

Functional Sieve Bootstrap for the Partial Sum Process with Application to Change-Point Detection without Dimension Reduction

Efstathios Paparoditis¹, Lea Wegner², and Martin Wendler^{*2,3}

¹University of Cyprus

²Otto-von-Guericke-University Magdeburg

³`martin.wendler@ovgu.de`

September 2, 2024

Abstract Change-points in functional time series can be detected using the CUSUM-statistic, which is a non-linear functional of the partial sum process. Various methods have been proposed to obtain critical values for this statistic. In this paper we use the functional autoregressive sieve bootstrap to imitate the behavior of the partial sum process and we show that this procedure asymptotically correct estimates critical values under the null hypothesis. We also establish the consistency of the corresponding bootstrap based test under local alternatives. The finite sample performance of the procedure is studied via simulations under the null -hypothesis and under the alternative.

Keywords Resampling; Autoregressive Processes; Functional Time Series; Structural Break

1 Introduction

There are two main approaches to do statistical inference for functional time series. One approach is to apply some form of dimension reduction and then use methods developed for multivariate time series analysis. Alternatively, one might use a fully functional approach. To be more specific and in order to test if a time series of observed functions Y_1, \dots, Y_n with $Y_t : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, has a change in mean, one can use a functional version of the CUSUM-test statistic, that is the statistic

$$T_n = \max_{k=1, \dots, n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i - \frac{k}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right\|, \quad (1)$$

*The research was supported by German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft - DFG), project WE 5988/5 *Graduelle Strukturänderungen in funktionalen Daten*. We thank Greg Rice for providing the R code for the method by Aue, Rice, and Sönmez [2018] we have used for comparison with our method.

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the L^2 norm. In the case of functional data, such a test statistic as well as variants thereof, have been studied by Horváth, Kokoszka, and Rice [2014], Sharipov, Tewes, and Wendler [2016], Aue et al. [2018].

The CUSUM test statistic (1) is a nonlinear functional of the partial sum process $(Z_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$, where the latter is given by

$$Z_n(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} Y_i, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

It turns out that it is difficult to obtain critical values for the test statistic, so re-sampling methods also have been proposed (among other approaches). For functional time series, different bootstrap methods have been proposed that intent to properly mimic the temporal dependence structure of the random variables: Politis and Romano applied the stationary bootstrap to Hilbert-space-valued processes, Dehling, Sharipov, and Wendler [2015] considered the nonoverlapping block bootstrap, Franke and Nyarige [2019] and Zhu and Politis [2017] investigated properties of residual-based bootstrap procedures for first order functional autoregression and Papanaroditis [2018] developed a functional sieve bootstrap approach. See Shang [2018] for an overview of bootstrap methods applied to stationary functional time series.

However, to obtain critical values for the change-point test statistic T_n , one needs a bootstrap version of the partial sum process $(Z_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$. In this context, Sharipov et al. [2016] studied a sequential non-overlapping block bootstrap, Dette, Kokot, and Aue [2020] a block multiplier bootstrap and Wegner and Wendler [2024] a dependent wild bootstrap approach. In this paper we investigate the capability of the functional sieve bootstrap (FSB) when applied to estimate the distribution of T_n under the null hypothesis of no change and to deduce critical values. Recall that the FSB builds upon the Karhunen-Loeve representation of Y_t and uses a finite set of (static) functional principal components (scores), the temporal dependence of which is mimicked via fitting a finite order vector autoregressive (VAR) model to the corresponding (estimated) vector time series of scores. The vector time series of scores is then bootstrapped using the fitted VAR model and the procedure delivers fully functional pseudo observations $Y_1^*, Y_2^*, \dots, Y_n^*$. To achieve consistency, however, the number of principal components (scores) used as well as the order of the VAR model fitted, both have to grow to infinity with the sample size in order to properly capture the infinite dimensionality of the process of scores as well as the infinite past of the temporal dependence. Note that the FSB (like its finite dimensional analogue, the AR-sieve bootstrap) can be valid for approximating the distribution of a statistic of interest even if the process of scores does not follow a linear model as long as the limit distribution of this statistic only depends on the first and second order moments of the underlying process. A theoretical justification of this statement in the finite dimensional case is given in Kreiss, Papanaroditis, and Politis [2011].

The aim of this paper is to justify theoretically the use of the FSB applied to estimate the random behavior of the partial sum process $Z_n(t), t \in [0, 1]$. This will allow for the use of this bootstrap approach in order to deduce critical values of the CUSUM based test statistic (1) in a fully functional context. In Section 2 we will introduce some notation and discuss the related testing problem. The main theoretical results under the null-hypothesis as well as under

local alternatives are presented in Section 3. In the following Section 4, the finite sample performance of the FSB applied to the CUSUM-test is investigated in the context of a simulation study. Comparisons to some alternative approaches to obtain critical values and to perform the same test also are made. Technical proofs are deferred to Section 5.

2 Notation and Test Statistic

We consider a strictly stationary stochastic process $\mathcal{X} := (X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ taking values in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of square integrable functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} equipped with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(t)g(t)dt$, $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$ and the norm $\|f\| = \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle}$. We denote by $\mathbb{E}X_n \in \mathcal{H}$ the expectation and for $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ by $\mathcal{C}_h = \mathbb{E}(X_n - \mathbb{E}X_0) \otimes (X_{n+h} - \mathbb{E}X_0)$ the lag h autocovariance operator of the process \mathcal{X} , where the tensor operator is defined as $x \otimes y = \langle x, \cdot \rangle y$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. For a nuclear (trace class) operator L , $\|L\|_N$ denotes the nuclear norm and $\|L\|_{HS}$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, if L is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Assume that $\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\mathcal{C}_h\|_N < \infty$, which implies that \mathcal{X} possesses the spectral density operator

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_h e^{-ih\omega}, \quad \omega \in (-\pi, \pi],$$

which is continuous in ω and bounded; see Panaretos and Tavakoli [2013] and Hörmann, Kidzinski and Hallin (2013).

We assume that the observations Y_1, \dots, Y_n at hand are obtained as

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} X_i & \text{for } i \leq k^* \\ X_i + \mu & \text{for } i > k^* \end{cases}$$

for some (unknown) $k^* \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and for some constant $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Our interest is focused on the problem of testing the null-hypotheses of mean stationarity, that is,

$$H_0 : \mu = 0$$

against the alternative of a single change-point,

$$H_1 : \mu \neq 0.$$

Under the null-hypothesis, we have $Y_i = X_i$, so the fully functional CUSUM-test statistic can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= \max_{1 \leq k < n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i - \frac{k}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \right\| \\ &= \max_{1 \leq k < n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k X_i - \frac{k}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j \right\| = \max_{1 \leq k < n} \left\| Z_n(k/n) - \frac{k}{n} Z_n(1) \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with $Z_n(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} X_i$. It is known that, under different regularity conditions on the underlying functional process $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, the partial sum processes

$(Z_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$ converges to a \mathcal{H} -valued Brownian motion W . More precisely, under Assumption 3.1 of Section 3, we have the weak convergence result

$$(Z_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow (W(t))_{t \in [0,1]}, \quad (3)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$; see Theorem 1.2 of Jirak [2013]. Other authors have proved such a result under other short-range dependence conditions, see e.g. Chen and White [1998]. By the continuous mapping theorem, it then follows that under the null hypothesis

$$T_n \Rightarrow \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|W(t) - tW(1)\|. \quad (4)$$

Here the Brownian motion $\{W(t), t \in [0, 1]\}$ in \mathcal{H} is characterized by the covariance operator $C_W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ of $W(1)$, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C_W(x), y \rangle &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Cov}(\langle X_0, x \rangle, \langle X_j, y \rangle) \\ &= 2\pi \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for any $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. The complex-valued functions $f_{r,s}$ appearing in (5) are the cross-spectral densities of the two score processes $\{\xi_{r,t}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{\xi_{s,t}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where $\xi_{j,t} = \langle X_t, v_j \rangle$ and $v_j, j = 1, 2, \dots$ denote the (up to a sign chosen) orthonormalized eigenfunctions associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_j, j = 1, 2, \dots$, of the lag zero autocovariance operator $\mathcal{C}_0 = E(X_t - EX_0) \otimes (X_t - EX_0)$. We assume that these eigenvalues are in descending order, that is, $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3 > \dots$ and that they are all distinct. Notice that for $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$f_{r,s}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Cov}(\xi_{0,r}, \xi_{h,s}) \exp(-ih\omega) = \langle \mathcal{F}_\omega(v_r), v_s \rangle.$$

The weak convergence result (4) allows for the implementation of an asymptotic valid testing procedure by rejecting H_0 at some chosen level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if $T_n \geq C_{1-\alpha}$. Here $C_{1-\alpha}$ denotes the $1 - \alpha$ upper quantile of the distribution of $\max_{t \in [0,1]} \|W(t) - tW(1)\|$. However, $C_{1-\alpha}$ is difficult to obtain in practice due to the fact that the limiting Brownian motion has a covariance structure which depends on the unknown spectral density operator \mathcal{F}_ω of the underlying process, i.e., on the infinite dimensional matrix of cross spectral densities $(f_{r,s}(\omega))_{r,s \in \mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, in finite samples, the limiting Gaussian approximation (4) may not properly capture all aspects of the distribution of T_n . These facts motivate the use of alternative, more specifically, bootstrap methods to deduce critical values of the test.

3 Functional Sieve Bootstrap for Change-Point Detection

3.1 The FSB procedure

We first elaborate on the FSB procedure applied to mimic the random behavior of the partial sum process $(Z_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$ and of the test statistic T_n under the null hypothesis of no change.

