

# Multilayer Network Regression with Eigenvector Centrality and Community Structure

Zhuoye Han

School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University

and

Tiandong Wang

Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University

May 14, 2024

## Abstract

In the analysis of complex networks, centrality measures and community structures are two important aspects. For multilayer networks, one crucial task is to integrate information across different layers, especially taking the dependence structure within and between layers into consideration. In this study, we introduce a novel two-stage regression model (CC-MNetR) that leverages the eigenvector centrality and network community structure of fourth-order tensor-like multilayer networks. In particular, we construct community-based centrality measures, which are then incorporated into the regression model. In addition, considering the noise of network data, we analyze the centrality measure with and without measurement errors respectively, and establish the consistent properties of the least squares estimates in the regression. Our proposed method is then applied to the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) dataset to explore how input-output network data between different countries and different industries affect the Gross Output of each industry.

*Keywords:* Multilayer Networks, Centrality Measures, Network Regression, Measurement Errors, World Input-Output Database

# 1 Introduction

Due to the heterogeneous nature of real-life situations, multilayer network is a powerful tool to understand the underlying mechanism of network models. Existing findings for single-layer network data cover a variety of aspects, such as the study of economic models that analyze how networks influence market structures and transaction costs, and social network analysis that investigates the social relationships between individuals or organizations (Banerjee et al., 2019; Allen et al., 2019; Richmond, 2019; Cai et al., 2021; Cai, 2022; Le and Li, 2022). However, these existing studies usually analyze multilayer data layer by layer, without considering the potential inter-layer relationship. For instance, for Twitter data, a single-layer network modeling approach will treat friendship, reply, and retweet as three separate networks, overlooking the possible dependence among them. A multilayer network approach, however, will regard each aspect as a layer, then integrating information from these three layers contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the dependence structure within and across layers.

For multilayer networks, the tensor-based analysis is one of the most important approaches in the literature. De Domenico et al. (2013) develop a tensorial framework to study general multilayer networks while reviewing the representation of the adjacency matrix of a single-layer (monoplex) network. Starting from the tensorial representation, we focus on the centrality measure of a node which captures its importance in the network. A variety of centrality measures have been proposed in the literature (Jackson et al., 2008; Kolaczyk and Csárdi, 2014), among which we focus on eigenvector centrality (Rowlinson, 1996). Also, the concept of eigenvector centrality from single-layer networks has been extended to different types of multilayer networks. For example, Solá et al. (2013) proposed a centrality measure in multiplex networks and illustrated its potential applications; De Domenico et al. (2013) presented the mathematical formulation of different centrality

measures in interconnected multilayer networks.

In network analysis, community structure characterizes the similarity among nodes, and so is another crucial aspect to consider when integrating information in multilayer networks. In single-layer network data analysis, the community structure is usually revealed by dense connections within a group of nodes (thus forming a community) and sparse connections between groups. This provides a powerful lens to interpret the intricate relationships and dynamics inherent in complex networks. Many efforts have been made to develop efficient algorithms for the community detection problem in single-layer networks, e.g. graph partitioning methods (Pothen, 1997), methods based on modularity (Newman and Girvan, 2004), spectral methods (Newman, 2013), structure definition methods (Palla et al., 2005). However, the above studies mostly focus on community detection algorithms, and few has combined node centrality measures with the community structure to study network macroscopic characteristics.

In this paper, we focus on the multilayer network analysis with eigenvector centrality and community structure. In single-layer network analysis, Le and Li (2022) look at linear regression on multiple eigenvectors of a network assuming the existence of measurement error and provide inference method for the null hypothesis that the slope coefficient is 0. Cai (2022) studies the properties of linear regression on several centrality measures based on sparse single-layer networks and gave the consistency properties and distributional theory for least square estimators. Cai et al. (2021) propose a unified framework called SuperCENT to study the relationship between the centralities of monoplex networks and a certain response variable of interest to investigate the network effect. However, such existing methods are not applicable to multilayer network data. When applied to multilayer network data, these methods only consider each layer of data individually, ignoring the connections between the different layers of the network. Thus, we here aim to tailor the analysis for the multilayer network centrality, while fully considering the interactions between layers.

In the literature, there are a few existing studies analyzing multilayer network data. For instance, Benson (2019) proves the existence of centrality measures for multilayer networks under some mild conditions; Wu et al. (2019) introduce a tensor-based framework for studying eigenvector multi-centrality in multilayer networks; Lin et al. (2022) aim to find influential edges based on edge centrality measures of multilayer networks; Liu and Zhao (2023) propose a parameter-free eigenvector centrality for weighted hypergraphs. However, these methods mostly focus on the centralities of multiplex networks or hypergraphs without analyzing the network effect under a regression framework. Moreover, none of these methods has considered the impact of community structures. Hence, we are motivated to propose a network regression framework by incorporating both the community structure and centrality scores of nodes in a multilayer network.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 proposes a multilayer regression framework, where the unique aspect is the inclusion of community-based centrality scores as predictors for tensorial multilayer network data. Section 3 includes theoretical properties of the least square estimators under mild conditions, both with and without measurement errors. In addition, Section 4 conducts simulation experiments to evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed methodology, and its applicability is further demonstrated by a real example in Section 5. The proofs of the theorems are collected in the supplement.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 The multilayer networks framework

In the sequel, we only consider multilayer networks where different layers share the same vertex set, and one example is the multiplex network. Following Tudisco et al. (2018), we now introduce the definition of multiplex networks.

**Definition 1.** (Multiplex networks) A multiplex network  $\mathcal{G}$  which contains  $L$  layers is a collection of  $L$  graphs:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{G^{(\ell)} \equiv (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^{(\ell)})\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}. \quad (2.1)$$

Each  $G^{(\ell)}$  denotes the graph of  $\ell$ -th layer network. Here  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  is the set of  $N$  nodes common to all layers,  $\mathcal{L} = \{1, \dots, L\}$  denotes the set of layers, and  $E^{(\ell)} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  represents the set of edges in layer  $\ell$ . For each  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $G^{(\ell)}$  can be represented by a nonnegative adjacency matrix  $A^{(\ell)} = (A_{ij}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ . In an undirected multiplex network,  $A^{(\ell)}, \ell = 1, \dots, L$  are symmetric. If all edges have the same weight, then the multiplex network is considered as unweighted.

However, data in matrix form does not provide sufficient information in the multilayer setup, especially when the interlayer correlation is considered. Here we consider multilayer networks in tensor form that account for interactions both within and between layers.

**Definition 2.** (Tensor-based multilayer networks) Let  $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_{i\alpha j\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times L \times N \times L}$  denote the fourth-order adjacency tensor of an undirected weighted multilayer network. Each element of  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_{i\alpha j\beta} = \begin{cases} \omega_{i\alpha j\beta}, & \text{if } (v_i^\alpha, v_j^\beta) \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $i, j \in \mathcal{V}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}$ , and  $v_i^\alpha$  represents node  $i$  in layer  $\alpha$ . Also,  $E$  is the set of edges in the graph, and  $\omega_{i\alpha j\beta}$  denotes the weight of the edge between node  $i$  in layer  $\alpha$  and node  $j$  in layer  $\beta$ .

De Domenico et al. (2013) build the supra-adjacency matrix associated with the multi-

layer adjacency tensor  $\mathcal{B}$ , which is an  $NL \times NL$  block matrix of the form

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} A^{(1)} & D^{(1,2)} & \dots & D^{(1,L)} \\ D^{(2,1)} & A^{(2)} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & D^{(L-1,L)} \\ D^{(L,1)} & \dots & D^{(L,L-1)} & A^{(L)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $A^{(\ell)}$ ,  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$ , are the weighted nonnegative symmetric adjacency matrices for each layer, and  $D^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}$ , are the interlayer adjacency matrices denoting the connection between layers. In the special case of multiplexes, different layers are connected solely by sharing the same nodes. Thus, the corresponding supra-adjacency matrix is

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} A^{(1)} & I & \dots & I \\ I & A^{(2)} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & I \\ I & \dots & I & A^{(L)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

In other words,  $D^{(\alpha,\beta)} = I$ , for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}$ .

## 2.2 Eigenvector centrality with community structure

With the settings above, we propose a Centrality-based Multilayer Network Regression (C-MNetR) model by incorporating eigenvector-like centrality measures. Then with extra community information, we further give a regression model referred to as the Centrality- and Community-based Multilayer Network Regression (CC-MNetR) where community-based centrality measures are used for regression.

### 2.2.1 Construction of eigenvector-like centrality for multilayer networks

Relying on the multilayer adjacency tensor  $\mathcal{B}$  as defined in (2.2), we start with the eigenvector-based centrality measure introduced by De Domenico et al. (2013, 2015). Consider the

matrix  $V = (V_{i\alpha}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times L}$  specified via:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\beta=1}^L \mathcal{B}_{i\alpha j\beta} V_{j\beta} = \lambda_1 V_{i\alpha}, \quad (2.5)$$

for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then the eigenvector centrality of node  $i$  is defined as the  $i$ -th row of the matrix  $V$ . With the supra-adjacency matrix defined in (2.3), the calculation of  $V$  becomes

$$B_0 \text{vec}(V) = \lambda_1 \text{vec}(V). \quad (2.6)$$

Here  $\lambda_1$  in (2.5) and (2.6) are defined as the spectral radius of positive semi-definite matrix  $B_0$ . The associated eigenvector is  $\text{vec}(V)$ , where  $\text{vec}(\cdot)$  denotes the standard vectorization operator. By the Perron-Frobenius Theorem, the leading eigenvector is the unique eigenvector that can be chosen so that every entry is non-negative and  $\|V\|_F = 1$ , motivating its use as a centrality measure. In the following regression step, we consider covariate  $C$  such that

$$C = a_N V, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $a_N$  is a given number related to  $N$ .

In practice, real data often contains noise. Therefore, we further consider the observed data  $B$  as a combination of real network structure and noise:

$$B = B_0 + E_0, \quad (2.8)$$

where  $B$  and  $B_0$  denote the observed and real undirected network structure, respectively. Here we suppose  $E_0$  is a symmetric random matrix with independent Gaussian variables on and above its diagonal. In what follows, we only consider undirected weighted graphs with undirected interlayer interactions.

### 2.2.2 Community structure of multilayer networks

Now we consider the community structure. For a multilayer network  $B_0$ , we assume all  $L$  layers share a common community structure. Let  $c_i \in \{1, \dots, R\}, i \in \mathcal{V}$  denote the

community assignment of node  $i$ ,  $R$  be the number of communities, and  $N_r$  be the size of community  $r$  such that  $\sum_{r=1}^R N_r = N$ .

Similar to White and Smyth (2005), we define an  $N \times R$  matrix  $S$  with one column for each community:  $S = (\mathbf{s}_1 | \mathbf{s}_2 | \cdots | \mathbf{s}_R)$  such that

$$S_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if vertex } i \text{ belongs to community } j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Here columns of  $S$  are mutually orthogonal and each row sums up to 1. The matrix  $S$  also satisfies the normalization condition  $\text{tr}(S^\top S) = N$ , and  $S^\top S = \text{diag}\{N_1, N_2, \dots, N_R\}$ . From above, we introduce the proportion of nodes in community  $r$  as  $\pi_r = \frac{N_r}{N}$  and then we define the community proportion vector  $\Pi$  as

$$\Pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_R)^\top. \quad (2.10)$$

Here we assume the community structure is always known, i.e.  $S$  and  $\Pi$  are given in advance.

