

GENERALIZED HADAMARD DIFFERENTIABILITY OF THE COPULA MAPPING AND ITS APPLICATIONS

NATALIE NEUMEYER^a, MAREK OMELKA^b

^a Department of Mathematics, University of Hamburg, Bundesstrasse 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

^b Department of Probability and Statistics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Sokolovská 83, 186 75 Praha 8, Czech Republic

March 30, 2023

ABSTRACT. We consider the copula mapping, which maps a joint cumulative distribution function to the corresponding copula. Its Hadamard differentiability was shown in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), [Fermanian et al. \(2004\)](#) and (under less strict assumptions) in [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#). This differentiability result has proved to be a powerful tool to show weak convergence of empirical copula processes in various settings using the functional delta method. We state a generalization of the Hadamard differentiability results that simplifies the derivations of asymptotic expansions and weak convergence of empirical copula processes in the presence of covariates. The usefulness of this result is illustrated on several applications which include a multidimensional functional linear model, where the copula of the error vector describes the dependency between the components of the vector of observations, given the functional covariate.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a d -dimensional random vector $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_d)^\top$ with continuous marginal cumulative distribution functions F_1, \dots, F_d . Then by the famous Sklar's Theorem (see e.g. [Nelsen, 2006](#)) there exists a unique copula function C such that the joint cumulative distribution function F can be written as

$$F(y_1, \dots, y_d) = C(F_1(y_1), \dots, F_d(y_d)).$$

The interest in copulas in applications is rooted in the fact that the copula function C captures the dependence structure of \mathbf{Y} . From the beginning of the use of copulas in statistical modeling researchers were also interested in the empirical copula C_n which presents a natural nonparametric estimator of C . Suppose you observe random vectors $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ such that each of the vector has the same cumulative distribution function (cdf) F . Then the empirical copula is given by

$$C_n(u_1, \dots, u_d) = \widehat{F}_n(\widehat{F}_{1n}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \widehat{F}_{dn}^{-1}(u_d)),$$

where \widehat{F}_n is the empirical cdf (based on $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$) and \widehat{F}_{jn}^{-1} ($j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$) denotes the generalized inverse of the marginal empirical cdf \widehat{F}_{jn} .

Provided that $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ are independent and identically distributed the asymptotic properties of C_n as a process in (u_1, \dots, u_d) has been studied already by [Gänssler and Stute \(1987\)](#) and then later on by [Fermanian et al. \(2004\)](#) and [Tsukahara \(2005\)](#) among others. Nevertheless the weak convergence of the copula process $\mathbb{C}_n = \sqrt{n}(C_n - C)$ on $[0, 1]^d$ under the present ‘standard assumptions’ on C (see Assumption **(C1)**) was for the first time proved in [Segers \(2012\)](#).

Already before the paper by [Segers \(2012\)](#) some researchers (see e.g. Section 3.9.4.4 of [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#); [Fermanian et al., 2004](#)) considered the empirical copula function C_n as a mapping of the standard (multivariate) empirical process. To explore this approach in detail it is convenient to write the empirical copula process C_n as

$$C_n(u_1, \dots, u_d) = \widehat{G}_n(\widehat{G}_{1n}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \widehat{G}_{dn}^{-1}(u_d)),$$

where

$$\widehat{G}_n(u_1, \dots, u_d) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{Y_{1i} \leq F_1^{-1}(u_1), \dots, Y_{di} \leq F_d^{-1}(u_d)\}, \quad (1)$$

with the corresponding marginals

$$\widehat{G}_{jn}(u) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{Y_{ji} \leq F_j^{-1}(u)\},$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{1i}, \dots, Y_{di})^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that with this notation one can write the empirical copula as $C_n = \Phi(\widehat{G}_n)$, where Φ is the copula mapping which is for cdf H on $[0, 1]^d$ defined as

$$\Phi : H \rightarrow H(H_1^{-1}, \dots, H_d^{-1}),$$

with H_j^{-1} being the generalized inverse of the marginal cdf H_j . The advantage of this approach is that provided the copula mapping Φ is appropriately Hadamard differentiable at C (with the derivative Φ'_C) and the empirical process $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{G}_n - C)$ defined in (1) converges weakly then by Theorem 3.9.4 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) one gets

$$\sqrt{n}(C_n - C) = \sqrt{n}(\Phi(\widehat{G}_n) - \Phi(C)) = \Phi'_C(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{G}_n - C)) + o_P(1). \quad (2)$$

Thus with the help of functional delta method the asymptotic distribution of the empirical copula can be deduced simply from the asymptotic distribution of the process $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{G}_n - C)$ plus the knowledge of Φ'_C .

The needed differentiability result was proved by [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#) who showed that under the same standard assumption **(C1)** as in [Segers \(2012\)](#) the mapping Φ is Hadamard differentiable at C tangentially to the set of functions $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{h \in C([0, 1]^d) : h(1, \dots, 1) =$

0 and $h(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ if some of the components of \mathbf{u} are 0} with the derivative given by

$$\Phi'_C(h)(\mathbf{u}) = h(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})h(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}), \quad (3)$$

where $C^{(j)} = \partial C / \partial u_j$, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$ and $\mathbf{u}^{(j)}$ denotes the vector whose all entries of \mathbf{u} except the j -th are equal to 1, i.e.

$$\mathbf{u}^{(j)} = (1, \dots, 1, u_j, 1, \dots, 1). \quad (4)$$

It should be stressed that this result on Hadamard differentiability of the copula functional simplifies the derivation of the asymptotic distribution of the empirical copula as it is sufficient only to prove the weak convergence of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{G}_n - C)$. This was utilized in [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#) where the authors extended the results on weak convergence of the copula process \mathbb{C}_n to situations when $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ are not independent but they follow for instance some mixing type conditions.

The contribution of our paper is a generalization of the Hadamard differentiability of the copula mapping in order to obtain weak convergence of the empirical copula process in situations where previous results are not applicable. This generalization was motivated by dealing with empirical copula processes based on pseudo-observations/residuals of the form $\hat{\varepsilon}_{ji} = \hat{t}_j(Y_{ji}, \mathbf{X}_i)$, ($i = 1, \dots, n$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$), where the mapping \hat{t}_j depends on the observed sample. To explain our approach we first consider the special case of copula estimation based on residuals in a regression model (the general description of these problems will be given in [Section 3](#)).

1.1. Empirical copula based on residuals - motivation example. Suppose we observe identically distributed random pairs $(\mathbf{Y}_1^{\mathbf{X}_1}), \dots, (\mathbf{Y}_n^{\mathbf{X}_n})$ of a generic random pair $(\mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{X}})$, where $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{1i}, \dots, Y_{di})^\top$ and \mathbf{X}_i is a (univariate or multivariate or even functional) covariate. Further suppose that the following homoscedastic regression models for each of the components of the marginal response hold

$$Y_{ji} = \mu_j(\mathbf{X}_i) + \varepsilon_{ji}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

where the random vector of innovations $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{1i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{di})^\top$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_i and has a continuous distribution. Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ be the generic random vector corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n$. Denote $F_\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, $F_{j\varepsilon}$ and C respectively the joint cdf, the marginal cdf and copula of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$. Note that the joint distribution of \mathbf{Y} given \mathbf{X} is thanks to Sklar's theorem and independence of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ and \mathbf{X} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \leq y_1, \dots, Y_d \leq y_d \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) &= \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 \leq y_1 - \mu_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \varepsilon_d \leq y_d - \mu_d(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= C\left(F_{1\varepsilon}(y_1 - \mu_1(\mathbf{x})), \dots, F_{d\varepsilon}(y_d - \mu_d(\mathbf{x}))\right) \end{aligned}$$

with conditional marginals $\mathbb{P}(Y_j \leq y_j \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = F_{j\varepsilon}(y_j - \mu_j(\mathbf{x}))$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Thus the copula function C of ε captures the conditional dependence structure of \mathbf{Y} given \mathbf{X} .

Let $\hat{\mu}_j$ be a regression estimator of the location function μ_j and

$$\hat{t}_j(Y_{ji}, \mathbf{X}_i) = \hat{\varepsilon}_{ji} = Y_{ji} - \hat{\mu}_j(\mathbf{X}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (6)$$

be the corresponding residuals. Then the straightforward empirical copula estimator of C is

$$\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \hat{F}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\hat{F}_{1\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{F}_{d\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_d)), \quad \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{F}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$ is an empirical cdf of the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_i = (\hat{\varepsilon}_{1i}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{di})^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\hat{F}_{1\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}, \dots, \hat{F}_{d\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}$ be the corresponding generalized inverses.

Assume for a moment that for each j the cdf $F_{j\varepsilon}$ is **strictly increasing** (on a set where $\hat{\varepsilon}_{j1}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{jn}$ take values). Then similarly as above one can rewrite \hat{C}_n as

$$\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\hat{G}_{1\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{G}_{d\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_d)), \quad \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{1i} \leq F_{1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{di} \leq F_{d\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d)\}, \quad (9)$$

and $\hat{G}_{1\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}, \dots, \hat{G}_{d\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}$ be the corresponding generalized inverses of marginals

$$\hat{G}_{j\hat{\varepsilon}}(u) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{ji} \leq F_{j\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)\}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Note that \hat{C}_n mimics the ideal ('oracle') empirical copula

$$C_n^{(or)}(\mathbf{u}) = \hat{G}_{n\varepsilon}(\hat{G}_{1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{G}_{d\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d)), \quad \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

that would be based on the empirical cdf of the true (but unobserved) errors

$$\hat{G}_{n\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{\varepsilon_{1i} \leq F_{1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \varepsilon_{di} \leq F_{d\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d)\}. \quad (10)$$

Nevertheless one can often (i.e. under appropriate regularity assumptions) prove that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{C}_n - C_n^{(or)}) = o_P(1). \quad (11)$$

Thus the asymptotic distribution of \hat{C}_n is the same as $C_n^{(or)}$. Note that this is rather surprising as one would intuitively expect that the uncertainty in estimation of μ_j should propagate to the asymptotic distribution of \hat{C}_n (which is the case for $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$, see (12) below).

To show (11) one has basically two possibilities. The more elegant approach is to note that $\hat{C}_n = \Phi(\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}})$ and to use the Hadamard differentiability proved in [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#). This approach was used for instance in [Neumeier et al. \(2019\)](#). The disadvantage of this approach is that weak convergence of the process $\mathbb{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}} = \sqrt{n}(\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}} - C)$ is needed which requires more strict assumptions or even may be rather problematic in some applications (see [Section 4](#)). The less elegant approach is to deal directly with the estimator \hat{C}_n for given

specific models as for instance in [Gijbels et al. \(2015\)](#) or [Portier and Segers \(2018\)](#). This approach does not require the weak convergence of $\mathbb{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$. But on the other hand it is more cumbersome and technical as one needs to deal with the process

$$\mathbb{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{n} \left[\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\hat{G}_{1\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{G}_{d\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u_d)) - C(\mathbf{u}) \right], \quad \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

instead of the simpler process $\mathbb{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$. That is why the results in the literature are usually tied to the model and to the method of estimation of the effect of the covariate on the marginals.

