

# Spectral estimation for high-dimensional linear processes

JAMSHID NAMDARI<sup>1,a</sup>, ALEXANDER AUE<sup>2,b</sup> and DEBASHIS PAUL<sup>2,3,c</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Biostatistics & Bioinformatics, Emory University*, <sup>a</sup>[jamshid.namdari@emory.edu](mailto:jamshid.namdari@emory.edu)

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis*, <sup>b</sup>[aaue@ucdavis.edu](mailto:aaue@ucdavis.edu)

<sup>3</sup>*Applied Statistics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata*, <sup>c</sup>[debpaull@ucdavis.edu](mailto:debpaull@ucdavis.edu)

We propose a novel estimation procedure for certain spectral distributions associated with a class of high dimensional linear time series. The processes under consideration are of the form  $X_t = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_{\ell} Z_{t-\ell}$  with iid innovations ( $Z_t$ ). The key structural assumption is that the coefficient matrices and the variance of the innovations are simultaneously diagonalizable in a common orthonormal basis. We develop a strategy for estimating the joint spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices and the innovation variance by making use of the asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of appropriately weighted integrals of the sample periodogram. Throughout we work under the asymptotic regime  $p, n \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$ , where  $p$  is the dimension and  $n$  is the sample size. Under this setting, we first establish a weak limit for the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of the aforementioned integrated sample periodograms. This result is proved using techniques from random matrix theory, in particular the characterization of weak convergence by means of the Stieltjes transform of relevant distributions. We utilize this result to develop an estimator of the *joint spectral distribution* of the coefficient matrices, by minimizing an  $L^{\kappa}$  discrepancy measure, for  $\kappa \geq 1$ , between the empirical and limiting Stieltjes transforms of the integrated sample periodograms. This is accomplished by assuming that the joint spectral distribution is a discrete mixture of point masses. We also prove consistency of the estimator corresponding to the  $L^2$  discrepancy measure. We illustrate the methodology through simulations and an application to stock price data from the S&P 500 series.

*Keywords:* Autocovariance; Empirical spectral distribution; Linear process; Periodogram; Marčenko-Pastur law; Stieltjes transform

## 1. Introduction

There is a growing literature dealing with estimation and prediction problems associated with high-dimensional time series. They are typically driven by scientific applications or problems in economics or other branches of the social sciences. Environmental applications in climatology or environmental sciences involve data collected from large number of sensors over time. Gene expression, neuroimaging and financial data comprise additional well-known instances of high dimensional time series. One characteristic of such data is that the dimension of the observations can be comparable to, or even an order of magnitude larger than, the sample size. This has the adverse effect of making the classical estimators of parameters of traditional time series models significantly biased due to the lack of sufficient degrees of freedom. For instance, it is known in the context of iid  $p$ -dimensional observations that under the asymptotic regime

$$p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty), \quad p, n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.1)$$

the sample covariance matrix is not a consistent estimator of the population covariance matrix. The results presented in this paper are given in the asymptotic regime specified by (1.1).

In classical multivariate analysis, the principal object of focus is typically the sample covariance matrix (e.g., principal component analysis, factor analysis), or the sample cross covariance matrix between

different sets of variables, or some functions thereof (e.g., MANOVA, canonical correlations). Many inference problems in multivariate analysis consequently involve statistics that can be expressed as, or whose behavior is characterized by, the distribution of eigenvalues of appropriate symmetric random matrices, such as the sample covariance matrix or the “Fisher-matrix” involving a pair of sample covariance matrices. The results on the asymptotic behavior of the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of relevant random matrices, especially in regime (1.1), have correspondingly led to modified inference procedures that account for the effects of large dimensions, without taking recourse to additional structural assumptions such as sparsity. Paul and Aue (2014) and Namdari, Paul, and Wang (2021), among others, provide comprehensive reviews of applications of random matrix theory in statistics.

In contrast to classical multivariate analysis, a major focus of multivariate time series analysis is on the estimation of parameters and prediction for stationary linear processes Lütkepohl (2005). One particular object that carries significant information about the behavior of the process is the *spectral density matrix*, which can be estimated from the (multivariate) sample periodograms (cf. Brillinger (2001) for fixed dimension and Zhang and Zhang (2025) for high dimensional time series). In addition, one may be interested in the asymptotic properties of eigenvalues of sample autocovariance matrices. The behavior of the latter can be utilized in statistical inference, for example in determining the model order for a multivariate ARMA process. Also, autocovariances are the building blocks of many estimation and prediction procedures in time series such as the Durbin–Levinson and innovation algorithms Brockwell and Davis (1991).

Since the seminal work of Marčenko and Pastur (1967) establishing the existence of limits of the ESD of matrices of the form  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}^*$ , where the columns of  $\mathbf{X}$  are mutually independent and  $\mathbf{T}$  is a positive semidefinite matrix, numerous mathematical investigations have focused on the behavior of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the sample covariance-type matrices, and functionals thereof. For a detailed account of random matrix theory from a statistical perspective, one can refer to Bai and Silverman (2010). A line of research in this context has been to relax the independence assumption across rows and columns. For instance, Pfaffel and Schlemm (2012) and Yao (2012), modeled the rows of the data matrix as independent stationary linear processes with independent innovations. Other types of dependence structures across both rows and columns have been further studied in Hachem, Loubaton, and Najim (2005, 2006), Bai and Zhou (2008).

Until recently, few results were available on the spectral behavior of sample autocovariance matrices or sample periodograms of high dimensional times series. In addition, the problem of detecting a low-dimensional signal embedded in high-dimensional noise, e.g. through (static/dynamic) factor models, requires understanding the behavior of the ESDs of autocovariances of the noise. Dynamic factor models (DFM) Forni and Lippi (1999) provide a popular modeling framework where a question of interest is the determination of the lag order of the dynamic factors. Jin, Wang, Bai, Nair, and Harding (2014) proposed a method for estimating the lag order and the number of factors that can be obtained by counting the number of “extreme” eigenvalues of the symmetrized sample autocovariance matrices  $S_{n,\tau} := \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-\tau} (Y_t Y_{t+\tau}^* + Y_{t+\tau} Y_t^*)$ , where  $Y_t = [Y_{1t}, \dots, Y_{pt}]^T$  is the observed process such that  $Y_{jt} = b_{j1}(L)U_{1t} + \dots + b_{jM}(L)U_{Mt} + X_{jt}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , the  $U_{kt}$ ’s are underlying common factors, the  $X_{jt}$ ’s are the idiosyncratic terms,  $L$  is the lag operator and the  $b_{jk}(\cdot)$ ’s are polynomials determining the lag order for the dynamic factors. To provide a mathematical basis for their procedure, they first established the existence of the limiting spectral distribution of symmetrized sample autocovariance matrices when the corresponding idiosyncratic process  $X_t = [X_{1t}, \dots, X_{pt}]^T$  has iid entries with zero mean and unit variance.

In the econometrics literature, the idiosyncratic process  $(X_{jt} : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  is typically taken to be a stationary linear process for each coordinate  $j$ . Liu, Aue, and Paul (2015) studied the spectral behavior of symmetrized sample autocovariances of such processes under a more general setting than Jin, Wang, Bai, Nair, and Harding (2014), allowing for correlation across both time and the coordinates of a time

series. Specifically, they assumed that  $(X_t)$  is  $p$ -dimensional linear process such that, up to an unknown rotation, its coordinates are independent stationary linear processes with short range dependence, and established the existence of limiting spectral distributions for symmetrized sample autocovariance matrices. They derived integral equations for the Stieltjes transform of the limiting eigenvalue distribution of  $M(\tau)$ . However, the integrals are with respect to the unknown limiting distribution of the eigenvalues of the coefficient matrices. The class of statistical models under which such results hold was extended further by [Bhattacharjee and Bose \(2016\)](#), who in their study of a multiplicative symmetrization of the sample autocovariance matrices, relaxed the requirement that the coefficients of the time series are simultaneously diagonalizable, by utilizing tools from free probability. One of the key features of these results is the assertion that even at the level of spectral measures, the sample covariances and quantities derived from them (such as the spectral density estimators), are not consistent for their population counterparts. This fact puts into question the validity of traditional methods for estimation and prediction for high-dimensional ARMA processes, and suggests the need for developing more enhanced estimation and model selection techniques for high-dimensional time series.

These considerations, and numerous practical applications involving both estimation and forecasting, underscore a growing need for developing accurate estimators of the spectra of the coefficients of high-dimensional linear processes. However, unlike in the setting of high-dimensional time-independent observations, where such problems have been studied (cf. [Karoui \(2008\)](#), [Ledoit and Wolf \(2015\)](#)), such an estimation procedure for time series data has hitherto been absent. In this paper, we propose a new estimation strategy for the joint spectrum of the coefficient matrices by restricting attention to the class of linear processes studied by [Liu, Aue, and Paul \(2015\)](#).

The main contributions of this paper are as follows. First, we establish the limiting spectral distribution of a weighted integral of the sample periodogram of the linear process. This result, specifically the functional form of the corresponding Stieltjes transforms, is used to derive a set of estimating equations for the joint spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices as well as the covariance matrix of the innovation terms, by equating the Stieltjes transforms of the empirical and the limiting spectral distributions. Secondly, by modeling the joint spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices as a discrete probability distribution over a pre-specified grid, we solve the estimating equations by a numerical optimization procedure. Thirdly, we develop a bootstrap based model selection procedure for selecting the weight functions used in the integrated sample spectral density matrix. Unlike our proposed estimation algorithm, the algorithm developed in [Liu \(2013\)](#) involves numerous numerical integration steps and solving of systems of equations at each iteration of the Newton method which is only feasible for low-order MA processes. As a further methodological innovation, we develop a model selection procedure to identify the best model among candidate models satisfying assumptions in [Section 2](#). This is of particular significance since there are few methods for detecting the order of the underlying linear process in the high dimensional setting beyond the frameworks that assume either sparsity or low rank structures for the coefficient matrices. Finally, by making use of the estimated joint spectral distribution, we also propose an estimator of the spectral density matrices of linear processes under the assumed time series model. This estimator represents estimated spectral density matrices at all frequencies in a common eigenbasis (estimated from data), by utilizing the simultaneous diagonalizability of the coefficient matrices of the linear process. Our application of the proposed methodology to log-transformed stock prices from the S&P 500 series shows the presence of temporal dependence structure among the stocks that goes beyond the dominant factor structure and is not apparent at the level of individual stocks.

The paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we state the main structural assumptions and the key steps involved in the analysis of the spectral distribution of sample covariance and autocovariances of the linear process satisfying these assumptions. This is followed by the main theoretical result in the paper, which establishes and describes the limiting spectral distribution of weighted integral of the sample periodogram. We propose the estimation procedure for the spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices in [Section 3.1](#) and then introduce the model selection procedure in [Section 6](#). In [Section](#)

5, we prove the consistency of the proposed estimator under an  $L^2$  discrepancy measure and assuming that the joint spectral distribution of the coefficients is a discrete mixture. In Section 7, we examine the performance of our estimation and model selection procedure through simulation studies. Section 8 is devoted to the analysis of S&P 500 data. Discussions on the results and further research directions are provided in Section 9. Proof details are given in the Appendix. All the plots and tables are provided in the Supplementary Materials, Section B.1.

