

Robust Inference for High-Dimensional Panel Data Models

JITI GAO^{*} and BIN PENG[†] and YAYI YAN[‡]

May 14, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a robust estimation and inferential method for high-dimensional panel data models. Specifically, (1) we investigate the case where the number of regressors can grow faster than the sample size, (2) we pay particular attention to non-Gaussian, serially and cross-sectionally correlated and heteroskedastic error processes, and (3) we develop an estimation method for high-dimensional long-run covariance matrix using a thresholded estimator.

Methodologically and technically, we develop two Nagaev-types of concentration inequalities: one for a partial sum and the other for a quadratic form, subject to a set of easily verifiable conditions. Leveraging these two inequalities, we also derive a non-asymptotic bound for the LASSO estimator, achieve asymptotic normality via the node-wise LASSO regression, and establish a sharp convergence rate for the thresholded heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent (HAC) estimator.

Our study thus provides the relevant literature with a complete toolkit for conducting inference about the parameters of interest involved in a high-dimensional panel data framework. We also demonstrate the practical relevance of these theoretical results by investigating a high-dimensional panel data model with interactive fixed effects. Moreover, we conduct extensive numerical studies using simulated and real data examples.

Keywords: Asset Pricing, Concentration Inequality, Heavy-Tailed Distribution, High-Dimensional Long-Run Covariance Matrix, Thresholding.

^{*}Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University. Email: jiti.gao@monash.edu.

[†]Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University. Email: bin.peng@monash.edu.

[‡]School of Statistics and Management, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics. Email: yanyai@mail.shufe.edu.cn.

1 Introduction

With the emergence of the data-rich world, numerous applications in many fields, including business and economics, focus on panel data regressions within a high-dimensional framework, where the number of variables can be very large and potentially exceed the sample size. For example, in the realm of asset pricing, academic researchers and financial analysts have put forth over five hundred risk factors and individual firm characteristics (which continue to grow) to explain the cross-sectional relationship of stock return (Feng et al., 2020; Chen and Zimmermann, 2022). Given the necessity for innovative statistical methodologies to dissect such data, there is increasing literature discussing the regularized estimation of high-dimensional panel data models (Vogt et al., 2022; Babii et al., 2023; Belloni et al., 2023). Nonetheless, achieving reliable inference in a high-dimensional panel model remains a challenge, particularly when error processes present features such as non-Gaussianity, time series autocorrelation (TSA), and cross-sectional dependence (CSD).

In many cases, when investigating high-dimensional panel data, one often assumes cross-sectional independence, perhaps because the relevant probability theory has not well been established. As discussed by Gao et al. (2023), however, CSD is likely to be the norm rather than the exception in practice, and overlooking CSD could significantly distort the interpretation of the estimation results. In the analysis of high-dimensional data, this issue is even more daunting. In order to construct confidence intervals practically, for example, it often requires to estimate the high-dimensional long-run covariance matrix under consideration. Its estimation with dependent and heavy-tailed processes however remains a topic that has not been thoroughly explored to the best of our knowledge (see Chen and Wu, 2019, p. 876, for useful discussion). This then poses a challenge for statistical inference.

In view of the aforementioned literature, this paper investigates estimation, variable selection, and inferential issues under the framework of high-dimensional panel data. Specifically, (1) we allow for the idiosyncratic errors to exhibit TSA, CSD, heteroskedasticity, as well as heavy-tailed behaviour; (2) we accommodate a scenario that the number of regressors may increase more rapidly than the sample size; (3) we debias the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) estimator to achieve asymptotic normality, and explore the estimation of high-dimensional long-run covariance matrix using a thresholded estimator. To achieve these goals with the aforementioned data features, we first establish two Nagaev-types of concentration inequalities, one for partial sum and the other for quadratic form, subject to a set of easily verifiable conditions. Leveraging these two inequalities, we derive a non-asymptotic bound for the LASSO estimator, achieve asymptotic normality via the nodewise LASSO regression, and obtain a sharp convergence rate for the thresholded heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent (HAC) estimator. Our study thus provides the relevant literature with a complete toolkit for conducting inference about the parameters of interest within a high-dimensional panel data framework.

Up to this point, it is worth commenting on some key references, and outlining our contributions accordingly.

1. Vogt et al. (2022) examine a high-dimensional panel data model with interactive fixed effects, and present error bounds for penalized estimators under the cross-sectional independence condition. In a similar vein, Belloni et al. (2023) delve into quantile regression within a comparable framework. In this context, cross-sectional independence remains crucial for establishing the corresponding asymptotic properties, and a valid inference procedure is absent. Building on this line of research, we respectively investigate high-dimensional panel data regression with and without a factor structure, and establish inference while accommodating non-Gaussian, serially and cross-sectionally correlated, and heteroskedastic error

processes.

2. Under a Gaussian assumption, Baek et al. (2023) establish non-asymptotic error bounds for the estimation of high-dimensional long-run covariance matrices. In their research, the Gaussian condition is employed to derive a concentration inequality for a quadratic form, controlling the maximum deviation of each element in the high-dimensional long-run covariance estimator from its true value. Similarly, Bai et al. (2024) explore the use of a thresholded HAC estimator to achieve valid inference for a fixed-dimensional panel data model under a sub-Gaussian assumption. Our contribution involves developing a general Nagaev-type concentration inequality for quadratic forms under the context of high-dimensional panel data, encompassing heavy-tailed behavior with temporal and cross-sectional correlation.
3. Adamek et al. (2023) and Babii et al. (2023) develop an inferential procedure for a high-dimensional regression setting using HAC estimators, and they show spectral norm consistent only if the dimensionality of regressors is much smaller than the number of observations. Furthermore, the pooled HAC estimator proposed by Babii et al. (2023) is not robust in the presence of CSD. Our contribution to this area of study involves providing a thresholded HAC estimator with a sharp rate, allowing for valid inference in the high-dimensional setting where the dimensionality of regressors can be much larger than the number of observations.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the main results of this paper and showcases their practical relevance by considering two widely adopted high-dimensional panel data models. Section 3 conducts Monte Carlo simulations to examine the theoretical findings. Section 4 consists of the empirical results by studying a high-dimensional asset pricing model. Section 5 concludes. Appendix A.1 gives the justification of Assumption 1. A numerical implementational procedure is presented in Appendix A.2, and Appendix A.3 lists the preliminary lemmas that are necessary for the proof of the main results. Many other secondary numerical and technical details are given in Appendix B of the online document.

We now provide a roadmap about how we achieve the key results sequentially.

- We start with a general data generating processing provided in Assumption 1. Using this condition, we construct two Nagaev-types of inequalities, one for partial sums and the other for quadratic forms.
- Having these two results in hand, we then study two specific and popular high-dimensional panel data models, i.e., (2.3) and (2.4). The first model (2.3) has a nice and simple form for us to understand how heavy tail and correlation along both dimensions influence typical high-dimensional analysis such as LASSO and its many different variants. The second model (2.4) has drawn considerable attentions recently (e.g., Vogt et al., 2022; Belloni et al., 2023).
- We finally shall consider its estimation with a nuclear norm to tackle the non-convexity issue, and then showcase the practical relevance of the basic results established for the simple model (2.3).

Before proceeding further, we introduce a set of notations which are repeatedly used throughout. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\mathbf{x}|_p$ denotes the ℓ_p norm such that $|\mathbf{x}|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$, in which x_i stands for the i^{th} element of \mathbf{x} ; for a random variable \mathbf{v} , $\|\mathbf{v}\|_p = (E|\mathbf{v}|_p^p)^{1/p}$; $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute value of a scalar or the cardinality of a set; for an $m \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A} = (A_{ij})_{i \leq m, j \leq n}$, $|\mathbf{A}|_p$ denotes the induced ℓ_p matrix norm such that $|\mathbf{A}|_p = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} |\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}|_p / |\mathbf{x}|_p$;

$|\mathbf{A}|_{\max} = \max_{i \leq m, j \leq n} |A_{ij}|$ denotes the matrix element-wise max norm; $|\mathbf{A}|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm; $|\mathbf{A}|_* = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(m,n)} \psi_k(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the nuclear norm, where $\psi_k(\cdot)$ is the k^{th} largest singular value of a matrix; $\psi_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\psi_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ denote the largest and smallest singular value of \mathbf{A} , respectively; \mathbf{I}_a stands for an $a \times a$ identity matrix; $\mathbf{0}_{a \times b}$ stands for an $a \times b$ matrix of zeros, and we write $\mathbf{0}_a$ for short when $a = b$; let \rightarrow_P and \rightarrow_D denote convergence in probability and convergence in distribution, respectively; finally, for two constants a and b , $a \asymp b$ stands for $a = O(b)$ and $b = O(a)$.

2 Methodology & Asymptotic Properties

We start this section by introducing a set of high-dimensional panel data. Specifically, for $\forall(i, t) \in \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1 \dots, T\}$, let

$$\mathbf{u}_i(\mathcal{F}_t) = (u_{1,i}(\mathcal{F}_t), \dots, u_{d_{NT},i}(\mathcal{F}_t))^\top \quad (2.1)$$

be a $d_{NT} \times 1$ vector, where d_{NT} may diverge and may be larger than NT , $\mathcal{F}_t = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-1}, \dots)$, $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors, and $u_{j,i}(\cdot)$'s are measurable functions. Accordingly, we define the following coupled version of \mathcal{F}_t in order to measure dependence:

$$\mathcal{F}_t^* = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0^*, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{-1}, \dots), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0^*$ is an i.i.d. copy of $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t\}$. For each element of $\mathbf{u}_i(\mathcal{F}_t)$, we assume that the following condition holds.

Assumption 1. *There exist constants $\alpha_u > 2$ and $q > 2$ such that*

$$\max_{j \leq d_{NT}} |\delta_q(u_j, t)| = O(t^{-\alpha_u}),$$

where $\delta_q(u_j, t) = \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N [u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t) - u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t^*)]\|_q$.

Assumption 1 generalizes the functional dependence measure of Wu (2005) to a panel data setting, allowing for a wide range of data generating processes (DGPs). Assumption 1 explicitly regulates the decay rate of temporal dependence and implicitly regulates the dependence along the cross-sectional dimension. In Example 1 of Appendix A.1, we showcase the verifiability and flexibility of Assumption 1.

Our first goal is to establish two Nagaev-types of concentration inequalities for both partial sum and quadratic form under Assumption 1, which will greatly facilitate the development of the paper.

Lemma 1. *Let Assumption 1 hold.*

1. Define $x = \sqrt{NT} \mu_u^{1+1/q} y$ for any $y \geq 1$ and $\mu_u = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (m^{q/2-1} \delta_q^q(u_j, m))^{1/(q+1)} < \infty$. Then there exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_s) \right| \geq x \right) \leq C_1 \frac{TN^{q/2}}{x^q} + C_2 \exp \left(-C_3 \frac{x^2}{TN} \right).$$

2. Define $L_{NT,jj'} = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \bar{u}_{j,t} \bar{u}_{j',s}$ and $\bar{u}_{j,t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t)$, where $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of non-negative constants satisfying that $a_k = 0$ for $k > \ell$ with $\ell = O(T^\gamma)$ and

$0 < \gamma < 1$. Let further $x_T = c_q \sqrt{TM\ell \log d_{NT}}$ for some constants $c_q > 0$ and any $M > 1$. Then for $\gamma < \theta < 1$ and $q > 4$, there exist constants $C_4, C_5 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|L_{NT,jj'} - E(L_{NT,jj'})| \geq x_T) \\ & \leq \frac{C_4 \log T}{x_T^{q/2}} \left(\frac{(T\ell)^{q/4}}{T^{(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2}} + T\ell^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + T \right) + C_5 \left(\frac{1}{d_{NT}^M} + \frac{1}{T^M} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 is self-contained, and generalizes Babii et al. (2023, Theorem B.1) and Baek et al. (2023, Proposition 3.1) by allowing for correlations along both dimensions and non-Gaussianity respectively. The first result will guide the choice of the penalty term of LASSO in order to exceed the empirical process $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}} |\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t)|$, while the second result will be used to calculate the maximum deviation of each element in the high-dimensional long-run covariance estimation from its true value.

With Lemma 1 in hand, we are ready to work with the following two models:

$$\text{Model 1: } y_{it} = \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{it}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\text{Model 2: } y_{it} = \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}^\top \mathbf{f}_{0t} + e_{it}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = [\beta_{0,1}, \dots, \beta_{0,d_{NT}}]^\top$ includes the true parameters, $\mathbf{x}_{it} = [x_{1,it}, \dots, x_{d_{NT},it}]^\top$ is a d_{NT} -dimensional vector of regressors, and e_{it} is an idiosyncratic error. In (2.4), $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{f}_{0t}\}$ are r -dimensional unobservable factor loadings and factors, and can be correlated with $\{\mathbf{x}_{it}\}$. We require r to be fixed.

Model (2.3) has a simple form for us to understand how dependence along both dimensions influences typical high-dimensional analysis such as LASSO and its many variants. As a benchmark model, investigating (2.3) also shows how this paper extends the existing literature (Babii et al., 2023; Baek et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2024). After establishing some basic results, we move on to model (2.4) which has drawn attentions recently (e.g., Vogt et al., 2022; Belloni et al., 2023, and references therein).

Before proceeding further, we introduce some suitable regularity conditions on the regressors and errors allowing for TSA, CSD, as well as heteroscedasticity. Let

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} = (g_{1,i}(\mathcal{F}_t), \dots, g_{d_{NT},i}(\mathcal{F}_t))^\top, \quad e_{it} = \phi_i(\mathcal{F}_t), \quad E(e_{it} | \mathbf{x}_{it}) = 0,$$

where $g_{j,i}(\cdot)$ and $\phi_i(\cdot)$ are measurable functions such that $g_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and $\phi_i(\mathcal{F}_t)$ are well defined. Without loss of generality, we suppose that \mathbf{x}_{it} and e_{it} are driven by the common innovations. When they are driven by different innovations, say $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{x,t}$'s and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{e,t}$'s, we can always write $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{x,t}^\top, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{e,t}^\top]^\top$. Then, it is reasonable to let

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} e_{it} \equiv \mathbf{u}_i(\mathcal{F}_t),$$

which will be used interchangeably from here onwards.

We impose the following conditions on $\{\mathbf{x}_{it}\}$.

Assumption 2.

1. There exist $\alpha_x > 2$ and $\nu > 2$ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq j, j' \leq d_{NT}} |\delta_\nu(x_j x_{j'}, t)| = O(t^{-\alpha_x}),$$

where $\delta_\nu(x_j x_{j'}, t) = \|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [g_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t) g_{j',i}(\mathcal{F}_t) - g_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t^*) g_{j',i}(\mathcal{F}_t^*)]\|_\nu$.

2. Suppose that

$$\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J) = \min_{\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}, \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}, |\mathbf{v}_{J^c}|_1 \leq 3|\mathbf{v}_J|_1\}} \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_x \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}} > 0,$$

where $\Sigma_x = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\mathbf{x}_{it} \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top)$, $J \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_{NT}\}$ is an index set such that $j \in J$ if and only if $\beta_{0,j} \neq 0$, and $J^c = \{1, 2, \dots, d_{NT}\} \setminus J$.

Assumption 2.1 is similar to Assumption 1. Assumption 2.2 formulates the compatibility condition, and enriches the literature by regulating the singular values of the second moment of \mathbf{x}_{it} . Typically, the literature imposes such a condition on a sample covariance matrix (e.g., Assumption A2 in Chernozhukov et al., 2021).

We then investigate model (2.3) via the following four steps, i.e., (2.5), (2.6), (2.10), and (2.11).

2.1 On Model (2.3)

The first two steps are about penalized estimation and variable selection.

Step 1 (LASSO) Conduct the typical LASSO estimation:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}} \frac{1}{2NT} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N^\top]^\top$ with $\mathbf{X}_i = [\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{iT}]^\top$, \mathbf{y} is defined accordingly, and $w_{1,NT}$ is a tuning parameter.

Step 2 (Weighted LASSO) Update the estimate using the weighted LASSO:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_w = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}} \frac{1}{2NT} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} g_j |\beta_j|, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\{g_j\}$ is a sequence of predetermined weights and may depend on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

Given $g_j = 1/|\hat{\beta}_j|$ or $g_j = \frac{w_{NT}}{\max(|\hat{\beta}_j|, w_{NT})}$ with a threshold w_{NT} , (2.6) becomes either an adaptive LASSO (Zou, 2006) or a conservative LASSO (Caner and Kock, 2018).

Using Lemma 1.1, we establish Lemma 2 below.

Lemma 2 (Steps 1 & 2). *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let*

$$w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log(d_{NT})/(NT)}, \quad s = |J|, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\min} = \min_{j \in J} |\beta_{0,j}|.$$

Then for constants $C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$, the following two results hold.

1. *If $s \leq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2C_0} \sqrt{\frac{NT}{\log d_{NT}}}$,*

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \leq \frac{8\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \leq \frac{32s w_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}$$

with probability larger than $1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right) - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right)$.

2. *Suppose further that*

- $s \leq \frac{\psi_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}{2C_0} \sqrt{\frac{NT}{\log d_{NT}}}$,
- $\beta_{\min} > \frac{\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}(1 + 2 \max_{j \in J} |g_j|)$,
- $\min_{j \in J^c} |g_j| \geq \left(\frac{2s|\Sigma_x|_{\max}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} + \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{16} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \max_{j \in J} |g_j| \right)$.

Then

$$\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_w) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)$$

with probability larger than $1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT}T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right) - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT}T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right)$.

Under the conditions

$$\frac{d_{NT}T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d_{NT}T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.7)$$

Lemma 2 present the error bounds of Step 1, and consistent variable selection of Step 2 respectively. Notably, Lemma 2 does not require specific tail behavior, and (2.7) infers that d_{NT} may grow at a polynomial order of T . If we impose further, for example, exponential tail assumption, d_{NT} can even diverge at an exponential rate (see Van de Geer et al., 2014 for the ultra-dimensional data with i.i.d. assumption). Therefore, there is a trade-off between the tail behavior of the error component and the divergence rate of d_{NT} .

To proceed further, we introduce some extra notation. Let \mathbf{X}_j be the j^{th} column of \mathbf{X} with $1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}$, and let \mathbf{X}_{-j} be the sub-matrix of \mathbf{X} with the j^{th} column removed. Accordingly, we define

$$\gamma_j = [E(\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-j})]^{-1} E(\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \mathbf{X}_j) := \Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{x,-j,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_j = \mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j. \quad (2.8)$$

It is easy to check that $|\gamma_j|_2 < \infty$, and $E(\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \eta_j) = \mathbf{0}$. To debias the LASSO estimator and perform inference, we define the following node-wise LASSO estimates:

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = \underset{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}-1}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \mathbf{b}|_2^2 + 2w_{NT,j} |\mathbf{b}|_1, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\{w_{NT,j}\}_{j=1}^{d_{NT}}$ is a sequence of penalty terms. Finally, we obtain the debiased LASSO estimate in Step 3.

Step 3 (Bias Correction) The debiased LASSO estimate is given below:

$$\hat{\beta}_{bc} = \hat{\beta} + \hat{\Omega}_x \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta})}{NT}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_x = \hat{\mathbf{T}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}$ is the approximated inverse of $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} / (NT)$, $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \text{diag}(\hat{\tau}_1^2, \dots, \hat{\tau}_{d_{NT}}^2)$ with $\hat{\tau}_j^2 = \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j|_2^2 + w_{NT,j} |\hat{\gamma}_j|_1$, and $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = (\hat{c}_{j,k})_{d_{NT} \times d_{NT}}$ with $\hat{c}_{j,k} = -\hat{\gamma}_{j,k} \mathbb{I}(j \neq k) + \mathbb{I}(j = k)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,k}$ being the k^{th} element of $\hat{\gamma}_j$.

To study Step 3, we let $\Theta = E \left[\frac{1}{NT} (\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{it} e_{it}) (\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{it} e_{it})^\top \right]$ and $\Omega_x := \Sigma_x^{-1}$ with $\Sigma_x = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E \left[\mathbf{x}_{it} \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \right]$, and require the following conditions.

Assumption 3.

1. Suppose that

- (a) $w_{NT,j} \asymp \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}$;
(b) $s \log d_{NT}/\sqrt{NT} \rightarrow 0$, and $\max_{j \leq d_{NT}} s_j = o(\sqrt{NT}/\log d_{NT})$, where $s_j = |\{k \neq j : \Omega_{x,j,k} \neq 0\}|$ denotes the sparsity with respect to rows of Ω_x .

2. $\max_j |\gamma_j|_1 < \infty$, $\psi_{\min}(\Sigma_x) > 0$ and $\psi_{\min}(\Theta) > 0$.

Assumption 3.1 regulates a few parameters. Assumption 3.2 requires some conditions on some population matrices, and are rather standard. The restriction $\max_j |\gamma_j|_1 < \infty$ imposes certain sparsity condition on Σ_x , and is used to ensure the elements of η_j have weak dependence along both dimensions.

We then establish Theorem 2.1, which applies to all elements of β_0 including those 0's.

Theorem 2.1 (Step 3). *Let Assumptions 1-3 and (2.7) hold, and $w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log(d_{NT})/(NT)}$. Let ρ be a $d_{NT} \times 1$ vector such that $|H| < \infty$ with $H = \{j = 1, \dots, d_{NT} : \rho_j \neq 0\}$. As $(N, T) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$,*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\rho^\top \Omega_x \Theta \Omega_x \rho)^{-1/2} \rho^\top (\hat{\beta}_{bc} - \beta_0) \rightarrow_D N(0, 1).$$

To close our investigation about (2.3), we construct confidence interval below. Thus, we consider the estimation of Ω_x and Θ , wherein the estimate of Ω_x is already obtained via the nodewise LASSO. Thus, we pay attention on Θ , and propose a thresholded HAC covariance estimator for the high-dimensional long-run covariance matrix for panel data with heavy-tailed errors. To our knowledge, only one article (Baek et al., 2023) in the literature has considered this issue, assuming that the high-dimensional time series follow Gaussian distribution.

Step 4 (Thresholded HAC) Define the estimator of Θ by

$$T_u(\widehat{\Theta}_\ell) = \left(\widehat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} \mathbb{I}(|\widehat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) \right)_{k,l \leq d_{NT}}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\widehat{\Theta}_\ell = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s,t=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_s^\top$, $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{it}(y_{it} - \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \widehat{\beta})$, and u is the threshold parameter to satisfy certain conditions.

The following assumptions are essential.

Assumption 4.

1. $a(\cdot)$ is a symmetric and Lipschitz continuous function defined on $[-1, 1]$, $a(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 0} \frac{1-a(x)}{|x|^{q_a}} = C_{q_a}$ for $q_a \in \{1, 2\}$ and $0 < C_{q_a} < \infty$. Additionally, $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and $\ell \log d_{NT}/T \rightarrow 0$.
2. Let $|\Gamma_t|_2 = O(t^{-(q_a+\epsilon)})$ for some $\epsilon > 1$, where $\Gamma_t = E(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 \bar{\mathbf{u}}_t^\top)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_i(\mathcal{F}_t)$.
3. Let $\max_{1 \leq k \leq l} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\Theta_{\ell,kl}^p| \leq C(d_{NT})$ for some $0 \leq p < 1$, where $\Theta_\ell = (\Theta_{\ell,kl})_{k,l \leq d_{NT}}$, $\Theta_\ell = E(\widehat{\Theta}_\ell)$, and $\widehat{\Theta}_\ell = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s,t=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_s^\top$.

The conditions on $a(\cdot)$ of Assumption 4.1 are satisfied by a number of commonly used kernels, such as the Bartlett and Parzen kernels. The last two conditions of Assumption 4.1 ensure the spectral norm consistency of our thresholded HAC covariance matrix estimator. On top of Assumption 1, Assumption 4.2 further requires an algebraic decay rate of the temporal dependence, which is used to derive the order of a bias term involved in truncating the long-run covariance matrix. Assumption 4.3 controls the order of elements in the population long-run covariance matrix Θ_ℓ , which allows the presence of many “small” but nonzero elements in Θ_ℓ .

Theorem 2.2 (Step 4). *Assume that Assumption 1-4 hold with $q > 4$ and $\nu > 4$, $E(e_{it} | \mathbf{X}) = 0$, $u \asymp \sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}$, $\frac{s^2 \sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}}}{\sqrt{T}} \rightarrow 0$, $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T \ell \log d_{NT})^{q/4}} \rightarrow 0$, and $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T \ell \log d_{NT})^{\nu/4}} \rightarrow 0$. Then we have*

$$|T_u(\widehat{\Theta}_\ell) - \Theta|_2 = O(\ell^{-q_\alpha}) + O_P\left((\ell \log d_{NT}/T)^{(1-p)/2} C(d_{NT})\right).$$

Utilizing Lemma 1.2, we provide the spectral norm consistency for $T_u(\widehat{\Theta}_\ell)$ in Theorem 2.2. Consequently,

$$\sqrt{NT}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \widehat{\Omega}_x T_u(\widehat{\Theta}_\ell) \widehat{\Omega}_x \boldsymbol{\rho})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\widehat{\beta}_{bc} - \beta_0) \rightarrow_D N(0, 1).$$

Up to this point, our investigation about (2.3) is completed. Again, the above investigation extends the current literature by allowing for idiosyncratic errors to exhibit TSA, CSD, heteroskedasticity, as well as heavy-tailed behavior.

