

Estimation and inference in models with multiple behavioural equilibria*

Alexander Mayer[†]

Erasmus University

Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Davide Raggi[‡]

Università Ca' Foscari

Venezia, Italy

5th December 2025

Abstract

We develop estimation and inference methods for a stylized macroeconomic model with potentially multiple behavioural equilibria, where agents form expectations using a constant-gain learning rule. We first show geometric ergodicity of the underlying process to study in a second step (strong) consistency and asymptotic normality of the nonlinear least squares estimator for the structural parameters. We propose inference procedures for the structural parameters and uniform confidence bands for the equilibria. When equilibrium solutions are repeated, mixed convergence rates and non-standard limit distributions emerge. Monte Carlo simulations and an empirical application illustrate the finite-sample performance of our methods.

Keywords: adaptive learning, nonlinear least squares, ergodicity, consistency, asymptotic distribution, identification.

*Financial support from MIUR, Grant 20228XTY79 003SH1 is gratefully acknowledged. Highly appreciated were the suggestions and comments made at seminars at Erasmus University Rotterdam. We would like to thank Mariia Artemova, John Cochrane, Christian Francq, Rutger-Jan Lange, Sven Otto, Andreas Pick, and Dominik Wied for helpful comments and discussions.

[†] *Corresponding author*, email: a.s.mayer@ese.eur.nl

[‡] Email: davide.raggi@unive.it

1 Introduction

The rational expectations hypothesis, proposed in the seminal work by Muth (1961) and Lucas (1972), is a benchmark for the study of macroeconomic models, as it allows for a dynamic system in which agents' expectations are incorporated in a manner internally consistent with the model itself. Starting with Marcet and Sargent (1989) and Sargent (1993, 1999), however, the orthodox view of agents forming full-information rational expectations has been increasingly questioned; see, e.g., Evans and Honkapohja (2001), Mankiw and Reis (2002), and Bernanke (2007). With a particular focus on inflation expectations, a large body of recent empirical studies that exploit survey data corroborates the finding that agents deviate from the benchmark of full rationality; see, e.g., Coibion and Gorodnichenko (2012), Bachmann et al. (2015), Malmendier and Nagel (2016), Coibion et al. (2020b), Coibion et al. (2020a), and Bordalo et al. (2020).

Several deviations from the pure rational expectations paradigm have since been proposed. Notable examples include models with frictions, such as sticky information (e.g., Mankiw and Reis, 2002) and rational inattention (e.g., Sims, 2003). Another popular route, drawing on bounded rationality and popularized by, among others, Bray (1982), Bray and Savin (1986), Marcet and Sargent (1989), and Evans and Honkapohja (2001), treats agents as statisticians who form expectations using simple, possibly misspecified, econometric models.

This is also the approach taken in this paper, which closely follows the specifications studied in Hommes and Sorger (1998), Lansing (2009), Hommes and Zhu (2014), and Hommes et al. (2023). In particular, we consider a New Keynesian Phillips curve (NKPC) in which agents update their beliefs by recursively estimating the parameters of a first-order autoregression, AR(1), that they (incorrectly) perceive to be the correct model of the inflation process. As Hommes and Zhu (2014) show theoretically, this framework provides a parsimonious account of several features of observed inflation dynamics.

Importantly, because agents remain even in the long run boundedly rational without correctly perceiving all stochastic aspects of the model, multiple so-called *behavioural equilibria* can coexist: self-confirming inflation paths that are fixed points of the perceived law of motion, rather than rational-expectations solutions of the full model. Recently, Hommes et al. (2023) and Casarin et al. (2025) take variations of this model to the data and, using Bayesian techniques, show its usefulness both in-sample and out-of-sample.

As we discuss in detail below, however, because of the model’s nonlinear features and the presence of multiple behavioural equilibria, a priori little is known about the properties of (frequentist) estimators for the structural parameters in these models. A growing literature on the econometrics of models with adaptive learning shows that the statistical analysis is indeed a challenging task; see, e.g., Chevillon et al. (2010), Adam et al. (2016), Chevillon and Mavroeidis (2017), Christopeit and Massmann (2018, 2019), Mayer (2022, 2023), Christiano et al. (2024), and Mayer and Massmann (2025).

To close this gap, we *first* provide a thorough statistical analysis of a plain-vanilla NKPC model with constant-gain learning. Specifically, we (i) establish geometric ergodicity of the dynamic system; (ii) prove strong consistency and asymptotic normality of the nonlinear least-squares (NLS) estimator of the structural parameters and the associated behavioural equilibria; and (iii) provide detailed guidance on conducting inference. Substantively, this delivers an estimable NKPC with learning and a characterization of the location of its behavioural equilibria. Methodologically, we develop a general strategy for establishing ergodicity and NLS inference in nonlinear learning models with potentially multiple equilibria, and highlight when and why standard limit theory breaks down. In doing so, we draw on recent results for nonlinear time series models to derive the model’s probabilistic properties (Chotard and Auger, 2019) and to justify point estimation (Francq et al., 2024). Moreover, several less-standard results emerge that connect to the broader econometric literature. For example, akin to Hansen (1996a), we show how to conduct inference when certain parameters (viz., the learning gain) are not *jointly* identified. In this case, following Saikkonen (1995) and Seo (2011), we can still verify \sqrt{n} -consistency of the remaining structural parameters. Our analysis of the (multiple) equilibria is also conceptually related to Kasy (2015), who develops a nonparametric procedure for inference on the number of roots of an unknown function. In contrast, we work in a parametric setup where the equilibria are the roots of a polynomial function that is known up to a finite dimensional parameter. This allows us to study the asymptotic distribution of equilibrium locations, its number, and uniform inference on the complete function. When inference concerns the (multiple) equilibria, convergence can be slow, akin to the second-order identification mechanism in Dovonon and Hall (2018). *Secondly*, we verify the theoretical findings in finite samples, using both simulated and real-world data. The empirical application to US data illustrates how our methods can be used to characterize uncertainty about equilibrium locations and learning

dynamics in practice.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the model. The time series properties of the resulting data generating process (dgp) are established in Section 3. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 discuss, respectively, consistency and asymptotic normality of the NLS estimator. The asymptotic distribution of the resulting estimator of the behavioural equilibria is derived in Section 4.3, while Section 4.4 is devoted to various inference procedures. Finite sample evidence in the form of a Monte Carlo experiment and an estimation exercise using US data are presented in Sections 5 and 6, respectively, before Section 7 concludes. All proofs are delegated to the appendix.

2 Model

Consider a standard version of a forward-looking NKPC:

$$\pi_t = \delta \pi_{t+1}^e + \psi y_t + u_t, \quad (1)$$

where $t = 1, 2, \dots$ indexes time, π_t denotes inflation, π_{t+1}^e is the agents', not necessarily rational, expectation of future inflation, the driving variable y_t is a proxy for real marginal costs (e.g. an output gap measure or real unit labour costs), and u_t is an error term (see, e.g., Woodford, 2003 for a theoretical discussion or Mavroeidis et al., 2014 for a more empirical treatment). Following, among others, Lansing (2009) and Hommes and Zhu (2014, Section 4), the driving variable is assumed to follow an AR(1) process,

$$y_t = a + \rho y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (2)$$

with intercept a , persistence parameter ρ , and innovation ε_t . The parameters ρ and δ are in the interval $(-1, 1)$, whereas the variances of the shocks ε_t and u_t are given by $0 < \sigma_\varepsilon^2 < \infty$ and $0 < \sigma_u^2 < \infty$, respectively. The relevant economic parameter is $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$, usually called the slope, that measures how inflation responds to changes in economic 'slack'.

Under the full information rational expectations (RE) hypothesis, agents have complete knowledge of the model structure (e.g. they know the functional form of Eq. (1)) and its history and make optimal use of it by setting $\pi_{t+1}^e = \mathbb{E}[\pi_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$, where $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\{(u_i, \varepsilon_i) : i \leq t\})$. It can easily be shown (see e.g. Hommes and Zhu, 2014, Appendix B) that the RE equilibrium is given by a linear projection

of π_t on $(1, y_t)^\top$:

$$\pi_t = \frac{a\delta\psi}{(1-\delta\rho)(1-\delta)} + \frac{\psi}{(1-\delta\rho)}y_t + u_t. \quad (3)$$

The RE paradigm, although providing an important benchmark, has been challenged over the years. One popular alternative, proposed by the macroeconomic learning literature, is to assume that agents themselves act like statisticians when forming their inflation expectations. In this literature, agents usually know the functional form of the RE equilibrium (3) but not its parameters, which they estimate; hence the term *bounded rationality* (see, e.g., Evans and Honkapohja, 2001 and Evans and McGough, 2020 for overviews).

Here, we deviate from complete rationality a bit further: Following Hommes and Zhu (2014), we assume that agents even lack knowledge of the functional form. Instead, expectations of tomorrow's inflation are formed according to a perceived law of motion (PLM) that incorrectly stipulates AR(1) dynamics for π_t :

$$\pi_t = \alpha + \beta(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha) + e_t, \quad (4)$$

with e_t denoting an error, while $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$ are parameters unknown by the agent, who has to estimate them. The PLM in Eq. (4) is thus an auxiliary model employed by the agent to update her beliefs about future inflation. Note that, similar to the discussion in Evans and Honkapohja (2001, Ch. 13), the PLM is misspecified in the sense that it does not nest the RE equilibrium Eq. (3).

Two questions arise: (1) *How do agents forecast?* and (2) *What do agents actually forecast?* To address the first question, assume that expectations are formed at the end of period $t-1$ using a mean-squared-error-optimal two-period-ahead rule based only on information available at $t-1$ ¹. This implies $\pi_{t+1}^e = \alpha + \beta^2(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha)$ and, therefore, the implied actual law of motion (ALM) for inflation is

$$\pi_t = \delta[\alpha + \beta^2(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha)] + \psi y_t + u_t, \quad (5)$$

which would obtain *if* agents knew the parameters $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$ governing their forecasting rule in Eq. (4).

To answer the second question, Hommes and Zhu (2014) introduce the notion

¹This mechanism—where forecasts are based on lagged rather than current information—is standard in the adaptive-learning literature (e.g., De Grauwe and Markiewicz, 2013 or Lansing and Ma, 2017) and is consistent with the timeline of events in Elias (2016); see also Adam (2003) for a theoretical justification.

of *behavioural learning equilibria*. With agents misspecifying the functional form (note that they disregard the regressor y_t entirely), Hommes and Zhu (2014) discipline behaviour from becoming overly irrational by imposing that (a) the unconditional mean and (b) the first-order autocorrelation of π_t are correctly perceived. These two restrictions pin down the equilibrium values of $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$. In particular, Hommes and Zhu (2014) equate the PLM and Eq. (5) on their unconditional moments, which yields that expected inflation under the ALM satisfies

$$\alpha = \frac{\psi a}{(1 - \rho)(1 - \delta)}, \quad (6)$$

whereas the first-order autocorrelation β solves the following quartic equation

$$\beta = F(\beta; \lambda), \quad F(\beta; \lambda) := \delta\beta^2 + \frac{\psi^2 \rho(1 - \delta^2 \beta^4)}{\psi^2(\delta\beta^2 \rho + 1) + (1 - \rho^2)(1 - \delta\beta^2 \rho)(\sigma_u/\sigma_\varepsilon)^2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\lambda := (\delta, \psi, \rho, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)^\top$. Put differently, the unconditional mean and autocorrelation agents believe in must equal the unconditional mean and autocorrelation actually generated by the NKPC under those beliefs. It is worth noting that, in this case, expected inflation corresponds to the rational expectation case. Furthermore, Eq. (7) might deliver multiple solutions, representing different expectational equilibria, depending on the value assigned to the structural NKPC parameters. For instance, the solution is unique when $\psi > 0$ is large enough and σ_u^2 is small. As discussed by Hommes and Zhu (2014), multiple equilibria correspond to different long-run inflation persistence regimes, and policy or shocks can move the economy between them. Specifically, drawing on the findings presented in Blanchard (2016) and Jørgensen and Lansing (2025), an equilibrium characterized by a low β parameter implies strongly anchored expectations, a scenario that aligns with the original specification of the Phillips curve, namely, one defined in terms of inflation levels and the output gap. Conversely, a high β parameter would be more consistent with an accelerationist formulation of the curve.

Agents typically do not know the parameters $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$ of their forecasting model Eq. (4). Instead, and in line with the adaptive learning literature (Evans and Honkapohja, 2001), we assume agents employ a recursive updating scheme to estimate them; formally, a stochastic approximation algorithm (Benveniste et al., 1990). In particular, agents are presumed to use a constant gain version of the sample autocorrelation learning (SAC) algorithm proposed by Hommes and Zhu (2014)

(see also Hommes et al., 2023) to estimate the subjective parameters $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$:

$$\alpha_t = (1 - \gamma)\alpha_{t-1} + \gamma\pi_t, \quad \beta_t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (1 - \gamma)^{t-1-i} (\pi_{i+1} - \alpha_i)(\pi_i - \alpha_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (1 - \gamma)^{t-1-i} (\pi_i - \alpha_{i-1})^2}, \quad (8)$$

for some so-called ‘gain’ or ‘learning’ parameter $\gamma > 0$ and initial value $\pi_0 = \alpha_0$. Note that $\gamma > 0$ implies that more weight is attached to recent data and that the recursive estimators do not converge in probability but, as discussed below, converge in distribution to non-degenerate weak limits. If, in contrast, $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, then the adaptive learning estimates can converge under mild conditions to one of the possible behavioural equilibria computed from Eq. (7), and in this respect the equilibrium is called locally stable. Constant-gain learning with $\gamma > 0$ implies, in turn, persistent deviations from rationality and is often employed in empirical applications where it is the preferred choice due to its tracking ability in nonstationary environments (see, e.g. Milani, 2007 or Chevillon et al., 2010).² Importantly, in their empirical estimation of an extended version of the NKPC discussed here and in Hommes and Zhu (2014), Hommes et al. (2023) employ the constant gain specification of Eq. (8).

To sum up, under learning, the resulting data generating process (dgp) is thus given by Eqs. (2) (for y_t) and (8) (for α_t, β_t) in conjunction with the true ALM:

$$\pi_t = \delta[\alpha_{t-1} + \beta_{t-1}^2(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1})] + \psi y_t + u_t. \quad (9)$$

The unknown parameters in this model are $\theta := (\gamma, \delta, \psi)^\top$ together with $(a, \rho, \sigma_u, \sigma_\varepsilon)$, that determine the potentially multiple equilibria β , all of which we aim to estimate. This task is nontrivial because the dgp defined by (2), (8), and (9) is highly nonlinear.³ Nevertheless, as discussed in the next section, it can be cast as a non-linear state-space model, in the sense of Meyn and Tweedie (2012), and shown to possess sufficient regularity needed for our later analysis.

²Markiewicz and Pick (2014) find that constant-gain least squares typically yields lower mean squared forecast errors than decreasing-gain learning, particularly for macroeconomic series such as inflation, GDP growth, and unemployment.

³Note that, although the dgp can be seen as an ‘*observation driven*’ model in the sense of Cox et al. (1981) (see also Blasques et al., 2024), commonly used results in that literature to establish the time series properties do not apply in a straightforward way. For example, as discussed in more detail below, results based on stochastic recurrence equations like Straumann and Mikosch (2006, Thm 2.8) require a Lipschitz condition that fails here.

3 Probabilistic properties of the dgn

Before turning to estimation and inference for the structural parameters, we first establish the time series properties needed to ensure that this exercise is meaningful. In particular, we establish that the model, summarized by the ALM in Eq. (9), viewed as a nonlinear Markov chain, is geometrically ergodic. This matters because, irrespective of initialization, this guarantees that the chain converges to a unique stationary distribution and insures the *invertibility* of the time series model (see, e.g. Straumann and Mikosch, 2006 or Blasques et al., 2018). Moreover, this notion of ergodicity justifies the use of law of large numbers (LLN) and central limit theorem (CLT) results for sample averages and smooth functionals which are key ingredients for our later analysis of estimation and inference (for discussions of these concepts in the context of non-linear time series models see, e.g. Carrasco and Chen, 2002 or Kristensen, 2005).

To set the stage, note that we can represent β_t also recursively i.e.

$$\beta_t = \beta_{t-1} + \frac{\gamma}{r_t}((\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1}) - \beta_{t-1}(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})^2),$$

and

$$r_t = r_{t-1} + \gamma((\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})^2 - r_{t-1}).$$

We follow a convention from Hommes and Zhu (2014), and assume that the agents' initial value equals the observed inflation; i.e. $\alpha_0 \stackrel{!}{=} \pi_0 =: \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus setting $r_1 = \gamma(\pi_1 - \alpha_0)^2$, ensures $\beta_1 = 0$ for any $r_0, \beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, using these two recursions, we define to that end the 5×1 state vector $s_t := (\pi_t, \alpha_t, y_t, \beta_t, r_t)^\top$. In Appendix A.1 we show that the dynamic system s_t can be viewed as a nonlinear Markov recursion $s_t = \mathcal{G}(s_{t-1}, v_t)$, for a continuous mapping $\mathcal{G}(s, v)$ and innovation vector $v_t := (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$. It is worth noting that s_t belongs to the class of nonlinear state space models, as defined in Meyn and Tweedie (2012, p. 33) and that, by Assumption A below, s_t is weak Feller (Meyn and Tweedie, 2012, Prop. 6.1.2).

We cannot, however, directly rely on off-the-shelf results typically used in the nonlinear time series literature to verify geometric ergodicity of s_t . For example, the otherwise very general results in Tong (1990, Section A.1) do not apply because, among other reasons, the underlying skeleton difference equation fails to be Lipschitz, owing to the highly nonlinear dependence induced by β_t . For a similar reason, we cannot invoke Straumann and Mikosch (2006, Thm 2.8) or the ergodicity result from Duffie and Singleton (1993, Lem 3) used, for instance, by Adam

et al. (2016, Appendix D); see Remark A.3 for details. Instead, we derive the stochastic properties of the model from first principles, following the exposition in Chotard and Auger (2019).

In doing so, we impose the following assumption:

Assumption A *The process ε_t and u_t are independently and identically distributed (IID), with finite second moments, both admit lower semicontinuous densities on \mathbb{R} , and $\varepsilon_t \perp u_t$.*

While some mild deviations from the IID assumption might in principle be possible, existence of lower semicontinuous error-densities with full support is essential for both our ergodicity proof as well as parameter identification. Under Assumption A, we can show that s_t explores all meaningful regions of the state space (φ -irreducibility) and avoids periodic behaviour (aperiodicity). To obtain ergodicity we also need to preclude divergence to infinity. This can be ensured by a so-called *drift condition*, for which we require the following parameter constraints.

Assumption B $|\delta| < 1$, $|\rho| < 1$, $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$

The bounds $|\delta| < 1$ and $|\rho| < 1$ guarantee stability and ergodicity of the dynamic system, while ψ can be left unrestricted for many of our core results. The gain is by construction positive, while $\gamma < 1$ is not restrictive as it covers the range of estimates of γ typically found in empirical work (see, e.g. Berardi and Galimberti, 2017, Fig. 3). We occasionally impose additional parameter restrictions to obtain further insights: for instance, $\rho > 0$ ensures existence of at least one equilibrium, $\delta \neq 0$ guarantees that γ is *jointly* identified with (δ, ψ) , while $\psi > 0$ is imposed to obtain valid uniform confidence bands. In line with economic theory, Hommes and Zhu (2014, Section 4.2) assume $\rho \in [0, 1)$, $\psi > 0$, and $\delta \in [0, 1)$, where $\rho > 0$ is imposed to ensure existence of at least one equilibrium.

