S1. PROOFS

PROOF OF LEMMA 4: Define \( B_p = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{ii}\sigma_i^2(1 - P_{ii})^{-2} (2 \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} P_{i\ell}^4 - P_{ii}^2(1 - P_{ii})^2) \).

Letting \((\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2\) be a second-order approximation of \(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta}\), we first show that \(E[(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2] = B_p\) and \(\text{V}[\hat{\theta}] - \frac{1}{p} (\text{V}[(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2]) = O(1/p)\). Then we finish the proof of the first claim by showing that the approximation error is ignorable. The bias bound follows immediately from the equality \(\sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} P_{i\ell}^4 = P_{ii}(1 - P_{ii})\), while \(\leq \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} P_{i\ell}^4 \leq P_{ii}^2(1 - P_{ii})^2\).

We have \(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2 + AE_2\), where

\[
(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\alpha}_i^2 \left( B_{ii} - \hat{B}_{ii} - \hat{B}_i \hat{\alpha}_i - \hat{B}_i \left( \hat{\alpha}_i^2 - \frac{1}{p} \frac{3 P_{ii}^3 + P_{ii}^2}{1 - P_{ii}} \right) \right)
\]

for \(\hat{\alpha}_i = (1 - P_{ii})^{-1} (\hat{P}_{ii} - P_{ii})\) and approximation error

\[
AE_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\alpha}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \left( \frac{1}{p} \frac{3 \hat{P}_{ii}^2 + \hat{P}_{ii}^2 - (3 P_{ii}^3 + P_{ii}^2) (1 + \hat{\alpha}_i)^2}{(1 + \hat{\alpha}_i)^2 (1 - P_{ii})} - \frac{\hat{\alpha}_i^3}{1 + \hat{\alpha}_i} \right).
\]

For the mean calculation involving \((\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2\), we use independence between \(\hat{B}_{ii}, \hat{P}_{ii}, \) and \(\hat{\alpha}_i^2\), unbiasedness of \(\hat{B}_{ii}, \hat{P}_{ii}, \) and \(\hat{\alpha}_i^2\), and the variance formula

\[
\text{V}[\hat{\alpha}_i] = \frac{2}{p} \frac{P_{ii}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{i\ell}^4}{(1 - P_{ii})^2} = \frac{1}{p} \frac{3 P_{ii}^3 + P_{ii}^2}{1 - P_{ii}} + \frac{P_{ii}^2 (1 - P_{ii})^2 - 2 \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} P_{i\ell}^4}{p(1 - P_{ii})^2}.
\]

Taken together, this implies that

\[
\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2] = - \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{ii}\sigma_i^2 \left( \text{V}[\hat{\alpha}_i] - \frac{1}{p} \frac{3 P_{ii}^3 + P_{ii}^2}{1 - P_{ii}} \right) = B_p.
\]
For the variance calculation, we proceed term by term. We have for \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)' \) that

\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 (B_{ii} - \hat{B}_{ii}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \mid y \right] \right] \leq 2 p^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} B_{i\ell}^2 \mathbb{E} [\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{\ell}^2] = O(p^{-1} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)),
\]

\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \hat{a}_i \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \hat{a}_i \mid y, R_B \right] \right] \leq 2 p^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} P_{i\ell}^2 \mathbb{E} [\hat{B}_{ii} \hat{B}_{i\ell}] \mathbb{E} [\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{\ell}^2] \frac{1 - P_{ii}(1 - P_{i\ell})}{(1 - P_{i\ell})^2} = O\left(p^{-1} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2) + p^{-2} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}_i^2) \right)^{1/2} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}_i^2)^{1/2}),
\]

where \( \tilde{A}_\ell = S_{xx}^{-1/2} A_\ell A_\ell S_{xx}^{-1/2} \) for \( \ell = 1, 2 \).

\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} (\hat{a}_i^2 - \mathbb{V}[\hat{a}_i]) \right]
= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} [\hat{B}_{ii} \hat{B}_{i\ell}] \mathbb{E} [\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{\ell}^2] \text{Cov}(\hat{a}_i^2, \hat{a}_{\ell}^2)
= O\left(p^{-2} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2) + p^{-3} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}_i^2) \right)^{1/2} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}_i^2)^{1/2}),
\]

\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{2 \sum_{\ell \neq i} P_{i\ell}^4 - P_{ii}^2 (1 - P_{ii})^2}{p(1 - P_{ii})^2} \hat{A}_{ii} \right] = O\left(p^{-3} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)\right),
\]

\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{2 \sum_{\ell \neq i} P_{i\ell}^4 - P_{ii}^2 (1 - P_{ii})^2}{p(1 - P_{ii})^2} \hat{B}_{ii} \right] = O\left(p^{-2} \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}]\right).
\]

From these bounds, it follows that \( \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}]^{-1/2}((\hat{\theta}_{JLA} - \hat{\theta})_2 - B_p) = o_p(1) \) since \( \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2) = O(\mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}]) \) and \( p^{-4} \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}]^{-2/2} \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}] \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}] = o(1) \).

We now treat the approximation error while utilizing that \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{\sigma}_i^2] = O(1/p^2), \mathbb{E}[\hat{\sigma}_i^2] = O(1/p^2) \), and \( \max |\hat{a}_i| = o_p(\log(n)/\sqrt{p}) \) which follows from Achlioptas (2003, Theorem 1.1 and its proof). Proceeding term by term, we list the conclusions

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \hat{a}_i^3 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \hat{a}_i^4 = p^{-2} O_p(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{1, PI} - \theta_1] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{2, PI} - \theta_2]),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \hat{a}_i^5 = \frac{\log(n)}{p^{5/4}} O_p(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{1, PI} - \theta_1] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{2, PI} - \theta_2]),
\]

\[
\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{B}_{ii} \frac{3\hat{P}_{ii}^2 + \hat{P}_{ii}^2 - (3P_{ii}^2 + P_{ii}^2)(1 + \hat{a}_i)^2}{(1 + \hat{a}_i)^2(1 - P_{ii})}.
\]
\[ \left( p^{-2} + \frac{\log(n)}{p^{3/4}} \right) \text{O}_p \left( \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{1,\text{PI}} - \theta_1] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{2,\text{PI}} - \theta_2] \right), \]

which finishes the proof. \hspace{1cm} Q.E.D.

**Proof of Lemma B.1:** The proof of Lemma B.1 uses the notation and verifies the conditions of Lemmas A2.1 and A2.2 in Sølvsten (2020) referred to as SS2.1 and SS2.2, respectively. First, we show marginal convergence in distribution of \( S_n \) and \( U_n \). Then, we show joint convergence in distribution of \( S_n \) and \( U_n \). Let \( V_n = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \), where \( \{v_i\} \) are as in the setup of Lemma B.1. Before starting, we note that \( \max_i \sigma_i^{-2} = O(1) \) and \( 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell}^2 \sigma_i^2 \sigma_{\ell}^2 = 1 \) imply trace\( (W^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell}^2 = O(1) \) so that \( \lambda_{\max}(W^2) = o(1) \Leftrightarrow \text{trace}(W^4) = o(1) \).

We first consider the marginal distribution of \( S_n \).

**Result S1.1:** If \( \max_i \mathbb{E}[v_i^4] + \sigma_i^{-2} = O(1) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{w}_i^2 \sigma_i^2 = 1 \), and \( \max_i \hat{w}_i^2 = o(1) \), then \( S_n \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \).

In the notation of SS2.1, we have \( \Delta_0^0 S_n = \hat{w}_i v_i \) and \( \mathbb{E}[T_n \mid V_n] = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{w}_i^2 (v_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \), so it follows from \( \max_i \mathbb{E}[v_i^4] + \sigma_i^{-2} = O(1) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{w}_i^2 \sigma_i^2 = 1 \), and Lemma B.1(i) that

\[ \mathbb{E}[T_n \mid V_n] \overset{\ell_1}{\to} 1, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_0^0 S_n)^2] = 1, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_0^0 S_n)^4] \leq \max_i \frac{\mathbb{E}[v_i^4]}{\sigma_i^2} \hat{w}_i^2 = o(1), \]

so Result S1.1 follows from SS2.1.

Next, we consider the marginal distribution of \( U_n \).

**Result S1.2:** If \( \max_i \mathbb{E}[v_i^4] + \sigma_i^{-2} = O(1) \), \( 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{n,i\ell}^2 \sigma_{n,i}^2 \sigma_{n,\ell}^2 = 1 \), and \( \text{trace}(W^4) = o(1) \), then \( U_n \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \).

In the notation of SS2.1, we have

\[ \Delta_0^0 U_n = 2v_i \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell} v_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad E[T_n \mid V_n] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i} (v_i + \sigma_i^2) W_{i\ell} W_{ik} v_{\ell} v_k, \]

and

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_0^0 U_n)^2] = 2, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_0^0 U_n)^4] \leq 2^5 \max_i \mathbb{E}[v_i^4]^2 \max_i \sigma_i^{-4} \max_{\ell \neq } W_{i\ell}^2, \]

where \( \max_i \sum_{\ell \neq } W_{i\ell}^2 \leq \text{trace}(W^4)^{1/2} = o(1) \). Now, split \( \mathbb{E}[T_n \mid V_n] - 1 \) into three terms

\[ a_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sigma_i^2 W_{i\ell}^2 (v_\ell + v_\ell^2 - \sigma_\ell^2), \]

\[ b_n = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k \neq i} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sigma_i^2 W_{ik} W_{i\ell} v_i v_\ell + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell}^2 (v_\ell^2 - \sigma_\ell^2), \]
\[ c_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{l \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, l} W_{i\ell} W_{ik} (\sigma_i^2 - \sigma_{\ell}^2) v_i v_k. \]

Convergence in \( L^1 \). The random variables \( a_n, b_n, \) and \( c_n \) are a linear sum, a quadratic sum, and a cubic sum. We treat similar sums later, so we record sufficient conditions for their convergence in \( L^1 \). For brevity, let \( \sum_{i \neq k}^{n} \sum_{i \neq \ell, l}^{n} \) and \( \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \sum_{l \neq i}^{n} \), etc.

