

Fractionally integrated curve time series with cointegration

Won-Ki Seo* Han Lin Shang
University of Sydney Macquarie University

December 9, 2022

Abstract

We introduce methods and theory for fractionally cointegrated curve time series. We develop a variance ratio test to determine the dimensions associated with the nonstationary and stationary subspaces. For each subspace, we apply a local Whittle estimator to estimate the long-memory parameter and establish its consistency. A Monte Carlo study of finite-sample performance is included, along with an empirical application.

JEL codes: C12; C14; C32

MSC 2010: 37M10; 62F03

Keywords: fractional cointegration; long memory time series; functional data; functional principal component analysis; limit theorems.

*Corresponding address: School of Economics, Level 5, Social Sciences Building, The University of Sydney, Camperdown NSW 2006, Sydney, Australia; Emails : won-ki.seo@sydney.edu.au (Won-Ki Seo), hanlin.shang@mq.edu.au (Han Lin Shang).

1 Introduction

Functional time series analysis is a harmony between functional data and time series analyses. Similar to univariate and multivariate time series, there exists a temporal dependence structure in functional observations. For example, intraday volatility functions are serially dependent and often exhibit long-memory feature (Lobato, 1997). Time series of airway pressure are used for monitoring patients undergoing mechanical ventilation, such series exhibits periodically strong dependence (Beran et al., 2023).

In functional time series analysis, the bulk of literature assuming stationarity over the short-range temporal dependence (see, e.g., Bosq, 2000; Ferraty and Vieu, 2006; Bathia et al., 2010; Hörmann and Kokoszka, 2010; Horváth and Kokoszka, 2012; Horváth et al., 2014; Laurini, 2014; Klepsch and Klüppelberg, 2017). Only in recent years, there has been some development on long-memory functional time series models (see, e.g., Li et al., 2020, 2021, 2022; Rubín and Panaretos, 2020). The long-memory functional time series describes processes with greater persistence than short-range dependent ones, such that in the stationary case autocovariances decay very slowly and the spectral density is unbounded, especially at frequency zero. While Li et al. (2020, 2021) consider inference and estimation of long-memory parameter in stationary curve time series, Li et al. (2022) studies inferential results for nonstationary curve time series. Based on the mean squared error, Shang (2020) and Shang (2022a) evaluate and compare various long-memory parameter estimators for stationary and nonstationary curve time series, respectively. In these comparisons, the local Whittle estimator of Robinson (1995) is recommended. While Li et al. (2021) presents the asymptotic properties of the local Whittle estimator, Shang (2022b) applies a sieve bootstrap method of Paparoditis (2018) to nonparametrically construct the confidence intervals of the memory parameter.

Given the recent surge of interest in functional time series analysis, cointegration methods have been extended to a functional time series setting by Chang et al. (2016). They define cointegration for curve time series and develop statistical methods based on functional principal component analysis. Beare et al. (2017) and Seo and Beare (2019) extend the Granger-Johansen representation theorem to a Hilbert space and a Bayes Hilbert space, respectively. While Beare et al. (2017) provide a representation of $I(1)$ autoregressive Hilbertian process, Beare and Seo (2020) present a representation of $I(1)$ and $I(2)$ autoregressive Hilbertian processes; see also Franchi and Paruolo (2020) and Seo (2022a) for similar representation results in a more general setting.

We study a fractionally cointegrated curve time series by developing inferential and estimation methods for such a time series. The curve time series consists of nonstationary and stationary components. For each component, we estimate the long-memory parameter

via the local Whittle estimator. Through a variance ratio test, we determine the subspaces spanned by nonstationary and stationary components. We compare the selected subspaces with the modified eigen-value ratio estimator of [Li et al. \(2020\)](#). In addition, this paper also develops statistical methods for the case when the stationary component can further be decomposed into the long-memory and short-memory components.

In Section 2, we present our notations and preliminaries. In Section 3, we introduce the fractionally cointegrated functional time series. The estimation procedure is given in Section 4. Illustrated by a series of simulation studies in Section 5, we evaluate the estimation accuracy of the proposed method and compare the result with the one by [Li et al. \(2022\)](#). The empirical performance of our proposed method is also validated through a Swedish human mortality data set in Section 5.2. In Section 6, we conclude and present some idea on how the methodology can be further extended.

2 Preliminaries

In the subsequent discussion, we assume that the curve-valued time series Z_t of interest takes values in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of square-integrable functions defined on $[0, 1]$. We let $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle$ denote the inner product of $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, and then let $\|h\|$ denote the norm of $h \in \mathcal{H}$, which is defined by $\langle h, h \rangle^{1/2}$. Given a set $G \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, we let G^\perp denote the orthogonal complement to G . We denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ the space of bounded linear operators acting on \mathcal{H} equipped with the uniform norm $\|A\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}} = \sup_{\|h\| \leq 1} \|Ah\|$. The adjoint A^* of a linear operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the unique linear operator satisfying $\langle Ah_1, h_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, A^*h_2 \rangle$ for all $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. We will say that an operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is nonnegative (resp. positive) definite if $\langle Ah, h \rangle \geq 0$ (resp. $\langle Ah, h \rangle > 0$) for all nonzero $h \in \mathcal{H}$. We let \otimes denote the tensor product of elements in \mathcal{H} , i.e., $h_1 \otimes h_2$ denotes the linear map given by $\langle h_1, \cdot \rangle h_2$ for any $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. We let the range of $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be denoted by $\text{ran } A$. The dimension of $\text{ran } A$ is called the rank of A , denoted by $\text{rank } A$. We will consider convergence of a sequence of random bounded linear operators as the sample size T tends to infinity. For such a sequence of operators A_j , we write $A_j \xrightarrow[p]{p} A$ if $\|A_j - A\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}} \xrightarrow[p]{p} 0$.

We define the $I(d)$ property of a time series, taking values in \mathcal{H} . As a crucial building block, we first introduce the $I(0)$ property adopted from [Beare et al. \(2017\)](#).

Definition 1 ($I(0)$ -ness). The time series X_t taking values in \mathcal{H} is said to be $I(0)$, and denoted $X_t \in I(0)$, if (i) it allows the representation

$$X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \varepsilon_{t-j},$$

where $\psi_j \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all j and ε_t is an i.i.d. sequence with $\mathbb{E}X_t = 0$ and positive definite covariance $C_\varepsilon := \mathbb{E}[X_t \otimes X_t]$, and (ii) $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j$ is a nonzero element in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

The $I(0)$ time series is necessarily stationary, and its long-run covariance $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_s \otimes$

$X_t]$ is a well defined bounded linear operator (see, e.g., [Beare et al., 2017](#)). Based on the $I(0)$ property, we define \mathcal{H} -valued $I(d)$ processes, which will subsequently be considered as follows:

Definition 2 ($I(d)$ -ness). For $d \geq 0$, the time series Y_t is said to be $I(d)$ (or equivalently, fractionally integrated of order d), and denoted $Y_t \in I(d)$, if $\Delta^d Y_t$ can be made $I(0)$ for some relevant past values of $\Delta^d Y_t$, where Δ^d is a power series of the lag operator defined by

$$\Delta^d = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(j-d)}{\Gamma(-d)\Gamma(j+1)} L^j.$$

Note that in the above definition of the $I(d)$ property, we do not require $\Delta^d Y_t$ to be exactly $I(0)$ but require the existence of relevant past values that can make the time series of $\Delta^d Y_t$ be $I(0)$. This is a necessary mathematical treatment since we will consider the nonstationary case with $d > 1/2$ in the subsequent discussion.

Cointegration is the property of multivariate nonstationary time series, implying the existence of a stationary linear combination. A cointegrating relationship of a collection of nonstationary variables is oftentimes understood as their stable long-run relationship. This notion has been extended to and studied in a Hilbert space setting by [Beare et al. \(2017\)](#), [Li et al. \(2022\)](#), [Nielsen et al. \(2022\)](#), and [Seo \(2022a,b\)](#). Extending these former notions of cointegration, we may define fractional cointegration in \mathcal{H} as follows:

Definition 3 (Fractional cointegration). Suppose that $Y_t \in I(d)$, $\langle Y_t, v \rangle \in I(d-b)$ for some $d \geq 1/2$, $b \in (d-1/2, d]$ and $v \in \mathcal{H}$. We then say that Y_t is (fractionally) cointegrated in the direction of v and call v a (fractional) cointegrating vector.

If $d \geq 1/2$, an $I(d)$ time series Y_t taking values in \mathcal{H} is nonstationary. However, given that (i) an inner product with some element of v can represent any arbitrary bounded linear functional defined on \mathcal{H} (the Riesz representation theorem) and (ii) the time series $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ is $I(d-b)$ for $d-b < 1/2$ and thus can be made stationary for some past values of $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$, the transformation $x \mapsto \langle x, v \rangle$ is exactly like the cointegrating vector considered in Euclidean space setting.

3 Fractionally cointegrated functional time series

We consider modeling nonstationary dependent curve-valued observations but exhibiting stable long-run linear relationships as fractionally cointegrated time series. A potential example of such a time series may be yield curves over time; it turns out that this time series tends to evolve like a nonstationary process ([Li et al., 2022](#)), but due to the expectation hypothesis, many linear functionals of such time series are expected not to exhibit nonstationarity.

Even if Definition 3 gives us a proper notion of \mathcal{H} -valued time series allowing fractional cointegration, the definition itself is, of course, not sufficient for the inferential methods to be

developed. For statistical analysis, we employ the following assumptions for the observed time series Z_t : below, Δ_+^d denotes the truncated fractional difference operator defined by $\Delta_+^{-d}X_t = \Delta^{-d}X_t\mathbb{1}\{t \geq 1\}$, i.e.,

$$\Delta_+^d = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{\Gamma(j-d)}{\Gamma(-d)\Gamma(j+1)} L^j.$$

Assumption 1. The observed time series Z_t , taking values in \mathcal{H} , satisfies the following:

- (a) $Z_t = \mu + Y_t$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$.
- (b) For some $d \in (1/2, 3/2)$, $b > 0$ with $0 \leq d - b < 1/2$, there exists an orthogonal projection P and an $I(0)$ sequence X_t given by $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$ satisfying

$$P(Y_t - Y_0) = \Delta_+^{-d} P X_t, \quad (3.1)$$

$$(I - P)Y_t = \Delta^{-(d-b)}(I - P)X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j \varepsilon_{t-j}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $b_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(j-k+d)}{\Gamma(d)\Gamma(j-k+1)}(I - P)\psi_j$, $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \|\psi_j\|^2 < \infty$, and ε_t satisfies that $\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon_t\|^\tau < \infty$ for some $\tau > \max\{4, 2/(2d-1)\}$.

- (c) $\text{rank } P \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j = q_d < \infty$.

Some comments on Assumption 1 are in order. First, in most empirical applications, a functional time series tends to have a nonzero intercept. Thus, in (a), we assume that the observed time series is given by the sum of an $I(d)$ process Y_t and an unobserved intercept $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, of course, it might sometimes be of interest to consider a linear time trend component; even if we do not explicitly deal with this case, most of the results to be subsequently given may be extended to accommodate this possibility with moderate modifications. We describe the cointegrating properties of the stochastic part of the observed time series Z_t in (b) with some other necessary conditions for our mathematical development. Here we restrict our interest to the case with $d \in (1/2, 3/2)$, which seems relevant in most empirical applications involving nonstationary fractional integrated time series.

Note also that we require $(I - P)Y_t$ to be a stationary long-range dependent (LRD) process. Given that any orthogonal projection may be understood as a bipartite decomposition of a Hilbert space, what (3.1) and (3.2) imply is that our observed time series may be understood as the sum of two heterogeneous components: the nonstationary component $P(Y_t - Y_0)$ and the stationary component $(I - P)Y_t$. Associated with this condition, (c) identifies the collection of the cointegrating vectors as $\text{ran}(I - P)$; under this condition, $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ is a stationary LRD process if and only if $v \in \text{ran}(I - P)$.

