and TIPUP

In this section, we compare the Monte Carlo performance of our tensor PC estimator with that of the two estimators proposed by Chen et al. (2022), TOPUP and TIPUP. These are designed for the case of idiosyncratic tensors with no serial autocorrelation. They are implemented considering different values of h_0, i.e., the maximum lag used in the computation of inner and outer products of the tensor data. In particular, we report results for $h_0 = 1$ and $h_0 = 10$. In Table 5, we report the relative RMSE

of the estimates of U provided by TOPUP, TIPUP, and our PC-based approach, as well as the RMSE of the TOPUP and TIPUP estimator with respect to ours. As expected TOPUP and PCA estimators behave very similarly when there is no autocorrelation in $\mathcal{E}$ (columns (a) and (b)), while the performance of TOPUP keeps deteriorating as the autocorrelation parameter $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ increases to 0.5 (columns (c) and (d)) and up to 0.9 (columns (e) and (f)). Our estimator has instead a similar performance in all considered cases, since by construction it is not affected by serial idiosyncratic autocorrelations, as long as the autocovariances are summable as prescribed by Assumption 2(ii). The TIPUP estimator seems to work poorly in all considered settings.

Table 5: Comparison with TOPUP and TIPUP estimators ($N = 10$, $T = 100$)

		$\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = 0.0$		$\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = 0.5$		$\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = 0.9$	
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
		ReRMSE	ratio to PC	ReRMSE	ratio to PC	ReRMSE	ratio to PC
PC		3.7%	1.00	3.7%	1.00	3.7%	1.00
TOPUP $h0 = 1$		2.7%	0.74	3.3%	0.91	10.2%	2.75
TOPUP $h0 = 10$	$m = 20$	2.7%	0.73	3.3%	0.89	10.1%	2.73
TIPUP $h0 = 1$		58.8%	15.95	91.4%	24.75	92.5%	24.88
TIPUP $h0 = 10$		15.0%	4.08	46.3%	12.53	88.9%	23.91
PC		1.8%	1.00	1.8%	1.00	1.8%	1.00
TOPUP $h0 = 1$		1.4%	0.77	1.7%	0.94	5.4%	2.94
TOPUP $h0 = 10$	$m = 50$	1.3%	0.72	1.6%	0.90	5.3%	2.93
TIPUP $h0 = 1$		57.7%	32.16	87.2%	48.54	100.7%	55.31
TIPUP $h0 = 10$		14.8%	8.27	20.4%	11.37	81.0%	44.52
PC		1.3%	1.00	1.3%	1.00	1.3%	1.00
TOPUP $h0 = 1$		1.0%	0.81	1.2%	0.98	3.9%	3.05
TOPUP $h0 = 10$	$m = 100$	0.9%	0.72	1.1%	0.90	3.9%	3.05
TIPUP $h0 = 1$		57.5%	45.25	68.6%	53.97	91.3%	70.80
TIPUP $h0 = 10$		14.7%	11.56	16.3%	12.82	52.1%	40.38

14 Empirical application: data and additional results

In this section we provide additional information about the data used in the empirical application considered in the paper. In Section 14.1 we provide details about how the network layers are built. Additional empirical results are provided in Section 14.2.

14.1 Data

Countries. The $N = 24$ countries we consider are: Australia (AUS), Belgium (BEL), Brazil (BRA), Canada (CAN), China (CHN), France (FRA), Germany (DEU), Hong Kong (HKG), Italy (ITA), India (IND), Indonesia (IDN), Japan (JAP), Mexico (MEX), Netherlands (NLD), Norway (NOR), Saudi Arabia (SAU), South Africa (ZAF), South Korea (KOR), Spain (ESP), Sweden (SWE), Switzerland (CHE), Turkey (TUR), United Kingdom (GBR), and United States (USA).

Network layers. The full list of the $m = 25$ network layers is reported in Table 6. Here we summarize the way we built our data.

Trade in goods and services. We calculate trade weights for goods using trade data from the UN Comtrade Database and classifying products into 10 categories, based on the 1-digit Standard International Trade Classification (SITC, revisions 3-4). To facilitate interpretation of the results, we exclude unclassified commodities (SITC code 9).

