

Double Local-to-Unity: Estimation under Nearly Nonstationary Volatility

Abir Sarkar¹ and Martin T. Wells²

Department of Statistics and Data Science, Cornell University

December 9, 2025

Abstract

This article develops a moderate-deviation limit theory for autoregressive models with jointly persistent mean and volatility dynamics. The autoregressive coefficient is allowed to drift toward unity slower than the classical $1/n$ rate, while the volatility persistence parameter also converges to one at an even slower, logarithmic order, so that the conditional variance process is itself nearly nonstationary and its unconditional moments may diverge. This double localization allows the variance process to be nearly nonstationary and to evolve slowly, as observed in macro-financial data and during asset-price bubble episodes. Under standard regularity conditions, we establish consistency and distributional limits for the OLS estimator of the autoregressive coefficient that remains valid in the presence of highly persistent stochastic volatility. We show that the effective normalization for least-squares inference is governed by an average volatility scale, and we derive martingale limit theorems for the OLS estimator under joint drift and volatility dynamics. In a mildly stationary regime (where the autoregressive root approaches one from below), the OLS estimator is asymptotically normal. In a mildly explosive regime (where the root approaches one from above), an OLS-based self-normalized statistic converges to a Cauchy limit. Strikingly, in both regimes, the limiting laws of our statistics are invariant to the detailed specification of the volatility process, even though the conditional variance is itself nearly nonstationary. Overall, the results extend moderate-deviation asymptotics to settings with drifting volatility persistence, unify local-to-unity inference with nearly nonstationary stochastic volatility, and deliver practically usable volatility-robust statistics for empirical work in settings approaching instability and exhibiting bubbles.

Keywords: Local-to-unity asymptotics, economic bubbles, mildly explosive autoregression, martingale CLT, moderate deviations, nearly nonstationary volatility, stochastic volatility.

¹as4458@cornell.edu, 301 CIS Building, Ithaca, New York 14853

²mtw1@cornell.edu

1 Introduction

Macroeconomic and financial time series often display two intertwined sources of strong dependence that challenge classical asymptotic theory: near-unit-root behavior in conditional means and slowly evolving persistent conditional variances. Here, persistence denotes the durability of shock effects, reflected in the degree to which the current value depends on its past. The former has been extensively analyzed in the unit-root and local-to-unity literature; see, for example, [Phillips \(1987\)](#) and [Chan and Wei \(1987\)](#). The second, equally important, strand of the literature emphasizes that volatility is neither constant nor weakly persistent. Conditional heteroskedasticity (whether deterministic, stochastic, or driven by structural breaks) can distort unit-root tests and alter the behavior of estimators and test statistics, motivating procedures that remain valid under broad classes of variance dynamics. [Kim and Schmidt \(1993\)](#) show how conditional heteroskedasticity affects ADF-type tests in finite samples, highlighting the need for heteroskedasticity-robust formulations. Moderate deviations from a unit root towards explosiveness can be interpreted as asset price exuberance under homoskedasticity [Phillips et al. \(2011\)](#), while a related literature on continuous time asset pricing theory explored by [Jarrow et al. \(2010\)](#) emphasizes on the pivotal role of volatility for the price process to carry an explosive bubble. This paper integrates these strands by developing inference on autoregressive parameter under persistent stochastic volatility and examining its implications for bubble detection.

In broader moderate deviation regimes, [Phillips and Magdalinos \(2007\)](#) allow the autoregressive root to depend on the sample size and approach one at an intermediate rate,

$$y_t = \rho_n y_{t-1} + u_t, \quad u_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t, \quad \epsilon_t \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

with $\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$, $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k_n = o(n)$. This framework spans a continuum of cases, from stationary behavior, through local-to-unity dynamics, to mildly explosive regimes, and provides limit theory that applies uniformly across all these intermediate departures from the classical setting. In particular, [Giraitis and Phillips \(2006\)](#) consider near-stationary processes and establish a normal limit theory that holds uniformly over autoregressive coefficients ρ_n satisfying $n(1 - \rho_n) \rightarrow \infty$ under martingale-difference errors. Within this general approach, [Park \(2003\)](#) analyzes autoregressive processes with $\rho_n = 1 - m/n$ where $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, and shows that the sample correlation coefficient is asymptotically normal with the convergence rate n/\sqrt{m} whenever $m = o(n)$. On the nearly stationary side, [Phillips and Magdalinos \(2007\)](#) obtains asymptotic normality with rate $\sqrt{nk_n}$ when ρ_n approaches one from below at the moderate-deviation scale.

In the moderately explosive regime, where $\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$ with $c > 0$, [Phillips and Magdalinos \(2007\)](#) shows that the OLS deviation $\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n$ converges at rate $k_n \rho_n^n$ (or $n^a \rho_n^n$ when $k_n = n^a$). A striking implication is that the usual serial correlation statistic has a Cauchy limit, even under non-Gaussian errors, paralleling early results for fixed explosive roots. For a Gaussian AR(1) with $|\rho| > 1$ fixed, [White \(1958\)](#) showed that the large-sample distribution of the OLS estimator is Cauchy, and [Basawa and Brockwell \(1984\)](#) derived related conditional limit theorems for nonergodic stochastic processes. In this case, the explosive growth of the regressor y_{t-1} is fast enough so that the weak serial dependence in u_t does not disrupt the Cauchy limit. In particular, [Phillips and Magdalinos \(2007\)](#) extend the Cauchy limit to linear-process errors of the form

$$u_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j e_{t-j}, \quad \mathbb{E}[e_t] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[e_t^2] < \infty, \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j |c_j| < \infty.$$

[Mikusheva \(2012\)](#) studies testing and construction of confidence sets for one-dimensional functionals of autoregressive coefficients in potentially persistent time series.

Beyond robustness, understanding volatility dynamics is a central concern in macroeconomics

and finance. [Cavaliere and Taylor \(2009\)](#) develop an invariance principle and asymptotic theory for Dickey–Fuller statistics under nonstationary stochastic volatility, and propose wild bootstrap methods as practical tools for inference in such environments. A recurring empirical finding in both SV and GARCH settings is that the volatility parameters are estimated close to one, which has motivated theoretical work on nearly integrated volatility, including IGARCH and GARCH processes near the unit-root boundary ([Nelson, 1990](#)). From an asymptotic point of view, martingale and linear process techniques ([Phillips and Solo, 1992](#)) provide invariance principles for dependent heteroskedastic innovations, Phillips’ decomposition of linear filters yielding a unified treatment of strong laws, central limit theorems and functional limit theory for linear processes.

1.1 Econometric Implications

Moderate deviations from a unit root indicate mildly explosive dynamics in the underlying process. In asset markets, such explosiveness is commonly interpreted as price exuberance, i.e., an asset price bubble. [Phillips and Yu \(2009\)](#) first characterized explosive autoregression as a bubble and suggested a recursive test procedure that provides a mechanism for testing explosive behavior, date-stamping the origination and collapse of economic exuberance, and providing valid confidence intervals for explosive growth rates with an empirical application to Nasdaq stock price index in the 1990s. Later, [Phillips et al. \(2015\)](#) provided the limit theory of real time dating algorithms for bubble detection in the presence of multiple bubbles. Very recently, [Basele et al. \(2025\)](#) investigated the formation of speculative bubbles in individual stocks during the recent AI boom. Similar studies have been conducted in [Shi et al. \(2016\)](#), [Deng et al. \(2017\)](#), [Yiu et al. \(2013\)](#) and [Shi \(2017\)](#) for the empirical detection of price bubbles in the regional housing markets of Australia, China, Hong-Kong, and the United States. [Corbet et al. \(2018\)](#) discusses date-stamping the Bitcoin and Ethereum bubbles, and common bubble detection in large dimensional financial systems ([Chen et al., 2023](#)). Cryptocurrency bubble on the systemic risk in global energy companies has been explained by [Ji et al. \(2022\)](#). However, the baseline implementations of these procedures typically impose homoskedastic innovations — an implausible assumption for asset pricing, as explained by [Shephard and Sheppard \(2010\)](#); [Patton and Sheppard \(2015\)](#). Volatility tends to spike in periods of exuberance and stress, and bubbles are empirically associated with increased and unstable volatility ([Greenwood et al., 2019](#)). Over long samples that span multiple regimes or in high-frequency data with intraday seasonality and microstructure effects, the variance is demonstrably nonconstant. Ignoring such heteroskedasticity can lead to misleading dating of bubble episodes because the limiting distributions of test statistics and autoregressive estimators might depend on the volatility process.

Indeed, unit-root inference has been shown to be sensitive to nonstationary volatility and structural breaks in variance, motivating heteroskedasticity-robust and bootstrap procedures [Cavaliere and Taylor \(2008\)](#). [Boswijk et al. \(2024\)](#) recently developed a test for explosive behavior in the price of financial assets with low frequency when prices are sampled at higher frequency based on a continuous-time stochastic volatility model with linear drift. A related literature on continuous time asset pricing theory was explored by [Jarrow et al. \(2010\)](#), and the effect of volatility is deemed to be essential for the price process to carry an explosive bubble. [Fusari et al. \(2025\)](#) exploit options prices data to develop an estimation procedure that enables us to quantify the magnitude of a price bubble in a heston model. Very recently [Montanino and De Luca \(2025\)](#) proposed a model to date-stamp rational bubbles in the cryptocurrency market and was evaluated against the standard GARCH framework to assess potential gains in volatility forecasting. These considerations justify modeling and estimating autoregressive coefficients under stochastic volatility or regime-switching variance, which better reflects the stylized facts of financial markets and yields asymptotic results and empirical procedures that remain valid when volatility is time-varying.

1.2 Our Contributions

We study the AR(1) model with a near-nonstationary stochastic-volatility recursion

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \rho_n y_{t-1} + u_t, & u_t &= \sigma_t \varepsilon_t, & \varepsilon_t &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ \log \sigma_t^2 &= \phi_n \log \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \eta_t, & \alpha &> 0, & \eta_t &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2), & \eta_t &\perp \varepsilon_t. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The AR(1) log-volatility specification is canonical in time-series econometrics and asset pricing, offering a parsimonious representation of volatility clustering and persistence (Taylor, 2008; Harvey et al., 1994). Both persistence parameters are allowed to depend on the sample size. The mean coefficient satisfies $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$, while the volatility parameter follows an “ultra-persistent” path $\phi_n \uparrow 1$. This specification generates a double near-unit-root regime. The latter can be viewed as a moderate deviation from unity in the volatility equation, with an effective rate of a slower order compared to the rate of ρ_n converging to 1, but still induces substantial persistence in the variance process.

The asymptotic theory for autoregressive estimation under this joint configuration has not been developed. Existing near-unit-root results typically assume homoskedastic errors or allow for heteroskedasticity without imposing an explicit nearly nonstationary volatility mechanism. Conversely, the literature on nearly integrated volatility (often in GARCH-type models) focuses on the volatility parameters themselves and does not study how such persistent volatility affects inference on a nearly unit root in the conditional mean. The main result provided here is - under the above stochastic volatility specification and the standard regularity conditions ensuring suitable martingale approximations for $\{u_t\}$, we show that the usual OLS estimator of ρ_n remains consistent even when the volatility persistence parameter ϕ_n tends to one at an extremely slow rate. In the mildly stationary regime, where ρ_n approaches one from below on the moderate device scale, the centered estimator is asymptotically normal under the normalization $\sqrt{nk_n}$, with a variance that is invariant of the dispersion parameter of volatility shocks. In the mildly explosive regime, where ρ_n approaches one from above at the same scale, the serial correlation statistic constructed from the OLS estimator is asymptotically Cauchy under the explosive normalization proportional to $k_n \rho_n^n$. This Cauchy limit is similarly robust to the presence of ultra-persistent stochastic volatility and is consistent with classic explosive results such as Anderson (1959), White (1958), and the moderate-deviation analysis in Phillips and Magdalinos (2007).

