

Estimation of Semiparametric Factor Models with Missing Data

Sijie Zheng

Center for Statistical Science, Tsinghua University
zhengsj0212@gmail.com

Abstract

We study semiparametric factor models in high-dimensional panels where the factor loadings consist of a nonparametric component explained by observed covariates and an idiosyncratic component capturing unobserved heterogeneity. A key challenge in empirical applications is the presence of missing observations, which can distort both factor recovery and loading estimation. To address this issue, we develop a projected principal component analysis (PPCA) procedure that accommodates general missing-at-random mechanisms through inverse-probability weighting. We establish consistency and derive the asymptotic distributions of the estimated factors and loading functions, allowing the sieve dimension to diverge and permitting the time dimension to be either fixed or growing. Unlike classical PCA, PPCA achieves consistent factor estimation even when T is fixed, and the limiting distributions under missing data exhibit mixture normality with enlarged asymptotic variances. Theoretical results are supported by simulations and an empirical application. Our findings demonstrate that PPCA provides an effective and robust framework for estimating semiparametric factor models in the presence of missing data.

Keywords: Semiparametric factor models, projected principal component analysis, missing data.

1 Introduction

Factor models have gained substantial popularity in various fields, including finance, economics, and social sciences, as they provide a powerful framework for understanding complex data structures and capturing underlying latent factors. These models offer valuable insights into the relationships between observed variables and unobserved factors, enabling dimension reduction and facilitating interpretation. There have been some in-depth studies on factor models, [Fan et al. \(2016\)](#) develops estimates of its large covariance and precision matrices, [Fan et al. \(2015\)](#) studies factor-based risk estimators of a large portfolio, [Fan et al. \(2017\)](#) proposes the sufficient

forecasting which allows the large number of predictors, and [Connor et al. \(2012\)](#) estimates stock returns by treating factor model as a weighted additive nonparametric regression model.

Accurate and efficient estimation of factor models is crucial for extracting meaningful information from high-dimensional datasets and making reliable predictions. The projected-principal component analysis (PPCA) has emerged as a prominent approach. PPCA extends the conventional PCA ([Bai and Ng \(2002\)](#), [Bai \(2003\)](#), [Jin et al. \(2021\)](#), [Bai and Ng \(2019\)](#), [Stock and Watson \(2002a\)](#)) by incorporating estimated factor loadings into the dimension reduction process. This approach projects the observed data onto a subspace spanned by the factor loadings, resulting in a parsimonious representation of the data and facilitating the identification and interpretation of the dominant factors. This integration of classical PCA with sieve approximation, as a means to extract features, sheds light on [Gu et al. \(2021\)](#)’s autoencoder estimation approach in a asset pricing model and [Bodelet and La Vecchia \(2022\)](#)’s sieve M-estimation in a semiparametric dynamic factor model. The PPCA estimation offers a valuable tool for uncovering the underlying structure of the data and capturing its main sources of variability. In contrast, conventional PCA is effective in reducing dimensionality, it does not explicitly consider the specific structure of factor models. As a result, the factor loadings obtained through conventional PCA may not be directly interpretable in terms of the underlying factors.

In empirical work, panel datasets often encounter the challenge of missing values. In financial data, the absence of stock returns can occur prior to a company’s listing, subsequent to its bankruptcy ([Gu et al. \(2021\)](#), [Giglio et al. \(2022\)](#)). In macroeconomic datasets, missing entries may be caused by mixed sampling frequencies, such as monthly and quarterly ([Stock and Watson \(2002b\)](#)). In the Netflix challenge, a majority of users’ scores for films are missing ([Zhou et al. \(2008\)](#)). Ignoring missing data can lead to biased and inefficient estimations, making it imperative to develop robust methods capable of handling missing panel data effectively.

Studies on factor models with missing data have received widespread attention. [Bańbura and Modugno \(2014\)](#) aims at the maximum likelihood estimation for dynamic factor models. [Jungbacker et al. \(2011\)](#) is computationally efficient by employing the Kalman filter smoothing methods. [Shumway and Stoffer \(1982\)](#) modifies the expectation-maximization algorithm that allows for missing data but assumed that the factor [Stock and Watson \(2002b\)](#) handles missing data in principal components analysis.

The main aim of this paper is to explore the effectiveness of the PPCA method in estimating factor models with missing data. We provide theoretical justifications for our approach, focusing on consistency and deriving the asymptotic distribution of the estimators in scenarios with missing data. Unlike traditional PCA estimators, which require both N and T to approach infinity to reach consistency, PPCA estimators only need N to approach infinity, while T can either diverge or remain a fixed constant. This suggests that our model has wide application prospects in the "high-dimensional-low-sample-size" (HDLSS) domain.

The asymptotic distribution of the estimates for factors and loading components may not generally exhibit asymptotic normality, but rather only achieve stable convergence. The limit distribution of the estimates for loading components holds in cases of finite T . However, the limit distribution of factor estimates does not hold in cases of finite T with missing values, although it is valid in scenarios without missing values, albeit with an adjusted asymptotic variance. Additionally, we compared the asymptotic variances of the limit distributions in scenarios with and without missing values. We found that the asymptotic variance in cases with missing values is always larger than in those without, and the greater the proportion of missing values, the larger the asymptotic variance.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 proposes the estimation method for the factor model with missing data. Section 3 introduces the asymptotic properties of the estimates. Section 4 constructs a specification test to examine the existence of the loading component. Section 5 validates the effectiveness of rank-minimization methods for estimating the number of factors. Section 6 carries out simulation studies on the finite sample performance. The methodology is verified by an empirical application in Section 7. Section 8 concludes. Technical lemmas and proofs are in the Supplementary materials.

2 The Model and Estimator

2.1 Semiparametric factor models and sieve approximation of the loadings

Suppose that y_{it}^* follows a factor model:

$$y_{it}^* = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i' \mathbf{f}_t + u_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N; t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where u_{it} is the error term, \mathbf{f}_t is the factor and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$ is the factor loading, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i, \mathbf{f}_t \in \mathbb{R}^R$. In addition, let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iL})' \in \mathbb{R}^L$ be a vector of time-invariant observed covariates for individual i , let $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i = (\gamma_{i1}, \dots, \gamma_{iR})' \in \mathbb{R}^R$ be the latent random variables that are independent from covariates \mathbf{x}_i . Then

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i,$$

where $\mathbf{g}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^L \mapsto \mathbb{R}^R$ is a vector of smooth functions, $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ represents the loading component that can be fully explained by the covariates \mathbf{x}_i , and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ stands for the part that cannot be explained by \mathbf{x}_i . Specifically, when $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i = 0$, observations y_{it}^* can be viewed as a smooth function against the covariates \mathbf{x}_i . When $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$, the factor loading no longer relies on \mathbf{x}_i , degenerating to conventional factor model (Bai and Ng (2002), Bai (2003)). The unobserved variable $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ is incorporated into the model to achieve more robust estimation. It serves to account for unobserved heterogeneity among individuals and to increase the flexibility and adaptability of

our model.

Let $g_r(\mathbf{x}_i)$ be the r -th element of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. To avoid the curse of dimensionality, we assume that g_r is additive:

$$g_r(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{l=1}^L g_{rl}(x_{il}).$$

Under these assumptions, we obtain a *semiparametric factor model* for y_{it}^* , which can be written in matrix form as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}^* = \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) \mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{U}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{Y}^* is the $N \times T$ matrix of y_{it}^* , \mathbf{U} is the $N \times T$ matrix of u_{it} , $\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_T)'$, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) = (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_N))'$, $\mathbf{\Gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N)'$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)'$.

Let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_J be a set of continuous basis functions. Write

$$\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)}_{LJ \times 1} = [\phi_1(x_{i1}), \dots, \phi_J(x_{i1}), \dots, \phi_1(x_{iL}), \dots, \phi_J(x_{iL}), \dots, \phi_1(x_{iL}), \dots, \phi_J(x_{iL})]'$$

Assumption 1. Suppose that for $r = 1, \dots, R$, there exists $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_R \in \mathbb{R}^{LJ}$ such that for some constant $\alpha \geq 2$,

$$\max_{1 \leq r \leq R} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |g_r(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}_r' \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})| = O(J^{-\alpha}). \quad (2)$$

Assumption 1 is required for the accuracy of sieve approximation method.