2.2 On Model (2.4)

This section investigates (2.4), which admits the following representation:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\beta_0 + \text{vec}(\Xi_0) + \mathbf{e}, \quad (2.12)$$

where \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{X} have been defined previously, $\Xi_0 = \mathbf{F}_0 \Lambda_0^\top$, $\mathbf{F}_0 = [\mathbf{f}_{01}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{0T}]^\top$, $\Lambda_0 = [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{01}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0N}]^\top$, and \mathbf{e} is defined accordingly. Note that Ξ_0 also admits the singular value decomposition (SVD):

$$\Xi_0 = \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{V}_0^\top,$$

where \mathbf{U}_0 and \mathbf{V}_0 are $T \times T$ and $N \times N$ respectively. Let $\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times r}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$ be the sub-matrices of singular vectors associated with the largest r singular values of Ξ_0 .

Here, we model the dependent variable as a linear combination of the predictors plus a low-rank matrix. The latent factor structure induces a nonconvex regression problem, and we deal with it via a nuclear norm constraint (e.g., Moon and Weidner, 2018; Belloni et al., 2023). In what follows, we again use multiple steps to investigate (2.12). Specifically, in Step 1, we use an ℓ_1 -nuclear norm penalized estimation method to obtain consistent estimator, which however suffers from substantial shrinkage biases. In Step 2, we propose an iterative estimation method that also combines the idea of adaptive LASSO method (Zou, 2006) in order to remove these shrinkage biases and then establish valid inference.

Step 1 (Initial Estimate) We estimate β_0 and Ξ_0 by

$$(\widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\Xi}) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}, \Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{2NT} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta - \text{vec}(\Xi)\|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} \|\beta\|_1 + \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} \|\Xi\|_*, \quad (2.13)$$

where $w_{1,NT}$ and $w_{2,NT}$ are tuning parameters. Accordingly, we estimate r by

$$\widehat{r} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{T, N\}} \mathbb{I}\left(\psi_k(\widetilde{\Xi}) \geq (w_{2,NT} \sqrt{NT} |\widetilde{\Xi}|_2)^{1/2}\right),$$

and obtain a preliminary estimate of Λ_0 by $\widetilde{\Lambda} = \sqrt{NT} \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}_{\cdot, [\widehat{r}]}$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}_{\cdot, [\widehat{r}]}$ includes the singular vectors associated with the largest \widehat{r} singular values of $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ is from the SVD decomposition $\widetilde{\Xi} = \widetilde{\mathbf{U}} \widetilde{\mathbf{D}} \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}^\top$.

Step 2 (Iterative Estimate) Set $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(0)} = \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$, for any integer $l \geq 1$, we update the estimates of β_0 and \mathbf{F}_0 by the weighted LASSO:

$$(\hat{\beta}^{(l)}, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^{(l)}) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}, \mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \hat{r}}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2NT} \left| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta - (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{F}) \right|_2^2 + w_{3,NT} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} g_j |\beta_j|, \quad (2.14)$$

where $g_j = \mathbb{I}(|\tilde{\beta}_j| < w_{3,NT})$ for some $w_{3,NT} > 0$. The estimate of $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l)}$ corresponds to the first \hat{r} eigenvalues of $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\beta}^{(l)}) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\beta}^{(l)})^\top$, where $\mathbf{y}_t = [y_{1t}, \dots, y_{Nt}]^\top$ and $\mathbf{X}_t = [\mathbf{x}_{1t}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{Nt}]^\top$.

Iterate the above steps until numerical convergence, and denote the final estimators as $\hat{\beta}$, $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$.

To study Step 1, we introduce some notation and assumptions.

Assumption 5.

1. $|\mathbf{E}|_2 / \sqrt{NT} \leq w_{2,NT}/2$, where $w_{2,NT} \asymp \max(1/\sqrt{N}, 1/\sqrt{T})$, and $\mathbf{E} = [\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_N]$ with $\mathbf{e}_i = [e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iT}]^\top$.

2. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C} = \left\{ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}, \Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N} \mid w_{1,NT} |\beta_{J^c}|_1 + \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} \left| \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]}} \Xi \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]}} \right|_* \right. \\ \left. \leq 3w_{1,NT} |\beta_J|_1 + 3 \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} \left| \Xi - \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]}} \Xi \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]}} \right|_* \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $(\beta, \Xi) \in \mathbb{C}$, then there exists a constant $\kappa_c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}\beta + \operatorname{vec}(\Xi)|_2^2 \geq \kappa_c |\beta|_2^2 + \kappa_c \frac{1}{NT} |\operatorname{vec}(\Xi)|_2^2.$$

3. $|\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T - \Sigma_f|_F = O_P(1/\sqrt{T})$ and $|\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N - \Sigma_\lambda|_F = O_P(1/\sqrt{N})$ for some positive definite matrices Σ_f and Σ_λ , and there exist constants $s_1 > \dots > s_r > 0$ such that s_j equals the j^{th} largest eigenvalue of $\Sigma_\lambda^{1/2} \Sigma_f \Sigma_\lambda^{1/2}$.

Assumption 5.1 requires the idiosyncratic error matrix to have an operator norm of order $\max(\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T})$, and nests high-dimensional MA(∞) processes as special cases (e.g., see Example 1 of Appendix A.1 for details). Assumption 5.2 is often referred to as the restricted strong convexity condition in the literature, and analogous conditions have been used to establish error bounds in the context of low-rank matrix estimation and sparse linear regression (e.g., Negahban and Wainwright, 2011; Miao et al., 2023). Assumption 5.3 requires distinct eigenvalues of $\Sigma_\lambda^{1/2} \Sigma_f \Sigma_\lambda^{1/2}$ in order to identify the corresponding eigenvectors.

With these conditions in hand, we are able to establish the asymptotic properties of these initial estimators.

Proposition 2.1.

Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 hold, $w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log(d_{NT})/(NT)}$, $\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} \rightarrow 0$, and $s = o(\max(T^{-1/2}, N^{-1/2}) NT / \log d_{NT})$. Then the following results hold:

1. $|\tilde{\beta} - \beta_0|_2 = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}))$;
 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} |\tilde{\Xi} - \Xi_0|_F = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})).$

2. $\lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\hat{r} = r) = 1$;

$|\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}|_F / \sqrt{N} = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}))$ for some rotation matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ depending on $(\mathbf{F}_0, \mathbf{\Lambda}_0)$.

Proposition 2.1 establishes consistency with slow convergence rates, and also offers a consistent estimation about the rank of factor structure. With \hat{r} in hand, we can move on to study Step 2. Specifically, we impose the following conditions.

Assumption 6.

1. $\frac{\sqrt{s}w_{3,NT}}{\beta_{\min}} \rightarrow 0$, $\frac{\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})}{w_{3,NT}} \rightarrow 0$, and $s \cdot \max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}) \rightarrow 0$.

2. $\psi_{\min}(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0)) > 0$, in which $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}}{NT}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t} = \mathbf{X}_{J,t} - \frac{\sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}}{T}$, and $a_{st} = \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top (\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T}) \mathbf{f}_{0s}$.

The first condition of Assumption 6.1 requires that the non-zero elements of β_0 are not too small. The second condition of Assumption 6.1 together with the first condition ensures the consistency of variable selection. The third condition of Assumption 6.1 imposes more conditions on the diverging rate of the number of nonzero elements in β_0 , which is used to validate the compatibility condition. Assumption 6.2 requires the matrix to be positive definite, and is standard.

The next proposition establishes the sign consistency and an asymptotic distribution.

Proposition 2.2. Suppose that condition (2.7) and Assumptions 1, 2, 5 and 6 hold, and $w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log(d_{NT})/(NT)}$. As $(N, T) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$, the following results hold:

1. $\Pr(\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}^{(l)}) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)) \rightarrow 1$ for any $l \geq 1$.

2. Suppose \mathbf{e} is independent of \mathbf{X} , $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0$ and \mathbf{F}_0 . In addition, let $\{\mathbf{e}_t\}$ satisfy the conditions of Example 1.3 of Appendix A.3, $\max_{j \in J} E(x_{j,it}^4) < \infty$, $E|\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^4 < \infty$, $E|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}|_F^4 < \infty$, $N/T \rightarrow \alpha$ with α being a positive constant and $s^{3/2} \max(1/\sqrt{N}, 1/\sqrt{T}) \rightarrow 0$. Conditional on the event $\{\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)\}$, we have

$$\sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \rightarrow_D N \left(\alpha^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_\xi + \alpha^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_\zeta, \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_J \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} \right),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\xi = \text{plim } \boldsymbol{\xi}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\zeta = \text{plim } \boldsymbol{\zeta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\xi} &= -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0}{N} \left(\frac{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N E(e_{it} e_{is}) \right), \\ \boldsymbol{\zeta} &= -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_e = E(\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J = \text{plim } \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0), \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\Theta}_J = \lim \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \mathbf{e}_t \right).$$

We next deal with the two biases and establish valid inference in Step 3.

Step 3 (Bias Correction) To remove the bias term in the limit distribution of $\hat{\beta}_J$ and in view of Section 2.3 of Gao et al. (2023), we defined the bias corrected estimator as follows:

$$\hat{\beta}_{J,\text{bc}} = \tilde{\beta}_{J,\text{bc}} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_\zeta, \quad \tilde{\beta}_{J,\text{bc}} = 2\hat{\beta}_J - (\hat{\beta}_{J,S_1} + \hat{\beta}_{J,S_2})/2,$$

$$\hat{\mu}_\zeta = -\mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda})^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} T_u(\hat{\Omega}_e) \hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t,$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{J,S_1}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{J,S_2}$ are obtained using sample from $\{(i, t) : i \in [N], t \in S_1\}$ and $\{(i, t) : i \in [N], t \in S_2\}$ respectively, $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, $S_1 = \{1, \dots, \lfloor T/2 \rfloor\}$, $S_2 = \{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor + 1, \dots, T\}$, $T_u(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.11), $\hat{\Omega}_e = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{e}}_t \hat{\mathbf{e}}_t^\top$, and $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_t = \mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J - \hat{\Lambda} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let the conditions of Proposition 2.2.2 hold, $\delta_{NT} = \min(\sqrt{T}, \sqrt{N})$, and $u \asymp \sqrt{\log N/T}$. Then the following results hold:*

1. *If $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|\lambda_{0i}\|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{\log N})$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\omega_{e,ij}^{p_e}| \leq C_e(N)$ for some $0 \leq p_e < 1$ with $\Omega_e = (\omega_{e,ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$,*

$$\|T_u(\hat{\Omega}_e) - \Omega_e\|_2 = O_P\left((\log N / \delta_{NT}^2)^{(1-p_e)/2} C_e(N)\right).$$

2. *If $\sqrt{s}(\log N/T)^{(1-p_e)/2} C_e(N) \rightarrow 0$, we have*

$$\sqrt{NT}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \hat{\Theta}_J \hat{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\beta}_{J,\text{bc}} - \beta_{0,J}) \rightarrow_D N(0, 1),$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_J = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}}{NT}$, $\hat{\Theta}_J = \frac{\sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_t) (\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_s)^\top}{NT}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}$ is defined in the same way as $\mathbf{X}_{J,t}$ with \mathbf{F}_0 and \mathbf{f}_{0t} replaced by $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$, respectively.

3 Simulations

A detailed numerical implementational procedure is given in Appendix A.2. Using it, we first evaluate the results of Section 2.1 by considering the following data generating process (DGP):

$$\text{DGP1 : } y_{it} = \alpha_i + \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \beta_0 + e_{it}, \quad \mathbf{e}_t = \rho_e \mathbf{e}_{t-1} + \Sigma_e^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{e,t},$$

where $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (x_{1,it} + x_{2,it})$ is individual fixed effect, $\Sigma_e = \{\delta_{\varepsilon_e}^{|i-j|}\}_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{e,t}$ is from an N -dimension t -distribution with a degree freedom of 5, and $\rho_e, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} \in \{0.2, 0.5\}$ corresponding to low and moderate dependence in the dynamics of error innovations. DGP1 also allows for serial and cross-sectional correlations in \mathbf{x}_{it} as follows;

$$\mathbf{x}_{l,t} = \rho_x + 0.2 \mathbf{x}_{l,t-1} + \Sigma_x^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l,t}, \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, d_{NT}$$

where $\Sigma_x = \{0.2^{|i-j|}\}_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$, $\rho_x \sim N(0, 1)$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l,t}$ is from an N -dimension t -distribution with a degree freedom of 5 and $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l,t}\}_l$ is mutually independent for $l = 1, \dots, d_{NT}$. Here, we let $d_{NT} \in \{50, 500\}$, $\beta_{0,j} = 0.2 + 0.1j$ for $j = 1, \dots, 5$ and $\beta_{0,6} = \beta_{0,7} = \dots = \beta_{0,d_{NT}} = 0$. When running regression, we deal with the fixed effects α_i by removing the time mean on both sides of DGP1. Therefore, we essentially use the demeaned data to conduct the estimation procedure of Section 2.1.

For DGP1, we consider two sets of sample sizes, which are $(N, T) \in (20, 30, 40)$ and $(N, T) \in (50, 100, 200, 400)$. For each pair of (N, T) , we conduct 1000 replications. In addition, we measure the accuracy of the LASSO estimates by the root mean squared error (RMSE):

$$\text{RMSE}(\hat{\beta}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1000} \sum_{j=1}^{1000} \|\hat{\beta}^{(j)} - \beta_0\|_F^2},$$

where $\hat{\beta}^{(j)}$ is the LASSO estimate of β_0 at the j^{th} replication. In order to evaluate the finite sample performance of our inferential procedure, we calculate the empirical coverage rates (ECR) for the nonzero elements in β_0 , i.e., $\beta_{0,1}-\beta_{0,5}$ based on Steps 3 & 4 of Section 2.1. We then take the average across these elements for ease of presentation. For comparison, we also report the empirical coverage rates (denoted by ECR2) using the HAC estimator considered in Babii et al. (2023), which is not robust in the presence of CSD. We also report the ratio of sign consistency (RSC) of the adaptive LASSO procedure (Zou, 2006), i.e., the ratio of $\{\hat{\beta}_w^{(j)} =_s \beta_0\}_{j=1}^{1000}$. Tables 1-4 report these results for the cases with $d_{NT} = 50$ and $d_{NT} = 500$

respectively.

Table 1: Simulation Results of DGP 1 for $d_{NT} = 50$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
50	50	0.106	0.943	0.905	1.000	0.115	0.931	0.844	0.999
	100	0.073	0.948	0.913	1.000	0.080	0.942	0.862	1.000
	200	0.053	0.946	0.921	1.000	0.058	0.944	0.867	1.000
	400	0.037	0.944	0.916	1.000	0.041	0.942	0.863	1.000
100	50	0.075	0.946	0.908	1.000	0.082	0.944	0.856	1.000
	100	0.052	0.946	0.911	1.000	0.058	0.938	0.850	1.000
	200	0.037	0.946	0.918	1.000	0.041	0.946	0.859	1.000
	400	0.026	0.951	0.923	1.000	0.029	0.950	0.867	1.000
200	50	0.053	0.948	0.906	1.000	0.059	0.939	0.851	1.000
	100	0.037	0.948	0.917	1.000	0.041	0.944	0.859	1.000
	200	0.027	0.949	0.916	1.000	0.029	0.949	0.864	1.000
	400	0.019	0.948	0.919	1.000	0.019	0.948	0.919	1.000
400	50	0.038	0.944	0.904	1.000	0.042	0.942	0.847	1.000
	100	0.027	0.951	0.913	1.000	0.029	0.945	0.854	1.000
	200	0.019	0.952	0.916	1.000	0.021	0.948	0.867	1.000
	400	0.013	0.950	0.917	1.000	0.015	0.948	0.862	1.000
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
50	50	0.123	0.907	0.878	0.999	0.141	0.892	0.813	0.997
	100	0.087	0.924	0.892	1.000	0.100	0.921	0.833	1.000
	200	0.062	0.931	0.904	1.000	0.071	0.929	0.849	1.000
	400	0.044	0.936	0.911	1.000	0.050	0.932	0.854	1.000
100	50	0.088	0.920	0.888	1.000	0.100	0.910	0.825	1.000
	100	0.062	0.922	0.895	1.000	0.071	0.917	0.835	1.000
	200	0.044	0.939	0.910	1.000	0.050	0.932	0.854	1.000
	400	0.031	0.939	0.911	1.000	0.035	0.937	0.855	1.000
200	50	0.062	0.918	0.885	1.000	0.071	0.912	0.821	1.000
	100	0.044	0.932	0.903	1.000	0.050	0.927	0.840	1.000
	200	0.032	0.934	0.903	1.000	0.035	0.936	0.847	1.000
	400	0.023	0.939	0.908	1.000	0.025	0.936	0.855	1.000
400	50	0.045	0.918	0.880	1.000	0.050	0.907	0.817	1.000
	100	0.032	0.930	0.894	1.000	0.036	0.925	0.833	1.000
	200	0.023	0.936	0.903	1.000	0.025	0.932	0.851	1.000
	400	0.016	0.940	0.910	1.000	0.018	0.939	0.855	1.000

In view of Tables 1 and 3, a few facts emerge. First, as expected, RMSE of the LASSO estimator decreases as both N and T increase. Second, as expected, RMSE increases if either ρ_e or δ_{ε_e} increases. Third, when $\rho_e = 0.2$, ECR is very close to its nominal level even when $T = 20$, although the distortion in ECR increases with the increase of ρ_e and alters with δ_{ε_e} slightly. Fourth, when $\rho_e = 0.5$, ECR converges to its nominal level only with an increase in T . This is consistent with our theoretical prediction that the estimation error of long-run covariance matrix is independent of N . Fifth, ECR2 is always below its nominal level and the distortion in ECR2 increases with the increase of δ_{ε_e} . This is not surprising since the HAC estimator in Babii et al. (2023) is not robust to the presence of CSD and just includes a

proportion of the asymptotic variance. Finally, the adaptive LASSO procedure can correctly identify the sparsity pattern as long as the size sample is not so small. When the sample size is relatively small, RSC converges to one rapidly as sample size increases.

In Tables 2 and 4, we find similar patterns as those revealed in Table 1. Interestingly, for $d_{NT} = 500$ and $\rho_e = 0.2$, ECR tends to be larger than its nominal level when T is relatively small. In addition, RMSE for $d_{NT} = 500$ is slightly larger than that for $d_{NT} = 50$, which is consistent with our theoretical prediction, i.e., RMSE should be proportion to $\sqrt{\log d_{NT}}$

Table 3: Simulation Results of DGP 1 for $d_{NT} = 50$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
20	20	0.264	0.931	0.893	0.478	0.286	0.920	0.840	0.478
	30	0.211	0.939	0.902	0.723	0.231	0.921	0.849	0.663
	40	0.183	0.938	0.906	0.873	0.195	0.931	0.854	0.848
30	20	0.214	0.942	0.894	0.667	0.231	0.926	0.840	0.669
	30	0.173	0.939	0.903	0.904	0.188	0.929	0.850	0.886
	40	0.149	0.939	0.899	0.975	0.162	0.935	0.857	0.970
40	20	0.187	0.945	0.897	0.820	0.202	0.927	0.845	0.789
	30	0.152	0.936	0.894	0.968	0.165	0.934	0.853	0.944
	40	0.128	0.944	0.910	0.992	0.140	0.938	0.850	0.991
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
20	20	0.297	0.892	0.865	0.496	0.332	0.867	0.805	0.467
	30	0.245	0.898	0.872	0.712	0.276	0.879	0.813	0.698
	40	0.214	0.895	0.873	0.829	0.214	0.895	0.873	0.829
30	20	0.246	0.904	0.862	0.649	0.277	0.883	0.807	0.656
	30	0.200	0.905	0.880	0.865	0.230	0.892	0.821	0.867
	40	0.174	0.906	0.880	0.948	0.200	0.892	0.824	0.920
40	20	0.212	0.897	0.868	0.814	0.239	0.882	0.801	0.815
	30	0.175	0.906	0.874	0.936	0.199	0.895	0.825	0.939
	40	0.153	0.916	0.887	0.985	0.173	0.900	0.827	0.985

according to Lemma 2.1.

Table 2: Simulation Results of DGP 1 for $d_{NT} = 500$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
50	50	0.148	0.968	0.913	0.993	0.163	0.966	0.852	0.953
	100	0.104	0.960	0.910	1.000	0.111	0.955	0.857	1.000
	200	0.073	0.959	0.916	1.000	0.079	0.955	0.866	1.000
	400	0.053	0.948	0.908	1.000	0.057	0.949	0.847	1.000
100	50	0.105	0.970	0.902	1.000	0.113	0.959	0.850	1.000
	100	0.075	0.966	0.909	1.000	0.080	0.959	0.856	1.000
	200	0.052	0.957	0.917	1.000	0.056	0.953	0.861	1.000
	400	0.037	0.964	0.931	1.000	0.039	0.958	0.877	1.000
200	50	0.075	0.970	0.902	1.000	0.081	0.966	0.850	1.000
	100	0.052	0.969	0.915	1.000	0.056	0.962	0.858	1.000
	200	0.037	0.959	0.915	1.000	0.040	0.954	0.862	1.000
	400	0.026	0.945	0.913	1.000	0.028	0.943	0.855	1.000
400	50	0.053	0.970	0.905	1.000	0.057	0.967	0.847	1.000
	100	0.038	0.973	0.916	1.000	0.040	0.968	0.864	1.000
	200	0.027	0.955	0.911	1.000	0.028	0.956	0.857	1.000
	400	0.019	0.953	0.918	1.000	0.020	0.953	0.869	1.000
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
50	50	0.174	0.951	0.894	0.914	0.191	0.945	0.828	0.864
	100	0.118	0.946	0.900	1.000	0.130	0.936	0.835	1.000
	200	0.083	0.948	0.905	1.000	0.092	0.942	0.844	1.000
	400	0.060	0.939	0.905	1.000	0.066	0.937	0.837	1.000
100	50	0.119	0.948	0.885	1.000	0.130	0.937	0.825	1.000
	100	0.084	0.949	0.896	1.000	0.092	0.935	0.835	1.000

Table 4: Simulation Results of DGP 1 for $d_{NT} = 500$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
20	20	0.385	0.978	0.899	0.032	0.414	0.972	0.862	0.021
	30	0.307	0.972	0.908	0.117	0.332	0.964	0.864	0.096
	40	0.259	0.976	0.914	0.271	0.281	0.969	0.861	0.199
30	20	0.314	0.983	0.908	0.098	0.339	0.977	0.853	0.078
	30	0.249	0.977	0.912	0.304	0.270	0.971	0.866	0.260
	40	0.215	0.973	0.911	0.565	0.233	0.966	0.860	0.463
40	20	0.267	0.985	0.907	0.211	0.291	0.980	0.853	0.163
	30	0.217	0.980	0.910	0.532	0.236	0.974	0.863	0.428
	40	0.186	0.972	0.906	0.794	0.202	0.968	0.851	0.700
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$				$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$			
		RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC	RMSE	ECR	ECR2	RSC
20	20	0.432	0.958	0.875	0.027	0.458	0.946	0.823	0.033
	30	0.350	0.949	0.883	0.095	0.376	0.937	0.821	0.110
	40	0.296	0.951	0.884	0.209	0.320	0.939	0.831	0.208
30	20	0.353	0.968	0.880	0.076	0.377	0.954	0.815	0.090
	30	0.283	0.957	0.890	0.236	0.307	0.947	0.839	0.232
	40	0.247	0.953	0.885	0.427	0.268	0.935	0.824	0.425
40	20	0.301	0.975	0.881	0.149	0.324	0.961	0.823	0.150
	30	0.248	0.963	0.888	0.387	0.268	0.947	0.829	0.373
	40	0.212	0.951	0.881	0.642	0.232	0.937	0.817	0.601

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} = [x_{1,i1}, x_{2,i1}]^\top$, $\mathbf{f}_{0t} = [x_{3,1t}, x_{4,1t}]^\top$, \mathbf{x}_{it} , $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ and $\{e_{it}\}$ are generated in exactly the same way as in DGP1. We compute the RMSE of the first and second stage estimators for DGP2, denoted them by RMSE1 and RMSE2 respectively. To evaluate the finite sample performance of our inference procedure, we compute the empirical coverage rates (ECR) of the non-zero elements in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, i.e., $\beta_{0,1}-\beta_{0,5}$. We then take the average across these elements. We also report the average shares of the relevant variables included (TPR, true positive rate) and the average shares of the irrelevant variables included (FPR, false positive rate) of the conservative LASSO procedure, as well as the exact estimation rate (EER) of the number of factors by using the singular value thresholding procedure. Tables 5-8 show the results of DGP2 for $d_{NT} = 50$ and $d_{NT} = 500$ respectively.

Tables 5 and 7 reveals some notable points. First, the first-stage ℓ_1 -nuclear norm penalized estimator has a larger RMSE due to the regularization, which slowly vanishes as the sample size increases. On the other hand, the second-stage has much smaller RMSE, which decreases as both N and T increase. Second, for $\rho_e = 0.5$, the finite sample coverage probabilities are smaller than their nominal level (95%) when T is small, but are quite close to 95% as T increases. Third, CSD and TSA in $\{e_{it}\}$ significantly affect the accuracy of our model selection procedure. For each pair of (N, T) , larger ρ_e and δ_{ε_e} infer larger FPR. Nevertheless, our procedure can pick up all the relevant variables when either N or T is larger than 40, and FPR converges to zero quickly when either N or T is large. Finally, the proposed singular value thresholding procedure can correctly determine the number of factors when the sample size is not too small.