The way how Hadamard differentiability is used to prove the surprising result [\(11\)](#) can be summarized follows. First one shows that uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$

$$\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{u}) + n^{-1/2}\mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}) + n^{-1/2}\mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}), \quad (12)$$

where

$$\mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{n} (\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})) + o_P(1), \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u_j), \quad (14)$$

with $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$ introduced in [\(10\)](#) and \mathbb{Z}_{jn} that is in model [\(5\)](#) given by

$$\mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u) = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [F_{j\hat{\varepsilon}}(F_{j\hat{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(u) + \hat{\mu}_j(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_j(\mathbf{X})) - u], \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Here and throughout $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}}$ denotes the expectation over \mathbf{X} , which is the generic covariate, independent of the sample, keeping all other random variables fixed.

Further one shows that the (joint) process

$$\{(\mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}), \mathbb{Z}_{1n}(u_1), \dots, \mathbb{Z}_{dn}(u_d)); \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d\} \quad (15)$$

converges weakly (jointly). Thus also the processes \mathbb{A}_n and \mathbb{B}_n converge weakly (jointly). So one can apply the Hadamard differentiability as in [\(2\)](#) together with the representation [\(12\)](#) to get

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{C}_n - C) = \sqrt{n} (\Phi(\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}) - \Phi(C)) = \Phi'_C(\mathbb{A}_n) + \Phi'_C(\mathbb{B}_n) + o_P(1), \quad (16)$$

where we used the linearity of Φ'_C . Now note that it follows from the specific structure of \mathbb{B}_n in [\(14\)](#), the Hadamard derivative in [\(3\)](#) and $C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) = 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'_C(\mathbb{B}_n)(\mathbf{u}) &= \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{k=1}^d C^{(k)}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u_j) - \sum_{k=1}^d C^{(k)}(\mathbf{u}) \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u_j^{(k)}) \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^d C^{(k)}(\mathbf{u}) \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \mathbb{Z}_{jn}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $u_j^{(k)}$ stands for the j -th coordinate of $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$. Thus with the help of $0 \leq C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$ and the fact that the limiting processes $\mathbb{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Z}_d$ corresponding to $\mathbb{Z}_{1n}, \dots, \mathbb{Z}_{dn}$ typically satisfy $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}_j(1) = 0) = 1$ one can obtain

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} |\Phi'_C(\mathbb{B}_n)(\mathbf{u})| \leq (d-1) \sum_{j=1}^d |\mathbb{Z}_{jn}(1)| = o_P(1). \quad (17)$$

Now combining (16) and (17) we get the approximation

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{C}_n - C) = \Phi'_C(\mathbb{A}_n) + o_P(1), \quad (18)$$

where \mathbb{B}_n is not present on the right-hand side. So it remains to note that the right-hand side of the last equation coincides with the asymptotic representation of the empirical copula based on unobserved errors $C_n^{(or)}$ (see (2) and (13)) which implies (11).

The aim of this paper is to introduce two useful modifications of the Hadamard differentiability result of Bücher and Volgushev (2013) that require milder properties of the process \mathbb{B}_n than the weak convergence, but still yield the result (18). This will present not only a technique that will simplify the proofs. It will be also useful in situations where one is either not able to prove the weak convergence of \mathbb{B}_n (i.e. typically the weak convergence of the processes $\mathbb{Z}_{1n}, \dots, \mathbb{Z}_{dn}$) or this convergence simply does not hold. See Section 4 for such applications. Finally it is worth noting that it is rather intuitive not to require the weak convergence of \mathbb{B}_n as this process is not present in the final asymptotic representation (18).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state the new Hadamard differentiability results. In Section 3 we discuss their use to empirical copulas based on pseudo-observations in general. In Section 4 we give some more specific applications where the results on the weak convergence of the process \mathbb{B}_n are either not available or require more stringent assumptions. Some conclusions and further discussions can be found in Section 5. All the proofs are given in Appendices.

2. HADAMARD DIFFERENTIABILITY OF COPULA FUNCTIONAL Φ

Similarly as in Bücher and Volgushev (2013) let \mathcal{D}_Φ be the set of distribution functions on $[0, 1]^d$ whose marginal cdfs satisfy $H_j(0) = 0$ and $H_j(1) = 1$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Further let

$$H_j^{-1}(u) = \inf \{v \in [0, 1] : H_j(v) \geq u\}, \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (19)$$

be the corresponding generalized inverse function.

Provided that (12) holds we will use the weak convergence of \mathbb{A}_n , but not of \mathbb{B}_n . The technique to prove (18) can be summarized as follows. For each $\eta > 0$ we find sequences of

sets of functions, say \mathcal{A}_n and \mathcal{B}_n , such that on one hand

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathbb{A}_n \in \mathcal{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n \in \mathcal{B}_n) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

But at the same time uniformly in $h \in \mathcal{A}_n$, $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_n$ (provided that $(C + \frac{h}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\tilde{h}}{\sqrt{n}}) \in \mathcal{D}_\Phi$)

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in I_n} \left| \sqrt{n} \left(\Phi\left(C + \frac{h}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\tilde{h}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)(\mathbf{u}) - \Phi(C)(\mathbf{u}) - \Phi'_C(h)(\mathbf{u}) \right) \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where I_n is either $[0, 1]^d$ (see Theorem 1) or an appropriate sequence of subsets of $[0, 1]^d$ (see Theorem 2).

In what follows we will keep in mind the representation (12) and find appropriate sets of functions for processes \mathbb{A}_n and \mathbb{B}_n .

Sets of functions for the process \mathbb{A}_n . Let $\ell^\infty([0, 1]^d)$ be the set of bounded functions on $[0, 1]^d$ and introduce

$$\mathcal{L} = \{h \in \ell^\infty([0, 1]^d) : h(1, \dots, 1) = 0$$

$$\text{and } h(\mathbf{u}) = 0 \text{ if some of the components of } \mathbf{u} \text{ are equal to } 0\}.$$

In our applications we will consider models for which the process \mathbb{A}_n converges in distribution to a limiting process \mathbb{A} that satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{C}([0, 1]^d)) = 1.$$

Note that this includes not only the i.i.d. setting but also various weak dependence concepts for strictly stationary sequences (see the discussion below Condition 2.1 in [Bücher and Volgushev, 2013](#)).

Thus the above weak convergence of the process \mathbb{A}_n for each $\eta > 0$ implies that one can find a sequence of sets of functions \mathcal{A}_n which fulfills the following conditions such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathbb{A}_n \in \mathcal{A}_n) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (20)$$

The functions in \mathcal{A}_n are asymptotically uniformly equi-continuous, i.e. for each $\varrho > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| < \delta} |h(\mathbf{u}) - h(\mathbf{v})| < \varrho. \quad (21)$$

Moreover the functions in \mathcal{A}_n are uniformly bounded and asymptotically close to the set \mathcal{L} , i.e.

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} |h(\mathbf{u})| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_n} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{L}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} |h(\mathbf{u}) - g(\mathbf{u})| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (22)$$

Remark 1. For $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ let $h_j(u) = h(\mathbf{u}^{(j)})$, where $\mathbf{u}^{(j)}$ was introduced in (4). Note that (21) and (22) imply that for each $\varrho > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{u \in [0, \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1]} |h_j(u)| < \varrho.$$

2.1. Assumptions on the copula function. In what follows we will consider the following two versions of the assumptions on copula C .

(C1). For each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ the first-order partial derivative $C^{(j)} = \partial C / \partial u_j$ exists and is continuous on the set $\{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d : 0 < u_j < 1\}$.

(C2). There is $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that for each $j, k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ the second order partial derivative $C^{(j,k)} = \partial^2 C / (\partial u_j \partial u_k)$ exists and satisfies

$$C^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{u}) = O\left(\frac{1}{u_j^\beta (1-u_j)^\beta u_k^\beta (1-u_k)^\beta}\right), \quad \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in (0, 1)^d.$$

Note that assumption **(C1)** does not imply the existence of the first-order partial derivative $C^{(j)}$ on the complement of the set $\{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d : 0 < u_j < 1\}$. As it will be evident later (see the definition of the sets of functions \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}_n^α in (25) and (28) below) it is irrelevant how $C^{(j)}$ is defined on that complement. Nevertheless, for simplicity of notation it is convenient that $C^{(j)}$ is defined on $[0, 1]^d$. To have that one can define $C^{(j)}$ for instance as zero in points where $C^{(j)}$ does not exist. Similarly for assumption **(C2)** which does not say anything about the existence of $C^{(j)}$ even on the complement of $(0, 1)^d$.

It is worth noting that assumption **(C1)** is the standard copula assumption that was introduced in Segers (2012). It is also the assumption under which the Hadamard differentiability result was proved in Bücher and Volgushev (2013). Roughly speaking the corresponding differentiability result (see Section 2.2) is useful when the effect of the covariate on the marginals can be removed in \sqrt{n} -rate. That is for instance in our motivating example in Section 1.1 when one (rightly) assumes a parametric model for μ_j .

On the other hand assumption **(C2)** is more strict but for $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ still satisfied for many common copulas (see e.g. Omelka et al., 2009). This more strict assumption on the copula function and the corresponding differentiability result (see Section 2.3) can be used to compensate the fact that one is able to remove the effect of the covariate on the marginals only at a slower than \sqrt{n} -rate.

2.2. Hadamard differentiability of copula mapping under assumption (C1). In what follows we introduce a set of functions for the process \mathbb{B}_n that is of the form (14). To do that first for $M \in (0, \infty)$ introduce the set of bounded functions

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M = \{\tilde{h} \in \ell^\infty([0, 1]) : \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{h}(u)| \leq M\}. \quad (23)$$

Further let r be a bounded non-negative function such that

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0_+} r(u) = 0 = \lim_{u \rightarrow 1_-} r(u). \quad (24)$$

Now consider the set of bounded univariate functions

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \{\tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M : |\tilde{h}(u)| \leq r(u); \forall u \in [0, 1]\}$$

and the corresponding set of multivariate functions

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \tilde{h} \in \ell^\infty([0, 1]^d) : \tilde{h}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{h}_j(u_j); \text{ where } \tilde{h}_j \in \mathcal{B}_1, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Now for a given sequence of positive constants $\{t_n\}$ going to zero introduce a sequence $\{\mathcal{D}_n\}$ of subsets of \mathcal{D}_Φ such that the marginals H_j have jumps of height at most $o(t_n)$

$$\sup_{H \in \mathcal{D}_n} \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \sup_{u \in (0, 1]} |H_j(u) - H_j(u_-)| = o(t_n). \quad (26)$$

Finally introduce

$$\mathcal{D}_n^{(1)} = \{H \in \mathcal{D}_n : H = C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h}, \text{ where } h \in \mathcal{A}_n, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Now we are ready to formulate the main result of this section that can be considered as a generalization of Theorem 2.4 of [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#).

Theorem 1. *Let the set of functions $\mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}$ be as explained above. Further let C satisfy **(C1)**. Then*

$$\sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} \left| \frac{\Phi(C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h})(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})}{t_n} - h(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) h(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

where $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} = C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h}$.

2.3. Hadamard differentiability of copula mapping under assumption **(C2).** Note that in Theorem 1 both perturbations of the copula function C presented by h and \tilde{h} have the same rates t_n . In what follows we allow that the perturbation corresponding to \tilde{h} converges to zero at a rate \tilde{t}_n which is slower than t_n . This will be useful when the processes \mathbb{Z}_{jn} in (14) are not bounded in probability.

