

Nonparametric inference with massive data via grouped empirical likelihood

Yongda Wang^{1,2}, Shifeng Xiong^{2,1*}

1. School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

2. State Key Laboratory of Mathematical Science, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Abstract

To address the computational issue in empirical likelihood methods with massive data, this paper proposes a grouped empirical likelihood (GEL) method. It divides N observations into n groups, and assigns the same probability weight to all observations within the same group. GEL estimates the n ($\ll N$) weights by maximizing the empirical likelihood ratio. The dimensionality of the optimization problem is thus reduced from N to n , thereby lowering the computational complexity. We prove that GEL possesses the same first order asymptotic properties as the conventional empirical likelihood method under the estimating equation settings and the classical two-sample mean problem. A distributed GEL method is also proposed with several servers. Numerical simulations and real data analysis demonstrate that GEL can keep the same inferential accuracy as the conventional empirical likelihood method, and achieves substantial computational acceleration compared to the divide-and-conquer empirical likelihood method. We can analyze a billion data with GEL in tens of seconds on only one PC.

KEY WORDS: distributed computation; estimating equation; nonparametric likelihood; two-sample mean problem.

*Corresponding author, Email: xiong@amss.ac.cn

1 Introduction

Empirical Likelihood (EL) was proposed by Owen [1] as an alternative to the bootstrap for constructing confidence regions in nonparametric problems. Building on Owen’s foundational work, Qin and Lawless [2] extended EL to general estimating equation frameworks. DiCiccio et al. [3] established that empirical likelihood methods are subject to Bartlett correction for confidence interval construction. EL has found broad applicability in quantile inference [4, 5], ROC curve analysis [6, 7, 8, 9], and Gini index estimation [10, 11]. More recently, Schennach [12] pioneered the integration of exponential tilting techniques, Chen et al. [13] addressed the challenges of complex survey design with scrambled responses, and Thorne [14] as well as Xu and Chen [15] demonstrated EL’s utility in detecting differential gene expression. Research on two-sample problems using empirical likelihood has also revived. Qin [16] developed a semi-empirical likelihood approach for inferring the difference between two population means. Jing [17] subsequently demonstrated that this two-sample empirical likelihood method for mean differences is Bartlett-correctable. Now, the EL method has become a primary statistical tool for nonparametric inference. This prominence stems from its methodological advantages over conventional approaches, including: minimal parametric assumptions for data distributions; the capacity to construct data-driven confidence regions; and natural incorporation of auxiliary information.

Advances in technology have driven exponential growth in data collection and dataset sizes. Although computing resources are also increasing rapidly, they pale in comparison to the astonishing surge in data volume. It is widely recognized that in large-scale learning, due to the immense computational demands, estimation and inference are the two primary challenges. The standard EL method assigns an individual probability weight to each data point, and estimates them via an optimization problem of maximizing the empirical likelihood ratio, which does not have a closed-form. As a result, EL can be computationally intensive, especially when applied to large datasets. While the empirical likelihood method can be computationally demanding, especially with large datasets, potentially limiting its practical application, its fundamental importance for massive data analysis remains undeni-

able. This is largely due to its strong theoretical ties with traditional statistical models and its distinct strengths in statistical inference. The challenges posed by massive datasets are not unique to empirical likelihood, other cornerstone nonparametric inference methods also face significant computational hurdles. For instance, scalable methods for the bootstrap, such as the Bag of Little Bootstraps [18], have been proposed. Consequently, overcoming these computational hurdles is crucial in the context of EL.

A variety of methods have been developed to address the challenges of big data, some of which also incorporate EL. For instance, subsampling-based methods [18, 19, 20], divide-and-conquer approaches [21, 22, 23], and sequential updating algorithms [24] are among the most prominent. In particular, Ma et al. [25], Liu and Li [26], and Zhou et al. [27] have proposed combining the divide-and-conquer strategy with EL to enhance scalability and efficiency in large-scale inference.

Note that, for N observations, there are N probability weights needed to estimate via optimization techniques in the standard EL method. We observe that, in large-sample settings, these probability weights all tend to be close to each other. It seems that we do not need so many parameters to fit the underlying distribution. In this paper, we propose a grouped empirical likelihood (GEL) method, which divides the N observations into n groups, and assigns the same probability weight to all observations within the same group. These n weights are also estimated by maximizing the empirical likelihood ratio. It can be seen that the dimensionality of the optimization problem from N to n , thereby lowering the computational burden. We prove that the GEL method possesses the same first order asymptotic properties as EL under the estimating equation settings and the classical two-sample mean problem. A distributed GEL method is also proposed when more than one servers are available.

Numerical simulations demonstrate that, with easy grouping strategies, GEL can keep the same inferential accuracy as EL, and simultaneously achieves substantial computational acceleration compared to both EL and divide-and-conquer EL. For a billion data, We can run GEL in tens of seconds on only one PC. The distributed GEL method can further accelerate the operation. The proposed methods are also applied to real datasets of anthropometric

records and A/B tests.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review the empirical likelihood. In Section 3, we explain GEL method in details and establish its theoretical property. Section 4 extends GEL to the two-sample mean problem. Section 5 introduces the distributed GEL framework for distributed computing environments. In Section 6 and Section 7, we assess the performance of proposed method via extensive simulation studies and real data analyses. Section 8 presents some concluding remarks and future directions. All proofs are deferred to the Appendix.

2 Empirical likelihood

In this section we briefly review the empirical likelihood (EL) method. Some notation and definitions are needed. For two vectors $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)'$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d)'$ in \mathbb{R}^d , the inequalities $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{b}$ are defined to hold if and only if $a_j < b_j$ and $a_j \leq b_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$, respectively. For a d -dimensional random vector \mathbf{X} , let $F(\mathbf{x}) = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x})$ denote its cumulative distribution function, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We use $F(\mathbf{x}-)$ to denote $\Pr(\mathbf{X} < \mathbf{x})$, and $\Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}-)$. Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N$ be independent random observations of \mathbf{X} . The empirical cumulative distribution function of $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N$ is defined as

$$F_N(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{x}\}$$

for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where \mathbb{I} represents the indicator function. The nonparametric likelihood of any probability measure F on \mathbb{R}^d is defined as

$$L(F) = \prod_{i=1}^N p_i = \prod_{i=1}^N (F(\mathbf{X}_i) - F(\mathbf{X}_i-)),$$

where $p_i = F(\mathbf{X}_i) - F(\mathbf{X}_i-) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$. Define \mathcal{F} as the class of all d -dimensional cumulative distribution functions. It is known that

$$\sup\{L(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\} = L(F_N) = N^{-N}. \quad (1)$$

The problem of interest is to make inference on a p -dimensional parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ defined as the unique solution to the following estimating functions

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathbf{0}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (g_1(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, g_r(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))'$ and $r \geq p$. By (1), the EL ratio at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is defined as

$$R(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sup \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N N p_i \mid p_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1, \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0} \right\}.$$

Using the method of Lagrange multipliers, the above maximization problem yields

$$p_i = \frac{1}{N\{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is the solution to the following equations

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (4)$$

By (3), the empirical log-likelihood ratio statistic for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is given by

$$-2 \log R(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \log \left\{ 1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

The maximum EL estimate of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{EL}$, is defined as the minimizer of $-2 \log R(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Under regularity conditions, Qin and Lawless [2] showed that as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{EL} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ denote the true value of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and

$$\mathbf{V} = \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}'} \right)' \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)' \right) \right)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}'} \right) \right\}^{-1}. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, the statistic for testing

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \quad (7)$$

is $-2 \log R(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. If $\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]$ is positive definite and the rank of $\mathbb{E}[\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}]$ is p , then

$$-2 \log R(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

3 Grouped empirical likelihood

When N is sufficiently large, the classical EL method often incurs substantial computational costs due to the requirement of solving large-scale nonlinear equations in (4). To reduce the costs, we propose the grouped empirical likelihood (GEL) method that involves much fewer unknown parameters.

