

Algorithmic Subsampling under Multiway Clustering*

Harold D. Chiang[†] Jiatong Li[‡] Yuya Sasaki[§]

July 30, 2021

Abstract

This paper proposes a novel method of algorithmic subsampling (data sketching) for multiway cluster dependent data. We establish a new uniform weak law of large numbers and a new central limit theorem for the multiway algorithmic subsample means. Consequently, we discover an additional advantage of the algorithmic subsampling that it allows for robustness against potential degeneracy, and even non-Gaussian degeneracy, of the asymptotic distribution under multiway clustering. Simulation studies support this novel result, and demonstrate that inference with the algorithmic subsampling entails more accuracy than that without the algorithmic subsampling. Applying these basic asymptotic theories, we derive the consistency and the asymptotic normality for the multiway algorithmic subsampling generalized method of moments estimator and for the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator. We illustrate an application to scanner data.

Keywords: algorithmic subsampling, data sketching, multiway clustering, robustness against degeneracy, scanner data

JEL Codes: C2, C3, C55

*First arXiv version: February 28, 2021. We benefited from very useful comments by Sokbae (Simon) Lee. The usual disclaimer applies. We thank James M. Kilts Center, University of Chicago Booth School of Business for allowing us to use scanner data from the Dominick’s Finer Foods (DFF) retail chain. H. Chiang is supported by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison with funding from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.

[†]Harold D. Chiang: hdchiang@wisc.edu. Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison William H. Sewell Social Science Building, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

[‡]Jiatong Li: jiatong.li@vanderbilt.edu. Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B #351819, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville, TN 37235-1819, USA

[§]Yuya Sasaki: yuya.sasaki@vanderbilt.edu. Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B #35afiliated1819, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville, TN 37235-1819, USA

1 Introduction

In the era of big data, it is not uncommon that data sets are so large that researchers may not need to use the whole sample for statistical inference to draw informative conclusions. Furthermore, computational bottlenecks in time and/or memory may even prohibit econometric analyses with such large data sets. The recent econometrics literature (Ng, 2017; Lee and Ng, 2020a,b) suggests methods to deal with these circumstances that started to arise in today’s data rich environments. The *algorithmic subsampling* or *data sketching* explored by these authors paves the way for econometric and statistical analyses based on random subsampling of big data.

The existing study of the algorithmic subsampling focuses on i.i.d. cases, and it has been “silent about how to deal with data that are dependent over time or across space” (Lee and Ng, 2020a, Section 8). On the other hand, some of big data may exhibit cross-sectional statistical dependence, such as multiway clustering. For instance, common scanner data (leading examples of big data) are clustered in two ways by markets and products. Common demand shocks within a market may induce statistical dependence among different products within that market. Similarly, common supply shocks by a producer may induce statistical dependence among different markets within the product produced by that producer. “A natural stochastic framework for the regression model with multiway clustered data is that of separately exchangeable random variables.” (MacKinnon, Nielsen, and Webb, 2020b)

In this paper, we propose a novel method of algorithmic subsampling for separately exchangeable random variables, which we will refer to as the *multiway algorithmic subsampling*, and develop asymptotic statistical properties of this method. We first establish basic theories for the multiway algorithmic subsample means, namely their uniform weak law of large numbers and central limit theorem, which differ from the standard ones in a meaningful way. In particular, the form of the central limit theorem that is unique to our multiway algorithmic subsampling entails a practically useful property of robustness against potential degeneracy. Researchers do not know *ex ante* how the data in use are affected by the cluster sampling. In case that the cluster-specific shocks have no mean effect on the data, the standard multiway-cluster-robust asymptotic distribution *without* the algorithmic subsampling would suffer from degeneracy, which can lead to either a Gaussian limiting

distribution of a faster convergence rate or a non-Gaussian limiting distribution, and invalidates the statistical inference based on standard multiway cluster robust standard errors. On the other hand, we show that the multiway algorithmic subsampling allows for a non-degenerate asymptotic distribution regardless of whether the data are dependent or not. In other words, the algorithmic subsampling ensures a robustness against potential degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution, and therefore allows researchers to robustly enjoy valid statistical analyses without knowing whether data are dependent or not. This finding about an additional practically useful property of the algorithmic subsampling is novel in the literature to our knowledge.

Once these basic asymptotic statistical theories are established, we apply them to common econometric frameworks. Specifically, we propose a multiway algorithmic subsampling generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator, and derive asymptotic theories of it, including the consistency, asymptotic normality, and consistent variance estimation. This multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator also enjoys the aforementioned property of robustness against potential degeneracy. Likewise, we also propose a multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator, and derive similar asymptotic theories of it, including the consistency, asymptotic normality, and consistent variance estimation.

Relation to the Literature: This paper intersects with two branches of the literature, namely the algorithmic subsampling and multiway clustering. In econometrics, the algorithmic subsampling and its properties are first studied by Ng (2017) and Lee and Ng (2020a,b). This literature has focused on random (i.i.d.) sampling as emphasized earlier. Asymptotic statistical properties under multiway clustering have been investigated by Cameron, Gelbach, and Miller (2011), Thompson (2011), Cameron and Miller (2014), Davezies, D’Haultfoeuille, and Guyonvarch (2020), MacKinnon, Nielsen, and Webb (2020b), Chiang, Kato, and Sasaki (2020), Chiang, Kato, Ma, and Sasaki (2021), and Menzel (2021). This literature has not considered the algorithmic subsampling. To our knowledge, this paper is the first to study the properties of algorithmic subsampling under multiway clustering, and therefore, is the first to propose the aforementioned advantage of the algorithmic subsampling for robustness against potential degeneracy in the asymptotic distribution under multiway clustering. We take advantage of the methods and approaches of Janson (1984) to develop parts of our basic theoretical results. The method of algorithmic subsampling is also closely related to the general scheme of

resampling methods for clustered data, which has been studied for one or multiway clustering by MacKinnon and Webb (2017), MacKinnon and Webb (2018), Djogbenou, MacKinnon, and Nielsen (2019), Davezies, D’Haultfoeuille, and Guyonvarch (2020), MacKinnon, Nielsen, and Webb (2020b), Chiang, Kato, and Sasaki (2020), and Menzel (2021), to name but a few.

Organization: The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the multiway algorithmic subsampling and presents its asymptotic statistical theories. Sections 3 and 4 demonstrate applications to the GMM and M-estimation frameworks, respectively. Section 5 presents Monte Carlo simulation studies. Section 6 presents an empirical application to scanner data. Section 7 concludes. All mathematical proofs and details are collected in the appendix.

2 The Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling

Suppose that a researcher observes data $\{W_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$, where N and M are the sample sizes in the first and second cluster dimensions. For instance, N and M are the number of markets and the number of products, respectively, in scanner data. The data may be two-way clustered, in the sense that we allow for arbitrary statistical dependence of W_{ij} across $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ within each market i (due to a common demand shock) and also allow for arbitrary statistical dependence of W_{ij} across $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ within each product j (due to a common supply shock). A formal assumption of this sampling process will be stated as Assumption 1 ahead. Using such two-way cluster sampled data, we are interested in (uniformly) consistent estimation of and statistical inference about $E[f(W_{ij})]$ based on standard econometric techniques. Since scanner data are very big, however, computational bottlenecks in time and/or memory may limit or even prohibit implementation of standard econometric analysis. Ng (2017) and Lee and Ng (2020a,b) therefore suggest the algorithmic subsampling of big data to alleviate computational burdens.

Adapting the ideas of Ng (2017) and Lee and Ng (2020a,b) to our framework of two-way clustered data, we propose the following multiway algorithmic subsampling procedure. (We remark that the algorithmic subsampling is different from the subsampling as a resampling method.) Let p_{NM} denote the probability of subsample selection that may depend on the current sample size (N, M) .

Generate i.i.d Bernoulli(p_{NM}) random variables $\{Z_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$ independently from data, and let $\widehat{L} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij}$ denote the number of non-zero elements. Note that \widehat{L} follows Binomial(NM, p_{NM}), and thus $L \equiv E[\widehat{L}] = NMp_{NM}$ in particular. We let the binary random variable Z_{ij} indicate the event that the (i, j) -th observation is selected (or in the sketched data), and \widehat{L} is thus the size of the selected subsample. In fact, this formulation of the algorithmic subsampling is called the Bernoulli subsampling, and is one of the alternative approaches to subsampling proposed by Lee and Ng (2020a). We focus on this Bernoulli subsampling in this paper for simplicity as well as its desired property of the aforementioned robustness against degeneracy. That said, we remark that it is also feasible to use alternative subsampling methods (namely, the uniform subsampling with and without replacement) proposed by Lee and Ng (2020a).

We use $\widehat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ to estimate and make inference about $E[f(W_{ij})]$. To this end, we first develop the uniform weak law of large numbers and the central limit theorem under this setting of the multiway algorithmic subsampling in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. We then apply these basic theories in turn to establish the consistency and the asymptotic normality for the generalized method of moments and M-estimation in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Hereafter for conciseness of notations, p_{NM} will be abbreviated as p . We let $[k]$ denote the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $[k]^c = \mathbb{N} \setminus [k]$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We use the short-hand notation $\underline{C} = \min\{N, M\}$. Throughout the paper, the asymptotics is understood as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$, let $\|v\|$ denote the Euclidean norm of v .

2.1 The Uniform Weak Law of Large Numbers

We first formally state the assumption of two-way cluster sampling.

Assumption 1 (Sampling). (i) $(W_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ is an infinite sequence of separately exchangeable d -dimensional random vectors. That is, for any permutations π_1 and π_2 of \mathbb{N} , we have $(W_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2} \stackrel{d}{=} (W_{\pi_1(i)\pi_2(j)})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$. (ii) $(W_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ is dissociated. That is, for any $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $(W_{ij})_{i \in [c_1], j \in [c_2]}$ is independent of $(W_{ij})_{i \in [c_1]^c, j \in [c_2]^c}$.

Part (i) requires a form of the identical distribution condition in separate permutations of the i index

and the j index. Although we relax the independent sampling, we maintain a form of the identical distribution as such. Part (ii) requires that sets of observations are independent if they do not share the same i index or the same j index. However, any observations are sharing either the same i index or the same j index, then they are allowed to be arbitrarily dependent. For example, in the scanner data, two observations in the same market i may be dependent due to a common demand shock, and likewise two observations in the same product j may also be dependent due to a common supply shock.