## 2. Spectral distributions of weighted integrals of the sample periodogram

Let the data matrix  $\mathbf{X}_n = [X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be obtained from a  $p$ -dimensional linear process ( $X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) given by

$$X_t = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_\ell Z_{t-\ell},$$

where the innovations ( $Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) are iid with zero mean and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . We impose the following structural assumptions on ( $X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}$ ). Let  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_0$  denote the set of positive and nonnegative integers, respectively.

- A.0** The process ( $Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) is represented as  $Z_t = \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{Z}_t$  where  $\Sigma^{1/2}$  is a square-root of  $\Sigma$ , and the  $p$ -dimensional vectors  $\tilde{Z}_t$  have iid entries  $\tilde{Z}_{jt}$  satisfying one of the following conditions:
- (for complex-valued processes):  $\tilde{Z}_{jt}$  is complex valued, with zero mean, and  $\mathbb{E}[\Re(\tilde{Z}_{jt})^2] = \mathbb{E}[\Im(\tilde{Z}_{jt})^2] = 1/2$  where  $\Re(\tilde{Z}_{jt})$  and  $\Im(\tilde{Z}_{jt})$  are the real and imaginary parts of  $\tilde{Z}_{jt}$ , which are independent, and  $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_{jt}|^4] < \infty$ ;
  - (for real-valued processes):  $\tilde{Z}_{jt}$  is real-valued, with zero mean,  $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_{jt}|^2] = 1$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_{jt}|^4] < \infty$ .
- A.1** The matrices ( $\mathbf{A}_\ell : \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ) are simultaneously diagonalizable, random Hermitian matrices, independent of ( $Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}$ ), satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}_\ell\| \leq \bar{\lambda}_\ell$  for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and large  $p$  with

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \bar{\lambda}_\ell < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \ell \bar{\lambda}_\ell < \infty.$$

- A.2** There is a compact subset  $\mathbb{K}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  for some  $m < \infty$ , and there are differentiable functions  $f_\ell : \mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , such that  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|f'_\ell\|_\infty < \infty$ , where  $f'_\ell$  denotes the derivative of  $f_\ell$ . For each  $p$ , there is a set of points  $\lambda_{p,1}, \dots, \lambda_{p,p} \in \mathbb{K}$ , not necessarily distinct, and a unitary  $p \times p$  matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  such that

$$\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{U} = \text{diag}(f_\ell(\lambda_{p,1}), \dots, f_\ell(\lambda_{p,p})), \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N},$$

and  $f_0(\lambda) = 1$ . In addition, we assume that  $\mathbf{U}^* \Sigma \mathbf{U} = \text{diag}\{\sigma_{p,1}, \dots, \sigma_{p,p}\}$ , where  $\sigma_{p,1}, \dots, \sigma_{p,p} \in \mathbb{K}_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathbb{K}_\sigma$  compact.

- A.3** Let  $\lambda_k = (\lambda_{p,k}, \sigma_{p,k})$  for  $k = 1, \dots, p$ , where  $\lambda_{p,k} = (\lambda_{p,k}^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{p,k}^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{K}$  are as above. Then the empirical distribution of  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p\}$ , denoted by  $F_p^{A, \Sigma}$ , converges weakly to a probability distribution function  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ .

We first give a brief interpretation of these assumptions. The simultaneous diagonalizability of the coefficient matrices ( $\mathbf{A}_\ell$ ) and the innovation variance  $\Sigma$  imply that, after a rotation in the orthogonal (or

unitary, in the complex case) basis  $\mathbf{U}$ , the coordinates of the transformed linear process  $(\mathbf{U}^* X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  are uncorrelated stationary linear processes (independent if the process  $(X_t)$  is Gaussian). The conditions in **A.1** and **A.2** imply that the linear process  $(X_t)$  only has short range dependence. The description of the *joint spectral distribution*  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  in **A.3** entails that the model for  $(\mathbf{U}^* X_t)$  can be thought of as a random effects model, with the underlying “random effects”  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p\}$  determining the parameters  $((f_\ell(\lambda_{p,k}) : \ell \in \mathbb{N}), \sigma_{p,k})$  of the  $k$ -th *coordinate process* of  $(\mathbf{U}^* X_t)$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, p$ .

Let  $\lambda = (\lambda, \sigma) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}_\sigma$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ ,  $\sigma \in \mathbb{K}_\sigma$ . For any such  $\lambda$  and any  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ , define

$$\psi(\lambda, \theta) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} e^{il\theta} \sigma f_l(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\lambda, \theta) = |\psi(\lambda, \theta)|^2. \quad (2.1)$$

Notice that  $h(\lambda_k, \theta)$  is the spectral density (up to a multiplier of  $1/(2\pi)$ ) of the  $k$ -th coordinate process. The class of models considered thus includes ARMA processes of finite order that satisfy the assumption of simultaneous diagonalizability of their coefficient matrices and the innovation covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ .

The main objective of this section is to establish the limiting distribution of eigenvalues of matrices of the form

$$\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n g(\theta_t) \tilde{X}_t \tilde{X}_t^* = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \mathbf{W}_g^2 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^*, \quad \theta_t = \frac{2\pi t}{n}, \quad (2.2)$$

where rows of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n$  are discrete Fourier transforms of the corresponding rows of  $\mathbf{X}_n$ ,  $g$  an appropriately chosen weight function satisfying assumption **A.4** below, and

$$\mathbf{W}_g = \text{diag}\{\sqrt{g(\theta_1)}, \dots, \sqrt{g(\theta_n)}\}.$$

Notice that in the definition of  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$ , the matrix  $\tilde{X}_t \tilde{X}_t^*$  can be identified as the (multivariate) sample periodogram of the observed process  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  at the discrete Fourier frequency  $\theta_t$ . This justifies referring to  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$  as a weighted integral of the sample periodogram. The role of the *weight function*  $g$  is to provide a contrast across frequency bands and thereby focus on different features of the time dependence. The nature of such functions will become clear when we discuss the spectrum estimation procedure and deduce consistency of such estimators.

We study the asymptotic behavior of the ESD of  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$  by focusing on the ESD of the *dual* matrix

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}_g \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \mathbf{W}_g \quad (2.3)$$

which has the same set of nonzero eigenvalues as  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$ . To this end, denote the ESD of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}$  by

$$F_g^{(n)}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_j^g \leq x\}},$$

where  $\xi_1^g, \dots, \xi_n^g$  are the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  is the indicator function. We prove that the random distributions  $F_g^{(n)}$  converge almost surely to a nonrandom limiting distribution under the following additional assumption on the function  $g$ .

**A.4** Let  $g : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a bounded function such that  $|g(\theta_2) - g(\theta_1)| \leq c_g |\theta_2 - \theta_1|$  for some constant  $c_g > 0$ .

To establish an almost sure limit of the ESD  $F_g^{(n)}$  of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}$ , referred to as the limiting spectral distribution (LSD), we make use of techniques that rely on the *Stieltjes transform* of the ESD. One may refer to the monograph [Bai and Silverstein \(2010\)](#) for details on the use of Stieltjes transforms in proving limit laws for random matrices. The Stieltjes transform of a distribution function  $F$  on the real line is the function

$$s_F : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+, \quad z \mapsto s_\mu(z) = \int \frac{1}{\lambda - z} \mu(dx),$$

where  $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{x + iy : x \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0\}$  denotes the upper half of the complex plane. The key role of this transformation in this context is the assertion that, subject to mild regularity conditions, pointwise convergence of the Stieltjes transform of a sequence of probability distributions  $\{P_n\}$  to the Stieltjes transform of a probability distribution  $P$  establishes the convergence in distribution of the sequence  $\{P_n\}$  to  $P$ .

We now state the main result that describes in the limiting spectral distribution associated with the sequence of matrices  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Consider the linear process  $(X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  satisfying assumptions **A.0–A.4**, and suppose that  $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$  as  $p, n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then,  $F_g^{(n)}$  converges almost surely to a nonrandom probability distribution  $F_g$  with Stieltjes transform  $\mathcal{S}_g(z)$  determined by the equations*

$$\mathcal{S}_g(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{cM_g(z, \theta) - z} d\theta, \quad (2.4)$$

$$K_g(\lambda, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta)h(\lambda, \theta)}{cM_g(z, \theta) - z} d\theta, \quad (2.5)$$

$$M_g(z, \theta) = \int \frac{g(\theta)h(\lambda, \theta)}{1 + K_g(\lambda, z)} dF^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $K_g : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$  is the unique solution to (2.5) subject to the restriction that  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  is a Stieltjes transform with total mass  $m_\lambda^{(g)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} g(\theta)h(\lambda, \theta) d\theta$ .

An outline of the proof of Theorem 2.1 is given in Section A.1 of the Appendix. A key step is to establish the *deterministic equivalent* of the resolvent matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_g(z) = (\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}(z) - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}$  (one may refer to [Liu, Aue, and Paul \(2015\)](#) or [Namdari \(2018\)](#) for details of this approach). This deterministic equivalent can then be used to derive approximating equations for the Stieltjes transform of  $F_g^{(n)}$ , i.e., for the function

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}_g^{(n)}(z) = \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}[\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_g(z)], \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \quad (2.7)$$

It is sufficient to focus attention on  $\mathbb{C}^+$  because Stieltjes transforms only defined over the closure of this domain can be used to characterize the distributions, and also since the function is analytic over the same domain.

It is shown in course of the proof of Theorem 2.1 that the approximating equation for the limiting Stieltjes transform involves the *Stieltjes kernel* function

$$\hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda, z) = \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}[\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_g(z) \mathbf{W}_g \Psi^*(\lambda) \Psi(\lambda) \mathbf{W}_g], \quad (2.8)$$

where  $\Psi(\lambda) = \text{diag}\{\psi(\lambda, \theta_1), \dots, \psi(\lambda, \theta_n)\}$ . It is also part of the assertion in Theorem 2.1 that the limiting equations (2.4)–(2.6) linking  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g^{(n)}(z)$  and  $\hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda, z)$  fully determine the LSD of weighted integral  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$  of the sample periodogram. These objects will play a crucial role in the estimation procedure to be introduced.

### 3. Estimation procedure

Utilizing results obtained in Section 2, we propose an estimation and model selection procedure. Before getting into the machinery of our algorithm, a few words about the intuition behind the choice of  $\mathbf{S}_n^{(g)}$  in (2.2) and the role of the associated weighting matrix  $\mathbf{W}_g$  are in order. The choice of an appropriate window  $\mathbf{W}_g$  in the frequency domain, followed by locally integrating the area under the curve of the resulting weighted sample periodogram, allows for a better discrimination of linear processes by isolating frequency bands that differ most in their contribution to the variance of the time series. Formally, for a function  $g$  with support in a neighborhood of a given frequency, the *locally integrated spectral density* is  $\int_0^{2\pi} g(\theta) f(\theta) d\theta$ , where

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(h) e^{-ih\theta}, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi,$$

and  $\Gamma(h)$  is the autocovariance function of a stationary process at lag  $h$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{S}_n^{(g)}$  is its sample counterpart.

