

Supplemental Material to
ROBUST TESTS FOR WHITE NOISE AND CROSS-CORRELATION

By

Violetta Dalla, Liudas Giraitis, and Peter C.B. Phillips

April 2019

COWLES FOUNDATION DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 2194S



COWLES FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH IN ECONOMICS
YALE UNIVERSITY
Box 208281
New Haven, Connecticut 06520-8281

<http://cowles.yale.edu/>

Online Supplement to ‘Robust Tests for White Noise and Cross-Correlation’*

Violetta Dalla¹, Liudas Giraitis² and Peter C.B. Phillips³

¹National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, ²Queen Mary, University of London,

³Yale University, University of Auckland, University of Southampton, Singapore Management University

April 18, 2019

Preface

This Online Supplement comprises two separate documents (I and II). Supplement I provides proofs of all the results given in the main paper. Supplement II provides details of the full Monte Carlo experiment reported in the text of the main paper. The documents are arranged below in sequence.

*Dalla acknowledges financial support from ELKE-EKPA. Phillips acknowledges support from the Kelly Fund at the University of Auckland and a KLC Fellowship at Singapore Management University.

Online Supplement I to ‘Robust Tests for White Noise and Cross-Correlation’*

Violetta Dalla¹, Liudas Giraitis² and Peter C.B. Phillips³

¹National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, ²Queen Mary, University of London,

³Yale University, University of Auckland, University of Southampton, Singapore Management University

April 18, 2019

1 Introduction

This Supplement I provides proofs of the results given in the text of the main paper. Equation references to the main paper are denoted with the affix M as (#M) and references to theorem and proposition numbers in the main paper are signified as “Theorem #M” and “Proposition #M”. Details of the full Monte Carlo experiment are provided in Supplementary II. References used here are the same as those given in the main paper and are not listed.

2 Proofs of Results in the Main Paper

The univariate tests for the absence of autocorrelation for a time series $\{x_t\}$ in Section 2 form a special case of the bivariate tests given in Section 3 for the absence of cross-correlation between two series $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$. Setting $y_t = x_t$ simplifies the assumptions of the bivariate tests. We demonstrate next how the results of Section 3 may be used to imply those of Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1M. We show that under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1M, the bivariate series $\{x_t, y_t\}$ with $y_t = x_t$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1M.

*Dalla acknowledges financial support from ELKE-EKPA. Phillips acknowledges support from the Kelly Fund at the University of Auckland and a KLC Fellowship at Singapore Management University.

First, in such a case, (21M) holds with $\mu_x = \mu_y$, $g_t = h_t$ and $\eta_t = \varepsilon_t$, while $q_n = \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2 g_t^2 = \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^4$ and assumption (7M) on h_t implies assumption (25M) on (h_t, g_t) . Second, since in Theorem 2.1M, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a stationary ergodic m.d. sequence with respect to some σ -field \mathcal{F}_t then for any $k \geq 1$ the sequence $\omega_{tk} := \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-k}$ is an m.d. sequence with respect to the same σ -field \mathcal{F}_t . Recall that $E\varepsilon_t^4 < \infty$.

Third, we verify that the ω_{tk} satisfy Assumption A of Theorem 3.1M. Recall, that if $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a stationary ergodic sequence and $\phi(\cdot)$ is a measurable function, then the sequence $z_t = \phi(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t+1}, \dots)$ is also stationary and ergodic (Stout, 1974, Thm. 3.5.8). In addition, by Stout (1974, Cor. 3.5.2.), if $\{z_t\}$ is stationary and ergodic with $E|z_1| < \infty$ then

$$E|n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n z_t - Ez_1| \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1)$$

This implies that for any $k, j \geq 0$, $\{\omega_{tk}\}$ and $\{\omega_{tk}\omega_{tj}\}$ are stationary ergodic sequences with $E|\omega_{tk}\omega_{tj}| < \infty$, and $z_t = \omega_{tk}\omega_{tj} = \varepsilon_t^2 \varepsilon_{t-j} \varepsilon_{t-k}$ has property (1). This verifies Assumption A.

Fourth, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ satisfies Assumption B of Theorem 3.1M since the ε_t are uncorrelated variables.

Thus, all assumption of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and (27M) implies that

$$(\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_1) = (\tilde{t}_{xx,1}, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xx,1}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_{xx}) \quad (2)$$

where $R_{xx} = (r_{xx,jk}, j, k = i, \dots, m)$ is a matrix with elements $r_{xx,jk} = \text{corr}(\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_{1-j}, \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_{1-k})$. This proves (9M) and completes the proof of Theorem 2.1M. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2M. In the bivariate case $\{x_t, y_t\}$ with $y_t = x_t$ all test statistics are the same as in the univariate case discussed in Theorem 2.2M. In addition, we showed above that under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1M the assumptions of Theorem 3.1M are satisfied. Hence Theorem 3.2M implies the results of Theorem 2.2M. \square

To prove the results given in Section 3 we use the following theorem establishing the asymptotic normality of self-normalized sums of products $x_t y_{t-k}$, $t = 1, \dots, n$ with lag $k \geq 0$ of the random variables

$$x_t = h_t \varepsilon_t, \quad y_t = g_t \eta_t \quad t = \dots - 1, 0, 1, \dots \quad (3)$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ are stationary sequences, $E\varepsilon_t = E\eta_t = 0$, $E\varepsilon_t^4 < \infty$, $E\eta_t^4 < \infty$

and h_t, g_t are positive real numbers. Define

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n x_t y_{t-k}}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n x_t^2 y_{t-k}^2\right)^{1/2}}, \quad \tilde{t}_{xy,k} = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n (x_t - \bar{x})(y_{t-k} - \bar{y})}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n (x_t - \bar{x})^2 (y_{t-k} - \bar{y})^2\right)^{1/2}}. \quad (4)$$

Recall Assumption A and B and assumption (25M) on (h_t, g_t) from Section 3 which will be used in what follows.

The theorem below establishes the multivariate limit distribution of the vector $(\tilde{t}_{xy,i}^*, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xy,m}^*)$ when $\text{corr}(x_t, y_{t-k}) = 0$ for $k = i, \dots, m$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\{x_t, y_t\}$ be as in (3), and Assumption A and (25M) hold.*

If for some $0 \leq i \leq m$, $\{\varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}\}$, $k = i, \dots, m$ are m.d. sequences with respect to the same σ -field \mathcal{F}_t , then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(\tilde{t}_{xy,i}^*, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xy,m}^*) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_{xy}) \quad (5)$$

where $R_{xy} = (r_{xy,jk}, j, k = i, \dots, m)$ is a matrix with elements

$$r_{xy,jk} = \text{corr}(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j}, \varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}).$$

In particular, $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for $k = i, \dots, m$.

Corollary 2.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Assumption B, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k} = \tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* + o_p(1), \quad k = i, \dots, m, \quad (6)$$

$$(\tilde{t}_{xy,i}, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xy,m}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_{xy}). \quad (7)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Denote

$$q_{nj,k} = \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k}, \quad j, k \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Write $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}^*$ in (4) as a self-normalized sum

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^2\right)^{1/2}} \quad (9)$$

of random variables

$$\zeta_{tk} = (q_n E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-k}^2])^{-1/2} x_t y_{t-k}.$$

We will show that

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* = \sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk} + o_p(1) = s_{nk} + o_p(1), \quad s_{nk} := \sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}. \quad (10)$$

The latter follows from

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^2 \rightarrow_p 1, \quad \sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk} = O_p(1). \quad (11)$$

The first claim is shown in (38) below. Under the assumptions of the theorem, $\{\zeta_{tk}\}$ is an m.d. sequence. So, $E\zeta_t = 0$, $E[\zeta_{tk}\zeta_{sk}] = 0$ for $t \neq s$, and

$$E\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}\right)^2 = \sum_{t=k+1}^n E\zeta_{tk}^2 = q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 = q_{nk}/q_n \rightarrow 1,$$

by Lemma 2.1. Hence $\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk} = O_p(1)$ which proves the second claim in (11) and completes verification of (10).

Hence, to prove (5), i.e. $(\tilde{t}_{xy,i}^*, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xy,m}^*) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_{xy})$, it suffices to show that

$$(s_{ni}, \dots, s_{nm}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_{xy}). \quad (12)$$

By the Cramér-Wold device, the latter holds if for any real numbers a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m ,

$$S_n = \sum_{k=i}^m a_k s_{nk} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_m^2), \quad \sigma_m^2 = \sum_{j,k=i}^m a_j a_k r_{xy,jk}. \quad (13)$$

Using the definition of s_{nk} , we can write

$$S_n = \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_t, \quad \tilde{\zeta}_t := \sum_{k=i}^m I(t \geq k+1) a_k (q_n E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-k}^2])^{-1/2} x_t y_{t-k}. \quad (14)$$

Under the assumptions of the theorem, $\{\tilde{\zeta}_t\}$ is an m.d. sequence with finite variance $E\tilde{\zeta}_t^2 < \infty$. Hence, by Theorem 3.2 of Hall and Heyde (1980), to prove (13) it suffices to show that

$$(a) \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_t^2 \rightarrow_p \sigma_m^2, \quad (b) \max_{t=1, \dots, n} |\tilde{\zeta}_t| \rightarrow_p 0, \quad (c) E[\max_{t=1, \dots, n} \tilde{\zeta}_t^2] = O(1). \quad (15)$$

Denote $\omega_{tk} = \varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}$. We have

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_t^2 = \sum_{j,k=i}^m a_j a_k (E\omega_{1j}^2 E\omega_{1k}^2)^{-1/2} \left(q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n x_t^2 y_{t-k}^2 \right).$$

Under the assumptions of the theorem, by (38) of Lemma 2.2 below,

$$q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n x_t^2 y_{t-k}^2 \rightarrow_p E[\omega_{1j}\omega_{1k}].$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_t^2 \rightarrow \sum_{j,k=i}^m a_j a_k (E\omega_{1j}^2 E\omega_{1k}^2)^{-1/2} E[\omega_{1j}\omega_{1k}] = \sum_{j,k=i}^m a_j a_k r_{xy,jk} = \sigma_m^2$$

which proves (15)(a).

To prove (15)(b), notice that

$$|\tilde{\zeta}_t| \leq c_0 \sum_{k=i}^m |\zeta_{tk}| I(t \geq k+1), \quad c_0 := \max_{k=i, \dots, m} |a_k|.$$

To show that $P(\max_{t=1, \dots, n} |\tilde{\zeta}_t| \geq \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$, it suffices to prove that for $k = i, \dots, m$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P(\max_{t=k+1, \dots, n} |\zeta_{tk}| \geq \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

We have

$$P(\max_{t=k+1, \dots, n} |\zeta_{tk}| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{t=k+1}^n P(|\zeta_{tk}| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n E\zeta_{tk}^2 I(\zeta_{tk}^2 \geq \varepsilon^2). \quad (16)$$

Write $\zeta_{tk}^2 = c_{tk}\omega_{tk}^2$, where $c_{tk} = (q_n E\omega_{tk}^2)^{-1} h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2$. By (25M),

$$\max_{t=1, \dots, n} c_{tk} \leq C q_n^{-1} \max_{t=1, \dots, n} h_t^2 \max_{t=1, \dots, n} g_t^2 =: \delta_n = o(1).$$

Therefore, $\zeta_{tk}^2 \leq \delta_n \omega_{tk}^2$. By the assumptions of the theorem, $\{\omega_{tk}^2\}$ is a stationary sequence such that $E\omega_{1k}^2 < \infty$. Hence,

$$P(\max_{t=k+1, \dots, n} |\zeta_{tk}| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{tk} E\omega_{tk}^2 I(\omega_{tk}^2 \geq \delta_n^{-1} \varepsilon^2) = (\sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{tk}) E\omega_{1k}^2 I(\omega_{1k}^2 \geq \delta_n^{-1} \varepsilon^2) = o(1)$$

because $\sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{tk} = (E\omega_{1k}^2)^{-1} q_{nkk}/q_n \rightarrow (E\omega_{1k}^2)^{-1}$ by (33), and $E\omega_{1k}^2 I(\omega_{1k}^2 \geq \delta_n^{-1} \varepsilon^2) \rightarrow 0$ since $E\omega_{1k}^2 < \infty$ and $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$. This proves (b). (15)(c) can be shown using a similar argument. This proves (13) and (5) and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.1. Denote $\zeta_{tk}^* = (q_n E\omega_{tk}^2)^{-1/2}(x_t - \bar{x})(y_{t-k} - \bar{y})$. Then

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k} = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^*}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^{*2}\right)^{1/2}} = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk} + R_{n1}}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^2 + R_{n2}\right)^{1/2}} \quad (17)$$

where ζ_{tk} is defined as in (9) and

$$R_{n1} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n (\zeta_{tk}^* - \zeta_{tk}), \quad R_{n2} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n (\zeta_{tk}^{*2} - \zeta_{tk}^2).$$

In (39) and (40) we show that

$$R_{n1} = o_p(1), \quad R_{n2} = o_p(1). \quad (18)$$

Together with (17) this implies

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k} = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk} + o_p(1)}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^2 + o_p(1)\right)^{1/2}} = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}}{\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}^2\right)^{1/2}} + o_p(1) = \tilde{t}_{xy,k}^* + o_p(1). \quad (19)$$

This verifies (6) and together with (5) proves (7). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1M. The claim of the theorem is shown in Corollary 2.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2M. Suppose for simplicity that $\mu_x = \mu_y = 0$. First we show that $\hat{r}_{xy,jk} \rightarrow_p r_{xy,jk}$.

Under the assumptions of the theorem, (38) and (40) of Lemma 2.2 imply that for $j, k = i, \dots, m$,

$$q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e_{xy,tj} e_{xy,tk} \rightarrow E[(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j})(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k})].$$

This together with definition (30M) implies

$$\hat{r}_{xy,jk} \rightarrow \frac{E[(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j})(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k})]}{(E(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j})^2)^{1/2} (E(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k})^2)^{1/2}} = \text{corr}(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j}, \varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}) = r_{xy,jk}$$

because by assumption $\{\varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}\}$ is an m.d. sequence and therefore $E[\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}] = 0$.

Next we show that $\hat{r}_{xy,jk}^* \rightarrow_p r_{xy,jk}$ for any $\lambda > 0$. Since $\hat{r}_{xy,jk} \rightarrow_p r_{xy,jk}$, then

$$\hat{r}_{xy,jk}^* = \hat{r}_{xy,jk} I(|\tau_{xy,jk}| > \lambda) = (r_{xy,jk} + o_p(1)) I(|\tau_{xy,jk}| > \lambda). \quad (20)$$

If $r_{xy,jk} = 0$, then $|\hat{r}_{xy,jk}^*| \leq |\hat{r}_{xy,jk}| \rightarrow |r_{xy,jk}| = 0$.

Let $r_{xy,jk} \neq 0$. To show $\widehat{r}_{xy,jk}^* \rightarrow_p r_{xy,jk}$, in view of (20), it suffices to prove that $I(|\tau_{xy,jk}| > \lambda) \rightarrow_p 1$. To prove the latter we will show that

$$|\tau_{xy,jk}| \rightarrow_p \infty. \quad (21)$$

Write $\tau_{xy,jk} = A_n/B_n^{1/2}$ where

$$A_n = q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e_{xy,tj} e_{xy,tk}, \quad B_n = q_n^{-2} \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e_{xy,tj}^2 e_{xy,tk}^2.$$

We will prove (21) by showing that

$$A_n \rightarrow E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}] = \text{cov}(\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-j}, \varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}) \neq 0, \quad B_n = o_p(1). \quad (22)$$

The results (38) and (40) of Lemma 2.2 imply the claim about A_n in (22).