Use the notation \( u_i = (v_{i1}, v_{i2}, v_{i3}, v_{i4}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \) to denote independent random vectors in order that the result applies to combinations of \( v_i \) and \( v_i^2 - \sigma_i^2 \) as in \( a_n, b_n, \) and \( c_n \). For the inferential results we also treat quartic sums and provide the sufficient conditions here.

**RESULT S1.3:** Let \( S_{n1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i v_{i1}, S_{n2} = \sum_{i \neq k}^{n} \omega_i v_{i1} v_{i2}, S_{n3} = \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \omega_i v_{i1} v_{i2} v_{i3}, \) and \( S_{n4} = \sum_{i \neq \ell, k}^{n} \omega_i v_{i1} v_{i2} v_{i3} v_{i4} \) where the weights \( \omega_i, \omega_{\ell i}, \omega_{i\ell k}, \) and \( \omega_{i\ell km} \) are non-random. Suppose that \( \mathbb{E}[u_i] = 0, \) max, \( \mathbb{E}[u_i u_j] = O(1). \)

1. If \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i^2 = o(1), \) then \( S_{n1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0. \)
2. If \( \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \omega_{\ell i}^2 = o(1), \) then \( S_{n2} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0. \)
3. If \( \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \omega_{i\ell k}^2 = o(1), \) then \( S_{n3} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0. \)
4. If \( \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \omega_{i\ell km}^2 = o(1), \) then \( S_{n4} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0. \)

Consider \( S_{n3} \); the other results follow from the same line of reasoning. In the notation of SS2.2, we have

\[ \Delta_{n3}^0 = v_{i1} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} \omega_{i\ell k} v_{i2} v_{k3} + v_{i2} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} \omega_{i\ell k} v_{i1} v_{k3} + v_{i3} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} \omega_{i\ell k} v_{i1} v_{k2}. \]

Focusing on the first term, we have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( v_{i1} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} \omega_{i\ell k} v_{i2} v_{k3} \right)^2 \right] \leq \max \mathbb{E} \left[ u_{i}' u_{i} \right]^3 \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \left( \omega_{i\ell k}^2 + \omega_{i\ell k} \omega_{i\ell \ell} \right) \leq 2 \max \mathbb{E} \left[ u_{i}' u_{i} \right]^3 \sum_{i \neq \ell}^{n} \omega_{i\ell k}^2,
\]

so the results follow from SS2.2, \( \sum_{i \neq \ell, k}^{n} \omega_{i\ell k}^2 = o(1), \) and the observation that the last bound also applies to the other two terms in \( \Delta_{n3}^0 \).

Returning to Result S1.2, we need to see how \( a_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0, \) \( b_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0, \) and \( c_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^1} 0 \) follow from Result S1.3. Let \( W_{i\ell} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} W_{ik} W_{k\ell} \) and note that trace(\( W^4 \)) = \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} W_{i\ell}^2 \). We have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sigma_{\ell}^2 W_{i\ell}^2 \right)^2 \leq \max_i \sigma_i^4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{i\ell}^2,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \left( \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} \sigma_{k}^2 W_{ik} W_{ik} \right)^2 \leq \max_i \sigma_i^4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} W_{i\ell}^2,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell}^4 = O \left( \max_i W_{i\ell}^2 \right),
\]

where the weights
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, \ell} W_{i\ell} W_{ik}^2 = O\left( \max_{i} W_{ii}^2 \right),
\]
all of which are \( o(1) \) as \( \text{trace}(W^4) = o(1) \).

Finally, we consider the joint distribution of \((S_n, U_n)^\prime\). Let \((u_1, u_2)^\prime \in \mathbb{R}^2\) be given and non-random with \( u_1^2 + u_2^2 = 1 \). Define \( W_n = u_1 S_n + u_2 U_n \). Lemma B.1 follows if we show that \( W_n \overset{d}{\rightarrow} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \). In the notation of SS2.1, we have

\[
\Delta_1^0 W_n = u_1 \tilde{w}_i v_i + u_2 2v_i \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell} v_\ell
\]

and

\[
\mathbb{E}[T_n \mid V_n] = u_1^2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{w}_i^2 (v_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right) + u_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} (v_i + \sigma_i^2) W_{i\ell} W_{i\ell} v_\ell v_k
\]

\[
+ u_1 u_2 3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} (v_i + \sigma_i^2) \hat{w}_i W_{i\ell} v_\ell.
\]

The proofs of Results S1.1 and S1.2 lead to \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_1^0 W_n^2] = O(1) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_1^0 W_n^4)] = o(1) \), and that the first two terms of \( \mathbb{E}[T_n \mid V_n] \) converge to \( u_1^2 + u_2^2 = 1 \). Thus, the lemma follows if we show that the conditional covariance \( 3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} (v_i^2 + \sigma_i^2) \hat{w}_i W_{i\ell} v_\ell v_{\ell} \) converges to 0 in \( \mathcal{L}^1 \). This conditional covariance involves a linear and a quadratic sum:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} \sigma_i^2 W_{i\ell} \right)^2 \leq \max_i \sigma_i^4 \max \lambda_i^2(W) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{w}_i^2 = O\left( \max \lambda_i^2(W) \right),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \hat{w}_i^2 W_{i\ell}^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} W_{i\ell}^2 \max_i \hat{w}_i^2 = O\left( \max_i \hat{w}_i^2 \right),
\]

and Result S1.3 ends the proof. \( \blacksquare \)

**Proof of Lemma 5:** The proof continues in two steps. First, it shows that \( \tilde{V}[\hat{\theta}] \) has positive bias of smaller order than \( V[\hat{\theta}] \) when \( |B| = O(1) \). Second, it shows that \( \tilde{V}[\hat{\theta}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{V}[\hat{\theta}] = o_p(V[\hat{\theta}]) \). Combined with Theorem 2, these conclusions establish the claims of the lemma.

**Bias of \( \tilde{V}[\hat{\theta}] \).** For the first term in \( \tilde{V}[\hat{\theta}] \), a simple calculation shows that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell} Y_\ell \right)^2 \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \right] = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell} x_\ell \beta \right)^2 \sigma_i^2 + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell}^2 \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2
\]

\[
+ 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell} C_{m\ell} (P_{mi,1} P_{m\ell,2} + P_{mi,2} P_{m\ell,1}) \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2
\]

\[
= \mathcal{V}[\hat{\theta}] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \check{C}_{i\ell} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2.
\]
For the second term in $\hat{\gamma}[\hat{\theta}]$, we note that if $P_{ik_{-1}\ell}P_{i_{-1}k_{-i}} = 0$ for all $k$, then independence between error terms yields $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\sigma}_i^2] \mathbb{E}[\hat{\sigma}_\ell^2] = \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2$. Otherwise if $P_{i_{-1}1} + P_{i_{-1}2} = 0$, then

$$
\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[ (\varepsilon_i - \sum_{j \neq i} P_{ij_{1}\ell} \varepsilon_j) (\varepsilon_i - \sum_{k \neq i} \sum_{m \neq \ell} P_{ik_{2}\ell} \varepsilon_k) (x_\ell \beta + \varepsilon_\ell) (\varepsilon_i - \sum_{m \neq \ell} P_{im_{-1}\ell} \varepsilon_m) \right]
$$

$$
= \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2 + x_\ell \beta \mathbb{E}\left[ (\varepsilon_i - \sum_{j \neq i} P_{ij_{1}\ell} \varepsilon_j) (\varepsilon_i - \sum_{k \neq i} \sum_{m \neq \ell} P_{ik_{2}\ell} \varepsilon_k) \sum_{m \neq \ell} P_{lm_{-1}\ell} \varepsilon_m \right],
$$

where the second term is zero since $P_{i_{-1}1} = 0$ and $P_{ij_{1}j_{-2}} = 0$ for all $j$. The same argument applies with the roles of $i$ and $\ell$ reversed when $P_{i_{-1}1} + P_{i_{-1}2} = 0$.

Finally, when $(i, \ell) \in B$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2] = \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2 + \left( (x_\ell - \bar{x})^\prime \beta \right)^2 + O(n^{-1}) 1_{\{\hat{c}_{i\ell} < 0\}},
$$

where the remainder is uniform in $(i, \ell)$ and stems from the use of $\bar{y}$ as an estimator of $\bar{x}^\prime \beta$. Thus, for sufficiently large $n$, $\mathbb{E}[\hat{c}_{i\ell} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2]$ is smaller than $\hat{c}_{i\ell} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2$, leading to a positive bias in $\hat{\nu}[\hat{\theta}]$. This bias is

$$
\sum_{(i, \ell) \in B} \hat{c}_{i\ell} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2 1_{\{\hat{c}_{i\ell} > 0\}} + \left( (x_\ell - \bar{x})^\prime \beta \right)^2 1_{\{\hat{c}_{i\ell} < 0\}} + O(\nu[\hat{\theta}] / n),
$$

which is ignorable when $|B| = O(1)$.

Variability of $\hat{\gamma}[\hat{\theta}]$. Now, $\hat{\gamma}[\hat{\theta}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\gamma}[\hat{\theta}]]$ involves a number of terms all of which are linear, quadratic, cubic, or quartic sums. Result S1.3 provides sufficient conditions for their convergence in $L^1$ and therefore in probability. We have already treated versions of linear, quadratic, and cubic terms carefully in the proof of Lemma B.1. Thus, we report here the calculations for the quartic terms (details for the remaining terms can be provided upon request) as they also highlight the role of the high-level condition $\lambda_{\max}(P, P') = O(1)$ for $s = 1, 2$.