Remark 1. For a Hölder class with smoothness $\alpha = m + \gamma$,

$$\Lambda^\alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ h \in C^m(\mathcal{X}) : \sup_{|q| \leq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |D^q h(\mathbf{x})| \leq c, \sup_{|q|=m} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}} \frac{|D^q h(\mathbf{x}) - D^q h(\mathbf{y})|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^\gamma} \leq c \right\}$$

where D^q is the differential operator defined by

$$D^q = \frac{\partial^{|q|}}{\partial x_1^{q_1} \dots \partial x_L^{q_L}}.$$

with $|q| = q_1 + \dots + q_L$, $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm, and $C^m(\mathcal{X})$ is the space of all m -times continuously differentiable real-valued functions on \mathcal{X} . In Assumption 1, $\{\phi_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \phi_J(\mathbf{x})\}$ is a sequence of basis functions, and J denotes the number of approximating terms in the sieve space, where J is allowed to grow to infinity alongside sample sizes. According to [Chen \(2007\)](#), for $\mathbf{g}_r(\cdot) \in \Lambda^\alpha(\mathcal{X})$, it can be well approximated by a linear span of infinite basis functions, including Fourier series, splines, and wavelets. Furthermore, the sieve approximation errors to \mathbf{g}_r in \mathcal{L}_∞ -norm are upper bounded in probability by $O_P(J^{-\alpha})$. This type of sieve methodology is widely used in nonparametric and semiparametric estimation; see [Zheng and Song \(2025\)](#); [Zheng et al.](#)

(2025).

Define $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_R)'$, $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = (\phi(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}_N))'$, and $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) - \Phi(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{B}'$. Then we can write:

$$\mathbf{Y}^* = \Phi(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{U}. \quad (3)$$

2.2 Missing observations and estimation of missing probabilities

In practice, it is very common that not all the outcomes can be observed at all sample periods. Thus, the practitioners usually have to deal with unbalanced panels. To accommodate such cases, the outcome y_{it}^* is allowed to be missing. In particular, let $\omega_{it} \in \{0, 1\}$ be a indicator for the availability of the observation y_{it}^* , i.e., y_{it}^* is observed if $\omega_{it} = 1$ and y_{it}^* is missing if $\omega_{it} = 0$. Define $\pi_i(\mathbf{x}) = P[\omega_{it} = 1 | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}]$, then $\pi_i = \pi_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ gives the probability of having missing values for individual i conditional on his/her observed covariates \mathbf{x}_i . We assume that π_i can be consistently estimated from the observed data.

Assumption 2. For all i , $\pi_i \in (0, 1]$. Moreover, let $\{\hat{\pi}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be estimators of $\{\pi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfying:

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i| = O_P((NT)^{-1/2}).$$

Remark 2. The missing completely at random (MCAR) mechanism, i.e., $\pi_i \equiv \pi$ for all i . The variables ω_{it} 's are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) following Bernoulli(π) distribution with $\pi \in (0, 1]$ and are independent of \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{F} , $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, \mathbf{U} . It can be readily observed that $\hat{\pi} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_{it} / (NT)$ serves as an \sqrt{NT} -consistent estimator of π . From [Little and Rubin \(2019\)](#), MCAR is often inappropriate when dealing with real data.

Remark 3. The missing at random (MAR) mechanism, according to [Newman \(2014\)](#)'s view that despite strict MAR may not be perfectly met in practical scenarios, it can still yield estimates that are less biased and more statistically powerful than any other available missing data techniques. A commonly adopted parametric model for missingness is the logistic regression model given by

$$\pi_i = \frac{\exp(\theta_0 + \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \exp(\theta_0 + \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad (4)$$

where θ_0 is a constant, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_L) \in \mathbb{R}^L$ are the coefficients. Directly from (4), ω_{it} is independent with respect to t and conditionally i.i.d. as Bernoulli(π_i) given \mathbf{x}_i . The unknown parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_L)$ can be estimated using maximum likelihood estimation, resulting in the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$. Under some mild conditions, it can be derived using likelihood theory that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 + O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}}\right)$. Denote by $L(z) = \exp(z) / (1 + \exp(z))$ the logistic cumulative distribution function and $L'(z) = L(z)(1 - L(z)) < 1/4$. Since \mathbf{x}_i is defined

on a compact set \mathcal{X} , the mean value theorem leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\max_i |\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i| &= \max_i \left| L((1, \mathbf{x}_i)' \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - L((1, \mathbf{x}_i)' \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \right) \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \right\| = O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{NT}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

2.3 Projected PCA with missing observations

Define $z_{it} = y_{it}^* \omega_{it} / \pi_i$. Next we show that the complete semiparametric factor model structure of y_{it}^* can be identified from z_{it} .

Assumption 3. *Conditional on $(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i, \mathbf{f}_t)$, ω_{it} is independent of u_{it} . In addition, conditional on \mathbf{x}_i , ω_{it} is independent of \mathbf{f}_t .*

Intuitively, the above assumption allows the missing to be dependent on \mathbf{x}_i but independent of the idiosyncratic errors u_{it} and the factors. It is easy to see that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(z_{it} | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{f}_t, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i) &= \mathbb{E}(y_{it}^* \omega_{it} / \pi_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{f}_t, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i) \\ &= \pi_i^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}(y_{it}^* | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{f}_t, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\omega_{it} | \mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i' \mathbf{f}_t = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i' \mathbf{f}_t.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, one can estimate the factor and loading functions by applying the projected PCA (PPCA) to z_{it} . However, to make this idea feasible, we need to replace the unknown $\{\pi_i\}$ by their consistent estimators. To this end, let $\hat{z}_{it} = y_{it}^* \omega_{it} / \hat{\pi}_i$, i.e., the observations $\{\hat{z}_{it}\}$ are constructed by replacing the missing observations y_{it}^* by 0 and by weighting the observed y_{it}^* using $1/\hat{\pi}_i$.

Define $\mathbf{P} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})(\boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})' \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{X}))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})' \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as the projection matrix of $\boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})$ onto \mathcal{X} , and let $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ denote the $N \times T$ matrix of \hat{z}_{it} . One performs the PPCA on $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ by minimizing the least squares objective function

$$\mathcal{L}_{NT}(\mathbf{F}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{NT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{Z}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}' \right) \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{\mathbf{Z}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}' \right)' \right]$$

under the identification restrictions:

$$\mathbf{F}' \mathbf{F} / T = \mathbf{I}_R, \quad \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})' \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R} \quad \text{is a diagonal matrix with distinct entries.} \quad (5)$$

The obtained estimators can minimize the sum of squares of residuals projected in the space spanned by the basis functions $\{\phi_j(\cdot)\}_{j=1}^J$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{D}}_R$ be the R largest eigenvalues of $(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}' \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ in descending order, and $\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{D}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{D}}_R)$. The estimated common factors, $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$, are given by the associated eigenvectors divided by \sqrt{T} . Thus, we can write:

$$(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}' \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\mathbf{F}} = \hat{\mathbf{F}} \hat{\mathbf{D}}, \quad (6)$$

and the estimated loading component matrix is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{P}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}/T.$$

As stated in Bai and Ng (2002), Bai (2003), $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is estimated by

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}/T, \quad (7)$$

resulting in a natural estimator of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} - \hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) = (\mathbf{I}_R - \mathbf{P})\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}/T.$$

For the semiparametric factor model with missing values, observations \hat{z}_{it} can be expressed as

$$\hat{z}_{it} = z_{it} + (\hat{z}_{it} - z_{it}) = y_{it}^* + \tilde{z}_{it} + (z_{it} - y_{it}^*) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i' \mathbf{f}_t + \tilde{z}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it},$$

where $\tilde{z}_{it} = \hat{z}_{it} - z_{it} = y_{it}^* \omega_{it} (\hat{\pi}_i^{-1} - \pi_i^{-1})$, $\tilde{u}_{it} = u_{it} + z_{it} - y_{it}^* = u_{it} + y_{it}^* (\omega_{it}/\pi_i - 1)$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ denote the $N \times T$ matrix of \tilde{z}_{it} , $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ denote the $N \times T$ matrix of \tilde{u}_{it} . Then we can write:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{F}' + \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} + \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}' + \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} + \tilde{\mathbf{U}}. \quad (8)$$

The residual term consists of three parts: the sieve approximation error $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}'$, the idiosyncratic error $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$, and the error caused by the estimated missing proportion $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$. In the absence of missing values, the observations can be written in matrix form as (3), where the residual term only consists of two parts: the sieve approximation error $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}'$ and the idiosyncratic \mathbf{U} . Compared to u_{it} , \tilde{u}_{it} incorporates an extra term $y_{it}^* (\omega_{it}/\pi_i - 1)$. The requirements for u_{it} (Assumption 5) are also satisfied by the additional term $y_{it}^* (\omega_{it}/\pi_i - 1)$, thereby allowing for a collective consideration of these two terms.