Table 6 reports the simulation results of DGP2 for $d_{NT} = 500$. We find similar patterns. Similar to DGP1, RMSE1 for $d_{NT} = 500$ is slightly larger than that for $d_{NT} = 50$, which is consistent with our theoretical prediction. Notably, increasing d_{NT} does not significantly

affect the estimation accuracy of the number of factors.

Table 5: Simulation Results of DGP 2 for $d_{NT} = 50$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	TPR	FPR	RSC	EER
50	50	0.154	0.050	0.903	1.000	0.018	0.995	0.133	0.053	0.900	1.000	0.020	0.997
	100	0.119	0.035	0.920	1.000	0.007	1.000	0.089	0.037	0.925	1.000	0.008	1.000
	200	0.126	0.024	0.938	1.000	0.003	0.997	0.063	0.026	0.935	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.090	0.017	0.945	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.078	0.018	0.944	1.000	0.000	1.000
100	50	0.115	0.034	0.906	1.000	0.015	1.000	0.098	0.037	0.906	1.000	0.010	1.000
	100	0.077	0.024	0.928	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.067	0.026	0.926	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.063	0.017	0.929	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.045	0.018	0.924	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.059	0.012	0.945	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.031	0.013	0.941	1.000	0.000	1.000
200	50	0.132	0.024	0.916	1.000	0.003	0.997	0.123	0.026	0.914	1.000	0.015	0.997
	100	0.062	0.017	0.914	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.050	0.019	0.913	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.038	0.012	0.943	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.033	0.013	0.944	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.034	0.009	0.931	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.023	0.009	0.931	1.000	0.000	1.000
400	50	0.088	0.017	0.902	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.089	0.019	0.902	1.000	0.000	1.000
	100	0.058	0.012	0.904	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.060	0.013	0.906	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.034	0.008	0.933	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.026	0.009	0.936	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.020	0.006	0.931	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.017	0.006	0.942	1.000	0.000	1.000
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER
50	50	0.154	0.061	0.877	1.000	0.080	0.972	0.142	0.064	0.864	1.000	0.120	0.952
	100	0.121	0.042	0.913	1.000	0.068	0.970	0.099	0.045	0.903	1.000	0.048	0.970
	200	0.145	0.029	0.926	1.000	0.010	0.995	0.079	0.031	0.923	1.000	0.030	0.987
	400	0.100	0.021	0.938	1.000	0.005	1.000	0.090	0.022	0.939	1.000	0.008	1.000
100	50	0.107	0.041	0.881	1.000	0.033	0.985	0.100	0.045	0.882	1.000	0.050	0.980
	100	0.080	0.029	0.910	1.000	0.013	0.997	0.072	0.031	0.909	1.000	0.015	0.997
	200	0.063	0.020	0.922	1.000	0.010	1.000	0.050	0.022	0.921	1.000	0.010	1.000
	400	0.066	0.014	0.942	1.000	0.008	1.000	0.041	0.016	0.934	1.000	0.018	0.997
200	50	0.126	0.029	0.892	1.000	0.025	0.992	0.080	0.031	0.894	1.000	0.050	0.992
	100	0.054	0.021	0.906	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.051	0.023	0.901	1.000	0.003	1.000
	200	0.040	0.014	0.938	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.037	0.015	0.942	1.000	0.010	1.000
	400	0.034	0.010	0.930	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.027	0.011	0.927	1.000	0.000	1.000
400	50	0.090	0.021	0.876	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.091	0.023	0.876	1.000	0.003	1.000
	100	0.061	0.015	0.895	1.000	0.005	0.997	0.042	0.016	0.909	1.000	0.010	1.000
	200	0.028	0.010	0.923	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.027	0.011	0.926	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.021	0.007	0.929	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.019	0.008	0.936	1.000	0.000	1.000

4 Empirical Application

Firm level characteristics which potentially can drive return and risk have drawn considerable attention in the literature of asset pricing. See Kelly et al. (2019), Chen and Zimmermann (2022), Belloni et al. (2023), and many references therein for example. In this section, we aim to contribute to this line of research by applying the aforementioned approaches to a set of firm level data.

We collect the return data of different firms of S&P 500 from Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP) (available at <https://www.crsp.org/>), and match them with firm characteristics assembled by Chen and Zimmermann (2022), which are available at <https://www.openassetpricing.com/>. These data are recorded monthly, and we pay attention to the period from Jan of 1990 to Dec of 2023 which in total gives 408 time periods. After matching “permno” code in both datasets and removing firm characteristics with missing

Table 6: Simulation Results of DGP 2 for $d_{NT} = 500$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	TPR	FPR	RSC	EER
50	50	0.192	0.054	0.899	1.000	0.028	0.995	0.172	0.056	0.900	1.000	0.035	0.995
	100	0.144	0.035	0.915	1.000	0.008	0.997	0.115	0.037	0.926	1.000	0.005	0.997
	200	0.163	0.024	0.923	1.000	0.003	0.997	0.080	0.026	0.930	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.113	0.017	0.937	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.101	0.018	0.937	1.000	0.005	1.000
100	50	0.142	0.035	0.906	1.000	0.025	0.995	0.124	0.037	0.912	1.000	0.013	0.995
	100	0.095	0.024	0.908	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.085	0.026	0.919	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.074	0.017	0.934	1.000	0.008	1.000	0.058	0.018	0.941	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.075	0.012	0.942	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.040	0.013	0.939	1.000	0.000	1.000
200	50	0.164	0.024	0.900	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.158	0.026	0.905	1.000	0.000	1.000
	100	0.076	0.017	0.914	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.064	0.019	0.912	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.047	0.012	0.939	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.042	0.012	0.938	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.039	0.008	0.943	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.028	0.009	0.940	1.000	0.000	1.000
400	50	0.112	0.017	0.899	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.109	0.019	0.900	1.000	0.000	1.000
	100	0.075	0.012	0.909	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.074	0.013	0.911	1.000	0.000	1.000
	200	0.039	0.008	0.938	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.031	0.009	0.935	1.000	0.000	1.000
	400	0.025	0.006	0.943	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.022	0.006	0.939	1.000	0.000	1.000
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER
50	50	0.197	0.062	0.887	1.000	0.118	0.965	0.184	0.066	0.879	1.000	0.145	0.950
	100	0.151	0.042	0.904	1.000	0.028	0.990	0.129	0.044	0.910	1.000	0.035	0.980
	200	0.174	0.030	0.923	1.000	0.008	0.997	0.097	0.032	0.919	1.000	0.035	0.970
	400	0.125	0.021	0.928	1.000	0.005	1.000	0.111	0.023	0.930	1.000	0.020	0.992
100	50	0.132	0.041	0.890	1.000	0.035	0.990	0.128	0.044	0.893	1.000	0.048	0.980
	100	0.098	0.029	0.909	1.000	0.003	0.997	0.091	0.031	0.914	1.000	0.013	0.997
	200	0.077	0.021	0.926	1.000	0.015	1.000	0.065	0.022	0.926	1.000	0.015	1.000
	400	0.083	0.014	0.936	1.000	0.005	0.997	0.050	0.016	0.932	1.000	0.005	1.000
200	50	0.161	0.029	0.884	1.000	0.005	0.970	0.098	0.031	0.882	1.000	0.023	0.980
	100	0.068	0.021	0.899	1.000	0.005	1.000	0.066	0.023	0.890	1.000	0.010	1.000
	200	0.049	0.014	0.930	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.046	0.015	0.932	1.000	0.005	1.000
	400	0.042	0.010	0.939	1.000	0.008	1.000	0.033	0.011	0.936	1.000	0.005	1.000
400	50	0.114	0.021	0.877	1.000	0.003	1.000	0.112	0.023	0.878	1.000	0.020	0.997
	100	0.076	0.015	0.898	1.000	0.005	0.997	0.050	0.016	0.908	1.000	0.005	1.000
	200	0.034	0.010	0.935	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.033	0.011	0.934	1.000	0.005	1.000
	400	0.025	0.007	0.934	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.024	0.008	0.939	1.000	0.000	1.000

values, we end up with 161 firms (i.e., $N = 161$) and 60 characteristics (i.e., $d_{NT} = 60$). We present the variable names with their means and standard deviations in Table B.1 of Appendix B.1 of the online supplementary document, and refer interested readers to Chen and Zimmermann (2022) for detailed definitions of these variables. As these variables are measured in different units and have significant differences in terms of their standard deviations, we normalize each variable (including stock return) to ensure mean 0 and standard deviation 1 before regression.

To run regression, we always regress the return of firm i at time t (y_{it}) on the firm level characteristics of firm i at time period $t - 1$ ($\mathbf{x}_{i,t-1}$), and we consider the model (2.3) with fixed effects as in the simulation studies and the model (2.4) with unobservable shocks, of which the latter one is also considered in Kelly et al. (2019) but under the finite dimensional framework. For both models, we end up with $T = 407$.

We mainly focus on the model (2.4) above, as it offers more features from the modeling perspective. The estimation procedure is identical to those presented in Section 2.2, so we do not repeat the details here. Since our conservative Lasso procedure may select irrelevant variables in finite sample according to simulation studies, we further eliminate irrelevant firm

Table 7: Simulation Results of DGP 2 for $d_{NT} = 50$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	TPR	FPR	RSC	EER
20	20	0.499	0.248	0.660	0.959	0.555	0.841	0.385	0.241	0.710	0.953	0.526	0.856
	30	0.378	0.165	0.768	0.994	0.364	0.898	0.284	0.163	0.796	0.993	0.333	0.908
	40	0.358	0.139	0.806	1.000	0.278	0.941	0.241	0.129	0.832	0.999	0.222	0.956
30	20	0.388	0.175	0.734	0.995	0.370	0.901	0.308	0.169	0.758	0.989	0.369	0.914
	30	0.262	0.108	0.835	1.000	0.194	0.964	0.220	0.108	0.840	1.000	0.168	0.963
	40	0.219	0.081	0.873	1.000	0.101	0.983	0.188	0.084	0.873	1.000	0.096	0.990
40	20	0.355	0.143	0.756	1.000	0.255	0.930	0.268	0.132	0.783	1.000	0.265	0.952
	30	0.224	0.082	0.860	1.000	0.105	0.982	0.194	0.083	0.860	1.000	0.122	0.983
	40	0.187	0.063	0.893	1.000	0.058	0.982	0.163	0.066	0.898	1.000	0.051	0.989
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER
20	20	0.481	0.266	0.640	0.949	0.698	0.746	0.394	0.260	0.673	0.936	0.714	0.789
	30	0.377	0.185	0.739	0.988	0.586	0.810	0.304	0.180	0.764	0.983	0.576	0.811
	40	0.376	0.157	0.766	1.000	0.526	0.805	0.264	0.143	0.811	0.998	0.486	0.852
30	20	0.345	0.183	0.713	0.987	0.538	0.819	0.308	0.185	0.726	0.982	0.557	0.808
	30	0.257	0.121	0.804	0.999	0.381	0.874	0.230	0.123	0.809	0.999	0.390	0.871
	40	0.227	0.096	0.846	1.000	0.241	0.910	0.204	0.098	0.853	1.000	0.271	0.907
40	20	0.295	0.148	0.737	0.999	0.390	0.862	0.264	0.146	0.743	0.998	0.461	0.876
	30	0.218	0.094	0.832	1.000	0.244	0.920	0.203	0.097	0.833	1.000	0.287	0.901
	40	0.193	0.075	0.869	1.000	0.151	0.934	0.175	0.080	0.871	1.000	0.171	0.920

level characteristics based on the constructed confidence intervals. Then, three firm level characteristics are selected, and are reported in Table 9 below. Compared to some selection results in the aforementioned literature, our results do not only provide estimates, but also show the signs of these coefficients are identified correctly with probability approaching 1. For example, we expect earnings announcement return has positive impact on the return, while past liquidity beta has negative impact on the return. For the purpose of comparison, in Table 9, we also report the estimates associated with the selected variables using the fixed effects model plus debiased LASSO method in Section 2.2. Interestingly, we find that after accounting for the interactive fixed effects, the estimates tend to have narrower confidence intervals overall. In addition, the estimation results obtained from model (2.4) indicate that idiosyncratic skewness and returns are significantly and negatively correlated, which is consistent with the asset pricing theory (cf., Boyer et al., 2010). In contrast, this result is not supported by model (2.3), which implies the necessity of introducing the common factor structure as emphasized by the literature on asset pricing.

The selection result shares certain similarity with Belloni et al. (2023). For example, both studies acknowledge the importance of liquidity beta. While they focus on the selection at different quantile, we emphasize the importance of accounting for dependence of error terms. To show the necessity of accounting for the weak cross-sectional dependence of the estimation residuals, we conduct the CD test¹ of Pesaran (2021) on the residuals, and obtain the test statistic -11.837 which is a sign of the existence of weak cross-sectional dependence. Additionally, we run Jarque-Bera test based on the estimation residuals for each i , and find that we reject the null for all i 's, which infers that no individual has normally distributed residuals. Therefore, it shows the necessity of accounting for non-Gaussian error process in theory.

Finally, we further justify the necessity of including the factor structure. We note that

¹The asymptotic distribution of the CD test follows the standard normal distribution, so at the 5% significance level, the critical values are ± 1.96 . We refer interested readers to Pesaran (2021) for more details.

Table 8: Simulation Results of DGP 2 for $d_{NT} = 500$

N	T	$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.2, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	TPR	FPR	RSC	EER
20	20	0.794	0.438	0.463	0.837	0.800	0.650	0.614	0.457	0.552	0.726	0.735	0.773
	30	0.588	0.312	0.546	0.967	0.575	0.838	0.402	0.310	0.632	0.951	0.497	0.898
	40	0.563	0.245	0.577	0.995	0.451	0.856	0.327	0.226	0.690	0.987	0.373	0.934
30	20	0.601	0.313	0.584	0.965	0.579	0.819	0.448	0.320	0.657	0.933	0.529	0.891
	30	0.352	0.192	0.711	0.999	0.345	0.945	0.302	0.200	0.722	0.997	0.366	0.949
	40	0.300	0.141	0.764	1.000	0.252	0.976	0.254	0.148	0.773	1.000	0.235	0.983
40	20	0.540	0.243	0.619	0.995	0.435	0.867	0.387	0.233	0.687	0.993	0.427	0.928
	30	0.301	0.142	0.761	0.999	0.262	0.974	0.260	0.147	0.767	0.998	0.268	0.975
	40	0.246	0.097	0.833	1.000	0.166	0.986	0.218	0.104	0.836	1.000	0.186	0.987
N	T	$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.2$						$\rho_e = 0.5, \delta_{\varepsilon_e} = 0.5$					
		RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER	RMSE1	RMSE2	ECR	TPR	FPR	EER
20	20	0.763	0.452	0.466	0.793	0.878	0.578	0.618	0.467	0.542	0.699	0.854	0.679
	30	0.591	0.327	0.549	0.960	0.791	0.695	0.429	0.325	0.626	0.925	0.739	0.781
	40	0.572	0.259	0.564	0.991	0.703	0.731	0.356	0.236	0.689	0.985	0.646	0.824
30	20	0.517	0.319	0.610	0.943	0.710	0.726	0.430	0.323	0.649	0.912	0.709	0.784
	30	0.348	0.204	0.703	0.998	0.578	0.846	0.318	0.211	0.706	0.994	0.592	0.855
	40	0.307	0.157	0.748	1.000	0.463	0.908	0.274	0.161	0.755	0.999	0.503	0.894
40	20	0.425	0.241	0.658	0.990	0.605	0.803	0.358	0.243	0.676	0.980	0.637	0.836
	30	0.291	0.155	0.747	0.999	0.490	0.883	0.273	0.162	0.743	0.997	0.534	0.882
	40	0.250	0.109	0.807	1.000	0.377	0.923	0.232	0.114	0.810	1.000	0.428	0.906

Table 9: Selected Key Variables


Key Variables	Definitions	IFE		FE	
		Est	CI	Est	CI
announcementreturn	Earnings announcement return	0.034	(0.012, 0.057)	0.047	(0.015, 0.079)
betaliquidityps	Pastor-Stambaugh liquidity beta	-0.032	(-0.058, -0.007)	-0.062	(-0.088, -0.035)
returnskew3f	Idiosyncratic skewness	-0.024	(-0.039, -0.009)	-0.030	(-0.085, 0.026)

three factors are selected, and they are plotted in Figure 1. In a typical PCA operation, one aims to examine how much of the variation of the response variable is explained by the unobservable factors. We do the same, and report the explanation power of those selected firm level characteristics and those unobservable factors in Table 10. Overall, 75% of the variation of return is explained by the three unobservables and the three observables selected. Interestingly, although we manage to collect 60 firm level characteristics, and identify 3 important ones, majority explanation power still comes from those unobservables. It then shows the necessity of including the factor structure practically, and so demonstrates the practical relevance of Section 2.2.

Table 10: Explanation Power

Observable		Unobservable	
announcementreturn	0.0342	$\hat{f}_{t,1}$	0.2478
betaliquidityps	0.0323	$\hat{f}_{t,2}$	0.2232
returnskew3f	0.0237	$\hat{f}_{t,3}$	0.1843
total	0.0902		0.6553

Figure 1: Estimated Three Factors



5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a robust inferential procedure for the proposed high-dimensional panel data models. Specifically, (1) we allow for the number of regressors to grow faster than the sample size, (2) we pay particular attention to non-Gaussian, serially and cross-sectionally correlated and heteroskedastic error processes, (3) we discuss the estimation of the high-dimensional long-run covariance matrix involved using a thresholded estimator. IN order to establish the corresponding theory, we derive two Nagaev-types of concentration inequalities, one for a partial sum and the other for a quadratic form, subject to a set of easily verifiable conditions. Leveraging these two inequalities, we derive a non-asymptotic bound for the LASSO estimator, achieve asymptotic normality via the nodewise LASSO regression, and obtain a sharp convergence rate for the thresholded heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent (HAC) estimator. We believe that our study provides the relevant literature with a complete toolkit for conducting inference about the parameters of interest within a high-dimensional panel data framework. We also demonstrate the practical relevance of these estimation and inferential results by investigating a high-dimensional panel data model with interactive fixed effects. Moreover, we conduct extensive numerical studies using simulated and real data examples.

References

- Adamek, R., Smeekes, S. and Wilms, I. (2023), ‘Lasso inference for high-dimensional time series’, *Journal of Econometrics* **235**(2), 1114–1143.
- Babii, A., Ball, R. T., Ghysels, E. and Striaukas, J. (2023), ‘Machine learning panel data regressions with heavy-tailed dependent data: Theory and application’, *Journal of Econometrics* **237**(2), 105315.
- Baek, C., Düker, M.-C. and Pipiras, V. (2023), ‘Local whittle estimation of high-dimensional long-run variance and precision matrices’, *The Annals of Statistics* **51**(6), 2386–2414.
- Bai, J. (2009), ‘Panel data models with interactive fixed effects’, *Econometrica* **77**(4), 1229–1279.
- Bai, J., Choi, S. H. and Liao, Y. (2024), ‘Standard errors for panel data models with unknown clusters’, *Journal of Econometrics* **240**(2), 105004.
- Belloni, A., Chen, M., Madrid Padilla, O. H. and Wang, Z. (2023), ‘High-dimensional latent panel quantile regression with an application to asset pricing’, *The Annals of Statistics* **51**(1), 96–121.

- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008), ‘Covariance regularization by thresholding’, *The Annals of Statistics* **36**(6), 2577–2604.
- Borovkov, A. (1973), ‘Notes on inequalities for sums of independent variables’, *Theory of Probability and its Applications* **17**(3), 556.
- Boyer, B., Mitton, T. and Vorkink, K. (2010), ‘Expected idiosyncratic skewness’, *The Review of Financial Studies* **23**(1), 169–202.
- Caner, M. and Kock, A. B. (2018), ‘Asymptotically honest confidence regions for high dimensional parameters by the desparsified conservative lasso’, *Journal of Econometrics* **203**(1), 143–168.
- Chen, A. Y. and Zimmermann, T. (2022), ‘Open source cross-sectional asset pricing’, *Critical Finance Review* **27**(2), 207–264.
- Chen, L. and Wu, W. B. (2019), ‘Testing for trends in high-dimensional time series’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**(526), 869–881.
- Chernozhukov, V., Karl Härdle, W., Huang, C. and Wang, W. (2021), ‘Lasso-driven inference in time and space’, *The Annals of Statistics* **49**(3), 1702–1735.
- Feng, G., Giglio, S. and Xiu, D. (2020), ‘Taming the factor zoo: A test of new factors’, *The Journal of Finance* **75**(3), 1327–1370.
- Gao, J., Peng, B. and Yan, Y. (2023), ‘Higher-order expansions and inference for panel data models’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* p. forthcoming.
- Haeusler, E. (1984), ‘An exact rate of convergence in the functional central limit theorem for special martingale difference arrays’, *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* **65**(4), 523–534.
- Johnson, W. B. (1985), ‘Best Constants in Moment Inequalities for Linear Combinations of Independent and Exchangeable Random Variables’, *The Annals of Probability* **13**(1), 234 – 253.
- Kelly, B. T., Pruitt, S. and Su, Y. (2019), ‘Characteristics are covariances: A unified model of risk and return’, *Journal of Financial Economics* **134**(3), 501–524.
- Latała, R. (2005), ‘Some estimates of norms of random matrices’, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **133**(5), 1273–1282.
- Miao, K., Phillips, P. C. and Su, L. (2023), ‘High-dimensional VARs with common factors’, *Journal of Econometrics* **233**(1), 155–183.
- Moon, H. R. and Weidner, M. (2018), ‘Nuclear norm regularized estimation of panel regression models’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10987*.
- Nagaev, S. V. (1979), ‘Large Deviations of Sums of Independent Random Variables’, *The Annals of Probability* **7**(5), 745 – 789.
- Negahban, S. and Wainwright, M. J. (2011), ‘Estimation of (near) low-rank matrices with noise and high-dimensional scaling’, *The Annals of Statistics* **39**(2), 1069–1097.
- Pesaran, M. H. (2021), ‘General diagnostic tests for cross section dependence in panels’, *Empirical Economics* **60**, 13–50.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2017), *Introduction to Econometrics (3rd edition)*, Pearson.
- Van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y. and Dezeure, R. (2014), ‘On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **42**(3), 1166–1202.
- Vogt, M., Walsh, C. and Linton, O. (2022), ‘CCE estimation of high-dimensional panel data models with interactive fixed effects’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.12152*.
- Wang, H., Li, B. and Leng, C. (2009), ‘Shrinkage tuning parameter selection with a diverging number of parameters’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **71**(3), 671–683.

- Wu, W. B. (2005), ‘Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102**(40), 14150–14154.
- Yuan, M. (2010), ‘High dimensional inverse covariance matrix estimation via linear programming’, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**(79), 2261–2286.
- Zou, H. (2006), ‘The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties’, *Journal of the American statistical association* **101**(476), 1418–1429.

A.1 Justification of Assumption 1

Example 1. Consider a high-dimensional MA(∞) process $\mathbf{e}_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$, where \mathbf{B}_j ’s are $N \times N$ matrices. Suppose that (a). $|\mathbf{B}_j|_2 = O(k^{-\alpha_e})$ for some $\alpha_e > 2$, and (b). $\{\varepsilon_{it}\}$ is independent over i, t and $E|\varepsilon_{it}|^q < \infty$ for some $q > 2$. Then

1. $\delta_q(e, k) = O(k^{-\alpha_e})$;
2. $|\mathbf{E}|_2 = O_P(\max(\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T}))$ if $E(\varepsilon_{it}^4) < \infty$, where $\mathbf{E} = [\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_T]$;
3. Suppose further for some $|\rho| < 1$, $|\mathbf{B}_j|_2 = O(\rho^j)$, $|\mathbf{B}_j|_1 = O(\rho^j)$, $|\mathbf{B}_j|_{\infty} = O(\rho^j)$ and $E(\varepsilon_{it}^8) < \infty$. Then $\{\mathbf{e}_t\}$ also satisfy Assumption C of Bai (2009) which regulates the correlation along both dimensions of e_{it} .

Verification of Example 1:

(1). Without loss of generality, let $q = 4$ in what follows. For notational simplicity, let $\mathbf{B}_j = \{B_{j,kl}\}_{k,l \in [N]}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{1}_N^\top \mathbf{B}_j = (B_{j, \cdot 1}, \dots, B_{j, \cdot N})$. As $\{\varepsilon_{it}\}$ are independent over i , we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{1}_N^\top \mathbf{B}_j (\varepsilon_{k-j} - \varepsilon'_{k-j}) \right|^4 = E \left| \sum_{l=1}^N B_{j, \cdot l}^2 (\varepsilon_{l, k-j} - \varepsilon'_{l, k-j})^2 \right|^2 \\
& + 4E \left| \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=l+1}^N B_{j, \cdot l} B_{j, \cdot k} (\varepsilon_{l, k-j} - \varepsilon'_{l, k-j}) (\varepsilon_{k, t-j} - \varepsilon'_{k, t-j}) \right|^2 \\
& \leq O(1) \left(\sum_{l=1}^N B_{j, \cdot l}^2 \right)^2 + O(1) \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=l+1}^N B_{j, \cdot l}^2 B_{j, \cdot k}^2 \\
& \leq O(1) \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_N^\top \mathbf{B}_j \mathbf{B}_j^\top \mathbf{1}_N \right)^2 = O(|\mathbf{B}_j|_2^4),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from some direct calculation, and the second inequality follows from $\sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=l+1}^N B_{j, \cdot l}^2 B_{j, \cdot k}^2 \leq (\sum_{l=1}^N B_{j, \cdot l}^2)^2$.