For convenience of stating the next assumption, we introduce additional notations and definitions. Let (T, d) be pseudometric space¹. For $\varepsilon > 0$, an ε -net of T is a subset T_ε of T such that for every $t \in T$ there exists $t_\varepsilon \in T_\varepsilon$ with $d(t, t_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. We define the ε -covering number $N(T, d, \varepsilon)$ of T by

$$N(T, d, \varepsilon) = \inf\{\text{Card}(T_\varepsilon) : T_\varepsilon \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-net of } T\}.$$

For any probability measure Q on a measurable space (S, \mathcal{S}) and any $q \geq 1$, define $\|f\|_{Q,q} = \{\int |f|^q dQ\}^{1/q}$ and let $L^q(S) = \{f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|f\|_{Q,q} < \infty\}$. A function $G : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an envelope of a class of functions $\mathcal{G} \ni g, g : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |g(s)| \leq G(s)$ for all $s \in S$. With these notations and definitions, we state the following assumption regarding the function class where f resides.

Assumption 2 (Function Class). *The function class \mathcal{F} satisfies (i) $E[f(W_{ij})] = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. (ii) \mathcal{F} admits an envelope F satisfying $E[F(W_{ij})] < \infty$, with $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \|F\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, where Q is any finite discrete measure. (iii) \mathcal{F} is pointwise measurable².*

Part (i) is a location normalization (centering) and is therefore without loss of generality. Although this part will not be needed in the short run (Lemma 1), we state it here as this Assumption 2 collects requirements about the function space where f resides. Part (ii) is a regularity condition imposed to establish a uniform weak law of large numbers. Part (iii) is a technical requirement that is used to avoid measurability issues. At this moment, we are stating these high-level assumptions for the sake of generality, but we will provide the standard lower-level primitive conditions in the contexts of the

¹That is, $d(x, y) = 0$ does not imply $x = y$

²For its definition, see, e.g. Kato (2019, pp.5)

application to the generalized method of moments presented in Section 3 and the application to the M-estimation presented in Section 4.

Under these assumptions, we can establish the uniform weak law of large numbers for multiway algorithmic subsample means as formally stated in the lemma below.

Lemma 1 (Uniform Weak Law of Large Numbers). *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and that \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 2 (ii)–(iii). Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{\bar{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) - E[f(W_{11})] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

This result is not very surprising, but we state above as Lemma 1 and prove it (in Appendix B.1) for the following two reasons. First, this is nonetheless the first time it is stated and proved in the literature to the best of our knowledge. Second, more importantly, this lemma serves as a useful auxiliary device for other results to be presented ahead that are practically more relevant.

2.2 The Central Limit Theorem

To establish the central limit theorem under the multiway algorithmic subsampling, we augment our assumptions with the following additional condition. Recall the short-hand notation $\underline{C} = \min\{N, M\}$.

Assumption 3. *There exist constants $\lambda_1 \geq 0$, $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, and $\Lambda \geq 0$ such that $\underline{C}/N \rightarrow \lambda_1$, $\underline{C}/M \rightarrow \lambda_2$, and $(\underline{C}/NM)((1 - p_{NM})/p_{NM}) \rightarrow \Lambda$.*

To facilitate the subsequent discussions, we introduce a notion of degenerate asymptotic distribution. For any scalar-valued sequence of random variables $(X_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ satisfying Assumption 1, we say the asymptotic distribution is degenerate if $\text{Var}\left(\left(\sqrt{\underline{C}}/NM\right) \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M X_{ij}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. The following theorem establishes the central limit theorem under the multiway algorithmic subsampling.

Theorem 1 (Central Limit Theorem). *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 (i), (iii) and 3 hold, and that the class $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$ is finite, independent of sample size, and admits an envelope F satisfying $E[F(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$. Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)^T$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{\underline{C}} \frac{1}{\bar{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Gamma),$$

where the variance is given by $\Gamma = \Gamma_A + \Lambda \cdot \Gamma_B$, $\Gamma_A = \lambda_1 E[f(W_{11})f^T(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E[f(W_{11})f^T(W_{21})]$ and $\Gamma_B = E[f(W_{11})f^T(W_{11})]$.

A proof is provided in Appendix B.2. This central limit theorem entails a novel and useful feature of the algorithmic subsampling for multiway clustered data in practice. Notably, the asymptotic variance Γ consists of a sum of two components, Γ_A and $\Lambda \cdot \Gamma_B$. This is in contrast with the algorithmic subsampling for independent data, where the asymptotic variance consists of only one term. The first part, Γ_A , in fact coincides with the asymptotic variance that we would get without algorithmic subsampling. Specifically, $\Gamma = \Gamma_A$ if $p = 1$. More generally, if p is a constant, as the sample sizes (N, M) increase, then $\Lambda = 0$ so that $\Gamma = \Gamma_A$. On the other hand, if p is chosen so that $\Lambda = \lim_{N, M \rightarrow \infty} (\underline{C}/NM)((1-p)/p) > 0$, then the second part, $\Lambda \cdot \Gamma_B$, is also present. Furthermore, Γ_B is nonzero whenever the distribution of $f(W_{ij})$ is non-degenerate, and this feature provides a practically useful property of the robustness in inference against possible events of no cross sectional dependence.

In practice, a researcher may not *ex ante* know whether data exhibit cross sectional dependence ($E[f(W_{11})f^T(W_{12})] \neq 0$ or $E[f(W_{11})f^T(W_{21})] \neq 0$) or not. In case where there is no cross sectional dependence, then $\Gamma_A = 0$ and the statistical inference based on the asymptotic normality *without* the algorithmic subsampling would suffer from the degeneracy problem. Because of the algorithmic subsampling, however, we can robustly safeguard against such degenerate asymptotic distributions without requiring a prior knowledge of the researcher about the presence/absence of cross sectional dependence in data. This result is novel in the literature, and also uncovers an additional useful property of the algorithmic subsampling in practice. Simulation studies presented in Section 5 support this practically relevant property of the multiway algorithmic subsampling.

We can apply these theoretical results to a number of common frameworks of econometric analysis. Two of the most frequently used classes of econometric methods are the generalized method of moments (GMM) and the M-estimation. Therefore, we will demonstrate applications of these basic theories of the uniform weak law of large numbers (Lemma 1) and the central limit theorem (Theorem 1) to establish the consistency and the asymptotic normality of the GMM and M-estimators under the

multiway algorithmic subsampling in Sections 3 and 4.

We conclude this section with a remark on alternative subsampling methods. As mentioned earlier, our method is based on the Bernoulli subsampling, and is one of the alternative approaches to subsampling proposed by Lee and Ng (2020a). Besides the Bernoulli subsampling on which we focus in this paper, they propose the uniform subsampling with replacement, the uniform subsampling without replacement, and the leverage score subsampling. Among these alternative methods, it is also feasible to use the uniform subsampling with replacement and the uniform subsampling without replacement. Similar asymptotic properties will follow through similar lines of the argument following Janson (1984) to those in the proof of Theorem 1.

3 Application to the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM)

In this section, we apply the basic methods and theories presented in Section 2 to the multiway algorithmic subsampling generalized method of moments (GMM). Suppose that an economic model implies moment restrictions $E[g(W_{ij}, \theta^0)] = 0$ for a true parameter vector $\theta^0 = (\theta_1^0, \dots, \theta_k^0)^T \in \Theta$, $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, where $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)^T$, and $m \geq k$. With a Bernoulli sample $\{Z_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$, the algorithmic subsample moment evaluated at $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)^T \in \Theta$ is given by $\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) = \hat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} g(W_{ij}, \theta)$. Let \hat{V} be a positive semi-definite random matrix. We define the multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator $\hat{\theta}$ as the solution to

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{Q}_{NM}(\theta),$$

where $\hat{Q}_{NM}(\theta) = -\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta)^T \hat{V} \hat{g}_{NM}(\theta)$. The true parameter vector $\theta^0 \in \Theta$ is assumed to uniquely solve the population problem $\max_{\theta \in \Theta} -E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]^T V E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]$, where V is positive semi-definite and $\hat{V} \xrightarrow{P} V$.

3.1 Consistency and Asymptotic Normality

To establish the consistency and asymptotic normality for the multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator $\hat{\theta}$, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4.

- (i) V is positive semi-definite, and $VE[g(W_{ij}, \theta)] = 0$ only if $\theta = \theta^0$.
- (ii) $\theta^0 \in \text{int}(\Theta)$, where Θ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^k .
- (iii) (a) $\theta \mapsto g_r(w, \theta)$ is Lipschitz with a universal Lipschitz constant across $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$ for all $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, i.e., $|g_r(w, \theta) - g_r(w, \theta')| \leq M \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for some constant M , which does not depend on w .
 (b) Each coordinate of $\theta \mapsto \nabla_{\theta} g_r(w, \theta)$ is Lipschitz with a universal Lipschitz constant across $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$ for all $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, i.e., $|\partial g_r(w, \theta) / \partial \theta_l - \partial g_r(w, \theta') / \partial \theta_l| \leq M' \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for each $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, for some constant M' , which does not depend on w .
- (iv) $E[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|g(W_{ij}, \theta)\|] < \infty$.
- (v) $G^T V G$ is nonsingular where $G = E[\nabla_{\theta} g(W_{ij}, \theta^0)]$.
- (vi) $E[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\nabla_{\theta} g(W_{ij}, \theta)\|] < \infty$.
- (vii) $g_{\text{sup}}(\cdot) = \max_{r \in \{1, \dots, m\}} |g_r(\cdot, \theta)|$ satisfies $E[g_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$.

Assumption 4 is analogous to and is a multiway counterpart of the conditions required for Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 3.4 in Newey and McFadden (1994), which concern about the consistency and asymptotic normality, respectively, of the GMM estimator under the conventional random sampling.

We first state the consistency of the multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator.

Lemma 2 (Consistency of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling GMM Estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 4 (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) hold, and that $\widehat{V} \xrightarrow{P} V$. Then, $\widehat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$.*

A proof is provided in Appendix D.1. It follows from combining the arguments in the proofs of Newey and McFadden (1994, Theorem 2.1) with our uniform weak law of large numbers for the multiway algorithmic subsampling (Lemma 1) presented in Section 2.1.

We next state the asymptotic normality of the multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Normality of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling GMM Estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3, and 4 hold, and that $\widehat{V} \xrightarrow{P} V$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{\underline{C}} \left(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^0 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, (G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G (G^T V G)^{-1} \right),$$

where $G = E [\nabla_{\theta} g (W_{11}, \theta^0)]$ and $\Omega = \Gamma_1 + \Lambda \cdot \Gamma_2$, with $\Gamma_1 = \lambda_1 E [g (W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T (W_{12}, \theta^0)] + \lambda_2 E [g (W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T (W_{21}, \theta^0)]$ and $\Gamma_2 = E [g (W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T (W_{11}, \theta^0)]$.

A proof is provided in Appendix D.2. It follows from combining the arguments in the proofs of Newey and McFadden (1994, Theorem 3.4) with our central limit theorem for the multiway algorithmic subsampling (Theorem 1) presented in Section 2.2.