Notations: Let $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})$ denote Frobenius and spectral norms of matrix \mathbf{A} . Let $\lambda_r(\cdot)$, $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ denote the r -th, the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of a square matrix. The operator \xrightarrow{p} denotes convergence in probability, \xrightarrow{d} convergence in distribution. \mathbb{R} denotes the set of real numbers, \mathbb{N} represents the set of natural numbers, and \mathbb{N}_+ represents the set of positive integers. $O_P(o_p)$ denotes a sequence of random variables of certain order in probability. For instance, $O_P(N^{-1/2})$ means a smaller order than $N^{-1/2}$ in probability. matrix. $a_n \asymp b_n$ means that a_n/b_n is bounded below and above for all large n . $[a]$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to a .

3 Asymptotic Results

In this section, we derive the convergence rates and the asymptotic distributions of the PPCA estimators proposed in the previous section. We assume that the number of factors is known.

Assumption 4. Let $c_{\min}, c_{\max}, c_1, c_2$ be bounded positive constants.

- (i) Conditional on $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_T\}$, $(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega_{i1}, \dots, \omega_{iT})$ are independent across i .
- (ii) $E\|\mathbf{f}_t\| \leq c_1$ and $E\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)\| \leq c_2$ for $1 \leq t \leq T, 1 \leq i \leq N$.
- (iii) $\hat{\Sigma}_G = N^{-1}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})'\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_G$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Sigma_G \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R}$ is a positive-definite matrix.
- (iv) The eigenvalues of $\Sigma_G(\mathbf{F}'\mathbf{F}/T)$ are distinct from each other.
- (v) Let $\Sigma_\Phi = E(\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)'), c_{\min} < \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_\Phi) < \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_\Phi) < c_{\max}$.
- (vi) $T^{-1}\mathbf{F}'\mathbf{F} \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma_F$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Sigma_F \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R}$ is a positive-definite matrix.

Assumption 4 is standard in the literature on factor models and sieve estimation. (i) specifies that, the observed entities $(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega_{i1}, \dots, \omega_{iT})$ of one individual are not related to another once the common factors are controlled. (ii), (iii) impose the convergence for $\hat{\Sigma}_G(\mathbf{F}'\mathbf{F}/T)$ to ensure the validity of Theorem 5. (vi) can be easily verified using the law of large numbers. It states that $N^{-1}\Phi(\mathbf{X})'\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)'\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ converges in probability to Σ_Φ if the \mathbf{x}_i 's are weakly correlated and $\phi(\cdot)$ is well-conditioned. (v) requires $T \rightarrow \infty$ and is used in the derivation of the limit distribution of factor and loading component in Theorems 2 and 3.

Assumption 5. For factors and errors,

- (i) $\{\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{f}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is strictly stationary. $\{\mathbf{u}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\{\mathbf{f}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ are independent, and $E\mathbf{u}_t = E\mathbf{f}_t = 0$ for all t .
- (ii) There exist $r_1, r_2 \in (0, 2]$, and $b_1, b_2 > 0$, such that for any $s > 0$,

$$P(|u_{it}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/b_1)^{r_1}), \quad P(|f_{jt}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/b_2)^{r_2}).$$

- (iii) Let $C < \infty$ denote a generic constant, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \leq N} \sum_{i=1}^N |Eu_{it}u_{jt}| &< C, \\ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T |Eu_{it}u_{js}| &< C, \\ \max_{i \leq N} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T |\text{cov}(u_{it}u_{kt}, u_{is}u_{ms})| &< C. \end{aligned}$$

- (iv) Let $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0$ and \mathcal{F}_T^∞ denote the σ -algebras generated by $\{(\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)\}_{\infty < t \leq 0}$ and $\{(\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)\}_{T \leq t < \infty}$ respectively. Vector process $(\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)$ is geometrically strongly mixing, its α -mixing coefficient satisfies: there exist $r_3 > 0, M > 0$ such that $\alpha(T) \leq \exp(-MT^{r_3})$ for all $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$. The mixing

coefficient is defined as

$$\alpha(T) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0, B \in \mathcal{F}_T^\infty} |P(A)P(B) - P(AB)|$$

Assumption 5 parallels Assumption 3.4 in Fan et al. (2016), Assumptions 4.1, 4.5 in Fan et al. (2015). The error terms $\{u_{it}\}$ exhibit both temporal and serial dependencies. The exponential-tail condition ensures the error terms and factors have bounded finite moments.

Assumption 6. For $1 \leq i \leq N$, $1 \leq r \leq R$, the loading components γ_{ir} satisfies

- (i) $E\gamma_{ir} = 0$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \leq N}$ are independent of $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \leq N}$.
- (ii) Let $\nu_N = \max_{r \leq R} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \leq N} \text{var}(\gamma_{ir})$, $\max_{r \leq R, j \leq N} \sum_{i \leq N} |E\gamma_{ir}\gamma_{jr}| = O(\nu_N)$. There exists a bounded positive constant C such that for any N , it holds that $\nu_N < C$.

Assumption 6 suggests that $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \leq N}$ can exhibit cross-sectional weak dependence. The requirement for the observed covariates \mathbf{x}_i to be independent of the unobserved latent variables γ_i is to avoid collinearity. The sequence ν_N is a deterministic series associated with N , which can be bounded by a positive constant, such as when γ_{ir} follows an independent standard normal distribution. Or ν_N can decrease to zero as N increases, representing the case where the factor loadings can be fully explained by the observed characteristics with the increase of N , as in Connor et al. (2012), Ma et al. (2021), Chen et al. (2023).

To nonparametrically estimate the function $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$, according to (8), write the projected data in the matrix form as:

$$\mathbf{P}\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = \Phi(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}' + \tilde{\mathbf{E}},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{P}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{P}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} + \mathbf{P}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ is negligible compared to the influence of $\Phi(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}'$. This is because γ and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ are orthogonal to the function space spanned by \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{R} is inherently bounded by Assumption 1 and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ is bounded by Assumption 2. By disregarding $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$ and substituting \mathbf{F} with $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$, we can obtain the least squares estimate for the sieve coefficient matrix

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} = (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_R) = \frac{1}{T} [\Phi(\mathbf{X})'\Phi(\mathbf{X})]^{-1} \Phi(\mathbf{X})'\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}. \quad (9)$$

and hence $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ is estimated by

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x})\hat{\mathbf{B}} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

According to $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})' = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)(\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})') - \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}_i)(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})'$, the approximation error at point \mathbf{x}_i , denoted as $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)\hat{\mathbf{B}}$, is bounded by Assumption 1. Therefore, the technical challenge lies in computing $\|\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})'\|$.

Define $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\Sigma}_G \cdot (\mathbf{F}'\hat{\mathbf{F}}/T) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}$ where $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ is asymptotically nonsingular. The following

theorem gives the convergence rates of the estimated factors and loading components.

Theorem 1. Suppose $J = o(\sqrt{N})$. Then under Assumptions 1-3, 4 (i)-(v), 5, 6, as $N, J \rightarrow \infty$, T can be either divergent or bounded, we have:

- (i) $T^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}\hat{\mathbf{H}}\| = O_P(N^{-1/2} + J^{-\alpha})$.
- (ii) $N^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})'\| = O_P(J^{1/2-\alpha} + J^{1/2}N^{-1/2}T^{-1/2} + J^{1/2}N^{-1} + J^{1/2}\nu_N^{1/2}N^{-1/2})$.
- (iii) Suppose $\sup_{\mathbf{x}} |\phi(\mathbf{x})| = O_P(J^{1/2})$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \right| = O_P(J^{1-\alpha} + JN^{-1/2}T^{-1/2} + JN^{-1} + J\nu_N^{1/2}N^{-1/2}).$$

In traditional PCA, the estimation of factors approaches the true values at rate $O_P(T^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2})$, requiring both N and T to approach infinity for consistent estimation. However, with PPCA, the convergence rate for estimated factors is improved when T is finite, achieving consistent estimation of factors without needing T to approach infinity.

The optimal $J^* = (N \min\{T, N, \nu_N^{-1}\})^{1/2\alpha}$ simultaneously minimizes the convergence rates of the factors and loading components. With $J = J^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}\hat{\mathbf{H}}\| &= O_P(N^{-1/2}), \\ N^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})'\| &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{(N \min\{T, N, \nu_N^{-1}\})^{1/2-1/4\alpha}}\right), \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - (\hat{\mathbf{H}})^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \right| &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{(N \min\{T, N, \nu_N^{-1}\})^{1/2-1/2\alpha}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The convergence rate of $N^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})(\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1})'\|$ can reach $O_P\left(\frac{1}{N^{1/2-1/4\alpha}}\right)$, which is predominantly determined by N . When T approaches infinity, ν_N approaches zero and the function $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ exhibits sufficient smoothness (indicated by a larger α), there is an improvement in the convergence rate of the estimated loading components.

Assume the following limiting objects exist and are finite:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \right), \\ \mathbf{\Phi}_{1g} &= \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \mathbf{f}'_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 7. (i) For each t , as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t})$.
(ii) As $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \mathbf{f}'_t \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbf{\Phi}_{1g})$.