### 2.2.3 Community-based centrality

We first introduce important notations. A column-wise Kronecker product of two matrices may also be referred to as the Khatri–Rao product (Khatri and Rao, 1968). This product assumes the partitions of the matrices are their columns. Suppose  $\otimes$  denotes Kronecker product. Given matrices  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times K}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times K}$ , their Khatri-Rao product is defined as

$$\mathbf{A} \odot \mathbf{B} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{b}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{a}_K \otimes \mathbf{b}_K \end{bmatrix}.$$

We use a row-wise Kronecker product called *face-splitting product* (Slyusar, 1999) in the construction of community-based centrality, which is also known as the transposed Khatri-Rao product. Given matrices  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times I}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times J}$ , their transposed Khatri-Rao



product is defined as

$$\mathbf{A} \bullet \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{b}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{a}_K \otimes \mathbf{b}_K \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we construct the community-based eigenvector centrality  $U$  as

$$U := S(H \bullet S^\top C), \quad (2.11)$$

where  $U = (u_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times L}$  with  $u_{ij}$  being the mean of centrality in cluster  $c_i$  of layer  $j$  and  $H = \left[ \frac{1}{N_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{N_R} \right]^\top$  with  $N_r$  being the size of community  $r$ .

However, the definition of  $U$  is the mean value of the centrality information in  $C$  grouped separately for each layer according to the community structure so that  $\text{rank}(U) = R$ . When  $L > R$ ,  $U$  is not column full rank so is improper to be employed directly by the regression model. Instead we define

$$Z := \frac{1}{L} U \mathbf{1}_L, \quad (2.12)$$

which is the vector consisting of the row averages of the matrix  $U$ . In the following regression setup, we use  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$  to denote the community-based centrality of each node rather than  $U$ . Also, nodes belonging to the same community share the same community-based centrality in  $Z$ .

### 2.3 Multilayer network regression and estimation

In this section, we introduce 2 regression models as follows. Suppose  $X$  is the covariate matrix of size  $N \times P$  and  $P$  is the number of covariates. First, we specify the Centrality-based Multilayer Network Regression (**C-MNetR**) model as

$$y = X\beta_X + C\beta_C + \varepsilon, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } B_0 \text{vec}(V) &= \lambda_1 \text{vec}(V), \\ C &= a_N V. \end{aligned}$$

For the C-MNetR model, we use ordinary least squares to estimate the coefficient  $\beta = (\beta_X^\top, \beta_C^\top)^\top$ . When measurement error does not exist, with observations  $\{B_0, X, y\}$ , we obtain  $C$ . Then the OLS estimator is

$$\hat{\beta}^{(ols)} = (W_1^\top W_1)^{-1} W_1^\top y \quad (2.14)$$

where  $W_1 = (X, C)$ . When measurement error exists, with observations  $\{B, X, y\}$ , we first calculate the top eigenvector of  $B$ , which is  $\text{vec}(\hat{V})$  and further we have  $\hat{C} = a_N \hat{V}$ . Suppose  $\hat{W}_1 = (X, \hat{C})$ , then

$$\hat{\beta} = (\hat{W}_1^\top \hat{W}_1)^{-1} \hat{W}_1^\top y. \quad (2.15)$$

The basic idea of C-MNetR is to regress directly on the centrality of nodes in different layers. However, in Section 3, we find that the asymptotic properties of the OLS estimators  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$  depend on the order of  $a_N$  when measurement error is absent. When measurement error exists, the performance of C-MNetR is worse. In centrality regression problems, it is a common practice (Le and Li, 2022) to set  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ , in which case  $\hat{\beta}_X$  is consistent but  $\hat{\beta}_C$  lacks consistency. If the order of  $a_N$  is increased to ensure the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_X$  will be biased again.

To avoid such a dilemma, we further propose the Centrality- and Community-based Multilayer Network Regression (**CC-MNetR**) model based on the community-based centrality. CC-MNetR not only effectively incorporates information on the network community structure, but also shows better statistical properties of the corresponding OLS estimators under mild conditions, regardless of the presence of measurement errors. Here, we define the CC-MNetR model as

$$y = X\beta_X + Z\beta_Z + \varepsilon, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{where } B_0 \text{vec}(V) &= \lambda_1 \text{vec}(V), \\
C &= a_N V, \\
U &= S(H \bullet S^\top C), \\
Z &= \frac{1}{L} U \mathbf{1}_L.
\end{aligned}$$

For the CC-MNetR model, we also use ordinary least squares to estimate the coefficient  $\beta = (\beta_X^\top, \beta_Z^\top)^\top$ . When measurement error does not exist, with observations  $\{B_0, S, H, X, y\}$ , the OLS estimator is

$$\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)} = (W_2^\top W_2)^{-1} W_2^\top y \quad (2.17)$$

where  $W_2 = (X, Z)$ . When measurement error exists, with observations  $\{B, S, H, X, y\}$ , similarly we calculate the eigenvector of  $B$ , which is  $\text{vec}(\hat{V})$ , and then

$$\hat{C} = a_N \hat{V}. \quad (2.18)$$

Since we suppose  $S$  and  $H$  are observed as true, we can calculate the estimators of  $U$  and  $Z$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{U} &= S(H \bullet S^\top \hat{C}); \\
\hat{Z} &= \frac{1}{L} \hat{U} \mathbf{1}_L,
\end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

we use ordinary least square to estimate the coefficient  $\beta = (\beta_X^\top, \beta_Z^\top)^\top$ . Suppose  $\tilde{W}_2 = (X, \hat{Z})$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta} = (\tilde{W}_2^\top \tilde{W}_2)^{-1} \tilde{W}_2^\top y. \quad (2.20)$$

## 3 Theoretical results

### 3.1 Model assumptions

Let  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_N$  be eigenvalues of the noiseless network  $B_0$ . Define projection matrices  $P_X := X(X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top$ ,  $P_C := C(C^\top C)^{-1}C^\top$ ,  $P_{\hat{C}} := \hat{C}(\hat{C}^\top \hat{C})^{-1}\hat{C}^\top$  and

$P_{\hat{Z}} := \hat{Z}(\hat{Z}^\top \hat{Z})^{-1} \hat{Z}^\top$ . For a vector  $\nu \equiv (\nu_j)_{j=1}^N$ , its  $\ell_1$ - and  $\ell_2$ -norms are defined as  $\|\nu\|_1 := \sum_{j=1}^N |\nu_j|$  and  $\|\nu\|_2 := \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , respectively. We now give important model assumptions which guarantee the theoretical properties of the least square estimators.

**Assumption 1. (Noise Structure)** We assume  $\varepsilon_i$  independently follows  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2)$ . Suppose also that the network-based noise  $E_0$  is a block diagonal matrix with blocks  $E_{01}, E_{02}, \dots, E_{0L}$  on the diagonal. Here  $E_{0i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, L$  are symmetric  $N \times N$  matrices with upper-diagonal entries being iid  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_b^2)$ .

**Assumption 2. (Design Matrix)** The fixed design matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$  satisfies  $N > P + L$  with  $P$  independent covariates. Assume also that  $X^\top X$  is invertible and  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top X \rightarrow V_X$ . Each of these  $P$  covariates has a finite second moment where the dimension  $P$  is not diverging. Suppose both  $C$  and  $\hat{C}$  are column full rank and independent of  $X$ .

Note that multilayer networks without interlayer relationships do not satisfy Assumption 2 since the top eigenvector of a block diagonal matrix can be extended by the top eigenvector of some piece of the diagonal. For instance, if block diagonal multilayer network  $B = \text{diag}\{A_1, \dots, A_L\}$ , then there exists  $i \in \mathcal{L}$  such that the top eigenvector of  $B$  is the combination of top eigenvector of  $A_\ell$  and 0. Thus the corresponding eigenvector centrality  $C$  will have some columns all 0 so that  $C$  is not column full rank. However, multiplexes in (2.4) shall be a simple case that satisfies Assumption 2.

**Assumption 3. (Centrality Structure)** We assume the community assignment  $S$  and  $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^R$  are independent from  $C$ , and  $\{\pi_i\}_{i=1}^R$  is known. Here  $C = [C_1^\top, \dots, C_N^\top]^\top$ , and each  $C_i$  denotes the centrality of node  $i$  in all  $L$  layers. We also assume that  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|C_i\|_1^2 \asymp \frac{a_N^2}{N}$ .

In Assumption 3, we impose restrictions on the order of the minimum value of the sum of centralities for each node across all layers of the network. In other words, we do not consider nodes that have low centralities in all layers. Such restriction ensures that

our focus is on nodes that exhibit significant influence or importance within the network structure, regardless of the layer they belong to.

**Assumption 4. (*Spectral Gap*)** *The spectral gap,  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ , needs to be large enough such that  $\frac{a_N}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .*

To ensure the validity of Assumption 4, the network matrix  $B_0$  must have a sufficiently large spectral gap  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ . Here the spectral gap primarily characterizes the differences between the blocks on the diagonal of the partitioned matrix  $B_0$ . Given that different layers of the network share the same community structure, to satisfy Assumption 4, it is necessary to have a significant difference in the connection strengths among the networks of these various layers.

In the context of regression analysis, when there are no measurement errors, the model relies on Assumptions 1-3 to ensure the consistency of the regression results. However, an additional assumption, Assumption 4, becomes necessary when measurement errors are introduced into the regression model.

## 3.2 Centrality-based regression without measurement error

We first consider the case when the true network  $B_0$ , is observed. Under the C-MNetR model, we first consider the centrality matrix  $C$  without measurement error. Theorem 3.1 shows the consistency property of the OLS estimator under mild conditions.

**Theorem 3.1.** (*Properties of  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)}$  without measurement error*) *Define  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)} := (\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)\top}, \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)\top})^\top = (W_1^\top W_1)^{-1} W_1^\top y$ , where  $\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$  are estimators of  $\beta_X$  and  $\beta_C$  respectively in the C-MNetR model and  $W_1 = (X, C)$ . Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 hold, then we have:*

(i) *As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2 V_X^{-1})$ .*

(ii) *Let  $\sigma_{\min}((I_N - P_X)V)$  be the smallest singular value of  $(I_N - P_X)V$ . Suppose there*

exists  $l_N > 0$  such that

$$\sigma_{\min}((I_N - P_X)V) \geq l_N > 0. \quad (3.1)$$

If  $a_N l_N \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , then we have  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} \xrightarrow{L_2} \beta_C$  and consequently  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_C$ .

For the CC-MNetR model, we consider the community-based centrality  $Z$  without measurement error. Theorem 3.2 gives the consistency properties of OLS estimators.