3.2 Algorithmic Subsampling Variance Estimation

The components, G and Ω in Theorem 2, of the asymptotic variance of the multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM estimator can be estimated by

$$\tilde{G} = \frac{1}{\tilde{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta} g (W_{ij}, \hat{\theta})$$

and

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \tilde{\Gamma}_1 + \Lambda \cdot \tilde{\Gamma}_2,$$

respectively, where

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{C}{\tilde{L}^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} Z_{ij} Z_{ij'} g (W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) g^T (W_{ij'}, \hat{\theta}) + \frac{C}{\tilde{L}^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} Z_{i'j} g (W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) g^T (W_{i'j}, \hat{\theta})$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_2 = \frac{1}{\tilde{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} g (W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) g^T (W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}).$$

We propose to estimate the asymptotic variance $(G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G (G^T V G)^{-1}$ by the sample counterpart $(\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1} \tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{\Omega} \hat{V} \tilde{G} (\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1}$. To guarantee that this algorithmic subsampling variance estimator works asymptotically, we make the following assumption in addition.

Assumption 5.

- (i) $\theta \mapsto E [\nabla_{\theta} g (W_{ij}, \theta)]$ is continuous at θ^0 .
- (ii) $\theta \mapsto \lambda_1 E [g (W_{ij}, \theta) g^T (W_{ij}, \theta)] + \lambda_2 E [g (W_{ij}, \theta) g^T (W_{ij}, \theta)]$ is continuous at θ^0 .
- (iii) $\theta \mapsto E [g (W_{ij}, \theta) g^T (W_{ij}, \theta)]$ is continuous at θ^0 .

With this additional assumption, $(\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1} \tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{\Omega} \hat{V} \tilde{G} (\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1}$ is consistent for the asymptotic variance $(G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G (G^T V G)^{-1}$, as formally stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3 (Consistent Asymptotic Variance Estimation of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling GMM Estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3, 4 and 5 hold and that $\widehat{V} \xrightarrow{P} V$. Then,*

$$\left(\widetilde{G}^T \widehat{V} \widetilde{G}\right)^{-1} \widetilde{G}^T \widehat{V} \widetilde{\Omega} \widehat{V} \widetilde{G} \left(\widetilde{G}^T \widehat{V} \widetilde{G}\right)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} \left(G^T V G\right)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G \left(G^T V G\right)^{-1}.$$

A proof is provided in Appendix D.3. It follows by combining Lemma 1 and similar lines of arguments to those in the proofs of Lemma 2 and Theorem 2.

4 Application to the M-Estimation

In this section, we apply the basic methods and theories presented in Section 2 to the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimation. Let $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be a parameter space and define the class $\mathcal{Q} = \{q(\cdot, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ of functions $q(\cdot, \theta)$ indexed by θ . With a Bernoulli sample $\{Z_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$, we define the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator $\widehat{\theta}$ as the solution to

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} -\frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} q(W_{ij}, \theta).$$

The true parameter vector $\theta^0 = (\theta_1^0, \dots, \theta_k^0)^T \in \Theta$ is assumed to uniquely solve the population maximization problem $\max_{\theta \in \Theta} -E[q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$, in the sense that $E[q(W_{ij}, \theta^0)] < E[q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$ holds for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)^T \in \Theta$ and $\theta \neq \theta^0$. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, let $-\widehat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} q(W_{ij}, \theta)$ and $-E[q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$ be denoted by $\widehat{Q}_{NM}(\theta)$ and $Q_0(\theta)$, respectively, for conciseness.

4.1 Consistency and Asymptotic Normality

To establish the consistency and asymptotic normality for the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator $\widehat{\theta}$, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 6.

- (i) $\theta^0 \in \text{int}(\Theta)$, where Θ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^k .
- (ii) (a) $\theta \mapsto q(w, \theta)$ is Lipschitz with a universal Lipschitz constant across $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$, i.e., $|q(w, \theta) - q(w, \theta')| \leq M \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for some constant M , which does not depend on w .

(b) Each coordinate of $\theta \mapsto \nabla_{\theta} q(w, \theta)$ is Lipschitz with a universal Lipschitz constant across $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$, i.e., $|\partial q(w, \theta) / \partial \theta_r - \partial q(w, \theta') / \partial \theta_r| \leq M' \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for each $r \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, for some constant M' , which does not depend on w .

(c) Each coordinate of $\theta \mapsto \nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(w, \theta) = \partial^2 q(w, \theta) / \partial \theta \partial \theta^T$ is Lipschitz with a universal Lipschitz constant across $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$, i.e., $|\partial^2 q(w, \theta) / \partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l - \partial^2 q(w, \theta') / \partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l| \leq M'' \|\theta - \theta'\|$ for each $r, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, for some constant M'' , which does not depend on w .

(iii) $E[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta)] < \infty$.

(iv) $E[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{ij}, \theta)\|] < \infty$.

(v) $H = H(\theta^0)$ is nonsingular, where $H(\theta) = -E[\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$.

(vi) $\dot{q}_{\text{sup}}(\cdot) = \max_{r \in \{1, \dots, k\}} |\partial q(\cdot, \theta) / \partial \theta_r|$ satisfies $E[\dot{q}_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$.

Assumption 6 is analogous to and is a multiway counterpart of the conditions required for Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994), which concern about the consistency and asymptotic normality, respectively, of the M-estimator under the conventional random sampling.

We first state the consistency of the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator.

Lemma 3 (Consistency of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling M-estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 6 (i), (ii), (iii) hold, and that $E[q(W_{ij}, \theta^0)] < E[q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\theta \neq \theta^0$. Then, $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$.*

A proof is provided in Appendix E.1. It follows from combining the arguments in the proof of Newey and McFadden (1994, Theorem 2.1) with our uniform weak law of large numbers for the multiway algorithmic subsampling (Lemma 1) presented in Section 2.1.

We next state the asymptotic normality of the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator.

Theorem 4 (Asymptotic Normality of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling M-estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3 and 6 hold, then*

$$\sqrt{C} (\hat{\theta} - \theta^0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, H^{-1} \Sigma H^{-1}),$$

where $H = -E[\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{11}, \theta^0)]$, $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 + \Lambda \cdot \Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_1 = \lambda_1 E[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta^0)^T] + \lambda_2 E[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{21}, \theta^0)^T]$ and $\Sigma_2 = E[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0)^T]$.

A proof is provided in Appendix E.2. It follows from combining the arguments in the proof of Newey and McFadden (1994, Theorem 3.1) with our central limit theorem for the multiway algorithmic subsampling (Theorem 1) presented in Section 2.2.

4.2 Algorithmic Subsampling Variance Estimation

The components, H and Σ in Theorem 4, of the asymptotic variance of the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator can be estimated by

$$\tilde{H} = -\frac{1}{\tilde{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{ij}, \hat{\theta})$$

and $\tilde{\Sigma} = \tilde{\Sigma}_1 + \Lambda \cdot \tilde{\Sigma}_2$, respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}_1 &= \frac{C}{\tilde{L}^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} Z_{ij} Z_{ij'} \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij'}, \hat{\theta})^T \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\tilde{L}^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} Z_{i'j} \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{i'j}, \hat{\theta})^T \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_2 = \frac{1}{\tilde{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \hat{\theta}) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \hat{\theta})^T.$$

Thus, we propose to estimate $H^{-1}\Sigma H^{-1}$ by the sample counterpart $\tilde{H}^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\tilde{H}^{-1}$. To guarantee that this asymptotic variance estimator works, we use the following assumption in addition.

Assumption 7.

- (i) $\theta \mapsto E[\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$ is continuous at θ^0 .
- (ii) $\theta \mapsto \lambda_1 E[\nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta)^T] + \lambda_2 E[\nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta)^T]$ is continuous at θ^0 .
- (iii) $\theta \mapsto E[\nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta q}(W_{ij}, \theta)^T]$ is continuous at θ^0 .

With this additional assumption, $\tilde{H}^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\tilde{H}^{-1}$ is consistent for the asymptotic variance $H^{-1}\Sigma H^{-1}$, as formally stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 5 (Consistency of the Asymptotic Variance of the Multiway Algorithmic Subsampling M-estimator). *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3, 6 and 7 hold. Then, $\tilde{H}^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\tilde{H}^{-1}$ is consistent for $H^{-1}\Sigma H^{-1}$.*

A proof is provided in Appendix E.3. It follows by combining Lemma 1 and similar lines of arguments to those in the proofs of Lemma 3 and Theorem 4.

5 Simulation Studies

As emphasized in Section 2, we discovered a new advantage of the algorithmic subsampling that it allows for robustness in inference against potential degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution under multiway clustering. In this section, we use Monte Carlo simulations to demonstrate this robustness property. Following Menzel (2021), we consider two broad categories of designs, namely additively separable designs (Section 5.1) and nonseparable designs (Section 5.2). For each of these two broad categories, we experiment with a design that leads to a non-degenerate asymptotic distribution and another design that leads to a degenerate asymptotic distribution if the algorithmic subsampling were not to be employed. In total, we consider four designs. The multiway algorithmic subsampling will be shown to yield more accurate finite sample coverage results than conventional methods robustly across all the four cases, thereby supporting the aforementioned theoretical discovery by this paper.

5.1 Additively Separable Designs

First, we generate the two-way clustered array $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}$ according to the additively separable model

$$Y_{ij} = \sigma_a \alpha_i + \sigma_b \beta_j + \sigma_e \varepsilon_{ij},$$

where β_j and ε_{ij} are i.i.d. standard normal, and $\alpha_i = (\zeta_i - \mu_\zeta) / \sigma_\zeta$ for $\log(\zeta_i) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, 1)$, $\mu_\zeta = E[\zeta_i]$, and $\sigma_\zeta^2 = \text{Var}(\zeta_i)$. With this basic setup, we consider two designs:

$$\text{Design 1 : } \sigma_a^2 = 0.5, \sigma_b^2 = 0.1, \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 = 0.2; \quad \text{and}$$

$$\text{Design 2 : } \sigma_a^2 = 0.0, \sigma_b^2 = 0.0, \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 = 0.2.$$

Note that Design 2, without i -specific randomness or j -specific randomness, would lead to a degenerate asymptotic distribution if the algorithmic subsampling were not employed.

Table 1 reports simulation results for $N = M = 20, 40, 80$ and 160 . The top panel reports results for Design 1 (non-degenerate case), and the bottom panel reports results for Design 2 (degenerate case). Each panel contains results based on no algorithmic subsampling (i.e., $p = 1$) and results based on the algorithmic subsampling (with the subsampling probabilities of $p = 1/\underline{C}$ and $p = 2/\underline{C}$) for estimation of the mean. The asymptotic variance is estimated using the full sample. The displayed statistics are the bias (Bias), the standard deviation (SD), the root mean square error (RMSE), and the 95% coverage (95% Cover).

