

IMPROVED INFERENCE FOR NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION*

Giuseppe Cavaliere
University of Bologna, Italy
& Exeter Business School, UK

Sílvia Gonçalves
McGill University, Canada
& CIREQ, Canada

Morten Ørregaard Nielsen
Aarhus Center for Econometrics
Aarhus University, Denmark

Edoardo Zanelli
Aarhus Center for Econometrics
Aarhus University, Denmark

November 25, 2025

ABSTRACT

Nonparametric regression estimators, including those employed in regression-discontinuity designs (RDD), are central to the economist’s toolbox. Their application, however, is complicated by the presence of asymptotic bias, which undermines coverage accuracy of conventional confidence intervals. Extant solutions to the problem include debiasing methods, such as the widely applied robust bias-corrected (RBC) confidence interval of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). We show that this interval is equivalent to a prepivoted interval based on an invalid residual-based bootstrap method. Specifically, prepivoting performs an implicit bias correction while adjusting the nonparametric regression estimator’s standard error to account for the additional uncertainty introduced by debiasing. This idea can also be applied to other bootstrap schemes, leading to new implicit bias corrections and corresponding standard error adjustments. We propose a prepivoted interval based on a bootstrap that generates observations from nonparametric regression estimates at each regressor value and show how it can be implemented as an RBC-type interval without the need for resampling. Importantly, we show that the new interval is shorter than the existing RBC interval. For example, with the Epanechnikov kernel, the length is reduced by 17%, while maintaining accurate coverage probability. This result holds irrespectively of: (a) the evaluation point being in the interior or on the boundary; (b) the use of a ‘small’ or ‘large’ bandwidths; (c) the distribution of the regressor and the error term.

KEYWORDS: Asymptotic bias; bootstrap; local polynomial estimation; nonparametric regression; regression-discontinuity; robust bias correction.

*We are grateful for comments from Matias Cattaneo, Bruce Hansen, Phillip Heiler, Guido Imbens, Michael Jansson, Sid Kankanala, Dennis Kristensen, Xinwei Ma, Mikkel Sølvsten, Guo Yan, seminar participants at Aarhus U, Bank of Portugal, Harvard-MIT, MacQuarie U, Queen’s U, Tilburg U, TU Dortmund, U Bologna, UC3M, U Connecticut, U Copenhagen, U Exeter, UNSW, U Sydney, and participants at several conferences and workshops. Cavaliere and Zanelli acknowledge support from the Italian Ministry of University and Research (PRIN 2020 Grant 2020B2AKFW and PRIN 2022 Grant 2020B2AKFW). Nielsen and Zanelli are grateful for support from the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF Chair grant DNRF154) and the Aarhus Center for Econometrics (ACE) funded by the Danish National Research Foundation grant DNRF186. Gonçalves acknowledges support from the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) grant RGPIN-2021-02663.

1 INTRODUCTION

Nonparametric regression methods are widely used in empirical economics research, with regression-discontinuity designs (RDD) being one of the leading applications. Inference in this setting is challenging due to the presence of a bias component affecting the nonparametric estimators and statistics usually employed by practitioners, even asymptotically. Several solutions to this inference problem have been proposed in the econometrics and statistics literatures. These include the so-called undersmoothing and bias correction approaches; see, *inter alia*, Hall (1992), Imbens and Lemieux (2008), Calonico, Cattaneo, and Titiunik (2014), Calonico, Cattaneo and Farrell (2018), and the references therein. A recent leading solution is the robust bias correction (RBC) approach of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018), which explicitly resolves this problem by debiasing the reference nonparametric estimator, while adjusting its standard error to account for the additional uncertainty introduced by the bias correction. Bootstrap and resampling methods, though widely used by economists as a bias correction tool, are rarely employed in the present setting due to the fact (e.g., Hall, 1992) that they generally fail to correct for smoothing bias.

The main objective of this paper is to propose a new robust procedure for inference in the context of nonparametric regression and RDD. Our approach is based on a non-standard application of the bootstrap that implicitly corrects for the bias, thus challenging the above fact. Standard bootstrap methods fail in the present context because the bootstrap cannot correctly mimic the asymptotic bias of the nonparametric estimator, leading to confidence intervals with incorrect coverage and bootstrap p-values which are not uniformly distributed (see also Cavaliere and Georgiev, 2020). We show that prepivoting, originally proposed by Beran (1987) as a means to obtain refinements for asymptotically unbiased estimators, can provide a solution to this failure, as motivated by recent work on asymptotically biased estimators in Cavaliere et al. (2024). The idea is that if the asymptotic distribution of the bootstrap p-value can be consistently estimated, then we can use it to restore validity by transforming (or prepivoting) a non-uniformly distributed bootstrap p-value into a uniformly distributed bootstrap p-value. In our context, we can use its quantiles to adjust the original bootstrap confidence intervals.

In this framework, our first contribution is to show that prepivoting performs an implicit bias correction and at the same time adjusts the standard error of the nonparametric regression estimator to account for the additional uncertainty introduced by debiasing. That is, the prepivoted bootstrap interval is asymptotically equivalent to an RBC-style interval. We also show that, for certain bootstrap schemes, bootstrap inference based on prepivoting can be computationally straightforward, as it does not require any resampling algorithm. This desirable property occurs because both the bootstrap bias correction and the standard error adjustment can be shown to be known functions of the regressors (and the kernel). When the external random variable used to construct the bootstrap confidence interval is drawn from a normal distribution, the prepivoted bootstrap interval is in fact identical to the corresponding RBC-style interval.

As our second contribution, we show that the RBC interval of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018)

is asymptotically equivalent to prepivoting a confidence interval based on the bootstrap scheme considered by Bartalotti et al. (2017) and He and Bartalotti (2020) for RDD. For inference based on a local linear estimator at a given evaluation point (e.g., the cutoff for RDD), this bootstrap method generates bootstrap observations using a local quadratic estimator estimated at that point. For this reason, we call this the ‘global polynomial’ (GP) bootstrap. The GP bootstrap is asymptotically invalid when used to construct conventional bootstrap intervals. Bartalotti et al. (2017) and He and Bartalotti (2020) estimate the bias by a first level bootstrap, and then use a second level bootstrap to obtain standard errors. However, we show that prepivoting solves the invalidity problem directly by modifying the bootstrap quantiles to reflect the presence of bias. In particular, we show that the prepivoted GP bootstrap (hereafter, PGP) interval is asymptotically equivalent to the RBC interval of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018) based on local quadratic estimates of the second-order derivative that enters the bias component. More generally, by changing the estimator of the conditional mean function used in the bootstrap DGP, we obtain different bias corrections and different studentizations.

By exploiting the asymptotic equivalence between prepivoting and RBC-style intervals, our third and main contribution is to revisit the classical bootstrap in nonparametric statistics (e.g., Härdle and Bowman, 1988, Härdle and Marron, 1991, and Hall and Horowitz, 2013). This bootstrap smooths the conditional mean function at each regressor value using a local polynomial estimator, and we label it the ‘local polynomial’ (LP) bootstrap. The inconsistency of naive, i.e., non-prepivoted, implementations of the LP bootstrap when used with ‘large’ (including MSE-optimal) bandwidths is well documented in the statistics literature. Different solutions have been proposed, and they typically require choosing additional bandwidth or tuning parameters. We propose and analyze new prepivoted LP bootstrap schemes (hereafter, PLP), and we show that they (i) deliver novel confidence intervals of the RBC style, not explored in the existing literature, and, more importantly, (ii) lead to efficiency gains (i.e., shorter confidence intervals) with respect to the classic RBC interval. Specifically, we show that the bias correction mechanism implicitly generated by prepivoting these bootstrap methods is more efficient than the bias estimator employed in the RBC procedure, resulting in confidence intervals of shorter length and correct coverage, asymptotically. Importantly, PLP allows using the same bandwidth for point estimation and in the bootstrap data generating process (DGP). As far as we are aware, ours is the first approach in the nonparametrics literature that delivers a valid and efficient implementation of the LP bootstrap without the need for additional tuning parameters.

As is usually the case for nonparametric estimators, the asymptotic distribution of PLP statistics depends on whether the evaluation point is interior or boundary. For interior points, prepivoting can be applied directly as discussed above. However, for boundary points, the implicit bias correction mimics the leading bias term of the original statistic only up to a multiplicative term. The consequence is that the standard prepivoting approach studied by Cavaliere et al. (2024) requires modification in this context. Since the multiplicative term depends on the regressors (and the kernel) only, and is therefore known, our solution involves reweighting the bootstrap statistic

TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF RELATIVE (ASYMPTOTIC) INTERVAL LENGTHS

	Triangular	Uniform	Epanechnikov	Biweight	Triweight
Interior point	0.84	0.86	0.83	0.85	0.86
Boundary point	0.84	0.86	0.83	0.84	0.85

Notes: Asymptotic relative length of confidence intervals based on RBC and mPLP for five different kernels for the local linear estimator. Entries less than one imply that mPLP is shorter.

before applying the pre pivoting approach. We show that this ‘modified’ PLP approach (hereafter, mPLP) adapts to the nature of the evaluation point and yields asymptotically valid inference across the entire support of the regressor, including boundary points.

Importantly, the new mPLP method not only has correct asymptotic coverage, but it also delivers shorter interval length compared to the RBC interval. Intuitively, mPLP is based on a convolution of the original observations, and such convolution introduces an additional layer of smoothing. We show that this additional smoothing induces a more efficient bias-correction in the sense that the overall variance of the debiased statistic is smaller. Crucially, this efficiency result is not tied to a specific DGP, as the asymptotic relative lengths of the confidence intervals based on mPLP and RBC depend only on the choice of kernel in the nonparametric regression and on whether the evaluation point is interior or boundary. Table 1 gives the asymptotic relative lengths of the mPLP bootstrap and RBC intervals for five common kernels for the special case of the local linear estimator. For the popular Epanechnikov kernel, mPLP bootstrap intervals are 17% shorter than RBC intervals for both interior and boundary evaluation points. These efficiency results are supported by our Monte Carlo simulation experiments.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some general results on pre pivoting in nonparametric regression and its relation to RBC-style intervals, as well as to the GP bootstrap scheme. In Section 3, we discuss how improved inference can be based on the LP bootstrap. We show asymptotic validity of the corresponding pre pivoted confidence interval and analyze its efficiency, in terms of length, compared with the RBC interval. In Section 4 we extend our approach to boundary problems and, in particular, to (sharp) RDD. In Section 5 we assess the performance of our methods in finite samples via Monte Carlo simulation. Finally, Section 6 concludes. All notation, technical derivations, and proofs are included in the appendix and in the accompanying supplemental material. R packages that implement the procedures in this paper are available at <https://pppackages.github.io>.

2 ROBUST BIAS CORRECTION AND PREPIVOTING

2.1 PRELIMINARIES

Given a random sample $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(y_i, x_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, consider the problem of inference on the conditional expectation $g(x) := \mathbb{E}[y_i | x_i = x]$ at a fixed point $x = \mathbf{x}$, using a local (p -th order, p odd) polynomial estimator $\hat{g}_n(x) := \hat{g}_n(x; h, K)$, where $h = h_n > 0$ is the bandwidth and K the

kernel function; that is, with $r_p(u) = (1, u, \dots, u^p)'$,

$$\hat{g}_n(x) := \iota'_0 \hat{\beta}_{p,n}(x), \quad \hat{\beta}_{p,n}(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - r_p(x_i - x)'b)^2 K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

An explicit form is $\hat{\beta}_{p,n}(x) = H_p(Z'_p(x)W(x)Z_p(x))^{-1}Z'_p(x)W(x)y$ with $y := (y_1, \dots, y_n)'$, $W(x) := h^{-1} \operatorname{diag}(K((x_1 - x)/h), \dots, K((x_n - x)/h))$, $H_p := \operatorname{diag}(1, h^{-1}, \dots, h^{-p})$, and $Z_p(x) := (r_p((x_1 - x)/h), \dots, r_p((x_n - x)/h))'$. In the following, dependence of Z_p and W on x is omitted when $x = \mathbf{x}$.

Inference based on $\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$ is challenging due to the presence of an asymptotic bias. In particular, we typically have

$$T_n := \sqrt{nh}(\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})) \xrightarrow{d} N(B, v_1^2), \quad (2.2)$$

where, letting $\mathcal{X}_n := \{x_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, the asymptotic bias $B := \operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n$, $B_n := \mathbb{E}[T_n | \mathcal{X}_n]$, is non-zero when bandwidths with MSE-optimal rate are employed. Sufficient conditions for (2.2) are given by Assumptions 2.1–2.2 below; e.g., Ruppert and Wand (1994) and Fan and Gijbels (1996).

ASSUMPTION 2.1. *(y_i, x_i) are i.i.d. and x_i has bounded support \mathbb{S}_x and continuous density f . Let \mathbf{N} be an open neighborhood of \mathbf{x} . Then, on $\mathbf{N} \cap \mathbb{S}_x$: (i) $f(x) > 0$; (ii) $\sigma^2(x) := \mathbb{V}[y_i | x_i = x] > 0$ is continuous and $\sup_x \mathbb{E}[y_i^4 | x_i = x] < \infty$; (iii) $g^{(p+1)}$ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\eta > 0$.*

ASSUMPTION 2.2. *(i) The kernel K has support $(-1, 1)$ on which it is symmetric, positive, and Lipschitz continuous; (ii) the bandwidth $h = h_n$ is such that $h + (nh)^{-1} \log n \rightarrow 0$ and $nh^{2p+3} \rightarrow \kappa \in [0, +\infty)$.*

Assumption 2.2 covers the most widely used kernel functions, e.g., the uniform, Epanechnikov, and triangular kernels, as well as ‘large’ ($\kappa > 0$) and undersmoothing ($\kappa = 0$) bandwidths. Under Assumptions 2.1–2.2, the bias term B_n satisfies

$$B_n = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}}g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})C_n/(p+1)! + o_p(1), \quad (2.3)$$

where $C_n = C_n(\mathbf{x}) := \iota'_0(Z'_p W Z_p)^{-1}Z'_p W Z_{p+1}\iota_{p+1}$ satisfies $C_n \rightarrow_p C$, and the constant $C := \iota'_0(\int_{\mathcal{X}} K(s)r_p(s)r_p(s)'ds)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} K(u)r_p(u)u^{p+1}du$. Here, and throughout, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ if \mathbf{x} is an interior point and $\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)$ if \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, such that the constant is uniquely determined by the kernel K , the order p , and whether \mathbf{x} is an interior or boundary point. Note that for undersmoothing bandwidths, $B_n = o_p(1)$ and $B = 0$.

The presence of bias invalidates confidence intervals that ignore it. For instance, with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ nominal level conventional interval that ignores the bias is

$$\text{CI}_n := [\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2}(nh)^{-1/2}\hat{v}_{1n}],$$

where \hat{v}_{1n}^2 is a consistent estimator of v_1^2 . However, $\mathbb{P}(g(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{CI}_n)$ does not converge to $1 - \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To restore asymptotic validity of the confidence interval, the RBC approach of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018) recenters CI_n by an estimate of the leading bias term and adjusts the standard error to account for the variability of the bias estimator. With $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{RBC},n}$ denoting the bias

estimate and the adjusted standard error, respectively, the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ nominal level RBC interval is

$$\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n} := [(\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2}(nh)^{-1/2}\hat{v}_{\text{RBC},n}]. \quad (2.4)$$

For local polynomial estimators, $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$ is based on nonparametric estimators of higher-order derivatives, which may involve the choice of additional bandwidths. It has the form $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n} = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}}\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})C_n/(p+1)!$, where C_n is as introduced previously, and $\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is an estimator of $g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})$. The estimator $\hat{v}_{\text{RBC},n}^2$ estimates the variance of the debiased statistic $\sqrt{nh}\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$. As such, it is equal to \hat{v}_{1n}^2 (the variance estimator of $\sqrt{nh}\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$) plus an additional term that estimates the variance of $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$ and the covariance between $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$ and $\sqrt{nh}\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$; see Calonico et al. (2018, Section 3.1).

2.2 AN EQUIVALENCE RESULT

As we show next, RBC intervals can be derived by prepivoting specific (invalid) bootstrap schemes. In Section 3 we exploit the link between the two approaches to derive new RBC-type intervals with improved length properties.

Let $\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) := \hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x}; h, K)$ denote a bootstrap analogue of $\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$ based on the same kernel function K and the same bandwidth h . Conventional percentile- t bootstrap intervals are typically based on the quantiles of the bootstrap distribution of T_n^* , a given bootstrap analogue of T_n (for instance, $T_n^* = \sqrt{nh}(\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}))$, see Section 3). Letting $\hat{L}_n(u) := \mathbb{P}^*(T_n^* \leq u)$, a standard $100(1-\alpha)\%$ nominal level equal-tailed bootstrap interval for $g(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$\text{CI}_{\text{Boot},n} := [\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{L}_n^{-1}(1-\alpha/2), \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{L}_n^{-1}(\alpha/2)], \quad (2.5)$$

which, however, does not contain $g(\mathbf{x})$ with probability converging to $1-\alpha$. Just as the original nonparametric estimator $\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$ is biased, its bootstrap analogue $\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x})$ is also biased, implying the invalidity of $\text{CI}_{\text{Boot},n}$. As discussed by Cavaliere et al. (2024, Remark 3.2), the root of the problem lies in the fact that the standard bootstrap p-value $\hat{p}_n := \mathbb{P}^*(T_n^* \leq T_n)$ is not asymptotically distributed as $U_{[0,1]}$ in the presence of asymptotic bias.

