

Penalized estimation for non-identifiable models *

Junichiro Yoshida^{1,2} and Nakahiro Yoshida^{1,2}

¹Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo †

²CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency

January 24, 2023

Summary We derive asymptotic properties of penalized estimators for singular models for which identifiability may break and the true parameter values can lie on the boundary of the parameter space. Selection consistency of the estimators is also validated. The problem that the true values lie on the boundary is dealt with by our previous results that are applicable to singular models, besides, penalized estimation and non-ergodic statistics. In order to overcome non-identifiability, we consider a suitable penalty such as the non-convex Bridge and the adaptive Lasso that stabilizes the asymptotic behavior of the estimator and shrinks inactive parameters. Then the estimator converges to one of the most parsimonious values among all the true values. In particular, the oracle property can also be obtained even if parametric structure of the singular model is so complex that likelihood ratio tests for model selection are labor intensive to perform. Among many potential applications, the examples handled in the paper are: (i) the superposition of parametric proportional hazard models and (ii) a counting process having intensity with multicollinear covariates.

Keywords and phrases Quasi-likelihood; Penalized likelihood; Boundary; Non-identifiability; Variable selection; Superposed process; Multicollinearity; Proportional hazard model

1 Introduction

The purpose of this article is to obtain the asymptotic behavior of the penalized estimator that possesses selection consistency under singular models where identifiability fails and the true parameter values may lie on the boundary of the parameter space. For that, we apply the limit theorem in Yoshida and Yoshida [26], which is a generalization of local asymptotic theory established by Ibragimov and Khas'minskii [12, 13] and which is valid for singular models, besides, non-ergodic statistics and penalized estimation. The limit theorem, recalled in Section 2, can overcome the singularity that the true values lie on the boundary by a more general local approximation of the parameter space than in previous studies. (See Remark 2.2 (i).)

For regular statistical models, there are many studies on the penalized maximum likelihood estimator (PMLE). Frank and Friedman [8] introduced the Bridge-type penalty

$$p_\lambda(\theta) = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^p |\theta_i|^q \quad (\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta),$$

where $q > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ are tuning parameters. In particular, this penalty gives the Lasso estimator when $q = 1$ (Tibshirani [22]). The limit distribution of the PMLE in the Bridge case is obtained by Knight and Fu [9], while the oracle property of the adaptive Lasso is shown by Zou [27]. In this article, we treat penalties that possess model selection consistency, including the non-convex Bridge with $q < 1$ and the adaptive Lasso. Also, many authors have studied the penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (PQMLE) in regular models: De

*This work was in part supported by Japan Science and Technology Agency CREST JPMJCR2115; Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.17H01702 (Scientific Research); and by a Cooperative Research Program of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics.

†Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo: 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. e-mail: nakahiro@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Gregorio and Iacus [7], Gaïffas and Matulewicz [10], Masuda and Shimizu [19], Kinoshita and Yoshida [15] and Umezu et al. [23], just to mention a few.

Let us explain the principle of our penalized estimation that overcomes non-identifiability. Let $\theta \in \Theta$ be the unknown parameter of interest whose true value is not necessarily uniquely determined. Denote by Θ^* the set consisting of the true values of $\theta \in \Theta$. The target value θ^* of our penalized estimation is one of the true values which is sufficiently parsimonious in that

$$\Theta^* \cap \{\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta; \text{ for every } j = 1, \dots, p, \theta_j^* = 0 \implies \theta_j = 0\} = \{\theta^*\}. \quad (1.1)$$

Then by adding to the quasi-log likelihood function a penalty term which is uniquely minimized on Θ^* by θ^* , the PQMLE converges to θ^* in probability, and we can derive its limit distribution and selection consistency. In particular, its oracle property can also be obtained.

One of the simplest example is the linear regression model

$$Y = \theta_1 X_1 + \dots + \theta_p X_p + \epsilon, \quad (1.2)$$

where the explanatory variables $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ are perfectly multicollinear in that $AX' = 0^1$ for some $(p-r) \times p$ matrix A . Here r denotes the dimension of the linear space spanned by X . Then the true values set Θ^* is determined as $\{\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta; A\theta' = A\theta_0'\}$, where θ_0 is one of the true values. Then considering the Bridge-type penalty with $q < 1$ that is uniquely minimized on Θ^* by some element $\theta^* \in \Theta^*$ satisfying (1.1), we are expected to obtain the penalized least squares estimator which converges to θ^* in probability, and can derive its limit distribution and selection consistency as well as its oracle property. The idea of estimating the unique minimizer θ^* of the penalty is mentioned briefly in the introduction of Knight and Fu [9]. Also, this estimation method is certainly valid for time-series data such as a counting process whose intensity is expressed as the following model.

$$\lambda_t(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_a) = \alpha_1 X_t^1 + \dots + \alpha_a X_t^a \quad (t \geq 0), \quad (1.3)$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_a$ are the non-negative unknown parameters, and $\{X_t^j\}_{t \geq 0}$ ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are non-negative observable processes that may be multicollinear. Without multicollinearity, the additive intensity model as (1.3) is found in the literature of survival analysis (Aalen [1]). Lindsey [17] shows that the additive model gives a better fit than the corresponding multiplicative intensity model in the parametric case, using event or life history data. The additive model is also treated by Chornoboy et.al. [6] in the context of neural network. Due to the natural boundary constraint $\alpha_j \geq 0$, this example is somewhat more difficult than usual linear regression models without the constraint such as (1.2). Therefore, prior to those models, we treat (1.3) in Section 5, but under the multicollinearity of X^1, \dots, X^a .

Moreover, this approach using penalized estimation is valid even when a nuisance parameter $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ exists with θ . Denote by Ξ^* the set of the true values of $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi = \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$, and by Θ^* the projection of Ξ^* as $\Theta^* = \{\theta \in \Theta; (\theta, \tau) \in \Xi^* \text{ for some } \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Then if we impose a suitable penalty on θ which is uniquely minimized on Θ^* by some parsimonious element $\theta^* \in \Theta^*$ satisfying (1.1), then the PQMLE converges to θ^* in probability, and its limit distribution and selection consistency can be obtained as well as its oracle property.

An example of when a nuisance parameter exists is estimation of the intensity of a counting process which is expressed as the superposition of some parametric proportional hazards models. That is, the intensity λ_t is parametrized as

$$\lambda_t = g + \alpha_1 e^{\beta_1 \cdot X_t^1} + \dots + \alpha_a e^{\beta_a \cdot X_t^a} \quad (t \geq 0), \quad (1.4)$$

where $g \geq 0, \alpha_j \geq 0, \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}^{k_j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are the unknown parameters, and X_t^j ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are \mathbb{R}^{k_j} -valued observed predictable processes. More generally, we may say that the model (1.4) is the superposition of counting processes whose intensity are given by the log-linear models $\log \lambda_t^{(j)} = \beta_j \cdot X_t^j$. The model (1.4) can be a generalization of superposed non-homogeneous Poisson processes such as Mun et al. [20], Pulcini [21] and Xu et al. [25]. They treat

$$\lambda_t = \alpha_1 e^{\beta_1 t} + \alpha_2 e^{-\beta_2 t} \quad (1.5)$$

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_1} \left(\frac{t}{\alpha_1}\right)^{\beta_1 - 1} + \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_2} \left(\frac{t}{\alpha_2}\right)^{\beta_2 - 1} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 + \frac{A_1}{\sqrt{2\pi\omega t}} \exp\left(\frac{-(\log \frac{t}{t_1})^2}{2\omega^2}\right) + A_2 \exp\left(\frac{t - t_2}{A_3}\right), \quad (1.7)$$

¹ B' denotes the transpose of a matrix B .

respectively, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ in (1.5) and (1.6), and $\lambda_0, A_1, \omega, t_1, A_2, A_3, t_2$ in (1.7) denote the unknown parameters. When treating the hazard function for mixture model as defined in Zou et al. [28], one would divide the right-hand side of (1.4) by the survival function. For a variety of parametric regression models including parametric proportional hazard models without superposition, see Kalbfleisch and Prentice [14] and Lawless [16].

Just to convey the idea of our penalized estimation for the non-identifiable model (1.4), we here consider the simplest model as

$$\lambda_t = g + \alpha e^{\beta X_t} \quad (t \geq 0),$$

where $(g, \alpha, \beta) \in [0, M]^3 =: \Xi$ denotes the unknown parameter, $M > 0$ is some constant, and X_t is an observed one-dimensional predictable process. Let the true intensity λ^* be a constant g^* . Then the true values set Ξ^* is determined as $\{(g, \alpha, \beta) \in \Xi; (g, \alpha) = (g^*, 0) \text{ or } (g + \alpha, \beta) = (g^*, 0)\}$. Let us consider β as a nuisance, and therefore denote (g, α) and β by θ and τ , respectively. Then the projection Θ^* is determined as $\Theta^* = \{\theta = (g, \alpha) \in [0, M]^2; g + \alpha = g^*\}$, and $\theta^* := (g^*, 0)$ is parsimonious in the sense of (1.1). With some non-convex Bridge-type penalty that is uniquely minimized on Θ^* by θ^* , we obtain an estimator which converges to θ^* in probability, and can derive its limit distribution and selection consistency as well as its oracle property.

There are still many other applications of our penalized estimation such as parameter estimation of mixture distributions. In such examples, however, the assumptions in this paper may not seem easy to verify because of the complexity of their parametric structure. Therefore, we consider to provide much more simple assumptions, using Hironaka's theorem, resolution of singularities [3, 11], and to apply our penalized estimation comprehensively to such complex examples including mixture distributions although those are to be discussed in the subsequent paper due to page limit. For these reasons, the two examples (1.3) and (1.4) whose parametric structure has a relatively simple explicit form are treated in this article without using Hironaka's theorem. The algebraic approach with resolution of singularities to non-identifiable models has been studied by Watanabe [24] in the context of Bayesian estimation rather than penalized estimation.

The main advantage of this penalized estimation in non-identifiable models is that even if the true value sets Ξ^* is extremely complex, it possesses the oracle property under suitable tuning parameters and therefore the asymptotic distribution of the estimator depends only on θ^* but on the nuisance $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. In non-identifiable models, (quasi-)likelihood ratio tests are sometimes labor intensive to perform because of the complexity of their asymptotic behavior. For a review of the asymptotics of the likelihood ratio in non-regular models, see Brazzale and Mameli [4]. As mentioned in the review, Liu and Shao [18] prove that when identifiability fails under the null hypothesis, the asymptotic null distribution of the likelihood ratio converges to the distribution of the supremum of a squared left-truncated centered Gaussian process. Here the derivation of the set over which the supremum is to be taken requires working out on a case by case basis, and simulation for approximation of the asymptotic null distribution may also be needed. Given those tasks in testing, penalized estimation could be a more handy way to estimate the true model. Also, even if we perform tests, testing with a small number of models pre-estimated by penalized estimation with different tuning parameters might be easier than testing with a large number of less well-founded models.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the theorem described in Yoshida and Yoshida [26]. The main result for the PQMLE is stated in Section 3.2, and some sufficient condition for its selection consistency is given in Section 3.3. (Their proofs is given in Section 6.) Applications are depicted in Sections 4 and 5. (Their proofs are given in Section 7.)

2 Preliminary

We recall Theorem 2.1 in Yoshida and Yoshida [26]. Denote by $\Xi = \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$ the unknown parameter space, where Θ is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^p , and \mathcal{T} is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^q . We estimate the true value (or one of the true values) θ^* of the unknown parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, while $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is treated as a nuisance parameter. Given a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) specifying the distribution of the data, the statistical inference will be carried out based on a continuous random field $\mathbb{H}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $T \in \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\sup \mathbb{T} = \infty$, where a continuous random field means that for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathbb{H}_T(\omega)$ is continuous on Ξ . Examples of \mathbb{H}_T are (quasi-)log likelihood functions and penalized (quasi-)log likelihood functions.

For each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, take an arbitrary \mathcal{T} -valued random variable $\hat{\tau}_T$, and suppose that we can take a Θ -valued random variable $\hat{\theta}_T$ that asymptotically maximizes $\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \hat{\tau}_T)$ on Θ . That is, $\hat{\theta}_T$ satisfies

$$P \left[\mathbb{H}_T(\hat{\theta}_T, \hat{\tau}_T) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \hat{\tau}_T) \right] \rightarrow 1 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

A common example of $(\hat{\theta}_T, \hat{\tau}_T)$ is the joint maximizer. Note that all the assumptions [A1]-[A5] described below do not depend on $\hat{\tau}_T$ nor on how $\hat{\theta}_T$ is taken and that the result below shows that the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_T$ is the same for different sequences $\hat{\tau}_T$.

Define U_T by

$$U_T = a_T^{-1}(\Theta - \theta^*) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p; \theta^* + a_T u \in \Theta\} \quad (2.1)$$

for a deterministic sequence a_T in $GL(p)$ with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} |a_T| \rightarrow 0$, where for any real matrix A , denote by $|A|$ the norm $\{\text{Tr}(AA')\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We mimic the local asymptotic theory to define the random field $\mathbb{Z}_T : \Omega \times U_T \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \exp\left(\mathbb{H}_T(\theta^* + a_T u, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\right) \quad (u \in U_T). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ denote the set of all continuous functions defined on \mathbb{R}^p . We give it the metric topology induced by a metric d_∞ defined as

$$d_\infty(f, g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \left(1 \wedge \max_{|x| \leq n} |f(x) - g(x)|\right) \quad (f, g \in C(\mathbb{R}^p)).$$

For each $T \in \mathcal{T}$, let \mathbb{V}_T be a $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ -valued random variable. Also, let \mathbb{Z} be a $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ -valued random variable which will be considered as the limit of \mathbb{Z}_T . Let \mathcal{G} be a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} .