Based on the above development, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_N^\top (\mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{e}_t^*) \right\|_4 = \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{1}_N^\top \mathbf{B}_j (\varepsilon_{k-j} - \varepsilon'_{k-j}) \right\|_4 = O(|\mathbf{B}_j|_2) = O(j^{-\alpha_e}).$$

(2). Note that $\mathbf{E} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_j \varepsilon_{-j}$ with $\varepsilon_{-j} = [\varepsilon_{1-j}, \dots, \varepsilon_{T-j}]$. Since ε_{-j} is an $N \times T$ random matrix consisting of independent random variables such that $E(\varepsilon_{it}^4) < \infty$, we have $E|\varepsilon_{-j}|_2 = O(\max(\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T}))$ (cf., Latała, 2005), which follows that

$$E|\mathbf{E}|_2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\mathbf{B}_j|_2 E|\varepsilon_{-j}|_2 = O(\max(\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T})).$$

(3). For the proof of part (3), please see Example 1 in Gao et al. (2023). □

A.2 Numerical Implementation

When estimating model (2.3), we use the following modified BIC (cf., Wang et al., 2009) to select the tuning parameter $w_{1,NT}$,

$$\hat{w}_{1,NT} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_1} \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}_{w_1}|_F^2 + |J_{w_1}| \frac{\log(NT)}{NT} \log(\log(d_{NT})), \quad (\text{A.2.1})$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{w_1}$ denotes the LASSO estimator obtained using the tuning parameter w_1 and $J_{w_1} = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{w_1,j} \neq 0\}$. When constructing $\hat{\Omega}_x$, similarly, we choose $w_{NT,j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}$ using the above modified BIC. When estimating the long-run covariance matrix, we use the Bartlett kernel function (i.e., $a(x) = (1 - |x|)\mathbb{I}(|x| \leq 1)$) and let $\ell = \lceil 0.75T^{1/3} \rceil$ following the suggestion of Stock and Watson (2017). To select the threshold level u for thresholded HAC estimator, we use the 2-fold cross validation method as suggested by Bickel and Levina (2008).

To obtain the first-stage ℓ_1 -nuclear norm penalized estimator for model (2.4), following Belloni et al. (2023) we propose a modified BIC to select the best pair of tuning parameters $(w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})$. Given a pair (w_1, w_2) , our estimation method produces the estimates $(\hat{\beta}(w_1, w_2), \tilde{\Xi}(w_1, w_2))$. Then the estimates of $w_{1,NT}$ and $w_{2,NT}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{w}_{1,NT}, \hat{w}_{2,NT}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_1, w_2} & \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\beta}(w_1, w_2) - \operatorname{vec}(\tilde{\Xi}(w_1, w_2))|_F^2 \\ & + \left(|J(w_1, w_2)| \frac{\log(NT)}{NT} \log(\log(d_{NT})) + |\hat{r}(w_1, w_2)| \frac{N+T}{NT} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2.2})$$

where $J(w_1, w_2) = \{j : \hat{\beta}_j(w_1, w_2) \neq 0\}$ and $\hat{r}(w_1, w_2)$ denotes the rank of $\tilde{\Xi}(w_1, w_2)$. For the second-stage iterated weighted LASSO estimator, we use the following modified BIC to select the tuning parameter $w_{3,NT}$,

$$\hat{w}_{3,NT} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_3} \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}_{w_3} - \operatorname{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{w_3} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{w_3}^\top)|_F^2 + |J_{w_3}| \frac{\log(NT)}{NT} \log(\log(d_{NT})), \quad (\text{A.2.3})$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{w_3}$, $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{w_3}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{w_3}$ denote the estimates of β_0 , \mathbf{F}_0 and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0$ obtained using the tuning parameter w_3 and $J_{w_3} = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{w_3,j} \neq 0\}$. In addition, we use the 2-fold cross validation method to select the penalty term u when estimating Ω_e .

A.3 Preliminary Lemmas

In this section, we list several preliminary lemmas, and their proofs are given in Appendix B.3 of the online document.

Lemma A.1.

1. Let Assumption 1 hold with $q > 2$. Then for some constant $c_q > 0$ only depending on q

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,NT}| \right\|_q \leq c_q \sqrt{NT} \Delta_2(u_j, 0) + c_q \sqrt{NT}^{1/q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \min(m, T)^{1/2-1/q} \delta_q(u_j, m),$$

where $S_{j,NT} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^t x_{j,is} e_{is}$ and $\Delta_q(u_j, m) = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \delta_q(u_j, k)$;

2. Let Assumption 2.1 hold with $\nu > 2$. Then for some constant $c_\nu > 0$ only depending on ν

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^t [x_{j,is} x_{j',is} - E(x_{j,is} x_{j',is})] \right| \right\|_\nu \\ & \leq c_\nu \sqrt{NT} \Delta_2(x_j x_{j'}, 0) + c_\nu \sqrt{NT}^{1/\nu} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \min(m, T)^{1/2-1/\nu} \delta_\nu(x_j x_{j'}, m), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_\nu(x_j x_{j'}, m) = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \delta_\nu(x_j x_{j'}, k)$.

Lemma A.2. Let Assumption 2.1 hold with $\nu > 2$. If $x = \sqrt{NT} \mu_x^{1+1/q} y$ for any $y \geq 1$, then for some constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ not depending on x, N, T ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^t [x_{j,ik} x_{j',ik} - E(x_{j,ik} x_{j',ik})] \right| \geq x \right) \\ & \leq C_1 \frac{TN^{\nu/2}}{x^\nu} + C_2 \exp \left(-C_3 \frac{x^2}{TN} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_x = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu_{x,m} < \infty$ and $\mu_{x,m} = \left(m^{\nu/2-1} \delta_\nu^\nu(x_j x_{j'}, m) \right)^{1/(\nu+1)}$.

Lemma A.3. Let Assumption 2 hold for some $\nu > 2$.

1. Let $\hat{\Sigma}_x = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} / (NT)$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{v}| \neq 0$ and $|\mathbf{v}_{J^c}|_1 \leq 3|\mathbf{v}_J|_1$, we have

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_x \mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_x \mathbf{v} - C_0 s \sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)} |\mathbf{v}|_2^2$$

with probability larger than

$$1 - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right)$$

for some constant $C_0, C_3, C_4 > 0$ not depending on N and T .

2. $|\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j / (NT)|_\infty = O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)})$,

$$|\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT} / (NT)}),$$

$$|\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j|_1 = O_P(s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)}) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, d_{NT},$$

where $s_j = |\{k \neq j : \Omega_{j,k} \neq 0\}|$ denotes the row sparsity with respect to rows of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_x = \Sigma_x^{-1}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{x,j}$ denote the j^{th} row of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_x$, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}} s_j = o(\sqrt{NT / \log d_{NT}})$ and $w_{NT,j} = O(\sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)})$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}$, then

3. $1/\hat{\tau}_j^2 = O_P(1)$,

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{x,j}|_1 = O_P(s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)}),$$

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{x,j}|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT} / (NT)}),$$

$$|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{x,j}|_1 = O(s_j^{1/2}) \text{ and } |\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j}|_1 = O_P(s_j^{1/2}).$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it} = E[\mathbf{u}_{it} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-m,t}]$, $\mathbf{u}_{it} = \mathbf{x}_{it} e_{it}$, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_{it}$, $\tilde{\bar{\mathbf{u}}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it}$, $\mathcal{F}_{t-m,t} = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-m})$ and

$$\Psi_q(u_j, m) = \left(\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \delta_q^{q'}(u_j, k) \right)^{1/q'}$$

with $q' = \min(2, q)$.

Lemma A.4. Let Assumption 1 hold with $q \geq 2$. Then

1. $\|\sum_{t=1}^T b_t \bar{u}_{j,t}\|_q = O\left((\sum_{t=1}^T b_t^2)^{1/2}\right)$,

$$\|\sum_{t=1}^T b_t (\bar{u}_{j,t} - \tilde{\bar{u}}_{j,t})\|_q = O\left((\sum_{t=1}^T b_t^2)^{1/2} \Delta_q(u_j, m+1)\right),$$

for any fixed sequences $\{b_t\}_{1 \leq t \leq T}$, where $\bar{u}_{j,t}$ and $\tilde{\bar{u}}_{j,t}$ are the j^{th} elements of $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_{it}$ and $\tilde{\bar{\mathbf{u}}}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it}$, respectively.

2. Let $a_1, a_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}$, $A_T = (\sum_{t=1}^T a_t^2)^{1/2}$, and $d_{j,m,q} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \min(\delta_q(u_j, t), \Psi_q(u_j, m+1))$. Further, denote $L_{NT,j,j'} = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \bar{u}_{j,t} \bar{u}_{j',s}$ and $\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \tilde{\bar{u}}_{j,t} \tilde{\bar{u}}_{j',s}$, for some $q \geq 4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'}) - \tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'})\|_{q/2} \\ &= O(\sqrt{T} A_T (d_{j,m,q} + d_{j',m,q})); \end{aligned}$$

3. $\|\sum_{s,t=1}^T a_{s,t} (\bar{u}_{j,t} \bar{u}_{j',s} - E(\bar{u}_{j,t} \bar{u}_{j',s}))\|_{q/2} = O(\sqrt{T} B_T)$ for some $q \geq 4$ and any fixed sequences $\{a_{s,t}\}_{1 \leq s,t \leq T}$, where $B_T^2 = \max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{s,t}^2, \max_{1 \leq s \leq T} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{s,t}^2 \right\}$.

Lemma A.5. Let Assumption 1 hold with $q > 4$.

1. Let $x_T > 0$ with $T^{1+\delta}/x_T \rightarrow 0$ for some $\delta > 0$. For $0 < \theta < 1$, there exists a constant $c_{q,\delta,\theta}$ only depending on q, δ and θ such that

$$\Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T) \leq c_{q,\delta,\theta} x_T^{-q/2} (\log T) (T^{q/2 - (\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2} + T).$$

2. Let $a_k = 0$ for $k > \ell$ and $x_T > 0$ such that $T^\delta \sqrt{T\ell}/x_T \rightarrow 0$ for some $\delta > 0$. For $0 < \theta < 1$, there exists a constant $c_{q,\delta,\theta}$ only depending on q, δ and θ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T) \\ & \leq c_{q,\delta,\theta} x_T^{-q/2} (\log T) ((T\ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2} + T\ell^{q/2 - 1 - (\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2} + T). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.6. Let Assumptions 1-4 hold with $q, \nu > 4$.

1. If $\frac{d_{NT}^2 T \log T}{(T\ell \log d_{NT})^{q/4}} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E(\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s})) \right| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).$$

2. If $\frac{s^2 \sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}}}{\sqrt{T}} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\hat{\bar{u}}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t}) (\hat{\bar{u}}_{l,s} - \bar{u}_{l,s}) \right| = o_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).$$

3. If $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T\ell \log d_{NT})^{q/4}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T\ell \log d_{NT})^{\nu/4}} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\hat{\bar{u}}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t}) \bar{u}_{l,s} \right| = o_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).$$

Lemma A.7. Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 hold. Let further that

$$\begin{aligned} & w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log(d_{NT})/(NT)}, \quad w_{2,NT} \asymp \max(1/\sqrt{T}, \sqrt{N}), \\ & s = o\left(\max(T^{-1/2}, N^{-1/2}) NT / \log d_{NT}\right), \quad \frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

1. $\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} \mathbf{e}_t \right|_\infty = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}));$
2. $\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_\infty = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}));$

$$3. \quad |\tilde{\Sigma}^{(l)} - \Sigma|_{\max} = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}), \text{ where } \tilde{\Sigma}^{(l)} = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{A}}^{(l)}} \mathbf{X}_t \text{ and } \Sigma = \text{plim } \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{A}_0} \mathbf{X}_t.$$

Online Supplementary Appendix B to “Robust Inference for High-Dimensional Panel Data Models”

JITI GAO* and BIN PENG[†] and YAYI YAN[‡]

May 14, 2024

In this document, Appendix B.1 presents the summary statistics of the data used for our empirical study; Appendix B.2 provides two secondary lemmas; we offer the proofs of the preliminary lemmas in Appendix B.3; and, finally, Appendices B.4-B.5 present the proofs of the main results of the paper.

Appendix B

B.1 Omitted Table of the Empirical Study

In this section, we present the summary statistics of the data used in our empirical study.

Table B.1: Summary Statistics of Firm Characteristics

	Mean	Std		Mean	Std		Mean	Std
accruals	0.040	0.092	delfinl	-0.018	0.105	pricedelaytstat	1.784	1.418
announcementreturn	0.006	0.085	dellti	-0.007	0.052	rdipo	0.000	0.022
assetgrowth	-0.126	0.991	delnetfin	-0.008	0.136	rds	-822.066	22660.487
bmdec	0.640	1.177	dolvoll	-3.819	3.375	realizedvol	-0.029	0.030
beta	0.883	0.670	earningsconsistency	0.059	1.511	residualmomentum	-0.036	0.327
betafp	0.908	0.523	equityduration	-16.823	19.766	returnskew	-0.137	0.871
betaliquidityps	0.016	0.397	grltnoa	0.035	0.103	returnskew3f	-0.117	0.810
bidaskspread	0.015	0.024	high52	0.804	0.224	roe	-0.065	7.261
bookleverage	-3.531	55.527	idiovol3f	-0.024	0.027	sharepurchase	0.521	0.500
cheq	-1.365	10.219	idiovolaht	-0.028	0.024	totalaccruals	-0.006	0.203
chinv	-0.006	0.041	illiquidity	0.000	0.000	volmkt	-0.128	0.257
chnncoa	0.003	0.117	maxret	-0.062	0.081	volsd	-11.827	49.032
chnwc	0.007	0.087	noa	-0.513	0.742	volumetrend	-0.006	0.018
chtax	0.001	0.023	netdebtfinance	-0.012	0.086	xfin	-0.009	0.159
convdbt	-0.065	0.247	neteconomyfinance	0.002	0.128	betavix	0.000	0.019
coskewacx	0.142	0.238	opleverage	0.828	0.780	dnoa	-0.070	0.858
coskewness	0.253	0.348	pctacc	2.120	23.208	hire	-0.019	0.225
delcoa	-0.013	0.081	pcttotacc	-0.407	20.494	zerotrade	0.788	2.330
delcol	-0.011	0.061	pricedelaysq	0.288	0.317	zerotradealt1	0.707	2.350
delequ	-0.022	0.188	pricedelayslope	-1.224	111.948	zerotradealt12	0.794	2.287

B.2 Secondary Lemmas

Lemma B.1. *Let X_1, \dots, X_T be mean zero independent random variables with $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t\|_q < \infty$ for some $q > 2$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{s=1}^t X_s \geq x \right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{q} \right)^q \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_q^q}{x^q} + 2 \exp \left(-2e^{-q}(q+2)^{-2} \frac{x^2}{\sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_2^2} \right).$$

Corollary 1.8 in Nagaev (1979) shows that the above inequality holds for $\sum_{s=1}^T X_s$, while Borovkov (1973) prove that the above inequality also holds for $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{s=1}^t X_s$.

Lemma B.2. *Let X_1, \dots, X_T be mean zero independent random variables.*

1. *Suppose $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t\|_q < \infty$ for some $1 \leq q \leq 2$. Then for $x > y$ and $y \geq (4 \sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_q^q)^{1/q}$, we have*

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t \geq x \right) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \Pr(X_t \geq y) + \left(\frac{e^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_q^q}{xy^{q-1}} \right)^{x/(2y)};$$

2. Suppose $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t\|_q < \infty$ for some $q \geq 2$, $\beta = q/(q+2)$ and $\alpha = 1 - \beta$. Then,

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t \geq x \right) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \Pr(X_t \geq y) + \exp \left(\frac{-\alpha^2 x^2}{2e^t \sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_2^2} \right) + \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \|X_t\|_q^q}{\beta x y^{q-1}} \right)^{\beta x/y}.$$

Lemma B.2 (1) is Corollary 1.6 in Nagaev (1979), while Lemma B.2 (2) is Corollary 1.7 in Nagaev (1979).

B.3 Proofs of the Preliminary Lemmas

Proof of Lemma A.1.

(1). We apply the martingale approximation technique and approximate $x_{j,it}e_{it}$ by m -dependent processes. Then we prove this lemma by using delicate block techniques and the results on independent random variables.

For $t \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$, define $S_{j,Nt,m} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^t u_{j,ik,m}$ and $u_{j,ik,m} = E[x_{j,ik}e_{ik} | \mathcal{F}_{k,k-m}]$, where $\mathcal{F}_{k,k-m} = (\varepsilon_k, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-m})$. Therefore, $u_{j,ik,m}$ and $u_{j,ik',m}$ are independent if $|k - k'| > m$. Write

$$u_{j,it} = u_{j,it} - u_{j,it,T} + \sum_{m=1}^T (u_{j,it,m} - u_{j,it,m-1}) + u_{j,it,0},$$

which follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt}| \right\|_q &\leq \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt} - S_{j,Nt,T}| \right\|_q + \sum_{m=1}^T \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,m} - S_{j,Nt,m-1}| \right\|_q \\ &\quad + \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,0}| \right\|_q = I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Consider I_2 first. By the stationarity of $\{\sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,ik,m}\}_{k=1}^T$, we have

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,m} - S_{j,Nt,m-1}| \right\|_q = \left\| \max_{0 \leq t \leq T-1} \left| \sum_{k=T-t}^T \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right| \right\|_q.$$

Note that $\{u_{j,i(T-k),m} - u_{j,i(T-k),m-1}\}_{k=0}^{T-1}$ are martingale differences with respect to $(\varepsilon_{T-k-m}, \varepsilon_{T-k-m+1}, \dots)$, and thus

$$\left\{ \left| \sum_{k=T-t}^T \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right| \right\}_{k=0}^{T-1}$$

is a positive submartingale with respect to $(\varepsilon_{T-k-m}, \varepsilon_{T-k-m+1}, \dots)$. Therefore, by the Doob L_p maximal inequality, we have

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,m} - S_{j,Nt,m-1}| \right\|_q \leq q/(q-1) \|S_{j,NT,m} - S_{j,NT,m-1}\|_q.$$

Define $Y_{l,m} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1+(l-1)m}^{\min(lm,T)} (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1})$ and $b = \lfloor T/m \rfloor + 1$, we have

$$|S_{j,NT,m} - S_{j,NT,m-1}| = \left| \sum_{l=1}^b Y_{l,m} \right|.$$

Note that $Y_{1,m}, Y_{3,m}, \dots$ are independent and $Y_{2,m}, Y_{4,m}, \dots$ are also independent, then by the Rosen-

that inequality for independent variables (e.g., Johnson, 1985), i.e.,

$$\left\| \sum_{l \text{ is odd}} Y_{l,m} \right\|_q \leq \frac{14.5q}{\log q} \left(\left\| \sum_{l \text{ is odd}} Y_{l,m} \right\|_2 + \left(\sum_{l \text{ is odd}} \|Y_{l,m}\|_q^q \right)^{1/q} \right),$$

for $q \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{j,NT,m} - S_{j,NT,m-1}\|_q &\leq \frac{14.5q}{\log q} \left[\left\| \sum_{l \text{ is odd}} Y_{l,m} \right\|_2 + \left\| \sum_{l \text{ is even}} Y_{l,m} \right\|_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\sum_{l \text{ is odd}} \|Y_{l,m}\|_q^q \right)^{1/q} + \left(\sum_{l \text{ is even}} \|Y_{l,m}\|_q^q \right)^{1/q} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by the Burkholder inequality for martingale differences, we have

$$\|Y_{l,m}\|_q^2 \leq (q-1) \sum_{k=1+(l-1)m}^{\min(lm,T)} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right\|_q^2.$$

For $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right\|_q$, by Assumption 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right\|_q &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k,k-m}) - E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k,k-m+1}) \right\|_q \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_m) \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,0}) - E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_m) \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,1}) \right\|_q \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_m) \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,0}) - E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_m^*) \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,0}) \right\|_q \\ &\leq \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, m). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $1 \leq l \leq b$ we have

$$\|Y_{l,m}\|_q \leq \sqrt{(q-1)(\min(lm,T) - (l-1)m)} \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, m).$$

Then, for $1 \leq m \leq T$, we have

$$\|S_{j,NT,m} - S_{j,NT,m-1}\|_q \leq \frac{29q}{\log q} \left(\sqrt{NT} \delta_2(u_j, m) + \sqrt{N} \sqrt{q-1} T^{1/q} m^{1/2-1/q} \delta_q(u_j, m) \right).$$

By the above developments and $q/(q-1) \leq 2$ when $q \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m=1}^T \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,m} - S_{j,Nt,m-1}| \right\|_q \\ &\leq \frac{87q}{\log q} \left(\sqrt{NT} \sum_{m=1}^T \delta_2(u_j, m) + \sqrt{N} \sqrt{q-1} T^{1/q} \sum_{m=1}^T m^{1/2-1/q} \delta_q(u_j, m) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the above developments, for I_1 , we have

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt} - S_{j,Nt,T}| \right\|_q \leq 3\sqrt{q-1} \sqrt{NT} \sum_{m=T+1}^{\infty} \delta_q(u_j, m).$$

For I_3 , note that $\{u_{j,it,0}\}$ are independent random variables, by the Doob L_p maximal inequality

and the Rosenthal inequality for independent variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,0}| \right\|_q &\leq q/(q-1) \|S_{j,NT,0}\|_q \\ &\leq q/(q-1) \frac{14.5q}{\log q} \left(\sqrt{T} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0} \right\|_2 + T^{1/q} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0} \right\|_q^q \right)^{1/q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $u_{j,it,0} = E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,t}) =_D E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_0) \mid \varepsilon_0)$ and $E(u_{j,i}(\mathcal{F}_0^*) \mid \varepsilon_0) = 0$, in which $=_D$ denotes equal in distribution, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0} \right\|_q \leq \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, 0).$$

Hence, $\left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,0}| \right\|_q \leq \frac{29}{\log q} \left(\sqrt{NT} \delta_q(u_j, 0) + T^{1/q} \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, 0) \right)$.

Combining the above analysis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt}| \right\|_q &\leq \sqrt{NT} \left[\frac{87q}{\log q} \sum_{m=1}^T \delta_2(u_j, m) + 3\sqrt{q-1} \sum_{m=T+1}^{\infty} \delta_q(u_j, m) + \frac{29q}{\log q} \delta_2(u_j, 0) \right] \\ &\quad + \sqrt{NT}^{1/q} \left[\frac{87q\sqrt{q-1}}{\log q} \sum_{m=1}^T m^{1/2-1/q} \delta_q(u_j, m) + \frac{29q}{\log q} \delta_q(u_j, 0) \right] \\ &\leq c_q \sqrt{NT} \Delta_2(u_j, 0) + c_q \sqrt{NT}^{1/q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \min(m, T)^{1/2-1/q} \delta_q(u_j, m). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of part (1) is now complete.

(2). The proof of part (2) is similar with that of part (1), so omitted here. \square

Proof of Lemma A.2.

The proof of Lemma A.2 is similar with that of Lemma 1 (1), so omitted here. \square

Proof of Lemma A.3.

(1). Note that

$$|\mathbf{v}|_1 = |\mathbf{v}_J|_1 + |\mathbf{v}_{J^c}|_1 \leq 4|\mathbf{v}_J|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s}|\mathbf{v}_J|_2,$$

which follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_x \mathbf{v} &\geq \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_x \mathbf{v} - |\widehat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} |\mathbf{v}|_1^2 \\ &\geq \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_x \mathbf{v} - 16s |\widehat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} |\mathbf{v}|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by using Lemma A.2 and $x = \frac{C_0}{16} \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$ for some constant $C_0 > 0$, $\mathcal{B}_{NT} = \{|\widehat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} \leq x\}$ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right)$$

for some $C_3, C_4 > 0$.

(2). Given the condition $|\gamma_j|_1 < \infty$, we first show the weak dependence properties of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j$. By the construction of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j$, we have $\eta_{j,it} = x_{j,it} - \mathbf{x}_{-j,it}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$, where $\mathbf{x}_{-j,it}$ is the sub-vector of \mathbf{x}_{it} with the j^{th}

column removed. Then, by using Assumption 2.1 and $|\gamma_j|_1 < \infty$, for any $j' \neq j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j',it} \eta_{j,it} - x_{j',it}^* \eta_{j,it}^*) \right\|_{\nu} \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j',it} x_{j,it} - x_{j',it} \mathbf{X}_{-j,it}^{\top} \gamma_j - x_{j',it}^* x_{j,it}^* + x_{j',it}^* \mathbf{X}_{-j,it}^{*\top} \gamma_j) \right\|_{\nu} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j',it} x_{j,it} - x_{j',it}^* x_{j,it}^*) \right\|_{\nu} + \sum_{l=1, \neq j}^{d_{NT}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j',it} x_{l,it} - x_{j',it}^* x_{l,it}^*) \right\|_{\nu} |\lambda_{j,l}| \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j',it} x_{j,it} - x_{j',it}^* x_{j,it}^*) \right\|_{\nu} (1 + |\gamma_j|_1) = O(t^{-\alpha_x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, given the weak dependence properties of $x_{j',it} \eta_{j,it}$, and by choosing $w_{NT,j} \asymp \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$, the proof of part (2) is similar with that of Lemma 2, so omitted here.