#### 3.1. Spectral estimation procedure

To establish the estimation procedure, we use a formulation similar to that in Karoui (2008), assuming that  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  is (or can be approximated by) a discrete mixture of point masses. Then, equations (2.4), (2.5), and (2.6) provide a way of estimating  $F^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda)$  as follows. Suppose that  $F^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda)$  is a mixture of point masses at the grid points  $\Lambda^0 = \{\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_J^0\} \subset \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}_\sigma$ , for some  $J \geq 1$ , that is

$$F^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \mathbb{I}\{\lambda_j^0 \leq \lambda\},$$

where  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_J \geq 0$  with  $\sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j = 1$ . Based on Theorem 2.1, we expect that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{S}}_g^{(n)}(z) &\approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{cM_g(z, \theta|\omega) - z} d\theta, \\ \hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda_j^0, z) &\approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{cM_g(z, \theta|\omega) - z} d\theta, \quad j = 1, \dots, J, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_J)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g^{(n)}(z), \hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda_j^0, z)$  are as in (2.7) and (2.8), respectively,

$$M_g(z, \theta|\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \frac{g(\theta) h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g(\lambda_j^0, z)},$$

and

$$\omega \in \Delta^J = \left\{ \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_J) : x_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^J x_j = 1 \right\}.$$

However,  $M_g(z, \theta | \omega)$  is a function of  $K_g(\lambda_j^0, z)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , which also depends on  $F^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda)$ . Our approach rests on finding a consistent estimator for  $K_g(\lambda_j^0, z)$ . In the algorithm stated below, we use a fixed point iteration to estimate  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}_\sigma$ , where the starting value  $\hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda, z)$  is defined in (2.8), which itself can be shown to be pointwise consistent for  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  by following the arguments used in proving Theorem 2.1.

#### Algorithm

Set  $K_g^{(1)}(\lambda, z) = \hat{K}_g^{(n)}(\lambda, z)$ .

For  $i = 1, \dots, I$  compute

$$M_g^{(i)}(z, \theta | \omega) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \frac{g(\theta) h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g^{(i)}(\lambda_j^0, z)},$$

$$K_g^{(i+1)}(\lambda, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) h(\lambda, \theta)}{c M_g^{(i)}(z, \theta | \omega) - z} d\theta.$$

end.

The estimate of  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  is the cdf that minimizes the distance between  $\mathcal{S}_g(z)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g(z)$  for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_D\} \subset \mathbb{C}^+$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  is a collection of functions satisfying assumption A.4 and  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}$  are prespecified. Denoting  $\{\hat{\mathcal{S}}\} = \{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g(z) : g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$  and  $\{\mathcal{S}\} = \{\mathcal{S}_g(z | \omega) : g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ , the problem is to find

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\Delta^J} \left\{ \mathcal{L} \left( \{\hat{\mathcal{S}}\}, \{\mathcal{S}\} \right) := \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{\mathcal{S}}_g(z_d), \mathcal{S}_g(z_d | \omega) \right) \right\}$$

for an appropriate choice of loss function  $\mathcal{L}$ , where

$$\mathcal{S}_g(z | \omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{c M_g(z, \theta | \omega) - z} d\theta.$$

In practice, we can choose any  $L^\kappa$  loss with  $\kappa \geq 1$ . For the numerical studies and theoretical analysis, we restrict attention to  $\kappa = 1$  and  $\kappa = 2$ .

Note that the dimension  $J$  of  $\omega \in \Delta^J$  increases exponentially with the order of the process: If each of the marginal spectral distributions of  $\Sigma$  and of the coefficient matrices of the AR( $q$ ) process is a mixture of  $r$  point masses then the dimension of  $\omega$  is  $J = r^q$ . The optimization becomes therefore increasingly difficult. To address this difficulty, one possibility is to reduce the number of parameters through imposing that the joint distribution of the eigenvalues is the product of the marginal distributions. For instance, if the marginal distributions of the  $k$ -th coefficient matrices of an AR( $q$ ) process are mixtures of point masses at  $\Lambda^{(k)} = \{\tau_1^{(k)}, \dots, \tau_{r_k}^{(k)}\}$  and the marginal distribution corresponding to  $\Sigma$  is a mixture of point masses at  $\Lambda^{(q+1)} = \{\tau_1^{(q+1)}, \dots, \tau_{r_{q+1}}^{(q+1)}\}$ , i.e.,

$F^{A_k}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_k} \omega_i^{(k)} \mathbb{I}\{\tau_i^{(k)} \leq x\}$ , and  $F^\Sigma(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_{q+1}} \omega_i^{(q+1)} \mathbb{I}\{\tau_i^{(q+1)} \leq x\}$ , then  $F^{A,\Sigma} = F^{A_1} \dots F^{A_q} F^\Sigma$  and  $\Lambda^0 = \Lambda^{(1)} \times \dots \times \Lambda^{(q+1)}$ . Moreover, denoting  $\underline{\omega}^{(k)} = \{\omega_1^{(k)}, \dots, \omega_{r_k}^{(k)}\}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, q+1$ , the optimization is over  $\Delta = \{\cup_{k=1}^{q+1} \omega^{(k)} : \sum_{i=1}^{r_k} \omega_i^{(k)} = 1, k = 1, \dots, q+1\}$ . Note that the dimension of  $\omega \in \Delta$  is  $\sum_{k=1}^{q+1} r_k$ , which is much smaller than  $J = \prod_{k=1}^{q+1} r_k$ .

## 4. Estimation of the spectral density matrix

It is important to emphasize that the estimation of the *joint spectral distribution*  $F^{A,\Sigma}$  of  $(\{\mathbf{A}_\ell\}, \Sigma)$  does not automatically lead to an estimate of the eigenvalues of the latter matrices. This is unlike in the case of estimating the spectrum of a covariance matrix when the observations are iid. In that setting, if  $F^\Sigma$  denotes the limiting spectral distribution of  $\Sigma_p$ , the  $p \times p$  covariance matrix of the data, then we can estimate the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_p$  from the estimate  $\widehat{F}^\Sigma$ , for example by setting  $\widehat{\lambda}_j = (\widehat{F}^\Sigma)^{-1}(1 - j/(p+1))$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , where  $(\widehat{F}^\Sigma)^{-1}$  denotes the inverse (or, the quantile) function of  $\widehat{F}^\Sigma$ .

In our setting, the problem stems at the least from the fact that  $F^{A,\Sigma}$  is a multivariate distribution. Since the eigenvalues  $\lambda_k = (\lambda_{p,k}, \sigma_k)$  are multidimensional, there is no “natural ordering”. If we can, however, impose a meaningful ordering based on the structure of  $\widehat{F}^{A,\Sigma}$ , and we have a reasonable estimate of  $\mathbf{U}$ , say  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$ , then we can obtain an estimate of each  $\mathbf{A}_\ell$  and  $\Sigma$  by making use of respective spectral decompositions. Below we describe an estimation procedure for the spectral density matrix of the process that is rotationally equivariant, and depends on an empirical ordering of the eigenvectors, which are estimated from the data, based on a fixed “target” function of the spectral density matrices. This common estimated eigenbasis is then used to represent the estimated spectral density matrix at all frequencies.

### 4.1. Estimation procedure

1. Let  $g_0$  be a positive-valued function on  $[0, 2\pi]$ . Then compute  $\mathbf{S}_{g_0}$ , the integrated spectral density matrix associated with the weight  $g_0$ . For example, if  $g_0 \equiv 1$ , then  $\mathbf{S}_{g_0}$  is simply the integrated spectral density matrix.
2. Perform spectral decomposition of  $\mathbf{S}_{g_0}$  and let  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$  be the matrix of eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{S}_{g_0}$ , ordered according to the (decreasing) order of eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{S}_{g_0}$ .
3. Since  $\widehat{F}^{A,\Sigma}$  is a discrete mixture, we represent it by the pairs  $(\lambda_j^0, \widehat{\omega}_j)$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , where  $\{\lambda_j^0\}$  are the grid points and  $\{\widehat{\omega}_j\}$  the corresponding estimated weights.
4. Order the grid points, and denote the ordered elements by  $\lambda_{(j)}^0$ , where the ordering is done by decreasing values of the scalar quantities

$$m_j(g_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int g_0(\theta) h(\lambda_j^0, \theta) d\theta.$$

Ties may be broken arbitrarily. Note that the quantities  $m_j(g_0)$  are the distinct eigenvalues of the integrated population spectral density matrix, where the integration is w.r.t.  $g_0$ .

5. Let  $\widehat{p}_j = \lceil p\widehat{\omega}_j \rceil$  where  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the closest integer approximation to  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , with corresponding integers  $p_{(j)}$  ordered according to the scheme above. Note that we need to ensure that  $\sum_j \widehat{p}_j = p$ . We may have to “prune” or threshold the small values of  $\widehat{\omega}_j$  to achieve this goal.

6. Define the estimator of the spectral density matrix at frequency  $\theta$  to be

$$\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(\theta) = \widehat{\mathbf{U}} \operatorname{diag} \left( (h(\lambda_j^0, \theta) I_{\widehat{p}(j)})_{j=1}^J \right) \widehat{\mathbf{U}}^*.$$

Observe that the estimates of  $\mathbf{H}(\theta)$  thus obtained are symmetric (Hermitian) and simultaneously diagonalizable. However, in general, the estimator and its actual performance may depend on the specification of the function  $g_0$ . One can also consider estimators of the spectral density matrix for a collection of different functions  $g_0$ , and then perform model selection or model averaging across these estimates, with the goal of improving fidelity to the data. Another option is to try to impose an ordering among the elements  $\{\lambda_j^0\}$  by searching over all plausible permutations of the indices that lead to the greatest fidelity to the observed data. In the interest of keeping the discussions more focused, we do not pursue these aspects here.

## 5. Consistency under the $L^2$ loss

In this section, we show that when the grid for representing the joint spectral distribution  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  is known, so that the model for the joint spectrum is parametric, the estimator obtained by minimizing the  $L^2$  discrepancy measure for the Stieltjes transforms is consistent. To present the main result, we first fix notations. Let  $F^{A, \Sigma}(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \delta_{\lambda_j^0}$  for some  $\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_J^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  and let  $\omega^0 := (\omega_1^0, \dots, \omega_J^0) \in \Delta^J$  (the unit simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^J$ ) be the LSD of the empirical measure of  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ .

Using Theorem 2.1 and the intermediate steps of the proof, we conclude that as  $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$ , under assumptions **A.0–A.4**, for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup [-\bar{a}, -a]$  (for  $0 < a < \bar{a} < \infty$ ), we have

$$S_g^{(n)}(z) \xrightarrow{a.s.} S_g(z), \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$K_g^{(n)}(\lambda_j^0, z) \xrightarrow{a.s.} K_g(\lambda_j^0, z) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$S_g(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{cM_g^0(z, \theta) - z} \quad (5.3)$$

$$K_g^0(\lambda, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta)h(\lambda, \theta)d\theta}{cM_g^0(z, \theta) - z} \quad (5.4)$$

$$M_g^0(z, \theta) = g(\theta) \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z)}. \quad (5.5)$$

Given  $\Lambda_J^0 := (\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_J^0)$ , we estimate  $F^{A, \Sigma}$  (equivalently  $\omega$ ) by solving the optimization problem

$$\widehat{\omega} = \arg \min_{\omega \in \Delta^J} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left| S_g^{(n)}(z) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left( c_n g(\theta) \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g^{(n)}(\lambda_j^0, z)} - z \right)^{-1} d\theta \right|^2, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $c_n = p/n$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a finite collection of points in a closed and bounded subset of  $\mathbb{C}^+$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a finite collection of nonnegative,  $C^1$  functions on  $[0, 2\pi]$ .

## 5.1. Sufficient condition for consistency

The core assumption is that the support of  $F^{A,\Sigma}$  is a subset of the known grid  $\Lambda_J^0$ . Let  $\omega^0$  be the *true parameter*, which may possibly belong to the boundary of the simplex  $\Delta^J$ . Let  $\mathbf{B}$  be any fixed  $J \times (J-1)$  matrix of rank  $J-1$  such that  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{1}_J = 0$ . Then, any  $\omega \in \Delta^J$  can be expressed as

$$\omega = \omega^0 + \mathbf{B}\eta, \quad \text{for some } \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{J-1}.$$

Indeed, the above provides a reparameterization of  $\omega$  that we use below. We have the following result that provides a sufficient condition for consistency of the estimator  $\widehat{\omega}$  defined in (5.6).

**Theorem 5.1.** *Suppose that assumptions A.0–A.4 hold. Provided that  $D \geq J$  and  $z_1, \dots, z_D$  are distinct, a sufficient condition for consistency of the estimator  $\widehat{\omega}$  is that, the matrix  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite, where*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) \mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) d\theta}{(cM_g^0(z, \theta) - z)^2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) \mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) d\theta}{(cM_g^0(z, \theta) - z)^2} \right)^*, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $M_g^0(z, \theta)$  is as in (5.5) and  $K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z)$  is as in (5.4), and

$$\mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) = \left( \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z)} \right)_{j=1}^J. \quad (5.8)$$

## 5.2. Special cases

### 5.2.1. Independent observations

In this case,  $X_t = \mathbf{A}_0 Z_t$ , so that  $\Sigma = \mathbf{A}_0^2 = \text{Var}(X_t)$ . Then,  $F^{A,\Sigma} \equiv F^\Sigma = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \delta_{\lambda_j^0}$  is the LSD of  $\Sigma$ , where  $\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_J^0$  are distinct nonnegative real numbers.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  to be the set containing the function  $g_0(\theta) \equiv 1$ . Provided that  $D \geq J$  and  $z_1, \dots, z_D$  are distinct, the matrix  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite.*

Note that Proposition 5.1 shows that, under the stated conditions, the proposed estimator is consistent with respect to the  $L^2$  discrepancy measure,

### 5.2.2. ARMA processes

Unlike in the independent case, where a single and constant  $g$  function suffices, a collection of functions is needed, each concentrated on a narrow frequency band, is needed for ARMA processes. Consider the matrix

$$\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta) (\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta))^T d\theta, \quad (5.9)$$

where  $\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta) = (h(\lambda_j^0, \theta))_{j=1}^J$ . Note that  $\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0)$  can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0) = \gamma_0^0 (\gamma_0^0)^T + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \gamma_\ell^0 (\gamma_\ell^0)^T, \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^0 = (\gamma_\ell(\lambda_1^0), \dots, \gamma_\ell(\lambda_J^0))^T, \quad (5.11)$$

and  $\gamma_\ell(\lambda_j^0)$  is the lag- $\ell$  autocovariance function of the one-dimensional process

$$x_{j,t} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} f_\ell(\lambda_j^0) z_{j,t}, \quad (5.12)$$

where  $(z_{j,t} : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  are white noise processes. Since  $(\exp(i\ell\theta) : \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0)$  is an orthonormal sequence of functions in  $L^2([0, 2\pi])$  with respect to the uniform measure on  $[0, 2\pi]$ , the representation (5.10) follows from noticing that, by the definition of the spectral density,

$$h(\lambda_j^0, \theta) = \gamma_0(\lambda_j^0) + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \gamma_\ell(\lambda_j^0) \cos(\ell\theta), \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi].$$

Then, we have the following proposition that gives a sufficient condition for consistency due to Theorem 5.1.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Suppose that the process  $(X_t)$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 5.1. Assuming that the  $J \times J$  matrix  $\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_j^0)$  is positive definite, we can construct a collection  $\mathcal{G}$  of functions  $g$  such that  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{Z}}(\Lambda_j^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite, where  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{Z}}(\Lambda_j^0, \omega^0)$  is as in (5.7).*

Below, we consider the special case of the AR(1) process to illustrate how Proposition 5.2 may be verified in practice. The result below can be extended to arbitrary finite order autoregressive processes with appropriate modifications.

### 5.2.3. AR(1) processes

Let  $X_t = \mathbf{A}X_{t-1} + \Sigma^{1/2}Z_t$ , where  $\Sigma$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  are symmetric/Hermitian,  $\|\mathbf{A}\| < 1$  and there exists an orthogonal/unitary matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  such that,  $\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U} = \text{diag}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)$  and  $\mathbf{U}^* \Sigma \mathbf{U} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$ , for  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \geq 0$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\alpha, \sigma)$  and suppose that the joint spectrum of  $(\mathbf{A}, \Sigma)$  is given by  $F^{\mathbf{A}, \Sigma} = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \delta_{\lambda_j^0}$ , where  $\lambda_j^0 = (\alpha_j^0, \sigma_j^0)$  with  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq J} |\alpha_j^0| < 1$  and  $\min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sigma_j^0 > 0$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *If the numbers  $\alpha_j^0$ 's, as defined above are all distinct, then  $\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_j^0)$  defined through (5.9) is positive definite.*

## 6. Model selection

Since in practice the orders of the underlying ARMA process are unknown, it is imperative to determine them from a set of candidate ARMA models. In this section we propose a bootstrap-based model selection procedure that can be used to choose the best-fitting from a list of candidate models

For each of  $M$  candidate models we generate  $B$  bootstrap samples and compare the distances between bootstrap and the original sample(s). We can then use, for instance, the mean of the distances or any other suitable statistics as a guideline for choosing the best candidate model. In particular for the time series model considered here, the algorithm is as follow:

- Let  $H_s$  denotes the sample version of a parameter of interest such as the lag- $\tau$ ,  $\tau \geq 0$ , sample autocovariance matrix. Let  $H_b^{(*)}$  be the  $b$ -th bootstrap counterpart.

- Let  $\hat{\theta}_A, \hat{\theta}_\Sigma$  be the estimated spectral densities for the coefficient matrices and  $\Sigma$ , respectively.
- For each candidate model do the following for  $b = 1, \dots, B$ :
  - Generate a sample from the Gaussian process  $X_t = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (\mathbf{A}_\ell(\hat{\theta}_A) Z_{t-\ell}(\hat{\theta}_\Sigma))$ ,  $Z_t(\hat{\theta}_\Sigma) \sim N(0, \hat{\Sigma})$ , such that the eigenvalue of  $A_\ell(\hat{\theta}_A)$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  have the same distributions as  $\hat{\theta}_A$  and  $\hat{\theta}_\Sigma$ , respectively.
  - Let  $L_b = \|\text{eig}(H_b^{(*)}) - \text{eig}(H_s)\|^2$ , where  $\text{eig}(H)$  denotes the vector of eigenvalues, sorted in descending order, of the matrix  $H$ .
- Choose the model with minimum mean loss  $(\sum_{b=1}^B L_b/B)$ .

## 7. Simulation study

### 7.1. Estimation of the spectral distribution

In this section the performance of the proposed estimation procedure is illustrated through simulation studies. Several factors can affect the precision of the estimate. They include the sample size, the dimension, the ratio of dimension to sample size, the underlying linear process, and the choice of the class of weight functions  $\mathcal{G}$ . Before studying these factors, we made a few preliminary considerations as follow:

- Note that when  $g(\theta) = 0$ , then  $M(z, \theta) = 0$ , which implies that the behavior of the integrand in  $\mathcal{S}(z)$  is the same as  $-1/z$ . Thus, to avoid high fluctuations in neighborhoods of  $z = 0$ , the function  $g$  was shifted by the constant value 0.05.
- Four fixed point iterations were performed to estimate  $K_g(\lambda, z)$ .
- $\mathcal{Z}$  is a grid of points in  $\mathbb{C}^+$  with real parts consisting of five equally spaced points from 0.1 to 0.5 and imaginary parts consisting of 25 equally spaced points from  $-2$  to  $2$ .
- $\mathcal{L}(\{\hat{\mathcal{S}}\}, \{\mathcal{S}\}) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g(z) - \mathcal{S}_g(z)|$ .
- Innovations  $(Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  were taken to be iid centered Gaussian random vectors with covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ .

In the first stage of simulation studies we considered five different AR(1) models and for each case we considered three classes of weight functions  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of 4, 8 and 12 B-spline functions. This was followed by ARMA(1,1) and AR(2) processes in a second stage. Denote the vector of non-zero eigenvalues of the coefficient matrix of the AR process by  $F_{value}^{AR}$  and the weights on the corresponding eigenvalues by  $F_{weight}^{AR}$ . Similarly, denote the vector of eigenvalues and associated weights corresponding to the MA coefficient matrix and  $\Sigma$  by substituting MA and  $\Sigma$  for AR in the above notation. The following models were considered for two combinations  $(p, n) = (400, 1600)$  and  $(p, n) = (600, 2400)$ , in the first stage of the simulation study.

**Case 1.** AR(1) processes constructed from innovations such that:

$$\text{Case 1.1. } F_{value}^{AR} = .5, F_{weight}^{AR} = 1, F_{value}^{\Sigma} = (1, 2), F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = (.5, .5).$$

$$\text{Case 1.2. } F_{value}^{AR} = .5, F_{weight}^{AR} = 1, F_{value}^{\Sigma} = (1, 2), F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = (.75, .25).$$

$$\text{Case 1.3. } F_{value}^{AR} = (-.5, .8), F_{weight}^{AR} = (.5, .5), F_{value}^{\Sigma} = 1, F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = 1.$$

$$\text{Case 1.4. } F_{value}^{AR} = (-.5, .8), F_{weight}^{AR} = (.25, .75), F_{value}^{\Sigma} = 1, F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = 1.$$

$$\text{Case 1.5. } F_{value}^{AR} = (-.5, .8), F_{weight}^{AR} = (.5, .5), F_{value}^{\Sigma} = (1, 2), F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = (.5, .5).$$

For each case, 20 samples from the corresponding model were generated and weights on the (prespecified) grid of candidate eigenvalues were estimated. Grid points were chosen such that they contain the true eigenvalues. To summarize the performance, the  $L_2$  distance between the true and estimated cdf

$$d_{L_2}(F, \hat{F}) = \sqrt{\int (F(x) - \hat{F}(x))^2 dx}$$

were calculated and mean, median, and standard deviation of the distances were reported in Tables B.1.1 and B.1.2. The results indicate that by considering 8 B-spline functions we can improve significantly over choosing 4 B-spline functions but the gain of using 12 B-spline functions comparing to the computational cost is not significant.