Building on the seminal analysis by Phillips and Magdalinos (2007) in the homoskedastic near-unit-root framework, our contribution extends the theory to a setting with highly persistent stochastic volatility. Although homoskedasticity offers analytical clarity, it is rarely natural in macro-financial applications where volatility clustering and near-nonstationary variance are pervasive. Replicating the proof strategy in this richer environment is both more subtle and more relevant. The volatility process alters effective scales, induces a nontrivial cross-moment structure, and, in different regimes, fundamentally adapts different normalizations to retain the limiting behavior. By identifying the correct volatility normalization and controlling lognormal moments and dependence through martingale methods, we show how valid inference can be recovered under stochastic volatility. This extension broadens the applicability of Phillips’s (and colleagues) insights to the empirical realities of modern time series, providing theory and tools that align more closely with real-world data.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 1.3 we define all the mathematical notations used throughout the paper. Section 2 discusses the econometric issues involving the asymptotic results for near-unit-root dynamics and lists down the assumptions. Section 3 and 4 develops the asymptotics involving consistency and distribution of the autoregressive coefficient under different persistent mean and volatility regimes. Section 5 provides empirical evidence through simulation studies that justifies the theoretical results with statistical analyses, and we conclude the paper in Section 6 with a summary of novel contributions and a discussion of potential directions

for future research. All of the proofs of the main results can be found in the [Appendix](#).

1.3 Notations

Here we collect the notation used throughout this paper. All random quantities are defined on a common probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We write \mathbb{P} for the probability measure and \mathbb{E} for expectation; conditional expectations are taken with respect to the indicated σ -algebras. The filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(y_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_t)$ denotes the information set up to time t . Asymptotic and stochastic orders are used as follows: $a_n = o(b_n)$ means $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$; $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$ means $|a_n/b_n|$ is uniformly bounded in n ; $a_n \asymp b_n$ indicates that a_n/b_n is bounded away from 0 and ∞ ; $a_n \sim b_n$ indicates $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$; $a_n \gg b_n$ means $a_n/b_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For random sequences, $X_n = o_p(1)$ means $X_n \xrightarrow{p} 0$ (convergence in probability), $X_n = \mathcal{O}_p(1)$ means $\{X_n\}$ is bounded in probability, $X_n \xrightarrow{p} X$ denotes convergence in probability, and $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ denotes convergence in distribution. For random variables, we also use $X_n \lesssim Y_n$ to indicate $X_n \leq C Y_n$ with probability 1 for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Miscellaneous notations include $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ for the indicator function, $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ for the floor function (greatest integer), $\log(\cdot)$ for the natural logarithm and $\text{poly}(a_n)$ for any polynomial in a_n . The symbol $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes a normal law with mean μ and variance σ^2 , while standard Cauchy or $\mathcal{C}(0, 1)$ refers to the symmetric Cauchy $(0, 1)$ law with density $f(x) = \{\pi(1 + x^2)\}^{-1}$.

2 Deviations from unity and key assumptions

We study model (1) with a root that deviates moderately from unity,

$$\rho_n = 1 \pm \frac{c}{k_n}, \quad k_n = o(n), \quad (2)$$

with volatility persistent coefficient of the form

$$\phi_n = 1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}, \quad d > 0. \quad (3)$$

The sequence $\{k_n\}$ increases to infinity with $k_n = o(n)$, so ρ_n approaches one at a rate slower than $1/n$ (moderate deviations). The volatility parameter ϕ_n also approaches one, but at a reasonably slow rate $1/\log r_n$, which makes the volatility process highly persistent yet mean-reverting. We list down this condition formally below.

Assumptions.

- A1. $\rho_n = 1 - \frac{c}{k_n}$ and $\phi_n = 1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}$, $c, d > 0$,
- A2. $\rho_n = 1 + \frac{c}{k_n}$ and $\phi_n = 1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}$, $c, d > 0$,
- A3. $k_n \gg \text{poly}(r_n)$ and $k_n = o(n)$, meaning k_n dominates r_n^m for every $m > 0$.

Assumption A1 underpins the asymptotic distribution for the nearly stationary regime, whereas Assumption A2 covers the mildly explosive regime. Assumption A3 imposes a separation of rates: k_n grows faster than any power of $\log n$ yet slower than n . Intuitively, this places ρ_n in a moderate-deviation neighborhood of unity—persistent enough to require nonstandard normalization, but far enough from a unit root to yield nondegenerate limits

To analyze the behavior of the statistic derived from the evolving-coefficient autoregressive specification for the model in (1) under these assumptions, we adopt tools that parallel classical

results for both stable AR(1) systems and explosive processes. The essential idea is that although the autoregressive parameter drifts toward unity, it does so slowly enough that the process neither behaves like a truly stationary AR(1) nor like a fully explosive one. Instead, its asymptotics fall in an intermediate “local-to-unity” domain. We analyze the large-sample behavior of the serial correlation estimator, namely

$$\hat{\rho}_n = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2}, \quad \hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2}. \quad (4)$$

In the near-stationary region, after scaling to absorb the slow drift in volatility, the accumulated squared observations $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2$ settle to a fixed, nonrandom limit determined by the local-to-unity parameter. The key term, the cross-product $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t$ satisfies a martingale central limit theorem under appropriate scaling. A conditional central limit theorem applies after normalizing by its variation, delivering Gaussian fluctuations conditionally on volatility. These results jointly imply that the least-squares estimate of the autoregressive coefficient exhibits a Gaussian limit, once centered and normalized.

In the nearly-explosive regime, the usual joint convergence of $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2$ and $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t$ carries over, with normalizations that account for the time-varying scale. A Lindeberg–Feller argument for the properly standardized pair implies that the serial correlation coefficient behaves like a ratio of two asymptotically normal terms sharing the same stochastic scale. This yields a Cauchy-type limit law. The result relies on martingale difference properties and moment conditions rather than strong parametric assumptions on u_t , so it is robust to rich volatility dynamics.

A central implication of our results is that, in both regimes, inference on serial correlation is effectively robust to misspecifying the volatility process, because the mean dynamics dominate the asymptotics. In practice, this delivers more reliable uncertainty quantification in calm but persistent phases and detection of exuberance or instability that is robust at conventional significance levels as markets or macro aggregates approach explosive behavior.

3 Double local-to-unity in mildly stationary regime

This section analyzes the large-sample behavior of the autoregressive coefficient under model (1) with Assumptions A1 and A3. We will stick to this set of assumptions for the rest of the discussion in this section.

We initialize at some $y_0 = o_p(\sqrt{k_n})$ and $\sigma_0 = 1$, both independent of the σ -field generated by $\{(\epsilon_t, \eta_t) : t \geq 1\}$. The sequences $\{\epsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ are independent of each other. Because both ρ_n and ϕ_n depend on n , the model defines triangular arrays $\{y_{nt} : 1 \leq t \leq n\}$. For notational simplicity we write y_t , suppressing the n index.

Our strategy is to handle the denominator and numerator in (4) separately. We first establish a law of large numbers for the quadratic form $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2$ and then derive a central limit theorem for the martingale term $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t$. The next result shows that, under an appropriate normalization tailored to the local-to-unity rate k_n , its asymptotic behavior parallels that of the strictly stationary case $\rho < 1$, providing the key scale for inference on ρ_n even in the presence of highly persistent, stochastic volatility. We need to define a few mathematical notations first.

Let $z_t := \log \sigma_t^2$ and $z_t = \phi_n z_{t-1} + \eta_t$. The following expressions hold due to (3):

$$z_t = \phi_n^t z_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j}, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \exp \left(\sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j} \right). \quad (5)$$

Define,

$$x_t := \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] = \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{1 - \phi_n^2} \alpha^2 \right), \quad m_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n x_t. \quad (6)$$

For ease of notation, we denote the dispersion factor at time t as

$$A_t = \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] = \exp(\alpha^2 A_t).$$

Lemma 3.1. *For the model in (1) with Assumption A3,*

- (a) $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] \leq e^{\alpha^2 A_n} \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)},$
- (b) $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] \leq e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/d},$
- (c) $\frac{1}{n^2} \sum \sum_{t \neq s} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \sigma_s^2] \leq e^{2\alpha^2 A_n}.$

The first two bounds control the second and fourth-order moments of the volatility process, preventing growth beyond the required rate and ensuring tightness of variance-driven quantities. The third bound controls cross moments over time, limiting temporal dependence in double sums and stabilizing the variance of aggregates. The third bound is crucial in particular, as it reflects weak temporal dependence, which is crucial for the asymptotic distribution to stabilize. Taken together, these bounds deliver concentration of quadratic terms, rate control in large samples, and asymptotic negligibility of cross components needed for the proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Under model (1) with Assumption A3, $m_n = e^{\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1))$.*

This result is central in establishing the consistency of $\hat{\rho}_n$. The quantity m_n captures the average unconditional innovation variance and therefore represents the effective volatility scale of the process over the sample when $\{\sigma_t^2\}$ is time-varying and highly persistent. In this sense, m_n provides the natural normalization under stochastic volatility: after rescaling by m_n , the residual fluctuations behave analogously to the homoskedastic case, leading to nondegenerate limit distributions. When $\phi_n \rightarrow 1$ at the double-logarithmic rate, m_n grows only polylogarithmically in n , so it modifies the scale but leaves the fundamental $\sqrt{n k_n}$ rate intact as obtained in Phillips and Magdalinos (2007).

Lemma 3.3. *Let $y_0 = o_p(k_n^{1/2})$. For the model in (1), under the Assumptions A1 and A3,*

- (a) *If $k_n r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} = o(n)$, then $\frac{y_n^2}{n} \xrightarrow{p} 0$.*
- (b) *If $k_n r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{d}} = o(n)$, then $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \xrightarrow{p} 0$.*

We will leverage these results for the remaining part of the proof. We first aim to show that,

$$\frac{1}{n k_n m_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c}. \quad (7)$$

From the identity

$$y_t^2 - \rho_n^2 y_{t-1}^2 = u_t^2 + 2\rho_n y_{t-1} u_t,$$

we obtain, upon summing over $t = 1, \dots, n$ and dividing by n ,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \rho_n^2) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} (y_0^2 - y_n^2) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 + 2\rho_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we used $y_0 = o_p(k_n^{1/2})$, $y_n^2/n \xrightarrow{p} 0$ (by Lemma 3.3 (a)), and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = o_p(1)$ (by Lemma 3.3 (b)).