However, given that (i) our $I(0)$ property does not require $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ to be $I(0)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and (ii) $\text{ran}(I - P) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j$ may not be equal to $\text{ran}(I - P)$, (c) does not imply that $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$

needs to be $I(d-b)$ for any $v \in \text{ran}(I-P)$, but allows $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ to be integrated of any arbitrary order $d_\ell \in [0, d-b]$. That is, the time series $(I-P)Y_t$ is a quite general stationary process. Given this time series, we are interested in identifying the nonstationary and stationary components from the observed time series, which will be discussed in the next section.

Sometimes, practitioners may also be interested in the case where the stationary part of Y_t can be decomposed into the short-range dependent (SRD) and LRD components. We will also consider this case by imposing the following additional conditions on the stationary component:

Assumption 1A. The observed time series Z_t satisfies Assumption 1, and there exists an orthogonal projection Q such that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(I-P)Y_t &= \Delta^{-(d-b)}Q(I-P)X_t, \\ (I-Q)(I-P)Y_t &= (I-Q)(I-P)X_t, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{rank } Q(I-P) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j = q_{d-b} < \infty.$$

Under Assumption 1A, the time series $\{Z_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfying Assumption 1 can be decomposed into three different components: q_d -dimensional nonstationary, q_{d-b} -dimensional LRD and infinite-dimensional SRD components. In this case, practitioners may be interested in decomposing the nonstationary component from the stationary component (given by the sum of the LRD and SRD components) and in decomposing the LRD component from the SRD component. Moreover, the memory parameters d and $d-b$ may also be useful in practice. We will also discuss these issues.

It will be convenient to introduce some additional notation and terminology. Under Assumption 1, we have the bipartite decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \text{ran } P \oplus \text{ran}(I-P)$. As clarified above, the collection of cointegrating vectors is given by $\text{ran}(I-P)$, which is called the cointegrating space and denoted by \mathcal{H}_S . The orthogonal complement to \mathcal{H}_S is called the dominant subspace (as in Li et al., 2022) and denoted by \mathcal{H}_N . If Assumption 1A is satisfied, then \mathcal{H}_S can also be decomposed into $Q\mathcal{H}_S$ and $(I-Q)\mathcal{H}_S$, which are called the LRD and SRD subspaces and denoted by \mathcal{H}_{LRD} and \mathcal{H}_{SRD} . To sum up, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_N \oplus \mathcal{H}_S && \text{under Assumption 1,} \\ \mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_N \oplus \mathcal{H}_{LRD} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{SRD} && \text{under Assumption 1A.} \end{aligned}$$

4 Statistical methods

To make our statistical inference invariant with respect to (possibly) nonzero intercept μ , we will consider Z_t^0 or \bar{Z}_t depending on the context, which is defined as follows: for $t \geq 1$,

$$Z_t^0 = Z_t - Z_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Z}_t = Z_t - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t, \quad (4.1)$$

where we assume that Z_0 is observed. Of course, in practice, Z_t^0 will be replaced by $Z_t - Z_1$ by putting the first observation aside to initialize the time series. Thus, no essential restriction is placed by using Z_t^0 in analysis.

4.1 Decomposition of \mathcal{H}_N and \mathcal{H}_S

In this section, we consider the decomposition of the nonstationary and stationary components, which essentially boils down to identifying the cointegrating space \mathcal{H}_S or the dominant subspace \mathcal{H}_N . As may be deduced from the existing literature (see, e.g., [Chang et al., 2016](#); [Nielsen et al., 2022](#); [Li et al., 2022](#)), the dominant subspace \mathcal{H}_N can be estimated by the span of the eigenvectors corresponding to the first q_d largest eigenvalues of a certain sample operator. For this reason, the estimation of \mathcal{H}_S reduces to the estimation of q_d , which will be subsequently discussed. The quantity q_d itself may be of interest to practitioners since it represents the number of linearly independent fractional unit root processes embedded into the time series; in the literature considering n -dimensional vector-valued fractionally integrated time series, the quantity $n - q_d$ is commonly called the (fractional) cointegrating rank and has been paid lots of attention. We will develop statistical inference on q_d in this section and obtain the desired decomposition.

4.1.1 Eigenvalue-ratio-based estimation of q_d

We will first consider an eigenvalue-ratio-based estimator, similar to [Li et al.'s \(2022\)](#) estimator of the dimension of the dominant subspace. This estimator will perform worse in finite samples than our second estimator obtained by the proposed sequential testing procedure in finite samples. Nevertheless, the subsequent discussion becomes a crucial input to the aforementioned testing procedure and helps a deeper understanding of fractionally cointegrated time series.

Under Assumption 1, an element v included in the dominant subspace \mathcal{H}_N is differentiated with any other element $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_S$ in the sense that the sample variance of $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ tends to be higher than that of $\langle Y_t, \tilde{v} \rangle$; more specifically, we have

$$\frac{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle Y_t, v \rangle^2}{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle Y_t, \tilde{v} \rangle^2} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Based on the above intuition combined with Lemma A.1 and the asymptotic properties of

the covariance operator of nonstationary fractionally integrated functional time series, we may establish the following result:

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, K is a finite integer satisfying $K > q_d$ and the $(K - q_d)$ -th largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ is nonzero and distinct from the next one. Let $(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$ be the ordered (from the largest) eigenvalues of the sample covariance operator of Z_t given by*

$$\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_t.$$

Then the following holds:

- (i) $\hat{\mu}_j / \hat{\mu}_{j+1} \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ if $j = q_d$ while $\hat{\mu}_j / \hat{\mu}_{j+1} = O_p(1)$ if $j \neq q_d$.
- (ii) The corresponding eigenvectors $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_{q_d})$ satisfy that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q_d} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} P. \quad (4.2)$$

Some direct consequences of the results given in Proposition 4.1 are given as follows:

Corollary 4.1. *Let everything be as in Proposition 4.1. Then the following hold.*

- (i) $\hat{q}_d := \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq j \leq K} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_j}{\hat{\mu}_{j+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{p} q_d$.
- (ii) $\hat{P} := \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{q}_d} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} P$.

Note that Proposition 4.1 requires a careful choice of K satisfying some mathematical conditions, which is crucial to have the consistency results given in Corollary 4.1 (see Remark 4.1). However, such a choice can be obtained feasibly without difficulty (see Remark 4.3). It is also worth emphasizing that our results given in Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 require only that the $(K - q_d)$ -th eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ is different from the next one; this allows the case where some of the first $(K - q_d)$ eigenvalues are tied and does not seem to be a restrictive assumption in practice. Given that any closed subspace of \mathcal{H} may be identified as the unique orthogonal projection onto the space, (ii) in Corollary 4.1 may be understood as the convergence of $\operatorname{ran} \hat{P}$ (resp. $\operatorname{ran}(I - \hat{P})$) to \mathcal{H}_N (resp. \mathcal{H}_S), we thus may write

$$\operatorname{ran} \hat{P} \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{H}_N \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{ran}(I - \hat{P}) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{H}_S.$$

Remark 4.1. In our proof of Proposition 4.1, it is shown that, for some Ω which is symmetric and positive definite on \mathcal{H}_N ,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{1-2d} \hat{\mu}_j &\xrightarrow{d} j\text{-th largest eigenvalue of } \int_0^1 \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) \otimes \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) ds, \quad \text{jointly for } j \leq q_d, \\ \hat{\mu}_j &\xrightarrow{p} j\text{-th largest eigenvalue of } \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t], \quad \text{jointly for } j > q_d, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where, as will be introduced in Section A, \bar{W}_d is a demeaned Type II fractional Brownian motion of order d defined on \mathcal{H}_N . The results given in Proposition 4.1(i) are consequences of the above convergence results. Moreover, this shows why we require the $(K - q_d)$ -th eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ to be nonzero in Proposition 4.1; if the $(K - q_d)$ -th eigenvalue is zero, then $\hat{\mu}_{K-1}/\hat{\mu}_K \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ which is not desirable for consistency of \hat{q}_d .

Remark 4.2. The estimator given in Proposition 4.1 may be understood as a tailored version of Li et al.'s (2022) eigenvalue-ratio estimator of the dimension of the dominant subspace. It is worth noting two important differences in theoretical and practical aspects. First, due to cointegration, we can explain more about the role of K (an upper bound of q_d , which needs to be chosen by a researcher) while its role is not sufficiently discovered in Li et al.'s (2022) setting. Due to this, Li et al.'s (2022) estimator requires an additional and arbitrary penalty parameter to suppress the possibility that two small eigenvalues result in a large ratio and hence may give a misleading estimate. On the other hand, we can provide a feasible and less arbitrary way to choose K (see Remark 4.3 below).

Remark 4.3. In Proposition 4.1, K needs to be greater than q_d . We know from Remark 4.1 that the first q_d largest eigenvalues of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}}$ have bigger stochastic orders than the remaining eigenvalues. It thus may not be difficult to conjecture a slightly bigger integer than q_d from the estimated eigenvalues, and K can be set to such an integer. Note that we also require the $(K - q_d)$ -th eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ to be nonzero and distinct from the next one. Given that we consider a functional time series of which dimension is very high, $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ tends to allow many nonzero eigenvalues in most empirical applications. Moreover, violation of this condition may be avoided by checking if $\hat{\mu}_K - \hat{\mu}_{K+1}$ is bounded away from zero (see (4.3)).

Even if we can consistently estimate q_d (and thus P) based on Proposition 4.1, practitioners may be more interested in a statistical test for q_d , which provides how strongly the data support a certain hypothesis about q_d . In the next section, we provide a variance-ratio-type test for q_d that can be applied to our functional time series setting and propose an alternative estimator \bar{q}_d obtained by sequential application of the test. Our simulation results show that this new estimator tends to outperform \hat{q}_d .

4.1.2 Variance-ratio test of q_d

The limiting behavior of the sample covariance operator $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_t$ under the existence of cointegration enables us to implement a statistical test about q_d , which will be discussed in this section.

As the first step to developing our test, we consider a fractionally integrated variable \tilde{Z}_t

as follows:

$$\tilde{Z}_t = \Delta_+^{-\alpha} \bar{Z}_t. \quad (4.4)$$

For any positive integer K , let \hat{P}_K denote the orthogonal projection given by

$$\hat{P}_K = \sum_{j=1}^K \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j, \quad (4.5)$$

where $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_K)$ is the eigenvectors corresponding to the first K largest eigenvalues of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}}$. Let A_T and B_T be defined by

$$A_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K \bar{Z}_t, \quad B_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K \tilde{Z}_t.$$

We then define the following generalized eigenvalue problem:

$$\hat{v}_j B_T \hat{w}_j = A_T \hat{w}_j, \quad \hat{v}_1 \leq \hat{v}_2 \leq \dots \leq \hat{v}_K, \quad \hat{w}_j \in \text{ran } \hat{P}_K. \quad (4.6)$$

Since the domain and the codomain of each of A_T and B_T are restricted to the span of the first K eigenvectors of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}}$, we may compute K (almost surely) positive eigenvalues from (4.6). Our main result in this section is given as follows: in the proposition below, $B_\delta(s)$ denotes q_d -dimensional type II fractional standard Brownian motion defined by $B_\delta(0) = 0$ almost surely and $B_\delta(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\delta)} \int_0^s (s-r)^{\delta-1} dW_0(r)$ for $s > 0$ and the standard Brownian motion W_0 .

