

Supplementary Material for
“Simultaneous confidence bands for nonparametric regression
with missing covariate data”

Li Cai¹, Lijie Gu², Qihua Wang¹, and Suojin Wang³

¹*Zhejiang Gongshang University*, ²*Soochow University*, and ³*Texas A&M University*

This supplementary material contains some proofs of the lemmas given in Appendices A.1 and A.2.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $T_n = n^\delta$ with $1/(2 + \eta) < \delta < 1/3$ which together with Assumption (A5) implies that $T_n n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \rightarrow 0$, $T_n^{-(1+\eta)} \ll n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2}$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n^{-(2+\eta)} < \infty$. We truncate the random error as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i &= \varepsilon_{i,1} + \varepsilon_{i,2} + \mu_{in}, & (S.1) \\ \varepsilon_{i,1} &= \varepsilon_i I(|\varepsilon_i| > T_n), \varepsilon_{i,2} = \varepsilon_i I(|\varepsilon_i| \leq T_n) - \mu_{in}, \\ \mu_{in} &= \mathbf{E} \left\{ \varepsilon_i I(|\varepsilon_i| \leq T_n) \middle| X_i \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. Firstly, note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_{in}| &= \left| \mathbf{E} \left\{ \varepsilon_i I(|\varepsilon_i| \leq T_n) \middle| X_i \right\} \right| = \left| \mathbf{E} \left\{ \varepsilon_i I(|\varepsilon_i| > T_n) \middle| X_i \right\} \right| \\ &\leq T_n^{-(1+\eta)} \mathbf{E} \left(|\varepsilon_1|^{2+\eta} \middle| X_1 \right) \leq T_n^{-(1+\eta)} M_\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where M_η is defined in Assumption (A2). It together with Lemma 3 implies

that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \mu_{in} \right| \\
& \leq \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left\{ \frac{h^l}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) |\mu_{in}| \right\} \\
& \leq T_n^{-(1+\eta)} M_\eta h^l \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} |L_{n,0}(x)| \\
& = O_p(T_n^{-(1+\eta)} h^l) = o_p(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2}). \tag{S.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, notice that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P\{|\varepsilon_n| > T_n\} \leq M_\eta \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n^{-(2+\eta)} < \infty.$$

The Borel-Cantelli Lemma implies that

$$P\{\omega: \text{there exists } N(\omega) > 0 \text{ such that } |\varepsilon_n(\omega)| \leq T_n \text{ for } n > N(\omega)\} = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\{\omega: \text{there exists } N_0(\omega) \text{ such that } |\varepsilon_i(\omega)| \leq T_n \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, n > N_0(\omega)\} \\
& = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes that

$$P\{\omega: \text{there exists } N_0(\omega) \text{ such that } \varepsilon_{i,1} = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, n > N_0(\omega)\} = 1.$$

Therefore, for large n ,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_{i,1} = 0 \text{ a.s.} \tag{S.3}$$

Finally, we apply Lemma 1 to deal with $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_{i,2}$.

Notice that $E(\varepsilon_{i,2}|X_i) = 0$ a.s. and

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var}(\varepsilon_{i,2}|X_i) &= E\left\{\varepsilon_i^2 I(|\varepsilon_i| \leq T_n) \middle| X_i\right\} - (\mu_{in})^2 \\
&= E(\varepsilon_i^2 | X_i) - E\left\{\varepsilon_i^2 I(|\varepsilon_i| > T_n) \middle| X_i\right\} - (\mu_{in})^2 \\
&= \sigma^2(X_i) + U_p(T_n^{-\eta} + T_n^{-2(1+\eta)}).
\end{aligned}$$

For $k \geq 3$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(|\varepsilon_{i,2}|^k \mid X_i \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(|\varepsilon_{i,2}|^{k-2} |\varepsilon_{i,2}|^2 \mid X_i \right) \leq (2T_n)^{k-2} \mathbb{E} \left(|\varepsilon_{i,2}|^2 \mid X_i \right).$$