To evaluate B_n , denote $e'_{xy,tk} = x_t y_{t-k}$. Then

$$e_{xy,tj}^2 e_{xy,tk}^2 - e'_{xy,tj} e'_{xy,tk} = (e_{xy,tj}^2 - e'_{xy,tj} e'_{xy,tj})(e_{xy,tk}^2 - e'_{xy,tk} e'_{xy,tk}) + e'_{xy,tk} (e_{xy,tj}^2 - e'_{xy,tj} e'_{xy,tj}) + e'_{xy,tj} (e_{xy,tk}^2 - e'_{xy,tk} e'_{xy,tk}).$$

Hence, setting $v_{nk} = \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n |e_{xy,tk}^2 - e'_{xy,tk} e'_{xy,tk}|$, $q'_{nkk} = \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e'_{xy,tk}^2$, we obtain

$$i_n := \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n |e_{xy,tj}^2 e_{xy,tk}^2 - e'_{xy,tj} e'_{xy,tk}| \leq v_{nj} v_{nk} + q'_{nkk} v_{nj} + q'_{njj} v_{nk}.$$

Since $v_{nk} = o_p(q_n)$ by (40) of Lemma 2.2, and $q'_{nkk} = O_p(q_n)$ by (55), this implies $i_n = o_p(q_n^2)$. To prove $B_n = o_p(1)$, it remains to show that

$$i'_n := \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e'_{xy,tj} e'_{xy,tk} = o_p(q_n^2). \quad (23)$$

First observe that by (25M),

$$\tilde{\delta}_{nk} := \max_{t=k+1, \dots, n} h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 \leq \max_{t=1, \dots, n} h_t^2 \max_{t=1, \dots, n} g_t^2 = o(q_n).$$

Therefore, there exists $\nu_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\tilde{\delta}_{nk} \nu_n = o(q_n)$.

Recall that $e'_{xy,tk} = x_t^2 y_{t-k}^2 = h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 \omega_{tk}^2$ where $\omega_{tk}^2 = \varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-k}^2$. Bound ω_{tk}^2 as $\omega_{tk}^2 \leq \omega_{tk}^2 I(\omega_{tk}^2 \geq \nu_n) + \nu_n$. Setting $z_{ntk} = \omega_{tk}^2 I(\omega_{tk}^2 \geq \nu_n)$, we obtain, $e'_{xy,tk} \leq \nu_n \tilde{\delta}_{nk} +$

$h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
i'_n &\leq \nu_n \tilde{\delta}_n \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e'_{xy,tj}{}^2 + \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk} e'_{xy,tj}{}^2 \\
&\leq \nu_n \tilde{\delta}_n q'_{njj} + \left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk} \right) \left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n e'_{xy,tj}{}^2 \right) \\
&= \nu_n \tilde{\delta}_n q'_{njj} + \left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk} \right) q'_{njj} \\
&= o_p(q_n^2) + \left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk} \right) O_p(q_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$E\left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 z_{ntk} \right) = \left(\sum_{t=\max(j,k)+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 \right) E z_{n1k} = q_{nkk} E[z_{n1k}] = o(q_n)$$

because $q_{nkk} = O(q_n)$ by Lemma 2.1 and $E z_{n1k} = E[\omega_{1k}^2 I(\omega_{1k}^2 \geq \nu_n)] \rightarrow 0$ because $\nu_n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies $i'_n = o_p(q_n^2)$ which proves (23) and completes the proof of (33M).

Thus, $\hat{R}_{xy} \rightarrow_p R_{xy}$ and $\hat{R}_{xy}^* \rightarrow_p R_{xy}$. This together with (28M) proves (34M) which completes the proof of theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3M. By assumption $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is an m.d. sequence with respect to some σ -field \mathcal{F}_t and $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ are mutually independent sequences. Therefore for $k = \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots$ $\{\varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}\}$ are m.d. sequences with respect to the σ -field $\mathcal{F}_{nt}^* = \mathcal{F}_t \cup \sigma(\eta_s, s = 1, \dots, n)$, i.e. $E[\varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k} | \mathcal{F}_{n,t-1}^*] = 0$. Moreover, for any negative or positive integers j, k ,

$$\text{corr}(\varepsilon_t \eta_{t-j}, \varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}) = \text{corr}(\eta_j, \eta_k).$$

Clearly, Corollary 2.1 implies convergence $\tilde{t}_{xy} = (\tilde{t}_{xy,0}, \dots, \tilde{t}_{xy,m}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_y)$ in (35M) and together with Theorem 3.2M proves (36M).

The same argument as in the proof of (6) and (10) implies that

$$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}^* = s_{yx,nk} + o_p(1), \quad s_{yx,nk} := \sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{yx,nk} \quad (24)$$

where $\zeta_{yx,nk} = (q_n E[\eta_1^2 \varepsilon_{1-k}^2])^{-1/2} y_t x_{t-k}$. Rewriting $s_{yx,nk}$ as

$$s_{yx,nk} = (q_n E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-k}^2])^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} x_t y_{t+k} = s_{n(-k)}$$

we arrive at the sum as in (10) where y_{t+k} appears with a negative lag. Since for any integer k , $\{\varepsilon_t \eta_{t+k}\}$ is an m.d. sequence with respect to σ -field \mathcal{F}_{nt}^* , the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.2M implies convergence $\tilde{t}_{yx} = (\tilde{t}_{yx,0}, \dots, \tilde{t}_{yx,m}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, R_y)$

in (35M), and the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.2M implies (37M). \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1M. Properties (6) and (10) do not require $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ or $\{\eta_t\}$ to be an m.d. sequence and hold under assumptions of the proposition. They imply (38M),

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k} = s_{nk} + o_p(1). \quad (25)$$

By definition (10), we have $s_{nk} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n \zeta_{tk}$, $\zeta_{tk} = (q_n E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-k}^2])^{-1/2} h_t g_{t-k} \omega_{tk}$, $\omega_{tk} = \varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}$.

Clearly, $E s_{nk} = 0$ since $E \omega_{tk} = 0$. Moreover,

$$\gamma_{\omega,t-s} := \text{cov}(\omega_{tk}, \omega_{sk}) = \text{cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_s) \text{cov}(\eta_{t-k}, \eta_{s-k}) = \gamma_{\varepsilon,t-s} \gamma_{\eta,t-s}.$$

By mutual independence of $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$,

$$r_j := \gamma_{\omega,j} / E[\varepsilon_1^2] E[\eta_1^2] = \text{corr}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_{1-j}) \text{corr}(\eta_1, \eta_{1-j}).$$

Moreover, under Assumption B, $\sum_j |r_j| < \infty$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E s_{nk}^2 &= \sum_{t,s=k+1}^n E[\zeta_{tk} \zeta_{sk}] = q_n^{-1} \sum_{t,s=k+1}^n h_t g_{t-k} h_s g_{s-k} r_{t-s} \\ &= q_n^{-1} \sum_{t,s=k+1:|t-s|>L} [\dots] + q_n^{-1} \sum_{t,s=k+1:|t-s|\leq L} [\dots] =: \nu_{n,1} + \nu_{n,2} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $L > 0$ is a fixed large number. Bound

$$\nu_{n,1} \leq q_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{|j|>L} |r_j| \right) = q_n^{-1} q_{nk} \left(\sum_{|j|>L} |r_j| \right). \quad (27)$$

By (33), $q_n^{-1} q_{nk} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while $\sum_{|j|>L} |r_j| \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\nu_{n,1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$.

Next we will show that for any fixed L , as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\nu_{n,2} \rightarrow \sum_{|j|\leq L} r_j. \quad (28)$$

Let $t - s = \ell$ where $\ell \geq 0$ is fixed. Then, $s = t - \ell$, and

$$q_n^{-1} \sum_{t,s=k+1}^n h_t g_{t-k} h_s g_{s-k} r_{t-s} = q_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t g_{t-k} h_{t-\ell} g_{t-\ell-k} \right) r_\ell \rightarrow r_\ell$$

by the first claim in (34) below, which proves (28).

Since $\sum_{|j| \leq L} r_j \rightarrow \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} r_j = \sigma_{xy}^2$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$, this proves $E s_{nk}^2 \rightarrow \sigma_{xy}^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ which completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.4M. Denote $\nu_n = \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t g_{t-k} \omega_{tk}$. By (25),

$$\tilde{t}_{xy,k} = s_{nk} + o_p(1) = (q_n E[\omega_{1k}^2])^{-1/2} \nu_n + o_p(1).$$

We will show

$$E \nu_n = E[\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}] (\sum_{t=1}^n h_t g_t) (1 + o(1)), \quad \text{var}(\nu_n) = O(q_n). \quad (29)$$

This implies $q_n^{-1/2} \nu_n = q_n^{-1/2} (\sum_{t=1}^n h_t g_t) E[\varepsilon_1 \eta_{1-k}] (1 + o_p(1))$ which proves (41M).

Under assumption (40M), $E \nu_n = (\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t g_{t-k}) E \omega_{1k} = E \omega_{1k} (\sum_{t=1}^n h_t g_t) (1 + o(1))$.

Under (39M), the same argument as in the proof $\text{var}(s_{nk}) \rightarrow \sigma_{xy}^2$ in Proposition 3.1M implies that $\text{var}(\nu_n) = O(q_n)$ which completes the proof of (29) and the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1M. We will verify (43M). (Proof of (44M) follows using a similar argument). Denote $\xi_{tk} = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-k}$, $|\xi|_{tk} = (|\varepsilon_t| - E|\varepsilon_t|)(|\varepsilon_{t-k}| - E|\varepsilon_{t-k}|)$. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{x,k} &= \tilde{\tau}_{x,k} + o_p(1), \quad \tilde{\tau}_{x,k} := \frac{1}{\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2 (n-k)^{1/2}} \sum_{t=k+1}^n \xi_{tk} \\ \tau_{|x|,k} &= \tilde{\tau}_{|x|,k} + o_p(1), \quad \tilde{\tau}_{|x|,k} := \frac{1}{\sigma_{|\varepsilon|}^2 (n-k)^{1/2}} \sum_{t=k+1}^n |\xi|_{tk}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, to prove (43M), it suffices to show that

$$(\tilde{\tau}_{x,1}, \tilde{\tau}_{|x|,1}, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_{x,m}, \tilde{\tau}_{|x|,m}) \rightarrow_D \mathcal{N}(0, V_{x,|x|,2m}). \quad (30)$$

Observe that for any $k \geq 1$, $\{\xi_{tk}\}$, $\{|\xi|_{tk}\}$ are m.d. sequences with respect to the σ -field $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\varepsilon_s, s \leq t)$. Moreover, $E \xi_{tk}^2 = E[\varepsilon_t^2 \varepsilon_{t-k}^2] = \sigma_{\varepsilon}^4$,

$$E|\xi|_{tk}^2 = (E[(|\varepsilon_t| - E|\varepsilon_t|)^2])^2 = \sigma_{|\varepsilon|}^4, \quad E[\xi_{tk} |\xi|_{tk}] = (E[\varepsilon_t (|\varepsilon_t| - E|\varepsilon_t|)])^2 = \text{cov}^2(\varepsilon_1, |\varepsilon_1|).$$

In addition, for $k > j \geq 1$, $E[\xi_{tk} \xi_{tj}] = 0$, $E[|\xi|_{tk} |\xi|_{tj}] = 0$, $E[\xi_{tk} |\xi|_{tj}] = 0$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n \xi_{tk}^2 &\rightarrow E \xi_{1k}^2 = \sigma_{\varepsilon}^4, \quad n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n |\xi|_{tk}^2 \rightarrow E|\xi|_{1k}^2 = \sigma_{|\varepsilon|}^4, \quad (31) \\ n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n \xi_{tk} |\xi|_{tk} &\rightarrow E[\xi_{tk} |\xi|_{tk}] = \text{cov}^2(\varepsilon_1, |\varepsilon_1|). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that an i.i.d. sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is ergodic. Therefore ξ_{tk}^2 , $|\xi|_{tk}^2$ and $\xi_{tk} |\xi|_{tk}$ are also ergodic sequences since they are measurable functions $f(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-k})$ of the ergodic

sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. The latter implies (31), see Remark 2.1. Hence, (30) follows using the same argument as in the proof of (12). \square

To prove Theorem 2.1 we use the following technical lemma. Recall the definition of q_n and q_{nkj} given in (25M) and (8). Set

$$\begin{aligned} q_{nik} &= \sum_{t=\max(i,j,k)+1}^n h_t h_{t-i} g_{t-j} g_{t-k}, \\ \Delta_{nik} &= \sum_{t=\max(j,k)+2}^n |h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k} - h_{t-1}^2 g_{t-1-j} g_{t-1-k}|. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $h_t, g_t, t \geq 1$ satisfy (25M) and $k \geq i, j \geq 1$ be fixed. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$q_n - q_{nik} = o(q_n), \quad q_{nik}/q_n \rightarrow 1, \quad (33)$$

$$q_n - q_{nik} = o(q_n), \quad \Delta_{nik} = o(q_n). \quad (34)$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We have

$$|q_n - q_{nik}| \leq \sum_{t=1}^k h_t^2 g_t^2 + \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 |g_t^2 - g_{t-j} g_{t-k}|. \quad (35)$$

By (25M), $\sum_{t=1}^k h_t^2 g_t^2 \leq k \max_{t=1, \dots, n} h_t^2 \max_{t=1, \dots, n} g_t^2 = o(q_n)$. Next we show that

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 |g_t^2 - g_{t-j} g_{t-k}| = o(q_n). \quad (36)$$

Assumption (25M) implies that

$$\delta_n := \left(\sum_{t=1}^n h_t^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=2}^n (g_t - g_{t-1})^4 \right)^{1/2} / \left(\sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2 g_t^2 \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

We have $g_t^2 - g_{t-j} g_{t-k} = g_t(g_t - g_{t-j}) + g_t(g_t - g_{t-k}) + (g_{t-j} - g_t)(g_t - g_{t-k})$. Using the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |g_t(g_t - g_{t-k})| &= |\delta_n^{1/4} g_t \delta_n^{-1/4} (g_t - g_{t-k})| \leq \delta_n^{1/2} g_t^2 + \delta_n^{-1/2} (g_t - g_{t-k})^2, \\ |(g_{t-j} - g_t)(g_t - g_{t-k})| &\leq (g_{t-j} - g_t)^2 + (g_t - g_{t-k})^2, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain $|g_t^2 - g_{t-j}g_{t-k}| \leq 2\delta_n^{1/2}g_t^2 + (\delta_n^{-1/2} + 1)[(g_t - g_{t-j})^2 + (g_t - g_{t-k})^2]$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 |g_t^2 - g_{t-j}g_{t-k}| &\leq 2\delta_n^{1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_t^2 \\ &\quad + (\delta_n^{-1/2} + 1) \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 [(g_t - g_{t-j})^2 + (g_t - g_{t-k})^2] \\ &\leq 2\delta_n^{1/2} q_n + (\delta_n^{-1/2} + 1) \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^4 \right)^{1/2} \left[\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n (g_t - g_{t-j})^4 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n (g_t - g_{t-k})^4 \right)^{1/2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $(a_1 + \dots + a_k)^4 \leq k^3(a_1^4 + \dots + a_k^4)$, we obtain

$$(g_t - g_{t-j})^4 = [(g_t - g_{t-1}) + (g_{t-1} - g_{t-2}) + \dots + (g_{t-j+1} - g_{t-j})]^4 \leq j^3 [(g_t - g_{t-1})^4 + \dots + (g_{t-j+1} - g_{t-j})^4].$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n (g_t - g_{t-j})^4 \leq j^4 \sum_{t=2}^n (g_t - g_{t-1})^4$$

which together with definition of δ_n implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 |g_t^2 - g_{t-j}g_{t-k}| &\leq 2\delta_n^{1/2} q_n + (\delta_n^{-1/2} + 1)(j^2 + k^2) \left(\sum_{t=1}^n h_t^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=2}^n (g_t - g_{t-1})^4 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= 2\delta_n^{1/2} q_n + (\delta_n^{-1/2} + 1)(j^2 + k^2) \delta_n q_n = o(q_n) \end{aligned}$$

since $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$.

