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GAUSSIAN SEMIPARAMETRIC ESTIMATION IN SEASONAL/CYCLICAL LONG MEMORY TIME SERIES

Josu Arteche

Gaussian semiparametric or local Whittle estimation of the memory parameter in standard long memory processes was proposed by Robinson [18]. This technique shows several advantages over the popular log-periodogram regression introduced by Geweke and Porter-Hudak [7]. In particular under milder assumptions than those needed in the log periodogram regression it is asymptotically more efficient. We analyse the asymptotic behaviour of the Gaussian semiparametric estimate of the memory parameter in seasonal or cyclical long memory processes allowing for asymmetric spectral divergences or zeros. Consistency and asymptotic normality are obtained.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \( \{x_t, t = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots\} \) be a real-valued covariance stationary process with spectral density \( f(\lambda) \). We say that \( x_t \) has standard long memory if

\[
f(\lambda) \sim C\lambda^{-2d} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0,
\]

where \( 0 < C < \infty \) and the memory parameter \( d \) satisfies \( |d| < 1/2 \). Whittle [19] proposed an estimation technique based on the minimization of the function

\[
\Upsilon_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\{ \log f(z) + \frac{I_n^c(z)}{f(z)} \right\} \, dz
\]

where \( \theta \) is the vector of parameters to estimate, \( f(z) \) is the spectral density (absolute knowledge of this function up to the vector of parameters \( \theta \) is thus assumed) and \( I_n^c(z) \) is the centered periodogram of \( \{x_t, t = 1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) at frequency \( z \),

\[
I_n^c(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi n} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{itz} (x_t - \bar{x}_n) \right|^2, \quad \bar{x}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} x_t.
\]

This technique was originally proposed for short memory processes with a smooth spectral density and in that case is asymptotically equivalent to maximum likelihood.
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The application of this methodology to standard long memory processes with a spectral density satisfying (1.1) has been analysed by Fox and Taqqu [6], Dahlhaus [5], Giraitis and Surgailis [8] and Heyde and Gay [12] and \( \sqrt{n} \)-consistency and asymptotic normality have been proved, and when \( x_t \) is actually Gaussian asymptotic efficiency has been found. However these properties depend strongly on a correct specification of \( f(\lambda) \) and if some kind of misspecification occurs the estimates will in general be inconsistent. Particularly the estimates of long memory parameters will be inconsistent if short memory components are misspecified. To overcome this inconvenience Kunsch [15] and Robinson [18] considered a semiparametric discrete version of (1.2) and assumed only partial knowledge of the spectral density so that the Gaussian semiparametric estimates of \( d \) and \( C \) are obtained by minimizing

\[
Q(C, d) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \log C \lambda_j^{-2d} + \frac{\lambda_j^{2d}}{C} I_n(\lambda_j) \right\}
\]  

(1.3)

where \( I_n(\lambda) = |W(\lambda)|^2 \) and \( W(\lambda) = (2\pi n)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \exp(it\lambda) x_t \) are the (uncentered) periodogram and discrete Fourier transform respectively, \( \lambda_j = 2\pi j/n \) are Fourier frequencies and \( m \) is the bandwidth number such that \( \lambda_m \) is the last frequency used in the estimation. It is required that at least \( m^{-1} + mn^{-1} \rightarrow 0 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \) such that the proportion of the frequency band involved in the estimation degenerates relatively slowly to 0 as \( n \) increases. Since \( j = 0 \) is omitted in (1.3) we do not need specification or estimation of an unknown mean. Robinson [18] proved that if \( \tilde{d} = \arg \min Q(C, d) \) over a closed interval of admissible estimates \( \Theta = [\Delta_1, \Delta_2] \), such that \( -1/2 < \Delta_1 < \Delta_2 < 1/2 \), then \( \sqrt{m}(\tilde{d} - d) \Rightarrow N(0, 1/4) \). This estimate overcomes the log-periodogram proposed by Geweke and Porter-Hudak [7] in the sense that its asymptotic variance is smaller. Moreover, unlike the log-periodogram regression, the proof of the asymptotic properties does not need to trim out low frequencies and much weaker assumptions than Gaussianity are imposed (see Robinson [17]). The main disadvantage is that \( \tilde{d} \) cannot be defined in a closed form.

The drawback of this estimate with respect to the parametric one is that only \( \sqrt{m} \) consistency is achieved. Therefore the semiparametric estimate is much less efficient than the parametric ones when they are based on a complete and correct specification of \( f(\lambda) \). This loss in efficiency is the price to pay for guaranteeing consistency under misspecification of the spectral density at frequencies far from the one we are interested in.

In this paper we study the properties of the Gaussian semiparametric estimate proposed by Robinson [18] in the case of seasonal or cyclical long memory such that the spectral density satisfies

\[
f(\omega + \lambda) \sim C\lambda^{-2d_1} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+ \\
f(\omega - \lambda) \sim D\lambda^{-2d_2} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+
\]

(1.4)

for \( C, D \in (0, \infty) \) and \( d_1, d_2 \in (-1/2, 1/2) \) and we allow

\[
d_1 \neq d_2 \quad \text{and/or} \quad C \neq D.
\]
Thus we allow for asymmetric spectral poles or zeros in the sense that the parameters \( d_1, C \) governing spectral behaviour just after \( \omega \) may be different from \( d_2, D \) which govern spectral behaviour at frequencies just before \( \omega \). Some parametric seasonal or cyclical long memory models have been discussed by Jonas [14], Carlin and Dempster [4], Gray et al [9], Hassler [11] and Robinson [16]. For a review see Arteche and Robinson [2]. The case of an asymmetric spectral pole or zero at frequency \( \omega \neq 0 \) presents a peculiarity with respect to the analysis at the origin where the spectral density function is symmetric. If the parameter we want to estimate is \( d_1 \) such that \( d_1 < d_2 \) we need to trim out some frequencies close to \( \omega \) in order to get rid of the influence of the periodogram at frequencies just before \( \omega \) where the spectral density is governed by \( d_2 \). Thus the Gaussian semiparametric estimates of \( d_1 \) and \( C \) are obtained by minimizing

\[
Q(C, d) = \frac{1}{m - l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left\{ \log C \lambda_j^{-2d} + \frac{\lambda_j^{2d}}{C} I_j \right\}
\]  

(1.5)

where \( \lambda_j = \frac{2\pi j}{n} \), \( j = l + 1, \ldots, m \), \( I_j = I_n(\omega + \lambda_j) \) is the periodogram at frequency \( \omega + \lambda_j \) and \( l = 0 \) if \( d_1 \geq d_2 \) and \( l \to \infty \) more slowly than \( m \) as \( n \to \infty \) if \( d_1 < d_2 \). Concentrating \( C \) out of the objective function we have that minimizing (1.5) is equivalent to minimize

\[
R(d) = \log \tilde{C}(d) - 2d \frac{1}{m - l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m} \log \lambda_i
\]  

(1.6)

where

\[
\tilde{C}(d) = \frac{1}{m - l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m} \lambda_i^{2d} I_j.
\]  

(1.7)

Then the procedure consists in obtaining an estimate of \( d_1 \), \( \tilde{d}_1 = \arg \min_{d \in \Theta} R(d) \) where \( \Theta = [\Delta_1, \Delta_2] \) is the set of admissible values for \( d_1 \) and then plug \( \tilde{d}_1 \) in (1.7) to obtain an estimate of \( C \), \( \tilde{C}(\tilde{d}_1) \). A similar procedure, using frequencies just before \( \omega \), can be used to estimate \( D \) and \( d_2 \). In Section 2 we proved the consistency of \( \tilde{d}_1 \) while the asymptotic distribution is obtained in Section 3. Finally technical lemmas are placed in the Appendix.

2. CONSISTENCY OF THE ESTIMATE

In order to prove the consistency of \( \tilde{d}_1 \) we need the following assumptions:

A.1. For \( \alpha \in (0, 2] \) and \( \omega \in (0, \pi), \) as \( \lambda \to 0^+ \):

\[
f(\omega + \lambda) \sim C \lambda^{-2d_1}(1 + O(\lambda^\alpha))
\]

\[
f(\omega - \lambda) \sim D \lambda^{-2d_2}(1 + O(\lambda^\alpha))
\]

where \( C, D \in (0, \infty), |d_2| < 1/2 \) and \( d_1 \in \Theta = [\Delta_1, \Delta_2] \) where \(-1/2 < \Delta_1 < \Delta_2 < 1/2 \). The choice of \( \Delta_1 \) and \( \Delta_2 \) reflects prior knowledge on \( d_1 \), for example if we know that \( f(\omega + \lambda) \neq 0 \) as \( \lambda \to 0^+ \) a reasonable choice is \( \Delta_1 = 0 \).
A.2. In a neighbourhood \((-\delta, 0) \cup (0, \delta)\) of \(\omega\), \(f(\lambda)\) is differentiable and
\[
\frac{d}{d\lambda} \log f(\omega \pm \lambda) = O(\lambda^{-1}) \quad \text{as } \lambda \to 0^+.
\]

A.3. \(x_t - Ex_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j \varepsilon_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j^2 < \infty\) where \(E[\varepsilon_t|F_{t-1}] = 0\), \(E[\varepsilon^2|F_{t-1}] = 1\) for \(t = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots\), \(F_t\) is the \(\sigma\)-field generated by \(\varepsilon_s\), \(s \leq t\) and there exists a random variable \(\varepsilon\) such that \(E\varepsilon^2 < \infty\) and for all \(\eta > 0\) and some \(\kappa < 1\), \(P(|\varepsilon_t| > \eta) \leq \kappa P(|\varepsilon| > \eta)\).