Let $\xi_{i,l,n}(x) = n^{-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_{i,2}$. Then one has $\mathbb{E} \xi_{i,l,n}(x) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \xi_{i,l,n}^2(x) &\leq c_\pi^{-1} n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_{i,2} \right)^2 \\ &= c_\pi^{-1} n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[K_h^2(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^{2l} \left\{ \sigma^2(X_i) + U_p(T_n^{-\eta} + T_n^{-2(1+\eta)}) \right\} \right] \\ &= c_\pi^{-1} n^{-2} h^{2l-1} \sigma^2(x) f_X(x) \int K^2(v) v^{2l} dv \{1 + u(1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} |\xi_{i,l,n}(x)|^k \leq (2n^{-1} h^{l-1} c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty T_n)^{k-2} \mathbb{E} |\xi_{i,l,n}(x)|^2.$$

Therefore, $\xi_{i,l,n}(x)$ satisfies Cramér's Conditions in Lemma 1 with $c = 2n^{-1} h^{l-1} c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty T_n$. Thus, for any fixed $x \in [a_0, b_0]$, large enough $\gamma > 0$, and large enough n ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x) \right| > \gamma n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right\} \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\gamma^2 n^{-1} h^{2l-1} \log n}{4 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \xi_{i,l,n}^2(x) + 4n^{-1} h^{l-1} c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty T_n \gamma n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n} \right\} \\ &= 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\gamma^2 \log n}{4n h^{1-2l} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \xi_{i,l,n}^2(x) + 4c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty \gamma T_n n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n} \right\} \\ &\leq 2n^{-5}, \end{aligned}$$

which holds since $n h^{1-2l} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \xi_{i,l,n}^2(x)$ is bounded and $T_n n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \rightarrow 0$. To further bound $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x)$ uniformly, we discretize $[a_0, b_0]$ by

equally spaced points $u_0 = a_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_{d_n} = b_0$ with $d_n = n^3 - 1$.

Thus, for large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| > \gamma n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{d_n} P \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| > \gamma n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{d_n} 2n^{-5} = 2(d_n + 1)n^{-5} = 2n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P \left\{ \max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| > \gamma n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right\} < +\infty.$$

The Borel-Cantelli Lemma implies that

$$\max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| = O \left(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right) \text{ a.s.}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x) \right| \\ & \leq \max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| + \max_{j=0}^{d_n-1} \sup_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| \\ & = \max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| + \max_{j=0}^{d_n-1} \sup_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left\{ K_h(X_i - x)(X_i - x)^l - K_h(X_i - x_j)(X_i - x_j)^l \right\} \varepsilon_{i,2} \right| \\ & \leq \max_{j=0}^{d_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{i,l,n}(x_j) \right| + (2c_{\pi}^{-1} T_n) h^{l-2} (\|K^{(1)}\|_{\infty} + l \|K\|_{\infty}) d_n^{-1} (b_0 - a_0) \\ & = O \left(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right) \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{S.4}$$

By (S.1)–(S.4), one obtains that

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_i \right| = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right),$$

completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Clearly, for $l = 0, 1, 2$ and uniformly for all $x \in [a_0, b_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{L_{n,l}(x)\} &= \int h^{-1} K \left(\frac{u-x}{h} \right) (u-x)^l f_X(u) du \\ &= \int K(v) h^l v^l f_X(x+hv) dv = h^l f_X(x) \mu_l(K) \{1+u(h)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta_{i,l,n}(x) = n^{-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l - \mathbb{E} \left\{ n^{-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \right\}$. Then $L_{n,l}(x) - \mathbb{E} \{L_{n,l}(x)\} = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,l,n}(x)$. It is clear that $\mathbb{E} \eta_{i,l,n}(x) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{ \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \}^2 &\leq n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi_i} K_h^2(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^{2l} \right\} \\ &\leq n^{-2} c_\pi^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ K_h^2(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^{2l} \right\} \\ &= n^{-2} c_\pi^{-1} f_X(x) h^{2l-1} \int K^2(v) v^{2l} dv \{1+u(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \{ \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \}^2 \leq n^{-1} c_\pi^{-1} f_X(x) h^{2l-1} \int K^2(v) v^{2l} dv \{1+u(1)\}.$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_{i,l,n}(x)| &= \left| n^{-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l - \mathbb{E} \left\{ n^{-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \right\} \right| \\ &\leq 2c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty \frac{h^{l-1}}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $k \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right|^k &= \mathbb{E} \left| \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right|^{k-2} \left| \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \left(2c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty n^{-1} h^{l-1} \right)^{k-2} \mathbb{E} \left| \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right|^2 \\ &\leq k! \left(2c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty n^{-1} h^{l-1} \right)^{k-2} \mathbb{E} \left| \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\eta_{i,l,n}(x)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, satisfy the Cramér's Conditions in Lemma 1 with $c = 2c_\pi^{-1} \|K\|_\infty n^{-1} h^{l-1}$. Therefore, using the inequality in Lemma 1 and the discretization method as in the proof of Lemma 2, one can obtain that