Assumption 7 is parallel to Assumption A.4 in Jin et al. (2021), where the limiting distri-

bution of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i}$ is a (finite) R -dimensional normal distribution, and the limiting distribution of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \mathbf{f}_t'$ is an (infinite) JL -dimensional normal distribution.

Denote by $\mathcal{G}_t^N = \sigma(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{f}_t)$ the sigma-field generated from $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \leq N}$, $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \leq N}$ and \mathbf{f}_t . Analogously, $\mathcal{G}^{NT} = \sigma(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{F})$ is the sigma-field generated from $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \leq N}$, $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \leq N}$ and $\{\mathbf{f}_t\}_{t=1}^T$. Define $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\cup_{N=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_t^N)$ and $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\cup_{N,T=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}^{NT})$.

Assume for some \mathcal{G}_t measurable random variables $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{2g,t} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{3g,t} \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t)^2 &\rightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}_{2g,t} \quad \text{in probability as } N \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1 + 3\pi_i}{\pi_i} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) (\gamma_i' \mathbf{f}_t)^2 &\rightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}_{3g,t} \quad \text{in probability as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Assume for some \mathcal{G} measurable random variables $\mathbf{\Phi}_{2g} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{\Phi}_{3g} \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t)^2 &\rightarrow \mathbf{\Phi}_{2g} \quad \text{in probability as } N, T \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\pi_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' (\gamma_i' \mathbf{f}_t)^2 &\rightarrow \mathbf{\Phi}_{3g} \quad \text{in probability as } N, T \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1 to 6, 7 (i) and $N^{1/2}O(N^{-1/2}T^{-1/2} + JN^{-1} + J^{-\alpha}) = o(1)$, as $N, T, J \rightarrow \infty$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} N^{1/2} \left(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \hat{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{f}_t \right) &= \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}' \mathbf{F}}{T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \left(u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} + \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t \frac{\omega_{it} - \pi_i}{\pi_i} + \gamma_i' \mathbf{f}_t \frac{\omega_{it} + \pi_i}{\pi_i} \right) + o_P(1) \\ &\rightarrow N(0, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{2g,t} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{3g,t}) \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \mathcal{G}_t\text{-stably} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{D} denotes the diagonal matrix consisting of the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_G^{1/2} \Sigma_F \Sigma_G^{1/2}$ in descending order with the corresponding eigenvector matrix denoted as $\mathbf{\Upsilon}$ such that $\mathbf{\Upsilon}' \mathbf{\Upsilon} = \mathbf{I}_R$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{\Upsilon}' \Sigma_G^{-1/2}$.

Theorem 2 illustrates the factor estimator is consistent but not asymptotically normal in general, since the asymptotic variance of the limiting distribution is measurable with respect to a particular σ -algebra \mathcal{G}_t . The sequence $\left\{ N^{1/2} \left(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \hat{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{f}_t \right), N \geq 1 \right\}$ is dominated by three parts, where directly applying Assumption 7 (i) leads to

$$\hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}' \mathbf{F}}{T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{D}^{-1}).$$

The last two parts \mathcal{G}_t -stably converges to a normal distribution based on conditional Lindeberg central limit theorem in Häusler and Luschgy (2015),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}' \mathbf{F}}{T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t \frac{\omega_{it} - \pi_i}{\pi_i} &\rightarrow N(0, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{2g,t} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \mathcal{G}_t\text{-stably as } N \rightarrow \infty, \\ \hat{D}^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{F}}' \mathbf{F}}{T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \gamma_i' \mathbf{f}_t \frac{\omega_{it} + \pi_i}{\pi_i} &\rightarrow N(0, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{3g,t} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \mathcal{G}_t\text{-stably as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The limiting distribution of these two parts can not be derived due to the existence of the common random term \mathbf{f}_t .

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions 1 to 6, 7 (ii) and $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_J} \left(\frac{1}{J^\alpha} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\sqrt{J}}{N} \right) = o(1)$, $\sigma_J \asymp J^{1/2}$, as $N, T, J \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_J} \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT} \sigma_J} \phi(\mathbf{x})' \Sigma_\Phi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \left(\mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \frac{\omega_{it} - \pi_i}{\pi_i} + u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} + \mathbf{f}_t' \gamma_i \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \right) \mathbf{f}_t \hat{\mathbf{H}} + o_P(1) \\ &\rightarrow N(0, \Sigma_F^{-1}) \mathcal{G}\text{-stably} \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_J^2 = \phi(\mathbf{x})' \Sigma_\Phi^{-1} (\Phi_{1g} + \Phi_{2g} + \Phi_{3g}) \Sigma_\Phi^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{x})$.

The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x})$ is derived from the decomposition:

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x})' \left(\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{B} \right) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$$

Under the condition $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_J} \left(\frac{1}{J^\alpha} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\sqrt{J}}{N} \right) = o(1)$, the primary component of $\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{B}$ is $(\Phi(\mathbf{X})' \Phi(\mathbf{X}))^{-1} \Phi(\mathbf{X})' (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{F}') \mathbf{F} \hat{\mathbf{H}} / T$. This condition is necessary to ensure that the terms involving asymptotic bias are smaller than those involving asymptotic variance, that is, the terms involving asymptotic bias are negligible compared to those involving asymptotic variance, as there is no method to estimate the asymptotic bias for sieve estimates. In Theorem 3, $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_J} \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \right)$ converges to a mixture normal distribution, where the asymptotic variance of this distribution is random but measurable with respect to a certain limit sigma-field \mathcal{G} . This is due to the presence of a common factor \mathbf{f}_t across all sectional units and $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ across all time units. Additionally, σ_J is a sequence of positive constants whose values depend on J .

The sieve dimension J is an important smoothing parameter, subject to the constraints of

$J = o(\sqrt{N})$ in Theorem 1. One simple setup is:

$$J = \left\lceil cN^{3/8} \log \log N \right\rceil \quad (10)$$

where $c = 0.6$ is a good choice in numerical studies. This empirical formula has been widely employed, see Huang et al. (2022); Zheng et al. (2025). Theorem 1 only require the number of cross section observations N to diverge, while the length of time series T can be either fixed or diverging.

Theorem 2 additionally stipulates that $N^{1/2}O(N^{-1/2}T^{-1/2} + J^{-\alpha}) = o(1)$, which means that T approaches infinity, and α depends on the smoothness of the Hölder space. For spline function spaces, the smoothness order (m, γ) of the loading component function $g_r(\cdot)$ is typically set as $(3, 1)$ or $(4, 0)$, with a corresponding spline order of $p = 4$ (cubic spline), $p \geq m + \gamma$. When $\sigma_J \asymp J^{1/2}$, Theorem 3 essentially requires that $(NT)^{1/2} J^{-(1/2+\alpha)} = o(1)$ and $T^{1/2}N^{-1/2} = o(1)$. As a result, to establish the asymptotic distribution of the estimated loading functions, J is set as (10), and the rate at which T diverges to infinity must be slower than N .

Corollary 1. *For finite T , assume the limiting objects*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1g,T} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \mathbf{f}_t' \right), \\ \Phi_{2g,T} &= \text{plim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \mathbf{f}_t)^2, \\ \Phi_{3g,T} &= \text{plim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\pi_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' (\gamma_i' \mathbf{f}_t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

exist and are finite. Under Assumptions 1-3, 4 (i)-(v), 5, 6, $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_{J,T}} \left(\frac{1}{J^\alpha} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\sqrt{J}}{N} \right) = o(1)$, $\sigma_{J,T} \asymp J^{1/2}$ and the condition that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) u_{it} \frac{\omega_{it}}{\pi_i} \mathbf{f}_t' \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Phi_{1g,T})$ as $N, J \rightarrow \infty$, T is finite, we have:

$$\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\sigma_{J,T}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \rightarrow N \left(0, \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}' \mathbf{F}}{T} \right)^{-1} \right) \mathcal{G}_T\text{-stably}$$

where $\sigma_{J,T}^2 = \phi(\mathbf{x})' \Sigma_\Phi^{-1} (\Phi_{1g,T} + \Phi_{2g,T} + \Phi_{3g,T}) \Sigma_\Phi^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{G}_T = \sigma(\cup_{N=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_{NT}^{NT})$.

In theorem 2, the decomposition of the factor estimates $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$ includes additional terms of order $O_P(1/\sqrt{NT})$ that contain $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$. The order of these terms is ensured by the accuracy of the non-missing proportion estimator $\hat{\pi}_i$ (Assumption 2). However, without requirements on the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\pi}_i$, these terms cannot be incorporated into the variance term and must be treated as bias. Therefore, the requirement that T approaches infinity is necessary to ensure

these terms can be neglected.