Proposition 1 *If Assumptions A and B hold, then the process s_t is geometrically ergodic, with $\mathbb{E}[|r_t|] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|z_t\|^2] < \infty$, where $z_t := (\pi_t, \alpha_t, y_t)^\top$. Moreover, if, in addition, $\mathbb{E}[\|v_t\|^k] < \infty$, $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$, then $\mathbb{E}[\|z_t\|^k] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|r_t|^{k/2}] < \infty$ for $k > 2$.*

Intuitively, geometric ergodicity ensures exponentially fast forgetting of initial conditions, a crucial requirement for valid estimation and inference covered in the following section.

Remark 1 *Another consequence of the preceding proposition is that the recursive estimators of the agent (viz. α_t and β_t) do not converge in probability for $\gamma > 0$*

as $t \rightarrow \infty$; a known feature of constant-gain stochastic approximation algorithms (see, e.g. Benveniste et al., 1990). Instead, (α_t, β_t) converge in distribution to a stationary law. The limiting law as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of $\alpha_t \rightarrow_d \alpha^*$ is centred at the RE solution with finite variance, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha^*] = \frac{a\psi}{(1-\rho)(1-\delta)}, \quad \text{var}[\alpha^*] = \frac{\gamma}{2-\gamma} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{cov}[\pi, \pi_{-i}](1-\gamma)^{|i|}.$$

A similar closed-form characterization of the first two moments of the stationary law of the recursive sample autocorrelation β_t is not feasible due its nonlinear form in Eq. (8) defined as a ratio.⁴ Following Benveniste et al. (1990, Ch. 4), more could be said using a so-called ‘small- γ ’ Gaussian approximation: i.e., both $\gamma^{-1/2}(\alpha_t - \mathbb{E}[\alpha^*])$ and $\gamma^{-1/2}(\beta_t - \text{corr}[x, x_{-1}])$, $x_t := \pi_t - \alpha_{t-1}$, converge in distribution to mean-zero Gaussian variates as $\gamma \rightarrow 0_+$ such that $\gamma t \rightarrow \infty$; see also Evans and Honkapohja (2001, Section 7.5). We will, however, maintain throughout the assumption of a constant gain viewing $\gamma > 0$ as a parameter to be estimated. For robust procedures covering the case $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, see Chevillon et al. (2010).

4 Estimation and inference

Observing a sample $\{\pi_t, y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ of length n , we estimate the 3×1 parameter vector $\theta := (\gamma, \delta, \psi)^\top$, using the nonlinear least squares (NLS) estimator $\theta_n := (\theta_{\gamma,n}, \theta_{\delta,n}, \theta_{\psi,n})^\top$, which minimizes, over a suitable parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, the sample objective

$$Q_n(\theta, \mathbf{a}) := \sum_{t=1}^n (\pi_t - f_t(\theta, \mathbf{a}))^2, \quad (10)$$

where, for a given initial value \mathbf{a} , $f_t(\cdot, \mathbf{a})$ is the nonlinear regression function

$$f_t(\theta, \mathbf{a}) := \delta[\alpha_{t-1}(\gamma, \mathbf{a}) + \beta_{t-1}^2(\gamma, \mathbf{a})(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1}(\gamma, \mathbf{a}))] + \psi y_t. \quad (11)$$

Importantly, by Proposition 1 the choice of initial condition is asymptotically irrelevant: in terms of Bougerol (1993), Straumann and Mikosch (2006), or Blasques et al. (2022), the *filter* forgets \mathbf{a} at a geometric rate

Lemma 1 *Fix any initial value \mathbf{a} . There exist constants $c \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varrho \in (0, 1)$*

⁴However, shifting to the first autocovariance $\omega_t := r_t \beta_t$, yields tractable moments of the stationary law $\omega_t \rightarrow_d \omega^*$: i.e., we get $\mathbb{E}[\omega^*] = \text{cov}[x, x_{-1}]$ and $\text{var}[\omega^*] = \frac{\gamma}{2-\gamma} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{cov}[w, w_{-i}](1-\gamma)^{|i|}$, where $w_t := x_t x_{t-1}$.

such that, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f_t(\theta, \mathbf{a}) - f_t(\theta)| \leq c \varrho^t \quad a.s.,$$

where $f_t(\theta)$ denotes the strictly stationary solution of the recursion in Proposition 1.

Because, by Lemma 1, the effect of initial values vanishes exponentially fast, we suppress in the following the dependence on \mathbf{a} .

Given θ_n , we can estimate σ_u^2 using $\hat{\sigma}_u^2 := \frac{1}{n} Q_n(\theta_n)$. Moreover, let ρ_n and $\hat{\sigma}_e^2$ denote the OLS estimators of the AR(1) process in Eq. (2) and its innovation variance σ_e^2 , respectively. We can then define for

$$\lambda_n := (\theta_{\delta,n}, \theta_{\psi,n}, \rho_n, \hat{\sigma}_u^2, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)^\top,$$

the estimator(s) of the (potentially multiple) equilibria

$$\vartheta_n = F(\vartheta_n; \lambda_n), \tag{12}$$

implicitly given as the solution of Eq. (7).

Remark 2 *As in Hansen (2017) (see also Mayer and Massmann, 2025), we can reduce the numerical complexity by profiling with respect to γ . That is, set $(\delta_n, \psi_n)^\top := (\delta_n(\gamma_n), \psi_n(\gamma_n))^\top$ and let γ_n the estimator that minimises the profiled objective*

$$Q_n^*(\gamma) := \sum_{t=1}^n (\pi_t - \delta_n(\gamma) h_{t-1}(\gamma) - \psi_n(\gamma) y_t)^2,$$

where, for a given γ , the 2×1 OLS estimator is given by

$$(\delta_n(\gamma), \psi_n(\gamma))^\top := \left[\sum_{t=1}^n (h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)^\top (h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n (h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)^\top \pi_t.$$

4.1 Consistency of the NLS estimator

Consistency of the NLS estimator requires identification of the true parameter vector θ_0 . Typically (e.g. Jennrich, 1969, Assumption (b)) one shows that the population objective $Q(\theta) := \mathbb{E}[Q_n(\theta)/n]$ is uniquely minimized at θ_0 . In our setting this route is impractical: the nonlinearity induced by β_t —itself a ratio of discounted partial sums that depend on θ —renders $Q(\theta)$ analytically intractable. Instead,

we adapt the strong-consistency argument in Francq et al. (2024, pp. 1445–1447), which extends Francq and Zakoïan (2004, Theorem 1) and does not require an explicit evaluation of the population objective.

To illustrate, note that

$$\pi_t = a\psi + \delta h_{t-1}(\gamma) + \rho\psi y_{t-1} + w_t, \quad h_t(\gamma) := \alpha_t(\gamma) + \beta_t(\gamma)^2(\pi_t - \alpha_t(\gamma)),$$

where $w_t := \psi\varepsilon_t + u_t$ drives the conditional law of $s_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. A key ingredient for identification is to show that $h_t(\gamma)$ is well separated from $h_t(\gamma_0)$ whenever $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$. While the nonlinearity in $\beta_t(\gamma)$ complicates this task, on tail events $\{|w_t| \geq c\}$ (which have strictly positive probability by the full-support part of Assumption A), the easier-to-handle $\alpha_t(\gamma)$ dominates. This yields the following separation result:

Lemma 2 *If Assumption A and B holds, then for any $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$ there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{|h_t(\gamma) - h_t(\gamma_0)| > c\} > 0$.*

This result, combined with compactness of Θ , yields strong consistency via the arguments of Francq et al. (2024). We therefore impose the additional restriction of the parameter space.

Assumption B' $|\rho| < 1$ and $\theta \in \Theta := \Gamma \times \Delta \times \Psi$, where

$$\Gamma := [\underline{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}], \quad \Delta := [-\bar{\delta}, -\underline{\delta}] \cup [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}], \quad \Psi := [\underline{\psi}, \bar{\psi}]$$

for $0 < \underline{\gamma} < \bar{\gamma} < 1$, $0 < \underline{\delta} < \bar{\delta} < 1$, $-\infty < \underline{\psi} < \bar{\psi} < \infty$.

We are now ready to state the first core result:

Proposition 2 *Suppose Assumptions A and B' hold, then $\theta_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} \theta_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

It is immediate that $\delta = 0$ implies that γ is no longer *jointly* identified with (δ, ψ) . However, we can still show that the remaining components of the NLS estimator remain (weakly) \sqrt{n} -consistent. In particular, following Saikkonen (1995) and Seo (2011), the idea is to show that under $\delta_0 = 0$

$$D_n(\theta) := Q_n(\theta) - Q_n(\theta_0) = \eta^\top \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) z_t(\gamma)^\top \eta - 2\eta^\top \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) u_t > 0,$$

$$\eta := (\delta, \psi - \psi_0)^\top, \quad z_t(\gamma) := (h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)^\top,$$

uniformly outside any shrinking neighbourhood of η_0 whose radius goes to zero slower than $1/\sqrt{n}$. This, in turn, forces the NLS minimizer to lie within an

$1/\sqrt{n}$ neighbourhood of η_0 . Our proof builds, amongst others, on a uniform LLN and CLT for $Z_n(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) z_t(\gamma)^\top$ and $S_n(\gamma) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) u_t$, respectively, which—following Andrews (1992, Lem 1) and Hansen (1996b, Thm 2)—can be shown by establishing stochastic Lipschitz bounds. Technically, these Lipschitz conditions are a result of the following uniform moment bounds that will be used throughout:

Lemma 3 *Let $k \geq 1$ and denote by $\alpha_t^{(m)}(\gamma) := \frac{d^m}{d\gamma^m} \alpha_t(\gamma)$ (similarly for r_t and β_t) the m -th derivative with respect to γ .*

- (i) *If $E[\|v_t\|^k] < \infty$, then $E[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\alpha_t^{(m)}(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$, $m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.*
- (ii) *If $E[\|v_t\|^{2k}] < \infty$, then $E[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |r_t^{(m)}(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$, $m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.*
- (iii) *If $E[\|v_t\|^{4k}] < \infty$ and $\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} r_t(\gamma) \geq r > 0$ a.s., then $E[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\beta_t^{(m)}(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$, $m \in \{1, 2\}$, and, if in addition, $E[\|v_t\|^{6k}] < \infty$, then $E[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\beta_t^{(3)}(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$.*

Intuitively, bounding moments of the derivatives of r_t and β_t requires more stringent moment conditions on the errors $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$ because r_t and β_t are functions of sample second moments and thus already involve squared data.

This leads us to impose the following restriction on the errors:

Assumption C $E[\|v_t\|^8] < \infty$.

Corollary 1 *Suppose Assumptions A, B, and C hold. If, in addition $\delta_0 = 0$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, then $\sqrt{n}(\theta_{n,\delta}, (\theta_{n,\psi} - \psi_0))^\top = O_p(1)$.*

As will be shown in the following section, if $\delta_0 \neq 0$, then the joint NLS estimator (weakly) \sqrt{n} -consistent for the full parameter vector $(\gamma, \delta, \psi)^\top$ under a slightly strengthened set of assumptions.

4.2 Asymptotic normality of the NLS estimator

Having established the consistency of θ_n , we turn to the question of its limiting distribution. To aid the discussion, define the gradient vector and the Hessian matrix of the nonlinear regression function $f_t(\theta) = \delta h_{t-1}(\gamma) + \psi y_t$ with respect to

$\theta = (\delta, \gamma, \psi)^\top$ by

$$\dot{f}_t(\theta) = (h_{t-1}(\gamma), \delta_0 \dot{h}_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)^\top \quad \text{and} \quad H_t(\theta) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dot{h}_{t-1}(\gamma) & 0 \\ \dot{h}_{t-1}(\gamma) & \delta \ddot{h}_{t-1}(\gamma) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\dot{h}_t(\gamma) := (1 - \beta_t(\gamma)^2)\dot{\alpha}_t(\gamma) + 2\beta_t(\gamma)\dot{\beta}_t(\gamma)(\pi_t - \alpha_t(\gamma))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{h}_t(\gamma) := & (1 - \beta_t(\gamma)^2)\ddot{\alpha}_t(\gamma) \\ & + 2(\dot{\beta}_t(\gamma)^2 + \beta_t(\gamma)\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma))(\pi_t(\gamma) - \alpha_t(\gamma)) - 4\beta_t(\gamma)\dot{\beta}_t(\gamma)\dot{\alpha}_t(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

The notation $\dot{\alpha}$ and $\ddot{\alpha}$ ($\dot{\beta}$ and $\ddot{\beta}$) is used to indicate the first and second derivative wrt γ of α (β). Using the definition of θ_n in conjunction with the mean-value theorem, ensures that there exists a $\bar{\theta}_n$ on the line segment connecting θ_n and θ_0 such that

$$\sqrt{n}(\theta_n - \theta_0) = -M_n(\bar{\theta}_n)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{f}_t u_t, \quad \dot{f}_t := \dot{f}_t(\theta_0),$$

where $M_n(\theta) := -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{f}_t(\theta) \dot{f}_t(\theta)^\top + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\pi_t - f_t(\theta)) H_t(\theta)$. Given the consistency of θ_n , standard arguments (see, e.g. Amemiya, 1985) yield limiting normality if the following holds true:

- (a) $A := \mathbb{E}[\dot{f}_t \dot{f}_t^\top]$ is a finite positive definite 3×3 matrix;
- (b) $M_n(\bar{\theta}_n) \rightarrow_p -A$ for any $\bar{\theta}_n$ such that $|\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_0| \leq \varepsilon_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0$;
- (c) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{f}_t u_t \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, A\sigma_u^2)$.

Often, (a) can be ensured by direct evaluation of the expectation A . Here, due to the highly nonlinear nature of the $\dot{f}_t(\theta)$, deriving A in closed form is not feasible. Still, we are able to verify (a) by a delicate tail argument, which, as an immediate consequence of Lemma 4 and the CLT for homoskedastic martingale difference sequences, yields part (c). Moreover, as argued in Andrews (1992, Lemma 1), part (b) follows from a stochastic Lipschitz bound. These results are summarized by the following lemma:

Lemma 4 *Let $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$.*

- (a) *If $\mathbb{E}[\|v_t\|^4] < \infty$, then A is a finite and positive definite 3×3 matrix.*
- (b) *If $\mathbb{E}[\|v_t\|^8] < \infty$, then $\|M_n(\theta_2) - M_n(\theta_1)\| \leq B_n \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$, with $B_n = O_p(1)$ for*

any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$.

In view of Lemma 3, it is interesting to note that, although part (b) involves bounds on expected moments of up to the third derivatives of the agents' recursive estimates, we do not require more than the eight error-moments already imposed by Assumption C.

We are now ready to derive the limiting distribution of the estimator:

Proposition 3 *If Assumptions A, B', and C hold and $\theta_0 = (\gamma_0, \delta_0, \psi_0)^\top \in \text{int}(\Theta)$, then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\theta_n - \theta_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \quad \Sigma := \sigma_u^2 A^{-1} \succ 0.$$

As is common for extremum estimators (see, e.g. Newey and McFadden, 1994), we restrict the true value θ_0 to fall within the interior of Θ , excluding boundary cases such like $\delta = 0$, which—as already discussed—require additional attention.

4.3 Asymptotic distribution of the roots and the number of roots

Recall from Eq. (12) that an equilibrium is defined via $\vartheta_n = F(\vartheta_n; \lambda_n)$ for $\lambda_n = (\theta_{\delta,n}, \theta_{\psi,n}, \rho_n, \hat{\sigma}_u^2, \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2)^\top$, where $\theta_n = (\theta_{\gamma,n}, \theta_{\delta,n}, \theta_{\psi,n})^\top$, while ρ_n and $\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2$ denote the OLS estimator of ρ and the associated error variance σ_ε^2 , respectively. In order to study the properties of our estimator of the equilibria, we thus need the following intermediate result:

Corollary 2 *Suppose the conditions of Proposition 3 are satisfied, then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega), \quad \Omega \succ 0.$$

If u_t is symmetric, Ω has a simple block-diagonal structure:

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix},$$

where Σ_{23} is the 2×2 (2, 3)-block of Σ and $D := \text{diag}(1 - \rho^2, \mathbb{E}[u^4] - \sigma_u^4, \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] - \sigma_\varepsilon^4)$.

Let $r(\lambda)$ denote the number of roots of $G(\beta; \lambda) = \beta - F(\beta; \lambda)$ for a given λ , and define

$$r_0 := r(\lambda_0), \quad r_n := r(\lambda_n), \quad G(\beta) := G(\beta; \lambda_0), \quad G_n(\beta) := G(\beta; \lambda_n).$$




Figure 1: The solid black line is the true $G(\beta)$ at $r_0 = 2$ with two roots indicated by the two grey vertical lines. The dashed and the dotted lines indicate a realized $G_n(\beta)$ conditioning on $r_n = 1$ and $r_n = 3$, respectively.

By Assumption B, $G(\beta)$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$, and, if in addition $\rho > 0$ and $\psi \neq 0$, satisfies $G(0) < 0 < G(1)$. This implies $r_0 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and that the number of simple roots is odd. In particular, if $r_0 = 2$, then there is one simple root and one repeated root, at which $G(\cdot)$ does not change sign; this case is illustrated by the solid black line in Figure 1. Moreover, when $r_0 = 2$, the event $\{r_n = r_0\}$ has probability zero; in terms of Figure 1, one observes with equal probability either the dashed curve ($r_n = 1$) or the dotted curve ($r_n = 3$) for the realised $G_n(\beta)$. Because the derivative of $G(\beta)$ at the repeated root is zero, the equilibria are not identified at first order but only at second order, echoing the discussion in Dovonon and Hall (2018). This leads to a slower convergence rate and is summarised by the following corollary.

To set the stage, recall that $\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) \rightarrow_d \mathbb{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$, let $\vartheta_{i,n}$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, denote the potential roots of $\beta \mapsto G_n(\beta)$ and impose the following:

Assumption B'' *Assumption B' holds with $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\Theta := \Gamma \times \Delta \times \Psi_{\neq 0}$, where*

$$\Psi_{\neq 0} := [-\bar{\psi}, -\underline{\psi}] \cup [\underline{\psi}, \bar{\psi}], \quad 0 < \underline{\psi} < \bar{\psi} < \infty.$$

Assumption B'' introduces the additional restriction $\psi \neq 0$. Since $\|F_\lambda(\beta; \lambda)\| = \beta^2$ if the true $\psi_0 = 0$, this is important to ensure that $F_\lambda(\beta; \lambda)$ is uniformly bounded away from zero at $\lambda = \lambda_0$; a crucial condition for the later analysis. The sign restriction $\rho > 0$ together with $\psi \neq 0$ ensures $G(0) < 0 < G(1)$ (e.g. existence of at least one root).

Corollary 3 *Suppose Assumptions A, B'', and C hold.*

- 1) *If $r_0 \in \{1, 3\}$, $r_n \rightarrow_p r_0$ and*

$$\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_{i,n} - \beta_{i,0}) \rightarrow_d J_i^\top \mathbb{Z}, \quad J_i := \frac{F_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0)}{1 - F_\beta(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_0.$$

2) If $r_0 = 2$, $r_n \rightarrow_d \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$ on $\{1, 3\}$, i.e. $r_n \not\rightarrow_p r_0$.

(a) If $r_n = 1$, $\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_{1,n} - \beta_0) \rightarrow_d J_1^\top \mathbb{Z}$.