For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the m -dimensional vector of scores

$$\xi_s(m) = (\xi_{s,1}, \xi_{s,2}, \dots, \xi_{s,m})^\top, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Observe that $\{\xi_t(m), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ obeys a so-called vector autoregressive (VAR) representation, see Cheng and Pourahmadi [1993] and Paparoditis [2018], that is,

$$\xi_t(m) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(m) \xi_{t-j}(m) + e_t(m), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (6)$$

where $\{e_t(m) = (e_1(m), e_2(m), \dots, e_m(m))^\top, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a m -dimensional, white noise process with mean zero and covariance matrix $\Sigma_e(m)$. We write for short $e_t(m) \sim WN(0, \Sigma_e(m))$. $\{A_j(m), j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of $m \times m$ coefficient matrices satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|A_j(m)\|_F < \infty$. Truncating the well-known Karhunen-Loeve representation we can write

$$X_t = \sum_{j=1}^m \xi_{j,t} v_j + U_{t,m},$$

where $U_{t,m} = \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{j,t} v_j$. In the above decomposition, we consider $X_{t,m} := \sum_{j=1}^m \xi_{j,t} v_j$ as the main "driving force" of the random element X_t and treat the "remainder" $U_{t,m}$ as a noise term; see Paparoditis [2018]. The following algorithm describes the FSB procedure applied for change-point detection when the test statistic T_n is used.

Bootstrap Proposal:

Step 1: Select a non-negative integer m and denote by

$$\widehat{\xi}_s(m) = (\widehat{\xi}_{s,1}, \widehat{\xi}_{s,2}, \dots, \widehat{\xi}_{s,m})^\top, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

the vector of estimated scores, $\widehat{\xi}_{j,s} = \langle X_s, \widehat{v}_j \rangle$, where \widehat{v}_j denotes the estimated (up to a sign) orthonormalized eigenfunction associated to the estimated eigenvalue $\widehat{\lambda}_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, of the sample lag zero autocovariance operator $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_0 = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n (X_t - \bar{X}) \otimes (X_t - \bar{X})$.

Step 2: Select an order p and fit to the estimated series of scores $\widehat{\xi}_t(m)$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the VAR(p) model

$$\widehat{\xi}_t(m) = \sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{A}_j(m) \widehat{\xi}_{t-j}(m) + \widehat{e}_t(m),$$

$t = p+1, p+2, \dots, n$, where $\widehat{A}_j(m)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, are the Yule-Walker estimators; see Brockwell and Davis (1991), Chapter 11.

Step 3: Generate pseudo random elements $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$, as

$$X_t^* = X_{t,m}^* + U_{t,m}^*,$$

where the two functional components $X_{t,m}^*$ and $U_{t,m}^*$ appearing above are generated as follows:

- (i) $X_{t,m}^* = \sum_{j=1}^m \xi_{j,t}^* \hat{v}_j$ with $\xi_{j,t}^*$ the j th component of the vector $\xi_t^*(m) = (\xi_{1,t}^*, \xi_{2,t}^*, \dots, \xi_{m,t}^*)^\top$,

$$\xi_t^*(m) = \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}_j(m) \xi_{t-j}^*(m) + e_t^*(m),$$

with $e_t^*(m)$ pseudo innovations generated by i.i.d. resampling from the empirical distribution function of the centered residuals. That is, define $\tilde{e}_t(m) = \hat{e}_t(m) - \bar{e}(m)$, where $\bar{e}(m) = (n-p)^{-1} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \hat{e}_t(m)$ and let I_1, \dots, I_n be i.i.d. uniformly on $\{p+1, \dots, n\}$. Then set $e_t^*(m) = \tilde{e}_{I_t}(m)$.

- (ii) $U_{t,m}^*$ is obtained by i.i.d. resampling from the set of estimated and centered "functional remainders" $\hat{U}_{t,m} - \bar{U}_m$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $\hat{U}_{t,m} = X_t - \hat{X}_{t,m}$, $\hat{X}_{t,m} = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\xi}_{j,t} \hat{v}_j$ and $\bar{U}_m = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \hat{U}_{t,m}$.

Step 4: Define $T_{n,m}^*$ as the bootstrap analogue of T_n , that is,

$$T_{n,m}^* = \max_{1 \leq k < n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^k X_s^* - \frac{k}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n X_s^* \right\|.$$

Step 5: Denote by $C_{1-\alpha}^*$ the upper α -percentage point of the distribution of $T_{n,m}^*$, that is, $P^*(T_{n,m}^* \geq C_{1-\alpha}^*) = \alpha$. Reject the hypothesis H_0 , if

$$T_n \geq C_{1-\alpha}^*.$$

As it is common for the bootstrap, the critical value $C_{1-\alpha}^*$ given in Step 5 can be estimated by means of Monte Carlo.

3.2 Bootstrap validity under H_0

To investigate the asymptotic behavior of the FSB procedure some assumptions have to be made regarding the stochastic structure of $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and the behavior of the tuning parameters m and p . To state these assumptions we make use of the fourth order cumulant operator of the functional process \mathcal{X} which is defined for any $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$, as

$$\begin{aligned} cum(X_{h_1}, X_{h_2}, X_{h_3}, X_0) &= E[(X_{h_1} \otimes X_{h_2}) \otimes (X_{h_3} \otimes X_0)] \\ &\quad - E[X_{h_1} \otimes X_{h_2}] \otimes E[X_{h_3} \otimes X_0] - E[X_{h_1} \otimes X_{h_3}] \otimes_{op} E[X_{h_2} \otimes X_0] \\ &\quad - E[X_{h_1} \otimes X_0] \otimes^\top E[X_{h_2} \otimes X_3] \end{aligned}$$

In the above expression and for linear operators $L_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, the following definitions are used: $L_1 \otimes_{op} L_2(L_3) := L_1 L_3 L_2^*$ and $L_1 \otimes_{op}^\top L_2(L_3) := L_1 L_3^\top L_2^\top$, where L^* is the adjoint operator and L^\top the transposed operator of L ; see Rademacher, Kreiß, and Papanoditis [2024] for more details.

We start with the following assumption which summarizes our requirements on the properties of the underlying functional process and which uses the notion of L^p - M approximability; see Berkes, Horváth, and Rice [2013]. To elaborate, suppose that for the functional process $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the random element X_t admits the representation $X_t = f(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-1}, \dots)$, where the ε_t 's are

i.i.d. random elements in \mathcal{H} , f is some measurable function $f : \mathcal{H}^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $E\|X_t\|^p < \infty$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, if for $\{\tilde{\varepsilon}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ an independent copy of $\{\varepsilon_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $X_t^{(M)} = f(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{t-M-1}, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t-M}, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t-M-1}, \dots)$, the condition $\sum_{k=1}^\infty (E\|X_k - X_k^{(M)}\|^p)^{1/p} < \infty$ is satisfied, the process \mathcal{X} is called L^p - M approximable.

Assumption 3.1.

- (i) $\mathcal{X} = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is purely nondeterministic, L^4 - M approximable process satisfying

$$\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |h|) \|C_h\|_N < \infty,$$

and

$$\sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \|Cum_{h_1, h_2, h_3}\|_N < \infty,$$

where $Cum_{h_1, h_2, h_3} = cum(X_{h_1}, X_{h_2}, X_{h_3}, X_0)$ is the fourth order cumulant operator of \mathcal{X} .

- (ii) The spectral density operator \mathcal{F}_ω of the process \mathcal{X} is of full rank, that is, $\ker(\mathcal{F}_\omega) = 0$, for all $\omega \in [0, \pi]$.
- (iii) For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $G_e^{(m)}$ be the marginal distribution function of $e_t(m)$ (which by part (i) of the assumption does not depend on t). For any $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $K < m$, denote by $G_{e,K}^{(m)}$ the distribution function of the first K components of the vector $e_t(m)$, that is of the vector $(e_1(m), e_2(m), \dots, e_K(m))^\top$. Then, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $G_{e,K}^{(m)} \rightarrow G_{e,K}$, where $G_{e,K}$ is continuous.

Remark 3.1.

- (i) Observe that $\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h) := Cov(\xi_{l_1, 0}, \xi_{l_2, h}) = \langle C_h(v_{l_1}), v_{l_2} \rangle$ and therefore, Assumption 3.1(i) implies that

$$\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |h|) |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| = \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |h|) |\langle C_h(v_{l_1}), v_{l_2} \rangle| \leq \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |h|) \|C_h\|_N < \infty,$$

for all $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (ii) Let $cum(\xi_{l_1, h_1}, \xi_{l_2, h_2}, \xi_{l_3, h_3}, \xi_{l_4, 0})$ be the fourth order cumulant of the scores processes $\{\xi_{l_j, t}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, Assumption 3.1(ii) implies that

$$\sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} |cum(\xi_{l_1, h_1}, \xi_{l_2, h_2}, \xi_{l_3, h_3}, \xi_{l_4, 0})| < \infty.$$

This follows because,

$$\begin{aligned} & |cum(\xi_{l_1, t_1}, \xi_{l_2, t_2}, \xi_{l_3, t_3}, \xi_{l_4, t_4})| \\ &= |cum(\langle X_{t_1}, v_{l_1} \rangle, \langle X_{t_2}, v_{l_2} \rangle, \langle X_{t_3}, v_{l_3} \rangle, \langle X_{t_4}, v_{l_4} \rangle)| \\ &= |\langle cum(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}, X_{t_4}), (v_{l_1} \otimes v_{l_2}) \otimes (v_{l_3} \otimes v_{l_4}) \rangle| \\ &\leq \|cum(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}, X_{t_4})\|_N \|(v_{l_1} \otimes v_{l_2}) \otimes (v_{l_3} \otimes v_{l_4})\| \\ &= \|cum(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}, X_{t_4})\|_N. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Notice that when the dimension m of the vector autoregressive representation (6) increases through adding new elements (scores) to the vector $\xi_t(m)$, the corresponding vector of white noise innovations $e_t(m)$ may entirely change. Part (iii) of Assumption 3.1 ensures that despite such changes, the distribution function of any fixed number of the first components of the vector of white noise innovations converges to a continuous distribution function as m increases to infinity.