In Theorem 3, the condition $T \rightarrow \infty$ is not imposed to make the bias term in the decomposition of $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x})$ vanish to zero, but rather to fulfill the requirements for the definition of the variance, i.e. Φ_{1g} , Φ_{2g} , Φ_{3g} , in the limiting distribution. Corollary 1 also aims to derive the asymptotic distribution of the loading component estimator $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x})$. By providing the definition of asymptotic variance under a finite T , that is $\Phi_{1g,T}$, $\Phi_{2g,T}$, $\Phi_{3g,T}$, Corollary 1 relaxes the requirement of $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4. *In the absence of missing data, by setting $\pi_i \equiv 1$, $\omega_{it} \equiv 1$, we directly obtain that $\Gamma_{2g,t}$ and Φ_{2g} vanish to zero. It can be demonstrated, using the law of iterated expectations, that $\Gamma_{1g,t}$ and Φ_{1g} are smaller in scenarios without missing data compared to those with missing data, and similarly, applying monotonicity shows that $\Gamma_{3g,t}$ and Φ_{3g} are also smaller in situations without missing values. Moreover, by comparing the asymptotic variance of the PPCA estimators $(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i))$ in scenarios with and without missing data, it is concluded that PPCA estimators in the presence of missing data are less effective than those without missing data, and their efficiency increases as the proportion of missing data decreases.*

4 Specification Test

In this section, we consider the following specification test:

$$H_0 : \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) = 0 \text{ v.s. } H_1 : \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) \neq 0 \quad (11)$$

This test tells whether the observed covariates explain the factor loadings. Under the null, model (1) reduces to a conventional factor model and PPCA estimates are not genuine.

The PCA estimators of factors and factor loadings for the model (8) are: $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}/\sqrt{T}$ is the eigenvectors corresponding to the R largest eigenvalues of the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}'/(NT)$,

$$(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}' \tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \tilde{\mathbf{F}}\tilde{\mathbf{D}},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ is a diagonal matrix consisting of the R largest eigenvalues of $(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}'$ arranged in descending order along its diagonal line. The estimate of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}/T$. If the null hypothesis in (11) holds, it is necessary to apply the asymptotic properties of the PCA estimators in subsequent statistical inferences, rather than the properties of the PPCA estimators.

The test statistic \hat{S}_G is constructed based on the PCA estimators $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$,

$$\hat{S}_G = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}' \mathbf{P} \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}) - JLR}{\sqrt{2JLR}} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_1 = (\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}' \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} / N)^{-1}$ is the weight matrix.

The following theorem states the limiting distribution of \hat{S}_G .

Theorem 4. *Suppose that Assumptions 1–6 hold and $J = o(\sqrt{N} \wedge \sqrt{T})$. Under H_0 , as $N, T, J \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\hat{S}_G \rightarrow^d N(0, 1).$$

A similar Wald test is proposed in Fan et al. (2016) for testing the explanatory power of covariates on factor loadings in panel data without missing values. Let $\mathbf{\Theta} = (\text{cov}(\gamma_i))^{-1}$, so following Lemma 3 in Berk (1974), we obtain $\|\mathbf{W}_1 - \mathbf{\Theta}\| = o_p(1)$. Therefore, \hat{S}_G is constructed by noting that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}' \mathbf{P} \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}' \mathbf{P} \mathbf{\Gamma})$ under the null. The latter is proved to follow the asymptotic normal distribution with mean JLR and variance $2JLR$ according to Theorem 1 in Hall (1984).

Theorem 1 demonstrates that as long as the projection is genuine, the consistency of the proposed factor and loading component estimators only requires $N \rightarrow \infty$, and there is no need for T to grow. This is an attractive property and marks the biggest difference from conventional factor models without considering covariates \mathbf{x}_i . In Theorem 4, under the null hypothesis where the projection is not genuine, the test statistics are constructed using PCA estimators. Both N and T need to approach infinity to achieve consistency.

5 Determine the number of factors

The rank-minimization method (Chen et al. (2023), Chen et al. (2021)) is adopted to determine the number of factors, due to its ease of computation and straightforward proofs. Denote by $\hat{\rho}_j$ the j -th largest eigenvalue of the projected matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}'$. The rank-minimization estimator is

$$\hat{R} = \sum_{j=1}^{R_{\max}} \mathbf{1}(\hat{\rho}_j > \rho_N),$$

where $\{\rho_N\}$ is a sequence of non-increasing positive constants. By the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}' / (NT)$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{\Sigma}_G(\mathbf{F}' \mathbf{F} / T)$ whose rank is R , we can directly apply the Wielandt-Hoffman inequality. From this, it follows that the largest R eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}' / (NT)$ converge in probability to certain positive constants. Meanwhile, the remaining eigenvalues are bounded by $O_P(N^{-1/2} + J^{-\alpha})$.

Theorem 5 shows the consistency of \hat{R} .

Theorem 5. *Under Assumptions 1–3, 4 (i)–(v), 5, 6, and $\rho_N \rightarrow 0$, $\rho_N / \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{J^\alpha}\right) \rightarrow \infty$, as $N, J \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$P(\hat{R} = R) \rightarrow 1.$$

Remark 5. For comparison, the eigenvalue-ratio method (Fan et al. (2016)) is applied, where \hat{R} is defined as

$$\hat{R} = \underset{0 < j < R_{max}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{\hat{\rho}_j}{\hat{\rho}_{j+1}}$$

This approach has the advantage of not needing to determine the decreasing sequence ρ_N . Simulation results indicate that it is not as effective as the rank-minimization method in estimating the number of factors when $R > 1$.

6 Simulation

In this section, one demonstrates the finite sample performance of the theoretical results. Data is generated by (1), where f_{tr} is i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, γ_{ir} is i.i.d. $N(0,1)$. Set $N = 50, 100, 200, 400, 800$ and $T = \lceil 2N^{1/2} \log N \rceil$. The errors $\{u_{it}\}$ follow three data generating processes (DGPs):

DGP.1: i.i.d. $N(0,1)$.

DGP.2: AR(1) process: $u_{it} = 0.5u_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}$, where ε_{it} is i.i.d. $N(0, 0.75)$.

DGP.3: MA(1) process: $u_{it} = \varepsilon_{it} + \varepsilon_{i-1,t}$, where ε_{it} is i.i.d. $N(0, 1/\sqrt{2})$.

When $R = 1$, set

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}_i) = 1 + x_{i1} + x_{i2}^2.$$

When $R = 3$, set

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sin(2\pi x_{i1}) + \sin(2\pi x_{i2}), g_2(\mathbf{x}_i) = 1 + \sin(\pi x_{i1}), g_3(\mathbf{x}_i) = 1 + \cos(\pi x_{i2}).$$

and $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2})$ is i.i.d. $U[0,1]^2$. The additive components are fitted by cubic spline and the sieve dimension is set as (10), $J = \lceil 0.7N^{3/8} \log \log N \rceil$. Each experiment is repeated 1000 times. The indicator ω_{it} follows Bernoulli (π_i). π_i is set by (4) where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (0.5, 0.5)'$ and $\theta_0 = 0, -0.5, -1$.

To estimate the number of factors, set the threshold $\rho_N = 0.7N^{-1/4} (\hat{\pi}^* \log N)^{-1} \hat{\rho}_1$, where $\hat{\rho}_1$ is the largest eigenvalue of $(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}' \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}$, and $\hat{\pi}^* = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\pi}_i$ is the mean estimate. Tables 1–2 present the under/over-estimation rates using rank-minimization method and eigenvalue-ratio method. The maximum rank is set as $R_{max} = 5$. The rank-minimization estimator accurately estimates R as N increases, which corroborates Theorem 5. The eigenvalue-ratio method shows slightly better results when $R = 1$, but its performance is notably less effective than the rank-minimization method when $R = 3$.

To verify the performance of test statistic \hat{S}_G developed in Section 4, Figure 1 displays the histograms of \hat{S}_G under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}) = 0$, with the density of $N(0,1)$ overlaid. Taking the case where errors follow DGP.1 with $N = 200$ as an example, it can be observed that

Table 1: The under/over-estimation rates computed by rank-minimization and eigenvalue-ratio method. The true number of factors is $R = 1$.

Rank-Minimization					Eigenvalue-Ratio		
	N	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3
$\theta_0 = 0$	50	0/0.002	0/0.003	0/0.002	0/0	0/0	0/0
	100	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	200	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
$\theta_0 = -0.5$	50	0/0.007	0/0.006	0/0.02	0/0	0/0	0/0
	100	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	200	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
$\theta_0 = -1$	50	0/0.052	0/0.035	0/0.1	0/0	0/0	0/0
	100	0/0	0/0.001	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	200	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0

Table 2: The under/over-estimation rates computed by rank-minimization and eigenvalue-ratio method. The true number of factors is $R = 3$.