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, K is a finite integer satisfying $K > q_d$ and the $(K - q_d)$ -th largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ is nonzero and distinct from the next one, and $\alpha > 0$. Let $(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{q_d})$ be the ordered eigenvalues (from the smallest) of*

$$\left(\int_0^1 \tilde{B}_{d+\alpha}(s) \tilde{B}_{d+\alpha}(s)' ds \right)^{-1} \int_0^1 \bar{B}_d(s) \bar{B}_d(s)' ds, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_d(r) &= B_d(r) - \int_0^1 B_d(s) ds, \\ \tilde{B}_{d+\alpha}(r) &= B_{d+\alpha}(r) - \left(\int_0^1 B_{d+\alpha}(s) ds \right) \left(\int_0^r \frac{(r-s)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$T^{2\alpha}(\hat{\nu}_1, \dots, \hat{\nu}_{q_d}) \xrightarrow{d} (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{q_d})$$

and

$$T^{2\alpha} \hat{\nu}_{q_d+j} \xrightarrow{p} \infty, \quad j = 1, \dots, K - q_d.$$

The asymptotic results given in Proposition 4.2 enable us to implement a more detailed statistical inference on q_d beyond consistent estimation of it. Specifically, let us consider the following null and alternative hypotheses:

$$H_0 : q_d = q \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : q_d < q. \quad (4.8)$$

Based on the asymptotic results given in Proposition 4.2, we know that, for example,

$$\Lambda_{q,\alpha}^0 = T^{2\alpha} \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \hat{\nu}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{q,\alpha}^1 = T^{2\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\nu}_j \quad (4.9)$$

have well-defined limiting distributions under H_0 while they diverge to infinity under H_1 . Using these statistics, we may easily evaluate the plausibility of the null hypothesis. Moreover, as an alternative way to estimate q_d , we may sequentially examine (4.8) for $q = q_{\max}, q_{\max} - 1, \dots, 1$, where q_{\max} is a reasonable upper bound. In practice, q_{\max} may be chosen based on the estimated eigenvalues of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}}$ (see Remark 4.3) or can be set to $\hat{q}_d + \epsilon$ using the modified eigenvalue ratio estimator of Li et al. (2022) and small finite integer ϵ . This sequential procedure is consistent in the following sense:

Corollary 4.2. *Suppose that the assumptions in Proposition 4.2 hold, and let \bar{q}_d be the estimator obtained from this sequential procedure with fixed significance level $\eta > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{q}_d = q_d) \rightarrow 1 - \eta \cdot \mathbb{1}\{q_d \geq 1\}.$$

By letting $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\bar{q}_d = q_d) \rightarrow 1$ for all possible values of q_d .

Our proof of Proposition 4.2 also shows that the first q_d eigenvectors computed from (4.6) converge to a random orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_N . Therefore, we can also obtain the following:

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose that the assumptions in Proposition 4.2 hold and let $\tilde{q}_d \xrightarrow{p} q_d$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$\tilde{P} = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_d} \hat{w}_j \otimes \hat{w}_j \xrightarrow{p} P.$$

Suppose that practitioners are only interested in consistent estimation of \mathcal{H}_N or \mathcal{H}_S ; they then might prefer to use the eigenvalue-ratio estimator \hat{q}_d developed in Section 4.1.1 since it is much easier to implement. However, our simulation study shows that \bar{q}_d substantially outperforms \hat{q}_d . Since the estimation of \mathcal{H}_N (or \mathcal{H}_S) can be affected by inaccuracy in the estimator of its dimension, this result suggests the use of the testing procedure given in Corollary 4.2 in practice.

Remark 4.4. The limiting distribution given in Proposition 4.2 depends on α and d . Note that d is an unknown parameter of interest. Therefore, in implementing the proposed test in practice, d needs to be replaced by a consistent estimator of d , such as the local Whittle estimator that we will consider later in Section 4.3. On the other hand, α is known and needs to be chosen by the researcher. Our simulation results show that the test with $\alpha = 0.5$ performs quite reasonably.

Remark 4.5. If we consider a finite-dimensional Euclidean space setting, our test based on $\Lambda_{q,\alpha}^1$ reduces to the test of Nielsen (2010) developed for fractionally cointegrated time series. Even if there are some moderate differences in the cointegrating properties assumed in the

present paper and that of [Nielsen \(2010\)](#) (e.g., in that paper, the considered time series is written as the sum of the nonstationary and asymptotically stationary components), our tests developed in this section may be viewed as generalizations of [Nielsen's \(2010\)](#) test to some degree.

4.2 Decomposition of \mathcal{H}_{LRD} and \mathcal{H}_{SRD}

We, in this section, consider the estimation of \mathcal{H}_{LRD} and \mathcal{H}_{SRD} in the case where \mathcal{H}_S can be further decomposed as in [Assumption 1A](#); of course, this requires a consistent estimator of \mathcal{H}_S in advance. The variance-ratio test developed in [Section 4.1.2](#) cannot be directly used to this problem since it requires nonstationarity of the underlying time series. As an alternative method, we here provide a consistent estimator of q_{d-b} , similar to the eigenvalue-ratio estimator considered in [Section 4.1.1](#).

Suppose that P is known. We then know that the long-run variance of $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ for $v \in \mathcal{H}_{LRD} = \text{ran } Q(I - P)$ is unbounded while that of $\langle Y_t, \tilde{v} \rangle$ for $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_{SRD} = \text{ran}(I - Q)(I - P)$ is bounded. Using this property, we may distinguish $v \in \mathcal{H}_{LRD}$ from any element in \mathcal{H}_{SRD} . Our proposed estimator of q_{d-b} is obtained by extending this idea, and then \mathcal{H}_{LRD} can also be estimated by the span of certain q_{d-b} eigenvectors as in [Section 4.1.1](#). Of course, we do not know P in practice, but by replacing P with \hat{P} or \tilde{P} obtained in the previous sections, we may achieve the desired result.

Let Λ_0 denote the operator defined by

$$\Lambda_0 = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(I - Q)(I - P)Y_s \otimes (I - Q)(I - P)Y_t],$$

which is the population long-run covariance of the SRD component of Y_t and a well-defined bounded linear operator. We also let $\hat{\Lambda}$ be the sample operator defined by

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \sum_{s=-T+1}^{T-1} \left(1 - \frac{|s|}{h}\right) \hat{C}_s, \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$\hat{C}_s = \begin{cases} \sum_{t=s+1}^T \bar{Z}_{t-s} \otimes \bar{Z}_t, & \text{if } s \geq 0, \\ \sum_{t=s+1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_{t-s}, & \text{if } s < 0. \end{cases}$$

We then establish the following result:

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that [Assumption 1A](#) holds, $h = o(T^{1/2})$, K is a finite integer satisfying $K > q_{d-b}$ and the $(K - q_{d-b})$ -th largest eigenvalue of Λ_0 is nonzero and distinct from the next one. Let $(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$ be the ordered (from the largest) eigenvalues of $(I - \bar{P})\hat{\Lambda}(I - \bar{P}^*)$ for any $\bar{P} \xrightarrow{p} P$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $\hat{\mu}_j / \hat{\mu}_{j+1} \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ if $j = q_{d-b}$ while $\hat{\mu}_j / \hat{\mu}_{j+1} = O_p(1)$ if $j \neq q_{d-b}$.

(ii) The corresponding eigenvectors $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_{q_d})$ of $(I - \bar{P})\hat{\Lambda}(I - \bar{P}^*)$ satisfy that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q_{d-b}} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} Q(I - P).$$

Some direct consequences of Proposition 4.3 are given as follows:

Corollary 4.4. *Let everything be as in Proposition 4.3. Then the following hold.*

- (i) $\hat{q}_{d-b} = \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq j \leq K} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_j}{\hat{\mu}_{j+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{p} q_{d-b}.$
- (ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{\hat{q}_{d-b}} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} Q(I - P)$ and $I - \bar{P} - \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{q}_{d-b}} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} (I - Q)(I - P).$

In Proposition 4.3 and Corollary 4.4, \bar{P} may be replaced by \hat{P} or \tilde{P} which is obtained earlier. The role of K in the estimation of q_{d-b} and $Q(I - P)$ is somewhat similar to that as described in Remark 4.1, which will be detailed in Remark 4.6 below.

Remark 4.6. In our proof of Proposition 4.3, we show that $h^{-2(d-b)}(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{q_{d-b}})$ converge in probability to the eigenvalues of a well-defined operator while $(\hat{\mu}_{q_{d-b}+1}, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$ converge to some eigenvalues of Λ_0 . This shows why we require the $(K - q_{d-b})$ -th largest eigenvalue of Λ_0 to be distinct from the next one; if there is no such a distinction, $\hat{\mu}_{K-1}/\hat{\mu}_K \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ which is not desirable to establish consistency of \hat{q}_{d-b} .

4.3 Estimation of the memory parameters

As shown in Section 4.1.2, a consistent estimator of the memory d is necessary to implement our variance-ratio test in practice. Moreover, practitioners may be interested in d and $d - b$ in themselves. In this section, we briefly discuss estimation results for these memory parameters via the local Whittle method. A more detailed discussion of our estimation results can be found in Appendix B.

For convenience, we let $\hat{d}_{LW}(z_t)$ denote the local Whittle estimator computed from a time series z_t with tuning parameter m (depending on the sample size T) and a proper range of admissible values (this range depends on z_t and will be detailed in Appendix B). We here omit the detailed discussion on the local Whittle estimation of the memory parameter of functional time series, and the reader is referred to Li et al. (2021, 2022) for more detailed discussions.

4.3.1 Estimation of d

We note that for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle$ is $I(d)$ as long as $v \notin \mathcal{H}_S = \operatorname{ran}(I - P)$. Given that $\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle$ is a univariate $I(d)$ process, our goal reduces to the estimation of the memory parameter of $\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle$.

With a simplifying assumption that $\psi_j = \phi_j A$ for some $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (this assumption is similar to and slightly general than the assumption employed for long-range

dependent functional time series in Li et al., 2021) and some standard regularity conditions imposed on the time series $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ for v satisfying $\mathbb{P}(v \notin \mathcal{H}_S) = 1$, we may establish that

$$\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d \quad (4.11)$$

for $d \in (1/2, 1]$ if m grows with an appropriate rate (see Proposition B.1(i)). Unfortunately, $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle)$ is not consistent if $d > 1$ (see Proposition B.1(ii)), but in this case, we may use the following result for consistent estimation:

$$1 + \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d, \quad (4.12)$$

where d can be all possible values in $(1/2, 3/2)$ (see Proposition B.1(iii)).

For the consistency results given in (4.11) and (4.12), v is required not to be included in \mathcal{H}_S with probability one. Choosing such v may not be difficult in practice since the probability that any v , randomly picked from \mathcal{H} , is exactly orthogonal to \mathcal{H}_N is zero. In practical implementation, we may conveniently set $v = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j v_j$ for some orthonormal set $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^J$ and nonzero coefficients $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^J$. This choice is valid as long as at least one v_j is not exactly orthogonal to \mathcal{H}_N , and thus will be valid even with a moderate integer J . Based on this idea, practitioners may implement an estimation of d for some repeated (possibly random) choices of v . More specifically, we may construct $v^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ by setting $v^{(\ell)} = \sum_{j=1}^J a_{j,\ell} e_j$, where $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^J$ is an orthonormal set (e.g., the first J elements of the Legendre polynomial basis of \mathcal{H}) and $a_{j,\ell}$ are nonzero coefficients. In this case, it is reasonable to take

$$\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v^{(\ell)} \rangle) \quad (4.13)$$

or

$$1 + \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v^{(\ell)} \rangle) \quad (4.14)$$

as the estimator of d since the memory parameter of the time series $\langle Z_t^0, v^{(\ell)} \rangle$ (resp. $\langle \Delta Z_t, v^{(\ell)} \rangle$) cannot exceed d (resp. $d - 1$). Another intuition for taking max in (4.13) and (4.14) is that each estimator might significantly underestimate d (resp. $d - 1$) in a finite sample if $Pv^{(\ell)}$ is by any chance chosen to be close to zero. If $\langle Z_t^0, v^{(\ell)} \rangle$ and $\langle \Delta Z_t, v^{(\ell)} \rangle$ satisfy certain regularity conditions that we will discuss in Appendix B for all ℓ , then $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle)$ (resp. $1 + \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle)$) can be replaced by (4.13) (resp. (4.14)) in (4.11) (resp. (4.12)).