Additional to Assumption 3.1, the parameters m and p involved in the FSB algorithm have to increase to infinity at a controlled rate, as the sample size n increases to infinity. Recall that m determines the number of principal components used to approximate the infinite dimensional score process $\xi_s = (\xi_{1,s}, \xi_{2,s}, \dots)^\top$, while p determines the finite order of the VAR process used to approximate the infinite order VAR representation (6). In order to capture this infinity dimensional nature of both components, the parameters m and p have to increase to infinity with the sample size n . This however, has to be done in a proper way which has to take into account a number of issues including the dependence characteristics of the underlying process \mathcal{X} , the fact that the parameter matrices $A_{j,p}(m)$ of the VAR(p) process have to be estimated and that the corresponding estimates are based on the estimated scores $\hat{\xi}_{j,s}$ and not on the unobserved random variables $\xi_{j,s}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, $s = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Our requirements concerning this part of the FSB algorithm are summarized in the following assumption; also see Paparoditis [2018].

Assumption 3.2. *The sequences $m = m(n)$ and $p = p(n)$ increase to infinity as n increases to infinity such that:*

- (i) $\frac{m^{3/2}}{p^{1/2}} = O(1)$.
- (ii) $\frac{p^7}{\sqrt{n\lambda_m^2}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2}} \rightarrow 0$, where $\alpha_1 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $\alpha_j = \min\{\lambda_{j-1} - \lambda_j, \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}\}$ for $j = 2, 3, \dots, m$.
- (iii) $\delta_m^{-1} \sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} j \|A_j(m)\|_F \rightarrow 0$, where $\delta_m > 0$ is the lower bound of the spectral density matrix f_ξ of the m -dimensional score process $\{\xi_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
- (iv) Let $\tilde{A}_{p,m} = (\tilde{A}_{j,p}(m), j = 1, 2, \dots, p)$ be the estimators of $(A_{j,p}(m), j = 1, 2, \dots, p)$, obtained by the same method as $\hat{A}_{j,p}(m)$ but based on the time series of true scores $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n$. Then, $m^4 p^2 \|\tilde{A}_{p,m} - A_{p,m}\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$.

Consider next the bootstrap partial sum process $(Z_{n,m}^*(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$, where

$$Z_{n,m}^*(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} X_i^*$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the pseudo time series $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$, is generated as in Step 3 of the bootstrap algorithm proposed. The following weak convergence result can then be established.

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, it holds true that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$Z_{n,m}^* \Rightarrow W, \text{ in probability,}$$

where W is a Brownian motion in \mathcal{H} and the covariance operator of $W(1)$ coincides with the covariance operator C_W given in (5).

Theorem 3.1 together with the continuous mapping theorem implies that, under the assumptions made,

$$d_\infty(T_{n,m}^*, T_n) \rightarrow 0, \text{ in probability,}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where d_∞ denotes Kolmogorov's distance between the distributions of the random variables $T_{n,m}^*$ and T_n , respectively. This result establishes the asymptotic validity of the FSB procedure for consistently estimating the distribution of the test statistic T_n provided this statistic obeys the limiting behavior described in equation (4). Together with the continuity of the distribution of the random variable T_n , this result also implies that,

$$P(T_n \geq C_{1-\alpha}^*) \rightarrow \alpha,$$

in probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This result shows that the bootstrap based test achieves (asymptotically) the desired level α .

3.3 Consistency under local alternatives

Let us now discuss the local power properties of the FSB based testing procedure presented in Section 3.2. For this consider unobserved functional time series X_1, \dots, X_n and denote the observed time series by Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n , where Y_i has a change of order $O(1/n^r)$ at some unknown time point k^* , that is,

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} X_i & \text{for } i \leq k^* \\ X_i + n^{-r}\mu & \text{for } i > k^*. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\mu \neq 0$, $r \in (0, 1)$ and $k^* = \lfloor nt^* \rfloor$ for some fixed $t^* \in (0, 1)$. Notice that the testing problem becomes more difficult as n increases to infinity, since the magnitude of the change shrinks to zero when the sample size increases. As before, consider then the partial sum process $(Z_{n,X}(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$, with $Z_{n,X}(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i)$. If $(Z_{n,X}(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow W$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and (7) with $r = 1/2$ is satisfied, then the following holds true for the observed functional time series Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n ,

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k (Y_i - \bar{Y}) \right\| \Rightarrow \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|W(t) - tW(1) + g(t)\mu\|, \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{Y}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ and

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} t(1-t^*) & \text{for } t \leq t^* \\ t^*(1-t) & \text{for } t > t^*. \end{cases}$$

The above result follows by the continuous mapping theorem and Corollary 2 of Sharipov et al. [2016].

Now, let $Z_{n,Y}^*$ be the bootstrap version of the partial sum defined by

$$Z_{n,Y}^*(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} Y_i^*,$$

where the bootstrap pseudo observations $Y_1^*, Y_2^*, \dots, Y_n^*$ are generated by applying to the observed functional time series Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n the same FSB procedure as the one used to generate $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$ in Section 3.1. We then have the following result.

If (7) holds with $r < 1/2$, then $\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k (Y_i - \bar{Y}) \right\|$ converges to the same limit as under the null hypothesis. Furthermore, for $r > 1/2$, $\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k (Y_i - \bar{Y}) \right\| \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and the validity of Model (7) with $r > 1/4$, we have that*

$$(Z_{n,Y}^*(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow W$$

and

$$T_{n,m}^* := \max_{k=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k (Y_i^* - \bar{Y}^*) \right\| \Rightarrow \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|W(t) - tW(1)\|, \quad (9)$$

in probability.

By comparing (9) with (8) and (3) one sees that the FSB procedure manages to consistently estimate the distribution of the test statistic T_n under validity of the null hypothesis even under the sequence of local alternatives (7). This immediately implies consistency of the change-point test T_n based on the bootstrap critical values $C_{1-\alpha}^*$ for the same class of local alternatives. This is the content of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Under the Assumption of Theorem 3.1 and for a functional time series $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (7) with $r \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$, it holds true that, in probability,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(T_n \geq C_{1-\alpha}^*) = 1.$$

4 Numerical Results

In this section we compare the size and the power of the CUSUM-test with critical values obtained using different methods: The sequential FSB procedure introduced in this paper, the sequential non-overlapping block bootstrap considered in Sharipov et al. [2016] and a testing procedure based on estimation of parameters involved in the limit distribution which has been proposed by Aue et al. [2018].

For all three methods, tuning parameters have to be chosen. For the FSB, we choose the number of principal components m and the order p of the VAR-model as outlined in Papanaroditis and Shang [2023]. For the block bootstrap, we choose the block length by adapting a method by Rice and Shang [2017], see also Wegner and Wendler [2021]. This method is also applied for the procedure as proposed by Aue et al. [2018], who also kindly provided their R-codes.

Different stochastic models are used to create the functional observations. In particular, a functional first order (FAR) model with Brownian bridge innovations as in Sharipov et al. [2016], a FAR(1) process with squared Brownian bridges as innovations, and a functional moving average (FMA) process of order 1 as in Aue and Klepsch [2017] have been used. In all scenarios, the results are based on sample sizes $n = 100$ and $n = 200$, 2000 simulation runs and 1000 bootstrap samples.

First, we generate FAR(1) processes by

$$X_{n+1}(t) = C \int_0^1 stX_n(s)ds + \epsilon_{n+1}(t),$$

where $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) series of Brownian bridges. The strength of the dependence is regulated by the parameter C which we choose either as 0.245 or as 0.490. For this model, the FSB procedure keeps the size best, see Tables 1 and 2, while the block bootstrap and the asymptotic method lead to oversized tests.

Next, we study the behaviour for non-Gaussian FAR(1)-processes generated by

$$X_{n+1}(t) = C \int_0^1 stX_n(s)ds + \epsilon_{n+1}^2(t) + \eta^2(t),$$

where $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent i.i.d. sequences of Brownian bridges and $C = 0.490$. For this time series, again the FSB method holds the size, while the rejection frequency especially for the asymptotic method is to high.

Finally, we simulate a FMA process of order 1 which is constructed like in Aue and Klepsch [2017]: First, for every simulation run a 21×21 matrix A with independent, centered Gaussian entries and $\text{Var}[A_{ij}] = (ij)^{-1}$ is generated and standardized to have spectral norm 1. Then the vector-valued process

$$Z_n = \epsilon_n + A\epsilon_{n-1}$$

is simulated for an i.i.d. sequence $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of centered Gaussian random vectors with $\text{Var}(\epsilon_{n,i}) = i^{-1}$. We then created a FMA(1) process $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by using the entries of Z_n as Fourier coefficients of X_n . In this case, both bootstrap methods are oversized for $n = 100$, while the asymptotic method is not. For $n = 200$, the empirical size of all three methods is close to the nominal size. In summary, we see that the FSB has a better behavior under the null-hypothesis in most situations.

To simulate the behavior under the alternative, we generate $n = 200$ observations by

$$Y_n(t) = \begin{cases} X_n(t) & \text{for } n \leq 100 \\ X_n(t) + C & \text{for } n \geq 101 \end{cases},$$

where C is chosen as 0.15 for the FAR-processes and as 0.3 for the FMA process. We adjusted the critical values such that the size under the null-hypothesis would be exactly the nominal level, so that we get the size-corrected power under the alternative. While the difference in the power of the three methods is not very pronounced, the other two methods lead to slightly higher power, see Figures 1, 2 and 3.

Table 1: Empirical rejection frequencies under the null hypothesis for theoretical sizes $\alpha = 10\%$, 5% , 1% , sample size $n = 100$ and different models. FSB refers to the functional sieve bootstrap, NBB to the non-overlapping block bootstrap and Asymptotic to the method based on estimation of the asymptotic distribution.