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \right| = O \left(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right) \text{ a.s.}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,l}(x) &= \mathbb{E} \{ L_{n,l}(x) \} + \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,l,n}(x) \\ &= h^l f_X(x) \mu_l(K) + u_p(h^{l+1}) + U_p \left(n^{-1/2} h^{l-1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n,l}(x) &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_i \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \{ m(X_i) - m(x) - m^{(1)}(x)(X_i - x) \}. \end{aligned}$$

When $l = 0$, using Lemma 3, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \{ m(X_i) - m(x) - m^{(1)}(x)(X_i - x) \} \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \{ 2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) (X_i - x)^2 + u_p(h^2) \} \\ &= 2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) L_{n,2} + u_p(h^2) \\ &= 2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) h^2 f_X(x) \mu_2(K) + u_p(h^2), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes that

$$M_{n,0}(x) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \varepsilon_i + 2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) h^2 f_X(x) \mu_2(K) + u_p(h^2).$$

Similarly, when $l = 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x) \{m(X_i) - m(x) - m^{(1)}(x)(X_i - x)\} \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x) \{2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) (X_i - x)^2 + u_p(h^2)\} \\ &= U_p(h^3), \end{aligned}$$

which together with Lemma 2 establishes

$$M_{n,1}(x) = U_p\left(h^3 + n^{-1/2} h^{1/2} \log^{1/2} n\right) = U_p\left(n^{-1/2} h^{1/2} \log^{1/2} n\right).$$

The proof is completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. Since $\pi(y)$ is assumed to follow a parametric model $\pi(y, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and has bounded first order partial derivative with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, it is easy to show that $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |\pi(y) - \hat{\pi}(y)| = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |\pi(y, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) - \hat{\pi}(y, \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is a root- n consistent estimator of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. This together with Lemma 3 implies that there exists some constant $d > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| L_{n,l}(x) - \hat{L}_{n,l}(x) \right| &= \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} - \frac{\delta_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right) K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \right| \\ &\leq dh^l \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i| \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} |L_{n,0}(x)| \\ &= O_p(n^{-1/2} h^l) = O_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, using Lemma 1 and a method similar to that in the proof of Lemma 2, one can verify that

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \left\{ |\varepsilon_i| - \mathbb{E}\left(|\varepsilon_i| \mid X_i\right) \right\} \right| = O_p\left(n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n\right).$$

Meanwhile, it is readily seen that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ and that