Asymptotic inference on d can also be implemented; in particular, under some additional assumptions to be detailed in Appendix B, we may use the following result:

$$m^{1/2}(1 + \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle) - d) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1/4); \quad (4.15)$$

see Proposition B.2. The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle)$ can also be obtained, but it turns out to be dependent on the true value of d , which is not desirable in the practical use of the asymptotic result. Therefore, (4.15) may be more convenient for practitioners.

Of course, $1 + \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle)$ may be replaced by (4.14) if $v^{(\ell)}$ satisfies the conditions to be detailed in Proposition B.2 for all ℓ .

The simplifying assumption imposed on ψ_j to obtain the results given in this section seems to be strong and significantly restricts the data generating process, but we conjecture that this assumption is not essentially required; our simulation results show that (4.14) performs well even if the assumption is not satisfied. The assumption is imposed only to make $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ be a stationary linear process. In more general cases where $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ is allowed to be a stationary nonlinear process, we may conjecture from the results given by Shao and Wu (2007) that the local Whittle estimator will be consistent if some additional assumptions are satisfied.

Remark 4.7. Li et al. (2022) provided a procedure to consistently estimate d . Let \hat{v}_1 be the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t^0 \otimes Z_t^0$. Then Theorem 4.2 of Li et al. (2022) implies that the local Whittle estimator computed from $\langle Z_t^0, \hat{v}_1 \rangle$ with a proper range of admissible values converges to d if $d \in (1/2, 1]$; in the case where $d > 1$, they proposed an integer-order differencing algorithm to estimate d . Even if this estimator can be used in our model, our simulation results show that (4.13) or (4.14) performs better than their estimator.

4.3.2 Estimation of $d - b$

Estimation of the memory parameter of the LRD component, $d - b$, requires prior knowledge of q_d or its consistent estimator. However, as shown in the previous sections, we may construct a consistent estimator of q_d , so it is assumed to be known in this section for simplicity.

Let $\{\hat{v}_j\}_{j=q_d+1}^\infty$ (resp. $\{v_j\}_{j=q_d+1}^\infty$) be the eigenvectors of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_t$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$) corresponding to the eigenvalues except for the first q_d largest ones. Then we may establish the following result under a similar set of assumptions employed for estimation of d : if the largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ is distinct from the second one and v_{q_d+1} satisfies certain regularity conditions (to be detailed in Appendix B.2)

$$\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1} \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d - b. \quad (4.16)$$

Under some additional conditions stated in Assumption 2* in Li et al. (2021), we may also deduce the following from Theorem 1 of Li et al. (2021):

$$m^{1/2}[\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1} \rangle) - (d - b)] \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1/4). \quad (4.17)$$

If the first J largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ are distinct, it can be shown that \hat{v}_{q_d+1} can be replaced by a linear combination of \hat{v}_{q_d+1} and the next $(J - 1)$ eigenvectors, such as $\tilde{v} = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j \hat{v}_{q_d+j}$ (see Appendix B.2). In this case, we may also implement estimation of $d - b$ via repeated (and possibly random) choices of \tilde{v} as in Section 4.3. Specifically, we may construct

$\tilde{v}^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ by setting $\tilde{v}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{j=1}^J a_{j,\ell} \hat{v}_{q_d+j}$. Then, it is reasonable to consider

$$\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v}^{(\ell)} \rangle) \quad (4.18)$$

as the estimator of $d - b$ as in Section 4.3.1. We may also replace $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1} \rangle)$ with (4.18) in (4.16) and (4.17) as in Section 4.3.1; see Appendix B.2 for more details.

5 Numerical studies

5.1 Monte Carlo Simulation studies

5.1.1 Simulation data generating process (DGP)

Let (v_1, \dots, v_{25}) be an orthonormal set where (v_1, \dots, v_{q_d}) is the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_N , and $(v_{q_d+1}, \dots, v_{q_d+q_d-b})$ is the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_{LRD} and the remaining vectors are contained in \mathcal{H}_{SRD} .

We generate the nonstationary part of the time series $P(Y_t - Y_0) = \Delta_+^{-d} P X_t$ as follows:

$$\Delta_+^{-d} P X_t = \Delta_+^{-d} \sum_{j=1}^{q_d} a_{j,t}^N v_j, \quad a_{j,t}^N \sim \text{ARMA}(1, 1),$$

where each of the coefficients of ARMA(1, 1) processes is a uniform random variable supported on $[-0.15, 0.15]$ independent of any other variables. The LRD part of the time series $(I - P)Y_t = \Delta^{-(d-b)}(I - P)X_t$ is generated as follows:

$$\Delta^{-(d-b)}(I - P)X_t = \Delta^{-(d-b)} \sum_{j=q_d+1}^{q_d+q_d-b+1} a_{j,t}^L v_j, \quad a_{j,t}^L \sim \text{ARMA}(1, 1),$$

where ARMA(1, 1) processes $a_{j,t}^L$ are similarly determined as $a_{j,t}^N$. The stationary part $\tilde{X}_t = (I - Q)(I - P)X_t$ is generated by the following functional ARMA model with banded coefficient operators:

$$\tilde{X}_t = A \tilde{X}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t + B \varepsilon_{t-1},$$

where A and B are defined on $\text{span}\{v_{q_d+q_d-b+1}, \dots, v_{25}\}$ as follows: for $q_d+q_d-b+1 \leq j, k \leq 25$,

$$\langle v_j, A v_k \rangle \sim u_{j,k,A}^S \mathbb{1}\{|j - k| \leq 2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle v_j, B v_k \rangle \sim u_{j,k,B}^S \mathbb{1}\{|j - k| \leq 2\},$$

where $u_{j,k,A}^S$ and $u_{j,k,B}^S$ are also the sequences of uniform random variables supported on $[-0.15, 0.15]$ independent across j and k (and of any other variables). Moreover, ε_t is generated by $\varepsilon_t = \sum_{j=1}^{20} a_j v_{q_d+q_d-b+j}$, where $a_j \sim N(0, 0.97^{j-1})$ for $j = 1, \dots, 20$.

We set $d = 0.95$, $d - b = 0.3$, $q_d = 3$, $q_d - b = 2$, and let (v_1, \dots, v_{25}) be the orthonormal basis obtained by first permuting the first 5 Fourier basis functions and then adding the remaining 20 basis functions which are randomly ordered. By doing so, we fix $\mathcal{H}_N \oplus \mathcal{H}_{LRD}$ to $\text{span}\{v_1, \dots, v_5\}$, but let \mathcal{H}_N and \mathcal{H}_{LRD} be differently realized.

5.1.2 Results

We will examine finite-sample properties of various estimators and tests that are considered in the previous sections. We will consider the following:

- (i) The estimators \hat{q}_d and \bar{q}_d of q_d (Table 1).
- (ii) The estimators \hat{q}_{d-b} of q_{d-b} (Table 2).
- (iii) The local Whittle estimators (4.13) and (4.18) (Tables 3 and 4).
- (iv) Absolute difference between empirical and nominal coverage probabilities, as well as the interval scores (see Gneiting and Raftery, 2007) of the confidence intervals constructed from (4.15) and (4.17) (Table 5).

More detailed information on implementing our statistical methods can be found in each table. Some additional simulation results, including sensitivity analysis of the local Whittle estimators to the choice of m and the size-power properties of the variance-ratio test, are reported in Appendix C.

To summarize the results, the estimator \bar{q} obtained from our variance-ratio testing procedure outperforms the eigenvalue-ratio estimator which is similar to Li et al.'s (2022) estimator. This performance gap seems huge, particularly in small samples, which makes \bar{q} attractive in practice where we do not always have enough observations. Given that q_d and P characterize the dominant part of the time series (see, e.g., Li et al., 2022) and they are used in inferential problems of other parameters (such as q_{d-b} and $d - b$), it may be recommended for practitioners to use our testing procedures. Note that \hat{q}_d significantly underestimates q_d in small samples while \bar{q}_d does not do so. As may be deduced from Corollary 4.2 and the fact that we are employing 5% significance level, the relative frequency of underestimation for \hat{q}_d must be close to 0.05 in large samples. Moreover, as shown in Table 8, the test tends to under-reject the correct null hypothesis in small samples. Thus we expect that the relative frequency of underestimation would tend to increase to 0.05 as the sample size gets larger, as seen in Table 1. On the other hand, \hat{q}_{d-b} does not perform quite well in small samples (the relative frequency of correct determination is only around 30% when $T = 200$), but Table 3 shows that its performance gets improved as the sample size gets larger. The local Whittle estimator (4.15), which we propose in Section 4.3, seems to perform better in small samples than the existing competitor developed by Li et al. (2022); even if their difference seems to converge as T gets larger, this result suggests that our estimator can be a better alternative in practice where the sample size is limited. The performance of (4.18) is also better than $\hat{d}_{LW}(\bar{Z}_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1})$ which is similar to Li et al.'s (2021) estimator. This may be because (4.18) uses information of the other $I(d - b)$ component characterized by v_{q_d+2} in this simulation setup. Another

reason may be found in [Nielsen et al.'s \(2022\)](#) observation in the $I(1)/I(0)$ system; obtaining \hat{v}_{q_d+1} in this statistical test may be understood as pre-estimation of v_{q_d+1} such that $\langle Y_t, v_{q_d+1} \rangle$ is $I(d-b)$, but this estimation may not be accurate in a finite sample. Thus, sometimes $\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1+j} \rangle$ for some positive j may behave more like an $I(d-b)$ process than $\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1} \rangle$ does, so the use of (4.18) can be advantages in practice. Lastly, the empirical coverage rates and interval scores based on our proposed results ((4.15) and (4.17)) overall seem to be better than those of our competitor, and ours seem to be more attractive, particularly in small samples.

Table 1: Finite sample performance of the estimators of q_d

Relative frequency of correct determination of q_d					
q_{\max} or K	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
4	Proposed	0.684	0.850	0.909	0.946
	LRS-type	0.182	0.549	0.777	0.931
5, 6	Proposed	0.682	0.849	0.909	0.946
	LRS-type	0.182	0.549	0.777	0.931
Relative frequency of underestimation of q_d					
q_{\max} or K	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
4, 5, 6	Proposed	0.004	0.002	0.004	0.050
	LRS-type	0.819	0.451	0.222	0.069

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The proposed estimator is obtained from the sequential application of the variance-ratio test based on $\Lambda_{s,\alpha}^0$ with $\alpha = 0.5$ and significance level $\eta = 0.05$. Moreover, K is set to $q + 2$ for each $H_0 : q_d = q$ and $H_0 : q_d = q_{\max}$ is first examined in this procedure. The LRS-type estimator is the eigenvalue-ratio estimator with tuning parameter K , which is considered in Proposition 4.1. As noted in Remark 4.2, the eigenvalue-ratio estimator given in Proposition 4.1 is not identical to [Li et al.'s \(2022\)](#) estimator, but the two are very similar and can be equivalent under some choice of tuning parameters. The reported frequencies are rounded to the third decimal place, and the results are reported in the same row if there are no differences in these rounded numbers.

Table 2: Finite sample performance of the estimators of q_{d-b}

Relative frequency of correct determination of q_{d-b}					
h	K	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$h = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.3} \rfloor$	4	0.344	0.447	0.536	0.678
	5	0.295	0.400	0.500	0.655
	6	0.274	0.390	0.503	0.658
$h = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.4} \rfloor$	4	0.364	0.501	0.595	0.767
	5	0.314	0.457	0.570	0.759
	6	0.286	0.448	0.577	0.763
Relative frequency of underestimation of q_{d-b}					
h	K	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$h = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.3} \rfloor$	4	0.384	0.300	0.242	0.130
	5	0.344	0.304	0.255	0.152
	6	0.362	0.320	0.271	0.170
$h = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.4} \rfloor$	4	0.390	0.292	0.236	0.108
	5	0.352	0.296	0.232	0.120
	6	0.362	0.306	0.250	0.140

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. \bar{P} is set to $\sum_{j=1}^{q_d} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j$ (see (4.2)). h is the bandwidth parameter used in (4.10) and K is a positive integer introduced in Proposition 4.3.