	$\alpha = 10\%$	$\alpha = 5\%$	$\alpha = 1\%$
FAR(1) with Brownian bridges $C = 0.245$			
FSB	0.088	0.041	0.005
NBB	0.113	0.058	0.008
Asymptotic	0.112	0.045	0.005
FAR(1) with Brownian bridges $C = 0.490$			
FSB	0.092	0.039	0.006
NBB	0.132	0.062	0.015
Asymptotic	0.131	0.055	0.009
FAR(1) with squared Brownian bridges			
FSB	0.089	0.039	0.003
NBB	0.114	0.055	0.008
Asymptotic	0.130	0.064	0.006
FMA(1)			
FSB	0.117	0.055	0.004
NBB	0.111	0.048	0.010
Asymptotic	0.082	0.042	0.010

Table 2: Empirical rejection frequencies under the hypothesis for theoretical size $\alpha = 10\%$, 5% , 1% , sample size $n = 200$ and the different models considered. FSB refers to the functional sieve bootstrap, NBB to the non-overlapping block bootstrap and Asymptotic to the method based on estimation of the asymptotic distribution.

	$\alpha = 10\%$	$\alpha = 5\%$	$\alpha = 1\%$
FAR(1) with Brownian bridges $C = 0.245$			
FSB	0.107	0.051	0.009
NBB	0.121	0.063	0.008
Asymptotic	0.113	0.062	0.010
FAR(1) with Brownian bridges $C = 0.490$			
FSB	0.094	0.039	0.007
NBB	0.122	0.058	0.012
Asymptotic	0.122	0.058	0.011
FAR(1) with squared Brownian bridges			
FSB	0.096	0.048	0.009
NBB	0.120	0.056	0.010
Asymptotic	0.123	0.061	0.010
FMA(1)			
FSB	0.095	0.041	0.006
NBB	0.098	0.047	0.012
Asymptotic	0.093	0.046	0.012

Figure 1: Size-corrected empirical power for a FAR(1)-process with $C = 0.49$ and Gaussian innovations, jump of size 0.15 after 100 of the $n = 200$ observations.




Figure 2: Size-corrected empirical power for a FAR(1)-process with $C = 0.49$ and innovations having χ^2 -distributed marginals, jump of size 0.15 after 100 of the $n = 200$ observations.





Figure 3: Size-corrected empirical power for a FMA(1)-process with Gaussian innovations, jump of size 0.3 after 100 of the $n = 200$ observations..



5 Proofs

We recall the following notation which will be used in the sequel:

- $\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_m$ are the estimated eigenfunctions corresponding to the estimated eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_1 > \hat{\lambda}_2 > \dots > \hat{\lambda}_m$ of the sample covariance operator
- $\hat{\xi}_t(m) = (\hat{\xi}_{j,t}, j = 1, \dots, m)^\top$, where $\hat{\xi}_{j,t} = \langle X_t, \hat{v}_j \rangle$, is the m -dimensional vector of estimated scores.
- $\hat{X}_{t,m} = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\xi}_{j,t} \hat{v}_j$ and $\hat{U}_{t,m} = X_t - \hat{X}_{t,m}$, $t = 1, \dots, n$.
- $U_{t,m}^*$ is drawn with replacement from the set $\{(\hat{U}_{t,m} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \hat{U}_{s,m}), t = 1, \dots, n\}$
- $\hat{A}_{j,p}(m)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$ are estimates of AR-matrices from p -th order VAR-process fitted to the vector time series $\hat{\xi}_t$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- residuals $\hat{e}_{t,p}(m) = \hat{\xi}_t(m) - \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}_{j,p}(m) \hat{\xi}_{t-j}(m)$, $t = p+1, p+2, \dots, n$
- $\xi_t^* = (\xi_{j,t}^*)_{j=1, \dots, m}$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, is a m -dimensional, FSB generated pseudo time series, where $\xi_t^* = \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}_{j,p}(m) \xi_{t-j}^* + e_t^*$, $t = 1, \dots, n$. e_t^* is drawn iid from the centered residuals: $e_t^* = (\hat{e}_{I_t,p} - \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{s=p+1}^n \hat{e}_{s,p})$. I_1, \dots, I_n are the same independent and uniformly on $\{p+1, \dots, n\}$ distributed random variables as used for the construction of e_t^* .
- $X_t^* = \sum_{j=1}^m \xi_{j,t}^* \hat{v}_j + U_{t,m}^*$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$ is the FSB generated functional time series.

For simplicity and if it is clear from the context, we avoid in the following the notation $y(m)$ for a m -dimensional vector and simply write y .

Proof of Theorem 3.1: We will make use of the following two theorems due to Serfling [1970], which we give here for easy of reference.

Theorem 5.1 (Theorem A of Serfling [1970]). *Let $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a series of random variables, $\nu \geq 2$. Suppose it exists a function $g(F_{a,n})$ (depending on the joint distribution function $F_{a,n}$ of X_{a+1}, \dots, X_{a+n}) satisfying*

$$g(F_{a,k}) + g(F_{a+k,l}) \leq g(F_{a,k+l}) \quad \forall a \geq a_0, 1 \leq k \leq k+l \quad (10)$$

such that $\mathbb{E}[\|S_{a,n}\|^\nu] \leq g^{\frac{1}{2}\nu}(F_{a,n})$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{a,n}^\nu) \leq \log_2(2n)^\nu g^{\frac{1}{2}\nu}(F_{a,n})$$

where $S_{a,n} = \sum_{i=a+1}^{a+n} X_i$ and $M_{a,n} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|S_{a,k}\|$.

Theorem 5.2 (Theorem B of Serfling [1970]). *Let $\nu > 2$ and use the same notation as in Theorem 5.1. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}|S_{a,n}|^\nu \leq g^{\nu/2}(n)$, for all $a \geq a_0$ and all $n \geq 1$, where $g(n)$ is nondecreasing, $2g(n) \leq g(2n)$, and $g(n)/g(n+1) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists a finite constant K (which may depend on ν , g and the joint distributions of the X_i 's) such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{a,n}^\nu) \leq K g^{\nu/2}(n).$$

Note that these results were formulated for real-valued random variables by Serfling [1970], but the proofs carry over to normed spaces without any changes. Define the following fictitious processes:

- $\{\tilde{\xi}_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a m -dimensional process which obeys a vector autoregressive representation as ξ_s , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\xi}_s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(m) \tilde{\xi}_{s-j} + \varepsilon_s \quad (11)$$

where the set of $m \times m$ coefficient matrices $\{A_j(m), j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the same as in (6) but the innovations ε_s are i.i.d. sequence with mean zero, variance $\Sigma_e(m)$ and distribution function G_e . That is, in contrast to the innovations e_t in (6), the innovations ε_t in (11) are i.i.d., which implies that $\{\tilde{\xi}_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a linear, m -dimensional VAR(∞) process.

- $\{\xi_t^+, s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a m -dimensional process, where ξ_t^+ is generated as

$$\xi_t^+ = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) \xi_{t-j}^+ + \epsilon_t^+.$$

Here $\tilde{A}_{p,m} = (A_{1,p}(m), \dots, A_{p,p}(m))$ is as $\hat{A}_{p,m}$ but with regard to the true series ξ_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and ϵ_t^+ is obtained by resampling from centered residuals: $\epsilon_t^+ = \tilde{\epsilon}_{I_t} - \tilde{\epsilon}_n$ with $\tilde{\epsilon}_t = (\xi_t - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) \xi_{t-j})$ and $\tilde{\epsilon} = (n-p)^{-1} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \tilde{\epsilon}_t$. I_1, \dots, I_n are the same independent and uniformly on $\{p+1, \dots, n\}$ distributed random variables as used for the construction of e_t^* .

- $\{\xi_s^\circ, s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a \mathbb{R}^N dimensional process which satisfies the following condition: For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds true that the m -dimensional vector process $\{\xi_t^\circ(m), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where $\xi_t^\circ(m)$ consists of the first m components of the infinite dimensional vector ξ_t° , coincides with the m -dimensional process $\{\tilde{\xi}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ given in (11).

Define next,

- (i) $Z_{n,m}^+(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \xi_{l,s}^+ v_l$, with $\xi_s^+ = (\xi_{1,s}^+, \dots, \xi_{m,s}^+)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$,
- (ii) $\tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \tilde{\xi}_{l,s} v_l$, with $\tilde{\xi}_s = (\tilde{\xi}_{1,s}, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{m,s})^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$,
- (iii) $Z_n^\circ(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^\infty \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l$, with $\xi_s^\circ = (\xi_{1,s}^\circ, \xi_{2,s}^\circ, \dots)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Using

$$Z_{n,m}^*(t) = Z_n^\circ(t) + (\tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t) - Z_n^\circ(t)) + (Z_{n,m}^+(t) - \tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t)) \\ + (Z_{n,m}^*(t) - Z_{n,m}^+(t)),$$

the assertion of the theorem follows from the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 it holds true, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|Z_{n,m}^*(t) - Z_{n,m}^+(t)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 it holds true, it is possible (after enlarging the probability space if needed) to define copies $Z_{c,n,m}^+$ of $Z_{n,m}^+$ and $\tilde{Z}_{c,n,m}$ of $\tilde{Z}_{n,m}$, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|Z_{n,m}^+(t) - \tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 5.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 it holds true, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t) - Z_n^\circ(t)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 it holds true as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that*

$$(Z_n^\circ(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow W,$$

where W is the Brownian motion given in Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 5.1: Using the definition of $Z_{n,m}^*$ and $Z_{n,m}^+$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{n,m}^*(t) - Z_{n,m}^+(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^* \hat{v}_l + U_{s,m}^* - \xi_{l,s}^+ v_l) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^* \hat{v}_l - \xi_{l,s}^+ v_l \pm \xi_{l,s}^* v_l) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} U_{s,m}^* \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^* - \xi_{l,s}^+) v_l + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} U_{s,m}^* \\
&=: V_{n,m}^*(t) + D_{n,m}^*(t) + R_{n,m}^*(t)
\end{aligned}$$

We will show convergence to zero for $V_{n,m}^*$, $D_{n,m}^*$ and $R_{n,m}^*$ separately. For $V_{n,m}^*$ and $R_{n,m}^*$, we will use Theorem 5.1 combined with the results of Paparoditis [2018], Lemma 6.8 and Lemma 6.6.