Of course there is some price to be paid which depends on the actual rate of \tilde{t}_n that we want to allow. This price is paid partly by the more severe assumption on the copula C and partly by assuming a finer behaviour of \tilde{h} when one is close to zero or one. A part of the price is also that the result will not hold uniformly on $[0, 1]^d$ but only at an increasing sequence of subsets of $[0, 1]^d$.

For $\epsilon > 0$ and $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$ denote

$$\tilde{I}_{1n}(\epsilon) = [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta], \quad \tilde{I}_n(\epsilon) = [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta]^d.$$

Further for $\alpha > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ fixed introduce the sets of functions

$$\mathcal{B}_{1n}^\alpha = \left\{ \tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M : \sup_{u \in \tilde{I}_{1n}(\epsilon)} \frac{|\tilde{h}(u)|}{u^\alpha(1-u)^\alpha} < 2M \right\} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_n^\alpha = \left\{ \tilde{h} \in \ell^\infty([0, 1]^d) : \tilde{h}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{h}_j(u_j); \text{ where } \tilde{h}_j \in \mathcal{B}_{1n}^\alpha, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

Finally for sequences of constants $\{t_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{t}_n\}$ going to zero introduce

$$\mathcal{D}_n^{(2)} = \{H \in \mathcal{D}_n : H = C + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}, \text{ where } h \in \mathcal{A}_n, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_n^\alpha\}$$

and \mathcal{D}_n was introduced in (26).

Theorem 2. Assume that (C2) holds and $\alpha \geq 0$, $\gamma \in [0, 1/4)$ and $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$ be constants such that

$$\gamma \geq \frac{(\beta - \alpha)_+}{4(1 - \beta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta = \min \left\{ \frac{1 + 4\gamma}{2(1 - \alpha)}, 1 \right\}. \quad (29)$$

Further let $\mathcal{D}_n^{(2)}$ be as explained above with $\tilde{t}_n = o(t_n^{1/2 + 2\gamma})$. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $M \in (0, \infty)$

$$\sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(2)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{I}_n(\epsilon)} \left| \frac{\Phi(C + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})}{t_n} - h(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) h(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

where $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} = C + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}$ and $\mathbf{u}^{(j)}$ is given in (4).

3. APPLICATION TO EMPIRICAL COPULAS BASED ON PSEUDO-OBSERVATIONS

In this section we generalize the model used in Section 1.1 and show how the results of the previous section can be applied.

Suppose we observe identically (but not necessarily independently) distributed random pairs $(\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{X}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{Y}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$ of a generic random pair (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}) , where $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{1i}, \dots, Y_{di})^\top$ and \mathbf{X}_i is a covariate (q -dimensional or even functional). Often we are interested in the conditional distribution of \mathbf{Y} given the value of the covariate. To simplify the situation it is often assumed that \mathbf{X} affects only the marginal distributions of Y_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$), but does not affect the dependence structure of \mathbf{Y} . More formally, it is assumed that there exists a copula C such that the joint conditional distribution of \mathbf{Y} given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be for all $\mathbf{x} \in S_{\mathbf{X}}$ (the support of \mathbf{X}) written as

$$F_{\mathbf{x}}(y_1, \dots, y_d) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \leq y_1, \dots, Y_d \leq y_d \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = C(F_{1\mathbf{x}}(y_1), \dots, F_{d\mathbf{x}}(y_d))$$

where $F_{j\mathbf{x}}(y_j) = \mathbb{P}(Y_j \leq y_j \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Let $t_j(y; \mathbf{x})$ be a real valued function defined on $S_{Y_j} \times S_{\mathbf{X}}$ (where S_{Y_j} is the support of Y_j) such that the random variable $\varepsilon_j = t_j(Y_j; \mathbf{X})$ is independent of \mathbf{X} and has a continuous

distribution. Moreover assume that for each $\mathbf{x} \in S_{\mathbf{X}}$ the function $t_j(\cdot; \mathbf{x})$ is increasing in the first argument. Then the copula C is the copula of the random vector $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d)^\top$.

Note that one can always take $t_j(y; \mathbf{x}) = F_{j\mathbf{x}}(y)$. Nevertheless simpler functions can be available depending on the assumptions about the effect of the covariate on the marginal distributions. For instance in model (5) one can use simply $t_j(y; \mathbf{x}) = y - \mu_j(\mathbf{x})$.

3.1. Empirical copula estimation. Note that ideally one would base the estimate of C on random variables

$$\varepsilon_{ji} = t_j(Y_{ji}; \mathbf{X}_i).$$

As the transformation t_j is usually in practice unknown, then one needs to work with the ‘estimates’ of ε_{ji} (‘pseudo-observations’)

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{ji} = \hat{t}_j(Y_{ji}; \mathbf{X}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n; j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (30)$$

where for instance in model (5) the pseudo-observations are the residuals as in (6). The empirical copula (based on estimated pseudo-observations) is then defined analogously as in Section 1.1.

Provided that for each j the cdf $F_{j\varepsilon}$ of $\varepsilon_j = t_j(Y_j; \mathbf{X})$ (introduced above) is strictly increasing one can rewrite the empirical copula as (8) using function $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$ introduced in (9). More generally if $F_{j\varepsilon}$ is not strictly increasing but it is continuous then one can always find a sequence of cdf’s, say $\{\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}\}$ such that $\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}$ is strictly increasing for each n and at the same time

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_{j\varepsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)) - u| = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (31)$$

Now $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}$ will not be defined as in (9) but rather as

$$\hat{G}_{n\hat{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{1i} \leq \tilde{F}_{n1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{di} \leq \tilde{F}_{nd\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d)\}.$$

Then (8) holds even if some of the cdfs $F_{1\varepsilon}, \dots, F_{d\varepsilon}$ are not strictly increasing.

Remark 2. Note that as we are in the conditional copula settings we need to use the word ‘pseudo-observation’ in the broader sense than is often used in the literature about copulas. In view of Ghoudi and Rémillard (1998) our pseudo-observations are functions of the observed Y_{ji} and the estimated conditional law $F_{j\mathbf{x}}$.

First we formulate generic assumptions that need to be verified for the given marginal models and methods of estimation.

3.2. Generic assumptions. In what follows let P stand for the measure of the random vector $\begin{pmatrix} Y \\ \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}$ and P_n be the corresponding empirical measure based on $\begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ \mathbf{X}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} Y_n \\ \mathbf{X}_n \end{pmatrix}$.

Further let \mathcal{T}_j be a set of real functions of the form $t_j(y; \mathbf{x})$ defined on $S_{Y_j} \times S_{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are for each fixed $\mathbf{x} \in S_{\mathbf{X}}$ increasing in y .

While the first assumption justifies that the empirical process of pseudo-observations is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability (see e.g. p. 38 of [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)), the second assumption ensures that pseudo-observations are consistent estimators of unobserved ε_{ji} .

(T1). Suppose that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ there exists a set of real functions \mathcal{T}_j such that

$$P(\hat{t}_j \in \mathcal{T}_j) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$$

and at the same time the empirical process $\sqrt{n}(P_n - P)$ indexed by the class of functions

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ (y, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{t}_1(y_1; \mathbf{x}) \leq z_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_d(y_d; \mathbf{x}) \leq z_d\}; z_1, \dots, z_d \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_d \in \mathcal{T}_d \right\} \quad (32)$$

is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability with respect to the semimetric

$$\rho(f_1, f_2) = P|f_1 - f_2| = \mathbb{E}|f_1(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}) - f_2(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})|. \quad (33)$$

(T2). For each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ there exists a function $t_j \in \mathcal{T}_j$ such that for each $y \in S_{Y_j}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in S_{\mathbf{X}}$

$$\hat{t}_j(y; \mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{P} t_j(y; \mathbf{x}).$$

Further the random vector

$$\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d)^\top, \text{ where } \varepsilon_j = t_j(Y_j; \mathbf{X}), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\},$$

has a continuous cdf and is independent of \mathbf{X} .

Remark 3. Note that in case of iid random vectors assumption **(T1)** is usually justified by showing that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ the class of functions

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \left\{ (y, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{t}(y; \mathbf{x}) \leq z\}; z \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{t} \in \mathcal{T}_j \right\}$$

is P_j -Donsker, where P_j is the measure of the random vector $\begin{pmatrix} Y_j \\ \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}$. Validity of assumption **(T1)** then follows by Example 2.10.8 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#). Nevertheless the formulation of **(T1)** allows also for dependent random variables. See for instance [Neumeyer et al. \(2019\)](#) where **(T1)** is verified in the context multivariate nonparametric AR-ARCH times series that satisfies an appropriate β -mixing assumption. Another application can be found in Section [4.2](#).

Assumptions on the quality of \hat{t}_j . Roughly speaking assumptions **(T1)** and **(T2)** justify that in representation [\(12\)](#) the process \mathbb{A}_n has really the form [\(13\)](#). Further we specify the assumptions so that the process \mathbb{B}_n is of the form [\(14\)](#) with appropriately defined processes \mathbb{Z}_{jn} .

For a fixed $\mathbf{x} \in S_{\mathbf{X}}$ let $\hat{t}_j^{-1}(\cdot; \mathbf{x})$ be a (possibly generalized) inverse function to $\hat{t}_j(\cdot; \mathbf{x})$, i.e.

$$\hat{t}_j^{-1}(z; \mathbf{x}) = \inf \{y \in \mathbb{R} : \hat{t}_j(y; \mathbf{x}) \geq z\}.$$

Now for $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ let $F_{j\varepsilon}$ be the cdf of ε_j and denote

$$Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{x}) = F_{j\varepsilon} \left(t_j \{ \hat{t}_j^{-1}(\tilde{F}_{n_j\varepsilon}^{-1}(u); \mathbf{x}); \mathbf{x} \} \right) - u \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u) = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X}), \quad (34)$$

where $\{\tilde{F}_{n_j\varepsilon}\}$ is a sequence of strictly increasing cdfs that satisfy (31). Note that the existence of such a sequence is guaranteed by the continuity of $F_{j\varepsilon}$ which is assumed in (T2).

Now we are ready to formulate assumptions on $Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{x})$ so that one can justify that the process \mathbb{B}_n in representation (18) is really of the form (14) and at the same time the properties of processes $\mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u)$ match with the corresponding Hadamard differentiability result.

We will introduce two versions (namely (Z1) and (Z2)) of the assumptions on $Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{x})$. While (Z1) is more strict and matches with the less strict assumption on the copula function (C1), assumption (Z2) is milder but requires the more strict assumption on the copula (C2).

(Z1). For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist a function M defined on $S_{\mathbf{X}}$ and a bounded function r defined on $(0, 1)$ that satisfies (24) such that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, each $u \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}]$

$$|Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X})| \leq M(\mathbf{X}) \left[r(u) O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right] \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{E} M(\mathbf{X}) < \infty,$$

where the terms $O_P(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, $o_P(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ depend neither on u nor \mathbf{X} .

In what follows β will be the constant from assumption (C2).