This proves (36) and together with (35) proves the claim $q_n - q_{nj} = o(q_n)$ of (33). The latter implies $q_{nj}/q_n = 1 - (q_n - q_{nj})/q_n \rightarrow 1$.

Next we show the claim $q_{nij} - q_n = o(q_n)$ in (34). We have $h_t h_{t-i} g_{t-j} g_{t-k} = -h_t^2 g_{t-j}^2 + h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k} + h_t h_{t-i} g_{t-j}^2 + h_t (h_{t-i} - h_t) g_{t-j} (g_{t-k} - g_{t-j})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{nij} &= \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t h_{t-i} g_{t-j} g_{t-k} = q_n + (q_n - \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-j}^2) + \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k} - q_n \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t h_{t-i} g_{t-j}^2 - q_n \right) + \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t (h_{t-i} - h_t) g_{t-j} (g_{t-k} - g_{t-j}) \right) \\ &=: q_n + v_{n,1} + v_{n,2} + v_{n,3} + v_{n,4} = q_n + o(q_n) + v_{n,4} \end{aligned}$$

because $v_{n,\ell} = o(q_n)$ for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ by relation $q_{nj} - q_n = o(q_n)$ shown above in (33).

By the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{n,4}| &\leq \left(\sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^4 \sum_{t=k+1}^n (h_{t-i} - h_t)^4 \sum_{t=k+1}^n g_{t-j}^4 \sum_{t=k+1}^n (g_{t-k} - g_{t-j})^4 \right)^{1/4} \\ &\leq \left(|k-j|^4 \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^4 \sum_{t=2}^n (g_t - g_{t-1})^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(i^4 \sum_{t=1}^n g_t^4 \sum_{t=2}^n (h_t - h_{t-1})^4 \right)^{1/4} = o(q_n) \end{aligned}$$

by (25M) which proves $q_{nijk} - q_n = o(q_n)$.

We complete the proof of lemma by showing the last claim in (34), $\Delta_{njk} = o(q_n)$. Since $h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k} - h_{t-1}^2 g_{t-1-j} g_{t-1-k} = h_t^2 (g_{t-j} g_{t-k} - g_t^2) - h_{t-1}^2 (g_{t-1-j} g_{t-1-k} - g_{t-1}^2) + (h_t^2 g_t^2 - h_{t-1}^2 g_{t-1}^2)$, we can bound

$$\Delta_{njk} \leq \sum_{t=k+2}^n h_t^2 |g_{t-j} g_{t-k} - g_t^2| + \sum_{t=k+2}^n h_{t-1}^2 |g_{t-1-j} g_{t-1-k} - g_{t-1}^2| + \sum_{t=k+2}^n |h_t^2 g_t^2 - g_{t-1}^2 h_{t-1}^2|.$$

By (36) the first and the second sum is $o(q_n)$. We can bound the last sum by

$$\sum_{t=k+2}^n |h_t^2 g_t^2 - g_{t-1}^2 h_{t-1}^2| \leq \sum_{t=k+2}^n h_t^2 |g_t^2 - g_{t-1}^2| + \sum_{t=k+2}^n g_{t-1}^2 |h_t^2 - h_{t-1}^2|.$$

By (36) and under assumption (25M), the latter is $o(q_n)$ which completes the proof. \square

Recall the notation $e'_{tk} = x_t y_{t-k} = h_t g_{t-k} \varepsilon_t \eta_{t-k}$ used in the proof of Theorem 3.2M and $e_{tk} = (x_t - \bar{x})(y_{t-k} - \bar{y})$ in (22M), respectively. We drop the subscript xy in e'_{tk} and e_{tk} for simplicity in what follows.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $h_t, g_t, t \geq 1$ satisfy (25M). Assume that for some $k \geq j \geq 0$, $\{\varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-j} \eta_{t-k}\}$ is a stationary sequence, $E|\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}| < \infty$, and as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$E \left| (n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n \varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-j} \eta_{t-k}) - E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}] \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (37)$$

Then,

$$q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tj} e'_{tk} \rightarrow_p E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}]. \quad (38)$$

In addition, if Assumption B holds, then

$$q_n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n e_{tk} - q_n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tk} \rightarrow_p 0, \quad (39)$$

$$q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n |e_{tj} e_{tk} - e'_{tj} e'_{tk}| \rightarrow_p 0. \quad (40)$$

In particular, (37) holds if $\{\varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-j} \eta_{t-k}\}$ is an ergodic sequence.

To prove Lemma 2.2, we shall use the following result.

Lemma 2.3. (Dalla, Giraitis and Koul (2014), Lemma 10). Let $T_n = \sum_{t=1}^n c_{nt} V_t$, where $\{V_t\}$ is a stationary ergodic sequence, $E|V_1| < \infty$, and c_{nt} are real numbers such that for some $0 < \alpha_n < \infty$, $n \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^n |c_{nt}| = O(\alpha_n), \quad |c_{n1}| + \sum_{t=2}^n |c_{nt} - c_{n,t-1}| = o(\alpha_n). \quad (41)$$

Then $E|T_n - ET_n| = o(\alpha_n)$.

Remark 2.1. The proof of Lemma 2.3 in Dalla, Giraitis and Koul (2014) uses the property

$$E\left|(n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n V_t) - EV_1\right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (42)$$

of ergodic sequence $\{V_t\}$, see Stout (1974, Cor. 3.5.2). Lemma 2.3 remains valid if the assumption of ergodicity of $\{V_t\}$ is replaced by assumption (42).

Proof of Lemma 2.2. The proof is based on Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.1. Denote the left hand side of (38) by T_n . Write

$$T_n = \sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{nt} V_t, \quad (43)$$

where stationary series $V_t = \varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-j} \eta_{t-k}$ satisfies (42) and $c_{nt} = q_n^{-1} h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k}$. Next we show that c_{nt} satisfies (41) with $\alpha_n = 1$

In particular, we show that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{nt} \rightarrow 1, \quad c_{n,k+1} + \sum_{t=k+2}^n |c_{nt} - c_{n,t-1}| = o(1). \quad (44)$$

By (33), $\sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{nt} = q_n^{-1} q_{njk} \rightarrow 1$ which proves the first claim in (44). By definition (32) of Δ_{njk} and (34),

$$\sum_{t=k+2}^n |c_{nt} - c_{n,t-1}| \leq q_n^{-1} \Delta_{njk} = o(1).$$

By definition of c_{nt} and (25M),

$$|c_{n,t}| = q_n^{-1} h_t^2 |g_{t-j} g_{t-k}| \leq q_n^{-1} \max_{k=1, \dots, n} h_k^2 \max_{k=1, \dots, n} g_k^2 = o(1).$$

This proves the second claim in (44).

Thus, by Lemma 2.3, $E|T_n - ET_n| \rightarrow 0$. Observe that

$$ET_n = \sum_{t=k+1}^n c_{nt} EV_t = E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}] q_n^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-j} g_{t-k} = E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}] q_n^{-1} q_{nj} k$$

where $q_n^{-1} q_{nj} k \rightarrow 1$ by (33). Hence, $T_n = ET_n + o_p(1) = E[\varepsilon_1^2 \eta_{1-j} \eta_{1-k}] + o_p(1)$ which proves (38).

Proof of (39). It suffices to show that

$$r_{n1} := \sum_{t=k+1}^n (e_{tk} - e'_{tk}) = o_p(q_n^{1/2}). \quad (45)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{tk} - e'_{tk} &= \bar{x}\bar{y} - \bar{y}x_t - \bar{x}y_{t-k}, \\ r_{n1} &= \sum_{t=k+1}^n (\bar{x}\bar{y} - \bar{y}x_t - \bar{x}y_{t-k}) = (n-k)\bar{x}\bar{y} - 2n\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{y} \sum_{t=1}^k x_t + \bar{x} \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n y_t. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Hence,

$$|r_{n1}| \leq 3n|\bar{x}\bar{y}| + |\bar{y}| \left| \sum_{t=1}^k x_t \right| + |\bar{x}| \left| \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n y_t \right|. \quad (47)$$

We will show below that for any fixed $k \geq 1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x} &= o_p(n^{-1/2} q_n^{1/4}), & \sum_{t=1}^k x_t &= o_p(q_n^{1/4}), & \sum_{t=1}^n x_t^2 &= o_p(nq_n^{1/2}) \\ \bar{y} &= o_p(n^{-1/2} q_n^{1/4}), & \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n y_t &= o_p(q_n^{1/4}), & \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 &= o_p(nq_n^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Together with (47) this implies $r_{n1} = o_p(q_n^{1/2})$ which verifies (45). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} E\bar{x}^2 &\leq Cn^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2, & E\bar{y}^2 &\leq Cn^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^n g_t^2, \\ E\left| \sum_{t=1}^k x_t \right| &\leq E|\varepsilon_1| \sum_{t=1}^k |h_t|, & E\left| \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n y_t \right| &\leq E|\eta_1| \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n |g_t|. \\ E\sum_{t=1}^n x_t^2 &\leq E\varepsilon_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2, & E\sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 &\leq E\eta_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^n g_t^2. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Indeed, by Assumption B, the stationary sequences $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ have absolutely summable autocovariance functions $\gamma_{\varepsilon,k}$ and $\gamma_{\eta,k}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E\bar{x}^2 &= n^{-2} \sum_{t,s=1}^n h_t h_s \text{cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_s) \leq 2n^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |\text{cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-k})| \\ &= Cn^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^n h_t^2, \quad C = 2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_{\varepsilon,k}| < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

which proves the first claim in (49). The claim for $E\bar{y}^2$ follows using similar arguments, and the remaining bounds in (49) are obvious.

Now we are ready to prove (48). By assumption (25M), $\max_{t=1,\dots,n} h_t^2 = o(q_n^{1/2})$ and $\max_{t=1,\dots,n} g_t^2 = o(q_n^{1/2})$. Hence from (49) we obtain $E\bar{x}^2 = O(n^{-1}q_n^{1/2})$, $E|\sum_{t=1}^k x_t| = o(q_n^{1/4})$ and $E\sum_{t=1}^n x_t^2 = o(nq_n^{1/2})$ which implies the claimed orders for the sums involving the x_t 's in (48). The claimed orders for the sums involving the y_t 's follow using the same argument.

Proof of (40). It suffices to show that

$$r_{n2} := \sum_{t=k+1}^n |e_{tj}e_{tk} - e'_{tj}e'_{tk}| = o_p(q_n). \quad (51)$$

We have, $e_{tj}e_{tk} - e'_{tj}e'_{tk} = (e_{tj} - e'_{tj})(e_{tk} - e'_{tk}) + e'_{tk}(e_{tj} - e'_{tj}) + e'_{tj}(e_{tk} - e'_{tk})$. So, setting $D_{nk} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n (e_{tk} - e'_{tk})^2$,

$$|r_{n2}| \leq D_{nj}^{1/2} D_{nk}^{1/2} + D_{nj}^{1/2} (\sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tk}{}^2)^{1/2} + D_{nk}^{1/2} (\sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tj}{}^2)^{1/2}. \quad (52)$$

We will show that

$$(a) \ D_{nk} = o_p(q_n), \quad (b) \ \sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tk}{}^2 = O_p(q_n), \quad (53)$$

which together with (52) implies $r_{n2} = o_p(q_n)$ proving (51).

First we show (a). By (46),

$$\begin{aligned} (e_{tk} - e'_{tk})^2 &= (\bar{x}\bar{y} - \bar{y}x_t - \bar{x}y_{t-k})^2 \leq 3(\bar{x}\bar{y})^2 + 3(\bar{y}^2 x_t^2) + 3(\bar{x}^2 y_{t-k}^2), \\ D_{nk} &= \sum_{t=k+1}^n (e_{tk} - e'_{tk})^2 \leq 3n(\bar{x}\bar{y})^2 + 3\bar{y}^2 \sum_{t=k+1}^n x_t^2 + 3\bar{x}^2 \sum_{t=k+1}^n y_{t-k}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

In view of (48), $\bar{x} = o_p(n^{-1/2}q_n^{1/4})$, $\bar{y} = o_p(n^{-1/2}q_n^{1/4})$, $\sum_{t=k+1}^n x_t^2 = o_p(nq_n^{1/2})$, and $\sum_{t=k+1}^n y_{t-k}^2 = o_p(nq_n^{1/2})$. These orders in conjunction with (54) prove (a):

$$D_{nk} = o_p(q_n) + o_p(q_n^{1/2})n^{-1}o_p(nq_n^{1/2}) = o_p(q_n).$$

(b) follows noting that by the definition of e'_{tk} ,

$$E\left[\sum_{t=k+1}^n e'_{tk}{}^2\right] = \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 E[\varepsilon_t^2 \eta_{t-k}^2] \leq (E\varepsilon_1^4 E\eta_1^4)^{1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n h_t^2 g_{t-k}^2 \leq Cq_{nkk} = O(q_n) \quad (55)$$

by (33) of Lemma 2.1. This completes the proof of (53) and of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $x_t = \mu + \varepsilon_t$, where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $E\varepsilon_t = 0$ and $E\varepsilon_t^2 < \infty$. Assume that $E\varepsilon_t^4 < \infty$ when $\widehat{\rho}_{x^2,k}$ is considered. Then for $k \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{n}{(n-k)^{1/2}} \widehat{\rho}_{x,k} = \frac{1}{\sigma_\varepsilon^2 (n-k)^{1/2}} \sum_{t=k+1}^n \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-k} + o_p(1), \quad (56)$$

$$\frac{n}{(n-k)^{1/2}} \widehat{\rho}_{|x|,k} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{|\varepsilon|}^2 (n-k)^{1/2}} \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|\varepsilon_t| - E|\varepsilon_t|)(|\varepsilon_{t-k}| - E|\varepsilon_{t-k}|) + o_p(1), \quad (57)$$

$$\frac{n}{(n-k)^{1/2}} \widehat{\rho}_{x^2,k} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\varepsilon^2}^2 (n-k)^{1/2}} \sum_{t=k+1}^n (\varepsilon_t^2 - E\varepsilon_t^2)(\varepsilon_{t-k}^2 - E\varepsilon_{t-k}^2) + o_p(1), \quad (58)$$

where $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = \text{var}(\varepsilon_1)$, $\sigma_{|\varepsilon|}^2 = \text{var}(|\varepsilon_1|)$ and $\sigma_{\varepsilon^2}^2 = \text{var}(\varepsilon_1^2)$.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mu = 0$. We prove (57). (The proof of (56) and (58) is simpler and follows using similar arguments).