In the second stage, we chose  $\mathcal{G}$  to contain 8 B-spline functions and considered the following two models for four different combinations  $(p, n) = (400, 1600)$ ,  $(p, n) = (400, 800)$ ,  $(p, n) = (200, 800)$ , and  $(p, n) = (200, 400)$ .

**Case 2.1.** ARMA(1,1) with  $F_{value}^{AR} = -.35$ ,  $F_{weight}^{AR} = 1$ ,  $F_{value}^{MA} = .65$ ,  $F_{weight}^{MA} = 1$ ,  $F_{value}^{\Sigma} = (1, 2)$ ,  $F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = (.5, .5)$ .

**Case 2.2.** AR(2) with  $F_{value}^{A1} = .5$ ,  $F_{weight}^{A1} = 1$ ,  $F_{value}^{A2} = -.8$ ,  $F_{weight}^{A2} = 1$ ,  $F_{value}^{\Sigma} = (1, 2)$ ,  $F_{weight}^{\Sigma} = (.5, .5)$ .

To make the optimization feasible, we worked assuming the independence structure in the estimation procedure:  $F^{A, \Sigma} = F^{A1} F^{A2} F^{\Sigma}$  for the AR(2) model and  $F^{A, \Sigma} = F^{AR} F^{MA} F^{\Sigma}$  for ARMA(1,1) model where  $F^{AR}$ ,  $F^{MA}$  stands for the spectral cdf of the coefficient matrix of AR and MA term, respectively. In addition, for each case 100 samples were generated from the corresponding model. Figures B.1.1–B.1.3 show median and 90% confidence bands for the estimated spectral densities associated with Case 2.1. Figures B.1.4–B.1.6 correspond to Case 2.2. The plots indicate that as the ratio of dimension to sample size decreases confidence bands become tighter.

## 8. Data analysis

The data set considered here consists of daily closing prices of 486 companies included in the S&P 500, recorded from 5/08/2012 to 10/17/2016. The data was obtained from historical data available at `yahoo.finance`. Preprocessing involved adjustment for stock split such that before and after market capitalization of the companies remain the same. The goal of this data analysis was to identify some of the dependence structures as well as factor structure in the S&P 500 data. Denoting the adjusted time series by  $X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n}$ , we looked at the log returns

$$R_{i,t} = \log X_{i,t} - \log X_{i,t-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 486, t = 1, \dots, n = 1111,$$

which is approximately equal to the return  $(X_{i,t+1} - X_{i,t})/X_{i,t}$ .

To set the notation, let  $\mathbf{R} = [R_1, \dots, R_n]$  be the  $p \times n$  log returns matrix and consider the factor model  $R_t - \mathbb{E}[R_t] = \mathbf{L}F_t + E_t$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $F_t$  is the  $k$  dimensional vector of unknown common factors and  $\mathbf{L}$  is a  $p \times k$  matrix of factor loadings. The classical factor analysis assumes that  $\mathbb{E}[F_t] = 0$ ,  $\text{Var}[F_t] = \mathbf{I}_{k \times k}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[E_t] = 0$ ,  $\text{Var}[E_t] = \Psi$ , where  $\Psi$  is a diagonal matrix. To investigate the validity of the assumptions, we first identified the leading factors of the data and then we studied how much of the correlation remained after removing the first leading factor. Estimation of the common factors was done by means of the principle factor analysis. Let  $\bar{R}$  be the sample mean vector of  $R_1, \dots, R_n$ , the SVD

yields  $\mathbf{R} - \bar{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^T$ , where  $\mathbf{U} = [\underline{u}_1 | \dots | \underline{u}_p]$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = [\underline{v}_1 | \dots | \underline{v}_n]$ ,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{p \times n} = \text{diag}\{\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_{\max(p,n)}}\}$ . Denote the remainder after removing the first  $s$  leading terms by  $\mathbf{E}_R^{(s)} := (\mathbf{R} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}) - \sqrt{\lambda_1}\underline{u}_1\underline{v}_1^T - \dots - \sqrt{\lambda_r}\underline{u}_s\underline{v}_s^T$ .

The plot of the proportion of variation explained (PVE) by the leading factors in Figure B.1.7 reveals that about 31.5% of the variation in the time series  $\{\underline{R}_t\}$  is captured by the first leading common factor. Moreover, the distribution of the pairwise correlations between the coordinates of the remainder series became concentrated around zero, unlike the distribution of pairwise correlations between the coordinates of the log return that was supported on the positive side; see Figure B.1.8. To better understand the dependence structure, in the remainder we propose to model  $E_R^{(1)}$  with linear processes. More precisely, we considered  $E_R^{(1)}$  to be of the form

$$E_R^{(1)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} A_{\ell} Z_{t-\ell},$$

where the coefficient matrices  $A_{\ell}$  and  $(Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  satisfy assumptions of Theorem 2.1. Using the proposed model selection and estimation procedure of Section 6, we can identify a process that best fits the data within the class of models considered. The following three models are considered for  $E_R^{(1)}$ .

- AR(1),
- AR(2) with joint density of eigenvalues as  $F^{A,\Sigma} = F^{A_1} F^{A_2} F^{\Sigma}$ .
- ARMA(1,1) with joint density of eigenvalues as  $F^{A,\Sigma} = F^{AR} F^{MA} F^{\Sigma}$ . The model is denoted as  $ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1)$ .

For comparison, we also included the iid model, denoted as Ind (independent), i.e.  $n$  samples were generated independently from  $N(0, \Sigma_0)$  where  $\Sigma_0$  is a diagonal matrix with a spectral density estimated from  $E_R^{(1)}$  using the AR(1) model with AR coefficient matrix set to zero. The parameter of interest for model selection  $H_s$  is lag- $\tau$  symmetrized autocovariance matrices and to better understand the variability in model selection based on the chosen parameter we choose  $\tau = 1, \dots, 5$ . Results are based on 500 bootstrap samples and are reported in Table 8, where the relation  $Ind < AR(1)$  in the table means that the model Ind has smaller loss ( $L_b$ ) than the model AR(1). For instance, the column corresponding to lag 0 in the table indicates that the  $L_b$  loss in estimating the variance covariance matrix of the data had the following ordering in 83 percent of the bootstrap samples

$$ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < AR(1) < Ind < AR(2).$$

	lag					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
$ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < AR(1) < Ind < AR(2)$	83	0	0	94	5	0
$ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < Ind < AR(1) < AR(2)$	17	0	0	5.8	5	10.6
$Ind < ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < AR(1) < AR(2)$	0	47.2	4.8	0	0	.2
$Ind < ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < AR(2) < AR(1)$	0	52.8	95.2	.2	.2	.6
$ARMA_{Ind}(1, 1) < Ind < AR(2) < AR(1)$	0	0	0	0	94.8	88.6

**Table 8.1.** Model selection; Percentages

## 9. Conclusion

In this paper, we make use of the random matrix framework to estimate the joint spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices of a stationary linear process, under the key structural assumption of simultaneous diagonalizability of these coefficients. Under a set of technical conditions, we established the consistency of the proposed estimator in the setting where the support of the spectral distribution is assumed to be known. We also propose an estimator of the spectral density matrix. We propose practical model selection strategy based on a resampling principle. Finally, in application to real-life data on stock prices, the proposed estimator obtains interesting dependency structures that are not observable using univariate or traditional multivariate time series approaches.

There are several related questions that may be worth pursuing in the future. First, the assumption of simultaneous diagonalizability imposes important limitations for real-world time series. So the relaxation of this assumption for describing the limiting behavior of the spectral distributions studied here will be an important enhancement. Secondly, the proposed procedure for estimating the joint spectral distribution of the coefficient matrices assumes that the support of this distribution is discrete and known. This effectively means that the consistency has been proved in a “parametric” setting. In contrast, procedures for estimation of the spectral distribution for the population covariance matrix for iid data have been developed even in the “nonparametric” setting, i.e., when the distribution to be estimated is arbitrary. A similar extension will of importance for further theoretical validation of the proposed procedure. Finally, a more efficient estimation strategy for the coefficient matrices themselves will require a further enhancement in the estimation of the common eigenbasis for describing the coefficient matrices. This will require further theoretical development also on the behavior of eigenvectors of the sample periodograms.

## Appendix A: Proofs

### A.1. Outline of the Proof of Theorem 2.1

We provide an outline of the proof of Theorem 2.1. Detailed technical arguments can be found in the Ph.D. thesis of the first author [Namdari \(2018\)](#). In what follows, we first illustrate the derivation of approximating equations for the Stieltjes transform of  $F_g^{(n)}$ . For simplicity, we illustrate the construction for an MA(1) process with Gaussian innovations. The outline of the proof of existence and uniqueness of the solution of the equations and extension of the results to linear processes with non-Gaussian innovations will follow.

To illustrate the main ideas behind the derivation, suppose for simplicity that  $\Sigma = I_p$ , and assume that  $(X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  is an MA(1) complex-valued Gaussian process satisfying assumptions of Theorem 2.1. The crucial step in the derivation of the result is to transform  $\mathbf{X}_n$  to a matrix with independent columns. Note that we can write  $\mathbf{X}_n$  in terms of the lag operator  $L = [0 : e_1 : \dots : e_{n-1}]$  as  $\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{Z}_n + \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{Z}_n L$ , where  $\mathbf{Z}_n = [Z_1 : \dots : Z_n]$ . The idea is to first approximate the lag operator  $L$  with a circulant matrix  $\tilde{L}$ , and then use the fact that circulant matrices are diagonalizable in the discrete Fourier basis. Formally, define  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n = \mathbf{Z}_n + \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{Z}_n \tilde{L}$  where  $\tilde{L} = [e_n : e_1 : \dots : e_{n-1}] = U_{\tilde{L}} \Lambda_{\tilde{L}} U_{\tilde{L}}^*$  and

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{L}} = \text{diag}((\eta_t)_{t=1}^n), \quad U_{\tilde{L}} = [u_1 : \dots : u_n], \quad u_t = \left[ (\eta_t)^1 : \dots : (\eta_t)^n \right]^T, \quad \eta_t = e^{i\theta_t}, \quad \theta_t = \frac{2\pi t}{n}.$$

Now we can rotate  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n$  using the matrix of discrete Fourier basis, i.e., define  $\check{\mathbf{X}}_n = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n U_{\tilde{L}}$ , which is a small modification to  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n$ . Note that, as columns of  $\mathbf{Z}_n$  are independent Gaussian random vectors and  $U_{\tilde{L}}$  is a unitary matrix columns of  $\check{\mathbf{X}}$  are also independent.