Table 3: Simulated bias and variance of the proposed estimators of d

$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.0329	-0.0184	-0.0117	-0.0011
	LRS-type	-0.1162	-0.0726	-0.0541	-0.0262
Variance	Proposed	0.0065	0.0042	0.0033	0.0021
	LRS-type	0.0220	0.0133	0.0093	0.0038
MSE	Proposed	0.0075	0.0046	0.0035	0.0021
	LRS-type	0.0355	0.0185	0.0122	0.0045

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The proposed estimator is based on (4.13) for 20 repetitions of a randomly chosen element; specifically $v = \sum_{j=1}^5 a_j p_j$, where $a_j \sim N(1, 1)$ and p_j is the Legendre

polynomial of order $j - 1$ in each repetition. The LRS-type estimator is $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, \hat{v}_1 \rangle)$, where \hat{v}_1 with the leading eigenvector of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t^0 \otimes Z_t^0$.

Table 4: Simulated bias and variance of the proposed estimators of $d - b$

$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.0754	-0.0464	-0.0335	-0.0190
	LRS-type	-0.1304	-0.0867	-0.0704	-0.0498
Variance	Proposed	0.0136	0.0088	0.0063	0.0035
	LRS-type	0.0154	0.0115	0.0086	0.0046
MSE	Proposed	0.0193	0.0110	0.0074	0.0039
	LRS-type	0.0325	0.0190	0.0135	0.0071

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The proposed estimator is based on (4.18) for 20 repetitions of a randomly chosen element; specifically $\tilde{v} = \hat{v}_{q_d+1} + a_1 \hat{v}_{q_d+2}$, where $a_1 \sim N(0, 1)$ in each repetition. The LRS-type estimator is $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \hat{v}_{q_d+1} \rangle)$, which is a consistent estimator of $d - b$ (see our proof of Proposition B.3) and \hat{v}_{q_d+1} denotes the eigenvector of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_t$ corresponding to the $(q_d + 1)$ -th largest eigenvalue.

Table 5: Coverage performance of the pointwise confidence intervals of the memory parameter estimated by the local Whittle estimators with the 95% nominal level

Coverage probability differences						
m	Target	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.6} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.0525	0.0355	0.0180	0.0020
		LRS-type	0.3370	0.2660	0.2070	0.1660
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.2220	0.1635	0.1145	0.0775
		LRS-type	0.3965	0.2995	0.2695	0.2265
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.0765	0.0640	0.0515	0.0305
		LRS-type	0.3180	0.2575	0.2160	0.1710
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.1750	0.1145	0.0820	0.0500
		LRS-type	0.3470	0.2415	0.2010	0.1460
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.7} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.1035	0.1205	0.1045	0.0980
		LRS-type	0.3245	0.2780	0.2500	0.2080
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.1600	0.1065	0.0725	0.0340

Continued on next page

Coverage probability differences						
m	Target	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
		LRS-type	0.3200	0.2060	0.1710	0.1190
Interval scores						
m	Target	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$[1 + T^{0.6}]$	q_d	Proposed	0.6047	0.4761	0.3832	0.2951
		LRS-type	2.6169	1.8270	1.3248	0.6999
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	1.1209	0.8295	0.6347	0.4257
		LRS-type	1.7899	1.4861	1.2139	0.8609
$[1 + T^{0.65}]$	q_d	Proposed	0.5965	0.4958	0.4017	0.3041
		LRS-type	2.6460	1.8466	1.3519	0.7165
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.9312	0.6280	0.4875	0.3224
		LRS-type	1.6781	1.1657	0.9037	0.5591
$[1 + T^{0.7}]$	q_d	Proposed	0.6266	0.5701	0.4748	0.4012
		LRS-type	2.7783	2.0358	1.5571	0.9048
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.7901	0.5122	0.3972	0.2606
		LRS-type	1.5874	0.9978	0.7199	0.4395

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. Coverage rates of the LRS-type estimators are computed from the confidence bands with significance level 0.05, which are constructed from (4.15) with $v = \hat{v}_1$ and (4.17), where \hat{v}_1 is the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t^0 \otimes Z_t^0$. On the other hand, coverage rates of the proposed estimators are computed by replacing the estimators in (4.15) and (4.17) with (4.14) and (4.18), respectively; $v^{(\ell)}$ for (4.14) (resp. (4.18)) is chosen as in Table 3 (resp. Table 4). The reported number in each case is computed as the absolute value of the difference between the computed coverage rate and the nominal level 0.95. The interval score in each case is computed as in Gneiting and Raftery (2007, Section 6.2) with the quantiles 0.025 and 0.975. An estimator with smaller interval scores is regarded as better.

5.2 Empirical application : Swedish mortality data

We apply our methodology to age- and gender-specific mortality data for Sweden observed from 1751 to 2021; the data used in this section is available from the Human Mortality Database at <https://www.mortality.org/>, and we specifically use the central mortality rates which are observed at various ages from 0 to 110 (and older) for each gender over time. Viewing the mortality rates at various ages as functional observations as in, e.g., Hyndman and Ullah (2007), Shang (2016), and Shang and Hyndman (2017), we may apply our inferential

methods to the considered data. As in the aforementioned literature, we hereafter consider the logarithms of the observed mortality rates for each gender, which are visualized in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Log-mortality rates at various ages

Notes: The data for a specific year and gender is given by a 111-dimensional vector of mortality rates from age 0 to 110 (and older), and each of such vectors is plotted as a function of age.

For our statistical analysis, we first represent the observed mortality rates at various ages for each gender with 40 Legendre polynomial basis functions. We first estimate the memory parameter d of the time series for each gender. The top rows of Table 6 report the local Whittle estimation results. As is not uncommon in many empirical applications, the memory of each time series is far greater than $1/2$ and quite closer to the unity. This not only implies that both time series of mortality rates are nonstationary but also justifies, to some degree, the conventional use of the random walk model for mortality in the literature. We then apply our variance-ratio testing procedure to estimate the dimension q_d of the dominant subspace for each time series. Of course, to implement the proposed testing procedure, the asymptotic null distribution of the test statistic, which depends on d , needs to be approximated by a feasible estimate of d (see Remark 4.4). This is done by replacing d with the relevant estimate obtained by our proposed local Whittle method and reported in Table 6.

The testing results are reported in the top rows of Table 7, and for comparison, we also report the eigenvalue-ratio estimates (\hat{q}_d), which are considered in Section 4.1. The estimated dimension of the dominant subspace by our proposed testing procedure is 5 for each case, but the eigenvalue-ratio estimate is given by 1 for each case. As may be deduced from Li et al.'s (2022) simulation studies considering a similar eigenvalue-ratio estimator (see Section 5 of their paper), this estimator tends to underestimate q_d in small samples, and our

Table 6: Local Whittle estimation - Swedish mortality data.

Target	Method	Male	Female
d	Proposed	0.962	0.989
	LRS-type	0.956	0.978
$d - b$	Proposed	0.424	0.433
	LRS-type	0.402	0.275

Notes: The proposed and LRS-type estimators of d are given as in Table 3, and the bandwidth m is set to $\lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$. The estimators of $d - b$ are given as in Table 4 with $m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$ but $\hat{v}_{q_{d+1}}$ and $\hat{v}_{q_{d+2}}$ are replaced by $\hat{v}_{\hat{q}_{d+1}}$ and $\hat{v}_{\hat{q}_{d+2}}$, where \hat{q}_{d+1} is the estimator obtained by our variance-ratio testing procedure.

Table 7: Dimension estimation - Swedish mortality data.

Target	Method	Male	Female
q_d	Proposed	5	5
	LRS-type	1	1
q_{d-b}	Proposed	6	4

Notes: The proposed estimator of q_d is obtained by our variance-ratio testing procedure as in Table 1, and $K = q + 2$, for each $H_0 : q_d = q$, $\eta = 0.05$, and q_{\max} is set to 7. The LRS-type estimator of q_d is the same as that in Table 1, and the tuning parameter K is set to 7. The proposed estimator of q_{d-b} is given as in Table 2, and h is set to $\lfloor 1 + T^{0.3} \rfloor$.

unreported simulation results also support this; for example, in our Table 1 based on our simulation setting with $q_d = 3$, the relative frequency that $\hat{q}_d = 1$ (resp. $\hat{q}_d = 2$) is around 0.648 (resp. 0.171) when $T = 200$. Given this evidence and our earlier observation that our proposed variance-ratio testing procedure performs quite better in our simulation studies, we are inclined to conclude that $q_d = 5$. Then, the dominant subspace may be estimated by the span of the eigenvectors corresponding to the first five largest eigenvalues of the sample covariance operator, as discussed in the previous sections.

Assuming that the additional conditions given in Assumption 1A hold, we may also estimate $d - b$ and q_{d-b} using the proposed methods, which are, respectively, reported in the bottom rows of Tables 6 and 7. Of course, these results might not be much meaningful if Assumption 1A is not satisfied, and, moreover, it may be hard to check if this assumption holds in practice. On top of all these estimation results, we report the time series of $\langle Z_t^0, \hat{v}_j \rangle$ for a few selected values of j in Figure 2, where \hat{v}_j is the eigenvector corresponding to the j -th largest eigenvalue of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t^0 \otimes Z_t^0$; specifically, j is chosen so that each time series has a different integration order based on our estimation results given in Table 7 (see Section 3 of Li et al., 2022). Based on the previous estimation results, we expect that, in Figure 2, the persistence of the time series tends to be higher in the left panel ((a) and (d)) and lower

in the right panel ((c) and (f)). It is quite clear that the time series reported in the left panel tend to be more persistent than those in the other panels, but it is less clear if the time series in the middle panel are more persistent than those in the right panel. This may be due to violation of the additional assumptions given in Assumption 1A (i.e., the SRD component is not clearly distinguishable by a single projection operator Q as assumed in Assumption 1A) or insufficient sample size which does not guarantee good performance of our proposed statistical methods for $d - b$ and q_{d-b} (see Section 5.1.2).




Figure 2: Sets of principal component scores for the Swedish female and male data.

6 Conclusion

This article has introduced a fractionally cointegrated curve time series with long-range dependence and derived some relevant asymptotic theorems. The functional dependence structure is specified via the projections of the curve process onto different subspaces spanned by additive orthonormal functions. The subspaces can be split into nonstationary and stationary components. The determination of the dimensions of the subspaces is carried out via our hypothesis tests, which outperforms the modified eigen-value ratio estimator in terms of correct identification. We have shown that the projection of curve linear process onto the subspaces contains most of the sample information carried by the original curve process. We also present a local Whittle estimator to estimate the memory parameter. The methodologies are illustrated via simulation and an empirical application to age-specific mortality rates.

The article might be extended in two directions: (i) nonstationary cointegration and (ii) cointegration in long-range dependent processes. We in this paper only consider the case with $d > 1/2$ and $d - b < 1/2$. However, it is also possible to have $d > 1/2$ and $1/2 \leq d - b < d$, and this corresponds to the case with nonstationary cointegration. As may be expected from the recent paper by [Johansen and Nielsen \(2019\)](#), this research direction will require a new theoretical approach. It may also be interesting to consider the case where $d < 1/2$ but $0 < d - b < d$. Given that the memory of a certain linear combination of the original time series is strictly smaller than the highest memory, this may be understood as a cointegration in long-range dependent processes. It is reasonable to assume that functional time series exhibiting long-range dependence may allow this kind of memory reduction while relevant theoretical results are currently absent.