The quartic term in $4 \sum_{i=1}^n (\sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij} y_i x_\ell) \hat{\sigma}_i^2$ is $\sum_{i \neq k} \omega_{i\ell m k} \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_k M_{i\ell, s}$ where

$$
\omega_{i\ell m k} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_{ij} C_{j \ell M_{j m, 1 M_{j k, 2}}}
$$

and

$$
M_{i\ell, s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = \ell, \\ -P_{i\ell, s} & \text{if } i \neq \ell. \end{cases}
$$

Letting $\odot$ denote Hadamard (element-wise) product and $M_s = I_n - P_s$, we have

$$
\sum_{i \neq k} \omega_{i\ell m k}^2 \leq \sum_{i, \ell, m, k} \omega_{i\ell m k}^2 = \sum_{j, f} (C^\prime_{j f} (M_1 M'_1)_{j f} (M'_{2} M_{2})_{j f}) = \text{trace} ((C^\prime \odot C^\prime) (M_1 M'_1 \odot M_2 M'_2)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(M_1 M'_1 \odot M_2 M'_2) \text{trace}(C^\prime \odot C^\prime) = O(\text{trace}(C^\prime)) = o(\nu[\hat{\theta}]^2),
$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(M_1 M'_1 \odot M_2 M'_2) = O(1)$ follows from $\lambda_{\max}(P, P') = O(1)$ and we established the last equality in the proof of Theorem 2. The quartic term involved in
2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \tilde{C}_{i\ell} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_{\ell}^2 \text{ has variability of the same order as } \sum_{i \neq \ell \neq m \neq k}^{n} \omega_{i\ell mk} \epsilon_i \epsilon_\ell \epsilon_m \epsilon_k, \text{ where }

\omega_{i\ell mk} = \tilde{C}_{i\ell} M_{im,1} M_{\ell k,1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{C}_{ij} M_{im,1} M_{jk,1} M_{j\ell,2}.

Letting \( \tilde{C} = (\tilde{C}_{i\ell})_{i,\ell} \), we find that

\[ \sum_{i \neq \ell \neq m \neq k}^{n} \omega_{i\ell mk}^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i,\ell}^{n} \tilde{C}_{i\ell}^2 (M_{i1} M_{1\ell}^\prime) (M_{2\ell}^\prime M_{21}) + 2 \sum_{j,\ell'}^{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \tilde{C}_{ij} \tilde{C}_{ij'} (M_{i1} M_{1\ell}^\prime) (M_{j1} M_{1\ell'}^\prime) (M_{2\ell}^\prime M_{2j'}).
\]

\[ = O \left( \sum_{i,\ell}^{n} \tilde{C}_{i\ell}^2 + \text{trace} \left( \left( (C^2 \odot M_{i1} M_{1\ell}^\prime) (M_{2\ell}^\prime M_{21}) \right) \right) \right) = O(\text{trace}(\tilde{C}^2)). \]

We have \( \tilde{C} = C \odot C + 2(C \odot P_1) (C \odot P_2) + 2(C \odot P_2) (C \odot P_1), \) from which we obtain that

\[ \text{trace}(\tilde{C}^2) = O \left( \left( \max_{i,\ell} C_{i\ell}^2 + \lambda_{\text{max}}(C^2) \right) \text{trace}(C^2) \right) = o(\sqrt[\ell]{\theta^2}), \]

where we established the last equality in the proof of Theorem 2. \( Q.E.D. \)

Section 6.2 proposed standard errors for the case of \( q > 0 \), but omitted a few definitions as they were analogous to those for the case of \( q = 0 \). Those definitions are \( \tilde{C}_{itq} = C_{itq}^2 + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{n} C_{mq} C_{mtq} (P_{mi,1} P_{ml,2} + P_{ml,2} P_{mi,1}), \) where \( C_{itq} = B_{itq} - 2^{-1} M_{it} (M_{ii,1} B_{ii,1}^\prime + M_{ii,1} B_{ii,1}^\prime) \) for \( B_{itq} = B_{it} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \lambda_i w_{it} w_{t1}. \) Furthermore,

\[ \tilde{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{\ell i}^2 & \text{if } P_{ki,1} P_{kt,1} = 0 \text{ for all } k, \\
\hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{\ell i}^2 & \text{else if } P_{it,1} + P_{it,2} = 0, \\
\hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{\ell i}^2 \cdot (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \cdot 1_{[\tilde{C}_{itq} = 0]} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]

**PROOF OF LEMMA 6:** The statements \( \sqrt[2]{\theta_q}^{-1} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_q} \overset{p}{\rightarrow} I_q \) and \( \sqrt[2]{\theta_q}^{-1} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_q} \overset{p}{\rightarrow} 1 \) follow by applying the arguments in the proofs of Theorem 1 and Lemma 5. Thus, we focus on the remaining claim that

\[ \delta(v) := \frac{\hat{C}[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q] - C[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]}{\sqrt[2]{\theta_q}^{-1} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_q}^{1/2}} \overset{p}{\rightarrow} 0 \]

where \( \hat{C}[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q] = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} v' w_{iq} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} C_{itq} y_{\ell} \right) \hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 \)

for all non-random \( v \in \mathbb{R}^q \) with \( v' v = 1. \)

**Unbiasedness of \( \hat{C}[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q].** Since \( \hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2 \) is unbiased for \( \sigma_{i\ell}^2 \), it follows that

\[ \mathbb{E}[\hat{C}[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]] = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} v' w_{iq} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} C_{itq} x_{\ell} \beta \right) \sigma_{i\ell}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} v' w_{iq} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i}^{n} C_{itq} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{i\ell} \hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2] \right) = C[v' \hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q] \]

as split sampling ensures that \( \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{i\ell} \hat{\sigma}_{i\ell}^2] = 0 \) for \( \ell \neq i. \)
Variability of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]$. Now, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q] - \mathcal{C}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]$ is composed of the following linear, quadratic, and quartic sums:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'w_{iq} \left( e_i^2 - \sigma_i^2 \right) \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} x_i' \beta + \sigma_i^2 \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} e_\ell
\]

\[+ \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} \sigma_\ell^2 \sum_{k \neq \ell} \left( M_{i\ell,1} M_{i,k,2} + M_{i\ell,2} M_{i,k,1} \right) e_k \],

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'w_{iq} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} x_i' \beta \sum_{m} \sum_{k \neq m} M_{im,1} M_{i,k,2} e_m + \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} (e_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right.
\[+ \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} \left( M_{i\ell,1} M_{i,k,2} + M_{i\ell,2} M_{i,k,1} \right) e_k \left( e_\ell^2 - \sigma_\ell^2 \right) \],

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'w_{iq} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} \sum_{m} \sum_{k \neq m} M_{im,1} M_{i,k,2} e_m e_k .
\]

These seven terms are $o_P(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]^{1/2}}/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q]^{1/2}})$ by Result S1.3 as outlined in the following:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \nu'w_{iq} \right)^2 \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} x_i' \beta \right)^2 = O\left( \max_i \nu'w_{iq} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q] \right) = o(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]}/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q]}),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} \nu'w_{iq} C_{i\ell q} \right)^2 = O\left( \lambda_{\max} \left( C_q^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]} \right) \right) = O\left( \lambda_{\max}^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]} \right) = o(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]}/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q]}),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} \nu'w_{iq} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} M_{i\ell,1} M_{i,k,2} \right)^2 = O\left( \max_i \nu'w_{iq} \text{trace}(C_q M_1 \otimes C_q M_1) \right) = o(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\nu^*\hat{b}_q]}/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q]}),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'w_{iq} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} x_i' \beta M_{im,1} M_{i,k,2} \right)^2 = O\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \nu'w_{iq} \right)^2 \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} x_i' \beta \right)^2 \right),
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q}^2 (\nu'w_{iq})^2 = O\left( \max_i \nu'w_{iq} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_q]} \right),
\]

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'w_{iq} C_{i\ell q} M_{i\ell,1} M_{i,k,2} \right)^2.
\]
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} v^{i} w_{i}^{m} C_{i \ell} \left( M_{m,1} M_{\ell,2} \right) \right) = O(\sqrt{v^{i} b_{q}}) \lambda_{\max} \left( (C_{q}^{2}) \right).
\]

Q.E.D.

Before turning to a proof of Lemma 7, we give precise definitions of the curvature and critical value function as introduced for the general problem considered by Andrews and Mikusheva (2016) does not have a closed form representation, but we show that it does in the special case considered here. For implementation, the closed form solution circumvents numerical approximation.

**Critical Value Function.** For a given curvature \( \kappa > 0 \) and confidence level \( 1 - \alpha \), the critical value function \( z_{\alpha,\kappa} \) is the \((1 - \alpha)\)th quantile of

\[
\rho(\chi_{q}, \chi_{1}, \kappa) = \sqrt{\chi_{q}^{2} + \left( \chi_{1} + \frac{1}{\kappa} \right)^{2} - \frac{1}{\kappa}},
\]

where \( \chi_{q}^{2} \) and \( \chi_{1}^{2} \) are independently distributed random variables from the \( \chi\)-squared distribution with \( q \) and 1 degrees of freedom, respectively. \( \rho(\chi_{q}, \chi_{1}, \kappa) \) is the Euclidean distance from \( (\chi_{q}, \chi_{1}) \) to the circle with center \((0, -\frac{1}{2}) \) and radius \( \frac{1}{2} \). The critical value function at \( \kappa = 0 \) is the limit of \( z_{\alpha,\kappa} \) as \( \kappa \downarrow 0 \), which is the \((1 - \alpha)\)th quantile of a central \( \chi_{1}^{2} \) random variable. See Andrews and Mikusheva (2016) for additional details.