Under the same setting in the previous section, GEL randomly divides the N sample points $\{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$ into n disjointed groups $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_n$. Let d_i represent the number of sample points in \mathcal{G}_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We require that the sample sizes in each group should be as equal as possible, i.e., they satisfy

$$\max_{i, k \leq n, i \neq k} |d_i - d_k| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad N = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i.$$

For simplicity, in the following we assume that the N observations $\{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$ can be evenly partitioned into n groups of size m . Rewrite them as $\{\mathbf{X}_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, n}^{j=1, \dots, m}$. The GEL method assigns the same probability measure q_i to all sample points within each group \mathcal{G}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, there are only n , instead of N , unknown parameters in the GEL

method.

For the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ satisfying the estimating equations in (2), the GEL framework maximizes $\prod_{i=1}^n q_i^m$ subject to restrictions

$$q_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \frac{1}{m}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (8)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H} = m \sum_{i=1}^n \log q_i + t \left(\frac{1}{m} - \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \right) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right),$$

where t and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)'$ are Lagrange multipliers. Taking derivatives with respect to q_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q_i} &= \frac{m}{q_i} - t + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q_i} &= m + t \sum_{i=1}^n q_i + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can get $t = -nm^2$ and

$$q_i = \frac{1}{N \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}}, \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/m$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -\boldsymbol{\lambda}/N$, and for given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10)$$

Since $0 \leq q_i \leq 1/m$, we have $1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 1/n$ for each i . Let $D_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} : 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 1/n\}$, which is convex, closed, and bounded if $\mathbf{0}$ is inside the convex hull of the $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ [2]. Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \right\} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})'}{\left\{ 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}^2}$$

is negative definite for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in D_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, provided that $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}'(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is positive definite. By

Algorithm 1 GEL Estimation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ Algorithm.

- 1: **Input:** Samples $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N$; group numbers n ; estimating functions $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.
- 2: Randomly divide $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ into n groups $\{\mathbf{X}_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, n}^{j=1, \dots, m}$ and compute $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/m$.
- 3: Obtain the GEL estimator via

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} m \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\},$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is the solution to the following equations:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{0}.$$

- 4: **Output:** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL}$.
-

the inverse function theorem, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is thus a continuously differentiable function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

The GEL function for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is now defined as

$$L_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{N \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}} \right\}^m.$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^n q_i^m$ is maximized at $q_i = N^{-1}$ without the constraints from the estimating equation (2), the empirical log-likelihood ratio is

$$-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2m \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

We can obtain an estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ through minimizing $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Consequently, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be estimated from (10), and the estimate \hat{q}_i of q_i follows from (9), $i = 1 \dots, n$. When $r = p$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL}$ is actually the unconstrained maximum likelihood estimator, i.e., $\hat{q}_i = N^{-1}$. Algorithm 1 summarizes the procedure for computing $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL}$. Compared with the computation for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{EL}$ in the previous section, the proposed GEL method involves only $n \ll N$ parameters, and this significantly reduces the computational complexity.

We next prove that the GEL method possesses the same first order asymptotic properties

as EL. Several conditions are needed. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm.

Condition 1. $\mathbb{E} [g(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)g'(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]$ is positive definite.

Condition 2. $\partial g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\partial^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top$ are continuous in a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ of the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$.

Condition 3. $\|\partial g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}\|$, $\|\partial^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top\|$ and $\|g(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3$ can be bounded by some integrable function $H(\mathbf{x})$ in the same neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ as in Condition 2.

Condition 4. The rank of $\mathbb{E}[\partial g(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}]$ is p .

These conditions are generally mild and commonly used in the EL theory; see e.g., [2, 28].

Theorem 1. *Under Conditions 1-4, we have*

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GEL} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where \mathbf{V} is given by (6).

By (11), the GEL ratio statistic for testing (7) is $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$.

Theorem 2. *Under Conditions 1-4 and H_0 in (7), as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/m \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2$ when H_0 is true.*

Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 are given in the Appendix. It is worth noting that Theorems 1 and 2 do not require any condition on m . They hold for fixed m or $m \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, even with much fewer number of parameters, the convergence rate of the proposed estimators keeps the order of $1/\sqrt{N}$.

4 Two-sample GEL

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be random vectors associated with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, respectively. Each parameter is defined as the unique solution to p functionally

independent unbiased estimating functions:

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)\} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)\} = \mathbf{0},$$

where \mathbf{g} is a vector-valued function $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^p$. Let $\boldsymbol{\pi} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_x$ be the parameter of interest.

Suppose that $\{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{N_1}\}$ is an i.i.d. sample from \mathbf{X} and $\{\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{N_2}\}$ is an i.i.d. sample from \mathbf{Y} , with the two samples mutually independent. Assume that both N_1 and N_2 are exact multiples of the block size m , i.e., $N_1 = m n_1$, $N_2 = m n_2$, for some integers $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. We then partition the two samples as $\{\mathbf{X}_{ik}\}_{i=1, \dots, n_1}^{k=1, \dots, m}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_{jt}\}_{j=1, \dots, n_2}^{t=1, \dots, m}$, respectively.

Define two probability vectors $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{n_1})'$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_{n_2})'$ satisfying $p_i \geq 0$, $q_j \geq 0$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} p_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} q_j = 1/m$. For each \mathbf{p} , let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x(\mathbf{p})$ solve

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} p_i \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ik}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x(\mathbf{p})) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (12)$$

and similarly define $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y(\mathbf{q})$ by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} q_j \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_{jt}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y(\mathbf{q})) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13)$$

The two-sample GEL for $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is defined as

$$L_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sup \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n_1} p_i^m \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n_2} q_j^m \right),$$

subject to the constraints in (12) and (13). The corresponding grouped empirical log-likelihood ratio is

$$-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = -2m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log(N_1 p_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \log(N_2 q_j) \right\}.$$

Let $N = N_1 + N_2$, $\tau_1 = N/N_1$, and $\tau_2 = N/N_2$. According to [29], using the method of

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for Calculating $R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi})$.