A Mathematical Appendix

It will be convenient to define some notation for the subsequent discussion. We first define

$$\Omega^2 = P \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \right) C_{\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \right)^* P. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and let $\{\beta_j, u_j\}_{j=1}^{q_d}$ be the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of Ω^2 . The square-root operator of Ω^2 is well defined and it is simply denoted by Ω . We then let W_d and $W_{d+\alpha}$ denote Type II fractional Brownian motions of order d and $d + \alpha$ taking values in $\mathcal{H}^N = \text{ran } P$ driven by the common Brownian motion whose covariance operator is given by $\sum_{j=1}^{q_d} u_j \otimes u_j$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_d(r) &= W_d(r) - \int_0^1 W_d(s) ds, \\ \widetilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(r) &= W_{d+\alpha}(r) - \left(\int_0^1 W_{d+\alpha}(s) ds \right) \left(\int_0^r \frac{(r-s)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

We first provide a useful lemma that will be used in the subsequent sections.

Lemma A.1. *Suppose that \overline{Z}_t and \widetilde{Z}_t are defined as in (4.1) and (4.4) for $\alpha > 0$, and the time series Z_t satisfies Assumption 1. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} T^{1/2-d} \overline{Z}_{[Tr]} &\Rightarrow \Omega \overline{W}_d(r), \\ T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \widetilde{Z}_{[Tr]} &\Rightarrow \Omega \widetilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(r), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where \Rightarrow denotes the weak convergence in $\mathcal{D}[0, 1]$ of \mathcal{H}_N -valued functions.

Proof. We first show (i). Note that $T^{1/2-d} \overline{Z}_{[Tr]} = T^{1/2-d} Y_{[Tr]} - T^{-1/2-d} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t$, and thus we have

$$T^{1/2-d} \overline{Z}_{[Tr]} = T^{1/2-d} P Y_{[Tr]} - T^{-1/2-d} \sum_{t=1}^T P Y_t + T^{1/2-d} (I - P) Y_{[Tr]} - T^{-1/2-d} \sum_{t=1}^T (I - P) Y_t, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $T^{1/2-d} (I - P) Y_{[Tr]} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ uniformly in $r \in [0, 1]$ and $T^{-1/2-d} \sum_{t=1}^T (I - P) Y_t \xrightarrow{p} 0$ since $(I - P) Y_t$ is stationary and $d > 1/2$. We thus only consider the first term of (A.3). We then apply Proposition 2.1 of Li et al. (2022) and the continuous mapping theorem to find that

$$T^{1/2-d} \overline{Z}_{[Tr]} \Rightarrow \Omega \left(W_d(r) - \int_0^1 W_d(s) ds \right).$$

We next show (ii). Note that

$$T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \widetilde{Z}_{[Tr]} = T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \Delta_+^{-\alpha} Y_{[Tr]} - T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \Delta_+^{-\alpha} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Given that $\Delta_+^{-\alpha} \Delta_+^{-d} Y_t = \Delta_+^{-d-\alpha} Y_t$ and $d + \alpha > 1/2$, we find that the first term of (A.4) satisfies that

$$T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \Delta_+^{-\alpha} Y_{[Tr]} \Rightarrow \Omega W_{d+\alpha}(r). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

On the other hand, let $\bar{Y}_T = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t$. Then the second term of (A.4) is equal to

$$T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \Delta_+^{-\alpha} \bar{Y}_T = T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \pi_{\lfloor Tr \rfloor - k}(\alpha) \bar{Y}_T, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\pi_k(\alpha) = \frac{\Gamma(k+\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(k+1)}$. Note that

$$T^{1/2-d} \bar{Y}_T \xrightarrow[d]{} \Omega \int_0^1 W_{d+\alpha}(s) ds$$

and

$$T^{-\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \pi_{\lfloor Tr \rfloor - k}(\alpha) \rightarrow \int_0^r \frac{(r-s)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} ds, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where the convergence result given in (A.7) may be deduced from equation (35) of Nielsen (2010). An application of Slutsky's theorem (see e.g., p. 35 of Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996) and the continuous mapping theorem with (A.5)-(A.7) gives the following convergence result:

$$T^{1/2-d-\alpha} \tilde{Z}_{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Rightarrow \Omega \left(W_{d+\alpha}(r) - \int_0^1 W_{d+\alpha}(s) ds \left(\int_0^r \frac{(r-s)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} ds \right) \right)$$

as desired. \square

Remark A.1. Suppose that $\mu = 0$ and thus $Z_t = Y_t$. Under some appropriate conditions similar to us, Li et al. (2022) shows that $T^{1/2-d} P Z_{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Rightarrow \Omega W_d(r)$. In the case where $\mu = 0$, (A.2) is slightly different from their result because P does not appear on the left-hand side.

Proofs of the main results

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We first deduce from Lemma A.1 and the continuous mapping theorem that

$$T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T P \bar{Z}_t \otimes P \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow[d]{} \int_0^1 \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) \otimes \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Note that $\bar{Z}_t = Y_t - \bar{Y}_T$, where $Y_T = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t$ and $(I - P)Y_t$ is stationary. Therefore, from the law of large numbers of the stationary ergodic sequences, we find that

$$T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (I - P) \bar{Z}_t \otimes (I - P) \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow[p]{} \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Define \hat{P}_K as in (4.5), i.e., $\hat{P}_K = \sum_{j=1}^K \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j$ and $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_K)$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to the first K largest eigenvalues of $\hat{C}_{\bar{Z}}$. We may deduce from (A.8), the Skorohod representation theorem, and Lemma 4.3 of Bosq (2000) that the first q_d eigenvectors $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_{q_d})$ converge to a random orthonormal basis of $\text{ran } P$; this proves (4.2). Note also that $(\hat{v}_{q_d+1}, \dots, \hat{v}_K)$ are the eigenvalues of $(I - \hat{P}_{q_d}) \hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} (I - \hat{P}_{q_d})$. Since $I - \hat{P}_{q_d} \xrightarrow[p]{} (I - P)$ and $(I - P) \hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} (I - P) \xrightarrow[p]{} \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ (see (A.9)), we have

$$(I - \hat{P}_{q_d}) \hat{C}_{\bar{Z}} (I - \hat{P}_{q_d}) \xrightarrow[p]{} \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t].$$

Since the $(K - q_d)$ -th largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ is distinct from the next one, the projection $\sum_{j=1}^{K-q_d} v_j^S \otimes v_j^S$ (where v_j^S is the eigenvector corresponding to the j -th largest eigenvalue) is a well defined fixed bounded linear operator regardless of if any j -th eigenvalue for $j < K - q_d$ is repeated (and thus v_j^S is not uniquely determined) or not. Moreover, in this case, we may deduce from Lemma 4.4 of [Bosq \(2000\)](#) that

$$\hat{P}_K - \hat{P}_{q_d} = \sum_{j=q_d+1}^K \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} \sum_{j=1}^{K-q_d} v_j^S \otimes v_j^S. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We now consider the limiting behavior of $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K \bar{Z}_t$ of which (almost surely) nonzero eigenvalues are given by $(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$. We will show later in our proof of Proposition 4.2 that (A.8)-(A.10) imply that the first q_d eigenvalues, multiplied by T^{1-2d} , converge to positive (and almost surely bounded) random eigenvalues while the remaining eigenvalues converge to fixed and positive eigenvalues as long as $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ allows $K - q_d$ nonzero eigenvalues; in particular, see (A.20). This proves the desired results. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.2. We will first show the limiting behaviors of two random operators given by $A_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{Z}_t \otimes \bar{Z}_t$ and $B_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \tilde{Z}_t$ when they are understood as the maps acting on $\text{ran } \hat{P}_K$ (the span of the first K eigenvectors $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_j)$ of A_T). In our proof of Proposition 4.1, we showed that $\hat{P}_{q_d} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_d} \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} P$. Combining this with (A.10), we find that

$$\hat{P}_K = \hat{P}_{q_d} + (\hat{P}_K - \hat{P}_{q_d}) \xrightarrow{p} P + \sum_{j=1}^{K-q_d} v_j^S \otimes v_j^S =: P_K,$$

where P_K is a well defined and fixed projection.

Let $\hat{P}_K^N = \hat{P}_K P$, $\hat{P}_K^S = \hat{P}_K (I - P)$, $P_K^N = P_K P$, $P_K^S = P_K (I - P)$ and $D_T = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-d} I_1 & 0 \\ 0 & T^{-1/2} I_2 \end{pmatrix}$, where I_1 and I_2 are the relevant identity maps of rank q_d and $K - q_d$, respectively. Given that $B_T = \hat{P}_K B_T \hat{P}_K$ and $\hat{P}_K = \hat{P}_K^N + \hat{P}_K^S$ holds, we may understand $T^{-2\alpha} D_T B_T D_T$ as the following operator matrix:

$$T^{-2\alpha} D_T B_T D_T = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-2d-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t & T^{-d-1/2-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \\ T^{-d-1/2-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t & T^{-1-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\hat{P}_K \xrightarrow{p} P_K$ and $T^{-2d-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t = \hat{P}_K \left(T^{-2d-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T P \tilde{Z}_t \otimes P \tilde{Z}_t \right) \hat{P}_K$. We then deduce from Lemma A.1 that

$$T^{-2d-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes P_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) \otimes \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Combining these results, we find that

$$T^{-2d-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) \otimes \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Using the isomorphism between \mathbb{R}^K and any K -dimensional Hilbert space and the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 6(f) of [Nielsen \(2010\)](#), we may deduce the following:

$$T^{-d-\psi-\alpha}(\log T)^{-1\{\psi=1/2\}} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes P_K^N \tilde{Z}_t = O_p(1),$$

where $\psi = \max\{d-b+\alpha, 1/2\}$. Note that $\psi < 1/2+\alpha$ and $\hat{P}_K \xrightarrow{p} P_K$, from which we find that

$$T^{-d-1/2-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

With nearly identical arguments, we also find that

$$T^{-d-1/2-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^N \tilde{Z}_t \otimes P_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Lastly, we note that $\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t$ is the unnormalized sample covariance of $I(d-b+\alpha)$ time series, and hence, $\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t = O_p(T^{-1})$ if $d-b+\alpha < 1/2$. On the other hand, if $d-b+\alpha \geq 1/2$, it can be shown from Lemma 6(e) of [Nielsen \(2010\)](#) that $\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t = O_p(T^{-2\psi}(\log T)^{-1\{\psi=1/2\}})$. Note that $2\psi < 1+2\alpha$ since $d-b < 1/2$, we thus find that

$$T^{-1-2\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \tilde{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Combining (A.12)-(A.14), we find that

$$T^{-2\alpha} D_T B_T D_T \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^1 \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) \otimes \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) ds & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

We next consider $D_T A_T D_T$. Given that $A_T = \hat{P}_K A_T \hat{P}_K$ holds, we may understand $T^{-2\alpha} D_T A_T D_T$ as the following operator matrix:

$$D_T A_T D_T = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t & T^{-d-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t \\ T^{-d-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t & T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly as in (A.11), we find that

$$T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^N \bar{Z}_t \otimes P_K^N \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 \Omega W_d(s) \otimes \Omega W_d(s) ds.$$

Since $T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t = \hat{P}_K (T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T P \bar{Z}_t \otimes P \bar{Z}_t) \hat{P}_K$ and $\hat{P}_K \xrightarrow{p} P_K$, we conclude that

$$T^{-2d} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^N \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 \Omega W_d(s) \otimes \Omega W_d(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Moreover, from similar arguments used in the proof of Lemma 6(c) in [Nielsen \(2010\)](#), we

may deduce that $\sum_{t=1}^T P_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes P_K^N \bar{Z}_t = O_p(T^{d-b-1/2})$ and thus

$$T^{-d-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^N \bar{Z}_t \otimes P_K^S \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$T^{-d-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T P_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes P_K^N \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Lastly, we deduce the following from the law of large numbers of stationary ergodic sequence:

$$T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \otimes \hat{P}_K^S \bar{Z}_t \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[P_K^S Y_t \otimes P_K^S Y_t] = P_K \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t] P_K. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Combining (A.16)-(A.19), we find that

$$D_T A_T D_T \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^1 \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) \otimes \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) ds & 0 \\ 0 & P_K \mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t] P_K \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Consider the eigenvalue problem given by

$$\hat{\tau}_j D_T A_T D_T v_k = T^{-2\alpha} D_T B_T D_T \hat{v}_j, \quad \hat{\tau}_1 \geq \hat{\tau}_2 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\tau}_K.$$