Next, note

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \exp \left(\frac{(1 - \phi_n^{2t}) \alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)} \right) = m_n,$$

and for the second moment,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{3}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2], \\ &\leq \frac{3}{n} O \left(r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{d}} \right) + e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} \quad \text{from Lemma 3.1.(b), (c) and } \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^4] = 3. \\ &= o(1) + e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^2] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^4] = 3$ for standard normal $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. Given that we are interested in studying the asymptotic behavior of $\sum y_t^2$, it is equally interesting to understand the results of the large sample on $\sum u_t^2$. Now it follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{nm_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right) &\leq \frac{\exp(2\alpha^2 A_n) - m_n^2 + o(1)}{m_n^2} \\ &= \frac{e^{2A_n \alpha^2} (1 + o(1))}{e^{2A_n \alpha^2} ((1 + o(1))^2)} - 1 \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows that the average volatility of the process stabilizes after this normalization.

$$\left(\frac{1}{nm_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right) \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

Plugging this in Equation (8), this implies that

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c}, \tag{9}$$

because $1 - \rho_n^2 = \frac{c}{k_n} \left(2 - \frac{c}{k_n} \right) = \frac{2c}{k_n} (1 + o(1))$.

Now, we calculate the limiting distribution of the sample covariance. We will show how the standardized sample variance converges to a normal distribution. For this, we define the martingale

difference array and the corresponding σ algebra, where α (the dispersion parameter of volatility) is as defined in Section (2). Throughout, we work with the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{(y_0, \epsilon_s, \eta_s), 1 \leq s \leq t\}$

$$\tau_{nt} = e^{-\alpha^2/4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_n m_n}} y_{t-1} u_t, \quad 1 \leq t \leq n.$$

Since ε_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} and centered, $\{\tau_{nt}, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ is a martingale difference array. Its conditional variance satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_{nt}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 u_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 | z_{t-1}] \quad (\text{since } u_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t \perp \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \quad (\text{because } \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 | z_{t-1}] = e^{\phi_n z_{t-1} + \alpha^2/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.4. *For the model in (1) under the Assumptions A1 and A3,*

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{2c}. \quad (10)$$

Remark. When $\phi_n \rightarrow 1$ slowly, the near-nonstationary volatility induces a multiplicative dispersion correction in the normalization, yielding the attenuation factor $e^{-\alpha^2/2}$. Crucially, the same factor appears with opposite sign in the corresponding normalization via τ_{nt} , and therefore cancels. This now implies,

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_{nt}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] \xrightarrow{p} \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{2c}.$$

Combining, we obtain the desired asymptotic result:

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 u_t^2] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2c}. \quad (11)$$

Next, invoking the Lindeberg condition here, we can conclude for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}(\tau_{n,t}^2 \mathbf{1}\{\tau_{n,t} > \eta\})] = o_p(1).$$

Hence, the martingale central limit theorem follows and conclude the asymptotic normality for the autoregressive coefficient.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_n m_n}} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1}{2c}\right). \quad (12)$$

Theorem 3.5. *For the model in (1) under the Assumptions A1 and A3, the following large-sample results hold:*

$$(a) \quad \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{n m_n k_n} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c},$$

$$(b) \frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_n m_n}} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1}{2c}\right),$$

$$(c) \sqrt{nk_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 2c).$$

Note that the rate of growth imposed on k_n is aligned with [Phillips and Magdalinos \(2007\)](#) with an added restriction that keeps the signal in the mean dynamics strong relative to the accumulating volatility effects.

Remark. One should note that the resulting limit does not depend on the dispersion parameter for the volatility, α , and therefore is robust and invariant to the volatility dispersion specification — under the prescribed rate for ϕ_n . This cancellation is crucial and interesting - the volatility dynamics influences intermediate scaling but disappears in the final asymptotics, hence we can potentially make valid inference without the need to estimate α .

Theorem 3.5 reveals convergence rates that smoothly interpolate between those characteristic of stationary processes and those associated with unit-root and local-to-unity models. Let $k_n = n^a$ with $a \in (0, 1)$ so that $\rho_n = 1 - c/n^a$. Then

$$\sqrt{nk_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) = n^{(1+a)/2}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \Rightarrow N(0, 2c),$$

which interpolates between the stationary $n^{1/2}$ rate ($a \rightarrow 0$) and the local-to-unity n rate ($a \rightarrow 1$).

We can recover the corresponding stationary theory. In the homoskedastic stationary case, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1 - \rho^2)$. With $\rho = 1 - c/k_n$, we have $1 - \rho^2 = \frac{2c}{k_n} - \frac{c^2}{k_n^2}$, so $\sqrt{nk_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \sim N(0, 2c)$. Theorem 3.5 is the stochastic-volatility analogue of this plug-in. The factor m_n here plays the role of a slowly varying long-run variance of the scale σ_t . The resulting CLTs are stable (conditional on the volatility path), which explains why variance-mixture behavior disappears once we standardize by the predictable variation.

The volatility structure is inherently dependent on Gaussian error distribution. Hence, it is difficult for the Cauchy limit to persist beyond sub-Gaussianity. However, in the [Appendix](#), we will prove that for any suitable distribution of errors such that $E[\sigma_n^2] = O((\log n)^k)$ for some $k > 0$, we can recover the same gaussian limit back.

The quantity m_n measures the average unconditional innovation variance and thus serves as the effective scale of the process over the sample when volatility is variable over time and highly persistent. Economically, m_n summarizes the average volatility risk over the sample: a larger m_n corresponds to more prolonged high-uncertainty episodes, implying wider confidence intervals and a greater amount of data required to reliably detect mean reversion. A related literature on continuous time asset pricing theory was explored by ([Mijatović and Urusov, 2012](#); [Jarrow et al., 2010](#)), where the authors arguably prescribe a relation between the variance of the volatility process and the mean reverting level for the process to contain an asset price bubble.

Our method can also handle moderately negative roots. If $\rho_n = -1 + c/k_n$, define $y_t^* = (-1)^t y_t$ and $u_t^* = (-1)^t u_t$. Then

$$y_t^* = (1 - c/k_n) y_{t-1}^* + u_t^*, \quad \mathbb{E}[(u_t^*)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n},$$

so the mean dynamics reduces to the near-stationary case with the same stochastic volatility. Quadratic forms are invariant, $\sum y_{t-1}^{*2} = \sum y_{t-1}^2$ and $\sum y_t^{*2} = \sum y_t^2$, while the score flips sign, $\sum y_{t-1} u_t = -\sum y_{t-1}^* u_t^*$. Hence, the large sample results and the Gaussian limits (with the same m_n) carry over verbatim, up to a trivial sign. We must note that distance to the unit circle, irrespective of its sign, governs precision even under highly persistent volatility.

4 Double local-to-unity in the mildly explosive regime

In this section, we consider the model (1) with assumptions (2) and (3) in the mildly explosive case with $\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$ and $c > 0$. In this regime the normalized sample variance $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2$ no longer stabilizes to a constant as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Instead, it carries a stochastic scale induced by the explosive mean dynamics. Let us define the long-term scale of the conditional variance process and denote by

$$\ell_n := e^{\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1-\phi_n^2)}}. \quad (13)$$

The factor ℓ_n captures the long-run (unconditional) scale of the conditional variance process induced by the near-nonstationary log-volatility recursion. With Gaussian innovations in $z_t = \log \sigma_t^2$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] = \exp\{\frac{1}{2}\text{Var}(z_t)\}$ and, for large t , $\text{Var}(z_t) \sim \alpha^2/(1 - \phi_n^2)$, yielding ℓ_n as the appropriate sample-size-dependent long-run variance of $\{\sigma_t^2\}$. When $\phi_n = 1 - d/\log r_n$, $1 - \phi_n^2 \sim 2d/\log r_n$, so ℓ_n grows only polylogarithmically, and it is easy to check,

$$\ell_n \sim (r_n)^{\alpha^2/(4d)}.$$

Now we present a few interesting lemmas which are very useful for the proof.

Lemma 4.1. *For the model in (1) under the Assumptions A2 and A3,*

$$\rho_n^{-n} = o\left(\frac{k_n^t}{n} r_n^{-\gamma}\right) \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t > 0. \quad (14)$$

Lemma 4.1 extends and strengthens the corresponding exponential bounds established by Phillips and Magdalinos (2007) in the homoskedastic setting. The adaptation to stochastic volatility relies on a careful treatment of the volatility recursion and its moment structure, ensuring that multiplicative volatility factors do not alter the leading exponential rate of ρ_n^{-n} . In particular, volatility-induced fluctuations enter only in subexponential order, so the stated $o(\cdot)$ bound persists in the SV regime.

Lemma 4.2. *In the mildly explosive regime described in Section 4, we have*

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{n \ell_n k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t}^n \rho_n^{t-j-1} u_j u_t \xrightarrow{L^1} 0.$$

Our objective is to show that, after a suitable normalization of both components, the bivariate array

$$\left(\frac{\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\ell_n k_n}, \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{\ell_n k_n^2} \right)$$

converges in distribution to the quadratic-linear Gaussian vector (WV, V^2) , where W and V are independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/(2c))$ random variables. To facilitate this, we introduce the auxiliary sequences

$$W_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{-j} u_j, \quad V_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{-(n-j+1)} u_j. \quad (15)$$

Heuristically, the normalized covariance term $\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t / (\ell_n k_n)$ factors as a product $W_n V_n$ up to a negligible remainder, while the normalized sum of squares $\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 / (\ell_n k_n^2)$ is asymptotically V_n^2 . We establish the joint Gaussian limit for (W_n, V_n) via the Cramer-Wold device. Hence,

it suffices to verify that for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$aW_n + bV_n \Rightarrow Z \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{a^2 + b^2}{2c}\right),$$

which in turn yields the convergence of (W_n, V_n) to a bivariate normal vector with independent components.

Lemma 4.3. *Let (W_n, V_n) be defined as in (15). Then*

$$(W_n, V_n) \xrightarrow{d} (W, V) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where W and V are independent $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2c})$ random variables.

Detailed proofs of these lemmas are deferred to [Appendix](#). Building on these results, we now establish the distributional limit of the serial autocorrelation in the mildly explosive regime.