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \mathbb{E}\left(|\varepsilon_i| \mid X_i\right) \right\} = O_p(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| M_{n,l}(x) - \hat{M}_{n,l}(x) \right| \\
& \leq \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} - \frac{\delta_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right) K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \varepsilon_i \right| \\
& \quad + \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} - \frac{\delta_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right) K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. \times \{m(X_i) - m(x) - m^{(1)}(x)(X_i - x)\} \right| \\
& \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right| \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| \frac{h^l}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \{|\varepsilon_i| - \mathbb{E}(|\varepsilon_i| | X_i)\} \right| \\
& \quad + \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right| \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left\{ \frac{h^l}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\pi_i} K_h(X_i - x) \mathbb{E}(|\varepsilon_i| | X_i) \right\} \\
& \quad + \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i (\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i)}{\pi_i \hat{\pi}_i} K_h(X_i - x) (X_i - x)^l \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. \times \{2^{-1} m^{(2)}(x) (X_i - x)^2 + u_p(h^2)\} \right| \\
& = O_p(n^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 6(a) By integration by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \zeta_{2n_0}(x) - \zeta_{3n_0}(x) \\
& = h^{1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{K_h(u-x) \varepsilon}{\pi(m(u) + \varepsilon)} d\{Z_{n_0}(u, \varepsilon) - B_{n_0}(T(u, \varepsilon))\} \\
& = h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \frac{K(v) \varepsilon}{\pi(m(x+hv) + \varepsilon)} d\{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, \varepsilon) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, \varepsilon))\} \\
& = h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, \varepsilon) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, \varepsilon))\} d \frac{K(v) \varepsilon}{\pi(m(x+hv) + \varepsilon)} \\
 & + h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \\
 & \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, \kappa_n) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, \kappa_n))\} d \frac{K(v) \kappa_n}{\pi(m(x+hv) + \kappa_n)} \\
 & + h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \\
 & \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, -\kappa_n) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, -\kappa_n))\} d \frac{K(v) \kappa_n}{\pi(m(x+hv) - \kappa_n)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, by (13) and (16), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, \varepsilon) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, \varepsilon))\} \right. \\
 & \left. d \frac{K(v) \varepsilon}{\pi(m(x+hv) + \varepsilon)} \right| = O_p(\kappa_n^2 n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^2 n) = o_p(\log^{-1/2} n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, \kappa_n) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, \kappa_n))\} \right. \\
 & \left. d \frac{K(v) \kappa_n}{\pi(m(x+hv) + \kappa_n)} \right| = O_p(\kappa_n n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^2 n) = o_p(\log^{-1/2} n),
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \left| h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \{Z_{n_0}(x+hv, -\kappa_n) - B_{n_0}(T(x+hv, -\kappa_n))\} \right. \\
 & \left. d \frac{K(v) \kappa_n}{\pi(m(x+hv) - \kappa_n)} \right| = O_p(\kappa_n n^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} \log^2 n) = o_p(\log^{-1/2} n),
 \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6(b) It is clear that the Jacobian of the transformation

T is $f_{X,\varepsilon|\delta=1}(x, \varepsilon)$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\zeta_{3n_0}(x) - \zeta_{4n_0}(x)| = h^{1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \times \\
& \quad \left| \int \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{1}{\pi(m(u) + \varepsilon)} K_h(u-x) \varepsilon d\{B_{n_0}(T(u, \varepsilon)) - W_{n_0}(T(u, \varepsilon))\} \right| \\
& = \left| h^{-1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{1}{\pi(m(u) + \varepsilon)} K\left(\frac{u-x}{h}\right) \varepsilon f_{X,\varepsilon|\delta=1}(u, \varepsilon) dud\varepsilon \right| \\
& \quad \times |W_{n_0}(1, 1)| \\
& = \left| h^{1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{1}{\pi(m(x) + \varepsilon)} \varepsilon f_{X,\varepsilon|\delta=1}(x, \varepsilon) d\varepsilon \{1 + u(1)\} \right| \\
& \quad \times |W_{n_0}(1, 1)| \\
& = U_p(h^{1/2}) = u_p(\log^{-1/2} n).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 6(c) Note that conditional on $\Delta_n = n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\zeta_{5n_0}(x) - \zeta_{6n_0}(x)| \\
& = \left| h^{1/2} \int \left[\{s_n(u)\}^{1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} - 1 \right] K_h(u-x) dW(u) \right| \\
& = \left| h^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 \left[\{s_n(x+hv)\}^{1/2} \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} - 1 \right] K(v) dW(x+hv) \right| \\
& = \left| -h^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 W(x+hv) \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \{ (s_n^{1/2}(x+hv) s_n^{-1/2}(x) - 1) K(v) \} dv \right| \\
& \leq \left| h^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 W(x+hv) \{ s_n^{1/2}(x+hv) s_n^{-1/2}(x) - 1 \} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} K(v) dv \right| \\
& \quad + \left| h^{-1/2} \int_{-1}^1 W(x+hv) K(v) \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \{ s_n^{1/2}(x+hv) s_n^{-1/2}(x) - 1 \} dv \right|. \quad (\text{S.5})
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $s(x)$ and Assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A4), it is easy to see that $s(x)$, $s^{-1}(x)$, and $s^{(1)}(x)$ are uniformly bounded. Meanwhile,