Trade weights for services are computed using data from the OECD-WTO Balanced Trade in Services Database (BPM6 edition). Services are classified into 10 categories, based on the Balance of Payments Services Classification (EBOPS, 2010 edition for the period 2005-2019 and 2002 edition for the period 2001-2004). Two categories of EBOPS 2010, namely "SA" (manufacturing services on physical inputs owned by others) and "SB" (maintenance and repair services n.i.e.), are excluded because they were absent in EBOPS 2002 and have a large number of missing values in EBOPS 2010.

Given a product/service type representing the k-th layer of the network, the weight of country j for country i in layer k at time t (i.e., the element ijk of the weight tensor $\mathcal{W}_t$) is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{W}_{ijk,t} = N \frac{imports_{ij,k,t} + exports_{ij,k,t}}{\sum_{h=1}^{N}(imports_{ih,k,t} + exports_{ih,k,t})},$$

where $imports_{ij,k,t}$ is the dollar amount of commodities of type k imported by country i from country j at time t and $exports_{ij,k,t}$ is the amount of exports of k from country i to country j.

Financial assets and liabilities. To construct the financial layers of the network, we first use data on outstanding bilateral assets/liabilities, classified into three categories of financial claims: equity, short-term

Table 6: Layers of the network of countries.

number	layer
1	**Trade in goods**: Food and live animals
2	**Trade in goods**: Beverages and tobacco
3	**Trade in goods**: Crude materials, inedible, except fuels
4	**Trade in goods**: Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials
5	**Trade in goods**: Animal and vegetable oils, fats and waxes
6	**Trade in goods**: Chemicals and related products, n.e.s.
7	**Trade in goods**: Manufactured goods classified chiefly by material
8	**Trade in goods**: Machinery and transport equipment
9	**Trade in goods**: Miscellaneous manufactured articles
10	**Trade in services**: Transport
11	**Trade in services**: Travel
12	**Trade in services**: Construction
13	**Trade in services**: Insurance and pension services
14	**Trade in services**: Financial services
15	**Trade in services**: Charges for the use of intellectual property n.i.e.
16	**Trade in services**: Telecommunications, computer, and information services
17	**Trade in services**: Other business services
18	**Trade in services**: Personal, cultural, and recreational services
19	**Trade in services**: Government goods and services n.i.e.
20	**Financial assets and liabilities**: Equity
21	**Financial assets and liabilities**: Long-term debt
22	**Financial assets and liabilities**: Short-term debt
23	**Financial assets and liabilities**: Flows of banks' assets and liabilities
24	**Mergers and acquisitions**: Goods sectors (Agriculture, forestry and fishing; Mining and construction; Manufacturing)
25	**Mergers and acquisitions**: Services sectors (Transportation, communications and utilities; Wholesale and retail trade; Finance, insurance and real estate; Services; Public Administration)

debt and long-term debt. The data source is the IMF's Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey (CPIS) database. The liabilities data that we use are derived from the assets data reported by counterparties. As explained by the IMF, while many countries report liabilities data directly, "more reliable detailed cross border positions data can usually be collected on an economy's holdings of portfolio investment because the holder (creditor) will usually know what securities it holds. On the liabilities side, the issuer of a security (debtor) may not know the residency of the holder because the securities may be held by foreign custodians or other intermediaries. Using the assets data reported by CPIS participating economies,

the IMF derives liabilities data for all economies (CPIS reporters as well as nonreporters); these data are termed *derived liabilities*" (source: https://datahelp.imf.org/knowledgebase/articles/500647-why-are-coordinated portfolio-investment-cpis-da).

Letting k identify a category of financial claims, the weight of country j for country i in layer k is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{W}_{ijk,t} = N \frac{assets_{ij,k,t} + liabilities_{ij,k,t}}{\sum_{h=1}^{N}(assets_{ih,k,t} + liabilities_{ih,k,t})},$$

where $assets_{ij,k,t}$ is the stock of assets held by country i and issued by country j, and $liabilities_{ij,k,t}$ is the stock of liabilities of country i towards country j.