Prepivoting solves this problem by changing the level of the bootstrap quantiles. Let \hat{H}_n be a (uniformly) consistent estimator of H , the asymptotic cumulative distribution function (cdf) of \hat{p}_n . A $100(1-\alpha)\%$ nominal level equal-tailed bootstrap interval based on prepivoting is

$$\text{CI}_{\text{P},n} := [\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{L}_n^{-1}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(1-\alpha/2)), \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{L}_n^{-1}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha/2))]. \quad (2.6)$$

When $\hat{p}_n \rightarrow_d U_{[0,1]}$ then $H(u) = u$ and $\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha) \rightarrow_p \alpha$, in which case the prepivoted interval $\text{CI}_{\text{P},n}$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\text{CI}_{\text{Boot},n}$. But when asymptotic uniformity of \hat{p}_n fails, $\text{CI}_{\text{P},n}$ remains asymptotically valid while $\text{CI}_{\text{Boot},n}$ becomes invalid. The main reason why prepivoting restores validity is that if \hat{H}_n is a uniformly consistent estimator of H (regardless of whether the latter is the uniform cdf or not), the prepivoted p-value $\tilde{p}_n := \hat{H}_n(\hat{p}_n)$ is asymptotically distributed as $U_{[0,1]}$ by the probability integral transform. This implies asymptotic validity of $\text{CI}_{\text{P},n}$, as shown by

Cavaliere et al. (2024, Remark 3.4); that is, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(g(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}) &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{L}_n^{-1}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha/2)) \leq T_n \leq \hat{L}_n^{-1}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2))) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha/2) \leq \hat{p}_n \leq \hat{H}_n^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2)) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha.\end{aligned}\quad (2.7)$$

Prepivoting avoids an explicit bias correction whenever \hat{H}_n does not require estimating B . Denote by $\hat{B}_n := \mathbb{E}^*[T_n^*]$ and $\hat{v}_n^2 := \mathbb{V}^*[T_n^*]$ the bias and variance, respectively, of the bootstrap statistic T_n^* under the bootstrap probability measure. As we show next, we may regard \hat{B}_n as a bias estimator implicitly induced by the bootstrap. Suppose the following high level conditions hold.

ASSUMPTION \mathcal{H} . (i) $T_n^* - \hat{B}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}_p^*} N(0, v^2)$ with $v^2 = \text{plim } \hat{v}_n^2 > 0$; (ii) $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_n - B_n)' \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} N(0, V)$, where V is positive definite.

Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) requires the bootstrap statistic T_n^* to be conditionally asymptotically Gaussian after we remove the bootstrap bias \hat{B}_n . Note that the bootstrap does not need to replicate the asymptotic variance of T_n , i.e., v^2 may be different from v_1^2 . Under Assumption \mathcal{H} (i), as in Theorem 3.4 of Cavaliere et al. (2024), we can show that $\hat{p}_n = \Phi(\hat{v}_n^{-1}(T_n - \hat{B}_n)) + o_p(1)$. If in addition Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) holds, then $T_n - \hat{B}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} N(0, v_{\mathbf{P}}^2)$ with $v_{\mathbf{P}}^2 > 0$, and the asymptotic cdf of \hat{p}_n is $H(u) := \Phi(m^{-1}\Phi^{-1}(u))$, $m := v_{\mathbf{P}}/v$. A consistent (plug-in) estimator of H can be obtained as

$$\hat{H}_n(u) := \Phi(\hat{m}_n^{-1}\Phi^{-1}(u)), \quad \hat{m}_n := \hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}/\hat{v}_n, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}^2$ is a consistent estimator of $v_{\mathbf{P}}^2$. Different bootstrap methods induce different \hat{B}_n and consequently require different estimators $\hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}^2$. Note that Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) requires the bootstrap bias \hat{B}_n to be asymptotically centered at B_n , a condition that may require modifying the bootstrap statistic T_n^* when inference on a boundary point is desired, as discussed in Section 4.

Although \hat{H}_n of (2.8), and hence $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}$, does not involve \hat{B}_n explicitly, we can show that $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}$ is asymptotically equivalent to an interval that bears a close resemblance to the RBC interval $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$ in that it too contains a bias correction and adjusts the standard error for the additional uncertainty appropriately. We describe this result next.

For simplicity, suppose that T_n^* is conditionally Gaussian; that is, conditionally on \mathcal{D}_n , $T_n^* \sim N(\hat{B}_n, \hat{v}_n^2)$ and hence $\hat{L}_n(u) = \Phi((u - \hat{B}_n)/\hat{v}_n)$. In this case, $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}$ in (2.6) is *exactly* equal to

$$\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P}\text{-RBC},n} = [\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2}\hat{B}_n \pm z_{1-\alpha/2}(nh)^{-1/2}\hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}]. \quad (2.9)$$

In general, T_n^* is Gaussian only asymptotically, and we obtain the following result.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}$, \hat{H}_n , and $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P}\text{-RBC},n}$ be defined in (2.6), (2.8), and (2.9), respectively.*

- (i) *If Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) holds then $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n} = \text{CI}_{\mathbf{P}\text{-RBC},n} + o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$.*
- (ii) *If Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) holds and T_n^* is Gaussian conditional on \mathcal{D}_n , then $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n} = \text{CI}_{\mathbf{P}\text{-RBC},n}$ a.s.*
- (iii) *If Assumption \mathcal{H} holds and $\hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}^2 \rightarrow_p v_{\mathbf{P}}^2$, then $\mathbb{P}(g(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{CI}_{\mathbf{P},n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$.*

An interesting implication of Theorem 2.1 is that we can obtain $\text{CI}_{\mathbf{P}\text{-RBC},n}$ without any resampling as it depends only on \hat{B}_n and $\hat{v}_{\mathbf{P},n}^2$ (which we derive analytically for different residual-based

bootstrap methods in the next sections), and standard normal critical values z_α . More importantly, this asymptotic equivalence result implies that we can view RBC through the lens of pre pivoting (or vice versa), as we show in the next section.

2.3 STANDARD RBC INFERENCE AS GP BOOTSTRAP PREPIVOTING

Assume that the bootstrap data $\mathcal{D}_n^* := \{(y_i^*, x_i^*) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are generated by setting $x_i^* = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ ('fixed regressor' bootstrap) and

$$y_i^* = \tilde{g}_{x,n}(x_i) + \varepsilon_i^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\varepsilon_i^* := \tilde{\varepsilon}_i e_i^*$ with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ being the bias-corrected HCk residuals considered in Calonico et al. (2018) and e_i^* being (conditionally on the data) i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}^*[e_i^*] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}^*[e_i^{*2}] = 1$. The bootstrap conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}^*[y_i^* | x_i^* = x_i]$ in (2.10) is

$$\tilde{g}_{x,n}(x_i) := r_{p+1}(x_i - \mathbf{x})' \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^{p+1} \iota_j' \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x}) (x_i - \mathbf{x})^j,$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x})$ is obtained as in (2.1) using local polynomial regression of order $p+1$ at the *fixed* point \mathbf{x} ; see Bartalotti et al. (2017) and He and Bartalotti (2020) for the case $p=1$. Since $\iota_j' \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x})$ is an estimator of $g^{(j)}(\mathbf{x})/j!$, the function $\tilde{g}_{x,n}(x)$ is an estimator of a $(p+1)$ -th order Taylor expansion of the conditional expectation $g(x) = \mathbb{E}[y_i | x_i = x]$ around the fixed point \mathbf{x} . That is, to generate the bootstrap data we use *the same* function $\tilde{g}_{x,n}(x)$ estimated locally at \mathbf{x} but evaluated globally at each $x = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, we use 'global polynomial' (GP) bootstrap to label the DGP (2.10). Importantly, this method generates bootstrap data using a polynomial order $(p+1)$ that is larger than the order p used in estimation. This mismatch is key to inducing an asymptotic bias under the bootstrap probability measure that satisfies Assumption \mathcal{H} .

Let $\hat{g}_n^*(x)$ be the local (p -th order) polynomial estimator applied to the bootstrap sample generated as (2.10). The GP bootstrap analogue of T_n is $T_{\text{GP},n}^* = \sqrt{nh}(\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{g}_{x,n}(\mathbf{x}))$, and its bootstrap bias and variance are denoted $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{\text{GP},n}^*]$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{GP},n}^2 := \mathbb{V}^*[T_{\text{GP},n}^*]$, respectively. Because the GP bootstrap is a fixed-design scheme (i.e., the regressors are fixed across bootstrap samples), these moments can be computed in closed form. Specifically, we show that

$$\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{C_n}{(p+1)!}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (p+1)! \iota_{p+1}' \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x})$ is an estimator of $g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})$, clearly implying that $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$ is an estimator of the dominant term of B_n in (2.3). Interestingly, $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$ is identical to $\hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$ as given in Calonico et al. (2018, Section 3); see the discussion after (2.4).

As explained in the previous section, a prepivoted bootstrap confidence interval (2.6) based on $(T_n, T_{\text{GP},n}^*)$, say $\text{CI}_{\text{PGP},n}$, can be constructed by choosing $\hat{v}_{\text{PGP},n}^2$ as a consistent estimator of v_{PGP}^2 , which is the asymptotic variance of $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$. Because $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} = \hat{B}_{\text{RBC},n}$, the natural plug-in estimator for the GP case coincides with the variance estimator in Calonico et al. (2018). In




FIGURE 1: NONPARAMETRIC CURVES: ORIGINAL (—), LP BOOTSTRAP (---), AND GP BOOTSTRAP (- · - ·)

Notes: The vertical bar corresponds to the evaluation point $x = -1/3$; the shaded area corresponds to the selected bandwidth; $n = 1,000$ observations are summarized into $n/5$ bins (circles); polynomial order $p = 1$.

Theorem 2.2 below we show (i) validity of such confidence interval, and (ii) its equivalence, up to an $o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$ term, to the RBC interval $CI_{RBC,n}$ in (2.4). The proof requires verifying that Assumption \mathcal{H} holds for $(T_n, T_{GP,n}^*)$ under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2. The theorem then follows by Theorem 2.1.

THEOREM 2.2. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any $x \in \mathbb{S}_x$, $\mathbb{P}(g(x) \in CI_{PGP,n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$ and $CI_{PGP,n} = CI_{RBC,n} + o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$. If, in addition, $T_{GP,n}^*$ is Gaussian conditional on \mathcal{D}_n , then $CI_{PGP,n} = CI_{RBC,n}$ a.s.*

3 IMPROVED NONPARAMETRIC INFERENCE

The main feature of the GP bootstrap discussed above is that the conditional mean function under the bootstrap probability measure is based on a *single* local approximation of the curve g , using a polynomial expansion of g around x , which is then applied globally to all x_i 's. In contrast, in this section we consider the ‘local polynomial’ (LP) bootstrap scheme traditionally employed in the statistics literature, where g is approximated locally for each of the x_i 's, implying that the bootstrap conditional expectation function resembles g more closely over the entire support (Härdle and Marron, 1988, Härdle and Bowman, 1991, Hall and Horowitz, 2013). This point is illustrated in Figure 1, where we contrast the true regression curve with the GP and LP bootstrap curves under the setup considered in Section 5.

In this section, we show how the prepivoted LP bootstrap leads to improved inference. We focus here on the case where x is an interior point. Boundary points will be considered in Section 4.

3.1 THE LOCAL POLYNOMIAL BOOTSTRAP

The LP bootstrap sets the bootstrap conditional expectation to $\mathbb{E}^*[y_i^*|x_i^* = x] = \hat{g}_n(x)$, where $\hat{g}_n(x)$ is as in (2.1). The bootstrap data $\mathcal{D}_n^* := \{(y_i^*, x_i^*) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ satisfy $x_i^* = x_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$y_i^* = \hat{g}_n(x_i) + \varepsilon_i^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\varepsilon_i^* := \tilde{\varepsilon}_i e_i^*$ with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ and e_i^* as defined in Section 2.3 to facilitate comparison with the existing RBC approach. Other choices are possible, e.g., $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{g}_n(x_i)$, without changing our results. Bootstrap DGPs of this or similar forms have been widely applied to nonparametric regression without pre pivoting; see, e.g., Härdle and Marron (1988), Härdle and Bowman (1991), and Hall and Horowitz (2013).

The LP bootstrap uses a p -th order local polynomial regression estimate of $g(x)$ calculated at each sample point $x = x_i$ to generate y_i^* , rather than extrapolating values for $g(x_i)$ from a single $(p+1)$ -th order local polynomial regression estimated at $x = \mathbf{x}$, as for the GP bootstrap. In this section, we exploit this key difference and show the following. First, we demonstrate that pre pivoting can also be used to restore asymptotic validity of the LP bootstrap without requiring undersmoothing or the choice of additional bandwidths, a result that stands in contrast to the existing bootstrap literature. Second, we show that the resulting pre pivoted LP bootstrap (PLP) generates a novel RBC-type confidence interval which differs from the existing RBC intervals in that it does not rely on a higher-order local polynomial estimate of the derivatives entering the bias term. Third, and most importantly, we show that in large samples, the new PLP interval is shorter than the classical RBC CIs in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018), while maintaining correct coverage. Put differently, with respect to the usual bias estimators used in RBC procedures, the bias estimator implicitly generated by the PLP method leads to improved inference on the regression curve.

3.2 THEORY

Consider the pre pivoted bootstrap confidence interval (2.6) based on $(T_n, T_{\text{LP},n}^*)$, say $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}$, where $T_{\text{LP},n}^* = \sqrt{nh}(\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x})$ is the local (p -th order) polynomial estimator applied to the bootstrap sample generated as (3.1). The bootstrap bias and variance of $T_{\text{LP},n}^*$ are $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{\text{LP},n}^*]$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{LP},n}^2 := \mathbb{V}^*[T_{\text{LP},n}^*]$, respectively.

Recall from Section 2.2 that in order to construct $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}$ as in (2.6), a consistent estimator $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2$ of the asymptotic variance v_{PLP}^2 of $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ is required to compute the plug-in estimator $\hat{H}_{\text{LP},n}(u) = \Phi((\hat{v}_{\text{LP},n}/\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n})\Phi^{-1}(u))$. To find $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2$, we first derive the bootstrap bias $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$.

It follows from the closed-form expression for $\hat{g}_n^*(\mathbf{x})$ that

$$\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} = \sqrt{nh} \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \hat{g}_n(x_i) - \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) \right),$$

where, for a generic x , $w_i(x) := \iota_0'(Z_p'(x)W(x)Z_p(x)/n)^{-1}r_p((x_i - x)/h)K((x_i - x)/h)$ so that $\hat{g}_n(x) = (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(x)y_i$. Here, $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ is an estimator of the so-called preasymptotic bias, i.e.

$B_n := \mathbb{E}[T_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = \sqrt{nh}((nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x})g(x_i) - g(\mathbf{x}))$, while, in contrast, $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$ is an estimator of the dominant term in B_n . We can rewrite $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ as

$$\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) y_i \quad (3.2)$$

with weights defined by the convolution $w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - w_i(\mathbf{x})$. Since $T_n = \sqrt{nh}((nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) y_i - g(\mathbf{x}))$, we obtain

$$T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} = \sqrt{nh} \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) y_i - g(\mathbf{x}) \right), \quad w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) := w_i(\mathbf{x}) - w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Let v_{PLP}^2 denote the asymptotic variance of $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$. Because the weights are measurable with respect to \mathcal{X}_n and $\mathbb{V}[y_i | \mathcal{X}_n] = \sigma^2(x_i)$, by conditioning on the regressors we have $\mathbb{V}[T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} | \mathcal{X}_n] = (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \sigma^2(x_i)$. This suggests the estimator

$$\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2 := \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \varepsilon_i^2. \quad (3.3)$$

A formal proof of consistency of $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2$ under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 is provided next.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2$ be defined in (3.3). Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} v_{\text{PLP}}^2 > 0$.*

In view of Lemma 3.1, an application of Theorem 2.1 implies the asymptotic validity of the PLP interval $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}$. In addition, $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}$ is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\text{CI}_{\text{PLP-RBC},n} = [(\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}],$$

which is a new RBC-type interval that does not require resampling. The following theorem states these results.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let \mathbf{x} be an interior point. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\mathbb{P}(g(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$ and $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n} = \text{CI}_{\text{PLP-RBC},n} + o_{\mathbb{P}}((nh)^{-1/2})$. If, in addition, $T_{\text{LP},n}^*$ is Gaussian conditional on \mathcal{D}_n , then $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n} = \text{CI}_{\text{PLP-RBC},n}$ a.s.*

3.3 IMPROVED INFERENCE

In this section, we compare the asymptotic efficiency of the new pre pivoted PLP intervals and the existing RBC-type intervals proposed by Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). We show that the former are asymptotically shorter than the latter. This efficiency result is based on the asymptotic equivalence between pre pivoting and the RBC approach in Section 2.2. In particular, Theorems 2.2 and 3.1 imply that the asymptotic relative length of $\text{CI}_{\text{PLP},n}$ compared to $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$ is equal to the ratio between the asymptotic standard deviations of their respective debiased statistics, i.e., $v_{\text{PLP}}/v_{\text{RBC}}$.