**Curvature.** For generic \( \tilde{\Sigma}_{q} \), our proposed confidence interval \( C_{q}^{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_{q}) \) inverts hypotheses of the type \( H_{0}: \theta = c \) versus \( H_{1}: \theta \neq c \) based on the value of the test statistic

\[
\min_{b_{q}, g(b_{q}, 0, \theta_{q}, c) = 0} \left( \frac{\hat{b}_{q} - b_{q}}{\tilde{\theta}_{q} - \theta_{q}} \right)^{\prime} \tilde{\Sigma}_{q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\hat{b}_{q} - b_{q}}{\tilde{\theta}_{q} - \theta_{q}} \right),
\]

where \( g(b_{q}, \theta_{q}, c) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q} \lambda_{\ell} \hat{b}_{\ell}^{2} + \theta_{q} - c \) and \( b_{q} = (\hat{b}_{1}, \ldots, \hat{b}_{q})' \). This testing problem depends on the manifold \( S = \{ x = \tilde{\Sigma}_{q}^{-1/2}(b_{q}, \theta_{q})' : g(b_{q}, \theta_{q}, c) = 0 \} \) for which we need an upper bound on the maximal curvature. We derive this upper bound using the parameterization \( x(\dot{y}) = \tilde{\Sigma}_{q}^{-1/2}(\dot{y}_{1}, \ldots, \dot{y}_{q}, c - \sum_{\ell=1}^{q} \lambda_{\ell} \dot{y}_{\ell})' \) which maps from \( \mathbb{R}^{q} \) to \( S \), is a homeomorphism, and has a Jacobian of full rank:

\[
dx(\dot{y}) = \tilde{\Sigma}_{q}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix}
diag(1, \ldots, 1) \\
-2\lambda_{1} \dot{y}_{1}, \ldots, -2\lambda_{q} \dot{y}_{q}\n\end{bmatrix}.
\]

The maximal curvature of \( S \), \( \kappa(\tilde{\Sigma}_{q}) \), is then given as \( \kappa(\tilde{\Sigma}_{q}) = \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{q}} \kappa_{y} \), where

\[
k_{y} = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{q}} \frac{\| (I - P_{y}) V(u \odot u) \|}{\| dx(\dot{y}) u \|^{2}}, \quad V = \tilde{\Sigma}_{q}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix}0 \\
-2\lambda_{1}, \ldots, -2\lambda_{q}\n\end{bmatrix},
\]

and \( P_{y} = dx(\dot{y})(dx(\dot{y})'dx(\dot{y}))^{-1}dx(\dot{y})' \).

**Curvature When \( q = 1 \).** In this case, the maximization over \( u \) drops out and we have

\[
\kappa(\tilde{\Sigma}_{1}) = \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{\sqrt{VV - \left( vV \right)^{2}}}{vV} \quad \text{where} \quad v = \tilde{\Sigma}_{1}^{-1/2}(1, -2\lambda_{1})' \]

\[
\tilde{\Sigma}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix}1 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 1\n\end{bmatrix}
\]
and \( V = \tilde{\Sigma}_1^{-1/2}(0, -2\lambda_1) \). The value \( \hat{y}^* = -\frac{\hat{\rho}(\hat{\theta}_q)}{2\lambda_1\hat{\rho}(\hat{\theta}_q)} \) for \( \hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{\xi}(\hat{b}_1, \hat{\theta}_q)}{\hat{v}(\hat{b}_1)^{1/2}} \) is both a minimizer of \( v'^2 \) and \( (v'V)^2 \), so we obtain that \( \kappa(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) = \frac{2\lambda_1\hat{\rho}(\hat{\theta}_q)}{\hat{v}(\hat{b}_1)^{1/2}(1 - p)} \).

Curvature When \( q > 1 \). In this case, we first maximize over \( \hat{y} \) and then over \( u \). For a fixed \( u \), we want to find

\[
\max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^q} \sqrt{V_u'V_u - V_u'P_yV_u} \quad \text{where} \quad V_u = \tilde{\Sigma}_q^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} 0, -2 \sum_{\ell=1}^q \lambda_\ell u_\ell \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_{u,y} = \tilde{\Sigma}_q^{-1/2}(u', -2u'D_q\hat{y})',
\]

and \( D_q = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q) \). The value for \( \hat{y} \) that solves \(-2D_q\hat{y} = \tilde{\nu}[\hat{b}_q]^{-1}\tilde{C}[\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q] \) sets \( P_yV_u = 0 \) and minimizes \( v_{u,y}v_{u,y} \). Thus we obtain

\[
\kappa(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) = \frac{2\max_{u \in \mathbb{R}^q} |u'D_qu|}{\tilde{\nu}[\hat{b}_q]^{-1/2}} \frac{(\tilde{\nu}[\hat{\theta}_q] - \tilde{C}[\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]\tilde{\nu}[\hat{b}_q]^{-1}\tilde{C}[\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q])^{1/2}}{\tilde{\nu}[\hat{\theta}_q] - \tilde{C}[\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q]\tilde{\nu}[\hat{b}_q]^{-1}\tilde{C}[\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q])^{1/2}} \]

where \( \hat{\lambda}_1(\cdot) \) is the eigenvalue of largest magnitude. This formula simplifies to the one derived above when \( q = 1 \).

PROOF OF LEMMA 7: The following two conditions are the inputs to the proof of Theorem 2 in Andrews and Mikusheva (2016), from which it follows that

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta \in \hat{C}_{a,q}) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \min_{(\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q) \in \mathbb{R}^q} \left( \hat{b}_q - b_q \right) \right) \leq \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_q^{-1/2}}{\hat{\theta}_q - \hat{\theta}_q} \leq \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_q^{-1/2}}{\hat{\theta}_q - \hat{\theta}_q} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_{\Sigma,\hat{\Sigma}}} \leq 1 - \alpha,
\]

where \( g(\hat{b}_q, \hat{\theta}_q, \theta) = \sum_{\ell=1}^q \lambda_\ell \hat{b}_\ell^2 + \theta - \theta \) and \( b_q = (\hat{b}_1, \ldots, \hat{b}_q)' \).

Condition (i) requires that \( \hat{\Sigma}_q^{-1/2}((\hat{b}_q', \hat{\theta}_q') - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{b}_q', \hat{\theta}_q')]) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{q+1}) \), which follows from Theorem 3 and \( \hat{\Sigma}_q^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_q \xrightarrow{p} I_{q+1} \).

Condition (ii) is satisfied if the conditions of Lemma 1 in Andrews and Mikusheva (2016) are satisfied. To verify this, take the manifold

\[
\tilde{S} = \{ \dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1} : \tilde{g}(\dot{x}) = 0 \}
\]

for

\[
\tilde{g}(\dot{x}) = \dot{x}' \tilde{\Sigma}_q^{1/2} \begin{bmatrix} D_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \dot{x}' \tilde{\Sigma}_q^{1/2} \dot{x} + (2\mathbb{E}[\hat{b}_q'], 1) \begin{bmatrix} D_q & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \dot{x}' \tilde{\Sigma}_q^{1/2} \dot{x}.
\]

The curvature of \( \tilde{S} \) is \( \tilde{\kappa} \), \( \tilde{g}(0) = 0 \), and \( \tilde{g} \) is continuously differentiable with a Jacobian of rank 1. These are the conditions of Lemma 1 in Andrews and Mikusheva (2016). Q.E.D.
S2. Calculation of $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)$ in Practice

To calculate our proposed confidence interval, one can rely on an implicit representation of $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)$ which is $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) = [\lambda_1 b^2_{1,-} + \theta_{1,-}, \lambda_1 b^2_{1,+} + \theta_{1,+}]$, where $b_{1,\pm}$ and $\theta_{1,\pm}$ are solutions to

\begin{align*}
    b_{1,\pm} &= \hat{b}_1 \pm z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) \left( \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]}{2} (1 - \tilde{a}(b_{1,\pm})) \right)^{1/2}, \quad (S1) \\
    \theta_{1,\pm} &= \hat{\theta}_1 - \tilde{\rho} \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} \left( \hat{b}_1 - b_{1,\pm} \right) \pm z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) \left( \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} (1 - \tilde{\rho}^2) \tilde{a}(b_{1,\pm}) \right)^{1/2}, \quad (S2)
\end{align*}

for $\tilde{a}(\hat{b}_1) = (1 + (\text{sgn}(\lambda_1)\kappa)(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)\hat{\theta}_1 \bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]^{-1/2} + \tilde{\rho}/\sqrt{1 - \tilde{\rho}^2})^{-1}$.

This construction is fairly intuitive. When $\tilde{\rho} = 0$, the interval has endpoints that combine

\begin{align*}
    \lambda_1 \left( \hat{b}_1 \pm z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) \left( \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]}{2} (1 - \tilde{a}(b_{1,\pm})) \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\theta}_q \pm z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) \left( \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} a(b_{1,\pm}) \right)^{1/2},
\end{align*}

where $a(\hat{b}_1)$ estimates the fraction of $\Psi[\hat{\theta}]$ that stems from $\hat{\theta}_1$ when $\bar{E}[\hat{b}_1] = \hat{b}_1$. When $\tilde{\rho}$ is nonzero, $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)$ involves an additional rotation of $(\hat{b}_1, \hat{\theta}_1)$. This representation of $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)$ is, however, not unique as (S1), (S2) can have multiple solutions. Thus, we derive the representation above together with an additional side condition that ensures uniqueness and represents $b_{1,\pm}$ and $\theta_{1,\pm}$ as solutions to a fourth-order polynomial.

**Derivation.** The upper end of $C^a_{\alpha}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)$ is found by noting that maximization over a linear function in $\theta_1$ implies that the constraint must bind at the maximum. Thus, we can reformulate the bivariate problem as a univariate problem:

\[
    \max_{(\hat{b}_1, \hat{\theta}_1) \in \mathbb{E}_a(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)} \lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 = \max_{\hat{b}_1} \lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 - \tilde{\rho} \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} \left( \hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1 \right) + \sqrt{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1] (1 - \tilde{\rho}^2) \left( z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)^2 - \frac{(\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1)^2}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} \right)},
\]

where we are implicitly enforcing the constraint on $\hat{b}_1$ that the term under the square root is nonnegative. Thus, we will find a global maximum in $\hat{b}_1$ and note that it satisfies this constraint. The first-order condition for a maximum is

\[
    2\lambda_1 \hat{b}_1 + \tilde{\rho} \frac{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} \sqrt{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{\theta}_1] (1 - \tilde{\rho}^2)} + \hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1 \sqrt{z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)^2 - \frac{(\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1)^2}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]}} = 0,
\]

which after a rearrangement and squaring of both sides yields $(\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1)^2 = (1 - a(\hat{b})) z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)^2$. This in turn leads to the representation of $b_{1,\pm}$ given in (S1). All solutions to this equation satisfy the implicit nonnegativity constraint since any solution $\hat{b}$ satisfies

\[
    z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)^2 - \frac{(\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1)^2}{\bar{\Psi}[\hat{b}_1]} = a(\hat{b}_1) z_{\alpha,\kappa}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1)^2 > 0.
\]
Then we define $Q_x$ be found as the maximizer of which has at most four solutions that are given on closed form. Thus, the solution $b_{1,+}$ can be found as the maximizer of

$$
\lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 - \hat{\rho} \frac{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{b}_1]^{1/2}} (\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1) + z_{a,\kappa}(\hat{\theta}_1) a(\hat{b}_1) \right)^{1/2}
$$

among the at most four solutions to (S3). More importantly, the maximum is the upper end of $C^a_{\alpha}(\hat{\Sigma}_1)$. Now, for the minimization problem, we instead have

$$
\min_{(\hat{b}_1, \hat{\theta}_1) \in E_{\alpha}(\hat{\Sigma}_1)} \lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 = \min_{\hat{b}_1} \lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 - \hat{\rho} \frac{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{b}_1]^{1/2}} (\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1)
$$

which when rearranging and squaring the first-order condition again leads to (S3) as a necessary condition for a minimum. Thus, $b_{1,-}$ and the lower end of $C^a_{\alpha}(\hat{\Sigma}_1)$ can be found by minimizing

$$
\lambda_1 \hat{b}_1^2 + \hat{\theta}_1 - \hat{\rho} \frac{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{\theta}_1]}{\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{b}_1]^{1/2}} (\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_1) - z_{a,\kappa}(\hat{\theta}_1) a(\hat{b}_1) \right)^{1/2}
$$