Consider $V_{n,m}^*$. Recall that m and p depend on n . We will sometimes write $m(n)$ and $p(n)$ in the following. First, we define the function g from Theorem 5.1, using calculations as in Lemma 6.8 of Paparoditis [2018].

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{n,m}^*(1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^m \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) \\
\mathbb{E}[\|V_{n,m}^*(1)\|^2] &\leq \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbb{E}\|\hat{v}_l - v_l\|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\|_F \\
&\leq C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{r-s}^* = \mathbb{E}[\xi_r^* \xi_s^{*T}]$ the autocovariance matrix function of the process $\{\xi_t^*\}$. For the last inequality, we used from Paparoditis [2018], that,

$$\sum_{l=1}^m \mathbb{E}\|\hat{v}_l - v_l\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2}\right).$$

With the same arguments we get for any $a \geq 0$, that,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\| \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{l=1}^m \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) \right\|^2 \leq C \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \right) \sum_{r=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+n} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| =: g^{\frac{1}{2}\nu}(F_{a,n})$$

Next, check (10) for $\nu = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&g(F_{a,k}) + g(F_{a+k,l}) \\
&= C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \sum_{r=a+1}^{a+k} \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+k} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| + C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \sum_{r=(a+k)+1}^{(a+k)+l} \sum_{s=(a+k)+1}^{(a+k)+l} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \left(\sum_{r=a+1}^{a+k} \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+k} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| + \sum_{r=(a+k)+1}^{(a+k)+l} \sum_{s=(a+k)+1}^{(a+k)+l} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| \right) \\
&\leq C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \sum_{r=a+1}^{a+k+l} \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+k+l} \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| = g(F_{a,k+l})
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^{m(n)} \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \log_2(2n)^2 g(F_0, n) \\
&= \log_2(2n)^2 C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \cdot \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\|,
\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|V_{n,m}^*(t)\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^{m(n)} \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^{m(n)} \xi_{l,s}^* (\hat{v}_l - v_l) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \log_2(2n)^2 C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| \\
&\leq \log_2(2n)^2 \mathcal{O}_P \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} \right) = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \log_2(2n)^2 \mathcal{O}_P \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and this converges to zero for $n \rightarrow \infty$, because we have by our assumptions that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n \|\Gamma_{r-s}^*\| \leq \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and $1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$.

Consider $R_{n,m}^*$. We proceed similar as for $V_{n,m}^*$ in order to define g . In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n,m}^*(1) &= \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{s=1}^n U_{s,m}^*, \quad \text{and,} \\
\mathbb{E} \|R_{n,m}^*(1)\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \|\hat{U}_{s,m}\|^2 + 2\|\bar{\hat{U}}_n\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

by the definition of $U_{s,m}^*$ in Step 3 of the bootstrap algorithm. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^n U_{s,m}^* \right\|^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{s=1}^n \|\hat{U}_{s,m}\|^2 + 2n \|\bar{\hat{U}}_n\|^2 = 2 \sum_{s=1}^n \|\hat{U}_{s,m}\|^2 + 2n \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \hat{U}_{s,m} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{s=1}^n \|\hat{U}_{s,m}\|^2 + 2n \left(\frac{1}{n} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^n \hat{U}_{s,m} \right\|^2 \right) = 4 \sum_{s=1}^n \|\hat{U}_{s,m}\|^2 \\
&\leq 16n \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

as in Lemma 6.6 of Paparoditis [2018]. So, it holds for any $a \geq 0$ and for $\nu = 2$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+n} U_{s,m}^* \right\|^2 \leq 16n \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right).$$

Next, check (10). We have,

$$\begin{aligned} g(F_{a,k}) + g(F_{a+k,l}) &= 16k \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + 16l \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right) \\ &= 16(k+l) \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Lemma 6.6 of Paparoditis [2018], we have that

$$\|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right) \leq \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \right),$$

so we can conclude with the help of Theorem 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sup_{t \in [0,1]} R_{n,m}^*(t) \right\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{s=1}^k U_{s,m}^* \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{s=1}^k U_{s,m}^* \right\|^2 \leq \log_2(2n)^2 g(F_{0,n}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \log_2(2n)^2 16n \|\hat{C}_0\|_{HS} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\| \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \log_2(2n)^2 \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} \right) = \frac{1}{n^{1/4}} \log_2(2n)^2 \mathcal{O}_P \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and this is independent of t and converges to zero for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Consider next $D_{n,m}^*$. To handle this term, we proceed differently. We will show that for arbitrary $t \in [0, 1]$, respectively $1 \leq k \leq n$, it holds that,

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^* - \xi_{l,s}^+) v_l = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^* - \xi_{l,s}^+) v_l$$

converges to zero in probability. To do so, we will follow the lines of the proof of Lemma 6.7 (Paparoditis [2018]). We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|D_{n,m}^*(t)\|^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \mathbb{E} [\xi_r^* (\xi_s^* - \xi_s^+)^T] \mathbf{I}_l + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \mathbb{E} [\xi_r^+ (\xi_s^+ - \xi_s^*)^T] \mathbf{I}_l \\ &=: D_{n,m}^{(1)}(\lfloor nt \rfloor) + D_{n,m}^{(2)}(\lfloor nt \rfloor) \end{aligned}$$

For simpler notation, we write $k = \lfloor nt \rfloor$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Starting with $D_{n,m}^{(1)}$, we upper bound the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{n,m}^{(1)}(k) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^T \mathbb{E}[\xi_r^* (\xi_s^* - \xi_s^+)^T] \mathbf{I}_l \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \Sigma_\epsilon^*(m) \left(\hat{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) - \tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) \right)^T \mathbf{I}_j \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{r,p}^*(m) (\epsilon_{t,p}^*(m) - \epsilon_{t,p}^+(m))] \tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m)^T \mathbf{I}_j \quad (13)$$

Here, $\Sigma_\epsilon^* \delta_{t,s} = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{t,p}^* \epsilon_{s,p}^{*\top}]$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_{j,p}(m)$, respectively, $\hat{\Psi}_{j,p}(m)$ $j = 1, 2, \dots$, are the coefficient matrices of the power series $\hat{A}_{p,m}^{-1}(z)$, respectively, $\tilde{A}_{p,m}^{-1}(z)$, $|z| \leq 1$, with $\hat{\Psi}_{0,p}(m) = \tilde{\Psi}_{0,p}(m) = \mathbf{I}_m$.

We will handle terms (12) and (13) separately.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(12)\|_F \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_\epsilon^*(m)\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \right\|_F \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T (\hat{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) - \tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m)) \right\|_F \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_\epsilon(m)\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \right\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) - \tilde{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \right\|_F \leq \mathcal{O}_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

since Lemma 6.1 and 6.5 of Paparoditis [2018] hold uniformly in m (and p).

$$\begin{aligned} \|(13)\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{r,p}^*(m) (\epsilon_{t,p}^*(m) - \epsilon_{t,p}^+(m))] \tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m)^T \right\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|\epsilon_{r,p}^*(m)\|^2 \mathbb{E} \|\epsilon_{t,p}^*(m) - \epsilon_{t,p}^+(m)\|^2} \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \hat{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \right\|_F}_{\leq \mathcal{O}_P(1)} \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \tilde{\Psi}_{l,p}(m) \right\|_F}_{\leq \mathcal{O}_P(1)} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in m (and p). We will now show that $\mathbb{E}[\|\epsilon_{r,p}^*(m) - \epsilon_{r,p}^+(m)\|^2]$ converges to zero in probability.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\|\epsilon_{r,p}^*(m) - \epsilon_{r,p}^+(m)\|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|\hat{\epsilon}_{r,p}(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_{r,p}(m)\|^2 + 4(\|\bar{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2 + \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_r(m) - \xi_r(m)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$+ \frac{4}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}_{j,p}(m) \hat{\xi}_{r-j}(m) - \tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) \xi_{r-j}(m) \right\|^2 \quad (15)$$

$$+ 4(\|\bar{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2 + \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2) \quad (16)$$

For (14), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_r(m) - \xi_r(m)\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|X_r\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_j - v_j\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} (15) &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \|\hat{A}_{j,p}(m)\|^2 \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_{r-j}(m) - \xi_{r-j}(m)\| \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \|\hat{A}_{j,p}(m) - \tilde{A}_{j,p}(m)\|^2 \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \|\xi_{r-j}(m)\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_P(1) \cdot \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_P\left((p(n)\lambda_{m(n)}^{-1}\sqrt{m(n)} + p(n)^2)^2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{m(n)}{n-p(n)}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2}\right) + \mathcal{O}_P\left(\lambda_{m(n)}^{-2} \frac{1}{n} m(n) p(n) \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6.1 and 6.3 (Papadimitis [2018]). And finally, for the last part

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2 &\leq 2 \left\| \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \hat{\xi}_r \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}_{j,p}(m) \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \hat{\xi}_{r-j} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{m(n)}{n-p(n)}\right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m(n)} \alpha_j^{-2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of Lemma 6.5 (Papadimitis [2018]). That $\|\bar{\epsilon}_n(m)\|^2$, convergence to zero can be shown similarly. Thus, we get that (16) $\rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Combining the results for (14), (15) and (16), we achieve that $\|(2)\| \rightarrow 0$ independently of k and thus it follows that $D_{n,m}^{(1)}(k) \rightarrow 0$ in probability for arbitrary $1 \leq k \leq n$. The convergence of $D_{n,m}^{(2)}(k)$ can be shown in a similar way, which then proves the desired convergence of $D_{n,m}^*$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2: Recall $Z_{n,m}^+$ is based on ξ_s^+ and $\tilde{Z}_{n,m}$ on $\tilde{\xi}_s$, where

$$\xi_s^+ = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Psi}_{j,p}(m) \epsilon_{s-j}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\xi}_s = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) \epsilon_{s-j},$$

with $m \times m$ coefficient matrices $\tilde{\Psi}_{j,p}$ and Ψ_j in the power series expansion of $\tilde{A}_{p,m}^{-1}(z) = (I_m - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) z^j)^{-1}$ and $A_m^{-1}(z) = (I_m - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_{j,p}(m) z^j)^{-1}$,