(b) If $r_n = 3$, let β_0 and β_0^\dagger be the simple and the double root, respectively, where

$$G_\beta(\beta_0^\dagger) = 0, \quad G_{\beta\beta}(\beta_0^\dagger) =: 2a, \quad \text{and} \quad G_\lambda(\beta_0^\dagger) =: B.$$

Then we have for three roots ϑ_n , ϑ_n^\pm , say, the following

$$(\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_n - \beta_0), n^{1/4}(\vartheta_n^\pm - \beta_0^\dagger)) \rightarrow_d (J^\top \mathbb{Z}, \pm \sqrt{|a^{-1} B^\top \mathbb{Z}|}).$$

Moreover, $\sqrt{n}(\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger) = O_p(1)$. If $cB \neq aD$, with $G_{\beta\beta\beta}(\beta_0^\dagger) =: 6c$, $G_{\beta\lambda}(\beta_0^\dagger) =: D$, then

$$\sqrt{n}(\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger) \rightarrow_d \frac{1}{2a}(\frac{c}{a}B - D)^\top \mathbb{Z},$$

and $\sqrt{n}(\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger) = o_p(1)$ otherwise.

Before proceeding, let us briefly comment on the case $r_0 = 2$ where $G(\beta)$ merely touches the horizontal axis. Using an argument similar to Donovan and Hall (2018, Proof of Thm 1), a second-order Taylor expansion yields, for β around the double root β_0^\dagger ,

$$\frac{1}{a}G(\beta; \lambda_n) = (\beta - \beta_0^\dagger)^2 + \mathbb{Z}_n + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad \mathbb{Z}_n := \frac{1}{a}B^\top(\lambda_n - \lambda_0),$$

with $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow_d \frac{1}{a}B^\top \mathbb{Z}$. That is, we have a parabola $\beta \mapsto (\beta - \beta_0^\dagger)^2$ shifted by a random intercept $\mathbb{Z}_n = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. As shown in Figure 1, a random downward shift ($\mathbb{Z}_n < 0$) yields, in addition to the simple root on the left, the dotted line ($r_n = 3$) with two more crossings at ϑ_n^\pm , while ($\mathbb{Z}_n > 0$) shifts the parabola above the zero line so that the dashed line with no additional crossing emerges ($r_n = 1$). Because \mathbb{Z} is symmetric, both these events occur asymptotically with equal probability of $\frac{1}{2}$. Importantly, although the roots are consistent the number of roots is not. Intuitively, consistency of the repeated roots ϑ_n^\pm depends on the *magnitude* of $\sqrt{|\mathbb{Z}_n|}$, which is $O_p(n^{-1/4})$. On the other hand, the root count r_n is determined by the *sign* of \mathbb{Z}_n , which, by limiting Gaussianity of $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{Z}_n$, remains a fair coin asymptotically. Put differently, $\lambda \mapsto r_n(\lambda)$ is discontinuous at λ_0 under multiple roots, so $r(\lambda_n)$ need not to converge to $r_0 = 2$ even though ϑ_n^\pm are consistent on the $\{r_n = 3\}$ event. An interesting by-product is that the double-roots ϑ_n^\pm have, with opposite sign, the same leading term of order $n^{-1/4}$. For large n , they therefore

split symmetrically around the repeated root β_0^\dagger . Akin to a two-sample Jackknife, averaging thus eliminates this leading *bias* term.

4.4 Inference

The variance-covariance matrix $\Sigma = \sigma_u^2 A^{-1}$, $A = \mathbb{E}[\dot{f}_t \dot{f}_t^\top]$, of the limiting distribution of θ_n is not known in closed-form. We therefore resort to numerical derivatives to estimate A . For a step size ℓ_n , the estimator $A_n := A_n(\theta_n)$ with i, j -th element ($1 \leq i, j \leq 3$) is given by

$$[A_n(\theta)]_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2n} (Q_n(\theta + e_i \ell_n + e_j \ell_n) - Q_n(\theta - e_i \ell_n + e_j \ell_n) - Q_n(\theta + e_i \ell_n - e_j \ell_n) + Q_n(\theta - e_i \ell_n - e_j \ell_n)) / (2\ell_n)^2 \quad (13)$$

for $\ell_n \searrow 0$ and $e_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, denoting some sequence of step-sizes and the 3×1 unit vector, respectively. Recalling $\hat{\sigma}_u^2 = \frac{1}{n} Q_n(\theta_n)$, the following result is obtained:

Corollary 4 *If the conditions of Proposition 3 hold and $\ell_n \rightarrow 0$ as $\sqrt{n}\ell_n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\Sigma_n := \hat{\sigma}_u^2 A_n^{-1} \rightarrow_p \Sigma$, where convergence in probability holds elementwise.*

The rate imposed on the step-size is common in the literature (see, e.g. Newey and McFadden, 1994, Theorem 7.4, Oh and Patton, 2013, Section 2.4 or Mayer and Massmann, 2025, Corollary 2).

We can use Corollary 4 directly to test hypotheses about $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ using Wald-type tests. An important exception is the boundary case $\delta = 0$, where γ is a non-identified nuisance parameter; this is similar to Andrews and Ploberger (1994) and Hansen (1996a). As a solution, we propose the following procedure similar to Hansen (2017) (see also Mayer and Massmann, 2025): Under the null $H_0: \delta = 0$, the ALM reduces to $\pi_t = \psi y_t + u_t$, where ψ can be estimated by the OLS estimator $\tilde{\psi}_n$, say. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_t (\pi_t - \tilde{\psi}_n y_t)^2$ and define $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 := \hat{\sigma}_n(\gamma_n)$, $\hat{\sigma}_n(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n} Q_n^*(\gamma)$, where $Q_n^*(\cdot)$ is the profiled objective (see Remark 2 above). The proposed test statistic is the following *supF* statistic:

$$\text{supF} := \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} F_n(\gamma), \quad F_n(\gamma) := n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 - \hat{\sigma}_n^2(\gamma)}{\hat{\sigma}_n^2(\gamma)}. \quad (14)$$

Note that, by definition of the profiled γ_n , the statistic takes its maximum at $\text{supF} = n(\tilde{\sigma}_n - \hat{\sigma}_n)/\hat{\sigma}_n$, while, by Frisch-Waugh-Lovell, $F_n(\gamma)$ equals the squared t -statistic for the exclusion of $h_{t-1}(\gamma)$ in a regression of π_t on $(h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)$.

Corollary 5 *Suppose Assumptions A, B and C hold and $H_0 : \delta = 0$, then*

$$\sup \mathbf{F} \rightarrow_d \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathbb{U}(\gamma)^2,$$

where $\mathbb{U}(\gamma)$ is a Gaussian process with

$$\text{cov}[\mathbb{U}(\gamma_1), \mathbb{U}(\gamma_2)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[h_{t-1}^*(\gamma_1)h_{t-1}^*(\gamma_2)]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[h_{t-1}^*(\gamma_1)^2]\mathbb{E}[h_{t-1}^*(\gamma_2)^2]}},$$

where $h_t^*(\cdot)$ is the population residual upon partialling out y_t from $h_t(\cdot)$.

Since the limiting process depends on unknown quantities, we follow Hansen (2017) and propose the use of a Gaussian multiplier bootstrap to obtain critical values: For $b \in \{1, \dots, B\}$, let $\{\pi_{1,b}, \dots, \pi_{n,b}\}$, be a draw of standard normal variates. Use $\pi_{t,b}$ in place of π_t to compute the bootstrap equivalent $\sup \mathbf{F}^b$, say, of Eq. (14). For B large enough, we can then approximate the bootstrap p -value using $p_{n,B} := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B 1\{\sup \mathbf{F} \leq \sup \mathbf{F}^b\}$, and reject at a significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ if $p_{n,B} \leq \alpha$. As shown in the appendix $p_{n,B}$ is consistent for the true p -value as n and B diverge.

Another interesting question is how to conduct inference with respect to the equilibria β . Here, we propose uniform confidence bands for the unknown curve $\beta \mapsto G(\beta)$. To fix ideas, note that, by the functional Delta method, we have in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$, $\sqrt{n}(G(\beta, \lambda_n) - G(\beta, \lambda_0)) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\beta)$, where $\mathbb{G}(\beta)$ is a Gaussian process with kernel $\text{cov}[\mathbb{G}(\beta_1), \mathbb{G}(\beta_2)] = F_\lambda(\beta_1)^\top \Omega F_\lambda(\beta_2)$. We can therefore compute uniform $1 - \alpha$ confidence intervals as summarized by the following Corollary:

Corollary 6 *For a consistent estimator $s_n^2(\beta)$ of $s^2(\beta) := F_\lambda(\beta)^\top \Omega F_\lambda(\beta)$ such that $\sup_\beta |s_n(\beta) - s(\beta)| = o_p(1)$, fix a significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and suppose Assumptions A, B'', and C hold, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\forall \beta \in [0, 1] : G(\beta) \in [G_n(\beta) \pm c_\alpha n^{-1/2} s_n(\beta)]\} \rightarrow 1 - \alpha,$$

where c_α is such that $\mathbb{P}\{\sup_{\beta \in [0, 1]} \frac{|\mathbb{G}(\beta)|}{s(\beta)} \leq c_\alpha\} = 1 - \alpha$.

If preferred, a non-studentized, *percentile* version of the confidence bands could be obtained by letting $[G_n(\beta) \pm \tilde{c}_\alpha n^{-1/2}]$, with \tilde{c}_α such that $\mathbb{P}\{\sup_\beta |\mathbb{G}(\beta)| \leq \tilde{c}_\alpha\} = 1 - \alpha$. Note that, contrary to pointwise confidence intervals at selected roots β , our confidence bands are constructed for the function $\beta \mapsto G_n(\beta; \lambda_0)$ itself, exploiting smoothness in λ , and are thus unaffected by potentially repeated roots where G_β

vanishes.

Since the limiting distribution is unknown and non-pivotal, to obtain c_α , we suggest to use a multiplier bootstrap based on the first order approximation:

$$\sqrt{n}(G_n(\beta) - G(\beta)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n m_t(\beta; \kappa_0) + o_p(1),$$

where

$$m_t(\beta; \kappa) := -F_\lambda(\beta; \lambda)^\top \phi_t(\kappa), \quad \kappa := (\lambda^\top, \gamma)^\top,$$

and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_t \phi_t(\kappa_0)$ is the influence function of $\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0)$. Thus, for a draw $b \in \{1, \dots, B\}$ of standard Gaussian multipliers $\{\xi_{1,b}, \dots, \xi_{n,b}\}$, and, conditionally on the data, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \xi_{t,b} m_t(\beta; \kappa_0) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{G}(\beta) \quad \text{in } \ell^\infty([0, 1]),$$

where $\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbb{P}}$ means that weak convergence holds in probability with respect to the data-generating measure. In practice, neither κ_0 nor $\phi_t(\kappa_0)$ is observed. As shown in Appendix A.5, we can however construct $\phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n)$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \|\phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n) - \phi_t(\kappa_0)\|^2 = o_p(1)$, and define the feasible linearization $m_{t,n}(\beta) := -F_\lambda(\beta; \lambda_n)^\top \phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n)$. We then simulate the critical value from the studentized bootstrap statistic

$$T_{n,b} := \sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \frac{\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \xi_{t,b} m_{t,n}(\beta) \right|}{s_n(\beta)}, \quad s_n(\beta)^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n m_{t,n}(\beta)^2,$$

and take $c_{\alpha,n,B}$ as the empirical $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $\{T_{n,b}\}_{b=1}^B$. As verified in the appendix, if $B \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$, $c_{\alpha,n,B} \rightarrow_p c_\alpha$, yielding the uniform bands in Corollary 6.

5 Monte Carlo simulation

In this section, we present finite-sample evidence based on simulated data. We consider two scenarios: Scenario (A) with three behavioural equilibria ($r_0 = 3$) and Scenario (B) with two equilibria ($r_0 = 2$). The Monte Carlo dgp is defined by Eqs. (2), (8), and (9), with IID Gaussian innovations $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}(\sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2))$. For Scenario (A), the parameter values are inspired by our empirical analysis. In particular, the parameter vector estimated by NLS is set to $\theta = (0.076, 0.998, 0.090)^\top$, the AR(1) dynamics (2) are parametrised via

$(a, \rho) = (-0.02, 0.93)$, and, for the innovations, we set $(\sigma_u, \sigma_\varepsilon) = (0.44, 0.76)$. This configuration gives rise to three behavioural equilibria $\beta = (0.174, 0.856, 0.999)^\top$. The implied values of $\lambda = (\delta, \psi, \rho, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)^\top$ are broadly in line with those in Hommes and Zhu (2014, Sec 4.2). For Scenario (B), we keep the value of the gain and the AR(1) dynamics, and choose $\lambda = (0.95, 0.2734, 0.9, 1, 1)^\top$, which gives rise to a simple root at $\beta = 0.9766$ and a repeated root at $\beta^\dagger = 0.5551$.




Figure 2: The solid and dashed lines indicate the true $G(\beta)$ for scenario (A) and (B), respectively. The $r_0 = 3$ and $r_0 = 2$ roots are indicated with grey vertical lines.

We report, for the NLS estimator θ_n of $\theta = (\gamma, \delta, \psi)^\top$, the mean, bias, standard deviation, and the empirical size of two-sided t -tests (using, in accordance with Corollary 4, numerical standard errors) at a nominal 5% level. We also present the empirical coverage of the percentile (*cover*) and studentized (*cover-s*) confidence bands (see Corollary 6) for the curves $\beta \mapsto G(\beta)$ plotted in Figure 2, based on $B = 4,999$ bootstrap replications at a 95% coverage level. Finally, we report the mean and standard deviation of the estimated equilibria, together with the observed frequency at which the true number of roots is recovered, i.e. $\mathbb{P}\{r = r_0\}$.

The findings are summarized in Table 1. In both scenarios, the NLS estimator appears consistent and the normal approximation for the t -statistics is fairly accurate, while the empirical coverage of the studentized confidence bands is slightly below the nominal 95% level for smaller n . Moreover, in line with Corollary 3, we observe that the estimated number of roots r_n either converges to the true value r_0 or, in Scenario (B), oscillates between $r = 1$ and $r = 3$ with approximately equal probability. In the latter case, the convergence of the estimates associated with the repeated root appears to be an order of magnitude slower than the \sqrt{n} -rate observed for simple roots, while averaging the two nearby estimates corresponding to the repeated root improves performance.

(A)		$\gamma = 0.076$	$\delta = 0.998$	$\psi = 0.090$	$\beta_1 = 0.174 \quad \beta_2 = 0.856 \quad \beta_3 = 0.999$			
250	mean	0.0754	0.9696	0.0929	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.4085	
	bias	-0.0006	-0.0285	0.0029	mean		0.2250	
	sd	0.0171	0.0551	0.0160	sd		0.2911	
	size	0.0595	0.0415	0.0525	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.5915	
	cover	0.9335			mean	0.1924	0.8516	0.9961
	cover-s	0.9085			sd	0.0832	0.0929	0.0086
500	mean	0.0760	0.9860	0.0911	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.2310	
	bias	0.0000	-0.0121	0.0011	mean		0.1967	
	sd	0.0123	0.0240	0.0110	sd		0.2434	
	size	0.0565	0.0440	0.0500	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.7690	
	cover	0.9290			mean	0.1863	0.8547	0.9963
	cover-s	0.9280			sd	0.0692	0.0802	0.0072
1,000	mean	0.0764	0.9935	0.0905	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.0695	
	bias	0.0004	-0.0046	0.0005	mean		0.1229	
	sd	0.0086	0.0104	0.0077	sd		0.0292	
	size	0.0455	0.0285	0.0495	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.9305	
	cover	0.9350			mean	0.1778	0.8598	0.9972
	cover-s	0.9490			sd	0.0494	0.0600	0.0050
2,000	mean	0.0758	0.9962	0.0904	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.0120	
	bias	-0.0002	-0.0018	0.0004	mean		0.1298	
	sd	0.0060	0.0048	0.0054	sd		0.0224	
	size	0.0520	0.0345	0.0480	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.9880	
	cover	0.9330			mean	0.1759	0.8582	0.9983
	cover-s	0.9505			sd	0.0357	0.0441	0.0030
(B)		$\gamma = 0.076$	$\delta = 0.95$	$\psi = 0.2734$	$\beta^\dagger \quad \beta^\dagger = 0.55 \quad \beta = 0.977$			
250	mean	0.0759	0.9361	0.2772	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.7550	
	bias	-0.0001	-0.0139	0.0039	mean		0.6382	
	sd	0.0156	0.0507	0.0310	sd		0.3632	
	size	0.0540	0.0450	0.0460	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.2450	
	cover	0.9270			mean	0.3429	0.7671	0.9755
	cover-s	0.9125			sd	0.0954	0.0906	0.0242
					$\frac{1}{2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$			
					mean	0.5550		
					sd	0.0255		
500	mean	0.0762	0.9438	0.2746	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.6525	
	bias	0.0002	-0.0062	0.0012	mean		0.7166	
	sd	0.0113	0.0261	0.0216	sd		0.3428	
	size	0.0520	0.0490	0.0515	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.3475	
	cover	0.9255			mean	0.3764	0.7572	0.9641
	cover-s	0.9205			sd	0.0771	0.0804	0.0239
					$\frac{1}{2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$			
					mean	0.5668		
					sd	0.0236		
1,000	mean	0.0766	0.9477	0.2737	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.5615	
	bias	0.0006	-0.0023	0.0004	mean		0.8238	
	sd	0.0077	0.0138	0.0152	sd		0.2913	
	size	0.0470	0.0400	0.0445	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.4385	
	cover	0.9385			mean	0.3893	0.7468	0.9637
	cover-s	0.9430			sd	0.0680	0.0793	0.0168
					$\frac{1}{2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$			
					mean	0.5680		
					sd	0.0166		
2,000	mean	0.0760	0.9487	0.2739	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 1\}$		0.5015	
	bias	0.0000	-0.0013	0.0006	mean		0.9253	
	sd	0.0054	0.0087	0.0105	sd		0.1863	
	size	0.0585	0.0445	0.0480	$\mathbb{P}\{r = 3\}$		0.4985	
	cover	0.9415			mean	0.4066	0.7263	0.9659
	cover-s	0.9425			sd	0.0608	0.0752	0.0136
					$\frac{1}{2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$			
					mean	0.5664		
					sd	0.0133		

Table 1: Simulation results for scenario (A) in the upper panel with $r_0 = 3$ roots and for scenario (B) in the lower panel with $r_0 = 2$ roots based on 2,000 Monte Carlo repetitions.

6 Empirical application

To illustrate the empirical relevance of our theoretical results, we estimate the NKPC given by Eqs. (2), (8), and (9) using quarterly US data from 1960:Q1 to 2019:Q4 ($n = 240$). Inflation π_t is measured by CPI inflation. Since marginal costs are proportional to the output gap or the real labour share (see, e.g., Woodford, 2003 or Mavroeidis et al., 2014, Section 2.1), we consider two standard slack measures: (A) the output gap measure from the Congressional Budget Office and (B) the percentage change in real unit labour costs (see also Galí and Gertler, 1999 or Sbordone, 2002). The three series are plotted in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Percentage change of the CPI (upper panel) and, in the lower panel, the output gap and the percentage change of unit labour costs .