Observe that the 95% coverage frequencies are closer to the nominal probability of 95% with a use of the algorithmic subsampling than without a use of it. This observation is robustly true in both Design 1 (non-degenerate case) and Design 2 (degenerate case). For Design 2 or the degenerate case, in particular, the coverage frequency moves away from the nominal probability as the sample size increases if the algorithmic subsampling were not used. On the other hand, the coverage frequency approaches the nominal probability as the sample size increase if the algorithmic subsampling is used. These results demonstrate the aforementioned robustness property of the multiway algorithmic subsampling against potential degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution. We also experimented with additional simulation settings with much larger N and M and other subsampling probabilities for the algorithmic subsampling variance estimation, but we observe the same qualitative patterns in the results under these alternative settings.

5.2 Nonseparable Designs

Second, we generate the two-way clustered array $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}$ according to the non-additive model

$$Y_{ij} = (\alpha_i - \mu_a)(\beta_j - \mu_b) - \mu_a\mu_b + \varepsilon_{ij},$$

where α_i , β_j and ε_{ij} are i.i.d. standard normal. With this basic setup, we consider two designs:

Design 3 : $\mu_a = 1.0$, and $\mu_b = 1.0$; and

Design 4 : $\mu_a = 0.0$, and $\mu_b = 0.0$.

Note that Design 4 would lead to a degenerate asymptotic distribution that is a Gaussian chaos (which is non-Gaussian) if the algorithmic subsampling were not employed.

Design 1: Non-Degenerate Case

		No Algorithmic Subsampling				Algorithmic Subsampling							
		$(p = 1)$				$p = 1/\underline{C}$				$p = 2/\underline{C}$			
N	M	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%
20	20	0.006	0.179	0.179	0.905	-0.001	0.257	0.257	0.926	-0.004	0.225	0.225	0.937
40	40	-0.001	0.124	0.124	0.911	0.002	0.184	0.184	0.931	-0.005	0.156	0.156	0.932
80	80	-0.003	0.082	0.082	0.929	-0.002	0.128	0.128	0.933	-0.003	0.110	0.110	0.938
160	160	0.001	0.061	0.061	0.941	0.001	0.093	0.093	0.946	0.001	0.079	0.079	0.945

Design 2: Degenerate Case

		No Algorithmic Subsampling				Algorithmic Subsampling							
		$(p = 1)$				$p = 1/\underline{C}$				$p = 2/\underline{C}$			
N	M	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%
20	20	0.001	0.022	0.022	0.990	0.001	0.103	0.103	0.978	-0.002	0.071	0.071	0.990
40	40	0.000	0.011	0.011	0.991	0.000	0.070	0.070	0.970	0.000	0.050	0.050	0.977
80	80	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.997	0.001	0.050	0.050	0.958	0.000	0.036	0.036	0.967
160	160	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.996	0.001	0.036	0.036	0.954	0.000	0.025	0.025	0.954

Table 1: Simulation results for the additively separable design with $N = M = 20, 40, 80$ and 160 based on 2,500 Monte Carlo iterations. The top panel reports results for Design 1 (non-degenerate case), whereas the bottom panel reports results for Design 2 (degenerate case). Each panel contains results based on no algorithmic subsampling ($p = 1$), results based on the algorithmic subsampling with $p = 1/\underline{C}$, and results based on the algorithmic subsampling with $p = 2/\underline{C}$ for estimation of the mean. The displayed statistics are the bias (Bias), the standard deviation (SD), the root mean square error (RMSE), and the 95% coverage (95%).

Table 2 reports simulation results for $N = M = 20, 40, 80$ and 160 . The top panel reports results for Design 3 (non-degenerate case), and the bottom panel reports results for Design 4 (degenerate case). Each panel contains results based on no algorithmic subsampling (i.e., $p = 1$) and results based on the algorithmic subsampling (with the subsampling probabilities of $p = 1/\underline{C}$ and $p = 2/\underline{C}$) for

Design 3: Non-Degenerate Case

		No Algorithmic Subsampling				Algorithmic Subsampling							
		$(p = 1)$				$p = 1/\underline{C}$				$p = 2/\underline{C}$			
N	M	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%
20	20	-0.011	0.323	0.323	0.926	-0.013	0.545	0.545	0.967	-0.006	0.442	0.442	0.955
40	40	-0.004	0.230	0.230	0.932	0.002	0.397	0.397	0.957	-0.002	0.321	0.321	0.951
80	80	0.002	0.156	0.156	0.946	0.004	0.279	0.279	0.951	-0.003	0.222	0.222	0.950
160	160	-0.001	0.111	0.111	0.946	-0.003	0.192	0.192	0.954	-0.001	0.159	0.159	0.950

Design 4: Degenerate Case

		No Algorithmic Subsampling				Algorithmic Subsampling							
		$(p = 1)$				$p = 1/\underline{C}$				$p = 2/\underline{C}$			
N	M	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%
20	20	0.000	0.071	0.071	0.994	0.001	0.324	0.324	0.992	0.000	0.224	0.224	0.987
40	40	0.001	0.035	0.035	0.996	0.009	0.224	0.224	0.980	0.003	0.160	0.160	0.980
80	80	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.999	-0.001	0.160	0.160	0.962	0.000	0.111	0.111	0.966
160	160	0.000	0.009	0.009	1.000	0.000	0.113	0.113	0.961	0.000	0.079	0.079	0.957

Table 2: Simulation results for the nonseparable design with $N = M = 20, 40, 80$ and 160 based on 2,500 Monte Carlo iterations. The top panel reports results for Design 3 (non-degenerate case), whereas the bottom panel reports results for Design 4 (degenerate case). Each panel contains results based on no algorithmic subsampling ($p = 1$), results based on the algorithmic subsampling with $p = 1/\underline{C}$, and results based on the algorithmic subsampling with $p = 2/\underline{C}$ for estimation of the mean. The displayed statistics are the bias (Bias), the standard deviation (SD), the root mean square error (RMSE), and the 95% coverage (95%).

estimation of the mean. The asymptotic variance is estimated using the full sample. The displayed statistics are the bias (Bias), the standard deviation (SD), the root mean square error (RMSE), and the 95% coverage (95% Cover).

Similarly to the case with the additively separable design, observe that the 95% coverage frequencies

are closer to the nominal probability of 95% with a use of the algorithmic subsampling than without a use of it. This observation is robustly true in both Design 3 (non-degenerate case) and Design 4 (degenerate case). For Design 4 or the degenerate case, in particular, the coverage frequency moves away from the nominal probability as the sample size increases if the algorithmic subsampling were not used. On the other hand, the coverage frequency approaches the nominal probability as the sample size increase if the algorithmic subsampling is used. As before, these results demonstrate the aforementioned robustness property of the multiway algorithmic subsampling against potential degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution. We also experimented with additional simulation settings with much larger N and M and other subsampling probabilities for the algorithmic subsampling variance estimation, but we observe the same qualitative patterns in the results under these alternative settings.

6 Application to Scanner Data

In this section, we demonstrate an application of our proposed method to an analysis of demand for differentiated products using scanner data from the Dominick’s Finer Foods (DFF) retail chain.³ Scanner data may be subject to two-way cluster dependence, as mentioned in Section 1. Specifically, common demand shocks within a market may induce statistical dependence among different products within that market. Similarly, common supply shocks by a producer may induce statistical dependence among different markets within the product produced by that producer. In this light, a researcher would like to use a two-way cluster robust variance estimate for inference about the model parameters. However, the scanner data from the Dominick’s Finer Foods (DFF) retail chain are too large, and today’s computational resources will not permit the two-way cluster robust variance estimation in reasonable lengths of time – see our discussions ahead for concrete computational times. Hence, we use our proposed multiway algorithmic subsampling method for estimation and two-way cluster robust inference about the key demand model parameter.

³We thank James M. Kilts Center, University of Chicago Booth School of Business for allowing us to use this data set. It is available at <https://www.chicagobooth.edu/research/kilts/datasets/dominicks>.

Following the literature (for instance, see a survey by Nevo, 2000) on analysis of demand for differentiated products with an additive Type-I-Extreme-Value error, we use the GMM approach with the moment restriction

$$g(W_{ij}, \theta) = \zeta_{ij}(\ln(S_{ij}) - \ln(S_{0j}) - \ln(P_{ij})\theta_1 - X_{ij}^T\theta_{-1}), \quad (6.1)$$

where i indexes products (universal product code, hereafter referred to as UPC), j indexes markets (store \times week), S_{ij} denotes the share of product i in market j , P_{ij} denotes the price, X_{ij} denotes a vector of controls (the UPC fixed effects and a time trend), ζ_{ij} denotes instruments, and $W_{ij} = (S_{ij}, P_{ij}, X_{ij}^T, \zeta_{ij}^T)^T$. In addition to the elements in X_{ij} , the instrument vector includes ζ_{ij} as an excluded variable the wholesale costs, which are calculated by inverting the gross margin. We drop those observations for which $\ln(S_{ij}) - \ln(S_{0j})$ is not finite, as well as those observations with missing values. The parameter vector in the model consists of $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_{-1}^T)^T$, and we are in particular interested in the price coefficient θ_1 .

We consider four product categories: beer, oats, snacks, and canned tuna. Table 3 summarizes the sizes of the original data in terms of various dimensions. It first shows the number of UPCs, the number of weeks, and the number of stores for each product category. As we define a product as that identified by the UPC, the number of products N coincides with the number of UPCs. We define a market as the unique combination of the week and the store. Therefore, the number of markets M is close to, but is generally smaller than, the product of the number of weeks and the number of stores. It is smaller than the naïve product because of the unbalancedness in data. Finally, the bottom row shows the total number of observations, which is again smaller than the naïve product NM because of the unbalancedness in data.

We now apply our multiway algorithmic subsampling GMM with the moment function defined in (6.1) for each of the four product categories. Table 4 summarizes the estimation results. Along with the estimates and their standard errors for the price coefficient, the table also displays the probability p of algorithmic subsampling and computational time in seconds for each of parameter estimation and asymptotic variance estimation.

First, observe that the estimates of the price coefficient are negative, as expected, and are statisti-

	Beer	Oats	Snacks	Tuna
Number of UPCs	788	96	425	94
Number of Weeks	303	306	386	375
Number of Stores	89	93	94	93
Number of Products N	788	96	425	94
Number of Markets M	22,299	26,210	32,708	31,853
Number of Observations	3,990,672	1,333,465	5,427,491	1,048,575

Table 3: Data sizes of the four product categories: beer, oats, snacks, and canned tuna.