Flows of banks' assets and liabilities. We use data on flows of banks' assets and liabilities, as measured in the Locational Banking Statistics by the Bank for International Settlements (BIS). We cannot calculate bilateral capital flows by simply taking the first differences of the IMF CPIS assets and liabilities. The reason is that financial positions are reported at their market values in the CPIS, so first differences also reflect changes in valuation and exchange rate movements. In its International Banking Statistics, the BIS reports changes in amounts outstanding adjusted for exchange-rate movements and breaks in reporting methodologies, in order to approximate flows. In the case of BIS banking data, we generally use data provided directly by country i. Five countries (China, India, Indonesia, Norway and Saudi Arabia) do not report data. For these countries, we use derived flows, i.e., data reported by their counterparties. As for bilateral flows among non-reporting countries, we assume them to be zero.

The weight of country j for country i in layer k is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{W}_{ijk,t} = N \frac{|\Delta bank_assets_{ij,t}| + |\Delta bank_liabilities_{ij,t}|}{\sum_{h=1,h\neq i}^{N}(|\Delta bank_assets_{ih,t}| + |\Delta bank_liabilities_{ih,t}|)},$$

where $\Delta bank_assets_{ij,t}$ is the annual change (at year-end) in outstanding assets held by banks located in country i and issued by counterparties of any type located in country j, and $\Delta bank_liabilities_{ij,t}$ is the annual change in liabilities of banks located in country i and held by counterparties of any type located in country j.

Mergers and acquisitions. We collect all cross-border mergers and acquisitions (M&A) deals involving

companies located in two different countries and classify them in two macro-sectors of economic activity, "goods sectors" and "services sectors", using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC). Data are from Bureau Van Dijk's Zephyr database (160,713 completed deals between the 24 countries considered over the period 2001-2019, corresponding to an average of around 15 deals for each pair of countries per year). We consider not only operations that are strictly speaking mergers or acquisitions, i.e., involving more than 50% of the target firms' capital, but also capital increases and acquisitions of minority stakes. We classify the M&A deals using the primary economic sector of the target companies. The rationale for this choice is that acquirors tend to be larger companies operating in a larger number of sectors than targets, so using the sectors of targets should provide a more accurate classification. Finally, given the greater volatility of M&A weights compared to the other types of weights (M&A operations are rarer than transactions in goods, services and portfolio instruments), we smooth out the M&A weights by taking 3-year moving averages.

If k identifies M&A deals in a given sector, the weight of country j for country i is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}_{ijk,t} = N \frac{m\&a_{ij,k,t}}{\sum_{h=1,h\neq i}^{N}(m\&a_{ih,k,t})} \tag{14.1}$$

where $m\&a_{ij,k,t}$ denotes the dollar value of all mergers and acquisitions in sector k at time t involving a company located in country i and a company located in country j. This includes both the deals in which country i's companies are acquirors and the deals in which they are targets.

14.2 Additional results


Cosine similarity. The cosine similarity (C) between two vectors x and y is their inner product normalized by the product of their norms, i.e.: $C(x,y) = \frac{x'y}{\|x\|\,\|y\|}$. To calculate the similarity between any two layers h and k, we vectorize the matrices $\mathcal{W}_{\cdot\cdot,h,t}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\cdot\cdot,k,t}$ for each t, then stack the resulting vectors for $t = 1,\ldots,T$ to obtain two column vectors of length $N^2T \times 1$ each. Results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Cosine similarity between layers.