We employ a preliminary step to obtain starting values: In particular, we use an initial grid search over $\gamma \in (0, 0.1)$ in order to obtain starting values, treating the initial value \mathbf{a} of the learning recursion as a parameter to be estimated. NLS estimation is carried out using the R `optim`-routine with default settings, restricting the parameter space for δ to $(0, 1)$. The upper panel of Table 2 reports the NLS estimation results, while the lower panel summarizes OLS estimation of the AR(1) models for the two different proxies of the driving variable; 95% confidence intervals based on numerical derivatives are given beneath. The NLS estimates of specification A (output gap) and B (unit labour costs) are in line with the empirical macro literature (see, e.g., Milani, 2007, Chevillon et al., 2010, Lansing, 2009, or Hommes et al., 2023). The estimated learning gains imply that agents place most weight on roughly the last 3 to 5 years of data for specifications A and B, respectively. The estimate of the discount factor on expected inflation (viz. δ) is large. This confirms that forward-looking expectations play a quantitatively

important role in the Phillips curve and that inflation dynamics are highly persistent. The slope parameter is positive and statistically significant, but small in magnitude, consistent with the ‘flattened’ NKPC found in much of the empirical literature.

	A	B
γ	0.07602311 [0.07292689, 0.07911934]	0.04630777 [0.04489319, 0.04772236]
δ	0.998593 [0.9981619, 0.9990241]	0.90173298 [0.89704627, 0.9064197]
ψ	0.08897832 [0.0873151, 0.09064154]	0.12586481 [0.12197922, 0.12975041]
σ_u	0.44388612	0.4673309
a	-0.0259546 [-0.1253596, 0.0734504]	0.5660696 [0.4009362, 0.731203]
ρ	0.9375791 [0.8929128, 0.9822454]	0.15752518 [0.03131037, 0.28374]
σ_ε	0.7613624	1.1100973

Table 2: Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals based on numerical standard errors.




Figure 4: Plot of $\beta \mapsto G_n(\beta)$ together with 90% confidence bands based on $B = 4,999$ bootstrap replications.

In specification A, the estimated parameters imply three behavioural equilibria $\beta_1 = 0.1914$, $\beta_2 = 0.8316$, $\beta_3 = 0.9995$; in specification B we find a unique equilibrium $\beta = 0.01341$. The corresponding $\beta \mapsto G_n(\beta)$ functions are shown in Figure 4. The key difference is the persistence of the driving variable: ρ is close to one in A but relatively small in B. This pattern is consistent with the theoretical

properties of the map $\beta \mapsto G(\beta; \lambda)$, which shows that, holding other parameters fixed, $\rho \rightarrow 0$ leads to a single equilibrium with $\beta \rightarrow 0$. The low persistence of unit labour costs is sufficient to support only a single, less persistent equilibrium, and the feedback between expectations and realized inflation is too weak to generate a high-persistence belief regime. Finally, in case of specification A, β_2 is under the criterion of Hommes and Zhu (2014, Prop 4) not stable; i.e. an agent that uses asymptotically all data ($\gamma \rightarrow 0$) is not able to learn β_2 in the limit. The empirical model thus points to two stable belief regimes for inflation persistence: a low and a high persistence equilibrium.

7 Conclusion

We have developed estimation and inference methods for a New Keynesian Phillips curve with constant-gain learning and potentially multiple behavioural equilibria. Under mild conditions the resulting model is geometrically ergodic, and a nonlinear least squares estimator of the structural parameters is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal. We explain how to conduct inference with respect to structural parameters, including the equilibria, and apply these techniques to U.S. inflation data, revealing multiple belief regimes in the data. This paper is only a starting point and several extensions are left for future work: A natural next step is to develop tools for multivariate versions of the model, along the lines of Milani (2007) or Hommes et al. (2023), in order to allow for richer joint dynamics of macroeconomic variables (see also the discussion in Mavroeidis et al., 2014). It would also be useful to relax some of our regularity conditions, to exploit panel data to increase effective sample size, and to adapt the analysis to decreasing-gain learning rules using results from earlier work on the econometrics of models with adaptive learning like Chevillon et al., 2010, Chevillon and Mavroeidis (2017), Christopheit and Massmann (2018), Mayer (2022), or Mayer and Massmann (2025).

References

- ADAM, K. (2003): “Learning and equilibrium selection in a monetary overlapping generations model with sticky prices,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 887–907.
- ADAM, K., A. MARCET, AND J. P. NICOLINI (2016): “Stock market volatility and learning,” *The Journal of Finance*, 71, 33–82.

- AMEMIYA, T. (1985): *Advanced econometrics*, Harvard university press.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. (1992): “Generic uniform convergence,” *Econometric Theory*, 8, 241–257.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. AND W. PLOBERGER (1994): “Optimal tests when a nuisance parameter is present only under the alternative,” *Econometrica*, 62, 1383–1414.
- BACHMANN, R., T. O. BERG, AND E. R. SIMS (2015): “Inflation expectations and readiness to spend: cross-sectional evidence,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 7, 1–35.
- BENVENISTE, A., M. MÉTIVIER, AND P. PRIOURET (1990): *Adaptive Algorithms and Stochastic Approximations*, Springer.
- BERARDI, M. AND J. K. GALIMBERTI (2017): “Empirical calibration of adaptive learning,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 144, 219–237.
- BERNANKE, B. S. (2007): “Inflation expectations and inflation forecasting,” Speech held at the NBER Summer Institute in Cambridge, MA.
- BLANCHARD, O. (2016): “The Phillips Curve: Back to the ’60s?” *American Economic Review*, 106, 31–34.
- BLASQUES, F., C. FRANCO, AND S. LAURENT (2024): “Autoregressive conditional betas,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 238, 105630.
- BLASQUES, F., P. GORGI, S. J. KOOPMAN, AND O. WINTENBERGER (2018): “Feasible invertibility conditions and maximum likelihood estimation for observation-driven models,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 12, 1019 – 1052.
- BLASQUES, F., J. VAN BRUMMELEN, S. J. KOOPMAN, AND A. LUCAS (2022): “Maximum likelihood estimation for score-driven models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 227, 325–346.
- BORDALO, P., N. GENNAIOLI, Y. MA, AND A. SHLEIFER (2020): “Overreaction in Macroeconomic Expectations,” *American Economic Review*, 110, 2748–2782.
- BOUGEROL, P. (1993): “Kalman Filtering with Random Coefficients and Contractions,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 31, 942–959.
- BRAY, M. (1982): “Learning, estimation, and the stability of rational expectations,” *Journal of economic theory*, 26, 318–339.

- BRAY, M. M. AND N. E. SAVIN (1986): “Rational expectations equilibria, learning, and model specification,” *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 1129–1160.
- CARRASCO, M. AND X. CHEN (2002): “Mixing and moment properties of various GARCH and stochastic volatility models,” *Econometric Theory*, 18, 17–39.
- CASARIN, R., A. PERUZZI, AND D. RAGGI (2025): “Multiple Equilibria and the Phillips Curve: Do Agents Always Underreact?” *Ca’Foscari University of Venice, Department of Economics Research Paper Series, N. 10/WP/2025*.
- CHEVILLON, G., M. MASSMANN, AND S. MAVROEIDIS (2010): “Inference in models with adaptive learning,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 57, 341–351.
- CHEVILLON, G. AND S. MAVROEIDIS (2017): “Learning can generate long memory,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 198, 1–9.
- CHOTARD, A. AND A. AUGER (2019): “Verifiable conditions for the irreducibility and aperiodicity of Markov chains by analyzing underlying deterministic models,” *Bernoulli*, 25, 112–147.
- CHRISTIANO, L., M. S. EICHENBAUM, AND B. K. JOHANNSEN (2024): “Slow Learning,” *Working Paper, National Bureau of Economic Research*, 32358.
- CHRISTOPEIT, N. AND M. MASSMANN (2018): “Estimating structural parameters in regression models with adaptive learning,” *Econometric Theory*, 34, 68–111.
- (2019): “Strong consistency of the least squares estimator in regression models with adaptive learning,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 13, 1646–1693.
- COIBION, O. AND Y. GORODNICHENKO (2012): “What can survey forecasts tell us about informational rigidities?” *Journal of Political Economy*, 120, 116–159.
- COIBION, O., Y. GORODNICHENKO, S. KUMAR, AND M. PEDEMONTE (2020a): “Inflation expectations as a policy tool?” *Journal of International Economics*, 124, 1–27.
- COIBION, O., Y. GORODNICHENKO, AND T. ROPELE (2020b): “Inflation expectations and firm decisions: new causal evidence,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135, 165–219.
- COX, D. R., G. GUDMUNDSSON, G. LINDGREN, L. BONDESSON, E. HARSAAE, P. LAAKE, K. JUSELIUS, AND S. L. LAURITZEN (1981): “Statistical Analy-

- sis of Time Series: Some Recent Developments [with Discussion and Reply],” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 8, 93–115.
- DE GRAUWE, P. AND A. MARKIEWICZ (2013): “Learning to forecast the exchange rate: Two competing approaches,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 32, 42–76.
- DOVONON, P. AND A. R. HALL (2018): “The asymptotic properties of GMM and indirect inference under second-order identification,” *Journal of econometrics*, 205, 76–111.
- DUFFIE, D. AND K. J. SINGLETON (1993): “Simulated Moments Estimation of Markov Models of Asset Prices,” *Econometrica*, 61, 929–952.
- ELIAS, C. (2016): “A Heterogeneous Agent Exchange Rate Model with Speculators and Non-speculators,” *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 203–223.
- EVANS, G. W. AND S. HONKAPOHJA (2001): *Learning and Expectations in Macroeconomics*, Princeton University Press.
- EVANS, G. W. AND B. MCGOUGH (2020): “Adaptive learning in macroeconomics,” in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Economics and Finance*.
- FRANCQ, C., B. M. KANDJI, AND J.-M. ZAKOÏAN (2024): “Inference on GARCH-MIDAS models without any small-order moment,” *Econometric Theory*, 40, 1422–1455.
- FRANCQ, C. AND J.-M. ZAKOÏAN (2004): “Maximum likelihood estimation of pure GARCH and ARMA-GARCH processes,” *Bernoulli*, 10, 605–637.
- GALI, J. AND M. GERTLER (1999): “Inflation dynamics: A structural econometric analysis,” *Journal of monetary Economics*, 44, 195–222.
- HANSEN, B. E. (1996a): “Inference when a nuisance parameter is not identified under the null hypothesis,” *Econometrica*, 64, 413–430.
- (1996b): “Stochastic equicontinuity for unbounded dependent heterogeneous arrays,” *Econometric Theory*, 12, 347–359.
- (2017): “Regression kink with an unknown threshold,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 35, 228–240.
- HOMMES, C., K. MAVROMATIS, T. ÖZDEN, AND M. ZHA (2023): “Behavioral Learning Equilibria in New Keynesian Models,” *Quantitative Economics*, 14, 1401–1445.

- HOMMES, C. AND G. SORGER (1998): “Consistent Expectations Equilibria,” *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 2, 287–321.
- HOMMES, C. AND M. ZHU (2014): “Behavioral learning equilibria,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 150, 778–814.
- JENNRICH, R. I. (1969): “Asymptotic properties of non-linear least squares estimators,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 40, 633–643.
- JØRGENSEN, P. AND K. LANSING (2025): “Anchored inflation expectations and the slope of the Phillips curve,” *European Economic Review*, 178, 1–38.
- KASY, M. (2015): “Non-parametric inference on the number of equilibria,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 18, 1–39.
- KRISTENSEN, D. (2005): “Geometric ergodicity of a class of Markov chains with applications to time series models,” *mimeo*.
- LANSING, K. (2009): “Time-Varying U.S. Inflation Dynamics and the New Keynesian Phillips Curve,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 12, 304–326.
- LANSING, K. AND J. MA (2017): “Explaining Exchange Rate Anomalies in a Model with Taylor-rule Fundamentals and Consistent Expectations,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 70, 62–87.
- LUCAS, R. (1972): “Expectations and the Neutrality of Money,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 4, 103–124.
- MALMENDIER, U. AND S. NAGEL (2016): “Learning from inflation experiences,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131, 53–87.
- MANKIW, N. G. AND R. REIS (2002): “Sticky Information versus Sticky Prices: A Proposal to Replace the Phillips Curve,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 1295–1328.
- MARCET, A. AND T. J. SARGENT (1989): “Convergence of least squares learning mechanisms in self-referential linear stochastic models,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 48, 337–368.
- MARKIEWICZ, A. AND A. PICK (2014): “Adaptive learning and survey data,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 107, 685–707.
- MAVROEIDIS, S., M. PLAGBORG-MØLLER, AND J. STOCK (2014): “Empirical Evidence of Inflation Expectations in the New Keynesian Phillips Curve,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 52, 124–188.

- MAYER, A. (2022): “Estimation and inference in adaptive learning models with slowly decreasing gains,” *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 43, 720–749.
- (2023): “Two-step estimation in linear regressions with adaptive learning,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 195.
- MAYER, A. AND M. MASSMANN (2025): “Least squares estimation in nonstationary nonlinear cohort panels with learning from experience,” *Journal of Business & Economics Statistics*.
- MEYN, S. P. AND R. L. TWEEDIE (2012): *Markov chains and stochastic stability*, Springer.
- MILANI, F. (2007): “Expectations, learning and macroeconomic persistence,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54, 2065–2082.
- MUTH, J. (1961): “Rational Expectations and the Theory of Price Movements,” *Econometrica*, 29, 315–335.
- NEWKEY, W. K. AND D. MCFADDEN (1994): “Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 4, chap. 36, 2111–2245.
- OH, D. H. AND A. J. PATTON (2013): “Simulated method of moments estimation for copula-based multivariate models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 689–700.
- SAIKKONEN, P. (1995): “Problems with the asymptotic theory of maximum likelihood estimation in integrated and cointegrated systems,” *Econometric Theory*, 11, 888–911.
- SARGENT, T. J. (1993): *Bounded Rationality in Macroeconomics*, Clarendon Press.
- (1999): *The Conquest of American Inflation*, Princeton University Press.
- SBORDONE, A. M. (2002): “Prices and unit labor costs: a new test of price stickiness,” *Journal of Monetary economics*, 49, 265–292.
- SEO, M. H. (2011): “Estimation of nonlinear error correction models,” *Econometric Theory*, 27, 201–234.
- SIMS, C. A. (2003): “Implications of Rational Inattention,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50, 665–690.

- STRAUMANN, D. AND T. MIKOSCH (2006): “Quasi-maximum-likelihood estimation in conditionally heteroscedastic time series: A stochastic recurrence equations approach,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 34, 2449–2495.
- TONG, H. (1990): *Non-linear time series: a dynamical system approach*, Oxford university press.
- WOODFORD, M. (2003): *Interest and Prices: Foundations of a Theory of Monetary Policy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ,.

Appendices

A Proofs

A.1 Results of Section 3

To begin with, we represent the 5×1 time series $s_t = (\pi_t, \alpha_t, y_t, \beta_t, r_t)^\top$ as a nonlinear Markov chain $s_t = \mathcal{G}(s_{t-1}, v_t)$ with continuous Markov kernel $\mathcal{G}(s, v)$ on the state space $\mathbf{S} := \mathbb{R}^3 \times [-1, 1] \times (0, \infty)$. Upon setting

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t - \alpha_{t-1} &= \psi a + (\delta(1 - \beta_{t-1}^2) - 1)\alpha_{t-1} + \delta\beta_{t-1}^2\pi_{t-1} + \psi\rho y_{t-1} + u_t + \psi\varepsilon_t \\ &=: g(s_{t-1}, v_t) = g_t, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$F(s_{t-1}, v_t) := \begin{bmatrix} \delta\beta_{t-1}^2 & \delta(1 - \beta_{t-1}^2) & \psi\rho & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma\delta\beta_{t-1}^2 & 1 - \gamma(1 - \delta(1 - \beta_{t-1}^2)) & \gamma\psi\rho & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma g_t}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & -\frac{\gamma g_t}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & 0 & 1 - \gamma\frac{g_t^2}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - \gamma + \frac{\gamma g_t^2}{r_{t-1}} \end{bmatrix},$$

the map $\mathcal{G}(s, v)$, $s \in \mathbf{S}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$, is thus defined via

$$s_t = c + F(s_{t-1}, v_t)s_{t-1} + Bv_t, \quad B := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \psi \\ \gamma & \gamma\psi \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with $c = (a\psi, a\gamma\psi, a, 0, 0)^\top$. Eq. (A.2) thus represents a nonlinear state space model as in Meyn and Tweedie (2012, Sec 2.2.2). Continuity, which follows immediately as $r_t \geq r > 0$, implies that s_t is a weak Feller nonlinear state-space chain (Meyn and Tweedie, 2012, Prop. 6.1.2).

We first verify forward accessibility; i.e. from any starting point $s_0 \in \mathbf{S}$, a nonempty set is reachable with positive probability. A sufficient condition, verified at the end of this appendix, is a rank condition for the associated deterministic

control model; see Meyn and Tweedie (2012, p. 160).

Lemma A.1 *The process s_t is forward accessible and is a T -chain.*

Next, we establish φ -irreducibility and aperiodicity. We apply Chotard and Auger (2019, Thm 4.2), which, by Lemma A.1, ensures φ -irreducibility if a steadily attracting state $s^* \in \mathbf{S}$ exists. Thus we show:

Lemma A.2 *For the Markov chain s_t , there exists a globally attracting state $s^* \in \mathbf{S}$.*

Because s_t satisfies conditions Chotard and Auger (2019, A1–A5), it follows from Chotard and Auger (2019, Thm 4.4) that the chain is a φ -irreducible, aperiodic T -chain.

The final step is to establish geometric ergodicity. By Meyn and Tweedie (2012), a sufficient condition is a Lyapunov–Foster drift: there exist $r \in (0, 1)$, $b \in (0, \infty)$, and a function $V : \mathbb{R}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[V(s_t) \mid s_{t-1} = s] \leq r V(s) + b. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The key insight for verifying (A.3) is that the state can be re-expressed through a 3-dimensional VAR(1) with time-varying coefficients:

$$z_t = c + A(\beta_{t-1}) z_{t-1} + B v_t, \quad z_t := \begin{bmatrix} \pi_t \\ \alpha_t \\ y_t \end{bmatrix}, \quad v_t := \begin{bmatrix} u_t \\ \varepsilon_t \end{bmatrix}, \quad c := \begin{bmatrix} \psi a \\ \gamma \psi a \\ a \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

with

$$A(\beta) := \begin{bmatrix} \delta \beta^2 & \delta(1 - \beta^2) & \psi \rho \\ \gamma \delta \beta^2 & 1 - \gamma(1 - \delta(1 - \beta^2)) & \gamma \psi \rho \\ 0 & 0 & \rho \end{bmatrix}, \quad B := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \psi \\ \gamma & \gamma \psi \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $M(\beta)$ denote the 2×2 upper-left block of $A(\beta)$. Since $M(\beta) = (1 - \beta^2)M(0) + \beta^2 M(1)$, the family $\{M(\beta) : \beta \in [-1, 1]\}$ is the convex hull of $M(0)$ and $M(1)$. Under Assumption B, by analysing $M(0)$ and $M(1)$ one sees that the joint spectral radius of $\{M(\beta)\}$ (and thus that of $A(\beta)$ when $|\rho| < 1$) is strictly bounded away from one. Hence the time-varying system $z_t = c + A(\beta_{t-1})z_{t-1} + Bv_t$ is stable, which is the main ingredient for constructing a suitable drift function V in Eq. (A.3).