**Theorem 3.2.** *(Properties of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)}$  without measurement error) Recall the estimator in (2.17), i.e.  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)} = (\tilde{\beta}_X^{(ols)\top}, \tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)\top})^\top = (W_2^\top W_2)^{-1} W_2^\top y$ , where  $\tilde{\beta}_X^{(ols)}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)}$  are estimators of  $\beta_X$  and  $\beta_Z$  respectively and  $W_2 = (X, Z)$ . Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 hold, we have the following:*

(i) As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sqrt{N}(\tilde{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2 V_X^{-1})$ .

(ii) Suppose  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$  and Assumption 3 holds, then  $\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)} \xrightarrow{L_2} \beta_Z$  and consequently  $\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_Z$ .

A common practice to ensure that elements in  $C$  and  $X$  are of the same order is to set  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$  (Le and Li, 2022). However, this common practice cannot guarantee the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$ . We give numerical evidence for the performance of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$  under different choices of  $a_N$  in Section 4.

### 3.3 Centrality-based regression with measurement error

In practice, most real networks observed contain noise. Considering such noisy networks, the influence of  $E_0$  must be taken into account. The Davis-Kahan theorem (Davis and Kahan, 1970) characterizes the  $\ell^2$ -difference of the top eigenvector as stated in Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.1.** *(Davis and Kahan, 1970) Recall the network model in (2.8). Let  $\delta := \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$  be spectral gap between the largest two eigenvalues of  $B_0$ . Suppose  $\tilde{u}_1$  and  $u_1$  are the top*

eigenvectors of  $B$  and  $B_0$ , respectively. Then we have

$$\|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 = O\left(\frac{\|E_0\|_2}{\delta}\right),$$

where  $\|E_0\|_2 = \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} \|E_0 u\|_2$  denotes the matrix operator norm.

From Lemma 3.1, we need  $\delta \gg \|E_0\|_2$  to ensure the difference  $\|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2$  vanishes. Specifically, Lemma 3.2 quantifies the measurement error between  $\hat{C}$  and  $C$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 hold, then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{C} - C\|_F^2 \right] = O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

With the above lemmas, for the C-MNetR model, Theorem 3.3 gives the consistency of OLS estimators with measurement error.

**Theorem 3.3.** *(Consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X$  with measurement error of eigenvector centrality  $C$ )*

Let  $\hat{\beta} := (\hat{\beta}_X^\top, \hat{\beta}_C^\top)^\top = (\hat{W}_1^\top \hat{W}_1)^{-1} \hat{W}_1^\top y$ , where  $\hat{\beta}_X$  and  $\hat{\beta}_C$  are estimators of  $\beta_X$  and  $\beta_C$ , respectively in the C-MNetR model and  $\hat{W}_1 = (X, \hat{C})$ . Suppose  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$  and Assumption 1, 2, 4 hold, then we have  $\hat{\beta}_X \xrightarrow{P} \beta_X$ .

Unfortunately, when Assumption 4 holds and  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ , bias may still exist in  $\hat{\beta}_C$ . The lack of consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C$  is mainly due to the node-based dependence in network data. Our numerical experiments in Section 4.3 also confirm this.

However, the CC-MNetR model relying on the centrality- and community-based variable  $Z$  provides a remedy. For the CC-MNetR model, Theorem 3.4 guarantees the consistency of the OLS estimators when measurement errors exist.

**Theorem 3.4.** *(Consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}$  with measurement error of eigenvector centrality  $C$ )*

Let  $\tilde{\beta} \equiv (\tilde{\beta}_X^\top, \tilde{\beta}_Z^\top)^\top = (\hat{W}_2^\top \hat{W}_2)^{-1} \hat{W}_2^\top y$ , where  $\tilde{\beta}_X$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_Z$  are estimators of  $\beta_X$  and  $\beta_Z$ , respectively in the CC-MNetR model and  $\hat{W}_2 = (X, \hat{Z})$ . Suppose  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$  and Assumptions 1-4 hold, then  $\tilde{\beta}_X \xrightarrow{P} \beta_X$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_Z \xrightarrow{P} \beta_Z$ .

## 4 Simulation Experiments

In this section, we use simulated data to examine the performance of our proposed C-MNetR and CC-MNetR models for multiplexes with and without measurement errors.

### 4.1 Data generation

For multiplexes, since connections between layers are represented by the identity matrix, we only need to generate the weighted adjacency matrix for each layer. Specifically, we consider networks with no self-loops, i.e. all diagonal elements of adjacency matrix  $A^{(\ell)}$  of layer  $\ell$  are 0. Here we set  $L = 2$  and  $P = 2$ , and generate binary adjacency matrix  $T^{(\ell)}$  of layer  $\ell$  using the stochastic block model (SBM) introduced in Holland et al. (1983).

We assume networks in different layers share the same community structure, and generate single-layer networks as follows. Suppose the size of communities  $R = 3$ , and  $\Pi = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$  is the probability vector for a node to be assigned to each community. For layer  $\ell$ , we have  $P^{(\ell)} \equiv (p_{l,k}^{(\ell)})$ , and  $p_{l,k}^{(\ell)}$  denotes the probability of edge existence between community  $l$  and community  $k$  in layer  $\ell$ . In this example, we assume the connection probability matrices  $\mathcal{P} = \{P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(L)}\}$  are identical and

$$P^{(\ell)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.8 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \ell = 1, 2.$$

This implies entries in the binary adjacency matrix  $T^{(\ell)}$  satisfy

$$T_{ij}^{(\ell)} | p_{c_i, c_j}^{(\ell)} \sim \text{Bin}(1, p_{c_i, c_j}^{(\ell)}).$$

For all non-zero entries in  $T^{(\ell)}$ , we further assume the weights of these edges are iid  $U(1, 2)$  random variables, thus giving the weighted matrices  $A^{(\ell)}$  and henceforth  $B_0$ . Then we generate the symmetric matrix  $E_0$  by assuming its upper triangular entries are iid  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_b^2)$ .



We assume all entries of the design matrix  $X$  are iid  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , and centrality measures  $C$  and  $Z$  are calculated according to (2.18) and (2.19). Also, set  $\beta_X = (1, 2)^\top$ ,  $\beta_C = (1, 2)^\top$  and  $\beta_Z = 2$ . For the error term in the regression model, we suppose  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2 I_N)$  with  $\sigma_y = 1$ .

## 4.2 Performance without measurement error

In this section, we examine the performance of the OLS estimators using simulated data. We choose  $N = 100, 200, 500, 1000$ , set  $\sigma_b = 0.25$  and generate  $n = 1000$  replications for each choice of  $N$ .




Figure 4.1: From left to right, each figure shows the QQ-plot of  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)} = (\hat{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}, \hat{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}, \hat{\beta}_{C_1}^{(ols)}, \hat{\beta}_{C_2}^{(ols)})$  respectively under  $N = 500$  and  $a_N = N^{0.8}$ . Here the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 1, 2)^\top$ .

(a) $a_N = N^{0.5}$				
	$\hat{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_2}^{(ols)}$
$N = 100$	1.0033(0.10)	2.0063(0.10)	1.0088(1.15)	1.9886(0.76)
$N = 200$	0.9983(0.07)	1.9988(0.07)	1.0099(1.00)	1.9998(0.95)
$N = 500$	0.9975(0.05)	2.0003(0.05)	1.0384(1.04)	1.9637(0.93)
$N = 1000$	0.9994(0.03)	2.0010(0.03)	0.9993(0.78)	1.9982(1.29)
(b) $a_N = N^{0.8}$				
	$\hat{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_2}^{(ols)}$
$N = 100$	1.0010(0.11)	2.0004(0.10)	1.0150(0.29)	1.9904(0.19)
$N = 200$	0.9973(0.07)	1.9978(0.07)	0.9843(0.22)	2.0143(0.21)
$N = 500$	0.9983(0.04)	2.0000(0.04)	1.0017(0.16)	1.9984(0.14)
$N = 1000$	1.0000(0.03)	2.0000(0.03)	0.9980(0.09)	2.0031(0.16)
(c) $a_N = N$				
	$\hat{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_1}^{(ols)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_2}^{(ols)}$
$N = 100$	0.9979(0.11)	1.9990(0.10)	0.9943(0.11)	2.0039(0.07)
$N = 200$	1.0013(0.07)	2.0016(0.07)	1.0013(0.07)	1.9987(0.07)
$N = 500$	1.0009(0.05)	2.0000(0.05)	0.9990(0.04)	2.0009(0.04)
$N = 1000$	1.0005(0.03)	2.0021(0.03)	0.9994(0.02)	2.0008(0.03)

Table 4.1: The average (standard deviation) of 1000 estimates of  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)}$  where the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 1, 2)^\top$ .

Figure 4.1 gives the QQ-plot of 1000 estimates of  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)}$  under  $N = 500$  and  $a_N = N^{0.8}$  which shows the normality of  $\hat{\beta}^{(ols)}$ . Numerical results in Table 4.1 confirm the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)}$  when  $a_N = N^{0.5}, N^{0.8}, N$ . For  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$ , consistency does not hold when  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ . As the order of  $a_N$  increases,  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$  is consistent, which agrees with our conclusions in

Theorem 3.1.




Figure 4.2: From left to right, each figure shows the QQ-plot of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)} = (\tilde{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}, \tilde{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}, \tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)})$  respectively under  $N = 500$  and  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ . Here the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 2)^\top$ .

For the CC-MNetR model, Figure 4.2 gives the QQ-plot of 1000 estimates of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)}$  when  $N = 500$  and  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ ; it confirms the normality of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)}$  for finite samples. Table 4.2 shows the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)}$  for  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ .

	$\tilde{\beta}_{X_1}^{(ols)}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{X_2}^{(ols)}$	$\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)}$
$N = 100$	1.0032(0.10)	2.0062(0.10)	1.9927(0.14)
$N = 200$	0.9983(0.07)	1.9989(0.07)	2.0094(0.10)
$N = 500$	0.9974(0.05)	2.0002(0.05)	1.9982(0.06)
$N = 1000$	0.9994(0.03)	2.0010(0.03)	1.9978(0.04)

Table 4.2: The average (standard deviation) of 1000 estimates of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(ols)}$  where the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 2)^\top$ .

### 4.3 Performance with measurement error

When measurement error exists, from Theorems 3.3 and 3.4, we see that Assumption 4 is required for the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$ . In this section, we choose weight distributions with significant differences in data generation procedure to ensure that  $B_0$  has a sufficiently large

spectral gap, thereby fulfilling Assumption 4. Also based on the SBM setup, we choose the weighted entries in matrix  $A^{(\ell)}$  to be i.i.d  $U(1, 2)$  and  $\text{Exp}(1)$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ , respectively. Then for each  $A^{(\ell)}$ , we rescale all elements to range between 1 and 2 so that all entries are on a comparable scale. Specifically, if we denote the original elements of  $A^{(\ell)}$  as  $a_{ij}$ , the rescaled elements  $a'_{ij}$  can be calculated using the following formula:

$$a'_{ij} = 1 + \frac{(a_{ij} - \min(A^{(\ell)}))}{(\max(A^{(\ell)}) - \min(A^{(\ell)}))}.$$

The other settings are the same as in Section 4.1. We examine the properties of  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$  with  $N = 100, 200, 500, 1000$  when  $\sigma_b = 0.25$ .