A.4. If \(d_1 \geq d_2\):
\[
\frac{1}{m} + \frac{m}{n} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty
\]
and if \(d_1 < d_2\):
\[
\frac{m}{n} + \frac{m}{n} \log m + \frac{n^{d_2-d_1}}{\left(\frac{1}{2}+(d_2-d_1)\right)(\log m)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]

Assumption A.1 and A.2 are those imposed in Arteche [1] for the asymptotics of the log-periodogram regression and correspond to those in Robinson [17] for \(\omega = 0\). Assumption A.3 says that the innovations in the Wold decomposition of \(x_t\) are a square integrable martingale difference sequence that satisfies a milder homogeneity restriction than strictly stationarity. Assumption A.4 distinguishes the cases \(d_1 \geq d_2\) and \(d_1 < d_2\). In the former \(m\) tends to \(\infty\) (necessary for consistency) but more slowly than \(n\) (due to our semiparametric specification of \(f(\lambda)\)). In the latter we introduce the trimming number \(l\) which has to go to infinity with \(n\) at a slower rate than \(m\) but its rate of divergence as \(n \to \infty\) is higher the larger the difference \(d_2 - d_1\). This is because the higher \(d_2\) with respect to \(d_1\) the more influential the periodogram at frequencies just before \(\omega\) (where the spectral density is governed by \(d_2\)) in the estimation of \(d_1\) (see Lemma 1) such that a larger trimming is needed. The more restrictive case comes up when \(d_2 - d_1\) approaches 1. In that case \(\frac{n}{l^2}(\log m)^{\frac{3}{2}} \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\) so that if \(m \sim n^\theta\) and \(l \sim n^\phi\), then \(1 > \theta > \phi > 2/3\) ensures A.4.

The following theorem establishes the consistency of the Gaussian semiparametric estimate of \(d_1\) in (1.4). We only focus on the case \(d_1 < d_2\). The proof when \(d_1 \geq d_2\) is a straightforward extension of that in Robinson [18] when \(\omega = 0\).

**Theorem 1.** Let assumptions A.1 - A.4 hold. Then as \(n \to \infty\)
\[
d_1 \xrightarrow{p} d_1.
\]

**Proof.** \(d_1 = \arg \min_{\Theta} R(d)\) where \(R(d)\) is defined in (1.6). Write \(S(d) = R(d) - R(d_1)\) and \(N_\delta = \{d : |d - d_1| < \delta\} \) for \(0 < \delta < 1/4\) and \(\tilde{N}_\delta = (-\infty, \infty) - N_\delta\). Then
\[
P(|\tilde{d}_1 - d_1| \geq \delta)
= P(\tilde{d}_1 \in \tilde{N}_\delta \cap \Theta) = P(P(\inf_{\tilde{N}_\delta \cap \Theta} R(d) \leq \inf_{\tilde{N}_\delta \cap \Theta} R(d) \leq P(\inf_{\tilde{N}_\delta \cap \Theta} S(d) \leq 0))
\]
because $d_1 \in N_{\delta} \cap \Theta$. Now define the following subsets of the set of admissible values $\Theta$,

$$\Theta_1 = \{ d : \Delta \leq d \leq \Delta_2 \} \text{ such that } \begin{cases} \Delta = \Delta_1 & \text{if } d_1 < \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \\ d_1 \geq \Delta > d_1 - \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } d_1 \geq \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

$$\Theta_2 = \begin{cases} \{ d : \Delta_1 \leq d < \Delta \} & \text{if } d_1 \geq \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$P(|\tilde{d}_1 - d_1| \geq \delta) \leq P\left( \inf_{\Theta_1} S(d) \leq 0 \right) + P\left( \inf_{\Theta_2} S(d) \leq 0 \right).$$

Write $S(d) = U(d) - T(d)$ where $U(d)$ is the deterministic part of $S(d)$ obtained by replacing $I_j$ by $C\lambda_j^{-2d_1}$ and sums by integrals, and $T(d)$ is the remainder.

$$U(d) = 2(d - d_1) - \log(2(d - d_1) + 1)$$

$$T(d) = \log\left( \frac{\tilde{C}(d)}{C} \right) - \log\left( \frac{\tilde{C}(d)}{C} \right) - \log \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m-l} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \{2(d - d_1) + 1\} \right)$$

$$+ 2(d - d_1) \left\{ \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \log j - \log(m-l) + 1 \right\}$$

where

$$C(d) = C \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \lambda_j^{2(d-d_1)}. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that $U(d)$ achieves a unique minimum in $\Theta_1$ for $d = d_1$. Now,

$$P\left( \inf_{N \in \Theta_1} S(d) \leq 0 \right) = P\left( \inf_{N \in \Theta_1} (U(d) - T(d)) \leq 0 \right) \leq P\left( \sup_{\Theta_1} |T(d)| \geq \inf_{N \in \Theta_1} U(d) \right).$$

Using the mean value theorem we have

$$\log(1 + x) \leq x - \frac{1}{8} x^2, \quad -\log(1 - x) \geq x + \frac{1}{2} x^2$$

for $0 < x < 1$. It follows that

$$\inf_{N \in \Theta_1} U(d) \geq \min\{2\delta - \log\{2\delta + 1\}, -2\delta - \log\{1 - 2\delta\}\} \geq \frac{\delta^2}{2}. \quad (2.2)$$

On the other hand, from the inequality $|\log(1 + x)| \leq 2|x|$ for $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we deduce that for any nonnegative random variable $y$, $P(2|y - 1| \leq \epsilon) \leq P(|\log y| \leq \epsilon)$ for $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ and

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{\tilde{C}(d)}{C} \right| > \epsilon \right\} \leq P \left\{ \left| \frac{\tilde{C}(d) - C(d)}{C(d)} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right\}$$

and thus $\sup_{\Theta_1} |T(d)| \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0$ if
a) \( \sup_{\Theta_1} \left| \frac{\tilde{C}(d) - C(d)}{C(d)} \right| = o_p(1) \)

b) \( \sup_{\Theta_1} \left| \frac{2(d - d_1) + 1}{m - l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m - l} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} - 1 \right| = o(1) \)

c) \( \left| \frac{1}{m - l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j - \log(m - l) + 1 \right| = o(1). \)

If \( d_1 \leq d_2 \) (\( l = 0 \)) the left hand sides of b) and c) are \( O(m^{-1 - 2(\Delta - d_1)}) \) and \( O\left( \frac{\log m}{m} \right) \) respectively from Lemmas 1 and 2 in Robinson [18]. If \( d_1 > d_2 \) (\( l \to \infty \)) the left hand sides of b) and c) are \( O\left( \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{1+2(\Delta - d_1)} \right) \) and \( O\left( \frac{\log m}{m} \right) \) respectively from Lemmas 2 and 3 in the Appendix. Since \( 1 + 2(\Delta - d_1) > 0 \) in \( \Theta_1 \), condition A.4 implies that b) and c) hold.

In order to prove a) write,

\[
\frac{\tilde{C}(d) - C(d)}{C(d)} = \frac{A(d)}{B(d)}
\]

where

\[
A(d) = \frac{2(d - d_1) + 1}{m - l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m - l} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right)
\]

\[
B(d) = \frac{2(d - d_1) + 1}{m - l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m - l} \right)^{2(d - d_1)}
\]

for \( g_j = C \lambda_j^{-2d_1} \). Since \( B(d) + |B(d) - 1| \geq 1 \) it follows that

\[
\inf_{\Theta_1} B(d) \geq 1 - \sup_{\Theta_1} |B(d) - 1| \geq \frac{1}{2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

for all sufficiently large \( m \) using Lemma 2. Now, by summation by parts, \( A(d) \) is bounded in absolute value by,

\[
\frac{3}{m - l} \left| \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left\{ \left( \frac{r}{m - l} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} - \left( \frac{r + 1}{m - l} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} \right\} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} - 1 \leq \frac{2|d - d_1|}{r} \max_{r \geq 1} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^{2(d - d_1)-1} \leq \frac{4}{r}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

Using the mean value theorem we have that for \( r \geq 1 \),

\[
\left| \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^{2(d - d_1)} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{2|d - d_1|}{r} \max_{r \geq 1} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^{2(d - d_1)-1} \leq \frac{4}{r}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)
in Θ. Thus the supremum in Θ of (2.4) is bounded by
\[
\sup_{\Theta_M} \frac{3}{m-1} \left| \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m-l} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \left\{ 1 - \left( \frac{r+1}{r} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \right\} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right|
\]
\[
\leq 12 \left( \frac{m}{m-l} \right)^{2(\Delta_2-d_1)+1} \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right). 
\]
Since \( (\frac{m}{m-l})^\alpha \to 1 \) for all \( \alpha \) we focus on the analysis of
\[
\sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right). 
\]

Now,
\[
\frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 = \left( 1 - \frac{g_j}{f_j} \right) \frac{I_j}{f_j} + \frac{1}{f_j} [I_j - |\alpha_j|^2 I_{\tilde{c}j}] + (2\pi I_{\tilde{c}j} - 1) 
\]
where \( I_{\tilde{c}j} = I_x(\omega + \lambda_j) = |W_x(\omega + \lambda_j)|^2, \) \( W_x(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \epsilon_\tau e^{it\lambda}, \) \( f_j = f(\omega + \lambda_j), \)
\( I_j = I_n(\omega + \lambda_j) \) and \( \alpha_j = \alpha(\omega + \lambda_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e^{i(k(\omega + \lambda_j))}. \) Assumption A.1 implies that
\[
|1 - \frac{g_j}{f_j}| = O(\lambda_\alpha). 
\]
Assumptions A.1 and A.2 and Lemma 1 imply that for \( n \) sufficiently large,
\[
E \left| \frac{I_j}{g_j} \right| = 1 + O \left( \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^\alpha + \frac{n^{2(d-d_1)}}{j^{1+2(d-d_1)}} \right). 
\]
Thus
\[
E \left\{ \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( 1 - \frac{g_j}{f_j} \right) \frac{I_j}{f_j} \right\}
\]
\[
= O \left( \sum_{l=1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^\alpha \left( 1 + \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^\alpha + \frac{n^{2(d-d_1)} \log j}{j^{1+2(d-d_1)}} \right) \right) 
\]
\[
= O \left( \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha \left( 1 + \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha + \frac{n^{2(d-d_1)} \log m}{m^{1+2(d-d_1)}} + \frac{n^{2(d-d_1)} \log m}{j^{1+2(d-d_1)}} \right) \right) 
\]
\[
= O \left( \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha \right) = o(1) 
\]
in \( \Theta_1 \) under A.4.