Rank-Minimization					Eigenvalue-Ratio		
	N	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3
$\theta_0 = 0$	50	0.354/0.004	0.388/0.014	0.313/0.016	0.860/0	0.858/0	0.899/0
	100	0.309/0	0.325/0	0.272/0	0.755/0	0.724/0	0.787/0
	200	0.124/0	0.107/0	0.097/0	0.419/0	0.401/0	0.428/0
	400	0.013/0	0.013/0	0.016/0	0.068/0	0.062/0	0.079/0
	800	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0.001/0
$\theta_0 = -0.5$	50	0.404/0.038	0.424/0.029	0.388/0.074	0.951/0	0.952/0	0.962/0
	100	0.399/0	0.398/0	0.377/0	0.929/0	0.902/0	0.927/0
	200	0.231/0	0.255/0	0.233/0	0.731/0	0.694/0	0.780/0
	400	0.053/0	0.063/0	0.063/0	0.263/0	0.283/0	0.342/0
	800	0/0	0.001/0	0.001/0	0.016/0	0.007/0	0.014/0
$\theta_0 = -1$	50	0.428/0.082	0.475/0.069	0.367/0.119	0.980/0	0.984/0.001	0.982/0.001
	100	0.453/0.005	0.473/0.002	0.416/0.004	0.978/0	0.976/0	0.971/0
	200	0.414/0	0.436/0	0.397/0	0.928/0	0.957/0	0.947/0
	400	0.312/0	0.330/0	0.276/0	0.667/0	0.662/0	0.710/0
	800	0.037/0	0.065/0	0.055/0	0.139/0	0.131/0	0.162/0




Figure 1: Histograms of the test statistic \hat{S}_G when the number of factors is (a) $R = 1$; (b) $R = 3$. The errors follow DGP.1, and $N = 200$. The standard normal density function is superimposed on the histograms.


\hat{S}_G approximately exhibits a standard normal distribution, which aligns with Theorem 4. Table 3 presents the frequencies at which \hat{S}_G is precisely within the 95% confidence intervals of the standard normal distribution, that is $-1.96 < \hat{S}_G < 1.96$. As can be seen that as N increases, this frequency becomes closer to the nominal confidence level.

Figure 2 illustrates the estimation errors of factors and loading components, taking $R = 1$ and errors following DGP.1 as an example. The estimation errors are measured by average Frobenius norms, which decrease as N increases, corroborating Theorem 1. Moreover, the result also shows a reasonable fact that the estimation error tends to be smaller when $\theta_0 = 0$, as this condition corresponds to a generally smaller proportion of missing data in the original data matrix.


To make inference on the factors and loading components, it's essential to estimate their

Table 3: Frequencies of \hat{S}_G within 95% standard normal confidence intervals.

		$\theta_0 = 0$			$\theta_0 = -0.5$			$\theta_0 = -1$		
	N	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3
$R = 1$	50	0.976	0.979	0.981	0.983	0.980	0.983	0.977	0.978	0.984
	100	0.971	0.968	0.968	0.967	0.967	0.970	0.969	0.962	0.968
	200	0.960	0.955	0.953	0.964	0.958	0.959	0.960	0.959	0.965
	400	0.957	0.956	0.955	0.957	0.954	0.944	0.956	0.955	0.956
	800	0.954	0.952	0.948	0.954	0.953	0.953	0.953	0.946	0.951
$R = 3$	50	0.984	0.985	0.977	0.979	0.983	0.977	0.978	0.981	0.980
	100	0.963	0.967	0.965	0.971	0.970	0.964	0.969	0.966	0.963
	200	0.955	0.958	0.960	0.958	0.959	0.961	0.960	0.959	0.955
	400	0.946	0.955	0.953	0.951	0.957	0.955	0.947	0.959	0.956
	800	0.953	0.954	0.952	0.954	0.953	0.954	0.956	0.957	0.955



(a)



(b)

Figure 2: Estimation errors of (a) factors $\|\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}\|/\sqrt{T}$; (b) loading components $\|\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X})\|/\sqrt{N}$ with respect to N . Set $R = 1$, and the errors follow DGP.1.

asymptotic variances consistently. For the factors, we estimate \mathbf{D} as $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ and \mathbf{Q} as $\hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1}$. Let $u_{it}^\omega = u_{it}\omega_{it}/\pi_i$ and assuming cross-sectional independence among $\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)u_{it}^\omega, i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, then $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t}$ can be written as $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E\left(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)' (u_{it}^\omega)^2\right)$. Accordingly, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{1g,t}$ is estimated by

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{1g,t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)' (\hat{u}_{it}^\omega)^2,$$

with $\hat{u}_{it}^\omega = (y_{it} - \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t' \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i) \omega_{it}/\hat{\pi}_i$. Similarly, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{2g,t}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{3g,t}$ are estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{2g,t} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1 - \hat{\pi}_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right)^2, \\ \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{3g,t} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1 + 3\hat{\pi}_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \left(\hat{\gamma}_i' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the estimation of the asymptotic variance for factors is

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{g,t} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{H}} \hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{1g,t} + \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{2g,t} + \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{3g,t} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \hat{\mathbf{H}}' \right)^{-1}.$$

For the loading components, Assumption 4 (vi) enables us to estimate $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_F^{-1}$ as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_F^{-1} = \hat{\mathbf{H}} \hat{\mathbf{H}}'$. And by the law of large numbers, we approximate $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\Phi$ with $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Assuming cross-sectional independence for $\{\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)u_{it}^\omega \mathbf{f}_t', i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, we can simplify the expression for $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1g}$ as:

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1g} = \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t,s=1}^T E\left(\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)' u_{it}^\omega u_{is}^\omega \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_s\right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,s=1}^T E\left(\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)' u_{it}^\omega u_{is}^\omega \mathbf{f}_t' \mathbf{f}_s\right)$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_i$ be the HAC estimator (Newey and West (1986)), constructed with $\left\{ \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \hat{u}_{it}^\omega \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t', t = 1, 2, \dots, T \right\}$,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_i = \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \left(\mathbf{D}_{0i} + \sum_{v=1}^q \left(1 - \frac{v}{q+1} \right) (\mathbf{D}_{vi} + \mathbf{D}_{vi}') \right) \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)',$$

where $\mathbf{D}_{vi} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=v+1}^T \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \hat{u}_{it}^\omega \hat{u}_{i,t-v}^\omega \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{t-v}'$ and q is set as $q = [0.5T^{1/8}]$. Then $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1g}$ can be consistently

estimated by $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Theta}_i$. Likewise, Φ_{2g} and Φ_{3g} are estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Phi}_{2g} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1 - \hat{\pi}_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right)^2, \\ \hat{\Phi}_{3g} &= \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_i} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)' \left(\hat{\gamma}_i' \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

The estimation of σ_J^2 is achieved with $\hat{\sigma}_J^2 = \phi(\mathbf{x})' \hat{\Sigma}_{\Phi}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Phi}_{1g} + \hat{\Phi}_{2g} + \hat{\Phi}_{3g} \right) \hat{\Sigma}_{\Phi}^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{x})$. This methodology aligns with the analytical approach outlined in Theorem 6 by Bai (2003), offering a robust framework for estimating variances.

Figure 3 displays the histograms of $\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{f}_t \hat{\mathbf{H}} \right) \hat{\Gamma}_{g,t}^{-1/2}$ at $t = [T/2]$, and $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\hat{\sigma}_J} \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \hat{\Sigma}_F^{1/2}$ at $i = [N/2]$, whose distributions are close to the standard normal distribution, corroborating Theorems 2 and 3. Confidence intervals are further created. Let

$$\Delta_{1t} = 1.96 \hat{\Gamma}_{g,t}^{-1/2} N^{-1/2}, \quad \Delta_{2i} = 1.96 \hat{\sigma}_J \hat{\Sigma}_F^{-1/2} (NT)^{-1/2}$$

The 95% pointwise confidence interval for \mathbf{f}_t is


$$(L_{1t}, U_{1t}) = \left(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \Delta_{1t}, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t + \Delta_{1t} \right) \hat{\mathbf{H}}^{-1}.$$

Analogously, the 95% confidence interval for $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is


$$(L_{2i}, U_{2i}) = \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Delta_{2i}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \Delta_{2i} \right) \left(\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}} / T \right)^{-1}.$$

Table 4 presents the frequencies that the true factor \mathbf{f}_t lies within (L_{1t}, U_{1t}) when $t = [T/2]$. Table 5 displays the frequencies that the true loading component $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is covered by (L_{2i}, U_{2i}) when $i = [N/2]$. In DGP.1–2 scenarios, where errors lack cross-sectional dependence, the coverage frequency becomes closer to the nominal confidence level as the sample size N grows. Conversely, for DGP.3, which exhibits cross-sectional dependence in errors, confidence intervals prove to be unreliable. Simulations further reveal that achieving the nominal confidence level under this condition is more challenging. This indicates that ignoring cross-sectional dependence can result in inaccurate estimations of standard errors for both factor and loading component estimators. It is noteworthy that Theorems 2 and 3 only achieve results of stable convergence. Therefore, only one draw $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{F})$ is necessary, but Monte Carlo repetition is still required to accommodate the randomness of u_{it} and ω_{it} .