layer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1		0.75	0.79	0.74	0.70	0.87	0.87	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.83	0.74	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.78	0.77	0.74	0.64	0.62	0.71	0.54	0.56	0.54	0.58
2	0.75		0.63	0.58	0.57	0.77	0.72	0.74	0.67	0.74	0.78	0.69	0.72	0.70	0.63	0.74	0.75	0.73	0.60	0.64	0.68	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.61
3	0.79	0.63		0.68	0.65	0.76	0.82	0.80	0.78	0.68	0.71	0.61	0.57	0.54	0.51	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.50	0.48	0.53	0.40	0.45	0.48	0.49
4	0.74	0.58	0.68		0.63	0.72	0.73	0.69	0.60	0.63	0.68	0.65	0.57	0.58	0.50	0.64	0.61	0.61	0.47	0.46	0.50	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.47
5	0.70	0.57	0.65	0.63		0.64	0.65	0.61	0.57	0.56	0.60	0.57	0.49	0.48	0.44	0.55	0.53	0.53	0.43	0.40	0.47	0.36	0.37	0.40	0.43
6	0.87	0.77	0.76	0.72	0.64		0.93	0.94	0.87	0.84	0.85	0.77	0.75	0.72	0.72	0.83	0.83	0.78	0.68	0.66	0.70	0.57	0.61	0.61	0.62
7	0.87	0.72	0.82	0.73	0.65	0.93		0.93	0.89	0.80	0.84	0.74	0.70	0.67	0.62	0.77	0.75	0.71	0.61	0.57	0.65	0.53	0.56	0.55	0.57
8	0.85	0.74	0.80	0.69	0.61	0.94	0.93		0.89	0.83	0.85	0.75	0.74	0.70	0.68	0.80	0.80	0.76	0.67	0.63	0.69	0.56	0.58	0.59	0.62
9	0.80	0.67	0.78	0.60	0.57	0.87	0.89	0.89		0.78	0.80	0.69	0.68	0.66	0.65	0.74	0.75	0.70	0.64	0.62	0.65	0.52	0.56	0.54	0.57
10	0.80	0.74	0.68	0.63	0.56	0.84	0.80	0.83	0.78		0.84	0.80	0.82	0.77	0.79	0.87	0.86	0.81	0.74	0.74	0.76	0.61	0.65	0.63	0.66
11	0.83	0.78	0.71	0.68	0.60	0.85	0.84	0.85	0.80	0.84		0.80	0.78	0.78	0.70	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.68	0.70	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.61	0.66
12	0.74	0.69	0.61	0.65	0.57	0.77	0.74	0.75	0.69	0.80	0.80		0.72	0.74	0.67	0.78	0.77	0.74	0.61	0.64	0.69	0.62	0.59	0.57	0.61
13	0.71	0.72	0.57	0.57	0.49	0.75	0.70	0.74	0.68	0.82	0.78	0.72		0.84	0.76	0.85	0.85	0.82	0.72	0.75	0.77	0.65	0.70	0.63	0.67
14	0.71	0.70	0.54	0.58	0.48	0.72	0.67	0.70	0.66	0.77	0.78	0.74	0.84		0.78	0.85	0.87	0.85	0.74	0.79	0.81	0.70	0.71	0.64	0.69
15	0.67	0.63	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.72	0.62	0.68	0.65	0.79	0.70	0.67	0.76	0.78		0.84	0.88	0.80	0.81	0.83	0.76	0.59	0.62	0.63	0.65
16	0.78	0.74	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.83	0.77	0.80	0.74	0.87	0.83	0.78	0.85	0.85	0.84		0.91	0.88	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.71
17	0.77	0.75	0.62	0.61	0.53	0.83	0.75	0.80	0.75	0.86	0.83	0.77	0.85	0.87	0.88	0.91		0.89	0.82	0.84	0.83	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.71
18	0.74	0.73	0.61	0.61	0.53	0.78	0.71	0.76	0.70	0.81	0.83	0.74	0.82	0.85	0.80	0.88	0.89		0.75	0.79	0.77	0.67	0.69	0.67	0.71
19	0.64	0.60	0.50	0.47	0.43	0.68	0.61	0.67	0.64	0.74	0.68	0.61	0.72	0.74	0.81	0.80	0.82	0.75		0.79	0.72	0.53	0.58	0.59	0.61
20	0.62	0.64	0.48	0.46	0.40	0.66	0.57	0.63	0.62	0.74	0.70	0.64	0.75	0.79	0.83	0.80	0.84	0.79	0.79		0.80	0.67	0.64	0.66	0.68
21	0.71	0.68	0.53	0.50	0.47	0.70	0.65	0.69	0.65	0.76	0.75	0.69	0.77	0.81	0.76	0.79	0.83	0.77	0.72	0.80		0.75	0.67	0.60	0.64
22	0.54	0.59	0.40	0.42	0.36	0.57	0.53	0.56	0.52	0.61	0.65	0.62	0.65	0.70	0.59	0.66	0.69	0.67	0.53	0.67	0.75		0.61	0.56	0.58
23	0.56	0.59	0.45	0.46	0.37	0.61	0.56	0.58	0.56	0.65	0.65	0.59	0.70	0.71	0.62	0.70	0.70	0.69	0.58	0.64	0.67	0.61		0.59	0.60
24	0.54	0.58	0.48	0.45	0.40	0.61	0.55	0.59	0.54	0.63	0.61	0.57	0.63	0.64	0.63	0.68	0.68	0.67	0.59	0.66	0.60	0.56	0.59		0.61
25	0.58	0.61	0.49	0.47	0.43	0.62	0.57	0.62	0.57	0.66	0.66	0.61	0.67	0.69	0.65	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.61	0.68	0.64	0.58	0.60	0.61	

The table reports the cosine similarity coefficients between the 25 layers of the network. Please refer to Table 6 for the list of layers.