To shed some light on this ratio, let $\mathbf{w}(u), u \in \mathbb{R}$, be the so-called ‘equivalent kernel’ associated with K and p . Specifically, $\mathbf{w}(u) := \iota'_0(\int_{\mathcal{X}} r_p(s) r'_p(s) K(s) ds)^{-1} r_p(u) K(u)$, which is the asymptotic analogue of the sample weights $w_i(x)$; see Lemma B.5. Similarly, define the asymptotic analogue

TABLE 2: RELATIVE (ASYMPTOTIC) INTERVAL LENGTH COMPARISON

Kernel	\mathcal{K}_{PLP}	\mathcal{K}_{RBC}	$(\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}}/\mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}})^{1/2}$
Triangular	0.95	1.33	0.84
Uniform	0.83	1.13	0.86
Epanechnikov	0.85	1.25	0.83
Biweight	1.01	1.41	0.85
Triweight	1.15	1.55	0.86

Notes: Polynomial order $p = 1$.

of $w_{\text{PLP},i}(x)$ as $w_{\text{PLP}}(u) := 2w(u) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(u-r)w(r)dr$. This contrasts with that of the RBC method given by $w_{\text{RBC}}(u) := w(u) - C\iota'_{p+1}(\int_{\mathcal{X}} r_{p+1}(s)r'_{p+1}(s)K(s)ds)^{-1}r_{p+1}(u)K(u)$ with $C := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(u)u^{p+1}du$; see Lemma B.1 and Calonico et al. (2022, Section 4.2).

COROLLARY 3.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2,*

$$(v_{\text{PLP}}^2, v_{\text{RBC}}^2) = \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}}, \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}),$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 du > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{RBC}}(u)^2 du > 0 \quad (3.4)$$

are functions only of the kernel K and the polynomial order p .

As shown in Section 3.2, v_{PLP}^2 is the asymptotic variance of a (scaled) weighted average of y_i with weights $w_{\text{PLP},i}(x)$. Using fairly standard arguments in the nonparametric literature (e.g., Fan and Gijbels, 1996, p. 66), Corollary 3.1 shows that this variance is proportional to $\sigma^2(x)/f(x)$ where the constant of proportionality is \mathcal{K}_{PLP} , which is a known function of the kernel and the polynomial order, p . A similar proportionality holds for v_{RBC}^2 with the difference that the constant of proportionality is \mathcal{K}_{RBC} , which is a different function of the kernel and p . Hence, the relative asymptotic length of the PLP and RBC intervals is the square root of $\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}}/\mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}$.

Table 2 reports the values of \mathcal{K}_{PLP} , \mathcal{K}_{RBC} , and the square root of their ratio for five common kernels and $p = 1$, which is by far the most commonly used value in practice. For all the kernels considered, the decrease is substantial, ranging from 14% to 17%. Figure 2 provides a comparison of the functions w_{PLP} and w_{RBC} for the five kernels previously considered and $p = 1$. While neither function is always closer to zero than the other, $w_{\text{PLP}}(u)$ clearly shows less variation around zero, resulting in $\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}} < \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}$.

We conclude this section by noticing that a double-bandwidth approach could be applied, where h is used to fit the local polynomial estimator as above, and a new bandwidth b is used for the bias estimator. Calonico et al. (2022) show that existing RBC inference can be optimized in terms of interval length by selecting an optimal value of $\rho := h/b$, say ρ_{opt} . Interestingly, with the values of ρ_{opt} derived by Calonico et al. (2022) for the triangular and Epanechnikov kernels and $p = 1$, the PLP approach based on a single bandwidth still provides shorter intervals, with relative lengths of 0.95 for the triangular kernel and 0.90 for the Epanechnikov kernel. For the uniform kernel, the




FIGURE 2: THE FUNCTIONS w_{PLP} (—) AND w_{RBC} (---) FOR FIVE KERNELS

Notes: Polynomial order $p = 1$.

result in Table 2 still holds because $\rho_{\text{opt}} = 1$ in that case.

4 INFERENCE AT THE BOUNDARY AND RDD

In this section, we extend the results in Section 3 to address inference on $g(\mathbf{x})$ when \mathbf{x} is a boundary point. This includes standard applications of nonparametric regression to RDD, which is prominent in empirical work. As it turns out, the key challenge when \mathbf{x} is on the boundary is that the LP bootstrap bias is no longer centered around the original bias B_n , not even asymptotically. Therefore, Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) breaks down and Theorem 3.1 no longer applies; see Section 4.1. We show that a simple modification of the pre pivoting method (mPLP) restores the validity results established in Section 3 for interior points. Importantly, confidence intervals based on the proposed mPLP procedure automatically account for cases where \mathbf{x} is at the boundary, while remaining asymptotically equivalent to the PLP procedure from Section 3 when \mathbf{x} is an interior point. The proposed modification is presented in Section 4.2, with its application to regression discontinuity designs discussed in Section 4.3.

4.1 CHALLENGES OF STANDARD PREPIVOTING AT THE BOUNDARY

A crucial assumption underlying the results of Section 3.2 is Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii), which requires that $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n$ converges in distribution to a mean-zero Gaussian random variable. This assumption fails when \mathbf{x} is a boundary point since $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n$ is no longer (asymptotically) centered at zero. The reason is that, in contrast with the interior case, C_n and its LP bootstrap analogue $C_{\text{LP},n}$ do not converge to the same constant C when \mathbf{x} is on the boundary. Instead, Lemma B.3 shows that

$$\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n - A_n = \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} + o_p(1), \quad A_n \rightarrow_p A := \sqrt{\kappa} g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})(C_{\text{LP}} - C)/(p+1)!, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\xi_{2n,\text{LP}} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i$ has zero mean, $A_n := \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})(C_{\text{LP},n} - C_n)/(p+1)!$, $C_{\text{LP},n} := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) C_n(x_i)$ is a smoothed version of C_n , and $g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the (directional) $(p+1)$ -order derivative at \mathbf{x} . Importantly, $C \neq C_{\text{LP}}$ when \mathbf{x} is on the boundary, but they are uniquely determined by the kernel K and the polynomial order p ; see Lemma B.1.

Our modified method restores validity of the pre pivoted bootstrap confidence interval by simply rescaling the bootstrap statistic $T_{\text{LP},n}^*$ with a known function of the data, say Q_n . The scaling factor

Q_n is chosen such that the term A_n is eliminated from the asymptotic distribution of the bootstrap bias. As we shall see, it does not involve any additional tuning parameters or unknown quantities.

4.2 A BOUNDARY-ADAPTIVE PREPIVOTING METHOD

Let $T_{\text{mLP},n}^* := Q_n T_{\text{LP},n}^*$, where $Q_n := C_n / C_{\text{LP},n}$ depends only on K , h , and \mathcal{X}_n . By definition, $\hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{\text{mLP},n}^*] = Q_n \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ with $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ as in Section 3.2. In contrast with $T_{\text{LP},n}^*$, Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) holds for $T_{\text{mLP},n}^*$ for any \mathbf{x} , including boundary points, because we have defined Q_n precisely such that $Q_n C_{\text{LP},n} = C_n$. Specifically,

$$\hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} - B_n = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} (Q_n C_{\text{LP},n} - C_n) + Q_n \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} + o_p(1) = Q_n \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} + o_p(1). \quad (4.2)$$

Consequently, the modified LP bootstrap bias $\hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}$ is asymptotically centered at B_n , as required in Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii). Crucially, this result holds for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_x$, including boundary points.

Taken together, these results imply that an asymptotically valid modified confidence interval, denoted $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}$, can be constructed provided a consistent estimator $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}^2$ is available for the asymptotic variance v_{mPLP}^2 of $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}$. By relying on arguments similar to those used for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2$ in (3.3), we can show that a consistent estimator of v_{mPLP}^2 is given by

$$\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}^2 := \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{mPLP},i}^2(\mathbf{x}) \tilde{\varepsilon}_i^2, \quad w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) := w_i(\mathbf{x}) - w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (4.3)$$

where $w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) := Q_n w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x})$ with $w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ as defined in Section 3.1. The following lemma formalizes this result.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}^2$ be as in (4.3). Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}^2 \rightarrow_p v_{\text{mPLP}}^2 > 0$.*

Because $T_{\text{mLP},n}^*$ satisfies Assumption \mathcal{H} , we can apply Theorem 2.1 to conclude that the mPLP interval $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}$ is asymptotically valid and equivalent to

$$\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP-RBC},n} = [(\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) - (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}],$$

which is an RBC-type interval involving no resampling. This interval is based on a new bootstrap bias correction, $\hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}$, and a new studentization, $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}$, and it is valid for both interior and boundary points as stated in the next theorem.

THEOREM 4.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_x$, $\mathbb{P}(g(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$ and $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n} = \text{CI}_{\text{mPLP-RBC},n} + o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$. If, in addition, $T_{\text{LP},n}^*$ is Gaussian conditional on \mathcal{D}_n , then $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n} = \text{CI}_{\text{mPLP-RBC},n}$ a.s.*

An important feature of the mPLP approach is that it automatically adapts to the location of the point \mathbf{x} . That is, it coincides with the PLP approach asymptotically when \mathbf{x} lies in the interior of \mathbb{S}_x (where $Q_n \rightarrow_p Q = 1$), and it provides a valid generalization when \mathbf{x} is on the boundary.

Finally, as in Section 3.3, we can show that confidence intervals for $g(\mathbf{x})$ are asymptotically shorter when based on mPLP compared to the existing RBC intervals. This result, which holds for both interior and boundary points, follows by comparing the asymptotic variances v_{mPLP}^2 and v_{RBC}^2 .

TABLE 3: RELATIVE (ASYMPTOTIC) INTERVAL LENGTH COMPARISON – BOUNDARY CASE

Kernel	$\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}$	\mathcal{K}_{RBC}	$(\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}/\mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}})^{1/2}$
Triangular	7.17	10.29	0.84
Uniform	6.62	9.00	0.86
Epanechnikov	6.78	9.82	0.83
Biweight	7.67	10.87	0.84
Triweight	8.54	11.87	0.85

Notes: Polynomial order $p = 1$.

COROLLARY 4.1. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. If \mathbf{x} is an interior point then $v_{\text{mPLP}}^2 = v_{\text{PLP}}^2$, and the conclusions of Corollary 3.1 hold. If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, then*

$$(v_{\text{mPLP}}^2, v_{\text{RBC}}^2) = \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}, \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}$ and \mathcal{K}_{RBC} are functions only of the kernel K and the polynomial order p .

In contrast to Corollary 3.1, Corollary 4.1 applies to any evaluation point \mathbf{x} , including both interior and boundary points. The values of the constants \mathcal{K} depend on the kernel function K , the polynomial order p , as well as on whether \mathbf{x} is in the interior or at the boundary of \mathbb{S}_x . When \mathbf{x} is in the interior of \mathbb{S}_x , these values coincide with those of \mathcal{K}_{PLP} and \mathcal{K}_{RBC} in Corollary 3.1, implying that Corollary 3.1 is a special case of Corollary 4.1.

When \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, \mathcal{K}_{RBC} takes different values compared with the interior point case, and $\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}$ is different from \mathcal{K}_{PLP} . Table 3 is the boundary analogue of Table 2 and confirms that, for the five kernels previously considered, the modified prepivoted interval $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}$ is asymptotically shorter than $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$. As in Figure 2, we also plot in Figure 3 the equivalent kernels of mPLP and RBC (see Appendix B.1). The comparison reveals that the conclusions from Section 3.3 also hold for mPLP, i.e., $\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}} < \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}$.

4.3 APPLICATION TO REGRESSION-DISCONTINUITY DESIGNS

In this section, we apply the modified prepivoting approach from Section 4.2 to the problem of inference in RDD. Adopting the standard potential outcome framework, let $y_i(1)$ and $y_i(0)$ denote the potential outcomes for individual i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) with and without the treatment, respectively. For each individual, we observe the associated treatment indicator d_i , which equals 1 if unit i is treated (0 otherwise), and the observed outcome, $y_i = y_i(0) + (y_i(1) - y_i(0))d_i$. We also observe the ‘forcing’ variable x_i , a scalar covariate which is not affected by the treatment and determines whether $d_i = 1$. Hence, the observed data are $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(y_i, x_i, d_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

We consider (sharp) RDD, where d_i is determined by x_i being above a given known cutoff \mathbf{x} ; that is, $d_i := \mathbb{I}_{\{x_i \geq \mathbf{x}\}}$. Interest is in estimating the average treatment effect at the cutoff, namely $\text{ATE}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[y_i(1) - y_i(0)|x_i = \mathbf{x}] = g_+(\mathbf{x}) - g_-(\mathbf{x})$, where $g_+(x) := \mathbb{E}[y_i(1)|x_i = x]$ and $g_-(x) := \mathbb{E}[y_i(0)|x_i = x]$ are the regression functions of the potential outcomes. We consider the following




FIGURE 3: THE FUNCTIONS w_{mPLP} (—) AND w_{RBC} (---) FOR FIVE KERNELS – BOUNDARY CASE

Notes: Polynomial order $p = 1$.

modification of Assumption 2.1, where $\sigma_+^2(x) := \mathbb{V}[y_i(1)|x_i = x]$ and $\sigma_-^2(x) := \mathbb{V}[y_i(0)|x_i = x]$.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. (y_i, x_i, d_i) are i.i.d. and x_i has bounded support \mathbb{S}_x and continuous density f . For all x in an open neighborhood of \mathbf{x} , it holds that (i) $f(x) > 0$; (ii) σ_+^2 and σ_-^2 are continuous and $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} \mathbb{E}[y_i^4|x_i = x] < \infty$; (iii) $g_+^{(p+1)}$ and $g_-^{(p+1)}$ are Hölder continuous with exponent $\eta > 0$.

This assumption, which will be used for the asymptotic analysis, also identifies $\text{ATE}(\mathbf{x})$ as the jump in the regression function g at the cutoff \mathbf{x} , i.e., as $\tau(\mathbf{x}) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^+} g(x) - \lim_{x \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^-} g(x) = g_+(\mathbf{x}) - g_-(\mathbf{x})$; see Hahn et al. (2001) and Imbens and Kalyanaraman (2012). Hence, $\tau(\mathbf{x})$ is the parameter of interest, and the average treatment effect can be estimated as the difference of two local polynomial regressions at the cutoff \mathbf{x} . Formally, we can write this estimator as

$$\hat{\tau}_n(\mathbf{x}) := \hat{g}_{+,n}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{g}_{-,n}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (4.4)$$

where $\hat{g}_{+,n}(x)$ and $\hat{g}_{-,n}(x)$ are defined as in (2.1) with $K((x_i - x)/h)$ replaced by $K_+((x_i - x)/h) := K((x_i - x)/h)\mathbb{I}_{\{x_i \geq \mathbf{x}\}}$ and $K_-((x_i - x)/h) := K((x_i - x)/h)\mathbb{I}_{\{x_i < \mathbf{x}\}}$, respectively.

To construct valid confidence intervals using the modified pre-pivoting method of Section 4.2, let $T_n := (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}_n(\mathbf{x}) - \tau(\mathbf{x}))$ and its LP bootstrap analogue $T_n^* := (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{\tau}_n(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\hat{\tau}_n^*(\mathbf{x})$ is calculated from bootstrap data, $\mathcal{D}_n^* := \{(y_i^*, x_i^*, d_i^*) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Specifically, $(x_i^*, d_i^*) = (x_i, d_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the y_i^* 's are as in (3.1) with $\hat{g}_n(x_i)$ replaced by $\hat{g}_{+,n}(x_i)\mathbb{I}_{\{x_i \geq \mathbf{x}\}} + \hat{g}_{-,n}(x_i)\mathbb{I}_{\{x_i < \mathbf{x}\}}$.

Next, we define the modified bootstrap statistic, $T_{\text{rd},n}^*$. Since estimation of τ requires fitting two distinct LP regressions, it is useful to decompose $T_n = T_{+,n} - T_{-,n}$, where $T_{+,n} := (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{g}_{+,n}(\mathbf{x}) - g_+(\mathbf{x}))$ and $T_{-,n} := (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{g}_{-,n}(\mathbf{x}) - g_-(\mathbf{x}))$. In the same way, we can decompose $T_n^* = T_{+,n}^* - T_{-,n}^*$ and define the scaling factors $Q_{+,n}$ and $Q_{-,n}$ as in Section 4.2 with K replaced by K_+ and K_- , respectively. Thus, the modified bootstrap statistic is $T_{\text{rd},n}^* := Q_{+,n}T_{+,n}^* - Q_{-,n}T_{-,n}^*$.

The bootstrap bias is

$$\hat{B}_{\text{rd},n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{\text{rd},n}^*] = Q_{+,n}\hat{B}_{+,n} - Q_{-,n}\hat{B}_{-,n}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $\hat{B}_{+,n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{+,n}^*]$ and $\hat{B}_{-,n} := \mathbb{E}^*[T_{-,n}^*]$ are computed as in (3.2) with K replaced by K_+ and K_- , respectively, in the definition of the weights $w_i(x)$. Finally, we need a consistent estimator $\hat{v}_{\text{rd},n}^2$ of the asymptotic variance v_{rd}^2 of $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{rd},n}$. To this end, we note that $\mathbb{V}[T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{rd},n}|\mathcal{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}[T_{+,n} - Q_{+,n}\hat{B}_{+,n}|\mathcal{X}_n] + \mathbb{V}[T_{-,n} - Q_{-,n}\hat{B}_{-,n}|\mathcal{X}_n]$. Consistent estimators of these two variance components can be obtained as in (4.3) with K replaced by K_+ and K_- , respectively, thus yielding $\hat{v}_{\text{rd},n}^2$.