Take the errors follow DGP.1 as an example and $N = 50$ to avoid an overcrowded graphical display. Figure 4 shows the confidence intervals for the factor $\{\mathbf{f}_t, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ and loading components $\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i), 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. The interval (L_{1t}, U_{1t}) fully contains \mathbf{f}_t at each point t , and



(a)



(b)

Figure 3: Histograms of (a) $\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{f}_t \hat{\mathbf{H}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{g,t}^{-1/2}$ at $t = \lceil T/2 \rceil$; (b) $\frac{\sqrt{NT}}{\hat{\sigma}_J} \left(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \frac{\mathbf{F}' \hat{\mathbf{F}}}{T} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_F^{1/2}$ at $i = \lceil N/2 \rceil$. Set $R = 1$, the errors follow DGP.1, and $N = 200$. The standard normal density function is superimposed on the histograms.

Table 4: Frequencies of \mathbf{f}_t within the 95% confidence interval (L_{1t}, U_{1t}) at $t = [T/2]$, $R = 1$.

$\theta_0 = 0$				$\theta_0 = -0.5$			$\theta_0 = -1$		
N	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3
50	0.943	0.957	0.907	0.931	0.928	0.938	0.951	0.935	0.929
100	0.949	0.961	0.921	0.958	0.962	0.931	0.953	0.956	0.936
200	0.946	0.956	0.926	0.949	0.957	0.932	0.946	0.954	0.939
400	0.953	0.955	0.936	0.951	0.952	0.941	0.948	0.950	0.943
800	0.951	0.954	0.940	0.950	0.951	0.944	0.951	0.949	0.946

Table 5: Frequencies of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ within the 95% confidence interval (L_{2i}, U_{2i}) at $i = [N/2]$, $R = 1$.

$\theta_0 = 0$				$\theta_0 = -0.5$			$\theta_0 = -1$		
N	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3	DGP.1	DGP.2	DGP.3
50	0.961	0.966	0.972	0.969	0.965	0.985	0.963	0.964	0.983
100	0.960	0.963	0.971	0.958	0.961	0.981	0.964	0.948	0.972
200	0.959	0.946	0.971	0.957	0.956	0.970	0.957	0.959	0.936
400	0.947	0.951	0.963	0.945	0.948	0.967	0.943	0.946	0.968
800	0.951	0.949	0.960	0.953	0.951	0.963	0.952	0.952	0.966


(L_{2i}, U_{2i}) covers $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ at each point i .

7 Application


In this section, we use the dataset from [Imai et al. \(2023\)](#) to examine the causal effect of democracy on economic development. The dataset consists of y_{it} , the logged real GDP per capita. The democracy indicator variable $\omega_{it} = 1$ if a country i in year t is categorized as ‘Free’ or ‘Partially Free’ in the Freedom House index and has a positive score in the Polity IV index (democracy, treated group). Otherwise, it is $\omega_{it} = 0$ (autocracy, control group). We identified three continuous, time-varying explanatory characteristics as $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3})$ for each country. Specifically, *Youth-Old Ratio* (x_{i1}) represents the mean ratio of the log population below 16 years to that above 64 years, while *Trade Mean* (x_{i2}) is the mean of trade volume, and *Flow Diff* (x_{i3}) correspond to the difference between the maximum and minimum values of net financial flow. These covariates are standardized to the interval $[0, 1]$.

The dataset spans from the year 1960 to 2010, with $T = 51$. Missing values in observation pairs $(y_{it}, \omega_{it}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ could potentially complicate the analysis of the treatment effect. To address this issue, countries with missing data were excluded. Furthermore, countries that did not experience a transition between democratic and autocratic regimes during 1960 to 2010 were also not considered. For the remaining $N = 40$ countries, a semi-parametric model was constructed and estimated.

Employing the treatment variation plot introduced by [Imai et al. \(2023\)](#), we visualize the



(a)



(b)

Figure 4: Plots of the true factors and loading components (solid line) and 95% pointwise confidence intervals (dashed line). (a) Factors \mathbf{f}_t with intervals (L_{1t}, U_{1t}) for $t = 1, \dots, T$; (b) Loading components $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ with intervals (L_{2i}, U_{2i}) for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Set $R = 1$, errors follow DGP.1, and $N = 50$.




Figure 5: The spatial-temporal distribution of democracy's impact on economic development: $\omega_{it} = 1$ (red), $\omega_{it} = 0$ (blue).

spatial-temporal distribution of ω_{it} in Figure 5, where red rectangles denote $\omega_{it} = 1$, while blue rectangles indicate $\omega_{it} = 0$. It reveals that some countries evolved from autocracy to democracy, and a few oscillated between these regimes multiple times. Utilizing a logistic regression model, as defined in (4), to model ω_{it} ,

$$\pi_i = \frac{\exp(\theta_0 + \theta_1 x_{i1} + \theta_2 x_{i2} + \theta_3 x_{i3})}{1 + \exp(\theta_0 + \theta_1 x_{i1} + \theta_2 x_{i2} + \theta_3 x_{i3})}$$

Wald test shows that all covariates are significant, with the estimated coefficients: $\hat{\theta}_0 = 1.413$, $\hat{\theta}_1 = -2.266$, $\hat{\theta}_2 = -0.655$, $\hat{\theta}_3 = -0.750$. Table 6 reveals that the correlations between three characteristics are not of significant magnitude to cause concern about the precise identification of the model.

Table 6: Correlation matrix between characteristics

	Youth-Old Ratio	Trade Mean	Flow Diff
Youth-Old Ratio	1.000	0.182	0.205
Trade Mean		1.000	0.365
Flow Diff			1.000

Each country-year unit has two potential outcomes, $y_{it}(0)$ and $y_{it}(1)$, which is subject to a binary treatment ω_{it} , and the realized outcome is $y_{it}(\omega_{it})$. Define $\mathbf{Y}(1) = \{y_{it}(1)\}_{i,t=1}^{N,T} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$, with observations when $\omega_{it} = 1$ and missing when $\omega_{it} = 0$. Analogously, $\mathbf{Y}(0) = \{y_{it}(0)\}_{i,t=1}^{N,T} \in$

$\mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$, with observations when $\omega_{it} = 0$ and missing when $\omega_{it} = 1$.

To determine the number of factors in $\mathbf{Y}(1)$, in alignment with the setup method in Section 6, we set $Rmax = 5$, the sieve dimension $J = \lceil 0.6N^{3/8} \log \log N \rceil = 3$ and the threshold $\rho_N = 0.7N^{-1/4} (\hat{\pi}^* \log N)^{-1} \hat{\rho}_1 = 13.107$. Following Section 2.3, $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ is constructed using $\mathbf{Y}(1)$ and the estimated missing probability $\hat{\pi}_i$, that is $\hat{z}_{it} = y_{it}(1)\omega_{it}/\hat{\pi}_i$. Table 7 presents the five largest eigenvalues of $(NT)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{P}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}'$, denoted as $\{\hat{\rho}_j, j = 1, \dots, 5\}$. The rank-minimization method suggests the number of factors is $\hat{R} = 1$, determined by counting the eigenvalues that exceed the threshold ρ_N . For comparison, Table 7 also computes the ratio between adjacent eigenvalues $\{\hat{\rho}_j/\hat{\rho}_{j+1}, j = 1, 2, \dots, 5\}$ as a means to estimate the number of factors by the eigenvalue-ratio method. Table 8 is to determine the number of factors using $\mathbf{Y}(0)$ where the threshold $\rho_N = 9.853$. The result also suggests that $\hat{R} = 1$.

Table 7: Rank-minimization method and Eigenvalue ratio method using $\mathbf{Y}(1)$.

Rank-minimization	Five largest eigenvalues					$\hat{R} = 1$
	79.274	3.771	3.363	2.597	1.921	
Eigenvalue ratio	First five ratios					$\hat{R} = 1$
	21.021	1.121	1.295	1.352	1.884	

Table 8: Rank-minimization method and Eigenvalue ratio method using $\mathbf{Y}(0)$.