	Beer	Beer	Oats	Oats	Snacks	Snacks	Tuna	Tuna
$p = 1/\underline{C}$	0.001		0.010		0.002		0.011	
$p = 2/\underline{C}$		0.003		0.021		0.005		0.021
Price Coefficient [†]	-0.326** (0.134)	-0.401*** (0.096)	-1.294*** (0.082)	-1.232*** (0.078)	-0.966*** (0.195)	-1.140*** (0.128)	-0.973** (0.491)	-0.996** (0.432)
Computational Time [‡]								
Parameter Estimation	2.436	5.237	0.187	0.359	1.848	4.163	0.109	0.219
Variance Estimation	152	579	388	2,356	419	1650	152	879

Table 4: Results of the estimation of the price coefficient. [†] The standard errors are shown in parentheses under the estimates. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$. [‡] Computational time is expressed in seconds based on a single processor of Intel Xeon Processor E5-2687W V4.

cally significant at the level of 95% for each column despite the algorithmic subsampling and despite the two-way cluster robustness in the asymptotic variance. As emphasized in Sections 2 and 5, the algorithmic subsampling with $p \propto \underline{C}^{-1}$ allows these standard errors to have asymptotically accurate coverage robustly against potential degeneracy, unlike the conventional two-way cluster robust

standard errors without the algorithmic subsampling.

Second, the computational time for parameter estimation is within a few seconds for each column, given that the algorithmic subsampling extracts only the proportions, $p \approx 0.001\text{--}0.021$, of the original sample sizes. However, it is the asymptotic variance estimation that costs more computational time under multiway cluster dependence. Focusing on the beer product category, for instance, even the algorithmic subsampling that extracts only the $p = 1/\underline{C} \approx 0.001$ portion of the original sample size requires 152 seconds of computation for variance estimation. When the proportion doubles to $p = 2/\underline{C} \approx 0.003$, then the computational time nearly quadruples to 579 seconds. A naïve calculation implies that the use of the full sample without the algorithmic subsampling would require about $788^2 \times 152 = 94,383,488$ seconds, or equivalently, 3 years. In other words, not using the algorithmic subsampling for multiway cluster samples would have incurred not only the nonrobustness, but also tremendous computational costs.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel method of algorithmic subsampling for multiway cluster dependent data. We develop asymptotic statistical properties of this proposed method. Specifically, we develop a new uniform weak law of large numbers and a new central limit theorem for the multiway algorithmic subsample means. As a consequence of the new central limit theorem, we discover an additional advantage of the algorithmic subsampling that it allows for robustness against potential degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution under multiway clustering. Applying these basic asymptotic statistical theories, we derive the consistency and the asymptotic normality for the multiway algorithmic subsampling generalized method of moments estimator and for the multiway algorithmic subsampling M-estimator.

Finally, we shed some light on possible future directions. In this paper we consider non-nested multiway clustering (as in Cameron, Gelbach, and Miller, 2011). In practice, the researcher may be interested in applications with nested clustering in one or more cluster dimensions. Under the current framework, one could take the coarsest levels of clustering. Handling it in a more efficient way is

a useful topic but is out of the scope of this paper. In addition, in MacKinnon, Nielsen, and Webb (2020a), formal theory is developed for testing the correct level of (one-way) clustering. One could consider to generalize such test for multiway nested clustering, which is also left for future research.

Appendix

Throughout this appendix, for any two sequences (a_{NM}) , (b_{NM}) , denote $a_{NM} \lesssim b_{NM}$ for $a_{NM} \leq Cb_{NM}$ for some positive constant C independent of sample size.

A Choice of the Subsample Size

Theorem 1 provides a guidance on rates at which p should converge in order to guarantee the robustness against degeneracy under multiway cluster sampling. Specifically, $p = p_{MN}$ should be chosen so that $\Lambda = \lim_{N,M \rightarrow \infty} (\underline{C}/NM)((1-p)/p) > 0$ holds. To this goal, it is in particular sufficient to choose

$$p = \frac{c}{\underline{C}} \text{ for some } c > 0.$$

For our asymptotic properties with the robustness, any choice of a positive constant c works in theory. Simulation studies presented in Section 5 demonstrate that even the naïve choices, such as $c = 1$ and $c = 2$, result in excellent finite-sample performances across various alternative data generating designs.

That said, it is also useful as well to provide a data-driven method to choose c based on a well-defined criterion. In this section, we propose a method to this end following the idea of power analysis which is often employed to determine experimental sample size. Suppose that a researcher has in mind a maximum tolerable level V_{\max} of the approximate variance Γ/\underline{C} of $\widehat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ in the asymptotic normal approximation by Theorem 1.

First, choose a preliminary positive value of c^{pre} , set $p^{\text{pre}} = c^{\text{pre}}/\underline{C}$, generate i.i.d Bernoulli(p^{pre}) random variables $\{Z_{ij}^{\text{pre}} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$ independently from data, and set $\widehat{L}^{\text{pre}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij}^{\text{pre}}$. Then, estimate $\Gamma_A = \lambda_1 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{21})]$ and $\Gamma_B = E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{11})]$ by

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_A^{\text{pre}} = \frac{\underline{C}}{(\widehat{L}^{\text{pre}})^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} Z_{ij}^{\text{pre}} Z_{ij'}^{\text{pre}} f(W_{ij}) f(W_{ij'}) + \frac{\underline{C}}{(\widehat{L}^{\text{pre}})^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij}^{\text{pre}} Z_{i'j}^{\text{pre}} f(W_{ij}) f(W_{i'j})$$

and

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_B^{\text{pre}} = \frac{1}{\widehat{L}^{\text{pre}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij}^{\text{pre}} f(W_{ij}) f(W_{ij}),$$

respectively. Finally, solve

$$\underline{C} \cdot V_{\max} = \widehat{\Gamma}_A^{\text{pre}} + \frac{\underline{C}}{MN} \frac{\underline{C} - c}{c} \cdot \widehat{\Gamma}_B^{\text{pre}}$$

for c to find the value c^* of c . This plug-in procedure yields the subsample size rate $p = c^*/\underline{C}$ under which the approximate variance Γ/\underline{C} of $\widehat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ is close to the target level V_{\max} . Note the similarity of this procedure to the power analysis for sample size calculation, which is often employed by experimental researchers.

We remark that this proposed procedure of choosing the subsample size differs from that proposed by Lee and Ng (2020a, Section 7.2). This difference in the approaches taken is due to the different goals under different dependence structures. Lee and Ng (2020a) base their requirement for the subsample size on a condition that guarantees the subspace embedding (Lee and Ng, 2020a, Definition 1). On the other hand, we base our requirement for the subsample size on attaining the robustness against degeneracy under multiway cluster sampling.

B Proofs of the Main Results

B.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. By the definition of Z_{ij} , it can be written as $Z_{ij} = \mathbb{1}\{U_{ij} \leq p_{NM}\}$ for some i.i.d. $U_{ij} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ independent from the data. Define $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{(u, w) \mapsto f(w) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{NM} = \{(u, w) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{g}_{NM}^*} \mathbb{1}(u \leq p_{NM})/p_{NM}\}$. Note that Assumption 2 (ii)–(iii) for \mathcal{F} implies that the same conditions hold with $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$

in place of \mathcal{F} . Also, note that for each (N, M) , $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{NM}$ consists of a single function with itself as an envelope. Therefore, by Corollary 7 in Kato (2019), for $\tilde{g}_{NM} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{\tilde{g}_{NM} \cdot f : f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}\}$, we have that

$$\sup_Q N \left(\tilde{g}_{NM} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \sqrt{2}\epsilon \|\tilde{g}_{NM} F\|_{Q,2} \right) \leq \sup_Q N \left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|F\|_{Q,2} \right) \cdot 1 < \infty$$

uniformly over (N, M) for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. Note that $\tilde{g}_{NM} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ satisfies Assumption 2 (ii)–(iii). Under Assumptions 1 and 2 (ii)–(iii), therefore, we can apply Lemma 6 (Appendix C) to $\tilde{g}_{NM} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, and then apply the Markov inequality to get

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij}}{p_{NM}} f(W_{ij}) - \frac{1}{p_{NM}} E[Z_{11} f(W_{11})] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Since $E[Z_{11} f(W_{11})] = E[Z_{11}] E[f(W_{11})] = p_{NM} E[f(W_{11})]$, we in turn obtain

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) - E[f(W_{11})] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Finally, Lemma 5 (Appendix C) implies that $\hat{L}/L \xrightarrow{P} 1$, and thus

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{\hat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) - E[f(W_{11})] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

B.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Consider the decomposition of $\hat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ into two terms as

$$\frac{1}{\hat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) = \frac{L}{\hat{L}} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) = \frac{L}{\hat{L}} \left(A_{NM} + \sqrt{1 - p_{NM}} B_{NM} \right),$$

where A_{NM} and B_{NM} are defined by

$$A_{NM} = \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{NM} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} f(W_{ij}),$$

respectively.

The first step is to get the asymptotic normality for A_{NM} . Our setup satisfies the first part of Assumption 3 in Davezies, D'Haultfoeuille, and Guyonvarch (2018), since class \mathcal{F} is finite and

$E [F^2] < \infty$. Under our Assumptions 1, 2 (i), (iii), and 3, applying Theorem 3.1 of Davezies et al. (2018) yields

$$\sqrt{\underline{C}}A_{NM} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \lambda_1 E [f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E [f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{21})]). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Next, we will obtain the variance-covariance matrix of B_{NM} by applying the law of total covariance,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(B_{NM}, B_{NM}) &= E \left[\text{Cov} \left(B_{NM}, B_{NM} \middle| \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \text{Cov} \left(E [B_{NM} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}], E [B_{NM} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}] \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left[\text{Cov} \left(B_{NM}, B_{NM} \middle| \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]} \right) \right] \\ &= E \left[\frac{1}{L^2(1-p_{NM})} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) f^T(W_{ij}) \text{Var}(Z_{ij} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}) \right] \\ &= E \left[\frac{1}{L^2(1-p_{NM})} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) f^T(W_{ij}) p_{NM}(1-p_{NM}) \right] \\ &= \frac{p_{NM}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E [f(W_{ij}) f^T(W_{ij})] \\ &= \frac{1}{L} E [f(W_{ij}) f^T(W_{ij})]. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E [B_{NM} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}] &= \frac{1}{L\sqrt{1-p_{NM}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) E [(Z_{ij} - p_{NM}) | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}] \\ &= \frac{1}{L\sqrt{1-p_{NM}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) E [(Z_{ij} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}) - p_{NM}] \\ &= \frac{1}{L\sqrt{1-p_{NM}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) (p_{NM} - p_{NM}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Cov} \left(E [B_{NM} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}], E [B_{NM} | \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}] \right) = 0.$$

It thus follows that

$$\text{Cov}(B_{NM}, B_{NM}) = \frac{1}{L} E [f(W_{ij}) f^T(W_{ij})] = \frac{1}{L} E [f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{11})], \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the second equality holds by Assumption 1 (i).