For a topological space S , a sequence of S -valued random variables Y_T ($T \in \mathbb{T}$) and a S -valued random variable Y , we say that Y_T converges stably with limit Y and write as $Y_T \rightarrow^{d_s(\mathcal{G})} Y$ if and only if for any bounded continuous function f defined on S and for any bounded \mathcal{G} -measurable random variable Z , $E[f(Y_T)Z] \rightarrow E[f(Y)Z]$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Also, for $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, $\delta > 0$, and $R > 0$, we define A^δ and $A(R)$ as

$$A^\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p; \inf_{a \in A} |x - a| < \delta\} \quad \text{and} \quad A(R) = A \cap \overline{B_R},$$

respectively, where $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p; |x| < R\}$ and \overline{B} denotes the closure of B for a subset B . Then we define $U \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ by

$$U = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta. \quad (2.3)$$

Consider the following conditions.

$$[\mathbf{A1}] \quad \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] = 0.$$

[\mathbf{A2}] For every $R > 0$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \mathbb{V}_T(u)| &\xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ \mathbb{V}_T &\xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{in } C(\overline{B_R}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

More precisely, the convergence (2.4) means $\mathbb{V}_T|_C \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{Z}|_C$ for $C = C(\overline{B_R})$.

$$[\mathbf{A3}] \quad U \supset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T}.$$

[\mathbf{A4}] There exists a U -valued random variable \hat{u} such that with probability 1,

$$\mathbb{Z}(\hat{u}) = \sup_U \mathbb{Z}(u)$$

and such that with probability 1, for all $u \in U$ with $u \neq \hat{u}$,

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) < \mathbb{Z}(\hat{u}).$$

[A5] There exist some $T_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ and a sequence of U -valued random variables $\{\hat{v}_T\}_{T \geq T_0, T \in \mathbb{T}}$ such that with probability 1,

$$\mathbb{V}_T(\hat{v}_T) = \sup_U \mathbb{V}_T(u)$$

and such that $\{\hat{v}_T\}_{T \geq T_0, T \in \mathbb{T}}$ is tight.

Define \hat{u}_T by $\hat{u}_T = a_T^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*)$.

Theorem 2.1 (Yoshida and Yoshida [26]). *Under [A1]-[A4],*

$$\hat{u}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, if [A5] also holds, then

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1). \quad (2.6)$$

Remark 2.2. (i) Yoshida and Yoshida [26] shows that U is a generalization of the cone sets introduced by Chernoff [5] and Andrews [2]. Some sufficient conditions for [A3] and a way to derive the explicit form of U is discussed in [26].

(ii) Consider a situation where $\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) = -\infty$ for some $(\omega, \theta, \tau) \in \Omega \times \Xi$ while $\mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $(\omega, \tau) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{T}$. Even in this case, if \mathbb{Z}_T defined as (2.2) is still continuous for each $\omega \in \Omega$ by interpreting $\exp(-\infty)$ as 0, then Theorem 2.1 still holds since its proof depends on the properties of \mathbb{Z}_T including its continuity but not on those of \mathbb{H}_T .

3 Penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimation under non-identifiability

3.1 Settings

Denote by $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ the unknown parameter space. As explained in Introduction, in this article, we treat models where identifiability may fail. Thus, the true value of $\theta \in \Theta$ is not necessarily uniquely determined. We denote by Θ^* the set consisting of all the true values of $\theta \in \Theta$. Suppose that some $\theta^* \in \Theta^*$ is sufficiently parsimonious in the sense of (1.1). Then we estimate θ^* based on the model Θ by adding a suitable penalty term whose minimizer is θ^* on Θ^* . (These assumptions including the definitions of Θ^* are more precisely described in Section 3.2.) More generally, in what follows, we also consider a nuisance parameter τ whose parameter space is denoted by \mathcal{T} . Then $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi := \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$ are the unknown parameters. Note that when actually estimating, we do not need to know which of the unknown parameters corresponds to θ and which to τ .

Suppose that Θ and \mathcal{T} are compact in \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}^q , respectively. Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a given probability space specifying the distribution of the data. Let \mathbb{T} be a subset of \mathbb{R} satisfying $\sup \mathbb{T} = \infty$. We consider the penalty term

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j) + s_T(\tau) \quad ((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta, \tau \in \mathcal{T}),$$

where $s_T : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a continuous random field depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$, \mathcal{J} is a subset of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, $\xi_{j,T} : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are random variables depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$, and $p_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are deterministic continuous functions satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $p_j|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}$ is of class C^1
- (ii) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_j(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.
- (iii) There exist some positive constants δ_0 and $q_j \leq 1$ such that

$$p_j(x) = |x|^{q_j} \quad (x \in [-\delta_0, \delta_0]).$$

We consider penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimation based on the random field \mathbb{H}_T given by

$$\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) = \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j, T} p_j(\theta_j) - s_T(\tau) \quad ((\theta, \tau) \in \Xi),$$

where for each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{H}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is some random field satisfying that $\mathcal{H}_T(\omega, \theta^*, \tau)$ is \mathbb{R} -valued for every $(\omega, \tau) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{T}$ and that $\exp\{\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\}$ is a continuous random field by interpreting $\exp(-\infty)$ as 0. Note that \mathbb{Z}_T defined as (2.2) becomes a continuous random field.

For each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, let $\hat{\tau}_T$ be an arbitrary \mathcal{T} -valued random variable and $\hat{\theta}_T$ a Θ -valued random variable that asymptotically maximizes $\mathbb{H}_T(\cdot, \hat{\tau}_T)$ on Θ . Under some conditions in Section 3.2, we derive the asymptotic behavior of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_T$. As already mentioned, the results below show that the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_T$ is the same for different sequences $\hat{\tau}_T$. Indeed, [H1]-[H5] do not depend on $\hat{\tau}_T$ nor on the choice of $\hat{\theta}_T$.

3.2 Asymptotic behavior of the PQMLE

To derive the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}_T$, we precisely describe the assumptions, and apply Theorem 2.1. Let r be a positive integer, and let $h : \Theta \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ be a continuous map. Define a set $\Xi^* \subset \Xi$ as

$$\Xi^* = \{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi; h(\theta, \tau) = 0\}.$$

Then we give the precise definition of Θ^* as

$$\Theta^* = \{\theta \in \Theta; (\theta, \tau) \in \Xi^* \text{ for some } \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

As in Section 3.1, let θ^* be an element of Θ^* which will be specified in [H2] as a sufficiently parsimonious value. For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we denote by θ_j^* the j -th component of θ^* . We decompose $(\theta_j^*)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ as

$$\theta_i^* \neq 0 \text{ and } \theta_k^* = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_1, k \in \mathcal{J}_0),$$

where \mathcal{J}_1 and \mathcal{J}_0 are disjoint subsets of \mathcal{J} satisfying $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_1 \cup \mathcal{J}_0$. For notational simplicity, we assume that

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \{p_1 + 1, \dots, p\},$$

where p_1 is some nonnegative integer. For $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote $(\theta_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p_1})$ and $(\theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} = (\theta_{p_1+1}, \dots, \theta_p)$ by $\bar{\theta}$ and $\underline{\theta}$, respectively. For each $j = 1, \dots, r$, let $\mathbf{a}_{j, T} > 0$ be a deterministic number depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying that $\mathbf{a}_{j, T} \rightarrow 0$. Define an $r \times r$ matrix \mathbf{a}_T as $\mathbf{a}_T = \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{1, T}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{r, T})$.² Let $\mathbf{b}_T > 0$ be some deterministic sequence satisfying that

$$C_0^{-1} \max_{j=1, \dots, r} (\mathbf{a}_{j, T}^{-2}) \leq \mathbf{b}_T \leq C_0 \min_{j=1, \dots, r} (\mathbf{a}_{j, T}^{-2}) \quad (T \in \mathbb{T}) \quad (3.1)$$

for some constant $C_0 \geq 1$. That is, $\mathbf{a}_{j, T}$ ($j = 1, \dots, r$) have the same rate of convergence as $\mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

We consider the following conditions. Here the r times tensor product of a vector v is denoted by $v^{\otimes r}$. For a tensor $T = (T_{i_1, \dots, i_k})_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ and vectors $v_1 = (v_1^{i_1})_{i_1}, \dots, (v_k^{i_k})_{i_k}$, we write $T[v_1, \dots, v_k] = T[v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_k] = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} T_{i_1, \dots, i_k} v_1^{i_1} \dots v_k^{i_k}$.

[H1] \mathcal{H}_T satisfies the inequality: for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$ and any $T \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \leq K_T(\theta, \tau) [\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)] - \frac{1}{2} \{G(\theta, \tau) + r_T(\theta, \tau)\} [(\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}], \quad (3.2)$$

where K_T is a $C(\Xi; \mathbb{R}^r)$ -valued random variable depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying that

$$\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |K_T(\theta, \tau)| = O_P(1),$$

G is a $C(\Xi; \mathbb{R}^r \otimes \mathbb{R}^r)$ -valued random variable satisfying that with probability 1, for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$,

$$G(\theta, \tau) \text{ is positive definite,}$$

and $r_T(\theta, \tau)$ is a $C(\Xi; \mathbb{R}^r \otimes \mathbb{R}^r)$ -valued random variable depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying that

$$\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |r_T(\theta, \tau)| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

²For any $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denotes an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix whose (i, i) entry is a_i for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

[H2] θ^* satisfies the parsimonious condition $\Theta^* \cap \{\theta \in \Theta; \underline{\theta} = 0\} = \{\theta^*\}$. (Especially, θ^* satisfies (1.1).) Moreover, there exists an open ball \mathcal{W} in \mathbb{R}^p with center at θ^* such that

(a) h can be extended on $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{T}$ and for some constant $C > 0$,

$$|h(\theta, \tau) - h(\bar{\theta}, 0, \tau)| \leq C|\underline{\theta}| \quad (\theta \in \mathcal{W} \cap \Theta, \tau \in \mathcal{T}),$$

(b) for some constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$|h(\bar{\theta}, 0, \tau)| \geq \epsilon_0|\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| \quad (\theta \in \mathcal{W} \cap \Theta, \tau \in \mathcal{T}),$$

where $\bar{\theta}^* = (\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_{p_1}^*)$.

[H3] For any $r > 0$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[E_T(\theta^*) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \inf_{\theta^\dagger \in \Theta^*, |\theta^\dagger - \theta^*| \geq r} E_T(\theta^\dagger) \right] = 0,$$

where $E_T : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is defined as

$$E_T(\omega, \theta) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T}(\omega) p_j(\theta_j) \quad (\omega \in \Omega, \theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p).$$

[H4] For any $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$ and any $i \in \mathcal{J}_1$,

$$\xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} = \begin{cases} O_P(1) & (q_k < 1) \\ o_P(1) & (q_k = 1) \end{cases}.$$

(If $\xi_{k,T} = 0$, then we interpret $\xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1}$ as ∞ .)

Let \mathcal{N} be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^p satisfying

(i) for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\Theta \cap \{|\theta - \theta^*| < \delta\} \subset \bar{\mathcal{N}}, \quad (3.3)$$

(ii) for any $\theta \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $0 < t \leq 1$,

$$t\theta + (1-t)\theta^* \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (3.4)$$

We suppose that \mathcal{H}_T is \mathbb{R} -valued on $\Omega \times (\bar{\mathcal{N}} \cap \Theta) \times \mathcal{T}$ and can be extended to an \mathbb{R} -valued continuous random field defined on $\Omega \times \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$ satisfying that for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{H}_T(\omega, \cdot, \tau)$ is of class $C^2(\bar{\mathcal{N}})^3$. Let $\bar{\Delta}(\theta^*)$ be an \mathbb{R}^{p_1} -valued random variable, and $\bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*)$ a \mathcal{G} -measurable $\mathbb{R}^{p_1} \otimes \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ -valued random variable, where $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is a sub- σ -field. Take $a_T \in GL(p)$ as a deterministic diagonal matrix defined by

$$(a_T)_{jj} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_{j,T} & (j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0) \\ \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_j}{2}} & (j \in \mathcal{J}_0) \end{cases}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\rho_k > 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) are deterministic constants. From **[H5]** described below, $\mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k}{2}}$ gives the rate of convergence of $\xi_{k,T}^{-\frac{1}{q_k}}$ for each $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$. Besides, let $c_i : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$) be nonnegative random variables, and $d_k : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) positive random variables. Then we also consider the following condition.

³For an open set G , $C^k(\bar{G})$ denotes the set of all functions which are of class C^k in G and whose derivatives can be continuously extended on \bar{G} .

[H5] For some $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |a_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) - a_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)| \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

$$(a_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0), (\mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T})_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}, (\mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \left((\overline{\Delta}(\theta^*), 0), (c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}, (d_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \right),$$

in $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_1|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_0|}$. Also, for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\theta - \theta^*)| \leq R}} \left| a_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) a_T + \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\Gamma}(\theta^*) & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix} \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Define U_T and U as (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. We also define \hat{u}_T by $\hat{u}_T = (a_T)^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*)$. In the following, for any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote (u_1, \dots, u_{p_1}) by \bar{u} . Define \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{V}_T for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \exp \left\{ \overline{\Delta}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}] - \frac{1}{2} \overline{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} c_i \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} d_k |u_k|^{q_k} \right\} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_T(u) = & \exp \left\{ \overline{\Delta}_T(\theta^*, \hat{\tau}_T)[\bar{u}] - \frac{1}{2} \overline{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

respectively, where

$$\overline{\Delta}_T(\theta^*, \cdot) = \left(\mathbf{a}_{1,T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \cdot), \dots, \mathbf{a}_{p_1,T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{p_1}} \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \cdot) \right).$$

The following theorem constitutes the main result. Its proof is given in Section 6.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume [H1]-[H5] and [A3]. Also, assume [A4] for \mathbb{Z} defined as (3.6). Then*

$$\hat{u}_T = (a_T)^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}.$$

Moreover, assume [A5] for \mathbb{V}_T defined as (3.7). Then

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1).$$

Remark 3.2. (i) Yoshida and Yoshida [26] assumed that $q_j > 0$, $\rho_k \geq 1$ and $d_k \geq 0$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$, $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$). However, in this article, we assume $0 < q_j \leq 1$, $\rho_k > 1$ and $d_k > 0$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$, $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$). It is because our estimator need to shrink its \mathcal{J}_0 -components to 0 by stronger penalization, which leads to the explicit form of \mathbb{Z} as (3.6) where the nuisance parameter τ does not appear.

(ii) Condition [H1] reflects that for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, by maximizing $\mathcal{H}_T(\cdot, \tau)$, we can only identify $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $h(\theta, \tau) = 0$. This implies that identifiability may break.