We show in the next theorem that $T_{rd,n}^*$ satisfies Assumption \mathcal{H} , so we can apply Theorem 2.1 to conclude that a modified confidence interval for $\tau(x)$, denoted $CI_{rd,n}$ and constructed using $\hat{v}_{rd,n}^2$ as in Sections 2.2 and 3.2, is asymptotically valid and equivalent to

$$CI_{rd-RBC,n} = [(\hat{\tau}_n(x) - (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{B}_{rd,n}) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{v}_{rd,n}],$$

which is an RBC-type interval involving no resampling.

THEOREM 4.2. *Under Assumptions 2.2 and 4.1 it holds that (i) $\hat{v}_{rd,n}^2 \rightarrow_p v_{rd}^2$, (ii) $\mathbb{P}(\tau(x) \in CI_{rd,n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$, (iii) $CI_{rd,n} = CI_{rd-RBC,n} + o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$, and (iv) if, in addition, $T_{rd,n}^*$ is Gaussian conditional on \mathcal{D}_n , then $CI_{rd,n} = CI_{rd-RBC,n}$ a.s.*

Finally, we note that all the results in this section can be generalized to allow for different kernel and bandwidth choices on each side of the cutoff. This changes the efficiency results in Sections 3.3 and 4.2 only slightly. Specifically, let $\mathcal{K}_{+,rd}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{-,rd}$ denote \mathcal{K}_{mPLP} for the kernel used to the right and to the left of the cutoff, respectively. We similarly define $\mathcal{K}_{+,RBC}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{-,RBC}$. By the i.i.d. assumption, the following result then follows from Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1.

COROLLARY 4.2. *Under Assumptions 2.2 (applied to both sides of the cutoff) and 4.1,*

$$\frac{v_{rd}^2}{v_{RBC-rd}^2} = \frac{\sigma_+^2(x) \mathcal{K}_{+,rd} + \sigma_-^2(x) \mathcal{K}_{-,rd}}{\sigma_+^2(x) \mathcal{K}_{+,RBC} + \sigma_-^2(x) \mathcal{K}_{-,RBC}},$$

where v_{RBC-rd}^2 is the asymptotic variance from the existing RBC interval for RDD.

As previously, the asymptotic relative length of the confidence intervals is the square root of the ratio given in Corollary 4.2. Because $\mathcal{K}_{+,rd} < \mathcal{K}_{+,RBC}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{-,rd} < \mathcal{K}_{-,RBC}$ for all the kernels considered (as seen in Table 3), it follows from Corollary 4.2 that our new confidence intervals $CI_{rd,n}$ and $CI_{rd-RBC,n}$ are asymptotically shorter compared to the existing RBC intervals for RDD. Indeed, when the same kernel is applied on both sides of the cutoff, as is most common in applied work, the result in Corollary 4.2 simplifies to that obtained in Corollary 4.1 and displayed in Table 3. Specifically, the new intervals are shorter than the existing RBC intervals by the same amount as in Table 3.

It is likely that these results can be extended to other types of RDDs, e.g., fuzzy or kinked RDD. Although relatively straightforward conceptually, such extensions are nontrivial. For example, the fuzzy RDD estimator is a ratio of two sharp RDD estimators. Thus, limit theory would require joint convergence of those two estimators, which in turn requires development of a generalization of the pre pivoting theory of Cavaliere et al. (2024) to vector-valued statistics. With such theory in hand, the fuzzy RDD estimator can be analyzed using the arguments above combined with the delta method.

5 MONTE CARLO

We now discuss the finite sample performance of the proposed CIs and compare them with the CIs based on existing RBC using Monte Carlo simulation. We also include the invalid (i.e., not prepivoted) CIs for comparison. We consider two distinct inference problems: a nonparametric regression curve evaluated at both an interior and a boundary point and a sharp RDD.

We report results for 5,000 Monte Carlo replications and nominal level 0.95. Estimators are based on the Epanechnikov kernel for the nonparametric regression setup and on the triangular kernel for the RDD setup, as those represent popular kernel choices. Two relevant bandwidth choices are considered: the infeasible MSE-optimal bandwidth (h), as a theoretical benchmark, and the feasible (plug-in based) coverage-error-optimal bandwidth (\hat{h}) of Calonico et al. (2018, 2020, 2022), representing the reference bandwidth if the aim is to minimize the coverage error of RBC intervals. For each bandwidth choice, we report the average bandwidth (\bar{h}) across Monte Carlo replications. We report empirical coverage probabilities and average lengths for four methods: $\text{CI}_{\text{GP},n}$, $\text{CI}_{\text{LP},n}$, $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$, and $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}$. The first two methods are based on the interval $\text{CI}_{\text{Boot},n}$ in (2.5), using the GP and LP bootstrap schemes, respectively. $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$ is the interval (2.4) and $\text{CI}_{\text{mPLP},n}$ is the interval defined in Section 4.2. For all methods, we use HC3 residuals. The bootstrap intervals are all based on a Gaussian wild bootstrap scheme, and hence implemented analytically without resampling; see Section 2.2. For the same reason, results for the prepivoted GP interval $\text{CI}_{\text{PGP},n}$ defined in Section 2.3 would be identical to $\text{CI}_{\text{RBC},n}$, and are thus not reported.

NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION. We consider i.i.d. data generated as $y_i = g(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$ with $x_i \sim U_{[-1,1]}$ and $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, where $\sigma = 1$ and

$$g(x) = \frac{\sin(3\pi x/2)}{1 + 18x^2(\text{sign}(x) + 1)}.$$

This DGP was previously considered in Berry, Carroll, and Ruppert (2001), Hall and Horowitz (2013), and Calonico et al. (2018, 2022), among others. We consider inference both at an interior point, $x = -1/3$, and a boundary point, $x = -1$, denoted *int* and *bnd*, respectively, in Table 4.

Results for samples of size $n \in \{250, 500, 1000, 2000\}$ are presented in Table 4. The numerical evidence supports the anticipated decrease in interval lengths of 17%, even for small sample sizes, suggesting that the asymptotic efficiency of *mPLP* is rapidly achieved as n increases. We observe that *RBC* and *mPLP* perform similarly in terms of coverage under both bandwidth choices, with empirical coverage probabilities remaining close to the nominal level. A deviation from the nominal level is detected for *mPLP* with \hat{h} , when x is an interior point and n is small, but this deviation rapidly vanishes as the sample size increases. Finally, because they are not robust to the ‘large’ bandwidth choices considered, non-prepivoted methods exhibit much smaller average lengths, resulting in severe undercoverage even for large n .

RDD. In the context of RDD, we generate i.i.d. data from $y_i = g(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$ with $x_i \sim 2\mathcal{B}(2, 4) - 1$ and $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, where \mathcal{B} is the Beta distribution and $\sigma = 0.1295$. We consider two choices for

TABLE 4: COVERAGE AND LENGTH OF 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS - NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION

eval.	n	h	\bar{h}	Coverage				Length			
				GP	LP	RBC	mPLP	GP	LP	RBC	mPLP
int	250	h	0.189	81.5	88.9	93.6	94.2	0.635	0.635	0.915	0.765
		\hat{h}	0.359	80.3	79.3	93.1	86.5	0.461	0.461	0.664	0.554
	500	h	0.165	82.1	89.2	94.2	94.4	0.479	0.479	0.690	0.573
		\hat{h}	0.303	81.6	85.4	94.1	91.1	0.353	0.353	0.510	0.422
	1000	h	0.143	81.9	90.0	94.4	94.9	0.361	0.361	0.521	0.431
		\hat{h}	0.256	81.9	87.7	94.6	93.8	0.270	0.270	0.390	0.322
	2000	h	0.125	83.3	90.7	95.1	95.4	0.273	0.273	0.394	0.326
		\hat{h}	0.217	82.5	89.4	94.9	94.5	0.207	0.207	0.299	0.247
bnd	250	h	0.353	77.7	85.6	90.9	92.2	1.277	1.277	1.901	1.596
		\hat{h}	0.373	77.8	83.2	91.0	91.2	1.271	1.271	1.895	1.602
	500	h	0.307	79.9	87.6	93.3	93.8	0.961	0.961	1.426	1.191
		\hat{h}	0.327	80.6	85.6	93.2	92.8	0.946	0.946	1.403	1.174
	1000	h	0.267	80.6	87.8	93.8	94.0	0.725	0.725	1.071	0.894
		\hat{h}	0.285	80.7	86.7	93.9	93.3	0.711	0.711	1.051	0.878
	2000	h	0.233	81.4	89.5	94.7	94.8	0.549	0.549	0.812	0.676
		\hat{h}	0.257	81.5	88.1	94.5	94.3	0.526	0.526	0.779	0.649

the regression function g based on the datasets in Ludwig and Miller (2007) and Lee (2008), as in Calonico et al. (2014). Specifically, the two DGPs are

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{DGP1: } g(x) &= \begin{cases} 3.71 + 2.30x + 3.28x^2 + 1.45x^3 + 0.23x^4 + 0.03x^5 & \text{if } x < 0, \\ 0.26 + 18.49x - 54.81x^2 + 74.30x^3 - 45.02x^4 + 9.83x^5 & \text{if } x \geq 0, \end{cases} \\
\text{DGP2: } g(x) &= \begin{cases} 0.48 + 1.27x - 0.5 \cdot 7.18x^2 + 0.7 \cdot 20.21x^3 + 1.1 \cdot 21.54x^4 + 1.5 \cdot 7.33x^5 & \text{if } x < 0, \\ 0.52 + 0.84x - 0.1 \cdot 3.00x^2 - 0.3 \cdot 7.99x^3 - 0.1 \cdot 9.01x^4 + 3.56x^5 & \text{if } x \geq 0, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where, as in Calonico et al. (2014), the fifth-order polynomial from the Lee (2008) data in DGP2 is modified to increase the curvature of g and hence increase bias.

Results for samples of size $n \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 4000\}$ (total sample sizes are twice those in the nonparametric regression example) are presented in Table 5. The results confirm the conclusions drawn for the nonparametric regression example: the mPLP method produces shorter intervals than RBC for all the considered sample sizes and bandwidth choices, with coverage levels of both prepivoted methods close to the nominal value. As expected, non-prepivoted methods fail to deliver valid inference.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes novel procedures for inference in nonparametric regression and regression-discontinuity designs based on non-standard implementations of the bootstrap. New confidence intervals based on the concept of prepivoting (Beran 1987, 1988; Cavaliere et al., 2024) are shown to

TABLE 5: COVERAGE AND LENGTH OF 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS - RDD

DGP	n	h	\bar{h}	Coverage				Length			
				GP	LP	RBC	mPLP	GP	LP	RBC	mPLP
1	500	h	0.082	80.6	86.7	93.3	93.2	0.345	0.345	0.589	0.470
		\hat{h}	0.073	79.6	86.0	93.5	94.0	0.373	0.373	0.674	0.539
	1000	h	0.072	81.1	87.8	94.3	94.2	0.249	0.249	0.388	0.318
		\hat{h}	0.060	81.0	86.8	93.8	93.9	0.276	0.276	0.441	0.358
	2000	h	0.063	81.2	88.0	94.5	94.7	0.185	0.185	0.279	0.231
		\hat{h}	0.049	80.4	87.8	94.4	94.4	0.210	0.210	0.321	0.265
	4000	h	0.054	81.3	88.3	94.8	95.1	0.138	0.138	0.205	0.170
		\hat{h}	0.041	81.2	88.2	94.8	94.8	0.160	0.160	0.240	0.199
2	500	h	0.260	80.7	88.0	94.4	94.2	0.183	0.183	0.274	0.228
		\hat{h}	0.126	80.2	86.9	94.1	94.0	0.271	0.271	0.434	0.354
	1000	h	0.226	81.6	89.0	94.7	94.8	0.136	0.136	0.202	0.168
		\hat{h}	0.115	81.9	88.7	94.9	95.1	0.194	0.194	0.297	0.244
	2000	h	0.197	82.9	88.5	94.8	94.8	0.102	0.102	0.150	0.125
		\hat{h}	0.101	82.0	88.8	94.7	94.7	0.144	0.144	0.214	0.178
	4000	h	0.172	81.0	89.1	94.7	94.7	0.077	0.077	0.113	0.094
		\hat{h}	0.087	82.4	89.2	94.8	95.1	0.108	0.108	0.160	0.134

deliver asymptotically correct coverage under general conditions that allow for the presence of bias and thus do not require undersmoothing. We show that pre pivoting different choices of bootstrap DGPs yield different robust bias correction (RBC)-type confidence intervals. This connection between the pre pivoting and robust bias correction approaches allows us to identify the specific bootstrap DGP underlying the RBC approach of Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). More importantly, it enables us to propose a new alternative approach based on a local polynomial bootstrap algorithm that delivers improved inference. Specifically, the pre pivoted local polynomial method yields 14–17% shorter intervals than existing RBC intervals, depending only on the choice of kernel function.

The application of pre pivoting to inference in the presence of nonnegligible bias has potential applications beyond those explored here. A natural extension is to sieve regression estimators, which have a long tradition in the nonparametrics literature (see, e.g., Andrews, 1991; Huang, 2003; Chen, 2007; Belloni et al., 2015; Chen and Christensen, 2015). Although bias is often assumed away through undersmoothing conditions, Cattaneo et al. (2020) have recently proposed RBC inference methods for the particular case of partitioning-based nonparametric estimators. It would be interesting to explore whether pre pivoting can improve inference in this setting.

Other potential applications include two-step semiparametric estimators where the first step involves nonparametric regression, potentially affecting the asymptotic distribution of the second step estimator (e.g., Andrews, 1994; Newey, 1994; Chen, Linton, and van Keilegom, 2003). While this literature has primarily focused on how to adjust the variance of the second step estimator, Cattaneo and Jansson (2018) show that asymptotic bias emerges under ‘small bandwidth’ asymptotics when the first step uses kernel regression. Although they show that a particular bootstrap automatically corrects for this bias, their results assume away smoothing bias. Exploring whether pre pivot-

ing can improve inference in this setting would be an interesting contribution. Extensions to time series and high-dimensional frameworks (Gupta and Seo, 2023) or spatial data (Hallin et al., 2004) are also of interest. Finally, investigating connections to honest confidence intervals (Armstrong and Kolesár, 2020; Imbens and Wager, 2019), which guarantee uniform coverage over function classes defined by smoothness bounds, represents another promising direction for future research.

APPENDIX

A NOTATION

The following notation is used throughout the paper. We let $\mathbb{I}_{\{\cdot\}}$ denote the indicator function and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_i$ a column vector of conforming, context-dependent dimension, with one in the $(i + 1)$ -th entry and zeros in the remaining entries. The p -th order derivative of a function f is denoted $f^{(p)}$. The Euclidean norm is denoted $|A|$. For two intervals, $I_1, I_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a scalar $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we use the notation $I_1 = I_2 + r$ to denote that the Hausdorff distance between I_1 and I_2 is r . Unless specified otherwise, all limits are for $n \rightarrow \infty$. The standard Gaussian cdf is denoted by Φ and its u -quantile by z_u . The uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ is denoted $U_{[0,1]}$. If F is a cdf, F^{-1} denotes the right-continuous generalized inverse, i.e., $F^{-1}(u) := \sup\{v \in \mathbb{R} : F(v) \leq u\}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

For a bootstrap sequence Y_n^* we use $Y_n^* = o_{\mathbb{P}^*}(1)$ to mean that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{P}^*(|Y_n^*| > \epsilon) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$, where \mathbb{P}^* denotes the probability measure conditional on the original data \mathcal{D}_n . We use $Y_n^* \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} \xi$ to mean that, for all continuity points $u \in \mathbb{R}$ of $G(u) := \mathbb{P}(\xi \leq u)$, it holds that $\mathbb{P}^*(Y_n^* \leq u) - G(u) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Finally, \mathbb{E}^* and \mathbb{V}^* denote expectation and variance computed under \mathbb{P}^* .

B PRELIMINARIES

B.1 MOMENTS, WEIGHTS, AND EQUIVALENT KERNELS

In this appendix, we define some relevant sample and population functions related to the moments of K and K^2 , used to derive our main results, as well as the weight functions and equivalent kernels of the (bias-corrected) estimators.

We first define quantities related to moments of K . Specifically, $\gamma_{j,n}(x) := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K((x_i - x)/h)((x_i - x)/h)^j$,

$$\hat{\gamma}_j := f(x) \int_{\mathcal{X}} K(u) u^j du, \quad \gamma_{\mathbb{E},j,n}(x) := \int_{-1}^1 K(u) u^j f(x + uh) du.$$

For the moments of K^2 , we let $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n}(x) := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K((x_i - x)/h)^2 ((x_i - x)/h)^j \tilde{\epsilon}_i^2$ and

$$\dot{\psi}_j := f(x) \sigma^2(x) \int_{\mathcal{X}} K(u)^2 u^j du.$$

Finally, we define the $(p + 1) \times (p + 1)$ matrices $\Gamma_p(x)$, $\Gamma_{\mathbb{E},p}(x)$, $\dot{\Gamma}_p$, $\tilde{\Psi}_p(x)$, $\dot{\Psi}_p$ with (i, j) -th entries given by $\gamma_{i+j-2,n}(x)$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{E},i+j-2,n}(x)$, $\dot{\gamma}_{i+j-2}$, $\tilde{\psi}_{i+j-2,n}(x)$, $\dot{\psi}_{i+j-2}$, respectively.