Returning to the time series process (1), summing from $t = 1, \dots, n$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n^2 \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{k_n^2 \ell_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left[\rho_n^{-2n} (y_n^2 - y_0^2) - 2\rho_n^{-2n+1} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t - \rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n} y_n^2}{k_n} - \frac{2\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t - \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

since $y_0 = o_p(\sqrt{k_n})$. We now show that, except the first term every other term is $o_p(1)$. By virtue of Lemma 4.1

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n^2 \rho_n^{-4n} r_n^{\alpha^2/d}}{k_n^2 \ell_n^2} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n^2 \rho_n^{-4n} r_n^{\alpha^2/2d}}{k_n^2} \right) = o(1).$$

Hence, by Markov we can claim,

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{n \rho_n^{-2n} r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{4d}}}{k_n \ell_n} \right) = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{n \rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n} \right) = o_p(1).$$

We decompose the other term as follows:

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{\ell_n k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = \frac{\rho_n^{-n} y_0}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-(n-t+1)}}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} u_t + \frac{1}{\ell_n} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t.$$

It is easy to see that the first term is $o_p(1)$ because of asymptotic normality of V_n . To address the

second term, we calculate,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \right]^2 &= \frac{\rho_n^{-4n+2}}{\ell_n^2 k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} E \left[u_j^2 u_t^2 \right] \\
&\leq r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-4n+2}}{k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^n (\rho_n^{2t} - 1) r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-4n+2}}{\rho_n^2 - 1} \\
&\leq \frac{n \rho_n^{2n} r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \rho_n^{-4n+2}}{k_n^2 (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \rho_n^{-2n+2}}{k_n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since $k_n(\rho_n^2 - 1) \rightarrow 2c$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \right]^2 = o(1).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{\ell_n k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{k_n(\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left(\frac{\rho_n^{-n} y_n}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \right)^2 + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{k_n(\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-j} u_j}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \right)^2 + o_p(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{2c} W^2, \quad \text{where } W \sim N \left(0, \frac{1}{2c} \right). \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

This converges follows from the asymptotic normality of W_n , established in Lemma 4.3. Similarly, we can decompose the normalized covariance term as,

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \left[\sum_{t=1}^n y_0 \rho_n^{t-1} u_t + \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \right].$$

Note, from the asymptotic normality of V_n (Lemma 4.3),

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{y_0}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \rho_n^{-(n-t+1)} \cdot \frac{u_t}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} = o_p(1),$$

Also from Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t &= \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t - \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t}^n \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t, \\
&= W_n V_n + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} W V \quad \text{where } W, V \text{ independent } \sim N(0, 1/2c). \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining Equation (16) and (17) we conclude that

$$\frac{\frac{\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\ell_n k_n}}{\frac{\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{\ell_n k_n^2}} = \frac{\rho_n^n k_n \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{2c \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2} = \frac{\rho_n^n k_n (\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n)}{2c} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{C}, \quad \mathcal{C} \sim \text{Cauchy}. \quad (18)$$

Theorem 4.4. *For the model in (1) under the Assumption A2 and A3, the following large sample properties hold:*

$$\left(\frac{\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\ell_n k_n}, \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{\ell_n k_n^2} \right) \xRightarrow{d} (WV, V^2),$$

$$\left(\frac{k_n \rho_n^n}{2c} \right) (\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \xRightarrow{d} \mathcal{C},$$

where W, V are independent $N(0, 1/(2c))$ random variables and \mathcal{C} is a standard Cauchy distribution.

Theorem 4.4 is linked to some earlier work by Basawa and Brockwell (1984) on the explosive AR(1) process. Theorem 4.4 shows that the OLS deviation $\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n$ converges at rate $k_n \rho_n^n$ (or $n^a \rho_n^n$ when $k_n = n^a$) equivalent to Phillips and Magdalinos (2007). This rate increases in a and interpolates smoothly between the local-to-unity case (order $O(n)$ as $a \rightarrow 1$) and the classical case (order $O((1-c)^n)$ as $a \rightarrow 0$). For Gaussian AR(1) with a fixed explosive root, classical results normalize the OLS deviation by a factor proportional to $(\rho^2 - 1)^{-1}$ and obtain a Cauchy limit, as explained by White (1958).

In the mildly explosive setup with $\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$, we have $\rho_n^2 - 1 = \frac{2c}{k_n} - \frac{c^2}{k_n^2}$, so the normalization used here is asymptotically equivalent. The key difference is that, despite near-unit volatility persistence, the ratio statistic retains a Cauchy limit that is invariant to the innovation distribution and to the volatility parameters. This implies that during incipient bubble phases, explosive mean dynamics dominates the details of volatility, yielding robust diagnostics of explosiveness. Thus, inference on exuberance is thus less sensitive to tail and volatility misspecification than in fully explosive environments. The mild-explosive, moderate-deviation limit is also insensitive to initial conditions of order $o_p(k_n^{1/2})$, in contrast to genuinely explosive AR(1) models where y_0 can affect the limit law (Anderson, 1959).

Economically, ℓ_n measures the cumulative impact of uncertainty shocks on the process scale, a measure of volatility, which rises slowly as volatility becomes ultra-persistent. Its appearance with the same power in both components explains why the serial correlation is invariant to the volatility parameters in the mildly explosive regime, leading to a Cauchy limit that is robust to the exact strength of volatility persistence.

Similarly to the near-stationary case, the conclusions extend to moderately explosive roots near -1 . Defining the sign-flipped series $y_t^* = (-1)^t y_t$ maps the problem to the positive near-explosive case without altering the volatility path, so the same normalization yields a Cauchy limit for the serial correlation statistic. This implies that the inference hinges on proximity to the unit circle rather than the sign of the root, and remains robust to slowly varying uncertainty.

5 Simulation Study

This section investigates the finite-sample behavior of the OLS estimator of the autoregressive root in the double local-to-unity model. We simulate data from the AR(1) specification in the homoskedastic as well as stochastic volatility regime and study the convergence of the centered estimator $\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n$ under different regimes for the mean-persistence sequence $\{k_n\}$ the volatility-persistence sequence $\{r_n\}$.

We first consider the homoskedastic AR(1) process and study two cases for the autoregressive parameter: (i) a constant coefficient $\rho_n \equiv \rho < 1$, and (ii) a local-to-unity sequence $\rho_n = 1 - c/k_n$ with $c > 0$, $k_n \in \{\log n, n^a : a \in [0, 1)\}$. For each specification, we simulate data from the model in (1) for sufficiently large sample sizes n and for different values of c , and compute the corresponding normalized test statistic implied by the asymptotic theory. For each design, we then compare the empirical distribution of the normalized statistic to the limiting Gaussian law $N(0, 2c)$ (nearly stationary) or the standard Cauchy (mildly explosive) as follows. First, we obtain the empirical distribution of the statistic across Monte Carlo replications. Next, we perform a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test with target distribution $N(0, 2c)$ or $\mathcal{C}(0, 1)$ and compute the associated p -values. We do this for 100 independent replications and calculate the average KS test statistics and the proportion of times the KS statistic p -value exceeds 0.05. Note that the p -values provide evidence that the suitably standardized test statistic converges in distribution to the anticipated limit, hence if the proportion is higher we can ensure a better degree of confidence. Table 1a indicates the KS test statistics and acceptance proportion (p -value > 0.05) of the test for different regimes of k_n under the nearly-stationary case, with the limiting law being Gaussian. Table 1b denotes the same for the mildly explosive case.

Next, we consider the heteroskedastic AR(1) process and study different combinations for the mean and volatility persistent parameters. For each specification, we again simulate data from the model in (1) with $\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$, $\phi_n = 1 - \frac{d}{\log \log n}$ for sufficiently large sample sizes n and for different values of c, d, α , similar to the earlier homoskedastic case and calculate the average KS test statistics and the proportion of times the KS statistic p -value exceeds 0.05 for 100 independent replications. Table 2a indicates the KS test statistics and acceptance proportion of the test for different of k_n regimes under the nearly-stationary case, with the limiting law being Gaussian. Table 2b denotes the same for the mildly explosive case.

k_n	Mean KS stat	Acceptance Proportion	Mean KS stat	Acceptance Proportion
constant	0.0515	0.95	0.0439	0.90
$\log n$	0.0528	0.90	0.0519	0.96
$n^{0.1}$	0.0498	0.95	0.0585	0.92
$n^{0.25}$	0.0503	0.94	0.0504	0.95
$n^{0.50}$	0.1046	0.80	0.0671	0.88
$n^{0.75}$	0.1321	0.82	0.1068	0.79
$n^{0.99}$	0.2175	0.66	0.2741	0.61
n	0.3031	0.00	0.3081	0.04

(a) Nearly stationary regime

(b) Mildly explosive regime

Table 1: KS statistics and acceptance proportions of the test for different mean-persistence regimes k_n (homoskedastic)

Remark 5.1. We should emphasize that in the nearly stationary regime, KS statistics and acceptance probabilities reported in Tables 1a and 2a are based on Monte Carlo simulations across sample sizes and growth rates of k_n . For slower sequences $k_n \in \{\log n, n^{0.1}, n^{0.25}, n^{0.5}\}$, the KS p -values exceed 0.05 already for $n \approx 10^3$, indicating adequate normal approximation. By contrast, for faster

k_n	Mean KS stat	Acceptance Proportion	Mean KS stat	Acceptance Proportion
$n^{0.1}$	0.0495	0.95	0.1037	0.95
$n^{0.25}$	0.0526	0.94	0.0952	0.92
$n^{0.50}$	0.0634	0.84	0.0901	0.93
$n^{0.75}$	0.1163	0.71	0.1012	0.85
$n^{0.99}$	0.1982	0.57	0.1447	0.71
n	0.3768	0.00	0.2948	0.01

(a) Nearly stationary regime
(b) Mild volatility regime

Table 2: KS statistics and acceptance proportions of the test for different mean-persistence regimes k_n under (a) a nearly stationary mean regime and (b) a mild volatility regime. In all designs the volatility persistence index is specified via $r_n = \log \log n$; the data generating process uses $c = d = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.

k_n , sample sizes on the order of $n \approx 10^4$ were required to achieve comparable convergence. For $k_n \in \{\log n, n^{0.1}, n^{0.25}, n^{0.5}\}$ when $n \approx 10^4$, the acceptance proportion is exactly 1.

Remark 5.2. In the mildly explosive regime ($\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n$), KS diagnostics reported in Tables 1b and 2b are similarly based on Monte Carlo simulations across sample sizes. Surprising, for slower sequences $k_n \in \{\log n, n^{0.1}, n^{0.25}, n^{0.5}\}$, KS p-values exceed 0.05 already for $n \approx 100$, indicating rapid convergence to the limiting law as compared to the near stationary regime. By contrast, for faster sequences (e.g., $k_n = n^{0.75}$ or $n^{0.9}$), sample sizes on the order of $n \approx 10^3$ were required to achieve comparable acceptance rates.


Next we construct the diagnostic plots by Monte Carlo simulation under two parameterizations to substantiate our claim. We set $n = 1,000$, $c = d = 1$, $\alpha = 0.5$. For growth rate $k_n \in \{n^{0.1}, n^{0.25}\}$, we generate $B = 500$ sample paths from the model in Section 3. For each replication, we compute the OLS estimator $\hat{\rho}_n$ and form the standardized statistic

$$T_n = \sqrt{n k_n} (\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n).$$

The left panel (Figure 1a) reports the histogram of $\{T_n\}_{b=1}^B$ superimposed with the density of $\mathcal{N}(0, 2c)$. The empirical histogram aligns closely with the Gaussian overlay across the reported k_n rates. For mildly explosive regime. We set a small $n = 300$ (to avoid numerical overflow), $c = 0.5$, $d = 1$, $\alpha = 0.5$. For the data-generating process as in Section 4 we compute

$$S_n = \frac{\rho_n^n k_n}{2c} (\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n).$$

The right panel (Figure 1b) reports the histogram of $\{S_n\}_{b=1}^B$ superimposed with the standard Cauchy density; the empirical distribution exhibits the expected heavy tails and overlays well with the theoretical limit. In both regimes, the empirical plots along with the KS diagnostics yielding non-rejecting p-values for the ranges of k_n considered, corroborate the asymptotic approximations.



(a) Nearly stationary regime: histogram of $T_n = \sqrt{nk_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n)$ with $\mathcal{N}(0, 2c)$ overlay. (b) Mildly explosive regime: histogram of $S_n = \rho_n^n k_n(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n)/(2c)$ with standard Cauchy overlay.

Figure 1: Empirical standardized statistics under different k_n growth rates with theoretical overlays. The left panel illustrates convergence to $\mathcal{N}(0, 2c)$ in the nearly stationary regime; the right panel illustrates the Cauchy limit in the mildly explosive regime. KS diagnostics from Tables 1 and 2 yield non-rejecting p-values in the vast majority of configurations, corroborating the asymptotic theory.