In what follows, denote

$$\check{\mathbf{S}} := \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}_g \check{\mathbf{X}}^* \check{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{W}_g = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p Y_k Y_k^*,$$

where  $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_1 : \dots : Y_p]$ ,  $Y_j = \mathbf{W}_g \Psi^*(\lambda_j) \check{Z}_j$ ,  $\Psi(\lambda_j) = \text{diag}\{\psi(\lambda_j, \theta_1), \dots, \psi(\lambda_j, \theta_n)\}$ , and  $\check{Z}_j, j = 1, \dots, p$  are independent Gaussian random vectors. In addition, denote and the resolvent, the reduced resolvent, and rank one perturbations of  $\check{\mathbf{S}}$  as  $\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) = (\check{\mathbf{S}} - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}$ ;  $\check{\mathbf{R}}_j(z) = (\check{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{1}{n} Y_j Y_j^* - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}$ ,  $\check{\mathbf{S}}_j = \check{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{1}{n} Y_j Y_j^*$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , respectively.

Since  $\|\text{rank}(\check{\mathbf{X}}) - \text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\| \leq 2$ , the ESDs of  $\check{\mathbf{S}}_n^{(g)}$  and  $\check{\mathbf{S}}$  converge to the same limit, provided the limit exists. This allows us to work with  $\check{\mathbf{S}}$ , i.e. establishing almost sure convergence of the ESD of  $\check{\mathbf{S}}_n^{(g)}$  to a nonrandom distribution is equivalent to showing  $\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\check{\mathbf{R}}(z))$  converges pointwise almost surely to the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure. In what follows, we drop the subscript  $g$  in  $\mathbf{W}_g$  for ease of notation.

### Derivation of the approximating equations for the Steiltjes transform $\mathcal{S}_g$ and the kernel $K_g$

One approach to derive the Stieltjes transform of the limiting spectral distribution (LSD) of  $\check{\mathbf{S}}$  is to find a deterministic equivalent of the resolvent matrix  $\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) = (\check{\mathbf{S}} - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}$ , i.e., find a matrix  $\mathbf{H}(z)$  such that for all  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices  $\mathbf{C}_n$  with uniformly bounded norm:

$$\text{tr} \left[ \left( (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H})^{-1} + z\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \right) \mathbf{C}_n \right] \approx 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1} + z\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) &= \check{\mathbf{R}}(z) [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)]^{-1} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1} + z\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z)) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1} \\ &= \check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \left( \check{\mathbf{S}} + z\mathbf{H}(z) \right) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

So equivalently we want  $\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)\check{\mathbf{S}} + z\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)\mathbf{H}(z) \approx 0$ . Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbf{R}}(z)\check{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \check{\mathbf{S}}_k - z\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n} Y_k Y_k^* \right)^{-1} Y_k Y_k^* \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) - \frac{\frac{1}{n} \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) Y_k Y_k^* \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z)}{1 + \frac{1}{n} Y_k^* \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) Y_k} \right) Y_k Y_k^* \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) Y_k \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{n} Y_k^* \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) Y_k} \right) Y_k^* \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) \mathbf{W} \Psi(\lambda_k) \check{Z}_k \check{Z}_k^* \Psi^*(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}}{1 + \frac{1}{n} \check{Z}_k^* \Psi^*(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W} \check{\mathbf{R}}_k(z) \mathbf{W} \Psi(\lambda_k) \check{Z}_k} \end{aligned}$$

$$\approx \check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)}{1 + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)]}.$$

Therefore a candidate for  $\mathbf{H}(z)$  is:

$$\mathbf{H}(z) = -\frac{1}{zn} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)}{1 + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)]}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now, if we choose  $\mathbf{C}_n = \mathbf{I}$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{S}}_n(z) &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)] \approx -\frac{1}{zn} \operatorname{tr} [(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left( z - \frac{p}{n} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{g(\theta_t) h(\lambda_k, \theta_t)}{1 + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)]} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Denote:  $\check{K}_n(\lambda_k, z) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)]$ , and  $c_p = \frac{p}{n}$ , then:

$$\check{\mathcal{S}}_n(z) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)] \approx -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left( z - c_p \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{g(\theta_t) h(\lambda_k, \theta_t)}{1 + \check{K}_n(\lambda_k, z)} \right) \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Also if we choose  $\mathbf{C}_n = \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)$  then:

$$\check{K}_n(\lambda_k, z) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)] \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\approx -\frac{1}{zn} \operatorname{tr} [(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1} \Psi(\lambda_k) \mathbf{W}^2 \Psi^*(\lambda_k)] \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{g(\theta_t) h(\lambda_k, \theta_t)}{z - c_p \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{g(\theta_t) h(\lambda_k, \theta_t)}{1 + \check{K}_n(\lambda_k, z)} \right)}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

One can see that the equations (2.4) and (2.5) are the limiting counterparts of (A.3) and (A.6), respectively. Then, proof of the theorem proceeds through the following steps:

**P.1:** Convergence of approximating equations was verified by showing that for any fixed  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$  and for any sequence of Hermitian matrices  $\mathbf{C}_n$  with  $\|\mathbf{C}_n\| \leq \tilde{\lambda}_c$ ,

$$\frac{1}{zn} \operatorname{tr} [(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}(z))^{-1} \mathbf{C}_n] + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \mathbf{C}_n] \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

**P.2:** Existence, uniqueness and continuity of the solutions were verified. To describe the steps, for a fixed  $\omega$  in the sample space  $\Omega$ , denote:  $X(\omega)$ ,  $\check{X}(\omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_n(z, \omega)$ ,  $\check{\mathcal{S}}_n(z, \omega)$ ,  $\check{K}_n(\lambda, z, \omega)$  the realizations of  $X$ ,  $\check{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_n(z)$ ,  $\check{\mathcal{S}}_n(z)$ ,  $\check{K}_n(\lambda, z)$ , where for ease of notation we denoted  $\mathcal{S}_n(z) = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_g^{(n)}(z)$  and  $\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) = (\hat{\mathcal{S}}_g^{(n)} - zI)^{-1}$ ,  $\check{\mathcal{S}}_n(z) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{trace} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z)]$ ,  $\check{K}_n(\lambda, z) = \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{trace} [\check{\mathbf{R}}(z) \mathbf{W} \Psi^*(\lambda) \Psi(\lambda) \mathbf{W}]$ . In what follows, we may drop the sub/super scripts  $n$  and  $g$  for ease of notation. The proof is organized in the following steps:

- S.1:** Define  $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = 1$  and show that the convergence statement in Theorem 2.1 holds for every  $\omega \in \Omega_0$ .
- S.2:** Prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  to (2.5) on  $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C}^+$  under the constraint that  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  is a Stieltjes kernel. It will be shown that for every  $\omega \in \Omega_0$ , there exists a subsequence  $n_\ell$  such that  $\check{K}_{n_\ell}(\lambda, z, \omega)$  converges to  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  uniformly in  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and point wise in  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ .
- S.3:** Prove that for every  $\omega \in \Omega_0$ ,  $\check{K}_n(\lambda, z, \omega)$  converges pointwise to  $K_g(\lambda, z)$  in  $\lambda$  and  $z$  (extending the results of (S.2) to the whole sequence).
- S.4:** Prove that for every  $\omega \in \Omega_0$ ,  $\check{S}_n(z, \omega)$  converges pointwise to  $S(z)$ .

## Extension to the case of non-Gaussian Innovations

Arguments of the proof requires truncation followed by centering and rescaling of the innovations. Proof then proceeds by first showing that the LSD of  $\check{S}_n$  remains the same if we replace the Gaussian innovations with their truncated, centered and rescaled counterparts. Then, the proof of Theorem 2.1 is proceed by showing that that if we replace Gaussian innovations one by one by a non-Gaussian random vector with the same first and second moments the aggregated error will be negligible. To make it more precise, for  $\bar{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p \bar{Y} \bar{Y}_j^*$  where  $\bar{Y}_j = \mathbf{W} \Psi^*(\lambda_j) \xi_j$ ,  $\xi_j = (\xi_{j1}, \dots, \xi_{jn}) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , and  $\xi_{jk}$  are iid zero mean (not necessarily Gaussian) with finite fourth moment we showed that the LSD of  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}$  are the same, by showing that the ESD of  $\mathbf{S}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}$  are tight and their corresponding Steiltjes transforms,  $s_n(z)$  and  $\bar{s}_n(z)$ , respectively, converges to the same limit  $s(z)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ . Point wise convergence is established in two steps.

- (1)  $\mathbb{E} [\bar{s}_n(z) - s_n(z)] \rightarrow 0$  under the HD setting for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ .
- (2)  $P [|\bar{s}_n(z) - \mathbb{E} [\bar{s}_n(z)]| \geq \epsilon] \rightarrow 0$  under the HD setting for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ .

To prove (1), we applied a generalization of the Lindeberg principle developed in Chatterjee [Chatterjee \(2006\)](#), and the proof of (2) requires the use of McDiarmid's inequality.

## A.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1

Define

$$f_g(z, \omega) = S_g(z) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{c \tilde{M}_g(z, \theta | \omega) - z} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where

$$\tilde{M}_g(z, \theta | \omega) = g(\theta) \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z)}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Notice that  $\tilde{M}_g(z, \theta | \omega^0) = M_g^0(z, \theta)$  and hence,  $f_g(z, \omega^0) \equiv 0$ . Also, since  $\Im(z) > \underline{a}$  for some  $\underline{a} > 0$  for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , by nonnegativity of  $g(\theta)$  and  $h(\lambda, \theta)$  and the fact that for each  $\lambda_j^0$ ,  $K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z)$  is a Stieltjes transform, it follows that  $\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{\omega \in \Delta_J} |f_g(z, \omega)|$  is bounded.

The objective function in (5.6) can be equivalently expressed as

$$D_n(\omega) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |f_g(z, \omega) + \varepsilon_n(g, z, \omega)|^2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_n(g, z, \omega) &= S_g^{(n)}(z) - \mathcal{S}_g(z) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{c\tilde{M}_g(z, \theta|\omega) - z} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{c_n g(\theta) \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_n^{(g)}(\lambda_j^0, z)} - z} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, by (5.1) and (5.2) and by the fact that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is finite subset of  $\mathbb{C}^+$ , we have

$$\max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{\omega \in \Delta_J} |\varepsilon_n(g, z, \omega)| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & D_n(\omega) - D_n(\omega^0) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |f_g(z, \omega)|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[ 2\Re(f_g(z, \omega) \bar{\varepsilon}_n(g, z, \omega)) + |\varepsilon_n(g, z, \omega)|^2 - |\varepsilon_n(g, z, \omega^0)|^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A.11}) \end{aligned}$$

Denote the first term on the right hand side of (A.11) by  $\bar{T}(\omega)$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrarily small, and  $\rho > \epsilon > 0$  be appropriately chosen. Define  $B(\epsilon, \rho) := \{\omega \in \Delta^J : \epsilon \leq \|\omega - \omega^0\| \leq \rho\}$ . It suffices to show that positive definiteness of  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  implies that

$$\inf_{\omega \in B(\epsilon, \rho)} \bar{D}(\omega) > 0. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This is because, by (A.10) it then follows that with probability tending to 1,  $D_n(\omega) > D_n(\omega^0)$ , which implies that there is a local minimum  $\hat{\omega} \in \Delta^J$  of  $T_n(\omega)$  that satisfies  $\|\hat{\omega} - \omega^0\| < \epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, this proves consistency of  $\hat{\omega}$ .