Since \( ||a||^2 - |b|^2| = |\text{Re}((a-b)(\bar{a}+\bar{b}))| \leq |(a-b)(\bar{a}+\bar{b})| \leq |a-b||a+b|, \) applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that \( E|I_j - |\alpha_j|^2 I_{\tilde{c}j}| \) is bounded by
\[
\{ E|I_j - \alpha_j EW_{\tilde{c}j} W_j - \bar{\alpha}_j EW_{\tilde{c}j} W_j + |\alpha_j|^2 EI_{\tilde{c}j} \}^{1/2} 
\]
\[
= \{ E|I_j + \alpha_j EW_{\tilde{c}j} W_j + \bar{\alpha}_j EW_{\tilde{c}j} W_j + |\alpha_j|^2 EI_{\tilde{c}j} \}^{1/2}. 
\]

From Lemma 1 we have that as $n \to \infty$

$$EI_j = f_j + O\left(\frac{\log j}{j} \lambda_j^{-2d_2}\right), \quad EW_j \tilde{W}_{ej} = \frac{\alpha_j}{2\pi} + O\left(\frac{\log j}{j} \lambda_j^{-2d_2}\right)$$

because $I_{ej} = \frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s e^{i(t-s)(\omega+\lambda_j)}$ and under A.3 $EI_j = \frac{1}{2\pi}$. Thus under A.4 and $d_2 > d_1$, (2.10) is $O\left(\left(\frac{\log j}{j}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_j^{-(d_2+d_1)}\right)$. Now

$$E \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \frac{1}{f_j} (I_j - |\alpha_j|^2 I_{ej}) \right\} = O \left( \sum_{l=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\log j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_j^{-(d_2-d_1)} \right). \quad (2.11)$$

We distinguish the cases $d_2 - d_1 > 1/2$, $1/2 < 1/2$. When $d_2 - d_1 < 1/2$, (2.11) is

$$O \left( \frac{n^{d_2-d_1} (\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{m^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1}} \sum_{l=1}^{m} r^{2(\Delta-d_1)-(d_2-d_1)-\frac{1}{2}} \right) = O \left( \frac{n^{d_2-d_1} (\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{l^{\frac{1}{2}+d_2-d_1}} \right) = o(1) \quad (2.12)$$

in $\Theta_1$ because of A.4. Now if $d_2 - d_1 = 1/2$, (2.11) is

$$O \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}(\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{m^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1}} \sum_{l=1}^{m} r^{2(\Delta-d_1)-1} (\log r) \right) = O \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}(\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{l} \right) = o(1) \quad (2.13)$$

in $\Theta_1$ and because of A.4. Finally when $d_2 - d_1 > 1/2$, (2.11) is

$$O \left( \frac{n^{d_2-d_1} (\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{m^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1}} \sum_{l=1}^{m} r^{2(\Delta-d_1)-1} \right) = O \left( \frac{n^{d_2-d_1} (\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{l^{\frac{1}{2}+d_2-d_1}} \right) \quad (2.14)$$

and consequently (2.11) is $o(1)$ in $\Theta_1$ under A.4.

The final contribution to (2.6) comes from the term involving $2\pi I_{ej} - 1$. Write

$$2\pi I_{ej} - 1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s e^{i(t-s)(\omega+\lambda_j)} - 1$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (\epsilon_t^2 - 1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \neq s} \cos((t-s)(\omega+\lambda_j)) \epsilon_t \epsilon_s$$

using $\sin(\lambda) = -\sin(-\lambda)$. Thus

$$\sum_{r=1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} (2\pi I_{ej} - 1)$$
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\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (e_t^2 - 1) \leq \sum_{l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1 \frac{r - l}{r^2} (2.15)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1 \frac{1}{r^2} n \sum_{t \neq s} \cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_j)\} e_t e_s \right). (2.16)
\]

Under A.3, \( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (e_t^2) \sim 1 \) from Theorem 1 in Heyde and Seneta [13] and

\[
\sum_{l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1 \frac{r - l}{r^2} = O \left( \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1 \frac{1}{r} \right) = O(1)
\]

and thus (2.15) is \( o_p(1) \) in \( \Theta_1 \). Assumption A.3 also implies that

\[
E \left[ \sum_{s} \sum_{t \neq s} e_t e_s \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_j)\} \right]^2
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left[ \sum_{k=l+1}^{r} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} \cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_j)\} \cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_k)\} - n \right]
\]

\[
= (r - l) n^2 - 2(r - l)^2 n (2.17)
\]

for \( r \) such that \( 0 < \omega + \lambda_r < \pi \). To prove (2.17) write

\[
\cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_j)\} \cos \{(t - s)(\omega + \lambda_k)\} = a_{ts} + b_{ts} + c_{ts} + d_{ts}
\]

where

\[
a_{ts} = \cos[s(\omega + \lambda_j)] \cos[s(\omega + \lambda_k)] \cos[t(\omega + \lambda_j)] \cos[t(\omega + \lambda_k)]
\]

\[
b_{ts} = \cos[s(\omega + \lambda_j)] \sin[s(\omega + \lambda_k)] \cos[t(\omega + \lambda_j)] \sin[t(\omega + \lambda_k)]
\]

\[
c_{ts} = \sin[s(\omega + \lambda_j)] \cos[s(\omega + \lambda_k)] \sin[t(\omega + \lambda_j)] \cos[t(\omega + \lambda_k)]
\]

\[
d_{ts} = \sin[s(\omega + \lambda_j)] \sin[s(\omega + \lambda_k)] \sin[t(\omega + \lambda_j)] \sin[t(\omega + \lambda_k)]. (2.18)
\]

Now

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} a_{ts} = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} d_{ts} = \frac{n^2}{4} \text{ if } k = j
\]

\[
= 0 \text{ otherwise}
\]

and

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} b_{ts} = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} c_{ts} = 0
\]

which proves (2.17), and thus (2.16) is

\[
O_p \left( \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1 \frac{r - l}{r^2} \right) = O_p \left( \frac{1}{m^{2(\Delta - d_1)} + 1} \sum_{l+1}^{m} r^{2(\Delta - d_1) - \frac{1}{2}} \right)
\]

\[
= O_p \left( \log m + \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \left( \frac{l}{m} \right)^{2(\Delta - d_1) + 1} \right) = o_p(1)
\]
as \( n \to \infty \). Thus we have proved that \( \sup_{\Theta_1} (2.4) = o_p(1) \).

Now \( \sup_{\Theta_1} (2.5) \) is bounded by

\[
\frac{3}{m-l} \left( \frac{m}{m-l} \right)^{2(\Delta_2-d_1)} \left| \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right|. \tag{2.19}
\]

Because \( \left( \frac{m}{m-l} \right)^{\alpha} \to 1 \) for all \( \alpha \) as \( n \to \infty \) we focus on \( \frac{1}{m} \left| \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| \) and use (2.7) to show in the same manner as above that \( \sup_{\Theta_1} (2.5) = o_p(1) \). Since \( d_1 < d_2 \),

\[
E \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left| 1 - \frac{j}{f_j} \right| \left| \frac{I_j}{g_j} \right| \right\} = O \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \frac{n^{2(d_2-d_1)} \log j}{j^{1+2(d_2-d_1)}} \right) = O \left( \frac{m^{\alpha}}{n^{\alpha}} \right) = o(1)
\]

under A.4. On the other hand,

\[
E \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \frac{1}{f_j} \left| I_j - |a_j|^2 I_{I_j} \right| \right\} = O \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \frac{n^{d_2-d_1} \log j}{j^{1/2+d_2-d_1}} \right) = o(1)
\]

under A.4, and finally \( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left| 2\pi I_{I_j} - 1 \right| \) is bounded by

\[
\frac{m-l}{m} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (\epsilon_t^2 - 1) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t} \sum_{s \neq t} \cos \{ (t-s) (\omega + \lambda_j) \} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s \right| = o_p(1) + O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right) = o_p(1).
\]

We have shown that \( \sup_{\Theta_1} |A(d)| \overset{p}{\to} 0 \) and thus

\[
\sup_{\Theta_1} \left| \frac{\bar{C}(d)}{C(d)} - 1 \right| = \sup_{\Theta_1} \left| \frac{A(d)}{B(d)} \right| \leq \sup_{\Theta_1} \left| \frac{A(d)}{B(d)} \right| p \to 0
\]

and the proof is completed in the case \( d_1 < \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \). But if \( d_1 \geq \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \), \( \Theta_2 \) is not an empty set and \( P(\inf_{\Theta_2} S(d) \leq 0) \) may be different from zero. However we will see that in fact \( P(\inf_{\Theta_2} S(d) \leq 0) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Write \( p = p_m = \exp \left( - \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j \right) \)

and \( S(d) = \log \left\{ \frac{\hat{D}(d)}{D(d)} \right\} \) where \( \hat{D}(d) = \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} j^{2d_1} I_j \). Since \( l + 1 \leq p \leq \)
m then,

\[
\inf_{\Theta_2} \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \geq \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)} \quad \text{for } l + 1 \leq j \leq p \\
\inf_{\Theta_2} \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \geq \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(\Delta_1-d_1)} \quad \text{for } p < j \leq m.
\]

It follows that

\[
\inf_{\Theta_2} \hat{D}(d) \geq \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} a_j j^{2d_1} I_j
\]

where

\[
a_j = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(\Delta-d_1)} & \text{for } l + 1 \leq j \leq p \\
\left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^{2(\Delta_1-d_1)} & \text{for } p < j \leq m
\end{cases}
\]

Thus

\[
P \left( \inf_{\Theta_2} S(d) \leq 0 \right) \leq P \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (a_j - 1) j^{2d_1} I_j \leq 0 \right).
\]

Under A.4,

\[
p \sim \exp \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \{m[\log m - 1] - l[\log l - 1]\} \right)
\]

\[
= \exp(-1 + \log m) \exp \left( \frac{l \log m}{m-l} - \frac{l \log l}{m-l} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{m}{e} (1 + o(1)) \sim \frac{m}{e},
\]

and

\[
\sum_{j=l+1}^{p} a_j \sim p^{2(d_1-\Delta)} \int_{1}^{p} x^{2(\Delta-d_1)} dx = \frac{p}{2(\Delta-d_1) + 1} - \frac{l^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1}}{(2(\Delta-d_1) + 1)p^{2(\Delta-d_1)}}.
\]

Thus

\[
\frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (a_j - 1) \geq \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{p} a_j - 1
\]

\[
\sim \frac{1}{e(2(\Delta-d_1) + 1)} \left( 1 + \frac{l}{m-l} - \frac{(l e)^{2(\Delta-d_1)+1}}{(m-l)m^{2(\Delta-d_1)}} \right) - 1
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{e(2(\Delta-d_1) + 1)} - 1 + o(1).
\]