(iii) The first sentence of [H2] means that on $\{\theta \in \Theta; \underline{\theta} = 0\} \times \mathcal{T}$, $h(\theta, \tau) = 0$ implies $\theta = \theta^*$. In particular, under [H1] and the first condition of [H2], if we restrict the parameter space Θ to $\{\theta \in \Theta; \underline{\theta} = 0\}$, then we can identify θ^* using \mathcal{H}_T . This comes from the fact that the model becomes identifiable for θ if $\underline{\theta} = 0$. Near θ^* , [H2]-(a) imposes on h some kind of Lipschitz continuity with respect to $\underline{\theta}$, and (b) requires a specific separation of the identifiable model $\{\theta \in \Theta; \underline{\theta} = 0\} \times \mathcal{T}$ for $\bar{\theta}$.

(iv) Roughly speaking, [H3] reflects that θ^* is the unique minimizer of the penalty term on Θ^* . To make it easy to understand, assume that there exists some positive random variable λ_T depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\lambda_T \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ such that for any $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\xi_{j,T} = \kappa_j \lambda_T, \quad (3.8)$$

where κ_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are some nonnegative random variables. Then the assumption [H3] holds if and only if the following condition [H3]' holds:

[H3]' With probability 1, θ^* is the unique minimizer of $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \kappa_j p_j(\theta_j)$ on Θ^* .

Therefore, for **[H3]**, we only need to adjust the values of κ_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) such that θ^* uniquely minimizes the penalty term on Θ^* .

(v) Assume that $q_k < 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) and $\mathbf{a}_{j,T} = \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$). An example of suitable $\{\xi_{j,T}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ is given by (3.8) if $\kappa_j \geq 0$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are deterministic numbers with $\kappa_k > 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) and

$$\lambda_T = \mathbf{b}_T^{\frac{r}{2}}$$

for some $r > 0$ with $q_k < r \leq 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$). Indeed, in this case, **[H4]** obviously holds, and by setting $\rho_k = \frac{r}{q_k} > 1$, we have

$$\mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} \rightarrow \kappa_i \mathbf{1}_{\{r=1\}} \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_1), \quad \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} = \kappa_k > 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{J}_0).$$

Therefore, part of **[H5]** imposed on $\xi_{j,T}$ also holds for $c_i = \kappa_i \mathbf{1}_{\{r=1\}}$ and $d_k = \kappa_k$. Thus, just by tuning κ_j for **[H3]'**, we obtain $\{\xi_{j,T}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ satisfying all the assumptions. If $q_k = 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$), then **[H4]** implies the need for the adaptive Lasso.

Remark 3.3. A way to derive the explicit form of $h(\theta, \tau)$ satisfying **[H1]** and **[H2]** is given at the end of Section 4. If we does not need the explicit form but only the existence of h , then it can be verified by some algebraic results such as Hironaka's theorem, resolution of singularities. This will be shown in the subsequent paper.

3.3 Selection consistency

In the following, assume that \mathcal{J}_0 is not empty. We denote by $\hat{u}_{j,T}$ the j -th component of \hat{u}_T ($j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{p}$). When we can show that $\hat{u}_{k,T} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) using Theorem 3.1, we can also show selection consistency under the following condition **[S]**. Note that similarly as before, for $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{\mathbf{p}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{\mathbf{p}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$, we denote $(u_1, \dots, u_{\mathbf{p}_1})$, $(u_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}$, $(v_1, \dots, v_{\mathbf{p}_1})$ and $(v_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}$ by \bar{u} , \underline{u} , \bar{v} and \underline{v} , respectively. Note that a_T is a diagonal matrix defined as (3.5).

[S] For any $R > 0$ and any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k|^{q_k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S(R, \delta_T) &= \{u \in U_T; |\bar{u}| \leq R, 0 < |\underline{u}| \leq \delta_T\} \quad \text{and} \\ I(R) &= \{v \in U_T; |\bar{v}| \leq R, |\underline{v}| = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.4. Assume that **[H1]**-**[H5]** and **[S]** hold and that

$$\hat{u}_{k,T} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{J}_0).$$

Then

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[(\hat{\theta}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} = 0] = 1.$$

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.3 in [26], and written in Section 6.

Remark 3.5. In this paper, we assume that $d_k > 0$ and $\rho_k > 1$ for all $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$ from the beginning. Under this assumption, Condition **[S2]** in [26] always holds, and **[S1]** in Yoshida and Yoshida [26] is equivalent to **[S]**.

Similarly as Yoshida and Yoshida [26], we give a simple example where the selection consistency condition **[S]** holds. A more complex case is treated in Section 4.4 in [26].

Example 3.6. Take Θ as $\Theta = \prod_{i=1}^p I_i$, where I_i ($i = 1, \dots, p$) are subsets of \mathbb{R} . Then for any $R > 0$ and any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k|^{q_k}} \leq \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{u}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k|^{q_k}} = 0 \quad (\because \bar{u} \in S(R, \delta_T) \implies \bar{u} \in I(R)).$$

Thus, [S] holds. More generally, if Θ can be decomposed as

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p; ((\theta_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0}, (\theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \in A \times B \right\}$$

for some $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{p-|\mathcal{J}_0|}$ and some $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_0|}$, then the same argument goes.

4 Superposition of parametric proportional hazard models

Let $\mathcal{B} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, P)$, $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ ⁴ be a stochastic basis, and assume that \mathbf{F} satisfies usual conditions. We consider a one-dimensional point process N_t on \mathbb{R}_+ . For the sake of simplicity, the initial value N_0 assumed to be zero. Let the \mathbf{F} -intensity of N_t be

$$\lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta) = g + \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j e^{\beta_j X_t^j} \quad (4.1)$$

$$(g \in [0, M_g], \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_a) \in [0, M_\alpha]^a, \beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_a) \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a, t \geq 0),$$

where $\{X_t^j\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are \mathbb{R} -valued \mathbf{F} -predictable processes, and $M_g, M_\alpha > 0$ and $L_\beta, M_\beta \geq 0$ are constants with $M_\beta + L_\beta > 0$. Although β_j and X_t^j ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are assumed to be one-dimensional, the discussion below can be generalized for vector-valued β_j and X_t^j as (1.4). The superposed model (4.1) is also thought of as a two-layered neural network employing exponential as the activation functions in the hidden layer.

Assume that $\{X_t^j\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ ($j = 1, \dots, a$) are locally bounded. We also assume the ergodicity of $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^a)$ as follows: for any bounded measurable function ψ on \mathbb{R}^a ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \psi(X_t) dt \xrightarrow{P} \int_{\mathbb{R}^a} \psi(x) \nu(dx) \quad (T \rightarrow \infty). \quad (4.2)$$

where ν is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^a .

Let the true intensity be

$$\lambda_t^* = g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{\beta_i^* X_t^i} \quad (t \geq 0),$$

where \mathcal{A} is a subset of $\{1, \dots, a\}$ and $g^* \in (0, M_g), \alpha_i^* \in (0, M_\alpha), \beta_i^* \in (-L_\beta, M_\beta) \setminus \{0\}$ ($i \in \mathcal{A}$). Note that if $\mathcal{A} \neq \{1, \dots, a\}$, then this model is non-identifiable. Indeed, for any subset $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}^c = \{1, \dots, a\} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ and any $(g, (\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathcal{B}}) \in [0, M_g] \times [0, M_\alpha]^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ with $g + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \alpha_k = g^*$,

$$\lambda_t^* = g + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \alpha_k e^{0 \cdot X_t^k} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{\beta_i^* X_t^i} \quad (t \geq 0).$$

Therefore, there are many (g, α, β) satisfying $\lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta) = \lambda_t^*$ ($t \geq 0$).

For given $T > 0$, we consider penalized estimation and maximize the estimation function

$$\Psi_T(g, \alpha, \beta) = \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta) dN_t - \int_0^T \lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta) dt - \kappa_g T^{\frac{q}{2}} |g|^q - \kappa_\alpha T^{\frac{r}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^a |\alpha_j|^q$$

$$(g \in [0, M_g], \alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a, \beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a),$$

where $\kappa_g, \kappa_\alpha, r, q \geq 0$ are tuning parameters with $0 < q < r \leq 1$. Let $(\hat{g}_T, \hat{\alpha}_T, \hat{\beta}_T) = (\hat{g}_T, \hat{\alpha}_{1,T}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{a,T}, \hat{\beta}_{1,T}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{a,T})$ be a random variable which maximizes Ψ_T on $[0, M_g] \times [0, M_\alpha]^a \times [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a$.

We assume the following conditions.

⁴ $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$.

[P1] For any $p > 1$,

$$\sup_{\beta_j \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta], t \geq 0} E \left[\left\{ (1 + |X_t^j|^3) e^{\beta_j X_t^j} \right\}^p \right] < \infty \quad (j = 1, \dots, a).$$

[P2] For any $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_a) \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^a} w(\beta, x)^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) \text{ is non-degenerate,}$$

where for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_a) \in \mathbb{R}^a$ and any $\beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a$,

$$w(\beta, x) = \left(1, \left(\frac{e^{\beta_i x_i} - e^{\beta_i^* x_i}}{\beta_i - \beta_i^*} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (e^{\beta_i^* x_i})_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \left(\frac{e^{\beta_k x_k} - 1}{\beta_k} \right)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

[P3] $\kappa_g < \kappa_\alpha$.

We define a random variable $\bar{\Delta}^\dagger$ taking value in $\mathbb{R}^{1+2|\mathcal{A}|}$ as $\bar{\Delta}^\dagger \sim N_{1+2|\mathcal{A}|}(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\Gamma})^5$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu} &= -q 1_{\{r=1\}} \left(\kappa_g (g^*)^{q-1}, (0)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\kappa_\alpha (\alpha_i^*)^{q-1})_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \right), \\ \bar{\Gamma} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^a} \frac{v(x)^{\otimes 2}}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{\beta_i^* x_i}} \nu(dx) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$v(x) = \left(1, (\alpha_i^* x_i e^{\beta_i^* x_i})_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (e^{\beta_i^* x_i})_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \right) \quad (x = (x_1, \dots, x_a) \in \mathbb{R}^a).$$

Note that if [P2] holds, then $\bar{\Gamma}$ is also non-degenerate.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume [P1]-[P3]. Then*

$$T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{g}_T - g^*, (\hat{\beta}_{i,T} - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\hat{\alpha}_{i,T} - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \bar{\Gamma}^{-1} \bar{\Delta}^\dagger, \quad (4.4)$$

$$T^{\frac{r}{2q}} (\hat{\alpha}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\hat{\alpha}_{k,T} = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{A}^c), \hat{\alpha}_{i,T} \neq 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{A})] = 1.$$

The proof is given in Section 7, where Theorem 3.1 is applied. The key function h in [H1] and [H2] can be obtained as follows. Define η and η^* as for any $g \in [0, M_g], \alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a, \beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^a$,

$$\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, x) = g + \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j e^{\beta_j x_j}, \quad \eta^*(x) = g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{\beta_i^* x_i}.$$

Note that $\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, X_t) = \lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta)$ and $\eta^*(X_t) = \lambda_t^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(g, \alpha, \beta, x) - \eta^*(x) &= g - g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \{ \alpha_i e^{\beta_i x_i} - \alpha_i^* e^{\beta_i^* x_i} \} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k e^{\beta_k x_k} \\ &= g - g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_i \beta_i^m - \alpha_i^* (\beta_i^*)^m) \frac{x_i^m}{m!} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \frac{(\beta_k x_k)^m}{m!}. \end{aligned}$$

⁵ $N_m(\mu, \Sigma)$ denotes the m -dimensional Gaussian distribution with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ .

By equating the coefficients, the equation $\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, \cdot) - \eta^*(\cdot) = 0$ holds if and only if

$$\begin{cases} f_1 := g - g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k = 0 \\ f_{2i} := \alpha_i \beta_i^m - \alpha_i^* (\beta_i^*)^m = 0 \quad (m \geq 1, i \in \mathcal{A}) \\ f_{3k} := \alpha_k \beta_k^m = 0 \quad (m \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{A}^c) \end{cases} .$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} g - g^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k = 0 \\ \beta_i - \beta_i^* = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \alpha_i - \alpha_i^* = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \alpha_k \beta_k = 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{A}^c) \end{cases} .$$

That is, the ideal $(f_1, (f_{2i})_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (f_{3k})_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c})$ of $\mathbb{R}[g, \alpha, \beta]$ equals the ideal

$$I = \left(g - g^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k, (\beta_i - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_k \beta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right).$$

Therefore, we can decompose $\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, \cdot) - \eta^*(\cdot)$ as for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^a$,

$$\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, x) - \eta^*(x) = \tilde{w}(\alpha, \beta, x) \left[\left(g - g^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k, (\beta_i - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_k \beta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right) \right],$$

where

$$\tilde{w}(\alpha, \beta, x) = \left(1, \left(\alpha_i \frac{e^{\beta_i x_i} - e^{\beta_i^* x_i}}{\beta_i - \beta_i^*} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (e^{\beta_i^* x_i})_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \left(\frac{e^{\beta_k x_k} - 1}{\beta_k} \right)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right).$$

Since \tilde{w} is degenerate if $\alpha_i = 0$ ($i \in \mathcal{A}$), we take α_i from \tilde{w} and obtain

$$\eta(g, \alpha, \beta, x) - \eta^*(x) = w(\beta, x) \left[\left(g - g^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k, \alpha_i (\beta_i - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_k \beta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right) \right],$$

where w is defined in (4.3). Thus, defining $h(g, \alpha, \beta)$ as

$$h(g, \alpha, \beta) = \left(g - g^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k, \alpha_i (\beta_i - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_k \beta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right),$$

we have

$$\lambda_t(g, \alpha, \beta) - \lambda_t^* = w(\beta, X_t)[h(g, \alpha, \beta)] \quad (t \geq 0, g \in [0, M_g], \alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a, \beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a), \quad (4.6)$$

Note that the remaining function w is non-degenerate in the sense of [P2].