Finally, we will show that A_{NM} and B_{NM} are independent and asymptotically Gaussian. We have already proved that $\sqrt{\underline{C}}A_{NM}$ is asymptotically Gaussian from (B.1). Pick any $q = (q_1, \dots, q_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Define

$$Y_{NM,L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{(Z_{ij} - p_{NM}) a_{ij}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{NM}^2 = \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M a_{ij}^2,$$

where $\{a_{ij}\}$ is a bounded sequence. Let V and W be independent random variables that follow the distributions $N(0, \lambda_1 E[f^T(W_{11}) qq^T f(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E[f^T(W_{11}) qq^T f(W_{21})])$ and $N(0, E[f^T(W_{11}) qq^T f(W_{11})])$, respectively. Let $\varphi_{\sqrt{\underline{C}}, L}(s, t)$ denote the characteristic function of $(\sqrt{\underline{C}}(NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M q^T f(W_{ij}), L^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M (Z_{ij} - p_{NM}) / (\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}) q^T f(W_{ij}))$ and let $\varphi(s, t) = \psi(s) e^{-t^2 \alpha^2 / 2}$ denote that of (V, W) , where $\alpha^2 = E[f^T(W_{11}) qq^T f(W_{11})]$. Applying Lemma 2 of Janson (1984) with $a_{ij} = q^T f(W_{ij})$, conditionally on $\{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]}$, we obtain

$$E \left(e^{itL^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} q^T f(W_{ij})} \middle| \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]} \right) - e^{-t^2 \alpha_{NM}^2 / 2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Meanwhile, $(NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f^T(W_{ij}) qq^T f(W_{ij}) \xrightarrow{P} E[f^T(W_{11}) qq^T f(W_{11})]$, and thus $\alpha_{NM}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \alpha^2$, so that the above conditional characteristic function converges to $e^{-t^2 \alpha^2 / 2}$. Therefore, for any real s and t ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_{\sqrt{\underline{C}}, L}(s, t) - \varphi(s, t) \\ &= E \left[e^{is\sqrt{\underline{C}}(NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M q^T f(W_{ij}) + itL^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} q^T f(W_{ij})} \right] - \psi(s) e^{-t^2 \alpha^2 / 2} \\ &= E \left[e^{is\sqrt{\underline{C}}(NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M q^T f(W_{ij})} \left(E \left[e^{itL^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} q^T f(W_{ij})} \middle| \{W_{ij}\}_{i \in [N], j \in [M]} \right] - e^{-t^2 \alpha^2 / 2} \right) \right] \\ &+ \left(E \left[e^{is\sqrt{\underline{C}}(NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M q^T f(W_{ij})} \right] - \psi(s) \right) e^{-t^2 \alpha^2 / 2} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain

$$\left(\sqrt{\underline{C}} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M q^T f(W_{ij}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} q^T f(W_{ij}) \right) \xrightarrow{d} (V, W).$$

Now, apply Cramér-Wold device to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sqrt{\underline{C}} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1 - p_{NM}}} f(W_{ij}) \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{d} (N(0, \lambda_1 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{21})]), N(0, E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{11})])). \end{aligned}$$

In case where f is unbounded, one can approximate f in L^2 using a bounded function f' following the argument in Theorem 1 of Janson (1984, pp. 499) under Lemma 5 and the condition $E[F^2] < \infty$ in the statement of the theorem. The result then follows by letting $f' \rightarrow f$. We have thus obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\underline{C}} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij}) &= \sqrt{\underline{C}} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) + \frac{\sqrt{\underline{C}}}{\sqrt{L}} \sqrt{1-p_{NM}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_{ij} - p_{NM}}{\sqrt{1-p_{NM}}} f(W_{ij}) \\ &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} N(0, \Gamma), \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_A + \Lambda \cdot \Gamma_B$, $\Gamma_A = \lambda_1 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{12})] + \lambda_2 E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{21})]$ and $\Gamma_B = E[f(W_{11}) f^T(W_{11})]$.

Finally, $\sqrt{\underline{C}} L^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ can be replaced by $\sqrt{\underline{C}} \widehat{L}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} f(W_{ij})$ by virtue of Lemma 5 (Appendix C). \square

C Useful Lemmas

In this appendix section, we state auxiliary lemmas that are used to prove our main results. Each of these results is either coming directly from the existing literature or is the existing result with minor modifications. For the latter case, we provide a proof.

Lemma 4. *Let Θ be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^k and let $\mathcal{F} = \{f(\cdot, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ be a class of real-valued functions indexed by θ such that $f(w, \cdot)$ is continuous for all $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$. Then, \mathcal{F} is a pointwise measurable class of functions.*

Proof. The proof is immediate and well-known. We provide the proof for completeness. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{f(\cdot, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta \cap \mathbb{Q}^k\}$, where \mathbb{Q} is the rationals. Therefore, by the denseness of \mathbb{Q}^k , for each $w \in \text{supp}(W_{ij})$, we can find $(\theta_m) \subset \Theta \cap \mathbb{Q}^k$, $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and then the continuity implies $f(w, \theta_m) \rightarrow f(w, \theta)$, which coincides with the definition of pointwise measurability. \square

The next lemma follows immediately from van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Lemma 2.2.9).

Lemma 5 (Bernstein's Inequality for Bernoulli r.v.'s). *For each $p \in (0, 1]$, it holds that*

$$P\left(|\widehat{L}/L - 1| > \sqrt{2t/L} + 2t/(3L)\right) \leq 2e^{-t},$$

for every $t > 0$.

Lemmas 6 and 7 below follow closely from Theorem 3.4(i) in Davezies et al. (2020) and Lemma D.12 in Davezies et al. (2018), respectively.

Lemma 6 (Glivenko-Cantelli for two-way clustered random variables). *Let (\mathcal{F}_{NM}) be a sequence of classes of functions that satisfies Assumption 2 (iii) and such that each \mathcal{F}_{NM} admits an envelope F_{NM} with $E[F_{NM}(W_{11})] \leq \overline{M} < \infty$, $\sup_Q \log N(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|F_{NM}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q , $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, then under Assumption 1, we have*

$$E \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{NM}} \left| \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) - E[f(W_{11})] \right| \right] = o(1).$$

Proof. The result is a minor modification of the proof of Theorem 3.4 (i) in Davezies et al. (2020) following Example 6.3 in Wellner (2005), in which the standard Glivenko-Cantelli theorem is modified for function classes changing with the sample size. Denote $\mathbb{P}_{NM} = (NM)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{X_{ij}}$, where δ_x is the Dirac measure at x . Following their symmetrization argument (which is nonasymptotic and independent of the function class) in the proof of Theorem 3.4 (i) in Davezies et al. (2020), for each $K > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, denote $\mathcal{F}_{NM,K} = \mathcal{F}_{NM} \mathbb{1}\{F_{NM} > K\}$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{NM}} \left| \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f(W_{ij}) - E[f(W_{11})] \right| \right] \\ & \lesssim E[F_{NM} \mathbb{1}\{F_{NM} > K\}] + E \left[\epsilon + \frac{K}{\sqrt{NM}} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}_{NM,K}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,1}, \epsilon})} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side is bounded by \overline{M} . To deal with the second term, by Jensen's inequality, it holds that $\|f - f'\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,1}} \leq \|f - f'\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,2}}$. Thus the smallest ϵ -net for $(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,2}})$ is an ϵ -net for $(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,1}})$. Thus we have $N(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,1}, \epsilon}) \leq N(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,2}, \epsilon})$. The condition $\sup_Q \log N(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|F_{NM}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ implies $N(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,2}, \epsilon}) < \infty$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Finally, observe that $E[\|F\|_{\mathbb{P}_{NM,1}}] = E[F_{NM}] < M$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 7 (Lemma D.11 in Davezies et al. (2018) for sequences). *Let (\mathcal{F}_{NM}) and (\mathcal{G}_{NM}) be two pointwise measurable classes of functions. Suppose that each \mathcal{F}_{NM} admits an envelope F_{NM} with*

$E \left[F_{NM} (W_{11})^2 \right] < \infty$ and

$$\int_0^1 \sup_Q \sqrt{\log N \left(\mathcal{F}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|F_{NM}\|_{Q,2} \right)} d\epsilon \leq \overline{M} < \infty,$$

where Q is taken over the set of all finite discrete measures and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. Similarly, (\mathcal{G}_{NM}) admits a sequence of envelop functions (G_{NM}) with $E \left[G_{NM} (W_{11})^2 \right] < \infty$ and

$$\int_0^1 \sup_Q \sqrt{\log N \left(\mathcal{G}_{NM}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|G_{NM}\|_{Q,2} \right)} d\epsilon \leq \overline{M} < \infty.$$

Then, under Assumptions 1 and 3,

$$\lim_{\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\sup_{\mathcal{F}_{NM} \times \mathcal{G}_{NM}} \left| \frac{\underline{C}}{(NM)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} f(W_{ij}) g(W_{ij'}) - \lambda_1 E[f(W_{11}) g(W_{12})] \right| \right] = 0.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same steps of the proof of Lemma D.11 of Davezie et al. (2018) with the modification of \mathcal{F}_{NM} , F_{NM} , \mathcal{G}_{NM} , and G_{NM} in place of \mathcal{F} , F , \mathcal{G} , and G , respectively. Notice that their symmetrization arguments and Lemma D.4 are non-asymptotic and thus are not affected by such modification. The detail is omitted. \square

D Proofs for the Application to the GMM

Define the class $\mathcal{G} = \{g_r(\cdot, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta \text{ and } r \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$ of functions indexed by r and θ and the class $\mathcal{G}' = \{\partial g_r(\cdot, \theta) / \partial \theta_l : \theta \in \Theta, r \in \{1, \dots, m\}, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$ of functions indexed by r , l and θ .