Choosing \( \Delta < d_1 - 1/2 + 1/(4e) \) (which can be done without loss of generality because \( d_1 - 1/2 \geq \Delta_1 \) in \( \Theta_2 \)) we have that for \( m \) sufficiently large and \( \frac{l}{m} \to 0 \) as
\( m \to \infty, \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \geq 1 \) and

\[
\begin{align*}
P \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) j^{2d_1} I_j \leq 0 \right) &= P \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \frac{\lambda_j^{2d_1} I_j}{C} + 1 \leq 1 \right) \\
&\leq P \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \frac{I_j}{g_j} + 1 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \right) \\
&\leq P \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \geq 1 \right).
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \sum_{i=l+1}^{m} a_j \sim p^{2(d_1-\Delta)} \int_p^{P} x^{2(\Delta-d_1)} dx + p^{2(d_1-\Delta_1)} \int_p^{P} x^{2(\Delta_1-d_1)} dx = O(m) \) it follows that

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \left( 1 - \frac{g_j}{f_j} \right) \frac{I_j}{g_j} \right| \\
&= O_p \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j + 1) \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^\alpha \left( 1 + \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^\alpha + \frac{n^{2(d_2-d_1)} \log j}{j^{1+2(d_2-d_1)}} \right) \right) \\
&= O_p \left( \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha \right) = o_p(1)
\end{align*}
\]

as \( n \to \infty \), under A.4 and because \( \alpha > 0 \). On the other hand,

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \frac{1}{f_j} [I_j - |\alpha_j|^2 I_{\epsilon_j}] \right| \\
&= O_p \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \frac{n^{d_2-d_1}(\log j)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{j^{\frac{1}{2}+d_2-d_1}} \right) \\
&= O_p \left( \frac{n^{d_2-d_1}(\log m)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{l^{\frac{1}{2}+d_2-d_1}} \right) = o_p(1)
\end{align*}
\]

as \( n \to \infty \) under A.4, and finally

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) (2\pi I_{\epsilon_j} - 1) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n}(\epsilon_t^2 - 1) \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j + 1) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t} \sum_{s \neq t} \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{i=l+1}^{m}(a_j - 1) \cos \{ (t-s)(\omega + \lambda_j) \} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s.
\end{align*}
\]

(2.20)

Since \( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum (a_j - 1) = O(1) \), (2.20) is \( o_p(1) \). Now (2.21) has variance

\[
\frac{2}{n^2 (m-l)^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} (a_j - 1) \sum_{k=l+1}^{m} (a_k - 1) \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} (a_{ts} + b_{ts} + c_{ts} + d_{ts}) - n \right)
\]
where \( a_{ts}, b_{ts}, c_{ts}, \) and \( d_{ts} \) are defined in (2.18). Thus the variance of (2.21) is

\[
\frac{2}{n^2} \frac{1}{(m-l)^2} \sum_{l+1}^m (a_j - 1)^2 \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2}{n(m-l)^2} \left( \sum_{l+1}^m (a_j - 1) \right)^2.
\]

(2.22)

The second term of (2.22) is \( O(n^{-1}) \) because \( \sum_{l+1}^m (a_j - 1) = O(m) \). Now

\[
\sum_{l+1}^m a_j^2 = \sum_{l+1}^p \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^4(\Delta - d_1) + \sum_{p+1}^m \left( \frac{j}{p} \right)^4(\Delta - d_1)
\]

\[
= O \left( p \log p + l \left( \frac{l}{p} \right)^4(\Delta - d_1) + m \log m \left( \frac{m}{p} \right)^4(\Delta - d_1) \right)
\]

\[
= O \left( m \log m + l \left( \frac{l}{m} \right)^4(\Delta - d_1) \right)
\]

and thus

\[
\frac{1}{(m-l)^2} \sum_{l+1}^m a_j^2 = O \left( \frac{\log m}{m} + \frac{l^4(\Delta - d_1 + 1)}{m^{4(\Delta - d_1) + 2}} \right) = o(1)
\]

because \( 4(\Delta - d_1) + 2 > 0 \). Thus (2.21) is \( o_p(1) \) and consequently \( P(\inf_{\theta_2} S(d) \leq 0) \to 0 \) and the proof is completed.

3. ASYMPTOTIC DISTRIBUTION

In this section we show that under some conditions stronger than those needed for consistency but milder than the assumptions imposed in the log-periodogram regression in the sense that Gaussianity is not needed,

\[
\sqrt{m(d_1 - d_1)} \xrightarrow{d} N \left( 0, \frac{1}{4} \right).
\]

The constancy of the asymptotic variance of \( d_1 \) makes easy the use of approximate rules of inference. We also observe the gain in efficiency with respect to the log-periodogram regression where the asymptotic variance has an upper bound of \( \pi^2/24 \) and a lower bound \( 1/4 \) but this lower bound is not attainable by that class of estimates (see Robinson [17] and Arteche [1]).

We introduce the following assumptions:

A.2'. In a neighbourhood \((-\delta, 0) \cup (0, \delta)\) of \( \omega \alpha(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k e^{ik\lambda} \) is differentiable and

\[
\frac{d}{d\lambda} \alpha(\omega \pm \lambda) = O \left( \frac{|\alpha(\omega \pm \lambda)|}{\lambda} \right) \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+.
\]
A.3'. Assumption A.3 holds and

\[ E(\epsilon_t^3 | F_{t-1}) = \mu_3 \quad \text{and} \quad E(\epsilon_t^4 | F_{t-1}) = \mu_4, \quad t = 0, \pm 1, \ldots \]

for finite constants \( \mu_3 \) and \( \mu_4 \).

A.4'. If \( d_1 \geq d_2 \),

\[ \frac{1}{m} + \frac{m^{1+2\alpha}(\log m)^2}{n^{2\alpha}} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \]

and if \( d_1 < d_2 \)

\[ \frac{(\log m)^3}{l^2} + \frac{l^3}{m}(\log m)^4 + \frac{n^2(d_2 - d_1)}{l^{1+2(d_2 - d_1)}} \log m + \frac{m^{1+2\alpha}}{n^{2\alpha}}(\log m)^2 \to 0 \]

as \( n \to \infty \).

Assumption A.2' implies A.2 because \( f(\lambda) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi} |\alpha(\lambda)|^2 \). A.3' implies that \( x_t \) is fourth order stationary and holds if the \( \epsilon_t \) are independent and identically distributed with finite fourth conditional moments. A.4' is Assumption A.4' in Robinson [18] if \( d_1 \geq d_2 \) but when \( d_1 < d_2 \) a strong trimming is needed as in the proof of the consistency. Taking \( m \sim n^\theta \) and \( l \sim n^\varphi \) we have that in case \( d_1 \geq d_2, \theta < 2\alpha/(1+2\alpha) \) suffices, but when \( d_2 > d_1 \), A.4' can only be satisfied if \( d_2 - d_1 < \alpha/(3+4\alpha) \). For instance when \( \alpha = 2, d_2 - d_1 \) has to be smaller than \( 2/11 \). However we can relax A.4' by strengthening A.3'. We thus can consider:

A.5. The fourth cumulant of \( \epsilon_t \) is zero for all \( t \).

A.6. If \( d_1 \geq d_2 \) A.4' holds and when \( d_1 < d_2 \)

\[ \frac{(\log m)^3}{l^2} + \frac{l^3}{m}(\log m)^2 + \frac{n^2(d_2 - d_1)}{l^{1+2(d_2 - d_1)}} \log m + \frac{m^{1+2\alpha}}{n^{2\alpha}}(\log m)^2 \to 0 \]

as \( n \to \infty \).

Assumption A.5 is implied by Gaussianity and A.6 entails \( (d_2 - d_1) < \alpha/(2(1+\alpha)) \)

where the upper bound is \( 1/3 \) when \( \alpha = 2 \). This requirement is not much stronger than \( d_2 - d_1 < 1/2 \) which is satisfied if there is both a left and right (stationary) spectral pole at \( \omega \).

Theorem 2. Under A.1, A.2', A.3' and either A.4' or A.5 and A.6,

\[ \sqrt{m}(\tilde{d}_1 - d_1) \overset{d}{\to} N \left( 0, \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \]

Proof. Like in the proof of consistency we focus on the case \( d_2 > d_1 \), the proof with \( d_2 \leq d_1 \) is a straightforward extension of that in Robinson [18]. Since \( \tilde{d}_1 \) is
consistent under the conditions in Theorem 2, then with probability approaching 1 as \( n \to \infty \), \( \tilde{d}_1 \) satisfies

\[
0 = \frac{dR(\tilde{d}_1)}{dd} = \frac{dR(d_1)}{dd} + \frac{d^2 R(d)}{dd^2} (\tilde{d}_1 - d_1)
\]

(3.1)

where \( |\tilde{d} - d_1| \leq |\tilde{d}_1 - d_1| \). Write

\[
\tilde{C}_k(d) = \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \lambda_j^{2d}(\log \lambda_j)^k I_j.
\]

Then

\[
\frac{dR(d)}{dd} = 2 \tilde{C}_1(d) - \frac{2}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \log \lambda_j, \quad \frac{d^2 R(d)}{dd^2} = \frac{4\{\tilde{C}_2(d)\tilde{C}(d) - \tilde{C}_1^2(d)\}}{\tilde{C}^2(d)}.
\]

Define also

\[
\tilde{F}_k = \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} (\log j)^k \lambda_j^{2d} I_j, \quad \tilde{E}_k(d) = \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} (\log j)^k j^{2d} I_j,
\]

thus

\[
\frac{d^2 R(d)}{dd^2} = \frac{4\{\tilde{F}_2(d)\tilde{F}_0(d) - \tilde{F}_1^2(d)\}}{\tilde{F}_0^2(d)} = \frac{4\{\tilde{E}_2(d)\tilde{E}_0(d) - \tilde{E}_1^2(d)\}}{\tilde{E}_0^2(d)}.
\]