- 1: **Input:** Samples $\{\mathbf{X}_{ik}\}_{i=1,\dots,n_1}^{k=1,\dots,m}$, $\{\mathbf{Y}_{jt}\}_{j=1,\dots,n_2}^{t=1,\dots,m}$; estimating functions $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)$, $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)$.
- 2: Let $N_1 = mn_1$, $N_2 = mn_2$, $N = N_1 + N_2$, $\tau_1 = N/N_1$, $\tau_2 = N/N_2$, $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x) = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ik}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)/m$, and $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y) = \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_{jt}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)/m$
- 3: Solve the nonlinear system of equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)}{1 - \tau_1 \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)}{1 + \tau_2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_x = \boldsymbol{\pi}$$

to get $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)$.

- 4: **Output:** Compute

$$-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = 2m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log(1 - \tau_1 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \log(1 + \tau_2 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)) \right\}.$$

Lagrange multipliers, we have:

$$-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = 2m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log \left\{ 1 - \tau_1 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right\} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \log \left\{ 1 + \tau_2 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \right\} \right\},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ik}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)/m$, $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) = \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_{jt}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)/m$, and $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is the solution to the following nonlinear system:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)}{1 - \tau_1 \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)} = \mathbf{0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)}{1 + \tau_2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)} = \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{\pi} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_x \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Algorithm 2 outlines the steps for computing $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi})$.

For the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\pi} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\pi} \neq \boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \quad (15)$$

the grouped empirical log-likelihood ratio statistic is $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0)$. To study its asymptotic properties, we need the following conditions.

Condition 5. For the true parameter values $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}$, the covariance matrices $\text{Var}[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0})]$ and $\text{Var}[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0})]$ are positive definite.

Condition 6. $\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_x}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_x \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_x'}$ are continuous with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}$, and they are bounded by an integrable function of \mathbf{x} .

Condition 7. $\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_y}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_y \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_y'}$ are continuous with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}$, and they are bounded by an integrable function of \mathbf{y} .

Condition 8. $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)\|^3 < \infty$ and $\limsup_{\|t\| \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}[\exp\{it' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x)\}]| < 1$; $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)\|^3 < \infty$ and $\limsup_{\|t\| \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}[\exp\{it' \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y)\}]| < 1$, where i denotes the imaginary unit.

These conditions are commonly used in two-sample empirical likelihood studies [30].

Theorem 3. *Under Conditions 5-8 and H_0 in (15), we have*

$$\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0)}{m} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2 \quad \text{as } n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty \text{ with } n_1/n_2 \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty).$$

Theorem 3 holds with no restriction on m , whether it is fixed or tends to infinity. We defer the proof of Theorem 3 to the Appendix.

5 Distributed GEL

In the previous two sections, we have focused on the implementation of the GEL method on a single machine. However, in many practical scenarios involving massive datasets, data are often stored and processed in a distributed manner across multiple servers. In this section, we extend the GEL framework to such distributed settings.

Suppose the entire dataset of size N is distributed across K servers. Let N_k denote the sample size on the k -th server with $N = \sum_{k=1}^K N_k$. For each k , the GEL method partitions the data into n_k groups of size m_k , with equal weights assigned to observations within each group. Then, we apply the GEL method independently to the local data, obtaining a local parameter

estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k$ and a local log-likelihood ratio statistic $-2 \log R_{G,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The distributed GEL (DGEL) estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{DGEL}$ is then computed by averaging the local estimates,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{DGEL} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k.$$

Similarly, for testing (7), the overall log-likelihood ratio statistic can be aggregated as

$$-2 \log R_{DGEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K -2 \log R_{G,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Under regularity conditions similar to those in Section 3, it can be shown that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{DGEL}$ is consistent and asymptotically normal, and $-2 \log R_{DGEL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ converges in distribution to a chi-square distribution. The DGEL strategy can also be used for the two-sample problem in Section 4.

6 Numerical simulation

In this section we conduct numerical experiments to compare the performance of the following EL methods: the standard EL method [2], the DCEL method [26], and the proposed GEL and DGEL methods. The `emplike` function in the `statsmodels` package of `Python` is used to compute the EL and GEL estimators.

Example 1 (Estimating the parameters of a normal distribution [26]). In this example X_1, \dots, X_N are independently drawn from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, where $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 2$. Note that μ and σ^2 satisfy the following moment conditions:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(X_1, \theta)] \equiv \mathbb{E} \begin{bmatrix} \mu - X_1 \\ \sigma^2 - (X_1 - \mu)^2 \\ X_1^3 - \mu(\mu^2 + 3\sigma^2) \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

We first compare the EL methods with $N = 10^5$ on a single server. In DCEL, we consider

$k = 10, 100, 1000$, and 5000 , and divide the entire sample set into k disjoint blocks S_1, \dots, S_k of (approximately) equal sizes. For each S_j , we compute the EL estimators $\hat{\mu}_j$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j$ based on the data in S_j . The final aggregated estimators are given by $\hat{\mu}_{DCEL} = \sum_{j=1}^k \hat{\mu}_j/k$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{DCEL} = \sum_{j=1}^k \hat{\sigma}_j/k$. In GEL, we set $m = 10, 100, 1000$, and 5000 , which correspond to the effective sample size $n = 10000, 1000, 100, 20$, and 10 , respectively.

Table 1 presents the mean squared error (MSE) of each estimator based on 1000 replications, along with the average computational time for a single experiment across all three methods. It can be seen that, the effectiveness of DCEL in estimating σ diminishes when k equals 1000 and 5000, performing less favorably than both EL and GEL. With appropriate m , the proposed GEL method demonstrates satisfactory performance with comparable estimation accuracy to EL and DCEL but much higher computational speed. Furthermore, within the GEL framework, $n = N/m$ can be viewed as the effective sample size of the EL problem. Although a smaller value of n leads to greater computational efficiency, n must be sufficiently large to ensure the reliability of statistical inference. In this example $n \in [20, 100]$ seems to be a good balance.

We next compare the proposed methods and DCEL under distributed settings with sample size $N \in \{10^6, 5 \times 10^6, 10^7, 5 \times 10^7, 10^8\}$. Here DCEL and DGEL are conducted in parallel across ten servers. GEL on only one server is also compared. For DCEL, we consider two settings with $k = 1$ and $k = 100$ on each server. For the proposed methods, m is chosen such that the effective sample size $n = 100$.

Figure 1 presents the results of average computational time, demonstrating the significant advantages of the proposed GEL methods. Notably, for large sample sizes, even the single-server implementation of GEL substantially outperforms the 10-server parallel implementation of DCEL in terms of computational speed. Furthermore, when deployed across multiple servers, our DGEL method achieves the fastest performance, showcasing its superior scalability and efficiency for massive data analysis.

Example 2 (Linear regression with heteroscedastic noise). As demonstrated in Example 1, the speed advantage of our method is more obvious in a parallel computing environment

Table 1: MSE and average computation time in Example 1 (standard deviations in parentheses).