D.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. We verify the conditions of Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994), where the population criterion is $Q_0(\theta) = -E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]^T V E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]$. Their Condition 2.1 (i), $Q_0(\theta)$ is uniquely maximized at θ^0 , holds by Lemma 2.3 in Newey and McFadden (1994) under Assumption 4 (i). Condition 2.1 (ii) holds by Assumption 4 (ii). Condition 2.1 (iii) that Q_0 is continuous at θ follows from Assumption 4 (iii) (a). Under Assumption 4 (ii), (iii) (a), (iv), by Lemma 26 in Kato (2019), we know that the class $\mathcal{G}_r = \{g_r(\cdot, \theta), \theta \in \Theta\}$, for $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, has an envelope $|g_r(W_{ij}, \theta^0)| + DM < \infty$, where D is a diameter of a set containing Θ . Thus, for any finite discrete measure Q and

$\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, $N(\mathcal{G}_r, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) \leq (1 + 4DM/\epsilon)^k$. Since $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{r=1}^m \mathcal{G}_r$, we obtain $N(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) \leq m(1 + 4DM/\epsilon)^k < \infty$, which implies that the class \mathcal{G} satisfies Assumption 2 (ii). \mathcal{G} is a pointwise measurable class of functions since \mathcal{G}_r , for $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, is a pointwise measurable class of functions by Lemma 4 under Assumption 4 (ii), (iii) (a) and $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{r=1}^m \mathcal{G}_r$. Thus, with Assumption 1, by applying Lemma 1, we have $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. By the triangle and Cauchy-Schwartz inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{Q}_{NM}(\theta) - Q_0(\theta) \right| \\ & \leq \left| (\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)])^T \hat{V} (\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]^T (\hat{V} + \hat{V}^T) (\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]) \right| + \left| E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]^T (\hat{V} - V) E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)] \right| \\ & \leq \|\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]\|^2 \|\hat{V}\| + 2 \|E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]\| \|\hat{g}_{NM}(\theta) - E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]\| \|\hat{V}\| \\ & \quad + \|E[g(W_{ij}, \theta)]\|^2 \|\hat{V} - V\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \hat{Q}_{NM}(\theta) - Q_0(\theta) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ so that condition 2.1 (iv) is satisfied. Applying Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994), we therefore obtain $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$. \square

D.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Under Assumption 4 (ii), (iii) (a), the first-order condition requires that $2\hat{G}_{NM}(\hat{\theta})^T \hat{V} \hat{g}_{NM}(\hat{\theta}) = 0$ holds with probability approaching one, where $\hat{G}_{NM}(\theta) = \nabla_{\theta} \hat{g}_{NM}(\theta)$. Expanding $\hat{g}_{NM}(\hat{\theta})$ around θ^0 and multiplying by $\sqrt{\underline{C}}$, we have

$$\sqrt{\underline{C}}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^0) = - \left[\hat{G}_{NM}(\hat{\theta})^T \hat{V} \hat{G}_{NM}(\bar{\theta}) \right]^{-1} \hat{G}_{NM}(\hat{\theta})^T \hat{V} \sqrt{\underline{C}} \hat{g}_{NM}(\theta^0),$$

where $\bar{\theta}$ is the mean value implied by the mean value theorem for each coordinate. Under Assumption 4 (ii), (iii) (b), similar lines of argument to those in the proof of Lemma 2 yield $N(\mathcal{G}', \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. \mathcal{G}' is a pointwise measurable class of functions by Lemma 4 under Assumption 4 (ii), (iii) (b). With Assumptions 1 and 4 (vi), Lemma 1 thus yields

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{\hat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \frac{\partial g_r(W_{ij}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_l} - E \left[\frac{\partial g_r(W_{11}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_l} \right] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

for each r and l . Since there are only finite numbers of r and l , it follows that $\widehat{G}_{NM}(\widehat{\theta}) - G(\widehat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and $\widehat{G}_{NM}(\bar{\theta}) - G(\bar{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$, where $G(\theta) = E[\nabla_{\theta} g(W_{11}, \theta)]$. Also, since the conditions of Lemma 2 are satisfied, we have $\bar{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$ and $\widehat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$. We thus obtain $G(\widehat{\theta}) - G \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and $G(\bar{\theta}) - G \xrightarrow{P} 0$ by the continuous mapping theorem under Assumption 4 (iii) (b). Combining the above results yields $\widehat{G}_{NM}(\widehat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} G$ and $\widehat{G}_{NM}(\bar{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} G$. Therefore, $\left[\widehat{G}_{NM}(\widehat{\theta})^T \widehat{V} \widehat{G}_{NM}(\bar{\theta})\right]^{-1} \widehat{G}_{NM}(\widehat{\theta})^T \widehat{V} \xrightarrow{P} (G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V$ follows by an application of the continuous mapping theorem under Assumption 4 (v). Now, notice that finite function class $\{g_1(\cdot, \theta^0), \dots, g_m(\cdot, \theta^0)\}$ is pointwise measurable since \mathcal{G} is a pointwise measurable class of functions following Lemma 2 and $E[g(W_{ij}, \theta^0)] = 0$. With $E[g_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ under assumption 4 (vii), by applying Theorem 1 under Assumptions 1 and 3, we obtain $\sqrt{\underline{C}} \widehat{g}_{NM}(\theta^0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Omega)$, where $\Omega = \Gamma_1 + \Lambda \cdot \Gamma_2$, with $\Gamma_1 = \lambda_1 E[g(W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T(W_{12}, \theta^0)] + \lambda_2 E[g(W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T(W_{21}, \theta^0)]$ and $\Gamma_2 = E[g(W_{11}, \theta^0) g^T(W_{11}, \theta^0)]$. The Slutsky's theorem then implies

$$\sqrt{\underline{C}}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^0) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, (G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G (G^T V G)^{-1}\right),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

D.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. First, we want to establish $\widetilde{G} \xrightarrow{P} G$ via $\|\widetilde{G} - G\| \leq \|\widetilde{G} - G(\widehat{\theta})\| + \|G(\widehat{\theta}) - G\|$, where $G(\theta) = E[\nabla_{\theta} g(W_{11}, \theta)]$. Since the conditions of Lemma 2 are satisfied, it holds that $\widehat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$. Under Assumption 5 (i), we obtain $\|G(\widehat{\theta}) - G\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ by the continuous mapping theorem. Note that \mathcal{G}' is pointwise measurable and $N(\mathcal{G}', \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q , $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ by the proof of Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1 and 4 (vi), by applying Lemma 1, we thus obtain

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{\partial g_r(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij}}{\partial \theta_l} - E \left[\frac{\partial g_r(W_{11}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_l} \right] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

for each r and l . Since there are only finite numbers of l and r , we get

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta} g(W_{ij}, \theta) - E[\nabla_{\theta} g(W_{11}, \theta)] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

It then follows that $\widetilde{G} \xrightarrow{P} G(\widehat{\theta})$. Combining the above arguments, we establish $\widetilde{G} \xrightarrow{P} G$.

We will next verify $\tilde{\Gamma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_2$. Define a new class $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}} = \{(w, z) \mapsto z \cdot g_r(w, \theta), \theta \in \Theta, r \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$. For any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, we have $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|g_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$ by the proof of Lemma 2. By Corollary 7 in Kato (2019), therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_Q N(\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \sqrt{2}\epsilon \|g_{\text{sup}}^2\|_{Q,2}) \\ & \leq \sup_Q N(\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|g_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) \sup_Q N(\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|g_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}$ is defined as the pointwise product. Note that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}$ is a pointwise measurable class of functions since \mathcal{G}_{sub} is a pointwise measurable class of functions by the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2. This implies that with $E[g_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ and Assumption 1, by applying Lemma 6, we thus obtain

$$E \left[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T - E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11})^T \right] \right\| \right] = o(1).$$

As we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T &= \frac{L}{NM} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T \\ &= p \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11})^T \right] = E \left[Z_{11}^2 \right] E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{11}, \theta) \right] = p E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{11}, \theta) \right].$$

Therefore, by Markov's inequality, it follows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T - E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{11}, \theta) \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

In addition,

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} g(W_{ij}, \theta) g(W_{ij}, \theta) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T.$$

Thus, Lemma 5 yields $\tilde{\Gamma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_2(\hat{\theta})$, where $\Gamma_2(\theta) = E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{11}, \theta) \right]$. Meanwhile, $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$ and we have $\Gamma_2(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_2$ by Assumption 5 (iii). Therefore, $\tilde{\Gamma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_2$ follows.

Finally, we establish $\tilde{\Gamma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_1$. Note that \mathcal{G}_{sub} is a pointwise measurable class of functions and that $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{G}_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|g_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. With $E[g_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ and Assumptions 1, 3, Lemma 7 yields

$$\lim_{\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\underline{C}}{(NM)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T - E \left[\lambda_1 g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (g(W_{12}, \theta) Z_{12})^T \right] \right\| \right] = 0.$$

As we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\underline{C}}{(NM)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T \\ &= \frac{L^2}{(NM)^2} \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T \\ &= p^2 \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\lambda_1 g(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (g(W_{12}, \theta) Z_{12})^T \right] &= E[Z_{11} Z_{12}] E \left[\lambda_1 g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{12}, \theta) \right] \\ &= p^2 E \left[\lambda_1 g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{12}, \theta) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Markov inequality, it follows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T - \lambda_1 E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{12}, \theta) \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, a symmetric argument also shows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{i'j}, \theta) Z_{i'j})^T - \lambda_2 E \left[g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{21}, \theta) \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. Also note that

$$\frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} Z_{ij} Z_{ij'} g(W_{ij}, \theta) g^T(W_{ij'}, \theta) = \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T$$

and

$$\frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} Z_{i'j} g(W_{ij}, \theta) g^T(W_{i'j}, \theta) = \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M g(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (g(W_{i'j}, \theta) Z_{i'j})^T$$

hold. Therefore, Lemma 5 yields $\tilde{\Gamma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_1(\hat{\theta})$ where

$$\Gamma_1(\theta) = \lambda_1 E [g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{12}, \theta)] + \lambda_2 E [g(W_{11}, \theta) g^T(W_{21}, \theta)].$$

Meanwhile, since $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$, we get $\Gamma_1(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_1$ by Assumption 5 (ii). We thus obtain $\tilde{\Gamma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma_1$.

Combining the above results yields $\tilde{\Omega} \xrightarrow{P} \Omega$ by continuous mapping theorem. By another application of the continuous mapping theorem and the continuity of matrix inversion under Assumption 4 (v), we get $(\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} (G^T V G)^{-1}$. Therefore, $(\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1} \tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{\Omega} \hat{V} \tilde{G} (\tilde{G}^T \hat{V} \tilde{G})^{-1}$ is consistent for $(G^T V G)^{-1} G^T V \Omega V G (G^T V G)^{-1}$ by the continuous mapping theorem. \square

E Proofs for the Application to the M-Estimation

For convenience, define the class $\mathcal{Q}'' = \{\partial^2 q(\cdot, \theta) / \partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l : \theta \in \Theta \text{ and } r, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$ of functions indexed by θ , r , and l .

