

Dynamic Factor Model for Functional Time Series: Identification, Estimation, and Prediction

Sven Otto*

Institute of Finance and Statistics, University of Bonn
and

Nazarii Salish

Department of Economics, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

January 10, 2022

Abstract

A functional dynamic factor model for time-dependent functional data is proposed. We decompose a functional time series into a predictive low-dimensional common component consisting of a finite number of factors and an infinite-dimensional idiosyncratic component that has no predictive power. The conditions under which all model parameters, including the number of factors, become identifiable are discussed. Our identification results lead to a simple-to-use two-stage estimation procedure based on functional principal components. As part of our estimation procedure, we solve the separation problem between the common and idiosyncratic functional components. In particular, we obtain a consistent information criterion that provides joint estimates of the number of factors and dynamic lags of the common component. Finally, we illustrate the applicability of our method in a simulation study and to the problem of modeling and predicting yield curves. In an out-of-sample experiment, we demonstrate that our model performs well compared to the widely used term structure Nelson-Siegel model for yield curves.

Keywords: functional data analysis, common components, information criterion, forecasting, yield curve modeling

*Corresponding author: Sven Otto, Institute of Finance and Statistics, University of Bonn, Adenauer-
allee 24, 53113 Bonn, Germany. Email: sven.otto@uni-bonn.de

1 Introduction

In recent decades, researchers have paid great attention to dynamic factor models, as they allow to model and forecast high-dimensional data in a parsimonious manner. The attractiveness of dynamic factor models lies in the decomposition of a multivariate time series into an idiosyncratic component and a low-dimensional dynamic component. The latter, in turn, provide a reliable signal about the time series dynamics without imposing overly restrictive modeling assumptions, which allows researchers to remain agnostic about the parametric structure of the process. The large and continuously growing factor literature branches out in different directions, providing a deep understanding of various modeling aspects. For instance, in exact dynamic factor models, the idiosyncratic vector is assumed to have mutually uncorrelated elements (see [Geweke 1977](#) and [Sargent and Sims 1977](#)). In contrast, in approximate dynamic factor models, this correlation structure is left unrestricted (see [Chamberlain and Rothschild 1983](#), [Stock and Watson 2002](#), [Bai and Ng 2002](#), and [Bai 2003](#)). Approximate dynamic factor models proved to be very useful for economic forecasting ([Eickmeier and Ziegler 2008](#)) or monetary policy analysis ([Bernanke et al. 2005](#)) and are also widely applied in psychology, epidemiology, environmental studies, and social sciences. For reviews on dynamic factor models, see [Bai and Ng \(2008\)](#), [Stock and Watson \(2012, 2016\)](#), and [Breitung and Choi \(2013\)](#).

While the prediction of high-dimensional data using dynamic factor models has been extensively studied, the research of factor models for functional (infinite-dimensional) data is not yet well advanced. The analysis of functional data (hereafter FDA) has emerged as a new field in statistics that allows addressing various problems where the underlying data structure can be represented as continuous curves or functions. Its application is especially useful when the complexity of the data does not allow the use of conventional multivariate methods (or finds it too restrictive). Examples of such data sets include economic data (e.g., government bond yields, income profiles), environmental data (e.g., pollution maps,

various maps of renewable energy sources), and financial data (e.g., spot prices, high-frequency data). Comprehensive reviews of the field of functional data analysis can be found in [Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#), [Horváth and Kokoszka \(2012\)](#), [Hsing and Eubank \(2015\)](#), and [Wang et al. \(2016\)](#). When it comes to predicting time-dependent functional data, commonly referred to as functional time series (FTS), the literature focuses mainly on the functional autoregressive model (see [Bosq 2000](#), [Besse et al. 2000](#), and [Kargin and Onatski 2008](#)). However, the functional autoregressive model is not easy to implement for practitioners and not applicable for a general forecasting purpose. Hence, both the complexity of available data sets and the restrictiveness of forecasting methods call for the development of new approaches capable of providing a simple framework while remaining sufficiently general. Factor models are a natural candidate for this task as they allow the extraction of a low-dimensional predictive component from infinite-dimensional FTS. This motivates the main objective of our paper: to provide a full study of the dynamic functional factor model (DFFM).

Although the idea of modeling an FTS by its low-dimensional dynamic component is appealing, only a small number of papers have addressed this topic so far. [Hays et al. \(2012\)](#) proposed a functional factor model with a discrete idiosyncratic component, [Kowal et al. \(2017\)](#) considered a Bayesian functional dynamic model, [Descary and Panaretos \(2019\)](#) addressed the problem of separate identification of a functional smooth and a rough component, and [Hörmann and Jammoul \(2021\)](#) showed that discretely observed functional data naturally follow some approximate factor model. Other prediction approaches related to factor analysis in the FDA literature focus on algorithms based on functional principal components (FPC) (see [Hyndman and Ullah 2007](#) and [Aue et al. 2015](#)). Our paper differs from the available literature in several important ways and makes three contributions.

First, in contrast to [Hays et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Kowal et al. \(2017\)](#), who considered an exact DFFM in which the discrete idiosyncratic elements are Gaussian and mutually independent,

we develop a model, where both the common component and the idiosyncratic component are random elements of a functional space, and the covariance kernel of the idiosyncratic component is left unrestricted. Therefore, our model goes beyond the exact DFFM (and beyond the restrictions of the approximate multivariate factor model) since the covariance kernel of our idiosyncratic component can have asymptotically non-negligible off-diagonal elements. More importantly, we assume that the number of factors is unknown (as opposed to [Hays et al. 2012](#) and [Kowal et al. 2017](#)), making our model applicable to a broader class of problems.

Second, we provide a complete identification study of the DFFM. We show that latent components of the model are identified through the principal components of the global covariance operator of the process of interest. Besides the orthogonality of the loading functions, our fundamental identification assumption is that the functional common component follows a time-dependent process while the functional idiosyncratic component is uncorrelated in the time domain. This allows to separately identify the functional common component from the functional idiosyncratic component. The common and idiosyncratic components may be weakly cross-correlated, which allows for certain forms of nonstationarities in our model.

Third, we develop a simple to use two-step estimation and prediction procedure. In the first step, the FPCs of the global covariance function are used to estimate latent components, and in the second, the number and dynamics of the factors are estimated jointly to provide the optimal forecast in the mean square error (MSE) sense. While results on the estimation of FPCs are available in the literature, the theory of the correct specification of the number of factors is absent. The factor selection problem for the DFFM is non-standard since, in addition to the number of factors, factors themselves and their dynamics have to be estimated. Furthermore, the selection problem is crucial to both the theoretical and empirical validity of factor models. To resolve this issue, we construct an

information criterion based on the prediction error. We assume that the common factors follow a stationary vector autoregressive (VAR) process with an unknown number of lags. The resulting information criterion provides jointly consistent estimates for the number of factors and lags under mild restrictions, as long as we introduce a suitable penalty term to avoid overselection. We provide a Monte Carlo simulation to understand the model's performance in finite samples.

The practical usefulness of our model is demonstrated with an application to yield curve modeling and prediction. We compare our results to the most established modeling framework in the literature, the dynamic Nelson Siegel model (DNS) (see [Diebold and Rudebusch 2013](#) for a review). Our main finding is that neither the loading functions should be pre-determined (as reported in [Lengwiler and Lenz 2010](#) and [Hays et al. 2012](#) as well) nor the number of factors should be fixed. We find that a four factor model describes dynamics of yield curves better as opposed to the one with three factors in the DNS framework. In particular, we show that the DFFM with a data-driven number of factors improves the forecasting performance of the conventional model with three fixed factors.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the DFFM and the model assumptions. Section 3 discusses in detail under which assumptions the model parameters are identified. The functional principal components estimator, the information criterion to jointly estimate the number of factors and lags, and the optimal curve predictor are presented in Section 4. Section 5 illustrates the finite sample performance of the estimators via Monte Carlo simulations. In Section 6, we apply the method to yield curves of U.S. Treasuries, and Section 7 concludes.

2 The dynamic functional factor model

We consider a time series of curves $Y_1(r), \dots, Y_T(r)$ on the domain $r \in [a, b]$, which is a closed subset of the real line. The general factor model for functional time series with K common dynamic factors is given as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t(r) &= \mu(r) + \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l(r) + \epsilon_t(r), \\ &= \mu(r) + \Psi'(r) F_t + \epsilon_r(r), \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad r \in [a, b], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mu(r)$ is an intercept function, $F_{l,t}$ denotes the l -th factor at time t , $\psi_l(r)$ is the corresponding l -th loading function, and $\epsilon_t(r)$ is an idiosyncratic error term. The number of factors K is fixed and unknown. While $\mu(r)$ and the vector of loading functions $\Psi(r) = (\psi_1(r), \dots, \psi_K(r))'$ are unobserved deterministic terms, the vector of factors $F_t = (F_{1,t}, \dots, F_{K,t})'$ is assumed to follow the VAR(p) process

$$F_t = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i F_{t-i} + \eta_t = A(L) F_{t-1} + \eta_t, \quad (2)$$

which stems the attribute ‘‘dynamic’’ in the name of the model. The lag polynomial $A(L)$ is defined as $A_1 + A_2 L + \dots + A_p L^{p-1}$ with the $K \times K$ coefficient matrices A_1, \dots, A_p , where L denotes the lag operator, and $\eta_t = (\eta_{1,t}, \dots, \eta_{K,t})'$ is the vector of factor innovations.

To motivate this model, consider the dynamic term-structure model by [Nelson and Siegel \(1987\)](#) and [Diebold and Li \(2006\)](#), which is one of the most commonly applied models in the context of yield curve forecasting. In this case, the curve $Y_t(r)$ is associated with the yield of some bond at time $t = 1, \dots, T$ and time to maturity $r \in [a, b]$. The underlying premise of the model is that the series $\{Y_t(r)\}$ is driven by three factors $\{F_{l,t}\}_{l=1}^3$ with known loading functions (usually referred to as the Nelson-Siegel loadings):

$$\psi_1(r) = 1, \quad \psi_2(r) = \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda r}}{\lambda r}, \quad \psi_3(r) = \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda r}}{\lambda r} - e^{-\lambda r}, \quad (3)$$

where λ is a fixed decay parameter. Although the economic theory motivates such a representation, there is evidence against assuming the number of factors and loading functions

to be known. For instance, [Lengwiler and Lenz \(2010\)](#) and [Hays et al. \(2012\)](#) argued that the Nelson-Siegel loadings are not optimal in some respect. This naturally motivates the development of a general dynamic factor model for functional time series, where the number and the shape of loading functions are assumed to be unknown.

The theory developed in this paper is not restricted to the yield curve prediction example. We assume a general setting that naturally arises from the prediction problem of functional data. The analysis of FTS under such settings is fundamentally different from conventional multivariate analysis of factor and time series models since functional data is, in general, infinite-dimensional. This inevitably requires complete identification of the model and the development of new estimation techniques, which we address in this paper.

The following notations are required to formalize the assumptions imposed in this paper. Let $H = L^2([a, b])$ be the space of functions $x : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\int_a^b x^2(r) dr < \infty$. Together with the inner product $\langle x, y \rangle = \int_a^b x(r)y(r) dr$ and the norm $\|x\| = \langle x, x \rangle^{1/2}$ the space H is a Hilbert space. Moreover, let L_H^p denote the space of H -valued random functions with $E[\|x\|^p] < \infty$. Any $x \in L_H^4$ possesses a covariance function $c_x(r, s) = Cov[x(r), x(s)]$, $r, s \in [a, b]$. The integral operator with kernel $c_x(r, s)$ is denoted as the covariance operator of x , which has the eigenequation $\int_a^b c_x(r, s)v(s) ds = \xi v(r)$, $r \in [a, b]$, where ξ is an eigenvalue and v a corresponding eigenfunction of the covariance operator. To differentiate between the norms used in this paper, the notation $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes both the Euclidean vector norm and the corresponding compatible Euclidean matrix norm and $\|\cdot\|_S$ denotes the operator norm of the Hilbert-Schmidt space of operators from H to H .

Assumption 1 (Common Component).

- (a) *The loading functions $\{\psi_k\}_{k=1}^K$ form an orthonormal system, that is, $\langle \psi_k, \psi_l \rangle = 0$ and $\|\psi_l\| = 1$, for all $k, l = 1, \dots, K$ with $k \neq l$;*
- (b) *The factors satisfy $E[F_t] = 0$, $E[F_t F_t'] = diag(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K)$, where $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_K > 0$,*

and $E[\|F_t\|_2^4] < \infty$;

(c) $E[F_{K,t}F_{l,t-i}] \neq 0$ for some $l = 1, \dots, K$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$;

(d) All roots of $\det(I - zA(z))$ lie outside the unit circle;

(e) $\{\eta_t\}$ is a multivariate martingale difference sequence with the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\{\eta_s, s \leq t\})$. Further, $E[\eta_t \eta_t' | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \Sigma_\eta$, $E\|\eta_t\|_2^\kappa < \infty$ for some $\kappa > 4$, and

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{T} \left| \sum_{t, s=1}^T \text{Cov}[\eta_{k_1, t-i_1} \eta_{k_2, t-i_2}, \eta_{k_3, s-i_3} \eta_{k_4, s-i_4}] \right| < \infty,$$

for all $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, where $\eta_{k,t}$ denotes the k -th element of the vector η_t .