Denote $z_t = |x_t - \bar{x}| - E|x_t|$, $y_t = |x_t| - E|x_t|$. Then, by (1M),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{(n-k)^{1/2}} \widehat{\rho}_{|x|,k} &= \frac{(n-k)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n (z_t - \bar{z})(z_{t-k} - \bar{z})}{n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n (z_t - \bar{z})^2} \\ &= \frac{(n-k)^{-1/2} (\sum_{t=k+1}^n y_t y_{t-k} + Q_{n1})}{n^{-1} (\sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 + Q_{n2})} \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where

$$Q_{n1} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n ((z_t - \bar{z})(z_{t-k} - \bar{z}) - y_t y_{t-k}), \quad Q_{n2} = \sum_{t=1}^n ((z_t - \bar{z})^2 - y_t^2).$$

We will show that

$$(a) Q_{n1} = o_p(n^{1/2}), \quad (b) Q_{n2} = o_p(n), \quad (c) n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \rightarrow \text{var}(|\varepsilon_1|). \quad (60)$$

Together with (59) this implies (57):

$$\frac{n}{(n-k)^{1/2}} \widehat{\rho}_{|x|,k} = \text{var}(|\varepsilon_1|)^{-1} (n-k)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=k+1}^n y_t y_{t-k} + o_p(1). \quad (61)$$

Proof of (60)(a). To prove $Q_{n1} = o_p(n^{1/2})$, we write $Q_{n1} = q_{n1} + q_{n2}$ with

$$q_{n1} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n ((z_t - \bar{z})(z_{t-k} - \bar{z}) - z_t z_{t-k}), \quad q_{n2} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n (z_t z_{t-k} - y_t y_{t-k}). \quad (62)$$

We will show that

$$q_{n1} = o_p(n^{1/2}), \quad q_{n2} = o_p(n^{1/2}). \quad (63)$$

As in (46), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (z_t - \bar{z})(z_{t-k} - \bar{z}) - z_t z_{t-k} &= \bar{z}^2 - \bar{z} z_t - \bar{z} z_{t-k}, \\ q_{n1} &= \sum_{t=k+1}^n (\bar{z}^2 - \bar{z} z_t - \bar{z} z_{t-k}) = (n-k)\bar{z}^2 - 2n\bar{z}^2 + \bar{z} \sum_{t=1}^k z_t + \bar{z} \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n z_t. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Hence,

$$|q_{n1}| \leq 3n|\bar{z}^2| + |\bar{z}| \left| \sum_{t=1}^k z_t \right| + |\bar{z}| \left| \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n z_t \right|. \quad (65)$$

Write

$$|\bar{z}| = n^{-1} \left| \sum_{t=1}^n z_t \right| \leq n^{-1} \left| \sum_{t=1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|) \right| + n^{-1} \left| \sum_{t=1}^n (|x_t| - E|x_t|) \right| \leq |\bar{x}| + |\bar{y}| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$$

because $||x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|| \leq |\bar{x}|$ and $|\bar{x}| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$, $|\bar{y}| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. The latter holds because $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ are i.i.d random variables, $E x_t = E y_t = 0$, $E x_t^2 < \infty$, $E y_t^2 < \infty$. Since, $E \sum_{t=1}^k |z_t| + E \sum_{t=n-k+1}^n |z_t| \leq 2kE|z_1|$, this together with (65) implies $q_{n1} = O_p(1) = o_p(n^{1/2})$ which proves the first claim in (63).

To evaluate q_{n2} , write

$$\begin{aligned} z_t z_{t-k} - y_t y_{t-k} &= (|x_t - \bar{x}| - E|x_t|)(|x_{t-k} - \bar{x}| - E|x_{t-k}|) - (|x_t| - E|x_t|)(|x_{t-k}| - E|x_{t-k}|) \\ &= (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)(|x_{t-k} - \bar{x}| - |x_{t-k}|) + (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)y_{t-k} + (|x_{t-k} - \bar{x}| - |x_{t-k}|)y_t. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{n2} &= \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)(|x_{t-k} - \bar{x}| - |x_{t-k}|) + \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)y_{t-k} \\ &+ \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|x_{t-k} - \bar{x}| - |x_{t-k}|)y_t =: q_{n2,1} + q_{n2,2} + q_{n2,3}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $||x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|| \leq |\bar{x}|$, we have

$$|q_{n2,1}| \leq n|\bar{x}|^2 = O_p(1).$$

Next we show $q_{n2,2} = o_p(n^{1/2})$. ($q_{n2,3} = o_p(n^{1/2})$ follows using a similar argument). Denote $\bar{x}_{(t-k)} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1:j \neq t-k}^n x_j$, $\bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1:j \neq t-k, s-k}^n x_j$. Hence

$$q_{n2,2} = \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}|) y_{t-k} + \sum_{t=k+1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t|) y_{t-k} =: v_n + v'_n.$$

We will show that

$$E|v_n| = o(n^{1/2}), \quad E v_n'^2 = o(n) \quad (67)$$

which proves $q_{n2,2} = o_p(n^{1/2})$.

Since $||x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}|| \leq |\bar{x} - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| = n^{-1}|x_{t-k}|$, we have

$$E|v_n| \leq \sum_{t=k+1}^n n^{-1} E|x_{t-k} y_{t-k}| \leq C$$

which implies $v_n = O_p(1)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} E v_n'^2 &= E \sum_{t,s=k+1}^n (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t|) y_{t-k} (|x_s - \bar{x}_{(s-k)}| - |x_s|) y_{s-k} \\ &= E \sum_{t,s=k+1:|t-s| \leq 2k}^n [\dots] + 2E \sum_{t,s=k+1:t > s+2k}^n [\dots] =: S_{n1} + 2S_{n2}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound S_{n1} , notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left| (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t|) y_{t-k} (|x_s - \bar{x}_{(s-k)}| - |x_s|) y_{s-k} \right| \\ &\leq E \left| \bar{x}_{(t-k)} y_{t-k} \bar{x}_{(s-k)} y_{s-k} \right| \leq (E[\bar{x}_{(t-k)}^2 y_{t-k}^2] E[\bar{x}_{(s-k)}^2 y_{s-k}^2])^{1/2} \\ &= (E[\bar{x}_{(t-k)}^2] E[y_{t-k}^2] E[\bar{x}_{(s-k)}^2] E[y_{s-k}^2])^{1/2} \leq C n^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where C does not depend on t, s . Hence, $|S_{n1}| \leq C n^{-1} \sum_{t,s=k+1:|t-s| \leq 2k}^n 1 \leq C = O(1)$.

To bound S_{n2} , write

$|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t| = (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}|) + (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| - |x_t|)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t|)y_{t-k}(|x_s - \bar{x}_{(s-k)}| - |x_s|)y_{s-k} \\
&= (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}|)y_{t-k}(|x_s - \bar{x}_{(s-k)}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}|)y_{s-k} \\
&\quad + (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| - |x_t|)y_{t-k}(|x_s - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| - |x_s|)y_{s-k} \\
&\quad + (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k)}| - |x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}|)y_{t-k}(|x_s - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| - |x_s|)y_{s-k} \\
&\quad + (|x_t - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| - |x_t|)y_{t-k}(|x_s - \bar{x}_{(s-k)}| - |x_s - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}|)y_{s-k} \\
&=: g_{t1} + g_{t2} + g_{t3} + g_{t4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$|g_{t1}| \leq |\bar{x}_{(t-k)} - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| |\bar{x}_{(s-k)} - \bar{x}_{(t-k,s-k)}| |y_{t-k} y_{s-k}| \leq (n^{-1} |x_{s-k}|) (n^{-1} |x_{t-k}|) |y_{t-k} y_{s-k}|.$$

Hence,

$$E \sum_{t,s=k+1:t>s+2k}^n |g_{t1}| \leq C n^{-2} \sum_{t,s=k+1:t>s+2k}^n 1 \leq C.$$

Recall that by assumption $\{x_t\}$ are i.i.d. random variables. Then for $t > s + 2k$ in g_{t2} and g_{t3} only $y_{t-k} = |x_{t-k}| - E|x_{t-k}|$ depends on x_{t-k} . Since $Ey_{t-k} = 0$, this implies $Eg_{t2} = 0$ and $Eg_{t3} = 0$. In g_{t4} only $y_{s-k} = |x_{s-k}| - E|x_{s-k}|$ depends on x_{s-k} . Hence, $Eg_{t4} = 0$.

This proves $S_{n2} = O(1)$ which completes the proof of (67) and proves (60)(a) for Q_{n1} .

Proof of (60)(b). Write

$$Q_{n2} = \sum_{t=1}^n ((z_t - \bar{z})^2 - z_t^2) + \sum_{t=1}^n (z_t^2 - y_t^2).$$

By the first claim of (63), $\sum_{t=1}^n ((z_t - \bar{z})^2 - z_t^2) = o_p(n)$. By (66)

$$z_t^2 - y_t^2 = (|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)^2 + 2(|x_t - \bar{x}| - |x_t|)y_t.$$

Hence, $|z_t^2 - y_t^2| \leq \bar{x}^2 + 2|\bar{x}y_t|$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
E|\sum_{t=1}^n (z_t^2 - y_t^2)| &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n (E\bar{x}^2 + 2(E\bar{x}^2)^{1/2}(Ey_t^2)^{1/2}) \\
&= nE\bar{x}^2 + 2(E\bar{x}^2)^{1/2} \sum_{t=1}^n (Ey_t^2)^{1/2} \leq Cn^{1/2} = o(n).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that $Q_{n2} = o_p(n)$.

Proof of (60)(c). Since an i.i.d. sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is also an ergodic sequence, then $y_t^2 = (|x_t| - E|x_t|)^2 = (|\varepsilon_t| - E|\varepsilon_t|)^2$ is a stationary ergodic sequence with $Ey_t^2 < \infty$. Thus, by Stout (1974, Cor. 3.5.2),

$$n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n y_t^2 \rightarrow Ey_1^2 = \text{var}(|\varepsilon_1|). \quad \square$$

Online Supplement II to ‘Robust Tests for White Noise and Cross-Correlation’*

Violetta Dalla¹, Liudas Giraitis² and Peter C.B. Phillips³

¹National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, ²Queen Mary, University of London,

³Yale University, University of Auckland, University of Southampton, Singapore Management University

April 18, 2019

1 Introduction

This Supplement II provides details of the full Monte Carlo experiment reported in the text of the main paper. Equation references to the main paper are denoted with the affix M as (#M) and references to theorem and proposition numbers in the main paper are signified as “Theorem #M” and “Proposition #M”. Proofs of the theorems and propositions in the main paper are provided in Supplementary I. References used here are the same as those given in the main paper.

2 Monte Carlo study

We present here the full set of results for the Monte Carlo study on the finite sample performance of the standard and corrected tests for zero serial correlation, cross-correlation and tests for the i.i.d. property. We evaluate the rejection frequency (in %) of the tests statistics using 5,000 replications for sample size $n = 100, 300$. We set the significance level at $\alpha = 5\%$. For the univariate standard test t_k, LB_m and the corrected tests \tilde{t}_k, \tilde{Q}_m for absence of serial correlation, results on size are reported for lags $k, m = 1, 2, \dots, 40$ and on power for lags $k, m = 1, 2, \dots, 20$. Same lags are used for the bivariate standard tests $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}, HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$ and the corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}, \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, including also the lag $k, m = 0$, and tests for the i.i.d. property $J_{x,|x|,k}, J_{x,x^2,k}, C_{x,|x|,m}, C_{x,x^2,m}$. The models used in the univariate case for $\{x_t\}$ and in the bivariate case for $\{x_t, y_t\}$ are listed later on. First, we summarize our main findings.

*Dalla acknowledges financial support from ELKE-EKPA. Phillips acknowledges support from the Kelly Fund at the University of Auckland and a KLC Fellowship at Singapore Management University.

- 1 The standard tests for testing zero serial correlation perform well when the data are i.i.d., but may over-reject when the data are non-i.i.d. The corrected tests achieve the right size. The power of tests are similar and in few cases the corrected tests have some loss in power.
- 2 All the tests for zero serial correlation, standard and corrected, produce spurious power when the data do not have constant mean. It is advisable to examine whether the data have constant mean prior to applying the tests.
- 3 The corrected tests for testing zero cross-correlation (at individual lag and cumulative) achieve right size when both series are uncorrelated with constant mean and either constant or time-varying variance. The corrected test at individual lag preserves the correct size when the leading series is uncorrelated and the lagged series is serially correlated, but the size of the cumulative test may become distorted.

The standard tests for testing zero cross-correlation (at individual lag and cumulative) perform well when both the series are serially uncorrelated, stationary and mutually independent. They over-reject when the series are mutually dependent or when both of them have time varying variance.

The power of standard and corrected tests is similar and in few cases the corrected tests have some loss in power.

- 4 All the tests for zero cross-correlation, standard and corrected, produce spurious power when the two series do not have constant mean or both series have serial correlation. It is advisable to examine whether each series has constant mean and no serial correlation prior to applying the tests.
- 5 The size of the corrected cumulative statistics for zero serial correlation or cross-correlation is not affected much by the value of thresholding. The value $\lambda = 1.96$ is a good choice for various significance levels.
- 6 The tests for the i.i.d. property show satisfactory size and power.
- 7 The size performance of the corrected statistics for testing zero correlation or cross-correlation and the tests for the i.i.d. property is satisfactory for a maximum lag of approximately $n/10$ for moderate sample sizes.

Tests for zero serial correlation

Tables 1-6 present testing results for zero serial correlation at individual lag k based on the statistics \tilde{t}_k and t_k , and at cumulative lags $1, \dots, m$ based on the statistics \tilde{Q}_m and LB_m . The results for the size are given in Tables 1-2, for the power in Tables 3 and 4 and for the spurious power in Tables 5 and 6.

Tables 1 and 2. Models:

- (a) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (b) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } t(6)$,
- (c) $x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (d) $x_t = h_{1t} \varepsilon_t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (e) $x_t = h_{2t} \varepsilon_t$, $h_{2t} = t/n$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (f) $x_t = r_t$, $r_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{t-1}^2$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (g) $x_t = h_{1t} r_t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $r_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{t-1}^2$,
 $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

In models (a) and (b), the data are i.i.d. Both the standard and corrected tests, t_k , LB_m and \tilde{t}_k , \tilde{Q}_m have good size, however, the size of the standard test t_k slightly drops when the lag k increases because of standardization \sqrt{n} in t_k instead of $n/\sqrt{n-k}$ as it is done in the cumulative LB_m test. In model (c), the series is uncorrelated, but not independent. In models (d)-(g), the data have unconditional and/or conditional heteroskedasticity. In models (c)-(g) the corrected tests \tilde{t}_k , \tilde{Q}_m produce the appropriate size. On the other hand, the standard test t_k over-rejects at lag $k = 1$ in model (c) and at several lags in models (d)-(g), which is magnified in the cumulative test LB_m .

Tables 3 and 4. Models:

- (a) $x_t = 0.2x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$,
- (b) $x_t = \varepsilon_t + 0.2\varepsilon_{t-1}$,
- (c) $x_t = r_{1,t}^2$, $r_{1,t} = \sigma_{1,t} \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_{1,t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{1,t-1}^2$,
- (d) $x_t = |r_{1,t}|$, $r_{1,t} = \sigma_{1,t} \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_{1,t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{1,t-1}^2$,
- (e) $x_t = r_{2,t}^2$, $r_{2,t} = \sigma_{2,t} \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_{2,t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{2,t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{2,t-1}^2$,
- (f) $x_t = |r_{2,t}|$, $r_{2,t} = \sigma_{2,t} \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_{2,t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{2,t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{2,t-1}^2$,
- (g) $x_t = |\varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}|$,
 $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

Tables report the power of the tests for dependent stationary time series models (a)-(g). In (a)-(b), the data follow the AR(1) and MA(1) models. The standard t_k , LB_m and corrected \tilde{t}_k , \tilde{Q}_m tests show similar power. In (c)-(f), the data are squared and absolute transformations of ARCH and GARCH series and we observe some loss in power for the corrected statistics. In the last model (g),

the series is correlated only at lag 1 and the standard and corrected statistics have similar power properties.

Tables 5 and 6. Models:

- (a) $x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 - (b) $x_t = m_{2t} + \varepsilon_t$, $m_{2t} = I(0.25 < t/n \leq 0.75)$,
 - (c) $x_t = m_{3t} + \varepsilon_t$, $m_{3t} = 0.01t$,
 - (d) $x_t = m_{2t} + h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$, $m_{2t} = I(0.25 < t/n \leq 0.75)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 - (e) $x_t = (h_{1t}\varepsilon_t)^2$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 - (f) $x_t = |h_{1t}\varepsilon_t|$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 - (g) $x_t = (m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t)^2$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$,
- $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

In models (a)-(g), the data are independent over time but have non-constant mean. All tests over-reject and show spurious power. This is especially so in models (a)-(c) where data have either breaking or trending mean and constant variance. The effect is such that the cumulative tests reach 100% rejection frequency at some lags. The changes in variance seems to dampen this effect, as seen in model (d). Absolute values of a series with breaking variance produce higher rejection frequency compared to squared series, see models (e)-(f). When independent data with breaking mean are squared, as in model (g), the distortions of the size are not as severe.