5 Counting process having intensity with multicollinear covariates

In this section, we also treat time-series data derived from some counting process although the discussion here can obviously be applied to other examples that are essentially based on linear regression. Similarly as in Section 4, let $\mathcal{B} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, P)$, $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ be a stochastic basis, and assume that \mathbf{F} satisfies usual conditions. We consider a counting process N_t on \mathbb{R}_+ . For the sake of simplicity, the initial value N_0 is assumed to be zero. Let the \mathbf{F} -intensity of N_t be

$$\lambda_t(\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j X_t^j \quad (\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_a) \in [0, M_\alpha]^a), \quad (5.1)$$

where $\{X_t^j\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ ($j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$) are \mathbf{F} -predictable non-negative progressively measurable processes, and $M_\alpha > 0$ is a constant. As parametric proportional hazard models, we may consider the composite with exponential function on the right-hand side of (5.1). In this case, the model does not need the boundary constraint $\alpha_j \geq 0$ and becomes slightly simpler.

Assume that $\{X_t^j\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ ($j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$) are locally bounded. We also assume the ergodicity of $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^\mathbf{a})$ as (4.2) for any bounded measurable function ψ on $[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}$, where ν is a probability measure on $[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}$.

Suppose that X is a separable and stationary process whose invariant distribution is ν with $E[|X_t|^2] = \int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} |x|^2 \nu(dx) < \infty$. We consider the singular case where X is multicollinear as

$$0 < r := \text{rank} \left[\int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} x^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) \right] < \mathbf{a}. \quad (5.2)$$

Then there exists an unknown subset $D \subsetneq \{1, \dots, \mathbf{a}\}$ with $|D| = r$ such that

$$\int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} ((x_j)_{j \in D})^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) \text{ is non-degenerate.} \quad (5.3)$$

Since

$$E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T X_t^{\otimes 2} dt \right] = \int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} x^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) \quad (T > 0),$$

there exist unknown real numbers $\{b_{ij}\}_{i \in D^c, j \in D}$ such that with probability one,

$$X_t^i = \sum_{j \in D} b_{ij} X_t^j \quad (i \in D^c, a.e. t). \quad (5.4)$$

From the separability of X , (5.4) holds for every $t \geq 0$. Thus, we have with probability one,

$$A((X^j)_{j \in D})' = X', \quad (5.5)$$

where $A = (A_{ij})_{\substack{i \leq \mathbf{a}, \\ j \in D}}$ is an $\mathbf{a} \times r$ matrix defined as

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} \delta_{ij} & (i \in D, j \in D) \\ b_{ij} & (i \in D^c, j \in D) \end{cases}.$$

Here δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta. Then

$$\lambda_t(\alpha) = \alpha A((X^j)_{j \in D})' \quad (\alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}). \quad (5.6)$$

Let the true intensity λ^* be

$$\lambda_t^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \alpha_j^* X_t^j \quad (t \geq 0),$$

where $\alpha^* = (\alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_\mathbf{a}^*) \in [0, \infty)^\mathbf{a} \setminus \{0\}^\mathbf{a}$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}$, the equation $\lambda_t(\alpha) = \lambda_t^*$ ($t \geq 0$) holds almost surely if and only if

$$\alpha A = \alpha^* A.$$

Thus, α is non-identifiable since $\mathbf{a} > r$. In particular, the set of all the true values is

$$\{\alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}; \alpha A = \alpha^* A\} = \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a},$$

where $\text{Ker}(A)$ denotes the kernel of $A : \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$, $\alpha \mapsto \alpha A$.

For given $T > 0$, let us consider penalized estimation and maximize the estimation function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_T(\alpha) &= \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\alpha) dN_t - \int_0^T \lambda_t(\alpha) dt - T^{\frac{r}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \kappa_j |\alpha_j|^q \\ & \quad (\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\mathbf{a}) \in [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_j, q, r > 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$) are tuning parameters with $0 < q < r \leq 1$. Let $\hat{\alpha}_T = (\hat{\alpha}_{1,T}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{a},T})$ be a random variable which asymptotically maximizes Ψ_T on $[0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}$.

We prepare to derive the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\alpha}_T$. Denote by Pe the time-invariant part of the penalty function i.e.

$$Pe(\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \kappa_j |\alpha_j|^q \quad (\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a}).$$

We consider the following conditions.

[L1] There exists some $\alpha^{**} = (\alpha_1^{**}, \dots, \alpha_{\mathbf{a}}^{**}) \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}$ which uniquely minimizes Pe on the true value sets $\{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}$.

[L2] $\int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} \frac{|x|^p}{\{\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \alpha_j^* x_j\}^{p-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \alpha_j^* x_j > 0\}} \nu(dx) < \infty \quad (p = 2, 3, 4).$

In the sense of **[L1]**, α^{**} is the most economical value. Similarly as before, define $\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1 \subset \{1, \dots, \mathbf{a}\}$ as two partitions of $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, \mathbf{a}\}$ satisfying

$$\alpha_i^{**} \neq 0, \quad \alpha_k^{**} = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_1, k \in \mathcal{J}_0).$$

We also define an $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_1|}$ -valued random variable $\bar{\Delta}$ as $\bar{\Delta} \sim N_{|\mathcal{J}_1|}(0, \bar{\Gamma})$, where

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \int_{[0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}} \frac{((x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1})^{\otimes 2}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \alpha_j^* x_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{a}} \alpha_j^* x_j > 0\}} \nu(dx).$$

From Lemma 7.4 described later, $|\mathcal{J}_1| \leq r$, and $\bar{\Gamma}$ is non-degenerate under **[L1]** and **[L2]**. We define an $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_1|}$ -valued random variable $\bar{\Delta}^\dagger$ as

$$\bar{\Delta}^\dagger = \bar{\Delta} - q \mathbf{1}_{\{r=1\}} (\kappa_i |\alpha_i^{**}|^{q-1})_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}.$$

Theorem 5.1. *Assume **[L1]**-**[L3]**. Then*

$$(T^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\alpha}_{i,T} - \alpha_i^{**})_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}, T^{\frac{r}{2q}}(\hat{\alpha}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \xrightarrow{d} (\bar{\Gamma}^{-1} \bar{\Delta}^\dagger, 0)$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\hat{\alpha}_{k,T} = 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{J}_0), \quad \hat{\alpha}_{i,T} \neq 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)] = 1.$$

The proof is given in Section 7.

Next, we consider a sufficient condition for **[L1]**. Define \mathcal{E} as a family of all $E \subset \{1, \dots, \mathbf{a}\}$ satisfying that $|E| = \mathbf{a} - r$ and that

$$\langle \{e_j; j \in E\} \rangle \oplus \text{Ker}A = \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a},$$

where we denote by e_j ($j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$) the element of $\mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a}$ with its j -th component 1 and the other components 0. For any $E \in \mathcal{E}$, we denote by $pr_E : \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a}$ the projection onto $\langle \{e_j; j \in E\} \rangle$ along $\text{Ker}(A)$, that is, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbf{a}$,

$$pr_E(y) = \sum_{j \in E} z_j e_j,$$

where $(z_j)_{j \in E}$ is the unique element of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{a}-r}$ satisfying that $y - \sum_{j \in E} z_j e_j \in \text{Ker}A$. Note that $pr_E(\alpha^*)$ denotes the intersecting point of the two hyperplanes $\langle \{e_j; j \in E\} \rangle$ and $\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)$. Then we consider the following condition.

[L1]^\# There exists some $E_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*) \in [0, M_\alpha]^\mathbf{a}$ is the unique minimizer of Pe on the finite set

$$\{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\} \cap [0, \infty)^\mathbf{a}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *If $[\mathbf{L1}]^\#$ holds, then $[\mathbf{L1}]$ holds and α^{**} in $[\mathbf{L1}]$ is determined as*

$$\alpha^{**} = pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*).$$

The proof is also given in Section 7.

Remark 5.3. The set $\{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\} \cap [0, \infty)^a$ is not empty. Indeed, denote the set $\{1 \leq j \leq a; \alpha_j^* > 0\}$ by F_1 . If $\langle \{e_j; j \in F_1\} \rangle \cap \text{Ker}(A) \neq \phi$, then we can choose some $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_a) \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, \infty)^a$ such that

$$F_2 := \{1 \leq j \leq a; \alpha_j > 0\} \subsetneq F_1.$$

If $\langle \{e_j; j \in F_2\} \rangle \cap \text{Ker}(A) \neq \phi$, then do the same. Repeating these operations, we obtain some $\alpha^\dagger \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, \infty)^a$ satisfying $\langle \{e_j; j \in K\} \rangle \cap \text{Ker}(A) = \phi$, where $K = \{1 \leq j \leq a; \alpha_j^\dagger > 0\}$. Then there exists some $E_K \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $K \subset E_K$, and hence we have $\alpha^\dagger = pr_{E_K}(\alpha^\dagger) = pr_{E_K}(\alpha^*)$. Thus, $\{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\} \cap [0, \infty)^a$ is not empty. In particular, by choosing sufficiently large M_α , Condition $[\mathbf{L1}]^\#$ holds.

6 Proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.4

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We first show $[\mathbf{A1}]$ using $[\mathbf{H1}]$ - $[\mathbf{H4}]$ and the following properties assumed by $[\mathbf{H5}]$.

$$\mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{i,T} \leq C_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} = O_P(1) \quad (i \in \mathcal{I}_1), \quad (6.1)$$

$$\mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k p_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} \rightarrow^d d_k > 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{J}_0), \quad (6.2)$$

where $C_0 \geq 1$ is constant satisfying (3.1). From $[\mathbf{H1}]$ (and the definition of E_T in $[\mathbf{H3}]$), for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \\ &= \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) - \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j^*) \right) \\ &\leq K_T(\theta, \tau) [\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)] - \frac{1}{2} \{G(\theta, \tau) + r_T(\theta, \tau)\} [(\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}] \\ &\quad - (E_T(\theta) - E_T(\theta^*)) \\ &\leq O_P(1) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - \frac{1}{2} \{\lambda + o_P(1)\} |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 - (E_T(\theta) - E_T(\theta^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

$$= O_P(1) - (E_T(\theta) - E_T(\theta^*)), \quad (6.4)$$

where λ is a random variable defined by $\lambda = \inf_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} \lambda_{\min}[G(\theta, \tau)]$.⁶ Note that λ is almost surely positive from $[\mathbf{H1}]$. From the equation $p_j(0) = 0$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\max_{j=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{a}_{j,T} \right)^2 E_T(\theta^*) &\lesssim \mathfrak{b}_T^{-1} E_T(\theta^*) = \mathfrak{b}_T^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \xi_{i,T} p_i(\theta_i^*) \\ &= o_P(1) \quad (\because (6.1)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (6.3) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\max_{j=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{a}_{j,T} \right)^2 \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \\ &\leq \left(\max_{j=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{a}_{j,T} \right)^2 \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - \frac{1}{2} \{\lambda + o_P(1)\} |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 \right\} - \left(\max_{j=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{a}_{j,T} \right)^2 E_T(\theta) + o_P(1) \\ &\leq \left(\max_{j=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{a}_{j,T} \right)^2 \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - \frac{1}{2} \{\lambda + o_P(1)\} |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 \right\} + o_P(1) \quad (\because E_T(\theta) \geq 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{p+q}$ that contains Ξ^* ,

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi \setminus O} \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \geq 0 \right] = 0. \quad (6.5)$$

⁶ $\lambda_{\min}[A]$ denotes the minimum eigenvalue of a matrix A .

Thus, we only need to consider $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$ near Ξ^* .

For a positive number $r > 0$, define $B = B(r)$ as $B = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p; |\theta - \theta^*| < r\} \cap \Theta$. Take r satisfying that the neighborhood \mathcal{W} in [H2],

$$B \subset \mathcal{W} \cap \Theta.$$

From [H2], $\Xi^* \cap \{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi; \underline{\theta} = 0\} \subset \{\theta^*\} \times \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, for any $(\theta^\dagger, \tau^\dagger) \in \Xi^* \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})$, $|\theta_k^\dagger|_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}$ is positive, where θ_j^\dagger represents the j -th component of θ^\dagger . Take any $\delta > 0$ with $\delta < \frac{\delta_0}{4|\Theta|}$, where δ_0 is the positive number defined in (iii) in Section 3.1, and $|\Theta| = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\theta|$. Since $\Xi^* \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})$ is compact, there exist a finite subset $\{(\theta_{(1)}^\dagger, \tau_{(1)}^\dagger), \dots, (\theta_{(L)}^\dagger, \tau_{(L)}^\dagger)\} \subset \Xi^* \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})$ and a finite open cover $\{V_l\}_{l=1}^L$ of $\Xi^* \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})$ such that V_l is an open ball with center $(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger, \tau_{(l)}^\dagger)$ and with radius η_l where

$$\eta_l = \delta \min_{j=1, \dots, p, \theta_{(l),j}^\dagger \neq 0} |\theta_{(l),j}^\dagger|,$$

and $\theta_{(l),j}^\dagger$ represents the j -th component of $\theta_{(l)}^\dagger$. Then, from Lemma 6.1 below, for any $l = 1, \dots, L$, any $(\theta, \tau) \in V_l$ with $|\theta| \leq |\Theta|$ and any $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$p_j(\theta_j) \geq (1 - C_1 \delta) p_j(\theta_{(l),j}^\dagger),$$

where C_1 is some positive constant depending only on p_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) and $|\Theta|$. Therefore, for any $l = 1, \dots, L$ and any $(\theta, \tau) \in V_l \cap \Xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_T(\theta) - E_T(\theta^*) &\geq (1 - C_1 \delta) E_T(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger) - E_T(\theta^*) \\ &= E_T(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger) \left(1 - C_1 \delta - \frac{E_T(\theta^*)}{E_T(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Also, for any $l = 1, \dots, L$, $E_T(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger) \rightarrow \infty$ in probability since $|\theta_{(l),k}^\dagger|_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} > 0$ and since $\xi_{k,T} \rightarrow \infty$ in probability for any $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$ from (6.2). Thus, from (6.4) and [H3],