Assumptions 1(a) and (b) are the functional counterparts of the restrictions considered in the approximate factor models of [Stock and Watson \(2002\)](#) and [Bai \(2003\)](#). Assumption 1(c) ensures that F_t is time-dependent, which differentiates the common component from the idiosyncratic component in its dynamic structure. This condition plays a crucial role in separating the common and idiosyncratic components and hence in identifying the number of factors K . Assumptions 1(d) and (e) imply that F_t is a stationary and causal VAR process that can be consistently estimated. Note that Assumptions 1(a)-(c) postulate general conditions under which the model is identified, whereas Assumptions 1(d) and (e) are used to construct an estimation framework for model (1). In principle, Assumption 1(d) and (e) could be replaced by any other (stationary) time series model for the factors, which we do not pursue in this paper.

Assumption 2 (Idiosyncratic Component). For any $r, s \in [a, b]$, $l = 1, \dots, K$, and t , the following conditions hold true:

(a) $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is a H -martingale difference sequence, that is, $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is adapted to the natural filtration $\mathcal{A}_t = \sigma(\epsilon_s, s \leq t)$ with $E[\epsilon_t(r) | \mathcal{A}_{t-1}] = 0$, $E[\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s) | \mathcal{A}_{t-1}] = \delta(r, s)$, and $\sup_{r, s \in [a, b]} |\delta(r, s)| < \infty$. Furthermore, the eigenvalues $\{\zeta_l\}$ of the integral operator with kernel $\delta(r, s)$ satisfy $\zeta_l > \zeta_{l+1}$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and $E\|\epsilon_t\|^\kappa < \infty$ for some $\kappa > 4$;

$$(b) \ E[\epsilon_t(r)\langle\epsilon_t, \psi_l\rangle] = 0;$$

$$(c) \ E[\langle\epsilon_t, x\rangle^2] < \lambda_K\|x\| \text{ for all } x \in H;$$

(d) *The common and the idiosyncratic component are weakly dependent, where*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{r \in [a, b]} \sup_{s \in \mathbb{N}} E \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \epsilon_{t-s}(r) \right\|_2^2 < \infty.$$

While it is common in functional time series analysis to assume H (strong) white noise for the error term (see [Bosq 2000](#)), we consider an H -martingale difference sequence, which is more in line with the factor literature. Assumption 2(a) rules out the presence of serial correlation in the idiosyncratic component. However, it allows for a weak form of time dependence as it implies that $\mathbb{E} \int_a^b \int_a^b [T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s) - \delta(r, s))]^2 dr ds = O(1)$. Further, Assumption 2(a) allows for a non-degenerated covariance kernel $\delta(r, s)$ of the idiosyncratic error as opposed to the approximate factor literature (see [Bai and Ng 2002](#) and [Stock and Watson 2002](#)) and exact functional factor models (see [Hays et al. 2012](#) and [Liebl 2013](#)), where off-diagonal elements of $\delta(r, s)$ are (asymptotically) negligible. Finally, to go a step further, we impose neither independence nor uncorrelatedness between common and idiosyncratic components and assume a weak form of dependence given by Assumption 2(d). Given these points and the fact that Assumption 2 also allows for certain forms of nonstationarity of the original process $\{Y_t\}$ (as shown in Section 3), our model is more general than those considered so far in FDA literature.

Remark 1. Throughout this paper, we assume that the curves Y_1, \dots, Y_T are already given as fully observed elements of H . In practice, however, the data is typically only available in the form of high-dimensional vectors, and additional preprocessing steps are needed to transform the discrete observations into functions. This problem has been extensively studied in the literature on functional data analysis and is well understood. The most commonly applied techniques are based on basis expansions (see [Ramsay and Silverman 2005](#)) or a conditional expectation approach (see [Yao et al. 2005](#)). [Hall et al. \(2006\)](#), [Li](#)

and Hsing (2010), Zhang and Wang (2016), and Kneip and Liebl (2020) showed that, if the discrete data is observed densely enough, mean functions, eigenvalues, and FPC can be estimated at the same \sqrt{T} -rate as if the curves were fully observed.

3 Identification

We start our analysis with the identification of the dynamic functional factor model (1)-(2).

First, it follows directly from Assumptions 1(b) and 2(a) that Y_t is L_H^4 with time-invariant mean function $E[Y_t(r)] = \mu(r)$ and covariance function

$$\text{Cov}[Y_t(r), Y_t(s)] = \sum_{l=1}^K \lambda_l \psi_l(r) \psi_l(s) + \delta(r, s) + \sum_{l=1}^K E[F_{l,t}(\epsilon_t(r) \psi_l(s) + \epsilon_t(s) \psi_l(r))]. \quad (4)$$

From Assumption 2(d), it follows that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Cov}[Y_t(r), Y_t(s)] = \sum_{l=1}^K \lambda_l \psi_l(r) \psi_l(s) + \delta(r, s) \equiv c(r, s), \quad (5)$$

which we denote as the global covariance function of Y_t . Note that (4) and (5) coincide if the factors and errors are mutually uncorrelated. The integral operator with kernel $c(r, s)$ is given by $C_Y(x)(r) = \int_a^b c(r, s)x(s) ds$, where $x \in H$. The pairs (λ_i, ψ_i) for $i = 1, \dots, K$ satisfy the eigenequation for C_Y , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b c(r, s) \psi_l(s) ds &= \int_a^b \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \psi_k(r) \psi_k(s) \right) \psi_l(s) ds + \int_a^b \delta(r, s) \psi_l(s) ds \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \psi_k(r) \langle \psi_k, \psi_l \rangle + E[\epsilon_t(r) \langle \epsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle] = \lambda_l \psi_l(r), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Assumptions 1(a) and 2(b). Hence, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ and ψ_1, \dots, ψ_K are identified as eigenvalues and the corresponding loading functions ψ_1, \dots, ψ_K as eigenfunctions of C_Y . Any eigenfunction ψ of C_Y is either an element of $\text{span}\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_K\}$ or an eigenfunction of the covariance operator of ϵ_t so that all eigenvalues of C_Y are either element of $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K\}$ or are eigenvalues of the covariance operator of ϵ_t . Further by Assumption 2(c), all eigenvalues of the covariance operator of ϵ_t are smaller than λ_K ,

which implies that $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K\}$ are the K largest eigenvalues of C_Y . Finally, the factors are identified as projection coefficients of the process Y_t onto the loading functions, i.e.,

$$\langle Y_t - \mu, \psi_l \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k,t} \langle \psi_k, \psi_l \rangle + \langle \epsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle = F_{l,t} \quad (\text{a.s.}),$$

for $l = 1, \dots, K$, where the last equation follows from the orthonormality of $\{\psi_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and Assumptions 2(a) and (b), which imply that $E[\langle \epsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle^2] = 0$ and $\langle \epsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle = 0$ (a.s.).

The results obtained so far are based only on equation (1) and identify the loading functions ψ_l and the factors $F_{l,t}$ as the first K principal components and corresponding scores of C_Y . However, it is impossible to identify the number of factors K or separate the common component from the idiosyncratic one without any additional conditions. The identification strategies in the classical factor literature (see [Stock and Watson 2002](#) and [Bai 2003](#)) allow only for weak cross-correlations in the error component that are asymptotically negligible. In the context of functional data, weak cross-correlation results in an idiosyncratic component with a covariance kernel with negligible off-diagonal elements, which would be too restrictive due to the infinite-dimensional nature of functional data. Therefore, we allow for non-degenerate covariance kernels and resort to the dynamic nature of the factors to identify K , which is one of the main departure points from the classical dynamic factor literature. The key to identifying the number of factors K lies in the fact that errors are uncorrelated in t and that the “last” K -th factor is correlated with at least one lagged factor (see Assumptions 1(c), 2(a), and 2(d)). Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of orthonormal eigenfunctions of C_Y , where the corresponding eigenvalues are ordered descendingly. For $l = 1, \dots, K$, the projection coefficient $\langle Y_t - \mu, \varphi_l \rangle$ and the factor $F_{l,t}$ coincide up to a sign change. Therefore, $\langle Y_t - \mu, \varphi_K \rangle$ is correlated with $\langle Y_{t-h} - \mu, \varphi_l \rangle$ for some $h \neq 0$ and $l = 1, \dots, K$ due to Assumption 1(c). However, $\langle Y_t - \mu, \varphi_j \rangle$ and $\langle Y_{t-h} - \mu, \varphi_l \rangle$ are uncorrelated for all $h \neq 0$ if $l \geq K + 1$ and $j \geq K + 1$, and are weakly correlated if $l \leq K$ and $j \geq K + 1$, or $j \leq K$ and $l \geq K + 1$. Consequently, the number of factors is identified

as

$$K = \min \{l \in \mathbb{N} \mid E[\langle Y_t - \mu, \varphi_{l+i} \rangle \langle Y_{t-h} - \mu, \varphi_{l+j} \rangle] = 0, \forall i, j, h \geq 1\}, \quad (6)$$

and the following theorem summarizes our identification results.

Theorem 1 (Identification). *Under Assumptions 1(a)-(c) and 2, the unobserved components of model (1) are identified. In particular,*

- (i) *Under Assumptions 1(b), 2(a), and 2(d), Y_t is L_H^4 -valued with $E[Y_t(r)] = \mu(r)$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Cov}[Y_t(r), Y_t(s)] = c(r, s)$, $r, s \in [a, b]$, where $c(r, s)$ is given in (5);*
- (ii) *Under Assumptions 1(a)-(b) and 2, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ are the largest eigenvalues of the integral operator with kernel $c(r, s)$, and ψ_1, \dots, ψ_K are corresponding eigenfunctions. Moreover, the factors satisfy $F_{l,t} = \langle Y_t - \mu, \psi_l \rangle$, (a.s.);*
- (iii) *Under Assumptions 1(a)-(c) and 2, the number of factors K is identified as in (6).*

Remark 2. Note that $\Psi(r)$ and F_t are identified separately only up to a sign change. Changing the sign of both the loadings and the factors will leave the common component $\Psi'(r)F_t$ unchanged. For the identification results in Theorem 1, we do not need to know the dynamic structure of the factors as specified in equation (2) and Assumptions 1(d)-(e). The identification of the model is obtained under the condition that the factors do have autocorrelations, whereas the idiosyncratic components do not (see Assumption 1(c)).

Remark 3 (Relation to dimension reduction). Factor analysis allows for dimension reduction of high-dimensional (in our case, infinitely-dimensional) data sets. In the context of FDA, FPC analysis has taken a role as a leading dimension reduction method. However, as shown by Brillinger (2001) for multivariate time series and by Hörmann et al. (2015) and Panaretos and Tavakoli (2013) for FTS, FPC analysis, in general, might be inappropriate for serially dependent data. Nonetheless, the solution for dependent data suggested in these papers (dynamic FPC) involves two-sided filters, making it inapplicable for the prediction.

Hence, the identification results in Theorem 1 are helpful as they can be seen as sufficient conditions under which FPC can be used (instead of dynamic FPC) for dimension reduction and consequent prediction of an FTS.

4 Estimation and prediction

The identification result of the previous section indicates that all parameters of model (1) can be represented as functions of the first two moments of the functional time series Y_t , i.e., the population mean function $\mu(r)$ and the global covariance function $c(r, s)$. Accordingly, we employ a moment estimator approach where corresponding sample counterparts replace the population moments. In Section 4.1, we show the consistency of the moment estimator, in Section 4.2, we discuss how to estimate the number of factors and the factor dynamics consistently, in Section 4.3, we give some guidance for the practical implementation of our information criterion, and in Section 4.4 we derive optimal predictors and present the algorithm for our estimation and prediction procedure.

4.1 Estimation of the primitives

Consider the sample mean function

$$\hat{\mu}(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t(r), \quad r \in [a, b],$$

and sample covariance function

$$\hat{c}(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (Y_t(r) - \hat{\mu}(r))(Y_t(s) - \hat{\mu}(s)), \quad r, s \in [a, b].$$

The sample covariance operator \hat{C}_Y is defined as the integral operator with kernel $\hat{c}(r, s)$, which has the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \hat{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\lambda}_T \geq 0$ and corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions $\hat{\psi}_1, \dots, \hat{\psi}_T$. The eigenfunction $\hat{\psi}_l$ is called the l -th empirical FPC, and the projection coefficient $\hat{F}_{l,t} = \langle Y_t - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle$ is the l -th empirical FPC score.

Another way of motivating this estimator comes from the least squares principle. Since $\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l \right\|^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t}$, which follows from Assumptions 1(a)–(b), the least squares minimization problem for model (1) with respect to the factors is solved as

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{F_{k,s}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| Y_t - \hat{\mu} - \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l \right\|^2 = \operatorname{argmin}_{F_{k,s}} \{ F_{k,s}^2 - 2F_{k,s} \langle Y_s - \hat{\mu}, \psi_k \rangle \} = \langle Y_s - \hat{\mu}, \psi_k \rangle,$$

where $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $s = 1, \dots, T$. The solution of the problem with respect to the loading functions is shown in [Hörmann and Kokoszka \(2012\)](#) and is solved as

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\psi_k} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| Y_t - \hat{\mu} - \sum_{l=1}^K \langle Y_t - \hat{\mu}, \psi_l \rangle \psi_l \right\|^2 = \hat{\psi}_k(r).$$

When it comes to FPC analysis, many results on the convergence of the sample FPCs to their population counterparts are available in the literature. Results of this type are developed for independent observations (see [Dauxois et al. 1982](#)), linear process (see [Bosq 2000](#)), weakly dependent data (see [Hörmann and Kokoszka 2010](#)), and data with long-range dependence (see [Salish and Gleim 2019](#)). However, as we have seen in the previous section, if the factors in model (1) are weakly correlated with the idiosyncratic error, the covariance function of Y_t is time-dependent (see Assumption 2(d) and equation (4)), which makes the analysis different from those of the above references. The following theorem complements available results with the case of weak dependencies between factors and errors.