Moreover, the recursive sample autocorrelation satisfies

$$\beta_t = b_t \beta_{t-1} + \gamma \eta_t, \quad b_t := 1 - \gamma \frac{(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})^2}{r_t}, \quad \eta_t := \frac{(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1})}{r_t}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By construction $0 < b_t < 1$ and $|\gamma \eta_t| \leq 1$, so the β_t recursion is contractive. Together with (A.3) and aperiodicity, this yields uniform (hence geometric) ergodicity by Meyn and Tweedie (2012, Thm 16.0.2 (viii)).

Proof of Proposition 1. Recall $s_t = (z_t^\top, \beta_t, r_t)^\top$, with $z_t = (\pi_t, \alpha_t, y_t)^\top$, living in the state space $\mathbf{S} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [-1, 1] \times (0, \infty)$. Define

$$V(s) := \|z\|^2 + v_1 |\beta| + v_2 r, \quad s = (z^\top, \beta, r)^\top \in \mathbf{S},$$

with $v_1, v_2 > 0$ to be chosen now: *Drift for β .* Trivially, because the state space constrains $\beta \in [-1, 1]$ and the recursion stays in \mathbf{S} , $\mathbb{E}[|\beta_{t+1}| \mid s_t] \leq 1$. *Drift for z .* Recall the VAR(1) representation $z_t = c + A(\beta_{t-1})z_t + Bv_t$. As argued before, $\{A(\beta) : \beta \in [-1, 1]\}$ is uniformly stable. Thus, there exists $a_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $a_2 < \infty$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|z_{t+1}\|^2 \mid s_t] \leq a_1 \|z_t\|^2 + a_2$. *Drift for r .* If $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\pi_{t+1} - \alpha_t = (1 - \gamma)^{-1}(\pi_{t+1} - \alpha_{t+1})$, we get

$$r_{t+1} = (1 - \gamma)r_t + \frac{\gamma}{(1 - \gamma)^2} z_{t+1}^\top M z_{t+1}, \quad M := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $z^\top M z \leq 2\|z\|^2$, we obtain $0 < r_{t+1} \leq (1 - \gamma)r_t + b\|z_{t+1}\|^2$, $b := 2\gamma/(1 - \gamma)^2 > 0$.

Combining the above and taking expectations, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(s_{t+1}) \mid s_t] &= \mathbb{E}[\|z_{t+1}\|^2 \mid s_t] + v_1 \mathbb{E}[|\beta_{t+1}| \mid s_t] + v_2 \mathbb{E}[r_{t+1} \mid s_t] \\ &\leq (1 + v_2 b) \mathbb{E}[\|z_{t+1}\|^2 \mid s_t] + v_2 (1 - \gamma)r_t + v_1 \\ &\leq (1 + v_2 b)(a_1 \|z_t\|^2 + a_2) + v_2 (1 - \gamma)r_t + v_1. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $v_2 > 0$ such that (note that $a_1 b \neq 0$)

$$0 < a_1(1 + v_2 b) < 1 \Leftrightarrow 0 < v_2 < \frac{1 - a_1}{a_1 b}$$

and set $r := \max\{a_1(1 + v_2 b), 1 - \gamma\} < 1$, $B := (1 + v_2 b)a_2 + v_1$. Since $V(s) \geq \|z\|^2 + v_2 r$, we conclude $\mathbb{E}[V(s_{t+1}) \mid s_t = s] \leq rV(s) + B$, $s \in \mathbf{S}$, which is

the Foster–Lyapunov geometric drift. Together with φ -irreducibility and aperiodicity, geometric—indeed uniform—ergodicity follows by Meyn and Tweedie (2012, Thm. 16.0.2 (viii)). Moreover, if $\mathbb{E}[\|v_t\|^k] < \infty$ for $k > 2$, then there exists a Lyapunov function $V_k(s) = c_k\|z\|^k + d_k r^{k/2}$ such that the drift condition $\mathbb{E}[V_k(s_t) \mid s_{t-1} = s] \leq \lambda_1 s + \lambda_2$, $\lambda_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda < \infty$. This yields the claim together with the irreducibility and aperiodicity. \square

Remark A.3 *The results in Tong (1990, Sec A.1.4) concern Markov chains of the form $s_t = T(s_{t-1}) + S(s_{t-1}, v_t)$. We can cast the dgp in that form by defining*

$$T(s_{t-1}) := (A(\beta_{t-1})z_t, 0, 0)^\top, \quad S(s_{t-1}, v_t) := Bv_t + N(s_{t-1}, v_t)s_{t-1},$$

with $A(\beta)$ and B given in Eq. (A.4), while

$$N(s_{t-1}, v_t) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma g_t}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & -\frac{\gamma g_t}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & 0 & 1 - \gamma \frac{g_t^2}{(1-\gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma g_t^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - \gamma + \frac{\gamma g_t^2}{r_{t-1}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Tong (1990) requires the skeleton map $T(s)$ to be globally Lipschitz on the state space \mathbf{S} . However, in our setting, the Jacobian of $T(s)$ wrt β is proportional to z . Hence, there is no constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that $|T(s_1) - T(s_2)| \leq c|s_1 - s_2|$ for any $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbf{S}$ and Tong (1990, (A.5) on p. 458) fails. Moreover, Tong (1990) assumes v_t to be a scalar; see also the comment on Tong (1990, p. 466). For a similar reason, the asymptotic unit circle condition in Duffie and Singleton (1993, Eq. (4.9)) is not satisfied.

A.2 Results of Section 4.1

Proof of Lemma 2.⁵ To start with, recall that

$$\beta_t = \frac{(1-\gamma)\beta_{t-1}r_{t-1} + \gamma(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})(\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1})}{r_t},$$

⁵To illustrate, consider $t = 1$:

$$h_1(\gamma) = h_1(\gamma_0) \Leftrightarrow \alpha_1(\gamma) = \alpha_1(\gamma_0) \Leftrightarrow (\gamma - \gamma_0)x_1 = 0, \quad x_1 := \pi_1 - \alpha_0$$

Because $\pi_1 = \delta_0\alpha_0 + \psi_0 y_1 + u_1$ and $\text{var}[u_1] > 0$ and $\text{var}[\varepsilon] > 0$, one has that the event $\{x_1 = 0\}$ has probability zero so that $\gamma = \gamma_0$ must hold.

where $r_t = (1 - \gamma)r_{t-1} + \gamma(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1}(\gamma))^2$. Conditional on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , where

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\{(u_j, \varepsilon_j), j \leq t\}),$$

$\beta_t = \beta(v_t)$ is a random function only because it continuously depends on v_t . Using (we assume w.l.o.g. that $a = 0$) $\pi_t = \delta h_{t-1} + \rho \psi y_{t-1} + v_t$, and choosing suitable \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable constants C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 , we get

$$\beta_t = \frac{\gamma \pi_t (\pi_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1}) + C_1}{\gamma \pi_t^2 + C_2 \pi_t + C_3} = O(|v_t|^{-1}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Hence, $h_t(\gamma) - h_t(\gamma_0) = (\gamma - \gamma_0)v_t + R_{1,t-1} + R_{2,t-1}(v_t)$, where, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , $R_{1,t-1}$ is constant given by $R_{1,t-1} = (1 - \gamma)\alpha_{t-1}(\gamma) - (1 - \gamma_0)\alpha_{t-1}(\gamma_0) + (\gamma - \gamma_0)(\delta_0(h_{t-1}(\gamma) - h_{t-1}(\gamma_0)) + \rho_0 \psi_0 y_{t-1})$ and, by Eq. (A.6), for any $v \mapsto R_{2,t-1}(v)$ is a continuous function in v such that $R_{2,t-1}(v) = O(|v|^{-1})$. Now, by hypothesis, $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$. Since we can choose some finite $M > 0$ such that for any $|v_t| \geq M$ we have $|\gamma - \gamma_0||v_t| - |R_{1,t-1}| - |R_{2,t-1}(v_t)| > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|h_t(\gamma) - h_t(\gamma_0)| > 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) &\stackrel{(1)}{\geq} \mathbb{P}(|\gamma - \gamma_0||v_t| - |R_{1,t-1}| - |R_{2,t-1}(v_t)| > 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \mathbb{P}(|v_t| \geq M \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \mathbb{P}(|v_t| \geq M) \stackrel{(3)}{>} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Explanations: (1) uses that for any constants a, b, c, d , it follows from the (reverse) triangle inequality that $|ab + c + d| \geq |a||b| - |c| - |d|$, for (2) we used $\{|v_t| \geq M\} \subseteq \{|\gamma - \gamma_0||v_t| - |R_{1,t-1}| - |R_{2,t-1}(v_t)| > 0\}$, and (3) follows from the fact that the distribution of $v_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is supported on \mathbb{R} ensuring that the event $\{|v_t| \geq M\}$ has non-zero probability for any finite M . By the law of iterated expectations, we obtain $\mathbb{P}(|h_t(\gamma) - h_t(\gamma_0)| > 0) > 0$. So, by the converse, we have just shown that $\gamma = \gamma_0$ whenever $h_t(\gamma) = h_t(\gamma_0)$ a.s.. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. The proof is based on Francq et al. (2024, Thm 3.1). In the following, we verify counterparts of their conditions (i)-(iv) on page 1445. To begin with, note that their condition (i) is satisfied due to geometric ergodicity and Lemma 1. Their condition (ii) translates to

$$\{h_t(\gamma) = h_t(\gamma_0) \text{ a.s.}\} \Rightarrow \gamma = \gamma_0, \quad (ii)$$

where $h_t(\gamma) = \alpha_t(\gamma) + \beta_t^2(\gamma)(\pi_t - \alpha_t(\gamma))$ has been defined before. Akin to Francq and Zakoian (2004, Proof of Thm 3.1), we show the converse of (ii), which holds

by Lemma 2. Their condition (iii), in turn, requires

$$\theta \neq \theta_0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[(\pi_t - f_t(\theta))^2 - (\pi_t - f_t(\theta_0))^2] > 0, \quad (iii)$$

where, we recall $f_t(\theta) = \delta h_{t-1}(\theta) + \psi y_t$ and $\pi_t = f_t(\theta_0) + u_t$.

Proof of (iii). Now, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\pi_t - f_t(\theta))^2 - (\pi_t - f_t(\theta_0))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(f_t(\theta) - f_t(\theta_0))^2] \\ &= (\psi - \psi_0)^2 \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[(\psi - \psi_0)(a + \rho y_{t-1}) + \delta h_{t-1}(\gamma) - \delta_0 h_{t-1}(\gamma_0))^2] \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top \perp \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. Now, note that the inequality of the preceding display is strict for $\psi \neq \psi_0$. On the other hand, if $\psi = \psi_0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[(f_t(\theta) - f_t(\theta_0))^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\delta h_{t-1}(\gamma) - \delta_0 h_{t-1}(\gamma_0))^2],$$

which is zero if and only if $\delta h_t(\gamma) = \delta_0 h_t(\gamma_0)$ *a.s.*. But condition (ii) implies (note that for $(\psi, \gamma) = (\psi_0, \gamma_0)$ we obtain $\delta h_t(\gamma) = \delta_0 h_t(\gamma_0) \Leftrightarrow (\delta - \delta_0)h_t(\gamma_0) = 0$ *a.s.*, which for $\text{var}[h_t(\gamma_0)] > 0$ holds if and only if $\delta = \delta_0$)

$$\left\{ \psi = \psi_0 \wedge \delta h_t(\gamma) = \delta_0 h_t(\gamma_0) \text{ a.s.} \right\} \Rightarrow \theta = \theta_0.$$

So, if $\theta \neq \theta_0$ it has to hold that $\mathbb{E}[(f_t(\theta) - f_t(\theta_0))^2] > 0$. \square

Finally, their condition (iv) translates to requiring that any $\theta \neq \theta_0$ has a open ball $V_k(\theta)$ of radius $1/k$ centred around θ that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} \tilde{Q}_n(\theta^*) - \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_0) \right] > 0 \text{ a.s.}, \quad (iv)$$

where $\tilde{Q}_n(\cdot)$ is the sample objective based on the stationary solutions (w/o initials).

Proof of (iv). To begin with, note that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} \tilde{Q}_n(\theta^*) - \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_0) \right] \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} r_t(\theta^*),$$

where $r_t(\theta) = (\pi_t - f_t(\theta))^2 - (\pi_t - f_t(\theta_0))^2$. Because $\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} r_t(\theta^*)$ satisfies the

conditions of the ergodic theorem, it follows

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} \tilde{Q}_n(\theta^*) - \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_0) \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} (f_t(\theta^*) - f_t(\theta_0))^2 \right],$$

while, as $\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} (f_t(\theta^*) - f_t(\theta_0))^2$ is non-negative and increasing in k , it follows from the monotone convergence theorem, the construction of the open ball $V_k(\cdot)$, and condition (iii) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\inf_{\theta^* \in V_k(\theta) \cap \Theta} (f_t(\theta^*) - f_t(\theta_0))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[(f_t(\theta) - f_t(\theta_0))^2] > 0.$$

Strong consistency then follows from the compactness of Θ . \square

Proof of Lemma 3. (i) Using $\alpha_t(\gamma) = \gamma \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^i \pi_{t-i}$, we get

$$\dot{\alpha}_t(\gamma) = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^{i-1} (1 - (i+1)\gamma) \pi_{t-i}, \quad \ddot{\alpha}_t(\gamma) = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^{i-2} i[(i+1)\gamma - 2] \pi_{t-i},$$

and $\ddot{\alpha}_t(\gamma) = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^{i-3} i[3(i-1) - (i^2-1)\gamma] \pi_{t-i}$. Moreover, there are $c_m \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\alpha_t^{(m)}(\gamma)| \leq c_m \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} i^m (1-\gamma)^i |\pi_{t-i}|, \quad m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}.$$

The claim is a direct consequence of the inequality $|\sum_i a_i b_i|^k \leq (\sum_i a_i)^{k-1} \sum_i a_i |b_i|^k$ for $a_i \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, and the convergence of $\sum_i i^m (1-\gamma)^m$, $m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. (ii) Write $x_t(\gamma) := \pi_t - \alpha_{t-1}(\gamma)$. From $r_t(\gamma) = \gamma \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^i x_{t-i}^2(\gamma)$, we get from the c_r -inequality

$$0 < \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} r_t(\gamma) \leq 2\bar{\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^i (|\pi_{t-i}|^2 + \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\alpha_{t-i-1}(\gamma)|^2).$$

The uniform k -moment bound on $r_t(\gamma)$ follows from part (i) with $\mathbb{E}[|\pi|^{2k}] < \infty$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}_t(\gamma) &= \sum_{i=1}^t (1-\gamma)^{t-i} (x_i(\gamma) [x_i(\gamma) - 2\gamma \dot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)] - r_{i-1}(\gamma)), \\ \ddot{r}_t(\gamma) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^t (1-\gamma)^{t-i} (\gamma [\dot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)^2 - x_i(\gamma) \ddot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)] - 2x_i \dot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma) - \dot{r}_{i-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\ddot{r}_t(\gamma) = & \sum_{i=1}^t (1-\gamma)^{t-i} [6\dot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)(\dot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma) + \gamma\ddot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)) \\ & - 2x_i(\gamma)(3\ddot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma) + \gamma\ddot{\alpha}_{i-1}(\gamma)) - 3\ddot{r}_{i-1}(\gamma)]\end{aligned}$$

the moment bound on $r_t(\gamma)$ and part (i) yield the desired result for the derivatives.

(iii) By Eq. (A.8), we get

$$\dot{\beta}_t = \frac{1}{r_t(\gamma)} \sum_{i=1}^t (1-\gamma)^{t-i} h_i(\gamma),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}h_t(\gamma) &:= (1 - \gamma \frac{\dot{r}_t(\gamma)}{r_t}(\gamma))((1-\gamma)x_{t-1}(\gamma)x_t(\gamma) - \beta_{t-1}(\gamma)x_t(\gamma)^2) \\ &\quad + \gamma(2\beta_{t-1}(\gamma)x_t(\gamma)\dot{\alpha}_{t-1}(\gamma) - \dot{\alpha}_{t-1}(\gamma)((1-\gamma)x_{t-1}(\gamma) + x_t(\gamma))) \\ &= C_t(\gamma)A_t(\gamma) + B_t(\gamma),\end{aligned}$$

say, with $A_t(\gamma)$, $B_t(\gamma)$, and $C_t(\gamma)$ defined implicitly. By the previous arguments, there exists a finite constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\dot{\beta}_t(\gamma)|^k] &\leq \frac{1}{r^k} (\sum_{i=1}^t (1-\underline{\gamma})^{t-i})^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^t (1-\underline{\gamma})^{t-i} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |h_t(\gamma)|^k] \\ &\leq c \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |h_t(\gamma)|^k] < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality follows from:

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |h_t(\gamma)|^k] \leq 2^{k-1} (\mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |C_t(\gamma)|^{2k}] \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |A_t(\gamma)|^{2k}] + \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |B_t(\gamma)|^k]).$$

Since $r_t \geq r > 0$, we have $\sup_{\gamma} |U_t(\gamma)| \leq 1 + \bar{\gamma}r^{-1} \sup_{\gamma} |\dot{r}_t(\gamma)|$. Thus, by part (ii), finite $4k$ moments of π_t imply $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |U_t(\gamma)|^{2k}] < \infty$. Using $|\beta_t| \leq 1$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we have $\sup_{\gamma} |A_t(\gamma)| \leq |x_t(\gamma)||x_{t-1}(\gamma)| + x_t(\gamma)^2$. By Cauchy-Schwarz and part (i), we thus see that finite $4k$ moments of π_t imply $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |A_t(\gamma)|^{2k}] < \infty$. Similarly, we see that, by part (i), finite $2k$ moments suffice for $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |B_t(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$. This completes the proof for $\dot{\beta}_t$. Turning to $\ddot{\beta}_t$, let $\beta_t(\gamma) = m_t(\gamma)/r_t(\gamma)$, $m_t(\gamma) := r_t(\gamma)\beta_t(\gamma)$ so that $m_t(\gamma) = \gamma \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (1-\gamma)^j x_{t-j}(\gamma)x_{t-j-1}(\gamma)$. Then, by the quotient rule

$$\ddot{\beta}(\gamma) = \frac{\ddot{m}_t(\gamma)r_t(\gamma) - m_t(\gamma)\ddot{r}_t(\gamma)}{r_t(\gamma)^2} - 2\frac{\dot{m}_t(\gamma)\dot{r}_t(\gamma)}{r_t(\gamma)^2} + 2\frac{m_t\dot{r}_t(\gamma)^2}{r_t(\gamma)^3}.$$

Thus, because $r_t \geq r > 0$, there is a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c}|\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma)| \leq |\ddot{m}_t(\gamma)||r_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{m}_t(\gamma)||\dot{r}_t(\gamma)| + |m_t(\gamma)|(|\ddot{r}_t(\gamma)| + \dot{r}_t(\gamma)^2).$$

Thus, it follows from the preceding discussion that finite $4k$ -moments of π_t ensure $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$. Similarly, it can be shown that there is a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c}\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma) \leq & |\ddot{m}_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{r}_t(\gamma)||\ddot{m}_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{m}_t(\gamma)|(|\ddot{r}_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{r}_t(\gamma)|^2) \\ & + |m_t(\gamma)|(|\ddot{r}_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{r}_t(\gamma)||\ddot{r}_t(\gamma)| + |\dot{r}_t(\gamma)|^3). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $6k$ -moments of π_t suffice to show that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma)|^k] < \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. Following Saikkonen (1995) and Seo (2011), we show that for $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $r_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(\nu) := \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|\eta\| > \nu/r_n\}$, $\eta := (\delta, \psi - \psi_0)^\top$, for some $\nu > 0$, we have