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \cup_{l=1}^L V_l \cap \Xi} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \cup_{l=1}^L V_l \cap \Xi} \{O_P(1) - (E_T(\theta) - E(\theta^*))\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{l=1, \dots, L} \frac{E_T(\theta^*)}{E_T(\theta_{(l)}^\dagger)} \geq 1 - 2C_1 \delta \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[E_T(\theta^*) \geq (1 - 2C_1 \delta) \inf_{\theta^\dagger \in \Theta^* \setminus B} E_T(\theta^\dagger) \right] \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Since $(B \times \mathcal{T}) \cup (\cup_{l=1}^L V_l \cap \Xi) = O \cap \Xi$ for some open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{p+q}$ and since it contains Ξ^* , the two evaluations (6.5) and (6.6) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \cup_{l=1}^L V_l \cap \Xi} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi \setminus O} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi \setminus (B \times \mathcal{T})} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] = 0. \tag{6.7}$$

We have for any $(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_0 |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| &\leq |h(\bar{\theta}, 0, \tau)| \quad (\because [\mathbf{H2}] \text{ (b)}) \\
&\leq |h(\theta, \tau)| + |h(\theta, \tau) - h(\bar{\theta}, 0, \tau)| \\
&\leq |h(\theta, \tau)| + C_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \quad (\because [\mathbf{H2}] \text{ (a)})
\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. Therefore, for any $(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} |\theta_i - \theta_i^*| &\lesssim \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| \\
&\lesssim \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \left\{ |h(\theta, \tau)| + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \right\} \\
&\lesssim \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| + \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \\
&= O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| + \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \quad (\because (6.1)).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

We may assume that $r < |\theta_i^*|/2$ ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$) and that $r < \delta_0$, where δ_0 is the positive number in the condition **(iii)** in Section 3.1. Then for some constant $C_3, C_4 > 0$ and for any $(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
-(E_T(\theta) - E_T(\theta^*)) &= -\sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} (p_i(\theta_i) - p_i(\theta_i^*)) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} p_k(\theta_k) \\
&\leq C_3 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} |\theta_i - \theta_i^*| - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} |\theta_k|^{q_k} \\
&\leq C_4 \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| + \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \right\} - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} |\theta_k|^{q_k} \quad (\because (6.10)) \\
&= O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |\theta_k|^{1-q_k} - 1 \right) \xi_{k,T} |\theta_k|^{q_k} \\
&\leq O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} - 1 \right) \xi_{k,T} |\theta_k|^{q_k} \\
&= O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T h(\theta, \tau)| \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} - 1 \right) \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |\mathbf{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k|^{q_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Therefore, the two evaluations (6.3) and (6.11) imply that for any $(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) &\leq O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - (\lambda + o_P(1)) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |\mathbf{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k|^{q_k}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

$$\leq O_P(1) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |\mathbf{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k|^{q_k}. \tag{6.13}$$

Since $\max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} = \begin{cases} O_P(1) & (q_k < 1) \\ O_P(1) & (q_k = 1) \end{cases}$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) from **[H4]** and from (6.2), we obtain

$$\overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\min_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left\{ \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathbf{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} \right\} \leq \eta \right] = 0. \tag{6.14}$$

From (6.13) and (6.14), we have for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\lim}_{K \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}, |(\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq K} \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \geq 0 \right] \\
& \leq \overline{\lim}_{K \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}, |(\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq K} \left\{ O_P(1) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k|^{q_k} \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\
& \leq \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\min_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left\{ \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} \right\} \leq \eta \right] \\
& \xrightarrow{\eta \rightarrow +0} 0. \tag{6.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Take an arbitrary $K > 1$. From (6.8), for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$ with $|(\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| & \gtrsim \mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} |h(\theta, \tau)| \geq \mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \epsilon_0 |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| - C_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |\theta_k| \right\} \\
& = \mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \epsilon_0 |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| - C_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k}{2}} |\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k| \right\} \\
& = \epsilon_0 \mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}^*| - C_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} O_P(1) |\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k| \\
& \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{C_5} \left| \left(\mathfrak{a}_{i,T}^{-1} (\theta_i - \theta_i^*) \right)_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0} \right| - O_P(1) K, \tag{6.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_5 > 0$ is some constant. For any subset $A_{T,r} \subset \Xi$ depending on T and $r > 0$, the inequality (6.12) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in (B \times \mathcal{T}) \cap A_{T,r}} \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \geq 0 \right] \\
& \leq \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in (B \times \mathcal{T}) \cap A_{T,r}} \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - (\lambda + o_P(1)) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k|^{q_k} \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\
& \leq \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in (B \times \mathcal{T}) \cap A_{T,r}} \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)| - (\lambda + o_P(1)) |\mathfrak{a}_T^{-1} h(\theta, \tau)|^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right], \tag{6.17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since (6.14) implies

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\min_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \left\{ \left(1 - C_4 \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} \xi_{k,T}^{-1} |r|^{1-q_k} \right) \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{\rho_k q_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} \right\} \leq 0 \right] = 0.$$

Thus, from (6.16) and (6.17), for any $K > 1$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in B \times \mathcal{T}, |(\mathfrak{b}_T^{\frac{\rho_k}{2}} \theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \leq K, \\ |(\mathfrak{a}_{i,T}^{-1} (\theta_i - \theta_i^*))_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq R}} \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \geq 0 \right] = 0. \tag{6.18}$$

From (6.7), (6.15) and (6.18), the condition **[A1]** holds.

Finally, we show **[A2]** for the continuous random fields \mathbb{V}_T and \mathbb{Z}_T defined by (3.7) and (3.6), respectively, under **[H5]**. Take any positive number $R > 0$, and fix it. We consider sufficiently large T such that for any $u \in U_T(R)$, $\theta^* + a_T u \in \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}; |x_i - \theta_i^*| < 2^{-1} |\theta_i^*| (i \in \mathcal{J}_1), |x_k| < \delta_0 (k \in \mathcal{J}_0)\}$. For each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, define a $C(U_T \times \mathcal{T})$ -valued random variable \mathcal{Z}_T as

$$\mathcal{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \exp \{ \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^* + a_T u, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \quad ((u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}).$$

Then the continuous random field \mathbb{Z}_T defined by (2.2) satisfies that

$$\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \mathcal{Z}_T(u, \tau) \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} (p_i(\theta_i^* + \mathbf{a}_{i,T} u_i) - p_i(\theta_i^*)) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\}$$

for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}$. Define $\Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau)$ and $R_T(u, \tau)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau) &= a'_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \\ R_T(u, \tau) &= \int_0^1 (1-k) \left\{ a'_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^* + k a_T u, \tau) a_T + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*) & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix} \right\} dk \end{aligned}$$

for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$, respectively. Then, from Taylor's series, for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathcal{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] + R_T(u, \tau)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\}.$$

Then from [H5],

$$\sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \leq R} |R_T(u, \tau)| = o_P(1).$$

and

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau) - \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)| = o_P(1).$$

Thus, for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$ with $|u| \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_T(u, \tau) &= \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] + o_P(1)|u| \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \bar{\Delta}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)[\bar{u}] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] + o_P(1)|u| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(Obviously, $o_P(1)|u|$ may be denoted by $o_P(1)$. However, we write in this form for use in the proof of Theorem 3.4.) Then for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$ with $|u| \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) &= \exp \left\{ \bar{\Delta}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)[\bar{u}] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*)[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} + o_P(1)|u| \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

Therefore, the continuous random field \mathbb{V}_T defined by (3.7) satisfies that

$$\sup_{u \in U_T(R), \tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \mathbb{V}_T(u)| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Moreover, for the continuous random field \mathbb{Z} defined by (3.6) and for any $R > 0$,

$$\mathbb{V}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{in } C(\bar{B}_R).$$

Thus, [A2] holds. □

Lemma 6.1. *Let M be a positive number. Take an arbitrary positive number δ with $\delta < \frac{\delta_0}{4M} \wedge 1$, where δ_0 is defined in Condition (iii) in Section 3.1. Also, take an arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ with $|x_0| \leq M$. Then for any $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|x| \leq M$ and with $|x - x_0| < \delta|x_0|$,*

$$p_j(x) \geq (1 - C_1 \delta) p_j(x_0), \quad (6.20)$$

where C_1 is some positive constant depending only on p_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) and M . (Note that (6.20) holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if $x_0 = 0$ since $p_j(0) = 0$.)

Proof. Fix $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|x| \leq M$ and with $|x - x_0| < \delta|x_0|$. First, assume that $x_0 \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$. Since $\delta|x_0| < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$, we have $|x| \leq \delta_0$. Therefore, from the condition **(iii)**,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_j(x)}{p_j(x_0)} &= \frac{|x|^{q_j}}{|x_0|^{q_j}} \\ &\geq \frac{(|x_0| - \delta|x_0|)^{q_j}}{|x_0|^{q_j}} \\ &= (1 - \delta)^{q_j} \\ &\geq 1 - K_1\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $K_1 > 0$ depends only on q_j (or p_j).

Second, assume that $x_0 > \frac{\delta_0}{2}$. Since $\delta|x_0| < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$, we have $|x| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{4}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_j(x)}{p_j(x_0)} &= 1 - \frac{p_j(x_0) - p_j(x)}{p_j(x_0)} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\sup_{\frac{\delta_0}{4} \leq |y| \leq M} |\frac{d}{dy}p_j(y)|}{\inf_{\frac{\delta_0}{2} \leq |y| \leq M} p_j(y)} \\ &= 1 - K_2\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $K_2 > 0$ depends only on p_j and M . Then we take C_1 as $C_1 = \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}}(K_1 \vee K_2)$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Take an arbitrary positive sequence ϵ_T with $\epsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. It suffices to show that

$$P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $|(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| = o_P(1)$, we can take a positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \delta_T] = 0.$$

Then from (6.19),

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] = \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\epsilon_T \leq |(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| < \delta_T] \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\epsilon_T \leq |(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| < \delta_T, |\hat{u}_T| \leq R] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\hat{u}_T \in S(R, \delta_T), |(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P\left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) - \sup_{v \in I(R)} \mathbb{Z}_T(v, \hat{\tau}_T) \geq 0\right] \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P\left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \{\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) - \mathbb{Z}_T(v, \hat{\tau}_T)\} \geq 0\right] \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P\left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \{O_P(1)|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + o_P(1)|\underline{u}| - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} |u_k|^{q_k}\} \geq 0\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $O_P(1)$ and $o_P(1)$ depend on $R > 0$. Since $\xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \xrightarrow{d} d_k > 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) from **[H5]**, we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{b}_T^{-\frac{q_k \rho_k}{2}} \leq \eta] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \\
\leq & \overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow 0, \eta > 0} \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \{O_P(1)|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + o_P(1)|\underline{u}| \right. \\
& \left. - \eta \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_j|^{q_k} \} \geq 0 \right] \\
\leq & \overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow 0, \eta > 0} \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \left\{ O_P(1) \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_j|^{q_k}} + o_P(1) - \eta \right\} \geq 0 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since [S] implies that for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(R, \delta_T), \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_j|^{q_k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty),$$

we have $\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{j,T})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] = 0$. Thus, Theorem 3.4 holds. \square

7 Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, and Proposition 5.2

We first prepare some lemmas.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\{N_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a counting process whose intensity is denoted by λ_t . Let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be an \mathbb{R}^d -valued predictable process assumed to be locally bounded. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^g$ be a bounded open domain admitting the Sobolev embedding. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^f$ be a measurable map satisfying the following conditions.*

- (i) *For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $f(x, \cdot)$ is of class $C^1(\overline{G})$.*
- (ii) *$\sup_{\gamma \in G} |\partial_\gamma^i f(\cdot, \gamma)|$ ($i = 0, 1$) are bounded on every bounded set of \mathbb{R}^d .*

If for any $p, q \geq 1$ with $p \geq 2q$,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in G, t \geq 0} E \left[|\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^p \lambda_t^q \right] < \infty \quad (i = 0, 1),$$

then

$$\sup_{T > 1} E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right| \right] < \infty,$$

where $\tilde{N}_t = N_t - \int_0^t \lambda_s ds$.

Proof. Let $T > 1$. Since the process $\sup_{\gamma \in G} |\partial_\gamma f(X, \gamma)|$ is locally bounded, we have

$$\partial_\gamma \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t = \int_0^T \partial_\gamma f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \quad (\gamma \in G).$$

Take some constant p with $p > g$. From Sobolev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right| \right] & \lesssim E \left[\int_G \sum_{i=0,1} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right|^p d\gamma \right] \\
& \lesssim \sup_{\gamma \in G, i=0,1} E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right|^p \right]. \tag{7.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Take some integer k with $2^k \geq p$. By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, for each $i = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right|^{2^k} \right] &\lesssim E \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^2 dN_t \right|^{2^{k-1}} \right] \\ &\lesssim E \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^2 \lambda_t dt \right|^{2^{k-1}} \right] + E \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^2 d\tilde{N}_t \right|^{2^{k-1}} \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^2 \lambda_t \right|^{2^{k-1}} \right] + E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^2 d\tilde{N}_t \right|^{2^{k-1}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Repeating this evaluation,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right|^{2^k} \right] &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^j} \lambda_t \right|^{2^{k-j}} \right] + E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^{k-1}} d\tilde{N}_t \right|^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^j} \lambda_t \right|^{2^{k-j}} \right] + E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^k} \lambda_t dt \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^j} \lambda_t \right|^{2^{k-j}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (7.1),

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) d\tilde{N}_t \right| \right] \lesssim \sup_{\gamma \in G, i=0,1} \sum_{j=1}^k \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| |\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^{2^j} \lambda_t \right|^{2^{k-j}} \right] < \infty.$$

□

Lemma 7.2. *Assume the same conditions as Lemma 7.1. Also assume the ergodicity of X as (4.2). If*

$$\left\{ \sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| \right\}_{t \geq 0} \text{ is uniformly integrable,} \quad (7.2)$$

then

$$\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^1(dP) \quad (T \rightarrow \infty). \quad (7.3)$$

In particular, if for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in G, t \geq 0} E \left[|\partial_\gamma^i f(X_t, \gamma)|^p \right] < \infty \quad (i = 0, 1), \quad (7.4)$$

then (7.3) holds.