6 Conclusion

Section 3 and Section 4 develop an asymptotic theory for autoregressive processes in which both the mean and volatility exhibit moderate deviations from unit roots. The autoregressive coefficient satisfies $\rho_n = 1 \pm c/k_n$ with $o(n) = k_n \gg \text{poly}(\log n)$, while the log-volatility follows a near-integrated AR process with persistence ϕ_n drifting to one at rate $1/\log \log n$. This double localization delivers a unified framework that accommodates stationary, mildly integrated, and local-to-unity behavior in the presence of highly persistent stochastic volatility.

In the mildly stationary regime ($\rho_n = 1 - c/k_n < 1$), the OLS estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal under volatility-adjusted normalization.

$$\sqrt{nk_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \Rightarrow N(0, 2c).$$

Negative near-unit roots ($\rho_n = -1 + c/k_n$) are covered by a sign-flip argument, delivering identical large-sample behavior after a trivial transformation. At the outer boundary where $k_n \asymp n$, our framework nests the classical local-to-unity limit theory of Phillips (1987).

In the mildly explosive regime ($\rho_n = 1 + c/k_n > 1$), the serial correlation statistic is asymptotically Cauchy under the explosive normalization implies the Cauchy limit

$$\left(\frac{k_n \rho_n^n}{2c}\right)(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}.$$

The appearance of ℓ_n , defined in (13) reflects the ultra-persistent volatility scale; its equal presence in the score and variance normalizations causes it to cancel in the serial-correlation ratio, so the Cauchy limit is invariant to α and the volatility persistence. Economically, this invariance indicates that in incipient bubble phases explosive mean dynamics dominate uncertainty details, yielding robust diagnostics for explosiveness even under nearly nonstationary volatility. The near-explosive,

moderate-deviation limit is also insensitive to initial conditions of order $o_p(k_n^{1/2})$, in contrast to genuinely explosive AR(1) models where y_0 can affect the limit law ([Anderson, 1959](#)).

The most significant contribution here is that we establish that the usual OLS estimator remains consistent even under ultra-persistent stochastic volatility. The suitably normalized estimator retains the same asymptotic law and is independent of the dispersion of the log-volatility shocks. These limits are robust to volatility persistence, and under homoskedastic innovations with a fixed autoregressive coefficient they collapse to the classical stationary, explosive, and local-to-unity results. Our analysis requires sub-Gaussian tails for the innovation sequences to secure martingale central limit theorems under moderate-deviation. However, we show that for any error distribution with conditional variance slower than a polynomial rate in n , it can retain the asymptotic laws. The approach extends to martingale difference innovations with sub-Gaussian envelopes. Overall, the results unify moderate-deviation asymptotics for the mean with nearly nonstationary stochastic volatility and provide practicable, volatility-robust pivots for empirical work.

Second, we show that ultra-persistent volatility fundamentally alters the stochastic environment in which local-to-unity asymptotics operate. In our setting, the familiar Brownian-functional limits of the local-to-unity literature are replaced by functionals of Brownian motion evaluated at a random time given by the cumulative variance of the innovations. This induces an additional layer of randomness in the scaling and can modify the required normalization, depending on the relative speeds at which ρ_n and ϕ_n approach one. This captures the idea that both the persistence in the conditional mean and the persistence in volatility co-determine the effective information content of the sample, as observed in financial econometrics. Methodologically, these features favor inference procedures that adapt to realized volatility, such as self-normalized statistics or wild/multiplier bootstrap schemes tailored to nonstationary variance, in the spirit of [Cavaliere and Taylor \(2008\)](#).

Our consistency and distributional results for the autoregressive coefficient presuppose a correct specification of the innovations in both the mean and volatility equations. Relatedly, [Dahlhaus \(1997\)](#) analyzes nonstationary time series with time-varying second moments via evolutionary spectra and develops minimum distance estimators with well-characterized asymptotic properties under possible misspecification, underscoring that inference remains meaningful when volatility evolves slowly over time. In subsequent work, we intend to examine how our asymptotics change under model misspecification and to explore the feasibility of doubly robust procedures (with respect to both mean and volatility) under reasonable assumptions. We also defer to follow-up papers extensions beyond AR(1) — to higher-order AR and ARMA models and to more realistic shock processes (including skewness, heavy tails, and long-memory volatility) with a view toward assessing robustness. Our framework is also amenable to conditional variance processes generated by near-integrated GARCH-type models (e.g., GARCH(1,1) with $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 \rightarrow 1$), under analogous moment and mixing conditions; an important question is whether similar normalization arguments deliver volatility-robust limit laws in these settings. Finally, we aim to develop a robust testing procedure for the presence of explosive episodes under general volatility dynamics and to consistently date the origination and collapse of mildly explosive bubbles. An ADF-type test adapted to stochastic volatility may be valuable in this context; we plan to extend the methodology of [Phillips and Yu \(2009\)](#) to a broader stochastic-volatility setting and to implement the resulting procedures on real data.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Professor Robert A. Jarrow for his insightful comments on asset pricing and bubble dynamics, as well as for suggestions that strengthened the economic interpretation of our results. MTW's research was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health under award P01AI159402.

References

- Anderson, T. W. (1959). On asymptotic distributions of estimates of parameters of stochastic difference equations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 30:676–687.
- Basawa, I. and Brockwell, P. (1984). Asymptotic conditional inference for regular nonergodic models with an application to autoregressive processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12:161–171.
- Basele, R. B., Phillips, P. C., and Shi, S. (2025). Speculative bubbles in the recent AI boom: Nasdaq and the magnificent seven. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*.
- Boswijk, H. P., Yu, J., and Zu, Y. (2024). Testing for an explosive bubble using high-frequency volatility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02087*.
- Cavaliere, G. and Taylor, A. R. (2008). Bootstrap unit root tests for time series with nonstationary volatility. *Econometric Theory*, 24(1):43–71.
- Cavaliere, G. and Taylor, A. R. (2009). Heteroskedastic time series with a unit root. *Econometric Theory*, 25(5):1228–1276.
- Chan, N. H. and Wei, C.-Z. (1987). Asymptotic inference for nearly nonstationary AR(1) processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 15:1050–1063.
- Chen, Y., Phillips, P. C., and Shi, S. (2023). Common bubble detection in large dimensional financial systems. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 21(4):989–1063.
- Corbet, S., Lucey, B., and Yarovaya, L. (2018). Datestamping the bitcoin and ethereum bubbles. *Finance Research Letters*, 26:81–88.
- Dahlhaus, R. (1997). Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(1):1–37.
- Deng, Y., Girardin, E., Joyeux, R., and Shi, S. (2017). Did bubbles migrate from the stock to the housing market in china between 2005 and 2010? *Pacific Economic Review*, 22(3):276–292.
- Fusari, N., Jarrow, R., and Lamichhane, S. (2025). Testing for asset price bubbles using options data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 43(4):1–15.
- Giraitis, L. and Phillips, P. C. (2006). Uniform limit theory for stationary autoregression. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 27(1):51–60.
- Greenwood, R., Shleifer, A., and You, Y. (2019). Bubbles for Fama. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 131(1):20–43.
- Harvey, A., Ruiz, E., and Shephard, N. (1994). Multivariate stochastic variance models. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 61(2):247–264.
- Jarrow, R., Protter, P., and Shimbo, K. (2010). Asset price bubbles in incomplete markets. *Mathematical Finance*, 20(2):145–185.
- Ji, Q., Ripple, R. D., Zhang, D., and Zhao, Y. (2022). Cryptocurrency bubble on the systemic risk in global energy companies. *The Energy Journal*, 43(1_suppl):1–24.
- Kim, K. and Schmidt, P. (1993). Unit root tests with conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 59(3):287–300.
- Mijatović, A. and Urusov, M. (2012). On the martingale property of certain local martingales. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(1–2):1–30.

- Mikusheva, A. (2012). One-dimensional inference in autoregressive models with the potential presence of a unit root. *Econometrica*, 80(1):173–212.
- Montanino, A. and De Luca, G. (2025). The bubble-crash GARCH model. *Available at SSRN 5604452*.
- Nelson, D. B. (1990). Stationarity and persistence in the GARCH (1, 1) model. *Econometric Theory*, 6(3):318–334.
- Park, J. Y. (2003). Weak unit roots. <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/econ/papers/2003papers/17park.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-11-28.
- Patton, A. J. and Sheppard, K. (2015). Good volatility, bad volatility: Signed jumps and the persistence of volatility. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(3):683–697.
- Phillips, P. C. (1987). Towards a unified asymptotic theory for autoregression. *Biometrika*, 74(3):535–547.
- Phillips, P. C. and Magdalinos, T. (2007). Limit theory for moderate deviations from a unit root under weak dependence. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soe_research/1117. Accessed: 2025-11-28.
- Phillips, P. C. and Magdalinos, T. (2007). Limit theory for moderate deviations from a unit root. *Journal of Econometrics*, 136(1):115–130.
- Phillips, P. C., Shi, S., and Yu, J. (2015). Testing for multiple bubbles: Historical episodes of exuberance and collapse in the s&p 500. *International Economic Review*, 56(4):1043–1078.
- Phillips, P. C. and Solo, V. (1992). Asymptotics for linear processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20:971–1001.
- Phillips, P. C., Wu, Y., and Yu, J. (2011). Explosive behavior in the 1990s nasdaq: When did exuberance escalate asset values? *International Economic Review*, 52(1):201–226.
- Phillips, P. C. and Yu, J. (2009). Limit theory for dating the origination and collapse of mildly explosive periods in time series data. *Unpublished manuscript, Sim Kee Boon Institute for Financial Economics, Singapore Management University*. [458, 466, 468, 469, 483].
- Shephard, N. and Sheppard, K. (2010). Realising the future: forecasting with high-frequency-based volatility (heavy) models. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(2):197–231.
- Shi, S. (2017). Speculative bubbles or market fundamentals? an investigation of us regional housing markets. *Economic Modelling*, 66:101–111.
- Shi, S., Valadkhani, A., Smyth, R., and Vahid, F. (2016). Dating the timeline of house price bubbles in australian capital cities. *Economic Record*, 92(299):590–605.
- Taylor, S. J. (2008). *Modelling Financial Time Series*. World Scientific.
- White, J. S. (1958). The limiting distribution of the serial correlation coefficient in the explosive case. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 29:1188–1197.
- Yiu, M. S., Yu, J., and Jin, L. (2013). Detecting bubbles in Hong Kong residential property market. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 28:115–124.

A Appendix

Let us recall the time series process. We start with sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ and $\{\phi_n\}$ that determines the rate of drift of the mean and the volatility persistence coefficient to unity, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \rho_n y_{t-1} + u_t, & u_t &= \varepsilon_t \sigma_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1), \\ \rho_n &= 1 - \frac{c}{k_n}, \quad c > 0, & \log(\sigma_t^2) &= \phi_n \log(\sigma_{t-1}^2) + \eta_t, \quad \eta_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, \alpha^2), \\ \phi_n &= 1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}, \quad d > 0, & \hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n &= \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.1. *For the model in (1) with Assumption A3,*

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] &\leq e^{\alpha^2 A_n} \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)}, \\ (b) \quad \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] &\leq e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/d}, \\ (c) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{t \neq s}^n \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \sigma_s^2] &\leq e^{2\alpha^2 A_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (a) From the Gaussian AR(1) structure of (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] &= \exp\left(\alpha^2 \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) \leq \exp\left(\alpha^2 \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2n}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) \exp\left(-\alpha^2 \frac{\phi_n^{2n}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\frac{\phi_n^{2n}}{1 - \phi_n^2} = \frac{(1 - d/\log r_n)^{2n}}{2d/\log r_n - (d/\log r_n)^2} \leq \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-n/\log r_n} \log r_n\right) = o(1).$$

Also, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) &= \exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2 \log r_n}{2(2d - d/\log r_n)}\right) \\ &= r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2 \log r_n}{2} \frac{d/\log r_n}{2d(2d - d/\log r_n)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) = r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{8d}\right)\right).$$

Hence, claim (a) follows.