To establish (A.12), first notice that by Taylor series expansion of  $f_g(z, \omega)$  around  $\omega^0$ , and the fact that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}} f_g(z, \omega) = -\mathbf{B} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \frac{g(\theta) \mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) d\theta}{(c\tilde{M}_g(z, \theta) - z)^2} \right), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

we have

$$\bar{D}(\omega) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O(\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^3).$$

Now, using the fact that  $\Delta^J$  is a simplex, and the first term on the right hand side of the above display is a positive definite function in  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ , (A.12) follows.

**Proof of Proposition 5.1**

In this case,  $X_t = \mathbf{A}_0 Z_t$ , so that  $\Sigma = \mathbf{A}_0^2 = \text{Var}(X_t)$ . Then,  $F^{A, \Sigma} \equiv F^\Sigma = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \delta_{\lambda_j^0}$  is the LSD of  $\Sigma$ , where  $\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_J^0$  are distinct nonnegative real numbers. Then,

$$K_g^0(\lambda_j^0, z) = \lambda_j^0 S_g^0(z), \quad M_g^0(z, \theta) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \frac{\lambda_j^0}{1 + \lambda_j^0 S_g^0(z)} \quad \text{for all } \theta,$$

where  $S_g^0(z)$  is the limiting Stieltjes transform of  $\mathbf{S}_g^{(n)}$  under the true population LSD  $\sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \delta_{\lambda_j^0}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{G}$  contains only the function  $g_0(\theta) \equiv 1$ , the matrix  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0)$  in (5.7) becomes

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left| c \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \frac{\lambda_j^0}{1 + \lambda_j^0 S^0(z)} - z \right|^{-4} \mathbf{v}^0(z) (\mathbf{v}^0(z))^* \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where  $S^0(z) = S_{g_0}^0(z)$ , and

$$\mathbf{v}^0(z) = \left( \frac{\lambda_j^0}{1 + \lambda_j^0 S^0(z)} \right)_{j=1}^J. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Define

$$T^0(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \lambda_j^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\max}^0 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \lambda_j^0. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

For all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\Im(z) \geq \underline{a} > 0$  and  $|z| \leq \bar{a} < \infty$ . Therefore, for all  $g$  satisfying the conditions,

$$0 < \Im(S_g^0(z)) \leq |S_g^0(z)| \leq \frac{1}{\Im(z)} \leq \frac{1}{\underline{a}}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Hence, for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\underline{a} \leq \Im(z) \leq \left| c \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j^0 \frac{\lambda_j^0}{1 + \lambda_j^0 S^0(z)} - z \right| \leq c T^0(\omega^0) + |z| \leq c T^0(\omega^0) + \bar{a}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

By (A.14) and (A.18),  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite if  $\mathbf{B}^T \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite, where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{v}^0(z) (\mathbf{v}^0(z))^*.$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^0(z) &= \left( \frac{1}{S^0(z)} \frac{\lambda_j^0 S^0(z)}{1 + \lambda_j^0 S^0(z)} \right)_{j=1}^J = \frac{1}{S^0(z)} \mathbf{1}_J - \frac{1}{(S^0(z))^2} \left( \frac{1}{1/S^0(z) + \lambda_j^0} \right)_{j=1}^J \\ &=: \frac{1}{S^0(z)} \mathbf{1}_J - \frac{1}{(S^0(z))^2} \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^0(z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Since  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{1}_J = 0$ , by (A.19), positive definiteness of  $\mathbf{B}^T \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is implied by the positive definiteness of

$$\mathbf{M}_*(\Lambda_J^0) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{1}{|S^0(z)|^4} \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^0(z) (\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^0(z))^T. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

In what follows, we show that the matrix  $\mathbf{M}_*(\Lambda_J^0)$  in (A.20) is positive definite. This shows that under the stated conditions, the proposed estimator with respect to the  $L^2$  discrepancy measure, is consistent

*Positive definiteness of  $\mathbf{M}_*(\Lambda_J^0)$  defined in (A.20)*

By (A.17), for the positive definiteness of  $\mathbf{M}_*(\Lambda_J^0)$ , it suffices to show that if  $\mathcal{Z}$  contains distinct elements  $z_1, \dots, z_J$ , then the matrix

$$\mathbf{v}_{z_1, \dots, z_J}(\Lambda_J^0) := [\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^0(z_1) : \dots : \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^0(z_J)] = \left( \frac{1}{1/S^0(z_k) + \lambda_j^0} \right)_{1 \leq j, k \leq J}$$

is nonsingular.

We prove this fact by contradiction. So suppose that  $z_1, \dots, z_J \in \mathcal{Z}$  are distinct. Then,  $u_k = 1/S^0(z_k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, J$  are also distinct. Suppose that there exists  $b_1, \dots, b_J$ , not all zero, such that  $\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{v}_{z_1, \dots, z_J}(\Lambda_J^0) = 0$  where  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_J)^T$ . This implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{b_j}{u_k + \lambda_j^0} = 0, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, J. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Since  $u_k > 0$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, J$ , the above set of equations can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{j=1}^J b_j \prod_{l \neq j} (u_k + \lambda_l^0) = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, J. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

We consider  $u$  as a positive real variable and then look for  $J$  distinct solutions of the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^J b_j \prod_{l \neq j} (u + \lambda_l^0) = 0.$$

The left hand side of the above equation is a polynomial in  $u$  with maximum degree  $J - 1$ . Hence it can have at most  $J - 1$  distinct roots. This contradicts (A.22) and hence (A.21), unless  $\mathbf{b} = 0$ , and therefore establishes the nonsingularity of  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0)$ .

## Proof of Proposition 5.2

Assuming that the  $J \times J$  matrix  $\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0)$  is positive definite, we aim to select a collection  $\mathcal{G}$  of functions  $g$  such that  $\mathbf{B}^T \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0) \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite, where  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_J^0, \omega^0)$  is as in (5.7).

As a first step, for a given  $\delta > 0$ , such that  $N_\delta := 2\pi/\delta$  is an integer, consider a collection of equally spaced points  $\{\theta_{k, \delta}\}_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \subset [0, 2\pi)$ . Since  $\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0)$  is positive definite, there is a  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that for  $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$

$$\mathbf{R}_\delta(\Lambda_J^0) := \frac{1}{N_\delta} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k, \delta}) (\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k, \delta}))^T \quad (\text{A.23})$$

is positive definite, where

$$\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta) = (h(\lambda_1^0, \theta), \dots, h(\lambda_J^0, \theta))^T.$$

In particular,  $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{R}_\delta(\Lambda_J^0)) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_J^0)) - O(\delta)$ , where  $\sigma_{\min}(A)$  denotes the smallest singular value of a matrix  $A$ .

Then, for each  $k = 1, \dots, N_\delta$ , set  $g_{k,\delta}(\theta) = \underline{g}((\theta - \theta_{k,\delta})/\delta)$ , where  $\underline{g}$  is a positive, symmetric, Lipschitz function, supported on  $(-C_0, C_0)$  for some  $C_0 > 0$ , with  $\underline{g}(0) = 1$  and  $\int \underline{g}(\theta) d\theta = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_\delta = \{g_{k,\delta}\}_{k=1}^{N_\delta}$ .

Let

$$h_\star(\Lambda_J^0) = \sup_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi]} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} h(\lambda_j^0, \theta).$$

Then, for all  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ , since  $\Im(z) \geq \underline{a}$  and  $\Im(M_g(z, \theta|\omega^0)) \leq 0$ ,

$$\underline{a} \leq \Im(z) \leq \left| \Im(cM_g(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z) \right| \leq \left| cM_{g_{k,\delta}}(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z \right| \quad (\text{A.24})$$

$$\leq \left| c \sum_{j=1}^K \omega_j^0 \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{1 + K_{g_{k,\delta}}(\lambda_j^0, z|\omega^0)} \right| + |z| \leq ch_\star(\Lambda_J^0) + \bar{a}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Also, for  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_\delta} \left| K_{g_{k,\delta}}(\lambda_j^0, z|\omega^0) \right| \leq \left( \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \right) h_\star(\Lambda_J^0) \sup_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi]} \frac{1}{|cM_{g_{k,\delta}}(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z|} \leq \left( \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \right) h_\star(\Lambda_J^0) \frac{1}{\underline{a}}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

If we let

$$J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda) = \frac{g_{k,\delta}(\theta)h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)}{(cM_g(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z)^2},$$

Thus, by the Taylor series expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\theta_k - \delta}^{\theta_k + \delta} J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda) d\theta &= \int_{\theta_k - \delta}^{\theta_k + \delta} \left\{ J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda) + (\theta - \theta_k) \frac{\partial J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda)}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\theta - \theta_k)^2 \frac{\partial^2 J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda)}{\partial \theta^2} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k} + O(|\theta - \theta_k|^3) \right\} d\theta \\ &= 2\delta J_{k,\delta}(\theta_k, \lambda) + 0 + \frac{\partial^2 J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda)}{\partial \theta^2} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k} O(\delta^3). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g_{k,\delta}(\theta)h(\lambda_j^0, \theta)d\theta}{(cM_g(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z)^2} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \int_{\theta_k - \delta}^{\theta_k + \delta} J_{k,\delta}(\theta, \lambda_j^0) d\theta$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \frac{h(\lambda_j^0, \theta_{k,\delta})}{(cM_{g_{k,\delta}}(z, \theta_{k,\delta}|\omega^0) - z)^2} + O(\delta^3), \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where the  $O(\delta^3)$  term is uniform in  $j$ ,  $k$  and  $z$ . Let

$$\mathbf{K}_{k,\delta}^0(z) = \text{diag}(K_{g_{k,\delta}}(\lambda_1^0, z|\omega^0), \dots, K_{g_{k,\delta}}(\lambda_J^0, z|\omega^0)).$$

Then, for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}_\delta|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) \mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) d\theta}{(cM_g(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z)^2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g(\theta) \mathbf{v}_g^0(z, \theta) d\theta}{(cM_g(z, \theta|\omega^0) - z)^2} \right)^* \\ &= \frac{1}{N_\delta} \left( \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \right)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \frac{1}{|cM_{g_{k,\delta}}(z, \theta_{k,\delta}|\omega^0) - z|^4} (I_J + \mathbf{K}_{k,\delta}^0(z))^{-1} \underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k,\delta}) (\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k,\delta}))^* (I_J + \mathbf{K}_{k,\delta}^0(z))^*{}^{-1} \\ & \quad + O(\delta^4) \\ &= \left( \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \right)^2 \frac{1}{N_\delta} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\delta} \frac{1}{|cM_{g_{k,\delta}}(z, \theta_{k,\delta}|\omega^0) - z|^4} \underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k,\delta}) (\underline{\mathbf{h}}^0(\theta_{k,\delta}))^* + O(\delta^3), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

where the last equality is due to (A.26). Since  $\mathbf{R}_\delta(\Lambda_j^0)$ , defined in (A.23), is positive definite for  $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ , by invoking (A.24), we can find a  $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$  such that, for  $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ , for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the matrix appearing in the last line of (A.28) is positive definite, with the minimum eigenvalue bounded below by  $c_0\delta^2$  for some  $c_0 > 0$  depending only on  $\Lambda_j^0$ . Consequently, with such a choice of  $\delta$ , for any finite collection  $\mathcal{Z} \subset \{z : \Im(z) \geq \underline{a}, |z| \leq \bar{a}\}$ , the matrix  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{G}_\delta, \mathcal{Z}}(\Lambda_j^0, \omega^0)$  is positive definite, with the minimum eigenvalue bounded below by  $c_0\delta^2$ .