Then we know that $T^{2\alpha} \hat{v}_j = \hat{\tau}_j^{-1}$. Then we know from (A.15) and (A.20) that $\hat{\tau}_j \xrightarrow{p} 0$ if $j > q_d$ while $(\hat{\tau}_1, \dots, \hat{\tau}_{q_d})$ converge to the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_d^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha}$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha} = \int_0^1 \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) \otimes \Omega \tilde{W}_{d+\alpha}(s) ds \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_d = \int_0^1 \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) \otimes \Omega \bar{W}_d(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

From these results, we find that $T^{2\alpha}(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_{q_d})$ converge in distribution to the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha}^{-1} \mathcal{A}_d$; moreover, we know from the properties of the eigenvalues that these eigenvalues are distributionally equivalent to those of (4.7) (see also Remark 5 of Nielsen et al., 2022). \square

Proof of Corollary 4.2. The desired result immediately follows from Proposition 4.2. The details are omitted. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.3. In our proof of Proposition 4.2, we showed that the first q_d eigenvalues, multiplied by $T^{2\alpha}$, converge to the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_d^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha}$ (see (A.21)). From this result and the fact that the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_d^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha}$ are almost surely distinct from each other, we may deduce that the corresponding eigenvectors converge to those of $\mathcal{A}_d^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{d+\alpha}$ (Lemma 4.3 of Bosq, 2000). This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.3. We first note that $I - \bar{P} \xrightarrow{p} I - P$ and, from the asymptotic result given in Proposition 2(i) of Li et al. (2021) (see also Proposition 2 of Li et al., 2020), we know that $h^{-2(d-b)}(I - P)\hat{\Lambda}(I - P) \xrightarrow{p} \Lambda$ of rank q_{d-b} , whose eigenvectors span $\text{ran } Q$. Combining all these results, we observe that

$$h^{-2(d-b)}(I - \bar{P})\hat{\Lambda}(I - \bar{P}) \xrightarrow{p} \Lambda$$

and thus find that $(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$ and the associated eigenvectors $(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_{q_{d-b}})$ satisfy the following:

$$h^{-2(d-b)} \hat{\mu}_j \xrightarrow{p} j\text{-th largest eigenvalue of } \Lambda \text{ if } j \leq q_{d-b}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$\hat{Q}_0 := \sum_{j=1}^{q_{d-b}} \hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j \xrightarrow{p} Q(I - P). \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We next note that $(\hat{v}_{q_{d-b}+1}, \dots, \hat{v}_K)$ are the eigenvectors of $(I - \hat{Q}_0)(I - \bar{P})\hat{\Lambda}(I - \bar{P})(I - \hat{Q}_0)$ and

$$(I - Q)(I - P)\hat{\Lambda}(I - P)(I - Q) = \sum_{s=-T+1}^{T-1} \left(1 - \frac{|s|}{h}\right) (I - Q)(I - P)\hat{\Gamma}_s(I - P)(I - Q) \xrightarrow{p} \Lambda_0,$$

where the convergence in probability follows from Theorem 4.2 of [Hörmann and Kokoszka \(2010\)](#) and that $(I - Q)(I - P)\hat{\Lambda}(I - P)(I - Q)$ is the sample long-run covariance operator of the SRD component. Combining this result with (A.23) and the fact that $I - \bar{P} \xrightarrow{p} I - P$, we find that

$$(I - \hat{Q}_0)(I - \bar{P})\hat{\Lambda}(I - \bar{P})(I - \hat{Q}_0) \xrightarrow{p} \Lambda_0.$$

This implies that $(\hat{\mu}_{q_{d-b}+1}, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K)$ converge to the eigenvalues of Λ_0 (see Lemma 4.2 of [Bosq, 2000](#)). Combining this with (A.22), the desired results are obtained. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.4. The desired result immediately follows from Proposition 4.3. The details are omitted. \square

B Local Whittle estimation

We employ the following assumptions associated with time series satisfying Assumption 1 and for an element $v \in \mathcal{H}$.

Assumption LW. ψ_j and the spectral density $f_v(\lambda)$ of the time series $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ for $v \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy the following:

- (i) $\psi_j = \phi_j A$ for $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(v \in \mathcal{H}_S) = 0$.
- (iii) $f_v(\lambda)$ is differentiable in a neighborhood of zero, and $\frac{d}{d\lambda} \log f_v(\lambda) = O(\lambda^{-1})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$.

For convenience we let $\Delta_1^S, \Delta_2^S, \Delta_1^N$ and Δ_2^N be real numbers satisfying that

$$-1/2 < \Delta_1^S < \Delta_2^S < 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad -1/2 < \Delta_1^N < \Delta_2^N < \infty.$$

We will consider the local Whittle estimator that can be computed from the time series $Z_t^0, \Delta Z_t$ or \bar{Z}_t on the range of admissible values given by $[\Delta_1^S, \Delta_2^S]$ or $[\Delta_1^N, \Delta_2^N]$ depending on the context.

B.1 Inference on d

We first establish the following:

Proposition B.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and LW hold. Then the following holds as $1/m + m/T \rightarrow 0$.*

- (i) *For $d \in (1/2, 1)$ and $d \in [\Delta_1^N, \Delta_2^N]$, $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d$.*
- (ii) *For $d \in [1, 3/2)$ and $d \in [\Delta_1^N, \Delta_2^N]$, $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} 1$.*
- (iii) *For $d \in (1/2, 3/2)$ and $d - 1 \in [\Delta_1^S, \Delta_2^S]$, $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d - 1$.*

Proof. First, initialization ($Z_t \mapsto Z_t^0$) does not affect the periodogram. Since $\mathbb{P}(v \notin \mathcal{H}_S) = 0$ and $\text{rank } P \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j = q_d$, we find that the long-run variance of $\langle X_t, v \rangle$ is equal to $\langle v, P \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \right) C_\varepsilon \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \right)^* P v \rangle$, which is nonzero almost surely if Assumption LW(ii) is true. Moreover, under Assumption LW(i), we have $\langle X_t, v \rangle = \langle \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \varepsilon_{t-j}, v \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \langle \varepsilon_{t-j}, \psi_j^* v \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j u_{t-j}$, where $u_t = \langle \varepsilon_t, A^* v \rangle$ which is an i.i.d. sequence with mean zero and positive variance. Combining these results with Assumption LW(iii), one can verify that $\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle$ satisfies all the assumptions employed in Section 3 of Phillips and Shimotsu (2004). Then the desired results (i) and (ii) immediately follow from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 of Phillips and Shimotsu (2004). From similar arguments, we may also deduce (iii) from Theorem 3.1 of Shimotsu and Phillips (2006). \square

Of course, if the time series $\langle Z_t^0, v \rangle$ satisfies some additional conditions employed in Phillips and Shimotsu (2004, Section 4), we then may establish the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{d}_{LW}(Z_t^0, v)$ for $d \in (1/2, 1]$. However, as shown by Phillips and Shimotsu (2004), this asymptotic distribution depends on values of d . A more convenient result is given below:

Proposition B.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and LW hold with $f_v(\lambda) = G_v(1 + O(\lambda^\beta))$ (as $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$) for some $G_v \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta \in (0, 2]$, the power transfer function $\phi(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j e^{ij\lambda}$ is differentiable around the origin with $\sum_{j \geq M} \phi_j = O(1/\log^4(M+1))$ and $\sum_{k \geq M} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j \phi_{j+k} = O(1/\log^4(M+1))$ uniformly in $M = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, assume that*

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\lambda} \phi(\lambda) \right| = O(\lambda^{-1}) \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow 0+.$$

Then, for $d \in (1/2, 3/2)$ and $d - 1 \in [\Delta_1^S, \Delta_2^S]$, we have

$$m^{1/2}(\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \Delta Z_t, v \rangle) - (d - 1)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1/4).$$

as $1/m + m^{1+2\beta}(\log m)^2/T^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We note that $\langle X_t, v \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j u_{t-j}$, where $u_t = \langle \varepsilon_t, A v \rangle$ is an i.i.d. sequence. We thus have $\sum_{j \geq M} \mathbb{E}[\langle X_t, v \rangle \langle X_{t+k}, v \rangle] = O(1/\log^4(M+1))$. Then one can easily verify that all the

assumptions employed in Shimotsu and Phillips (2006, Section 4) are satisfied, and then we may deduce the desired result from their Theorem 4.1. \square

B.2 Inference on $d - b$

We then provide our estimation results for $d - b$. In this section, the following preliminary result will be used: if Assumption 1 holds and the first K largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ are distinct, then $\tilde{v} = \sum_{j=q_d+1}^{q_d+K} a_j \hat{v}_j$ with $a_{q_d+1} \neq 0$ (where \hat{v}_j is defined in Section 4.3.2) satisfies that

$$\|\tilde{v} - \text{sgn}(\langle \tilde{v}, v \rangle) v\| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for some fixed element v with $(I - P)v \neq 0$. In this section, the asymptotic results given by Proposition 1 and Theorem 1 in Li et al. (2021) are crucial inputs. In this regard, the following is worth to be mentioned: even if Li et al. (2021) assume that $\psi_j = \phi_j I$, unlike in the present paper, their results can be extended to the case where Assumption LW(i) is satisfied with only a slight modification.

Proposition B.3. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and the first K largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ are distinct. Moreover, we suppose that Assumption LW holds for v satisfying (B.1) and $d - b \in [\Delta_1^S, \Delta_2^S]$. Then, as $1/m + m/T \rightarrow 0$,*

$$\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d - b, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\tilde{v} = \sum_{j=q_d+1}^{q_d+K} a_j \hat{v}_j$ and $a_{q_d+1} \neq 0$.

Proof of Proposition B.3. If the first K largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ are distinct, we know from Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 of Bosq (2000) that \hat{v}_{q_d+j} converges to the eigenvector v_{q_d+j} corresponding to the j -th largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[(I - P)Y_t \otimes (I - P)Y_t]$ in the following sense:

$$\|\hat{v}_{q_d+j} - \text{sgn}(\langle \hat{v}_{q_d+j}, v_{q_d+j} \rangle) v_{q_d+j}\| \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, \min\{q_d - b, K\}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

As may be deduced from the fact that the periodogram is not affected by demeaning and the proof of Theorem 1 in Li et al. (2021), replacing the periodogram associated with $\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle$ with that of $\langle \bar{Z}_t, v \rangle$ causes only negligible changes if $\|\tilde{v} - \text{sgn}(\langle \tilde{v}, v \rangle) v\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$, and thus the difference between $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle)$ and $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, v \rangle)$ becomes negligible. Note that we may write $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}_1 + \tilde{v}_2$, where $\tilde{v}_1 = \sum_{j=q_d+1}^{q_d+q_d-b} a_j \hat{v}_j$ and $\tilde{v}_2 = \sum_{j=q_d+q_d-b+1}^K a_j \hat{v}_j$. (B.3) implies that, for $k = 1$ and 2 , $\|\tilde{v}_k - \text{sgn}(\langle \tilde{v}_k, \bar{v}_k \rangle) \bar{v}_k\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$, where $\bar{v}_1 = \sum_{j=q_d+1}^{q_d+q_d-b} a_j v_j$ and $\bar{v}_2 = \sum_{j=q_d+q_d-b+1}^K a_j v_j$. We thus find that $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ for $v = \bar{v}_1 + \bar{v}_2$ is not only stationary $I(d - b)$ but also satisfies all the requirements for Proposition 1(i) of Li et al. (2021) under Assumption LW. We thus conclude that $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, v \rangle) \xrightarrow{p} d$, which completes the proof given that the distance between $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle)$ and $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, v \rangle)$ is negligible. \square

Note that (4.16) is a special case of (B.2) when $K = 1$. Moreover, note that if we consider $\tilde{v}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{j=1}^J a_{j,\ell} \hat{v}_{q_d+j}$ and this converges to $\text{sgn}(\langle \tilde{v}^{(\ell)}, v^{(\ell)} \rangle) v^{(\ell)}$. If $v^{(\ell)}$ satisfies Assumption LW for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, then we may replace \tilde{v} with the alternative estimator given in (4.18).