(b) From (5),

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= \phi_n^t z_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j} \sim N\left(0, \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2}\right) \\ \Rightarrow 2z_t &\sim N\left(0, \frac{4\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

we have the lognormal moments

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] = \mathbb{E}[e^{2z_t}] = \exp(2 \operatorname{Var}(z_t)) = \exp\left(\frac{2\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2}\right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] = e^{4\alpha^2 A_t} \leq e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/d}.$$

Hence, (b) follows.

(c) We now measure the temporal dependence through the cross-term moments. Note that for $t \geq s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{z_s + z_t}] \\ &= \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Var}(z_s) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Var}(z_t) + \operatorname{Cov}(z_s, z_t)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\operatorname{Cov}(z_s, z_t) = \alpha^2 \phi_n^{t-s} \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2s}}{1 - \phi_n^2} \quad (t \geq s),$$

which is generally positive when $\phi_n \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then the cross moment admits the representation

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2] = \exp\left\{\frac{\alpha^2}{2} (2A_s + 2A_t) + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^{t-s} A_s\right\}.$$

Using $A_s \leq A_n$, $A_t \leq A_n$, and $\phi_n^{t-s} \leq 1$, we obtain the uniform envelope

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2] \leq \exp\{4\alpha^2 A_n\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

However, this uniform bound is reasonably weak to guarantee the convergence of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2$ under near-nonstationary volatility, hence we require a tight bound. To obtain this, we set

$$M_n = \left\lfloor \frac{\log r_n}{2d} \cdot \log\left(\frac{\log r_n}{\delta_n}\right) \right\rfloor, \quad \delta_n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\log \log r_n}\right), \quad Z_n = \left(1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}\right)^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Then

$$Z_n^{M_n} = \left(1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}\right)^{2M_n} \leq \exp\left(-\log(\log r_n / \delta_n)\right) = \frac{\delta_n}{\log r_n}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Hence, for all $h > M_n$,

$$\phi_n^h = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta_n}{\log r_n}\right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq n} \exp\left\{\alpha^2(A_s + A_t) + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^{|s-t|} A_s\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \exp\left\{\alpha^2(A_t + A_{t-h}) + (\alpha^2 + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^h) A_{t-h}\right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^n (n-h) \exp\left\{2\alpha^2(1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{h=1}^n \exp\left\{2\alpha^2(1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{h < M_n} e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} + \sum_{h \geq M_n} \exp\left\{2\alpha^2(1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\right\} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{M_n}{n} e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} + \frac{n - M_n}{n} \exp\left\{2\alpha^2(1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta_n / \log r_n)) A_n\right\} \quad \text{from (A.6)} \\
&\leq o(1) + \exp\{2\alpha^2 A_n\} \exp(\delta_n) \\
&= o(1) + \exp\{2\alpha^2 A_n\} (1 + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result (c) follows. □

Lemma A.2. For the model in (1) with Assumption A3, $m_n = e^{\alpha^2 A_n}$.

Proof. From (A.3), recall

$$M_n = \left\lfloor \frac{\log r_n}{2d} \cdot \log\left(\frac{\log r_n}{\delta_n}\right) \right\rfloor.$$

Then

$$Z_n^{M_n} = \left(1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}\right)^{2M_n} \leq \exp\left(-\log(\log r_n / \delta_n)\right) = \frac{\delta_n}{\log r_n}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and therefore,

$$\frac{Z_n^{M_n}}{1 - \phi_n^2} \leq \frac{\delta_n}{d}.$$

Recall

$$A_t = \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}.$$

Then

$$0 \leq A_n - A_t = \frac{\phi_n^{2t} - \phi_n^{2n}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}, \quad 0 \leq A_n - A_{M_n} = \frac{Z_n^{M_n}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log r_n}\right) \leq \frac{\delta_n}{2d} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log r_n}\right).$$

Thus, it follows that

$$A_{M_n} \leq A_n \leq A_{M_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log r_n}\right),$$

and for all $t \geq M_n$,

$$x_t = e^{\alpha^2 A_t} \geq e^{\alpha^2 A_{M_n}} \geq e^{\alpha^2 A_n} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2 \delta_n}{2d} - o(1/\log r_n)\right) = e^{\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)).$$

Now consider the sum

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

Then

$$S_n \geq \sum_{i \geq M_n} x_i \geq (n - M_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)) \Rightarrow m_n = \frac{S_n}{n} \geq e^{\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)).$$

Also,

$$S_n = \sum_{i < M_n} x_i + \sum_{i \geq M_n} x_i \leq \sum_{i < M_n} x_i + (n - M_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} \leq n e^{\alpha^2 A_n},$$

Hence, $m_n \leq e^{\alpha^2 A_n}$, combining with the previous bound gives

$$m_n = e^{\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\Rightarrow m_n = e^{\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1-\phi_n^2)}} (1 + o(1)) = r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{4d}} \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Hence, the result follows. \square

Lemma A.3. Let $y_0 = o_p(k_n^{1/2})$ and assume $r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} k_n = o(n)$. Then, $\frac{y_n^2}{n} \xrightarrow{p} 0$.

Proof. Write

$$y_n = \rho_n^n y_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{n-j} u_j, \quad u_t = \varepsilon_t \sigma_t.$$

Then, by the elementary inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$,

$$\frac{y_n^2}{n} \leq \frac{2}{n} \rho_n^{2n} y_0^2 + \frac{2}{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{n-j} u_j \right)^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} y_0^2 + \frac{2}{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{n-j} u_j \right)^2,$$

since $\rho_n^{2n} \leq 1$ for $\rho_n < 1$. Using $\mathbb{E}[u_t] = 0$ and independence across t ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{n-j} u_j \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{2(n-j)} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^2].$$

Note $z_t = \log \sigma_t^2$, $z_t = \phi_n z_{t-1} + \eta_t$. Iterating,

$$z_t = \phi_n^t z_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j} \Rightarrow \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j} \sim N\left(0, \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{1 - \phi_n^2} \alpha^2\right).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \phi_n^{2t}}{1 - \phi_n^2} \alpha^2\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)}\right) \lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)}, \text{ from Lemma A.1. (a).}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{n-j} u_j \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{2(n-j)} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} k_n}{n} \right) = o(1),$$

using $\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{2(n-j)} \asymp (1 - \rho_n^2)^{-1} = \frac{k_n}{2c} (1 + o(1))$ and $r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} k_n = o(n)$. Finally, $y_0 = o_p(k_n^{1/2})$ implies $\frac{y_0^2}{n} = o_p(1)$. Hence,

$$\frac{y_n^2}{n} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

□

Lemma A.4. *If $r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{d}} k_n = o(n)$, then $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \xrightarrow{p} 0$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\rho_n^{t-1} y_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \rho_n^{t-1} y_0 u_t}_{\equiv T_{1n}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t}_{\equiv T_{2n}}. \end{aligned}$$

For T_{1n} , $\mathbb{E}[T_{1n}] = 0$ and, using $y_0^2 = o_p(k_n)$ and Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{1n}^2 \mid y_0] \leq \frac{y_0^2}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \rho_n^{2(t-1)} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2] \lesssim \frac{y_0^2}{n^2} \frac{k_n}{2c} r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} = o_p(1).$$

Hence $T_{1n} = o_p(1)$. For T_{2n} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_{2n}^2] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} u_j^2 u_t^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^2 \sigma_t^2] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - \rho_n^2} \mathcal{O}(r_n^{\alpha^2/d}) \quad \text{from Lemma A.1 (b).} \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{r_n^{\alpha^2/d} k_n}{n} \right) = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

by the assumed growth condition. Thus $T_{2n} = o_p(1)$, and the result follows. □

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.5

We first aim to show that,

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

From the identity

$$y_t^2 - \rho_n^2 y_{t-1}^2 = u_t^2 + 2\rho_n y_{t-1} u_t,$$

we obtain, upon summing over $t = 1, \dots, n$ and dividing by n ,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \rho_n^2) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} (y_0^2 - y_n^2) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 + 2\rho_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where we used $y_0 = o_p(k_n^{1/2})$, $y_n^2/n \xrightarrow{p} 0$ (by Lemma A.3), and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = o_p(1)$ (by Lemma A.4).

Next, note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \exp \left(\frac{(1 - \phi_n^{2t}) \alpha^2}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)} \right),$$

and for the second moment,

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right)^2 \right] = \frac{3}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \sigma_t^2],$$

where we used $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^2] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^4] = 3$ for standard normal ε_t . Recall,

$$z_t = \phi_n^t z_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \phi_n^j \eta_{t-j} \sim N \left(0, \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2} \right) \Rightarrow 2z_t \sim N \left(0, \frac{4\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2} \right),$$

we have the lognormal moments

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^4] = \mathbb{E}[e^{2z_t}] = \exp(2 \text{Var}(z_t)) = \exp \left(\frac{2\alpha^2(1 - \phi_n^{2t})}{1 - \phi_n^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We decompose the following expression as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(u_t^4) + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{t \neq s} \mathbb{E}(u_t^2 u_s^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left(3n \mathcal{O} \left(r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{d}} \right) + \sum_{t \neq s} \mathbb{E}(\sigma_t^2 \sigma_s^2) \right) \quad \text{from Lemma A.1 (b) and } \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^4] = 3. \end{aligned}$$

Now also note that

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{t \neq s}^n \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \sigma_s^2] \leq e^{2\alpha^2 A_n}.$$

Thus we conclude,

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right)^2 = o(1) + \exp\{2\alpha^2 A_n\} (1 + o(1)).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 / m_n \right) &\leq \frac{\exp(2\alpha^2 A_n) - m_n^2 + o(1)}{m_n^2} \\ &= \frac{e^{2A_n\alpha^2}(1 + o(1))}{e^{2A_n\alpha^2}((1 + o(1))^2)} - 1 \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

So we proved,

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right) / \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] \right) \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

Plugging this in Equation (A.10), this implies that

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c}, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

because $1 - \rho_n^2 = \frac{c}{k_n} \left(2 - \frac{c}{k_n} \right) = \frac{2c}{k_n} (1 + o(1))$.