We now introduce the main weighting functions and equivalent kernels. First, the weights for a p -th order local polynomial estimator are

$$w_i(x) := \iota'_0 \Gamma_p^{-1}(x) r_p \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) K \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right),$$

where the associated equivalent kernel is given by $w(u) := \iota'_0 (\int_{\mathcal{X}} r_p(v) r'_p(v) K(v) dv)^{-1} r_p(u) K(u)$. For boundary points, we also define $w_{\text{bnd}}(u, s) := \iota'_0 (\int_{-s}^1 r_p(v) r'_p(v) K(v) dv)^{-1} r_p(u) K(u)$, such that $w_{\text{bnd}}(u, 0) = w(u)$. Moreover, we let $w_{\text{E}}(u, s) := \iota'_0 (\int_{-1}^1 r_p(v) r'_p(v) K(v) f(s + vh) dv)^{-1} r_p(u) K(u)$.

For the PGP method, the weights of the bias estimator are

$$w_{\text{GP-bc},i}(x) := C_n \iota'_{p+1} \Gamma_{p+1}^{-1}(x) r_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) K \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right)$$

with associated equivalent kernel $w_{\text{GP-bc}}(u) := C \iota'_{p+1} (\int_{\mathcal{X}} r_{p+1}(s) r'_{p+1}(s) K(s) ds)^{-1} r_{p+1}(u) K(u)$. Thus, the bias-corrected weights are $w_{\text{PGP},i}(x) := w_i(x) - w_{\text{GP-bc},i}(x)$ with equivalent kernel $w_{\text{PGP}}(u) := w(u) - w_{\text{GP-bc}}(u)$. Moreover, by the equivalence between the PGP and RBC methods, we let $w_{\text{RBC}}(u) := w_{\text{PGP}}(u)$.

For the (m)PLP method, the weights of the bias estimator are

$$w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(x) := \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x) w_i(x_j) - w_i(x)$$

with associated equivalent kernels $w_{\text{LP-bc}}(u) := w_{\text{conv}}(u) - w(u)$ and $w_{\text{LP-bc,bnd}}(u) := w_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u) - w(u)$, where $w_{\text{conv}}(u) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(r) w(u-r) dr$ and $w_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{bnd}}(r, 0) w_{\text{bnd}}(u-r, r) dr$. Therefore, the bias-corrected weights are $w_{\text{PLP},i}(x) := w_i(x) - w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(x)$ and $w_{\text{mPLP},i}(x) := w_i(x) - Q_n w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(x)$ with equivalent kernels $w_{\text{PLP}}(u) := w(u) - w_{\text{LP-bc}}(u)$ and $w_{\text{mPLP}}(u) := w(u) - Q w_{\text{LP-bc,bnd}}(u)$.

B.2 BIAS EXPANSIONS

In this appendix we collect some results regarding the bias term B_n and its expansion for both interior and boundary points. Recall that throughout we consider only left boundary points. Proofs of the results in this appendix are given in Section S.2 of the Supplementary Material.

We first formalize the asymptotic behavior of C_n and $C_{\text{LP},n}$.

LEMMA B.1. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied.*

- (i) *If x is an interior point, then $C_n \rightarrow_p C$ and $C_{\text{LP},n} \rightarrow_p C$, where $C := \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(u) u^{p+1} du$.*
- (ii) *If x is a boundary point, then $C_n \rightarrow_p C$ and $C_{\text{LP},n} \rightarrow_p C_{\text{LP}}$, where*

$$C_{\text{LP}} := \int_0^1 w_{\text{bnd}}(s, 0) \int_{-s}^1 w_{\text{bnd}}(u, s) u^{p+1} du ds \neq C.$$

The next two lemmas derive expansions of $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$ and $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ for interior and boundary points. As we will see in Lemma B.3, the key consequence of Lemma B.1 is that the probability limit of A_n is zero if x is an interior point.

LEMMA B.2. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any evaluation point \mathbf{x} ,

$$\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} - B_n = \xi_{2n,\text{GP}} + o_p(1), \quad \xi_{2n,\text{GP}} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{GP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i.$$

LEMMA B.3. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any evaluation point \mathbf{x} ,

$$\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n - A_n = \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} + o_p(1), \quad \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i,$$

where $A_n := \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})(C_{\text{LP},n} - C_n)/(p+1)!$ and:

- (i) If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, $A_n \rightarrow_p 0$;
- (ii) If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, $A_n \rightarrow_p \sqrt{\kappa} g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})(C_{\text{LP}} - C)/(p+1)!$, where $C_{\text{LP}} \neq C$.

Let $T_n - B_n = \xi_{1n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i$. The next two lemmas show how the equivalent kernels defined in Appendix B.1 can be used in asymptotic approximations of the bias-corrected statistics, $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} = \xi_{1n} - \xi_{2n,\text{GP}}$ and $T_n - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} = \xi_{1n} - \xi_{2n,\text{LP}}$.

LEMMA B.4. Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. Then,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{1n} \\ \xi_{2n,\text{GP}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \\ w_{\text{GP-bc}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1).$$

LEMMA B.5. Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied.

(i) If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{1n} \\ \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \\ w_{\text{LP-bc}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1).$$

(ii) If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{1n} \\ \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \\ w_{\text{LP-bc,bnd}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1).$$

C PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

In this appendix we prove our results. Throughout, for simplicity, we give all proofs for the case of the bias-corrected HC0 residuals,

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_i := y_i - r_{p+1}(x_i - \mathbf{x})' \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The proofs with $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are notationally more cumbersome, but very similar in spirit; see also Calonico et al. (2018, 2022).

C.1 PROOFS FROM SECTION 2

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

PART (i). We write the quantile function of T_n^* as $\hat{L}_n^{-1}(u) = \hat{B}_n + \hat{L}_{1,n}^{-1}(u)$, where $\hat{L}_{1,n}(u) := \mathbb{P}^*(\xi_{1n}^* \leq u)$ and $\xi_{1n}^* := T_n^* - \hat{B}_n$. Under Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) and using the continuous mapping theorem, we have $\hat{L}_{1,n}^{-1}(u) \rightarrow_p v\Phi^{-1}(u) =: L_1^{-1}(u)$ pointwise for all u . Because $\hat{L}_{1,n}^{-1}(u)$ is monotonic in u and $L_1^{-1}(u)$ is continuous in u , the convergence is uniform in u . By the definition of \hat{H}_n in (2.8) we have, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha) = \Phi(\hat{m}_n \Phi^{-1}(\alpha)) = \Phi(\hat{m}_n z_\alpha)$. Combining these results we find that

$$(nh)^{-1/2} \hat{L}_n^{-1}(\hat{H}_n^{-1}(\alpha)) = (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{B}_n + (nh)^{-1/2} \hat{v}_n \hat{m}_n z_\alpha + o_p((nh)^{-1/2}),$$

which proves part (i) because $\hat{v}_n \hat{m}_n = \hat{v}_{P,n}$ by definition of \hat{m}_n .

PART (ii). If T_n^* is Gaussian conditionally on \mathcal{D}_n , then $\hat{L}_n^{-1}(u) = \hat{B}_n + \hat{v}_n \Phi^{-1}(u)$, and the remainder of the proof follows as in part (i).

PART (iii). This result follows from (2.7) if we show that \hat{H}_n is a uniformly consistent estimator of H . Under Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) we have $\hat{p}_n := \mathbb{P}^*(T_n^* \leq T_n) = \Phi((T_n - \hat{B}_n)/v) + o_p(1)$, so that, applying also Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(u) &:= \mathbb{P}(\hat{p}_n \leq u) = \mathbb{P}(\Phi((T_n - \hat{B}_n)/v) \leq u) + o(1) = \mathbb{P}((T_n - \hat{B}_n)/v_P \leq (v/v_P)\Phi^{-1}(u)) + o(1) \\ &\rightarrow \Phi((v/v_P)\Phi^{-1}(u)) =: H(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{H}_n(u) - H(u)| \rightarrow_p 0$ if $\hat{m}_n \rightarrow_p v_P/v$, which holds by assumption. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

By Theorem 2.1, the result follows by showing that Assumption \mathcal{H} holds with $(T_n^*, \hat{B}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{v}_{P,n})$ replaced by $(T_{GP,n}^*, \hat{B}_{GP,n}, \hat{v}_{GP,n}, \hat{v}_{PGP,n})$.

Let x be an interior point. We first show that Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) is satisfied under Assumptions 2.1–2.2. Note that

$$T_{GP,n}^* - \hat{B}_{GP,n} = \xi_{1n}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(x) \varepsilon_i^*,$$

where $\mathbb{E}^*[\xi_{1n}^*] = 0$. By Lemma S.5 we can write $\xi_{1n}^* = f(x)^{-1} s_{1n}^* (1 + o_p(1))$, where

$$s_{1n}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_i e_i^*.$$

The conditional mean and variance are $\mathbb{E}^*[s_{1n}^*] = 0$ and $\mathbb{V}^*[s_{1n}^*] = (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w((x_i - x)/h)^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_i^2 = f(x)^2 \iota_0' \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} \tilde{\Psi}_p \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} \iota_0$. From Lemma S.3, $\tilde{\Psi}_p \rightarrow_p \dot{\Psi}_p$, so that $\mathbb{V}^*[s_{1n}^*] \rightarrow_p f(x)^2 v_1^2$ with $v_1^2 := \iota_0' \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} \dot{\Psi}_p \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} \iota_0$. We prove asymptotic normality using Lyapunov's CLT. To this end, we first show

$$s_{1n}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) \varepsilon_i e_i^* + o_p^*(1). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

To see this, it is sufficient to note that $(nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)(\tilde{\varepsilon}_i - \varepsilon_i)e_i^* = f(\mathbf{x})\iota_0' \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} \eta_n^*$, where $\eta_n^* := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n K((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)r_p((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)(\tilde{\varepsilon}_i - \varepsilon_i)e_i^*$ has conditional mean $\mathbb{E}^*[\eta_n^*] = 0$ and conditional variance $\mathbb{V}^*[\eta_n^*] = (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)r_p((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)r_p'((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)(\tilde{\varepsilon}_i - \varepsilon_i)^2$, which has (i, j) -th element equal to $\tilde{\psi}_{i+j-2, n, 2}$ defined in the proof of Lemma S.3. Hence, (C.2) follows by Chebychev's inequality because $\tilde{\psi}_{i+j-2, n, 2} \rightarrow_p 0$ as shown in the proof of Lemma S.3.

Clearly, $\mathbb{E}^*[(nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)\varepsilon_i e_i^*] = 0$ and $\mathbb{V}^*[(nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)\varepsilon_i e_i^*] \rightarrow_p v_1^2 f(\mathbf{x})^2$; see also the proof of Lemma S.3. To verify Lyapunov's condition we find, for $\delta > 1$,

$$\frac{1}{(nh)^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}^*[|\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)\varepsilon_i e_i^*|^{2\delta}] \leq \frac{c}{(nh)^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta} |\varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}.$$

By Markov's inequality, the law of iterated expectations, and $\sup_i \mathbb{E}[|\varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}] < \infty$ (taking $\delta \in (1, 2]$),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta} |\varepsilon_i|^{2\delta} \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta} |\varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}\right] \leq \frac{c}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta}].$$

By the i.i.d. assumption, the right-hand side is bounded by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned} n \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{w}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta}] &= n f(\mathbf{x})^{2\delta} \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} |\iota_0' \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} r_p((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h) K((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta} f(x_1) dx_1 \\ &= n h f(\mathbf{x})^{2\delta} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\iota_0' \dot{\Gamma}_p^{-1} r_p(u) K(u)|^{2\delta} f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du = O(nh), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

which verifies Lyapunov's condition because $\delta > 1$.

Next, we show that Assumption $\mathcal{H}(\text{ii})$ is satisfied under Assumptions 2.1–2.2. By definition of $\hat{B}_{\text{GP}, n}$ and Lemmas B.2 and B.4,

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_n - B_n \\ \hat{B}_{\text{GP}, n} - B_n \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \\ \mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1) = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n} + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h), \mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h))' \varepsilon_i$. Assumption $\mathcal{H}(\text{ii})$ is then verified by showing asymptotic normality of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n}] = 0$ by the law of iterated expectations. The asymptotic variance of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n}$ is V_{GP} , where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{GP}, 11} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^2 \varepsilon_i^2\right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^2 \sigma^2(x_i)] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} \mathbf{w}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)^2 \sigma^2(x_1) f(x_1) dx_1 = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 du. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $V_{\text{GP}, 12} = V_{\text{GP}, 21} = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}(u) du$ and $V_{\text{GP}, 22} = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}(u)^2 du$. Because $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP}, n}$ is a sum of independent bivariate random variables, we use the Cramér-Wold device and verify Lyapunov's condition. Thus, we prove that, for any $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \neq (0, 0)$ and some $\delta > 1$,

$$\frac{1}{(nh)^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|(\zeta_1 \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h) + \zeta_2 \mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)) \varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}] \rightarrow 0.$$

By Minkowski's inequality we can prove this separately for each summand. For \mathbf{w} , the result follows

directly from (C.3), and the corresponding result for $\mathbf{w}_{\text{GP-bc}}$ is proven in the same way and therefore omitted. This concludes the proof of asymptotic normality of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP},n}$ and hence of Theorem 2.2.

If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, the proof follows by nearly identical steps, so we omit the details. The main difference between the interior and boundary point cases is the asymptotic variance of $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} - B_n)'$. Specifically, if \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, this asymptotic variance changes because its entries have integrals evaluated on $[0, \infty)$ instead of \mathbb{R} .

C.2 PROOFS FROM SECTION 3

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1

We use (C.1) and $r_{p+1}(x) = r_{p+1}(x/h)H_{p+1}^{-1}$ to decompose $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}^2 = \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2 + \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},2n}^2 + \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2 + 2\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},4n}^2$, where we show that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2 &:= \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \varepsilon_i^2 = \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 du + o_p(1) =: v_{\text{PLP}}^2 + o_p(1), \\ \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},2n}^2 &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \right) \varepsilon_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2 &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left(g(x_i) - r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} \right)^2 = o_p(1), \\ \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},4n}^2 &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left(g(x_i) - r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} \right) \varepsilon_i = o_p(1),\end{aligned}$$

which suffices to prove the required result.

Proof for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2$. By Assumption 2.1, the mean is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2] &= \frac{1}{hf(\mathbf{x})^2} \int_{\mathbf{x}-2h}^{\mathbf{x}+2h} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \sigma^2(x_1) f(x_1) dx_1 \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 du + o(1) =: v_{\text{PLP}}^2 + o(1)\end{aligned}$$

and the variance is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}[\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2] &= \frac{1}{(nh)^2 f(\mathbf{x})^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^4 \varepsilon_i^4 \right] - \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \varepsilon_i^2 \right] \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(nh)^2 f(\mathbf{x})^4} \sum_{i=1}^n ch \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}(u)^4 f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(nh)^2 f(\mathbf{x})^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(h \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 \sigma^2(\mathbf{x} + uh) f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \right)^2 = O \left(\frac{1}{nh} \right).\end{aligned}$$

This shows L_2 -convergence of $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},1n}^2$.

Proof for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},2n}^2$. Follows by direct application of Lemma S.8 with $\zeta_i = \varepsilon_i$.

Proof for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$. By the mean-value theorem, and using $\ell'_j \beta_{p+1} = g^{(j)}(\mathbf{x})/j!$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_i) &= \sum_{j=1}^p (x_i - \mathbf{x})^j g^{(j)}(\mathbf{x})/j! + (x_i - \mathbf{x})^{p+1} g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i)/(p+1)! \\ &= r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \beta_{p+1} + (x_i - \mathbf{x})^{p+1} (g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})) / (p+1)! \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

for an intermediate value \tilde{x}_i such that $|\tilde{x}_i - \mathbf{x}| \leq |x_i - \mathbf{x}|$. Then we can write $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left(r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} (\beta_{p+1} - \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}) \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{2p+2} h^{2p+2} \left(\frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{2}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{p+1} r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} (\beta_{p+1} - \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}) h^{p+1} \left(\frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the fact that $|\hat{\beta}_{s,p+1,n} - \beta_{s,p+1}| = \text{O}_p((nh^{2s-1})^{-1/2})$, where $\hat{\beta}_{s,p+1,n}$ and $\beta_{s,p+1}$ are the s -th elements of $\hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}$ and β_{p+1} , respectively, we obtain $|H_{p+1}^{-1}(\hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} - \beta_{p+1})| = \text{O}_p((nh)^{-1/2}) = \text{o}_p(1)$. Moreover, noting that $w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ only when $|\tilde{x}_i - \mathbf{x}| \leq |x_i - \mathbf{x}| \leq 2h$, the Hölder condition on $g^{(p+1)}$ in Assumption 2.1(iii) implies that $\sup_{i: w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0} |g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{x: |x - \mathbf{x}| \leq 2h} |g^{(p+1)}(x) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{x: |x - \mathbf{x}| \leq 2h} c|x - \mathbf{x}|^\eta = o(1)$. Thus, for some power $k \geq 0$, we can bound all the terms in $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$ by

$$\text{o}_p(1) \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left| \frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right|^k = \text{o}_p(1) \frac{1}{nh f(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \left| \frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right|^k + \text{o}_p(1),$$

where the equality is by Lemma S.8 with $\zeta_i = |(x_i - \mathbf{x})/h|^k$. The main term satisfies

$$\frac{1}{nh f(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \left| \frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right|^k = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 |u|^k du + \text{o}_p(1),$$

which proves the result for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$.