Method	$\mu (\times 10^{-5})$	$\sigma (\times 10^{-4})$	Time (sec.)
EL	7.9615 (6.8961)	6.8807 (5.9562)	1.8712
DCEL ($k = 10$)	7.9623 (6.8972)	6.7976 (5.8714)	0.1551
GEL ($m = 10, n = 10000$)	7.9623 (6.8973)	6.8824 (5.9623)	0.0982
DCEL ($k = 100$)	7.9623 (6.8972)	6.6054 (5.3852)	0.2717
GEL ($m = 100, n = 1000$)	7.9623 (6.8972)	6.8819 (5.9620)	0.0639
DCEL ($k = 1000$)	7.9684 (6.9423)	8.5057 (8.4236)	2.2119
GEL ($m = 1000, n = 100$)	7.9623 (6.8972)	6.8824 (5.9623)	0.0038
DCEL ($k = 5000$)	7.9683 (6.9420)	14.2426 (12.3267)	10.4574
GEL ($m = 5000, n = 20$)	7.9615 (6.8892)	6.8817 (5.9615)	0.0028
DCEL ($k = 10000$)	8.7986 (7.9656)	16.5652 (14.9234)	23.2565
GEL ($m = 10000, n = 10$)	8.2615 (7.4654)	8.3512 (7.2352)	0.0017

with multiple servers. The subsequent experiments will be conducted on a single server. In this example we consider estimating the coefficients of the linear regression model:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \mathbf{X}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

where $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})'$ with $p \geq 5$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)'$ with the linear constraint $\sum_{j=1}^5 \beta_j = 15$, and ϵ_i denotes the random error. The covariates $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, (1 - \rho)\mathbf{I}_p + \rho\mathbf{1}_p\mathbf{1}_p')$, where $\rho \in (-1, 1)$, \mathbf{I}_p denotes the $p \times p$ identity matrix, and $\mathbf{1}_p$ represents the p -dimensional column vector of ones. Given the covariates, the errors are generated from normal distributions with mean zero and

$$\text{Var}(\epsilon_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i) = 1 + \alpha \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{X}_i}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $\alpha > 0$ controls the heteroscedasticity intensity. In the simulation we fix $N = 10^5$, $\beta_0 = 1$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (1, 2, \dots, p)'$, and consider three combinations of (p, ρ, α) : $(5, 0.2, 1)$,




Figure 1: Average computation time for GEL (single server), DCEL (ten servers), and Distributed GEL (ten servers) across varying sample sizes.

(10, 0, 2), and (50, 0.5, 5). Note that parameter vector β satisfies the following moment conditions:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(Y_1, \mathbf{X}_1, \beta)] \equiv \mathbb{E} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_1(Y_1 - \mathbf{X}_1' \beta) \\ \sum_{j=1}^5 \beta_j - 15 \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

The same three methods are compared as in Table 1. Table 2 presents simulation results based on 1000 replications. Like the findings in Example 1, with appropriate m , the proposed GEL method possesses comparable estimation accuracy to EL and DCEL but much shorter computational time. We also recommend selecting m such that $n = N/m$ is of the order 10^2 . In addition, the performance of GEL is much more stable than DCEL in extreme cases of higher dimensions and/or strong heteroscedasticity.

Example 3 (Two-sample mean test) We consider a simulation study to evaluate the performance of the two-sample GEL method for testing the equality of population means. The

Table 2: MSE and average computation time in Example 2 (standard deviations in parentheses).

$$p = 5, \rho = 0.2, \alpha = 1$$

Method	MSE ($\times 10^{-5}$)	Time (sec.)
EL ($k = m = 1$)	2.9095 (2.1992)	0.8085
DCEL ($k = 10$)	2.9362 (2.2089)	0.3039
GEL ($m = 10, n = 10000$)	2.8984 (2.1737)	0.4024
DCEL ($k = 100$)	2.9375 (2.2274)	0.1779
GEL ($m = 100, n = 1000$)	2.9087 (2.2135)	0.0986
DCEL ($k = 200$)	2.9241 (2.2023)	0.2503
GEL ($m = 200, n = 500$)	2.8963 (2.1884)	0.0647
DCEL ($k = 500$)	2.9162 (2.2155)	0.3015
GEL ($m = 500, n = 200$)	2.9038 (2.2142)	0.0305
DCEL ($k = 1000$)	2.9855 (2.2174)	0.4761
GEL ($m = 1000, n = 100$)	2.8772 (2.2005)	0.0131
DCEL ($k = 10000$)	2.9379 (2.3201)	674.85
GEL ($m = 10000, n = 10$)	3.8721 (6.2057)	0.0060

$$p = 10, \rho = 0, \alpha = 2$$

Method	MSE ($\times 10^{-5}$)	Time (sec.)
EL ($k = m = 1$)	3.4055 (3.2043)	1.3052
DCEL ($k = 10$)	3.3984 (3.1205)	0.6599
GEL ($m = 10, n = 10000$)	3.4655 (3.2624)	0.6457
DCEL ($k = 100$)	3.4715 (3.2329)	0.2971
GEL ($m = 100, n = 1000$)	3.3056 (3.2351)	0.2056
DCEL ($k = 200$)	3.5034 (3.3275)	0.3408
GEL ($m = 200, n = 500$)	3.2863 (3.2359)	0.0853
DCEL ($k = 500$)	3.5047 (3.3245)	0.6441
GEL ($m = 500, n = 200$)	3.3204 (3.2145)	0.0265
DCEL ($k = 1000$)	3.5591 (3.3651)	0.9276
GEL ($m = 1000, n = 100$)	3.4125 (3.3213)	0.0047
DCEL ($k = 10000$)	26.984 (22.656)	692.43
GEL ($m = 10000, n = 10$)	14.865 (12.965)	0.0035

$$p = 50, \rho = 0.5, \alpha = 5$$

Method	MSE ($\times 10^{-3}$)	Time (sec.)
EL ($k = m = 1$)	2.4264 (2.3683)	3.6597
DCEL ($k = 10$)	2.4251 (2.3694)	3.0654
GEL ($m = 10, n = 10000$)	2.4249 (2.3687)	2.6836
DCEL ($k = 100$)	2.6035 (2.4698)	2.3278
GEL ($m = 100, n = 1000$)	2.4262 (2.3677)	0.3559
DCEL ($k = 200$)	2.7132 (2.6987)	2.9674
GEL ($m = 200, n = 500$)	2.4365 (2.3965)	0.0853
DCEL ($k = 500$)	3.2762 (2.9873)	4.2926
GEL ($m = 500, n = 200$)	2.4236 (2.3871)	0.0922
DCEL ($k = 1000$)	4.6365 (4.2745)	4.4244
GEL ($m = 1000, n = 100$)	2.4259 (2.3689)	0.0638
DCEL ($k = 10000$)	8.5032 (6.6541)	4657.6
GEL ($m = 10000, n = 10$)	6.9961 (5.9654)	0.0314

two populations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
X &\sim \frac{1}{3}N(0, 1) + \frac{1}{3}N(10^2, 10^2) + \frac{1}{3}N(10^3, 10^3), \\
Y &\sim \frac{1}{3}N(0, 2) + \frac{1}{3}N(10^2, 2 \times 10^2) + \frac{1}{3}N(10^3 + 20j, 3 \times 10^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, j is an integer index ranging from 0 to 5, which systematically introduces a shift in the mean of the third component in the distribution of Y . We have $\mu_X = E(X) = 1100/3$ and $\mu_Y = E(Y) = (1100 + 20j)/3$, and the difference in means, $\Delta\mu = E(Y) - E(X)$, takes the values $\{0, 20/3, 40/3, 60/3, 80/3, 100/3\}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, 5$. Consider the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_X = \mu_Y$ against the alternative $H_1 : \mu_X \neq \mu_Y$. Clearly, the case for $j = 0$ corresponds to the null hypothesis.