S3. INFERENCES WITH NON-EXISTING SPLIT SAMPLE ESTIMATORS

The standard error estimators considered in Lemmas 5 and 6 rely on existence of the independent and unbiased estimators $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$ and $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$. Here, we propose an adjustment for observations where these estimators do not exist. The adjustment ensures that one can obtain valid inference as stated in the lemma at the end of the section.

For observations where it is not possible to create $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$ and $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$, we construct $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$ to satisfy the requirements in Lemma 6 and set $P_{\ell,2} = 0$ for all $\ell$ so that $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i} = 0$. Then we define $Q_\ell = 1_{(\max_{\ell} p_{\ell,2} = 0)}$ as an indicator that $\hat{x}_l^i\beta_{l-1,i}$ could not be constructed as an unbiased estimator.

Based on this, we let

$$
\hat{\Sigma}_{\ell,2} = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{\ell,i} y_{\ell} \right)^2 \tilde{\sigma}_{\ell,2}^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{\ell,i} \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 \tilde{\sigma}_{\ell,2}^2,
$$
where $\tilde{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 = (1 - Q_i) \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 + Q_i(y_i - \bar{y})^2$ and

$$
\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 \sigma_{1,2}^2 = \begin{cases} 
\tilde{\sigma}_{i-\ell}^2 \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_{i-\ell}^2 & \text{if } P_{i,\ell-1} P_{i,k-1} = 0 \text{ for all } k \text{ and } Q_i = Q_{\ell i} = 0, \\
\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 & \text{else if } P_{i,\ell+1} + P_{i,\ell+2} = 0 \text{ and } Q_i = Q_{\ell i} = 0, \\
\tilde{\sigma}_{i-\ell}^2 \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_{i-\ell}^2 \cdot (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \cdot 1_{(\tilde{\ell i} < 0)} & \text{else if } Q_i = 0, \\
(\bar{y} - \bar{y})^2 \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 \cdot 1_{(\tilde{\ell i} < 0)} & \text{else if } Q_i = 0, \\
(y_i - \bar{y})^2 \cdot (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \cdot 1_{(\tilde{\ell i} < 0)} & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
$$

where we let $Q_{\ell i} = 1_{(P_{i,\ell-1} \neq 0 \neq Q_i)}$. The definition of $\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]$ is such that $\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}] = \hat{V}[\hat{\theta}]$ when two independent unbiased estimators of $x_i' \beta$ can be formed for all observations, that is, when $Q_i = 0$ for all $i$.

Similarly, we let

$$
\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ w_{iq} w_{iq}' \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 + 2 w_{iq} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} y_{\ell} \right) \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 + 4 \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell q} y_{\ell} \right) \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \right. \\
- 2 \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} \hat{C}_{i\ell q} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 \right)
$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 = (1 - Q_i) \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + Q_i(y_i - \bar{y})^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2$ is defined as $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2$ but using $\hat{C}_{i\ell q}$ instead of $\hat{C}_{i\ell q}$.

The following lemma shows that these estimators of the asymptotic variance lead to valid inference when coupled with the confidence intervals proposed in Sections 5 and 7.

**Lemma S3.1:** Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^n P_{i,\ell} x_i' \beta = x_i' \beta$, either $\sum_{\ell \neq i} P_{i,\ell} x_i' \beta = x_i' \beta$ or $\max_{\ell} P_{i,\ell} = 0$, $P_{i,\ell} P_{i,\ell+2} = 0$ for all $\ell$, and $\lambda_{\max}(P_{i,\ell}, P_{i,\ell+2}) = O(1)$ where $P_i = (P_{i,\ell})_{i,\ell}$.

1. If the conditions of Theorem 2 hold, then $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta \in [\hat{\theta} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]^{1/2}]) \geq 1 - \alpha$.
2. If the conditions of Theorem 3 hold, then $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta \in C_\alpha^\theta(\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2})) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

**Proof of Lemma S3.1:** As in the proof of Lemma 5, it suffices for the first claim to show that $\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]$ has a positive bias in large samples and that $\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]]$ is $O_p(\mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}])$.

The second claim involves no new arguments relative to the proof of Lemma 5 and is therefore omitted. Thus, we briefly report the positive bias in $\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]$.

We have that

$$
\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_2[\hat{\theta}]] = \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}] + 4 \sum_{i:Q_i=1} \left( \sum_{\ell \neq i} C_{i\ell} x_i' \beta \right)^2 \left( (x_i - \bar{x})' \beta \right)^2 \\
+ 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_1} \hat{C}_{i\ell} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \left( \hat{\sigma}_i^2 1_{(\hat{\ell i} > 0)} + ((x_i - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 1_{(\hat{\ell i} < 0)} \right) \\
+ 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_2} \hat{C}_{i\ell} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \left( \hat{\sigma}_i^2 1_{(\hat{\ell i} > 0)} + ((x_i - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 1_{(\hat{\ell i} < 0)} \right) \\
+ 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_3} \hat{C}_{i\ell} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}^2 1_{(\hat{\ell i} > 0)} + 2 \hat{\sigma}_i^2 ((x_i - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 \\
$$
where the remainder stems from estimation of \( \hat{y} \) and \( B_1, B_2, B_3 \) refer to pairs of observations that fall in each of the three last cases in the definition of \( o_p(1) \).

The proof of the second claim contains two main parts. One part is to establish that the bias \( \hat{\Sigma}_{q,2} \) is positive semi-definite in large samples, and that \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{q,2} - I_{q+1} \) is \( o_p(1) \). These arguments are only sketched as they are analogues to those presented in the proof of Lemma 5 and the first part of this lemma. The other part is to show that this positive semi-definite asymptotic bias in the variance estimator does not alter the validity of the confidence interval based on it.

Validity. First, we let \( QQ' \) be the spectral decomposition of \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1/2} \Sigma_q ^{p} [\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1/2} \). Here, \( QQ' = Q'Q = I_{q+1} \) and all diagonal entries in the diagonal matrix \( D \) belong to \((0, 1]\) in large samples. Now,

\[
P\left( \theta \in C_{a}^{q} (\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}) \right) = P\left( \min_{(b_{q}, \theta_{q})' \in \mathcal{G}(b_{q}, \theta_{q}, \theta) = 0} \left( \hat{b}_{q} - b_{q} \right) ' \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1} \left( \hat{\theta}_{q} - \theta_{q} \right) \right) = \min_{\xi \in \hat{S}_{2}} (\xi - x)'(\xi - x),
\]

where \( \hat{S}_{2} = \{ x : x = Q'\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1/2}((b_{q}', \theta_{q})' - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{b}_{q}', \hat{\theta}_{q})']) , g(b_{q}, \theta_{q}, \theta) = 0 \} \) and the random vector \( \xi = Q'\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]^{-1/2}((b_{q}', \hat{\theta}_{q})' - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{b}_{q}', \hat{\theta}_{q})']) \) has the property that \( D^{-1/2} \xi \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{q+1}) \). From the geometric consideration in Andrews and Mikusheva (2016), it follows that \( S_{2} \) has curvature of \( \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}]) \) since curvature is invariant to rotations. Furthermore,

\[
\min_{\xi \in S_{2}} (\xi - x)'(\xi - x) \leq \rho^{2}(\|\xi_{-1}\|, |\xi_{1}|, \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}])) \leq \rho^{2}(\|D^{-1/2}\xi\|_{-1}, |D^{-1/2}\xi\|_{1}, \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}])),
\]

where \( \xi = (\xi_{1}, \xi_{-1})' \) and \( D^{-1/2} \xi = ((D^{-1/2}\xi)_{1}, (D^{-1/2}\xi)_{-1}) \) and the first inequality follows from the proof of Theorem 1 in Andrews and Mikusheva (2016). Thus,

\[
\lim \inf_{n \to \infty} P\left( \theta \in C_{a}^{q} (\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}) \right) = \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} P\left( \min_{\xi \in S_{2}} (\xi - x)'(\xi - x) \leq z_{\alpha, \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}])} \right) \geq \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} P\left( \rho^{2}(\chi_{q}, \chi_{1}, \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}])) \leq z_{\alpha, \kappa(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}])} \right) = 1 - \alpha
\]

since \((\|\xi_{-1}\|, |\xi_{1}|) \overset{d}{\to} (\chi_{q}, \chi_{1}).\)
Bias and Variability in \( \hat{\Sigma}_{q,2} \). We finish by reporting the positive semi-definite bias in \( \hat{\Sigma}_{q,2} \). We have that

\[
E[\hat{\Sigma}_{q,2}] = \Sigma_q + \sum_{i:Q_i=1} \sigma_i^2 \left( 2 \sum_{\ell \neq i} w_{\ell q} C_{\ell i} x_\ell \beta \right) \left( 2 \sum_{\ell \neq i} w_{\ell q} C_{\ell i} x_\ell \beta \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix} + O(\sqrt{\hat{\theta}}/n),
\]

where

\[
B = 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_1} \tilde{C}_{i\ell q} \sigma_i^2 (\sigma_\ell^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} > 0} + ((x_\ell - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} < 0})
+ 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_2} \tilde{C}_{i\ell q} \sigma_i^2 (\sigma_\ell^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} > 0} + ((x_i - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} < 0})
+ 2 \sum_{(i,\ell) \in B_3} \tilde{C}_{i\ell q} (\sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} > 0} + (2\sigma_i^2 ((x_\ell - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 + ((x_i - \bar{x})' \beta (x_\ell - \bar{x})' \beta)^2 1_{\tilde{C}_{i\ell q} < 0})
\]

for \( B_1, B_2, B_3 \) referring to pairs of observations that fall in each of the three last cases in the definition of \( \sigma_i^2 \sigma_\ell^2 \). Q.E.D.