Proof for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},4n}^2$. By the same arguments as in the proof for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$ we find that all the terms in $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},4n}^2$ are bounded, for some k , by

$$\text{o}_p(1) \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 \left| \frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right|^k |\varepsilon_i| = \text{o}_p(1) \frac{1}{nh f(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \left| \frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right|^k |\varepsilon_i| + \text{o}_p(1),$$

where the equality is by Lemma S.8 with $\zeta_i = |(x_i - \mathbf{x})/h|^k |\varepsilon_i|$, and the result for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},4n}^2$ follows as for $\hat{v}_{\text{PLP},3n}^2$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

By Theorem 2.1, the result follows by showing that Assumption \mathcal{H} holds with $(T_n^*, \hat{B}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{v}_{\text{P},n})$ replaced by $(T_{\text{LP},n}^*, \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{LP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n})$. First, Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) is satisfied because $T_{\text{LP},n}^* - \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} =$

$\xi_{1n}^* = (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i^*$ is identical to the corresponding term in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

We now prove that Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) holds. By definition of $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$ and Lemma B.3,

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_n - B_n \\ \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A_n \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w_i(\mathbf{x}) \\ w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

By Lemma B.3(i), $A_n = o_p(1)$ because \mathbf{x} is an interior point, and by Lemma B.5(i) we have that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w_i(\mathbf{x}) \\ w_{\text{LP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \\ \mathbf{w}_{\text{LP-bc}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1) = \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n} + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h), \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h))' \varepsilon_i$. Because $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n}$ is a sum of independent bivariate random variables, we can verify Lyapunov's condition in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.2. The condition for the term involving \mathbf{w} was verified in the proof of Theorem 2.2, so we are left with proving that, for some $\delta > 1$,

$$\frac{1}{(nh)^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h) \varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}] \rightarrow 0.$$

By the i.i.d. assumption and taking $\delta \in (1, 2]$, the left-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{(nh)^\delta} \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h) \varepsilon_1|^{2\delta}] &\leq c \frac{n}{(nh)^\delta} \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta}] \\ &= c \frac{n}{(nh)^\delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} |\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)|^{2\delta} f(x_1) dx_1 \\ &= c \frac{1}{(nh)^{\delta-1}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}(u)|^{2\delta} f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

We are left with defining the asymptotic variance of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n}$, which is needed to define the asymptotic variance of $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n)'$. To do so, we let $\Omega_{\text{LP},n} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}[\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n}]$ and note that $\omega_{\text{LP},11} = V_{\text{GP},11} = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 du$, and, similarly, $\omega_{\text{LP},12} = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}(u) du$ and $\omega_{\text{LP},22} = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}(u)^2 du$. Hence, the convergence $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n} \rightarrow_d N(0, \Omega_{\text{LP}})$ implies that $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n)' \rightarrow_d N(0, V_{\text{LP}})$ with

$$V_{\text{LP}} := \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \Omega_{\text{LP}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

concluding the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.1

From (C.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{LP},11} &= \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(u)^2 du, \\ V_{\text{LP},12} &= \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(u)(w_{\text{conv}}(u) - w(u)) du, \\ V_{\text{LP},22} &= \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(u) - w_{\text{conv}}(u))^2 du, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $v_{\text{PLP}}^2 := V_{\text{LP},11} + V_{\text{LP},22} - 2V_{\text{LP},12} = (\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})/f(\mathbf{x}))\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}}$, where

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{PLP}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} (2w(u) - w_{\text{conv}}(u))^2 du = \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{PLP}}(u)^2 du.$$

Similarly, by the proof of Theorem 2.2, we have that $v_{\text{RBC}}^2 = (\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})/f(\mathbf{x}))\mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}$, where

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(u) - w_{\text{GP-bc}}(u))^2 du = \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{RBC}}(u)^2 du,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

C.3 PROOFS FROM SECTION 4

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.1

The proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 3.1, except for two differences. First, we apply Lemma S.9 instead of Lemma S.8 to show that $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP}}^2 = \hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},1n}^2 + o_p(1)$. Second, to define the asymptotic variance we need to distinguish between interior and boundary points. Specifically, in the interior case we have $\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},1n}^2 := \hat{v}_{\text{LP},1n}^2 \rightarrow_p v_{\text{PLP}}^2 =: v_{\text{mPLP}}^2$, and in the boundary case we have

$$\hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},1n}^2 := \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{mPLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \varepsilon_i^2 \rightarrow_p \frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} w_{\text{mPLP}}(u)^2 du =: v_{\text{mPLP}}^2. \quad \square$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1

By Theorem 2.1, the proof follows by showing that Assumption \mathcal{H} holds with $(T_n^*, \hat{B}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{v}_{\text{P},n})$ replaced by $(T_{\text{mLP},n}^*, \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{mLP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n})$.

If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, $Q_n = 1 + o_p(1)$ by Lemma B.1 so that $(T_{\text{mLP},n}^*, \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{mLP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{mPLP},n}) = (T_{\text{LP},n}^*, \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{LP},n}, \hat{v}_{\text{PLP},n}) + o_p(1)$. Thus, Assumption \mathcal{H} holds by Theorem 3.1.

If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, $Q_n = C/C_{\text{LP,bnd}} + o_p(1)$ by Lemma B.1. In this case, Assumption \mathcal{H} (i) is verified by noting that $T_{\text{mLP},n}^* - \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} = Q_n \xi_{1n}^* \xrightarrow{d^*}_p N(0, v_{\text{mLP}}^2)$ with $v_{\text{mLP}}^2 := Q^2 v_1^2$, which follows directly from the proof of Theorem 3.1. To show that Assumption \mathcal{H} (ii) is satisfied, we first apply

(4.2) and Lemma B.5(ii) to obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_n - B_n \\ \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} - B_n \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{f(x)\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) \\ Q\mathbf{w}_{\text{LP-bc,bnd}}\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i + o_p(1) = \frac{1}{f(x)} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -Q & Q \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}_{\text{LP,bnd},n} + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP,bnd},n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{w}((x_i - x)/h), \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}((x_i - x)/h))' \varepsilon_i$. Asymptotic normality of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP,bnd},n}$ follows from the Cramér-Wold device and Lyapunov's condition, similarly to $\mathbf{s}_{\text{GP},n}$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2 and $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP},n}$ in the proof of Theorem 3.1 by noting that, for any (ζ_1, ζ_2) and $\delta \in (1, 2]$, $\mathbb{E}[|(\zeta_1 \mathbf{w}((x_i - x)/h) + \zeta_2 \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}((x_i - x)/h)) \varepsilon_i|^{2\delta}] = O(h)$. The asymptotic variance of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP,bnd},n}$, denoted by $\Omega_{\text{LP,bnd}}$, can therefore be derived in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, noting that integrals are taken over $[0, \infty)$ because x is a (left) boundary point, and has elements $\omega_{\text{LP,bnd},11} = \sigma^2(x)f(x) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 du$, $\omega_{\text{LP,bnd},12} = \sigma^2(x)f(x) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u) du$, and $\omega_{\text{LP,bnd},22} = \sigma^2(x)f(x) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u)^2 du$. Finally, the convergence of $\mathbf{s}_{\text{LP,bnd},n}$ implies that $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} - B_n)' \rightarrow_d N(0, V_{\text{mLP}})$, where

$$V_{\text{mLP}} := \frac{1}{f^2(x)} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -Q & Q \end{bmatrix} \Omega_{\text{LP,bnd}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -Q \\ 0 & Q \end{bmatrix},$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

PROOF OF COROLLARY 4.1

If x is an interior point, the proof is identical to the proof of Corollary 3.1 because $Q = 1$ implies that the asymptotic variances of $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} - B_n)$ and $(T_n - B_n, \hat{B}_{\text{mLP},n} - B_n)$ coincide.

If x is on the boundary, then $Q \neq 1$ and analogous results as in the proof of Corollary 3.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{mLP},1}^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 du, \\ V_{\text{mLP},12} &= \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} Q \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) (\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u) - \mathbf{w}(u)) du, \\ V_{\text{mLP},2}^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} Q^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\mathbf{w}(u) - \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u))^2 du, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $v_{\text{mPLP}}^2 = (\sigma^2(x)/f(x)) \mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}}$ where

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{mPLP}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} ((Q+1)\mathbf{w}(u) - Q\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}(u))^2 du = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{mPLP}}(u)^2 du.$$

Similarly, by the proof of Theorem 2.2, we have that $v_{\text{RBC}}^2 = (\sigma^2(x)/f(x)) \mathcal{K}_{\text{RBC}}$, where \mathcal{K}_{RBC} is defined in the proof of Corollary 3.1, thus concluding the proof. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.2

PART (i). Let $\hat{v}_{+, \text{mPLP},n}^2 := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{+, \text{mPLP},i}(x)^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_i^2$, $\hat{v}_{-, \text{mPLP},n}^2 := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{-, \text{mPLP},i}(x)^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_i^2$, where $w_{+, \text{mPLP},i}(x)$ and $w_{-, \text{mPLP},i}(x)$ are defined like $w_{\text{mPLP},i}(x)$ replacing the kernel function with K_+ and K_- , respectively. Then, $\hat{v}_{\text{rd},n}^2 := \hat{v}_{+, \text{mPLP},n}^2 + \hat{v}_{-, \text{mPLP},n}^2$. Because the cutoff truncation

induced by K_+ and K_- implies that x is a (strict) boundary point for both $\hat{v}_{+,mPLP,n}^2$ and $\hat{v}_{-,mPLP,n}^2$, and because observations on different sides of the cutoff are independent, we can apply Lemma 4.1 to each term in $\hat{v}_{rd,n}^2$. Specifically, by Lemma 4.1, $\hat{v}_{rd,n}^2 \rightarrow_p v_{rd}^2 := f(x)^{-1}(\sigma_+^2(x) + \sigma_-^2(x))\mathcal{K}_{mPLP}$.

PARTS (ii)–(iv). In view of the decompositions $T_n = T_{+,n} - T_{-,n}$ and $T_n^* = T_{+,n}^* - T_{-,n}^*$, and the independence of observations on different sides of the cutoff, the results follow by application of Theorem 4.1 on both sides of the cutoff. \square

PROOF OF COROLLARY 4.2

Suppose a different kernel is applied to the left and to the right of the cutoff, and redefine K_+ , K_- , and subsequent quantities accordingly. In this case, by slight modification of the proof of Theorem 4.2(i), we have that $v_{rd}^2 = f(x)^{-1}(\sigma_+^2(x)\mathcal{K}_{+,rd} + \sigma_-^2(x)\mathcal{K}_{-,rd})$.

For the RBC approach, note that validity of the method for the RDD extends in the same manner as for the mPLP bootstrap, with the asymptotic properties of the test statistic being derived from the boundary point case; see also Calonico et al. (2014). Hence, from the proof of Corollary 4.1, we have that $v_{RBC-rd}^2 = f(x)^{-1}(\sigma_+^2(x)\mathcal{K}_{+,RBC} + \sigma_-^2(x)\mathcal{K}_{-,RBC})$. \square

REFERENCES

- ANDREWS, D.W.K. (1991): Asymptotic normality of series estimators for nonparametric and semiparametric regression models. *Econometrica* 59, 307–345.
- ANDREWS, D.W.K. (1994): Asymptotics for semiparametric econometric models via stochastic equicontinuity. *Econometrica* 62, 43–72.
- ARMSTRONG, T., AND KOLESÁR, M. (2020): Simple and honest confidence intervals in nonparametric regression. *Quantitative Economics* 11, 1–39.
- BARTALOTTI, O., CALHOUN, G., AND HE, Y. (2017): Bootstrap confidence intervals for sharp regression discontinuity designs. In *Regression Discontinuity Designs: Theory and Applications*, 421–453. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- BELLONI, A., CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D., AND KATO, K. (2015): Some new asymptotic theory for least squares series: Pointwise and uniform results. *Journal of Econometrics* 186, 345–366.
- BERAN, R. (1987): Prepivoting to reduce level error of confidence sets. *Biometrika* 74, 457–468.
- BERAN, R. (1988): Prepivoting test statistics: A bootstrap view of asymptotic refinements. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83, 687–697.
- BERRY, S.M., CARROLL, R.J., AND RUPPERT, D. (2002): Bayesian smoothing and regression splines for measurement error problems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 97, 160–169.
- CALONICO, S., CATTANEO, M.D., AND FARRELL, M.H. (2018): On the effect of bias estimation

- on coverage accuracy in nonparametric inference, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113, 767–779.
- CALONICO, S., CATTANEO, M.D., AND FARRELL, M.H. (2020): Optimal bandwidth choice for robust bias-corrected inference in regression discontinuity designs. *Econometrics Journal* 23, 192–210.
- CALONICO, S., CATTANEO, M.D., AND FARRELL, M.H. (2022): Coverage error optimal confidence intervals for local polynomial regression. *Bernoulli* 28, 2998–3022.
- CALONICO, S., CATTANEO, M.D., AND TITIUNIK, R. (2014): Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs, *Econometrica* 82, 2295–2326.
- CATTANEO, M.D., FARRELL, M.H., AND FENG, Y. (2020): Large sample properties of partitioning-based series estimators. *Annals of Statistics* 48, 1718–1741,
- CATTANEO, M.D., AND JANSSON, M. (2018): Kernel-based semiparametric estimators: Small bandwidth asymptotics and bootstrap consistency. *Econometrica* 86, 955–995.
- CAVALIERE, G., AND GEORGIEV, I. (2020): Inference under random limit bootstrap measures. *Econometrica* 88, 2547–2574.
- CAVALIERE, G., GONÇALVES, S., NIELSEN, M.Ø., AND ZANELLI, E. (2024): Bootstrap inference in the presence of bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 119, 2908–2918.
- CHEN, X. (2007): Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models. In: Heckman, J.J., Leamer, E.E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, vol. 6B, 5549–5632.
- CHEN, X., AND CHRISTENSEN, T.M. (2015): Optimal uniform convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators under weak dependence and weak conditions. *Journal of Econometrics* 188, 447–465.
- CHEN, X., LINTON, O. AND VAN KEILEGOM, K. (2003): Estimation of semiparametric models when the criterion function is not smooth. *Econometrica* 71, 1591–1608.
- FAN, J., AND GIJBELS, I. (1996): Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications. *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, vol. 66. Chapman & Hall.
- GUPTA, A., AND SEO, M.H. (2023): Robust inference on infinite and growing dimensional time-series regression. *Econometrica* 91, 1333–1361.
- HAHN, J., TODD, P., AND VAN DER KLAUW, W. (2001): Identification and estimation of treatment effects with a regression-discontinuity design. *Econometrica* 69, 201–209.
- HALL, P. (1992): Effect of bias estimation on coverage accuracy of bootstrap confidence intervals for a probability density. *Annals of Statistics* 20, 675–694.
- HALL, P., AND HOROWITZ, J. (2013): A simple bootstrap method for constructing nonparametric confidence bands for functions. *Annals of Statistics* 41, 1892–1921.
- HALL, P., AND MARRON, J.S. (1990): On variance estimation in nonparametric regression. *Biometrika* 77, 415–419.
- HALLIN, M., LU, Z., AND TRAN, L.T. (2004): Local linear spatial regression. *Annals of Statistics*

32, 2469–2500.

- HÄRDLE, W., AND BOWMAN, A.W. (1988): Bootstrapping in nonparametric regression: Local adaptive smoothing and confidence bands. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83, 102–110.
- HÄRDLE, W., AND MARRON, J.S. (1991): Bootstrap simultaneous error bars for nonparametric regression. *Annals of Statistics* 19, 778–796.
- HE, Y., AND BARTALOTTI, O. (2020): Wild bootstrap for fuzzy regression discontinuity designs: Obtaining robust bias-corrected confidence intervals. *Econometrics Journal* 23, 211–231.
- HUANG, J.Z. (2003): Local asymptotics for polynomial spline regression. *Annals of Statistics* 31, 1600–1635.
- IMBENS, G.W., AND KALYANARAMAN, K. (2012): Optimal bandwidth choice for the regression discontinuity estimator. *Review of Economic Studies* 79, 933–959.
- IMBENS, G.W., AND LEMIEUX, T. (2008): Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice. *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 615–635.
- IMBENS, G.W., AND WAGER, S. (2019): Optimized regression discontinuity designs. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 101, 264–278.
- LEE, D.S. (2008): Randomized experiments from non-random selection in US House elections. *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 675–697.
- LUDWIG, J., AND MILLER, D.L. (2007): Does Head Start improve children’s life changes? Evidence from a regression discontinuity design. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122, 159–208.
- NEWAY, W.K. (1994): The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica* 62, 1349–1382.
- RUPPERT, D., AND WAND, M.P. (1994): Multivariate locally weighted least squares regression. *Annals of Statistics* 22, 1346–1370.