Fix \( \zeta > 0 \) such that \( 2\zeta < (\log m)^2 \). On the set \( M = \{ d : (\log m)^3 |d - d_1| \leq \zeta \} \)

\[
|\tilde{E}_k(d) - \tilde{E}_k(d_1)| \leq \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \frac{1}{j^{2(d-d_1)}} - 1 |j^{2d_1}(\log j)^k I_j
\]

\[
\leq 2e|d - d_1| \tilde{E}_{k+1}(d_1) \leq 2e\zeta(\log m)^{k-2} \tilde{E}_0(d_1)
\]

where the second inequality comes from the fact that

\[
\frac{|j^{2(d-d_1)} - 1|}{2|d - d_1|} \leq (\log j) m^{2|d - d_1|} \leq m^{\frac{1}{\log m}} \log j = e \log j
\]

on \( M \). Thus for \( \eta > 0 \),

\[
P\left( |\tilde{E}_k(\tilde{d}) - \tilde{E}_k(d_1)| > \eta \left( \frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{-2d_1} \right) \]

\[
\leq P\left( 2e\zeta(\log m)^{k-2} \tilde{E}_0(d_1) > \eta \left( \frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{-2d_1} \mid \tilde{d} \in M \right)
\]

\[
+ \quad P\left( |\tilde{E}_k(\tilde{d}) - \tilde{E}_k(d_1)| > \eta \left( \frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{-2d_1} \mid \tilde{d} \notin M \right)
\]

\[
\leq P(\tilde{C}(d_1) > \frac{\eta}{2e\zeta}(\log m)^{2-k}) + P((\log m)^3 |\tilde{d} - d_1| > \zeta). \quad (3.2)
\]
Since from the proof of Theorem 1, $\tilde{C}(d_1) \overset{p}{\to} C \in (0, \infty)$, the first probability in (3.2) tends to zero for $\zeta$ sufficiently small and $k = 0, 1, 2$. The second probability is bounded by

\[
P\left( (\log m)^3 |d_1 - d_1| > \zeta \right) \leq P\left( \inf_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6 \cap \tilde{M}} S(d) \leq 0 \right) + P\left( \inf_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} S(d) \leq 0 \right) + P\left( \inf_{\Theta_2} S(d) \leq 0 \right)
\]

where $\tilde{M} = (-\infty, \infty) - M$. We have already shown in the proof of Theorem 1 that the last two probabilities in (3.3) tend to zero. The first probability is bounded by

\[
P\left( \sup_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} |T(d)| \geq \inf_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6 \cap \tilde{M}} U(d) \right).
\]

As in the proof of Theorem 1,

\[
\inf_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6 \cap \tilde{M}} U(d) \geq \frac{\zeta^2}{(\log m)^6}.
\]

Call $\gamma = 2(\Delta - d_1) + 1$. On $\Theta_1$, $\gamma > 0$. Consider $\left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\gamma} (\log m)^6 = \frac{t^\gamma (\log m)^6}{m^{\gamma-a}}$ where $0 < a < \gamma$. Now $\frac{\log m}{m^a} \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$ and

\[
\left( \frac{t^\gamma}{m^{\gamma-a}} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} = \frac{t^2}{m} \frac{1}{m^{1-\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma}}}.
\]

Under A.6 (and of course A.4'), $\frac{t^2}{m} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Choose $a < \frac{\gamma}{2}$, which can always be done because $\gamma > 0$. Then $\frac{\log m}{m^a} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus noting the form of $T(d)$ and the orders of magnitude obtained in Lemmas 2 and 3 it follows that under A.4 or A.6 (3.4) tends to 0 if

\[
\sup_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} \left| \frac{\tilde{C}(d) - C(d)}{C(d)} \right| = o_p \left( (\log m)^{-6} \right).
\]

Using the notation in the proof of Theorem 1, and because of (2.3),

\[
\inf_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} B(d) \geq \inf_{\Theta_1} B(d) \geq \frac{1}{2}
\]

for all large enough $m$. Thus it remains to prove that $\sup_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} |A(d)| = o_p \left( (\log m)^{-6} \right)$. Now

\[
\sup_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} |A(d)| \leq \sup_{\Theta_1 \cap N_6} \left\{ 12 \left( \frac{m}{m-l} \right)^{2(d-d_1)+1} \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(d-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right\} + \frac{3}{m-l} \left( \frac{m}{m-l} \right)^{2(d-d_1)} \left\| \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right\|.
\]
Since \( \left( \frac{m}{m-1} \right)^\alpha \to 1 \) for all \( \alpha \) we focus on
\[
\sup_{\theta_1 \cap N_\delta} \left\{ \sum_{l+1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{2(d-d_1)+1} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| + \frac{1}{m} \left| \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| \right\}
\leq \sum_{r=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{1-2\delta} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| + \frac{1}{m} \left| \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right|.
\tag{3.5}
\]

Now, using Lemmas 4 and 6, the first part of (3.5) is
\[
\sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{1-2\delta} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 2\pi I_{c_j} + 2\pi I_{c_j} - 1 \right) \right|
= \mathcal{O}_p \left( \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{r}{m} \right)^{1-2\delta} \frac{1}{r^2} \left( \frac{r^{\alpha+1}}{n^\alpha} + l^{\frac{3}{4}} r^{\frac{1}{4}} + r^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right)
= \mathcal{O}_p \left( \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha + \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \log m + \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{1-2\delta} + \log m \right)
\tag{3.6}
\]
under A.4' or A.6. Since \( \delta < \frac{1}{4} \) then (3.6) is \( \mathcal{O}_p((\log m)^{-6}) \). Similarly the second part of (3.5) is
\[
\mathcal{O}_p \left( \frac{1}{m} \left( \sqrt{m} + \frac{m^{\alpha+1}}{n^\alpha} + l^{\frac{3}{4}} m^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \right) = \mathcal{O}_p (\log m)^{-6}
\]
under A.4' or A.6. Thus \( P(\inf_{\theta_1 \cap N_\delta \cap H} S(d) \leq 0) \to 0 \) and
\[
P \left( \left| \tilde{E}_k(d) - \tilde{E}_k(d_1) \right| > \eta \left( \frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{-2d_1} \right) \to 0
\]
as \( n \to \infty \). Consequently \( \frac{d^2 R(d)}{dd^2} \) is
\[
4\left\{ \tilde{E}_2(d_1) + o_p(n^{2d_1}) \right\} \left\{ \tilde{E}_0(d_1) + o_p(n^{2d_1}) \right\} - \left\{ \tilde{E}_1(d_1) + o_p(n^{2d_1}) \right\}^2
= \frac{4(\tilde{F}_2(d_1) - \tilde{F}_0(d_1) - \tilde{F}_2^0(d_1))}{\tilde{F}_0^2(d_1)} + o_p(1)
\tag{3.7}
\]
as \( n \to \infty \). Now for \( k = 0, 1, 2 \),
\[
\left| \tilde{F}_k(d_1) - C \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (\log j)^k \right|
\leq \left| \frac{C}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (\log j)^k \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right) \right| \leq (\log m)^k \frac{C}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left| \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 1 \right|
= \mathcal{O}_p \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{\sqrt{m}} + \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^\alpha (\log m)^2 + \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} (\log m)^2 \right) = \mathcal{O}_p(1)
\tag{3.8}
\]
under $A.4'$ or $A.6$. Thus from (3.7) and (3.8)

$$\frac{d^2 R(d)}{dd^2} = 4 \left\{ \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (\log j)^2 - \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j \right)^2 \right\} (1 + o_p(1)) + o_p(1) \rightarrow 4$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now since $\tilde{C}(d_1) \rightarrow C$

$$\frac{dR(d_1)}{dd} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{\lambda_j^{2d_1} I_j \log \lambda_j}{C(d_1)} - \log \lambda_j \right)$$

$$= \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \left( \log \lambda_j - \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log \lambda_j \right) \lambda_j^{2d_1} I_j$$

$$= \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 2\pi I_{ij} \right) (1 + o_p(1)) \quad (3.9)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j 2\pi I_{ij} (1 + o_p(1)) \quad (3.10)$$

where $v_j = \log j - \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j$ satisfies $\sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j = 0$. Since $|v_j| = O(\log m)$, using Lemma 6 we have that (3.9) is

$$O_p \left( \frac{m^{a+\frac{1}{2}}}{n^{\alpha}} \log m + \frac{l^2}{m^4} \log m \right)$$

under $A.4'$ and

$$O_p \left( \frac{m^{a+\frac{1}{2}}}{n^{\alpha}} \log m + \frac{l}{\sqrt{m}} \log m \right)$$

under $A.5$ and $A.6$. In both cases (3.9) is $o_p(1)$. Apart from the $o_p(1)$ terms, (3.10) is

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s e^{i(t-s) \omega} \log \lambda_j$$

$$= \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j 2 \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_t \epsilon_s \cos \{ (t-s)(\omega + \lambda_j) \} = 2 \sum_{t=1}^{n} z_t$$

where $z_1 = 0$ and

$$z_t = \epsilon_t \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s c_{t-s} \quad \text{for} \quad t = 2, 3, \ldots, n,$$

$$c_t = \frac{2}{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j \cos \{ \omega + \lambda_j \} \quad (3.11)$$
The $z_t$ form a zero-mean martingale difference array and from a standard martingale CLT (Hall and Heyde [10], section 3.2) $\sum_{t=1}^{n} z_t$ converges in distribution to a $N(0,1)$ random variable if

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s c_{t-s} \right)^2 |F_{t-1}| - 1 = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s c_{t-s} \right)^2 - 1 \]

\[ = \left\{ \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_s^2 c_{t-s}^2 - 1 \right\} + \left\{ \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{r\neq s} c_r \epsilon_s c_{t-r} c_{t-s} \right\} . \]

The term in braces is

\[ \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (\epsilon_t^2 - 1) \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} c_s^2 \right\} + \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} c_s^2 - 1 \right\} . \] (3.12)

Now $\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} c_s^2$ is equal to

\[ = \frac{4}{m \pi^2} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{m} v_j \cos\{s(\omega + \lambda_j)\} \right)^2 \]

\[ = \frac{4}{m n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \sum_{t=1}^{1} \cos^2\{s(\omega + \lambda_j)\} + \frac{2}{m n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j v_k \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \sum_{t=1}^{1} [\cos\{s(2\omega + \lambda_j + \lambda_k)\} + \cos\{s(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)\}] . \] (3.13)

From formula (4.18) in Robinson [18], namely,

\[ \sum_{r=1}^{q-r} \sum_{t=1}^{q-r} \cos(\theta t) = \frac{\cos \theta - \cos(q\theta)}{4 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}} - \frac{q-1}{2} \] (3.15)

for $\theta \neq 0, \mod(2\pi)$, we have that for $j$ such that $0 < \omega + \lambda_j < \pi$ (which holds for $n$ large enough),