Theorem 2 (Primitives). *If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true, then, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

(a) $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| = O_P(T^{-1/2});$

(b) $\|\widehat{C}_Y - C_Y\|_{\mathcal{S}} = O_P(T^{-1/2});$

(c) $|\widehat{\lambda}_l - \lambda_l| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$ for $1 \leq l \leq K$;

(d) $\|s_l \widehat{\psi}_l - \psi_l\| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$ for $1 \leq l \leq K$, where $s_l = \operatorname{sign}(\langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \psi_l \rangle)$.

Since $|s_l \widehat{F}_{l,t} - F_{l,t}| \leq \|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\| + \|Y_t - \mu\| \cdot \|s_l \widehat{\psi}_l - \psi_l\|$, a direct consequence of Theorem 2 is that the t -th estimated factor is \sqrt{T} -consistent up to a sign change. This also applies to the

common component, so that $\|\sum_{l=1}^K \widehat{F}_{l,t} \widehat{\psi}_l - F_{l,t} \psi_l\| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$, for any fixed $t = 1, \dots, T$, and $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\sum_{l=1}^K \widehat{F}_{l,t} \widehat{\psi}_l - F_{l,t} \psi_l\| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

4.2 Estimation of \mathbf{K} , \mathbf{p} , and the dynamics

In this section, we propose an estimation procedure that selects asymptotically the correct numbers of factors K and lags p and simultaneously allows to estimate the VAR model (2) consistently. The dynamic component of the factor model is represented by the $K \times pK$ matrix of true autoregressive coefficients $\mathbf{A} = [A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p]$ in equation (2). We resort to the standard conditional least square (LS) estimator to estimate \mathbf{A} . That is, for a selected number of factors J , and a number of lags m , the true unobserved ($K \times 1$) vectors of factors F_t are replaced by ($J \times 1$) vectors of estimated factors $\widehat{F}_t^{(J)} = (\widehat{F}_{1,t}, \dots, \widehat{F}_{J,t})'$, where $\widehat{F}_{l,t} = \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle$, and the LS estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)} = [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}]$ is given by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)} = \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{F}_t^{(J)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} \left(\sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})' \right)^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} = ((\widehat{F}_{t-1}^{(J)})', \dots, (\widehat{F}_{t-m}^{(J)})')'$.

Given that \mathbf{A} is estimated with the LS procedure conditional on the selected number of lags and factors, we obtain estimators of K and p from the minimization of the corresponding mean squared error

$$MSE_T(J, m) = \frac{1}{T - m} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 \quad (8)$$

with respect to J and m , where the fitted values are given by

$$\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}(r) = \widehat{\mu}(r) + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J)}(r))' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)}, \quad \widehat{\Psi}^{(J)}(r) = (\widehat{\psi}_1(r), \dots, \widehat{\psi}_J(r)).$$

In order to evaluate $MSE_T(J, m)$ and obtain estimators of K and p , we need to take into account two forms of uncertainty when constructing $\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}$. One comes from estimating the primitives and factors, and the other from estimating the dynamic equation (2). While the estimation of the factors does not depend on (J, m) as presented in the

previous section, the estimation of the autoregressive coefficient matrix \mathbf{A} does. Hence, to investigate the minimization problem of the MSE in (8) with respect to J and m , it is essential to understand how misspecified values for both parameters affect the estimation of \mathbf{A} . To proceed with the discussion, we require several notations. Since the true parameter matrix of interest \mathbf{A} and its LS estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)}$ have different dimensions, we consider the completion matrices

$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{I}_K \mathbf{1}_{\{J \leq K\}} + [\mathbf{I}_K, \mathbf{0}'_{J-K, K}]' \mathbf{1}_{\{J > K\}}, \quad \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{I}_J \mathbf{1}_{\{J \geq K\}} + [\mathbf{I}_J, \mathbf{0}'_{K-J, K}]' \mathbf{1}_{\{J < K\}},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\{\cdot\}}$ denotes the indicator function, \mathbf{I}_M denotes the identity matrix of dimension M and $\mathbf{0}_{M,N}$ denotes the $M \times N$ matrix of zeros. Then, the matrix $\mathbf{s}A_i\mathbf{s}'$ contains all true parameters A_i and completes it with zeros (if necessary) to have the same dimension as its LS estimator $\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_i^{(J)}\mathbf{r}'$ irrespective of the values for K and J . Furthermore, to compare the true stacked lag coefficient matrix with its LS estimator, we define the completed true stacked coefficient matrix \mathbf{A}^* and its estimated counterpart $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*$ by

$$\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* = \begin{cases} [\mathbf{s}A_1\mathbf{s}', \dots, \mathbf{s}A_p\mathbf{s}', \mathbf{0}_{J,(m-p)J}] - [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m \geq p, \\ [A_1, \dots, A_p] - [\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{0}_{K,(p-m)K}], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [\mathbf{s}A_1\mathbf{s}', \dots, \mathbf{s}A_p\mathbf{s}'] - [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}, \mathbf{0}_{J,(p-m)J}], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [A_1, \dots, A_p, \mathbf{0}_{K,(m-p)K}] - [\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}'], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m \geq p, \end{cases}$$

so that both matrices have the same dimensions. Then the following is true.

Theorem 3 (Dynamics). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true, and let p_{max} and K_{max} be bounded integers with $p_{max} \geq p$ and $K_{max} \geq K$. Then, for any selected numbers of lags $m \leq p_{max}$ and factors $J \leq K_{max}$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2 = O_p(T^{-1/2}) \text{ if } J \geq K \text{ and } m \geq p.$$

Further, if $J < K$ or $m < p$ or both, we have

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2 = \tau_{(J,m)} > 0.$$

It follows from Theorem 3 that the consistency of the LS estimator will be achieved as long as both $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$. If at least one of the selected parameters J or m is smaller than the true values, then model (2) cannot be consistently estimated with the conditional LS estimator. These findings indicate why the selection of K and p should be made simultaneously when using the LS estimator. For instance, if the number of selected factors is larger than the actual one, i.e., $J \geq K$, and the number of selected lags is $m < p$, the LS estimator is biased, whereas it is consistent when $m \geq p$.

However, the main implication of Theorem 3 for our analysis is that the behavior of $MSE_T(J, m)$ is mainly driven by $\|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2$, where the MSE is asymptotically minimized as long as $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$. More specifically, an estimated model with $K + j$ factors and $p + i$ lags for $i, j > 0$ can never asymptotically fit worse than a model with K factors and p lags. Of course, this can lead to parameter proliferation and efficiency losses as more factors and more lags are estimated. Hence, we consider an MSE-based information criterion for estimating K and p of the form

$$CR_T(J, m) = f\left(\frac{1}{T-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2\right) + g_T(J, m), \quad (9)$$

where $g_T(J, m)$ is a penalty term for overfitting a model. If the penalty term $g_T(J, m)$ is strictly monotonically increasing in both arguments J and m and $f(\cdot)$ is some strictly increasing function, the following consistency result holds.

Theorem 4 (Numbers of factors and lags). *Let the conditions of Theorem 3 hold true, and let the number of factors, K , and the number of lags, p , be estimated as*

$$(\widehat{K}, \widehat{p}) = \underset{1 \leq L \leq K_{max}, 1 \leq m \leq p_{max}}{\operatorname{argmin}} CR_T(J, m). \quad (10)$$

where $g_T(J, m) \rightarrow 0$ and $Tg_T(J, m) \rightarrow \infty$ for all $0 \leq J \leq K_{max}$ and $0 \leq m \leq p_{max}$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Then, $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{K} = K, \widehat{p} = p) = 1$.

The results of Theorem 4 show that penalized MSE-based information criteria select both the correct number of factors and the correct order of lags with probability 1. The

crucial element for the consistent estimation of K and p is a penalty term that vanishes at an appropriate rate, ensuring that an overparameterized model is not chosen.

The practical implementation of the proposed information criterion requires the specification of $f(\cdot)$ and $g_T(J, m)$. Moreover, the evaluation of the functional norms $\|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ is required, which may impose unnecessary limitations for practitioners. For this reason, we discuss simple implementation procedures for the estimator in the following subsection.

4.3 Practical implementation of the information criterion

In this section, we discuss two approaches on how to implement the information criterion $\text{CR}_T(J, m)$ in practice. The main aim is to provide a procedure that is easy to implement by means of existing software. Using the theoretical results of Section 4.2, we propose two solutions: one based on the analytical representation of the expression in (9), the other on a graphical representation. The numerical implementation of both methods requires the computation of empirical eigenfunctions and eigenvalues using numerical integration. This is easily achieved, for example, with the “fda” package from Ramsay et al. (2009) for R and MATLAB or our accompanying R-package.

Analytical representation. To obtain a simplified analytical expression for $\text{CR}_T(J, m)$, we start with the expression for the MSE given in (8). The fitted values can be written as $\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}(r) = \widehat{\mu}(r) + \sum_{l=1}^J \widehat{F}_{l,t|t-1} \widehat{\psi}_l(r)$, where $\widehat{F}_{t|t-1}^{(J)} = (\widehat{F}_{1,t|t-1}, \dots, \widehat{F}_{J,t|t-1})' = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)}$. Furthermore, it should be noted that the sample covariance operator \widehat{C}_Y has at most T nonzero eigenvalues, which implies that the observed curves have the empirical basis representation $Y_t(r) = \widehat{\mu}(r) + \sum_{l=1}^T \widehat{F}_{l,t} \widehat{\psi}_l(r)$. Using the residuals $\widehat{\eta}_{l,t} = \widehat{F}_{l,t} - \widehat{F}_{l,t|t-1}$ the functional forecast error can be written as

$$Y_t(r) - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}(r) = \sum_{l=1}^J \widehat{\eta}_{l,t} \widehat{\psi}_l(r) + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle \widehat{\psi}_l(r). \quad (11)$$

From the orthonormality of $\{\widehat{\psi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\psi}_T\}$, the MSE can be rewritten as

$$MSE_T(J, m) = \frac{1}{T-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \left(\sum_{l=1}^J \widehat{\eta}_{l,t}^2 + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle^2 \right) \approx \text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}) + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \widehat{\lambda}_l, \quad (12)$$

where $\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)} = (T-m)^{-1} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\eta}_t \widehat{\eta}_t'$, $\widehat{\eta}_t = (\widehat{\eta}_{1,t}, \dots, \widehat{\eta}_{J,t})'$, and the last step follows from the fact that $(T-m)^{-1} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle^2 \approx T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle^2 = \widehat{\lambda}_l$.

The advantage of the expression (12) over the MSE in (8) is that all components can be easily computed. In particular, $\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}$ is the least square estimator of Σ_η obtained by fitting a VAR(m) model based on the time series of estimated factors $\{\widehat{F}_t^{(J)}\}$. The L^2 norms of the functional forecast error (11) in the expression of the MSE (8) reduce to the trace of $\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}$ and the higher order eigenvalues $\{\widehat{\lambda}_l\}$.

Finally, to put all terms of our generic information criterion (9) on the same scale, we recommend the $\ln(\cdot)$ transformation for both $f(\cdot)$ and $g_T(J, m)$. More precisely, we construct $g_T(J, m)$ similar to the penalty term in well-established information criteria from multivariate time series analysis such as the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the Hannan-Quinn criterion (HQC). Our BIC-type estimator for K and p is given by

$$(\widehat{K}_{\text{bic}}, \widehat{p}_{\text{bic}}) = \underset{1 \leq J \leq K_{\text{max}}, 1 \leq m \leq p_{\text{max}}}{\text{argmin}} \ln \left(\text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}) + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \widehat{\lambda}_l \right) + Jm \frac{\ln(T)}{T}, \quad (13)$$

where Jm is the number of estimated parameters in the model, and $T^{-1} \ln(T)$ is the penalization rate. As an alternative with a lower penalization rate, the HQC-type estimator

$$(\widehat{K}_{\text{hqc}}, \widehat{p}_{\text{hqc}}) = \underset{1 \leq J \leq K_{\text{max}}, 1 \leq m \leq p_{\text{max}}}{\text{argmin}} \ln \left(\text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}) + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \widehat{\lambda}_l \right) + 2Jm \frac{\ln(\ln(T))}{T} \quad (14)$$

can be used. Both (13) and (14) satisfy the conditions from Theorem 4 and are therefore consistent estimators for K and p .

Remark 4. Our final versions of the information criterion are related to the fFPE criterion proposed in Aue et al. (2015), which is given by

$$(\widehat{K}_{\text{fFPE}}, \widehat{p}_{\text{fFPE}}) = \underset{1 \leq J \leq K_{\text{max}}, 1 \leq m \leq p_{\text{max}}}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{T+Jm}{T} \text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_\eta^{(J,m)}) + \sum_{l=J+1}^T \widehat{\lambda}_l \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Although the fFPE criterion was derived in the context of dimension reduction of functional time series for prediction exercises, it can be used to select the number of factors and lags, interpreting the number of factors as a dimension. However, using the arguments from the proof of Theorem 4, we conclude that the fFPE information criterion of Aue et al. (2015) may lead to overparameterizations of the functional factor model (1)–(2) since it does not contain a penalty term. A further comparison of the estimators (13) and (14) with (15) is made in Section 5 to corroborate this remark.