Supplementary Material:

Improved Inference for Nonparametric Regression

by

G. Cavaliere, S. Gonçalves, M.Ø. Nielsen, and E. Zanelli

November 25, 2025

This supplementary material for Cavaliere, Gonçalves, Nielsen, and Zanelli (2025) contains two sections. Section [S.1](#) collects auxiliary approximation lemmas that are used throughout. Section [S.2](#) contains the proofs of the bias expansion lemmas in Appendix [B.2](#). References are included at the end of the supplement.

S.1 APPROXIMATION LEMMAS

LEMMA S.1. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. For $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$:*

(i) $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} |\gamma_{j,n}(x) - \gamma_{\mathbb{E},j,n}(x)| = o_p(1)$ and (ii) $\gamma_{\mathbb{E},j,n}(x) \rightarrow \dot{\gamma}_j$.

PROOF OF LEMMA S.1. Part (i). Suppose first that K is globally Lipschitz continuous. Then $K(u)u^j$ is globally Lipschitz continuous for all $j = 0, 1, \dots$, the conditions in Masry (1996, Theorem 2) apply; see also Hansen (2008). Therefore,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} |\gamma_{j,n}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x)]| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{nh}} \right) = o_p(1).$$

Next, suppose K is not globally Lipschitz continuous such that Theorem 2 of Masry (1996) does not apply. In this case, $K(u) = 0$ for $|u| \geq 1$ and it is Lipschitz continuous on $(-1, 1)$.

Since \mathbb{S}_x is compact, it can be divided into a finite number $L(n)$ of intervals $I_{k,n}$ with centers $x_{k,n}$ and length $\ell_n = c_0/L(n)$ for some $c_0 > 0$ and $k = 1, \dots, L(n)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} |\gamma_{j,n}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x)]| &= \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} |\gamma_{j,n}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x)]| \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} |\gamma_{j,n}(x) - \gamma_{j,n}(x_{k,n})| \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} |\gamma_{j,n}(x_{k,n}) - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x_{k,n})]| \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} |\mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x_{k,n})] - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x)]| \\ &=: Q_{1n} + Q_{2n} + Q_{3n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\ell_n = ((\log n)h^3/n)^{1/2}$. Note that the Lipschitz condition is not needed for Q_{2n} because the function is only evaluated at $x_{k,n}$, so we can conclude that $Q_{2n} = O_p(\ell_n h^{-2}) = O_p((\log n)^{1/2}/(nh)^{1/2})$ by the proof of Theorem 2 of Masry (1996).

We now prove that $Q_{1n} = O_p((\log n)^{1/2}/(nh)^{1/2})$. For $j = 0, 1, \dots$, let $k_j(u) := u^j \mathbb{I}_{\{|u| < 1\}}$. Similarly to Cattaneo, Jansson and Ma (2024), we will use the fact that

$$|k_j(u) - k_j(v)| \leq c_1 |u - v| + c_2 \mathbb{I}_{\{||u|-1| \leq |u-v|\}}, \quad (\text{S.1})$$

$$|K(u) - K(v)| \leq c_1 |u - v| + c_2 \mathbb{I}_{\{||u|-1| \leq |u-v|\}}, \quad (\text{S.2})$$

where c_1 and c_2 are bounded positive constants. For all $j = 0, 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{1n} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right)^j - K\left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right) \left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right)^j \right| \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) \left| k_j\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) - k_j\left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right) \right| \\
&\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| k_j\left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right) \right| \left| K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) - K\left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right) \right| \\
&=: Q_{11n} + Q_{12n}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (S.1) and (S.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{11n} &\leq O_p(\ell_n h^{-2}) + c_2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right) \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_i - x_{k,n}| - h| \leq |x - x_{k,n}|\}}, \\
Q_{12n} &\leq O_p(\ell_n h^{-2}) + c_2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| k_j\left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h}\right) \right| \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_i - x_{k,n}| - h| \leq |x - x_{k,n}|\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By uniform boundedness of k and K on \mathbb{R} , and since $\mathbb{I}_{\{|x_i - x_{k,n}| - h| \leq |x - x_{k,n}|\}} \leq \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_i - x_{k,n}| - h| \leq \ell_n\}}$, to show that $Q_{1n} = O_p((\log n)^{1/2}/(nh)^{1/2})$, it suffices to show that $\max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} (nh)^{-1} S_{k,n} = O_p(\ell_n h^{-2})$, where $S_{k,n} := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_i - x_{k,n}| - h| \leq \ell_n\}} \sim \text{Bin}(n, p(x_{k,n}))$ with $p(x) := \mathbb{P}(|x_1 - x| - h| \leq \ell_n)$. By the union bound, $\mathbb{P}(\max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} h(\ell_n n)^{-1} S_{k,n} > \epsilon) \leq L(n) \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \mathbb{P}(h(\ell_n n)^{-1} S_{k,n} > \epsilon)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[S_{k,n}] = np(x_{k,n})$, where $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} p(x) \leq c_3 \ell_n = o(h)$ for some $c_3 > 0$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ we then have, for $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ and n sufficiently large, that $\epsilon > \delta + p(x_{k,n})h/\ell_n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(h(\ell_n n)^{-1} S_{k,n} > \epsilon) &\leq \mathbb{P}(S_{k,n} - np(x_{k,n}) > \delta \ell_n nh^{-1}) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\frac{1}{2}(\delta \ell_n nh^{-1})^2}{np(x_{k,n})(1 - p(x_{k,n})) + \frac{1}{3}\delta \ell_n nh^{-1}}\right) = O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{3}{2}\delta \ell_n nh^{-1}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

again for n sufficiently large, where the second inequality is Bernstein's and the final equality is because $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} p(x) \leq c_3 \ell_n$. Since $L_n = c_0/\ell_n$, it then follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \frac{h}{\ell_n n} S_{k,n} > \epsilon\right) \leq L(n) \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{h}{\ell_n n} S_{k,n} > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{c_0}{\ell_n} O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{3}{2}\delta \ell_n nh^{-1}\right)\right),$$

which is $o(1)$ because

$$-\log \ell_n - \frac{3}{2}\delta \ell_n nh^{-1} = \sqrt{(\log n)nh} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\log \log n}{\sqrt{(\log n)nh}} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\log h}{\sqrt{(\log n)nh}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\log n}{nh}\right)^{1/2} - \frac{3}{2}\delta\right) \rightarrow -\infty$$

by Assumption 2.2(ii), noting that the term in the large parenthesis converges to $-3\delta/2$. This shows the result for Q_{1n} .

The result for \mathbf{Q}_{3n} follows analogously, since, by Jensen's inequality, for all $j = 0, 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_{3n} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) \left| \mathbf{k}_j \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) - \mathbf{k}_j \left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h} \right) \right| \right] \\ &\quad + \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbf{k}_j \left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h} \right) \right| \left| K \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) - K \left(\frac{x_i - x_{k,n}}{h} \right) \right| \right] \\ &=: \mathbf{Q}_{31n} + \mathbf{Q}_{32n}. \end{aligned}$$

By (S.1) and (S.2), we have that $\mathbf{Q}_{31n} \leq c_4 \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} h^{-1} \mathbf{p}(x_{k,n}) + O(\ell_n h^{-2})$ for some $c_4 > 0$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{32n} \leq c_5 \max_{1 \leq k \leq L(n)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x \cap I_{k,n}} h^{-1} \mathbf{p}(x_{k,n}) + O(\ell_n h^{-2})$ for some $c_5 > 0$. Because $\mathbf{p}(x_{k,n}) = O(\ell_n)$ it follows that $\mathbf{Q}_{3n} = O(\ell_n h^{-2}) = O((\log n)^{1/2}/(nh)^{1/2})$.

Finally we derive the mean,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}(x)] &= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[K \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h} \right)^j \right] = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[K \left(\frac{x_1 - x}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_1 - x}{h} \right)^j \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{x-h}^{x+h} K \left(\frac{x_1 - x}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_1 - x}{h} \right)^j f(x_1) dx_1 = \int_{-1}^1 K(u) u^j f(x + uh) du =: \gamma_{\mathbf{E},j,n}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by the i.i.d. assumption and the third uses the bounded support of K .

PART (ii). If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, then $\int_{-1}^1 K(u) u^j f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \rightarrow f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{-1}^1 K(u) u^j du$. If \mathbf{x} is a (left) boundary point, then $\int_{-1}^1 K(u) u^j f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du = \int_0^1 K(u) u^j f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \rightarrow f(\mathbf{x}) \int_0^1 K(u) u^j du$. Therefore, for every \mathbf{x} , we have that $\mathbb{E}[\gamma_{j,n}] = \dot{\gamma}_j + o(1)$. \square

LEMMA S.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. Then:*

(i) $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} |\Gamma_p(x) - \Gamma_{\mathbf{E},p}(x)| = o_p(1)$ and (ii) $\Gamma_{\mathbf{E},p}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \dot{\Gamma}_p$.

PROOF OF LEMMA S.2. These results follow by noting that the (i, j) -th elements of $\Gamma_p(x)$, $\Gamma_{\mathbf{E},p}(x)$, $\dot{\Gamma}_p$ are $\gamma_{i+j-2,n}(x)$, $\gamma_{\mathbf{E},i+j-2,n}(x)$, $\dot{\gamma}_{i+j-2,n}$, respectively, and applying Lemma S.1. \square

LEMMA S.3. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. For $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n} = \dot{\psi}_j + o_p(1)$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA S.3. We first prove that $\psi_{j,n} = \dot{\psi}_j + o_p(1)$ with $\psi_{j,n} := (nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^2 ((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^j \sigma^2(x_i)$.

If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\psi_{j,n}] &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[K^2 \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \sigma^2(x_1) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} K^2 \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j f(x_1) \sigma^2(x_1) dx_1 \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) u^j f(\mathbf{x} + uh) \sigma^2(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \rightarrow \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) u^j du, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by the i.i.d. assumption and the second uses bounded support of K . Similarly, if \mathbf{x} is a boundary point, $\int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) u^j f(\mathbf{x} + uh) \sigma^2(\mathbf{x} + uh) du \rightarrow \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_0^1 K^2(u) u^j du$.

Therefore, for every \mathbf{x} , we have that $\mathbb{E}[\psi_{j,n}] = \dot{\psi}_j + o(1)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\psi_{j,n}^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \sigma^2(x_i) \right]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[K^4 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{2j} \sigma^4(x_i) \right] + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{i \neq i'} \mathbb{E} \left[K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \sigma^2(x_i) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[K^2 \left(\frac{x_{i'} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_{i'} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \sigma^2(x_{i'}) \right] \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{1}{nh} \right) + \dot{\psi}_j^2,\end{aligned}$$

which shows L_2 -convergence.

We now show that $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n} = \psi_{j,n} + o_p(1)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Insert $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ from (C.1) and decompose

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\psi}_{j,n} &= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \tilde{\varepsilon}_i^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \left(g(x_i) - r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \left(g(x_i) - r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} \right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_i \\ &=: \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,1} + \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,2} + \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,3}.\end{aligned}$$

We show that $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,1} = \psi_{j,n} + o_p(1)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,2} = o_p(1)$. It then follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,3} = o_p(1)$ because $\psi_{j,n} = O_p(1)$.

Consider first $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,2}$. By mean-value argument in (C.4) we can write $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,2}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \left(r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} (\beta_{p+1} - \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}) \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{2p+2+j} h^{2p+2} \left(\frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{2}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{p+1+j} r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} (\beta_{p+1} - \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}) h^{p+1} \left(\frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} \right) \\ &=: \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,21} + \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,22} + \tilde{\psi}_{j,n,23}.\end{aligned}$$

By the fact that $|\hat{\beta}_{s,p+1,n} - \beta_{s,p+1}| = O_p((nh^{2s-1})^{-1/2})$, where $\hat{\beta}_{s,p+1,n}$ and $\beta_{s,p+1}$ are the s -th elements of $\hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}$ and β_{p+1} , respectively, we obtain $|H_{p+1}^{-1}(\hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} - \beta_{p+1})| = O_p((nh)^{-1/2}) = o_p(1)$. Moreover, noting that $K((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h) \neq 0$ only when $|\tilde{x}_i - \mathbf{x}| \leq |x_i - \mathbf{x}| \leq h$, the Hölder condition on $g^{(p+1)}$ in Assumption 2.1(iii) implies that $\sup_{i:K((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h) \neq 0} |g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{x:|x - \mathbf{x}| \leq h} |g^{(p+1)}(x) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{x:|x - \mathbf{x}| \leq 2h} c|x - \mathbf{x}|^\eta = o(1)$. Thus, for some power $k \geq 0$, we can bound all the terms in $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,2}$ by $o_p(1)(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K^2((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^k = o_p(1)$ by Assumption 2.2(i).

The proof is concluded by showing that $\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,1} = \psi_{j,n} + o_p(1)$. We first notice that, by the law of iterated expectations, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,1}] = \mathbb{E}[\psi_{j,n}]$. Also by the law of iterated expectations,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{\psi}_{j,n,1} - \psi_{j,n})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n K^2 \left(\frac{x_{i_1} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) K^2 \left(\frac{x_{i_2} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_{i_1} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j \left(\frac{x_{i_2} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^j (\varepsilon_{i_1}^2 - \sigma^2(x_{i_1})) (\varepsilon_{i_2}^2 - \sigma^2(x_{i_2})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n K^4 \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{2j} (\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^4 | x_i] - \sigma^4(x_i)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.1, $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} |\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^4 | x_i] - \sigma^4(x_i)| < \infty$, and the proof is then completed in the same way as in the proof for $\psi_{j,n}$ above. \square

LEMMA S.4. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. Then:*

- (i) $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} |w_i(\mathbf{x})| = O_p(1)$,
- (ii) $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} |(nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_i(x_j) w_j(\mathbf{x})| = O_p(1)$,
- (iii) $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} |w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})| = O_p(1)$,
- (iv) $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} |w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x})| = O_p(1)$.

PROOF OF LEMMA S.4. Part (i): By Lemma S.2, $\Gamma_p^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = O_p(1)$. The result then follows by uniform boundedness of K and r_p on \mathbb{S}_x .

PART (ii). Using part (i) we find that $|\sum_{j=1}^n w_i(x_j) w_j(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h\}} |w_j(\mathbf{x})| |w_i(x_j)| = O_p(1) \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h\}} |w_i(x_j)|$. By Lemma S.2 we can replace $\Gamma_p^{-1}(x_j)$ by $(\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_p(x_j)])^{-1}$, which is bounded uniformly in $x_j \in [\mathbf{x} - h, \mathbf{x} + h]$ for sufficiently large n because K and r_p are bounded on \mathbb{S}_x and f is bounded away from zero in a neighborhood of \mathbf{x} . We are left with the term $\sup_{i=1,\dots,n} (nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h\}} r_p((x_i - x_j)/h) K((x_i - x_j)/h) \leq c(nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h\}}$, where the inequality is again due to boundedness of K and r_p . The right-hand side is $O_p(1)$ because the second moment is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h\}} \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h) + \frac{2}{(nh)^2} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{P}(|x_j - \mathbf{x}| \leq h) \mathbb{P}(|x_m - \mathbf{x}| \leq h) \\ &= \frac{1}{nh^2} \int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} f(x_1) dx_1 + \frac{n-1}{nh^2} \left(\int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} f(x_1) dx_1 \right)^2 = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

PARTS (iii)–(iv). Follow directly by application of parts (i) and (ii) and the fact that $Q_n = O_p(1)$. \square

LEMMA S.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{i=1,\dots,n} \left| w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right| = o_p(1), \\ & \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}_x} \sup_{i=1,\dots,n} \left| w_i(x) - \mathbf{w}_E \left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}, x \right) \right| = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA S.5. The results follow immediately from Lemma S.2 and the definition of $w_i(x)$.

\square

LEMMA S.6. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied, and let ζ_i be such that $\phi^2(x_i) := \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^2|x_i]$ for a continuous and bounded function $\phi : \mathbb{S}_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^4|x_i]$ is uniformly bounded. For an interior point \mathbf{x} it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \quad (\text{S.3})$$

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = O_p(1). \quad (\text{S.4})$$

PROOF OF LEMMA S.6. We will prove (S.3) by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ W_{2n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ W_{12n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma S.5, $W_{1n} = o_p(1)(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i:|x_i - \mathbf{x}| < h} \zeta_i^2$, and by Chebychev's inequality and the law of iterated expectations, $(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i:|x_i - \mathbf{x}| < h} \zeta_i^2 = O_p(1)$.