(3). The Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) condition of the optimization problem (2.9) implies that there exists a subgradient $\vec{\mathbf{k}}_j$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j) + w_{NT,j} \vec{\mathbf{k}}_j = \mathbf{0} \\
& -\hat{\gamma}_j^{\top} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j) + w_{NT,j} |\hat{\gamma}_j|_1 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_j^2 &= (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_j / (NT) \\
&= \frac{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j}{NT} + \frac{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j}{NT} - \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j}{NT} - \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j}{NT}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $j = 1, \dots, d_{NT}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \tau_j^2| &\leq \left| \frac{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j}{NT} - \tau_j^2 \right| + \left| \frac{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j}{NT} \right| + \left| \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j}{NT} \right| + \left| \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j}{NT} \right| \\
&= I_4 + I_5 + I_6 + I_7.
\end{aligned}$$

For I_4 , it can be shown that $\left| \frac{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j}{NT} - \tau_j^2 \right| = O_P((NT)^{-1/2})$ by using similar arguments as the proof of Lemma A.4 (1). For I_5 , by part (2) of this lemma, we have

$$I_8 \leq |\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} / (NT)|_{\infty} |\gamma_j|_1 \leq \sqrt{s_j} |\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j} / (NT)|_{\infty} |\gamma_j|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT} / (NT)}).$$

Consider I_6 . Note that by the KKT condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j) + \lambda_j \vec{\mathbf{k}}_j = \mathbf{0} \\
& -\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} (\mathbf{X}_{-j} \gamma_j + \boldsymbol{\eta}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \hat{\gamma}_j) + \lambda_j \vec{\mathbf{k}}_j = \mathbf{0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by using part (2) of this lemma, we have

$$\left| \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \mathbf{X}_{-j}}{NT} \right|_{\infty} = |\mathbf{X}_{-j}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j / (NT) + \lambda_j \vec{\mathbf{k}}_j|_{\infty} = O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)})$$

and

$$I_9 \leq \left| \frac{(\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j)^\top \mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-j}}{NT} \right|_\infty |\gamma_j|_1 = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)}).$$

Similarly, $I_7 = O_P(s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT))$. Therefore, $|\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \tau_j^2| = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)})$.

Note that $\tau_j^2 = 1/\Omega_{x,j,j} \geq 1/\psi_{\max}(\mathbf{\Omega}_x) = \psi_{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_x) > 0$, and thus $\hat{\tau}_j^2 \geq \tau_j^2 - |\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \tau_j^2| > 0$ with probability approaching to 1 as $|\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \tau_j^2| = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)}) = o_P(1)$, which also implies that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\hat{\tau}_j^2} - \frac{1}{\tau_j^2} \right| = \frac{|\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \tau_j^2|}{\hat{\tau}_j^2 \tau_j^2} = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)}) = o_P(1).$$

Next, consider $|\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{x,j}|_1$. As $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{x,j} = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2$, by using part (2) of this lemma and $|\gamma_j|_1 = O(\sqrt{s_j})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{x,j}|_1 &= |\hat{\mathbf{C}}_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \mathbf{C}_j/\tau_j^2|_1 \leq |1/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - 1/\tau_j^2| + |\hat{\gamma}_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \gamma_j/\tau_j^2|_1 \\ &\leq |1/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - 1/\tau_j^2| + |\hat{\gamma}_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \gamma_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2|_1 + |\gamma_j/\hat{\tau}_j^2 - \gamma_j/\tau_j^2|_1 \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)}) + O_P(s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}) + O_P(s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}) \\ &= O_P(s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by using $|\gamma_j|_2 = O(1)$, we have $|\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{x,j}|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{s_j \log d_{NT}/(NT)})$. □

Proof of Lemma A.4.

(1). Consider $\|\sum_{t=1}^T b_t(\bar{u}_{j,t} - \tilde{u}_{j,t})\|_q$ first. Define $D_{t,k} = E[\bar{u}_{j,t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-k,t}] - E[\bar{u}_{j,t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-k+1,t}]$, then $\{D_{t,k}, t = T, \dots, 1\}$ form martingale differences with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{t-k,\infty}$. In addition, by Jensen inequality, we have $\|D_{t,k}\|_q \leq \delta_q(u_j, k)$.

By using Burkholder inequality and Minkowski inequality, for $q \geq 2$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T b_t D_{t,k} \right\|_q^2 \leq O(1) \sum_{t=1}^T \|b_t D_{t,k}\|_q^2 = O(1) \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^2 \delta_q^2(u_j, k).$$

Since $\bar{u}_{j,t} - \tilde{u}_{j,t} = \sum_{k=m+1}^\infty D_{t,k}$, the result follows.

The proof of $\|\sum_{t=1}^T b_t \bar{u}_{j,t}\|_q$ is similar to above, so omitted here.

(2). In what follows, let

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{j,t} &= \sum_{s=1}^t a_{t+1-s} \bar{u}_{j,s}, & \tilde{Z}_{j',t} &= \sum_{s=1}^t a_{t+1-s} \tilde{u}_{j',s}, \\ L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond &= \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \bar{u}_{j,t} \tilde{u}_{j',s} = \sum_{t=2}^T \bar{u}_{j,t} \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, let $Z_{j,t,\{k\}}, \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}}$ be the coupled version of Z_t and x_t replacing ε_k with ε'_k .

Define the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_t(\cdot) = E[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t] - E[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$. By Jensen inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{P}_k(L_{T,j,j'} - L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond)\|_{q/2} \\ &= \left\| E \left[\sum_{t=2}^T [\bar{u}_{j,t}(Z_{j',t-1} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1}) | \mathcal{F}_k] \right] - E \left[\sum_{t=2}^T [\bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}}(Z_{j',t-1,\{k\}} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1,\{k\}}) | \mathcal{F}_k] \right] \right\|_{q/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \sum_{t=2}^T [\bar{u}_{j,t}(Z_{j',t-1} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1}) - \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}}(Z_{j',t-1,\{k\}} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1,\{k\}})] \right\|_{q/2} \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{t=2}^T \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}}(Z_{j',t-1} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1} - Z_{j',t-1,\{k\}} + \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1,\{k\}}) \right\|_{q/2} \\
&\quad + \left\| \sum_{t=2}^T [\bar{u}_{j,t} - \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}}](Z_{j',t-1} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1}) \right\|_{q/2} \\
&:= I_8 + I_9.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider I_8 first. Since $\|\bar{u}_{j',t} - \bar{u}_{j',t,\{k\}}\|_q \leq \delta_q(u_{j'}, t - k)$ and $\|\bar{u}_{j',t} - \tilde{u}_{j',t}\|_q \leq \Psi_q(u_{j'}, m + 1)$, we thus obtain that

$$\|\bar{u}_{j',t} - \tilde{u}_{j',t} - \bar{u}_{j',t,\{k\}} + \tilde{u}_{j',t,\{k\}}\|_q \leq 2 \min(\delta_q(u_{j'}, t - k), \Psi_q(u_{j'}, m + 1)).$$

In addition, by Minkowski inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and part (1) of this lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_8 &= \left\| \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} (\bar{u}_{j',s} - \tilde{u}_{j',s} - \bar{u}_{j',s,\{k\}} + \tilde{u}_{j',s,\{k\}}) \sum_{t=s+1}^T a_{t-s} \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}} \right\|_{q/2} \\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \left\| \bar{u}_{j',s} - \tilde{u}_{j',s} - \bar{u}_{j',s,\{k\}} + \tilde{u}_{j',s,\{k\}} \right\|_q \cdot \left\| \sum_{t=s+1}^T a_{t-s} \bar{u}_{j,t,\{k\}} \right\|_q \\
&= O(A_T) \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \min(\delta_q(u_{j'}, s - k), \Psi_q(u_{j'}, m + 1)).
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider I_9 . By part (1) of this lemma, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|Z_{j',t-1} - \tilde{Z}_{j',t-1}\|_4 \leq O(1) A_T \Delta_q(u_{j'}, m + 1).$$

Also, note that I_9 is actually $I_{9,k}$, and the sub-index k is suppressed previously for notational simplicity. In addition, by , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=-\infty}^T I_{9,k}^2 &\leq O(1) \sum_{k=-\infty}^T A_T^2 \Delta_q^2(u_{j'}, m + 1) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \delta_q(u_{j'}, t - k) \right)^2 \\
&\leq O(1) A_T^2 \Delta_q^2(u_{j'}, m + 1) \sum_{k=-\infty}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_q(u_{j'}, t - k) \\
&= O(1) T A_T^2 \Delta_q^2(u_{j'}, m + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\sum_{k=-\infty}^T I_{8,k}^2 = O(1) T A_T^2 d_{j',m,q}^2$. Since $\{\mathcal{P}_k(L_T - L_T^\diamond)\}_k$ is a sequence of martingale differences, by Burkholder inequality and $\Delta_q(u_{j'}, m + 1) \leq d_{j',m,q}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|L_{T,j,j'} - E(L_{T,j,j'}) - L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond - E(L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond)\|_{q/2}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{k=-\infty}^T \mathcal{P}_k(L_{T,j,j'} - L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond) \right\|_{q/2}^2 \\
&\leq O(1) \sum_{k=-\infty}^T \|\mathcal{P}_k(L_{T,j,j'} - L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond)\|_{q/2}^2 = O(1) T A_T^2 d_{j',m,q}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\|\tilde{L}_{T,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{T,j,j'}) - L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond - E(L_{T,j,j'}^\diamond)\|_{q/2}^2 = O(1) T A_T^2 d_{j',m,q}^2$.

The proof is now complete.

(3). The proof of part (3) is similar to that of part (2), so omitted here. \square

Proof of Lemma A.5.

(1). Let $m = \lfloor T^\theta \rfloor$ for some $0 < \theta < 1$. By Lemmas A.4 (2) and (3) and using Markov inequality, we have

$$\Pr\left(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'}) - \tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T/2\right) \leq C_q x_T^{-q/2} T^{q/2 - (\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2}.$$

Then to complete the proof, it is sufficient to show

$$\Pr\left(|\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T/2\right) \leq C_{q,\delta,\theta} x_T^{-q/2} (T \log T) (m^{q/2 - 1 - (\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2} + 1).$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T) &\leq \Pr\left(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'}) - \tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T/2\right) \\ &\quad + \Pr\left(|\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'} - E(\tilde{L}_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T/2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let z_T satisfy $T^{1+\delta}/z_T \rightarrow 0$ and $l_T = \lfloor -\log(\log T)/(\log \theta) \rfloor$ such that $T^{\theta^{l_T}} \leq e$. Let $y_T = z_T/(2l_T)$ and $1 < m < T/4$.

Define $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it,\theta} = E[\mathbf{u}_{it} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-\lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, t}]$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t,\theta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it,\theta}$, $Y_{j',t,1} = \sum_{s=1}^{t-3m-1} a_{s,t} \tilde{u}_{j',s}$ and $Z_{j',t,1} = \sum_{s=1 \vee (t-3m)}^t a_{s,t} \tilde{u}_{j',s}$. Define $Y_{j',t,2}$ and $Z_{j',t,2}$ similarly by replacing $\tilde{u}_{j',s}$ with $\tilde{u}_{j',s,\theta}$. Observe that $\tilde{u}_{j,t}$ and $\tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta}$ are independent of $Y_{j',t,l}$ for $l = 1, 2$.

We first consider $\sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Z_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Z_{j',t,2})$. Split $[1, \dots, T]$ into blocks B_1, \dots, B_{b_T} with block size $4m$ and define $W_{T,b} = \sum_{t \in B_b} (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Z_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Z_{j',t,2})$. Let y_T satisfy $y_T < z_T/2$ and $T^{1+\delta/2}/y_T \rightarrow 0$. Since $W_{T,b}$ and $W_{T,b'}$ are independent if $|b - b'| > 1$, by Lemma B.2 (1), Lemma A.4 (3) and Lemma A.4 (2), for any $M > 1$, there exists a constant $C_{q,M,\delta,\theta}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left(\left|\sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Z_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Z_{j',t,2}) - E\left(\sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Z_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Z_{j',t,2})\right)\right| \geq y_T\right) \\ &\leq C_{q,M,\delta,\theta} y_T^{-M} + \sum_{b=1}^{b_T} \Pr(|W_{T,b} - E(W_{T,b})| \geq y_T/C_{M,\delta}) \\ &\leq C_{q,M,\delta,\theta} y_T^{-M} + C_{q,M,\delta,\theta} y_T^{-q/2} T m^{q/2 - 1 - (\alpha_u - 1)\theta q/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We next deal with the term $\sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Y_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Y_{j',t,2})$. Split $[1, \dots, T]$ into blocks $B_1^*, \dots, B_{b_T}^*$ with size m . Define $R_{T,b} = \sum_{t \in B_b^*} (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Y_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Y_{j',t,2})$. Let ξ_b be the σ -fields generated by $(\varepsilon_{l_b}, \varepsilon_{l_{b-1}}, \dots)$, where $l_b = \max\{B_b^*\}$. Note that $\{R_{T,b}\}_{b \text{ is odd}}$ is a martingale sequence with respect to $\{\xi_b\}_{b \text{ is odd}}$, and so are $\{R_{T,b}\}_{b \text{ is even}}$ and $\{\xi_b\}_{b \text{ is even}}$. By Lemma 1 of Haeusler (1984), for any $M > 1$ there exists a constant $C_{M,\delta}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left(\left|\sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{u}_{j,t} Y_{j',t,1} - \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} Y_{j',t,2})\right| \geq y_T\right) \\ &\leq C_{M,\delta} y_T^{-M} + 4 \Pr\left(\left|\sum_{b=1}^{B_T^*} E(R_{T,b}^2 \mid \xi_{b-2})\right| > y_T^2/(\log T)^{3/2}\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{b=1}^{B_T^*} \Pr(|R_{T,b}| \geq y_T/\log T) = I_{10} + I_{11} + I_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider I_{12} first. Since $(\bar{u}_{j,t}, \bar{u}_{j,t,\theta})$ and $(Y_{j',t,1}, Y_{j',t,2})$ are independent, by using similar arguments as Lemma A.4 (2), we have

$$\|R_{T,b}\|_q \leq C_q(mT)^{q/2}m^{-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q},$$

which implies that

$$I_{12} \leq C_q y_T^{-q} (\log y_T)^q T^{q/2+1} m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q}.$$

Consider I_{11} . Let $r_{j,s-t} = E(\tilde{u}_{j,t} \tilde{u}_{j,s})$ and $r_{j,s-t,\theta} = E(\tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} \tilde{u}_{j,s,\theta})$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b=1}^{b_T^*} E(R_{T,b}^2 \mid \xi_{b,2}) &\leq 2 \sum_{b=1}^{b_T^*} \left[\sum_{s,t \in B_b^*} (r_{j,s-t} Y_{j',s,1} Y_{j',t,1} + r_{j,s-t,\theta} Y_{j',s,2} Y_{j',t,2}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t \leq T} a_{j,s,t} \tilde{u}_{j',t} \tilde{u}_{j',s} + \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t \leq T} a_{j,s,t,\theta} \tilde{u}_{j',t,\theta} \tilde{u}_{j',s,\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

in which $|a_{j,s,t}| \leq CT$ and $|a_{j,s,t,\theta}| \leq CT$ since $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_{j,l}| < \infty$ and $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_{j,l,\theta}| < \infty$. Define $U(T, m, x_T) = \sup_{\{a_{j,s,t}\}} \Pr \left(\left| \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t \leq T} a_{j,s,t} \tilde{u}_{j',t} \tilde{u}_{j',s} - E \left(\sum_{1 \leq s \leq t \leq T} a_{j,s,t} \tilde{u}_{j',t} \tilde{u}_{j',s} \right) \right| \geq x_T \right)$, where the supremum is taken over all arrays $\{a_{s,t}\}$ such that $|a_{s,t}| \leq 1$. Therefore, we have

$$I_{11} \leq C_\theta U(T, m, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2)) + C_\theta U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2)).$$

Combining the above analysis, we have shown that $U(T, m, z_T)$ is bounded from above by (up to a constant)

$$\begin{aligned} &U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, z_T - 2y_T) + U(T, m, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2)) \\ &+ U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2)) + y_T^{-M} + y_T^{-q/2} T m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} \\ &+ y_T^{-q} (\log y_T)^q T^{q/2+1} m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3.1})$$

Since $\sup_{a_{j,s,t}} \|L_{T,j,j'} - E(L_{T,j,j'}) - \tilde{L}_{T,j,j'}\|_{q/2} = O(T)$ by Lemma A.4 (3), by applying (B.3.1) recursively to deal with the term $U(T, m, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2))$ for p times such that $(y_t/T)^{-2p} = O(y_T^{-(M+1)})$, we have (up to a constant)

$$\begin{aligned} U(T, m, z_T) &\leq U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, z_T - 2y_T) + y_T^{-M} + y_T^{-q/2} T m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} \\ &+ y_T^{-q} (\log y_T)^q T^{q/2+1} m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3.2})$$

Using similar arguments, we can show for $1 \leq m \leq 3$

$$U(T, m, z_T/(2l_T)) \leq O(1) \left(z_T^{-M} + z_T^{-q/2} T \log T + z_T^{-q} (\log z_T)^{q+1} T^{q/2+1} \right).$$

Using (B.3.2) for $l_T - 1$ times, we have

$$U(T, m, z_T) \leq O(1) (\log z_T)^{q+1} \left(z_T^{-q/2} T + z_T^{-q} T^{q/2+1} \right) (m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + 1). \quad (\text{B.3.3})$$

Plugging (B.3.3) back into (B.3.1) for the terms $U(T, m, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2))$ and $U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, y_T^2/(T(\log T)^2))$ and using $T^{1+\delta/2}/y_T \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$U(T, m, z_T) \leq U(T, \lfloor m^\theta \rfloor, z_T - 2y_T) + O(1) z_T^{-q} T (m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + 1). \quad (\text{B.3.4})$$

Finally, by using (B.3.4) for $l_T - 1$ times, we obtain

$$U(T, m, z_T) \leq O(1) z_T^{-q} T \log T (m^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + 1).$$

The proof is now complete.

(2). For $l \geq 1$, define $m_{T,l} = \lfloor T^{\theta^l} \rfloor$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it,l} = E[\mathbf{u}_{it} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-m_{T,l},t}]$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it,l}$ and $Q_{NT,l} = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,l} \tilde{u}_{j',s,l}$. Let $l_T = \lceil -\log(\log T)/\log \theta \rceil$ and thus $m_{T,l_T} \leq e$. By using Lemmas A.4 (2) and (3), we have

$$\Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'}) - Q_{NT,1} + E(Q_{NT,1})| \geq x_T/l_T) \leq C_{q,\theta}(\log T)^{1/2} x_T^{-q/2} (T\ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2}.$$

Let l'_T be the smallest l such that $m_{T,l} \leq \ell/4$. For $1 \leq l \leq l'_T$, split $[1, T]$ into blocks $B_1^l, \dots, B_{b_{T,l}}^l$ with size $\ell + m_{T,l}$. Define $W_{T,l,b} = \sum_{t \in B_b^l} \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,l} \tilde{u}_{j',s,l}$ and $W'_{T,l,b} = \sum_{t \in B_b^l} \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,l+1} \tilde{u}_{j',s,l+1}$. Then, by using Lemma B.2 (1) and using Lemma A.4 (3), we have for any $C > 2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|Q_{NT,l} - E(Q_{NT,l}) - (Q_{NT,l+1} - E(Q_{NT,l+1}))| \geq x_T/(2l_T)) \\ & \leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_{T,l}} \Pr(|W_{T,l,b} - E(W_{T,l,b}) - (W'_{T,l,b} - E(W'_{T,l,b}))| \geq x_T/(Cl_T)) + O(1) \left[\frac{T\ell^2_T}{x_T^2} \right]^{C/4}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3.5})$$

Note that for any $M > 1$, there exists a constant $C_{M,\delta,\theta}$ such that the second term in the right hand of (B.3.5) is less than $C_{M,\delta,\theta} x_T^{-M}$. For the first term, by using Lemmas A.4 (2) and (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{b=1}^{b_{T,l}} \Pr(|W_{T,l,b} - E(W_{T,l,b}) - (W'_{T,l,b} - E(W'_{T,l,b}))| \geq x_T/(Cl_T)) \\ & \leq O(1) T m_{T,l}^{-1} \sqrt{\log T} x_T^{-q/2} (m_{T,l} \ell)^{q/4} m_{T,l+1}^{-(\alpha_u-1)q/2} \leq O(1) x_T^{-q/2} \sqrt{\log T} T \ell^{q/4} m_{T,l}^{q/4-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} \\ & \leq O(1) x_T^{-q/2} \sqrt{\log T} \left((T\ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + T \ell^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3.6})$$

Combining (B.3.5) and (B.3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'})| \geq x_T) \leq \Pr(|Q_{NT,l'_T} - E(Q_{NT,l'_T})| \geq x_T/2) + O(1) x_T^{-M} \\ & + O(1) x_T^{-q/2} \sqrt{\log T} \left((T\ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + T \ell^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $\Pr(|Q_{NT,l'_T} - E(Q_{NT,l'_T})| \geq x_T/2)$, split $[1, \dots, T]$ into blocks B_1, \dots, B_{b_T} with block size 2ℓ and define $W_{T,l'_T,b} = \sum_{t \in B_b} \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,l'_T} \tilde{u}_{j',s,l'_T}$. Similarly, we have

$$\Pr(|Q_{NT,l'_T} - E(Q_{NT,l'_T})| \geq x_T/2) \leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_T} \Pr(|W_{T,l'_T,b} - E(W_{T,l'_T,b})| \geq x_T/C) + C x_T^{-M}.$$

By using part (1) of this lemma, we have

$$\Pr(|W_{T,l'_T,b} - E(W_{T,l'_T,b})| \geq x_T/C) \leq O(1) x_T^{-q/2} (\log T) (\ell^{q/2-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + \ell),$$

which follows that

$$\Pr(|Q_{NT,l'_T} - E(Q_{NT,l'_T})| \geq x_T/2) \leq O(1) x_T^{-q/2} (T \log T) (\ell^{q/2-1-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + 1).$$

The proof is now complete. □

Proof of Lemma A.6.

(1). By using Lemma 1 (2) and letting $x_T = M \sqrt{T \ell \log d_{NT}}$ for some sufficient large but fixed M

and $\theta = 1/(\alpha_u - 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E(\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s})) \right| \geq x_T \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k,l=1}^{d_{NT}} \Pr \left(\left| \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E(\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s})) \right| \geq x_T \right) \\
& \leq O(1) d_{NT}^2 x_T^{-q/2} \log T (T^{-q/4} \ell^{q/4} + T \ell^{-1} + T) + O(1) d_{NT}^{2-M} + O(1) d_{NT}^2 T^{-M} \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

if $d_{NT}^2 T \log T / (T \ell \log d_{NT})^{q/4} \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we have proved

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| T^{-1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E(\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s})) \right| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).$$

(2). By using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{1 \leq k, l, l' \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{k,jt} x_{l,it} x_{l',jt} \right| \\
& \leq \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{l,it} \right)^2 \right| \leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it}^2 \right\}^2 \right| = O_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, if $s^2 \sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\hat{u}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t}) (\hat{u}_{l,s} - \bar{u}_{l,s}) \right| \\
& \leq (2\ell + 1) \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{u}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t})^2 \right| \\
& = N(2\ell + 1) \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \left| \sum_{1 \leq l, l' \leq d_{NT}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{k,jt} x_{l,it} x_{l',jt} (\hat{\beta}_l - \beta_l) (\hat{\beta}_{l'} - \beta_{l'}) \right| \\
& \leq N(2\ell + 1) |\hat{\beta} - \beta|_1^2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \max_{l, l' \in J} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{k,jt} x_{l,it} x_{l',jt} \right| \\
& = O_P(\ell s^2 \log d_{NT}/T) = o_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of part (2) is now complete.

(3). By using similar arguments of Lemma 1 (2), if $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T \ell \log d_{NT})^{q/4}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{d_{NT}^3 T \log T}{(T \ell \log d_{NT})^{\nu/4}} \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{1 \leq k, l, l' \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \left(N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{l',it} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E \left(N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{l',it} \bar{u}_{l,s} \right) \right) \right| \\
& = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $E(N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{l,it} \bar{u}_{l,s}) = 0$ (implied by $E(e_{it} | \mathbf{X}) = 0$), then we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\hat{u}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t}) \bar{u}_{l,s} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \max_{1 \leq k, l, l' \leq d_{NT}} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} x_{l',it} \bar{u}_{l,s} \right| \times |\hat{\beta} - \beta|_1 \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}) \times O_P(s \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}) = o_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Proof of Lemma A.7.

(1). Write

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} \mathbf{e}_t \right|_\infty \leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_\infty + \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)} \hat{\Lambda}^{(l),\top} \mathbf{e}_t \right|_\infty.$$

By using Lemma A.2 (1), the first term is of order $O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)})$. For the second term, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)} \hat{\Lambda}^{(l),\top} \mathbf{e}_t \right|_\infty \leq \left\{ \max_{j \in J} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \mathbf{X}_{j,t}^\top \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)} / N \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\lambda}_i^{(l)} e_{it} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Note that $\left| \mathbf{X}_{j,t}^\top \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)} / N \right|_F^2 \leq \hat{r} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{j,it}^2$ and

$$\max_{j \in J} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{j,it}^2 - E(x_{j,it}^2)) \right| = O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}),$$

we then have

$$\max_{j \in J} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \mathbf{X}_{j,t}^\top \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)} / N \right|_F^2 \leq \max_{j \in J} \frac{r}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N x_{j,it}^2 = O_P(1).$$

In addition, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\lambda}_i^{(l)} e_{it} \right|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{T} |\tilde{\mathbf{H}}|_F^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{0i} e_{it} \right|_F^2 + \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_{0i} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^\top \hat{\lambda}_i^{(l)}) e_{it} \right|_F^2 \\
&\leq O_P(1/N) + \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \lambda_{0i} - \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^\top \hat{\lambda}_i^{(l)} \right|_F^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{it}^2 \\
&= O_P(1/N + \max(sw_{1,NT}^2, w_{2,NT}^2)).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above analyses, we have proved part (1).