Tests for zero cross-correlation

Tables 7-16 present testing results for zero serial cross-correlation at individual lag k based on the statistics $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ and $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$, and at cumulative lags $0, 1, \dots, m$ based on the statistics $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$ and $HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$. The results for the size are given in Tables 7-12, for the power in Tables 13 and 14 and for the spurious power in Tables 15 and 16.

Tables 7 and 8. Models:

- (a) $x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, y_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5),$
- (b) $x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, y_t = h_{3t}\varepsilon_t, h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5), h_{3t} = 1 + 3I(t/n > 0.5),$
- (c) $x_t = r_{1t}, y_t = r_{2t}, r_{1t} = \sigma_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \sigma_{1t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{1,t-1}^2, r_{2t} = \sigma_{2t}\eta_t, \sigma_{2t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{2,t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{2,t-1}^2,$
 $\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent.

In models (a)-(c), series are independent and thus with zero cross-correlation. In (a)-(b), both series have breaks in the variance. All the corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ have the right size for all lags, and so do the corrected cumulative tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$ for all lags up to $m \approx 30$. On the other hand, the standard tests $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ show distortions in size at several lags, with the effect accumulating in the standard tests $HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$. In (c), when the series follow stationary ARCH(1) and GARCH(1,1) models that are uncorrelated and independent, all tests for cross-correlation, standard and modified, achieve the correct size. However, the standard tests $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ become slightly undersized when the individual lag k increases. This size distortion occurs because of the use of normalization \sqrt{n} in $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ instead of $n/\sqrt{n-k}$ as it is done in the cumulative $HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$ tests.

Tables 9 and 10. Models:

- (a) $x_t = \varepsilon_t, y_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t}\eta_t, m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5), h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5),$
- (b) $x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5), h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5), \varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1),$
- (c) $x_t = \varepsilon_t, y_t = 0.7y_{t-1} + \eta_t,$
 $\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent.

In models (a)-(c), the two series are independent of each other. One of the two series, x_t , has no serial correlation, while the second series, y_t , has either a break in the mean or is autocorrelated. In all models, the standard $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ and corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ for the individual lag k perform well at all lags. However, the cumulative versions of tests, standard $HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$ and corrected $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, show distortions in size which increase in magnitude as the lag m increases. In the simulation study, the statistics $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$ use respectively the matrices $\hat{R}_{xy,m}^*, \hat{R}_{yx,m}^*$, rather than using in both cases $\hat{R}_{xy,m}^*$ as theory would suggest for model (c). Thus, the poor performance of the $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$ test was expected.

Tables 11 and 12. Models:

$$(a) \ x_t = \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = \exp(\varepsilon_t)\eta_t,$$

$$(b) \ x_t = \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = \varepsilon_t\varepsilon_{t-1},$$

$$(c) \ x_t = \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = r_t^2, \ r_t = \sigma_t\varepsilon_t, \ \sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{t-1}^2,$$

$$\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \ \{\varepsilon_t\} \text{ and } \{\eta_t\} \text{ mutually independent.}$$

In models (a)-(c), series x_t and y_t are series of uncorrelated random variables. They are not cross-correlated at any lag but they are not independent of each other. The size of the corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ is satisfactory for all lags k and for lags up to $m \approx 30$ for the cumulative tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}, \tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$. The standard tests $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ substantially over-reject at $k = 0$. As a consequence their cumulative versions $HB_{xy,m}, HB_{yx,m}$ show size distortions at several lags m .

Tables 13 and 14. Models:

$$(a) \ x_t = r_{1t}, \ y_t = r_{2t}, \ r_{1t} = \sigma_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \ \sigma_{1t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{1,t-1}^2, \ r_{2t} = \sigma_{2t}\varepsilon_t, \ \sigma_{2t}^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{2,t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{2,t-1}^2,$$

$$(b) \ x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \ y_t = x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t, \ h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5),$$

$$(c) \ x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \ y_t = m_{1t} + x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t, \ m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5), \ h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5),$$

$$\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \ \{\varepsilon_t\} \text{ and } \{\eta_t\} \text{ mutually independent.}$$

In models (a)-(c), series x_t is serially uncorrelated, and the two series are cross-correlated. In (a), both x_t and y_t are series of uncorrelated variables (ARCH and GARCH). When the two series are only contemporaneously cross-correlated, as in model (a), we observe strong power for both standard $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ and corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ at lag $k = 0$, which is transmitted in all the cumulative tests. In models (b)-(c), series y_t is autocorrelated with lag, and y_t depends also on x_{t-1} and x_{t-2} . For individual lags $k = 0, 1, 2$, both $t_{yx,k}$ and $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ exhibit strong power, which is further amplified by the cumulative tests $HB_{yx,m}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$. For k such that x_t and y_{t-k} (or y_t and x_{t-k}) are not cross-correlated, the corrected tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}, \tilde{t}_{yx,k}$ have correct size, while the standard tests $t_{xy,k}, t_{yx,k}$ show size distortions, in model (a), because the two series are not independent at those lags, and in models (b)-(c), because both series have breaks in unconditional variance.

Tables 15 and 16. Models:

$$(a) \ x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, \ m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5),$$

$$(b) \ x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = m_{4t} + \eta_t, \ m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5), \ m_{4t} = I(t/n > 0.25),$$

$$(c) \ x_t = 0.7x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \ y_t = 0.7y_{t-1} + \eta_t,$$

$$\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \ \{\varepsilon_t\} \text{ and } \{\eta_t\} \text{ mutually independent.}$$

In models (a)-(c), the two series are mutually independent. They either both have a break in the mean or both are dependent $AR(1)$ series. In spite zero cross-correlation, all the tests, standard and corrected, over-reject. When both series have break in the mean, as in models (a)-(b), the over-rejection is stronger when the break is common. The spurious power is even more evident in the cumulative tests.

Tests for i.i.d. property

Tables 17-20 report testing results for the i.i.d. property at individual lag k based on the statistics $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $J_{x,x^2,k}$, and at cumulative lags $1, \dots, m$ based on the statistics $C_{x,|x|,m}$ and $C_{x,x^2,m}$. The results for the size are given in Tables 17 and 18 and for the power in Tables 19 and 20.

Tables 17 and 18. Models:

- (a) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$,
- (b) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } t(6)$,
- (c) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } \chi^2(3)$,
- (d) $x_t = \exp(2\varepsilon_t)$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

In models (a)-(d) the data are i.i.d. with different distributions. Both tests $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $J_{x,x^2,k}$ have good size for all individual lags k . When the data are highly skewed, as in model (d), the tests under-reject which is in line with theory. The cumulative tests $C_{x,|x|,m}$ and $C_{x,x^2,m}$ perform well for lags up to $m \approx 30$, observing though some distortions when the skewness is high. The size performance is overall better for the test based on levels and absolute deviations from the sample mean, i.e., $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $C_{x,|x|,m}$.

Tables 19 and 20. Models:

- (a) $x_t = 0.2x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$,
- (b) $x_t = r_t$, $r_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{t-1}^2$,
- (c) $x_t = r_t$, $r_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$, $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.2r_{t-1}^2 + 0.7\sigma_{t-1}^2$,
- (d) $x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$,
- (e) $x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$,
- (f) $x_t = h_{1t} \varepsilon_t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$,
- (g) $x_t = h_{1t} y_t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $y_t = 0.2y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$,
- (h) $x_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t} \varepsilon_t$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 $\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

In models (a)-(h), the data are not i.i.d. They either have correlation, or non-constant mean or non-constant variance or both. The tests $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $J_{x,x^2,k}$ for i.i.d. property at individual lag have satisfactory power and there is a boost in power, when the data have combined non-i.i.d features, as in models (g)-(h). The power of the cumulative tests $C_{x,|x|,m}$ and $C_{x,x^2,m}$ is magnified with increasing lag m . The power performance is overall better for the tests based on levels and absolute deviations from the sample mean, that is, $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $C_{x,|x|,m}$.

Effect of threshold λ

Tables 21 and 22 are for the statistics Q_m and \tilde{Q}_m for testing zero serial correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Tables 23 and 24 are for the statistics $Q_{xy,m}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$ for testing zero cross-correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Here, we write $\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$ and check the size of the tests for thresholds $\lambda = 1.645, 1.96, 2.576$ at different significance levels $\alpha = 10\%, 5\%, 1\%$. Recall that $Q_m = \tilde{Q}_m(0)$.

Tables 21 and 24. Models:

- (a) $x_t = \varepsilon_t$,
- (b) $x_t = h_{2t}\varepsilon_t, h_{2t} = t/n$,
- (c) $x_t = \varepsilon_t, y_t = \varepsilon_t$,
- (d) $x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, y_t = h_{3t}\varepsilon_t, h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5), h_{3t} = 1 + 3I(t/n > 0.5)$,
 $\varepsilon_t, \eta_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1), \{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent.

In models (a)-(d), the data are i.i.d. or independent with breaking variance. In all these cases, the univariate Q_m and bivariate $Q_{xy,m}$ cumulative tests with no thresholding suffer size distortions that increase with increasing lag m . Size distortion is observed even for ideal i.i.d. normally distributed data, in models (a) and (c). It is more evident for heteroskedastic data, in models (b) and (d). On the other hand, when thresholding is applied, the size of the tests \tilde{Q}_m and $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$ is satisfactory and not as sensitive to the value of the threshold λ for all lags m for i.i.d. data and up to $m \approx 30$ for heteroskedastic data. Overall, the threshold $\lambda = 1.96$ is a good choice at all significance levels $\alpha = 10\%, 5\%, 1\%$.

Table 1: Tests for zero serial correlation at lag k . Size of tests \tilde{t}_k and t_k .

k	x_t iid $N(0,1)$		x_t iid $t(6)$		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{1t} \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{2t} \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = r_t$ r_t GARCH		$x_t = h_{1t} r_t$ r_t GARCH	
	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k
1	4.60	4.48	4.42	4.46	4.70	23.04	4.28	8.02	4.76	13.40	4.56	12.58	4.22	16.36
2	5.14	4.96	5.24	4.92	4.34	4.32	5.46	9.22	5.12	14.22	4.70	12.34	5.10	16.20
3	5.30	4.98	5.06	4.80	5.00	5.06	4.70	8.64	4.60	13.78	4.36	10.88	4.84	15.32
4	4.76	4.80	4.66	4.84	4.18	4.54	4.92	8.90	4.70	13.12	4.72	10.20	5.04	13.80
5	5.02	4.72	4.86	4.60	4.48	4.36	4.72	8.08	4.92	12.96	4.76	9.26	4.86	12.72
6	4.74	4.86	4.74	4.64	5.22	5.06	4.74	8.48	4.70	13.02	4.72	8.38	4.28	11.82
7	4.66	4.46	4.42	4.10	4.64	4.28	5.04	8.32	5.18	13.02	4.74	8.14	4.90	11.76
8	4.66	4.40	4.64	4.20	5.08	4.72	4.84	7.94	5.10	12.34	4.40	7.42	4.58	11.40
9	4.78	4.44	4.78	4.28	5.08	4.58	4.52	7.58	4.46	12.12	4.88	7.16	5.12	10.10
10	5.08	4.68	4.90	4.52	4.68	4.32	4.46	8.32	4.86	12.62	4.96	6.68	4.50	9.70
11	4.94	4.56	4.96	4.44	4.92	4.24	4.90	7.98	4.76	11.66	4.82	6.06	4.66	8.58
12	4.62	4.30	4.48	4.00	4.68	4.26	4.50	7.56	4.60	11.64	4.30	5.68	4.52	8.58
13	5.02	4.58	4.90	4.26	4.92	4.38	5.56	8.50	5.80	12.86	4.80	5.74	5.26	9.28
14	5.26	4.62	5.08	4.44	5.46	4.98	5.34	8.06	5.04	11.88	5.24	5.74	5.14	8.86
15	4.80	4.38	4.84	4.36	4.82	4.02	4.92	7.40	4.84	11.28	4.52	4.80	4.38	7.82
16	5.46	4.88	5.58	4.74	4.98	4.24	5.12	7.86	4.72	11.26	5.20	5.40	5.00	8.50
17	4.66	4.14	4.74	3.98	4.40	3.84	4.62	7.54	5.02	11.30	4.76	4.70	5.02	7.80
18	5.00	4.22	4.84	4.26	4.92	3.76	5.08	7.48	4.74	11.48	4.86	4.84	4.76	7.72
19	4.82	4.10	4.80	4.34	4.60	4.04	4.94	7.38	5.52	11.24	4.98	4.68	5.02	7.30
20	5.32	4.44	5.48	4.66	4.76	4.04	5.28	7.96	5.04	11.42	5.18	4.72	5.04	7.58
21	4.56	3.58	4.72	3.94	4.96	4.04	4.72	7.14	5.32	11.24	4.36	4.06	4.76	7.06
22	4.86	4.04	4.78	3.94	4.34	4.16	5.04	7.18	4.94	10.76	4.58	3.94	4.66	6.62
23	5.20	4.42	5.26	4.68	4.20	3.62	5.14	7.76	5.06	10.46	4.98	4.24	4.98	7.12
24	5.04	4.34	5.22	4.66	4.10	3.68	5.32	7.40	4.96	9.96	5.24	4.42	5.16	6.42
25	4.96	4.08	4.92	3.96	4.42	3.92	5.00	7.14	5.48	11.02	5.26	4.50	5.06	6.86
26	5.20	4.12	5.08	4.00	5.02	3.90	4.64	6.56	5.04	10.10	4.88	3.84	4.92	6.40
27	5.14	4.02	5.04	3.82	4.48	3.62	5.00	6.96	4.84	9.78	5.00	3.82	4.86	6.66
28	5.04	3.92	4.90	3.86	4.34	3.70	4.90	6.80	5.00	9.90	4.96	3.74	4.66	6.14
29	5.22	4.16	5.06	4.28	4.60	3.68	5.20	7.26	5.28	9.94	5.50	4.04	5.18	6.52
30	5.12	3.96	5.14	3.82	4.90	3.66	4.84	6.90	4.68	8.98	5.14	3.76	4.94	5.66
31	5.42	3.94	5.44	3.92	4.70	3.34	4.94	6.38	4.96	9.36	5.46	3.94	4.90	5.66
32	4.82	3.44	4.92	3.36	4.62	3.56	5.44	6.60	5.08	9.08	5.24	3.24	5.28	6.08
33	4.62	3.56	4.60	3.36	4.84	3.80	4.80	6.28	4.70	8.96	4.90	3.20	4.70	5.40
34	5.24	3.98	5.16	3.74	4.60	3.34	5.42	7.54	5.50	10.06	5.38	3.76	5.68	6.50
35	5.16	3.66	4.94	3.48	4.30	3.38	5.12	6.20	4.58	8.28	5.10	3.26	4.92	5.46
36	5.00	3.24	4.98	3.38	5.00	3.96	4.96	6.38	5.38	9.42	4.88	3.24	5.18	5.64
37	5.46	4.04	5.16	3.86	4.56	3.30	5.40	6.38	5.10	8.40	5.00	3.14	5.12	5.30
38	5.44	3.76	5.50	3.70	4.52	3.58	5.24	6.18	4.68	8.30	5.14	3.40	5.04	5.42
39	4.94	3.68	5.02	3.64	5.20	3.50	4.94	6.06	4.82	7.84	5.44	3.26	5.08	5.14
40	5.20	3.38	4.96	3.60	5.02	3.24	5.22	5.86	5.02	7.82	5.08	2.90	5.60	5.12

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{2t} = t/n$, $r_t \sim \text{GARCH}(1,1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$.