(Z2). For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function M defined on $S_{\mathbf{X}}$ such that:

- for $\beta = 0$ one has

$$\sup_{u \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{n^{1/2}}, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n^{1/2}}]} |Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X})| = M(\mathbf{X}) o_P(n^{-1/4}) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{E} M^2(\mathbf{X}) < \infty;$$

- for $\beta > 0$ there exist constants $\alpha \geq 0$, $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and $s \geq 2$ so that

$$\sup_{u \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}]} \frac{|Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X})|}{u^\alpha (1-u)^\alpha} = M(\mathbf{X}) o_P(n^{-(1/4+\gamma)}),$$

where

$$\gamma \geq \frac{\frac{s-2}{s-1}(\beta - \alpha)_+}{4(1 - \alpha - (\beta - \alpha) \frac{s}{s-1})_+}, \quad \mathbf{E} [M(\mathbf{X})]^s < \infty, \quad (35)$$

and

$$\vartheta = \min \left\{ \frac{\frac{s-2}{s-1} + 4\gamma \frac{s}{s-1}}{2(1 - \alpha)}, 1 \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Moreover the term $o_P(\cdot)$ in either of the versions of the assumption depends neither on u nor \mathbf{X} .

Remark 4. Regarding **(Z2)** note that typically one is interested in situations when $\vartheta = 1$ as this implies the weak convergence of the copula process on $[0, 1]^d$. To achieve that one needs

$$s \geq \frac{(4 - 2\alpha)_+}{(1 + 4\gamma - 2(1 - \alpha))_+}.$$

3.3. General results on empirical copulas based on pseudo-observations.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that assumptions **(T1)**, **(T2)**, **(C1)**, and **(Z1)** are satisfied. Then **(11)** holds, i.e.*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} \sqrt{n} |\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) - C_n^{(or)}(\mathbf{u})| = o_P(1).$$

Theorem 4. *Suppose that **(T1)**, **(T2)**, **(C2)**, and **(Z2)** are satisfied. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \left[\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}\right]^d} \sqrt{n} |\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) - C_n^{(or)}(\mathbf{u})| = o_P(1).$$

Note that although Theorem 4 does not guarantee the asymptotic equivalence of \hat{C}_n and $C_n^{(or)}$ on the whole d -dimensional unit cube $[0, 1]^d$, the important thing is that $\left[\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}\right]^d$ is expanding to $[0, 1]^d$. This is often enough to prove for instance the asymptotic equivalence of moment-like estimators based on estimated pseudo-observations ($\hat{\varepsilon}_{ji}$) and estimators based on the unobserved ε_{ji} . See Section 4.3 of Côté et al. (2019) where it is shown that even a weaker result is sufficient for some type of inference.

If $\vartheta = 1$, that is if γ and α are ‘sufficiently large’ then one gets the stronger statement of Theorem 3. This is formulated in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 4 are satisfied. If either $\beta = 0$ or $4\gamma + 2\alpha \frac{s}{s-1} \geq 1$ then **(11)** holds.*

Note that one can view **(Z2)** as a more general version of assumption **(Yn)** from Gijbels et al. (2015). Note that **(Yn)** does not only require that $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$ but more importantly it requires a bounded covariate (i.e. $s = \infty$).

4. SOME SPECIFIC EXAMPLES

In this section we illustrate how the results presented in this paper can be used in the specific models. For simplicity of presentation we start with the linear model with iid errors (Section 4.1). This model will be then generalized to β -mixing errors (Section 4.2) or functional linear model (Section 4.3). The section is concluded by the application to location-shape-scale models (Section 4.4).

4.1. Linear model with iid errors. Consider the standard linear model for each of the marginals (with the same k -dimensional covariates $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$), i.e.

$$Y_{ji} = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}_j + \varepsilon_{ji}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (37)$$

where the vector of centred errors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{1i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{di})^\top$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_i . Thus one can take simply $t_j(y; \mathbf{x}) = y - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{b}_j$ and $\hat{t}_j(y; \mathbf{x}) = y - \mathbf{x}^\top \hat{\mathbf{b}}_j$, where $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j$ is for instance least squares estimator of \mathbf{b}_j . Then under mild assumptions (including among others that $\mathbf{E} \|\mathbf{X}_1\|^2 < \infty$ with $\|\cdot\|$ being the Euclidean norm) $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent. Further, for some $\delta > 0$, one can define

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \{(y, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{y - \mathbf{x}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \leq z\}; z \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \|\tilde{\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{b}_j\| \leq \delta\},$$

which is P_j -Donsker ($j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$) and thus **(T1)** is satisfied by Remark 3. Further note that

$$Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X}) = F_{j\varepsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u) + \mathbf{X}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{b}_j)) - u, \quad u \in [0, 1].$$

So with the help of the mean value theorem

$$Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X}) = F_{j\varepsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)) - u + f_{j\varepsilon}(\xi_{n,u}^{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{X}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{b}_j),$$

with $\xi_{n,u}^{\mathbf{X}}$ between $\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)$ and $\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u) + \mathbf{X}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{b}_j)$. Thus with the help of (31) it is straightforward to show that **(Z1)** holds provided that there exists (a version of the) density $f_{j\varepsilon}$ which is bounded and satisfies

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0_+} f_{j\varepsilon}(F_{j\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)) = 0 = \lim_{u \rightarrow 1_-} f_{j\varepsilon}(F_{j\varepsilon}^{-1}(u)).$$

On the other hand the straightforward application of the Hadamard differentiability result of Bücher and Volgushev (2013) would require (among others) the weak convergence of the process

$$Z_{jn}(u) = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [F_{j\varepsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u) + \mathbf{X}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{b}_j)) - u], \quad u \in [0, 1],$$

which is a more delicate task. Moreover to show this weak convergence it seems to be necessary to add the assumption of **the continuity** of $f_{j\varepsilon}(F_{j\varepsilon}^{-1}(u))$ which is not required by our approach.

4.2. Linear regression with β -mixing observations. Note that Theorem 3 gives conditions to obtain asymptotic equivalence of the residual-based empirical copula process and the one based on true errors even in models with dependent observations. Assume observations $(\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{X}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{Y}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$ from a strictly stationary β -mixing sequence $(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, fulfilling the linear model (37), where the errors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{1i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{di})^\top$ are independent of past and present covariates \mathbf{X}_ℓ , $\ell \leq i$. For the β -mixing coefficients we assume $\beta_i = O(i^{-b})$ for some $b > 1$.

Provided that consistent estimators $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_d$ are available it is sufficient to verify condition **(T1)** for the function class

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{y_1 - \mathbf{x}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_1 \leq z_1, \dots, y_d - \mathbf{x}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_d \leq z_d\}; z_1, \dots, z_d \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\ \left. \forall_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^k \text{ \& } \|\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{b}_j\| \leq \delta \right\}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. To do that we will follow the approach of [Dedecker and Louhichi \(2002\)](#) and consider the seminorm

$$\|f\|_{2,\beta}^2 = \int_0^1 \beta^{-1}(u) Q_f^2(u) du,$$

where $\beta^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x > 0 : \beta_{[x]} \leq u\}$ and $Q_f(u) = \inf\{x > 0 : P(|f(\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{X}_1)| > x) \leq u\}$. In [Neumeyer et al. \(2019\)](#) (see their formula (A.13) in section A2) it was derived that there exists a finite constant K such that

$$\|f - g\|_{2,\beta}^2 \leq \frac{Kb}{b-1} (P|f - g|)^{(b-1)/b} \quad (38)$$

for all indicator functions f and g . Denote $\|\cdot\|_2$ the $L^2(P)$ -norm. Then similarly as in the proof of Lemma 1 of [Dette et al. \(2009\)](#) one can show that the bracketing integral condition

$$\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\beta})} d\epsilon < \infty \quad (39)$$

is fulfilled when for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon^{2b/(b-1)}, \mathcal{M}_j, \|\cdot\|_2)} d\epsilon < \infty,$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_j = \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x}^\top (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{b}_j); \widetilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^k \text{ \& } \|\widetilde{\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{b}_j\| \leq \delta\}.$$

But the bracketing number $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon^{2b/(b-1)}, \mathcal{M}_j, \|\cdot\|_2)$ is of order $\epsilon^{-2bd/(b-1)}$ by applying Theorem 2.7.11 in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2007\)](#). Thus the bracketing integral (39) is finite which implies asymptotic equicontinuity of the empirical process indexed in \mathcal{F} with respect to the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{2,\beta}$ (see Section 4.3 of [Dedecker and Louhichi, 2002](#)). Now using once more the inequality in (38) yields that **(T1)** holds. Further **(T2)** follows from consistency of the estimator for the regression function.

Now condition **(Z1)** can be verified similarly as in Section 4.1 provided that the estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_j$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent. For example for the least squares estimator this is a simple consequence of the law of large numbers and central limit theorem for β -mixing sequences and is fulfilled under existence of $m > 2$ moments of covariates and errors if $b > m/(m-2)$ (see e.g. Proposition 2.8 and Theorem 2.21 in [Fan and Yao, 2005](#)).

Remark 5. For simplicity here (as well in Section 4.1) we consider only linear models so far. But analogously one can consider nonlinear or even non- or semiparametric regression models

provided that suitable regression estimators are available. See for instance [Gijbels et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Neumeier et al. \(2019\)](#) where nonparametric location-scale models were considered.

4.3. Functional linear model. Now assume that $(\mathbf{Y}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{Y}_n)$ is a random sample from the generic distribution (\mathbf{Y}_X) , where X is a functional covariate such that

$$Y_j = \langle X, b_j \rangle + \varepsilon_j, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\},$$

and the error vector $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d)^\top$ is independent of X .

Suppose that the covariate X as well as the true parameter function b_j are random elements of the Hilbert space $L^2([0, 1])$ with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(t)g(t) dt$ and norm $\|f\|_2 = \langle f, f \rangle^{1/2}$. For simplicity assume $X \geq 0$.

Assume that for each j there is an estimator \hat{b}_j based on an iid sample $(\frac{Y_{ji}}{X_i}), i = 1, \dots, n$, such that

$$\|\hat{b}_j - b_j\|_2 = o_P(n^{-1/4+\gamma}) \quad (40)$$

for some $\gamma \geq 0$ corresponding to γ in assumption [\(Z2\)](#). Convergence rates for estimators in the functional linear model can be found in [Hall and Horowitz \(2007\)](#), [Yuan and Cai \(2010\)](#) or [Shang and Cheng \(2015\)](#), among others. For example, under the assumption that b_j is an element of the univariate Sobolev-space $\mathcal{W}_2^m([0, 1])$ for some $m \geq 1$, condition [\(40\)](#) is fulfilled for the regularized estimators in [Yuan and Cai \(2010\)](#) under the assumptions of their Corollary 11.

We further assume that $P(\hat{b}_j - b_j \in \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for a function class \mathcal{G} such that the bracketing number fulfills

$$\log N_{[\cdot]}(\mathcal{G}, \epsilon, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \frac{K}{\epsilon^{1/k}} \quad (41)$$

for some $K > 0$ and $k > 1$. For example for $k = 2$ this is satisfied with the Sobolev unit ball given by

$$\mathcal{G} = \{b \in \mathcal{W}_2^2([0, 1]) : \|b\|_2 + \|b^{(2)}\|_2 \leq 1\},$$

where $b^{(2)}$ stands for the second derivative of b . Note that $\|\cdot\|_2$ -bracketing numbers can be bounded by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -covering numbers, such that Corollary 4.3.38 in [Giné and Nickl \(2021\)](#) can be applied. Similar results can be found in Example 19.10 in [van der Vaart \(2000\)](#) or Corollary 4 in [Nickl and Pötscher \(2007\)](#). We obtain $P(\hat{b}_j - b_j \in \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow 1$ for \mathcal{G} as above for example under the assumption $b_j \in \mathcal{W}_2^m([0, 1])$ for some $m > 2$ for the estimator in [Yuan and Cai \(2010\)](#) also chosen from $\mathcal{W}_2^m([0, 1])$ under the assumptions of their Corollary 11, because then $\|\hat{b}_j - b_j\|_2 + \|\hat{b}_j^{(2)} - b_j^{(2)}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Other estimators and subspaces \mathcal{G} of $L^2([0, 1])$ could be used as well.