(2). Note that $|\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}}|_2 = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_\infty &= \max_{j \in J} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{j,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} - \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}) \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_t \right| \\
&\leq \max_{j \in J} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{j,t}|_F |\mathbf{f}_t|_F |\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}}|_2 N^{-1/2} |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} - \hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}|_F |\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1}|_F \\
&= O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})).
\end{aligned}$$

(3). Note that $\|\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0}\|_F = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}))$ by the proof of Theorem 2.1, and by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l)}} \mathbf{X}_t - \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \mathbf{X}_t \right|_{\max} \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0}\|_F \max_{1 \leq j \leq d_{NT}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{j,it}^2 = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})). \end{aligned}$$

In addition by using Lemma A.2, we can show

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \mathbf{X}_t - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}).$$

The proof is now complete. \square

B.4 Asymptotic Properties of the Oracle Least Squares Estimator

Given the information of set J , the oracle least squares estimator can be written as

$$(\hat{\beta}_J, \hat{\Lambda}) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^s, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \beta)^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda} (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \beta).$$

Similar to Bai (2009), interchanging the i and t dimensions, we have the following relationship:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_J &= \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \right)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{y}_t, \\ \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}_{NT} &= \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)(\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)^\top \right) \hat{\Lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{V}_{NT} is a diagonal matrix that consists of the r largest eigenvalues of the matrix $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)(\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)^\top$ arranged in a descending order.

Proposition B.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{e}_t\}$ satisfy the conditions of Assumption C in Bai (2009). Suppose further that (1) $E(x_{j,it}^4) < \infty$ and $\inf_{\Lambda} \mathbf{D}(\Lambda) > 0$ with $\Lambda^\top \Lambda / N = \mathbf{I}_r$; (2) $\frac{1}{T} \mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 \rightarrow_P \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_f > 0$ with $E|\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^4 < \infty$, and $\frac{1}{N} \Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 \rightarrow_P \Lambda_\lambda > 0$ with $E|\lambda_{0i}|_F^4 < \infty$; (3) $\{\mathbf{e}_t\}$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_J , Λ_0 and \mathbf{F}_0 . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) &= \sqrt{N/T} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} + \sqrt{T/N} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\Lambda_0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \mathbf{e}_t \\ &\quad + O_P(s^2/\sqrt{NT} + s^{3/2} \delta_{NT}^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{NT} = \min(\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T})$, $\mathbf{D}(\Lambda) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t} = \mathbf{X}_{J,t} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}$, $a_{st} = \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T) \mathbf{f}_{0s}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\Lambda_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N E(e_{it} e_{is}) \right),$$

and

$$\zeta = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \mathbf{\Omega}_e \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}.$$

Proof of Proposition B.1.

Proposition B.1 follows directly from Lemmas B.5 (2)-(4) and B.6. \square

Lemma B.3. *Under the conditions of Proposition B.1, then*

1. $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} e_{it} \right|_F^2 = O(1/T)$ and $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|^2 = O(1/T)$;
2. $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T [e_{it} e_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})] \right|^2 = O(1/T)$ and
$$E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T [e_{it} e_{is} - E(e_{it} e_{is})] \right|^2 = O(1/(NT));$$
3. $E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}^\top e_{it} \right|_F^2 = O(1/(NT))$, $E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} e_{it} \right|_F^2 = O(1/(NT))$ and
$$E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T x_{j,is} e_{it} \right|_F^2 = O(1/(NT));$$
4. $E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T x_{j,it} e_{is} \mathbf{f}_{0s}^\top \right|_F^2 = O(1/(NT))$;
5. $E \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{j,it} e_{is} \right|^2 = O(1/N)$ and $E \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} e_{it} \right|_F^2 = O(1/N)$;
6. $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T e_{ks} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{j,is} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}^\top \right|^2 = O(1/T)$;
7. $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_{k,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top \right|_F^2 = O(1/T)$;
8. $E \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N x_{k,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \right|_F^2 = O(1/(NT))$;
9. $E \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \right|_F^2 = O(1/T)$;

Lemma B.4. *Under the conditions of Proposition B.1, then*

1. $N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F = O_P \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1} \right)$, where $\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T) (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} / N) \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}$ and \mathbf{V}_{NT} is a diagonal matrix that consists of the r largest eigenvalues of the matrix $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J)^\top$;
2. $N^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = O_P \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right)$ and
$$N^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = O_P \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right);$$
3. $\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top = \left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N \right)^{-1} + O_P(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$;
4. $|\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0}|_F = O_P(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1})$;
5. $\left| N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F = O_P \left(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$;

6. $\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F = O_P \left(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right);$
7. $N^{-1} \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}) = O_P \left(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$;
8. $N^{-1} T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}) = O_P \left(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + T^{-1/2} + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right);$
9. $(TN)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}) = O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + T^{-1} + T^{-1/2} \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right);$
10. $(TN)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0 / N) (\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 / N) (\hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \Lambda_0)^\top \mathbf{e}_t = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T (\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0 / N) (\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 / N)$
 $\times (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} e_{it} \right) + O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s/T} \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right);$

Lemma B.5. *Under the conditions of Proposition B.1, then*

1.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \Omega_e) \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ &= O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s/T} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s/(NT)} \delta_{NT}^{-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{G} = (\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda} / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1}$ and $\Omega_e = E(\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top)$;

2.

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{NT} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) &= \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \right] \mathbf{e}_t + \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{NT} \\ &\quad + O_P(\sqrt{sNT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{sNT} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{sNT} \delta_{NT}^{-3}), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{ts} = \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T) \mathbf{f}_{0s}$, $\mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t} = \mathbf{X}_{J,t} - \frac{1}{s} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}$
and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{NT} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t}$;

3.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{ts} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \right] \mathbf{e}_t \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{ts} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \right] \mathbf{e}_t \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e_{it} e_{is} \right) \\ &\quad + O_P(\sqrt{Ns} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{Ns} \delta_{NT}^{-2}); \end{aligned}$$

$$4. |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s/(NT)}).$$

Lemma B.6. *Under the conditions of Proposition B.1, then*

$$1. \left| \mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}) - \mathbf{D}(\Lambda_0) \right|_F = O_P(s^{3/2}/\sqrt{NT} + s \delta_{NT}^{-1});$$

$$2. |\boldsymbol{\xi}_{NT} - \boldsymbol{\xi}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s/N} + s^2/\sqrt{NT} + s^{3/2} \delta_{NT}^{-1}), \text{ where}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_{NT} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e_{it} e_{is} \right),$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N E(e_{it} e_{is}) \right);$$

3. $|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{NT} - \boldsymbol{\zeta}|_F = O_P(s^2/\sqrt{NT} + s^{3/2}\delta_{NT}^{-1})$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta} = -\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}.$$

Lemma B.7. Under the conditions of Proposition B.1, then

1. $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 = O_P(s^2/(NT) + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$;
2. $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}) \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top = O_P(s/\sqrt{NT} + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$;
3. $\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T - \mathbf{H}^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T) \mathbf{H}^{-1,\top} = O_P(s/\sqrt{NT} + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$;
4. $(\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}/T)^{-1} - \mathbf{H}^\top (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{H} = O_P(s/\sqrt{NT} + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$;

Proof of Lemma B.3.

By using the weak dependence conditions of $\{\mathbf{e}_t\}$ in Assumption C of Bai (2009), this lemma can be proved by using similar arguments as in the proof of Bai (2009), e.g., the proof of Lemma A.2 in Bai (2009). \square

Proof of Lemma B.4.

(1). Note that $\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} + \mathbf{e}_t$, write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{V}_{NT} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J})^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J) \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J) \mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J)^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J)^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} \\ &= \mathbf{K}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{K}_9, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{V}_{NT} (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 = (\mathbf{K}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{K}_8) (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1}.$$

Since $|N^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}}|_F = \sqrt{r}$ and we can show that $N^{-1/2} \mathbf{K}_1, \dots, N^{-1/2} \mathbf{K}_8$ are all $o_P(1)$ in the below, we have $|\mathbf{V}_{NT} - (\hat{\mathbf{A}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N) (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T) (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}} / N)|_F = o_P(1)$.

Given the invertibility of \mathbf{V}_{NT} , we have

$$N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{A}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F = N^{-1/2} (\mathbf{K}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{K}_8) \times O_P(1).$$

We next prove the convergence rate of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_8$. For \mathbf{K}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1/2}\mathbf{K}_1|_F &\leq \frac{\sqrt{r}}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 = (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})^\top \frac{\sqrt{r}}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \\ &\leq |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 \psi_{\max} \left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} \mathbf{x}_{J,it}^\top \right) = O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2). \end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_2 , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |T^{-1/2}\mathbf{K}_2|_F &\leq \sqrt{r} \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the term \mathbf{K}_2 , we can show that $\mathbf{K}_3, \dots, \mathbf{K}_5$ are all $O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$. For \mathbf{K}_6 and \mathbf{K}_7 , by using Lemma B.3 (1), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\lambda_{0i}|_F^2 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} e_{jt} \right|_F^2 = O_P(1/T).$$

For \mathbf{K}_8 , by using Lemma B.3 (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F &\leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top - E(\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top)) \right|_F + \frac{1}{N} |E(\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top)|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it} e_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})) \right]^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} |E(\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top)|_2 \\ &= O_P(1/\sqrt{T}) + O_P(1/\sqrt{N}) \end{aligned}$$

as $N^{-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N E \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it} e_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})) \right]^2 = O(1/T)$.

Combing the above analyses, we have proved part (1).

(2). We first consider the term $N^{-1} \Lambda_0^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H})$, which can be decomposed into eight terms. Similar to the proof of part (1), it is easy to show the first five terms are each $O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$. Next, consider the last three terms. For the sixth term, by using Lemma B.3 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F \\ &\leq O_P(1) \left| \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F N^{-1/2} |\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}|_F + O_P(1) \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{0i} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top e_{it} \right|_F \\ &= O_P(1/\sqrt{T}) O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}) + O_P(1/\sqrt{NT}) \\ &= O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the seventh term, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \Lambda_0^\top \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F \leq O_P(1) \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{0i} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top e_{it} \right|_F = O_P(1/\sqrt{NT}).$$

For the last term, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and using Lemma B.3 (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \right|_F \\
& \leq |\mathbf{H}|_F \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| N^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_F^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| N^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_F |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{e}_t|_F N^{-1/2} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\
& \leq O_P(1/N) + \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| N^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{e}_t|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} N^{-1/2} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\
& = O_P(|\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \delta_{NT}^{-1} + \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the term $N^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})$, which is bounded by

$$\left| N^{-1/2} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F^2 + |\mathbf{H}|_F \left| N^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F = O_P(|\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2}).$$

The proof is now complete.

(3). By using $\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N = \mathbf{I}_r$, we have

$$\mathbf{I}_r = \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N = \frac{1}{N} \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{N} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} + \frac{1}{N} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H},$$

which implies that $\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0/N = \mathbf{H}^{-1, \top} \mathbf{H}^{-1} + O_P(|\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1})$.

The proof is now complete.

(4). By using parts (1)-(3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} &= \frac{1}{N} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})^\top + \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})^\top + \frac{1}{N} (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top - (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0/N)^{-1} \right) \frac{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top}{\sqrt{N}} = O_P(|\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

(5). Note that $N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{K}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{K}_8) \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}$. For $N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_1|_F &\leq \sqrt{r} |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F |\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 \psi_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} \mathbf{x}_{J,it}^\top \right) \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s} |\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For $N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_2|_F &\leq |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N|_F \left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}(\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s} |\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that $N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_3, \dots, N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_5$ are all $O_P(\sqrt{s} |\widehat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$.

Consider the last three terms. For $N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_6$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|N^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_6|_F &\leq |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0/N|_F \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \lambda_{0i} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F \\
&\quad + |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0/N|_F \left| \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F N^{-1/2} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F
\end{aligned}$$

$$= O_P(\sqrt{s/(NT)}) + O_P(\sqrt{s/T})O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}).$$

For $N^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_7$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_7 &\leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{is} \mathbf{f}_{0s}^\top \right|_F |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N|_F \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{s/(NT)}). \end{aligned}$$

For $N^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{K}_8 &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{is} \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F \\ &\quad + |N^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{s}/N) + O_P(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.

(6). Write

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \frac{1}{N} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}).$$

The first term on the right is an average of (3) over t and thus it can be show that its order is of same magnitude. For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \frac{1}{N} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}/\sqrt{N}|_F |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/\sqrt{T}|_F \frac{1}{N} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.

(7). Note that $N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top (\mathbf{K}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{K}_8) \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}$, we next consider these eight terms respectively. For $N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_1$, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_1|_F &\leq |N^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}|_F |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{r} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F O_P(\sqrt{s/N}) O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F) = O_P(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2). \end{aligned}$$

For $N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_2$, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_2|_F &\leq |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N|_F |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,is} e_{it} \right|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0s}|_F \\ &\leq O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F) \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,is} e_{it} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T |\mathbf{f}_{0s}|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= O_P\left(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F\right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that $N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_3, \dots, N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_5$ are both $O_P(\sqrt{s/N}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$. For $|N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_6|_F$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_6|_F &\leq |\mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0/N|_F \left(\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F + \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0t} \mathbf{e}_t^\top \right|_F |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \right) \\ &= O_P(1/\sqrt{N}) \left(O_P(1/\sqrt{T}) + O_P(1/\sqrt{T}) O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}) \right) \\ &= O_P(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \delta_{NT}^{-1} + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show the next two terms are both $O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \delta_{NT}^{-1} + \delta_{NT}^{-2})$.

The proof is now complete.

(8). Note that $N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) = N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\mathbf{K}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{K}_8) \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{NT}^{-1}$.

For the first term, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &|N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_1|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| (NT)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,s} \right|_F |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F |\mathbf{X}_{J,s}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F |N^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{r} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| (NT)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,is} e_{it} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,s}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{r} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F O_P(\sqrt{s/N}) O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F) = O_P(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_2|_F &\leq N^{-1/2} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| (NT)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{is} \right|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N|_F \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_3 = O_P(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$ and $N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_4 = O_P(\sqrt{s/N} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$.

For the fifth term, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &|N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_5|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T e_{is} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,ks} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0k}^\top \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta|_F \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,ks} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T e_{is} \right) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_k - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0k})^\top \right|_F |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta|_F \\ &\leq O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta|_F) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T e_{is} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,ks} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0k}^\top \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta|_F) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,ks} e_{is} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_k - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0k}|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= O_P(\sqrt{s/T}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta|_F).$$

For the sixth term,

$$\begin{aligned} & |N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_6|_F \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{N\sqrt{T}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{0i}^\top e_{it} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T \lambda_{0i} \mathbf{f}_{0s}^\top e_{is} \right) \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{0i}^\top e_{it} \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top \right|_F N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\ & = O_P(N^{-1}T^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

For the seventh term,

$$\begin{aligned} & |N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \mathbf{K}_7|_F \\ & \leq T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it} \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T e_{is} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \right|_F |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N|_F = O_P(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| N^{-1}T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \right|_F \\ & \leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it} e_{is} - E(e_{it} e_{is})) \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} \lambda_{0i} \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T E(e_{it} e_{is}) \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} \lambda_{0i} \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F \\ & \quad + N^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it} e_{is} - E(e_{it} e_{is})) \right|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{e}_t|_F^2 / N \right)^{1/2} N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T E(e_{it} e_{is}) \right|_F |\mathbf{e}_s / \sqrt{N}|_F N^{-1/2} |\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\ & = O_P(1/N) + O_P(1/\sqrt{NT}) + O_P(N^{-1/2}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(T^{-1/2}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above analysis, the proof is now complete.

(9). The proof of part (9) is similar to that of part (8). The details are omitted.

(10). The proof of part (10) is similar to that of part (8). The details are omitted. \square

Proof of Lemma B.5.

(1). Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ & = \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} + \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\
& = \mathbf{K}_{10} + \mathbf{K}_{11} + \mathbf{K}_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{10} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_{10} &= \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{H} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\
&= \frac{1}{N \sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top \right\} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s}/(N \sqrt{T})).
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{11} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{11}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \right\} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j})^\top \mathbf{H} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(1/\sqrt{NT}) \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it} (e_{is} e_{js} - E(e_{is} e_{js})) \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s/NT} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s/NT} \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{12} , as $|\mathbf{X}_{J,t}/\sqrt{N}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s})$ and $|\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/\sqrt{N}|_F = \sqrt{r}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{12}|_F &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}/N \right|_F |\mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(\sqrt{s}) \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(\sqrt{s}) \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \right|_F + O_P(\sqrt{s}) \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F \\
&\quad + O_P(\sqrt{s}) \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H})^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) (\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s}) (\mathbf{K}_{12,1} + \mathbf{K}_{12,2} + \mathbf{K}_{12,3}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{K}_{12,1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_e) \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \\
&= \frac{1}{N \sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N \sqrt{T}} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0k} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}^\top (e_{is} e_{ks} - E(e_{is} e_{ks})) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{N \sqrt{T}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{K}_{12,2}$, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{12,2}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T \lambda_{0i}(e_{is}e_{js} - E(e_{is}e_{js})) \right\} (\hat{\lambda}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \lambda_{0j})^\top \right|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^T \lambda_{0i}(e_{is}e_{js} - E(e_{is}e_{js})) \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{\lambda}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \lambda_{0j}|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{K}_{12,3}$, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{12,3}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\hat{\lambda}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \lambda_{0j})(\hat{\lambda}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \lambda_{0i})^\top \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it}e_{jt} - E(e_{it}e_{jt})) \right\} \right|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{\lambda}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \lambda_{0j}|_F^2 \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it}e_{jt} - E(e_{it}e_{jt})) \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combing the above analyses, we have proved part (1).

(2). Note that

$$\left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \right) (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_t.$$

Consider $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t}$, since $\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1} = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} &= -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\mathbf{K}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{K}_8) \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\
&= \mathbf{K}_{13} + \cdots \mathbf{K}_{20}.
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{13} , since $|\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}|_F \leq |\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}|_2 |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{Ns})$, we have $\mathbf{K}_{13} = O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F)$. For \mathbf{K}_{14} , we have

$$\mathbf{K}_{14} = \frac{1}{N} \left[\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} a_{st} \right] (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}).$$

For \mathbf{K}_{15} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and $|\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}|_2 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{15}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right) \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \right|_F \\
&\leq |\mathbf{G}|_F \left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{s=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,s}|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0s}|_F \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{\mathbf{e}_t^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F) \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{\mathbf{e}_t^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right|_F + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{e}_t / \sqrt{N}|_F |(\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}) / \sqrt{N}|_F \right) \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{16} , since $\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}\hat{\Lambda} = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{K}_{16}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{T^2 N^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1}) \mathbf{f}_{0s} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{r}}{\sqrt{N}} |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1}|_F |\mathbf{G}|_F \left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F \right) \left(\frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{s=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,s} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0s}|_F \right) \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \delta_{NT}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{17} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{K}_{17}|_F &= \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{s=1}^T \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right) (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,s} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \right|_F \\ &\leq O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \right|_F \\ &\leq O_P(1) \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^N |\mathbf{X}_{J,s} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F) \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top$, by using $|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} - \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}}|_F = O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{is} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F + \left| \frac{1}{T\sqrt{N}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0}{N} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_s}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0}) \mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \\ &\leq O_P(\sqrt{s}/\sqrt{N}) + O_P(\sqrt{s}/N) + \sqrt{s} O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $|\mathbf{K}_{17}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F \delta_{NT}^{-1})$.

For \mathbf{K}_{18} , using $\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 = \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{K}_{18}| &\leq O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \mathbf{X}_{J,t} / \sqrt{N} \right|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F N^{-1/2} |\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{H}^{-1}|_F \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{s} O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}) \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by using Lemma B.4 (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top \hat{\Lambda} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{f}_{0s} \mathbf{e}_s^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \\ &= O_P(1/\sqrt{NT}) + O_P(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + T^{-1} + T^{-1/2} \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $|\mathbf{K}_{18}|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-2} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + s/\sqrt{NT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-3})$. The term \mathbf{K}_{19} is simply

$$\mathbf{K}_{19} = -\frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s.$$

For \mathbf{K}_{20} , by part (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_{20} &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} (\mathbf{e}_s \mathbf{e}_s^\top - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e) \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ &= -\frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ &\quad + O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s/T} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s/(NT)} \delta_{NT}^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above analyses, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{f}_{0t} &= \frac{1}{N} \left[\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} a_{st} \right] (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{e}_s - \frac{1}{N^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\ &\quad + O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-3}). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by using the equality $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^T a_{tk} a_{sk} = a_{ts}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} - \frac{1}{N} \left[\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} a_{st} \right] = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t} = \mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) &= \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{st} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \right] \mathbf{e}_t + \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{NT} \\ &\quad + O_P(\sqrt{sNT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{sNT} \delta_{NT}^{-1} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{sNT} \delta_{NT}^{-3}). \end{aligned}$$

(3). Consider $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} - \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{e}_t$, write

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} - \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{e}_t \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H})}{N} \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H})}{N} (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H})^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}}{N} (\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H})^\top \mathbf{e}_t + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top - (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\ &= \mathbf{K}_{21} + \mathbf{K}_{22} + \mathbf{K}_{23} + \mathbf{K}_{24}. \end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{21} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|\mathbf{K}_{21}|_F = \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{jt} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top \right) \mathbf{H}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}) \right|_F$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{jt} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}^\top \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} |\mathbf{H}|_F \\
&= \sqrt{s} O_P(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for \mathbf{K}_{22} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}_{22}|_F &= \left| \sqrt{N} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i})^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j}) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{jt} \right) \right|_F \\
&\leq \sqrt{N} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} \right|_F^2 \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_{J,it} e_{jt} \right|_F^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= \sqrt{Ns} O_P(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F^2 + \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathbf{K}_{23} , write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_{23} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0)^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N \right)^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0)^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top - \left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N \right)^{-1} \right) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0)^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\
&= \mathbf{K}_{23,1} + \mathbf{K}_{23,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{K}_{23,1}$, by using Lemma B.4 (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_{23,1} &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T (\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N) (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N) \times (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} e_{it} \right) \\
&\quad + O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{Ns} \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{K}_{23,2}$, by using Lemma B.4 (3) and the arguments of Lemma B.4 (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_{23,2} &= \sqrt{NT} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0) \otimes \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}{N} \right) \right) \text{vec} \left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\top - (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N)^{-1} \right) \\
&= \sqrt{NT} O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s}/T + \sqrt{s/T} \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right) O_P \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by using Lemma B.4 (3), we have $\mathbf{K}_{24} = O_P \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right)$. In summary, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0} - \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}}) \mathbf{e}_t \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T (\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N) (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 / N) \times (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} e_{it} \right) \\
&\quad + O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{Ns} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{Ns} \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{V}_{J,t} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T a_{ts} \mathbf{X}_{J,s}$. Then replacing $\mathbf{X}_{J,s}$ with $\mathbf{V}_{J,s}$ and using same arguments as above,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{V}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} - \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{e}_t \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T (\mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0 / N) (\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 / N) \times (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e_{is} e_{it} \right) \\
&\quad + O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{Ns} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F^2 + \sqrt{Ns} \delta_{NT}^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combing the above results, we have completed the proof.

(4). Part (4) follows directly from parts (1)-(3). \square

Proof of Lemma B.6.

(1). Write

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}) - \mathbf{D}(\Lambda_0)|_F &\leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}|_F^2 \times |\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0}|_F \\
&= O_P(s |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + s \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

(2). Note that $|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\Lambda_0)|_F \leq |\mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}) - \mathbf{D}(\Lambda_0)|_F \frac{1}{\psi_{\min}(\mathbf{D}(\hat{\Lambda}))} \frac{1}{\psi_{\min}(\mathbf{D}(\Lambda_0))} = O_P(s |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + s \delta_{NT}^{-1})$. It is sufficient to show

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N [e_{it} e_{is} - E(e_{it} e_{is})] \right) = O_P(\sqrt{s/N}),$$

which can be proved by using Assumption C (iv) of Bai (2009).

(3). It suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \\
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \Lambda_0 (\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} + O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

By adding and subtracting terms, we first consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0}) \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} (\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda} / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t} / \sqrt{N}|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F \times |\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0}|_F \\
&= O_P(\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that $|\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e|_2 = O(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \left[\hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} - \Lambda_0 \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \right] \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0}{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t} / \sqrt{N}|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F \times N^{-1/2} \left| \hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} - \Lambda_0 \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \right|_F
\end{aligned}$$

$$= O_P(\sqrt{s}|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \sqrt{s}\delta_{NT}^{-1})$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-1/2} \left(\hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} - \Lambda_0 \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \right) \\ &= N^{-1/2} \left(\hat{\Lambda} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0} \hat{\Lambda} \right) \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} = (\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_0}) N^{-1/2} \hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} \\ &= O_P(|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_F + \delta_{NT}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma B.7.