Table 2: Tests for zero serial correlation at lags 1, ..., m. Size of tests \tilde{Q}_m and LB_m .

	x_t iid $N(0,1)$		x_t iid $t(6)$		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{1t} \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{2t} \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = r_t$ r_t GARCH		$x_t = h_{1t} r_t$ r_t GARCH	
m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m
1	4.60	4.70	4.42	4.52	4.70	23.42	4.28	8.24	4.76	13.56	4.56	12.76	4.22	16.52
2	4.78	4.64	4.86	5.04	3.74	18.94	4.56	10.90	4.46	18.44	4.50	15.88	4.30	22.14
3	4.66	4.62	4.58	4.66	3.90	16.78	4.42	11.42	4.46	21.28	4.36	18.48	4.20	26.08
4	4.58	4.74	4.32	4.90	4.00	15.24	4.36	12.70	4.26	24.90	4.46	18.98	3.86	29.58
5	4.34	4.58	4.14	4.62	3.92	14.20	4.26	13.60	4.40	27.34	4.52	20.02	3.92	30.92
6	4.40	4.88	4.46	4.70	3.94	13.72	4.44	14.34	4.36	29.26	4.48	20.36	4.20	32.34
7	4.52	4.86	4.30	4.64	4.14	13.08	4.52	15.68	4.36	31.52	4.32	20.54	4.10	33.58
8	4.26	4.82	3.96	4.34	4.28	12.82	4.44	16.32	4.52	33.98	4.30	20.80	4.22	34.48
9	4.26	4.78	4.02	4.52	4.14	12.18	4.56	17.14	4.34	35.70	4.42	21.82	4.30	34.84
10	4.28	4.92	4.14	4.66	4.42	12.06	4.08	17.60	4.10	38.02	4.52	21.50	4.28	35.42
11	4.30	5.00	4.20	4.82	4.64	11.54	4.24	18.74	4.32	39.12	4.32	21.54	4.30	36.32
12	4.28	5.18	4.34	4.90	4.34	11.52	4.08	19.26	4.20	40.80	4.48	21.02	4.56	36.20
13	4.20	5.12	4.08	4.82	4.36	11.34	4.50	20.58	4.52	42.08	4.34	20.82	4.56	37.00
14	4.60	5.06	4.26	4.84	4.30	11.10	4.60	21.08	4.68	43.80	4.56	20.98	4.50	37.74
15	4.60	5.54	4.20	4.94	4.46	10.82	4.56	21.06	4.58	45.00	4.70	20.52	4.40	37.46
16	4.66	5.58	4.22	5.36	4.60	10.54	4.88	21.96	4.76	46.58	4.46	20.52	4.66	38.32
17	4.60	5.52	4.10	5.36	4.52	10.32	4.60	22.92	4.90	47.64	4.76	20.64	4.78	38.24
18	4.64	5.52	4.26	5.34	4.52	10.12	4.40	23.38	4.64	48.60	4.68	20.00	4.78	37.90
19	4.72	5.58	4.42	5.10	4.46	9.64	4.52	24.18	4.96	49.76	4.70	19.28	4.66	38.24
20	4.50	5.50	4.18	5.20	4.48	9.62	4.66	25.18	4.94	50.88	4.96	19.42	4.84	38.74
21	4.76	5.62	4.28	5.16	4.42	9.48	4.66	25.62	5.02	52.02	4.98	19.12	5.36	38.86
22	4.68	5.62	4.16	5.32	4.36	9.40	4.84	25.82	5.26	53.60	4.96	18.96	5.46	39.06
23	4.44	5.88	4.30	5.38	4.42	9.36	4.88	26.66	5.20	54.52	5.02	18.72	5.42	38.86
24	4.76	5.76	4.20	5.56	4.36	9.40	4.76	26.84	5.58	55.68	5.38	18.54	5.34	39.48
25	4.96	6.16	4.48	5.74	4.12	9.10	5.00	27.58	5.74	56.74	5.34	18.66	5.48	39.44
26	4.74	6.14	4.48	5.66	4.16	8.86	4.96	27.80	5.86	57.38	5.40	18.14	5.56	39.34
27	4.72	6.10	4.68	5.60	4.46	8.84	5.08	28.48	6.00	58.22	5.48	18.14	5.92	39.58
28	4.76	6.08	4.74	5.72	4.70	8.66	4.96	29.10	6.06	58.98	5.54	18.08	6.02	39.32
29	4.66	6.28	4.74	5.74	4.40	8.60	5.00	29.56	6.52	59.86	5.56	17.96	6.26	39.74
30	4.62	6.58	4.98	5.96	4.42	8.58	5.24	30.22	6.34	60.22	5.58	17.92	6.04	40.14
31	4.78	6.44	4.86	6.12	4.50	8.48	5.76	30.84	6.52	60.44	5.52	17.86	6.32	40.22
32	4.62	6.40	4.82	6.06	4.64	8.40	5.74	31.10	6.96	60.68	5.66	17.74	6.44	40.38
33	4.60	6.52	5.00	6.20	4.64	8.36	5.86	31.90	7.28	61.72	5.66	17.40	6.44	40.22
34	5.00	6.70	5.16	6.32	4.64	8.36	5.94	32.22	7.62	62.50	5.74	17.40	6.44	40.52
35	4.86	6.82	4.92	6.30	4.80	8.58	6.02	32.86	7.48	62.80	5.96	17.14	6.84	40.88
36	5.06	6.72	4.88	6.44	4.88	8.68	6.16	33.38	7.48	63.74	6.04	17.08	6.84	41.04
37	5.06	6.80	4.96	6.44	4.98	8.52	6.30	33.66	7.96	64.06	5.78	16.96	7.06	40.98
38	5.20	6.96	5.28	6.78	5.02	8.44	6.40	33.78	8.12	64.68	5.98	16.96	7.18	41.16
39	5.10	7.04	5.28	6.78	5.10	8.44	6.68	34.42	8.56	65.44	6.10	16.94	7.38	41.12
40	5.04	7.08	5.26	7.02	5.26	8.44	6.86	34.82	8.96	65.60	6.44	16.88	7.54	41.18

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{2t} = t/n$, $r_t \sim$ GARCH(1,1), $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$.

Table 3: Tests for zero serial correlation at lag k . Power of tests \tilde{t}_k and t_k .

k	x_t AR(1) $\phi = 0.2$		x_t MA(1) $\theta = 0.2$		$x_t = r_{1t}^2$ r_{1t} ARCH		$x_t = r_{1t} $ r_{1t} ARCH		$x_t = r_{2t}^2$ r_{2t} GARCH		$x_t = r_{2t} $ r_{2t} GARCH		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1} $ ε_t iid	
	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k
1	92.28	92.40	91.02	91.12	46.08	73.86	60.18	70.40	60.66	83.34	77.68	84.06	99.94	100
2	10.88	10.52	6.24	6.32	6.14	10.94	6.82	8.68	50.66	75.20	68.56	76.30	12.46	9.56
3	6.08	5.66	5.90	5.60	7.50	5.30	5.72	5.90	42.66	65.58	59.30	67.66	9.94	7.76
4	5.40	5.28	5.28	5.28	7.26	4.74	5.56	5.42	34.14	57.06	50.76	59.04	10.16	7.24
5	5.82	5.74	5.66	5.56	7.50	4.22	5.36	5.24	27.56	48.16	41.98	50.34	8.94	6.96
6	5.92	5.36	5.66	5.34	7.38	4.12	5.32	4.72	21.70	40.28	35.00	41.88	9.64	6.66
7	5.50	5.14	5.40	5.02	8.08	3.98	5.32	4.80	18.24	34.72	30.16	36.76	9.82	6.96
8	5.40	5.04	5.30	4.96	7.78	4.08	5.88	5.44	14.88	28.12	25.42	30.88	10.34	7.30
9	5.84	5.60	5.84	5.48	7.90	4.32	6.14	5.32	12.60	24.10	21.68	26.76	9.96	7.94
10	5.96	5.62	5.88	5.52	7.40	3.62	5.32	4.80	11.18	19.76	18.20	21.86	9.46	6.84
11	6.24	5.90	6.14	5.64	8.26	4.40	6.08	4.86	9.94	18.00	16.26	19.96	9.90	6.62
12	5.66	5.10	5.44	5.02	8.28	4.26	6.10	5.34	9.34	13.96	13.66	16.54	10.52	7.04
13	5.42	5.00	5.46	4.90	8.36	4.00	5.66	5.10	9.24	12.92	13.10	15.28	10.02	7.22
14	5.90	5.24	5.92	5.10	7.44	3.66	5.88	5.02	7.80	9.72	10.90	12.46	10.06	6.56
15	5.54	4.94	5.50	4.90	8.00	3.96	5.84	5.08	8.48	9.74	10.58	12.04	9.90	6.82
16	6.34	5.76	6.22	5.64	7.74	4.30	5.94	4.66	8.90	8.70	9.98	10.66	9.98	7.16
17	5.50	4.84	5.44	4.68	7.96	3.80	6.06	4.72	9.98	7.90	10.30	10.62	9.76	6.82
18	5.66	4.94	5.64	5.00	7.58	3.86	5.64	4.68	8.80	7.72	9.04	9.42	9.76	7.02
19	6.04	5.18	5.84	5.06	8.16	3.80	6.42	5.10	10.16	6.52	10.16	9.48	10.46	7.08
20	6.32	5.46	6.16	5.24	7.78	3.52	6.02	4.48	9.74	5.80	9.18	8.30	10.84	6.92

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim$ ARCH(1), $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim$ GARCH(1,1), $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$.

Table 4: Tests for zero serial correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Power of tests \tilde{Q}_m and LB_m .

m	x_t AR(1) $\phi = 0.2$		x_t MA(1) $\theta = 0.2$		$x_t = r_{1t}^2$ r_{1t} ARCH		$x_t = r_{1t} $ r_{1t} ARCH		$x_t = r_{2t}^2$ r_{2t} GARCH		$x_t = r_{2t} $ r_{2t} GARCH		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1} $ ε_t iid	
	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m
1	92.28	92.50	91.04	91.34	46.14	74.04	60.18	70.66	60.66	83.50	77.68	84.22	99.94	100
2	86.38	87.52	85.78	86.44	33.20	67.72	47.58	62.02	73.20	91.04	84.14	90.24	99.68	100
3	81.74	83.36	80.24	81.58	27.28	63.06	40.10	56.52	77.62	92.94	86.48	91.46	99.12	100
4	76.76	78.58	75.10	76.54	24.80	59.44	35.16	52.52	78.44	93.50	86.18	91.92	98.28	100
5	72.50	74.98	69.88	71.92	22.80	56.82	31.54	49.54	78.26	93.52	85.58	91.92	97.52	100
6	68.92	72.14	66.26	68.40	22.26	54.42	28.50	47.46	77.38	93.44	84.62	91.60	96.52	99.98
7	64.96	68.96	62.70	65.08	21.98	52.08	26.00	44.88	76.32	93.34	83.66	91.26	95.74	100
8	62.14	66.64	60.00	62.72	21.30	50.30	24.76	43.02	75.06	93.02	82.40	91.00	94.78	100
9	59.22	64.42	56.42	60.10	20.66	48.64	23.48	41.70	73.38	92.56	81.50	90.58	93.56	99.96
10	57.26	62.20	54.36	58.10	20.38	47.58	22.10	40.02	72.52	92.26	80.40	90.02	92.28	99.96
11	54.90	60.40	52.10	56.18	20.58	45.92	21.50	39.26	71.28	91.92	79.22	89.60	91.36	99.90
12	52.70	58.74	50.16	54.28	20.24	44.98	20.62	38.46	70.34	91.76	78.00	89.02	90.46	99.88
13	50.90	57.26	47.82	52.28	20.02	44.00	20.16	37.48	69.84	91.12	76.78	88.56	89.54	99.86
14	49.28	56.02	46.08	50.94	19.92	42.70	19.74	37.10	68.84	90.52	75.72	88.52	88.52	99.78
15	47.76	54.70	44.76	49.88	20.24	42.00	18.90	36.30	68.34	90.22	74.74	88.02	87.42	99.70
16	46.18	53.40	43.42	48.92	20.64	41.56	18.42	35.54	67.24	89.78	73.76	87.54	86.42	99.66
17	45.20	52.90	42.18	47.92	20.32	40.88	17.66	34.92	66.88	89.34	72.84	87.20	85.60	99.68
18	44.16	52.12	40.76	47.68	20.10	40.08	17.24	34.02	66.14	88.96	71.98	86.92	84.14	99.58
19	43.02	51.56	39.84	47.10	20.06	39.36	16.78	34.16	66.10	88.60	71.20	86.80	83.02	99.52
20	41.36	51.00	38.68	45.84	20.04	38.52	16.92	33.46	65.86	88.30	70.36	86.46	82.16	99.44

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim$ ARCH(1), $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim$ GARCH(1,1), $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$.

Table 5: Tests for zero serial correlation at lag k . Spurious power of tests \tilde{t}_k and t_k .

k	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{2t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{3t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{2t} + h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = (h_{1t}\varepsilon_t)^2$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t $ ε_t iid		$x_t = (m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t)^2$ ε_t iid	
	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k	\tilde{t}_k	t_k
1	91.92	91.22	92.12	91.52	100	100	27.66	34.98	35.36	45.94	62.46	67.36	10.42	18.02
2	91.18	90.44	91.04	90.38	100	100	28.28	35.36	35.30	47.40	62.50	67.28	10.42	18.26
3	92.10	91.24	90.72	89.92	100	100	26.72	33.30	34.74	46.10	62.06	66.90	10.22	16.96
4	90.86	90.24	89.16	88.60	100	100	27.38	34.56	35.26	46.06	62.04	66.40	11.12	17.42
5	90.20	89.58	89.06	87.96	100	100	26.84	33.26	33.52	45.26	60.66	65.60	10.48	17.30
6	90.20	88.96	87.60	86.42	100	100	25.02	31.10	33.02	44.28	59.50	64.60	9.98	16.88
7	89.62	88.94	87.46	86.02	100	100	24.08	29.80	32.00	43.92	59.02	63.80	9.80	16.48
8	89.00	88.06	85.76	84.16	100	100	23.70	29.18	31.88	43.04	59.08	62.78	10.58	16.36
9	88.28	86.92	83.76	82.46	100	100	23.06	28.14	30.66	42.56	57.76	62.16	9.02	15.28
10	87.80	86.18	83.44	81.68	100	100	22.38	27.50	30.30	42.70	56.62	61.52	9.72	15.30
11	87.00	85.46	81.70	80.16	100	100	22.14	27.86	28.64	39.72	54.88	58.48	8.86	14.90
12	87.10	85.02	80.24	78.28	100	100	21.02	26.14	28.66	39.64	54.62	58.52	9.12	15.36
13	85.98	84.28	78.88	76.66	100	100	21.30	25.82	28.76	39.76	53.98	58.42	9.02	15.22
14	85.32	83.04	77.84	75.30	100	100	19.66	24.26	26.98	38.46	53.04	57.54	8.16	14.42
15	85.02	83.10	76.78	74.18	100	100	18.84	23.90	27.34	39.34	53.42	57.42	7.82	14.26
16	83.86	82.02	73.66	71.24	100	100	20.20	24.22	25.62	36.86	51.12	54.90	8.30	13.90
17	83.92	81.54	72.22	69.52	100	100	17.70	21.64	25.52	36.34	51.06	54.44	8.36	13.66
18	81.76	79.38	69.50	66.72	100	100	17.24	20.80	24.50	35.56	49.72	52.92	8.28	13.66
19	82.52	80.08	69.04	65.76	100	100	16.74	20.18	25.54	35.70	48.84	52.24	7.50	12.66
20	81.18	78.22	66.88	63.32	100	100	16.72	20.40	24.28	34.60	48.20	51.82	8.14	13.02

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $m_{2t} = I(0.25 < t/n \leq 0.75)$, $m_{3t} = 0.01t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 6: Tests for zero serial correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Spurious power of tests \tilde{Q}_m and LB_m .