$|z| \leq 1$, respectively, and $\tilde{\Psi}_{0,p} = \Psi_0 = I_m$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_s^+ - \tilde{\xi}_s &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Psi}_{j,p}(m) - \Psi_j(m)) \epsilon_{s-j}^+ + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (\epsilon_{s-j}^+ - \tilde{\epsilon}_{s-j}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (\tilde{\epsilon}_{s-j} - \epsilon_{s-j}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_r = e_{I_r}$ is a pseudo random variable generated by i.i.d. resampling from the centered set of $n-p$ random variables $e_{p+1}, e_{p+2}, \dots, e_n$, where $e_s = \xi_s - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(m) \xi_{s-j}$, also see (6). Using (17) and $k = \lfloor nt \rfloor$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_{l,s}^+ - \tilde{\xi}_{l,s}) v_l &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^m I_l \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Psi}_{j,p}(m) - \Psi_j(m)) \epsilon_{s-j}^+ v_l \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^m I_l \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (\epsilon_{s-j}^+ - \tilde{\epsilon}_{s-j}) v_l \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^m I_l \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (\tilde{\epsilon}_{s-j} - \epsilon_{s-j}) v_l \\ &= \tilde{D}_{n,m}^{(1)}(k) + \tilde{D}_{n,m}^{(2)}(k) + \tilde{D}_{n,m}^{(3)}(k), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with an obvious notation for $\tilde{D}_{n,m}^{(i)}(k)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \|D_{n,m}^{(1)}(k)\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^T \tilde{\Psi}_l(m) \Sigma_{\epsilon,p}^+(m) (\tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) - \Psi_{l+s-r,p}(m))^T \mathbf{I}_j \quad (19)$$

$$- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^T \Psi_l(m) \Sigma_{\epsilon,p}^+(m) (\tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) - \Psi_{l+s-r,p}(m))^T \mathbf{I}_j \quad (20)$$

For (19) we have by setting $\Psi_{j+s} = \tilde{\Psi}_{j+s} = 0$ for $j+s < 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(19)\|_F &\leq \|\Sigma_{\epsilon}^+(m)\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j \tilde{\Psi}_l(m) \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T (\tilde{\Psi}_{l+s-r,p}(m) - \Psi_{l+s-r,p}(m)) \right\|_F \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_{\epsilon}^+(m)\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T \tilde{\Psi}_l(m) \right\|_F \sum_{s=-k+1}^{k-1} \frac{k-|s|}{n} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^T (\tilde{\Psi}_{j+s}(m) - \Psi_{j+s}(m)) \right\|_F \\ &\leq 2 \|\Sigma_{\epsilon}^+(m)\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j \tilde{\Psi}_l(m) \right\|_F \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^T (\tilde{\Psi}_l(m) - \Psi_l(m)) \right\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P(1) o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6.1 and 6.5 of (Paparoditis [2018]). By the same arguments it follows that (20) is $o_P(1)$, too.

For $D_{n,m}^{(2)}(k)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|D_{n,m}^{(2)}(k)\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r,s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{I}_j^\top \Psi_l(m) \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)^\top \Psi_{l+s-r}(m)^\top \mathbf{I}_j \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)^\top = \Sigma_\epsilon^+(m) - 2\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m)\tilde{\epsilon}_r^\top] + \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n (e_t - \bar{e})(e_t - \bar{e})^\top.$$

Now

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m)\tilde{\epsilon}_r^\top] = \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n (\tilde{\epsilon}_t - \bar{\epsilon})(e_t - \bar{e})^\top,$$

and $\|\tilde{\epsilon}\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $\|\bar{e}\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, while,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \tilde{\epsilon}_t e_t^\top &= \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n e_t e_t^\top + \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p (\tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) - A_j(m)) \xi_{t-j} e_t^\top \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} A_j(m) \xi_{t-j} e_t^\top \\ &= E_{1,n} + E_{2,n} + E_{3,n}, \end{aligned}$$

with an obvious notation for $E_{i,n}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Observe that $\|E_{1,n} - \Sigma_\epsilon(m)\|_F \xrightarrow{P} 0$, while

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_{2,n}\| &\leq \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{r=p+1}^n \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^p \|\tilde{A}_{j,p}(m) - A_{j,p}(m)\|_F^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^p \|\xi_{r-j} e_r^\top\|^2} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_P(m^{-3} p^{-3/2}) = o(1), \\ \|E_{3,n}\| &\leq \mathcal{O}(m p^{-1} \sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} j \|A_j(m)\|_F) = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of Lemma 6.4 in Paparoditis [2018]. Hence

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)^\top\|_F = o_P(1),$$

from which we conclude using

$$\|(21)\|_F \leq \|\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)(\epsilon_{r,p}^+(m) - \tilde{\epsilon}_r)^\top\|_F \underbrace{\left(\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_j^\top \Psi_l(m) \right\|^2 \right)}_{\leq \mathcal{O}(1)},$$

by Lemma 6.1 and 6.5 of Paparoditis [2018], that $D_{n,m}^{(2)}(k) = o_P(1)$.

Consider next $D_{n,m}^{(3)}(k)$. We will show that there are copies $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $(\tilde{\varepsilon})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{[nt]} \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (w_{s-j} - u_{s-j}) v_l \right\| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (22)$$

From this, the statement of the Lemma will follow.

For the construction of the copies $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we use Mallows metric d_2 . Recall the definition of this metric according to which, for two random vectors X and Y with $\mathbb{E}\|X\|^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|Y\|^2 < \infty$, $d_2(X, Y) := \inf \{ \mathbb{E}\|X - Y\|^2 \}^{1/2}$, where the infimum is taken over all pairs of random vectors (W, U) with finite second moments, such that $\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\mathcal{L}(U) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$. Here and for a random vector X , $\mathcal{L}(X)$ denotes the law of X . We refer to Bickel and Freedman (1981), Section 8, for more details on the d_2 metric and its properties. We also write for simplicity $d_2(X, Y) = d_2(F_X, F_Y)$, where F_X and F_Y denote the distribution functions of X and Y , respectively. Now, on a sufficiently rich probability space, let (w_t, u_t) , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, be i.i.d. random vectors satisfying $w_t \sim \hat{G}_e^{(m)}$ and $u_t \sim G_e^{(m)}$ and such that $d_2(w_1, u_1) = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|w_1 - u_1\|^2}$ holds true. Here $\hat{G}_e^{(m)}$ denotes the empirical distribution function of the centered $n-p$ random variables $e_{p+1}, e_{p+2}, \dots, e_n$. Observe that $d_2(w_1, u_1) = d_2(\hat{G}_e^{(m)}, G_e^{(m)})$. We first establish that

$$d_2(\hat{G}_e^{(m)}, G_e^{(m)}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (23)$$

For this we introduce some additional notation in order to make clear the dependence of the random variables considered on m . In particular, we write $\underline{u}(m) = (u_1(m), u_2(m), \dots, u_m(m))^\top$ for the m -dimensional vector having distribution function $G_e^{(m)}$ and $\underline{w}(m) = (w_1(m), w_2(m), \dots, w_m(m))^\top$ for the m -dimensional vector having distribution function $\hat{G}_e^{(m)}$. Notice that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds true that

$$0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}(e_{j,t}(m))^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}(\xi_{j,t}^2) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j = C < \infty.$$

This implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $M_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ exists, such that $\sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(e_{j,t}(m))^2 < \epsilon$ for all $m > M_\epsilon$. Recall that $m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and let n be large enough such that $m > M_\epsilon$. We then have, keeping in mind that the infimum is taken overall pairs of random vectors $(\underline{w}(m), \underline{u}(m))$ such that $\underline{u}(m)$ and $\underline{w}(m)$ have marginal distributions $G_e^{(m)}$ and $\hat{G}_e^{(m)}$, respectively, that

$$\begin{aligned} d_2(\hat{G}_e^{(m)}, G_e^{(m)}) &= \inf \{ \mathbb{E}\|\underline{w}(m) - \underline{u}(m)\|^2 \}^{1/2} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{M_\epsilon} \mathbb{E}(w_j(m) - u_j(m))^2 + \sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(w_j(m) - u_j(m))^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{M_\epsilon} \mathbb{E}(w_j(m) - u_j(m))^2 \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ 2 \sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(w_j(m))^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left\{ 2 \sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(u_j(m))^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the infimum in the first term of (24) is taken overall pairs $(w(M_\epsilon), u(M_\epsilon))$ of M_ϵ -dimensional random vectors such that $w(M_\epsilon) \sim \hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}$ and $u(M_\epsilon) \sim G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}$. Notice that the last term of (24) is smaller than 2ϵ while the term before the last one takes with a probability approaching one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, a value which does not exceed 2ϵ . To see this, observe that $\mathbb{E}(w_j(m))^2 = (n-p)^{-1} \sum_{t=p+1}^n I_j^\top (e_t(m) - \bar{e})(e_t(m) - \bar{e})^\top I_j = \mathbb{E}(u_j(m))^2 + O_P((n-p)^{-1})$, that is,

$$\sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(w_j(m))^2 = \sum_{j=M_\epsilon+1}^m \mathbb{E}(e_j(m))^2 + O_P(m/(n-p)^{-1}) \leq \epsilon + o_P(1).$$

The first term of (24) equals $d_2(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}, G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)})$, which can be bounded by

$$d_2(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}, G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}) \leq d_2(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}, G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}) + d_2(G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}, G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}).$$

By Assumption 3.1(iii), $G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)} - G_{e, M_\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, $\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)} - G_{e, M_\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$, in probability. This holds true since