(a)  $a_N = N^{0.5}$

	$\frac{a_N}{\delta}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_1}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_2}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_1}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_2}$
$N = 100$	0.77	0.9952(0.10)	1.9990(0.10)	0.8794(0.73)	3.5993(9.61)
$N = 200$	0.52	0.9968(0.07)	2.0009(0.07)	0.8481(0.84)	6.1348(22.32)
$N = 500$	0.33	0.9978(0.05)	2.0000(0.05)	0.8879(0.82)	9.9986(56.75)
$N = 1000$	0.22	0.9989(0.03)	1.9992(0.03)	0.9367(0.84)	11.0566(121.18)

(b)  $a_N = N^{1.5}$

	$\frac{a_N}{\delta}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_1}$	$\hat{\beta}_{X_2}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_1}$	$\hat{\beta}_{C_2}$
$N = 100$	77	1.0505(0.72)	1.9527(0.51)	0.9164(0.04)	3.0875(0.52)
$N = 200$	104	0.8463(0.50)	2.0655(0.55)	0.8776(0.03)	5.3456(0.86)
$N = 500$	163	0.7587(0.53)	1.9127(0.50)	0.8773(0.02)	10.4453(1.27)
$N = 1000$	224	1.0104(0.47)	1.9073(0.49)	0.8821(0.01)	19.0037(1.79)

Table 4.3: The average (standard deviation) of 1000 estimates of  $\hat{\beta}$  where the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 1, 2)^\top$ .

For  $\hat{\beta}$ , Table 4.3 shows the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X$  while Assumption 4 holds. However, when  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$  and Assumption 4 holds, Table 4.3 clearly reveals the existence of bias in  $\hat{\beta}_C$ ,

and the bias increases with  $N$ .

We also notice that increasing the order of  $a_N$  fails to make both  $\hat{\beta}_X$  and  $\hat{\beta}_C$  consistent simultaneously when measurement error is present. From the theoretical derivation in Section 3, we see that the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X$  requires Assumption 4 to hold. In other words, the order of  $a_N$  should be no larger than that of the spectral gap, while the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C$  requires the order of  $a_N$  to be greater than  $1/l_N$ .

In addition, it is worthwhile pointing out that simply increasing  $a_N$  does not necessarily lead to the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X$  or  $\hat{\beta}_C$ . Here we use the case of  $a_N = N^{1.5}$  as an example. As is shown in Table 4.3(b), when  $a_N = N^{1.5}$ , bias exists for  $\hat{\beta}_X$ , but  $\hat{\beta}_C$  is still inconsistent. Therefore, our numerical results reveal that the C-MNetR model is likely to be unreliable when measurement errors exist.

	$\frac{a_N}{\delta}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{X_1}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{X_2}$	$\tilde{\beta}_Z$
$N = 100$	0.77	0.9952(0.10)	1.9995(0.10)	2.0073(0.18)
$N = 200$	0.52	0.9977(0.07)	2.0007(0.07)	2.0020(0.13)
$N = 500$	0.33	0.9982(0.05)	2.0002(0.05)	2.0082(0.09)
$N = 1000$	0.22	0.9989(0.03)	1.9993(0.03)	1.9991(0.06)

Table 4.4: The average (standard deviation) of 1000 estimates of  $\tilde{\beta}$  where the true value  $\beta = (1, 2, 2)^\top$ .

For the CC-MNetR model instead, Table 4.4 shows the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}$ , which further confirms that  $\tilde{\beta}$  may have more tractable asymptotic behavior in the presence of measurement errors. Overall, the CC-MNetR model exhibits significant advantages in our numerical experiments and provides a more reliable way to analyze multilayer network data with community information.

## 5 Applications to the World Input-Output Database

Due to the numerical stability of the CC-MNetR model as shown in the simulation examples, we now apply it to the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) (Timmer et al., 2015). WIOD covers 28 EU countries and 15 other major countries or regions in the world for the period from 2000 to 2014. Data for 56 sectors are classified according to the International Standard Industrial Classification Revision 4 (ISIC Rev.4). To obtain the multilayer network structure, each node denotes an individual industry sector, and each layer represents the input-output data for a specific country, leading to  $N = 56$  and  $L = 43$ . Detailed information for each sector is listed in Table B.1 of the supplement.

Here each year’s input-output table forms a supra-adjacency matrix  $B_a$  of a multilayer network, and we focus on  $B = B_a + B_a^\top$ , representing the total flow between sectors. Note that  $B$  is symmetric, and we normalized  $B$  such that all variables are on a comparable scale. Specifically, each block in  $B$  is normalized separately by reducing its elements to a range of 0 to 2, following the way  $B$  is partitioned in (2.3). We set  $a_N = \sqrt{NL}$  and the 56 industries can be naturally divided into 20 communities. The community information is also enclosed in Table B.1. We use the input-output table of 2007 and 2014 as an example for our analysis.

Different community-based centrality measures  $Z$  in years 2007 and 2014 are summarized in Figure 5.1, from which we see that the communities corresponding to *Construction*, *Manufacturing*, and *Mining and quarrying* exhibit the highest three centrality scores in the network. Such observation coincides with the fact that these sectors are often considered as the backbone of an economy due to their significant contributions to GDP and employment (Lean, 2001; Szirmai, 2013; Fugiel et al., 2017). In contrast, the communities representing *Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies*, and *Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use*




Figure 5.1: Changes in the centrality of different communities corresponding to industries from 2007 to 2014.

demonstrate the lowest centrality scores within the network.

For our analysis, we choose years 2007 and 2014 to see if there exists any interesting comparison for the period before and after the global financial crisis. The centrality score of the *Construction* sector has declined from 2007 to 2014, potentially reflecting the impact of the crash of real estate market during the financial crisis. On the other hand, communities such as *Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles*, *Human health and social work activities*, and *Administrative and support service activities* have seen a substantial increase in their centrality scores. This may indicate the economic recovery and the gradual shift in the economic structure for the post-crisis period, when sectors like healthcare and services start to have more prominence in the economy.

After admitting the difference in the centrality score  $Z$ , we now focus on the application of the CC-MNetR model to the WIOD data. To choose proper covariates,  $X$ , and the response variable,  $y$ , we consider the Socio Economic Accounts (SEA) data contained in

the WIOD. SEA includes the industry-level data for each country on different aspects that reflect macro-characteristics of different industries, including: employment, capital stocks, gross output, and value-added at current and constant prices, in millions of local currency. The industry classification is consistent with the world input-output tables. Also, since the data in the SEA is organized at the sector level for each country, we calculate the average of sector data across different countries before conducting the regression analysis.

<b>Values</b>	<b>Description</b>
GO	Gross output by industry at current basic prices (in millions of national currency)
II	Intermediate inputs at current purchasers' prices (in millions of national currency)
VA	Gross value added at current basic prices (in millions of national currency)
EMP	Number of persons engaged (thousands)
EMPE	Number of employees (thousands)
H.EMPE	Total hours worked by employees (millions)
COMP	Compensation of employees (in millions of national currency)
LAB	Labour compensation (in millions of national currency)
CAP	Capital compensation (in millions of national currency)
K	Nominal capital stock (in millions of national currency)

Table 5.1: Descriptions of 10 variables contained in SEA.

The description of 10 variables contained in the SEA dataset is summarized in Table 5.1. We choose GO (Gross Output) as the response variable  $y$ , while the remaining 9 variables are considered as potential covariates  $X$ . However, we notice that the Intermediate Input (II) is part of the total flow matrix  $B$ , so is dependent on the community-based centrality score  $Z$ . Therefore, we remove the variable II in our analysis.

Another significant issue in the model specification is the existence of multi-collinearity among covariates. In particular, we find the variables EMP (Number of Persons Engaged),



LAB (Labour Compensation), EMPE (Number of Employees), and H\_EMPE (Total Hours Worked by Employees) having a strong linear relationship, due to their inherent economic interpretations. These variables represent different aspects of employment in the overall economy, and it is common in the economic data for such variables to exhibit high correlation. To resolve this issue, we only retain EMP in our analysis, removing LAB, EMPE, and H\_EMPE to mitigate the concern caused by the multi-collinearity.




Figure 5.2: Scatterplot matrix of 6 variables and the lower panel of this matrix denotes the correlation coefficient between variables.

Variable	VA	CAP	COMP	EMP	K
VIF	38.80	16.34	7.03	3.44	1.41

Table 5.2: VIFs of 5 potential variables

Figure 5.2 shows the pairwise scatter plot matrix of the 6 variables, where the concern on multi-collinearity still exists. To further refine the model, we use the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) to quantify the severity of the multi-collinearity issue in the regression

analysis. The VIF for a specific predictor  $X_i$  is computed as

$$\text{VIF}(X_i) = \frac{1}{1 - R_i^2},$$

where  $R_i^2$  is the coefficient of determination from a regression of  $X_i$  on all the other covariates in the model. VIF measures how much the variance of an estimated regression coefficient is increased due to multi-collinearity. Usually, a VIF value exceeding 5 is regarded as having high multi-collinearity (O'brien, 2007).

After calculating the VIF for each covariates, we remove those with a VIF greater than 5. The VIFs of 5 potential candidates of the covariates based on the data in 2014 are listed in Table 5.2. Among the three variables having VIF larger than 5 (VA, CAP and COMP), we choose to only retain VA in the model. Such refinement leads to a final model that includes only VA (Value Added), EMP (Number of Persons Engaged) and K (Nominal Capital Stock) as covariates. To proceed, we also normalize GO, VA, EMP, and K to have mean 0 and variance 1.

Next, we compare two regression models to evaluate the impact of the community-based centrality score  $Z$ . The R-squared statistic of the first model  $y = \beta X$ , is equal to 0.8152, indicating that approximately 81.52% of the variation in the response variable GO (Gross Output) can be explained by VA (Value Added), EMP (Number of Persons Engaged) and K (Nominal Capital Stock). However, adding  $Z$  as in the CC-MNetR model further increases the R-squared statistic to 0.87. Such an increase demonstrates the importance of including  $Z$  in the regression analysis. In addition, according to the F-test results presented in Table 5.3, the centrality score  $Z$  is associated with a high F-statistic and a small p-value ( $p < 0.001$ ) for both years 2007 and 2014, reinforcing its statistical significance when analyzing the factors influencing GO.