### Proof of Proposition 5.3

To prove this, we note that the autocovariance function  $\gamma_\ell(\lambda_j^0)$  of the univariate AR(1) process

$$x_{j,t} = \alpha_j^0 x_{j,t-1} + \sigma_j^0 z_{j,t}$$

where  $\{z_{j,t}\}$  are white noise processes, is given by

$$\gamma_\ell(\lambda_j^0) = (\sigma_j^0)^2 \frac{(\alpha_j^0)^\ell}{1 - (\alpha_j^0)^2}, \quad \ell = 0, 1, \dots; \quad j = 1, \dots, J. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{G}(\Lambda_j^0) = \mathbf{D}_0 \left( \left( \frac{2}{1 - \alpha_j^0 \alpha_k^0} - 1 \right) \right)_{1 \leq j, k \leq J} \mathbf{D}_0$$

where  $\mathbf{D}_0 = \text{diag}((\sigma_j^0)^2 / (1 - (\alpha_j^0)^2))_{j=1}^J$  is positive definite. Now, recall the definition of  $\gamma_\ell^0$  in (5.11), and observe that the  $J \times J$  matrix

$$\mathbf{D}_0^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0^0 & \cdots & \gamma_{J-1}^0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha_1^0 & (\alpha_1^0)^2 & \cdots & (\alpha_1^0)^{J-1} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\ 1 & \alpha_J^0 & (\alpha_J^0)^2 & \cdots & (\alpha_J^0)^{J-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is a Vandermonde matrix. This matrix is therefore nonsingular since  $\alpha_j^0$ 's are all distinct. As a consequence, we have that the matrix  $((2(1 - \alpha_j^0 \alpha_k^0)^{-1} - 1))_{1 \leq j, k \leq J}$ , and hence  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{A}_J^0)$ , is positive definite.

## Acknowledgments

Most of this work was done when the first author was at the University of California Davis.

## Supplementary Material

The supplementary materials contains all the tables and plots referenced in Sections 7 and 8.

## References

- Bhattacharjee, M. and Bose, A. (2016). Large sample behaviour of high dimensional autocovariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **44**, 598–628.
- Bai, Z.D. and Silverstein, J.W. (2010). *Spectral Analysis of Large Dimensional Random Matrices*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Bai, Z. and Zhou, W. (2008). Large sample covariance matrices without independence structures in columns. *Statistica Sinica*, 425–442.
- Brillinger, D.R. (2001). *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory (2nd ed.)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Brockwell, P.D. and Davis, R.A. (1991). *Time Series Analysis: Theory and Methods (2nd ed.)*. Springer, New York.
- Chatterjee, S. (2006). A generalization of the Lindeberg principle. *The Annals of Probability*, **34**, 2061–2076.
- Karoui, N. E. (2008). Spectrum estimation for large dimensional covariance matrices using random matrix theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, **36**, 2757–2790.
- Forni, M. and Lippi, M. (1999). Aggregation of linear dynamic microeconomic models. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, **31**, 131–158.
- Hachem, W., Loubaton, P., and Najim, J. (2006). The empirical distribution of the eigenvalues of a Gram matrix with a given variance profile. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, **42**, 649–670.
- Hachem, W., Loubaton, P. and Najim, J. (2005). The empirical eigenvalue distribution of a Gram matrix: from independence to stationarity. *Markov Processes and Related Fields* **11**, 629–648.
- Johnstone, I. M. (2007). High dimensional statistical inference and random matrices. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians I*, 307–333. European Mathematical Society, Zurich.
- Jin, B., Wang, C., Bai, Z. D., Nair, K. K., and Harding, M. (2014). Limiting spectral distribution of a symmetrized auto-cross covariance matrix. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **24**, 1199–1225.
- Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2015). Spectrum estimation: A unified framework for covariance matrix estimation and PCA in large dimensions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **139**, 360–384.
- Liu, H., Aue, A., and Paul, D. (2015). On the Marčenko–Pastur law for linear time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, **43**, 675–712.
- Liu, H. (2013). *Spectral Analysis of High Dimensional Time Series*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of California, Davis.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2005). *New introduction to multiple time series analysis*, Springer, New York.

- Marčenko, V. and Pastur, L. (1967). Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik* **1**, 457–483.
- Namdari, J. (2018) *Estimation of Spectral Distributions of a Class of High-dimensional Linear Processes*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of California, Davis.
- Namdari, J., Paul, D. and Wang, L. (2021). High-dimensional linear models: a random matrix perspective. *Sankhya A*, **83**(2), 645–695.
- Paul, D. and Aue, A. (2014). Random matrix theory in statistics: A review. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **150**, 1–29.
- Pfaffel, O. and Schlemm, E. (2012). Limiting spectral distribution of a new random matrix model with dependence across rows and columns. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, **436**, 2966–2979.
- Yao, J.-F. (2012). A note on a Marčenko-Pastur type theorem for time series. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **82**, 22–28.
- Zhang, C. and Zhang, D. (2025). Spectral Inference for High Dimensional Time Series. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **71**, 2909-2929.

## B. Supplementary Material


### B.1. Tables and Plots

AR		Sigma			p400n1600		p600n2400		
evals	weights	evals	weights	statistics	4g	8g	4g	8g	12g
0.5	1	(1,2)	(0.5,0.5)	mean	0.0378	0.0122	0.0266	0.0090	0.0069
				median	0.0377	0.0078	0.0203	0.0067	0.0054
				sd	0.0218	0.0119	0.0285	0.0081	0.0055
0.5	1	(1,2)	(0.75,0.25)	mean	0.0286	0.0102	0.0192	0.0084	0.0059
				median	0.0274	0.0076	0.0159	0.0080	0.0045
				sd	0.0212	0.0085	0.0141	0.0060	0.0043
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.5,0.5)	1	1	mean	0.0155	0.0095	0.0096	0.0061	0.0053
				median	0.0140	0.0092	0.0082	0.0059	0.0047
				sd	0.0092	0.0054	0.0070	0.0034	0.0037
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.25,0.75)	1	1	mean	0.0161	0.0084	0.0067	0.0054	0.0057
				median	0.0152	0.0074	0.0052	0.0053	0.0049
				sd	0.0098	0.0049	0.0038	0.0025	0.0033
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.5,0.5)	(1,2)	(0.5,0.5)	mean	0.1137	0.0281	0.1096	0.0255	0.0140
				median	0.1199	0.0205	0.1028	0.0219	0.0133
				sd	0.0337	0.0176	0.0230	0.0143	0.0090


**Table B.1. Case 1.** Table contains mean, median, and standard deviation of  $L_2$  distance between true and estimated spectral cdf of AR(1) coefficient matrix, i.e.  $d_{L_2}(F^A, \hat{F}^A)$ .

AR		Sigma			p400n1600		p600n2400		
evals	weights	evals	weights	statistics	4g	8g	4g	8g	12g
0.5	1	(1,2)	(0.5,0.5)	mean	0.0435	0.0329	0.0423	0.0295	0.0312
				median	0.0365	0.0318	0.0308	0.0225	0.0262
				sd	0.0284	0.0185	0.0332	0.0219	0.0234
0.5	1	(1,2)	(0.75,0.25)	mean	0.0310	0.0295	0.0240	0.0222	0.0212
				median	0.0231	0.0235	0.0185	0.0206	0.0209
				sd	0.0258	0.0200	0.0141	0.0085	0.0094
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.5,0.5)	1	1	mean	0.0344	0.0215	0.0191	0.0137	0.0149
				median	0.0304	0.0201	0.0158	0.0125	0.0114
				sd	0.0240	0.0151	0.0120	0.0062	0.0124
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.25,0.75)	1	1	mean	0.0290	0.0264	0.0149	0.0181	0.0171
				median	0.0248	0.0249	0.0132	0.0143	0.0147
				sd	0.0154	0.0152	0.0057	0.0213	0.0119
(-0.5,0.8)	(0.5,0.5)	(1,2)	(0.5,0.5)	mean	0.1640	0.0697	0.1585	0.0657	0.0495
				median	0.1726	0.0668	0.1499	0.0642	0.0454
				sd	0.0284	0.0270	0.0304	0.0258	0.0189


**Table B.2. Case 1.** Table contains mean, median, and standard deviation of  $L_2$  distance between true and estimated spectral cdf of  $\Sigma$ , i.e.  $d_{L_2}(F^\Sigma, \hat{F}^\Sigma)$ .




**Figure B.1.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of AR coefficient matrix corresponding to the case 2.1. Dash-Dot Red curve: median, Dashed Blue curve: 90% confidence band, Black Solid curve: true spectral cdf




**Figure B.2.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of MA coefficient matrix corresponding to the case 2.1. Dash-Dot Red curve: median, Dashed Blue curve: 90% confidence band, Black Solid curve: true spectral cdf




**Figure B.3.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of  $\Sigma$  corresponding to the **case 2.1**. **Green Dash-Dot Red** curve: median, **Dashed Blue** curve: 90% confidence band, **Black Solid** curve: true spectral cdf




**Figure B.4.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of  $A_1$  corresponding to the **case 2.2**. **Dash-Dot Red** curve: median, **Dashed Blue** curve: 90% confidence band, **Black Solid** curve: true spectral cdf




**Figure B.5.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of  $A_2$  corresponding to the **case 2.2**. **Dash-Dot Red** curve: median, **Dashed Blue** curve: 90% confidence band, **Black Solid** curve: true spectral cdf



**Figure B.6.** Plot of Median and 90% confidence band for spectral cdf of  $\Sigma$  corresponding to the **case 2.2**. **Dash-Dot Red** curve: median, **Dashed Blue** curve: 90% confidence band, **Black Solid** curve: true spectral cdf



**Figure B.7.** Plot of the proportion of variation explained (PVE) by leading factors of the log return series.



**Figure B.8.** Plot of the densities of the pairwise correlation between coordinates of the series  $\mathbf{R}$ , in blue, and  $\mathbf{E}_R^{(1)}$ , in red.