note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} |s(x) - s_n(x)| &= \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \int_{|\varepsilon| > \kappa_n} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2 (m(x) + \varepsilon)} f_{X, \varepsilon | \delta=1}(x, \varepsilon) d\varepsilon \\
 &\leq c_\pi^{-2} \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \int_{|\varepsilon| > \kappa_n} \varepsilon^2 f_{X, \varepsilon | \delta=1}(x, \varepsilon) d\varepsilon \\
 &= c_\pi^{-2} \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} \int_{|\varepsilon| > \kappa_n} \varepsilon^2 f_{\varepsilon | X, \delta=1}(\varepsilon | x) f_{X | \delta=1}(x) d\varepsilon \\
 &\leq c_\pi^{-2} \kappa_n^{-\eta} \sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} |f_{X | \delta=1}(x)| M_\eta / P(\delta = 1) = O(h^2 \log^{-1} n), \quad (\text{S.6})
 \end{aligned}$$

which holds due to (16) and Assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A4). Hence one obtains that $s_n(x)$, $s_n^{-1}(x)$, and $s_n^{(1)}(x)$ are uniformly bounded which implies

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0], v \in [-1, 1]} \left| \{s_n^{1/2}(x + hv) s_n^{-1/2}(x) - 1\} \right| = O(h),$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0], v \in [-1, 1]} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \{s_n^{1/2}(x + hv) s_n^{-1/2}(x) - 1\} \right| = O(h).$$

These equations together with (S.5) conclude

$$\sup_{x \in [a_0, b_0]} |\zeta_{5n_0}(x) - \zeta_{6n_0}(x)| = O_p(h^{1/2}) = o_p(\log^{-1/2} n),$$

completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 7 Clearly, conditional on $\Delta_n = n_0$, $\zeta_{4n_0}(x)$ is a Gaussian process satisfying $E\{\zeta_{4n_0}(x) | \Delta_n = n_0\} = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ \zeta_{4n_0}(x) \zeta_{4n_0}(x') \mid \Delta_n = n_0 \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left[h \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \{s_n(x')\}^{-1/2} \iint_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{K_h(u-x)\varepsilon}{\pi(m(u)+\varepsilon)} dW_{n_0}(T(u,\varepsilon)) \int \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{K_h(u-x')\varepsilon}{\pi(m(u)+\varepsilon)} dW_{n_0}(T(u,\varepsilon)) \right] \\
&= h \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \{s_n(x')\}^{-1/2} \int \int_{|\varepsilon| \leq \kappa_n} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2(m(u)+\varepsilon)} K_h(u-x) K_h(u-x') \\
&\quad \times f_{X,\varepsilon|\delta=1}(u,\varepsilon) du d\varepsilon \\
&= h \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \{s_n(x')\}^{-1/2} \int K_h(u-x) K_h(u-x') s_n(u) du.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, notice that conditional on $\Delta_n = n_0$, $\zeta_{5n_0}(x)$ is also a Gaussian process with mean 0 and covariance function $\mathbb{E} \left\{ \zeta_{5n_0}(x) \zeta_{5n_0}(x') \mid \Delta_n = n_0 \right\}$ equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&h \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \{s_n(x')\}^{-1/2} \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[\int \{s_n(u)\}^{1/2} K_h(u-x) dW(u) \int \{s_n(u)\}^{1/2} K_h(u-x') dW(u) \right] \\
&= h \{s_n(x)\}^{-1/2} \{s_n(x')\}^{-1/2} \int K_h(u-x) K_h(u-x') s_n(u) du \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \zeta_{4n_0}(x) \zeta_{4n_0}(x') \mid \Delta_n = n_0 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\zeta_{4n_0}(x)$ and $\zeta_{5n_0}(x)$ have the same asymptotic distribution, completing the proof. \square