Proof. Let $M > 0$, and define a bounded function f_M as $f_M(x, \gamma) = (f(x, \gamma) \wedge M) \vee (-M)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \right] \\ &\leq E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t, \gamma) dt - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_M(X_t, \gamma) dt \right| \right] + \sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_M(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \\ &\quad + E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_M(X_t, \gamma) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_M(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first and second terms on the rightmost side are as small as we want by taking sufficiently large $M > 0$ since

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, \gamma) 1_{\{|f(x, \gamma)| \geq M\}} \nu(dx) \right| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(x, \gamma)| 1_{\{\sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(x, \gamma)| \geq M\}} \nu(dx) \\
&= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T L \wedge \sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| 1_{\{\sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| \geq M\}} dt \right] \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| 1_{\{\sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| \geq M\}} dt \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| 1_{\{\sup_{\gamma \in G} |f(X_t, \gamma)| \geq M\}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

and since (7.2) holds. Also, let $\delta > 0$ and take a finite set $G_\delta \subset G$ such that $\max_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G_\delta} |\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| < \delta$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left[\sup_{\gamma \in G} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_M(X_t, \gamma) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_M(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \right] \\
&\leq E \left[\max_{\gamma \in G_\delta} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_M(X_t, \gamma) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_M(x, \gamma) \nu(dx) \right| \right] \\
&\quad + E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \sup_{\substack{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G \\ |\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| < \delta}} |f_M(X_t, \gamma_1) - f_M(X_t, \gamma_2)| dt \right] + \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\substack{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G \\ |\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| < \delta}} |f_M(x, \gamma_1) - f_M(x, \gamma_2)| \nu(dx) \\
&\xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 2 \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\substack{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G \\ |\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| < \delta}} |f_M(x, \gamma_1) - f_M(x, \gamma_2)| \nu(dx) \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (7.3) holds.

Also, from Sobolev's inequality, (7.2) holds if (7.4) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We define a new parameter space $\Xi = \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta &= [0, M_g] \times [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^{|A|} \times [0, M_\alpha]^{|A|} \times [0, M_\alpha]^{a-|A|}, \\
\mathcal{T} &= [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^{a-|A|},
\end{aligned}$$

and also define new parameters $\theta = (\bar{\theta}, \underline{\theta}) \in \Theta$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\theta} &= (g, (\beta_i)_{i \in A}, (\alpha_i)_{i \in A}), \\
\underline{\theta} &= (\alpha_k)_{k \in A^c}, \\
\tau &= (\beta_k)_{k \in A^c}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is, we consider a parameter transformation as $(\theta, \tau) = \varphi(g, \alpha, \beta)$, where $\varphi : [0, M_g] \times [0, M_\alpha]^a \times [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a \rightarrow \Xi$ is defined as

$$\varphi(g, \alpha, \beta) = (g, (\beta_i)_{i \in A}, (\alpha_i)_{i \in A}, (\alpha_k)_{k \in A^c}, (\beta_k)_{k \in A^c}). \quad (7.5)$$

Define estimators $\hat{\theta}_T$ and $\hat{\tau}_T$ taking values in Θ and \mathcal{T} , respectively, as

$$(\hat{\theta}_T, \hat{\tau}_T) = \varphi(\hat{g}_T, \hat{\alpha}_T, \hat{\beta}_T).$$

We define \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}_1 by $\mathbf{p} = 1 + |A| + a$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 = 1 + 2|A|$, respectively. We also define \mathcal{J}_1 , \mathcal{J}_0 and \mathcal{J} by $\mathcal{J}_1 = \{1\} \cup \{2 + |A|, \dots, \mathbf{p}_1\}$, $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{\mathbf{p}_1 + 1, \dots, \mathbf{p}\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_1 \cup \mathcal{J}_0$, respectively. We also define one of the true values $\theta^* = (\bar{\theta}^*, \underline{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_1}$ as

$$\bar{\theta}^* = (g^*, (\beta_i^*)_{i \in A}, (\alpha_i^*)_{i \in A}), \quad \underline{\theta}^* = (0)_{k \in A^c}.$$

For $r := \mathbf{p}$, let $\mathbf{a}_T = \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{1,T}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{r,T}) = T^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_r$,⁷ $\mathbf{b}_T := T$ and $\rho_k = \frac{r}{q} > 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$). We take $a_T \in GL(\mathbf{p})$ as a deterministic diagonal matrix defined by

$$(a_T)_{jj} = \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (j \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_1\}) \\ T^{-\frac{r}{2q}} & (j \in \{\mathbf{p}_1 + 1, \dots, \mathbf{p}\}) \end{cases}.$$

⁷ I_m denotes the m -dimensional matrix

Define U_T and U by (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. Then from Example 2.4 in Yoshida and Yoshida [26], Condition **[A3]** holds, and

$$U = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|} \times [0, \infty)^{a-|\mathcal{A}|} \subset \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Define c_i ($i \in \mathcal{I}_1$) and d_k ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) as

$$c_i = \begin{cases} \kappa_g 1_{\{r=1\}} & (i = 1) \\ \kappa_\alpha 1_{\{r=1\}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad d_k = \kappa_\alpha.$$

Define a random field \mathbb{Z} as

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \overline{\Delta}[\bar{u}] - \frac{1}{2}\overline{\Gamma}[\bar{u}^{\otimes 2}] - q \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} c_i |\theta_i^*|^{q-1} u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} d_k |u_k|^q,$$

for any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, where $\bar{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{p_1})$ and $\overline{\Delta} \sim N_{p_1}(0, \overline{\Gamma})$. We also define a U -valued random variable \hat{u} by

$$\hat{u} = (\overline{\Gamma}^{-1} \overline{\Delta}^\dagger, 0),$$

where $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{a-b}$. Note that \hat{u} becomes a unique maximizer of \mathbb{Z} on U , and **[A4]** holds. Define a random field $\mathcal{H}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) = \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) dN_t - \int_0^T \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) dt,$$

where ϕ denotes φ^{-1} for φ defined in (7.5). Then $\hat{\theta}_T$ is a maximizer of

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \hat{\tau}_T) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j)$$

on Θ , where for any $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{j,T} &= \begin{cases} \kappa_g T^{\frac{r}{2}} & (j = 1) \\ \kappa_\alpha T^{\frac{r}{2}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\ p_j(x) &= |x|^q \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Note that q_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) defined in (iii) of Section 3.1 are determined as $q_j = q < 1$. In the following, we show **[H1]**-**[H5]** under **[P1]**-**[P3]**, and use Theorem 3.1.

We first show **[H1]**. From Taylor's series, for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \\ & \leq \int_0^T \log \frac{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t^*} dN_t - \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\} dt, \\ & = \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} dN_t - \int_0^1 (1-s) \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} dN_t ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\} dt, \\ & = \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} d\tilde{N}_t - \int_0^1 (1-s) \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} dN_t ds, \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{N} is a martingale defined by $\tilde{N}_t = N_t - \int_0^t \lambda_s^* ds$. Take an arbitrary $R > 0$. The integrand of the second term in the rightmost side is evaluated as for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} & \geq \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{M_R g^*} \varphi_R(X_t) \\ & \geq \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{M_R \lambda_t^*} \varphi_R(X_t) \quad (\because \lambda_t^* \geq g^*), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_R : \mathbb{R}^a \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous function vanishing outside of $[-R - 1, R + 1]^a$ and satisfying $\varphi_R \equiv 1$ on $[-R, R]^a$, and $M_R > 0$ is a constant depending on R . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \leq \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} d\tilde{N}_t - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{M_R \lambda_t^*} \varphi_R(X_t) dN_t.$$

In the following, we denote $\phi(\theta, \tau)$ by (g, α, β) . As (4.6), we have

$$\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) - \lambda_t^* = w(\beta, X_t)[h(\theta, \tau)] \quad (t \geq 0, (\theta, \tau) \in \Xi),$$

where $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is a continuous function defined as for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$h(\theta, \tau) = \left(g + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k - g^*, (\alpha_i(\beta_i - \beta_i^*))_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, (\alpha_k \beta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \right). \quad (7.7)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{w(\beta, X_t)}{\lambda_t^*} d\tilde{N}_t [\sqrt{T}h(\theta, \tau)] - \frac{1}{2M_R T} \int_0^T \frac{w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t^*} \varphi_R(X_t) dN_t [(\sqrt{T}h(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}] \\ & = K_T(\theta, \tau) [\sqrt{T}h(\theta, \tau)] - \frac{1}{2} \{G(\theta, \tau) + r_T(\theta, \tau)\} [(\sqrt{T}h(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}] \quad (t \geq 0, (\theta, \tau) \in \Xi), \end{aligned}$$

where for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_T(\theta, \tau) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{w(\beta, X_t)}{\lambda_t^*} d\tilde{N}_t, \\ G(\theta, \tau) &= \frac{1}{M_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^a} w(\beta, x)^{\otimes 2} \varphi_R(x) \nu(dx), \\ r_T(\theta, \tau) &= \frac{1}{M_R} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t^*} \varphi_R(X_t) d\tilde{N}_t \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2} \varphi_R(X_t) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^a} w(\beta, x)^{\otimes 2} \varphi_R(x) \nu(dx) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since **[P1]** implies that for any $p, q \geq 1$ with $p \geq 2q$,

$$\sup_{\beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a, t \geq 0} E \left[\left| \frac{\partial_\beta^i w(\beta, X_t)}{\lambda_t^*} \right|^p (\lambda_t^*)^q \right] < \infty \quad (i = 0, 1) \quad (\because \lambda_t^* \geq g^*),$$

we can use Lemma 7.1, and obtain

$$\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |K_T(\theta, \tau)| = O_P(1). \quad (7.8)$$

Similarly, $\sup_{\beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t^*} \varphi_R(X_t) d\tilde{N}_t \right| = O_P(1)$. Since for any $p > 1$,

$$\sup_{\beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a, t \geq 0} E \left[\left| \partial_\gamma^i \{w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2}\} \varphi_R(X_t) \right|^p \right] < \infty \quad (i = 0, 1),$$

we can use Lemma 7.2, and obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T w(\beta, X_t)^{\otimes 2} \varphi_R(X_t) dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^a} w(\beta, x)^{\otimes 2} \varphi_R(x) \nu(dx) \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

uniformly in $\beta \in [-L_\beta, M_\beta]^a$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |r_T(\theta, \tau)| = o_P(1).$$

Moreover, **[P2]** implies the non-degeneracy of G for sufficiently large R . Thus, **[H1]** holds for $\mathbf{a}_T = T^{-\frac{1}{2}}I_r$. **[H2]** also holds. Indeed, continuing to denote $\phi(\theta, \tau)$ by (g, α, β) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta^* &= \{\theta \in \Theta; \exists \tau \in \mathcal{T}, h(\theta, \tau) = 0\} \\ &= \left\{ \theta \in \Theta; g + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k = g^*, (\beta_i - \beta_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}} = 0, (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{A}} = 0 \right\},\end{aligned}$$

where h is given by (7.7). Therefore, $\Theta^* \cap \{\underline{\theta} = 0\} = \Theta^* \cap \{\alpha_k = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0)\} = \{\theta^*\}$. Condition **(a)** of **[H2]** obviously holds since h can be smoothly extended on \mathbb{R}^p . Condition **(b)** of **[H2]** holds since $\alpha_i > 2^{-1}\alpha_i^* > 0$ ($i \in \mathcal{A}$) if θ is close to θ^* .

We show **[H3]**. From Remark 3.2, we only need to show **[H3]'**. Since $\kappa_g < \kappa_\alpha$ from **[P3]**, for any $\theta \in \Theta^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_g |g|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^a |\alpha_j|^q &= \kappa_g \left| g^* - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} \alpha_k \right|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} |\alpha_k|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} |\alpha_i^*|^q \\ &\geq \kappa_g |g^*|^q - \kappa_g \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} |\alpha_k|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c} |\alpha_k|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} |\alpha_i^*|^q \\ &\geq \kappa_g |g^*|^q + \kappa_\alpha \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} |\alpha_i^*|^q,\end{aligned}$$

where the equations hold if and only if $\alpha_k = 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{A}^c$). Therefore, under $\theta \in \Theta^*$, the penalty term is minimized if and only if $\alpha_k = 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{A}^c$), that is, if and only if $\theta = \theta^*$. Thus, **[H3]'** holds.

Condition **[H4]** also holds for $\xi_{j,T}$ defined in (7.6) since $\kappa_\alpha > 0$ and $q_j = q < 1$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$). Finally, we show **[H5]**. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\phi, \Omega\}$, and take \mathcal{N} as

$$\mathcal{N} = \text{Int}(\Theta) \cap \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p; \theta_1 > 2^{-1}g^*\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{N} satisfies (3.3) and (3.4) and that for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$ and any $t \geq 0$,

$$\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) \geq 2^{-1}g^*. \quad (7.9)$$

For any $(\theta, \tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) = \left(\int_0^T \frac{v(X_t)}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{-\beta_i^* X_t^i}} d\tilde{N}_t, \int_0^T \frac{(e^{\tau_k X_t^k})_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c}}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{-\beta_i^* X_t^i}} d\tilde{N}_t \right)'.$$

Similarly as before, from **[P1]** and Lemma 7.1,

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{(e^{\tau_k X_t^k})_{k \in \mathcal{A}^c}}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{-\beta_i^* X_t^i}} d\tilde{N}_t \right| = O_P(1).$$

Moreover, from the martingale central limit theorem, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{v(X_t)}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{-\beta_i^* X_t^i}} d\tilde{N}_t \xrightarrow{d} \overline{\Delta},$$

checking Lindeberg's condition as for $S_t = S_t(T) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^t \frac{v(X_s)}{g^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_i^* e^{-\beta_i^* X_s^i}} d\tilde{N}_s$ and for any $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}E \left[\sum_{t \leq T} (\Delta S_t)^2 1_{\{|\Delta S_t| > a\}} \right] &\leq a^{-1} E \left[\sum_{t \leq T} |\Delta S_t|^3 \right] \\ &\leq a^{-1} E \left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{v(X_t)}{\lambda_t^*} \right|^3 dN_t \right] \\ &\leq a^{-1} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| \frac{v(X_t)}{\lambda_t^*} \right|^3 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first half of the argument of [X5] holds. Also, for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) &= - \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} dN_t + \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} dN_t \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) dt \\
&= - \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) dt - \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} d\tilde{N}_t \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} d\tilde{N}_t + \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly as before, from [P1] and (7.9), we can use Lemma 7.1, and obtain

$$\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}} \left| - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} d\tilde{N}_t + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} d\tilde{N}_t \right| = O_P(1).$$

Therefore, for any $(\theta, \tau) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) &= - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) dt \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)) dt + o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

From [P1] and (7.9), we can apply Lemma 7.2 to

$$f(\gamma, X_t) = \frac{\partial_\theta \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))^2} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) + \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))}{\lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau))} \lambda_t(\phi(\theta^*, \tau)) - \partial_\theta^2 \lambda_t(\phi(\theta, \tau)),$$

where $\gamma = (\theta, \tau) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\theta - \theta^*)| \leq R}} \left| a_T' \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) a_T + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Gamma}(\theta^*) & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix} \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Thus, the second half of the argument of [H5] also holds. Then using Theorem 3.1, we have

$$a_T^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d} \hat{u}.$$

This implies (4.4) and (4.5).