For each j , we generate an i.i.d. sample of size $N_1 = N_2 = 30,000$ from each population. The simulation is repeated for 1000 times to assess the empirical Type I error rate for $j = 0$ and statistical power for $j > 0$. The significance level is set to $\alpha = 0.05$. For the two-sample GEL method, we evaluate its performance under different group sizes, setting

$m_1 = m_2 = 100, 200, 300$, and 500 , which correspond to $n_1 = n_2 = 300, 150, 100$, and 60 , respectively.

Figure 2 presents the simulation results, comparing the standard two-sample EL method with our proposed two-sample GEL method. It can be seen that the proposed GEL method possesses almost the same performance as the EL method, both under H_0 and H_1 , demonstrating its effectiveness in detecting mean differences. Furthermore, the two-sample GEL method offers substantial computational advantages. For example, with $m = 300$ ($n = 100$), the average time for GEL is five times faster than the standard EL method.

7 Real data analysis

7.1 Evaluation of GEL on the SOCR Height-Weight Dataset

We conducted a comprehensive performance evaluation of our proposed GEL estimators using [SOCR Data Dinov 020108 HeightsWeights](#) dataset. This dataset contains 25,000 anthropometric records documenting heights (in inches) and weights (in pounds) of 18-year-old individuals. We partition the first 20,000 observations as a training set and reserve the remaining 5,000 for testing. On the training data, we fit a linear regression model $W = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H$, where W denotes weight and H denotes height, by four approaches: ordinary least squares (OLS), EL, DCEL and GEL.

In the DCEL approach, the samples in the training set are randomly split into $k = 10, 100, 200, 500$ disjoint blocks. In contrast, for GEL, the same training samples are grouped into equal weighted subsets of size $m = 10, 100, 200, 500$, where the definitions of m and k are given in Example 1. Table 3 presents the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) on the test set across all methodologies. Numbers in parentheses denote the standard deviation of individual squared prediction errors $(\widehat{W}_{\text{predict}} - W_{\text{true}})^2$ across the 5,000 test cases, quantifying variability in predictive accuracy.

We can see that, the GEL method demonstrates compelling advantages across performance and efficiency metrics. It achieves predictive performance parity with both EL and




Figure 2: Comparison of EL and GEL estimators across different partition sizes.

OLS benchmarks, with MSPE values (100.6239–100.6290) essentially equivalent to centralized EL (100.6264) and OLS (100.6264). Computationally, GEL delivers dramatic efficiency improvements, achieving up to $11,600\times$ acceleration over EL (0.0011s vs 12.8138s at $m = 200$) and $115\times$ faster execution than DCEL at comparable partition sizes (0.0011s vs 0.1262s). Remarkably, at $m = 200$, GEL runs $9\times$ faster than even highly optimized OLS implementations while maintaining equivalent accuracy. The method further demonstrates robustness to partitioning schemes, with negligible impact on predictive performance as ev-

Table 3: MSPE and average computation time for various methods on the test set (standard deviations in parentheses).

Method	MSPE	Time (sec.)
OLS ($k = m = 1$)	100.6264 (144.6296)	0.0102
EL ($k = m = 1$)	100.6264 (144.6296)	12.8138
DCEL ($k = 10$)	100.6282 (144.6331)	1.2900
GEL ($m = 10, n = 2000$)	100.6265 (144.6266)	0.1253
DCEL ($k = 50$)	100.6273 (144.6286)	0.3029
GEL ($m = 50, n = 400$)	100.6239 (144.6278)	0.0082
DCEL ($k = 100$)	100.6283 (144.6287)	0.3671
GEL ($m = 100, n = 200$)	100.6290 (144.6312)	0.0038
DCEL ($k = 200$)	100.6264 (144.6290)	0.1262
GEL ($m = 200, n = 100$)	100.6260 (144.6143)	0.0011

identified by stable MSPE values (range: 0.0151) and standard deviations (range: 0.2177) across group sizes ($m = 10$ to $m = 200$).

Moreover, our simulations indicate that the GEL estimator is remarkably insensitive to the particular random split of the data. For instance, with $m = 10$, we performed 1000 independent random partitions of the training set, computed the GEL coefficient estimate for each partition, and averaged these 1000 estimates to obtain a final model. The resulting MSPE on the test set was 100.6264, which is virtually identical to the single-split value of 100.6265 reported in Table 3, demonstrating the robustness of GEL to sample division.

7.2 Evaluation of two-sample GEL on the Gross Merchandise Volume Dataset

The two-sample GEL method we proposed can be applied to controlled experiments within internet companies. Controlled experiments, commonly known as A/B tests, allow businesses to assess the impact of product changes by comparing key metrics (e.g., user engagement, revenue, conversion rates) between different treatment groups [31, 32, 33]. Controlled exper-

iments have become a cornerstone of data-driven decision-making, especially in large-scale online platforms and technology companies.

Welch t-test (WT) is commonly used in traditional A/B tests [34, 35]. However, when dealing with typical heavy-tailed big data commonly encountered in business contexts, such as Gross Merchandise Volume (GMV), we observed that the WT often fails to control Type I error in A/B tests platform. GMV is a key performance indicator (KPI) that measures the total sales volume of goods and services transacted through a company’s platform or marketplace [36]. However, given the current limitations of optimization algorithms, the traditional two-sample EL method often fails when applied to large-scale datasets. The two-sample GEL method we proposed can address the aforementioned challenges.

At a certain’s A/B test platform, we randomly allocated 1% of weekly gross merchandise volume (GMV) traffic to both the experimental and control groups, each containing 204,000 observations. For two-sample GEL, we fixed the number of equal-weight partitions at 1,000. With a significance level of 0.05, we conducted 1,000 times A/A tests using the WT method and the two-sample GEL method, producing 1,000 p-values. The WT method yielded a Type I error rate of 0.062, while two-sample GEL held it at 0.047. Although the average runtimes (0.1235 s and 0.1277 s) were comparable, two-sample GEL demonstrated superior control over the Type I error.

8 Conclusion

We have proposed the GEL method for nonparametric inference on massive datasets. It is shown that the proposed methods possess similar statistical properties to EL with much fewer parameters. Extensive simulations and real-data analyses demonstrate that GEL delivers competitive inferential accuracy while substantially shorter computation time. The selection of the group number n , also known as the effective sample size, depends on the complexity of the specific problem. Generally, we can recommend selecting n to be of the order 100.