If some additional conditions given by Assumption 2* in Li et al. (2021) hold, the following may also be deduced from the proof of Theorem 1 of Li et al. (2021):

$$m^{1/2}(\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle) - (d - b)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

A detailed proof of this result is omitted since it is, in fact, similar to that of Proposition B.3; under all of the aforementioned assumptions, one may show that (i) the time series $\langle Y_t, v \rangle$ becomes an $I(d - b)$ stationary linear process, (ii) $m^{1/2}(\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, v \rangle) - (d - b)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$ (Proposition 1 of Li et al., 2021) and (iii) replacing \tilde{v} with v only has a negligible impact (Theorem 1 and Remark 4 of Li et al., 2021). If $v^{(\ell)}$ satisfies that $\|\tilde{v}^{(\ell)} - \text{sgn}(\langle \tilde{v}^{(\ell)}, v^{(\ell)} \rangle) v^{(\ell)}\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ and all the other assumptions hold for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, we may also replace $\hat{d}_{LW}(\langle \bar{Z}_t, \tilde{v} \rangle)$ with (4.18).

C Additional simulation results

Size-power properties of the variance-ratio test

Table 8: Size and power of the variance-ratio test

	K	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Size	4	max-test	0.003	0.002	0.005	0.050
Power			0.627	0.827	0.903	0.996
Size		trace-test	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.050
Power			0.321	0.599	0.765	0.995
Size	5	max-test	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.050
Power			0.586	0.818	0.894	0.995
Size		trace-test	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.049
Power			0.259	0.568	0.745	0.995
Size	6	max-test	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.049
Power			0.548	0.806	0.889	0.995
Size		trace-test	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.049
Power			0.218	0.540	0.730	0.995

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The reported power is computed by testing $H_0 = q_d = 4$ under the simulation DGP. The tests are implemented based on $\Lambda_{s,\alpha}^0$ (max-test) and $\Lambda_{s,\alpha}^1$ (trace-test), respectively, with $\alpha = 0.5$, $K = 5$ and significance level $\eta = 0.05$.

Sensitivity analysis and coverage performance of the Local Whittle estimators

Table 9: Finite-sample performance of the Local Whittle estimators of d

$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.6} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.0376	-0.0231	-0.0155	-0.0027
	LRS-type	-0.1345	-0.0910	-0.0676	-0.0373
Variance	Proposed	0.0070	0.0047	0.0036	0.0021
	LRS-type	0.0225	0.0135	0.0096	0.0043
MSE	Proposed	0.0084	0.0053	0.0038	0.0021
	LRS-type	0.0406	0.0218	0.0142	0.0057
$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.7} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.0346	-0.0221	-0.0162	-0.0073
	LRS-type	-0.1106	-0.0708	-0.0502	-0.0246
Variance	Proposed	0.0063	0.0044	0.0034	0.0024
	LRS-type	0.0223	0.0139	0.0097	0.0042
MSE	Proposed	0.0075	0.0049	0.0037	0.0024
	LRS-type	0.0345	0.0189	0.0122	0.0048

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The estimates are computed as in Table 3.

Table 10: Finite-sample performance of the Local Whittle estimators of $d - b$

$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.6} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.1061	-0.0762	-0.0563	-0.0387
	LRS-type	-0.1590	-0.1211	-0.1002	-0.0774
Variance	Proposed	0.0158	0.0114	0.0086	0.0049
	LRS-type	0.0158	0.0133	0.0111	0.0067
MSE	Proposed	0.0271	0.0172	0.0118	0.0064
	LRS-type	0.0410	0.0279	0.0212	0.0126
$m = \lfloor 1 + T^{0.7} \rfloor$	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
Mean Bias	Proposed	-0.0564	-0.0292	-0.0194	-0.0090
	LRS-type	-0.1077	-0.0662	-0.0498	-0.0325
Variance	Proposed	0.0113	0.0069	0.0048	0.0025
	LRS-type	0.0149	0.0096	0.0068	0.0035
MSE	Proposed	0.0145	0.0077	0.0051	0.0026
	LRS-type	0.0264	0.0140	0.0093	0.0046

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The estimates are computed as in Table 4.

Table 11: Coverage performance of the pointwise confidence intervals of the memory parameter estimated by the local Whittle estimators with the 80% nominal level

Coverage probability differences						
m	Target	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.6} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.0735	0.0620	0.0315	0.0045
		LRS-type	0.3485	0.2860	0.2515	0.2010
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.2695	0.2220	0.1645	0.1205
		LRS-type	0.4310	0.3370	0.3135	0.2930
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.1065	0.0805	0.0690	0.0390
		LRS-type	0.3295	0.2710	0.2380	0.1875
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.2205	0.1575	0.1025	0.0605
		LRS-type	0.3760	0.2795	0.2405	0.2070
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.7} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.1520	0.1335	0.1295	0.1215
		LRS-type	0.3100	0.2770	0.2490	0.2135
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.1980	0.1350	0.0890	0.0445
		LRS-type	0.3490	0.2365	0.2015	0.1640
Interval scores						
m	Target	Method	$T = 200$	$T = 350$	$T = 500$	$T = 1000$
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.6} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.4298	0.3484	0.2910	0.2192
		LRS-type	1.1267	0.8191	0.6351	0.4035
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.6877	0.5215	0.4148	0.2952
		LRS-type	0.9711	0.7605	0.6413	0.4742
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.65} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.4143	0.3341	0.2830	0.2139
		LRS-type	1.0646	0.7691	0.5992	0.3697
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.5586	0.4001	0.3207	0.2234
		LRS-type	0.8496	0.5985	0.4842	0.3286
$\lfloor 1 + T^{0.7} \rfloor$	q_d	Proposed	0.4106	0.3500	0.2989	0.2387
		LRS-type	1.0490	0.7839	0.6210	0.3970
	q_{d-b}	Proposed	0.4815	0.3310	0.2638	0.1820
		LRS-type	0.7610	0.4998	0.3883	0.2579

Notes: Based on 2,000 Monte Carlo replications. The estimates are computed as in Table 5, and the reported number in each case is computed as the absolute value of the difference between the computed coverage rate and the nominal level 0.8. The interval score in each case is computed with the quantiles 0.1 and 0.9.

References

- Bathia, N., Yao, Q., and Ziegelmann, F. (2010). Identifying the finite dimensionality of curve time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3352–3386.
- Beare, B. K., Seo, J., and Seo, W.-K. (2017). Cointegrated linear processes in Hilbert space.

- Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 38(6):1010–1027.
- Beare, B. K. and Seo, W.-K. (2020). Representation of I(1) and I(2) autoregressive Hilbertian processes. *Econometric Theory*, 36(5):773–802.
- Beran, J., Näscher, J., Farquharson, F., Kustermann, M., Kabitz, H.-J., and Walterspacher, S. (2023). On seasonal functional modeling under strong dependence, with applications to mechanically ventilated breathing activity. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 222:38–65.
- Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear Processes in Function Spaces*. Springer-Verlag New York.
- Chang, Y., Kim, C. S., and Park, J. Y. (2016). Nonstationarity in time series of state densities. *Journal of Econometrics*, 192(1):152–167.
- Ferraty, F. and Vieu, P. (2006). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Springer, New York.
- Franchi, M. and Paruolo, P. (2020). Cointegration in functional autoregressive processes. *Econometric Theory*, 36(5):803–839.
- Gneiting, T. and Raftery, A. E. (2007). Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association: Review Article*, 102(477):359–378.
- Hörmann, S. and Kokoszka, P. (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(3):1845–1884.
- Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for Functional Data with Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Horváth, L., Kokoszka, P., and Rice, G. (2014). Testing stationarity of functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 179(1):66–82.
- Hyndman, R. J. and Ullah, M. S. (2007). Robust forecasting of mortality and fertility rates: A functional data approach. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(10):4942–4956.
- Johansen, S. and Nielsen, M. Ø. (2019). Nonstationary cointegration in the fractionally cointegrated VAR model. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 40(4):519–543.
- Klepsch, J. and Klüppelberg, C. (2017). An innovations algorithm for the prediction of functional linear processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 155:252–271.
- Laurini, M. P. (2014). Dynamic functional data analysis with non-parametric state space models. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 41(1):142–163.
- Li, D., Robinson, P. M., and Shang, H. L. (2020). Long-range dependent curve time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association: Theory and Methods*, 115(530):957–971.
- Li, D., Robinson, P. M., and Shang, H. L. (2021). Local Whittle estimation of long-range dependence for functional time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 42(5-6):685–695.
- Li, D., Robinson, P. M., and Shang, H. L. (2022). Nonstationary fractionally integrated functional time series. *Bernoulli*, in press.

- Lobato, I. N. (1997). Semiparametric estimation of seasonal long memory models: Theory and an application to the modeling of exchange rates. *Investigaciones Economicas*, XXI(2):273–295.
- Nielsen, M. Ø. (2010). Nonparametric cointegration analysis of fractional systems with unknown integration orders. *Journal of Econometrics*, 155(2):170–187.
- Nielsen, M. Ø., Seo, W.-K., and Seong, D. (2022). Inference on the dimension of the nonstationary subspace in functional time series. *Econometric Theory*, in press.
- Paparoditis, E. (2018). Sieve bootstrap for functional time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6B):3510–3538.
- Phillips, P. C. and Shimotsu, K. (2004). Local Whittle estimation in nonstationary and unit root cases. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(2):656–692.
- Robinson, P. M. (1995). Gaussian semiparametric estimation of long range dependence. *The Annals of statistics*, 23(5):1630–1661.
- Rubín, T. and Panaretos, V. M. (2020). Spectral simulation of functional time series. Technical report, arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.08458>.
- Seo, W.-K. (2022a). Cointegration and representation of cointegrated autoregressive processes in Banach spaces. *Econometric Theory*, in press.
- Seo, W.-K. (2022b). Fully modified functional principal component analysis for cointegrated functional time series. Technical report, arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.12781>.
- Seo, W.-K. and Beare, B. K. (2019). Cointegrated linear processes in Bayes Hilbert space. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 147:90–95.
- Shang, H. L. (2016). Mortality and life expectancy forecasting for a group of populations in developed countries: A multilevel functional data method. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 10(3):1639–1672.
- Shang, H. L. (2020). A comparison of Hurst exponent estimators in long-range dependent curve time series. *Journal of Time Series Econometrics*, 12(1):20190009.
- Shang, H. L. (2022a). Not all long-memory estimators are born equal: The case of nonstationary functional time series. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 50(1):357–380.
- Shang, H. L. (2022b). Sieve bootstrapping the memory parameter in long-range dependent stationary functional time series. *ASTA Advances in Statistical Analysis*, in press.
- Shang, H. L. and Hyndman, R. J. (2017). Grouped functional time series forecasting: An application to age-specific mortality rates. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(2):330–343.
- Shao, X. and Wu, W. B. (2007). Local Whittle estimation of fractional integration for nonlinear processes. *Econometric Theory*, 23(5):899–929.

- Shimotsu, K. and Phillips, P. C. (2006). Local Whittle estimation of fractional integration and some of its variants. *Journal of Econometrics*, 130(2):209–233.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer, New York.