From Table 5.3, for Year 2007, the estimated regression model is

$$\text{GO} = 0.70Z + 0.89\text{VA} - 0.06\text{EMP} - 0.005\text{K} - 0.38,$$

(a) Results of data in year 2007

Variable	Estimate	Std error	F value	p-value	Significance
Z	0.701817	0.113611	84.6779	2.031e-12	***
VA	0.890549	0.068982	334.0376	<2.2e-16	***
EMP	-0.064841	0.062490	1.1361	0.2915	
K	0.005725	0.052783	0.0118	0.9141	
Intercept	-0.377839	0.076335			

(b) Results of data in year 2014

Variable	Estimate	Std error	F value	p-value	Significance
Z	0.61119	0.13186	68.0814	5.895e-11	***
VA	0.95168	0.08106	269.9858	<2.2e-16	***
EMP	-0.13850	0.07592	3.2593	0.07693	.
K	-0.01550	0.05545	0.0781	0.78095	
Intercept	-0.34459	0.08961			

Table 5.3: Estimated coefficients, standard error and Analysis of Variance Table for 2014 and 2007. The “Significance” column indicates the level of significance: \*\*\* for  $p < 0.001$ , \*\* for  $p < 0.01$ , \* for  $p < 0.05$ , · for  $p < 0.1$ .

and that in 2014 is

$$GO = 0.61Z + 0.95VA - 0.14EMP - 0.02K - 0.34.$$

Take the results for Year 2007 as an example, and the coefficient of VA is 0.89, suggesting that a unit increase in VA will raise GO by 0.89 units. This underscores the importance of VA as a key driver in the production process. Since VA represents the gross output minus the cost of intermediate goods and services used in production, it is a direct measure of the efficiency of the production process, thus encapsulating the driving forces of the economic growth and development at the industrial level. However, the negative coefficient for EMP

may reflect the diminishing marginal productivity, where additional labor inputs beyond an optimal point contribute less to the overall Gross Output (GO) due to overcrowding or insufficient complementary capital.

Comparing the estimated model in 2007 with 2014, the positive estimated coefficient for  $Z$  indicates that as the centrality score of a node increases, so does the Gross Output ( $y$ ). This aligns with our common understanding that sectors with extensive connections with other sectors, i.e. that are more central in the network, tend to produce more output. Meanwhile, we observe a decrease in the estimated coefficients for the variable EMP. Additionally, the level of statistical significance for EMP has also augmented, suggesting that the impact of EMP on the response variable GO has been strengthened over time.

## 6 Concluding remarks

Overall, we consider a multilayer network regression framework, where one may have either individual or community-based centrality scores as predictors in the regression. Both theoretical analyses and numerical evidence show that the proposed CC-MNetR model captures the effects of the underlying communities on the behavior of the network, and provide a more accurate and robust model for network analysis.

The real data analysis in Section 5 also aligns with established economic principles, revealing the important role of centrality measures. Moreover, the community-based centrality measure  $Z$  has demonstrated potent significance within the regression model. The estimated positive coefficient indicates a significant linear relationship between a sector's centrality score and its total flow within the input-output framework. The stable estimated values in both years also suggest that the substantial impact of network centrality measures on economic flows remains consistent over time.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12301660; and the Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality under Grant 23JC1400700.

## Disclosure statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

## References

- Allen, F., J. Cai, X. Gu, J. Qian, L. Zhao, W. Zhu, et al. (2019). Ownership networks and firm growth: What do forty million companies tell us about the chinese economy? Available at SSRN 3465126.
- Banerjee, A., A. G. Chandrasekhar, E. Duflo, and M. O. Jackson (2019). Using gossips to spread information: Theory and evidence from two randomized controlled trials. *The Review of Economic Studies* 86(6), 2453–2490.
- Benson, A. R. (2019). Three hypergraph eigenvector centralities. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 1(2), 293–312.
- Cai, J., D. Yang, W. Zhu, H. Shen, and L. Zhao (2021). Network regression and supervised centrality estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.12921*.
- Cai, Y. (2022). Linear regression with centrality measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10024*.
- Davis, C. and W. M. Kahan (1970). The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 7(1), 1–46.

- De Domenico, M., A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Cozzo, M. Kivelä, Y. Moreno, M. A. Porter, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas (2013). Mathematical formulation of multilayer networks. *Physical Review X* 3(4), 041022.
- De Domenico, M., A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Omodei, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas (2013). Centrality in interconnected multilayer networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2906*.
- De Domenico, M., A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Omodei, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas (2015). Ranking in interconnected multilayer networks reveals versatile nodes. *Nature communications* 6(1), 6868.
- Fugiel, A., D. Burchart-Korol, K. Czaplicka-Kolarz, and A. Smoliński (2017). Environmental impact and damage categories caused by air pollution emissions from mining and quarrying sectors of european countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 143, 159–168.
- Holland, P. W., K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks* 5(2), 109–137.
- Jackson, M. O. et al. (2008). *Social and economic networks*, Volume 3. Princeton university press Princeton.
- Khatri, C. and C. R. Rao (1968). Solutions to some functional equations and their applications to characterization of probability distributions. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, 167–180.
- Kolaczyk, E. D. and G. Csárdi (2014). *Statistical analysis of network data with R*, Volume 65. Springer.
- Le, C. M. and T. Li (2022). Linear regression and its inference on noisy network-linked data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 84(5), 1851–1885.

- Lean, C. S. (2001). Empirical tests to discern linkages between construction and other economic sectors in singapore. *Construction Management & Economics* 19(4), 355–363.
- Lin, W., L. Xu, and H. Fang (2022). Finding influential edges in multilayer networks: Perspective from multilayer diffusion model. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 32(10).
- Liu, X. and C. Zhao (2023). Eigenvector centrality in simplicial complexes of hypergraphs. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 33(9).
- Newman, M. E. (2013). Spectral methods for community detection and graph partitioning. *Physical Review E* 88(4), 042822.
- Newman, M. E. and M. Girvan (2004). Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical review E* 69(2), 026113.
- O'brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & quantity* 41, 673–690.
- Palla, G., I. Derényi, I. Farkas, and T. Vicsek (2005). Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society. *nature* 435(7043), 814–818.
- Pothen, A. (1997). Graph partitioning algorithms with applications to scientific computing. In *Parallel Numerical Algorithms*, pp. 323–368. Springer.
- Richmond, R. J. (2019). Trade network centrality and currency risk premia. *The Journal of Finance* 74(3), 1315–1361.
- Rowlinson, P. (1996). D. m. cvetković, m. doob and h. sachs spectra of graphs (3rd edition) (johann ambrosius barth verlag, heidelberg-leipzig 1995), 447 pp., 3 335 00407 8, dm 168. *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society* 39(1), 188–189.

- Slyusar, V. (1999). A family of face products of matrices and its properties. *Cybernetics and systems analysis* 35(3), 379–384.
- Solá, L., M. Romance, R. Criado, J. Flores, A. García del Amo, and S. Boccaletti (2013). Eigenvector centrality of nodes in multiplex networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 23(3).
- Szirmai, A. (2013). Manufacturing and economic development. *Pathways to industrialization in the twenty-first century: New challenges and emerging paradigms*, 53–75.
- Timmer, M. P., E. Dietzenbacher, B. Los, R. Stehrer, and G. J. De Vries (2015). An illustrated user guide to the world input–output database: the case of global automotive production. *Review of International Economics* 23(3), 575–605.
- Tudisco, F., F. Arrigo, and A. Gautier (2018). Node and layer eigenvector centralities for multiplex networks. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 78(2), 853–876.
- van Handel, R. (2017). Structured random matrices. *Convexity and concentration*, 107–156.
- White, S. and P. Smyth (2005). A spectral approach to finding communities in graphs. In *Proc. SIAM Conf. on Data Mining*.
- Wu, M., S. He, Y. Zhang, J. Chen, Y. Sun, Y.-Y. Liu, J. Zhang, and H. V. Poor (2019). A tensor-based framework for studying eigenvector multicentrality in multilayer networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(31), 15407–15413.



## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### A Proof of theoretical results in Section 3

#### A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.2:

Under Assumption 2 and the setting of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{C} - C\|_F^2 &= \|\text{vec}(\hat{C}) - \text{vec}(C)\|_2^2 \\ &= a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

and from Lemma 3.1 we see that  $\|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 = O\left(\frac{\|E_0\|_2}{\delta}\right)$ . Therefore,  $\|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2^2 \leq c\frac{\|E_0\|_2^2}{\delta^2}$  a.s. for some positive constant  $c$ . Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{C} - C\|_F^2 \right] \leq ca_N^2 \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|E_0\|_2^2]}{\delta^2}.$$

Under Assumption 1 and combining with results in Lemmas 3.7, 3.8, and 3.11 in van Handel (2017), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|E_0\|_2] \asymp \sqrt{NL}, \quad \mathbb{E} [\|E_0\|_2^2] \asymp NL.$$

Hence, for fixed  $L$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{C} - C\|_F^2 \right] = O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right).$$

□

In what follows, Lemma A.1 is a powerful tool, which we now explain. It is used in the proofs of Theorem 3.3 and 3.4.

**Lemma A.1.** *Suppose  $A$  and  $B$  are positive semi-definite matrices with the same size  $n \times n$ . Then we have  $\text{tr}(AB) \leq \text{tr}(A)\text{tr}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* From Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\text{tr}(AB) \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_F = \sqrt{\text{tr}(A^2)} \sqrt{\text{tr}(B^2)}.$$

Denote the eigenvalues of  $A$  as  $\nu_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n$ , the eigenvalues of  $B$  as  $\mu_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then  $\sqrt{\text{tr}(A^2)} = \sqrt{\sum \nu_i^2} \leq \sum \nu_i = \text{tr}(A)$ , and similarly we have  $\sqrt{\text{tr}(B^2)} = \sqrt{\sum \mu_i^2} \leq \sum \mu_i = \text{tr}(B)$ . Finally, we have  $\text{tr}(AB) \leq \text{tr}(A)\text{tr}(B)$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

(i) Let  $W_1 = (X, C)$  and  $\beta = (\beta_X^\top, \beta_C^\top)^\top$ , then the OLS estimator is

$$\hat{\beta}^{(ols)} = \arg \min_{\beta_X, \beta_C} \|y - X\beta_X - C\beta_C\|_2^2.$$

Define also that  $\mathbb{L} := \|y - X\beta_X - C\beta_C\|_2^2$ , then setting the partial derivatives of all the parameters as zero leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbb{L}}{\partial \beta_X} &= -\frac{2}{N} X^\top (y - X\beta_X - C\beta_C) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \mathbb{L}}{\partial \beta_C} &= -\frac{2}{N} C^\top (y - X\beta_X - C\beta_C) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} X^\top X \hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} &= X^\top (y - C \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}), \\ C^\top C \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} &= C^\top (y - X \hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)}). \end{aligned}$$

This further implies

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} &= (X^\top (I_N - P_C) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_C) y \\ &= (X^\top (I_N - P_C) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_C) (X\beta_X + C\beta_C + \varepsilon) \\ &= \beta_X + (X^\top (I_N - P_C) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_C) (C\beta_C + \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} &= (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} C^\top (I_N - P_X) y \\ &= (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} C^\top (I_N - P_X) (X\beta_X + C\beta_C + \varepsilon) \\ &= \beta_C + (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} C^\top (I_N - P_X) (X\beta_X + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the projection matrices  $P_C$  and  $P_X$  satisfy  $(I_N - P_C)C = 0$  and  $(I_N - P_X)X = 0$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X &= (X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1}X^\top(I_N - P_C)\varepsilon, \\ \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C &= (C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1}C^\top(I_N - P_X)\varepsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

Also, since  $W$  is column full rank, from the inverse formula for the partitioned matrix, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(W_1^\top W_1)^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} X^\top X & X^\top C \\ C^\top X & C^\top C \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1} & *_{1} \\ *_{2} & (C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1} \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}*_{1} &= -(X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1}X^\top C(C^\top C)^{-1} \\ &= -(X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top C(C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1}, \\ *_{2} &= -(C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1}C^\top X(X^\top X)^{-1} \\ &= -(C^\top C)^{-1}C^\top X(X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1} &= (X^\top X)^{-1} + (X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top C(C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1}C^\top X(X^\top X)^{-1}, \\ (C^\top(I_N - P_X)C)^{-1} &= (C^\top C)^{-1} + (C^\top C)^{-1}C^\top X(X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1}X^\top C(C^\top C)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, both  $X^\top(I_N - P_C)X$  and  $C^\top(I_N - P_X)C$  are symmetric and positive definite.