Actually this paper reveals a parameters’ dimensionality-reduction principle of EL. It is easy to extend this idea to other nonparametric likelihood settings, including Euclidean Like-

lihood [37], Bayesian empirical likelihood [38], the bias-corrected empirical likelihood [39], the jackknife empirical likelihood [40], the adjusted empirical likelihood [41], the extended empirical likelihood [42], the transformed empirical likelihood [43], the mean empirical likelihood [44], and Bayesian penalized empirical likelihood [45], We can also extend GEL to streaming data settings to support online inference [46, 24].

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12571276).

References

- [1] Owen, A.B. Empirical Likelihood Ratio Confidence Intervals for a Single Functional. *Biometrika*, 75(2):237–249, 1988.
- [2] Qin, J., and Lawless, J. Empirical Likelihood and General Estimating Equations. *the Annals of Statistics*, 22(1):300–325, 1994.
- [3] DiCiccio, T., Hall, P., and Romano, J. Empirical Likelihood is Bartlett-correctable. *the Annals of Statistics*, pages 1053–1061, 1991.
- [4] Chen, S., and Hall, P. Smoothed Empirical Likelihood Confidence Intervals for Quantiles. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1166–1181, 1993.
- [5] Zhou, W., and Jing, B. Adjusted Empirical Likelihood Method for Quantiles. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 55:689–703, 2003.
- [6] journal=Canadian Journal of Statistics Claeskens, G., Jing, B., Peng, L., and Zhou, W. Empirical Likelihood Confidence Regions for Comparison Distributions and ROC Curves. 31(2):173–190, 2003.

- [7] Qin, G., and Zhou, X. Empirical Likelihood Inference for the Area Under the ROC Curve. *Biometrics*, 62(2):613–622, 2006.
- [8] Yang, H., and Zhao, Y. Smoothed Empirical Likelihood for ROC Curves with Censored Data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 109:254–263, 2012.
- [9] Liu, X., and Zhao, Y. Semi-empirical Likelihood Inference for the ROC Curve with Missing Data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 142(12):3123–3133, 2012.
- [10] Qin, Y., Rao, JNK., and Wu, C. Empirical Likelihood Confidence Intervals for the Gini Measure of Income Inequality. *Economic Modelling*, 27(6):1429–1435, 2010.
- [11] Peng, L. Empirical Likelihood Methods for the Gini Index. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 53(2):131–139, 2011.
- [12] Schennach, S.M. Point Estimation with Exponentially Tilted Empirical Likelihood. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(2):634–672, 2007.
- [13] Chen, S., Zhao, Y., and Wang, Y. Sample Empirical Likelihood Approach Under Complex Survey Design with Scrambled Responses. *Survey Methodology*, 47(1):59–75, 2021.
- [14] Thorne, T. Empirical Likelihood Tests for Nonparametric Detection of Differential Expression from RNA-seq Data. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 14(6):575–583, 2015.
- [15] Xu, M., and Chen, L. An Empirical Likelihood Ratio Test Robust to Individual Heterogeneity for Differential Expression Analysis of RNA-seq. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 19(1):109–117, 2018.
- [16] Qin, J. Semi-empirical Likelihood Ratio Confidence Intervals for the Difference of Two Sample Means. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 46:117–126, 1994.
- [17] Jing, B. Two-sample Empirical Likelihood Method. *Statistics & probability letters*, 24(4):315–319, 1995.

- [18] Kleiner, A., Talwalkar, A., Sarkar, P., and Jordan, M.I. A Scalable Bootstrap for Massive Data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(4):795–816, 2014.
- [19] Ma, P., Mahoney, M.W., and Yu, B. A Statistical Perspective on Algorithmic Leveraging. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):861–911, 2015.
- [20] Wang, H., Zhu, R., and Ma, P. Optimal Subsampling for Large Sample Logistic Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522):829–844, 2018.
- [21] Zhang, Y., Duchi, J.C., and Wainwright, M.J. Communication-efficient Algorithms for Statistical Optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):3321–3363, 2013.
- [22] Chen, X., and Xie, M. A Split-and-conquer Approach for Analysis of Extraordinarily Large Data. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1655–1684, 2014.
- [23] Lian, H., and Fan, Z. Divide-and-Conquer for Debiased l_1 -norm Support Vector Machine in Ultra-high Dimensions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(182):1–26, 2018.
- [24] Schifano, E.D., Wu, J., Wang, C., Yan, J., and Chen, M. Online Updating of Statistical Inference in the Big Data Setting. *Technometrics*, 58(3):393–403, 2016.
- [25] Ma, X., Wang, S., and Zhou, W. Statistical Inference in Massive Datasets by Empirical Likelihood. *Computational Statistics*, pages 1–22, 2022.
- [26] Liu, Qi., and Li, Z. Distributed Estimation with Empirical Likelihood. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 51(2):375–399, 2023.
- [27] Zhou, L., She, X., and Song, P.X.K. Distributed Empirical Likelihood Approach to Integrating Unbalanced Datasets. *Statistica Sinica*, 33(3):2209–2231, 2023.
- [28] Owen, A.B. *Empirical Likelihood*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2001.

- [29] Liu, Y., Zou, C., and Zhang, R. Empirical Likelihood for the Two-sample Mean Problem. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 78(5):548–556, 2008.
- [30] Tsao, M., and Wu, F. Two-sample Extended Empirical Likelihood for Estimating Equations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 142:1–15, 2015.
- [31] Kohavi, R., Tang, D., and Xu, Y. *Trustworthy Online Controlled Experiments: A Practical Guide to A/B Testing*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [32] Kohavi, R., and Longbotham, R. Online Controlled Experiments and A/B Tests. In *Encyclopedia of machine learning and data science*, pages 1–13. Springer, 2023.
- [33] Larsen, N., Stallrich, J., Sengupta, S., Deng, A., Kohavi, R., and Stevens, N.T. Statistical Challenges in Online Controlled Experiments: A Review of A/B Testing Methodology. *The American Statistician*, 78(2):135–149, 2024.
- [34] Welch, B.L. The Significance of the Difference Between Two Means When the Population Variances Are Unequal. *Biometrika*, 29(3/4):350–362, 1938.
- [35] Johari, R., Koomen, P., Pekelis, L., and Walsh, D. Peeking at A/B Tests: Why It Matters, and What To Do About It. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1517–1525, 2017.
- [36] Prokhorova, T. Forecasting Long-Term Effect of Marketing Actions on the Basis of the Analysis of Incremental Retention of Gross Merchandise Volume. In *Proceedings of the European Marketing Academy*, volume 49, page 64385, 2020.
- [37] Owen, A.B. Empirical Likelihood for Linear Models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1725–1747, 1991.
- [38] Lazar, N.A. Bayesian Empirical Likelihood. *Biometrika*, 90(2):319–326, 2003.
- [39] Zhu, L., and Xue, L. Empirical Likelihood Confidence Regions in a Partially Linear Single-index Model. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 68(3):549–570, 2006.