(1). By using $\frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \hat{\Lambda} = \mathbf{I}_r$, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} = \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top (\Lambda_0 - \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}) \mathbf{f}_{0t} + \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{e}_t + \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\beta_{0,J} - \hat{\beta}_J),$$

which follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 &\leq \frac{3}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \times \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top (\Lambda_0 - \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}) \right|_F^2 + \frac{3}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F^2 \left| N^{-1/2} \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F^2 |\beta_{0,J} - \hat{\beta}_J|_F^2 \\ &= O_P(s/(NT) + \delta_{NT}^{-4}) + O_P(1/N + s/(NT) + \delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(s^2/(NT)) \end{aligned}$$

provided that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{26} &\leq \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \Lambda_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \right|_F^2 \times |\mathbf{H}|_F^2 + \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{e}_t|_F^2 \left| N^{-1/2} (\hat{\Lambda} - \mathbf{H} \Lambda_0) \right|_F^2 \\ &= O_P(1/N + s/(NT) + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

(2). Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}) \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \times \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top (\Lambda_0 - \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}) \right|_F + \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F \left| N^{-1/2} \hat{\Lambda} \right|_F |\beta_{0,J} - \hat{\beta}_J|_F \\ &= O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(1/N + \delta_{NT}^{-2}) + O_P(s/\sqrt{NT}) \end{aligned}$$

provided that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F &\leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \Lambda_0^\top \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F |\mathbf{H}|_F + \left| \frac{1}{TN^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \right|_F N^{-1/2} |\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda_0 \mathbf{H}|_F \\ &= O_P \left(1/\sqrt{NT} + T^{-1/2} (\delta_{NT}^{-1} + \sqrt{s/(NT)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

(3)-(4). By using the identity $\widehat{\mathbf{F}} = \widehat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{H}^{-1, \top} + \mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{H}^{-1, \top}$, parts (3)-(4) follow directly from parts (1) and (3). \square

B.5 Proofs of the Main Results

Proof of Lemma 1.

For notational simplicity, let

$$\mu_u = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu_{u,m} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{u,m} = (m^{q/2-1} \delta_q^q(u_j, m))^{1/(q+1)}.$$

(1). We apply the martingale approximation technique and approximate $u_{j,it} = x_{j,it} e_{it}$ by m -dependent processes. Then we prove this lemma by using delicate block techniques and the results on independent random variables.

Let $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^T$ be a positive sequence such that $\sum_{m=1}^T \lambda_m \leq 1$. For any $t \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$, define $S_{j,Nt,m} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^t u_{j,ik,m}$ and $u_{j,ik,m} = E[x_{j,ik} e_{ik} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k,k-m}]$, where $\mathcal{F}_{k,k-m} = (\varepsilon_k, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-m})$. Therefore, $u_{j,ik,m}$ and $u_{j,ik',m}$ are independent if $|k - k'| > m$. Write $u_{j,it} = u_{j,it} - u_{j,it,T} + \sum_{m=1}^T (u_{j,it,m} - u_{j,it,m-1}) + u_{j,it,0}$. Let $M_{t,m} = \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1})$ and $M_{T,m}^* = \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |M_{t,m}|$, and thus $S_{j,NT,T} - S_{j,NT,0} = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,it,T} - u_{j,it,0}) = \sum_{m=1}^T M_{T,m}$.

Write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt}| \geq 5x \right) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^T \Pr \left(M_{T,m}^* \geq 3\lambda_m x \right) + \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,0}| \geq x \right) \\ &\quad + \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt} - S_{j,Nt,T}| \geq x \right) = I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Consider I_1 . Let $Y_{l,m} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1+(\ell-1)m}^{\min(lm, T)} (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1})$, $b = \lfloor T/m \rfloor + 1$, $W_{s,m}^e = \sum_{l=1}^s ((1 + (-1)^l)/2) \cdot Y_{l,m}$, $W_{s,m}^o = \sum_{l=1}^s ((1 - (-1)^l)/2) \cdot Y_{l,m}$ and $\lfloor t \rfloor_m = \lfloor t/m \rfloor \times m$. Hence, for any $x > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(M_{T,m}^* \geq 3\lambda_m x \right) &\leq \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |M_{\lfloor t \rfloor_m, m}| \geq 2\lambda_m x \right) + \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |M_{\lfloor t \rfloor_m, m} - M_{t,m}| \geq \lambda_m x \right) \\ &\leq \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq s \leq b} |W_{s,m}^e| \geq \lambda_m x \right) + \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq s \leq b} |W_{s,m}^o| \geq \lambda_m x \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{T}{m} \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} |M_{t,m}| \geq \lambda_m x \right) = I_{1,1} + I_{1,2} + I_{1,3}. \end{aligned}$$

For $I_{1,1}$, since $Y_{2,m}, Y_{4,m}, \dots$ are independent, then by using the Nagaev inequality for i.i.d. random variables (see Lemma B.1), we have

$$\Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq s \leq b} |W_{s,m}^e| \geq \lambda_m x \right) \leq (1 + 2/q)^q \frac{\sum_{l=1}^b \|Y_{l,m}\|_q^q}{(\lambda_m x)^q} + 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2(\lambda_m x)^2}{e^q (q+2)^2 \sum_{l=1}^b \|Y_{l,m}\|_2^2} \right).$$

In addition, by the proof of Lemma A.1, we have

$$\|Y_{l,m}\|_q \leq \sqrt{(q-1)(\min(lm, T) - (l-1)m)} \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, m),$$

which follows that

$$I_{1,1} \leq (1 + 2/q)^q (q-1)^{q/2} \frac{T}{x^q} \frac{N^{q/2} m^{q/2-1} \delta_q^q(u_j, m)}{\lambda_m^q} + 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2(\lambda_m x)^2}{e^q (q+2)^2 N T \delta_2^2(u_j, m)} \right).$$

Similarly,

$$I_{1,2} \leq (1 + 2/q)^q (q - 1)^{q/2} \frac{T}{x^q} \frac{N^{q/2} m^{q/2-1} \delta_q^q(u_j, m)}{\lambda_m^q} + 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2(\lambda_m x)^2}{e^q (q + 2)^2 N T \delta_2^2(u_j, m)} \right).$$

Consider $I_{1,3}$. By the Doob L_p maximal inequality and the Burkholder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} |M_{t,m}|^q \right) &= E \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} \left| \sum_{k=t}^m \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right|^q \right) \\ &\leq (q/(q-1))^q E \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^N (u_{j,ik,m} - u_{j,ik,m-1}) \right|^q \right) \\ &\leq (q/(q-1))^q (q-1)^{q/2} N^{q/2} m^{q/2} \delta_q^q(u_j, m), \end{aligned}$$

which follows that

$$\Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} |M_{t,m}| \geq \lambda_m x \right) \leq (q/(q-1))^q (q-1)^{q/2} \frac{N^{q/2} m^{q/2} \delta_q^q(u_j, m)}{x^q \lambda_m^q}.$$

Combining the above analysis and choose $\lambda_m = \mu_{u,m}/\mu_u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^T \Pr \left(M_{T,m}^* \geq 3\lambda_m x \right) &\leq c_q \frac{T N^{q/2}}{x^q} \sum_{m=1}^T \frac{m^{q/2-1} \delta_q^q(u_j, m)}{\lambda_m^q} + 4 \sum_{m=1}^T \exp \left(-c_q \frac{2(\lambda_m x)^2}{N T \delta_2^2(u_j, m)} \right) \\ &\leq c_q \frac{T N^{q/2}}{x^q} \mu^{q+1} + 4 \sum_{m=1}^T \exp \left(-c_q \frac{2(\mu_{u,m} x)^2}{N T \mu^2 \delta_2^2(u_j, m)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_q > 0$ only depending on q .

Consider I_2 . Note that $\{u_{j,it,0}\}$ are independent random variables, by using the Nagaev inequality and $\|\sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0}\|_q \leq \sqrt{N} \delta_q(u_j, 0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt,0}| \geq x \right) &\leq (1 + 2/q)^q \frac{T \|\sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0}\|_q^q}{x^q} + 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2x^2}{e^q (q + 2)^2 T \|\sum_{i=1}^N u_{j,it,0}\|_2^2} \right) \\ &\leq (1 + 2/q)^q \frac{T N^{q/2} \delta_q^q(u_j, 0)}{x^q} + 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2x^2}{e^q (q + 2)^2 T N \delta_2^2(u_j, 0)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider I_3 . Since $\|\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt} - S_{j,Nt,T}|\|_q \leq 3\sqrt{q-1} \sqrt{NT} \sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \delta_q(u_j, m)$ by the proof of Lemma A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt} - S_{j,Nt,T}| \geq x \right) &\leq \frac{(3\sqrt{q-1} \sqrt{NT} \sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \delta_q(u_j, m))^q}{x^q} \\ &\leq c_q \frac{N^{q/2} T (\sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \mu_{u,m})^{q+1}}{x^q} \end{aligned}$$

in view of

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \delta_q(u_j, m) \right)^q &\leq \left(\sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \delta_q^{q/(q+1)}(u_j, m) \right)^{q+1} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{m=T+1}^\infty (m/T)^{\frac{q/2-1}{q+1}} \delta_q^{q/(q+1)}(u_j, m) \right)^{q+1} \\ &= T^{1-q/2} \left(\sum_{m=T+1}^\infty \mu_{u,m} \right)^{q+1} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above analysis, we then have for any $x > 0$,

$$\Pr\left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |S_{j,Nt}| \geq x\right) \leq c_q \frac{TN^{q/2}}{x^q} \left(\mu^{q+1} + \delta_q^q(u_j, 0)\right) + 4 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-c_q \frac{\mu_{u,m}^2 x^2}{NT \mu_u^2 \delta_2^2(u_j, m)}\right) \\ + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c_q x^2}{TN \delta_2^2(u_j, 0)}\right).$$

Note that if $x = \sqrt{NT} \mu_u^{1+1/q} y$ with $y > 0$, then $\mu_{u,m}^2 x^2 / (NT \mu_u^2 \delta_2^2(u_j, m)) \geq m^{1-2/q} y^2$ and thus

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-c_q \frac{\mu_{u,m}^2 x^2}{NT \mu_u^2 \delta_2^2(u_j, m)}\right) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-c_q m^{1-2/q} y^2\right).$$

In addition, since for any $s > 0$

$$\sup_{y \geq 1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-m^s y^2\right) \exp\left(y^2\right) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-m^s\right) \exp(1)$$

and

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-m^s y^2\right) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-m^s\right) \exp\left(1 - y^2\right),$$

thus for some $c'_q > 0$

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-c_q \frac{\mu_{u,m}^2 x^2}{NT \mu_u^2 \delta_2^2(u_j, m)}\right) \leq c'_q \exp\left(-c_q x^2 (NT \mu_u^{2+2/q})\right).$$

The proof of part (1) is now complete.

(2). For notation simplicity, let $\ell \leq T^\gamma$. For $\gamma < \theta < 1$, let $m_T = \lfloor T^{\sqrt{\theta}} \rfloor$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t,\theta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{it,\theta}$ and $Q_{NT,\theta} = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq T} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} \tilde{u}_{j',s,\theta}$. By using Lemmas A.4 (2) and (3), we have

$$\Pr(|L_{NT,j,j'} - E(L_{NT,j,j'}) - Q_{NT,\theta} + E(Q_{NT,\theta})| \geq x_T/2) \leq C_{q,M} x_T^{-q/2} (T\ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u-1)\sqrt{\theta}q/2}.$$

Split $[1, \dots, T]$ into blocks B_1, \dots, B_{b_T} with block size $2m_T$ and define $Q_{NT,\theta,k} = \sum_{t \in B_k} \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} a_{t-s} \tilde{u}_{j,t,\theta} \tilde{u}_{j',s,\theta}$. By using Lemma B.2 (2) and Lemma A.4 (3), we have for any $M > 1$

$$\Pr(|Q_{NT,\theta} - E(Q_{NT,\theta})| \geq x_T/2) \\ \leq \sum_{k=1}^{b_T} \Pr(|Q_{NT,\theta,k} - E(Q_{NT,\theta,k})| \geq x_T/C_{q,M,\theta}) + \left\{ \frac{C_{q,M,\theta} T m_T^{-1} (m_T \ell)^{q/4}}{(T\ell)^{q/4}} \right\}^{C_{q,M,\theta}} \\ + C_\theta \exp\left\{ \frac{c_q^2 \log d_{NT}}{C_q} \right\} \\ \leq \sum_{k=1}^{b_T} \Pr(|Q_{NT,\theta,k} - E(Q_{NT,\theta,k})| \geq x_T/C_{q,M,\theta}) + C_{q,M,\theta} (d_{NT}^{-M} + T^{-M}).$$

By using Lemma A.5 (2), we have

$$\Pr(|Q_{NT,\theta,k} - E(Q_{NT,\theta,k})| \geq x_T/C_{q,M,\theta}) \\ \leq O(1) x_T^{-q/2} \log T \left((T^{\sqrt{\theta}} \ell)^{q/4} T^{-(\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} T^{\sqrt{\theta} \ell q/2 - 1 - (\alpha_u-1)\theta q/2} + T^{\sqrt{\theta}} \right).$$

Combining the above analysis, the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.

(1). This proof is conditional on the following two events

$$\mathcal{A}_{NT} = \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X} \right|_\infty \leq w_{1,NT}/2 \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_{NT} = \left\{ |\hat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} \leq \frac{C_0}{16} \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)} \right\}$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$. Note that by using Lemma 1 (1) and $w_{1,NT} \asymp \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$, the event $\mathcal{A}_{NT} = \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X} \right|_\infty \leq w_{1,NT}/2 \right\}$ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right)$$

for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$. In addition, by using Lemma A.2 (1) and $x = \frac{C_0}{16} \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$ for some constant $C_0 > 0$, $\mathcal{B}_{NT} = \left\{ |\hat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} \leq x \right\}$ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right)$$

for some $C_3, C_4 > 0$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{NT} \cap \mathcal{B}_{NT}) &= \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{NT}) + \Pr(\mathcal{B}_{NT}) - \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{NT} \cup \mathcal{B}_{NT}) \\ &\geq 1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right) - C_3 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-\nu/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{\nu/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the nature of minimizing procedure in (2.5), we have

$$\frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \beta_0|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\beta_0|_1,$$

which follows that

$$\frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}|_1 \leq \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0) + w_{1,NT} |\beta_0|_1.$$

Since $\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0) \leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X} \right|_\infty |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1 \leq \frac{w_{1,NT}}{2} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 + 2w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}|_1 \leq w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1 + 2w_{1,NT} |\beta_0|_1.$$

Note that $|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1 + |\beta_0|_1 - |\hat{\beta}|_1 = |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1 + |\beta_{0,J}|_1 - |\hat{\beta}_J|_1 \leq 2|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1 \leq 4w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}_{J^c} - \beta_{0,J^c}|_1 \leq 3w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1.$$

By using Lemma A.3 (1) and the condition $s \leq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2C_0} \sqrt{\frac{NT}{\log d_{NT}}}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 \geq (\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J) - C_0 s \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}) |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_2^2 \geq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_2^2$$

conditional on the event $\mathcal{A}_{NT} \cap \mathcal{B}_{NT}$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_2^2 &\leq 4w_{1,NT} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1 \leq 4w_{1,NT} \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_2 \\ &\leq 4w_{1,NT} \sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which follows that

$$|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_2 \leq \frac{8\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}$$

and

$$|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|_1 \leq 4|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s} |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_2 \leq \frac{32sw_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}.$$

We now complete the proof.

(2). Similar to part (1), this proof is conditional on the event $\mathcal{A}_{NT} \cap \mathcal{B}_{NT}$.

Define $\vec{\mathbf{b}} = (\text{sgn}(\beta_j)g_j)_{j \in J}$. Due to the property of convex optimization, $\hat{\beta}_w \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}$ is a solution if and only if there exists a subgradient

$$\vec{\mathbf{g}} \in \partial \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} g_j |\hat{\beta}_j| = \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}} \mid z_j = \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_j)g_j \text{ for } \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0 \text{ and } |z_j| \leq g_j \text{ elsewhere} \right\}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}_w - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y} + w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} (\hat{\beta}_w - \beta_0) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} + w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}} &= \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_w) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{J^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_J (\hat{\beta}_{w,J} - \beta_{0,J}) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{J^c}^\top \mathbf{e} &= -w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}}_{J^c}, \\ \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J (\hat{\beta}_{w,J} - \beta_{0,J}) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} &= -w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}}_J = -w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}}, \\ \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_{w,J}) &= \text{sgn}(\beta_{0,J}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_{w,J^c} = \beta_{0,J^c} = \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{X}_J denotes the sub-matrix of \mathbf{X} only containing the columns indexed by J , and $\beta_{0,J}$ denotes the sub-vector of β containing the elements indexed by J .

By standard results in matrix perturbation theory, Lemma A.3 (1) and $s \leq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2C_0} \sqrt{\frac{NT}{\log d_{NT}}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \psi_{\min}((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J) - \psi_{\min}(\Sigma_{x,J,J}) \right| \\ &\leq \left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J - \Sigma_{x,J,J} \right|_2 \leq s \left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J - \Sigma_{x,J,J} \right|_{\max} \leq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma_{x,J,J}$ is the sub-matrix of Σ_x that contains

Therefore, conditional on the set $\mathcal{B}_{NT} = \left\{ |\hat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x|_{\max} \leq \frac{C_0}{16} \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)} \right\}$, we have

$$\psi_{\min}((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J) \geq \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{2}$$

and thus $(NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J$ is nonsingular.

Given the invertibility of $(NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J$, to prove $\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_w) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)$, it suffices to show

$$\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_{w,J}) = \text{sgn} \left[\beta_{0,J} + \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right) \right] = \text{sgn}(\beta_{0,J}) \quad (\text{B.5.1})$$

and for any $j \in J^c$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{e} \right| \\ &= | -w_{1,NT} \vec{g}_j | \leq w_{1,NT} g_j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5.2})$$

Consider (B.5.1) first. It is sufficient to show $|(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J)^{-1} (\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}})|_\infty < \beta_{\min}$. Since $|(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J)^{-1}|_2 \leq \frac{2}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}$ and $\beta_{\min} > \frac{\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} (1 + 2 \max_{j \in J} |g_j|)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right) \right|_\infty \\ & \leq \left| \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \right|_\infty \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right|_\infty \\ & \leq \frac{2\sqrt{s}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} \left(\left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty + |w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}}|_\infty \right) \\ & \leq \frac{2\sqrt{s}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} \left(w_{1,NT}/2 + w_{1,NT} \max_{j \in J} |g_j| \right) < \beta_{\min}. \end{aligned}$$

Next consider (B.5.2). By the triangle inequality, it suffices to show for any $j \in J^c$

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{e} \right| \leq w_{1,NT} g_j.$$

The first term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} - w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \right|_1 \times \left(\left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty + |w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}}|_\infty \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{s} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \left(\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right)^{-1} \right|_2 \times \left(\left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty + |w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}}|_\infty \right) \\ & \leq \frac{2s}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right|_\infty \times \left(\left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty + |w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{b}}|_\infty \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\max_{j \in J^c} \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_J \right|_\infty \leq |\Sigma_x|_{\max} + \frac{C_0}{16} \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)}$ by Lemma A.3 (1), the left hand of (B.5.2) is bounded by

$$\left(\frac{2s|\Sigma_x|_{\max}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} + \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{16} \right) \left(\frac{w_{1,NT}}{2} + w_{1,NT} \max_{j \in J} |g_j| \right).$$

The proof is now completed provided that

$$\min_{j \in J^c} |g_j| \geq \left(\frac{2s|\Sigma_x|_{\max}}{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)} + \frac{\psi_{\Sigma_x}(J)}{16} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \max_{j \in J} |g_j| \right).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.1.

(1). Due to the property of convex optimization, $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}$ is a solution if and only if there exists a subgradient

$$\vec{\mathbf{g}} \in \partial \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\beta}_j| = \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}} \mid z_j = \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_j) \text{ for } \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0 \text{ and } |z_j| \leq 1 \text{ elsewhere} \right\}$$

such that $|\vec{\mathbf{g}}|_\infty \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y} + w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + w_{1,NT} \vec{\mathbf{g}} &= \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{bc} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) &= \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_x \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} + \sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{d_{NT}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_x \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ &= J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, J_2 is the error resulting from using an approximate inverse of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x$, which will be proved asymptotically negligible. In addition, the bias term $w_{1,NT} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_x \vec{\mathbf{g}}$ resulting from the penalization of the parameters is known to be equal to $\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$.

Hence, we have

$$\sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{bc} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} + \sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{d_{NT}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0).$$

We will then provide: (1) a central limit theorem for J_1 ; and (2) a verification of asymptotic negligibility of J_2 .

Consider J_2 first. By Yuan (2010), we have

$$\Omega_{x,j,j} = [\Sigma_{x,j,j} - \Sigma_{x,j,-j} \Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{x,-j,j}]^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{x,j,-j} = -\Omega_{x,j,j} \Sigma_{x,j,-j} \Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1},$$

where $\Omega_{x,j,j}$ denotes the j^{th} diagonal entry of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_x$, $\Omega_{x,j,-j}$ is the $1 \times (d_{NT} - 1)$ vector obtained by removing the j^{th} entry of the j^{th} row of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_x$, $\Sigma_{x,j,j}$ is the j^{th} diagonal entry of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$, $\Sigma_{x,-j,-j}$ is the submatrix of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ with the j^{th} row and column removed, $\Sigma_{x,j,-j}$ is the j^{th} row of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ with its j^{th} entry removed, $\Sigma_{x,-j,j}$ is the j^{th} column of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ with its j^{th} entry removed. Define the $(d_{NT} - 1) \times 1$ vector

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j = \underset{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}-1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{NT} E |\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \mathbf{b}|_2^2$$

such that

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j = \left(\frac{1}{NT} E (\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-j}) \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} E (\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \mathbf{X}_j) = \Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{x,-j,j}$$

and $|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j|_2 \leq |\Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1}|_2 |\Sigma_{x,-j,j}|_2 < \infty$. Define $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j = \mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ and thus $E(\mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) = \mathbf{0}$. Define $\tau_j^2 = \frac{1}{NT} E |\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_{-j} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j|_2^2 = \Sigma_{x,j,j} - \Sigma_{x,j,-j} \Sigma_{x,-j,-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{x,-j,j} = 1/\Omega_{x,j,j}$. Observe that $\Omega_{x,j,-j} = -\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j^\top / \tau_j^2$, and thus we can write $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_x = \mathbf{T}^{-2} \mathbf{C}$, where \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{C} is defined similarly to $\hat{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ but with τ_j^2 and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ replacing $\hat{\tau}_j^2$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j$.

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{x,j}$ denote the j^{th} row of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_x$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_x$, respectively, and thus $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j} = \hat{\tau}_j^{-2} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{x,j}$. By the properties of Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) condition, we have

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j}^\top - \mathbf{e}_j|_\infty \leq \lambda_j / \hat{\tau}_j^2 = O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)}),$$

where \mathbf{e}_j is the j^{th} unit column vector. Hence, by using Lemma A.3 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_2| &\leq |\boldsymbol{\rho}|_1 \times |\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|_1 \times \max_{j \in H} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_x \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j}^\top - \mathbf{e}_j|_\infty \\ &= O_P(s \sqrt{\log d_{NT}}) O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT} / (NT)}) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider J_1 . Write

$$J_1 = \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_x - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_x \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} + \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_x \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} = J_{1,1} + J_{1,2}.$$

For $J_{1,1}$, by using Lemma A.3 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{1,1}| &\leq \left| \sum_{j \in H} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{x,j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{x,j}) \rho_j \right|_1 \times \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty \\ &= O_P \left(\sum_{j \in H} s_j \sqrt{\log d_{NT}/(NT)} \right) O_P(\sqrt{\log d_{NT}}) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that

$$J_{1,1} \rightarrow_D N(0, 1).$$

We next prove the asymptotic normality by using martingale approximation technique and the martingale central limit theorem. Define $S_{j,NT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{u}_{j,t}$ and $\bar{u}_{j,t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N X_{j,it} e_{it}$. Hence, $J_{1,1} = \sum_{k \in H} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} \rho_k \Omega_{x,k,j} S_{j,NT}$.

Let $S_{j,NT,L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t})$ and $\hat{S}_{j,NT,L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{P}_t(\bar{u}_{j,t+l})$, in which $\mathcal{P}_t(\cdot) = E[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t] - E[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$, $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $L/T \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\bar{u}_{j,t} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t})$ and $\{\mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t})\}_{t=1}^T$ is a sequence of martingale differences, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{j,NT,L} - S_{j,NT}\|_2 &= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t}) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t}) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq O(1) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T E \left[(\mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t}))^2 \right] \right\}^{1/2} \leq O(1) \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \delta_2(u_j, l) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Burkholder's inequality, and the last step follows from $L \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, by using Burkholder's inequality, we have as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $L/T \rightarrow 0$

$$\|\hat{S}_{j,NT,L} - S_{j,NT,L}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^l \mathcal{P}_{t-l}(\bar{u}_{j,t}) \right\|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \left\| \sum_{t=T-l+1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(\bar{u}_{j,t+l}) \right\|_2 = O(1) \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{T}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, we have $\|\hat{S}_{j,NT,L} - S_{j,NT}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\{\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{P}_t(\bar{u}_{j,t+l})\}_{t=1}^T$ is a sequence of martingale differences subject to \mathcal{F}_t , so the asymptotic normality can be easily obtained by using a standard martingale central limit theory.

The proof is now completed. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2.