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}(x)) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x)| &= |G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}(x + \bar{e}) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x)| \\ &\leq |G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}(x + \bar{e}) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x + \bar{e})| + |G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x + \bar{e}) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_x |G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}(x) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x)| + |G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x + \bar{e}) - G_{e, M_\epsilon}(x)| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

by the assumed continuity of G_{e, M_ϵ} and the fact that $\|\bar{e}\| \rightarrow 0$, in probability. Also, $\text{Var}(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}(x)) \leq 1/(4n) \rightarrow 0$, which shows that $\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)} - G_{e, M_\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$, in probability. For the second moments of $w(M_\epsilon)$ and $u(M_\epsilon)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}w(M_\epsilon)w(M_\epsilon)^\top = E_{M_\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n (e_t(m) - \bar{e})(e_t(m) - \bar{e})^\top \right) E_{M_\epsilon}^\top$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}u(M_\epsilon)u(M_\epsilon)^\top = E_{M_\epsilon} \Sigma_e(m) E_{M_\epsilon}^\top,$$

where E_{M_ϵ} is the $M_\epsilon \times m$ matrix $E_{M_\epsilon} = (I_{M_\epsilon}, 0_{M_\epsilon \times m})$ with I_{M_ϵ} the $M_\epsilon \times M_\epsilon$ unit matrix and $0_{M_\epsilon \times m}$ a $M_\epsilon \times m$ matrix of zeros. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}w(M_\epsilon)w(M_\epsilon)^\top - \mathbb{E}u(M_\epsilon)u(M_\epsilon)^\top\|_F &\leq C \left\| \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n (e_t - \bar{e})(e_t - \bar{e})^\top - \Sigma_e(m) \right\|_F \xrightarrow{P} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Lemma 8.3 of Bickel and Freedman (1981), we conclude that

$$d_2(\hat{G}_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}, G_{e, M_\epsilon}^{(m)}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{in probability,}$$

that means we can define copies $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $\mathbb{E}[\|u_1 - w_1\|^2] \rightarrow 0$.

Consider next (22). For every $u \in [0, 1]$, we consider the sequence

$$\sum_{l=1}^m I_l^\top \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m)(w_{s-j} - u_{s-j})v_l(u), \quad s = 1, \dots, n$$

of real-valued random variables and will apply Theorem 1 of Wu [2007]. For this, we consider the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma((u_k, w_k)_{k \leq n})$ (the sigma algebra generated by $(u_k, w_k)_{k \leq n}$). Now

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{n,2} &= \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (w_{n-j} - u_{n-j}) v_l(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (w_{n-j} - u_{n-j}) v_l(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{-1} \right] \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l^\top \Psi_n(m) (w_0 - u_0) v_l(u) \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{l=1}^m \|\mathbf{I}_l^\top \Psi_n(m)\|_F \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|w_0 - u_0\|^2} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \theta_{n,2} \leq C \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|w_0 - u_0\|^2}$. With Theorem 1 of Wu [2007], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (w_{s-j} - u_{s-j}) v_l \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \mathbf{I}_l \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j(m) (w_{s-j} - u_{s-j}) v_l(u) \right\|^2 \right] du \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \|w_0 - u_0\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Proof of Lemma 5.3: We write

$$Z_n^\circ(t) - \tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^m \tilde{\xi}_{l,s} v_l = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l$$

Note that $\text{Var}(\xi_{l,s}^\circ) = \lambda_l \rightarrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, where λ_l is the l -th largest eigenvalue of $C_0 = \mathbb{E}[X_t \otimes X_t]$. Using Markov's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|Z_n^\circ(t) - \tilde{Z}_{n,m}(t)\| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l \right\|^4 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l \right\|^4 \right) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l \right\|^4 \right) \end{aligned}$$

We apply Theorem 5.2. Using the notation $\gamma_l(h) = \text{Cov}(\xi_{l,0}^\circ, \xi_{l,h}^\circ)$ and $\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h) = \text{Cov}(\xi_{l_1,0}^\circ, \xi_{l_2,h}^\circ)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l \right\|^4 &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_4=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_4=m+1}^{\infty} \langle v_{l_1}, v_{l_2} \rangle \langle v_{l_3}, v_{l_4} \rangle \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}(\xi_{l_1, s_1}^\circ \xi_{l_2, s_2}^\circ \xi_{l_3, s_3}^\circ \xi_{l_4, s_4}^\circ) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_4=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \left\{ |\gamma_{l_1}(s_2 - s_1)| |\gamma_{l_2}(s_4 - s_3)| \right. \\
&\quad + |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(s_3 - s_1)| |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(s_4 - s_2)| \\
&\quad + |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(s_4 - s_1)| |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(s_3 - s_2)| \\
&\quad \left. + |cum(\xi_{l_1, s_1}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_1, s_2}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_2, s_3}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_2, s_4}^{\circ})| \right\} \\
&= S_{1, n} + S_{2, n} + S_{3, n} + S_{4, n},
\end{aligned}$$

with an obvious notation for $S_{i, n}$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Using

$$\sum_{s_1, s_2=a+1}^{a+n} |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(s_1 - s_2)| = \sum_{h=-n+1}^{n-1} (n - |h|) |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)|,$$

we get that $n^{-2} E \| \sum_{s=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l, s}^{\circ} v_l \|^4$ is for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
g^2(n) &:= \left(\sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{h=-n+1}^{n-1} (1 - |h|/n) |\gamma_l(h)| \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{h=-n+1}^{n-1} (1 - |h|/n) |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_4=a+1}^{a+n} \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3=a+1-s_4}^{a+n-s_4} |cum_{l_1, l_1, l_2, l_2}(s_1, s_2, s_3)|, \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

where $cum_{l_1, l_1, l_2, l_2}(s_1, s_2, s_3) = cum(\xi_{l_1, 0}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_1, s_1}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_2, s_3}^{\circ}, \xi_{l_2, s_4}^{\circ})$. Notice that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, by

$$g^2(n) \leq \left(\sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_l(h)| \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| \right)^2 + Cn^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

where $C = \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} |cum_{l_1, l_1, l_2, l_2}(s_1, s_2, s_3)| < \infty$ and, therefore, $g(n)$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.2. By the same theorem we then have for a constant $K > 0$, that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|n^{-1/2} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l, s}^{\circ} v_l\|^4 \right) \leq K g^2(n) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_l(h)| = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l_1, l_2=m+1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| \right)^2 = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 5.4: Recall the definition of Z_n° :

$$Z_n^{\circ}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \xi_{l, s}^{\circ} v_l = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \xi_{l, s}^{\circ} v_l$$

and define

$$Z_{n, m}^{\circ}(t) := \sum_{l=1}^m \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \xi_{l, s}^{\circ} v_l$$

By Theorem 3.2 of Billingsley [1968] $(Z_n^\circ(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow W$ holds true if we show that

- I) $(Z_{n,L}^\circ(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow W_L$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed. Here, W_L is a Brownian Motion in H with covariance operator $C_{\omega,L}$, s.t.

$$\langle C_{\omega,L}x, y \rangle = 2\pi \sum_{r=1}^L \sum_{s=1}^L f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle$$

- II) $W_L \Rightarrow W$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$

III)

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z_{n,L}^\circ(t) - Z_n^\circ(t)| > \varepsilon) = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

I): Recall that the first L components of $\{\xi_s^\circ\}$ equal the L -dimensional process $\{\tilde{\xi}_s(L)\}$. Use $\tilde{\xi}_s$ for $\tilde{\xi}_s(L)$ in the following. Rewrite $Z_{n,L}^\circ$ in the following way:

$$Z_{n,L}^\circ(t) = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l = \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{I}_l^\top \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \tilde{\xi}_s}_{=: L_n(t)} v_l = \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{I}_l^\top L_n(t) v_l$$

with $\mathbf{I}_l, \tilde{\xi}_s, L_n(t) \in \mathbb{R}^L$. Recall that

$$\tilde{\xi}_s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j} + \varepsilon_s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(L) \tilde{\xi}_{s-j} + \varepsilon_s$$

We show that

$$(L_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow B_L \tag{27}$$

where B_L is a Brownian Motion in \mathbb{R}^L with covariance matrix Γ_L , $\Gamma_L = 2\pi(f_{r,s}(0))_{r,s=1,\dots,L}$. For this, we use Theorem A.1 of Aue et al. [2018]. According to this theorem, (27) holds true if

$$\sum_{r \geq 1} (\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}_s - \tilde{\xi}_s^{(r)}\|^2])^{1/2} < \infty$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_s^{(r)} = \sum_{j=1}^r \Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j} + \varepsilon_s$, is a truncated version of $\tilde{\xi}_s$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}_s - \tilde{\xi}_s^{(r)}\|^2])^{1/2} &= \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j} - \sum_{j=1}^r \Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}[\|\Psi_j(L) \varepsilon_{s-j}\|^2])^{1/2} \\ &= \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j(L)\|_F (\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{s-j}\|^2])^{1/2} = \|\Sigma_\varepsilon(L)\|_F \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j(L)\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma_\varepsilon(L) = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_s \varepsilon_s^\top]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r \geq 1} (\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{\xi}_s - \tilde{\xi}_s^{(r)}\|^2)^{1/2} &\leq \|\Sigma_\varepsilon(L)\|_F \sum_{r \geq 1} \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j(L)\|_F \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_\varepsilon(L)\|_F \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j \|\Psi_j(L)\|_F < \infty \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6.1 of Paparoditis [2018]. Thus we get $(L_n(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow B_L$ and

$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{I}_l^\top L_n(t) v_l \right) \Rightarrow W_L$$

with a Brownian motion W_L that has the covariance operator $\langle W_L(x), y \rangle = 2\pi \sum_{r=1}^L \sum_{s=1}^L f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle$.

II) We have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{r=1}^L \sum_{s=1}^L f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle \right\|_{HS} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{r=1}^L \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle \right\|_{HS} \\ &+ \left\| \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^L f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle \right\|_{HS} \\ &+ \left\| \sum_{r=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=L+1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} f_{r,s}(0) \langle v_r, x \rangle \langle v_s, y \rangle \right\|_{HS} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0; \end{aligned}$$

see the last step in the proof of Prop. 3.2 (Paparoditis [2018]).