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} \cos^2\{s(\omega + \lambda_j)\} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} (1 + \cos\{2s(\omega + \lambda_j)\}) \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j^2 &= \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} (\log j)^2 - \left( \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j \right)^2 = 1 + O \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{m} \right) \\
\end{align*}
\]
we have that (3.13) is
\[
4 \frac{m-l}{mn^2} \left( 1 + O \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{m} \right) \right) \left( \frac{(n-1)^2}{4} + O(1) \right) = \frac{4}{n^2} \left( \frac{(n-1)^2}{4} + O \left( \frac{n^2 (\log m)^2}{m} \right) \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.
\]
Now for \( j, k \) such that \( 0 < 2\omega + \lambda_j + \lambda_k < 2\pi \) (which always holds for a large enough \( n \)) and \( j \neq k \) we can again apply formula (3.15) and we get that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} \cos \{ s(2\omega + \lambda_j + \lambda_k) \} + \cos \{ s(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) \} = -n + O(1)
\]
so that (3.14) is
\[
O \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j^2 \right) = O \left( \frac{m}{n} \right) = o(1).
\]
Thus the second term in (3.12) tends to zero as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). The first term has mean zero and its variance is
\[
O \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{n-t} c_s^2 \right)^2 \right).
\]
Now
\[
|c_s| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{m/n}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} |v_j| = O \left( \frac{\sqrt{m \log m}}{n} \right) \quad (3.16)
\]
and for \( 1 \leq s \leq n/2 \), by summation by parts, \(|c_s|\) is
\[
\begin{align*}
\left| \frac{2}{n\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l+1}^{m} v_j \cos \{ s(\omega + \lambda_j) \} \right| &= \left| \frac{2}{n\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} (v_r - v_{r+1}) \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \cos \{ s(\omega + \lambda_j) \} + \frac{2}{n\sqrt{m}} v_m \sum_{l+1}^{m} \cos \{ s(\omega + \lambda_j) \} \right| \\
&= O \left( \frac{1}{n\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=l+1}^{m-1} \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right) \frac{n}{s} + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{m}} \log m \frac{n}{s} \right) = O \left( \frac{\log m}{s\sqrt{m}} \right) \quad (3.17)
\end{align*}
\]
because \( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \cos\{s(\omega + \lambda_j)\} = O(ns^{-1}) \) for \( 1 \leq s \leq n/2 \) (see proof of Lemma 4) and \( |\log (1 + \frac{1}{r})| \leq 1/r \) for \( r \geq 1 \). The bound in (3.17) is at least as good as that in (3.16) for \( n/m \leq s \leq n/2 \). Consider \( \omega \) a harmonic frequency (which can always be done for \( n \) sufficiently large), then \( c_s = c_{n-s} \) and from (3.16) and (3.17)

\[
\sum_{s=1}^{n} c_s^2 = O \left( \frac{n (\log m)^2}{m^2} + \frac{(\log m)^2}{m} \sum_{s \geq \frac{n}{m}} s^{-2} \right) = O \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{n} \right) \tag{3.18}
\]

and the variance of the first part of (3.12) is \( O \left( \frac{(\log m)^4}{n} \right) \). Thus (3.12) is \( o_p(1) \). In order to prove a) it remains to show that

\[
\sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{r \neq s} \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_r \epsilon_s c_{t-r} c_{t-s} = o_p(1). \tag{3.19}
\]

The left hand side of (3.19) has mean zero and variance

\[
\sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{r \neq s} \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} E[\epsilon_r \epsilon_s c_{t-r} c_{t-s} c_{u-p} c_{u-q}]
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{u=2}^{\min(t-1, u-1)} \sum_{r \neq s} c_{t-r} c_{t-s} c_{u-r} c_{u-s}
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{r \neq s} \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} c_{t-r}^2 c_{t-s}^2 + 4 \sum_{t=3}^{n} \sum_{u=2}^{t-u+1} \sum_{r \neq s} c_{t-r} c_{t-s} c_{u-r} c_{u-s}. \tag{3.20}
\]

The first part of (3.20) is \( O \left( (\log m)^4 n^{-1} \right) \) from (3.18). The second part is bounded in absolute value by

\[
4 \sum_{t=3}^{n} \sum_{u=2}^{t-u+1} \left( \sum_{r=1}^{u-1} c_{t-r}^2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{u-s}^2 \right) \leq 4 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} c_{t}^2 \right) \left( \sum_{t=3}^{n} \sum_{u=2}^{t-u+1} \sum_{r \neq s} c_{t-r}^2 c_{t-s} \right). \tag{3.21}
\]

Now

\[
\sum_{t=3}^{n} \sum_{u=2}^{t-u+1} \sum_{r \neq s} c_{t-r}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} j(n - j - 1) c_{j+1}^2 \leq n \sum_{j=1}^{n} j c_{j+1}^2
\]

\[
\leq n \sum_{j=1}^{\left[\frac{nm^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{2}\right]} j c_{j+1}^2 + n \sum_{\left[\frac{nm^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{2}\right]+1}^{n} j c_{j+1}^2 = O \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{m^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right)
\]

using (3.16) and (3.17). Thus noting (3.18) we see that (3.21) is

\[
O \left( \frac{(\log m)^2}{m^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right) = O \left( \frac{(\log m)^4}{m^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right) = o(1)
\]
and (3.19), and thus a), are proved.

In order to prove b) we check the sufficient condition

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{n} E[z_t^4] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \]

Now

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{n} E[z_t^4] = \sum_{t=2}^{n} E \left[ \left( \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s c_{t-s} \right)^4 \right] = \mu_4 \sum_{t=2}^{n} E \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s c_{t-s} \right]^4
\]

\[
\leq \mu_4 \sum_{t=2}^{n} E \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{r=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s \epsilon_r \epsilon_p \epsilon_q c_{t-s} c_{t-r} c_{t-p} c_{t-q} \right]
\]

\[
\leq \mu_4^2 \sum_{t=2}^{n} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_s^4 \right) + 3 \mu_4 \mu_2 \sum_{t=2}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c^2_{t-s} c^2_{t-r}
\]

\[
= O \left( n \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} c_t^2 \right)^2 \right) = O \left( \frac{(\log m)^4}{n} \right) = o(1)
\]

in view of (3.18) and this concludes the proof of the theorem. □

4. APPENDIX: TECHNICAL LEMMAS

Let \( v_j = \frac{W(\omega + \lambda_j)}{c_j \lambda_j^{-d_j}} \) be a scaled discrete Fourier transform and denote \( \bar{v}_j \) the complex conjugate of \( v(\lambda) \).

**Lemma 1.** Let assumptions A.1 and A.2 hold and let \( k = k(n) \) and \( j = j(n) \) be two sequences of positive integers such that \( j > k \) and \( \frac{j}{n} \rightarrow 0 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). Then as \( n \rightarrow \infty \):

a) \( E|v_j|^2 = 1 + O \left( \frac{\log j \lambda_j^{-2(d_j-d_1)} + \left( \frac{j}{n} \right)^{\alpha}}{n} \right) \)

b) \( E v_j v_j = O \left( \frac{\log j \lambda_j^{-2(d_j-d_1)}}{n} \right) \)

c) \( E v_j \bar{v}_k = O \left( \frac{\log j \lambda_j^{-d_j-d_d} \lambda_k^{-d_j-d_d}}{\sqrt{k} j} \right) \)

d) \( E v_j v_k = O \left( \frac{\log j \lambda_j^{-d_j-d_d} \lambda_k^{-d_j-d_d}}{\sqrt{k} j} \right) \)

where \( d_i = \max(d_1, d_2) \).

**Proof.** See Arteche [1]. □
Lemma 2. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\kappa \in (\epsilon, \infty)$, when $l \to \infty$ and $\frac{l}{m} \to 0$,

$$
\sup_{\epsilon \leq \gamma \leq \kappa} \left| \frac{\gamma}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-1} - 1 \right| = O \left( \left( \frac{l}{m} \right)^{\epsilon} \right). \tag{4.1}
$$

Proof. For $\gamma > 0$

$$
\left| \frac{\gamma}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-1} - 1 \right|
\leq \gamma \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{m-l-1}} \left\{ \left( \frac{l+1}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-1} + x^{\gamma-1} \right\} \, dx + \gamma \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left| \int_{\frac{j-l-1}{m-l}}^{\frac{j-l}{m-l}} \left\{ \left( \frac{j}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-1} - x^{\gamma-1} \right\} \, dx \right|
\leq \frac{\gamma}{m-l} \left( \frac{l+1}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-1} + \frac{1}{(m-l)\gamma} + \gamma \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \left( \frac{j}{m-l} \right)^{\gamma-2} \tag{4.2}
$$

using the mean value theorem. The first term is $O(m^{-\gamma}l^{\gamma-1})$, the second is $O(m^{-\gamma})$ and the third is $O(m^{-1})$ for $\gamma > 1$, zero for $\gamma = 1$ and $O(m^{-\gamma}l^{\gamma})$ if $\gamma < 1$. Thus (4.2) is $O \left( \left( \frac{l}{m} \right)^{\gamma} + \frac{l}{m} \right)$ and the left hand side of (4.1) is $O \left( \left( \frac{l}{m} \right)^{\epsilon} \right)$ because $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. \qed

Lemma 3. Let $l \to \infty$ and $\frac{l}{m} \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Then,

$$
\left| \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{j=l+1}^{m} \log j - \log(m-l) + 1 \right| = O \left( \frac{l}{m} \log m \right).
$$

Proof.

$$
\left| \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \log j - \log(m-l) + 1 \right|
= \left| \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \int_{j-l-1}^{j-l} \log \left( \frac{j}{x} \right) \, dx + \frac{1}{m-l} + \frac{1}{m-l} \log(l+1) \right|
\leq \frac{1}{m-l} \sum_{l+1}^{m} \int_{j-l-1}^{j-l} \left| x-j \right| \frac{1}{j-l-1} \, dx + \frac{1}{m-l} + \frac{1}{m-l} \log(l+1)
\leq \frac{l+1}{m-l} \sum_{1}^{m-l-1} \frac{1}{j} + \frac{1}{m-l} (1 + \log(l+1)) = O \left( \frac{l}{m} \log m \right). \quad \square
Lemma 4. Let \( r > l \) and \( I_{ej} \) defined in (2.7) and A.3' hold. Then

\[
\sum_{j=l+1}^{r} (2\pi I_{ej} - 1) = O_p(r^{\frac{1}{2}}).
\]