m	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{2t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{3t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = m_{2t} + h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid		$x_t = (h_{1t}\varepsilon_t)^2$ ε_t iid		$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t $ ε_t iid		$x_t = (m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t)^2$ ε_t iid	
	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m	\tilde{Q}_m	LB_m
1	91.94	91.40	92.12	91.60	100	100	27.66	35.26	35.36	46.24	62.46	67.70	10.42	18.34
2	97.76	97.74	97.88	97.70	100	100	37.60	48.62	49.98	65.10	78.96	84.22	12.78	24.18
3	99.26	99.22	98.92	98.92	100	100	44.20	56.64	62.12	76.58	86.94	91.18	14.62	28.70
4	99.60	99.66	99.38	99.42	100	100	49.06	63.04	70.20	83.72	91.20	94.68	17.18	32.90
5	99.68	99.70	99.68	99.76	100	100	53.66	68.48	75.38	88.30	94.04	96.84	19.38	36.74
6	99.78	99.84	99.80	99.84	100	100	56.36	71.58	79.36	91.46	95.38	97.82	20.28	39.78
7	99.88	99.92	99.82	99.86	100	100	58.96	74.90	82.42	93.96	96.50	98.60	22.30	41.64
8	99.88	99.92	99.88	99.94	100	100	60.96	77.40	85.10	95.18	97.00	98.88	24.30	44.78
9	99.86	99.92	99.96	99.96	100	100	62.72	79.30	86.84	96.16	97.72	99.20	25.70	46.82
10	99.88	99.94	99.98	99.98	100	100	63.60	80.88	88.08	97.16	97.88	99.38	26.98	48.98
11	99.90	99.96	99.96	99.98	100	100	65.60	82.12	89.40	97.50	98.36	99.56	28.24	50.56
12	99.86	99.98	99.88	99.98	100	100	66.28	82.90	90.66	97.98	98.44	99.62	29.26	51.36
13	99.90	99.98	99.88	99.98	100	100	67.06	84.08	91.52	98.36	98.68	99.66	30.20	52.70
14	99.84	100	99.88	99.98	99.98	100	67.52	84.90	92.30	98.66	98.78	99.74	31.34	54.02
15	99.64	100	99.80	99.98	99.98	100	67.38	85.70	92.88	98.88	98.88	99.74	31.98	55.36
16	99.46	100	99.62	100	99.98	100	68.18	86.16	93.36	98.96	98.92	99.78	32.88	56.52
17	99.14	100	99.08	100	99.98	100	68.28	86.88	93.98	99.02	98.98	99.80	33.64	57.30
18	98.86	100	98.60	100	99.96	100	68.40	87.08	94.52	99.02	98.96	99.84	34.20	58.02
19	98.16	100	97.84	99.98	99.96	100	68.82	87.60	94.74	99.12	98.84	99.86	34.98	58.76
20	97.54	100	97.30	100	99.98	100	68.66	87.98	94.84	99.30	98.74	99.86	35.36	59.40

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $m_{2t} = I(0.25 < t/n \leq 0.75)$, $m_{3t} = 0.01t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 7: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lag k . $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ independent. Size of tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$, $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$, $t_{xy,k}$ and $t_{yx,k}$.

k	$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = h_{1t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = h_{3t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = r_{1t}, r_{1t}$ ARCH $y_t = r_{2t}, r_{2t}$ GARCH			
	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$
0	4.50	4.50	9.22	9.22	4.64	4.64	11.00	11.00	5.08	5.08	5.26	5.26
1	4.48	5.46	8.42	10.18	4.38	5.54	10.08	12.02	5.04	5.20	4.88	5.18
2	5.30	5.02	10.10	8.96	5.26	4.96	11.88	11.12	5.30	5.06	5.02	5.02
3	5.30	5.00	9.34	9.68	5.30	5.20	11.04	12.18	4.52	5.02	4.56	4.98
4	5.10	5.34	8.90	9.50	5.00	5.30	10.68	11.20	4.52	5.20	4.36	5.10
5	5.26	5.12	9.20	9.22	5.24	5.28	11.42	11.10	4.70	4.84	4.76	4.70
6	5.26	4.60	8.98	8.00	5.30	4.70	10.66	9.82	5.32	4.64	4.98	4.66
7	4.86	4.78	8.48	8.34	4.92	4.96	10.24	10.44	4.92	5.34	4.70	4.90
8	4.52	4.68	8.14	8.22	4.58	4.46	10.04	10.04	4.96	5.24	4.64	5.02
9	4.40	5.04	7.98	8.44	4.64	4.76	9.80	9.96	4.82	5.02	4.58	4.66
10	5.10	4.74	8.36	7.96	5.12	4.60	10.04	9.70	4.80	4.50	4.66	4.56
11	4.62	5.12	8.38	8.80	4.68	5.44	9.96	10.84	4.50	5.08	4.02	4.72
12	4.84	4.80	8.24	8.18	4.74	4.66	9.74	9.98	4.80	4.90	4.54	4.54
13	5.04	4.62	7.88	8.38	4.86	4.64	9.66	10.44	4.98	5.10	4.72	4.44
14	4.82	5.12	7.60	8.24	4.88	5.04	9.40	10.64	5.22	5.18	4.36	4.36
15	4.36	4.70	7.58	8.16	4.38	4.60	9.40	10.16	4.56	5.06	4.16	4.88
16	5.42	4.84	8.26	7.82	5.44	4.70	9.64	9.94	5.54	4.86	5.02	4.24
17	5.04	5.00	8.12	8.08	4.96	5.14	9.08	10.06	5.02	4.56	4.36	3.96
18	4.86	4.80	7.86	7.86	5.00	4.92	9.40	9.76	4.54	5.26	4.20	4.54
19	5.06	5.00	7.68	7.74	4.80	4.94	8.84	9.62	5.10	4.78	4.54	4.24
20	4.76	5.30	7.38	7.78	4.54	5.08	8.42	9.90	5.08	5.18	4.46	4.42
21	5.02	4.66	7.70	7.60	5.00	4.96	8.86	9.62	4.74	4.80	4.22	3.88
22	5.02	5.30	7.68	8.12	5.16	5.28	9.42	9.72	4.76	4.88	4.14	4.18
23	4.88	5.48	7.26	8.34	4.68	5.54	8.84	10.20	4.80	5.40	4.38	4.50
24	4.64	5.50	7.10	8.16	4.84	5.46	8.30	9.98	4.38	5.34	3.74	4.28
25	4.98	5.08	6.78	7.40	4.94	5.10	8.04	9.44	4.86	4.60	3.80	3.78
26	5.42	5.78	7.86	8.18	5.36	5.82	8.96	9.84	4.66	5.10	3.92	4.18
27	5.16	4.90	7.08	7.02	4.94	5.10	8.12	8.96	4.96	4.56	4.02	3.54
28	5.08	5.20	6.80	6.64	4.70	5.18	7.90	8.34	4.84	5.64	4.06	4.36
29	5.52	5.28	7.30	7.24	5.30	5.06	8.30	9.32	5.62	5.36	4.50	4.20
30	4.54	4.56	6.46	6.28	4.58	4.50	7.36	8.50	4.66	4.80	3.82	3.72
31	4.20	5.06	6.20	7.00	4.40	4.90	7.12	8.60	4.38	4.90	3.22	3.80
32	4.82	5.04	6.42	6.80	4.72	4.76	7.48	8.34	5.20	5.22	3.92	4.30
33	4.52	4.46	6.56	5.98	4.64	4.64	7.44	7.52	4.52	4.74	3.32	3.76
34	4.92	5.04	6.44	6.92	4.68	5.28	7.32	8.76	5.12	5.04	3.92	4.00
35	4.60	4.72	6.24	6.08	4.68	4.66	7.16	7.62	4.74	5.02	3.90	3.78
36	4.80	4.68	6.20	6.08	4.94	4.72	7.18	8.08	5.14	5.10	3.92	3.72
37	5.50	5.06	6.44	6.20	5.38	5.08	7.22	8.16	4.70	4.72	3.46	3.52
38	4.80	4.46	6.02	5.38	4.70	4.64	6.70	7.00	4.92	4.62	3.44	3.42
39	5.18	4.60	6.06	5.74	5.12	4.60	6.66	7.42	5.42	5.04	3.84	3.64
40	5.04	4.98	5.92	5.88	5.06	5.06	6.70	7.80	4.42	5.30	3.22	3.92

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{3t} = 1 + 3I(t/n > 0.5)$, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim \text{GARCH}(1,1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$, $\{r_{1t}\}$ and $\{r_{2t}\}$ mutually independent.

Table 8: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $0, 1, \dots, m$. $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ independent. Size of tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$, $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, $HB_{xy,m}$ and $HB_{yx,m}$.

m	$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = h_{1t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = h_{3t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = r_{1t}, r_{1t}$ ARCH $y_t = r_{2t}, r_{2t}$ GARCH			
	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$
0	4.50	4.50	9.22	9.22	4.64	4.64	11.00	11.00	5.08	5.08	5.26	5.26
1	4.42	4.70	10.40	11.16	4.58	4.54	13.12	14.38	5.14	4.82	5.32	4.96
2	4.64	4.56	12.22	12.78	4.38	4.50	16.28	16.46	5.08	4.82	5.28	4.92
3	4.82	4.92	14.02	13.86	4.82	4.66	18.28	18.34	5.16	5.10	5.40	5.16
4	4.52	4.86	14.92	14.88	4.54	4.62	20.18	20.58	4.44	4.96	4.86	5.30
5	4.42	4.62	15.94	15.72	4.40	4.62	21.62	22.50	4.94	5.10	5.16	5.12
6	4.80	4.34	17.04	16.38	4.54	4.38	23.84	23.96	4.98	5.00	5.14	5.10
7	5.08	4.30	17.70	17.80	4.88	4.22	25.12	25.62	5.00	4.78	4.92	5.10
8	4.66	4.32	18.74	19.04	4.70	4.22	26.96	26.74	4.60	4.90	5.02	5.14
9	4.88	4.54	19.22	19.72	4.90	4.52	27.54	28.88	4.60	4.92	4.88	5.32
10	4.72	4.12	19.90	19.68	4.70	4.26	29.10	29.82	4.60	4.80	4.76	5.14
11	4.64	4.10	20.84	20.98	4.66	4.40	30.30	31.08	4.46	4.84	4.48	5.26
12	4.56	4.28	21.10	21.72	4.68	4.36	31.28	32.18	4.48	4.62	4.88	5.16
13	4.66	4.12	21.90	22.70	4.52	4.22	31.98	33.80	4.62	4.34	4.98	5.14
14	4.40	4.22	22.70	23.08	4.24	4.12	33.06	35.22	4.68	4.40	4.96	5.14
15	4.26	4.48	23.30	23.98	4.16	4.40	34.02	35.86	4.54	4.58	4.92	5.14
16	4.58	4.26	25.10	24.90	4.46	4.40	34.84	38.02	4.60	4.60	5.28	5.26
17	4.08	4.34	24.98	25.64	4.34	4.22	36.46	39.36	4.52	4.84	5.20	4.94
18	4.60	4.54	25.56	26.24	4.26	4.54	37.20	40.10	4.62	4.76	5.36	5.08
19	4.44	4.36	26.22	26.92	4.20	4.56	38.26	40.90	4.72	4.78	5.50	5.22
20	4.68	4.46	26.78	27.58	4.32	4.40	38.72	41.90	4.66	4.94	5.58	5.46
21	4.60	4.62	27.28	28.26	4.32	4.74	40.14	42.50	4.54	4.96	5.56	5.32
22	4.46	4.78	27.64	28.60	4.38	4.36	41.26	44.32	4.62	4.88	5.40	5.20
23	4.52	4.68	28.68	29.62	4.26	4.56	41.82	45.40	4.54	4.72	5.26	5.52
24	4.44	4.64	29.40	30.10	4.58	4.68	42.86	46.80	4.56	4.84	5.36	5.48
25	4.20	4.84	30.02	30.68	4.28	4.86	43.30	47.84	4.58	4.92	5.36	5.52
26	4.38	4.96	30.66	31.66	4.46	5.04	44.74	49.04	4.50	4.94	5.20	5.32
27	4.58	4.88	31.28	32.50	4.48	5.34	44.78	49.88	4.44	4.70	5.18	5.44
28	4.78	5.12	31.68	32.78	4.70	5.34	45.86	50.20	4.54	4.86	5.46	5.44
29	5.06	5.26	32.04	32.86	4.74	5.52	46.86	51.24	4.56	4.86	5.42	5.72
30	4.94	5.34	32.34	34.18	5.02	5.58	47.42	51.88	4.32	4.88	5.32	5.84
31	4.92	5.26	32.56	34.58	5.24	5.58	47.78	52.56	4.74	4.68	4.90	5.70
32	5.18	5.56	32.90	34.88	5.70	5.74	48.12	53.08	4.64	4.70	5.14	5.80
33	5.12	5.66	33.00	34.96	5.78	5.90	48.84	53.82	4.76	4.90	5.20	5.74
34	5.50	6.02	33.44	35.70	6.12	6.36	49.56	54.74	4.58	4.82	4.98	5.70
35	5.68	6.44	34.08	36.24	6.34	6.46	49.66	55.60	4.64	5.06	5.12	5.78
36	6.02	6.58	34.32	36.20	6.58	6.82	50.34	56.56	5.04	5.30	5.30	5.68
37	5.84	6.86	34.62	36.42	7.04	7.16	50.62	56.76	4.84	5.56	5.18	5.80
38	6.28	6.90	35.12	36.94	7.36	7.46	51.22	57.52	4.92	5.40	5.30	5.78
39	6.66	7.22	35.80	37.32	7.58	7.90	51.24	57.82	5.16	5.60	5.20	5.74
40	6.70	7.34	35.80	37.88	8.14	8.30	51.88	58.48	4.84	6.04	5.48	5.90

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{3t} = 1 + 3I(t/n > 0.5)$, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim \text{GARCH}(1,1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$, $\{r_{1t}\}$ and $\{r_{2t}\}$ mutually independent.