Next, we consider the asymptotic behavior of

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X &= (X^\top(I_N - P_C)X)^{-1}X^\top(I_N - P_C)\varepsilon \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_C)X\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_C)\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

We start by showing

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top P_C X \xrightarrow{L_1} 0.\tag{A.2}$$

Note that the projection matrix  $P_C$  is idempotent and  $\text{rank}(P_C) = \text{tr}(P_C) = L$ . Therefore, for a fixed  $C$ , there exists an orthogonal matrix  $J = (J_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$  such that

$$JP_CJ^\top = \begin{bmatrix} I_L & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}_{N \times N}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Here we consider each individual element of  $\frac{1}{N}X^\top P_C X$ . Denote  $X = [X_1, \dots, X_P]$ , and we have

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top P_C X = \left( \frac{1}{N}X_i^\top P_C X_j \right)_{i,j=1}^P.$$

Denote the conditional expectation on  $C$  as  $\mathbb{E}^C[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot|C]$ . By (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N}X_i^\top P_C X_j \right| \right] &= \mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N}X_i^\top J^\top \begin{bmatrix} I_L & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} J X_j \right| \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^L \left( \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{li} \right) \left( \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{lj} \right) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^L \mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \left( \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{li} \right) \left( \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{lj} \right) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^L \left( \mathbb{E}^C \left| \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{li} \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E}^C \left| \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{lj} \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the last inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

Since  $J$  is orthogonal, we have  $\sum_{l=1}^L J_{kl}^2 = 1$ , for  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose  $\mathbb{E}[X_{ij}] = 0$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq P$ . Then for  $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^C \left| \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl} X_{li} \right|^2 &= \mathbb{E}^C \left( \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl}^2 X_{li}^2 + \sum_{l \neq l'} J_{kl} X_{li} \cdot J_{kl'} X_{l'i} \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^N J_{kl}^2 \mathbb{E} X_{li}^2 + \sum_{l \neq l'} J_{kl} J_{kl'} \mathbb{E} [X_{li} X_{l'i}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} X_{1i}^2 + \sum_{l \neq l'} J_{kl} J_{kl'} \cdot 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}X_{1i}^2,$$

as  $X_{li}$  and  $X_{l'i}$  are independent for  $l \neq l'$ . Therefore, by (A.4), we have as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_C X_j \right| \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^L \sqrt{\mathbb{E}X_{1i}^2 \mathbb{E}X_{1j}^2} = \frac{L}{N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}X_{1i}^2 \mathbb{E}X_{1j}^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, P\},$$
(A.5)

which further gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_C X_j \right| \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}^C \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_C X_j \right| \right] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{L}{N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}X_{1i}^2 \mathbb{E}X_{1j}^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{L}{N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}X_{1i}^2 \mathbb{E}X_{1j}^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, P\}, \end{aligned}$$

and proves (A.2). Also, (A.2) implies

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top P_C X \xrightarrow{P} 0. \tag{A.6}$$

By the law of large numbers, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top X \xrightarrow{P} V_X, \tag{A.7}$$

where  $V_X$  is a deterministic and nonsingular diagonal matrix. From (A.6) and (A.7) we also obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I - P_C) X \xrightarrow{P} V_X. \tag{A.8}$$

Applying the continuous mapping theorem to (A.8) we conclude

$$\left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I - P_C) X \right)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} V_X^{-1}. \tag{A.9}$$

Now we consider the asymptotic normality of

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X) = \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_C) X \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X^\top (I_N - P_C) \varepsilon.$$

By (A.2), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X^\top P_C \varepsilon \right\|_2^2 \right] = \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N} \text{tr} (\mathbb{E} [X^\top P_C X]) \rightarrow 0,$$

which  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X^\top P_C \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Also, for  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X^\top \varepsilon$ , the central limit theorem gives that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X^\top \varepsilon \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2 V_X).$$

Hence, we arrive at the asymptotic normality result:

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_y^2 V_X^{-1}).$$

(ii) To prove the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C$ , we first point out that

$$\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C = (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon,$$

and examine the  $\ell_2$ -norm of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \varepsilon^\top (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \varepsilon^\top (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \right) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \right] \right) \\ &= \sigma_y^2 \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \right] \right) \\ &= \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} C^\top (I_N - P_X) \right) \right] \\ &= \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( C^\top (I_N - P_X) C (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-2} \right) \right] \\ &= \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $C^\top (I_N - P_X) C$  is positive definite, and we denote its eigenvalues as  $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_L > 0$ . Then we have

$$\text{tr} \left( (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{1}{\mu_i} \leq \frac{L}{\mu_L} = \frac{L}{a_N^2 \sigma_{\min}^2 ((I_N - P_X) V)} \leq \frac{L}{a_N^2 l_N^2}.$$

Thus, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)} - \beta_C \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( (C^\top (I_N - P_X) C)^{-1} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{L}{a_N^2 l_N^2} \right] = \frac{\sigma_y^2 L}{a_N^2 l_N^2} \rightarrow 0,\end{aligned}$$

thereby verifying the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{(ols)}$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2:

Similar to the calculation of (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\beta}_X^{(ols)} - \beta_X &= (X^\top (I_N - P_Z) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_Z) \varepsilon, \\ \tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)} - \beta_Z &= (Z^\top (I_N - P_X) Z)^{-1} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Applying a similar proof strategy to  $\tilde{\beta}_X^{(ols)}$  gives its consistency and asymptotic normality.

Thus, we only need to consider  $\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)}$ , and divide the proof into three steps:

1. Show that  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top P_X Z \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .
2. For  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ , show that there exists a constant  $m > 0$  such that  $\frac{1}{N} \|Z\|_2^2 \geq m$  a.s..
3. Show that  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .

With the above three steps, we conclude that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)} - \beta_Z \right| \\ &= \left| (Z^\top (I - P_X) Z)^{-1} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \right| \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{N} Z^\top (I - P_X) Z \right)^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \right| \\ &\leq \left( m - \frac{1}{N} Z^\top P_X Z \right)^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \right| \\ &\xrightarrow{P} m^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0,\end{aligned}$$

showing the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_Z^{(ols)}$ .

**Step 1:** We start the proof by showing  $\frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X Z \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Note that

$$\frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X Z = \frac{1}{N}Z^\top X \left( \frac{1}{N}X^\top X \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N}X^\top Z,$$

where

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top Z = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_{1i} Z_i \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_{Pi} Z_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Recall from the definition of  $Z$  (2.12) that  $Z$  represents the estimated community-based centrality of nodes, and nodes within the same community share the same value for the centrality measure  $Z$ . Here we rewrite  $Z$  corresponding to  $R$  communities by  $\{Z^{(1)}, \dots, Z^{(R)}\}$  i.e.  $Z = [Z^{(c_1)}, \dots, Z^{(c_N)}]^\top$  where  $Z^{(c_i)}$  denotes the centrality of community  $c_i$  with  $c_i \in \{1, \dots, R\}$  being the community label of node  $i$ . From the definitions of  $Z$  and  $U$ , we observe that

$$L \sum_{k=1}^N Z_k = \sum_{r=1}^R N_r Z^{(r)} = \sum_{i,j} C_{ij}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

which further gives

$$N_r Z^{(r)} \leq \sum_{r=1}^R N_r Z^{(r)} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{L} \sqrt{NL \sum_{i,j} C_{ij}^2} = \frac{\sqrt{N a_N^2}}{\sqrt{L}} = \frac{N}{\sqrt{L}}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Since  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\frac{N_r}{N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \pi_r$ , we then have

$$Z^{(r)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{N}{N_r} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L} \pi_r}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Without loss of generality, we suppose  $\forall 1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq P, \mathbb{E}[X_{ji}] = 0$ , and consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}^{N_r} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right)^2 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N_r} \mathbb{E} [X_{ji}^2] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N_r} \right] \mathbb{E} [X_{ji}^2] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$



since for fixed  $r$ ,  $\frac{1}{N_r}$  is bounded and converges to 0 a.s. so that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N_r} \right] \rightarrow 0$ . In other words, we have shown  $\frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$  and consequently  $\frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Then for fixed community size  $R$ , combining (A.11) and (A.12), we have for  $1 \leq j \leq P$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_{ji} Z_i \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r=1}^R Z^{(r)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{1i} \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{r=1}^R Z^{(r)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{r=1}^R Z^{(r)} \left| \frac{N_r}{N} \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{N}{N_r} \frac{N_r}{N} \left| \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right| \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \left| \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} X_{ji} \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top Z \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} Z^\top P_X Z \xrightarrow{P} 0 \cdot V_X^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

**Step 2:** Now we consider  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top Z$ . Since  $C_{ij} > 0$ , with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \|Z\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N Z_k^2 \sum_{k=1}^N 1 \geq \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N Z_k \right)^2.$$

Combining with equation (A.10) and Assumption 5, we see that

$$\frac{1}{N} \|Z\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{N^2} \frac{1}{L^2} \left( N \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{j=1}^L C_{ij} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|C_i\|_1^2 \asymp \frac{a_N^2}{N} = 1.$$

Hence, with  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ , there exists a constant  $m > 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \|Z\|_2^2 \geq m, \quad a.s.. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

From the results of **Step 1** and **Step 2**, by (A.14) and (A.15), we see that for  $N$  sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}Z^\top(I_N - P_X)Z &= \frac{1}{N}Z^\top Z - \frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X Z \\ &\geq m - \frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X Z > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\left(\frac{1}{N}Z^\top(I_N - P_X)Z\right)^{-1} \leq \left(m - \frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X Z\right)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

**Step 3:** Now we consider the behavior of

$$\frac{1}{N}Z^\top(I_N - P_X)\varepsilon = \frac{1}{N}Z^\top \varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}Z^\top P_X \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

For the first part of RHS of (A.17), here we consider its  $\ell_2$ -norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N}Z^\top \varepsilon \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon^\top Z Z^\top \varepsilon] \\ &= \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|Z\|_2^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

And then we need to calculate  $\mathbb{E} [\|Z\|_2^2]$ . The randomness of  $Z$  arises from both eigenvector centrality and community structure. Therefore, we need to consider  $\|Z\|_2^2$  from a different perspective here. From the definition of  $Z$  in (2.12), we have

$$\|Z\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} \|U 1_L\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|U\|_F^2.$$