Proof. Write

\[
2\pi I_{ej} = 2\pi |W_{\epsilon}(\omega + \lambda_j)|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{n} \epsilon_t e^{i(\omega + \lambda_j)} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \epsilon_t^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{t=2}^{n} \epsilon_t \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s \cos\{(\omega + \lambda_j)(t-s)\}.
\]

Thus

\[
\sum_{j=l+1}^{r} (2\pi I_{ej} - 1) = \frac{r-l}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (\epsilon_t^2 - 1) + \sum_{t=2}^{n} \epsilon_t \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \epsilon_s d_{t-s} \tag{4.3}
\]

where \( d_s = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i+1}^{r} \cos\{(\omega + \lambda_j)s\} \). If \( \omega \) is a harmonic frequency of the form \( \omega = \frac{2\pi w}{n} \), where \( w \) is an integer then \( d_s = d_{n-s} \). Since in our analysis \( n \to \infty \), we can express any frequency \( \omega \in (0, \pi] \) as a harmonic frequency for a large enough \( n \). Also \( |d_s| \leq \frac{2r}{n} \) and for \( 1 \leq s \leq n/2 \), \( |d_s| \leq \frac{6}{\pi^2} + \frac{6}{n} \). This last inequality can be proved in the following way. Write

\[
d_s = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i+1}^{r} \cos(\omega s) \cos(s \lambda_j) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i+1}^{r} \sin(\omega s) \sin(s \lambda_j),
\]

then

\[
|d_s| \leq \frac{2}{n} \left| \sum_{i+1}^{r} \cos(s \lambda_j) \right| + \frac{2}{n} \left| \sum_{i+1}^{r} \sin(s \lambda_j) \right|.
\]

By formulae (5.10) and (5.11) in Zygmund [20], Chapter 2,

\[
\left| \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \cos tv - \frac{1}{2} \cos rt \right| \leq \frac{1}{t} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < t \leq \pi
\]

and

\[
\left| \sum_{v=1}^{r} \sin tv - \frac{1}{2} \sin rt \right| \leq \frac{2}{t}.
\]

Thus

\[
\left| \sum_{i+1}^{r} \cos(\lambda_j s) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{1}^{r} \cos(\lambda_j s) \right| + \left| \sum_{1}^{r} \cos(\lambda_j s) \right|
\]

\[
\leq \left| \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{1}^{r} \cos(\lambda_j s) - \frac{1}{2} \cos(\lambda_r s) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(\lambda_r s) \right|.
\]
and similarly $|\sum_{i+1} \sin(\lambda_j s)|$ is bounded by

$$
\left| \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sin(\lambda_j s) - \frac{1}{2} \sin(\lambda_r s) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} \sin(\lambda_r s) \right|
$$

and thus $|d_s| \leq \frac{6}{\pi^2} + \frac{6}{n}$.

Both terms on the right hand side of (4.3) have zero mean and variance respectively $O\left(\frac{r^2}{n}\right)$ and

$$
O\left(n \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2\right) = O\left(n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{r}{n}\right)^2 + n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{\pi s} + \frac{1}{n}\right)^2\right) = O(r)
$$

which concludes the proof. \(\square\)

**Lemma 5.** Let \( j \) be a sequence of integers such that \( \frac{j}{n} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Then under A.1 and A.2',

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \frac{\alpha(\lambda)}{\alpha(\omega + \lambda_j)} - 1 \right|^2 K(\lambda - \lambda_j - \omega) \, d\lambda = O\left(\frac{1}{j}\right) \text{ if } d_1 \geq d_2
$$

$$
= O\left(\frac{1}{j} \left[\frac{n}{j}\right]^{2(d_2 - d_1)}\right) \text{ if } d_1 < d_2.
$$

**Proof.** A.1 and A.2' imply that we can pick \( \delta \in (2\lambda_j, \pi) \) such that for some \( C < \infty \),

$$
|\alpha(\omega + \lambda)| \leq C\lambda^{-d_1}, \quad |\alpha(\omega - \lambda)| \leq C\lambda^{-d_2}
$$

and

$$
|\alpha'(\omega + \lambda)| \leq C\lambda^{-d_1-1}, \quad |\alpha'(\omega - \lambda)| \leq C\lambda^{-d_2-1}
$$

for \( 0 < \lambda < \delta \). Now split the integral up into

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{\omega - \delta} + \int_{\omega - \delta}^{\omega - \frac{\lambda_j}{2}} + \int_{ \omega - \frac{\lambda_j}{2} }^{ \omega + \frac{\lambda_j}{2} } + \int_{ \omega + \frac{\lambda_j}{2} }^{ \omega + 2\lambda_j } + \int_{ \omega + 2\lambda_j }^{ \omega + \delta } + \int_{ \omega + \delta }^{ \pi }.
$$

Write \( \alpha_j = \alpha(\omega + \lambda_j) \) and \( f_j = f(\omega + \lambda_j) \). The first integral is equal to

$$
\frac{1}{|\alpha_j|^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\omega - \delta} \left\{ |\alpha(\lambda)|^2 - \alpha(\lambda)\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_j\bar{\alpha}(\lambda) + |\alpha_j|^2 \right\} K(\lambda - \lambda_j - \omega) \, d\lambda.
$$
and this is bounded in absolute value by
\[
\frac{1}{f_j} \left\{ \max_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{2}} K(\lambda - \lambda_j - \omega) \right\} \left\{ \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(\lambda) \, d\lambda + \frac{\tilde{a}^j}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |a(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right. \\
+ \frac{|a^j|}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \tilde{a}(\lambda) \, d\lambda \right\} + \int_{-\pi}^{\omega - \delta} K(\lambda - \lambda_j - \omega) \, d\lambda \\
= O \left( \frac{j^{2d_1}}{n^{1+2d_1}} + \frac{j^{d_1}}{n^{1+d_1}} + n^{-1} \right) = O(j^{-1})
\]
using well known properties of the Fejer’s Kernel (see formulae (4.5) – (4.7) in Arteche [1]). Similarly
\[
\left| \int_{\omega + \delta}^{\pi} \right| = O(j^{-1}).
\]

The integral over \([\omega - \delta, \omega - \lambda_j/2]\) has an absolute value bounded by
\[
\frac{1}{f_j} \left\{ \max_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{2}} \frac{f(\omega - \lambda)}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - d_2}} \right\} \int_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2}}^{\delta} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - d_2} K(-\lambda - \lambda_j) \, d\lambda \\
+ \frac{|a^j|}{|a^j|^2} \left\{ \max_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{2}} \frac{|a(\omega - \lambda)|}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - d_2}} \right\} \int_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2}}^{\delta} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - d_2} K(-\lambda - \lambda_j) \, d\lambda \\
+ \int_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2}}^{\delta} K(-\lambda - \lambda_j) \, d\lambda \\
= O \left( \lambda_j^{2d_1} n^{-1} \lambda_j^{1-2d_2} + \lambda_j^{d_1} n^{-1} \lambda_j^{1-d_2} + n^{-1} \lambda_j^{-1} \right) \\
= O \left( \frac{1}{j} \right) \quad \text{if} \quad d_1 \geq d_2 \\
= O \left( \frac{1}{j} \left[ \frac{n^{1}}{j} \right]^{2(d_2-d_1)} \right) \quad \text{if} \quad d_1 < d_2.
\]

Proceeding similarly we get that
\[
\left| \int_{\omega + 2\lambda_j}^{\pi} \right| = O(j^{-1}).
\]

Now the integral over \([\omega \pm \frac{\lambda_j}{2}]\) is bounded in modulus by
\[
\max_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{2}} |K(\lambda - \lambda_j)| \left\{ \frac{1}{f_j} \int_{-\frac{\lambda_j}{2}}^{\lambda_j} f(\omega + \lambda) \, d\lambda \right.
\]
where $i = 1$ if $d_1 \geq d_2$ and $i = 2$ if $d_2 > d_1$. Thus (4.4) is $O(j^{-1})$ if $d_1 \geq d_2$ and $O\left(\frac{1}{j^2} \right)$ if $d_2 > d_1$.

Finally using the mean value theorem

$$\left| \int_{\omega+\lambda_j}^{\omega+2\lambda_j} \right| = \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|^2} \int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda_j} |\alpha(\omega + \lambda) - \alpha(\omega + \lambda_j)|^2 K(\lambda - \lambda_j) \, d\lambda$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|^2} \left( \max_{\lambda_j \leq \lambda \leq 2\lambda_j} \left| \frac{d}{d\lambda} \alpha(\omega + \lambda) \right|^2 \right) \int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda_j} |\lambda - \lambda_j|^2 K(\lambda - \lambda_j) \, d\lambda$$

$$= O\left(\lambda_j^{2d_1} \lambda_j^{-2-2d_1} n^{-1} \lambda_j \right) = O\left(j^{-1}\right)$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

**Lemma 6.** Let $0 < l < r \leq m$. Let A.1, A.2' and A.3' hold and $d_2 > d_1$. Then

$$\sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - 2\pi I_{sj} \right) = O_p \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{n^\alpha} + l^4 r^4 \right) \text{ under C.4}$$

$$= O_p \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{n^\alpha} + l \right) \text{ under C.5 and C.6}$$

where $I_j$ is the periodogram of $x_t = Ex_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j \epsilon_t \alpha_j$ at $(\omega + \lambda_j)$, $I_{sj}$ is the periodogram of $\epsilon_t$ at frequency $(\omega + \lambda_j)$ and $g_j = C \lambda_j^{-2d_1}$.

**Proof.** From Lemma 1 and A.1,

$$E \left| \sum_{i=1}^{r} \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} - \frac{I_j}{f_j} \right) \right| = E \left| \sum_{i=1}^{r} \left( 1 - \frac{g_j}{f_j} \right) \left( \frac{I_j}{g_j} \right) \right|$$

$$= O \left( \sum_{i=1}^{r} \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) \alpha \left( 1 + \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) \alpha + \frac{n^{2(d_2-d_1) \log j}}{j^{l+2(d_2-d_1)}} \right) \right)$$

$$= O \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{n^\alpha} + \frac{\alpha+1}{n^\alpha} \frac{n^{2(d_2-d_1) \log r}}{(l+2(d_2-d_1))} \right) = O \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{n^\alpha} \right)$$

under A.4' or A.6.