- [40] Jing, B., Yuan, J., and Zhou, W. Jackknife Empirical Likelihood. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(487):1224–1232, 2009.
- [41] Chen, J., Variyath, A.M., and Abraham, B. Adjusted Empirical Likelihood and Its Properties. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 17(2):426–443, 2008.
- [42] Tsao, M. Extending the Empirical Likelihood by Domain Expansion. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 41(2):257–274, 2013.
- [43] Jing, B., Tsao, M., and Zhou, W. Transforming the Empirical Likelihood Towards Better Accuracy. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 45(3):340–352, 2017.
- [44] Liang, W., Dai, H., and He, S. Mean Empirical Likelihood. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 138:155–169, 2019.
- [45] Chang, J., Tang, C., and Zhu, Y. Bayesian Penalized Empirical Likelihood and Markov Chain Monte Carlo Sampling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, page qkaf009, 2025.
- [46] Aggarwal, C.C. *Data Streams: Models and Algorithms*, volume 31. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

A Appendix

We now present proofs of theorems in the order as they appeared in the paper. As a preliminary to the proof of the theorem, we state Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]$ is positive definite, $\partial\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is continuous in a neighborhood of the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, $\|\partial\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3$ are bounded by some integrable function $H(\mathbf{x})$ in this neighborhood, and the rank of $\mathbb{E}[\partial\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}]$ is p . Then, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, with probability 1, $L_E(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ attains its minimum value at some point $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ in the interior of the ball $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq N^{-1/3}$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ satisfy*

$$\mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \mathbf{0},$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \boldsymbol{\lambda}. \quad (17)$$

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Define

$$\mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Write $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \mathbf{u} N^{-1/3}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, and let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{0}.$$

A Taylor expansion of $1/(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ around $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{0}$ gives, for some ξ_i on the line segment between 0 and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$,

$$\frac{\mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (1 - \xi_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + o_p((m/n)^{1/3}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (1 - \xi_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + o_p((m/n)^{1/3}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})' \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} + o_p((m/n)^{1/3}). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging and inverting the empirical second-moment matrix,

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p((m/n)^{1/3}) = O_p((m/n)^{1/3}),$$

uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in the neighborhood $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq N^{-1/3}$. Now for the log-likelihood

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{m} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \right) + o_p((n/m)^{1/3}) \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)' \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})' \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) + o_p((n/m)^{1/3}). \end{aligned}$$

Expanding around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{m} &= \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u} N^{-1/3} \right)' \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})' \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u} N^{-1/3} \right) + o_p((n/m)^{1/3}) \\
&= \frac{n}{2} \left\{ O_p(N^{-1/2}(\log \log N)^{1/2}) + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) \mathbf{u} N^{-1/3} \right\}' \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{G}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ O_p(N^{-1/2}(\log \log N)^{1/2}) + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) \mathbf{u} N^{-1/3} \right\} + o_p((n/\log n)^{1/3}) \\
&\geq \frac{n}{2} \cdot (mc - m\epsilon) \cdot N^{-2/3} = (c - \epsilon) \cdot N^{1/3} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}.$$

Therefore, at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{G}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right).$$

Let c be the smallest eigenvalue of

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right),$$

then the smallest eigenvalue of

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{G}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)$$

is *mc.* Similarly, at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{m} &= \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)' \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{G}_i'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{N}{2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)' \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) + o_p(1) \\
&= O_p(\log \log N).
\end{aligned}$$

From $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > -2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ for $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| = N^{-1/3}$, we see that $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is larger on the sphere than at the center. By continuity, $R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ attains a minimum at some interior point of the ball, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{-2 \partial \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left. \frac{\frac{\partial \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left. \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \\
&= \mathbf{0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{G}_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})} = \mathbf{0}, \\
\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{0},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}, \\
\mathbf{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \boldsymbol{\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Taking derivatives about $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})'$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)'$$

Expanding $\mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ at $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})$ by the conditions of the Theorem 1 and Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \\ &= \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathbf{0}) + r_N \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \\ &= \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{2n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathbf{0}) + r_N \end{aligned}$$

where $r_N = o_p(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|)$. We have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{S}_N^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + r_N \\ r_N \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_N = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{1n}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{2n}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}_{(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{11} & \mathbf{S}_{12} \\ \mathbf{S}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}') & \mathbb{E}(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}) \\ \mathbb{E}(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}})' & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbf{S}_{21}^* = -(\mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12})^{-1} = \{\mathbb{E}(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}})' \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}')^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}})\}^{-1}$, we can get

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) - \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} r_N + \mathbf{S}_{21}^* r_N.$$

Thus

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \sqrt{N} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{\mathbf{V}}{m}),$$

where \mathbf{V} is given by (6). □

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. When $r = p$, we can get

$$q_i = \frac{1}{N\{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}}.$$

From the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Let

$$Z_N^* = \max_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|, \quad \bar{Z}_n^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|,$$

and we have

$$Z_N^* = o_p(N^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Since $\text{Var}(\sqrt{m} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})) < \infty$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(\|\sqrt{m} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\| > n) < \infty.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, the event $\|\sqrt{m}\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta})\| > \sqrt{n}$ occurs only for finitely many n , almost surely. This implies that for all sufficiently large n

$$\sqrt{m}\bar{Z}_n^* \leq \sqrt{n} \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

That is, for $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\sqrt{m}\bar{Z}_n^* \leq \epsilon n^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{almost surely for large } n.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{Z}_n^* \sqrt{m} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \epsilon \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{Z}_n^* = o_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \mathbf{I}$ where \mathbf{I} is a unit vector. Define $Y_i := \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and

$$A(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = 0.$$

Due to $1/(1 + Y_i) = 1 - Y_i/(1 + Y_i)$ and substituting into $\mathbf{I}' A(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = 0$, we can get

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \mathbf{I}' \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{I}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})'}{1 + Y_i}$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})/n$. Since $1 + Y_i > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \mathbf{I}' \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} &\leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \mathbf{I}' \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{I} (1 + \max_i |Y_i|) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \mathbf{I}' \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{I} (1 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \bar{Z}_n^*), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{S} = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})'$. Thus

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \left(\mathbf{I}' \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} - \bar{Z}_n^* \mathbf{I}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \leq \mathbf{I}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Given that $\mathbf{I}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = O_p(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, we can get

$$\bar{Z}_n^* \mathbf{I}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = o_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \right) = o_p \left(\frac{1}{m} \right),$$

$$\frac{\sigma_1}{m} + o_p \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) \geq \mathbf{I}' \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} \geq \frac{\sigma_p}{m} + o_p \left(\frac{1}{m} \right),$$

where σ_1 denotes the minimum eigenvalue of $\text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$, and σ_p denotes the maximum eigenvalue of $\text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$. Therefore, we have $\mathbf{I}' \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} = O_p(1/m)$. Next, we have

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| \left(O_p \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) + o_p \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) \right) = O_p(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$\Rightarrow \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \right) \cdot o_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \right) = o_p(1).$$

From $A(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \left(1 - Y_i + \frac{Y_i^2}{1 + Y_i} \right) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{S} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) Y_i^2}{1 + Y_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) Y_i^2}{1 + Y_i} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|^2 |1 + Y_i|^{-1}.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3 \leq \frac{\bar{Z}_n^*}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2$$

and $\text{Var}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})) = \text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))/m = O(1/m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{Z}_n^*}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2 &= o_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\right) \cdot O_p\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) = o_p\left(\frac{n^{1/2}}{m^{3/2}}\right) \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3 = o_p\left(\frac{n^{1/2}}{m^{3/2}}\right). \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) Y_i^2}{1 + Y_i} = o_p\left(\frac{n^{1/2}}{m^{3/2}}\right) \cdot O_p\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) \cdot O_p(1) = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can get

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{S}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{\beta},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = o_p(1/\sqrt{N})$.