To derive conditions under which assumption [\(T1\)](#) is valid introduce

$$t_j(Y_j; X) = Y_j - \langle X, b_j \rangle, \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_j = \hat{t}_j(Y_j; X) = Y_j - \langle X, \hat{b}_j \rangle$$

and note that

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \{(y, x) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{y - \langle x, b \rangle \leq z\}; z \in \mathbb{R}, b - b_j \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

To show that this function class is Donsker we derive an upper bound for the bracketing number. To this end let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $[b_i^L, b_i^U]$, $i = 1, \dots, N(\epsilon) = O(\exp(\epsilon^{-2/k}))$ be brackets for \mathcal{G} of $\|\cdot\|_2$ -length ϵ^2 (see assumption (41)). Note that for $x \geq 0$ and for $b - b_j$ from the bracket $[b_i^L, b_i^U]$ we obtain that the indicator function $\mathbb{I}\{y - \langle x, b \rangle \leq z\}$ is contained in the bracket

$$[\mathbb{I}\{y - \langle x, b_j + b_i^L \rangle \leq z\}, \mathbb{I}\{y - \langle x, b_j + b_i^U \rangle \leq z\}]$$

for each $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Further the above bracket has $L^2(P_j)$ -length (where P_j denotes the distribution of $(\frac{Y_j}{X})$) bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbf{E} [\mathbb{I}\{Y_j - \langle X, b_j \rangle \leq z + \langle X, b_i^U \rangle\} - \mathbb{I}\{Y_j - \langle X, b_j \rangle \leq z + \langle X, b_i^L \rangle\}]^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\mathbf{E} [F_{j\epsilon}(z + \langle X, b_i^U \rangle) - F_{j\epsilon}(z + \langle X, b_i^L \rangle)] \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq (\|f_{j\epsilon}\|_\infty \mathbf{E} [\langle X, b_i^U - b_i^L \rangle])^{1/2} \leq (\|f_{j\epsilon}\|_\infty \mathbf{E} \|X\|_2 \epsilon^2)^{1/2} = O(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality provided that one assumes a bounded density $f_{j\epsilon}$ and $\mathbf{E} \|X\|_2 < \infty$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 1 in [Akritas and Van Keilegom \(2001\)](#) from this one obtains an upper bound $O(\epsilon^{-2} \exp(\epsilon^{-2/k}))$ for the $L^2(P_j)$ -bracketing number of the class \mathcal{F}_j . Thus \mathcal{F}_j is Donsker by the bracketing integral condition in Theorem 19.5 of [van der Vaart \(2000\)](#) for $k > 1$ and **(T1)** is fulfilled by Remark 3.

Further note that by the mean value theorem and (31)

$$Z_{jn}(u; X) = F_{j\epsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\epsilon}^{-1}(u) + \langle X, \hat{b}_j - b_j \rangle) - u = f_{j\epsilon}(\xi_{n,u}^X) \langle X, \hat{b}_j - b_j \rangle + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

with $\xi_{n,u}^X$ converging to $F_{j\epsilon}^{-1}(u)$. Now using (40) one can bound

$$|Z_{jn}(u; X)| \leq f_{j\epsilon}(\xi_{n,u}^X) \|X\|_2 o_P(n^{-1/4+\gamma}) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

where the o_P as well as o term do not depend on u and X . As this term is typically larger than $O_P(n^{-1/2})$ one can use Theorem 4 that requires **(Z2)** (instead of more strict **(Z1)**). With some further effort it possible to find appropriate moment assumptions for $\|X\|_2$ and smoothness assumption on $f_{j\epsilon}(F_{j\epsilon}^{-1}(u))$ so that **(Z2)** holds.

It is worth noting that trying to show the weak convergence of the process

$$\mathbb{Z}_{jn}(u) = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_X [F_{j\epsilon}(\tilde{F}_{nj\epsilon}^{-1}(u) + \langle X, \hat{b}_j - b_j \rangle) - u] = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_X [f_{j\epsilon}(\xi_{n,u}^X) \langle X, \hat{b}_j - b_j \rangle] + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

could be rather tough here as the rate of convergence of terms like $\langle X, \hat{b}_j - b_j \rangle$ is typically slower than $n^{-1/2}$ (see e.g. [Cardot et al., 2007](#); [Shang and Cheng, 2015](#); [Yeon et al., 2023](#)).

4.4. Location-scale-shape models. In this subsection we consider generalizations of location-scale models. Assume that Y is a real-valued random variable with a cdf

$$P(Y \leq y) = \Psi\left(\frac{y-\alpha}{\beta}; \gamma\right)$$

with location parameter α , scale parameter $\beta > 0$ shape parameter γ and a known function Ψ . As an example one can consider the skew-normal distribution ([Azzalini, 1985](#)) where Ψ is given by

$$\Psi_s(z; \gamma) = \int_{-\infty}^z 2\varphi(t)\Phi(\gamma t) dt$$

Alternatively one can consider for instance epsilon-skew-normal distribution ([Mudholkar and Hutson, 2000](#)) or generalized normal distribution ([Nadarajah, 2005](#)).

Now consider our model with observations (Y_{ji}, \mathbf{X}_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, where for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, the conditional distribution of Y_{ji} , given $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}$, is of the above form with parameters depending on the covariate, i.e.

$$F_{j\mathbf{x}}(y) = P(Y_{ji} \leq y | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) = \Psi_j\left(\frac{y - \alpha_j(\mathbf{x})}{\beta_j(\mathbf{x})}; \gamma_j(\mathbf{x})\right),$$

where Ψ_j is known but possibly different for $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Set $t_j(y; \mathbf{x}) = F_{j\mathbf{x}}(y)$, such that each $\varepsilon_{ji} = t_j(Y_{ji}; \mathbf{X}_i)$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and thus independent of \mathbf{X}_i . Further, assume that also the random vector $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{1i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{di})^\top$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_i . Then the joint cdf of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ coincides with the copula function C and can be estimated by \hat{C}_n as in (7) based on pseudo-observations

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{ji} = \hat{t}_j(Y_{ji}; \mathbf{X}_i) = \Psi_j\left(\frac{Y_{ji} - \hat{\alpha}_j(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\hat{\beta}_j(\mathbf{X}_i)}; \hat{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{X}_i)\right)$$

if consistent estimators $\hat{\alpha}_j, \hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\gamma}_j$ for the parameter functions are available.

In the models without covariates parameters are typically estimated with method of moments or maximum likelihood and are \sqrt{n} -consistent with asymptotic normal distribution under regularity assumptions. To the authors' knowledge estimators for covariate-dependent parameters have not yet been investigated in the literature. Thus to obtain asymptotic results for the copula estimator it is desirable to require only weak assumptions on the parameter function estimators. One possibility to show assumption **(T1)** is to find estimators and function classes $\mathcal{F}_j^{(\ell)}$, $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, such that $P(\hat{\alpha}_j \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(1)}) \rightarrow 1$, $P(\hat{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(2)}) \rightarrow 1$, $P(\hat{\gamma}_j \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(3)}) \rightarrow 1$ and the corresponding empirical process indexed by

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \left\{ (y, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{y \leq \alpha(\mathbf{x}) + \beta(\mathbf{x})\Psi_j^{-1}(z; \gamma(\mathbf{x}))\}; z \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(1)}, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(2)}, \gamma \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(3)} \right\}$$

is P_j -Donsker, see Remark 3.

Further one has to consider

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X}) &= t_j(\hat{t}_j^{-1}(u; \mathbf{X}); \mathbf{X}) - u \\ &= \Psi_j \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha}_j(\mathbf{X}) - \alpha_j(\mathbf{X}) + \hat{\beta}_j(\mathbf{X}) \Psi_j^{-1}(u; \hat{\gamma}_j(\mathbf{X}))}{\beta_j(\mathbf{X})}; \gamma_j(\mathbf{X}) \right) - u \end{aligned}$$

and it should be easier to derive conditions to show either **(Z1)** or **(Z2)** using a Taylor expansion and convergence rates of the parameter estimators than to show weak convergence of the process defined in (15) with $Z_{jn}(u) = \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X})$. The latter weak convergence would be needed without the new Hadamard differentiability result.

Note that in this example one could estimate C also by the empirical cdf of $(\hat{\varepsilon}_{1i}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{di})^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, instead of the empirical copula function \hat{C}_n . However, the weak convergence of the process \mathbb{B}_n would be needed to derive the limit distribution of such estimator. But this can be avoided by considering the empirical copula estimator (7) and the results presented in this paper.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

In our paper we presented two generalizations of the Hadamard-differentiability of [Bücher and Volgushev \(2013\)](#) that are motivated by dealing with the empirical copulas in the presence of covariates. It is worth noting that these results can be used in many other situations provided that appropriate results on the estimates are available. One can (among others) think of for instance long-range dependence where one would get different than \sqrt{n} -rates of convergence. A different (but rather straightforward) generalization would be to consider appropriately weighted differentiability result to get the weighted empirical copula approximation as in [Côté et al. \(2019\)](#).

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF THE RESULTS IN SECTION 2

A.1. Proof of Theorem 1. Let $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}$. Note that thanks to (24) (which implies that $\tilde{h}_k(1) = 0$) and (25)

$$\tilde{h}(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) = \tilde{h}_j(u_j) + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^d C^{(k)}(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) \tilde{h}_k(1) = \tilde{h}_j(u_j),$$

where $\mathbf{u}^{(j)}$ was introduced in (4). Further recall that $h_j(u_j) = h(\mathbf{u}^{(j)})$.

Now let U stand for the cdf of a random variable with the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Then the marginal cdf for the j -th coordinate of the joint cdf $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} = C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h}$ is given by

$$(C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h})(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) = (U + t_n h_j + t_n \tilde{h}_j)(u_j).$$

Denote its corresponding generalized inverse function as

$$\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u) = (U + t_n h_j + t_n \tilde{h}_j)^{-1}(u).$$

For simplicity of notation introduce

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u}) = (\xi_{1n}^{h_1, \tilde{h}_1}(u_1), \dots, \xi_{dn}^{h_d, \tilde{h}_d}(u_d))^\top.$$

Note that applying Lemma 1(i) (with $t_n = \tilde{t}_n$) given in Section A.3 for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ implies that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbf{u}$ (uniformly in $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$).

Now using the asymptotic uniform equicontinuity of $h \in \mathcal{A}_n$ and the form of \tilde{h} given in (25) one derives that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h})(\mathbf{u}) &= (C + t_n h + t_n \tilde{h})(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) \\ &= C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) + t_n h(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) + t_n \tilde{h}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) \\ &= C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) + t_n h(\mathbf{u}) + t_n \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{h}_j(\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j)) + o(t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where here (as well as in the sequel) by $o(t_n)$ we understand a remainder term that may depend on \mathbf{u} , h and \tilde{h} but it is uniformly asymptotically negligible, i.e.

$$\sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} \frac{|o(t_n)|}{t_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Now we compare the quantity $C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u}))$ with $C(\mathbf{u})$. Note that by the mean value theorem

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| |\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j|, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}$ lies between the points $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})$ and \mathbf{u} .