Also, we see easily that [S] holds from Example 3.6. Therefore, using Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\hat{\alpha}_{k,T} = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{A}^c)] = 1.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5.1. From (5.3), we can take some large $L > 0$ such that the following matrix is non-degenerate:

$$\int_{[0, \infty)^a} \{(x_j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(x) \{\alpha^* \cdot x 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} + 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x = 0\}}\} \nu(dx), \quad (7.10)$$

where $\varphi_L : \mathbb{R}^a \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous function vanishing outside of $[-L - 1, L + 1]^a$ and satisfying $\varphi_L \equiv 1$ on $[-L, L]^a$. Choose some constant $M_L > 1$ satisfying that

$$\lambda_t(\alpha) \varphi_L(X_t) \leq M_L \quad (t \geq 0, \alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a). \quad (7.11)$$

We define an estimating function $\tilde{\Psi}_T$ as

$$\tilde{\Psi}_T(\alpha) = \Psi_T(\alpha) + \int_0^T \left\{ \lambda_t(\alpha) - \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) \right\} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \quad (\alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a).$$

Note that $\tilde{\Psi}_T \geq \Psi_T$. For each T , let $\tilde{\alpha}_T = (\tilde{\alpha}_{1,T}, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_{a,T})$ be an arbitrary $[0, M_\alpha]^a$ -valued random variable that asymptotically maximizes $\tilde{\Psi}_T(\alpha)$.

In order to show Theorem 5.1, it is sufficient to show that under **[L1]** and **[L2]**,

$$(T^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,T} - \alpha_i^{**}), T^{\frac{r}{2q}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \xrightarrow{d} (\bar{\Gamma}^{-1} \bar{\Delta}^\dagger, 0) \quad (7.12)$$

and

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\tilde{\alpha}_{k,T} = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0), \tilde{\alpha}_{i,T} \neq 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)] = 1. \quad (7.13)$$

In fact, assume (7.12) and (7.13) for any asymptotic maximizer $\tilde{\alpha}_T$ of $\tilde{\Psi}_T$. Then since $\lambda_t^* = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \alpha_i^{**} X_t^i$ *a.s.* and therefore $1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} = 1_{\{X_t^i = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}}$ *a.s.*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P[\tilde{\Psi}_T(\tilde{\alpha}_T) = \Psi_T(\tilde{\alpha}_T)] &= P\left[\int_0^T \left\{ \lambda_t(\tilde{\alpha}_T) - \frac{\{\lambda_t(\tilde{\alpha}_T)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) \right\} 1_{\{X_t^i = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}} dt = 0\right] \\ &\geq P[\tilde{\alpha}_{k,T} = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0)] \rightarrow 1 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\because (7.13)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the following evaluation asymptotically holds:

$$\tilde{\Psi}_T(\hat{\alpha}_T) \leq \tilde{\Psi}_T(\tilde{\alpha}_T) = \Psi_T(\tilde{\alpha}_T) \leq \Psi_T(\hat{\alpha}_T).$$

Thus, together with the inequality $\tilde{\Psi}_T \geq \Psi_T$, $\tilde{\Psi}_T(\hat{\alpha}_T)$ is asymptotically equal to $\tilde{\Psi}_T(\tilde{\alpha}_T)$. This means that $\hat{\alpha}_T$ also asymptotically maximizes $\tilde{\Psi}_T$. Then (7.12) and (7.13) holds when substituting $\hat{\alpha}_T$ for $\tilde{\alpha}_T$. Therefore, Theorem 5.1 holds.

In the following, we show (7.12) and (7.13) under **[L1]** and **[L2]**. We consider two parameter spaces Θ and \mathcal{T} by

$$\Theta = [0, M_\alpha]^a, \quad \mathcal{T} = \{1\},$$

and we consider new parameters $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ by

$$\theta = \alpha, \quad \tau = 1.$$

Define estimators $\hat{\theta}_T$ and $\hat{\tau}_T$ taking values in Θ and \mathcal{T} , respectively, as $\hat{\theta}_T = \tilde{\alpha}_T$, $\hat{\tau}_T = 1$. In the following, we omit τ . Also, define $\theta^* \in \Theta$ as $\theta^* = \alpha^{**}$. We take \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}_1 as $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 = |\mathcal{J}_1|$, respectively. For notational simplicity, assume that $\mathcal{J}_1 = \{1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_1\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{\mathbf{p}_1 + 1, \dots, \mathbf{p}\}$. Define $\mathbf{a}_T = \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{1,T}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{r,T})$ as $\mathbf{a}_T = T^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_r$. (r is already defined as $r = |D|$ in Section 5.) Let $\mathbf{b}_T := T$ and $\rho_k := \frac{r}{q} > 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$), and take $a_T \in GL(\mathbf{p})$ as a deterministic diagonal matrix defined by

$$(a_T)_{jj} = \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (j \in \mathcal{J}_1 = \{1, \dots, \mathbf{p}\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0) \\ T^{-\frac{r}{2q}} & (j \in \mathcal{J}_0) \end{cases}. \quad (7.14)$$

Define U_T and U by (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. Then from Example 2.4 in Yoshida and Yoshida [26], Condition **[A3]** holds, and

$$U = \{u = (u_1, \dots, u_{\mathbf{p}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}; u_k \geq 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0)\}.$$

Define $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$) and $d_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) as

$$c_i = \kappa_i 1_{\{r=1\}}, \quad d_k = \kappa_k,$$

respectively. Define a random field Z as

$$Z(u) = \bar{\Delta}[(u_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Gamma}[\{(u_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}\}^{\otimes 2}] - q \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} c_i |\alpha_i^{**}|^{q-1} u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} d_k |u_k|^q,$$

for any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We also define a U -valued random variable \hat{u} by

$$\hat{u} = (\bar{\Gamma}^{-1} \bar{\Delta}^\dagger, 0),$$

Note that with probability 1, \hat{u} becomes a unique maximizer of Z on U , and **[A4]** holds. Define a random field $\mathcal{H}_T : \Omega \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) = \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\alpha) dN_t - \int_0^T \lambda_t(\alpha) dt + \int_0^T \left\{ \lambda_t(\alpha) - \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) \right\} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt.$$

Then the estimation function $\tilde{\Psi}_T$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_T(\alpha) &= \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) - T^{\frac{q}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^a \kappa_j \alpha_j^q \\ &= \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) - \sum_{j=1}^p \xi_{j,T} p_j(\alpha_j) \quad (\alpha \in \Theta), \end{aligned}$$

where for any $j \in \mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_1 \cup \mathcal{J}_0 = \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{j,T} &= \kappa_j T^{\frac{q}{2}}, \\ p_j(x) &= |x|^q \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

Note that q_j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) defined in (iii) of Section 3.1 are determined as $q_j = q < 1$.

From Theorem 3.1, if **[H1]**-**[H5]** holds for $\tilde{\Psi}_T$ under **[L1]** and **[L2]**, then

$$a_T^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}_T - \alpha^{**}) \xrightarrow{d} \hat{u},$$

i.e. (7.12) holds. Therefore, in the following, we show **[H1]**-**[H5]** under **[L1]** and **[L2]**.

We first show **[H1]**. Since $\int_0^T 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dN_t = 0$ a.s., we have $\int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\alpha) dN_t = \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\alpha) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t$ a.s.. Then from Taylor's series,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) - \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha^{**}) \\ &= \int_0^T \log \lambda_t(\alpha) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T \lambda_t(\alpha) dt + \int_0^T \left\{ \lambda_t(\alpha) - \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) \right\} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \log \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t + \int_0^T \lambda_t^* dt \\ &= \int_0^T \log \frac{\lambda_t(\alpha)}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dt - \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^1 (1-s) \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\alpha) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dt - \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t - \int_0^1 (1-s) \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\alpha) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{N} is a martingale defined by $\tilde{N}_t = N_t - \int_0^t \lambda_s^* ds$. The integrand of the second term in the rightmost side is evaluated as for any $\alpha \in \Theta$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{\{s\lambda_t(\alpha) + (1-s)\lambda_t^*\}^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} \geq \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2}{M_L^2} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} \quad (\because (7.11)).$$

Therefore, noting that $M_L^2 > M_L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) - \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha^*) \\
& \leq \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t - \frac{1}{2M_L^2} \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2 \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t \\
& \quad - \int_0^T \frac{\{\lambda_t(\alpha)\}^2}{2M_L^2} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\
& = \int_0^T \frac{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t - \frac{1}{2M_L^2} \int_0^T \{\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^*\}^2 \varphi_L(X_t) \{1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t + 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt\}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (5.6), we have

$$\lambda_t(\alpha) - \lambda_t^* = (X_t^j)_{j \in D} [h(\alpha)] \quad (t \geq 0, \alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a),$$

where $h = (h_1, \dots, h_r) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ is a continuous function defined by

$$h(\alpha) = (\alpha - \alpha^*)A = (\alpha - \alpha^{**})A \quad (\alpha \in [0, M_\alpha]^a). \quad (7.16)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) - \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha^*) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t [\sqrt{T}h(\alpha)] - \frac{1}{2M_L^2 T} \int_0^T \{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(X_t) \\
& \quad \cdot \{1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t + 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt\} [(\sqrt{T}h(\alpha))^{\otimes 2}] \\
& = K_T [\sqrt{T}h(\alpha)] - \frac{1}{2} \{G + r_T\} [(\sqrt{T}h(\alpha))^{\otimes 2}] \quad (t \geq 0, \alpha \in \Theta),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
K_T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t, \\
G &= \frac{1}{M_L^2} \int_{[0, \infty)^a} \{(x_j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(x) \{\alpha^* \cdot x 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} + 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x = 0\}}\} \nu(dx), \\
r_T &= \frac{1}{M_L^2 T} \int_0^T \{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{M_L^2 T} \int_0^T \{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(X_t) \{\lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} + 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}}\} dt - G.
\end{aligned}$$

Since from [L2],

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \geq 0} E[|K_T|^2] &= \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left| \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}}{\lambda_t^*} \right|^2 \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dt \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} E \left[\left| \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}}{\lambda_t^*} \right|^2 \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dt \right] \\
&= \int_{[0, \infty)^a} \frac{|(x_j)_{j \in D}|^2}{\alpha^* \cdot x} 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain $K_T = o_P(1)$. Similarly,

$$\frac{1}{M_L^2 T} \int_0^T \{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t = o_P(1).$$

From the ergodicity, we have

$$\frac{1}{M_L^2 T} \int_0^T \{(X_t^j)_{j \in D}\}^{\otimes 2} \varphi_L(X_t) \{\lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} + 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}}\} - G \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Therefore,

$$r_T = o_P(1).$$

Moreover, (7.10) implies the non-degeneracy of G . Thus, **[H1]** holds.

Second, we show **[H2]**. From Lemma 7.4 described below, $\text{Ker}A \cap \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1} \rangle = \{0\}$. Therefore, for any $\alpha \in \Theta$ with $\alpha_k = 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$),

$$\begin{aligned} |h(\alpha)| &= |(\alpha - \alpha^{**})A| = \left| \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1} \alpha_j e_j - \alpha^{**} \right) A \right| \\ &\geq \epsilon_0 |(\alpha_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1} - (\alpha_j^{**})_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1}|, \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_0 is some positive constant. Therefore, **(a)** and **(b)** of **[H2]** hold, and $\Theta^* \cap \{\underline{\theta} = 0\} = \{\alpha \in \Theta; h(\alpha) = 0\} \cap \{\alpha_k = 0 \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0)\} = \{\theta^*\}$. Thus, **[H2]** holds.

From **[L1]**, Condition **[H3]'** holds for $\Theta^* = \{\alpha \in \Theta; h(\alpha) = 0\} = \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M_\alpha]^a$, which implies **[H3]**. Condition **[H4]** obviously holds for $\xi_{j,T}$ defined in (7.15) since $\kappa_j > 0$ and $q_j = q < 1$ ($j = 1, \dots, a$).

Finally, we show **[H5]**. Take $\mathcal{G} = \{\phi, \Omega\}$, and take \mathcal{N} as

$$\mathcal{N} = \text{Int}(\Theta) \cap \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^a; |\alpha_i - \alpha_i^{**}| < 2^{-1} \alpha_i^{**} \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}. \quad (7.17)$$

Note that \mathcal{N} satisfies (3.3) and (3.4) and that for any $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}$, $\lambda_t^* > 0$ implies $\lambda_t(\alpha) > 0$ since $\lambda_t(\alpha) \geq 2^{-1} \lambda_t^*$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha^{**}) &= \int_0^T \frac{X_t}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T X_t dt + \int_0^T X_t 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \frac{X_t}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as before, from **[L2]**,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left| \int_0^T \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t \right| = O_P(1).$$

Moreover, from **[L2]** and the martingale central limit theorem, we have

$$S_T := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t \xrightarrow{d} \overline{\Delta},$$

checking Lindeberg's condition as for any $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} E \sum_{t \leq T} (\Delta S_t)^2 1_{\{|\Delta S_t| > a\}} &\leq a^{-1} E \sum_{t \leq T} |\Delta S_t|^3 \\ &\leq a^{-1} E \left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{(X_t^j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} \right|^3 dN_t \right] \\ &= a^{-1} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} E \left[\left| \frac{(X_0^j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1}}{\lambda_0^*} \right|^3 \lambda_0^* 1_{\{\lambda_0^* > 0\}} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first half of the argument of **[H5]** holds.