Figure 6: Network factors (averages 2001-2019).




Each panel reports the estimated network factors $\widehat{F}_{j,t}$, $j = 1, \ldots, 6$, averaged over the period 2001-2019, using color scales. Green cells identify positive entries and red cells negative entries, with darker shades of color indicating larger entries in absolute value.

NETWORK FACTORS. Figure 6 displays the average values of the factors over the period 2001-2019 using color scales. Green cells identify positive weights and red cells negative weights, with darker shades of color indicating larger weights in absolute value. Figure 7 plots the factor loadings for different layers of the network.


Figure 8 reports the time-varying weights of different countries in the network of US. For each network factor, the countries reported are those that have on average over the sample 2001-2019 the largest weights in absolute values. Similarly, Figure 9 reports the time-varying weights of different countries in the network of China. Again, for each network factor, the countries reported are those that have on average over the sample 2001-2019 the largest weights in absolute values. The estimated network

Figure 7: Factor loadings for different network layers.



The figure reports the loading coefficients $\widehat{U}_{ik}$, $i = 1, \ldots, 25$, $k = 1, \ldots, 6$, of the 6 network factors for the 25 layers of the multinetwork. The vertical lines separate layers related to trade in goods (1-9), layers related to trade in services (10-19) and financial layers (20-25). See Table 6 for the complete list of layers. We report all loadings scaled (divided) by N.

Figure 8: Network factors for the United States.




Time-varying weights of different countries in the network of US.

factors are divided by N.

EXPLAINED VARIANCE. Consider the order-4 tensor $\mathcal{W}$ of size $T \times N \times N \times m$ such that $\text{mat}_{(1)}(\mathcal{W})$ is $T \times mN^2$ with t-th row $\text{vec}(\text{mat}_{(1)}W_t)$. and, letting $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_t^{(k)} := \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\cdot\cdot,k,t} \times_3 \widehat{U}_{\cdot k}$, $t = 1, \ldots, T$, $k = 1, \ldots, r$, we

Figure 9: Network factors for China.



Time-varying weights of different countries in the network of China.

define the tensor $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$ of size $T \times N \times N \times m$ in the same way. The fraction of variance in $\mathcal{W}$ explained by the k-th factor, denoted as $v^{(k)}$, is then:

$$v^{(k)} = \frac{\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \right\|_F^2}{\|\mathcal{W}\|_F^2}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, r.$$

And we have $v^{(1)} = 0.68$, $v^{(2)} = 0.07$, $v^{(3)} = 0.03$, $v^{(4)} = 0.03$, $v^{(5)} = 0.02$, and $v^{(6)} = 0.02$. Thus, over all the 6 factors explain about 85% of the total variance of $\mathcal{W}$. However, the importance of different factors varies greatly across countries. Let $v_{ij}^{(k)}$ be the fraction of variance in the weight of country j for country i explained by the k-th factor. Then, we have that:

$$v_{ij}^{(k)} = \frac{\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{ij,\cdot\cdot}^{(k)} \right\|_F^2}{\|\mathcal{W}_{ij,\cdot\cdot}\|_F^2}, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, N, \quad k = 1, \ldots, r.$$

For each factor, Table 8 reports the ten network links for which the factor explains the largest share of variance.

Table 8: Variance decomposition of network links: share of variance explained by each factor.