Now, we calculate the limiting distribution of the sample covariance. We will show the standardized sample variance converges to a normal distribution. For this, we define the martingale difference array and the corresponding σ algebra, where α is the dispersion parameter of volatility. Define,

$$\tau_{nt} = e^{-\alpha^2/4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_n m_n}} y_{t-1} u_t, \quad \mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(y_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_t), \quad 1 \leq t \leq n.$$

Since ε_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}$ and centered, $\{\tau_t, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ is a martingale difference array. Its conditional variance satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_{nt}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] &= \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 u_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] \\ &= \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] \quad (\text{since } u_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t \perp \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \quad (\text{because } \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] = e^{\phi_n z_{t-1} + \alpha^2/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since we already know from (A.12) that

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2c},$$

we now show that

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{2c}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

which implies

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_{nt}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] \xrightarrow{p} \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{2c}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

To obtain (A.13) note that

$$\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}] = \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2 e^{-\eta_t}] = e^{-\alpha^2/2} \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2], \quad (\text{A.15})$$

because $\sigma_t^2 = e^{\phi_n z_{t-1} + \eta_t}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \mid z_{t-1}] = e^{\phi_n z_{t-1} + \alpha^2/2}$.

Thus, it suffices to prove

$$\frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2c}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Conditioning on the volatility path $\{\sigma_j\}$ and using the independence of ε_j ,

$$\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \mid \{\sigma_j\}, y_0] = \rho_n^{2(t-1)} y_0^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \sigma_j^2.$$

Since $z_t = \log \sigma_t^2 = \phi_n z_{t-1} + \eta_t$ with $\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$ independent of the past,

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 \mid z_{t-1}] = \exp(\phi_n z_{t-1} + \alpha^2/2).$$

Hence, by iterated expectations and independence of ε_t ,

$$\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] = \rho_n^{2(t-1)} \mathbb{E}[y_0^2 \sigma_t^2] + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^2 \sigma_t^2].$$

If y_0 is independent of the volatility process, then $\mathbb{E}[y_0^2 \sigma_t^2] = \mathbb{E}[y_0^2] \exp(\alpha^2 A_t)$. Therefore, the explicit representation is

$$\mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] = \rho_n^{2(t-1)} \mathbb{E}[y_0^2] e^{\alpha^2 A_t} + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \exp\left\{\alpha^2 A_j + \alpha^2 A_t + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^{t-j} A_j\right\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] &= \sum_{t=1}^n \rho_n^{2(t-1)} \mathbb{E}[y_0^2] e^{\alpha^2 A_t} + \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \exp\left\{\alpha^2 A_j + \alpha^2 A_t + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^{t-j} A_j\right\} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + \sum_{h=1}^n \rho_n^{2(h-1)} (n-h) \exp\left\{\alpha^2 A_n + \alpha^2 A_{n-h} + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^h A_{n-h}\right\} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + \sum_{h=1}^n \rho_n^{2(h-1)} (n-h) \exp\left\{2\alpha^2 (1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\right\} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + n \sum_{h=1}^n \rho_n^{2(h-1)} \exp\left\{2\alpha^2 (1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\right\} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + n \left(\sum_{h=1}^{M_n} \rho_n^{2(h-1)} \exp\{4\alpha^2 A_n\} + \sum_{h>M_n} \rho_n^{2(h-1)} \exp\{2\alpha^2 (1 + \phi_n^h) A_n\} \right) \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + n \left(M_n e^{4\alpha^2 A_n} + \sum_{h>M_n} \rho_n^{2(h-1)} e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} e^{\delta_n} \right) \\
&\lesssim \mathcal{O}(nk_n) e^{\alpha^2 A_n} + n \left(M_n r_n^{\alpha^2/d} + \frac{\rho_n^{2M_n}}{1 - \rho_n^2} (1 + o(1)) e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over t , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n m_n^2 k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] &\leq \frac{\mathcal{O}(nk_n e^{\alpha^2 A_n}) + n \left(M_n r_n^{\alpha^2/d} + \frac{\rho_n^{2M_n}}{1 - \rho_n^2} e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)) \right)}{n k_n m_n^2} \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{O}(nk_n e^{\alpha^2 A_n})}{n k_n m_n^2} + \frac{n M_n r_n^{\alpha^2/d}}{n k_n m_n^2} + \frac{n \rho_n^{2M_n} e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)) / (1 - \rho_n^2)}{n k_n m_n^2} \\
&\lesssim r_n^{-\alpha^2/(4d)} + \frac{M_n r_n^{\alpha^2/(2d)}}{k_n} + \frac{\rho_n^{2M_n}}{2c} \rightarrow 1/2c.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows since $M_n = \mathcal{O}(\log r_n) = o(k_n)$. We can follow similar steps to conclude

the equality. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] &= \sum_{t=1}^n \rho_n^{2(t-1)} \mathbb{E}[y_0^2] e^{\alpha^2 A_t} + \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \exp\left\{\alpha^2 A_j + \alpha^2 A_t + 2\alpha^2 \phi_n^{t-j} A_j\right\} \\
&\geq \sum_{t=M_n}^n \sum_{j=M_n}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \exp\left\{\alpha^2 A_j + \alpha^2 A_t\right\} \\
&\geq \sum_{t=M_n}^n \sum_{j=M_n}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \exp\left\{2\alpha^2 A_n\right\} (1 + o(1)) \\
&\geq \sum_{t=M_n}^n \sum_{h=0}^{t-M_n} \rho_n^{2(h-1)} \exp\left\{2\alpha^2 A_n\right\} (1 + o(1)) \\
&= \sum_{t=M_n}^n \frac{1 - \rho_n^{2(t-M_n)}}{1 - \rho_n^2} e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1)) \\
&= \frac{(n - M_n) e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1))}{(1 - \rho_n^2)} - \frac{(1 - \rho_n^{2(n-M_n)}) e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1))}{(1 - \rho_n^2)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n m_n^2 k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] &= \frac{(n - M_n) e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1))}{n k_n m_n^2 (1 - \rho_n^2)} - \frac{(1 - \rho_n^{2(n-M_n)}) e^{2\alpha^2 A_n} (1 + o(1))}{n k_n m_n^2 (1 - \rho_n^2)^2} \\
&\rightarrow 1/2c \quad \text{since } M_n = o(k_n) \text{ and } n(1 - \rho_n^2) \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{(n m_n^2 k_n)^2} \text{Var} \left[\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2 \right] = o(1).$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\frac{1}{n k_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_t^2] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2c}.$$

Thus, the result in Equation (A.14) is proved:

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_{nt}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}] \xrightarrow{p} \frac{e^{-\alpha^2/2}}{2c}.$$

Now, we verify the Lindeberg condition to finally conclude the martingale central limit theorem.

Take any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}(\tau_{n,t}^2 \mathbf{1}\{\tau_{n,t} > \eta\})] &= \frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \mathbb{E}[u_t^2 \mathbf{1}\{|y_{t-1} u_t| > \eta m_n \sqrt{nk_n}\}] \\
&= \frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}[u_t^2 \mathbf{1}\{|y_{t-1} u_t| > \eta m_n \sqrt{nk_n}\}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{nk_n m_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 \sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}[u_t^2 \mathbf{1}\{|y_{t-1} u_t| > \eta m_n \sqrt{nk_n}\}] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}[u_t^2 \mathbf{1}\{|y_{t-1} u_t| > \eta m_n \sqrt{nk_n}\}] \text{ by (A.14)} \\
&\leq M \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}[|u_t|^4]^{1/2} \Pr(|y_{t-1} u_t| > \eta m_n \sqrt{nk_n})^{1/2} \text{ (Cauchy-Schwarz)} \\
&\leq M \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}[|u_t|^4]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sigma_t^2}{\eta^2 m_n^2} \left(\frac{y_{t-1}^2}{nk_n}\right)\right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq M' \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{x_t^2}{\sigma_{t-1}^{2\phi_n}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sigma_t^2 y_{t-1}^2}{nk_n m_n^2}\right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq M' \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \frac{x_t^2}{\sigma_t^2} e^{\eta t} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sigma_t^2 y_{t-1}^2}{nk_n m_n^2}\right]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, due to log-normal property,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma_t^2}\right] = x_t, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{x_t^2 e^{\eta t}}{\sigma_t^2}\right] = \mathcal{O}(x_t) = \mathcal{O}(r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)}).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}(\tau_{n,t}^2 \mathbf{1}\{\tau_{n,t} > \eta\})] &\lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \left(\frac{kn e^{\alpha^2 A_t} + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} e^{4\alpha^2 A_n}}{n m_n^2 kn} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \left(\frac{e^{-\alpha^2 A_n}}{n} + \frac{1}{1 - \rho_n^2} \frac{e^{4\alpha^2 A_n}}{nk_n} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)} \left(o(1) + \frac{r_n^{\alpha^2/d}}{2cn} \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}(\tau_{n,t}^2 \mathbf{1}\{\tau_{n,t} > \eta\})] = o_p(1). \tag{A.17}$$

Combining (A.14) and (A.17), we conclude the asymptotic normality.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_n m_n}} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1}{2c}\right). \tag{A.18}$$

The asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\rho}_n - \rho_n$ can now be obtained from (A.14) and (A.18)

$$\sqrt{nk_n}(\widehat{\rho}_n - \rho_n) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 2c). \quad (\text{A.19})$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Let us now consider the time series process as described in Section 4.

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \rho_n y_{t-1} + u_t, & u_t &= \varepsilon_t \sigma_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1), \\ \rho_n &= 1 + \frac{c}{k_n}, \quad c > 0, & \log(\sigma_t^2) &= \phi_n \log(\sigma_{t-1}^2) + \eta_t, \quad \eta_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, \alpha^2), \\ \phi_n &= 1 - \frac{d}{\log r_n}, \quad d > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the autoregressive coefficient ρ_n is now more than 1 and slowing approaching 1. This regime is usually described as “mild” explosive regime under nearly non-stationary stochastic volatility. We will prove the consistency results of $\widehat{\rho}_n$, and asymptotic distribution of

$$\widehat{\rho}_n - \rho_n = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2}.$$

Lemma A.5. *Under the model specifications described in Section 4*

$$\rho_n^{-n} = o\left(\frac{k_n^t}{n} r_n^{-\gamma}\right) \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t > 0.$$

Proof. Consider

$$\log\left(n \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-n} r_n^\gamma}{k_n}\right).$$

We have

$$\log\left(n \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-n} r_n^\gamma}{k_n}\right) = -n \log \rho_n + \gamma \log r_n + \log n - t \log k_n,$$

and, since $\rho_n = 1 + \frac{c}{k_n}$,

$$-n \log \rho_n = -n \log\left(1 + \frac{c}{k_n}\right) = -\frac{cn}{k_n} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{k_n^2}\right).$$

Hence

$$\log\left(n \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-n} r_n^\gamma}{k_n}\right) = \frac{cn}{k_n} \left[-1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k_n}\right) + \frac{\gamma \log r_n}{cn/k_n} + \frac{\log n - t \log k_n}{cn/k_n}\right] \longrightarrow -\infty.$$

Hence, the result follows. \square

Lemma A.6. *Under the mild explosive regime as described in Section 4, we have*

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{n \ell_n k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t}^n \rho_n^{t-j-1} u_j u_t \xrightarrow{L^1} 0.$$

where $\ell_n = \exp(\alpha^2/[2(1 - \phi_n^2)])$.

Proof. We decompose

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{n k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t}^n \rho_n^{t-j-1} u_j u_t = \frac{\rho_n^{-n-1}}{n k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 + \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{n k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t+1}^n \rho_n^{t-j-1} u_j u_t =: I_{1n} + I_{2n}.$$

First,

$$\mathbb{E}|I_{1n}| = \frac{\rho_n^{-n-1}}{n k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(u_t^2) = \frac{\rho_n^{-n-1}}{n k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n x_t \leq \frac{\rho_n^{-n-1}}{n k_n \ell_n} n m_n = \frac{n \rho_n^{-n-1}}{k_n} \frac{m_n}{n \ell_n} = o(1),$$

since $m_n \asymp r_n^{\alpha^2/(4d)}$ and $n \rho_n^{-n}/k_n \cdot r_n^{-\alpha^2/(4d)} \rightarrow 0$.