E.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. We verify the conditions of Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994). Since $E[q(W_{ij}, \theta^0)] < E[q(W_{ij}, \theta)]$ for $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\theta \neq \theta^0$, condition 2.1 (i) that $Q_0(\theta)$ is uniquely maximized at θ^0 holds. Condition 2.1 (ii) holds by Assumption 6 (i). Condition 2.1 (iii) that $Q_0(\theta)$ is continuous at θ follows from Assumption 6 (ii) (a). Under Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (a), (iii), by Lemma 26 in Kato (2019), the class \mathcal{Q} has an envelope $|q(W_{ij}, \theta^0)| + DM < \infty$, where D is the diameter of a set containing Θ . Thus, for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, $N(\mathcal{Q}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) \leq (1 + 4DM/\epsilon)^k$, which implies that the class \mathcal{Q} satisfies Assumption 2 (ii). \mathcal{Q} is a pointwise measurable class of functions by Lemma 4 under Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (a). Thus, with Assumption 1, by applying Lemma 1, we have $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\hat{Q}_{NM}(\theta) - Q_0(\theta)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, so that condition 2.1 (iv) is satisfied. Applying Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994), we obtain $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$. \square

E.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. We verify the conditions of Theorem 3.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994). Conditions 3.1 (i), (ii) and (v) follow from the Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (c), (v). Note that the finite function class

$\{\partial q(\cdot, \theta^0)/\partial \theta_1, \dots, \partial q(\cdot, \theta^0)/\partial \theta_k\}$ is pointwise measurable since \mathcal{Q}' is by Lemma 4 under Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (b). With $E[\dot{q}_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ under Assumption 6 (vi), by applying Theorem 1 under Assumptions 1 and 3, we obtain $\sqrt{\underline{C}}\nabla_{\theta}\widehat{Q}_{NM}(\theta^0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$, where $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 + \Lambda \cdot \Sigma_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1 &= \lambda_1 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta^0)^T \right] + \lambda_2 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{21}, \theta^0)^T \right], \\ \Sigma_2 &= E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta^0)^T \right].\end{aligned}$$

This implies that condition 3.1 (iii) is satisfied. Under Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (c), similar lines of argument to those in the proof of Lemma 3 yield $N(\mathcal{Q}'', \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. Note that \mathcal{Q}'' is a pointwise measurable class of functions by Lemma 4 under Assumptions 6 (i), (ii) (c). With Assumptions 1 and 6 (iv), Lemma 1 thus yields

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 q(W_{ij}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l} - E \left[\frac{\partial^2 q(W_{11}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l} \right] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

for each $r, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Since there are only finite numbers of r and l , we obtain $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\widehat{H}(\theta) - H(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, where $\widehat{H}(\theta) = \nabla_{\theta\theta^T} \widehat{Q}_{NM}(\theta)$. With Assumption 6 (ii) (c), condition 3.1 (iv) is satisfied. Applying Theorem 3.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994), we obtain $\sqrt{\underline{C}}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, H^{-1}\Sigma H^{-1})$. \square

E.3 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. First, we want to establish $\widetilde{H} \xrightarrow{P} H$ via $\|\widetilde{H} - H\| \leq \|\widetilde{H} - H(\widehat{\theta})\| + \|H(\widehat{\theta}) - H\|$, where $H(\theta) = -E[\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{11}, \theta)]$. Since the conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied, we have $\widehat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$. Under Assumption 7 (i), we thus obtain $\|H(\widehat{\theta}) - H\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ by the continuous mapping theorem. Note that \mathcal{Q}'' is pointwise measurable and $N(\mathcal{Q}'', \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon) < \infty$ for any finite discrete measure Q , $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ by the proof of Theorem 4. Under Assumptions 1 and 6 (iv), by applying Lemma 1, we obtain

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 q(W_{ij}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l} - E \left[\frac{\partial^2 q(W_{11}, \theta)}{\partial \theta_r \partial \theta_l} \right] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

for each $r, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Since there are only finite numbers of r and l , we get

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{\widehat{L}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{ij}, \theta) - E[\nabla_{\theta\theta^T} q(W_{11}, \theta)] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Thus, we obtain $\tilde{H} \xrightarrow{P} H(\hat{\theta})$. Combining the above result together yields $\tilde{H} \xrightarrow{P} H$. By the continuity of matrix inversion under Assumption 6 (v), it follows that $\tilde{H}^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} H^{-1}$.

Next, we will establish $\tilde{\Sigma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_2$. Define a new class $\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}} = \{(w, z) \mapsto z \cdot \partial q(w, \theta) / \partial \theta_r, \theta \in \Theta, r \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$. Under Assumption 6 (i), (ii) (b), similar lines of argument to those in the proof of Lemma 3 yield $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|q_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$, for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. By Corollary 7 in Kato (2019),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_Q N(\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \sqrt{2}\epsilon \|q_{\text{sup}}^2\|_{Q,2}) \\ & \leq \sup_Q N(\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|q_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) \sup_Q N(\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|q_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty \end{aligned}$$

holds for any finite discrete measure Q and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}$ is defined as the pointwise product. Note that $\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}$ is a pointwise measurable class of functions since $\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}$ is a pointwise measurable class of functions by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4. With Assumption 1 and $E[\dot{q}_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ under Assumption 6 (vi), by applying Lemma 6, we obtain

$$E \left[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T - E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta)^T \right] \right\| \right] = o(1).$$

Therefore, by Markov inequality, it follows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T - E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta)^T \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

In addition, we can write

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta)^T = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij})^T.$$

Thus, Lemma 5 yields $\tilde{\Sigma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_2(\hat{\theta})$, where $\Sigma_2(\theta) = E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta)^T \right]$. Meanwhile, $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$ and we have $\Sigma_2(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_2$ by Assumption 7 (iii). Therefore, we establish $\tilde{\Sigma}_2 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_2$.

Finally, we will establish $\tilde{\Sigma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_1$. Note that $\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}$ is a pointwise measurable class of functions and $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{Q}'_{\text{sub}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \epsilon \|q_{\text{sup}}\|_{Q,2}) < \infty$, for any finite discrete measure Q , $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. With Assumptions 1, 3 and $E[\dot{q}_{\text{sup}}(W_{ij})^2] < \infty$ under Assumption 6 (vi), Lemma 7 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{C}{(NM)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T - E \left[\lambda_1 \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta) Z_{12})^T \right] \right\| \right] \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

As we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\underline{C}}{(NM)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T \\
&= \frac{L^2}{(NM)^2} \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T \\
&= p^2 \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\lambda_1 \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) Z_{11} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta) Z_{12})^T \right] &= E [Z_{11} Z_{12}] E \left[\lambda_1 \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta)^T \right] \\
&= p^2 E \left[\lambda_1 \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta)^T \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Markov inequality, it follows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T - \lambda_1 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta)^T \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, a symmetric argument also shows that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{i'j}, \theta) Z_{i'j})^T - \lambda_2 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{21}, \theta)^T \right] \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

as $\underline{C} \rightarrow \infty$. Also, we can write

$$\frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} Z_{ij} Z_{ij'} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta)^T = \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq M} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij'}, \theta) Z_{ij'})^T$$

and

$$\frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M Z_{ij} Z_{i'j} \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{i'j}, \theta)^T = \frac{\underline{C}}{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, i' \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^M \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{ij}, \theta) Z_{ij} (\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{i'j}, \theta) Z_{i'j})^T.$$

Therefore, Lemma 5 yields $\tilde{\Sigma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_1(\hat{\theta})$, where

$$\Sigma_1(\theta) = \lambda_1 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{12}, \theta)^T \right] + \lambda_2 E \left[\nabla_{\theta} q(W_{11}, \theta) \nabla_{\theta} q(W_{21}, \theta)^T \right].$$

Meanwhile, since $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^0$, we get $\Sigma_1(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_1$ by Assumption 7 (ii). We thus obtain $\tilde{\Sigma}_1 \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_1$ and $\tilde{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma$ by continuous mapping theorem. Therefore, $\tilde{H}^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma} \tilde{H}^{-1}$ is consistent for $H^{-1} \Sigma H^{-1}$ by the continuous mapping theorem. \square

References

- CAMERON, A. C., J. B. GELBACH, AND D. L. MILLER (2011): “Robust inference with multiway clustering,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29, 238–249.
- CAMERON, A. C. AND D. L. MILLER (2014): “Robust inference for dyadic data,” *Unpublished manuscript, University of California-Davis*.
- CHIANG, H. D., K. KATO, Y. MA, AND Y. SASAKI (2021): “Multiway cluster robust double/debiased machine learning,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, *forthcoming*.
- CHIANG, H. D., K. KATO, AND Y. SASAKI (2020): “Inference for high-dimensional exchangeable arrays,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05150*.
- DAVEZIES, L., X. D’HAULTFOEUILLE, AND Y. GUYONVARCH (2018): “Asymptotic results under multiway clustering,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07925*.
- (2020): “Empirical process results for exchangeable arrays,” *Annals of Statistics*, *forthcoming*.
- DJOGBENOU, A. A., J. G. MACKINNON, AND M. Ø. NIELSEN (2019): “Asymptotic theory and wild bootstrap inference with clustered errors,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 212, 393–412.
- JANSON, S. (1984): “The asymptotic distributions of incomplete U-statistics,” *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 66, 495–505.
- KATO, K. (2019): “Lecture notes on empirical process theory,” Tech. rep.
- LEE, S. AND S. NG (2020a): “An econometric perspective on algorithmic subsampling,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 12, 45–80.
- (2020b): “Sketching for two-stage least squares estimation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07781*.
- MACKINNON, J. G., M. Ø. NIELSEN, AND M. WEBB (2020a): “Testing for the appropriate level of clustering in linear regression models,” *Working Paper*.

- MACKINNON, J. G., M. Ø. NIELSEN, AND M. D. WEBB (2020b): “Wild bootstrap and asymptotic inference with multiway clustering,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, *forthcoming*.
- MACKINNON, J. G. AND M. D. WEBB (2017): “Wild bootstrap inference for wildly different cluster sizes,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, *32*, 233–254.
- (2018): “The wild bootstrap for few (treated) clusters,” *Econometrics Journal*, *21*, 114–135.
- MENZEL, K. (2021): “Bootstrap with cluster-dependence in two or more dimensions,” *Econometrica*, *forthcoming*.
- NEVO, A. (2000): “A practitioner’s guide to estimation of random-coefficients logit models of demand,” *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, *9*, 513–548.
- NEWKEY, W. K. AND D. MCFADDEN (1994): *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume IV*, ed. Engle, Robert F and McFadden, Daniel L, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 2111–2245.
- NG, S. (2017): “Opportunities and challenges: Lessons from analyzing terabytes of scanner data,” Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- THOMPSON, S. B. (2011): “Simple formulas for standard errors that cluster by both firm and time,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, *99*, 1–10.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. AND J. A. WELLNER (1996): “Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes,” in *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, Springer.
- WELLNER, J. A. (2005): “Empirical processes: Theory and applications,” *Notes for a course given at Delft University of Technology*.