(a) Factor 1

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	CAN	USA	0.969
2	MEX	USA	0.948
3	BRA	USA	0.851
4	JAP	USA	0.829
5	DEU	FRA	0.828
6	GBR	USA	0.825
7	BEL	FRA	0.813
8	KOR	USA	0.800
9	FRA	DEU	0.797
10	FRA	GBR	0.796

(b) Factor 2

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	AUS	KOR	0.368
2	BRA	CHN	0.360
3	CHE	ITA	0.338
4	AUS	CHN	0.338
5	KOR	IDN	0.331
6	USA	MEX	0.326
7	CHN	IND	0.289
8	IDN	CHN	0.287
9	IND	BRA	0.282
10	BRA	IND	0.276

(c) Factor 3

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	TUR	HKG	0.438
2	JAP	FRA	0.417
3	KOR	HKG	0.406
4	ZAF	ITA	0.340
5	IND	NOR	0.313
6	IND	HKG	0.301
7	BRA	KOR	0.272
8	AUS	HKG	0.261
9	BRA	MEX	0.241
10	KOR	BRA	0.231

(d) Factor 4

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	MEX	ESP	0.358
2	CAN	AUS	0.356
3	IDN	CAN	0.298
4	IDN	SAU	0.281
5	SAU	AUS	0.276
6	BEL	TUR	0.275
7	HKG	NLD	0.260
8	BRA	ZAF	0.259
9	MEX	BRA	0.252
10	HKG	ESP	0.251

(e) Factor 5

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	IND	IDN	0.378
2	ZAF	IDN	0.360
3	ITA	IDN	0.357
4	CHN	IDN	0.357
5	TUR	IDN	0.352
6	BRA	IND	0.349
7	AUS	ESP	0.324
8	DEU	IDN	0.322
9	NLD	IDN	0.321
10	SAU	IDN	0.321

(f) Factor 6

ranking	country i	country j	share of var.
1	KOR	BEL	0.503
2	BEL	KOR	0.395
3	TUR	ZAF	0.388
4	BEL	BRA	0.382
5	HKG	NLD	0.339
6	BEL	IDN	0.328
7	DEU	IND	0.303
8	MEX	BRA	0.300
9	FRA	SWE	0.294
10	BRA	ZAF	0.284

For each network factor $\widehat{F}_{k,t}$, the table reports the 10 bilateral links for which the factor explains the largest share of variance (calculated both across network layers and across time). Each link represents the weight of country j for country i.

References

Acemoglu, D., Akcigit, U. and Kerr, W. (2015). 'Networks and the Macroeconomy: An Empirical Exploration', NBER Working Paper 21344.

Acemoglu, D., Carvalho, V.M., Ozdaglar, A. and Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2012). 'The Network Origins of Aggregate Fluctuations', *Econometrica*, Vol. 80, pp. 1977–2016.

Adamic, L., Brunetti, C., Harris, J.H. and Kirilenko, A. (2017). 'Trading Networks', *The Econometrics Journal*, Vol. 20, pp. S126–S149.

Ahn, S.C. and Horenstein, A.R. (2013). 'Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors', *Econometrica*, Vol. 81, pp. 1203–1227.

Bai, J. (2003). 'Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions', *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, pp. 135–171.

Bai, J. (2009). 'Panel data models with interactive fixed effects', *Econometrica*, Vol. 77, pp. 1229–1279.

Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). 'Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models', *Econometrica*, Vol. 70, pp. 191–221.

Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2006). 'Confidence Intervals for Diffusion Index Forecasts and Inference for Factor-Augmented Regressions', *Econometrica*, Vol. 74, pp. 1133–1150.

Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2020). 'Simpler proofs for approximate factor models of large dimensions', ArXiv:2008.00254.

Bargigli, L., di Iasio, G., Infante, L., Lillo, F. and Pierobon, F. (2015). 'The Multiplex Structure of Interbank Networks', *Quantitative Finance*, Vol. 15, pp. 673–691.

Barigozzi, M. (2022). 'On estimation and inference of large approximate dynamic factor models via the principal component analysis', ArXiv:2211.01921.

Barigozzi, M. and Brownlees, C. (2019). 'NETS: Network Estimation for Time Series', *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 34, pp. 347–364.

Barigozzi, M., He, Y., Li, L. and Trapani, L. (2023). 'Statistical Inference for Large-dimensional Tensor Factor Model by Iterative Projections', arXiv:2206.09800.

Bernanke, B.S., Boivin, J. and Eliasz, P. (2005). 'Measuring the Effects of Monetary Policy: A Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressive (FAVAR) Approach', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 120, pp. 387–422.