Let us show the second half of the argument of **[H5]**. That is, take any $R > 0$ and we show

$$\sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \left| a'_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) a_T + \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\Gamma} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix} \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (7.18)$$

for $\partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha)$ that satisfies the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) &= - \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{\lambda_t^* = 0\}} dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{X_t^i = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}} dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dN_t - \int_0^T \frac{\{(X_t^j 1_{\{j \in \mathcal{J}_0\}})_{j=1, \dots, p}\}^{\otimes 2}}{M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{X_t^i = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}} dt \quad (\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}). \end{aligned}$$

Since a_T is defined as (7.14) and $\frac{r}{q} > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& a_T' \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\alpha) a_T \\
&= a_T' \left(- \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t \right) a_T - \frac{1}{T^{\frac{r}{q}}} \int_0^T \frac{\{(X_t^j 1_{\{j \in \mathcal{J}_0\}})_{j=1, \dots, p}\}^{\otimes 2}}{M_L} \varphi_L(X_t) 1_{\{X_t^i = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}} dt \\
&= (\sqrt{T} a_T)' \left(- \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t \right) (\sqrt{T} a_T) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for (7.18), it suffices to show

$$\sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \left| - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t + \Gamma \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (7.19)$$

where Γ is a $\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{a}$ matrix defined as

$$\Gamma = \int_{[0, \infty)^{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{x^{\otimes 2}}{\alpha^* \cdot x} 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx).$$

Take any $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists some $T_0 = T_0(R, \epsilon)$ such that for any $T \geq T_0$ and any $\alpha \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$ with $|a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R$,

$$(1 - \epsilon) \lambda_t^* \leq \lambda_t(\alpha) \leq \lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j \quad a.s. \quad (t \geq 0).$$

Therefore, for any $T \geq T_0$ and any $\alpha \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$ with $|a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R$,

$$A_T[u^{\otimes 2}] \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t[u^{\otimes 2}] \leq B_T[u^{\otimes 2}] \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{a}}, |u| \leq 1),$$

where

$$A_T = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t, \quad B_T = \frac{1}{T} (1 - \epsilon)^{-2} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^*)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t.$$

for any $T > 1$, any $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ with $|u| \leq 1$ and any $\alpha \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$. Since from [L2],

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t \right|^2 \right] &\lesssim E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{|X_t|^4}{(\lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j)^4} \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dt \right] \\
&\leq E \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{|X_t|^4}{(\lambda_t^*)^4} \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dt \right] \\
&= \int_{[0, \infty)^{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{|x|^4}{(\alpha^* \cdot x)^3} 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

and since

$$\int_{[0, \infty)^{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{|x^{\otimes 2}|}{(\alpha^* \cdot x + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} x_j)^2} \alpha^* \cdot x 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) \leq \int_{[0, \infty)^{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{|x^{\otimes 2}|}{\alpha^* \cdot x} 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) < \infty,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_T &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^* + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} X_t^j)^2} \lambda_t^* 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dt \\
&\xrightarrow{P} \int_{[0, \infty)^{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{x^{\otimes 2}}{(\alpha^* \cdot x + \epsilon \sum_{j \in D} x_j)^2} \alpha^* \cdot x 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) =: A(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} B_T &= (1 - \epsilon)^{-2} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{(\lambda_t^*)^2} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} d\tilde{N}_t + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t^*} 1_{\{\lambda_t^* > 0\}} dt \right\} \\ &\xrightarrow{P} (1 - \epsilon)^{-2} \int_{[0, \infty)^a} \frac{x^{\otimes 2}}{\alpha^* \cdot x} 1_{\{\alpha^* \cdot x > 0\}} \nu(dx) =: B(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $T \geq T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{N} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left| -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{N} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left(-\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right)^+ \\ & \quad + \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{N} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left(-\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right)^- \\ & \leq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left(-A_T[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right)^+ + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left(-B_T[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right)^- \\ & \lesssim | -A_T + \Gamma | + | -B_T + \Gamma | \xrightarrow{P} | -A(\epsilon) + \Gamma | + | -B(\epsilon) + \Gamma | \quad (T \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

where $f^+ := f \vee 0$ and $f^- := f \wedge 0$ for any \mathbb{R} -valued function f . Since $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow +0} A(\epsilon) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow +0} B(\epsilon) = \Gamma$, we have

$$\sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{N} \\ |a_T^{-1}(\alpha - \alpha^{**})| \leq R}} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^a, |u| \leq 1} \left| -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{X_t^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_t(\alpha)^2} 1_{\{\lambda^* > 0\}} dN_t[u^{\otimes 2}] + \Gamma[u^{\otimes 2}] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Therefore, (7.19) holds. Thus, the second half of the argument of [H5] also holds. Then using Theorem 3.1, we obtain (7.12).

Also, [S] holds from Example 3.6. Therefore, using Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[(\tilde{\alpha}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} = 0] = 1.$$

Since (7.12) holds and $\alpha_i^{**} \neq 0$ ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$), we obtain (7.13). □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. From the following Lemma 7.3,

$$\left\{ \alpha \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, \infty)^a; Pe(\alpha) = \inf_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, \infty)^a} Pe(\tilde{\alpha}) \right\} \subset \{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\} \cap [0, \infty)^a.$$

Under [L1][#], the set on the right-hand side has the unique minimizer $pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*)$ of Pe on the set itself. Therefore, $pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*)$ uniquely minimizes Pe on $\{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, \infty)^a$. Since $pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*) \in [0, M_\alpha]^a$ under [L1][#], $pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*)$ also uniquely minimizes Pe on $\{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M_\alpha]^a$. Therefore, [L1] holds and $\alpha^{**} = pr_{E_0}(\alpha^*)$. □

Lemma 7.3. For any $M \in (0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$,

$$\left\{ \alpha \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M]^a; Pe(\alpha) = \inf_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M]^a} Pe(\tilde{\alpha}) \right\} \subset \{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (7.20)$$

Proof. Take any $\alpha \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M]^a$ satisfying $Pe(\alpha) = \inf_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M]^a} Pe(\tilde{\alpha})$. Define F as the set of all $j \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ with $\alpha_j \neq 0$. We prove

$$\langle \{e_j\}_{j \in F} \rangle \cap \text{Ker} A = \{0\} \quad (7.21)$$

by contradiction. Suppose that $\langle \{e_j\}_{j \in F} \rangle \cap \text{Ker}A \neq \{0\}$. Then there exists $(c_j)_{j \in F} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|} \setminus \{0\}^{|F|}$ such that

$$\sum_{j \in F} c_j e_j \in \text{Ker}A.$$

Take $\underline{\lambda} < 0$ and $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \in (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda})$,

$$\alpha - \lambda \sum_{j \in F} c_j e_j \in [0, M]^a. \quad (7.22)$$

Note that for any $\lambda \in (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda})$,

$$\alpha - \lambda \sum_{j \in F} c_j e_j \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\}. \quad (7.23)$$

Define functions $f : (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^a$ and $g : (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(\lambda) = \alpha - \lambda \sum_{j \in F} c_j e_j, \quad g(\lambda) = Pe(f(\lambda)) \quad (\underline{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}).$$

Then $g(0)$ cannot be the local minimum of g since $g''(\lambda) < 0$ for any $\lambda \in (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda})$. Therefore, there exists some $\lambda_0 \in (\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda})$ such that

$$Pe(\alpha) = g(0) > g(\lambda_0) = Pe(f(\lambda_0)).$$

Also, $f(\lambda_0) \in \{\alpha^* + \text{Ker}(A)\} \cap [0, M]^a$ from (7.22) and (7.23). This contradicts the minimality of α . Thus, (7.21) holds.

From (7.21), we can take some $E_1 \in \mathcal{E}$ with $E_1 \supset F$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (\alpha - \alpha^*)A \\ &= (\alpha - pr_{E_1}(\alpha^*))A. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha \in \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in F} \rangle \subset \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in E_1} \rangle$ and $\langle \{e_j\}_{j \in E_1} \rangle \cap \text{Ker}A = 0$, we have

$$\alpha = pr_{E_1}(\alpha^*).$$

Therefore, $\alpha \in \{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Thus, (7.20) holds. □

Lemma 7.4. *Assume [L1]. Then*

$$\text{Ker}A \cap \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1} \rangle = \{0\}. \quad (7.24)$$

Moreover, if [L2] holds, then $\bar{\Gamma}$ is non-degenerate.

Proof. From Lemma 7.3, under [L1], $\alpha^{**} \in \{pr_E(\alpha^*); E \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Therefore, there exists some $E \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_1 \subset E$. Thus, $\text{Ker}A \cap \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_1} \rangle \subset \text{Ker}A \cap \langle \{e_j\}_{j \in E} \rangle = \{0\}$, and (7.24) holds.

We show that $\bar{\Gamma}$ is non-degenerate under [L2]. Assume $\bar{\Gamma}[v^{\otimes 2}] = 0$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_1|}$. Then

$$|(x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \cdot v| \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^* x_j > 0\}} = 0 \quad \nu\text{-a.e. } x \in [0, \infty)^a. \quad (7.25)$$

Since $\lambda_t^* = \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^* X_t^j = \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^{**} X_t^j$ ($t \geq 0$) almost surely, we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^* x_j = 0\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^{**} x_j = 0\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{x_j = 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{J}_1)\}} \quad \nu\text{-a.e. } x \in [0, \infty)^a.$$

Therefore, from (7.25),

$$(x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \cdot v = 0 \quad \nu\text{-a.e. } x \in [0, \infty)^a.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_{[0,\infty)^a} ((x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1})^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) [v^{\otimes 2}] \\
&= \int_{[0,\infty)^a} \{(e_i \cdot x)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}\}^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) [v^{\otimes 2}] \\
&= \int_{[0,\infty)^a} \{(e_i A \cdot (x_j)_{j \in D})_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}\}^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) [v^{\otimes 2}] \quad (\because (5.5)) \\
&= (e_i A)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \int_{[0,\infty)^a} ((x_j)_{j \in D})^{\otimes 2} \nu(dx) ((e_i A)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1})' [v^{\otimes 2}].
\end{aligned}$$

Now $\{e_i A\}_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}$ is linearly independent from (7.24). Therefore, from (5.3), we obtain $v = 0$, which implies the non-degeneracy of $\bar{\Gamma}$. \square

References

- [1] Aalen, O.: Nonparametric inference for a family of counting processes. *The Annals of Statistics* pp. 701–726 (1978)
- [2] Andrews, D.W.: Estimation when a parameter is on a boundary. *Econometrica* **67**(6), 1341–1383 (1999)
- [3] Atiyah, M.F.: Resolution of singularities and division of distributions. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics* **23**(2), 145–150 (1970)
- [4] Brazzale, A.R., Mameli, V.: Likelihood asymptotics in nonregular settings: A review with emphasis on the likelihood ratio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.15178* (2022)
- [5] Chernoff, H.: On the distribution of the likelihood ratio. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **25**, 573–578 (1954)
- [6] Chornoboy, E., Schramm, L., Karr, A.: Maximum likelihood identification of neural point process systems. *Biological cybernetics* **59**(4), 265–275 (1988)
- [7] De Gregorio, A., Iacus, S.M.: Adaptive lasso-type estimation for multivariate diffusion processes. *Econometric Theory* **28**(4), 838–860 (2012)
- [8] Frank, L.E., Friedman, J.H.: A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools. *Technometrics* **35**(2), 109–135 (1993)
- [9] Fu, W., Knight, K.: Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of statistics* **28**(5), 1356–1378 (2000)
- [10] Gaïffas, S., Matulewicz, G.: Sparse inference of the drift of a high-dimensional ornstein–uhlenbeck process. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **169**, 1–20 (2019)
- [11] Hironaka, H.: Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero: II. *Annals of Mathematics* pp. 205–326 (1964)
- [12] Ibragimov, I.A., Khas'minskii, R.Z.: The asymptotic behavior of statistical estimators in the smooth case. I. Study of the likelihood ratio. *Theory of Probability and its Applications* **17**, 445–462 (1973)
- [13] Ibragimov, I.A., Khas'minskii, R.Z.: Statistical estimation, *Applications of Mathematics*, vol. 16. Springer-Verlag, New York (1981). Asymptotic theory, Translated from the Russian by Samuel Kotz
- [14] Kalbfleisch, J.D., Prentice, R.L.: *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. John Wiley & Sons (2011)
- [15] Kinoshita, Y., Yoshida, N.: Penalized quasi likelihood estimation for variable selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12871* (2019)
- [16] Lawless, J.F.: *Statistical models and methods for lifetime data*. John Wiley & Sons (2011)

- [17] Lindsey, J.: Fitting parametric counting processes by using log-linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* **44**(2), 201–212 (1995)
- [18] Liu, X., Shao, Y.: Asymptotics for likelihood ratio tests under loss of identifiability. *The Annals of Statistics* **31**(3), 807–832 (2003)
- [19] Masuda, H., Shimizu, Y.: Moment convergence in regularized estimation under multiple and mixed-rates asymptotics. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **26**(2), 81–110 (2017)
- [20] Mun, B.M., Bae, S.J., Kvam, P.H.: A superposed log-linear failure intensity model for repairable artillery systems. *Journal of Quality Technology* **45**(1), 100–115 (2013)
- [21] Pulcini, G.: Modeling the failure data of a repairable equipment with bathtub type failure intensity. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **71**(2), 209–218 (2001)
- [22] Tibshirani, R.: Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **58**(1), 267–288 (1996)
- [23] Umezu, Y., Shimizu, Y., Masuda, H., Ninomiya, Y.: Aic for the non-concave penalized likelihood method. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **71**(2), 247–274 (2019)
- [24] Watanabe, S.: Algebraic geometry and statistical learning theory, vol. 25. Cambridge university press (2009)
- [25] Xu, Q., Qiang, Z., Chen, Q., Liu, K., Cao, N.: A superposed model for the pipe failure assessment of water distribution networks and uncertainty analysis: a case study. *Water resources management* **32**(5), 1713–1723 (2018)
- [26] Yoshida, J., Yoshida, N.: Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and penalized estimation under non-standard conditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13871* (2022)
- [27] Zou, H.: The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical association* **101**(476), 1418–1429 (2006)
- [28] Zou, Y., Henrickson, K., Lord, D., Wang, Y., Xu, K.: Application of finite mixture models for analysing freeway incident clearance time. *Transportmetrica A: Transport Science* **12**(2), 99–115 (2016)