Next, by the uniform convergence in Lemma S.5, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2n} &= \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) w_E \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) - w_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n w \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) w_E \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) - w_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 + o_p(1) \\ &=: \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} R_n + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows because the sum

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} w \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) w_E(0, x_i) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n w \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) w_E \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) - w_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{nh} w \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) w_E(0, x_i) \right) \zeta_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

is $O_p((nh)^{-1})$ by L_1 -convergence. We will also show that $R_n \rightarrow_p 0$ by L_1 -convergence. Specifically,

by the law of iterated expectations,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[R_n] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) - \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\ &=: \mathbb{E}[R_{1n}] + \mathbb{E}[R_{2n}] - 2 \mathbb{E}[R_{12n}].\end{aligned}$$

We start by deriving the limit of $\mathbb{E}[R_{1n}]$, which is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[R_{1n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) \right)^2 \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^3} \sum_{\substack{i, j, j'=1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_{j'} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_{j'}}{h}, x_{j'} \right) \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^3} \sum_{i, j=1, i \neq j}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right)^2 \phi^2(x_i) \right].\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{n(n-1)}{(nh)^3} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_2 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_1 - x_2}{h}, x_2 \right)^2 \phi^2(x_1) f(x_1) f(x_2) dx_2 dx_1 \\ &= \frac{n(n-1)}{n^3 h} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}}(s - u, \mathbf{x} + uh)^2 \phi^2(\mathbf{x} + sh) f(\mathbf{x} + sh) f(\mathbf{x} + uh) du ds \\ &= \frac{n(n-1)}{n^3 h} \left(\phi^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x})^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)^2 \mathbf{w}(s - u)^2 du ds + o(1) \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{nh} \right),\end{aligned}$$

and the main term in $\mathbb{E}[R_{1n}]$ is

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^3} \sum_{\substack{i, j, j'=1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_{j'} - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_{j'}}{h}, x_{j'} \right) \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\ &= \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{n^2 h^3} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} \left(\int_{\mathbf{x}-h}^{\mathbf{x}+h} \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_2 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{E}} \left(\frac{x_1 - x_2}{h}, x_2 \right) f(x_2) dx_2 \right)^2 \phi^2(x_1) f(x_1) dx_1 \\ &= \phi^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w}(s - u) du \right)^2 ds + o(1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R} := \phi^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}(s)^2 ds$. Similarly, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[R_{2n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} - u \right) du \right)^2 \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u) \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} - u \right) du \right)^2 \phi^2(x_1) f(x_1) dx_1 = \mathbf{R} + o(1)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[R_{12n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(nh)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_j - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{E}} \left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{h}, x_j \right) \phi^2(x_i) \right] \\
&= \frac{n-1}{nh^2} \int_{\mathbb{S}_x} \int_{x-h}^{x+h} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}} \left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_2 - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{E}} \left(\frac{x_1 - x_2}{h}, x_2 \right) \phi^2(x_1) f(x_1) f(x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \\
&= \phi^2(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}(r) \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(r-s) \mathbf{w}(s) ds \right) dr + o(1) = R + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $R_n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{p}} 0$ and hence that $W_{2n} \rightarrow_{\mathbf{p}} 0$.

Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $W_{12n} = W_{1n}^{1/2} W_{2n}^{1/2} = o_{\mathbf{p}}(1)$.

Finally, using the result in (S.3), to prove (S.4) it is sufficient to show that

$$W_{3n} := \frac{4}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \zeta_i^2 = O_{\mathbf{p}}(1).$$

By Lemma S.4, $|W_{3n}| = O_{\mathbf{p}}((nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |w_{\text{PLP}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)| \zeta_i^2)$. To conclude the proof, we apply the law of iterated expectations and find $\mathbb{E}[(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |w_{\text{PLP}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)| \zeta_i^2] = \mathbb{E}[(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |w_{\text{PLP}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)| \phi^2(x_i)] = f(\mathbf{x})^{-2} \phi^2(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} |w_{\text{PLP}}(u)| du + o(1) = O(1)$ by the same method as above. \square

LEMMA S.7. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied, and let ζ_i be such that $\phi^2(x_i) := \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^2 | x_i]$ for a continuous and bounded function $\phi : \mathbb{S}_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^4 | x_i]$ is uniformly bounded. Then:*

(i) *If \mathbf{x} is an interior point,*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_{\mathbf{p}}(1), \quad (\text{S.5})$$

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = O_{\mathbf{p}}(1). \quad (\text{S.6})$$

(ii) *If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point,*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{mPLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_{\mathbf{p}}(1), \quad (\text{S.7})$$

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} w_{\text{mPLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = O_{\mathbf{p}}(1). \quad (\text{S.8})$$

PROOF OF LEMMA S.7. We prove (S.5) by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{1n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 + Q_n)w_i(\mathbf{x}) - 2f(\mathbf{x})^{-1}\mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ Z_{2n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(Q_n \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x})w_i(x_j) - f(\mathbf{x})^{-1}\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ Z_{12n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 + Q_n)w_i(\mathbf{x}) - 2f(\mathbf{x})^{-1}\mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(Q_n \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x})w_i(x_j) - f(\mathbf{x})^{-1}\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.1 and Lemma S.4, we have that $Z_{1n} = 4W_{1n} + o_p(1)$, $Z_{2n} = W_{2n} + o_p(1)$, and $Z_{12n} = 2W_{12n} + o_p(1)$, where W_{1n} , W_{2n} , and W_{12n} are defined in the proof of Lemma S.6. Therefore, the proof of (S.5) is concluded because we showed in the proof of Lemma S.6 that W_{1n} , W_{2n} , and W_{12n} are all $o_p(1)$.

Next, we prove (S.6). To do so, by (S.5), it is sufficient to show that

$$Z_{3n} := \frac{4}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \zeta_i^2 = O_p(1).$$

By Lemma S.4, $|Z_{3n}| = O_p((nh)^{-1}) \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)| \zeta_i^2$. The result then follows by Markov's inequality and the law of iterated expectations because

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right| \zeta_i^2 \right] = \phi^2(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}}(u)| du + o(1) = O(1).$$

Next, we will prove (S.7) in the same way as (S.5), by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\text{bnd},1n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 + Q_n)w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1+Q}{f(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ Z_{\text{bnd},2n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{Q_n}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x})w_i(x_j) - \frac{Q}{f(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1), \\ Z_{\text{bnd},12n} &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 + Q_n)w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{(1+Q)}{f(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{Q_n}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x})w_i(x_j) - \frac{Q}{f(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{w}_{\text{conv,bnd}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.1 and Lemma S.4, we have that $Z_{\text{bnd},1n} = (1+Q)^2 Z_{1n}^\dagger + o_p(1)$, $Z_{\text{bnd},2n} = Q^2 Z_{2n}^\dagger + o_p(1)$,

and $Z_{\text{bnd},12n} = Q(1+Q)Z_{12n}^\dagger + o_p(1)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{1n}^\dagger &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2, \\ Z_{2n}^\dagger &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv},\text{bnd}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2, \\ Z_{12n}^\dagger &:= \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{conv},\text{bnd}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \zeta_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then (S.7) follows by showing that Z_{1n}^\dagger , Z_{2n}^\dagger , and Z_{12n}^\dagger are all $o_p(1)$, which holds by identical arguments applied in the proof of Lemma S.6 for W_{1n} , W_{2n} , and W_{12n} , respectively.

Finally, the proof of (S.8) is analogous to that of (S.6) and is therefore omitted. \square

LEMMA S.8. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied, and let ζ_i be such that $\phi^2(x_i) := \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^2|x_i]$ for a continuous and bounded function $\phi : \mathbb{S}_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^4|x_i]$ is uniformly bounded. For an interior point \mathbf{x} it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \quad (\text{S.9})$$

PROOF OF LEMMA S.8. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the absolute value of the left-hand side of (S.9) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right) \zeta_i^2 \right| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{PLP},i}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{PLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \right)^2 \zeta_i^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is $o_p(1)$ by Lemma S.6. \square

LEMMA S.9. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied, and let ζ_i be such that $\phi^2(x_i) := \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^2|x_i]$ for a continuous and bounded function $\phi : \mathbb{S}_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^4|x_i]$ is uniformly bounded. Then:*

(i) *If \mathbf{x} is an interior point,*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \mathbf{w}_{\text{mPLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \quad (\text{S.10})$$

(ii) *If \mathbf{x} is a boundary point,*

$$\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_{\text{mPLP},i}(\mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})^2} \mathbf{w}_{\text{mPLP}} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^2 \right) \zeta_i^2 = o_p(1). \quad (\text{S.11})$$

PROOF OF LEMMA S.9. Like the proof of Lemma S.8, both parts follow from application of the

Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, except we use Lemma S.7 instead of Lemma S.6. \square

S.2 PROOFS OF BIAS EXPANSION LEMMAS IN APPENDIX B.2

PROOF OF LEMMA B.1. Proof for C_n : By Lemma S.5, $C_n = f(\mathbf{x})^{-1}(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^{p+1} + o_p(1)$. Inserting \mathbf{w} yields the vector $(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n r_p((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)K((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^{p+1}$. This has j -th element $\gamma_{j+p,n}(\mathbf{x})$, and the results then follow from Lemma S.1.

PART (i) FOR $C_{\text{LP},n}$. Let $\theta_{\text{E},p}(x) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} K(u)r_p(u)u^{p+1}f(x+uh)du$. By Lemmas S.1 and S.5,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{LP},n} &= \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{w}_{\text{E}}\left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h}, x_i\right) \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h}\right)^{p+1} + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(x_i) \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h}\right) r_p\left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h}\right) \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h}\right)^{p+1} + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right) \iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(x_i) \theta_{\text{E},p}(x_i) + o_p(1) =: C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we analyze $C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}$ and find that, by the i.i.d. assumption and Lemmas S.1 and S.2, $\mathbb{E}[C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}] \rightarrow \iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \theta_{\text{E},p}(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{w}(u)du = C$. Moreover, by the i.i.d. assumption,

$$\mathbb{E}[(C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger})^2] = (\mathbb{E}[C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}])^2 + \frac{1}{n(hf(\mathbf{x}))^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{w}\left(\frac{x_1 - \mathbf{x}}{h}\right)^2 (\iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(x_1) \theta_{\text{E},p}(x_1))^2\right].$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}((x_1 - \mathbf{x})/h)^2 (\iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(x_1) \theta_{\text{E},p}(x_1))^2] = O(h)$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[(C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger})^2] = (\mathbb{E}[C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}])^2 + O((nh)^{-1})$, which concluding the proof of part (i) by L_2 -convergence.

PART (ii) FOR $C_{\text{LP},n}$. As in the proof of part (i), we can write

$$C_{\text{LP},n} = \frac{1}{nhf(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}_{\text{bnd}}\left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h}, 0\right) \iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(x_i) \theta_{\text{E},p}(x_i) + o_p(1) =: C_{\text{LP},\text{bnd},n}^{\dagger} + o_p(1).$$

In this case we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}] &= \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_0^1 \mathbf{w}_{\text{bnd}}(s, 0) \iota'_0 \Gamma_{\text{E},p}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + sh) \theta_{\text{E},p}(\mathbf{x} + sh) f(\mathbf{x} + sh) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})} \int_0^1 \mathbf{w}_{\text{bnd}}(s, 0) \iota'_0 \left(\int_{-s}^1 K(v) r_p(v) r'_p(v) f(\mathbf{x} + sh + vh) dv \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \int_{-s}^1 K(u) r_p(u) u^{p+1} f(\mathbf{x} + sh + uh) du f(\mathbf{x} + sh) ds \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbf{w}_{\text{bnd}}(s, 0) \int_{-s}^1 \mathbf{w}_{\text{bnd}}(u, s) u^{p+1} du ds + o(1) = C_{\text{LP}} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that, since \mathbf{x} is a (left) boundary point, $f(\mathbf{x} + a) = 0$ for $a < 0$. Finally, the proof is completed by noting that $\mathbb{E}[(C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger})^2] = (\mathbb{E}[C_{\text{LP},n}^{\dagger}])^2 + o(1)$ by the same arguments used in part (i). \square

PROOF OF LEMMA B.2. By definition of $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n}$ and using $\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{x},n}(\mathbf{x}) = \iota'_0 \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} &= \sqrt{nh} \iota'_0 ((Z'_p W Z_p)^{-1} Z'_p W Z_{p+1} H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= \sqrt{nh} \iota'_0 (Z'_p W Z_p)^{-1} Z'_p W Z_{p+1} \iota'_{p+1} H_{p+1}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} C_n \iota'_{p+1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{C_n}{(p+1)!}.\end{aligned}\tag{S.12}$$

From (2.3) and (S.12) we have $\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} - B_n = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} (\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})) C_n / (p+1)! + o_p(1)$, where $\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (p+1)! \iota'_{p+1} \hat{\beta}_{p+1,n} = (p+1)! (nh^{p+2})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) y_i$ with $w_{(q),i}(x) := \iota'_q \Gamma_q^{-1}(x) r_q((x_i - x)/h) K((x_i - x)/h)$. Let \tilde{x}_i be an intermediate value between x_i and \mathbf{x} . Then, by the mean-value argument in (C.4),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(p+1)!}{nh^{p+2}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) g(x_i) &= \frac{(p+1)!}{nh^{p+2}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) \left(r'_{p+1} \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) H_{p+1}^{-1} \beta_{p+1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{p+1} h^{p+1} \left(\frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} \right) \right) \\ &= g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{x_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^{p+1} (g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_i) - g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})) = g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + O_p(h^\eta),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by Hölder continuity of $g^{(p+1)}$ (Assumption 2.1(iii)) and the fact that $(nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) ((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)^{p+1} = O_p(1)$. That is, $\hat{g}_n^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) = g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + O_p(h^\eta) + (p+1)!(nh^{p+2})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i$ such that

$$\hat{B}_{\text{GP},n} - B_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(p+1),i}(\mathbf{x}) \varepsilon_i C_n + o_p(1),$$

which proves the result by definition of the weights $w_{\text{GP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x})$. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA B.3. By definition of $\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{B}_{\text{LP},n} &= \sqrt{nh} \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \hat{g}_n(x_i) - \hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x_i) g(x_j) - g(x_i) \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x_i) \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i \right) \\ &=: B_{2n} + \xi_{2n,\text{LP}}.\end{aligned}$$

By the mean-value theorem,

$$B_{2n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x_i) \left(r'_p \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h} \right) H_p^{-1} \beta_p(x_i) + h^{p+1} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_{ij})}{(p+1)!} \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h} \right)^{p+1} \right) - g(x_i) \right),$$

where \tilde{x}_{ij} takes values in the open interval $(\min\{x_j, x_i\}, \max\{x_j, x_i\})$. By definition of the weights w_j ,

$(nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x_i) r_p'((x_j - x_i)/h) = \iota_0'$, so that

$$B_{2n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(x_i) h^{p+1} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\tilde{x}_{ij})}{(p+1)!} \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{h} \right)^{p+1}.$$

Using $\max_{i,j:w_j(x_i)>0} \{|x_j - \mathbf{x}|, |x_i - \mathbf{x}|\} \leq 2h$ and Hölder continuity of $g^{(p+1)}$ (Assumption 2.1(iii)),

$$B_{2n} = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} C_{\text{LP},n} (1 + O(h^\eta)) = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} C_{\text{LP},n} + o_p(1),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} C_{\text{LP},n} = O_p(1)$, which holds by Lemma B.1 whether \mathbf{x} is interior or on the boundary. Combining this with (2.3) we then find

$$B_{2n} - B_n = \sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \frac{g^{(p+1)}(\mathbf{x})}{(p+1)!} (C_{\text{LP},n} - C_n) + o_p(1) =: A_n + o_p(1),$$

which concludes the proof of the expansion. The limits of A_n follow immediately from Lemma B.1 and by noticing that $\sqrt{nh^{2p+3}} \rightarrow \sqrt{\kappa}$ by Assumption 2.2(ii). \square

PROOF OF LEMMA B.4. Part (i). The result for ξ_{1n} follows from $r_{1n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})^{-1} w((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)) \varepsilon_i \rightarrow_p 0$. This in turn follows because $\mathbb{E}[r_{1n}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[r_{1n}^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] = W_{1n} \rightarrow_p 0$; see the proof of Lemma S.6 with $\zeta_i^2 = \sigma^2(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The result for $\xi_{2n,\text{GP}}$ follows similarly because $r_{2n} := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_{\text{GP-bc},i}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})^{-1} w_{\text{GP-bc}}((x_i - \mathbf{x})/h)) \varepsilon_i \rightarrow_p 0$. This in turn follows because $\mathbb{E}[r_{2n}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[r_{2n}^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] \rightarrow_p 0$, which can be shown in the same way as for r_{1n} using the method of proof of Lemma S.6 and applying also Lemma B.1.

PART (ii). The proof is identical to that in part (i), but replacing interior point equivalent kernels with boundary point equivalent kernels. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA B.5. We first write

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{1n} \\ \xi_{2n,\text{LP}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} w_i(\mathbf{x}) \\ (nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j) - w_i(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} s_n,$$

where $s_n = (s_{1n}, s_{2n})' := (nh)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\mathbf{x}), (nh)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\mathbf{x}) w_i(x_j))' \varepsilon_i$. Clearly it suffices to prove the results separately for s_{1n} and s_{2n} .

PART (i). The proof for s_{1n} is given in the proof of Lemma B.4 because $s_{1n} = \xi_{1n}$. The proof for s_{2n} is identical, but applies W_{2n} from the proof of Lemma S.6 instead of W_{1n} .

PART (ii). The proof is identical to that in part (i), but applies Z_{1n}^\dagger and Z_{2n}^\dagger from the proof of Lemma S.7 instead of W_{1n} and W_{2n} . \square

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

CATTANEO, M.D., JANSSON, M., AND MA, X. (2024): Local regression distribution estimators. *Journal of Econometrics* 240, article 105074.

- CAVALIERE, G., GONÇALVES, S., NIELSEN, M.Ø., AND ZANELLI, E. (2025): Improved inference for nonparametric regression.
- HANSEN, B.E. (2008): Uniform convergence rates for kernel estimation with dependent data. *Econometric Theory* 24, 726—748.
- MASRY, E. (1996): Multivariate local polynomial regression for time series: Uniform strong consistency and rates. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 17, 571–599.