Figure 1: Example of MSE minimization

various combinations of J and m and choose the minimum vertex of a rectangular surface with respect to J and m for which the MSE remains “flat”. For this purpose, the expression (12) can be used. Figure 1 shows an example illustrating an MSE surface. This figure suggests that $\hat{K} = 4$ and $\hat{p} = 4$ should be selected.

This graphical approach has an advantage over the analytical expressions presented in (13) and (14) since it does not require the specification of the penalty term. However, it cannot be automated when it comes to a multiple model selection (for instance, in Monte Carlo simulations). Furthermore, it often comes to a subjective decision of a researcher where the smallest point of the MSE rectangular “flat” area is since the estimated MSE will fluctuate in this area in finite samples as well.

Graphical representation. A careful inspection of the proof of Theorem 4 shows that the MSE reaches its asymptotic minimum when $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$. This result can be used to select (K, p) graphically, similar to the concept of the scree plot. More precisely, one can plot $MSE_T(J, m)$ for var-

4.4 Mean square error optimal prediction

Since the factors F_t follow a causal VAR(p) model, their best h -step ahead predictor in the mean square error sense is given by the conditional expectation,

$$F_{T+h|T} = E[F_{T+h} | F_T, F_{T-1}, \dots] = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i F_{T+h-i|T},$$

where $F_{T+j|T} = F_{T+j}$ if $j \leq 0$. Similarly, for the functional process Y_t , let the infinite history up to time T be given by $\mathcal{I}_T = \sigma(\{Y_t, t \leq T\})$, and let $g(\mathcal{I}_T) \in L_H^4$ be any predictor function for Y_{T+h} that is measurable with respect to \mathcal{I}_T . Then, by the law of the iterated expectation $\operatorname{argmin}_{g(\mathcal{I}_T)} \{E\|Y_{T+h} - g(\mathcal{I}_T)\|^2\} = E[Y_{T+h} | \mathcal{I}_T]$. The resulting best h -step ahead curve predictor is then

$$Y_{T+h|T}(r) = E[Y_{T+h}(r) | Y_T, Y_{T-1}, \dots] = \mu(r) + \Psi(r)' F_{T+h|T}. \quad (16)$$

The theoretical predictor $Y_{T+1|T}$ attends the smallest mean-squared error, which is given as $E\|Y_{T+1} - Y_{T+1|T}\|_2^2 = E\|\eta_{T+1}\|_2^2 + E\|\epsilon_{T+1}\|^2$.

The estimators introduced in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 allow us to replace the unobserved parameters in (16), μ , Ψ , F_T , $A(L)$, K , and p , by consistent estimators. This leads to the feasible predictor given as

$$\hat{Y}_{T+h|T}^{(\hat{K}, \hat{p})}(r) = \hat{\mu}(r) + (\hat{\Psi}^{(\hat{K})}(r))' \hat{F}_{T+h|T}^{(\hat{K})}, \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{F}_{T+1|T}^{(\hat{K})} = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{p}} \hat{A}_i^{(\hat{K})} \hat{F}_{T+1-i|T}^{(\hat{K})}$ with $\hat{F}_{T+j|T}^{(\hat{K})} = \hat{F}_{T+j}^{(\hat{K})}$ for $j \leq 0$. However, the estimation step introduces an additional small sample estimation error that comes from estimating the primitives, K , p , and the dynamics. Theorems 2–4 indicate that the estimation error becomes negligible as $T \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.,

$$\|Y_{T+1} - \hat{Y}_{T+1|T}^{(\hat{K}, \hat{p})}\| = \|Y_{T+1} - Y_{T+1|T}\| + O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

which provides a theoretical justification for the asymptotic optimality of the predictor (17) in terms of the MSE. We conclude this section with an estimation and prediction algorithm.

Estimation and prediction algorithm

Step 1: Estimation of the primitives. Compute the sample mean function $\hat{\mu}(r)$ and the sample covariance function $\hat{c}(r, s)$ from the observed curves $Y_1(r), \dots, Y_T(r)$. Fix some K_{max} large enough and compute the eigenvectors $\{(\hat{\lambda}_l, \hat{\psi}_l)\}_{l=1}^{K_{max}}$ and the functional principal component scores $\hat{F}_{l,t} = \langle Y_t - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle$, $l = 1, \dots, K_{max}$, as estimates for the factors.

Step 2: Estimation of K , p , and the factor dynamics. Fix some p_{max} large enough, compute $MSE_T(J, m)$ from (12) for any $J = 0, \dots, K_{max}$ and $m = 0, \dots, p_{max}$, and select K and p according to (13) or (14). Finally, estimate the VAR(\hat{p}) model (2) by the LS estimator given in (7) yielding $[\hat{A}_1^{(\hat{K})}, \dots, \hat{A}_p^{(\hat{K})}] = \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{(\hat{K}, \hat{p})}$.

Step 3: Fitted curves and forecasting. The fitted curves for the sample $t = 1, \dots, T$ are $\hat{Y}_t(r) = \hat{\mu}(r) + \sum_{l=1}^{\hat{K}} \hat{F}_{l,t} \hat{\psi}_l(r)$, and the h -step predictor $\hat{Y}_{T+h|T}^{(\hat{K}, \hat{p})}(r)$ is given in (17).

5 Simulations

We analyze the finite sample properties of the estimator for K and p presented in Theorem 4 using a Monte Carlo simulation. The functional time series are simulated as

$$Y_t(r) = \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} v_l(r) + \sum_{l=K+1}^{10} e_{l,t} v_l(r), \quad r \in [0, 1], \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (18)$$

where $v_1(r) = 1$, $v_{2j}(r) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2j\pi r)$, and $v_{2j+1}(r) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2j\pi r)$ are the Fourier basis functions, and $e_t = (e_{1,t}, \dots, e_{10,t})' \sim NID(0, \text{diag}(1, 2^{-2}, \dots, 10^{-2}))$. The factors are simulated as $F_t = (F_{1,t}, \dots, F_{K,t})' = A(L)^{-1} \eta_t$, where $\eta_t = (e_{1,t}, \dots, e_{K,t})'$. We consider 4 different model specifications, which are presented in Table 1. The models reflect different dependence structures, with the numbers of factors ranging from 1 to 3 and lags ranging from 1 to 4. The model specification M1 coincides with the setting that was used by Aue et al. (2015) in their simulations.

We compare the estimators from the BIC-type and HQ-type information criteria from equations (13) and (14) with the fFPE criterion proposed by Aue et al. (2015), which is

Table 1: Model specifications for the Monte Carlo simulations

model	K	p	lag polynomial
M1	3	1	$A(L) = I_3 - \begin{pmatrix} -0.05 & -0.23 & 0.76 \\ 0.80 & -0.05 & 0.04 \\ 0.04 & 0.76 & 0.23 \end{pmatrix} L$
M2	2	2	$A(L) = I_2 - \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 & -0.8 \\ 0.1 & -0.5 \end{pmatrix} L - \begin{pmatrix} -0.3 & -0.3 \\ -0.2 & 0.3 \end{pmatrix} L^2$
M3	2	4	$A(L) = I_2 - \begin{pmatrix} 0.4 & -0.2 \\ 0.0 & 0.3 \end{pmatrix} L - \begin{pmatrix} -0.1 & -0.1 \\ 0.0 & -0.1 \end{pmatrix} L^2 - \begin{pmatrix} 0.15 & 0.15 \\ 0.00 & 0.15 \end{pmatrix} L^3 - \begin{pmatrix} 0.3 & -0.4 \\ 0.0 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix} L^4$
M4	1	4	$A(L) = 1 - 0.2L - 0.7L^4$

Note: The table presents the implemented specifications for model (18) for the simulation results from Table 2.

Table 2: Finite sample performances of the joint estimators for K and p

T	bias						RMSE					
	\hat{K}_{bic}	\hat{K}_{hqc}	\hat{K}_{HFPE}	\hat{p}_{bic}	\hat{p}_{hqc}	\hat{p}_{HFPE}	\hat{K}_{bic}	\hat{K}_{hqc}	\hat{K}_{HFPE}	\hat{p}_{bic}	\hat{p}_{hqc}	\hat{p}_{HFPE}
M1 100	0.010	0.039	0.389	0.001	0.008	1.458	0.107	0.227	0.850	0.023	0.092	2.721
M1 200	0.006	0.029	0.287	0.000	0.004	0.752	0.082	0.192	0.704	0.009	0.061	1.709
M1 500	0.003	0.023	0.290	0.000	0.002	0.552	0.053	0.170	0.709	0.003	0.044	1.353
M2 100	-0.016	0.010	0.392	-0.184	-0.023	2.010	0.155	0.144	0.954	0.440	0.325	3.028
M2 200	0.001	0.006	0.217	-0.004	0.018	1.407	0.024	0.081	0.643	0.080	0.148	2.391
M2 500	0.000	0.004	0.185	0.000	0.010	1.161	0.013	0.060	0.581	0.018	0.109	2.106
M3 100	-0.429	-0.165	0.332	-0.796	-0.140	1.511	0.658	0.417	0.902	1.505	0.798	2.188
M3 200	-0.016	0.000	0.126	-0.004	0.021	1.064	0.128	0.035	0.463	0.135	0.160	1.757
M3 500	0.000	0.000	0.084	0.000	0.012	0.899	0.000	0.012	0.359	0.018	0.113	1.578
M4 100	0.000	0.002	0.352	0.033	0.179	1.967	0.011	0.040	0.962	0.311	0.596	2.534
M4 200	0.000	0.001	0.146	0.023	0.120	1.756	0.000	0.023	0.496	0.170	0.462	2.362
M4 500	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.011	0.082	1.659	0.000	0.014	0.391	0.110	0.360	2.281

Note: The biases and root mean square errors (RMSE) for the estimators presented in (13), (14), and (15) are simulated for a functional time series of sample size T under models M1–M4 from Table 1 using 100,000 Monte Carlo replications. The information criteria are evaluated using $K_{max} = 8$ and $p_{max} = 8$ as the maximum numbers of factors and lags.


given in (15). The results are presented in Table 2 and support our theoretical findings. Furthermore, both \hat{K}_{bic} and \hat{p}_{bic} as well as \hat{K}_{hqc} and \hat{p}_{hqc} provide a good approximation of the true parameters for reasonable sample sizes.

6 Application: yield curve modeling and forecasting

To model the dynamics of the term structure of government bond yields, we study two yield curve datasets. The first dataset (hereafter JKV) is taken from Jungbacker et al. (2014)¹ and consists of monthly unsmoothed Fama-Bliss zero-coupon yield curves of U.S. Treasuries, which are observed at 17 different fixed maturities of 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21,

¹Data source: <http://qed.econ.queensu.ca/jae/2014-v29.1/>.

Figure 2: Yield curves of U.S. Treasuries



Note: The figure depicts the monthly yield curves of U.S. Treasuries from 1985 until 2007 from the JKV dataset (left) and the monthly yield curves from 2001 until 2021 from the FED dataset (right).

24, 30, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, and 120 months, from January 1987 until December 2007, with a sample size of $T = 252$. The period ranges from after the Volcker disinflation until the 2008 financial crisis, which can be treated as a consistent monetary policy regime (see, e.g., Mönch 2012). The second dataset (hereafter FED) is obtained from the Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15² and consists of monthly zero-coupon yield curves of U.S. Treasuries, which are observed at 11 different constant maturities of 1, 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 60, 84, 120, 240, and 360 months, from July 2001 until December 2021, with a sample size of $T = 242$. Plots of the JKV and FED data are presented in Figure 2.

Following Zhang and Wang (2016), the relative orders of observed maturities to sample size are large enough to classify the data as dense functional data, for which parametric convergence rates are preserved under conventional preprocessing methods (see also Remark 1). To obtain a functional representation of the yield curve $Y_t(r)$ at time t with time to maturity $r \in [a, b]$, where a is the lowest time to maturity and b is the longest one, we follow Ramsay and Silverman (2005). We apply smoothing spline preprocessing, where we set single interior knots at each observed time to maturity and determine the smoothing parameter by cross-validation.

In the first step of our analysis, we estimate the number of factors and the number of


²Data source: <https://www.federalreserve.gov/datadownload/Choose.aspx?rel=H15>.

Table 3: Estimated numbers of factors and lags

	\hat{K}_{bic}	\hat{K}_{hqc}	\hat{K}_{ffPE}	\hat{p}_{bic}	\hat{p}_{hqc}	\hat{p}_{ffPE}
JKV data (full period)	4	7	8	1	1	2
FED data (full period)	4	4	4	1	1	5
JKV data (first 120 months)	2	4	6	1	1	4
FED data (first 120 months)	4	4	4	1	1	5

Note: The estimated numbers of factors and lags from the BIC estimator (13), the HQC estimator (14), and the ffPE criterion (15) are presented using the full samples and the training samples of the first 120 months. The maximum numbers of factors and lags are set as $K_{\text{max}} = 8$ and $p_{\text{max}} = 8$.

Figure 3: Loading functions




Note: The left figure presents the dynamic Nelson-Siegel loading functions defined in equation (3). The decay parameter is set to $\lambda = 0.0609$, maximizing the curvature factor at $r = 30$ month maturity (see Diebold and Li 2006). The middle and right plots present the first four empirical functional principal components of the functional time series of Figure 2.

lags needed to describe the yield curve series adequately. For this purpose, we implement the information criterion developed in section 4.3 and the one proposed in Aue et al. (2015). Results are reported in Table 3. An interesting finding is that in most cases we need at least four factors to describe yield curve dynamics as opposed to the three factor DNS modeling framework. This result becomes even more prominent if we concentrate on forecasting exercises rather than consistent estimation of K and p . The ffPE criterion, designed for this purpose and selects K and p such that forecasts MSE is minimized, reports even higher values for the number of required factors. This finding supports one of our main arguments in this paper: the number of factors should not be fixed in some applications but instead selected in a data-driven manner.