III) By Markov's inequality it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|Z_{n,L}^\circ(t) - Z_n^\circ(t)\| \right)^4 \right] = 0.$$

For this we argue as in the proof of Lemma 5.3 and get the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|Z_{n,L}^\circ(t) - Z_n^\circ(t)\| \right)^4 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} \xi_{l,s}^\circ v_l \right\|^4 \right) \leq K g_L^2(n),$$

where, similarly to (25), the function $g_L^2(n)$ is given here by,

$$\begin{aligned} g^2(n) &:= \left(\sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} \sum_{h=-n+1}^{n-1} (1 - |h|/n) |\gamma_l(h)| \right)^2 \\ &+ 2 \sum_{l_1, l_2=L+1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{h=-n+1}^{n-1} (1 - |h|/n) |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{l_1, l_2=L+1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_4=a+1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3=a+1-s_4}^{a+n} |cum_{l_1, l_1, l_2, l_2}(s_1, s_2, s_3)|, \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_L^2(n) = \left(\sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_l(h)| \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{l_1, l_2=L+1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |\gamma_{l_1, l_2}(h)| \right)^2,$$

and the limit on the right hand side above goes to zero as $L \rightarrow \infty$, the proof of Lemma 5.4 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 3.2 : Before we start with the proof, let's introduce some notation: As only Y_1, \dots, Y_n are observed (not X_1, \dots, X_n), estimates have to be based on this observations. To make this clear, we write

- $\hat{C}_{0,Y}$ for the sample covariance operator based on Y_1, \dots, Y_n
- $\hat{v}_{j,Y}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{j,Y}$ for its eigenvectors and eigenvalues
- $\hat{\xi}_{t,Y}$ for score vectors with $\hat{\xi}_{j,t,Y} = \langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{j,Y} \rangle$
- $\hat{A}_{j,m,Y}$ estimated autoregressive matrices based on Y_1, \dots, Y_n

and so on. However, as the distribution of Y_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ is changing with n , we still use the original notation for true quantities related to the distribution of X_1, \dots, X_n :

- C_0 : covariance operator of X_1
- v_j and λ_j : eigenvectors and eigenvalues of C_0
- $\xi_{t,Y}$: score vectors with $\xi_{j,t,Y} = \langle Y_t, v_j \rangle$
- ξ_t : score vectors with $\xi_{j,t} = \langle X_t, v_j \rangle$
- $A_{j,m}$ autoregressive matrices for process $(\xi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$

Lemma 5.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{C}_{0,Y} - \hat{C}_{0,X} \right\|_{HS}^2 = O(n^{-\min\{4r, 1+2r\}})$$

Proof. A short calculation gives $Y_i - \bar{Y} = X_i - \bar{X} + c_{i,n}$ with $c_{i,n} = -\frac{n-k^*}{n^{1+r}}$ for $i \leq k^*$ and $c_{i,n} = -\frac{k^*}{n^{1+r}}$ for $i > k^*$. So we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{0,Y} - \hat{C}_{0,X} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y}) \otimes (Y_i - \bar{Y}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (X_i - \bar{X}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes c_{i,n} \mu + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,n} \mu \otimes (X_i - \bar{X}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,n} \mu \otimes c_{i,n} \mu \end{aligned}$$

The last summand is deterministic and of order $O(n^{-2r})$, as $|c_{i,n}| \leq n^{-r}$. For the first summand, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes c_{i,n} \mu = \frac{n-k^*}{n^{2+r}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k^*} X_i \right) \otimes \mu + \frac{k^*}{n^{2+r}} \left(\sum_{i=k^*+1}^n X_i \right) \otimes \mu$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes c_{i,n} \mu \right\|_{HS}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{C}{n^{2+2r}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} X_i \right\|^2 + \frac{C}{n^{2+2r}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=k^*+1}^n X_i \right\|^2 = O(n^{1+2c}) \end{aligned}$$

as $\mathbb{E}[\|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\|^2] = O(n)$. The second summand can be treated in the same way. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2 The statement of the theorem can be proved along the lines of Theorem 3.1. We have to check that Lemmas 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 of Paparoditis [2018] which are used in the proof still hold.

The proof of Lemma 6.3 of Paparoditis [2018] is based Hörmann and Kokoszka [2010]. First note that Theorem 3.1 of Hörmann and Kokoszka [2010] still holds, because by this Theorem applied to X_1, X_2, \dots and by our Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{C}_{0,Y} - C_0\|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\hat{C}_{0,Y} - \hat{C}_{0,X}\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \|\hat{C}_{0,X} - C_0\|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Using Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, Lemma 6.3 of Paparoditis [2018] follows for the estimators $\hat{A}_{j,m,Y}$ the same way as before.

For Lemma 6.5 of Paparoditis [2018], only parts (iii) and (iv) have to be generalized. Part (iii) does still hold because Lemma 6.3 does still hold. For part (iv), we have to bound $\frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_{t,Y} - \xi_t\|$ and $\frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_{t-p,Y} - \xi_{t-p}\|$. We will only treat the first sum in detail

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_{t-p,Y} - \xi_{t-p}\|^2 = \frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{j,Y} \rangle - \langle X_t, v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{j,Y} \rangle - \langle Y_t, v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t, v_j \rangle - \langle X_t, v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2 \\ & = \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{j,Y} - v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2 + \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t - X_t, v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the first summand, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and obtain

$$\frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t, \hat{v}_{j,Y} - v_j \rangle)_{j=1,\dots,m}\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|Y_t\| \sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_{j,Y} - v_j\|^2.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 6.3 of Paparoditis [2018], we have $\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_{j,Y} - v_j\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2})$. For the second summand, we use that $Y_i - X_i = n^{-r} \mu$ for

$i > k^*$ and $Y_i - X_i = 0$ otherwise, so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|(\langle Y_t - X_t, v_j \rangle)_{j=1, \dots, m}\|^2 \\ = \frac{2}{n^{2r}(n-p)} \sum_{t=k^*+1}^n \|(\langle \mu, v_j \rangle)_{j=1, \dots, m}\|^2 = O(n^{-2r}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\frac{1}{n-p} \sum_{t=p+1}^n \|\hat{\xi}_{t-p, Y} - \xi_{t-p}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(\max\{n^{-2r}, n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2}\})$. By Assumption 3.2 it holds $\frac{p}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{p}{n^{2r}} \rightarrow 0$ and the rest of the proof of statement 4 of Lemma 6.5 (Paparoditis [2018]) works in exactly the same way as before.

Lemma 6.6 of Paparoditis [2018] also holds, one has to use Lemma 5.5 in the proof to bound $\|\hat{C}_{0, y} - C_0\|$. Lemma 6.7 of Paparoditis [2018] is still true for $D_{n, m}^*$ based on Y_1, \dots, Y_n , because we still can use Lemma 6.5. Lemma 6.8 of Paparoditis [2018] is also valid, because $\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{v}_{j, Y} - v_j\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j^{-2})$. This completes the proof.

References

- A. Aue and J. Klepsch. Estimating functional time series by moving average model fitting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.00770*, 2017.
- A. Aue, G. Rice, and O. Sönmez. Detecting and dating structural breaks in functional data without dimension reduction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80(3):509–529, 2018.
- I. Berkes, L. Horváth, and G. Rice. Weak invariance principles for sums of dependent random functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 123(2):385–403, 2013.
- P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. 1968.
- X. Chen and H. White. Central limit and functional central limit theorems for hilbert-valued dependent heterogeneous arrays with applications. *Econometric Theory*, 14(2):260–284, 1998.
- R. Cheng and M. Pourahmadi. Baxter’s inequality and convergence of finite predictors of multivariate stochastic processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 95:115–124, 1993.
- H. Dehling, O.Sh. Sharipov, and M. Wendler. Bootstrap for dependent hilbert space-valued random variables with application to von mises statistics. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 133:200–215, 2015.
- H. Dette, K. Kokot, and A. Aue. Functional data analysis in the banach space of continuous functions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1168–1192, 2020.
- J. Franke and E.G. Nyarige. A residual-based bootstrap for functional autoregressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07635*, 2019.

- S. Hörmann and P. Kokoszka. Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(3):1845–1884, 2010.
- L. Horváth, P. Kokoszka, and G. Rice. Testing stationarity of functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 179(1):66–82, 2014.
- M. Jirak. On weak invariance principles for sums of dependent random functionals. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 83(10):2291–2296, 2013.
- J.-P. Kreiss, E. Paparoditis, and D.N. Politis. On the range of validity of the autoregressive sieve bootstrap. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2103–2130, 2011.
- V. Panaretos and S. Tavakoli. Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):568–603, 2013.
- E. Paparoditis. Sieve bootstrap for functional time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6B):3510–3538, 2018.
- E. Paparoditis and H.L. Shang. Bootstrap prediction bands for functional time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):972–986, 2023.
- D. Rademacher, J.-P. Kreiß, and E. Paparoditis. Asymptotic normality of spectral means of hilbert space valued random processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 173:104357, 2024.
- G. Rice and H.L. Shang. A plug-in bandwidth selection procedure for long-run covariance estimation with stationary functional time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 38(4):591–609, 2017.
- R.J. Serfling. Moment inequalities for the maximum cumulative sum. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41(4):1227–1234, 1970.
- H.L. Shang. Bootstrap methods for stationary functional time series. *Statistics and Computing*, 28(1):1–10, 2018.
- O.Sh. Sharipov, J. Tewes, and M. Wendler. Sequential block bootstrap in a hilbert space with application to change point analysis. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 44(3):300–322, 2016.
- L. Wegner and M. Wendler. Block length choice for the bootstrap of dependent panel data—a comment on choi and shin (2020). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.11805*, 2021.
- L. Wegner and M. Wendler. Robust change-point detection for functional time series based on u-statistics and dependent wild bootstrap. *Statistical Papers*, pages 1–44, 2024.
- W.B. Wu. Strong invariance principles for dependent random variables. 2007.
- T. Zhu and D.N. Politis. Kernel estimates of nonparametric functional autoregression models and their bootstrap approximation. 2017.