Write

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_\ell) - \boldsymbol{\Theta} &= \left(T_u(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_\ell) - E(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_\ell) \right) + \left(E(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_\ell) - \boldsymbol{\Theta} \right) \\ &= J_3 + J_4. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the bias term J_4 first. Note that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k = E(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 \bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^\top)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} J_4 &= \sum_{k=-\ell}^{\ell} [a(k/\ell) - 1] \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k - \sum_{k=-\ell}^{\ell} \frac{k}{T} [a(k/\ell) - 1] \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k - \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{T-1} \frac{T-k}{k} (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k^\top) \\ &= J_{4,1} + J_{4,2} + J_{4,3}. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_{4,1}$, by Assumption 4 (1), for $\forall \epsilon > 0$, we choose $\nu_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$|k/\ell| < \nu_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{1 - a(k/\ell)}{|k/\ell|^{q_a}} - C_q \right| < \epsilon.$$

Letting $\ell_T^* = \lfloor \nu_\epsilon \ell \rfloor$, write

$$\ell^{q_a} \times J_{4,1} = \sum_{k=-\ell_T^*}^{\ell_T^*} \frac{a(k/\ell) - 1}{|k/\ell|^{q_a}} |k|^{q_a} \mathbf{\Gamma}_k + \sum_{k=\ell_T^*+1}^{\ell} \frac{a(k/\ell) - 1}{|k/\ell|^q} |k|^q (\mathbf{\Gamma}_k + \mathbf{\Gamma}_k^\top).$$

Since $|\mathbf{\Gamma}_k|_2 = O(k^{-(q_a+\epsilon)})$ for some $\epsilon > 1$, the first term of the right-hand side converges to $-C_q \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |k|^{q_a} \mathbf{\Gamma}_k$ in spectral norm. For the second term, since $|a(\cdot)| \leq M$, $\left| \frac{1-a(k/\ell)}{|k/\ell|^{q_a}} \right| \leq (M+1)/\nu_\epsilon^{q_a}$ due to the fact that $k/\ell \geq \nu_\epsilon$. Then this term in spectral norm is bounded by

$$(M+1)/\nu_\epsilon^{q_a} \sum_{k=\ell_T^*+1}^{\infty} k^2 |\mathbf{\Gamma}_k + \mathbf{\Gamma}_k^\top|_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $|J_{4,1}|_2 = O(\ell^{-q_a})$. Similarly, it can be shown that $|J_{4,2}|_2 = o(\ell^{-q_a})$ and $|J_{4,3}|_2 = o(\ell^{-q_a})$, which implies that $|J_4|_2 = O(\ell^{-q_a})$.

Now consider J_3 . We first prove $\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl} &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \left(\hat{u}_{k,t} \hat{u}_{l,s} - \bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} \right) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) (\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s} - E(\bar{u}_{k,t} \bar{u}_{l,s})) \\ &= J_5 + J_6. \end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma A.6 (1), we have $\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |J_6| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$. For J_5 , write

$$\begin{aligned} J_5 &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \left(\hat{u}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t} \right) \left(\hat{u}_{l,s} - \bar{u}_{l,s} \right) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \left(\hat{u}_{k,t} - \bar{u}_{k,t} \right) \bar{u}_{l,s} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T a((t-s)/\ell) \bar{u}_{k,s} \left(\hat{u}_{l,t} - \bar{u}_{l,t} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemmas A.6 (2)-(3) to the above three terms, we have $J_5 = o_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$. Hence, we have proved $\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$. Next, write

$$J_3 = \left| T_u(\hat{\Theta}_\ell) - E(\tilde{\Theta}_\ell) \right|_2 \leq \left| T_u(\hat{\Theta}_\ell) - T_u(E(\tilde{\Theta}_\ell)) \right|_2 + \left| T_u(E(\tilde{\Theta}_\ell)) - E(\tilde{\Theta}_\ell) \right|_2 = J_{3,1} + J_{3,2}.$$

The term $J_{3,2}$ is bounded by

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \leq u) \leq u^{1-p} C(d_{NT}) = O\left((\ell \log d_{NT}/T)^{(1-p)/2} C(d_{NT})\right).$$

For $J_{3,1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,1} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| < u) + \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| < u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) \\ &= J_{3,11} + J_{3,12} + J_{3,13}. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_{3,13}$, by using $\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$, we have

$$J_{3,13} \leq \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\Theta_{\ell,kl}|^p u^{-p} = O_P\left((\ell \log d_{NT}/T)^{(1-p)/2} C(d_{NT})\right).$$

For $J_{3,11}$, write

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,11} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| < u) + \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\Theta_{\ell,kl}| < u) \\ &\leq J_{3,111} + J_{3,112}. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_{3,112}$, we have $J_{3,112} \leq u^{1-p} C(d_{NT})$. For $J_{3,111}$, take some $a \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,111} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| < au) \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| \geq u, au \leq |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| < u) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \times \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| > (1-a)u) \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \times C(d_{NT})(au)^{1-p}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| = O_P(\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T})$, then for some large $C > 0$ and $u = C\sqrt{\ell \log d_{NT}/T}$, we have

$$\Pr\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| > au) > 0\right) = \Pr\left(\max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| > (1-a)u\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Combining the above analysis, we have $J_{3,11} = O_P\left((\ell \log d_{NT}/T)^{(1-p)/2} C(d_{NT})\right)$.

For $J_{3,12}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,12} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} \left(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| + |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}|\right) \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl}| < u, |\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq k, l \leq d_{NT}} |\hat{\Theta}_{\ell,kl} - \Theta_{\ell,kl}| \times \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} \mathbb{I}(|\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) \\ &\quad + u \max_{1 \leq k \leq d_{NT}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{NT}} \mathbb{I}(|\Theta_{\ell,kl}| \geq u) = O_P\left((\ell \log d_{NT}/T)^{(1-p)/2} C(d_{NT})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above results, the proof is now complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1.

(1). We first evaluate the difference of the objective function defined in (2.13) at $(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\Xi})$ and (β_0, Ξ_0) . Thus, by the definition of $(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\Xi})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2NT} \left(\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\beta} - \text{vec}(\tilde{\Xi})\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{e}\|_2^2 \right) + w_{1,NT}(|\tilde{\beta}|_1 - |\beta_0|_1) + \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} \left(|\tilde{\Xi}|_* - |\Xi_0|_* \right) \\ &:= J_7 + J_8 + J_9 \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the definitions of J_7 , J_8 and J_9 are self-evident.

Consider J_7 . Note that the event $\mathcal{A}_{NT} = \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X} \right|_\infty \leq w_{1,NT}/2 \right\}$ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right).$$

Conditional on \mathcal{A}_{NT} , using Assumption 5.1, $(\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}))^\top \text{vec}(\mathbf{B}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B})$ and $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B}) \leq |\mathbf{A}|_2 |\mathbf{B}|_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_7 &= \frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{e}^\top \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 - \left| \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{e} \right|_\infty |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 - \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{E}|_2 |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_* \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2NT} |\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 - \frac{w_{1,NT}}{2} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 - \frac{w_{2,NT}}{2\sqrt{NT}} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_*. \end{aligned}$$

For J_8 , we have $J_8 = w_{1,NT} (|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J|_1 + |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{J^c}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_1) \geq w_{1,NT} (|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{J^c}|_1 - |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_1)$.

Consider J_9 . Let $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}) = \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]}} \boldsymbol{\Xi} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]}}$ and $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}) = \boldsymbol{\Xi} - \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]}} \boldsymbol{\Xi} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]}}$. Note that $|\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}|_* = |\mathbf{A}|_* + |\mathbf{B}|_*$ if $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B} = 0$ and $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top = 0$, and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}|_* &= |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0 + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_* = |\boldsymbol{\Xi}_0 + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) + \mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* \\ &\geq |\boldsymbol{\Xi}_0 + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* - |\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* = |\boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_* + |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* - |\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_*, \end{aligned}$$

which follows that

$$J_9 \geq \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* - \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_*.$$

Combing the above analyses, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 + w_{1,NT} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{J^c}|_1 + \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* \\ &\leq 3w_{1,NT} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_1 + 3 \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) \in \mathbb{C}$ and thus by Assumption 5.2, we have

$$\kappa_c |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2 + \kappa_c \frac{1}{NT} |\text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{NT} |\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2.$$

In addition, since $|\boldsymbol{\Xi}|_F^2 = |\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})|_F^2 + |\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})|_F^2 + 2\text{tr}(\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})^\top \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})) = |\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})|_F^2 + |\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})|_F^2$, $|\boldsymbol{\Xi}|_*^2 \leq |\boldsymbol{\Xi}|_F^2 \text{rank}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})$ and $\text{rank}(\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)) \leq 2r$ (which we will prove in the following), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_c |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2 + \kappa_c \frac{1}{NT} |\text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_2^2 \\ &\leq 3w_{1,NT} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}|_1 + 3 \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)|_* \\ &\leq 3\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 + 3\sqrt{2r} \frac{w_{2,NT}}{\sqrt{NT}} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_F \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 6\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, 6\sqrt{2r} w_{2,NT} \right\} \sqrt{|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2 + \frac{1}{NT} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0|_F^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove $\text{rank}(\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0)) \leq 2r$. Define the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \mathbf{U}_0^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) \mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{U}_0^\top \mathbb{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) \mathbf{V}_0 + \mathbf{U}_0^\top \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}_0) \mathbf{V}_0$, and write it in block form as

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{11} & \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{21} & \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ and $\mathbf{\Delta}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T-r) \times (N-r)}$. Since $\mathbf{U}_0^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{U}_{0,[r]}} = [\mathbf{0}_{T \times r}, \mathbf{U}_{0,[T-r]}]^\top$ and $\mathbf{V}_0^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{0,[r]}} = [\mathbf{0}_{N \times r}, \mathbf{V}_{0,[N-r]}]^\top$, we have

$$\mathbf{U}_0^\top \mathbb{M}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} - \mathbf{\Xi}_0) \mathbf{V}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Delta}_{11} & \mathbf{\Delta}_{12} \\ \mathbf{\Delta}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(\mathbb{M}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} - \mathbf{\Xi}_0)) &= \text{rank}(\mathbf{U}_0^\top \mathbb{M}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} - \mathbf{\Xi}_0) \mathbf{V}_0) \\ &\leq \text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Delta}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right) + \text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Delta}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{\Delta}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq 2r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have proved

$$|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \leq \max \left\{ \frac{6\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}}{\kappa_c}, \frac{6\sqrt{2r}w_{2,NT}}{\kappa_c} \right\}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} |\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} - \mathbf{\Xi}_0|_F \leq \max \left\{ \frac{6\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}}{\kappa_c}, \frac{6\sqrt{2r}w_{2,NT}}{\kappa_c} \right\}$$

with probability larger than $1 - C_1 \left(\frac{d_{NT} T^{1-q/2}}{(\log d_{NT})^{q/2}} + d_{NT}^{-C_2} \right)$.

(2). Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda = \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f = \mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T$ and $\hat{s}_1 \geq \dots \geq \hat{s}_r$ be the r nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Xi}_0^\top \mathbf{\Xi}_0 / (NT) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 / N$. Note that the nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top / N$ are the same as those of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2}$. Then with probability approaching to 1 (w.p.a.1), for some $0 < C < \infty$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$, by using the Weyl's theorem, we have

$$|\hat{s}_j - s_j| \leq |\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_f \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{1/2}|_2 \leq C(T^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}),$$

which also implies that $|\mathbf{\Xi}_0|_2 / \sqrt{NT} = \sqrt{s_1 + O_P(T^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2})}$.

Let $\tilde{s}_1 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{s}_{N \wedge T}$ be the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} / (NT)$. Again, by using the Weyl's theorem, part (1) of this lemma and the condition $s = o(\max(T^{-1/2}, N^{-1/2})NT / \log d_{NT})$, we have

$$|\tilde{s}_j - s_j| \leq C \cdot \max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}) = o(C\sqrt{w_{2,NT}})$$

w.p.a.1 for all $j \geq 1$ and $|\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}|_2 / \sqrt{NT} = \sqrt{s_1 + o_P(C\sqrt{w_{2,NT}})}$. In addition, since $\psi_j(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}) / \sqrt{NT} = \sqrt{\tilde{s}_j}$, we have $\psi_j(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}) / \sqrt{NT} \geq \sqrt{s_j - C\sqrt{w_{2,NT}}}$ w.p.a.1 for $1 \leq j \leq r$. The above results imply that $\psi_r(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}) \geq (w_{2,NT} \sqrt{NT} |\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}|_2)^{1/2}$ and $\psi_{r+1}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}) < (w_{2,NT} \sqrt{NT} |\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}|_2)^{1/2}$ w.p.a.1.

We next prove $|\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}|_F / \sqrt{N} = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT}))$ for some rotation matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ depending on $(\mathbf{F}_0, \mathbf{\Lambda}_0)$. Let \mathbf{V} be the $r \times r$ matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2}$. Then $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{V}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{V}$ is a diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1/2} \mathbf{V}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{\Xi}_0^\top \mathbf{\Xi}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_f \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{V} \\ &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1/2} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{D} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{D}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have $(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} / N = \mathbf{I}_r$ and thus the columns of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} / \sqrt{N}$ are the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{\Xi}^\top \mathbf{\Xi}$ with the associated eigenvalues in \mathbf{D} . In addition, conditional on the event $\hat{r} = r$, by using

Davis-Kahan $\sin(\Theta)$ theorem, we have

$$|\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}|_F / \sqrt{T} \leq \frac{(NT)^{-1} |\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}} - \mathbf{\Xi}_0^\top \mathbf{\Xi}_0|_2}{\min_{j \leq r} \min(|\hat{s}_{j-1} - \tilde{s}_j|, |\tilde{s}_j - \hat{s}_{j+1}|)} = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})).$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0}|_F &\leq \left| \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top / N - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0)^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top \right|_F + \left| \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \right|_F^2 / N \\ &\quad + 2 \left| \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \right|_F \left| \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \right|_F / N = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2.

(1). Let $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(g_1, \dots, g_{d_{NT}})$. Note that $\max_{j \in J^c} |\tilde{\beta}_j| = \max_{j \in J^c} |\tilde{\beta}_j - \beta_{0,j}| \leq |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 = O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})) = o_P(w_{3,NT})$ by Assumption 6, which follows that $\mathbf{G}_{J^c} = \mathbf{I}_{d_{NT}-s}$ w.p.a.1. In addition, since $\max_{j \in J} |\tilde{\beta}_j| \geq \beta_{\min} - |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \geq w_{3,NT}$ w.p.a.1 by using Assumptions 6, which implies that $\mathbf{G}_J = \mathbf{0}_s$ w.p.a.1.

By concentrating out \mathbf{F} , the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)}$ can be re-written as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{NT}}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{2NT} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) + w_{3,NT} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{NT}} g_j |\beta_j|.$$

By the properties of convex optimization, we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) + w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G} \vec{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbf{0},$$

where $|\vec{\mathbf{g}}|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\vec{g}_j = \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_j^{(l)})$ if $\hat{\beta}_j^{(l)} \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, d_{NT}$.

Hence, $\text{sgn}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)}) = \text{sgn}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{J^c}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_{J^c}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) &= -w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_{J^c} \vec{\mathbf{g}}_{J^c}, \\ \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,J}) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) &= -w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_J \vec{\mathbf{g}}_J, \\ \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_J^{(l)}) &= \text{sgn}(\beta_{0,J}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_{J^c}^{(l)} = \beta_{0,J^c} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{(l)} = \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}$. By standard results in matrix perturbation theory, Lemma A.7 (3) and Assumption 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \psi_{\min}((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J) - \psi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{J,J}) \right| \\ &\leq \left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{J,J} \right|_2 \\ &\leq s \left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{J,J} \right|_{\max} \\ &= s \times O_P(\max(\sqrt{s}w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, given the invertibility of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{J,J}^{(l)}$, to prove $\text{sgn}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)}) = \text{sgn}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$, it suffices to show w.p.a.1.

$$\left| \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{J,J}^{(l-1),-1} \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) - w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_J \vec{\mathbf{g}}_J \right) \right|_\infty < \beta_{\min} \quad (\text{B.5.3})$$

and for any $j \in J^c$

$$\left| (NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_j^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_j (\hat{\beta}_j^{(l)} - \beta_{0,j}) - \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_j^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) \right|_\infty \leq w_{3,NT} g_j. \quad (\text{B.5.4})$$

Consider (B.5.3) first, by using Lemmas A.7 (1)-(2) and Assumption 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tilde{\Sigma}_{J,J}^{(l-1),-1} \left((NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) - w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_J \vec{g}_J \right) \right|_\infty \\ & \leq |\tilde{\Sigma}_{J,J}^{(l-1),-1}|_\infty \left(|(NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top)|_\infty + |(NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}^{(l-1)}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{e}|_\infty + w_{3,NT} \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{s} |\tilde{\Sigma}_{J,J}^{(l-1),-1}|_2 \times (O_P(\max(\sqrt{s} w_{1,NT}, w_{2,NT})) + w_{3,NT}) = o_P(\beta_{\min}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (B.5.3) holds w.p.a.1. Similarly, using Lemma A.7, (B.5.4) holds w.p.a.1. We then have proved $\Pr(\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}^{(l)}) = \text{sgn}(\beta_0)) \rightarrow 1$ as $(N, T) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$.

(2). By the proof of part (1), we have

$$\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J} = \hat{\Sigma}_{J,J}^{-1} \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) (\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^\top) + \mathbf{e}) - w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_J \vec{g}_J,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)^\top \hat{\Lambda} = \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}_{NT},$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_{J,J} = \frac{1}{NT} \mathbf{X}_J^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_T) \mathbf{X}_J$ and \mathbf{V}_{NT} is a diagonal matrix that consists of the \hat{r} eigenvalues of $\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\beta}_J)^\top$. By part (1), $\max_{j \in J} g_j = 0$ w.p.a.1 and thus $\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top w_{3,NT} \mathbf{G}_J \vec{g}_J = o_P((NT)^{-1/2})$. Then we can follow the analysis of oracle least squares estimator to establish the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_J$. Specifically, by using Proposition B.1, if $s^{3/2} \times \max(1/\sqrt{N}, 1/\sqrt{T}) \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\sqrt{NT} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) = \sqrt{N/T} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} + \sqrt{T/N} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \mathbf{e}_t + o_P(1).$$

In addition, by using a similar arguments as the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_0} \mathbf{e}_t \rightarrow_D N \left(0, \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_J \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} \right).$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.3.

(1). Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, to show $|T_u(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_e) - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e|_2 = O_P((\log N/T)^{(1-p_e)/2} C_e(N))$ it suffices to prove

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})) \right| = O_P(\sqrt{\log N/T}).$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})) \right| \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - e_{it} e_{jt}) \right| + \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_{it} e_{jt} - E(e_{it} e_{jt})) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$= J_{10} + J_{11}.$$

By using concentration inequality in Lemma A.2, we have $J_{11} = O_P(\sqrt{\log N/T})$.
Now consider J_{10} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - e_{it} e_{jt}) \right| \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} - e_{it})^2 \right| + 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} - e_{it})^2 \right\}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ & = O_P \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} - e_{it})^2 \right\}^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} - e_{it})^2$, by using Lemma B.7 (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} - e_{it})^2 \\ & \leq 3|\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_2^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{x}_{J,it}|_F^2 + 3 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}^\top \mathbf{H}|_F^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \\ & \quad + 3 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}|_F^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t|_F^2 \\ & = O_P \left(s^2/(NT) + \log N/\delta_{NT}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}|_F^2 = O_P(\log N/\delta_{NT}^2)$. By the proof of Lemma B.4 (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})^\top \mathbf{x}_{J,jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_{J,it}^\top (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}) e_{jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})^\top \mathbf{x}_{J,jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N e_{it} (\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J})^\top \mathbf{x}_{J,jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i} e_{jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N e_{it} \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0j} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N e_{it} e_{jt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \\ & = J_{10,1} + \dots + J_{10,8}. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_{10,1}$, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |J_{10,1}|_F^2 & \leq |\hat{\beta}_J - \beta_{0,J}|_2^4 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{x}_{J,it}|_F^2 \times \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N |\mathbf{x}_{J,jt}|_F^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j^\top \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}|_F^2 \\ & = O_P(s^2/(NT)^2) = o_P(\log N/\delta_{NT}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |J_{10,i}|_F^2 = O_P(s/(NT)) = o_P(\log N/\delta_{NT}^2)$ for $2 \leq l \leq 5$.

For $J_{10,6}$, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |J_{10,6}|_F^2 \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0i}|_F^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{f}_{0t}|_F^2 \times \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j e_{jt} \right|_F^2 \times |\mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}|^2 = O_P(\log N/\delta_{NT}^2)$$

since by using Lemma A.1 (1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j e_{jt} \right|_F^2 \\ & \leq 2|\mathbf{H}|_F^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j e_{jt} \right|_F^2 + 2 \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N |e_{jt}|^2 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j|_F^2 \\ & = O_P(1/N + s/(NT) + \delta_{NT}^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |J_{10,7}|_F^2$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |J_{10,8}|_F^2$ are both $O_P(\log N/\delta_{NT}^2)$.

Combining the above results, we have proved part (1).

(2). We first show the consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_\zeta$. By using Lemma B.6 (1), part (1) of this proposition and the condition $\sqrt{s}(\log N/T)^{(1-p_e)/2} C_e(N) \rightarrow 0$, it suffices to consider the following term:

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t.$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}} (T_u(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_e) - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right|_F \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \right|_F \left| \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right|_F \left| \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}} \right|_2 \left| T_u(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_e) - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \right|_2 \left| N^{-1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \right|_F \left| \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \right|_F \\ & = O_P(\sqrt{s}(\log N/T)^{(1-p_e)/2} C_e(N)). \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we first note that

$$\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t^\top = \frac{1}{N^2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^\top \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J)^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \mathbf{V}_{NT},$$

where \mathbf{V}_{NT} includes the largest r eigenvalues of $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J) (\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_J)^\top$ in descending order, the second equality follows from the definition of $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$, and the third equality follows from the definition of PCA. Second, by Lemmas B.4 (1)-(2), we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{H}) \right|_F = O_P \left(\sqrt{s/(NT)} + \delta_{NT}^{-2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \right|_F = O_P(\sqrt{s/(NT)} + \delta_{NT}^{-1}),$$

where $\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0/T)(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}/N) \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1}$.

In addition, since $\|\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}} - \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0}\|_F = O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1})$ by Lemma B.4 (4), we have

$$\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_e \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t + O_P(\sqrt{s}/\delta_{NT}) \\
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \Lambda_0 \mathbf{f}_t + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{e}_t \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}_{NT}^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \hat{\Lambda}^\top \mathbf{X}_{J,t} (\beta_J - \hat{\beta}_J) + O_P(\sqrt{s}/\delta_{NT}) \\
&= J_{12} + J_{13} + J_{14} + O_P(\sqrt{s}/\delta_{NT}).
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to show that J_{13} and J_{14} are both $O_P(\sqrt{s}/\delta_{NT})$, we next investigate J_{12} . By the proofs of Lemmas B.4 (1) and B.6 (3), we have

$$|\mathbf{V}_{NT} - (\hat{\Lambda}^\top \Lambda_0 / N)(\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)(\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda} / N)|_F = O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}),$$

and

$$N^{-1/2} \left(\hat{\Lambda} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda}}{N} \right)^{-1} - \Lambda_0 \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0}{N} \right)^{-1} \right) = O_P(\delta_{NT}^{-1}),$$

which follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{12} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \hat{\Lambda} (\Lambda_0^\top \hat{\Lambda} / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_t + O_P(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0} \Omega_e \Lambda_0 (\Lambda_0^\top \Lambda_0 / N)^{-1} (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{f}_t + O_P(\sqrt{s} \delta_{NT}^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

We next prove consider the consistency of $\hat{\Sigma}_J$. Write

$$\hat{\Sigma}_J = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} - \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} \hat{a}_{st}$$

where $\hat{a}_{st} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t^\top (\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_s$. For the first term, by using Lemma B.4 (4), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top (\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0}) \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \right|_F \leq \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbf{X}_{J,t}|_F^2 |\mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \mathbf{M}_{\Lambda_0}|_F = O_P(s/\delta_{NT}).$$

For the second term, it suffices to show

$$\frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} (\hat{a}_{st} - a_{st}) = O_P(s/\delta_{NT}).$$

Adding and subtracting terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{a}_{st} - a_{st} &= (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t})^\top (\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_s \\
&\quad + \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1, \top} \left[(\hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T)^{-1} - \mathbf{H}^\top (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{H} \right] \hat{\mathbf{f}}_s \\
&\quad + \mathbf{f}_{0t}^\top (\mathbf{F}_0^\top \mathbf{F}_0 / T)^{-1} \mathbf{H} (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_s - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0s}) \\
&= b_{st} + c_{st} + d_{st}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term b_{st} , by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} b_{st} \right|_F$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left| (\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}}/T)^{-1} \right|_F \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,t} \right|_F \left| \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \left| N^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} \right|_F \left| \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right|_F \\
&\leq O_P(s) \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{0t} \right|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} = O_P(s/\delta_{NT}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show $\left| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} d_{st} \right|_F = O_P(s/\delta_{NT})$. For the term c_{st} , by using Lemma B.7 (4), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{NT^2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{J,t}^\top \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}} \mathbf{X}_{J,s} c_{st} \right|_F = O_P(s^2/\sqrt{NT} + s\delta_{NT}^{-2}) = o_P(s/\delta_{NT}).$$

In addition, by using similar arguments as the proof of Theorem 2.1 and using moments inequality in Lemma A.4 (3), we have $\left| \widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}_J - \mathbf{\Theta}_J \right|_2 = O(\ell^{-q_\alpha}) + O_P \left[s(\ell/T)^{1/2} \right]$.

Combining the above results, we have now completed the proof. \square