Using the Taylor expansion for logarithm, we have

$$\log(1 + Y_i) = Y_i - \frac{1}{2} Y_i^2 + \eta_i,$$

for some finite $B > 0$, we have

$$\Pr(|\eta_i| \leq B|Y_i|^3, 1 \leq i \leq n) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus the log-likelihood ratio is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{m} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log\{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log\{1 + Y_i\} \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i - \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \\
&= 2n \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - n \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{S} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \\
&= n \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})' \mathbf{S}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - n \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{S} \boldsymbol{\beta} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term converges to χ_p^2 . The remainder terms satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}
n \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{S} \boldsymbol{\beta} &= n \cdot o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \cdot O_p\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \cdot o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \\
&= o_p\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \right| &\leq B \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|^3 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|^3 \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{m^{3/2}}{n^{3/2}}\right) \cdot n \cdot o_p\left(\frac{n^{1/2}}{m^{3/2}}\right) \\
&= o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/m \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2$.

When $r > p$,

$$\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{m} = \frac{2}{m} \left\{ m \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right) - m \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right) \right\}.$$

Note that

$$-2 \log R_G(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}' \mathbf{G}_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right) = -\frac{n}{2} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0})' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}_{12} \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1})$. Also under H_0 ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_0' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)} \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbf{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_0 = -\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_0' \mathbf{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) = -\frac{n}{2} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{m} &= n \mathbf{Q}_{1n}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}) \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1) \\ &= n \mathbf{Q}_{1n}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{12} \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) + o_p(1) \\ &= \left[(-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{n} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) \right]' \left[(-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{S}_{12} \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} (-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \left[(-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{n} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) \right] + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{Z} := (-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-1/2} \sqrt{n} \mathbf{Q}_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{0}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ and $\mathbf{M} := (-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}_{12} \mathbf{S}_{21}^* \mathbf{S}_{21} (-\mathbf{S}_{11})^{-1/2}$. Since \mathbf{M} is symmetric and idempotent, with trace equal to p , the empirical likelihood ratio statistic $-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/m = \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Z} + o_p(1)$ converges to χ_p^2 . \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Define the sample moment functions

$$\mathbf{G}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x), \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}_y) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y).$$

At the true parameter values $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}$, by the law of large numbers (with Conditions 6 and 7 ensuring uniform integrability), we have

$$\mathbf{G}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) = O_p(N^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) = O_p(M^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

By applying a first-order Taylor expansion of (14) around $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}$, and using the positive definiteness of the covariance matrices in Condition 5, we can get

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = O_p(N^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Note that

$$-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0) = 2m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log \left(1 - \tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \log \left(1 - \tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \right) \right\},$$

expanding the log terms in $W_E(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0)$ using Taylor series yields

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(1 - \tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right) &= -\tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right)^2 + r_{1i} \\ \log \left(1 + \tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \right) &= \tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \right)^2 + r_{2j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $|r_{1i}| \leq C_1 |\tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)|^3$ and $|r_{2j}| \leq C_2 |\tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)|^3$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0) &= 2m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left\{ -\tau_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) - \frac{\tau_1^2}{2} \left((\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right)^2 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \left\{ \tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) - \frac{\tau_2^2}{2} \left((\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \right)^2 \right\} + r \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $r = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} r_{1i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} r_{2j}$. From (14), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)}{1 + \tau_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) - \tau_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)' \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + o_p(1) = \mathbf{0},$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) = \tau_2 n_2 \left\{ \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)' \right\} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = n_2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2 = \tau_2 \text{Var}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}))$. Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) = -n_1 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 = \tau_1 \text{Var}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}))$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2$. The linear term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & -2m \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \tau_1 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) + 2m \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \tau_2 (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \\ & = 2N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the expressions, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0) &= 2N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - m(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \\ & \cdot \left\{ \tau_2^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)' + \tau_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)' \right\} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + r. \end{aligned}$$

By Condition 5, we have:

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0})' \xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{m} \text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0})),$$

$$\frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0})' \xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{m} \text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0})).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \quad & m\tau_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \bar{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)' = N\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 + o_p(1), \\ & m\tau_2^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*) \bar{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^*)' = N\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2 + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} -2\log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0) &= 2N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' (N\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 + N\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2) \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + o_p(1) \\ &= N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1 := \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}), \quad \bar{\mathbf{G}}_2 := \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}).$$

Perform a Taylor expansion on the first equation in (14)

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) + \left\{ \tau_1 \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*)' - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 \right\} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n_1}\right) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= -\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^*) \right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n_1}\right) \\ &= -\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{G}}_1 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n_1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{G}}_2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n_2}\right).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2) \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= (\bar{\mathbf{G}}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{G}}_1) + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{m}{N} \left(\tau_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) - \tau_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) \right) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathbf{V}_1 := \tau_1 \text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}))$, $\mathbf{V}_2 := \tau_2 \text{Var}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}))$. Then we have $\mathbf{V}_1 = m\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1$, $\mathbf{V}_2 = m\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2$. Thus, $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 + \mathbf{V}_2 = m\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2)\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= \frac{m}{N} \left(\tau_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_{jt}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) - \tau_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_{ik}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\tau_2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) - \tau_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) \right) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\mathbf{D}_N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\tau_2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0}) - \tau_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0}) \right),$$

by the Central Limit Theorem (with Condition 8 ensuring the Lindeberg condition), we have

$$\mathbf{D}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\mathbf{D}_N) = \mathbf{V}_1 + \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}$. Then we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{D}_N}{\sqrt{N}} + o_p(1) \\ &= m\mathbf{V}^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{D}_N}{\sqrt{N}} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0) &= N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)' \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + o_p(1) \\ &= N \left(m\mathbf{V}^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{D}_N}{\sqrt{N}} \right)' \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}}{m} \right) \left(m\mathbf{V}^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{D}_N}{\sqrt{N}} \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= m\mathbf{D}_N' \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_N + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \mathbf{D}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p)$, it follows that:

$$\mathbf{D}_N' \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_N = \|\mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \mathbf{D}_N\|^2 \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2.$$

By Condition 4 and the fact that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = O_p(N^{-1/2})$, we can get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} |r_{1i}| + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} |r_{2j}| = O_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

From Conditions 6 and 7 together with the M-estimation theory, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_y^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y_0} = O_p(N^{-1/2}), \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_x^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{x_0} = O_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Hence $r = o_p(1)$. Therefore

$$\frac{-2 \log R_G(\boldsymbol{\pi}_0)}{m} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2.$$

□