Turning our attention to the estimated loading functions, we have plotted the first four functions from the DFFM and the DNS loadings in Figure 3. We observe a similar outcome as in Hays et al. (2012). The first three estimated loading functions inherit shapes similar

Figure 4: Graphical representation of the mean squared errors



Note: The mean squared errors for different numbers of factors J and lags m according to equation (12) are plotted. The left figure shows the plot for the JKV dataset, and the right figure shows the plot for the FED dataset.

to the DNS loadings and share similar economic interpretations. However, their magnitude and curvature differ slightly. Furthermore, our analysis adds a fourth factor to the model to improve forecasting performance. To see how much additional factor(s) improve the performance of the DFFM, we proceed with comparing forecasts.

To evaluate and compare out-of-sample performances, we follow the setting in [Diebold and Li \(2006\)](#) and forecast the yield curves sequentially for each month until the end of the sample. The first prediction is made using the first 120 observations, the second prediction using the first 121 observations, and so on, so that the h -step prediction for time t is made using the curves from the beginning of the sample to time $t - h$. We consider both unrestricted and restricted VAR model specifications for the dynamics of the factors. The unrestricted VAR model specification (2) with K factors and p lags has Kp coefficient parameters, which might be prone to in-sample overfitting. Since empirical cross-correlation functions indicate little cross-factor interaction, restricted VAR models may be more appropriate. Therefore, following [Hyndman and Ullah \(2007\)](#), we also consider univariate autoregressive (AR) models for each factor separately, where the coefficient matrices A_1, \dots, A_p are restricted to be diagonal. We use both fixed and data-driven settings for determining the numbers of factors and lags and apply the information criteria (13) and (14) in the data-driven settings for each prediction separately. The curve predictions (17)

Table 4: Average root mean square forecast errors

K	BIC	HQC	BIC	HQC	3	4	6	3	4	6	DNS	DNS
p	BIC	HQC	BIC	HQC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
factor dynamics	VAR	VAR	AR	AR	VAR	VAR	VAR	AR	AR	AR	VAR	AR
JKV data												
in-sample 1-step	0.276	0.267	0.285	0.284	0.286	0.276	0.272	0.287	0.285	0.284	0.285	0.290
1-step ahead	0.267	0.261	0.266	0.264	0.266	0.263	0.262	0.266	0.264	0.264	0.265	0.271
3-step ahead	0.514	0.509	0.501	0.500	0.506	0.508	0.512	0.501	0.501	0.500	0.502	0.517
6-step ahead	0.771	0.776	0.772	0.772	0.799	0.762	0.781	0.772	0.772	0.772	0.791	0.798
12-step ahead	1.188	1.187	1.231	1.230	1.309	1.169	1.192	1.231	1.230	1.230	1.307	1.259
FED data												
in-sample 1-step	0.235	0.235	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.235	0.229	0.241	0.239	0.237	0.247	0.250
1-step ahead	0.209	0.212	0.184	0.186	0.193	0.209	0.211	0.188	0.183	0.186	0.205	0.208
3-step ahead	0.408	0.412	0.336	0.340	0.357	0.407	0.410	0.337	0.336	0.340	0.352	0.366
6-step ahead	0.612	0.616	0.506	0.508	0.548	0.612	0.611	0.506	0.506	0.508	0.524	0.549
12-step ahead	0.904	0.897	0.788	0.789	0.873	0.903	0.889	0.788	0.788	0.789	0.820	0.841

Note: The average root mean square forecast errors from equation (19) are presented. The first two rows indicate the selected number of factors and lags, and the third row indicates whether unrestricted VAR dynamics or AR dynamics are used. The results from the DNS model are given in the last two columns.

are computed sequentially, the root mean square forecast errors (RMSFE) are evaluated at the observed times to maturity $a = r_1 < \dots < r_N = b$, and the average root mean square forecast error is given by

$$RMSFE(h, K, p) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(T-h-119)} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=120}^{T-h} \left(\widehat{Y}_{t+h|t}^{(K,p)}(r_i) - Y_{t+h}(r_i) \right)^2}. \quad (19)$$

The results are presented in Table 4. For both datasets, the predictions from the functional factor model tend to produce more accurate forecasts than those from the DNS model, which we include as a benchmark. The factors in the DNS model are estimated by regressing the available yields onto the Nelson-Siegel loadings given by equation (3) for a fixed value of $\lambda = 0.0609$. In a second step, a linear autoregressive model with constant is fitted to the estimated factors from the first step, which gives rise to a forecast of the entire yield curve. Following Diebold and Li (2006), we include both unrestricted VAR(1) and univariate AR(1) factor dynamics.

7 Conclusion

This paper provides an in-depth study of the dynamic factor model for functional time series, including construction, identification, estimation, and prediction. From a practical

point of view, the DFFM is an attractive modeling framework for infinitely-dimensional temporal data as it allows to perform analyses and predictions via a low-dimensional common component of the data. Our results are useful for a broad range of applications in which the number of factors in the common component are unknown and the idiosyncratic component potentially has strong cross-correlation and is weakly correlated with the common component. We have developed a simple-to-use novel method, yielding consistent estimates of the number of factors and their dynamics. A Monte Carlo study and an empirical illustration to yield curves show that our method provides an attractive modeling and predictive framework.

Several methodological problems await further analysis. The first is to develop the distributional and inferential theory for estimated factors and loading functions beyond the consistency results obtained in this paper. For instance, in the empirical illustration to yield curves, it might be interesting to provide confidence bands or test some restrictions on the loading functions. The second is to go beyond the weakly stationary assumption on the factors. For instance, letting some of the factors have short memory whereas others are permitted to have a long memory (persistence). Finally, the third is to develop a predictive methodology for the factors using semiparametric or nonparametric models.

Acknowledgments

We are thankful to Alois Kneip, Dominik Liebl, Jörg Breitung, and Malte Knüppel for very helpful comments and suggestions. Many thanks also to Justin Franken for his assistance in implementing the accompanying R-package. The usage of the CHEOPS HPC cluster for parallel computing is gratefully acknowledged. The first author also gratefully acknowledges the financial support from an Argelander Grant provided by the University of Bonn, and the second author gratefully acknowledges the financial support from Juan de la Cierva

Supporting Information

An accompanying R-package is available at <https://github.com/ottosven/dfm>.

References

- Aue, A., Norinho, D. D., and Hörmann, S. (2015). On the prediction of stationary functional time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110:378–392.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica*, 71:135–171.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70:191–221.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2008). Large dimensional factor analysis. *Foundations and Trends in Econometrics*, 3:89–163.
- Berk, K. N. (1974). Consistent autoregressive spectral estimates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2:489–502.
- Bernanke, B. S., Boivin, J., and Eliasziw, P. (2005). Measuring the effects of monetary policy: a factor-augmented vector autoregressive (FAVAR) approach. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120:387–422.
- Besse, P. C., Cardot, H., and Stephenson, D. B. (2000). Autoregressive forecasting of some functional climatic variations. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 27:673–687.
- Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear processes in function spaces: Theory and applications*. Springer.
- Breitung, J. and Choi, I. (2013). Factor models. In *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Empirical Macroeconomics*, pages 249–265. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Brillinger, D. R. (2001). *Time series: data analysis and theory*. SIAM.
- Chamberlain, G. and Rothschild, M. (1983). Arbitrage, factor structure and mean-variance analysis in large asset markets. *Econometrica*, 51:1305–1324.
- Dauxois, J., Pousse, A., and Romain, Y. (1982). Asymptotic theory for the principal component analysis of a vector random function: Some applications to statistical inference. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 12:136 – 154.
- Descary, M.-H. and Panaretos, V. M. (2019). Functional data analysis by matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47:1–38.
- Diebold, F. X. and Li, C. (2006). Forecasting the term structure of government bond yields. *Journal of Econometrics*, 130:337–364.

- Diebold, F. X. and Rudebusch, G. D. (2013). *Yield curve modeling and forecasting: the dynamic Nelson-Siegel approach*. Princeton University Press.
- Eickmeier, S. and Ziegler, C. (2008). How successful are dynamic factor models at forecasting output and inflation? a meta-analytic approach. *Journal of Forecasting*, 27:237–265.
- Geweke, J. (1977). The dynamic factor analysis of economic time series. In Aigner, D. and Goldberger, A., editors, *Latent variables in socio-economic models*, pages 365–383. North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Hall, P., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2006). Properties of principal component methods for functional and longitudinal data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34:1493–1517.
- Hays, S., Shen, H., and Huang, J. Z. (2012). Functional dynamic factor models with application to yield curve forecasting. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 6:870–894.
- Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for functional data with applications*. Springer.
- Hsing, T. and Eubank, R. (2015). *Theoretical foundations of functional data analysis, with an introduction to linear operators*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hyndman, R. J. and Ullah, M. S. (2007). Robust forecasting of mortality and fertility rates: a functional data approach. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51:4942–4956.
- Hörmann, S. and Jammoul, F. (2021). Consistently recovering the signal from noisy functional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2021.104886>.
- Hörmann, S., Kidziński, Ł., and Hallin, M. (2015). Dynamic functional principal components. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 77:319–348.
- Hörmann, S. and Kokoszka, P. (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38:1845–1884.
- Hörmann, S. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). Functional time series. In *Handbook of statistics*, volume 30, pages 157–186. Elsevier.
- Jungbacker, B., Koopman, S. J., and Van der Wel, M. (2014). Smooth dynamic factor analysis with application to the US term structure of interest rates. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 29:65–90.
- Kargin, V. and Onatski, A. (2008). Curve forecasting by functional autoregression. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 99:2508–2526.
- Kneip, A. and Liebl, D. (2020). On the optimal reconstruction of partially observed functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48:1692–1717.
- Kowal, D. R., Matteson, D. S., and Ruppert, D. (2017). A bayesian multivariate functional dynamic linear model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112:733–744.
- Lengwiler, Y. and Lenz, C. (2010). Intelligible factors for the yield curve. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157:481–491.

- Li, Y. and Hsing, T. (2010). Uniform convergence rates for nonparametric regression and principal component analysis in functional/longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38:3321–3351.
- Liebl, D. (2013). Modeling and forecasting electricity spot prices: A functional data perspective. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7:1562–1592.
- Lütkepohl, H. (1996). *Handbook of Matrices*. Wiley.
- Mönch, E. (2012). Term structure surprises: the predictive content of curvature, level, and slope. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27:574–602.
- Nelson, C. R. and Siegel, A. F. (1987). Parsimonious modeling of yield curves. *The Journal of Business*, 60:473–489.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Tavakoli, S. (2013). Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41:568–603.
- Ramsay, J., Hooker, G., and Graves, S. (2009). *Functional data analysis with R and MATLAB*. Springer.
- Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. (2005). *Functional data analysis*. Springer.
- Salish, N. and Gleim, A. (2019). A moment-based notion of time dependence for functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 212:377–392.
- Sargent, T. J. and Sims, C. A. (1977). Business cycle modeling without pretending to have too much a priori economic theory. In Sims, C. A., editor, *New methods in business cycle research*, pages 45–109. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2002). Forecasting using principal components from a large number of predictors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97:1167–1179.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2012). Dynamic factor models. In *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Forecasting*, pages 35–39. Oxford University Press.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2016). Dynamic factor models, factor-augmented vector autoregressions, and structural vector autoregressions in macroeconomics. In *Handbook of macroeconomics*, volume 2, pages 415–525. Elsevier.
- Wang, J.-L., Chiou, J.-M., and Müller, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 3:257–295.
- White, H. (2001). *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians, revised edition*. Academic Press, Inc.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2005). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100:577–590.
- Zhang, X. and Wang, J.-L. (2016). From sparse to dense functional data and beyond. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44:2281–2321.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A Technical proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Before presenting the main proof of Theorem 2, we show the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold for model (1)–(2). Then, for any $0 \leq h < \infty$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$E \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=h+1}^T F_t F'_{t-h} - E[F_t F'_{t-h}] \right\|_2^2 = O(T^{-1}).$$

Proof. The problem can be rewritten as follows

$$E \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=h+1}^T F_t F'_{t-h} - E[F_t F'_{t-h}] \right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,s=h+1}^T \sum_{m,l=1}^K \text{Cov}[F_{m,t} F_{l,t-h}, F_{m,s} F_{l,s-h}]. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By Assumption 1(d) the factors follow a stable VAR(p) process. Hence, F_t has a moving average representation

$$F_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_j \eta_{t-j},$$

where $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B_j\|_2 < \infty$, or, equivalently

$$F_{l,t} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^K b_j^{(l,k)} \eta_{k,t-j},$$

where $b_j^{(l,k)}$ is (l, k) element of matrix B_j and $\eta_{k,t-j}$ is k -th element of vector η_{t-j} . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}[F_{m,t} F_{l,t-h}, F_{m,s} F_{l,s-h}] \\ &= \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4=1}^K b_{i_1}^{(m, k_1)} b_{i_2}^{(l, k_2)} b_{i_3}^{(m, k_3)} b_{i_4}^{(l, k_4)} \text{Cov}[\eta_{k_1, t-i_1} \eta_{k_2, t-h-i_2}, \eta_{k_3, s-i_3} \eta_{k_4, s-h-i_4}], \end{aligned}$$

and, by Assumption 1(e), there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4=1}^K \left| \sum_{t,s=h+1}^T \text{Cov}[\eta_{k_1, t-i_1} \eta_{k_2, t-h-i_2}, \eta_{k_3, s-i_3} \eta_{k_4, s-h-i_4}] \right| < T \cdot C.$$