Write $w_j = \sqrt{2\pi |\alpha_j|}$ and $w_j = \sqrt{2\pi W_j}$ where $W_j$ and $W_{\epsilon j}$ are discrete Fourier transforms of $x_t$ and $\epsilon_t$ respectively at frequency $\omega + \lambda_j$, and $\alpha_j = \alpha(\omega + \lambda_j) =$
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e^{ik(\omega + \lambda_j)}. \text{ Then}
\]
\[
E \left\{ \sum_{l+1}^{r} \left( \frac{l_j}{f_j} - 2\pi l_j \right) \right\}^2 = E \left\{ \sum_{l+1}^{r} (|u_j|^2 - |v_j|^2) \right\}^2 = a + b
\]

where
\[
a = \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} (E|u_j|^4 + E|v_j|^4 - 2E|u_j v_j|^2)
\]
\[
b = 2 \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \sum_{k > j} (E|u_j u_k|^2 - E|u_j v_k|^2 - E|u_k v_j|^2 + E|v_j v_k|^2).
\]

Since for any zero mean random variables \(u, v, w, z\),
\[
\]

where \(\text{cum}(u, v, w, z)\) is the joint cumulant of \(u, v, w\) and \(z\), we can decompose \(a\) and \(b\) into \(a_1 + a_2\) and \(b_1 + b_2\) where
\[
a_1 = \sum_{l+1}^{r} \{2(E|u_j|^2)^2 + |E(u_j^2)|^2 - 2|E(u_j v_j)|^2
\]
\[
- 2|E(u_j v_j)|^2 - 2|E|u_j|^2 |v_j|^2 + 2(E|v_j|^2)^2 + |E(v_j^2)|^2\}
\]
\[
a_2 = \sum_{l+1}^{r} \{\text{cum}(u_j, u_j, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_j) - 2\text{cum}(u_j, v_j, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_j) + \text{cum}(v_j, v_j, \bar{v}_j, \bar{v}_j)\}
\]
\[
b_1 = 2 \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \sum_{k > j} \{E|u_j|^2 E|u_k|^2 + |E(u_j u_k)|^2 + |E(u_j \bar{u}_k)|^2 - E|u_j|^2 E|v_k|^2
\]
\[
- |E(u_j v_k)|^2 - |E(u_j \bar{v}_k)|^2 - E|u_k|^2 E|v_j|^2 - |E(u_k v_j)|^2 - |E(u_k \bar{v}_j)|^2
\]
\[
+ E|v_j|^2 E|v_k|^2 + |E(v_j v_k)|^2 + |E(v_j \bar{v}_k)|^2\}
\]
\[
b_2 = 2 \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \sum_{k > j} \{\text{cum}(u_j, u_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{u}_k) - \text{cum}(u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k)
\]
\[
- \text{cum}(u_k, v_j, \bar{v}_j, \bar{v}_k) + \text{cum}(v_j, v_k, \bar{v}_j, \bar{v}_k)\}.\]

Now because \(E|v_j|^2 = 1\) and Lemma 1,
\[
a_1 = \sum_{l+1}^{r} \{2(E|u_j|^2 - 1)^2 + 2(E|u_j|^2 - 1) + |E(u_j^2)|^2 - 2|E(u_j v_j)|^2
\]
\[
- 2|E(u_j \bar{v}_j)|^2 - 2|E(u_j v_j - 1) - 2(E(\bar{u}_j v_j) - 1) + |E(v_j^2)|^2\}
\]
\[
= O \left( \sum_{l+1}^{r} \frac{n^{2(d_2 - d_1)} \log j}{j^1 + 2(d_2 - d_1)} \right) = O \left( \frac{n^{2(d_2 - d_1)}}{j^{12(d_2 - d_1) \log j}} \right).\]
\[ b_1 = 2 \sum_{l+1}^{r} \sum_{k>j} \{ (E|u_j|^2 - 1)(E|u_k|^2 - 1) + E(u_j u_k)^2 + (E(u_j \bar{v}_k))^2 - (E(u_j v_k))^2 \} \]

\[ = O \left( \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \sum_{k>j} \frac{n^4(d_2-d_1)(\log k)^2}{k^{1+2(d_2-d_1)}j^{1+2(d_2-d_1)}} \right) = O \left( \frac{n^4(d_2-d_1)(\log r)^2}{t^4(d_2-d_1)} \right) \]

and under A.4' or A.6, \( a_1 = O(l) \) and \( b_1 = O(l^2) \). Now applying formula (2.6.3) in Brillinger [3],

\[ \text{cum}(u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_{u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda d\mu d\zeta \]

where \( f_{u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k} \) is the fourth order cumulant spectrum, and by formula (2.10.3) in Brillinger [3], we have that

\[ \text{cum}(u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\kappa}{(2\pi)^3} A_{u_j}(\lambda) A_{v_k}(\lambda) A_{\bar{u}_j}(\mu) A_{\bar{v}_k}(\zeta) \, d\lambda d\mu d\zeta \]

where \( \kappa \) is the fourth cumulant of \( \epsilon_t \), \( \kappa = \mu_4 - 3 \), and \( A_{u_j}, A_{v_k}, A_{\bar{u}_j}, A_{\bar{v}_k} \) are transfer functions of the filters implied in the definition of \( u_j \) and \( v_j \),

\[ u_j = \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega + \lambda_j)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \epsilon_{t-k} \]

\[ v_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega + \lambda_j)} \epsilon_t \]

so that if \( \alpha(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e^{ik\lambda} \),

\[ A_{u_j}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \alpha(-\lambda) \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega + \lambda_j + \lambda)} \]

\[ A_{\bar{u}_j}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \alpha(-\lambda) \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega - \lambda_j + \lambda)} \]

\[ A_{v_k}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega + \lambda_k + \lambda)} \]

\[ A_{\bar{v}_k}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} e^{it(\omega - \lambda_k + \lambda)} \]

Since \( \kappa = 0 \) under A.5, then \( a_2 = b_2 = 0 \), and (4.6) follows. In any other case \( \text{cum}(u_j, v_k, \bar{u}_j, \bar{v}_k) \) is equal to

\[ \frac{\kappa}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{n^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\alpha(\lambda + \mu + \zeta)\alpha(-\mu)}{|\alpha_j|^2} E_{jk}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda d\mu d\zeta \quad (4.7) \]
where \( E_{j,k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) = D(\omega + \lambda_j - \mu - \zeta) \) \( D(\omega + \lambda_k + \lambda) \) \( D(\mu - \omega - \lambda_j) \) \( D(\zeta - \omega - \lambda_k) \)
and \( D(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} e^{it\lambda} \) is Dirichlet's kernel. Doing the same with the other cumulants in \( b_2 \) we see that the summand of \((2\pi)^3 b_2\) is

\[
\frac{\kappa}{n^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ \frac{\alpha(\lambda + \mu + \zeta)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\mu)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\lambda)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\zeta)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} E_{j,k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda \, d\mu \, d\zeta.
\]

(4.8)

Since

\[
(c_1 c_2 - 1)(c_3 c_4 - 1) = \prod_{j=1}^{4} (c_j - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{4} \prod_{j \neq i} (c_j - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} (c_i - 1)(c_{j+2} - 1)
\]

then (4.8) has components of three types. The first one is

\[
\frac{\kappa}{n^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ \frac{\alpha(\lambda + \mu + \zeta)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\mu)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\lambda)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\zeta)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} E_{j,k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda \, d\mu \, d\zeta.
\]

(4.9)

Proceeding as in Robinson [18] we have that because of the Schwarz inequality and by periodicity, (4.8) is bounded in absolute value by \( \kappa (2\pi)^3 P_j P_k \) where

\[
P_j = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \frac{\alpha(\lambda)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \right|^2 K(\lambda - \omega - \omega_j) \, d\lambda
\]

and \( K(\lambda) = \frac{|D(\lambda)|^2}{2\pi n} \) is Fejer's kernel. The second component is

\[
\frac{\kappa}{n^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ \frac{\alpha(\lambda + \mu + \zeta)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\mu)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\lambda)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\zeta)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} E_{j,k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda \, d\mu \, d\zeta.
\]

(4.10)

As before, (4.10) is bounded in absolute value by \( \kappa (2\pi)^3 P_j P_k^\frac{1}{2} \). An example of the third type component is

\[
\frac{\kappa}{n^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ \frac{\alpha(\lambda + \mu + \zeta)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\mu)}{\alpha_j} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\lambda)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} \{ \frac{\alpha(-\zeta)}{\alpha_k} - 1 \} E_{j,k}(\lambda, \mu, \zeta) \, d\lambda \, d\mu \, d\zeta
\]

\[
\times D(\omega + \lambda_j - \theta) D(\omega + \lambda_k + \lambda) D(\theta - 2\omega - \lambda - \lambda_j - \lambda_k) \, d\lambda \, d\mu \, d\theta
\]

(4.11)

because

\[
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} D(u + \lambda) D(v - \lambda) \, d\lambda = 2\pi D(u + v).
\]

Thus the absolute value of (4.11) is bounded by \( \kappa (2\pi)^3 P_j^\frac{1}{2} P_k^\frac{1}{2} \).

Now since the summand of \( a_2 \) is that of \( b_2 \) with \( j = k \), applying Lemma 5 we have when \( d_1 < d_2 \),

\[
a_2 = O \left( \sum_{i=1}^{r} \left\{ \frac{n^4(d_2 - d_1)}{j^2 + 4(d_2 - d_1)} + \frac{n^3(d_2 - d_1)}{j^{2/3} + 3(d_2 - d_1)} + \frac{n^2(d_2 - d_1)}{j^{1/2} + 2(d_2 - d_1)} \right\} \right)
\]
Gaussian Semiparametric Estimation in Seasonal/Cyclical Long Memory Time Series

\[ b_2 = O \left( \sum_{j=l+1}^{r} \sum_{k=l+1}^{r} \left\{ \frac{n^4(d_2-d_1)}{j^1+2(d_2-d_1)k^1+2(d_2-d_1)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^3(d_2-d_1)}{j^{1/2}+(d_2-d_1)k^{1/2}+(d_2-d_1)} \right\} \right) \]

\[ = O \left( \frac{n^4(d_2-d_1)}{l^4(d_2-d_1)} + \frac{n^3(d_2-d_1) \log r}{l^2(d_2-d_1)r^{-1/2}+(d_2-d_1)} + \frac{n^2(d_2-d_1)}{l^{1/2}+(d_2-d_1)r^{-1/2}+(d_2-d_1) \log r} \right) = O \left( l^{3/4} r^{1/2} \right) \]

under A.4' which completes the proof of the lemma.
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