S4. VERIFYING CONDITIONS

This section fills in details omitted from the discussion of Examples 1–3 in Sections 2 and 8.

EXAMPLE S1: We first derive the representations of \( \hat{\sigma}_g^2 \) given in Section 2. When there are no common regressors, the representation in (4) follows from \( B_{ii} = \frac{1}{nT_g(i)} (1 - T_g(i)/n) \) and

\[
\hat{\sigma}_g^2 = \frac{1}{T_g} \sum_{t=1}^{T_g} \sum_{s \neq t} y_{gt} \left( y_{gt} - \frac{1}{T_g} \sum_{s \neq t} y_{gs} \right) = \frac{1}{T_g} \sum_{i: g(i) = g} \hat{\sigma}_i^2,
\]

which yields that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{ii} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^{N} \left( 1 - \frac{T_g}{n} \right) \hat{\sigma}_g^2.
\]

With common regressors, it follows from the formula for block inversion of matrices that

\[
\hat{X}' = AS_{xx}^{-1}(D, X)' = \frac{1}{n} \left( (I - (I - P_D)X(X'(I - P_D)X)^{-1}X)'(D - \bar{d}1_n), 0 \right)'
= \frac{1}{n} (D - \bar{d}1_n - (I - P_D)X \hat{\Gamma}, 0),'
\]

where \( D = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)' \), \( X = (x_{g(1)\ell(i)}, \ldots, x_{g(n)\ell(i)})' \), \( P_D = DS_{dd}^{-1}D' \), \( 1_n = (1, \ldots, 1)' \), and \( S_{dd} = D'D \). Thus, it follows that

\[
\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \left( d_i - \bar{d} - \hat{\Gamma}'(x_{g(i)\ell(i)} - \bar{x}_{g(i)}) \right).
\]
The no common regressors claims are immediate. With common regressors, we have

\[ P_{it} = T_{g(i)}^{-1}1_{g(i) = g(\ell)} + n^{-1}(x_{g(i)(i)} - \bar{x}_{g(i)})'W^{-1}(x_{g(\ell)(\ell)} - \bar{x}_{g(\ell)}) = T_{g(i)}^{-1}1_{i = t} + O(n^{-1}), \]

where \( W = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{T} (x_{gt} - \bar{x}_{g})(x_{gt} - \bar{x}_{g})' \) so \( P_{it} \leq C < 1 \) in large samples. The eigenvalues of \( \tilde{A} \) are equal to the eigenvalues of

\[ \frac{1}{n} (I_N - nS_{dd}^{-1/2}d'd'S_{dd}^{-1/2}) \begin{pmatrix} I_N + \frac{1}{n}S_{dd}^{1/2}D'XW^{-1}X'DS_{dd}^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \]

which in turn satisfies that \( \frac{\lambda_i}{n} \leq \lambda_i \leq \frac{\lambda_i}{n} \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, N-1 \) and \( c_2 \geq c_1 > 0 \) not depending on \( n \). \( w'_i w_i = O(P_{ii}) \) so Theorem 1 applies when \( N \) is fixed and \( \min_g T_g \to \infty \). Finally,

\[ \max_i \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}^{-1}(\tilde{x}'_i \beta)]^2 = N^{-1}O \left( \max_{g,i} \alpha_g^2 + \|x_{gt}\|^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{g(i)(i)}\|^2 \sigma_n^2 \right), \]

\[ \max_i \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}^{-1}(\tilde{x}'_i \beta)]^2 = N^{-1}O \left( \max_{i,j} (x'_i \beta)^2 \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} |M_{\ell}| \right)^2 \right), \]

and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |M_{it}| = O(1) \) so Theorem 2 applies when \( N \to \infty \).

**Example S2:** \( A \) is diagonal with \( N \) diagonal entries of \( \frac{T_g}{nS_{zz,g}} \), so \( \lambda_g = \frac{T_g}{nS_{zz,g}} \) for \( g = 1, \ldots, N \). trace(\( \tilde{A}^2 \)) \( \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{\min_g S_{zz,g}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^{N} T_g = O(\lambda_1) \). max, \( w'_i w_i = \max_{g,i} \frac{(z_{gt} - \bar{z}_g)^2}{S_{zz,g}} = o(1) \) when \( \min_g S_{zz,g} \to \infty \). Furthermore, \( \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}^{-1}] = O\left( \frac{n^2}{N} \right) \), so

\[ \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}^{-1}] \max_i (\tilde{x}'_i \beta)^2 = O \left( \max_{g,i} \frac{z^2_{gt} \delta^2_g}{NS_{zz,g}} \right) = o(1), \]

and \( M_{it} = 0 \) if \( g(i) \neq g(\ell) \) so

\[ \mathbb{V}[\hat{\theta}^{-1}] \max_i (\tilde{x}'_i \beta)^2 = nN^{-1/2}O \left( \max_{g,i} \left( \sum_{l:g(i) = g} B_{ii} \right) \right)^2 = O \left( \max_{g,i} \left( \frac{T_g}{\sqrt{NS}_{xx,g}} \right)^2 \right) = o(1), \]

both under the condition that \( N \to \infty \) and \( \frac{\sqrt{NS}_{xx,1}}{T_1} \to \infty \). Used above:

\[ P_{it} = T_{g(i)}^{-1}1_{g(i) = g(\ell)} + \frac{(z_{g(i)(i)} - \bar{z}_{g(i)})(z_{g(\ell)(\ell)} - \bar{z}_{g(\ell)})}{S_{zz,g(i)}} 1_{g(i) = g(\ell)}, \]

\[ B_{ii} = \frac{1}{n} \frac{z_{g(i)(i)} - \bar{z}_{g(i)}}{S_{zz,g(i)}} T_{g(i)} \frac{T_{g(i)}}{S_{zz,g(i)}}. \]

Finally,

\[ \max_i w'_i w_{iq} = \max_i \frac{(z_{i} - \bar{z}_i)^2}{S_{zz,1}} = o(1) \],
where

\[ \Delta f = \hat{f} - \tilde{f}, \]

with \( \Delta f \) being the difference between \( \hat{f} \) and \( \tilde{f} \). Letting \( \hat{D} \) be a diagonal matrix that holds the diagonal of \( S_{\Delta/\Delta f} \), we have that

\[ E = \hat{D} S_{ff}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad L = \hat{D}^{-1/2} S_{\Delta/\Delta f} \hat{D}^{-1/2}. \]

S\( \Delta/\Delta f \) is rank deficient with \( S_{\Delta/\Delta f} \mathbf{1}_{\text{r}+1} = 0 \), from which it follows that the nonzero eigenvalues of \( E^{1/2} L E^{1/2} \) (which are the nonzero eigenvalues of \( S_{ff}^{-1} S_{\Delta/\Delta f} \)) are also the eigenvalues of \( S_{\Delta/\Delta f} (S_{ff}^{-1} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \cdot S_{ff}^{-1}) \). Finally, from the Woodbury formula we have that \( A_{ff} \) is invertible with

\[
A_{ff}^{-1} = n(S_{ff} - n\tilde{f}\tilde{f}^T)^{-1} = n \left( S_{ff}^{-1} + n \frac{S_{ff}^{-1} \tilde{f} \tilde{f}^T S_{ff}^{-1}}{1 - n\tilde{f}^T S_{ff}^{-1} \tilde{f}} \right) = n \left( S_{ff}^{-1} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \cdot S_{ff}^{-1} \right),
\]

so

\[
\lambda_\ell = \lambda_\ell(A_{ff} S_{\Delta/\Delta f}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{J+1-\ell} (S_{\Delta/\Delta f} A_{ff}^{-1})} = \frac{1}{n \lambda_{J+1-\ell} (E^{1/2} L E^{1/2})}.
\]

With \( E_{jj} = 1 \) for all \( j \), we have that

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{J} \lambda_\ell^2 \leq \frac{4}{(\sqrt{J} \hat{\lambda}_J)^2}
\]

for \( J = \mathbb{N} \) and \( \hat{\lambda}_J = 2 \) (Chung (1997), Lemma 1.7). An algebraic definition of Cheeger’s constant \( C \) is

\[
C = \min_{X \subset \{0, \ldots, J\}} \frac{-\sum_{j \in X} \sum_{k \notin X} S_{\Delta/\Delta f, jk}}{\sum_{j \in X} \hat{D}_{jj}},
\]
and it follows from the Cheeger inequality $\hat{\lambda}_j \geq 1 - \sqrt{1 - C^2}$ (Chung (1997), Theorem 2.3) that $\sqrt{J} \lambda_j \to \infty$ if $\sqrt{J} \mathcal{C} \to \infty$.