Consequently, for (A.1), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,s=h+1}^T \sum_{m,l=1}^K \text{Cov}[F_{m,t} F_{l,t-h}, F_{m,s} F_{l,s-h}] \leq \frac{K^6 C}{T} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|B_i\|_{\infty} \right)^4 = O(T^{-1}),$$

where $\|A\|_{\infty} = \max_{i,j} \{ |a_{i,j}| \}$ is the maximum norm, and the final step follows by the matrix inequality $\|A\|_{\infty} \leq \|A\|_2$ (see, e.g., Lütkepohl 1996) and the fact that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B_j\|_2 < \infty$. \square

Main proof of Theorem 2. *Proof of item (a).* First, we decompose

$$E\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\| = E \int_a^b \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi'(r) F_t + \epsilon_t(r) \right)^2 dr = A_T + B_T + C_T,$$

where

$$A_T = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T \sum_{l,m=1}^K E[F_{l,t} F_{m,h}] \langle \psi_l, \psi_m \rangle, \quad B_T = \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K E[F_{l,t} \langle \psi_l, \epsilon_h \rangle],$$

$$C_T = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T E[\langle \epsilon_t, \epsilon_h \rangle].$$

By Assumption 1(d), the factors follow a stable VAR(p), implying that F_t has a moving average representation

$$F_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_j \eta_{t-j},$$

such that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B_j\|_2 < \infty$ and, by Assumption 1(e), $\sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \|E[F_t F'_{t-h}]\|_2 < \infty$. Using Assumption 1(a) we have

$$|A_T| = \left| \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K E[F_{l,t} F_{l,h}] \right| \leq \frac{C}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T \|E[F_t F'_{t-h}]\|_2 = O(T^{-1}),$$

where $C > 0$ denotes a constant. For the term B_T we make use of the triangle and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, which yield

$$\begin{aligned} |B_T| &\leq 2 \sum_{l=1}^K \left| E \left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{l,t} \right) \left\langle \psi_l, \frac{1}{T} \sum_{h=1}^T \epsilon_h \right\rangle \right] \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{l=1}^K \sqrt{E \left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{l,t} \right)^2 \right] E \left[\left\langle \psi_l, \frac{1}{T} \sum_{h=1}^T \epsilon_h \right\rangle^2 \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \|E[F_t F'_{t-h}]\|_2 < \infty$, we have that $E[(T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{l,t})^2] = O(T^{-1})$. From the triangle inequality, the orthonormality of the loadings, and the martingale difference sequence property of ϵ_t , it follows that $E[\langle \psi_l, T^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^T \epsilon_h \rangle^2] = E[\|T^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^T \epsilon_h\|^2] = O(T^{-1})$. Hence, $B_T = O(T^{-1})$. Finally, for the term C_T , Assumption 2(a) implies

$$C_T = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t,h=1}^T E[\langle \epsilon_t, \epsilon_h \rangle] = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T E\|\epsilon_t\|^2 = O(T^{-1}),$$

and, consequently, $E\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 = A_T + B_T + C_T = O(T^{-1})$.

Proof of item (b). Without loss of generality and for the simplicity of the proof exposition we assume that $\widehat{\mu}(r) = \mu(r)$ for all $r \in [a, b]$. The result for $\widehat{\mu}(r) \neq \mu(r)$ follows from (a).

Then, we have

$$E\|\widehat{C}_Y - C_Y\|_S^2 = E \int_a^b \int_a^b (\widehat{c}(r, s) - c(r, s))^2 dr ds,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{c}(r, s) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l(r) + \epsilon_t(r) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^K F_{m,t} \psi_m(s) + \epsilon_t(s) \right), \\ c(r, s) &= \sum_{l,m=1}^K \lambda_l \psi_l(r) \psi_m(s) 1_{\{l=m\}} + \delta(r, s). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the decomposition

$$\widehat{c}_Y(r, s) - c_Y(r, s) = A_T(r, s) + B_T(r, s) + C_T(r, s) + D_T(r, s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(r, s) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l,m=1}^K (F_{l,t} F_{m,t} - \lambda_l 1_{\{l=m\}}) \psi_l(r) \psi_m(s), \\ B_T(r, s) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l(r) \epsilon_t(s), \quad C_T(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K F_{l,t} \psi_l(s) \epsilon_t(r), \\ D_T(r, s) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\epsilon_t(r) \epsilon_t(s) - \delta(r, s)). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that the Hilbert-Schmidt norms of these four terms are $O(T^{-1})$. The proof of the original problem $E \int_a^b \int_a^b (\widehat{c}(r, s) - c(r, s))^2 dr ds = O(T^{-1})$ then follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For the first term, we make use of the auxiliary Lemma A.1, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} E \int_a^b \int_a^b (A_T(r, s))^2 dr ds &= E \int_a^b \int_a^b \left(\Psi'(r) \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t F_t' - E[F_t F_t'] \right) \Psi(s) \right)^2 dr ds \\ &= E \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t F_t' - E[F_t F_t'] \right\|_2^2 = O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \int_a^b \int_a^b (B_T(r, s))^2 dr ds &= E \int_a^b \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{l,t} \epsilon_t(s) \right)^2 ds \\ &= E \int_a^b \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t \epsilon_t(s) \right\|_2^2 ds = O(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Assumption 1(a), and the last equality follows from Assumption 2(d). Since $C_T(r, s) = B_T(s, r)$, the proof for the third term follows analogously.

Finally, for the last term,

$$\begin{aligned}
E \int_a^b \int_a^b (D_T(r, s))^2 dr ds &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T E \int_a^b \int_a^b (\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s) - \delta(r, s))^2 dr ds \\
&+ \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \sum_{q=t+1}^T E \int_a^b \int_a^b (\epsilon_q(r)\epsilon_q(s) - \delta(r, s))(\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s) - \delta(r, s)) dr ds \\
&= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[E \|\epsilon_t\|^4 - \int_a^b \int_a^b \delta^2(r, s) dr ds \right] \\
&+ \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \sum_{q=t+1}^T \int_a^b \int_a^b \left[E[\epsilon_q(r)\epsilon_q(s)\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s)] - \delta^2(r, s) \right] dr ds = O(T^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Assumption 2(a) and the fact that

$$E[\epsilon_q(r)\epsilon_q(s)\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s)] = E[E[\epsilon_q(r)\epsilon_q(s)|\mathcal{A}_t]\epsilon_t(r)\epsilon_t(s)] = \delta^2(r, s).$$

Proof of item (c). Lemma 2.2 in Horváth and Kokoszka (2012) implies

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq K} |\widehat{\lambda}_l - \lambda_l| \leq \|\widehat{C}_Y - C_Y\|_S,$$

and the result follows from (b).

Proof of item (d). Lemma 2.3 in Horváth and Kokoszka (2012) implies

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq K} \|s_l \widehat{\psi}_l - \psi_l\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha} \|\widehat{C}_Y - C_Y\|_S,$$

where $\alpha = \min\{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \lambda_2 - \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{K-1} - \lambda_K, \lambda_K\}$, and the result follows from (b).

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3

To facilitate the understanding of the main proof, we first introduce some notations.

- (1) The numbers of selected factors and lags are given by J and m , where $0 \leq J \leq K_{max}$ and $0 \leq m \leq p_{max}$.
- (2) The selected empirical FPCs are denoted as $\{\widehat{\psi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\psi}_T\}$. The first J empirical FPCs can be stacked into the functional vector $\widehat{\Psi}^{(J)} = (\widehat{\psi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\psi}_J)'$. Note that the empirical FPCs are not uniquely defined since $\{-\widehat{\psi}_1, \dots, -\widehat{\psi}_T\}$ are also orthonormal eigenfunctions of \widehat{C}_Y .
- (3) Let $\{\phi_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of orthonormal eigenfunctions of $\delta(r, s)$ that correspond to the descendingly ordered eigenvalues $\{\zeta_l\}$. For simplicity, we determine the sign of the

first $(K_{max} - K)$ orthonormal eigenfunctions by fixing the sign as $\text{sign}(\langle \phi_j, \widehat{\psi}_{K+j} \rangle) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq (K_{max} - K)$. Then, under the conditions of Theorem 3, $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{K_{max}-K}$ are uniquely determined conditionally on the sign of the chosen empirical FPCs for a given sample $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_T\}$.

- (4) By Assumption 2(b), the sequence $\{\varphi_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ with $\varphi_l = s_l \psi_l$ for $l \leq K$ and $\varphi_l = \phi_{l-K}$ for $l > K$ forms a sequence of orthonormal eigenfunctions of C_Y . Moreover, φ_l is uniquely identified for $l = 1, \dots, K_{max}$ conditional on the sign of the selected empirical FPCs since all eigenvalues of C_Y have multiplicity 1. The first J eigenfunctions can be stacked into the functional vector $\Phi^{(J)} = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_J)'$.
- (5) The FPC scores with respect to the basis φ_l are given by $F_{l,t}^* = \langle Y_t - \mu, \varphi_l \rangle$, where $F_{l,t}^* = s_l F_{l,t}$ if $l \leq K$, and $F_{l,t}^* = \langle Y_t - \mu, \phi_{l-K} \rangle$ if $l > K$. For $j = 1, \dots, K_{max}$ the scores $F_{l,t}^*$ are uniquely identified conditional on the basis defined above. Moreover, we use the notations $F_t^{(J)} = (F_{1,t}^*, F_{2,t}^*, \dots, F_{J,t}^*)'$ and $\widehat{F}_t^{(J)} = (\widehat{F}_{1,t}, \widehat{F}_{2,t}, \dots, \widehat{F}_{J,t})'$, where $\widehat{F}_{l,t} = \langle Y_t - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle$ are the empirical FPC scores.
- (6) $\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} = ((F_{t-1}^{(J)})', (F_{t-2}^{(J)})', \dots, (F_{t-m}^{(J)})')'$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} = ((\widehat{F}_{t-1}^{(J)})', (\widehat{F}_{t-2}^{(J)})', \dots, (\widehat{F}_{t-m}^{(J)})')'$.
- (7) For the selected number of factors J and lags p , we consider the completion matrices

$$\mathbf{A}^* = \begin{cases} [\mathbf{s}A_1\mathbf{s}', \dots, \mathbf{s}A_p\mathbf{s}', \mathbf{0}_{J,(m-p)J}], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m \geq p, \\ [A_1, \dots, A_p], \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{0}_{K,(p-m)K}], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [\mathbf{s}A_1\mathbf{s}', \dots, \mathbf{s}A_p\mathbf{s}'], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [A_1, \dots, A_p, \mathbf{0}_{K,(m-p)K}], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m \geq p, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* = \begin{cases} [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m \geq p, \\ [\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{0}_{K,(p-m)K}], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}, \mathbf{0}_{J,(p-m)J}], & \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m < p, \\ [\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}\mathbf{r}', \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}'], & \text{if } J < K \text{ and } m \geq p, \end{cases}$$

where \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{s} , and $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(J,m)} = [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)}]$ are defined in Section 4.2.

- (8) $\Gamma_{(J,m)} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T E[F_t^{(J)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})']$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{F}_t^{(J)} (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})'$.
- (9) $\Sigma_{(J,m)} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T E[\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})']$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})'$.

$$(10) \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_t^{(J)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})' \text{ and } \tilde{\Sigma}_{(J,m)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J,m)})'.$$

Lemma A.2. *Under conditions of Theorem 3, and for $0 \leq s \leq m$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\max_{\substack{0 \leq m \leq p_{max} \\ 0 \leq l, j \leq K_{max}}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \left(\hat{F}_{l,t} \hat{F}_{j,t-s} - F_{l,t}^* F_{j,t-s}^* \right) \right| = O_p(T^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. Note first that the empirical FPC scores admit the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_{l,t} &= \langle Y_t - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle = F_{l,t}^* + \langle Y_t - \mu, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle + \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle \\ &= F_{l,t}^* + \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k,t} \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle + \langle \epsilon_t, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle + \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle = F_{l,t}^* + R_{l,t}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $R_{l,t} = \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k,t} \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle + \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle + \langle \epsilon_t, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle$. Throughout the proof of this lemma we will be using the fact that

$$|\langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle| \leq \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\| = O_p(T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for all l , which follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the orthonormality of $\{\hat{\psi}_l\}$, and Theorem 2(a). Moreover, using similar arguments, we have

$$|\langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle| \leq \|\hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l\| = O_p(T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq K_{max}} E \|\hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l\| = O(T^{-1/2}) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

follows analogously to the proof of Theorem 2(d) since the eigenvalues of C_Y have multiplicity 1. Using the decomposition (A.2) we have

$$\max_{\substack{m \leq p_{max} \\ l, j \leq K_{max}}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \hat{F}_{l,t} \hat{F}_{j,t-s} - F_{l,t}^* F_{j,t-s}^* \right| \leq \max_{\substack{m \leq p_{max} \\ l, j \leq K_{max}}} (S_{1,m,l,j} + S_{2,m,l,j} + S_{3,m,l,j}), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$S_{1,m,l,j} = \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T R_{l,t} R_{j,t-s} \right|, \quad S_{2,m,l,j} = \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* R_{j,t-s} \right|, \quad S_{3,m,l,j} = \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{j,t-s}^* R_{l,t} \right|.$$

The rest of the proof is split in two steps. First, we show that $S_{1,m,l,j} = O_p(T^{-1/2})$ for any m , l , and j , and, in the second step, we show that $S_{2,m,l,j} = O_p(T^{-1/2})$. Note that the convergence rate of $S_{3,m,l,j}$ is identical to that of the second term and is therefore omitted.