Now fix $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$. Introduce the sets

$$I_j(\delta) = \{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d : \delta \leq u_j \leq 1 - \delta\}, \quad I_j^c(\delta) = [0, 1]^d \setminus I_j(\delta).$$

Then with the help of the (uniform) continuity of $C^{(j)}$ on $I_j(\delta/2)$ and Lemma 1(ii) (with $t_n = \tilde{t}_n$) one gets that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in I_j(\delta)} \{|C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| |\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j|\} \\ &\leq \sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in I_j(\delta/2)} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| O(t_n) = o(1) O(t_n) = o(t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where we have used that by Lemma 1(i) for all sufficiently large n one has

$$\sup_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(1 - \delta) \leq 1 - \delta/2 \quad \& \quad \inf_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(\delta) \geq \delta/2$$

and thus $\mathbf{u}_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in I_j(\delta/2)$.

Further as from the properties of the copula function we know that $C^{(j)} \in [0, 1]$ one can with the help of Lemma 1(ii) (for all sufficiently large n) bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in I_j^c(\delta)} \{ |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{h,\tilde{h}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| | \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j | \} \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \sup_{v \in [0, \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1]} | \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(v) - v | \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} t_n \left\{ \sup_{v \in [0, \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1]} |h_j(v)| + \sup_{v \in [0, 2\delta] \cup [1 - 2\delta, 1]} | \tilde{h}_j(v) | \right\} + o(t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where (similarly as above) we have used that by Lemma 1(i) for all sufficiently large n one has

$$\sup_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(\delta) \leq 2\delta \quad \& \quad \inf_{C_n^{h,\tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(1)}} \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(1 - \delta) \geq 1 - 2\delta.$$

Now by Remark 1 one can make $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{v \in [0, \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1]} |h_j(v)|$ arbitrarily small by taking n sufficiently large and δ small enough. Note that from the properties of \mathcal{B} and (24) the same is true also for $\sup_{v \in [0, 2\delta] \cup [1 - 2\delta, 1]} | \tilde{h}_j(v) |$ as one can bound

$$\sup_{\tilde{h}_j \in \mathcal{B}_1} \sup_{v \in [0, 2\delta] \cup [1 - 2\delta, 1]} | \tilde{h}_j(v) | \leq \sup_{v \in [0, 2\delta] \cup [1 - 2\delta, 1]} r(v).$$

Thus combining (45) with (44) yields that also the right-hand side of (43) is $o(t_n)$ (uniformly in h, \tilde{h} and \mathbf{u}) and so we have showed that

$$C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h,\tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j] + o(t_n).$$

This combined with Lemma 1(ii) implies

$$C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h,\tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) = t_n \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [-h_j(u_j) - \tilde{h}_j(\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j))] + o(t_n),$$

which together with (42) gives the statement of Theorem 1.

A.2. Proof of Theorem 2. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1 denote

$$\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u) = (U + t_n h_j + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}_j)^{-1}(u).$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h,\tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u}) = (\xi_{1n}^{h_1, \tilde{h}_1}(u_1), \dots, \xi_{dn}^{h_d, \tilde{h}_d}(u_d))^{\top}.$$

Note that Lemma 1(i) implies that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbf{u}$ (uniformly in $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$). Now in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1 one can make use of the asymptotic uniform equicontinuity of the functions in \mathcal{A}_n and the form of \tilde{h} given in (28) to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(C + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(\mathbf{u}) &= (C + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) \\ &= C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) + t_n h(\mathbf{u}) + \tilde{t}_n \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{h}_j(\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j)) + o(t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where here (as well as in the sequel) by $o(t_n)$ we understand a remainder term that may depend on \mathbf{u} , h and \tilde{h} but it is uniformly small, i.e.

$$\sup_{C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(2)}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} \frac{|o(t_n)|}{t_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Using the second order Taylor expansion we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d |C^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}})| |\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j| |\xi_{kn}^{h_k, \tilde{h}_k}(u_k) - u_k|, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}$ lies between the points $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})$ and \mathbf{u} .

Now note that if $\beta > 0$ then one can use Lemma 1(iii) to deduce that for all sufficiently large n the j -th component of $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})$ satisfies

$$\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) \geq \frac{u_j}{2}, \quad \& \quad \xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(1 - u_j) \leq 1 - \frac{u_j}{2} \quad (48)$$

for each $u_j \in [\epsilon t_n^\beta, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\beta]$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $C_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{D}_n^{(2)}$. And thus the same is also true for the components of $\mathbf{u}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}$.

Now with the help of Lemma 1(ii), assumption (C2), (47) and (48) we have for $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{I}_n(\epsilon)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d O\left(\frac{1}{u_j^\beta (1-u_j)^\beta u_k^\beta (1-u_k)^\beta}\right) \left[t_n |h_j(u_j)| + \tilde{t}_n |\tilde{h}_j(\xi_{jn}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j))| + o(t_n) \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[t_n |h_k(u_k)| + \tilde{t}_n |\tilde{h}_k(\xi_{kn}^{h_k, \tilde{h}_k}(u_k))| + o(t_n) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Now let $u_0 \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, 1/2]$ be fixed. Note that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta]} \frac{t_n |h_j(u)|}{u^\beta (1-u)^\beta} &\leq O(t_n) + \sup_{u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, u_0] \cup [1 - u_0, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta]} \frac{t_n |h_j(u)|}{u^\beta (1-u)^\beta} \\ &\leq O(t_n) + O(t_n^{1-\vartheta\beta}) \sup_{u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, u_0] \cup [1 - u_0, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta]} |h_j(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

As u_0 can be taken arbitrarily small (for n sufficiently large enough) one can conclude that

$$\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \sup_{u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, 1 - \epsilon t_n^\vartheta]} \frac{t_n |h_j(u)|}{u^\beta (1-u)^\beta} = O(t_n) + o(t_n^{1-\vartheta\beta}).$$

This together with (49), (27) and $\tilde{t}_n = o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma})$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_n(\epsilon)} \left| C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) [\xi_{j_n}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j) - u_j] \right| \\ = O(t_n^2) + o(t_n^{2-2\vartheta\beta}) + o(t_n^{3/2-2\beta\vartheta+2\gamma-\vartheta(\beta-\alpha)_+}) + o(t_n^{1+4\gamma-2\vartheta(\beta-\alpha)_+}) = o(t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where we use that $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\vartheta \leq 1$ and $2\gamma - \vartheta(\beta - \alpha)_+ \geq 0$ which can be deduced in the same way as in the reasoning following (66) below by taking $s = \infty$.

Now (50) combined with Lemma 1(ii) implies

$$C(\boldsymbol{\xi}_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u}) = -t_n \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) h_j(u_j) - \tilde{t}_n \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{h}_j(\xi_{j_n}^{h_j, \tilde{h}_j}(u_j)) + o(t_n),$$

which together with (46) gives the statement of Theorem 2.

A.3. Hadamard differentiability of a quantile function. Now it remains to generalize the result on the inverse of the cdf on $[0, 1]$. More precisely we are interested in the differentiable properties of the mapping

$$\Lambda : F \rightarrow F^{-1}, \quad \text{at } F = U,$$

for cumulative distribution functions defined on $[0, 1]$ that satisfy $F(0) = 0$ and $F(1) = 1$.

For the special case $d = 1$ denote \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{A}_{1n} the sets \mathcal{D}_n and \mathcal{A}_n introduced in Section 2. Note that the elements of the set \mathcal{A}_{1n} are uniformly bounded, asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous and satisfy the property described in Remark 1.

Further given sequence $\{t_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{t}_n\}$ of positive constants going to zero denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{1n} &= \{F \in \mathcal{D}_{1n} : F = U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}, h \in \mathcal{A}_{1n}, \tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha &= \{F \in \mathcal{D}_{1n} : F = U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}, h \in \mathcal{A}_{1n}, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_{1n}^\alpha\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M$ and \mathcal{B}_{1n}^α were introduced in (23) and (27). Note that $\mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}_{1n}$. Thus the statements of the following lemma that holds for \mathcal{F}_{1n} are automatically also true for \mathcal{F}_{1n}^α .

Finally denote

$$\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) = (U_n^{h, \tilde{h}})^{-1}(u), \quad u \in [0, 1],$$

with $U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} = U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}$ and the inverse should be understood as in (19).

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{F}_{1n} and \mathcal{F}_{1n}^α be as explained above. Then the following statements hold.*

$$(i) \sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) - u| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

(ii)

$$\sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} \left| \frac{\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) - u}{t_n} + h(u) + \frac{\tilde{t}_n}{t_n} \tilde{h}(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

(iii) *Suppose that $\tilde{t}_n = o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma})$. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$ for all sufficiently large n for all $u \in [\epsilon t_n^\gamma, \frac{1}{2}]$:*

$$\sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) \leq 2u \quad \& \quad \inf_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(1-u) \geq 1-2u$$

and also

$$\sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(1-u) \leq 1 - \frac{u}{2} \quad \& \quad \inf_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) \geq \frac{u}{2}.$$

Proof. For simplicity for an arbitrary non-decreasing function g defined on $[0, 1]$ introduce the notation

$$g(v_-) = \begin{cases} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} g(v - \epsilon), & \text{if } v \in (0, 1], \\ g(0), & \text{if } v = 0. \end{cases}$$

Using this notation by the definition of the generalized inverse function

$$(U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)_-) \leq u \leq (U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)),$$

which with the help of (26) yields that

$$\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) + t_n h(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) + o(t_n) \leq u \leq \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) + t_n h(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)). \quad (51)$$

From this one can conclude that

$$\sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) - u| \leq t_n \sup_{h \in \mathcal{A}_{1n}} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |h(u)| + \tilde{t}_n \sup_{\tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{h}(u)| + o(t_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which yields *the first statement* of the lemma.

To prove *the second statement* note that the inequalities in (51) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} -h(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) + h(u) + o(1) &\leq \frac{\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) - u}{t_n} + h(u) + \frac{\tilde{t}_n}{t_n} \tilde{h}(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)) \\ &\leq -h(\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u)_-) + h(u) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now using the first statement of the lemma and that the functions in \mathcal{A}_{1n} are asymptotically equicontinuous (see Section 2) one can conclude that both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of the above inequalities converge to zero (uniformly in u , h and \tilde{h}) which was to be proved.

Regarding *the third statement* note that for each fixed positive u_0 the proof for $u \in [u_0, \frac{1}{2}]$ follows from the first statement of the lemma.

Thus in what follows we prove that for all $u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, u_0]$

$$\sup_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) \leq 2u \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha} \xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) \geq \frac{u}{2}. \quad (52)$$

The remaining statements can be proved analogously.