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma, \eta \in \mathcal{B}_n(\nu)} D_n(\theta) > 0.$$

This implies that the NLS estimators of (δ, ψ) are with probability approaching one outside $\mathcal{B}_n(\nu)$; implying, because ν is arbitrary, that they are \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators of $(0, \psi_0)^\top$. In order to complete the proof, define

$$u_{1,t}(\gamma, \delta) := -(\delta - \delta_0)h_{t-1}(\gamma), \quad u_{2,t}(\gamma, \psi) := u_t - \delta_0(h_{t-1}(\gamma) - h_{t-1}(\gamma_0)) - (\psi - \psi_0)y_t,$$

so that $Q_n(\theta) = Q_{1,n}(\theta) + Q_{2,n}(\gamma, \psi)$, where

$$Q_{1,n}(\theta) := 2 \sum_{t=1}^n u_{2,t}(\theta)u_{1,t}(\theta) + \sum_{t=1}^n u_{1,t}(\theta)^2, \quad Q_{2,n}(\gamma, \psi) := \sum_{t=1}^n u_{2,t}(\gamma, \psi)^2.$$

Note that $Q_{1,n}(\gamma, \delta_0, \psi) = 0$ and thus $Q_n(\gamma, \delta_0, \psi) = Q_{2,n}(\gamma, \psi)$. Moreover, if $\delta_0 = 0$, then $Q_{2,n}(\gamma, \psi) = Q_{2,n}(\gamma_0, \psi)$. So,

$$D_n(\theta) := Q_n(\theta) - Q_n(\theta_0) = Q_{1,n}(\theta) + Q_{2,n}(\gamma_0, \psi) - Q_{2,n}(\gamma_0, \psi_0)$$

with $Q_{2,n}(\gamma_0, \psi) - Q_{2,n}(\gamma_0, \psi_0) = (\psi - \psi_0)^2 \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 - 2(\psi - \psi_0) \sum_{t=1}^n y_t u_t$ and

$$Q_{1,n}(\theta) = -2\delta \sum_{t=1}^n h_{t-1}(\gamma)(u_t - (\psi - \psi_0)y_t) + \delta^2 \sum_{t=1}^n h_{t-1}(\gamma)^2.$$

Now, with $\eta = (\delta, \psi - \psi_0)^\top$ and $z_t(\gamma) = (h_{t-1}(\gamma), y_t)^\top$, we get

$$D_n(\theta) = \eta^\top \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) z_t(\gamma)^\top \eta - 2\eta^\top \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) u_t,$$

or,

$$\frac{1}{\xi_n} D_n(\theta) = \xi_n \frac{\eta^\top Z_n(\gamma) \eta}{\|\eta\|^2} - 2 \frac{\eta^\top S_n(\gamma)}{\|\eta\|}, \quad \xi_n := \sqrt{n} \|\eta\|.$$

Note that, uniformly in $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have $Z_n(\gamma) \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E}[Z_n(\gamma)]$. Since for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_n(\gamma)] \succ 0$, it follows from continuity of $Z_n(\gamma)$ and compactness of Γ that there is a $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that, with probability approaching one,

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t(\gamma) z_t(\gamma)^\top \right) \geq c.$$

Moreover, by Hansen (1996b, Thm 2) with $q = 2$, $S_n(\cdot)$ is stochastically equicontinuous. By the Cramer-Wold device and the CLT for MDS, we obtain *fidi*-convergence, implying $S_n(\gamma) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{S}(\gamma)$ in $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$, where \mathbb{S} is a Gaussian process with $\text{cov}[\mathbb{S}(\gamma_1), \mathbb{S}(\gamma_2)] = \sigma_u^2 \mathbb{E}[z(\gamma_1) z(\gamma_2)^\top]$. This implies that $S_n(\gamma) = O_p(1)$ uniformly in $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Therefore, with probability approaching one,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma, \eta \in \mathcal{B}_n(\nu)} \frac{1}{\xi_n} D_n(\theta) &\geq c \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}_n(\nu)} \xi_n - O_p(1) = c \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}_n(\nu)} \sqrt{n} \|\eta\| - O_p(1) \\ &\geq \sqrt{n} \frac{c\nu}{r_n} - O_p(1) \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

A.3 Results of Section 4.2

Proof of Lemma 4 (a). To that end, choose an arbitrary 3×1 vector $\iota := (\iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3$. It remains to show that $\iota^\top A \iota = \mathbb{E}[(\iota^\top s_{t+1})^2] > 0$. Set

$$z_t := \iota^\top s_{t+1} = \iota_1 h_t + \delta_0 \iota_2 \dot{h}_t + \iota_3 y_{t+1}.$$

The proof proceeds by considering four cases.

Case 1): $\iota_3 \neq 0$. By construction $y_{t+1} = a + \rho y_t + \varepsilon_{t+1}$, with $\varepsilon_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t \sim (0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$. Because h_t and \dot{h}_t are \mathcal{F}_t -measurable, it follows $\mathbb{E}[(\iota^\top s_{t+1})^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \geq (\iota_3 \sigma_\varepsilon)^2 > 0$, which, by the law of iterated expectations implies the claim.

Note. In the following, we use the following variance lower bound: Let A and B be two events with $A \cap B = \emptyset$, X be a random variable with $\mathbb{E}[X^2] < \infty$, and

$X \geq u$ on A , $X \leq v$ on B , then

$$\text{var}[X] \geq pq(u - v)^2, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $p := \mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, $q := \mathbb{P}(B) > 0$. This follows from Cauchy-Schwarz for $\text{var}[X] \geq \text{cov}[X, Y]^2 / \text{var}[Y]$, with $Y := q1_A - p1_B$, $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 0$, and $\text{var}[Y] = pq(p+q)$.

Case 2): $\iota_1 \neq 0$, $\iota_2 = \iota_3 = 0$. First, note that (assuming, without loss of generality, $a = 0$)

$$h_t = (1 - \beta_t^2)(1 - \gamma_0)\alpha_{t-1} + (\gamma_0 + (1 - \gamma_0)\beta_t^2)\pi_t = b_t\alpha_{t-1} + c_tM_{t-1} + c_tv_t,$$

where $v_t := \psi_0\varepsilon_t + u_t$, while $M_{t-1} := \delta_0h_{t-1}(\gamma_0) + \psi_0\rho_0y_{t-1}$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable. Moreover,

$$b_t := (1 - \beta_t^2)(1 - \gamma_0) \in [0, 1 - \gamma_0]$$

and

$$c_t := \gamma_0 + (1 - \gamma_0)\beta_t^2 \in [\gamma_0, 1]$$

are, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , continuous function in v_t . We thus may write $b_t = b(v)$ and $c_t = c(v)$ for a given realization under the conditional law of v_t . Now, for the \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable constant $B_{t-1} := |\alpha_{t-1}|(1 - \gamma_0) + |M_{t-1}|$, we obtain

$$-B_{t-1} \leq b(v)\alpha_{t-1} + c(v)M_{t-1} \leq B_{t-1} \quad \mu\text{-a.e. } v,$$

where μ is the conditional law of v_t given \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . Now, because $c(v) \geq \gamma_0 > 0$, we have for some $\bar{C} > 0$ on $C_+ := \{v_t \geq \bar{C}\}$, $h_t \geq -B_{t-1} + \gamma_0\bar{C}$ and on $C_- := \{v_t \leq -\bar{C}\}$, we have $h_t \leq B_{t-1} - \gamma_0\bar{C}$. Let \bar{C} be large enough such that $\gamma_0\bar{C} > B_{t-1} + 1$. Then $h_t \geq 1$ on C_+ and $h_t \leq -1$ on C_- . Therefore, by Eq. (A.7), $\mathbb{E}[h_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \text{var}[h_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq 4\mathbb{P}(C_+ | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})\mathbb{P}(C_- | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0$, using that the tail events have positive probability and are independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . The claim then follows from $\mathbb{E}[(\iota^\top s_{t+1})^2] = \iota_1^2 \mathbb{E}[h_t^2]$ and the law of iterated expectations.

Case 3): $\iota_2 \neq 0$, $\iota_1 = \iota_3 = 0$. Note that

$$\dot{\alpha}_t = (1 - \gamma_0)\dot{\alpha}_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1} + \pi_t = (1 - \gamma_0)\dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + \delta h_{t-1} + \rho_0\psi_0y_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1} + v_t.$$

Moreover, $\pi_t - \alpha_t = (1 - \gamma_0)(\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1})$, where $\pi_t - \alpha_{t-1} = \delta_0h_{t-1} + \rho_0\psi_0y_{t-1} -$

$\alpha_{t-1} + v_t$. Thus, for

$$N_{t-1} := \delta_0 h_{t-1} + \rho_0 \psi_0 y_{t-1} - \alpha_{t-1}, \quad d_t := (1 - \beta_t^2) + 2(1 - \gamma_0) \beta_t \dot{\beta}_t,$$

and, see Case 2), $b_t = (1 - \beta_t^2)(1 - \gamma_0)$, we get

$$\dot{h}_t = b_t \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + d_t N_{t-1} + d_t v_t.$$

Moreover, with $x_t = \pi_t - \alpha_{t-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\beta}_t &= \dot{\beta}_{t-1} + \frac{1}{r_t} \left(1 - \gamma \frac{\dot{r}_t}{r_t} \right) ((1 - \gamma_0) x_{t-1} x_t - \beta_{t-1} x_t^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_0}{r_t} (2\beta_{t-1} x_t \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} - \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} ((1 - \gamma_0) x_{t-1} + x_t) - \dot{\beta}_{t-1} x_t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Given \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , $\beta_t = \beta(v_t)$ and $\dot{\beta}_t = \dot{\beta}(v_t)$ are continuous functions of v_t , and thus also $b_t = b(v_t)$ and $d_t = d(v_t)$. Moreover,

$$\beta(v) \rightarrow 0, \quad \dot{\beta}(v) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } |v| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus, there exists a finite \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable constant $L > 0$ such that $d(v) > 1/2$ on $E_L := \{v : |v| \geq L\}$. Moreover, given \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , we have for the continuous function $v \mapsto b(v) \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + d(v) N_{t-1} \rightarrow (1 - \gamma_0) \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + N_{t-1}$ as $|v| \mapsto \infty$ so that

$$\sup_{|v| \geq L} |b(v) \dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + d(v) N_{t-1}| =: B_{t-1} < \infty.$$

So, on $L^+ = \{v_t \geq L\}$, $\dot{h}_t \geq -B_{t-1} + L/2$, while on $L^- = \{v_t \leq -L\}$, $\dot{h}_t \leq B_{t-1} - L/2$. Choose L such that $L \geq 2(B_{t-1} + 1)$, we get, similarly to Case 2), $\text{var}[\dot{h}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq 4\mathbb{P}(L^+ \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})\mathbb{P}(L^- \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0$. The claim follows again by the law of iterated expectations.

Proof of Eq. (A.9). By Eq. (A.6), it follows $\beta_t = \beta(v_t)$, where $\beta(v) = O(|v|^{-1})$. Turning to $\dot{\beta}(v)$, it follows similarly from Eq. (A.8), that $\dot{\beta}(v) = O(|v|^{-1})$.

Case 4): $(\iota_1, \iota_2) \neq (0, 0)$, $\iota_3 = 0$. To begin with, note that conditionally on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , z_t is a continuous function of $v_t = \psi_0 \varepsilon_t + u_t$ given by

$$z(v) = K(v) + S(v)v,$$

where $S(v) := \iota_1 c(v) + \iota_2 \delta_0 d(v)$, while $K(v) := \iota_1 K_1(v) + \iota_2 \delta_0 K_2(v)$, with

$$K_1(v) := b(v)\alpha_{t-1} + c(v)M_{t-1} \text{ and } K_2(v) := b(v)\dot{\alpha}_{t-1} + d(v)N_{t-1}.$$

We first establish two intermediate results

$$\mathbb{P}(|S(v)| > 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0 \Rightarrow \text{var}[z(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] > 0 \quad (\text{A})$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(d(v) \neq c(v)/\gamma_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(|S(v)| > 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0. \quad (\text{B})$$

Proof of (A). The proof is similar to the argument employed in verifying Cases 2) and 3). By hypothesis, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $G := \{|S(v)| > \eta\}$ has positive probability $\mathbb{P}(G \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0$. Moreover, for any $|v| > L$, $L < \infty$, $M_L := \sup_{|v| \geq L} |K(v)| < \infty$. Now, define $A = G \cap \{v \geq L\}$, $B = G \cap \{v \leq -L\}$. So, $z(v) \geq -M_L + \eta L$ on A , while $z(v) \leq M_L - \eta L$ on B . Thus, by picking L large enough we get $\text{var}[z(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \mathbb{P}(A \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})\mathbb{P}(B \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})(\eta L - 2M_L)^2 > 0$.

Proof of (B). Consider first the case $\iota_1 \gamma_0 + \iota_2 \delta_0 \neq 0$. We know that $S(v) \rightarrow \iota_1 \gamma_0 + \iota_2 \delta_0$ as $|v| \rightarrow \infty$. Or, there exists $L < \infty$ such that $|S(v)| > 0$ for all $v \in \{|v| \geq L\}$. Because $\{|v| \geq L\}$ has positive probability $\mathbb{P}(|S(v)| > 0) > 0$. Consider now the case $\iota_1 \gamma_0 + \iota_2 \delta_0 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \iota_1 = -\iota_2 \delta_0 / \gamma_0$ and $S(v) = \iota_2 \delta_0 (d(v) - c(v)/\gamma_0)$. But, by hypothesis, $d(v) \neq c(v)/\gamma_0$ with positive probability, thus ensuring $\mathbb{P}(|S(v)| > 0) > 0$.

It thus remains to prove $d(v) \neq c(v)/\gamma_0$ has positive probability, i.e., we show that $\mathbb{P}(|\Phi(v)| > 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) > 0$, with

$$\Phi(v) := d(v)\gamma_0 - c(v) = -\beta(v)^2 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\dot{\beta}(v)\beta(v).$$

To see this, define $T_t := \Delta_t(\Delta_t + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\dot{\alpha}_t)$, where $\Delta_t := \pi_t - \alpha_t$. Note that $T_t = T(v_t)$ is a quadratic function in v_t ; in particular, $T(v_t) = (1 - \gamma)^2(1 + 2\gamma)v_t^2 + B_{t-1}v_t + C_{t-1}$ for \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable constants B_{t-1} and C_{t-1} . Since the leading coefficient $(1 - \gamma)^2(1 + 2\gamma)$ is strictly positive, the polynomial $v \mapsto T(v)$ is non-degenerate. Full support of v_t ensures that $\mathbb{P}(|T_t| > 0) > 0$, which, by stationarity, holds for any t . Hence, there exists an event $A \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, with $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$, such that for any history $\omega \notin A$, $T_{t-1}(\omega) \neq 0$. To that end, fix such a history ω outside the probability-zero event A . Put differently, the following three sentences that

conclude the proof can be restricted to the probability-one event on which $T_{t-1} \neq 0$: From Eqs. (A.6) and (A.8) one gets for large v (or, equivalently, as $\pi = \pi(v)$ is affine in v , large π), $\beta(v) = \pi^{-1}\Delta_{t-1}\{1 + o(1)\}$ and $\dot{\beta}(v) = -\pi^{-1}\dot{\alpha}_{t-1}\{1 + o(1)\}$. This yields, $\Phi(v) = -\pi^{-2}T_{t-1}\{1 + o(1)\}$ as $|v| \rightarrow \infty$. Because, T_{t-1} is non-zero almost surely, the claim follows by picking v sufficiently large; this is justified because v has strictly positive tail probability.

Proof of Lemma 4 (b). Pick $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, and define $g_t(\theta) := -\dot{f}_t(\theta)\dot{f}_t(\theta)^\top + (\pi_t - f_t(\theta))H_t(\theta)$. Before proceeding, note that $\dot{f}_t(\theta)$ and $H_t(\theta)$ are affine in $(\delta, \psi)^\top$; i.e. the complications arise only due to the nonlinear γ -functionals. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(\theta_1) - g_t(\theta_2) &= \dot{f}_t(\theta_1)\dot{f}_t(\theta_1)^\top - \dot{f}_t(\theta_2)\dot{f}_t(\theta_2)^\top \\ &\quad + [(\pi_t - f_t(\theta_1))H_t(\theta_1) - (\pi_t - f_t(\theta_2))H_t(\theta_2)] \\ &=: A_t(\theta_1, \theta_2) + B_t(\theta_1, \theta_2), \end{aligned}$$

say. By $|A_t(\theta_1, \theta_2)|_2 \leq (|\dot{f}_t(\theta_1)|_2 + |\dot{f}_t(\theta_2)|_2)|\dot{f}_t(\theta_1) - \dot{f}_t(\theta_2)|_2$, the mean-value theorem yields

$$|A_t(\theta_1, \theta_2)|_2 \leq 2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\dot{f}_t(\theta)|_2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |H_t(\theta)|_2 |\theta_1 - \theta_2|_2.$$

Next, $B_t(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (f_t(\theta_2) - f_t(\theta_1))H_t(\theta_2) + (\pi_t - f_t(\theta_1))(H_t(\theta_1) - H_t(\theta_2))$

$$\begin{aligned} |B_t(\theta_1, \theta_2)|_2 &\leq [\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\dot{f}_t(\theta)|_2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |H_t(\theta)|_2 + (|\pi_t| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f_t(\theta)|_2) \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\nabla_\theta H_t(\theta)|_2] \\ &\quad \times |\theta_1 - \theta_2|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $|g_t(\theta_1) - g_t(\theta_2)|_2 \leq C_t |\theta_1 - \theta_2|_2$, where

$$C_t := 3 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\dot{f}_t(\theta)|_2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |H_t(\theta)|_2 + (|\pi_t| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f_t(\theta)|_2) \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\nabla_\theta H_t(\theta)|_2 = 3C_{1,t} + C_{2,t},$$

say, where $C_{1,t}, C_{2,t}$ are implicitly defined. It thus remains to be shown that $B_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n C_t = O_p(1)$. By Markov's inequality, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[C_t] < \infty$. By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E}[C_{1,t}] \leq \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\dot{f}_t(\theta)|_2^2] \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |H_t(\theta)|_2^2] < \infty,$$

where the strict equality follows, by Lemma 3, from the assumed finite 8 moments.