Step 1: Note that $S_{1,m,l,j}$ consist of several sub-terms, which we study below:

(i) For the first sub-term we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \sum_{k,n=1}^K F_{k,t} F_{n,t-s} \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \langle \psi_n, \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \\ & \leq K^2 \max_{1 \leq k, n \leq K} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{k,t}^* F_{n,t-s} \right| \left| \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \right| \left| \langle \psi_n, \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| = O_p(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (A.4) and the fact that, by Assumptions 1(d), 1(e) and 2(a), $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{k,t}^* F_{n,t-s} = O_p(1)$.

(ii) For the second sub-term

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k,t}^* \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_j \rangle \right| \\ & \leq K \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{k,t}^* \right| \left| \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \right| \left| \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_j \rangle \right| = O_p(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which follows from (A.3), (A.4) and the fact that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{k,t}^* = O_p(1)$.

(iii) For the next sub-term

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K F_{k,t}^* \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \langle \epsilon_{t-s}, \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \\ & \leq K \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{k,t}^* \epsilon_{t-s} \right\| \left\| \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \right\| \left| \langle \psi_k, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \right| = O_p(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (A.4) and Assumption 2(d).

(iv) By (A.3) we have $|T^{-1} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_j \rangle| \leq \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|^2 = O_p(T^{-1})$.

(v) Similarly, for the fifth term,

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \langle \mu - \hat{\mu}, \hat{\psi}_l \rangle \langle \epsilon_{t-s}, \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|\epsilon_{t-s}\| \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\| \|\hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j\| = O_p(T^{-1}),$$

which follows from (A.3), (A.4), and Assumption 2(a).

(vi) Finally, for the last sub-term by Assumption 2(b)

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \langle \epsilon_t, \hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l \rangle \langle \epsilon_{t-s}, \hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|\epsilon_t\| \|\epsilon_{t-s}\| \|\hat{\psi}_l - \varphi_l\| \|\hat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j\|,$$

which is $O_p(T^{-1})$ by (A.4) and the fact that

$$E \left[\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|\epsilon_t\| \|\epsilon_{t-s}\| \right\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T E \left[\|\epsilon_t\|^2 \right]^{1/2} E \left[\|\epsilon_{t-s}\|^2 \right]^{1/2} = O(1).$$

Putting all results (i)-(vi) together allows us to conclude Step 1 of the proof with

$$\max_{\substack{m \leq p_{max} \\ l, j \leq K_{max}}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T R_{l,t} R_{j,t-s} \right| = O_p(T^{-1}).$$

Step 2: For the second term on the r.h.s of (A.6), $S_{2,m,l,j}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* R_{j,t-s} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \sum_{n=1}^K F_{l,t}^* F_{n,t-s}^* \langle \psi_n, \widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \langle \mu - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_j \rangle \right| + \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \langle \epsilon_{t-s}, \widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

For the first term on the r.h.s of (A.7) using the same arguments as in step 1 we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \sum_{n=1}^K F_{l,t}^* F_{n,t-s}^* \langle \psi_n, \widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \leq K \max_{n \leq K} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* F_{n,t-s}^* \right| \|\widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

For the second term on the r.h.s of (A.7) it holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \langle \mu - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_j \rangle \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \right| \|\langle \mu - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_j \rangle\| = O_p(T^{-1/2}),$$

and, for the last term, analogously to step 1 item (iii),

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \langle \epsilon_{t-s}, \widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j \rangle \right| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* \epsilon_{t-s} \right\| \|\widehat{\psi}_j - \varphi_j\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

which concludes step 2 with

$$\max_{\substack{m \leq p_{max} \\ l, j \leq K_{max}}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t}^* R_{j,t-s} \right| = O_p(T^{-1/2}).$$

Hence all terms in the r.h.s of (A.6) behave as $O_p(T^{-1/2})$, which concludes the proof. \square

Main proof of Theorem 3. We split the proof into four cases: **(A)** $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$; **(B)** $J < K$ and $m < p$; **(C)** $J \geq K$ and $m < p$; and **(D)** $J < K$ and $m \geq p$.

Case (A): $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$. In this case we have that $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{(J,m)} = \widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} \widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}^{-1}$, and, following standard multivariate time series results, the true coefficient matrices are identified as $\mathbf{A}^* = \Gamma_{(J,m)} \Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}$. Hence,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}^{-1} - \Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2 \|\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Note that the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_{(J,m)}$ are bounded and bounded away from zero, which implies that $\|\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2$ is bounded. Since the fourth moments of the factors and errors are bounded,

$\Gamma_{(J,m)}$ is a $Jm \times J$ matrix of bounded elements, which implies that $\|\Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2$ is also bounded. Moreover, we have $\|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)}\|_2 \leq \|\Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2$. The rates of convergence of $\|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2$ and $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}^{-1} - \Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2$ are established by Lemmas A.1 and A.2. More detailed, we have that

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \widetilde{\Gamma}_{(J,m)}\|_2 + \|\widetilde{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2$$

where, by Lemma A.1 and the fact that $F_{l,s}^*$ and $F_{m,t}^*$ are uncorrelated for all $k, m > K$ with $k \neq m$, we have $\|\widetilde{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \Gamma_{(J,m)}\|_2 = O_p(T^{-1/2})$. Lemma A.2 yields

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}_{(J,m)} - \widetilde{\Gamma}_{(J,m)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{m}J \max_{\substack{s \leq p_{max} \\ l, j \leq K_{max}}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\widehat{F}_{l,t} \widehat{F}_{j,t-s} - F_{l,t}^* F_{j,t-s}^* \right) \right| = O_p(T^{-1/2}).$$

Using identical arguments it follows that

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)} - \Sigma_{(J,m)}\|_2 = O_p(T^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Following Lemma 3 in Berk (1974) we define $q = \widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}^{-1} - \Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}$. Then,

$$q = (\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1} + q)(\Sigma_{(J,m)} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)})\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1},$$

which implies that

$$\|q\|^2 \leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2^2 \|\Sigma_{(J,m)} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}\|_2}{1 - \|\Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2 \|\Sigma_{(J,m)} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}\|_2}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where the numerator of (A.10) is $O_p(T^{-1/2})$, and the denominator is bounded away from zero. Thus,

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{(J,m)}^{-1} - \Sigma_{(J,m)}^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2 = O_p(T^{-1/2})$ follows by putting together all rates into (A.8).

Case (B): $J < K$ and $m < p$. In this scenario,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^* = [\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_1^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' - A_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_m^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' - A_m, A_{m+1}, \dots, A_p]$$

where \mathbf{r} is the completion matrix defined in Section 4.2. Hence,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \|\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_i^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' - A_i\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=m+1}^p \|A_j\|_2^2 \geq \sum_{j=m+1}^p \|A_j\|_2^2 > 0,$$

for all T , and $\text{plim inf}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2 > 0$.

Case (C): $J \geq K$ and $m < p$. Similar arguments are made for this scenario. We have

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^* = [\widehat{A}_1^{(J)} - \mathbf{s}A_1\mathbf{s}', \dots, \widehat{A}_m^{(J)} - \mathbf{s}A_m\mathbf{s}', \mathbf{s}A_{m+1}\mathbf{s}', \dots, \mathbf{s}A_p\mathbf{s}'],$$

where \mathbf{s} is the completion matrix defined in Section 4.2. Hence,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \|\widehat{A}_i^{(J)} - \mathbf{s}A_i\mathbf{s}'\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=m+1}^p \|A_j\|_2^2 \geq \sum_{j=m+1}^p \|A_j\|_2^2 > 0.$$

Case (D): $J < K$ and $m \geq p$. In this scenario, we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p \|\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_i^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' - A_i\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=p+1}^m \|\widehat{A}_j^{(J)}\|_2^2.$$

Since $J < K$ consider the following matrix partitioning

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_i & \mathbf{b}_i \\ \mathbf{c}_i & \mathbf{d}_i \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{a}_i is a $J \times J$ matrix. Further, from the definition of the completion matrix \mathbf{r} we have

$$\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_i^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_i^{(J)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\| &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \|\mathbf{r}\widehat{A}_i^{(J)}\mathbf{r}' - A_i\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\|\widehat{A}_i^{(J)} - \mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{b}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_i\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\|\mathbf{b}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_i\|_2^2 \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of the theorem.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4

Before discussing the main proof, we establish several auxiliary results. We take explicitly into account the dependence on K , p , J and m to keep the proofs traceable. Hence, in addition to the notations introduced in the proof of Theorem 3 given at the top of Section A.2, the following notations will be used:

- (1) Given a selected number of factors J and lags m we define $J^* = \max\{J, K\}$ and $m^* = \max\{m, p\}$.
- (2) Combining model equations (1) and (2) the functional time series can be written as

$$Y_t = \mu + \Psi'F_t + \epsilon_t = \mu + \Psi'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \Psi'\eta_t + \epsilon_t = \mu + (\Phi^{(J^*)})'\mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} + \Psi'\eta_t + \epsilon_t,$$

where $\Psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_K)'$, and $\mathbf{x}_{t-1} = (F'_{t-1}, \dots, F'_{t-p})'$.

(3) The best one-step ahead curve predictor is given as

$$Y_{t|t-1} = \mu + \Psi' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1} = \mu + (\Phi^{(J^*)})' \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}.$$

(4) The sample counterpart of $Y_{t|t-1}$ when using J empirical principal components and m lags is given as

$$\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J, m)} = \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(J, m)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} = \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J^*)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}.$$

(5) The mean square error when using J factors and m lags is given as

$$MSE_T(J, m) = \frac{1}{T - m} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J, m)}\|^2.$$

Lemma A.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3, for any $J \leq K_{max}$ and $m \leq p_{max}$,*

- (a) $\sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} \eta_{h, t} \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2})$;
- (b) $\sum_{l=1}^J \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2})$;
- (c) $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K, p)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)}\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. Item (a): By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} \eta_{h, t} \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} \eta_{h, t} \right\|_2 + \sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J, m)} - \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(J, m)}) \eta_{h, t} \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \sum_{h=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^J \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l, t-i}^* \eta_{h, t} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (F_{l, t-i}^* - \widehat{F}_{l, t-i}) \eta_{h, t} \right| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Consider a fixed h , i , and l . For the first term of (A.12), we treat the cases $l \leq K$ and $l > K$ separately. If $l \leq K$, we have $F_{l, t-i}^* = s_l F_{l, t-i}$. Since F_t is a causal process with respect to η_t , and η_t is a martingale difference sequence with respect to \mathcal{F}_t with bounded κ -th moments, $F_{l, t-i}^* \eta_{h, t}$ is also a martingale difference sequence with respect to \mathcal{F}_t with bounded $(\kappa/2)$ -th moments, where $\kappa > 4$ by Assumption 1(e). Then, by the central limit theorem for martingale difference sequences (see, e.g., Corollary 5.2.6 in White 2001),

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l, t-i}^* \eta_{h, t} \right| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$$

for all $l \leq K$. For the case $l > K$, we have $F_{l,t-i}^* = \langle \epsilon_{t-i}, \varphi_l \rangle$, and

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t-i}^* \eta_{h,t} \right| = \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \epsilon_{t-i} \eta_{h,t}, \varphi_l \right\rangle \right| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \epsilon_{t-i} \eta_{h,t} \right\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

which follows by Assumption 2(d) and the fact that $\eta_t = F_t - \sum_{j=1}^p A_j F_{t-j}$. For the second term in (A.12), the difference of the factors can be rearranged as

$$F_{l,t-i}^* - \widehat{F}_{l,t-i} = \langle Y_{t-i} - \mu, \varphi_l \rangle - \langle Y_{t-i} - \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle = \langle Y_{t-i} - \mu, \varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle + \langle \widehat{\mu} - \mu, \widehat{\psi}_l \rangle$$

for any $l = 1, \dots, J$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $t = m+1, \dots, T$. Then, by (A.5), Theorem 2(a), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the fact that $Y_t \in L_H^4$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (F_{l,t-i}^* - \widehat{F}_{l,t-i}) \eta_{h,t} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|Y_{t-i} - \mu\| \cdot |\eta_{h,t}| \cdot \|\varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l\| + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T |\eta_{h,t}| \cdot \|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By combining (A.13) and (A.14), it follows that (A.12) is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Item (b): By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=1}^J \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{h=1}^J \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \widehat{F}_{h,t-i} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{h=1}^J \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{h,t-i}^* \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| + \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (\widehat{F}_{h,t-i} - F_{h,t-i}^*) \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

We follow the same steps as in the proof of item (a). Analogously to (A.14) and the fact that ϵ_t has bounded fourth moments,

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (\widehat{F}_{h,t-i} - F_{h,t-i}^*) \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

For the case $l \leq K$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the triangle inequality, and Assumption 2(d) imply

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{h,t-i}^* \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{l,t-i} \epsilon_t \right\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

For the case $l > K$, note that $F_{h,t-i}^* = \langle \epsilon_{t-i}, \varphi_h \rangle$, and $\langle \epsilon_{t-i}, \varphi_h \rangle \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to \mathcal{A}_t with bounded $(\kappa/2)$ -th moments, where $\kappa > 4$. The central limit theorem for martingale difference sequences implies