Rank-minimization	Five largest eigenvalues					$\hat{R} = 1$
	70.988	9.543	3.713	2.928	1.699	
Eigenvalue ratio	First five ratios					$\hat{R} = 1$
	7.439	2.570	1.268	1.724	1.777	

The sample average treatment effect (sample ATE) is computed as


$$\hat{\tau} = \sum_{i,t} (\hat{y}_{it}(1) - \hat{y}_{it}(0)) / (NT). \quad (13)$$

the challenge lies in accurately estimating the counterfactual outcomes, see Li and Bell (2017), Athey et al. (2021), Bai and Ng (2021). Here, $\hat{y}_{it}(1)$ is estimated based on $\mathbf{Y}(1)$, where $\hat{y}_{it}(1) = y_{it}(1)$ when $\omega_{it} = 1$, and $\hat{y}_{it}(1) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t' \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i$ when $\omega_{it} = 0$. The terms $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i$ are derived from (6) and (7). Similarly, $\hat{y}_{it}(0)$ can be estimated from $\mathbf{Y}(0)$. Substituting $\hat{y}_{it}(0)$ and $\hat{y}_{it}(1)$ into (13) yields $\hat{\tau} = 0.00753$. This result indicates that the effect of democracy on logged GDP per capita is positive, transitioning to democracy leads to an average economic development increase of 0.753%. The sample ATE we computed is close to the ATE results in Imai et al. (2023), with both estimates of the ATE exceeding 0.5% but less than 1%.

Figure 6 displays the estimated factors $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$ and 95% confidence intervals, computed by $\mathbf{Y}(1)$ and $\mathbf{Y}(0)$, respectively. Figure 7 shows the estimated loading components $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and 95% confidence intervals. It is observed that in period where the intervals computed by $\mathbf{Y}(1)$ are wider,




(a)




(b)

Figure 6: The estimated factors $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t$ (solid line) and 95% pointwise confidence intervals (L_{1t}, U_{1t}) (dashed line) derived from (a) $\mathbf{Y}(1)$; (b) $\mathbf{Y}(0)$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$.



(a)



(b)

Figure 7: The estimated loading components $\hat{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ (solid line) and 95% pointwise confidence intervals (L_{2i}, U_{2i}) (dashed line) derived from (a) $\mathbf{Y}(1)$; (b) $\mathbf{Y}(0)$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

such as in the latter half of Figure 6 (a), the intervals computed by $\mathbf{Y}(0)$ tend to be narrower, as seen in the latter half of Figure 6 (b). This result is reasonable, considering that the missing data patterns for $\mathbf{Y}(0)$ and $\mathbf{Y}(1)$ are exactly opposite.

8 Conclusion

This paper investigates semiparametric factor models in high-dimensional panel data with missing observations. We consider a flexible loading structure that decomposes the factor loadings into a nonparametric component driven by observed covariates and an idiosyncratic component capturing unobserved heterogeneity. To accommodate general missing-at-random mechanisms, we develop a projected principal component analysis (PPCA) estimator based on inverse-probability-weighted data. The proposed approach retains the advantages of PPCA while delivering consistent recovery of both factors and loading functions in the presence of missing values.

We derive convergence rates and asymptotic distributions for the estimated factors and nonparametric loading components, allowing the sieve dimension to diverge and permitting the time dimension to be either fixed or increasing. A key insight is that, unlike classical PCA, PPCA achieves consistent factor estimation even when T is fixed, and the limiting distributions under missing data follow mixture-normal laws with asymptotic variances that increase with the proportion of missing observations. These results highlight both the robustness and the efficiency limits of factor estimation under incomplete panels.

Several avenues for future research remain open. These include dynamic semiparametric factor structures, heavy-tailed or non-Gaussian errors, high-dimensional covariates with variable selection, and extensions to interactive fixed-effects models or treatment-effect estimation with incomplete panels. Overall, the PPCA frameworks offer a flexible and effective foundation for analyzing modern panel datasets with complex loading structures and missing observations.

References

- Athey, S., M. Bayati, N. Doudchenko, G. Imbens, and K. Khosravi (2021). Matrix completion methods for causal panel data models. Journal of the American Statistical Association 116(536), 1716–1730.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. Econometrica 71(1), 135–171.
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. Econometrica 70(1), 191–221.
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2019). Rank regularized estimation of approximate factor models. Journal of Econometrics 212(1), 78–96.
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2021). Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. Journal of the American Statistical Association 116(536), 1746–1763.
- Bañbura, M. and M. Modugno (2014). Maximum likelihood estimation of factor models on datasets with arbitrary pattern of missing data. Journal of applied econometrics 29(1), 133–160.
- Berk, K. N. (1974). Consistent autoregressive spectral estimates. The Annals of Statistics, 489–502.
- Bodelet, J. and D. La Vecchia (2022). Robust sieve m-estimation with an application to dimensionality reduction. Electronic Journal of Statistics 16(2), 3996–4030.
- Chen, L., J. J. Dolado, and J. Gonzalo (2021). Quantile factor models. Econometrica 89(2), 875–910.
- Chen, L., J. J. Dolado, J. Gonzalo, and H. Pan (2023). Estimation of characteristics-based quantile factor models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13206.
- Chen, X. (2007). Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models. Handbook of econometrics 6, 5549–5632.
- Connor, G., M. Hagmann, and O. Linton (2012). Efficient semiparametric estimation of the fama–french model and extensions. Econometrica 80(2), 713–754.
- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and H. Liu (2016). An overview of the estimation of large covariance and precision matrices. The Econometrics Journal 19(1), C1–C32.
- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and X. Shi (2015). Risks of large portfolios. Journal of Econometrics 186(2), 367–387.

- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and W. Wang (2016). Projected principal component analysis in factor models. Annals of statistics 44(1), 219.
- Fan, J., L. Xue, and J. Yao (2017). Sufficient forecasting using factor models. Journal of econometrics 201(2), 292–306.
- Giglio, S., B. Kelly, and D. Xiu (2022). Factor models, machine learning, and asset pricing. Annual Review of Financial Economics 14, 337–368.
- Gu, S., B. Kelly, and D. Xiu (2021). Autoencoder asset pricing models. Journal of Econometrics 222(1), 429–450.
- Hall, P. (1984). Central limit theorem for integrated square error of multivariate nonparametric density estimators. Journal of multivariate analysis 14(1), 1–16.
- Häusler, E. and H. Luschgy (2015). Stable convergence and stable limit theorems, Volume 74. Springer.
- Huang, K., S. Zheng, and L. Yang (2022). Inference for dependent error functional data with application to event-related potentials. TEST 31(4), 1100–1120.
- Imai, K., I. S. Kim, and E. H. Wang (2023). Matching methods for causal inference with time-series cross-sectional data. American Journal of Political Science 67(3), 587–605.
- Jin, S., K. Miao, and L. Su (2021). On factor models with random missing: Em estimation, inference, and cross validation. Journal of Econometrics 222(1), 745–777.
- Jungbacker, B., S. J. Koopman, and M. Van der Wel (2011). Maximum likelihood estimation for dynamic factor models with missing data. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 35(8), 1358–1368.
- Li, K. T. and D. R. Bell (2017). Estimation of average treatment effects with panel data: Asymptotic theory and implementation. Journal of Econometrics 197(1), 65–75.
- Little, R. J. and D. B. Rubin (2019). Statistical analysis with missing data, Volume 793. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ma, S., O. Linton, and J. Gao (2021). Estimation and inference in semiparametric quantile factor models. Journal of Econometrics 222(1), 295–323.
- Newey, W. K. and K. D. West (1986). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelationconsistent covariance matrix.
- Newman, D. A. (2014). Missing data: Five practical guidelines. Organizational Research Methods 17(4), 372–411.

- Shumway, R. H. and D. S. Stoffer (1982). An approach to time series smoothing and forecasting using the em algorithm. Journal of time series analysis 3(4), 253–264.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (2002a). Forecasting using principal components from a large number of predictors. Journal of the American statistical association 97(460), 1167–1179.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (2002b). Macroeconomic forecasting using diffusion indexes. Journal of Business & Economic Statistics 20(2), 147–162.
- Zheng, S., K. Huang, and L. Yang (2025). Inference for dependent error functional data: Covariance function. Electronic Journal of Statistics 19(2), 5216–5248.
- Zheng, S., F. Meng, and J. Zhou (2025). Efficient covariance estimation for sparsified functional data. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18237.
- Zheng, S. and X. Song (2025). Inference for trend functions in partially linear models. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 106338.
- Zhou, Y., D. Wilkinson, R. Schreiber, and R. Pan (2008). Large-scale parallel collaborative filtering for the netflix prize. In Algorithmic Aspects in Information and Management: 4th International Conference, AAIM 2008, Shanghai, China, June 23-25, 2008. Proceedings 4, pp. 337–348. Springer.