To prove the first inequality in (52) suppose that for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, u_0]$ and $U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha$ such that

$$\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) > 2u.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u &> (U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})(2u) = 2u + t_n h(2u) + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h}(2u) \\ &\geq 2u + t_n h(2u) + o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma}) u^\alpha (1-u)^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

which further gives

$$u \leq -t_n h(2u) - o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma}) u^\alpha. \quad (53)$$

Note that (29) implies that $\vartheta \leq \frac{1/2+2\gamma}{1-\alpha}$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \left(\frac{t_n}{u}\right) |h(2u)| + o\left(\frac{t_n^{1/2+2\gamma}}{u^{1-\alpha}}\right) \\ &\leq O(t_n^{1-\vartheta}) \sup_{u \in [0, 2u_0]} |h(u)| + o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma-\vartheta(1-\alpha)}) = O(1) \sup_{u \in [0, 2u_0]} |h(u)| + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

But this is a contradiction as by Remark 1 the right hand side of the last inequality can be made arbitrarily small uniformly in h by taking u_0 small enough.

Analogously to prove the second inequality in (52) suppose that for some $u \in [\epsilon t_n^\vartheta, \delta]$ and $U_n^{h, \tilde{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{1n}^\alpha$

$$\xi_n^{h, \tilde{h}}(u) < \frac{u}{2}.$$

This implies that

$$u \leq (U + t_n h + \tilde{t}_n \tilde{h})\left(\frac{u}{2}\right) = \frac{u}{2} + t_n h\left(\frac{u}{2}\right) + o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma}) \tilde{h}\left(\frac{u}{2}\right). \quad (54)$$

Note that by the properties of \mathcal{B}_{1n}^α one has $\tilde{h}\left(\frac{u}{2}\right) = O(u^\alpha)$. Thus with the help of (54)

$$\frac{u}{2} \leq t_n \sup_{v \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}]} |h(v)| + o(t_n^{1/2+2\gamma}) O(u^\alpha).$$

Now one can arrive at a contradiction similarly as from the inequality (53). \square

APPENDIX B. PROOFS OF RESULTS IN SECTION 3

B.1. **Restricting to a subset of $[0, 1]^d$.** Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. First of all we show that it is sufficient to consider $\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\epsilon)$, where

$$J_n(\epsilon) = \left[\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \right]^d. \quad (55)$$

Note that

$$[0, 1]^d \setminus J_n(\epsilon) = \bigcup_{j=1}^d (J_{jn}^{(L)}(\epsilon) \cup J_{jn}^{(U)}(\epsilon)),$$

where

$$J_{jn}^{(L)}(\epsilon) = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d : u_j < \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}, \quad J_{jn}^{(U)}(\epsilon) = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d : u_j > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

Suppose for a moment that $\mathbf{u} \in \underline{J_{jn}^{(L)}(\epsilon)}$, then

$$|\sqrt{n} [\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})]| \leq \sqrt{n} [|\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u})| + |C(\mathbf{u})|] \leq \sqrt{n} [\hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}(\hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_j)) + u_j] \leq 2\epsilon + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Now consider that $\mathbf{u} \in \underline{J_{jn}^{(U)}(\epsilon)}$. Denote $\mathbf{u}^{(-j)}$ the vector \mathbf{u} whose j -th component is replaced with 1, i.e.

$$\mathbf{u}^{(-j)} = (u_1, \dots, u_{j-1}, 1, u_{j+1}, \dots, u_d)^\top.$$

Then from the basic properties of the copula function (see e.g. Theorem 2.2.4 [Nelsen, 2006](#))

$$\sqrt{n} |C(\mathbf{u}^{(-j)}) - C(\mathbf{u})| \leq \epsilon. \quad (56)$$

Similarly also

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} |\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}^{(-j)}) - \hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u})| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{I}\{\hat{\epsilon}_{1i} \leq \hat{F}_{1\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{ji} \leq \hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(1), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{di} \leq \hat{F}_{1\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_d)\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{I}\{\hat{\epsilon}_{1i} \leq F_{1\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{ji} \leq F_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_j), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{di} \leq F_{d\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_d)\} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{I}\{\hat{\epsilon}_{ji} \leq \hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(1)\} - \mathbb{I}\{\hat{\epsilon}_{ji} \leq \hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_j)\} \right] \\ &= \sqrt{n} [1 - \hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}(\hat{F}_{j\hat{\epsilon}}^{-1}(u_j))] \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Now combining (56) and (57) yields that uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in J_{jn}^{(U)}$

$$\sqrt{n} [\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})] = \sqrt{n} [\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}^{(-j)}) - C(\mathbf{u}^{(-j)})] + O(\epsilon).$$

Repeatedly using this argument for other components of \mathbf{u} bigger than $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}}$ one can conclude that without loss of generality one can consider only $\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\epsilon)$.

Note that to prove Theorem 4 it is sufficient to consider \mathbf{u} from the set

$$\tilde{J}_n(\epsilon) = \left[\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}} \right]^d.$$

which is for $\vartheta < 1$ a (strict) subset of $J_n(\epsilon)$, see (55). Thus denote

$$\overset{\circ}{J}_n(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} J_n(\epsilon), & \text{when proving Theorem 3,} \\ \tilde{J}_n(\epsilon), & \text{when proving Theorem 4.} \end{cases}$$

B.2. Using Theorems 1 and 2. Let $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}}$ be as in (9) where the residuals are of the general form (30). We will show in Section B.3 that for each $\epsilon > 0$ the representation (12) holds uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \overset{\circ}{J}_n(\epsilon)$ with $\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n$ given by (13), (14) and \mathbb{Z}_{jn} introduced in (34).

First note that the marginals of $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}}$ are discontinuous with jumps of the height $\frac{1}{n}$. Thus for $t_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ there exists a sequence of functions \mathcal{D}_n such that even $\mathbb{P}(\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}} \in \mathcal{D}_n) = 1$.

Further, as explained in Section 2 for each $\eta > 0$ there exists a sequence of sets $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ of functions on $[0, 1]^d$ such that (20) holds and Theorem 1 is satisfied.

Finally if (Z1) (or (Z2)) hold then as explained in Remark 4 there exists a set \mathcal{B} as in (25) (or a sequence of sets $\{\mathcal{B}_n^\alpha\}$ as in (28)) of functions on $[0, 1]^d$ such that assumptions of Theorem 1 (or Theorem 2) with $t_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ (and $\tilde{t}_n = n^{-(1/4+\gamma)}$) are met and at the same time

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n \in \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 - \eta \quad \left(\text{or} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{t_n}{\tilde{t}_n} \mathbb{B}_n \in \mathcal{B}_n^\alpha\right) \geq 1 - \eta \right).$$

Now note that one can rewrite the empirical copula process as

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{C}_n - C) = \frac{\Phi(\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}}) - \Phi(C)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}},$$

where Φ stands for the copula mapping formally introduced in Section 2. Thus with the help of (12) one can use Theorem 1 (or Theorem 2) with $h = \mathbb{A}_n$ and $\tilde{h} = n^{-1/4+\gamma} \mathbb{B}_n = \frac{t_n}{\tilde{t}_n} \mathbb{B}_n$ to deduce that (uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \overset{\circ}{J}_n(\epsilon)$)

$$\sqrt{n}[\hat{C}_n(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})] = \mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j=1}^d C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) + o_P(1). \quad (58)$$

Now the standard result for the empirical process copula (see e.g. Proposition 3.1 Segers, 2012) together with (58) implies that asymptotic equivalence (11) holds for each $\epsilon > 0$ uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \overset{\circ}{J}_n(\epsilon)$ which yields the statement of the theorem.

B.3. Proof of (12). Introduce

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{n}[\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}}(\mathbf{u}) - C(\mathbf{u})] \quad (59)$$

with $\hat{G}_{n\hat{\epsilon}}$ from (10) and note that (12) is equivalent to showing that

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{A}_n(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}).$$

Now recall the set of functions \mathcal{F} introduced in (32). Note that each function in \mathcal{F} can be identified with ‘parameter’ $\times_{j=1}^d (z_j, \tilde{t}_j)$ (having $2d$ components). Now $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_n(\mathbf{u})$ given by (59)

can be rewritten with the help of the standard empirical processes notation as

$$\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{n} [P_n(f_n^{(\mathbf{u})}) - f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}] + \sqrt{n} [P_n(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}) - P(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})})], \quad (60)$$

where P stands for the expectation given by the distribution of (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}) , P_n for the empirical expectation given by the observed data $(\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{X}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{Y}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$ and

$$f_n^{(\mathbf{u})} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^d (\tilde{F}_{nj\epsilon}^{-1}(u_j), \hat{t}_j), \quad f_0^{(\mathbf{u})} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^d (F_{j\epsilon}^{-1}(u_j), t_j).$$

Thus thanks to assumption **(T1)** we know that the empirical process $\sqrt{n}(P_n - P)$ is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability with respect to the semimetric ρ given by **(33)**. Further with the help of assumption **(Z1)** (or **(Z2)**)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)} P |f_n^{(\mathbf{u})} - f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)} \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{I}\{\hat{t}_j(Y_j; \mathbf{X}) \leq \tilde{F}_{nj\epsilon}^{-1}(u_j)\} - \mathbb{I}\{t_j(Y_j; \mathbf{X}) \leq F_{j\epsilon}^{-1}(u_j)\}| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^d \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| = o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation on the first line is with respect to the random vector (\mathbf{Y}_j) keeping \hat{t}_j fixed.

Thus from the asymptotic uniform equicontinuity of the process $\{\sqrt{n}(P_n(f) - P(f)), f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and assumption **(T2)** one can conclude that uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)$

$$\sqrt{n} [P_n(f_n^{(\mathbf{u})}) - f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}] = \sqrt{n} [P(f_n^{(\mathbf{u})}) - f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}] + o_P(1),$$

which combined with **(60)** implies that (uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)$)

$$\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \sqrt{n} [P_n(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}) - P(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})})] + \sqrt{n} [P(f_n^{(\mathbf{u})}) - f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}] + o_P(1). \quad (61)$$

Note that the first term on the right-hand side of **(61)** can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} [P_n(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})}) - P(f_0^{(\mathbf{u})})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbb{I}\{t_1(Y_{1i}; \mathbf{X}_i) \leq F_{1\epsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, t_d(Y_{di}; \mathbf{X}_i) \leq F_{d\epsilon}^{-1}(u_d)\} - C(\mathbf{u})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbb{I}\{\varepsilon_{1i} \leq F_{1\epsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \varepsilon_{di} \leq F_{d\epsilon}^{-1}(u_d)\} - C(\mathbf{u})] = \mathbb{A}_n^*(\mathbf{u}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{A}_n^* denotes the dominating term in the definition of \mathbb{A}_n in **(13)**.

In what follows we need to explore the second term on the right-hand side of **(61)** which we denote as $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n$. We will show that (uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{J}_n(\epsilon)$)

$$\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u}) + o_P(1), \quad (62)$$

where \mathbb{B}_n is introduced in **(14)**.

B.4. **Dealing with $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n$.** Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n(\mathbf{u}) &= \sqrt{n} [P(f_n^{\mathbf{u}}) - f_0^{\mathbf{u}}] \\ &= \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[F_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \left(t_1 \{ \hat{t}_1^{-1}(\tilde{F}_{n1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1); \mathbf{X}); \mathbf{X} \}, \dots, t_d \{ \hat{t}_d^{-1}(\tilde{F}_{nd\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d); \mathbf{X}); \mathbf{X} \} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - F_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(F_{1\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, F_{d\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_d)) \right] \\ &= \sqrt{n} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [C(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{u})) - C(\mathbf{u})],\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$ stands for the joint distribution function of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d)^\top$ and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{u}) = (\hat{\xi}_{1n}^{\mathbf{X}}(u_1), \dots, \hat{\xi}_{dn}^{\mathbf{X}}(u_d)), \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\xi}_{jn}^{\mathbf{X}}(u_j) = F_{j\varepsilon} \left(t_j \{ \hat{t}_j^{-1}(\tilde{F}_{nj\varepsilon}^{-1}(u_j); \mathbf{x}); \mathbf{x} \} \right).$$

Now the proof of (62) depends on whether we assume **(C1)** and **(Z1)** or **(C2)** and **(Z2)**.