For the stochastic block model, we consider $J$ odd and order the firms so that the first $(J + 1)/2$ firms belongs to the first block, and the remaining firms belong to the second block. We assume that $\Delta \hat{f}_g$ is generated i.i.d. across $g$ according to

$$\Delta \hat{f} = W(1 - D) + BD,$$

where $(W, B, D)$ are mutually independent, $P(D = 1) = 1 - P(D = 0) = p_b \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $W$ is uniformly distributed on $\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1} : v'1_{J+1} = 0, v'v = 2, max_j v_j = 1, v'c = 0 \}$, and $B$ is uniformly distributed on $\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1} : v'1_{J+1} = 0, v'v = 2, max_j v_j = 1, (v'c)^2 = 4 \}$ for $c = (1_{(J+1)/2}, -1_{(J+1)/2})'$. In this model, $E_{ij} = 1$ for all $j$. The following lemma characterizes the large sample behavior of $S_{\Delta/\Delta'}$ and $\mathcal{L}$. Based on this lemma, it is relatively straightforward (but tedious) to verify the high-level conditions imposed in the paper.

**Lemma S4.1:** Suppose that \( \frac{\log(J)}{\sigma_{\mathcal{P}}} + \frac{\log(J)}{n} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) and \( J \to \infty \). Then

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}^\top \frac{J+1}{n} S_{\Delta/\Delta'} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right\| = o_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}^\top \mathcal{L} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right\| = o_p(1),$$

where \( \mathcal{L} = I_{J+1} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}'} \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} : I_{J+1} - (1 - 2p_b) \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} : \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} \) and \( \| \cdot \| \) returns the largest singular value of its argument. Additionally, \( max_i \hat{\lambda}_i |\hat{\lambda}_i - \hat{\lambda}_j| = o_p(1) \) where \( \hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \hat{\lambda}_J \) are the nonzero eigenvalues of \( \mathcal{L}^\top \).

**Proof:** First, note that

$$\frac{J+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[S_{\Delta/\Delta'}] - \mathcal{L} = \frac{2 + 2p_b}{J-1} \left( I_{J+1} - \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right) \mathcal{L} = \frac{2 + 2p_b}{J-1} \left( I_{J+1} - \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right) \mathcal{L},$$

and \( \mathcal{L}^\top = I_{J+1} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}'} \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} : I_{J+1} - (1 - \frac{1}{2p_b} \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} : \mathcal{L} \mathcal{L} \) so

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}^\top \frac{J+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[S_{\Delta/\Delta'}] - I_{J+1} + \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right\| = \left\| \frac{2 + 2p_b}{J-1} \left( I_{J+1} - \frac{1}{J+1} J_{J+1} \right) \mathcal{L} \right\| = \frac{2 + 2p_b}{J-1}.$$

Therefore, we can instead show that \( \|S\| = o_p(1) \) for the zero-mean random matrix

$$S = (\mathcal{L}^\top)^{1/2} \frac{J+1}{n} (S_{\Delta/\Delta'} - \mathbb{E}[S_{\Delta/\Delta'}]) (\mathcal{L}^\top)^{1/2} = \sum_{g=1}^{N} s_g s_g' - \mathbb{E}[s_g s_g'],$$

LEAVE-OUT ESTIMATION OF VARIANCE COMPONENTS

where $s_g = \sqrt{\frac{J+1}{n} \Delta \hat{f}_g} - \sqrt{\frac{2p_n-1}{2p_n}} \Delta \hat{f}_g \cdot \epsilon / \sqrt{J+1}$. Now, since

$$s'_g s_g = O \left( \frac{J}{n} + \frac{1}{np_b} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \sum_{g=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[s'_g s_g s'_g] \right\| = O \left( \frac{J}{n} + \frac{1}{np_b} \right),$$

Oliveira (2009, Corollary 7.1) yields that $P(\|S\| \geq t) \leq 2(J + 1) \exp(-t^2(J + 1)/ (8c + 4ct))$ for some constant $c$ not depending on $n$. Letting $t = \sqrt{\frac{\log(J/\delta_n)}{np_b}} + \frac{\log(J/\delta_n)}{n}$ for $\delta_n$ that approaches zero slowly enough that $\frac{\log(J/\delta_n)}{np_b} + \frac{\log(J/\delta_n)}{n} \to 0$ yields the conclusion that $\|S\| = o_p(1)$.

Since $\mathcal{L} = \hat{D}^{-1/2} S_{\Delta t} \hat{D}^{-1/2}$, the second conclusion follows from the first if $\|\frac{J+1}{n} \hat{D} - I_{J+1}\| = o_p(1)$. We have $\frac{J+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\hat{D}] = I_{J+1}$ and $\frac{J+1}{n} \hat{D}_{ji} = \frac{J+1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^{N} (\Delta \hat{f}_g e_j)^2$, where $e_j$ is the $j$th basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta \hat{f}_g e_j\|^2 = 1) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta \hat{f}_g e_j\|^2 = 0) = \frac{2}{J+1}$. Thus, it follows from $\forall (\frac{J+1}{n} \hat{D}_{ji} \leq 2\frac{J+1}{n} \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta \hat{f}_g e_j\|^2 = 1)$ and standard exponential inequalities that $\|\frac{J+1}{n} \hat{D} - I_{J+1}\| = \max_{j} |\frac{J+1}{n} \hat{D}_{ji} - 1| = o_p(1)$ since $\frac{\log(J)}{n} \to 0$.

Finally, we note that $\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L} - I_{J+1} + J_{J+1} J_{J+1}^\dagger\| \leq \epsilon$ implies

$$v' \mathcal{L} v(1 - \epsilon) \leq v' \mathcal{L} v \leq v' \mathcal{L} v(1 + \epsilon),$$

which together with the Courant–Fischer min-max principle yields $(1 - \epsilon) \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j} \leq (1 + \epsilon)$. Q.E.D.

Next, we will verify the high-level conditions of the paper in a model that uses $\frac{n}{J+1} \mathcal{L}$ in place of $S_{\Delta t}$ and $\frac{n}{J+1} \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ in place of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\frac{n}{J+1} I_{J+1}$ in place of $\hat{D}$. Using an underscore to denote objects from this model, we have

$$\max_{g} P_{gg} = \max_{g} \frac{J+1}{n} \Delta \hat{f}_g \mathcal{L}^\dagger \Delta \hat{f}_g = 2 \frac{J+1}{n} + 2 \frac{(1-2p_n)}{np_b} = o(1),$$

$$\text{trace}(\mathcal{A}^2) = \frac{\text{trace}(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L})}{n^2} = \frac{J - 1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{4(np_b)^2} = o(1),$$

$$\frac{\lambda_{1}^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{J} \lambda_{\ell}^2 \text{trace}(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L})} = \frac{1}{(J - 1)4p_n^2 + 1},$$

which is $o(1)$ if and only if $\sqrt{J} p_n \to \infty$, and $\frac{\lambda_{1}^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{J} \lambda_{\ell}^2} \leq \frac{1}{J}$. Furthermore,

$$\max_{g} w_{g1}^2 = n^{-1} \max_{g} (c'(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)^{1/2} \Delta \hat{f}_g)^2 = \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2p_n^2}}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{np_n} = o(1),$$

$$\max_{g} (\hat{x}_g^\dagger \beta)^2 = n^{-2} \max_{g} (\psi' \mathcal{L}^\dagger \Delta \hat{f}_g)^2 \leq 2n^{-2} \left[ \max_{g} (\Delta \hat{f}_g^2)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2p_n}\right)^2 (\bar{\psi}_{cl,1} - \bar{\psi}_{cl,2})^2 \right] = O(n^{-2} + (np_b)^{-2}),$$
which is $o(\nabla [\hat{\theta}])$ if $\sqrt{J} p_b \to \infty$ as $\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2) = O(\nabla [\hat{\theta}])$ and

$$ \max_g (\tilde{x}_g' \beta)^2 = n^{-2} \max_g (\psi' \Delta \hat{f}_g)^2 = O(n^{-2}) = o(\nabla [\hat{\theta}]). $$

Finally,

$$ \max_g (\tilde{x}_g' \beta)^2 = O\left( \sum_{g=1}^N B_{gg}^2 \right) = O\left( \max_g B_{gg} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}) \right), $$

where

$$ \max_g B_{gg} = \max_g \Delta \hat{f}_g \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \Delta \hat{f}_g = \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top + \frac{1 - 4 P_b^2}{(np_b)^2} = O(\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)), $$

$$ \text{trace}(\tilde{A}) = \frac{J - 1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{2p_b n} = o(1), $$

so $\max_g B_{gg} \text{trace}(\tilde{A}) = O(\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)) o(1)$.

Finally, we use the previous lemma to transfer the above results to their relevant sample analogues:

$$ \max_g |P_{gg} - P_{gg}| $$

$$ = \max_g \left| \Delta \hat{f}_g \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \Delta \hat{f}_g \right| $$

$$ = \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \max_g \left| \Delta \hat{f}_g \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \Delta \hat{f}_g \right| $$

$$ = O\left( \left| \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right| \right) \max_g |P_{gg} - P_{gg}| = o\left( \max_g |P_{gg} - P_{gg}| \right), $$

$$ |\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2 - \tilde{A}^2)| = \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^J \frac{1}{n^2 \lambda_\ell^2} - \frac{1}{\lambda_\ell^2} \right| = \text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2) O\left( \max_g \left| \frac{\lambda_\ell - \hat{\lambda}_\ell}{\lambda_\ell} \right| \right) = o_p(1), $$

$$ \left| \frac{\lambda_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \lambda_\ell^2} - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2} \right| = \frac{\lambda_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \lambda_\ell^2} - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2} = O\left( \frac{\lambda_\ell - \hat{\lambda}_\ell}{\lambda_\ell} \right) = o_p(1), $$

with a similar argument applying to $\frac{\lambda_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \lambda_\ell^2} - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2}{\sum_{\ell=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_\ell^2}$. Furthermore,

$$ \max_g w_{g1}^2 = \max_g \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) \left( \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right) = \left\| \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \mathcal{L}^\top \right\| \max_g |P_{gg} - P_{gg}| = o_p(1) $$. 