Next, by Hölder's inequality with $p = 4$, $q = 4/3$ ($1/p + 1/q = 1$), we get

$$\mathbb{E}[C_{2,t}] \leq \mathbb{E}^{1/4}[(|\pi_t| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f_t(\theta)|_2)^4] \mathbb{E}^{3/4}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\nabla_\theta H_t(\theta)|_2^{4/3}].$$

Lemma 3 directly shows that the first factor is finite. Note that $\nabla_\theta H_t(\theta)$ involves up to the third derivatives of the recursions; in particular, we need a uniform $q = 4/3$ -moment bound of $\ddot{\beta}_t(\gamma)$. By Lemma 3, this requires $6 \times 4/3 = 8$ moments. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[C_t] < \infty$, completing the proof. \square

A.4 Results of Section 4.3

Lemma A.3 *Suppose Assumption B holds. Then (i) $F(\beta; \lambda)$ is continuously differentiable in (β, λ) . If, in addition, $\psi_0 \neq 0$, then (ii) there exists $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\inf_{\beta \in [0,1]} \|F_\lambda(\beta, \lambda_0)\| \geq c$. If, in addition, $\rho_0 > 0$, then (iii) $G(0) < 0 < G(1)$.*

Proof of Lemma A.3. Define

$$D(\beta; \lambda) := \psi^2(\delta\beta^2\rho + 1) + (1 - \rho^2)(1 - \delta\beta^2\rho)(\sigma_u/\sigma_\varepsilon)^2,$$

so that $F(\beta; \lambda) = \delta\beta^2 + \psi^2\rho(1 - \delta^2\beta^4)/D(\beta; \lambda)$. Under Assumption B, $1 \pm \delta\beta^2\rho > 0$, $1 - \rho^2 > 0$, and $\sigma_u^2/\sigma_\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Hence $D(\beta; \lambda) > 0$ uniformly in β, λ ; note that we only require Assumption B. Moreover, $F(\beta; \lambda)$ is a ratio of polynomial functions with nondegenerate denominator and thus in C^1 in on $(\beta, \lambda) \in [0, 1] \times B$. For part (ii), it suffices to show that individual partial derivatives are non-zero: If $\rho_0 = 0$, then

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} F(\beta; \lambda_0)| = \frac{\psi_0^2(1 - \delta_0^2\beta^4)}{\psi_0^2 + (\sigma_u/\sigma_\varepsilon)^2} > 0.$$

If $\rho_0 \neq 0$, then

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_u^2} F(\beta; \lambda_0)| = \psi_0^2 \frac{(1 - \delta_0^2\beta^4)(1 - \rho_0^2)(1 - \delta_0\beta^2\rho_0)}{D(\beta; \lambda_0)\sigma_\varepsilon^2}.$$

If $\psi \neq 0$, both displays are strictly positive uniformly over $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Part (iii) follows because $F(0) = \psi_0^2\rho_0/(\psi_0^2 + (1 - \rho_0^2)(\sigma_u/\sigma_\varepsilon)^2)$ and $F(1) = \delta_0 + \psi_0^2\rho_0(1 - \delta_0^2)/(\psi_0^2(\delta_0\rho_0 + 1) + (1 - \rho_0^2)(1 - \delta_0\rho_0)(\sigma_u/\sigma_\varepsilon)^2)$. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. By Assumption B, the denominator of $F(\beta, \lambda)$ is strictly positive on $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and uniformly in λ , hence $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ (and thus G) are continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of $(\beta, \lambda) = (\beta_{i,0}, \lambda_0)$ for each equilibrium $\beta_{i,0}$ $i \in \{1, \dots, r_0\}$. Next, define $G_\beta := \partial_\beta G$, $G_{\beta\beta} := \partial_{\beta\beta}^2 G$, and the 5×1 Jacobian

$G_\lambda := \nabla_\lambda G$. Moreover, we know that λ_n satisfies $\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) \rightarrow_d \mathbb{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$. Equilibria at λ_n are the roots of $G(\beta; \lambda_n) = \beta - F(\beta; \lambda_n) = 0$. Denote by r_n the number of distinct roots of $\beta \mapsto G_n(\beta; \lambda_n)$ in $[0, 1]$, and by r_0 the corresponding number of roots of $G(\beta; \lambda_0) = 0$. Since $G(\cdot; \lambda_0)$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$ and $G(0; \lambda_0) < 0 < G(1; \lambda_0)$, the number of simple roots (having multiplicity 1) is odd implying the $r_0 = 2$ involves one simple and one root with multiplicity 2.

Part 1: $r_0 \in \{1, 3\}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, r_0\}$, since $G(\vartheta_{i,0}; \lambda_0) = 0$, we can write

$$0 = G(\vartheta_{i,n}; \lambda_n) = G(\vartheta_{i,n}; \lambda_n) - G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_n) + G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_n) - G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0).$$

By the mean value theorem in β , $G(\vartheta_{i,n}; \lambda_n) - G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_n) = G_\beta(\bar{\vartheta}_{i,n}; \lambda_n)(\vartheta_{i,n} - \beta_{i,0})$, for some $\bar{\vartheta}_{i,n}$ connecting the line segment between $\vartheta_{i,n}$ and $\beta_{i,0}$. Analogously, $G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_n) - G(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0) = G_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \bar{\lambda}_n)^\top (\lambda_n - \lambda_0)$, for some $\bar{\lambda}_n$ on the line segment joining λ_0 to λ_n . Combining and rearranging gives

$$\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_{i,n} - \beta_{i,0}) = -G_\beta(\bar{\vartheta}_{i,n}; \lambda_n)^{-1} G_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \bar{\lambda}_n)^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) = J_i^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0),$$

where $J_i := F_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0)/(1 - F_\beta(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0))$. By Proposition 2 and the continuous mapping theorem, $G_\beta(\bar{\vartheta}_{i,n}; \lambda_n) \rightarrow_p G_\beta(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0)$ and $G_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \bar{\lambda}_n) \rightarrow_p G_\lambda(\beta_{i,0}; \lambda_0)$. Hence, by Slutsky, $\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_{i,n} - \beta_{i,0}) \rightarrow_d J_i^\top \mathbb{Z}$.

Part 2: $r_0 = 2$. Let β_0 be the simple root and β_0^\dagger the root of $G(\beta; \lambda_0)$ with multiplicity 2. Then

$$G(\beta_0^\dagger; \lambda_0) = 0, \quad G_\beta(\beta_0^\dagger; \lambda_0) = 0, \quad G_{\beta\beta}(\beta_0^\dagger; \lambda_0) = 2a, \quad B := G_\lambda(\beta_0^\dagger; \lambda_0). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Note that $a \neq 0$ by the definition of β_0^\dagger having multiplicity 2. Moreover, under Assumption B, $B \neq 0$. Now, a second-order Taylor expansion of $G(\beta; \lambda_n)$ around $(\beta_0^\dagger, \lambda_0)$ gives, uniformly for β in a neighbourhood of β_0^\dagger ,

$$G(\beta; \lambda_n) = a(\beta - \beta_0^\dagger)^2 + B^\top (\lambda_n - \lambda_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Consequently, the number of zeros of $\beta \mapsto G(\beta; \lambda_n)$ near β_0^\dagger equals (on an event with probability converging to one) the number of real solutions of

$$a\sqrt{n}(\beta - \beta_0^\dagger)^2 + B^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) = 0.$$

Because $\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) \rightarrow_d \mathbb{Z}$ is centred and symmetric, there are (besides the simple

root β_0) no additional roots if $a^{-1}B^\top \mathbb{Z} < 0$, or, put differently

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{r_n = 3\} = \mathbb{P}\{a^{-1}B^\top \mathbb{Z} < 0\} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{r_n = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{a^{-1}B^\top \mathbb{Z} > 0\} = \frac{1}{2},$$

and $\mathbb{P}\{r_n = 2\} \rightarrow 0$; i.e. $r_n \rightarrow_d \text{Bern}(1/2)$ on the set $\{1, 3\}$.

The root, ϑ_n , say, that continues the simple root β_0 satisfies the same linear expansion as in Part 1, i.e. $\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_n - \beta_0) \rightarrow_d J^\top \mathbb{Z}$. When $r_n = 3$, the two roots ϑ_n^\pm , say, with $\vartheta_n^- < \beta_0^\dagger < \vartheta_n^+$, that split from the double root solve (on an event with probability converging to one)

$$a\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_n^\pm - \beta_0^\dagger)^2 = -B^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0),$$

so

$$n^{1/4}(\vartheta_n^\pm - \beta_0^\dagger) \rightarrow_d \pm \sqrt{|a|^{-1} |B^\top \mathbb{Z}|}.$$

Collecting, we have jointly

$$(\sqrt{n}(\vartheta_n - \beta_0), n^{1/4}(\vartheta_n^\pm - \beta_0^\dagger)) \rightarrow_d (J^\top \mathbb{Z}, \pm \sqrt{|a^{-1}B^\top \mathbb{Z}|}),$$

with the Bernoulli limit for r_n as above. Next, we derive the properties of $\sqrt{n}(\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger)$. Recall $2a = G_{\beta\beta}(\beta_0^\dagger)$ and $6c = G_{\beta\beta\beta}(\beta_0^\dagger)$. Then for $x \rightarrow 0$:

$$G(\beta_0^\dagger + x) = G(\beta_0^\dagger) + xG_\beta(\beta_0^\dagger) + ax^2 + cx^3 + O(x^4),$$

which, using $G(\beta_0^\dagger) = G_\beta(\beta_0^\dagger) = 0$, simplifies to $G(\beta_0^\dagger + x) = ax^2 + cx^3 + O(x^4)$ as $x \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, for the 5×1 vectors $B := G_\lambda(\beta_0^\dagger)$, $D := G_{\beta\lambda}(\beta_0^\dagger)$, we get

$$G_\lambda(\beta_0^\dagger + x) = B + xD + O(x^2).$$

Moreover, for small $y \in \mathbb{R}^5$:

$$G(\beta; \lambda_0 + y) = G(\beta) + G_\lambda(\beta)^\top y + \frac{1}{2}y^\top G_{\lambda\lambda}(\beta)y + O(\|y\|^3).$$

This yields with $\beta = \beta_0^\dagger + x$ and $y = \Delta_n := \lambda_n - \lambda_0$:

$$G_n(\beta_0^\dagger + x) = G(\beta_0^\dagger + x) + G_\lambda(\beta_0^\dagger + x)^\top \Delta_n + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_n^\top G_{\lambda\lambda}(\beta_0^\dagger + x)\Delta_n + O(\|\Delta_n\|^3).$$

We thus obtain for $E := \frac{1}{2}G_{\lambda\lambda}(\beta_0^\dagger)$

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(\beta_0^\dagger + x) &= ax^2 + cx^3 + O(x^4) + (B + xD + O(x^2))^\top \Delta_n \\ &\quad + \Delta_n^\top (E + O(x)) \Delta_n + O(\|\Delta_n\|^3) \\ &= ax^2 + cx^3 + B^\top \Delta_n + xD^\top \Delta_n + \Delta_n^\top E \Delta_n + R_n, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_n = O(x^4 + x^2 \|\Delta_n\| + x \|\Delta_n\|^2 + \|\Delta_n\|^3).$$

Next, when $r_n = 3$, the roots ϑ_n^\pm satisfy $G_n(\vartheta_n^\pm) = 0$ so that we get with $x_n^\pm := \vartheta_n^\pm - \beta_0^\dagger$ from the previous display

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= G_n(\beta_0^\dagger + x_n^\pm) \\ &= a(x_n^\pm)^2 + c(x_n^\pm)^3 + B^\top \Delta_n + x_n^\pm D^\top \Delta_n + \Delta_n^\top E \Delta_n + O_p(n^{-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

where the order of the remainder uses $x_n^\pm = O_p(n^{-1/4})$ and $\Delta_n = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Next, define $u_n = (x_n^+ + x_n^-)/2$, $v_n = (x_n^+ - x_n^-)/2$, and note that $x_n^\pm = u_n \pm v_n$ and that $u_n = \frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger$. Thus, by subtracting Eq. (A.11), we get

$$0 = a4u_nv_n + c(6u_n^2v_n + 2v_n^3) + 2v_n D^\top \Delta_n + O_p(n^{-1}) \tag{A.12}$$

and, by adding Eq. (A.11),

$$0 = a(u_n^2 + v_n^2) + B^\top \Delta_n + c(u_n^3 + 3u_nv_n^2) + u_n D^\top \Delta_n + \Delta_n^\top E \Delta_n + O_p(n^{-1}). \tag{A.13}$$

We first show that $u_n = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ using Eq. (A.13). Since $r_n = 3$, $\frac{1}{a}B^\top \Delta_n < 0$ a.s. and $av_n^2 + \frac{1}{a}B^\top \Delta_n = O_p(n^{-1})$. So, on $\{u_n \neq 0\}$, Eq. (A.13) becomes after dividing by u_n^2 :

$$0 = a + c(u_n + 3u_n^{-1}v_n^2) + u_n^{-1}D^\top \Delta_n + u_n^{-2}\Delta_n^\top E \Delta_n + u_n^{-2}O_p(n^{-1}).$$

We know $\Delta_n = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ and, from Corollary 3, that $v_n^2 = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Suppose now, for the sake of contradiction, that $u_n = O_p(n^{-\iota})$, $\iota \in (0, 1/2)$. Then, $u_n^{-1}v_n^2 = O_p(n^{\iota-1/2})$, $u_n^{-1}\|\Delta_n\| = O_p(n^{\iota-1/2})$, and $u_n^{-2}n^{-1} = O_p(n^{2(\iota-1/2)})$. Because $\iota - 1/2 < 0$, this implies that all these terms vanish and $a = 0$, which is a contradiction as $a \neq 0$ by definition of the multiplicity. This shows that $u_n = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Next, we use Eq. (A.12), to obtain the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}u_n$. Because $r_n = 3$,

$v_n \neq 0$ a.s.. Hence dividing Eq. (A.12) by $2v_n$ yields

$$0 = 2au_n + c(3u_n^2 + v_n^2) + D^\top \Delta_n + O_p(n^{-3/4}).$$

where the order of magnitude is due to the fact that $v_n = O_p(n^{-1/4})$. Therefore, using again $av_n^2 + \frac{1}{a}B^\top \Delta_n = O_p(n^{-1})$ and $u_n^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$

$$0 = 2au_n - \frac{c}{a}B^\top \Delta_n + D^\top \Delta_n + O_p(n^{-3/4}),$$

or

$$\sqrt{n}u_n = \sqrt{n}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_n^+ + \vartheta_n^-) - \beta_0^\dagger\right) = \frac{1}{2a}\left(\frac{c}{a}B - D\right)^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) + O_p(n^{-1/4}),$$

which yields the claim. \square

A.5 Results of Section 4.4

Proof of Corollary 4. The claim follows from Proposition 3 and Newey and McFadden (1994, Thm 7.4). \square

Proof of Corollary 5. Note that $F_n(\gamma) = t_n(\gamma)^2$, where, by Frisch-Waugh-Lovell,

$$t_n(\gamma) = \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t \tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma)}{\hat{\sigma}_u(\gamma) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma)^2 \right)^{1/2}}.$$

Here, $\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma) := h_t(\gamma) - \tilde{b}_n(\gamma)^\top z_t$, $\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) := (\sum_{t=1}^n z_t z_t^\top)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma)$ are the residuals upon partialling out $z_t = (1, y_t)^\top$ and

$$\hat{\sigma}_u^2(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\pi_t - x_t(\gamma)^\top b_n(\gamma))^2, \quad b_n(\gamma) := \left(\sum_t x_t(\gamma) x_t(\gamma)^\top \right)^{-1} \sum_t x_t(\gamma) \pi_t,$$

where $x_t(\gamma) = (h_{t-1}(\gamma), z_t^\top)^\top$. Let $\tilde{h}_t(\gamma)$ denote the population residual $\tilde{h}_t(\gamma) := h_t(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)^\top z_t$, $\tilde{b}(\gamma) := \mathbb{E}[z_t z_t^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma)]$ and define the infeasible t -statistic:

$$\tilde{t}_n(\gamma) := \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma)}{\sigma_u \omega(\gamma)}, \quad \omega^2(\gamma) := \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_t(\gamma)^2].$$

Set $b(\gamma) := \mathbb{E}[x_t(\gamma) x_t(\gamma)^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[x_t(\gamma) \pi_t]$ and let us first prove the following:

$$(i) \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)\| = o_p(1) \quad (ii) \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|b_n(\gamma) - b(\gamma)\| = o_p(1)$$

Proof of (i) and (ii). Next,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)\| &\leq \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t z_t^\top \right)^{-1} - \mathbb{E}[z_t z_t^\top]^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t z_t^\top \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}[z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma)] \right\|.\end{aligned}$$

By the LLN, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t z_t^\top \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E}[z_t z_t^\top] \succ 0$. Because, by Lemma 3, $\mathbb{E}[\sup_\gamma h_t(\gamma)^2] < \infty$, the LLN for stationary ergodic processes and Hansen (1996b, Thm 2) yield $\sup_\gamma \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}[z_t h_{t-1}(\gamma)] \right\| = o_p(1)$. The proof of part (ii) is similar.

Next, use (i) and (ii) to show uniformly in $\gamma \in \Gamma$

$$(a) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma)^2 - \omega(\gamma)^2 \right| = o_p(1) \quad (b) \quad \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t (\tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma) - \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma)) \right| = o_p(1).$$

Proof of parts (a) and (b). Note that $|\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma)^2 - \omega(\gamma)^2| \leq |\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma)^2 - \tilde{h}_t(\gamma)^2| + |\tilde{h}_t(\gamma)^2 - \omega(\gamma)^2|$. Because, by Lemma 3, $\mathbb{E}[\sup_\gamma h_t(\gamma)^4] < \infty$, the LLN for stationary ergodic processes and Hansen (1996b, Thm 2) yield $\sup_\gamma \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma)^2 - \omega^2(\gamma) \right| = o_p(1)$. Moreover, $|\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma)^2 - \tilde{h}_t(\gamma)^2| \leq |\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma) - \tilde{h}_t(\gamma)| |\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma) + \tilde{h}_t(\gamma)|$, where $|\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma) - \tilde{h}_t(\gamma)| \leq |\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)| \|z_t\|$. By part (i) and the LLN,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\tilde{h}_{t,n}(\gamma) - \tilde{h}_t(\gamma))^2 \leq \|\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)\|^2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t z_t^\top \right\| = o_p(1).$$

Part (a) follows from Cauchy-Schwarz. Turning to part (b), note that

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t (\tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma) - \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma)) \right\| \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\tilde{b}_n(\gamma) - \tilde{b}(\gamma)\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t u_t \right\| = o_p(1),$$

using that, by the CLT for MDS, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t u_t = O_p(1)$. This proves part (b).

Now, by continuity of $\gamma \mapsto \omega(\gamma)$ and compactness of Γ , Lemma 4 (a) yields $\inf_\gamma \omega(\gamma) > 0$. Therefore, (a), (b), and the uniform consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_u(\gamma)$ imply that, uniformly in γ , $t_n(\gamma) = \tilde{t}_n(\gamma) + o_p(1)$. It remains to be proven that $\tilde{t}_n(\gamma) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{U}(\gamma)$ in $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$. This is, however, a direct consequence of the multivariate CLT for MDS (*fidi*-convergence) and Hansen (1996b, Thm 2). This proves the claim. \square

Validity of multiplier bootstrap. For each $b \in \{1, \dots, B\}$,

$$t_{n,b}(\gamma) := \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \pi_{t,b} \tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma)}{\hat{\sigma}_{u,b}(\gamma) (\sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{h}_{t-1,n}(\gamma)^2)^{1/2}},$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{u,b}(\gamma)^2$ is the residual variance from the regression of $\pi_{t,b}$ on z_t ; $\pi_{t,b} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are bootstrap multipliers independent of the data. Since $\sup_{\gamma} |\hat{\sigma}_{n,b}(\gamma) - 1| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, following the proof of the corollary, $\sup_{\gamma} |t_{n,b}(\gamma) - \tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, with

$$\tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \zeta_{t,b}(\gamma), \quad \zeta_{t,b}(\gamma) := \frac{\pi_{t,b} \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma)}{\omega(\gamma)}.$$

For each n , conditionally on the data, $\tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma)$ is thus Gaussian with $\mathbf{E}^*[\tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma)] = 0$ and $\mathbf{cov}^*[\tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma_1), \tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma_2)] = \frac{\tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma_1) \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma_2)}{\omega(\gamma_1) \omega(\gamma_2)}$, where $\mathbf{E}^*[\cdot]$ and $\mathbf{cov}^*[\cdot]$ denote expectation and covariance based on the empirical measure \mathbb{P} induced by the data. Next, recall that $\mathbf{cov}[\mathbb{U}(\gamma_1), \mathbb{U}(\gamma_2)] = \mathbf{E}[\tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma_1) \tilde{h}_{t-1}(\gamma_2)] / (\omega(\gamma_1) \omega(\gamma_2))$. Moreover,

$$\sup_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{cov}^*[\zeta_{t,b}(\gamma_1), \zeta_{t,b}(\gamma_2)] - \mathbf{cov}[\mathbb{U}(\gamma_1), \mathbb{U}(\gamma_2)]) \right| = o_p(1),$$

which follows from the two-parameter case of Hansen (2017, Thm 2) with $q > 2$, as $\mathbf{E}[\sup_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} |\tilde{h}_t(\gamma_1) \tilde{h}_t(\gamma_2)|^q] \leq \mathbf{E}[\sup_{\gamma} |\tilde{h}_t(\gamma)|^{2q}] < \infty$ for some $q \in (2, 4]$ by Lemma 3. We therefore obtain, $\tilde{t}_{n,b}(\gamma) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{U}(\gamma)$ in $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$, which proves the claim.