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T F_{h,t-i}^* \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| = \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \langle \epsilon_{t-i}, \varphi_h \rangle \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right| = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

and, consequently, (A.15) is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Item (c): By the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left\| \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2 \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^J |F_{l,t-i}^* - \widehat{F}_{l,t-i}| |\widehat{F}_{h,t-j}| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Analogously to (A.14),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T |F_{l,t-i}^* - \widehat{F}_{l,t-i}| |\widehat{F}_{h,t-j}| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^T (\|Y_{t-i} - \mu\| \cdot \|\varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l\| + \|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|) (\|Y_{t-j} - \mu\| + \|\mu - \widehat{\mu}\|) = O_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

for any i, j, l , and h , and (A.16) is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let the conditions of Theorem 3 hold true, and let $J \leq K_{max}$ and $m \leq p_{max}$ be the numbers of selected factors and lags. Then, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$MSE_T(J, m) - MSE_T(K, p) = O_P(T^{-1}), \quad \text{if } J \geq K \text{ and } m \geq p.$$

Further, if $J < K$ or $m < p$ or both, we have

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} (MSE_T(J, m) - MSE_T(K, p)) = \tau_{(J,m)}^* > 0.$$

Proof. We denote the case of overselection ($J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$) as case I, and the case of underselection ($J < K$ or $m < p$ or both) as case II. From $\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$, $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* - \mathbf{A}^*\|_2 = O_P(1)$, the fact that $Y_t \in L_H^4$, the orthonormality of the loadings, and Lemma A.2, it follows that $MSE_T(J, m) = (T - m)^{-1} \sum_{t=m+1}^T \|Y_t - Y_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 = O_P(1)$. Moreover, we have $MSE_T(J, m) - T^{-1}(T - m)MSE_T(J, m) = O_P(T^{-1})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{T - m}{T} MSE_T(J, m) - \frac{T - p}{T} MSE_T(K, p) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left(\|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 - \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}\|^2 \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m+1}^{m^*} \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=p+1}^{m^*} \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}\|^2 = O_P(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $m^* = \max\{m, p\}$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & MSE_T(J, m) - MSE_T(K, p) \\ & = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left(\|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 - \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}\|^2 \right) + O_P(T^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

for both cases I and II, so it remains to study $T^{-1} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T (\|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 - \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}\|^2)$ in the remainder of this proof. A useful decomposition is obtained by adding and subtracting $\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}$ in the expression $\|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 &= \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} + \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 \\ &= \|Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}\|^2 + \|\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 + 2\langle Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}, \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Thus, it remains to show that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 = \begin{cases} O_P(T^{-1}) & \text{for case I,} \\ \Theta_P(1) & \text{for case II,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $\Theta_P(\cdot)$ denotes the exact order Landau symbol, that is, $a_T = \Theta_P(1)$ if and only if $a_T = O_P(1)$ and $a_T^{-1} = O_P(1)$, and

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}, \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)} \rangle = \begin{cases} O_P(T^{-1}) & \text{for case I,} \\ O_P(T^{-1/2}) & \text{for case II.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Then, the final result follows by (A.17), (A.18), (A.19), and (A.20).

To show statement (A.19) note that

$$\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)} = \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(J,m)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)} = \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J^*)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*,m^*)},$$

where $J^* = \max\{J, K\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} &= \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(K)})' \mathbf{A} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \\ &= \widehat{\mu} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} + (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J^*)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^* \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*,m^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)} = Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)},$$

where

$$Z_{(1)} = (\widehat{\Psi}^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*,m^*)}, \quad Z_{(2)} = (\widehat{\Psi}^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}.$$

To simplify the exposition we ignore the additional indices $\{t, T, J, m, K, p\}$ on which $Z_{(1)}$ and $Z_{(2)}$ depend. To disentangle the loading vectors and matrix products, let $e_i^{(J)}$ be the

l -th unit vector of length J , i.e., the l -th entry of $e_l^{(J)}$ is 1, and all other entries are zeros.

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Z_{(1)}\|^2 &= \int_a^b \left(\sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \hat{\psi}_l(r) (e_l^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right)^2 dr \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \left((e_l^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right)^2 \\
&= \|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2^2 \\
&= \text{tr} \left((\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right) \\
&= \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)})' \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(1)}\|^2 = \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Sigma}_{(J^*, m^*)} \right).$$

From (A.9) and (A.11) in the proof of Theorem 3 we have $\|\hat{\Sigma}_{(J^*, m^*)} - \Sigma_{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 = o_P(1)$ and $\|\hat{\Sigma}_{(J^*, m^*)}^{-1} - \Sigma_{(J^*, m^*)}^{-1}\|_2 = o_P(1)$. Consider the Cholesky decompositions $\hat{\Sigma}_{(J^*, m^*)} = \hat{\Omega} \hat{\Omega}'$ and $\Sigma_{(J^*, m^*)} = \Omega \Omega'$, where $\|\Omega\|_2 < \infty$ and $\|\Omega^{-1}\| < \infty$. Then,

$$\text{tr} \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' (\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Sigma}_{(J^*, m^*)} \right) = \|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Omega}\|_2^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Omega}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2^2} &\leq \|\hat{\Omega}\|_2 = O_P(1), \\
\frac{\|\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2^2}{\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Omega}\|_2^2} &= \frac{\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Omega} \hat{\Omega}^{-1}\|_2^2}{\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \hat{\Omega}\|_2^2} \leq \|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\|_2 = O_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(1)}\|^2$ is of exactly the same order as $\|\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2^2$. By Theorem 3, we have $\|\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2^2 = O_P(T^{-1})$ for case I and $\|\mathbf{A}^* - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2^2 = \Theta_P(1)$ for case II, which implies that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(1)}\|^2 = \begin{cases} O_P(T^{-1}) & \text{for case I,} \\ \Theta_P(1) & \text{for case II.} \end{cases}$$

For the second term,

$$\|Z_{(2)}\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{l=1}^K \hat{\psi}_l(e_l^{(K)})' (\hat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2^2 = \left\| (\hat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2^2,$$

where $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}\|_2^2 = O_P(T^{-1})$ by Theorem 3, Lemma A.2, and

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(2)}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2^2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}\|_2^2 = O_P(T^{-1})$$

for both cases. Finally, for the cross term,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(2)} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J,m)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2$$

which is $O_P(T^{-1})$ for case I and $O_P(T^{-1/2})$ for case II by Theorem 3. Since

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(J,m)}\|^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T (\|Z_{(1)}\|^2 + \|Z_{(2)}\|^2 + 2\langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(2)} \rangle),$$

statement (A.19) follows.

Now, consider statement (A.20). We show that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}, Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)} \rangle = O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2),$$

which, together with Theorem 3, implies statement (A.20). The term $Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t - \widehat{Y}_{t|t-1}^{(K,p)} &= \mu + (\Phi^{(K)})' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} + \Psi' \eta_t + \epsilon_t - \widehat{\mu} - \widehat{\Psi}^{(K)} \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \\ &= Z_{(3)} + Z_{(4)} + Z_{(5)} + Z_{(6)} + Z_{(7)} + Z_{(8)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{(3)} &= \mu - \widehat{\mu}, \quad Z_{(4)} = \Psi' \eta_t, \quad Z_{(5)} = \epsilon_t, \\ Z_{(6)} &= (\Phi^{(K)} - \widehat{\Psi}^{(K)})' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} = \sum_{l=1}^K (\varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l) (\mathbf{A}' e_l^{(K)})' \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}, \\ Z_{(7)} &= (\widehat{\psi}^{(K)})' (\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}) \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} = \sum_{l=1}^K \widehat{\psi}_l ((\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)})' e_l^{(K)})' \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}, \\ Z_{(8)} &= (\widehat{\psi}^{(K)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}) = \sum_{l=1}^K \widehat{\psi}_l ((\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)})' e_l^{(K)})' (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that the terms

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)}, Z_{(j)} \rangle \tag{A.21}$$

are $O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2)$ for all $j = 3, \dots, 8$. Recall that from the proof of statement (A.19),

$$Z_{(1)} = \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \widehat{\psi}_l ((\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' e_l^{(J^*)})' \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}, \quad Z_{(2)} = \sum_{l=1}^K \widehat{\psi}_l ((\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A})' e_l^{(K)})' \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(1)}\| &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2 = O_P(\|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2), \\ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|Z_{(2)}\| &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K, p)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K, p)} - \mathbf{A}\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2}).\end{aligned}$$

For $j = 3$, term (A.21) satisfies

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)}, Z_{(3)} \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T (\|Z_{(1)}\| + \|Z_{(2)}\|) \|\mu - \widehat{\mu}\|,$$

which is $O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2)$ by Theorem 2(a). For $j = 4$, Lemma A.4(a) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(4)} \rangle \right| &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \sum_{h=1}^K \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' e_l^{(J^*)} \right)' \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \eta_{h,t} \right) \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \psi_h \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \sum_{h=1}^K \left| \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' e_l^{(J^*)} \right)' \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \eta_{h,t} \right) \right| \\ &\leq J^* \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2 \sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \eta_{h,t} \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2),\end{aligned}$$

and, analogously,

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(2)}, Z_{(4)} \rangle \right| \leq K \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K, p)} - \mathbf{A}\|_2 \sum_{h=1}^K \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \eta_{h,t} \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1}).$$

For $j = 5$, Lemma A.4(b) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(5)} \rangle \right| &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \left((\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' e_l^{(J^*)} \right)' \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{J^*} \left\| (\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*)' e_l^{(J^*)} \right\|_2 \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(2)}, Z_{(5)} \rangle \right| &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^K \left((\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K, p)} - \mathbf{A})' e_l^{(K)} \right)' \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^K \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K, p)} - \mathbf{A})' e_l^{(K)} \right\|_2 \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \langle \widehat{\psi}_l, \epsilon_t \rangle \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the Euclidean inner product. For term

(A.21) with $j = 6$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(6)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^{J^*} \left((e_l^{(K)})' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \right) \cdot \left((e_h^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right) \langle \varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l, \widehat{\psi}_h \rangle, \\ \langle Z_{(2)}, Z_{(6)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^K \left((e_l^{(K)})' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \right) \cdot \left((e_h^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K, p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K, p)} \right) \langle \varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l, \widehat{\psi}_h \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (A.5), implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)}, Z_{(6)} \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \frac{J^*}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \sum_{l=1}^K \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \left(\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 + \|(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \right) \|\varphi_l - \widehat{\psi}_l\| \\
& = O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2).
\end{aligned}$$

For $j = 7$, due to the fact that the empirical FPCs are orthonormal, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(7)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \left((e_l^{(K)})' (\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}) \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right) \cdot \left((e_l^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right), \\
\langle Z_{(2)}, Z_{(7)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \left((e_l^{(K)})' (\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}) \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right) \cdot \left((e_l^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)}, Z_{(7)} \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \frac{K}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}) \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2 \left(\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 + \|(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \right) \\
& = O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2)
\end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 3. Finally, for $j = 8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Z_{(1)}, Z_{(8)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \left((e_l^{(K)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}) \right) \cdot \left((e_l^{(J^*)})' (\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)} \right), \\
\langle Z_{(2)}, Z_{(8)} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^K \left((e_l^{(K)})' \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} (\mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}) \right) \cdot \left((e_l^{(K)})' (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \langle Z_{(1)} + Z_{(2)}, Z_{(8)} \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \frac{K \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}\|_2}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left\| \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2 \left(\|(\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 + \|(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)} - \mathbf{A}) \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \right) \\
& \leq \frac{2K}{T} \sum_{t=m^*+1}^T \left\| \mathbf{x}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(K,p)} \right\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}^{(J^*, m^*)}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(K,p)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

which is $O_P(T^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^*\|_2)$ by Lemma A.4(c). This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Main proof of Theorem 4. In what follows, we shall show that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\text{CR}_T(J, m) < \text{CR}_T(K, p) \right) = 0$$

for all $J \leq K_{max}$ and $m \leq p_{max}$. From the definition of the criterion, we have

$$\text{CR}_T(J, m) - \text{CR}_T(K, p) = \text{MSE}_T(J, m) - \text{MSE}_T(K, p) + g_T(J, m) - g_T(K, p).$$

It is sufficient to prove the result for the case when $f(x) = x$ as the proof for any other strictly increasing transformation $f(\cdot)$ is identical. Hence, it remains to show that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\text{MSE}_T(K, p) - \text{MSE}_T(J, m) > g_T(J, m) - g_T(K, p) \right) = 0.$$

We split the proof into two cases: (i) $J \geq K$ and $m \geq p$; (ii) $J < K$ or $m < p$ or both.

For case (i) we have $\text{MSE}_T(J, m) - \text{MSE}_T(K, p) = O_p(T^{-1})$ by Lemma A.4. If $J \geq K$ and $m > p$ or $J > K$ and $m \geq p$, it follows that $g_T(J, m) - g_T(K, p) > 0$, which converges to zero at a slower rate than T^{-1} . This follows from the condition that $Tg_T(J, m) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for all J and m . Thus, $\mathbb{P}(\text{CR}_T(J, m) < \text{CR}_T(K, p)) \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. If $(J, m) = (K, p)$, the result is trivially satisfied.

For case (ii) Lemma A.4 implies $\text{plim inf}_{T \rightarrow \infty} (\text{MSE}_T(K, p) - \text{MSE}_T(J, m)) > 0$, which yields $\text{plim sup}_{T \rightarrow \infty} (\text{MSE}_T(K, p) - \text{MSE}_T(L, m)) < 0$. Since $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (g_T(L, m) - g_T(K, p)) = 0$, which is implied by the condition that $g_T(J, m) \rightarrow 0$ for all J and m , it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\text{CR}_T(J, m) < \text{CR}_T(K, p)) \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, which concludes the proof of the theorem.