By the definition of  $U$  in (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U\|_F^2 &= \|S(H \bullet S^\top C)\|_F^2 \\ &= \|\text{vec}(S(H \bullet S^\top C))\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\text{vec}(A(\omega \bullet B)) = (B^\top \odot A)\omega$  (Slyusar, 1999), then

$$= \|(C^\top S \odot S)H\|_2^2 \leq \|(C^\top S \odot S)\|_F^2 \|H\|_2^2.$$

It follows from the special structure of  $S = [S_1, \dots, S_R]$  that  $\|T \odot S\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^R N_i \|T_i\|_2^2$ , for an  $L \times R$  matrix  $T = [T_1, \dots, T_R]$ , where  $N_i$  denotes the size of community  $i$ . Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|C^\top S \odot S\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^R N_i \|C^\top S_i\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^R N_i \|C^\top\|_F^2 \|S_i\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^R N_i \|C^\top\|_F^2 N_i = \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \|C\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the following upper bound for  $\|Z\|_F^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z\|_F^2 &\leq \frac{1}{L} \|U\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|(C^\top S \odot S)\|_F^2 \|H\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \|C\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} = \frac{1}{L} \|C\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Since for  $1 \leq i \leq R$ ,  $N_i$  is independent from the centrality  $C$ , then (A.19) implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_F^2] \leq \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{E}[\|C\|_F^2] \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}\right],$$

and applying the simple bound  $\sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \leq RN^2$  gives

$$\leq \frac{R}{L} \mathbb{E}[\|C\|_F^2] \sum_{i=1}^R \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{N^2}{N_i^2}\right].$$

Now it suffices to compute  $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{N^2}{N_i^2}\right]$ . Note that here  $N_i > 0$ , so for known  $\{\pi_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq R}$ , the vector  $(N_1 - 1, \dots, N_R - 1)$  follows a multinomial distribution with parameters  $N - R$  and  $\Pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_R)$ . Therefore, marginally  $N_i - 1$  follows  $\text{Bin}(N - R, \pi_i)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{N^2}{N_i^2}\right] &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-R} \frac{N^2}{(k+1)^2} \binom{N-R}{k} \pi_i^k (1-\pi_i)^{N-R-k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-R} \binom{N-R+2}{k+2} \pi_i^{k+2} (1-\pi_i)^{(N-R+2)-(k+2)} \frac{k+2}{k+1} \pi_i^{-2} \frac{N^2}{(N-R+1)(N-R+2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\frac{k+2}{k+1} \leq 2$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^{N-R} \binom{N-R+2}{k+2} \pi_i^{k+2} (1-\pi_i)^{(N-R+2)-(k+2)} < 1$ . Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}\right] \leq R \sum_{i=1}^R \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{N^2}{N_i^2}\right]$$

$$\leq \frac{2RN^2}{(N-R+1)(N-R+2)} \sum_{i=1}^R \pi_i^{-2} = O(1).$$

Then applying (A.19) gives

$$\mathbb{E} [\|Z\|_F^2] \leq \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{E} [\|C\|_F^2] \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \right] = \frac{a_N^2}{L} O(1), \quad (\text{A.20})$$

and with (A.20), we have as  $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} Z^\top \varepsilon \right\|_2^2 \right] = \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|Z\|_2^2] \leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \frac{O(a_N^2)}{L} \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

i.e.  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top \varepsilon \xrightarrow{L_2} 0$ .

For the second part of RHS of (A.17), using (A.13) and the law of large numbers, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} Z^\top P_X \varepsilon = \frac{1}{N} Z^\top X \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} X^\top \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0 \cdot V_X^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

so that  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top P_X \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .

Therefore, combining (A.21), and (A.22), we conclude that  $\frac{1}{N} Z^\top (I_N - P_X) \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$  and completes the proof of Step 3.

## A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Now we consider the situation where measurement errors exist. Let  $\hat{W}_1 = (X, \hat{C})$ , then the two-stage estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &= (\hat{W}_1^\top \hat{W}_1)^{-1} \hat{W}_1^\top y \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} X^\top X & X^\top \hat{C} \\ \hat{C}^\top X & \hat{C}^\top \hat{C} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} X^\top \\ \hat{C}^\top \end{pmatrix} y \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1} & *_{1} \\ *_{2} & (\hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{C})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X^\top \\ \hat{C}^\top \end{pmatrix} y, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} *_{1} &= -(X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1} X^\top \hat{C} (\hat{C}^\top \hat{C})^{-1} \\ &= -(X^\top X)^{-1} X^\top \hat{C} (\hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{C})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} *_2 &= -(\hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{C})^{-1} \hat{C}^\top X (X^\top X)^{-1} \\ &= -(\hat{C}^\top \hat{C})^{-1} \hat{C}^\top X (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\hat{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_X \\ \hat{\beta}_C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) y \\ (\hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{C})^{-1} \hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) y \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since we assume  $y = X\beta_X + C\beta_C + \varepsilon$ , we have for  $\delta_C := C - \hat{C}$ ,

$$\hat{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_X \\ \hat{\beta}_C \end{pmatrix} = \beta + \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) [\delta_C \beta_C + \varepsilon] \\ (\hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{C})^{-1} \hat{C}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_C \beta_C + \varepsilon] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We first consider the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X - \beta_X$ , and observe from (A.23) that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_X - \beta_X &= (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) [\delta_C \beta_C + \varepsilon] \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) X \right)^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C + \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \varepsilon \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as long as we justify the three convergence results below:

1.  $\left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I - P_{\hat{C}}) X \right)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} V_X^{-1}$ ,
2.  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ,
3.  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ,

we are able to obtain the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}_X$ .

**Step 1:** Using a similar proof strategy as for (A.2) gives

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X \xrightarrow{L_1} 0, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

which combined with the law of large numbers leads to

$$\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I - P_{\hat{C}}) X \xrightarrow{P} V_X. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Applying the continuous mapping theorem to (A.25), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I - P_{\hat{C}})X\right)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} V_X^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

**Step 2:** Now we show that  $\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I - P_{\hat{C}})\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Consider the  $\ell_2$ -norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N}X^\top P_{\hat{C}}\varepsilon \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon^\top P_{\hat{C}} X X^\top P_{\hat{C}} \varepsilon] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\varepsilon^\top P_{\hat{C}} X X^\top P_{\hat{C}} \varepsilon)] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top P_{\hat{C}} X X^\top P_{\hat{C}})] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sigma_y^2 \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(P_{\hat{C}} X X^\top P_{\hat{C}})] \\ &= \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] \\ &= \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N} \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X \right] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N} \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X \right\| \right] \right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the convergence is given by (A.24). Therefore,  $\frac{1}{N}X^\top P_{\hat{C}}\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L_2} 0$  and

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top P_{\hat{C}}\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Then combining the law of large numbers with (A.27) gives

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{C}})\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

**Step 3:** For  $\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{C}})\delta_C\beta_C$ , we again consider its  $\ell_2$ -norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{C}})\delta_C\beta_C \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\beta_C^\top \delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\beta_C^\top \delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C)] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top \delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C)] \end{aligned}$$

and applying Lemma A.1 gives

$$\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \text{tr}(\delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C)] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_C \delta_C^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}))];
\end{aligned}$$

since  $I_n - P_{\hat{C}}$  is idempotent, applying Lemma A.1 again leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_C \delta_C^\top) \text{tr}((I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X X^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}))] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top (I_n - P_{\hat{C}}) X)] \\
&= \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \left( \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] - \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, since  $C$  and  $X$  are independent and  $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{N} X_i^\top X_i] < \infty$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, P$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] &= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] \sum_{i=1}^P \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top X_i \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we see from Lemma 3.2 that  $\mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] = O(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2})$ , so

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] = \frac{1}{N} O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right). \tag{A.29}$$

Similar to (A.5), we have for  $i, j = 1, \dots, P$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\hat{C}} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_{\hat{C}} X_j \right| \right] \leq \frac{L}{N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} X_{1i}^2 \mathbb{E} X_{1j}^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\delta_C\|_F^2 \mathbb{E}^{\hat{C}, C} [\text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \|\delta_C\|_F^2 \mathbb{E}^{\hat{C}, C} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X \right) \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \|\delta_C\|_F^2 \mathbb{E}^{\hat{C}} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X \right) \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \|\delta_C\|_F^2 O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right).$$

Additionally, we obtain from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2] O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = \frac{1}{N} O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right) O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta^2}\right). \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Combining (A.29) and (A.30), we have

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] - \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right) - O\left(\frac{1}{\delta^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right).$$

Provided Assumption 3 holds, then as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C \right\|_2^2 \right] &\leq \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) \left( \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] - \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_C\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{C}} X)] \right) \\ &= \text{tr}(\beta_C \beta_C^\top) O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C \xrightarrow{L_2} 0$ , so that  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{C}}) \delta_C \beta_C \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . This completes the proof of Step 3. □

## A.5 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Similar to the calculation procedure of (A.23) in Theorem 3.3, we denote  $\delta_Z = Z - \hat{Z}$ , and

$$\tilde{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\beta}_X \\ \tilde{\beta}_Z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) y \\ (\hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{Z})^{-1} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) y \end{pmatrix}.$$

From the regression model  $y = X\beta_X + Z\beta_Z + \varepsilon$ , we have

$$\tilde{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\beta}_X \\ \tilde{\beta}_Z \end{pmatrix} = \beta + \begin{pmatrix} (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \\ (\hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{Z})^{-1} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \end{pmatrix}.$$

First, we show the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_X$ . Since

$$\tilde{\beta}_X - \beta_X = (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon],$$



then similar to the proof of (A.26) and (A.28), we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{Z}})X\right)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} V_X^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{Z}})\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Thus, it suffices to prove

$$\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{Z}})\delta_Z\beta_Z \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Here we prove (A.33) by computing the  $\ell_2$ -norm of  $\frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{Z}})\delta_Z\beta_Z$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N}X^\top(I_N - P_{\hat{Z}})\delta_Z\beta_Z \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\beta_Z^\top \delta_Z^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z \beta_Z] \\ &= \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_Z^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z)] \\ &= \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_Z \delta_Z^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}))], \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma A.1, we have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_Z \delta_Z^\top) \text{tr}((I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}))] \\ &= \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\delta_Z \delta_Z^\top) \text{tr}((I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X X^\top)] \\ &= \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X)] \\ &= \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} (\mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] - \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X)]). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Now we first calculate  $\mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2]$ . From the definition of  $\hat{Z}$ , we see that

$$\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} \|(\hat{U} - U) \mathbf{1}_L\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|\hat{U} - U\|_F^2.$$

Similar to (A.19), replacing  $U$  and  $C$  with  $\hat{U} - U$ , and  $\hat{C} - C$  respectively yields

$$\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|\hat{U} - U\|_F^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{L} \left\| \left( (\hat{C} - C)^\top S \odot S \right) \right\|_F^2 \|H\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{L} \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

Then by Lemma 3.2, taking expectations on both sides of (A.35) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2] &\leq \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{L} O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right) O(1) = O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.36}$$

Given the upper bound in (A.36), we return to the  $\ell_2$ -norm of  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z \beta_Z$  as in (A.34). Since  $Z$  and  $\hat{Z}$  are independent of  $X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right] < \infty$ , then

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right).$$

In addition, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X)] &= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \mathbb{E}^{\hat{Z}, Z} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X \right) \right] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E}^{\hat{Z}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X \right] \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^P \left( \mathbb{E}^{\hat{Z}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X_i \right] \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{Z}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} X_i^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X_i \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\delta_Z\|_F^2 O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} O\left(\frac{a_N^2 N}{\delta^2} \frac{1}{N}\right) = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{N \delta^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, when Assumption 3 holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z \beta_Z \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
& \leq \beta_Z^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top X)] - \mathbb{E} [\|\delta_Z\|_F^2 \text{tr}(X^\top P_{\hat{Z}} X)] \right) \\
& = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right) - O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{N\delta^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{a_N^2}{\delta^2}\right) \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z \beta_Z \xrightarrow{L_2} 0$  and then  $\frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) \delta_Z \beta_Z \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , completing the proof of (A.33). Finally, combining (A.31), (A.32) and (A.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\beta}_X - \beta_X &= (X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X)^{-1} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) X \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} X^\top (I_N - P_{\hat{Z}}) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \\
&\xrightarrow{P} V_X^{-1} (0 + 0) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

showing the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_X$ .