Suppose that assumptions **(C1)** and **(Z1)** hold. Then one can use the mean value theorem to bound

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u})| &\leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| \\ &\leq O_P(1) \sum_{j=1}^d r(u) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| M(\mathbf{X}) + o_P(1),\end{aligned}\tag{63}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}$ lies between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{u})$ and \mathbf{u} . Now note that for each sequence $\{a_n\}$ going to infinity

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) > a_n\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus it is sufficient to consider

$$\sum_{j=1}^d r(u) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\}.$$

Further with the help of (34) and assumption **(Z1)** one can conclude that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat{\xi}_{jn}^{\mathbf{X}}(u) - u| \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} &= |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} \\ &\leq M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} r(u) O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = o_P(1).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{u} + o_P(1)$ uniformly in $\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\varepsilon)$ (on the event $[M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}]$). Note that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} \leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} M(\mathbf{X}) < \infty.$$

Thus for every $\eta > 0$ one can find $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0,1]^d: u_j \in [0,\delta] \cup [1-\delta,1]} r(u) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} < \eta$$

and it remains to consider the case $u_j \in [\delta, 1 - \delta]$. For this we can work conditionally on the event

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\epsilon)} \|\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{u}\| \leq \tilde{\delta},$$

for each $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ and we require $\tilde{\delta} < \frac{\delta}{2}$. Now thanks to assumption **(C1)** one can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\epsilon), u_j \in [\delta, 1-\delta]} \sum_{j=1}^d r(u) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \leq n^{1/3}\} \\ \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in [0,1]^d: u_j, v_j \in [\delta/2, 1-\delta/2], \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}\| \leq \tilde{\delta}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{v})| \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} M(\mathbf{X}), \end{aligned}$$

which can be made arbitrarily small by taking $\tilde{\delta}$ small enough.

This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.

Suppose that assumptions **(C2)**, **(Z2)** hold and introduce $a_n = n^{\frac{1/4-\gamma}{s-1}}$. Then similarly as in (63) there exists $\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}$ between $\hat{\xi}_n^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{u})$ and \mathbf{u} such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_n(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{B}_n(\mathbf{u})| &\leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}) - C^{(j)}(\mathbf{u})| |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \geq a_n\} \quad (64) \\ &= \mathbb{B}_{n1}(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbb{B}_{n2}(\mathbf{u}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{B}_{n1} and \mathbb{B}_{n2} stand for the first and second term on the right-hand side of (64).

Now with the help of **(Z2)** one can bound \mathbb{B}_{n2} as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in J_n(\epsilon)} \mathbb{B}_{n2}(\mathbf{u}) &= \sqrt{n} o_P(n^{-1/4-\gamma}) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [M(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) \geq a_n\}] \\ &= o_P(n^{1/4-\gamma}) \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} M^s(\mathbf{X})}{a_n^{s-1}} = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus one can concentrate on \mathbb{B}_{n1} . Using once more the mean value theorem one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{B}_{n1}(\mathbf{u}) &\leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} |C^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}})| |Z_{jn}(u_j; \mathbf{X})| |Z_{kn}(u_k; \mathbf{X})| \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\} \\ &\leq o_P(n^{-2\gamma}) \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d u_j^\alpha (1-u_j)^\alpha u_k^\alpha (1-u_k)^\alpha \\ &\quad \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [|C^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}})| M^2(\mathbf{X}) \mathbb{I}\{M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\}], \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n^{\mathbf{X}}$ lies between $\hat{\xi}_n^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{u})$ and \mathbf{u} .

Now if $\beta = 0$ then (62) follows immediately as the second derivatives of the copula function C are bounded. Thus suppose that $\beta > 0$. Then with the help of assumption **(Z2)**

uniformly in $u \in [\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}]$ on the event $\{M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\xi}_{jn}^{\mathbf{X}}(u) &= Z_{jn}(u; \mathbf{X}) + u \\ &= u^\alpha(1-u)^\alpha o_P(a_n n^{-(1/4+\gamma)}) + u = u(1-u) o_P(1) + u,\end{aligned}$$

as

$$(1-\alpha)\frac{\vartheta}{2} + \frac{1/4-\gamma}{s-1} - \frac{1}{4} - \gamma \leq 0,$$

by the definition of ϑ given in (36).

Thus one can conclude that

$$P\left(\frac{u}{2} \leq \xi_{jn}^{\mathbf{X}}(u); \forall u \in \left[\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}\right], \forall j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \mid M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$$

and also

$$P\left(\xi_{jn}^{\mathbf{X}}(1-u) \leq 1 - \frac{u}{2}; \forall u \in \left[\frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}, 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{n^{\vartheta/2}}\right], \forall j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \mid M(\mathbf{X}) < a_n\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

Thus the same holds true also for the components of $\mathbf{u}_n^{\mathbf{X}}$. So with the help of assumption (C2) one can further rewrite (65) as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{B}_{2n}(\mathbf{u}) &\leq o_P(n^{-2\gamma}) \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d O\left(\frac{1}{u_j^{\beta-\alpha}(1-u_j)^{\beta-\alpha} u_k^{\beta-\alpha}(1-u_k)^{\beta-\alpha}}\right) + o_P(1) \\ &= o_P(n^{-[2\gamma-(\beta-\alpha)\vartheta]}) + o_P(1) = o_P(1),\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

where the last equality is implied the definition of ϑ and properties of γ given in (36) and (35) respectively as follows. Note that it is sufficient to consider $\beta > \alpha$. Now distinguish two cases.

(i) First if $\underline{\vartheta = 1}$ then by (36)

$$\frac{\frac{s-2}{s-1} + 4\gamma\frac{s}{s-1}}{2(1-\alpha)} \geq 1,$$

from which one conclude that

$$4\gamma \geq 2(1-\alpha)\frac{s-1}{s} - \frac{s-2}{s} = 2(1-\alpha) - \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{s} - 1 + \frac{2}{s} \geq 2(1-\alpha) - 1 = 1 - 2\alpha$$

and thus taking into consideration that $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$

$$2\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2} - \alpha \geq \beta - \alpha,$$

which was to proved.

(ii) Second suppose that $\underline{\vartheta < 1}$. Then $\vartheta = \frac{\frac{s-2}{s-1} + 4\gamma\frac{s}{s-1}}{2(1-\alpha)}$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}2\gamma - (\beta - \alpha)\vartheta &= 2\gamma - (\beta - \alpha)\frac{\frac{s-2}{s-1} + 4\gamma\frac{s}{s-1}}{2(1-\alpha)} \\ &= 2\gamma\left(1 - \frac{\beta - \alpha}{1-\alpha}\frac{s}{s-1}\right) - \frac{\beta - \alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}\frac{s-2}{s-1} \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by (35).

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.

B.5. Proof of Corollary 1. The assertion follows simply from the fact that if $4\gamma + 2\alpha \frac{s}{s-1} \geq 1$, then $\vartheta = 1$ and $\tilde{J}_n(\epsilon) = J_n(\epsilon)$ (see (55)).

REFERENCES

- Akritis, M. G. and Van Keilegom, I. (2001). Non-parametric estimation of the residual distribution. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 28:549–567.
- Azzalini, A. (1985). A class of distributions which includes the normal ones. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 12:171–178.
- Bücher, A. and Volgushev, S. (2013). Empirical and sequential empirical copula processes under serial dependence. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 119:61–70.
- Cardot, H., Mas, A., and Sarda, P. (2007). CLT in functional linear regression models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 138(3):325–361.
- Côté, M.-P., Genest, C., and Omelka, M. (2019). Rank-based inference tools for copula regression, with property and casualty insurance applications. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, 89:1–15.
- Dedecker, J. and Louhichi, S. (2002). Maximal inequalities and empirical central limit theorems. In Dehling, H., Mikosch, T., and Sorensen, M., editors, *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*, pages 137–160. Birkhäuser Boston.
- Dette, H., Pardo-Fernández, J. C., and Keilegom, I. V. (2009). Goodness-of-fit tests for multiplicative models with dependent data. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 36(4):782–799.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2005). *Nonlinear Time Series : Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer series in statistics. Springer, New York.
- Fermanian, J.-D., Radulović, D., and Wegkamp, M. (2004). Weak convergence of empirical copula processes. *Bernoulli*, 10:847–860.
- Gänssler, P. and Stute, W. (1987). *Seminar on Empirical Processes*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Ghoudi, K. and Rémillard, B. (1998). Empirical Processes Based on Pseudo-Observations. In Szyszkowitz, B., editor, *Asymptotic Methods in Probability and Statistics, A Volume in Honour of Miklós Csörgő*, pages 171–197. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Gijbels, I., Omelka, M., and Veraverbeke, N. (2015). Estimation of a copula when a covariate affects only marginal distributions. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 42:1109–1126.
- Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2021). *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Hall, P. and Horowitz, J. L. (2007). Methodology and convergence rates for functional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(1):70–91.
- Mudholkar, G. S. and Hutson, A. D. (2000). The epsilon-skew-normal distribution for analyzing near-normal data. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 83:291–309.
- Nadarajah, S. (2005). A generalized normal distribution. *J. Appl. Stat.*, 32(7):685–694.

- Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas*. Springer, New York. Second Edition.
- Neumeier, N., Omelka, M., and Hudecová, Š. (2019). A copula approach for dependence modeling in multivariate nonparametric time series. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 171:139–162.
- Nickl, R. and Pötscher, B. M. (2007). Bracketing metric entropy rates and empirical central limit theorems for function classes of Besov-and Sobolev-type. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 20(2):177–199.
- Omelka, M., Gijbels, I., and Veraverbeke, N. (2009). Improved kernel estimation of copulas: Weak convergence and goodness-of-fit testing. *Ann. Statist.*, 37(5B):3023–3058.
- Portier, F. and Segers, J. (2018). On the weak convergence of the empirical conditional copula under a simplifying assumption. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 166:160–181.
- Segers, J. (2012). Weak convergence of empirical copula processes under nonrestrictive smoothness assumptions. *Bernoulli*, 18:764–782.
- Shang, Z. and Cheng, G. (2015). Nonparametric inference in generalized functional linear models. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(4):1742–1773.
- Tsukahara, H. (2005). Semiparametric estimation in copula models. *Canad. J. Statist.*, 33:357–375.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer, New York.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (2007). Empirical processes indexed by estimated functions. In Cator, E. A., Jongbloed, G., Kraaikamp, C., Lopuhaä, H. P., and Wellner, J. A., editors, *IMS Lecture Notes Monograph Series 2007: Asymptotics: Particles, Processes and Inverse Problems*, volume 55, pages 234–252. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Yeon, H., Dai, X., and Nordman, D. J. (2023). Bootstrap inference in functional linear regression models with scalar response. To appear in *Bernoulli*.
- Yuan, M. and Cai, T. T. (2010). A reproducing kernel Hilbert space approach to functional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(6):3412–3444.