Billio, M., Getmansky, M., Lo, A.W. and Pelizzon, L. (2012). 'Econometric Measures of Connectedness and Systemic Risk in the Finance and Insurance Sectors', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 104, pp. 535–559.

Carvalho, V.M., Nirei, M., Saito, Y.U. and Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2020). 'Supply Chain Disruptions: Evidence from the Great East Japan Earthquake', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 136, pp. 1255–1321.

Chang, J., He, J., Yang, L. and Yao, Q. (2023). 'Modelling matrix time series via a tensor cp-decomposition', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, Vol. 85, pp. 127–148.

Chen, E.Y., Fan, J. and Zhu, X. (2023). 'Community Network Auto-Regression for High-Dimensional Time Series', *Journal of Econometrics*.

Chen, R., Yang, D. and Zhang, C.H. (2022). 'Factor Models for High-Dimensional Tensor Time Series', *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 117, pp. 94–116.

Denbee, E., Julliard, C., Li, Y. and Yuan, K. (2021). 'Network Risk and Key Players: A Structural Analysis of Interbank Liquidity', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 141, pp. 831–859.

Diebold, F.X. and Yilmaz, K. (2014). 'On the Network Topology of Variance Decompositions: Measuring the Connectedness of Financial Firms', *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 182, pp. 119–134.

Fan, J., Liao, Y. and Mincheva, M. (2013). 'Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, Vol. 75.

Forni, M., Giannone, D., Lippi, M. and Reichlin, L. (2009). 'Opening the Black Box: Structural Factor Models with Large Cross Sections', *Econometric Theory*, Vol. 25, pp. 1319–1347.

Han, Y., Chen, R., Yang, D. and Zhang, C.H. (2020). 'Tensor Factor Model Estimation by Iterative Projection', arXiv:2006.02611.

Han, Y., Chen, R. and Zhang, C.H. (2022). 'Rank determination in tensor factor model', *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, Vol. 16, pp. 1726–1803.

Han, Y., Zhang, C.H. and Chen, R. (2021). 'CP Factor Model for Dynamic Tensors', arXiv:2110.15517.

Jiang, B., Yang, Y., Gao, J. and Hsiao, C. (2021). 'Recursive estimation in large panel data models: Theory and practice', *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 224, pp. 439–465.

Kivelä, M., Arenas, A., Barthelemy, M., Gleeson, J.P., Moreno, Y. and Porter, M.A. (2014). 'Multilayer Networks', *Journal of Complex Networks*, Vol. 2, pp. 203–271.

Kolda, T.G. and Bader, B.W. (2009). 'Tensor Decompositions and Applications', *SIAM Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 455–500.

Lam, C. (2021). 'Rank Determination for Time Series Tensor Factor Model Using Correlation Thresholding', Working paper, London School of Economics.

Merikoski, J.K. and Kumar, R. (2004). 'Inequalities for spreads of matrix sums and products', *Applied Mathematics E-Notes*, pp. 150–159.

Nicholls, D. and Quinn, B. (1981). 'Multiple autoregressive models with random coefficients', *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, Vol. 11, pp. 185–198.

Pesaran, M.H., Schuermann, T. and Weiner, S.M. (2004). 'Modeling Regional Interdependencies Using a Global Error Correcting Macroeconometric Model', *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, Vol. 22, pp. 129–62.

Stock, J.H. and Watson, M.W. (2002). 'Forecasting Using Principal Components From a Large Number of Predictors', *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 97, pp. 1167–1179.

Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, Cambridge University Press.

Yu, Y., Wang, T. and Samworth, R.J. (2015). 'A useful variant of the davis–kahan theorem for statisticians', *Biometrika*, Vol. 102, pp. 315–323.

Zhang, X., Li, G. and Liu, C.C. (2022). 'Tucker Tensor Factor Models for High-Dimensional Higher-Order Tensor Observations', arXiv:2206.02508.

Zhu, X., Pan, R., Li, G., Liu, Y. and Wang, H. (2017). 'Network Vector Autoregression', *The Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 45, pp. 1096–1123.

Zhu, X., Xu, G. and Fan, J. (2022). 'Simultaneous estimation and group identification for network vector autoregressive model with heterogeneous nodes', arXiv:2209.12229.