Now we consider the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_Z$ . Note that

$$\tilde{\beta}_Z - \beta_Z = (\hat{Z}^\top (I - P_X) \hat{Z})^{-1} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon],$$

and we divide the proof of the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_Z - \beta_Z$  to 2 steps:

- **Step 1:** Prove that with  $N$  sufficiently large, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} &\leq \left( m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} \\
&\xrightarrow{P} m^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $m$  is a positive constant.

- **Step 2:** Prove that  $\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .

Assembling the results of **Step 1** and **Step 2**, we obtain that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\left| \tilde{\beta}_Z - \beta_Z \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| (\hat{Z}^\top (I - P_X) \hat{Z})^{-1} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \right| \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I - P_X) \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \right| \\
&\leq \left( m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] \right| \\
&\xrightarrow{P} m^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the consistency of  $\tilde{\beta}_Z$ .

**Step 1:** Given the analogous properties of  $Z$  and  $\hat{Z}$ , similar to (A.13) and (A.14), we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top X \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Then we focus on  $\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \hat{Z}$ . Since  $\frac{1}{N} \delta_Z^\top \delta_Z \geq 0$ , we see that

$$\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \hat{Z} = \frac{1}{N} Z^\top Z - \frac{2}{N} Z^\top \delta_Z + \frac{1}{N} \delta_Z^\top \delta_Z \geq \frac{1}{N} Z^\top Z - \frac{2}{N} Z^\top \delta_Z. \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Then with the upper bound of  $\|Z\|_2^2$  and  $\|\delta_Z\|_2^2$  derived in (A.19) and (A.35), we have

$$\frac{2}{N} Z^\top \delta_Z \leq \frac{2}{N} \|Z\|_2 \|\delta_Z\|_2 \leq \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} \|C\|_F \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}. \quad (\text{A.40})$$

Plugging (A.15) and (A.40) into (A.39), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \hat{Z} &\geq m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} \|C\|_F \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \\
&= m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N \left\| \hat{C} - C \right\|_F \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \\
&= m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2},
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.41})$$

where  $\tilde{u}_1$  and  $u_1$  are as defined in Lemma 3.1. To derive a positive lower bound for  $\frac{1}{N}\hat{Z}^\top\hat{Z}$ , i.e. show that the RHS of (A.41) is greater than zero for  $N$  sufficiently large, we need to show that

$$\frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Here from Lemma 3.1 and  $\|E_0\|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{N})$ , we have

$$\frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 = O_P\left(\frac{a_N^2 \sqrt{N}}{N\delta}\right) = O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\delta}\right). \quad (\text{A.42})$$

Under Assumption 3 and  $a_N = \sqrt{N}$ , we have  $\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\delta} \rightarrow 0$ . As for  $\sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} = \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{N_i^2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{N^2}{N_i^2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sum_{i=1}^R \pi_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{\pi_i^2} < \infty. \quad (\text{A.43})$$

Thus, combining (A.42) and (A.43) gives

$$\frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Then with (A.38), (A.41) and (A.44), for  $N$  large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{Z} &= \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \hat{Z} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \\ &\geq m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} &\leq \left( m - \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{L} a_N^2 \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\|_2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \right)^{-1} \\ &\xrightarrow{P} m^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.45})$$

**Step 2:** Now we consider

$$\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top (I_N - P_X) [\delta_Z \beta_Z + \varepsilon] = \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \delta_Z \beta_Z - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \delta_Z \beta_Z + \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.46})$$

For the first part of RHS of (A.46), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives the upper bound that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \delta_Z \beta_Z \right| \right] = \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \hat{Z}^\top \delta_Z \right| \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \hat{Z} \right\|_2^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \delta_Z \right\|_2^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similar to the calculation leading to (A.19), replacing  $Z$  and  $C$  with  $\hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{C}$  respectively, we have

$$\|\hat{Z}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|\hat{C}\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2}, \quad (\text{A.47})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{Z}\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{L} \|\hat{C}\|_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^R N_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{N_i^2} \right] = \frac{a_N^2}{L} O(1). \quad (\text{A.48})$$

Then combining (A.36) and (A.48), provided Assumption 3 holds, we have as  $N \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \delta_Z \beta_Z \right| \right] \leq \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \frac{a_N}{\sqrt{L}} O(1) O\left(\frac{a_N \sqrt{N}}{\delta}\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\delta}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.49})$$

i.e.  $\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \delta_Z \beta_Z \xrightarrow{L_1} 0$ .

For the second part in the RHS of (A.46), also using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.1, we have the following upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \delta_Z \beta_Z \right| \right] &= \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \hat{Z}^\top P_X \delta_Z \right| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| P_X \hat{Z} \right\|_2^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \delta_Z \right\|_2^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

From (A.48), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| P_X \hat{Z} \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \hat{Z}^\top P_X \hat{Z} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \hat{Z} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \hat{Z} \hat{Z}^\top \right) \text{tr} \left( P_X \right) \right] = P \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{Z}\|_2^2 \right] \leq \frac{P a_N^2}{L} O(1), \end{aligned}$$

and as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \delta_Z \beta_Z \right| \right] = \frac{\beta_Z}{N} \left( \frac{P a_N^2}{L} O(1) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( O\left(\frac{N}{\delta^2}\right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) = o(1). \quad (\text{A.50})$$

For the third part in the RHS of (A.46), also from Lemma A.1 and (A.48) we have as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top \varepsilon \right\|_2^2 \right] = \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \varepsilon^\top \hat{Z} \hat{Z}^\top \varepsilon \right]$$

$$= \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{Z}\|_2^2 \right] \leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{N^2} \frac{a_N^2}{L} O(1) \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.51})$$

Finally, for the fourth part in the RHS of (A.46), with (A.37) and the law of large numbers, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top P_X \varepsilon = \frac{1}{N} \hat{Z}^\top X \left( \frac{1}{N} X^\top X \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} X^\top \varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} 0 \cdot V_X^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0. \quad (\text{A.52})$$

By synthesizing equations (A.49), (A.50), (A.51) and (A.52), we can demonstrate the convergence of (A.46) which completes the proof of Step 2.

□

## B Details of sectors:

According to ISIC Rev.4, industries in WIOD release 2016 are as follows.

No.	Industries	Description	Community
1	A01	Crop and animal production, hunting and related service activities	Agriculture, forestry and fishing
2	A02	Forestry and logging	Agriculture, forestry and fishing
3	A03	Fishing and aquaculture	Agriculture, forestry and fishing
4	B	Mining and quarrying	Mining and quarrying
5	C10-C12	Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco products	Manufacturing
6	C13-C15	Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel and leather products	Manufacturing
7	C16	Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, except furniture; etc.	Manufacturing
8	C17	Manufacture of paper and paper products	Manufacturing
9	C18	Printing and reproduction of recorded media	Manufacturing
10	C19	Manufacture of coke and refined petroleum products	Manufacturing
11	C20	Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	Manufacturing



No.	Industries	Description	Community
12	C21	Manufacture of basic pharmaceutical products and pharmaceutical preparations	Manufacturing
13	C22	Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	Manufacturing
14	C23	Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products	Manufacturing
15	C24	Manufacture of basic metals	Manufacturing
16	C25	Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment	Manufacturing
17	C26	Manufacture of computer, electronic and optical products	Manufacturing
18	C27	Manufacture of electrical equipment	Manufacturing
19	C28	Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c.	Manufacturing
20	C29	Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers	Manufacturing
21	C30	Manufacture of other transport equipment	Manufacturing
22	C31-C32	Manufacture of furniture; other manufacturing	Manufacturing
23	C33	Repair and installation of machinery and equipment	Manufacturing

No.	Industries	Description	Community
24	D	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply
25	E36	Water collection, treatment and supply	Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
26	E37-E39	Sewerage; waste collection, treatment and disposal activities; materials recovery; etc.	Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
27	F	Construction	Construction
28	G45	Wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles
29	G46	Wholesale trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles	Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles
30	G47	Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles	Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles
31	H49	Land transport and transport via pipelines	Transportation and storage
32	H50	Water transport	Transportation and storage
33	H51	Air transport	Transportation and storage
34	H52	Warehousing and support activities for transportation	Transportation and storage
35	H53	Postal and courier activities	Transportation and storage
36	I	Accommodation and food service activities	Accommodation and food service activities

No.	Industries	Description	Community
37	J58	Publishing activities	Information and communication
38	J59-J60	Motion picture, video and television program production, sound recording and music publishing activities; etc.	Information and communication
39	J61	Telecommunications	Information and communication
40	J62-J63	Computer programming, consultancy and related activities; information service activities	Information and communication
41	K64	Financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding	Financial and insurance activities
42	K65	Insurance, reinsurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security	Financial and insurance activities
43	K66	Activities auxiliary to financial services and insurance activities	Financial and insurance activities
44	L	Real estate activities	Real estate activities
45	M69-M70	Legal and accounting activities; activities of head offices; management consultancy activities	Professional, scientific and technical activities
46	M71	Architectural and engineering activities; technical testing and analysis	Professional, scientific and technical activities
47	M72	Scientific research and development	Professional, scientific and technical activities

No.	Industries	Description	Community
48	M73	Advertising and market research	Professional, scientific and technical activities
49	M74-M75	Other professional, scientific and technical activities; veterinary activities	Professional, scientific and technical activities
50	N	Rental and leasing activities, Employment activities, Travel services, security and services to buildings	Administrative and support service activities
51	O	Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
52	P	Education	Education
53	Q	Human health and social work activities	Human health and social work activities
54	R-S	Creative, Arts, Sports, Recreation and entertainment activities and all other personal service activities	Arts, entertainment and recreation; Other service activities
55	T	Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use	Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use
56	U	Activities of extra-territorial organizations and bodies	Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies

Table B.1: 56 sectors and their corresponding communities in WIOD release 2016