and \( \max_g |(\hat{x}_g \beta - \tilde{x}_g \beta)^2| = o_p(\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)) \) since

\[
\max_g (\hat{x}_g \beta - \tilde{x}_g \beta)^2 = \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \max_g \left( \Delta \hat{f}_g \ell^* \left( L \hat{S}_{/l} \hat{D} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1_{J+1} 1_{J+1}}{J+1} \right) \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{J+1}} \right)^2 \\
\leq \left\| L \hat{S}_{/l} \hat{D} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1_{J+1} 1_{J+1}}{J+1} \right\| \max_g B_{gg} \frac{\|\psi\|^2}{J+1} = o_p(\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^2)),
\]

and this also handles \( \max_g |(\hat{x}_g \beta - \tilde{x}_g \beta)^2| = o_p(1) \) as the previous result does not depend on the behavior of \( \sqrt{J} p_b \). Finally,

\[
\max_g |B_{gg} - B_{gg}| = \frac{J + 1}{n^2} \max_g \left| \Delta \hat{f}_g \ell^* \left( L \hat{S}_{/l} \hat{D} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1_{J+1} 1_{J+1}}{J+1} \right) \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{J+1}} \right| \\
\leq \left\| L \hat{S}_{/l} \hat{D} - I_{J+1} + \frac{1_{J+1} 1_{J+1}}{J+1} \right\| \max_g B_{gg} \\
= o_p(\max_g B_{gg}),
\]

\[
|\text{trace}(\tilde{A} - \tilde{A})| = \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^J \frac{1}{n\lambda_{\ell}} - \frac{1}{n\hat{\lambda}_{\ell}} \right| = \text{trace}(\tilde{A})O\left( \max_{\ell} \left| \frac{\lambda_{\ell}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\ell}} \right| \right) \\
= o_p(\text{trace}(\tilde{A})).
\]

\[\text{S5. RELATION TO EXISTING APPROACHES}\]

Next, we verify that the bias of \( \hat{\theta}_H \) is a function of the covariation between \( \sigma_i^2 \) and \( (B_{ii}, P_{ii}) \). Specifically, the bias of \( \hat{\theta}_H \) is \( \sigma_{nB_{ii}, \sigma_i^2} + S_B \frac{n}{n-k} \sigma_{P_{ii}, \sigma_i^2} \), where \( \sigma_{nB_{ii}, \sigma_i^2} = \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ii}(\sigma_i^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2), \tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2, S_B = \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ii}, \sigma_{P_{ii}, \sigma_i^2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{ii}(\sigma_i^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2). \) This is so since \( \tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i \tilde{\beta})^2 = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n M_{ii} e_i e_\ell, \) from which we get that

\[
\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_H] - \theta = \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ii} \sigma_i^2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ii} \right) \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=1}^n M_{ii} \sigma_i^2 \\
= \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ii}(\sigma_i^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2) - S_B \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=1}^n M_{ii}(\sigma_i^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2) = \sigma_{nB_{ii}, \sigma_i^2} + S_B \frac{n}{n-k} \sigma_{P_{ii}, \sigma_i^2}.
\]

From this formula and the discussion of Example 1, it immediately follows that the homoscedasticity-only estimator \( \hat{\theta}_H \) is first-order biased in unbalanced panels with heteroscedasticity.

\[\text{Comparison to Jackknife Estimators}\]

We finish by comparing the leave-out estimator \( \hat{\theta} \) to estimators predicated on jackknife bias corrections. We start by introducing some of the high-level assumptions that are typically used to motivate jackknife estimators. We then consider some variants of Examples 1 and 2 where these high-level conditions fail to hold and establish that the jackknife estimators have first-order biases while the leave-out estimator retains consistency.
**High-Level Conditions.** Jackknife bias corrections are typically motivated by the high-level assumption that the bias of a plug-in estimator $\hat{\theta}_{PI}$ shrinks with the sample size in a known way and that the bias of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\theta}_{PI-i}$ depends on sample size in an identical way, that is,

$$
\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{PI}] = \theta + \frac{D_1}{n} + \frac{D_2}{n^2},
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\theta}_{PI-i}
\right] = \theta + \frac{D_1}{n-1} + \frac{D_2}{(n-1)^2}
$$

for some $D_1, D_2$.

Under (S4), the jackknife estimator $\hat{\theta}_{JK} = n \hat{\theta}_{PI} - \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\theta}_{PI-i}$ has a bias of $-\frac{D_2}{n(n-1)}$.

For some long panel settings, the bias in $\hat{\theta}_{PI}$ is shrinking in the number of time periods $T$ such that

$$
\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{PI}] = \theta + \frac{\hat{D}_1}{T} + \frac{\hat{D}_2}{T^2}
$$

for some $\hat{D}_1, \hat{D}_2$.

In such settings, it may be that the biases of $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\theta}_{PI-t}$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta}_{PI,1} + \hat{\theta}_{PI,2})$ depend on $T$ in an identical way, that is,

$$
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\theta}_{PI-t}
\right] = \theta + \frac{\hat{D}_1}{T-1} + \frac{\hat{D}_2}{(T-1)^2}
$$

and

$$
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta}_{PI,1} + \hat{\theta}_{PI,2})
\right] = \theta + \frac{2\hat{D}_1}{T} + \frac{4\hat{D}_2}{T^2}.
$$

From here, it follows that the panel jackknife estimator $\hat{\theta}_{PJK} = T \hat{\theta}_{PI} - \frac{T-1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\theta}_{PI-t}$ has a bias of $-\frac{\hat{D}_2}{T(T-1)}$ and that the split panel jackknife estimator $\hat{\theta}_{SPJK} = 2 \hat{\theta}_{PI} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta}_{PI,1} + \hat{\theta}_{PI,2})$ has a bias of $-\frac{2\hat{D}_2}{T^2}$, both of which shrink faster to zero than $\frac{\hat{D}_1}{T}$ if $T \to \infty$. Typical sufficient conditions for bias-representations of this kind to hold (to second order) are that (i) $T \to \infty$, (ii) the design is stationary over time, and (iii) $\hat{\theta}_{PI}$ is asymptotically linear (see, e.g., Hahn and Newey (2004), Dhaene and Jochmans (2015)). Below, we illustrate that jackknife corrections can be inconsistent in Examples 1 and 2 when (i) and/or (ii) do not hold.

**Examples of Jackknife Failure**

**EXAMPLE S1—Special Case:** Consider the model

$$
y_{gt} = \alpha_g + \epsilon_{gt} \quad (g = 1, \ldots, N, t = 1, \ldots, T \geq 2),
$$

where $\sigma^2_{gt} = \sigma^2$ and suppose the parameter of interest is $\theta = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g=1}^{N} \alpha_g^2$. For $T$ even, we have the following bias calculations:

$$
\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{PI}] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T},
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\theta}_{PI-i}
\right] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T} + \frac{\sigma^2}{n(T-1)},
$$
\[
E \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\theta}_{pl,-t} \right] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T - 1}, \quad E \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\theta}_{pl,1} + \hat{\theta}_{pl,2}) \right] = \theta + \frac{2\sigma^2}{T}.
\]

The jackknife estimator \( \hat{\theta}_{JK} \) has a first-order bias of \( -\frac{\sigma^2}{T(T-1)} \), which, when \( T = 2 \), is as large as that of \( \hat{\theta}_{pl} \) but of opposite sign. By contrast, both of the panel jackknife estimators, \( \hat{\theta}_{PJK} \) and the leave-out estimator, are exactly unbiased and consistent as \( n \to \infty \) when \( T \) is fixed.

This example shows that the jackknife estimator can fail when applied to a setting where the number of regressors is large relative to sample size. Here, the number of regressors is \( N \) and the sample size is \( NT \), yielding a ratio of \( 1/T \) and \( 1/T \to 0 \) is necessary for consistency of \( \hat{\theta}_{JK} \). While the panel jackknife corrections appear to handle the presence of many regressors, this property disappears when adding the “random” coefficients of Example 2.

**EXAMPLE S2—Special Case:** Consider the model
\[
y_{gt} = \alpha_g + x_{gt} \delta_g + \varepsilon_{gt} \quad (g = 1, \ldots, N, t = 1, \ldots, T \geq 3),
\]
where \( \sigma^2_{gt} = \sigma^2 \) and \( \theta = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g=1}^{N} \delta_g^2 \).

An analytically convenient example arises when the regressor design is “balanced” across groups as follows: \( (x_{g1}, x_{g2}, \ldots, x_{gT}) = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_T) \), where \( x_1, x_2, x_3 \) take distinct values and \( \sum_{t=1}^{T} x_t = 0 \). The leave-out estimator is unbiased and consistent for any \( T \geq 3 \), whereas for even \( T \geq 4 \) we have the following bias calculations:

\[
E[\hat{\theta}_{pl}] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T}, \quad E \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\theta}_{pl,-t} \right] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s \neq t} (x_s - \bar{x}_t)^2,
\]

\[
E[\hat{\theta}_{pl,1} + \hat{\theta}_{pl,2}/2] = \theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{T/2} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{t=T/2+1}^{T} (x_t - \bar{x}_2)^2,
\]

where \( \bar{x}_t = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{s \neq t} x_s, \bar{x}_1 = \frac{3}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T/2} x_t, \) and \( \bar{x}_2 = \frac{3}{T} \sum_{t=T/2+1}^{T} x_t \).

The calculations above reveal that non-stationarity in either the level or variability of \( x_t \) over time can lead to a negative bias in panel jackknife approaches, for example,

\[
E[\hat{\theta}_{SPJK}] - \theta \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} - \frac{\sigma^2}{T/2} - \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \leq 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} x_t^2 \quad 2 \sum_{t=1}^{T/2} x_t^2 \quad 2 \sum_{t=T/2+1}^{T} x_t^2
\]
where the first inequality is strict if $\bar{x}_1 \neq \bar{x}_2$ and the second if $\sum_{i=1}^{T/2} x_i^2 \neq \sum_{i=T/2+1}^{T} x_i^2$. In fact, the following example $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_T) = (-1, 2, 0, \ldots, 0, -1)$ renders the panel jackknife corrections inconsistent for small or large $T$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{PJ}] = \theta - \frac{7/5}{6} \sigma^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{SPJ}] = \theta - \frac{8/5}{6} \sigma^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Inconsistency results here from biases of first order that are negative and larger in magnitude than the original bias of $\hat{\theta}_{PI}$ (which is $\sigma^2/6$).
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