Next, by independence of u_t and $\{u_j\}_{j < t}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}^2) = \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{n^2 k_n^2 \ell_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=t+1}^n \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right)^2 u_t^2 \right] = \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{n^2 k_n^2 \ell_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t+1}^n \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} r_n^{\frac{2\alpha^2}{d}}.$$

Using $x_t \leq \ell_n$ and $\sum_{j=t+1}^n \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \leq \rho_n^{-2}/(\rho_n^2 - 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}^2) \leq \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{n^2 k_n^2 \ell_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-2}}{\rho_n^2 - 1} r_n^{\frac{2\alpha^2}{d}} \leq \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{n^2 k_n^2} \frac{n r_n^{\frac{2\alpha^2}{d}}}{\rho_n^2 - 1} \lesssim \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} r_n^{\frac{2\alpha^2}{d}}}{n k_n} = o(1),$$

because $(\rho_n^2 - 1)^{-1} \asymp k_n$ and from Lemma A.5. Thus $I_{2n} \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 , hence in L^1 . Combining the two parts yields the claim. To prove asymptotic normality, we need to define two sequences,

$$W_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{-j} u_j,$$

and

$$V_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{-(n-j+1)} u_j.$$

because the normalized sample variance of $\sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t$ can be represented as a product of W_n, V_n . We will prove asymptotic normality of (W_n, V_n) by the Cramér–Wold device, hence it is sufficient to prove that, for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$aW_n + bV_n \Rightarrow aW + bV,$$

where W and V are independent $N(0, 1/(2c))$ random variables. Consequently, it suffices to show that $aW_n + bV_n \Rightarrow Z$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, where,

$$Z \sim N\left(0, \frac{(a^2 + b^2)}{2c}\right).$$

To show this, we need to define

$$\tau_{nj} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \left(a \rho_n^{-j} + b \rho_n^{-(n-j+1)} \right) u_j,$$

Note that, we can write

$$aW_n + bV_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_{nj},$$

We will now prove,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \tau_{nj}^2 \right) = \frac{a^2 + b^2}{2c} + o(1). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

To obtain this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \tau_{nj}^2 \right) &= \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^n (a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2} + 2ab \rho_n^{-n+1}) x_j \\ &= \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^n (a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2}) x_j + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n \rho_n^{-n} r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{4d}}}{k_n} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^n (a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2}) x_j + o(1), \text{ since } k_n(\rho_n^2 - 1) \rightarrow 2c \text{ and by Lemma A.5.} \end{aligned}$$

Define,

$$w_{nt} = \frac{x_t}{\ell_n} = \exp \left(-\frac{\alpha^2 \phi_n^{2t}}{2(1 - \phi_n^2)} \right), \quad 0 \leq w_{nt} \leq 1.$$

We now decompose the sum $\frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^n (a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2}) x_j$ in two parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{M_n} \frac{\rho_n^{-2t} w_{n,t}}{k_n} &\leq \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^{M_n} \rho_n^{-2t} = \frac{\rho_n^{-2}(1 - \rho_n^{-2M_n})}{(1 - \rho_n^{-2}) k_n} = \frac{1 - \rho_n^{-2M_n}}{(\rho_n^2 - 1) k_n} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where we used $(\rho_n^2 - 1)k_n \rightarrow 2c$ and $M_n = o(k_n)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=M_n+1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-2t} w_{n,t}}{k_n} &= (1 + o(1)) \sum_{t=M_n+1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-2t}}{k_n} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\rho_n^{-2(M_n+1)} - \rho_n^{-2(n+1)}}{(\rho_n^2 - 1) k_n} \\ &\longrightarrow \frac{1}{2c}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

since $\rho_n^{-2(M_n+1)} \rightarrow 1$ (because $M_n = o(k_n)$ and $\rho_n^2 \downarrow 1$), $\rho_n^{-2n} \rightarrow 0$, and $(\rho_n^2 - 1)k_n \rightarrow 2c$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \geq M_n+1} \frac{\rho_n^{-2(n-t+1)} w_{n,t}}{k_n} &\geq \rho_n^{-2n} (1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{2M_n} (\rho_n^{2(n-M_n)} - 1)}{k_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \\ &= \frac{1 - \rho_n^{-2(n-M_n)}}{k_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} (1 + o(1)) \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2c}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{M_n} \frac{\rho_n^{-2(n-t+1)} w_{n,t}}{k_n} &\leq \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^{M_n} \rho_n^{-2(n-t+1)} = \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} (\rho_n^{2M_n} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_n^{-2}) k_n} \\ &= \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} - \rho_n^{-2(n-M_n)}}{(\rho_n^2 - 1) k_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2} + 2ab \rho_n^{-n+1} \right) x_j &\leq \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2n+2j-2} + 2ab \rho_n^{-n+1} \right) w_{nj} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{a^2 + b^2}{2c} + o(1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Combining (A.21), (A.22), (A.23), (A.24), and (A.25) we now conclude

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \tau_{nj}^2 \right) \rightarrow \frac{a^2 + b^2}{2c}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Now, we can verify the Lindeberg condition.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\tau_{nj}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tau_{nj}| > \eta\}} \right] &= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a \rho_n^{-j} + b \rho_n^{-(n-j-1)} \right)^2 u_j^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|u_j| |a \rho_n^{-j} + b \rho_n^{-(n-j-1)}| > \eta \sqrt{k_n \ell_n}\}} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n} \mathbb{E} \left[2 \left(a^2 \rho_n^{-2j} + b^2 \rho_n^{-2(n-j-1)} \right) u_j^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|u_j| |a \rho_n^{-j} + b \rho_n^{-(n-j-1)}| > \eta \sqrt{k_n \ell_n}\}} \right] \\ &\leq M \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{u_j^2}{x_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{u_j^2 > \eta^2 k_n \ell_n / (a^2 + b^2)\}} \right] \\ &\leq M \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{u_t^2}{x_t} \mathbf{1}_{\{u_t^2 > c' k_n \ell_n\}} \right] = M \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sigma_t^2}{x_t} \varepsilon_t^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_t^2 \sigma_t^2 > c' k_n \ell_n\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now define

$$S_t := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sigma_t^2}{x_t} \varepsilon_t^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_t^2 \sigma_t^2 > c' k_n \ell_n\}} \right].$$

For any $p > 0$,

$$\varepsilon_t^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_t^2 \sigma_t^2 > c' k_n \ell_n\}} \leq (c' k_n \ell_n)^{-p} \varepsilon_t^{2p+2} \sigma_t^{2p},$$

hence

$$S_t \leq (c' k_n \ell_n)^{-p} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sigma_t^2}{x_t} \varepsilon_t^{2p+2} \sigma_t^{2p} \right] = (c' k_n \ell_n)^{-p} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^{2p+2}] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^{2p+2}]}{x_t}.$$

With $x_t = e^{\alpha^2 A_t}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^{2p+2}] = e^{(p+1)^2 \alpha^2 A_t}$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^{2p+2}]}{x_t} = \exp(p(p+2)\alpha^2 A_t) \leq \exp(p(p+2)\alpha^2 A_n),$$

so

$$S_t \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^{2p+2}]}{(c'k_n\ell_n)^p} \exp(p(p+2)\alpha^2 A_n) = \frac{C_p}{(c'k_n\ell_n)^p} \exp(p(p+2)\alpha^2 A_n),$$

for some $C_p > 0$.

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\tau_{n,j}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tau_{n,j}| > \eta\}} \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\exp(p(p+2)\alpha^2 A_n)}{(k_n\ell_n)^p} \right) \lesssim \frac{r_n^{(p(p+1))\frac{\alpha^2}{4d}}}{k_n^p} \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Combining, (A.26) and (A.27), we conclude the first part of Theorem 4.4

$$\left(\frac{\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\ell_n k_n}, \frac{\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{\ell_n k_n^2} \right) \xrightarrow{d} (WV, V^2),$$

where W, V are independent $N(0, 1/(2c))$ random variables.

Recall the time series process,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n^2 \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{k_n^2 \ell_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left[\rho_n^{-2n} (y_n^2 - y_0^2) - 2\rho_n^{-2n+1} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t - \rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k_n \ell_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n} y_n^2}{k_n} - \frac{2\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t - \frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right] + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma A.3. In addition, note that, by Lemma A.5

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n^2 \rho_n^{-4n} r_n^{\alpha^2/2d}}{k_n^2} \right) = o(1),$$

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t^2 = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{n \rho_n^{-2n} r_n^{\frac{\alpha^2}{4d}}}{k_n} \right) = o_p(1),$$

and,

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{\ell_n k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = \frac{\rho_n^{-n} y_0}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-(n-t-1)} u_t}{\sqrt{\ell_n k_n}} + \frac{1}{\ell_n} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t.$$

Also, note that the first term is $o(1)$ because of asymptotic normality of V_n , and the second term

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\rho_n^{-2n+1}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \right]^2 &= \frac{\rho_n^{-4n}}{\ell_n^2 k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} E \left[u_j^2 u_t^2 \right] \\
&\leq r_n^{2\alpha^2/d} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-4n}}{k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{2(t-1-j)} \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^n (\rho_n^{2(t-1)} - 1) r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \cdot \frac{\rho_n^{-4n}}{\rho_n^2 - 1} \\
&\leq \frac{n \rho_n^{2n} r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \rho_n^{-4n}}{k_n^2 (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n r_n^{\alpha^2/2d} \rho_n^{-2n}}{k_n} \right) = o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\rho_n^{-2n}}{\ell_n k_n^2} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{k_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left(\frac{\rho_n^{-n} y_n}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \right)^2 + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{k_n (\rho_n^2 - 1)} \left(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-j} u_j}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \right)^2 + o_p(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{2c} W^2, \quad \text{where } W \sim N \left(0, \frac{1}{2c} \right). \tag{A.28}
\end{aligned}$$

This converges follows from the asymptotic normality of W_n . Similarly,

$$\frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t = \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \left[\sum_{t=1}^n y_0 \rho_n^{t-1} u_t + \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j \right) u_t \right].$$

Note, from the asymptotic normality of V_n

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{y_0}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} \rho_n^{-(n-t-1)} \cdot \frac{u_t}{\sqrt{k_n \ell_n}} = o_p(1),$$

Also using Lemma A.6

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t &= \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t - \frac{\rho_n^{-n}}{k_n \ell_n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=t}^n \rho_n^{t-1-j} u_j u_t, \\
&= W_n V_n + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} VW \quad \text{where } W, V \text{ independent } \sim N(0, 1/2c) \tag{A.29}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining (A.28) and (A.29) we conclude that

$$\frac{\frac{\rho_n^{-n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{\ell_n k_n}}{\frac{\rho_n^{-2n} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2}{\ell_n k_n^2}} = \frac{\rho_n^n k_n \sum_{t=1}^n y_{t-1} u_t}{2c \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2} = \frac{\rho_n^n k_n (\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n)}{2c} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{C}, \quad \mathcal{C} \sim \text{Cauchy}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Thus, the proof is complete. □