Proof of Corollary 6. First, we show

$$\sqrt{n}(G_n(\beta) - G(\beta)) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\beta) \quad \text{in } \ell^\infty([0, 1]).$$

Because $\lambda \mapsto G(\beta; \lambda)$ is differentiable at λ_0 , by the mean value theorem,

$$G_n(\beta) - G(\beta) = G_\lambda(\beta; \bar{\lambda}_{n,\beta})^\top (\lambda_n - \lambda_0) = -F_\lambda(\beta; \bar{\lambda}_{n,\beta})^\top (\lambda_n - \lambda_0),$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_{n,\beta} := \lambda_0 + t_{n,\beta}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0)$ for some (random) $t_{n,\beta} \in [0, 1]$ that depends on $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Clearly, $\sup_{\beta} \|\bar{\lambda}_{n,\beta} - \lambda_0\| \leq \|\lambda_n - \lambda_0\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Moreover, $G_\lambda(\beta, \lambda)$ is continuous on the compact set $[0, 1] \times B$, where B is a compact ball around λ_0 such that $\mathbb{P}\{\lambda_n \in B\} \rightarrow 1$; thus, by Heine-Cantor, $G(\beta, \lambda)$ is uniformly continuous on the compact set $[0, 1] \times B$, so that $\sup_{\beta} \|G_\lambda(\beta; \bar{\lambda}_{n,\beta}) - G_\lambda(\beta, \lambda_0)\| = o_p(1)$, and therefore uniformly in β , $\sqrt{n}(G_n(\beta) - G(\beta)) = -F_\lambda(\beta)^\top \sqrt{n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_0) + o_p(1)$. Thus, $\sqrt{n}(G_n(\beta) - G(\beta)) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\beta)$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$, where $\mathbf{cov}[\mathbb{G}(\beta_1), \mathbb{G}(\beta_2)] = F_\lambda(\beta_1)^\top \Omega F_\lambda(\beta_2)$. Next, for each $\beta \in [0, 1]$

$$G(\beta) \in [G_n(\beta) \pm c_\alpha n^{-1/2} s_n(\beta)] \Leftrightarrow T_n(\beta) := \frac{\sqrt{n}|G_n(\beta) - G(\beta)|}{s_n(\beta)} \leq c_\alpha.$$

Next, the statement $\{\forall \beta : T_n(\beta) \leq c_\alpha\}$ is equivalent to $\{\sup_{\beta} T_n(\beta) \leq c_\alpha\}$. Because $\mathbb{P}\{T \leq c_\alpha\} = 1 - \alpha$, $\sup_{\beta} |s_n(\beta) - s(\beta)| = o_p(1)$ and, as a result of $\Omega \succ 0$

and Assumption B", $\inf_{\beta} s(\beta) \geq \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\Omega)} \inf_{\beta} \|F_{\lambda}(\beta)\| > 0$, it follows, by the continuous mapping theorem, $\sup_{\beta} T_n(\beta) \rightarrow_d T$. This proves the claim. \square

Proof of multiplier bootstrap. First we show that if $\sup_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (m_t(\beta) - m_{t,n}(\beta, \kappa_n))^2 = o_p(1)$, then $\mathbb{G}_{n,b}(\beta) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{G}(\beta)$ in $\ell^{\infty}([0, 1])$. To see this, define first by $\mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \xi_{t,b} m_t(\beta)$ and $\mathbb{G}_{n,b}(\beta) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \xi_{t,b} m_{t,n}(\beta, \kappa_n)$ the infeasible and feasible multiplier bootstrap processes, respectively. Conditionally on the data, $\mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta)$ is mean zero Gaussian with covariance kernel

$$\text{cov}^*[\mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta_1), \mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta_2)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n m_t(\beta_1) m_t(\beta_2).$$

By the LLN for stationary ergodic processes and Hansen (1996b, Thm 2) in conjunction with $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\beta} |m_t(\beta)|^{2q}] < \infty$ for some $q \in (2, 4]$, the preceding display converges uniformly in $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in [0, 1]$ to the covariance kernel of $\mathbb{G}(\beta)$, thus showing that $\mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{G}(\beta)$ in $\ell^{\infty}([0, 1])$. Next, recall that by construction the Gaussian multipliers $\xi_{t,b}$ are independent of the data, uncorrelated with unit variance such that

$$\text{var}^*[\mathbb{G}_{n,b}(\beta) - \mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (m_t(\beta) - m_{t,n}(\beta, \kappa_n))^2.$$

By hypothesis, the preceding display is, uniformly in β , $o_p(1)$, so that, by Markov's inequality $\sup_{\beta} |\mathbb{G}_{n,b}(\beta) - \mathbb{G}_{n,b}^{\circ}(\beta)| = o_p(1)$, which verifies the claim. Next, we have to find $m_{t,n}(\beta, \kappa_n)$ that satisfies the hypothesis. In doing so, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (m_{t,n}(\beta, \kappa_n) - m_t(\beta))^2 &\leq \|F_{\lambda}(\beta; \lambda_n) - F_{\lambda}(\beta)\|^2 \phi_t(\kappa_0)^2 \\ &\quad + \|F_{\lambda}(\beta; \lambda_n)\|^2 (\phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n) - \phi_t(\kappa_0))^2 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.3 and consistency of λ_n , we have $\sup_{\beta} \|F_{\lambda}(\beta; \lambda_n) - F_{\lambda}(\beta)\| = o_p(1)$, while, by the LLN for stationary ergodic processes, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \phi_t(\kappa_0)^2 = O_p(1)$. Because $\sup_{\beta, \lambda \in [0, 1] \times B} \|F_{\lambda}(\beta; \lambda)\|^2 < \infty$, it remains to find $\phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\phi_{t,n}(\kappa_n) - \phi_t(\kappa_0))^2 = o_p(1).$$

It can be shown, that a suitable choice is

$$\phi_{t,n}(\kappa) := \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{t,n,\delta}(\theta) \\ \phi_{t,n,\psi}(\theta) \\ \phi_{t,n,\rho}(\rho) \\ \phi_{t,n,\sigma_u^2}(\kappa) \\ \phi_{t,n,\sigma_\varepsilon^2}(\kappa) \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } A_n^{-1} \dot{f}_t(\theta_n) u_t(\theta_n) = (\phi_{t,n,\gamma}(\theta_n), \phi_{t,n,\delta}(\theta_n), \phi_{t,n,\psi}(\theta_n))^\top,$$

and $u_t(\theta) = \pi_t - f_t(\theta)$,

$$\phi_{t,n,\rho}(a, \rho) = \frac{(y_{t-1} - \bar{y})\varepsilon_t(a, \rho)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_{t-1} - \bar{y})^2}, \quad \varepsilon_t(a, \rho) := y_t - a - \rho y_{t-1},$$

while

$$\phi_{t,n,\sigma_u^2}(\theta) := u_t(\theta)^2 - \hat{\sigma}_u^2, \quad \phi_{t,n,\sigma_\varepsilon^2}(\rho) := \varepsilon_t(\rho)^2 - \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2.$$

A.6 Proofs of auxiliary results

Proof of Lemma A.1. First, note that, by backward substitution, s_t can be written as $s_t = \mathcal{G}_t(s_0, v_1, \dots, v_t)$, where $v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$ and we define $\mathcal{G}_0(s_0) := s_0$, $\mathcal{G}_1(s_0, v_1) := \mathcal{G}(s_0, v_1)$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_i(s_0, v_1, \dots, v_i) := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}_{i-1}(s_0, v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}), v_i), \quad i \geq 2.$$

The associated (deterministic) so-called *control model* (see Meyn and Tweedie, 2012, p. 29) to the nonlinear state space model is $\tilde{s}_k := (\tilde{\pi}_k, \tilde{\alpha}_k, \tilde{y}_k, \tilde{\beta}_k, \tilde{r}_k)^\top = \mathcal{G}_k(\tilde{s}_0, e_1, \dots, e_k)$, where $e_i := (e_{i1}, e_{i2})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the so-called *control sequence*. The rank condition (see Meyn and Tweedie, 2012, p. 153) requires that there exists at least a finite value k and a specific sequence $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ such that the rank of the $5 \times 2k$ Jacobian with respect to the controls is equal to the number of equations defining s_t , i.e.

$$\exists \tilde{s}_k \in \mathbf{S}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{s.th.} \quad C_{\tilde{s}_0}^k := [\nabla_{e_1} \tilde{s}_k \mid \dots \mid \nabla_{e_k} \tilde{s}_k] \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \text{rank}(C_{\tilde{s}_0}^k) = 5.$$

By construction, this cannot hold for $k \leq 2$, and $k = 3$ is the first possible candidate. And, indeed, below we show that this holds using a 5×5 submatrix

formed by the highlighted cells of the 5×6 Jacobian for $k = 3$:

$$C_{s_0}^3 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial u_1} & \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial u_2} & \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial \varepsilon_2} & \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial u_3} & \frac{\partial \pi_3}{\partial \varepsilon_3} \\ \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial u_1} & \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial u_2} & \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial \varepsilon_2} & \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial u_3} & \frac{\partial \alpha_3}{\partial \varepsilon_3} \\ \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial u_1} & \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial u_2} & \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial \varepsilon_2} & \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial u_3} & \frac{\partial y_3}{\partial \varepsilon_3} \\ \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial u_1} & \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial u_2} & \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial \varepsilon_2} & \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial u_3} & \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial \varepsilon_3} \\ \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial u_1} & \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial u_2} & \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial \varepsilon_2} & \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial u_3} & \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial \varepsilon_3} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that, to ease notation, we set $s_t = \tilde{s}_t$, and for the control sequence we write $e_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top$. Recall also from Eq. (A.4), the VAR(1) representation

$$z_t = (\pi_t, \alpha_t, y_t)^\top, \quad z_t = c + A(\beta_{t-1})z_{t-1} + Bv_t, \quad v_t = (u_t, \varepsilon_t)^\top.$$

The idea is to show that, for the 3×1 z -component of s_t , the blue highlighted cells (columns $\{u_2, u_3, \varepsilon_3\}$) have rank 3, while for the 2×1 (β, r) -component the green highlighted cells (columns $\{u_2, u_3\}$) have rank 2. Because the rank is invariant under column/row permutations, this yields the desired result. First, fix an initial state $s_0 = (z_0^\top, \beta_0, r_0)^\top$ with $\beta_0 = 0$, $r_0 > 0$, and arbitrary $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We can pick (s_0, e_1, e_2, e_3) so that for $x_t = \pi_t - \alpha_{t-1}$

$$x_1 = 0, \quad x_2 = 1, \quad x_3 = 0, \quad \beta_0 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0, \quad r_t > 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

All derivatives below are evaluated at this point.

Step 1: z -block. From (A.4), and using that z_2 and β_2 do not depend on v_3 , we obtain $\partial_{u_3} z_3 = (1, \gamma, 0)^\top$, $\partial_{\varepsilon_3} z_3 = (\psi, \gamma\psi, 1)^\top$. For the derivative with respect to u_2 , write $z_2 = c + A(0)z_1 + Bv_2$, so that $\partial_{u_2} z_2 = (1, \gamma, 0)^\top$. Next, at the path (A.14) we have $x_1 = 0$ and $\beta_1 = 0$, so

$$\eta_2 = (1 - \gamma) \frac{x_2 x_1}{r_2} = 0, \quad \beta_2 = b_2 \beta_1 + \gamma \eta_2 = 0.$$

Since x_1, β_1 do not depend on u_2 , this shows that β_2 is constant in u_2 in a neighbourhood of the path, hence $\partial_{u_2} \beta_2 = 0$ at (A.14). Next, differentiating $z_3 = c + A(\beta_2)z_2 + Bv_3$ and using $\partial_{u_2} \beta_2 = 0$ at (A.14) gives

$$\partial_{u_2} z_3 = A(\beta_2) \partial_{u_2} z_2 + (\partial_{\beta} A(\beta_2) z_2) \partial_{u_2} \beta_2 = A(0)(1, \gamma, 0)^\top =: q.$$

From the explicit form of $A(\beta)$, we obtain

$$q = A(0)(1, \gamma, 0)^\top = (q_1, q_2, 0)^\top, \quad q_1 := \delta\gamma, \quad q_2 := \gamma(1 - \gamma + \delta\gamma).$$

Thus the first two components of q and $(1, \gamma, 0)^\top$ form

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} q_1 & 1 \\ q_2 & \gamma \end{bmatrix} = q_2 - \gamma q_1 = \gamma(1 - \gamma) > 0$$

for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, so q is not collinear with $(1, \gamma, 0)^\top$. Moreover, $(\psi, \gamma\psi, 1)^\top$ has third component 1, whereas both q and $(1, \gamma, 0)^\top$ have third component 0. Hence $\partial_{\varepsilon_3} z_3$, $\partial_{u_3} z_3$, and $\partial_{u_2} z_3$ are linearly independent in \mathbb{R}^3 , and the z -block of $C_{s_0}^3$ has rank 3 on the three columns $\{u_2, u_3, \varepsilon_3\}$.

Step 2: (β, r) block. Recall that $\beta_t = b_t \beta_{t-1} + \gamma \eta_t$, $b_t = 1 - \gamma \frac{x_t^2}{r_t}$, and $\eta_t = (1 - \gamma) \frac{x_t x_{t-1}}{r_t}$. At the path Eq. (A.14), we obtain

$$r_1 = (1 - \gamma)r_0, \quad r_2 = (1 - \gamma)^2 r_0 + \gamma, \quad r_3 = (1 - \gamma)^3 r_0 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)x_2^2 + \gamma x_3^2.$$

At $t = 3$ this gives, as a function of (x_2, x_3) ,

$$r_3(x_2, x_3) = C + \gamma(1 - \gamma)x_2^2 + \gamma x_3^2, \quad \beta_3(x_2, x_3) = \gamma(1 - \gamma) \frac{x_2 x_3}{r_3(x_2, x_3)},$$

where $C = (1 - \gamma)^3 r_0 > 0$ does not depend on (x_2, x_3) . Computing partial derivatives yields

$$\frac{\partial r_3}{\partial x_2} = 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)x_2, \quad \frac{\partial r_3}{\partial x_3} = 2\gamma x_3,$$

and, using the quotient rule,

$$\frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial x_2} = \gamma(1 - \gamma)x_3 \frac{r_3 - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)x_2^2}{r_3^2}, \quad \frac{\partial \beta_3}{\partial x_3} = \gamma(1 - \gamma)x_2 \frac{r_3 - 2\gamma x_3^2}{r_3^2}.$$

Hence the 2×2 Jacobian matrix

$$J_2 := \frac{\partial}{\partial(x_2, x_3)} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_3 \\ r_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

has determinant $\det(J_2) = \frac{2\gamma^2(1-\gamma)}{r_3}(x_3^2 - (1-\gamma)x_2^2)$. Evaluating at the point (A.14), where $x_2 = 1$ and $x_3 = 0$, shows that $\det(J_2) \neq 0$. Next consider the map $(u_2, u_3) \mapsto (x_2, x_3)$. Recall that $\partial_{u_2} x_2 = 1$, $\partial_{u_3} x_3 = 1$, and $\partial_{u_3} x_2 = 0$, while, using $\partial_{u_2} \beta_2 = 0$, $\partial_{u_2} x_3 = \gamma(\delta - 1)$.

Hence, we have

$$J_1 := \frac{\partial}{\partial(u_2, u_3)} \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \gamma(\delta - 1) & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

so that $\det J_1 = 1 \neq 0$. By the chain rule,

$$\det \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial(u_2, u_3)} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_3 \\ r_3 \end{bmatrix} \right] = \det(J_2) \det(J_1) \neq 0.$$

Thus the (β, r) block has rank 2 on the two columns $\{u_2, u_3\}$.

Combining Step 1 and Step 2, we have shown that, for $k = 3$, there exists an initial state s_0 and a control sequence (e_1, e_2, e_3) such that $C_{s_0}^3$ has rank 5. By the rank condition of Meyn and Tweedie (2012, Sec. 7.2), the Markov chain (s_t) is forward accessible and is a T -chain. \square

Proof of Lemma A.2. It is enough to define a given sequence $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and check if s_k converges to a steady point s^* if $k \rightarrow +\infty$ see Meyn and Tweedie, 2012, Ch. 7.4. In particular, we can fix any deterministic sequence of shocks and set it to zero, i.e., $e_k := (0, 0)$ for all k . By the contraction property of the β -update, $\beta_k \rightarrow \beta^* \in (-1, 1)$. The y -recursion is $y_k = a + \rho y_{k-1}$ with $|\rho| < 1$, hence $y_k \rightarrow y^* := a/(1 - \rho)$. For fixed β^* , the linear system for (π_k, α_k) is stable, so $(\pi_k, \alpha_k) \rightarrow (\pi^*, \alpha^*)$. Let $x_k := g(s_{k-1}, 0)$, i.e., by Eq. (A.1),

$$x_k = \psi a + \psi \rho y_{k-1} + [\delta(1 - \beta_{k-1}^2) - 1] \alpha_{k-1} + \delta \beta_{k-1}^2 \pi_{k-1}.$$

By the convergences above, $x_k \rightarrow x^* = \psi a + \psi \rho y^* + [\delta(1 - \beta^2) - 1] \alpha^* + \delta \beta^2 \pi^*$. With zero shocks the r -recursion is $r_{k+1} = (1 - \gamma) r_k + \gamma x_{k+1}^2$, or, upon solving the recursion $r_k = (1 - \gamma)^k r_0 + \gamma \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (1 - \gamma)^j x_{k-j}^2$. Since $x_k \rightarrow x^*$ and $(1 - \gamma)^j$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, is summable, $r_k \rightarrow r^* = x^{*2}$. Therefore, by Chotard and Auger (2019, propositions 3.1 and 3.2) $s^* = (\pi^*, \alpha^*, y^*, \beta^*, r^*)$ is attracting. Furthermore, by Chotard and Auger (2019, Lemma 5.1 (ii)), s^* is also steadily attracting. This completes the proof. \square