Table 9: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lag k . $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ independent. Size of tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$, $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$, $t_{xy,k}$ and $t_{yx,k}$.

k	$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid y_t AR(1), $\phi = 0.7$			
	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$
0	4.84	4.84	4.96	4.96	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	5.06	5.06	4.92	4.92
1	4.94	4.88	4.84	5.16	4.74	5.10	4.84	5.12	4.84	4.88	5.06	4.72
2	5.42	5.62	5.46	5.74	5.32	5.40	5.32	5.50	5.10	5.10	4.96	4.92
3	5.04	5.30	4.66	5.54	4.84	5.34	4.86	5.12	4.42	5.28	4.30	5.16
4	4.72	5.40	4.78	5.42	4.92	4.86	5.06	4.80	4.64	5.06	4.20	5.12
5	5.22	4.98	4.72	5.00	5.06	5.14	5.00	4.62	5.32	5.12	5.30	4.84
6	5.48	4.32	5.24	4.12	5.46	4.44	5.54	3.92	4.80	4.72	4.54	4.40
7	4.90	5.40	4.54	5.30	4.52	5.24	4.54	4.76	5.06	4.94	4.86	4.70
8	4.74	4.76	4.38	4.62	4.96	4.82	5.14	4.48	4.82	4.74	4.54	4.38
9	4.42	5.68	4.10	5.16	4.58	5.42	4.62	5.14	4.92	5.44	4.54	5.36
10	4.98	4.98	4.64	4.88	5.18	4.62	5.28	4.32	4.92	4.72	4.66	4.50
11	4.60	5.04	3.80	4.72	4.90	4.78	4.86	4.10	5.02	4.62	4.80	4.20
12	5.04	4.96	4.14	4.64	5.16	4.70	5.06	4.10	5.10	5.02	4.68	4.44
13	5.20	5.04	4.38	4.72	5.12	5.04	4.82	4.34	4.96	4.94	4.26	4.48
14	5.24	5.16	4.54	4.80	5.28	4.80	5.18	4.04	4.76	4.98	4.30	4.58
15	4.98	5.18	4.34	4.94	5.02	4.82	4.86	4.08	5.26	5.12	4.90	4.68
16	6.04	4.90	5.02	4.50	6.14	5.04	5.80	4.06	5.08	4.58	4.34	4.02
17	5.10	5.16	4.38	4.84	5.44	5.06	5.14	4.20	5.18	4.86	4.32	4.12
18	4.90	4.92	3.76	4.66	4.90	4.52	4.92	3.58	5.08	4.88	4.54	4.28
19	5.18	4.50	4.16	4.38	5.08	4.36	5.06	3.40	5.00	4.64	4.20	4.00
20	4.98	5.58	4.14	5.26	5.18	5.48	4.94	4.34	4.40	5.40	3.86	4.58
21	4.92	4.54	3.62	4.28	5.42	4.72	4.92	3.50	4.26	5.22	3.66	4.28
22	5.02	5.16	3.94	5.28	5.06	4.84	4.86	4.08	4.64	5.32	3.84	4.46
23	4.56	5.42	3.44	5.20	5.04	5.34	4.58	3.60	4.68	5.44	4.14	4.66
24	4.62	5.36	3.54	5.00	5.10	5.04	5.00	3.72	4.54	5.08	3.54	4.02
25	5.06	4.98	3.70	4.90	5.36	4.84	5.14	3.50	4.96	4.90	4.16	4.06
26	5.06	5.40	3.68	5.12	5.20	5.16	4.84	3.50	5.30	4.82	4.38	3.98
27	4.92	4.94	3.64	4.58	5.34	4.94	4.88	3.42	4.72	4.36	3.80	3.68
28	4.80	5.06	3.48	4.60	5.30	5.12	5.20	3.52	5.12	4.96	3.80	3.92
29	5.18	5.24	3.44	4.54	5.18	5.40	4.94	3.54	5.26	4.94	4.26	3.90
30	5.38	4.50	3.56	4.16	5.64	4.10	5.22	2.68	4.78	4.74	3.76	3.82
31	4.36	5.10	2.84	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.32	2.84	5.82	4.94	4.24	3.62
32	4.48	4.96	3.02	4.54	5.06	4.78	4.40	3.12	5.12	4.98	3.66	3.68
33	4.66	4.40	3.10	3.88	4.88	4.32	4.64	2.58	4.98	5.04	3.86	3.74
34	4.84	4.96	3.04	4.66	4.98	4.60	4.50	2.96	5.22	4.96	4.02	3.58
35	4.96	5.00	3.32	4.68	5.16	4.56	4.76	2.58	5.28	5.02	3.84	3.94
36	5.18	4.46	2.94	4.04	5.36	4.22	4.62	2.50	5.02	4.96	3.72	3.58
37	4.68	4.76	2.92	4.24	5.06	4.38	4.58	2.26	5.18	4.42	3.90	3.22
38	4.70	4.72	2.68	4.10	5.44	4.64	4.72	2.64	4.90	4.54	3.72	2.96
39	5.38	4.86	3.02	3.98	5.84	4.46	5.40	2.56	5.04	4.38	3.72	3.34
40	4.72	5.14	3.04	4.52	4.66	4.66	4.28	2.48	4.46	4.72	3.06	3.46

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 10: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags 0, 1, ..., m. $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ independent. Size of tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$, $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, $HB_{xy,m}$ and $HB_{yx,m}$.

m	$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t}\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid y_t AR(1), $\phi = 0.7$			
	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$
0	4.84	4.84	4.96	4.96	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	5.06	5.06	4.92	4.92
1	5.00	5.02	5.16	4.86	5.12	4.78	5.28	5.04	4.84	6.36	6.76	6.48
2	5.20	4.88	5.20	5.14	5.32	5.54	5.74	5.44	4.72	7.56	8.36	7.74
3	5.10	5.02	5.72	5.30	5.44	5.48	6.14	5.74	5.36	8.78	8.80	9.04
4	5.12	5.16	5.14	5.34	5.68	5.76	6.12	5.98	5.86	9.62	8.84	9.78
5	5.12	5.64	5.22	5.68	5.86	6.28	6.58	6.36	7.06	10.32	9.46	10.38
6	4.94	5.36	5.18	5.50	6.28	5.92	6.84	6.50	8.60	10.60	9.78	10.58
7	4.96	4.98	5.26	5.76	7.06	6.12	7.30	6.40	10.98	10.88	10.04	10.82
8	4.94	5.10	5.10	5.74	7.70	6.36	7.30	6.58	13.62	11.32	9.90	11.44
9	5.06	5.20	5.28	5.90	8.46	6.60	7.60	6.72	16.60	11.04	9.88	11.18
10	5.10	4.98	5.54	5.74	9.54	6.88	7.98	6.74	18.52	11.16	10.36	11.58
11	5.14	5.14	5.24	6.00	11.08	7.14	8.22	6.96	20.38	11.56	10.92	11.68
12	4.90	5.44	5.06	6.40	12.10	7.42	8.48	7.48	21.40	11.92	11.02	11.90
13	5.32	5.42	5.40	6.16	14.22	7.48	8.54	7.64	23.36	11.80	11.18	11.90
14	5.40	5.10	5.24	6.22	16.84	7.46	8.62	7.90	23.78	11.76	11.50	11.80
15	5.52	5.34	4.98	6.64	18.92	7.68	8.68	7.72	23.52	11.74	11.80	12.18
16	6.20	5.48	5.40	6.60	20.94	7.86	9.56	8.00	23.70	12.06	11.86	12.12
17	6.52	5.56	5.34	6.64	22.16	8.20	9.40	7.88	24.44	12.08	12.02	12.24
18	7.22	5.62	5.30	6.78	23.08	8.46	9.46	8.14	24.08	12.44	12.40	12.62
19	7.96	5.64	5.20	6.92	24.02	8.34	9.74	8.10	24.86	12.54	12.24	12.84
20	8.46	5.86	5.26	7.14	25.58	8.50	9.88	7.90	25.84	12.68	11.98	12.76
21	8.62	6.00	5.06	7.26	26.58	8.68	10.02	8.16	25.22	12.40	12.08	12.80
22	8.96	6.10	5.08	7.48	26.62	8.92	10.10	8.34	23.82	12.74	12.34	12.96
23	8.96	5.88	5.00	7.38	26.78	9.14	10.26	8.36	24.00	12.96	12.08	13.34
24	9.92	5.80	5.26	7.44	26.38	9.00	10.68	8.28	24.06	13.26	12.12	13.34
25	10.96	5.96	5.26	7.74	25.68	9.04	10.92	8.12	23.56	13.00	12.44	13.50
26	11.88	5.88	5.20	7.80	26.58	9.22	10.96	8.22	23.82	12.88	12.60	13.72
27	11.66	5.90	5.18	7.76	26.36	9.12	10.86	8.20	23.86	13.16	12.70	13.78
28	12.28	6.16	5.00	8.18	26.24	9.26	11.18	8.20	23.30	13.00	12.74	13.50
29	13.06	6.22	4.96	8.22	26.26	9.52	11.56	8.44	22.66	12.72	12.64	13.74
30	14.36	6.42	5.00	8.24	26.58	9.52	11.90	8.22	22.46	12.94	12.60	13.36
31	15.14	6.44	5.04	8.22	25.98	9.68	11.66	8.32	22.88	12.62	13.08	13.34
32	15.44	6.80	5.28	8.44	25.82	10.12	12.06	8.12	22.40	12.80	13.16	13.36
33	16.40	7.20	5.12	8.70	25.34	10.08	12.22	8.34	22.36	12.84	13.30	13.68
34	16.90	7.04	5.02	9.00	25.10	10.30	12.34	8.42	22.16	13.22	13.60	13.76
35	17.24	7.36	5.18	9.12	25.24	10.46	12.50	8.38	21.98	13.24	13.80	13.70
36	18.02	7.82	5.42	9.34	24.96	10.88	12.74	8.46	22.00	13.50	13.72	13.74
37	18.74	7.40	5.26	9.34	24.86	10.80	12.88	8.40	22.18	13.52	13.70	13.64
38	18.88	7.56	5.08	9.24	24.46	10.86	13.32	8.28	21.70	13.76	13.62	13.74
39	19.34	8.02	5.04	9.72	24.40	10.88	13.54	8.34	21.64	13.58	13.80	13.50
40	19.38	8.04	4.98	9.94	24.32	11.00	13.54	8.24	21.26	13.70	13.96	13.34

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 11: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lag k . $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ uncorrelated (not independent). Size of tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$, $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$, $t_{xy,k}$ and $t_{yx,k}$.

k	$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = \exp(\varepsilon_t)\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = \varepsilon_t\varepsilon_{t-1}$				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = r_t^2, r_t = \sigma_t\varepsilon_t$ ARCH			
	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$
0	4.44	4.44	35.32	35.32	4.96	4.96	25.80	25.80	4.72	4.72	38.16	38.16
1	4.28	4.50	5.16	4.92	4.72	4.84	24.52	4.64	5.16	4.56	4.44	15.52
2	4.98	4.74	5.00	4.68	4.92	5.30	4.62	4.90	4.24	4.34	4.20	7.20
3	4.22	4.36	4.62	4.88	4.66	4.90	4.70	4.78	5.16	4.44	5.20	4.96
4	3.90	4.18	4.22	4.46	5.16	4.80	5.04	4.60	5.08	4.64	4.84	4.68
5	4.14	4.18	5.04	4.76	5.38	5.10	5.00	4.78	4.60	4.72	4.82	5.12
6	4.20	4.12	5.02	4.52	5.30	4.88	5.08	4.70	4.60	5.20	4.62	4.90
7	4.32	4.22	4.46	4.70	5.18	4.86	4.76	4.68	5.08	4.92	4.66	4.54
8	4.62	4.54	4.84	4.56	5.36	5.20	4.78	4.92	4.50	4.80	4.34	4.78
9	4.20	4.06	4.26	4.10	4.58	4.92	4.32	4.60	3.74	4.52	3.50	4.36
10	4.64	4.88	4.02	5.12	4.60	4.86	4.10	4.50	4.58	4.76	4.36	4.82
11	4.42	4.72	4.42	4.80	4.74	4.90	4.26	4.42	4.78	4.42	4.34	4.50
12	3.84	4.36	4.34	4.44	5.02	5.10	4.82	4.56	4.70	4.46	4.50	4.16
13	4.38	4.74	4.10	4.42	5.12	4.66	4.66	4.60	5.04	4.88	4.86	4.30
14	4.50	4.64	4.72	4.76	4.82	4.62	4.28	4.20	4.84	3.94	4.50	4.04
15	4.50	4.40	4.54	3.94	4.48	4.98	4.10	4.74	4.94	4.50	4.20	4.14
16	4.98	4.56	4.82	4.36	4.90	4.58	4.42	4.16	4.92	4.86	4.78	4.98
17	5.12	4.28	5.18	4.08	5.36	4.96	4.46	4.20	4.80	4.38	4.48	4.18
18	4.46	4.72	4.18	4.52	4.88	4.92	4.18	4.50	4.84	4.66	4.30	4.48
19	4.74	4.24	4.52	4.28	4.44	5.16	3.82	4.20	4.64	4.96	4.64	4.36
20	4.48	4.74	3.86	4.48	5.14	5.26	4.18	3.84	4.50	4.30	4.20	3.76
21	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.40	5.44	4.98	4.64	3.82	4.72	4.46	3.70	3.76
22	4.18	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.38	4.74	3.70	4.00	4.56	4.50	4.00	3.94
23	4.04	4.58	4.02	4.40	4.74	4.80	3.96	3.80	4.30	4.74	3.92	4.26
24	4.26	4.40	4.40	4.10	5.24	4.80	4.14	4.04	4.94	4.90	4.22	4.36
25	5.00	4.12	4.40	3.86	5.04	4.62	3.86	3.66	4.22	4.74	3.84	4.26
26	4.02	4.48	3.98	4.28	5.22	4.88	4.02	3.92	4.44	4.96	3.90	3.86
27	4.24	4.66	3.86	3.82	4.66	4.98	3.64	3.94	4.70	4.72	3.88	4.04
28	4.26	4.38	3.96	3.84	5.06	4.80	3.84	3.94	4.64	4.90	3.92	4.32
29	4.72	4.36	3.96	3.96	5.30	4.58	3.88	3.58	5.16	5.20	4.14	4.12
30	4.72	4.32	3.94	3.92	4.44	4.82	3.62	3.66	4.68	4.64	3.34	3.70
31	4.26	4.64	3.52	4.08	5.10	4.66	3.92	3.54	4.58	4.10	3.72	3.52
32	4.66	4.18	3.86	3.90	4.96	4.90	3.78	3.56	4.34	4.86	3.40	4.26
33	4.60	4.34	4.00	3.96	4.88	4.70	3.50	3.64	4.38	4.28	3.58	3.50
34	4.64	4.14	4.04	3.62	4.86	4.54	3.42	3.78	4.66	5.08	3.20	4.06
35	4.30	4.74	3.66	3.84	4.52	4.72	3.44	3.68	4.72	4.58	3.44	3.60
36	4.94	4.28	4.26	3.64	4.96	4.48	3.86	3.22	4.56	4.94	3.62	3.32
37	4.68	4.12	3.62	3.28	4.78	4.92	3.52	3.52	4.92	4.58	3.76	3.34
38	4.32	4.18	3.64	3.54	4.86	4.66	3.32	3.32	4.54	4.70	3.24	3.28
39	4.60	4.18	4.04	3.54	5.06	5.20	3.50	3.88	4.52	4.44	3.48	3.32
40	4.50	4.80	3.18	3.98	4.84	4.60	3.52	3.08	4.92	4.46	3.68	3.04

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_t \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$.

Table 12: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $0, 1, \dots, m$. $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ uncorrelated (not independent). Size of tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$, $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, $HB_{xy,m}$ and $HB_{yx,m}$.

m	$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = \exp(\varepsilon_t)\eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = \varepsilon_t\varepsilon_{t-1}$				$x_t = \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = r_t^2, r_t = \sigma_t\varepsilon_t$ ARCH			
	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$
0	4.44	4.44	35.32	35.32	4.96	4.96	25.80	25.80	4.72	4.72	38.16	38.16
1	3.86	4.20	30.12	30.18	5.02	4.76	35.00	20.80	4.92	4.70	31.98	39.16
2	4.18	3.92	27.04	26.72	4.94	4.96	30.64	18.54	4.54	4.48	29.60	36.70
3	3.80	3.86	24.92	24.36	4.84	5.12	27.64	16.92	4.60	4.52	27.78	34.42
4	3.70	3.74	22.88	22.96	4.72	4.96	25.60	15.54	4.88	4.22	26.08	32.66
5	3.60	3.66	21.90	21.68	4.90	4.58	24.88	14.74	5.02	4.12	24.40	30.86
6	3.62	3.46	20.84	20.72	4.86	4.48	23.48	13.90	4.58	4.52	23.80	29.96
7	3.54	3.66	20.12	19.76	4.88	4.64	22.64	13.46	4.70	4.36	22.36	28.80
8	3.52	3.56	19.44	19.16	4.98	4.52	22.04	12.68	4.66	4.18	21.84	27.44
9	3.52	3.82	18.86	18.08	4.82	4.46	21.18	12.18	4.18	4.04	20.78	26.36
10	3.18	4.28	17.98	17.64	4.72	4.72	20.72	12.10	4.16	4.12	20.06	25.50
11	3.48	4.10	16.96	17.26	4.48	4.78	20.38	12.04	4.08	4.24	19.04	24.80
12	3.58	4.24	16.14	16.68	4.40	4.54	19.38	11.76	4.06	4.38	18.80	23.90
13	3.36	4.40	15.86	16.54	4.56	4.68	18.76	11.62	4.16	4.58	18.56	23.44
14	3.08	4.18	15.38	16.02	4.68	4.64	18.32	11.08	4.36	4.54	17.92	22.56
15	3.10	4.32	14.98	15.48	4.66	4.72	17.68	11.04	4.30	4.90	18.12	22.20
16	3.54	4.26	14.96	15.40	4.20	4.90	17.50	10.98	4.26	5.14	17.72	21.44
17	3.72	4.38	14.82	15.12	4.60	4.86	17.10	10.50	4.14	4.94	17.44	20.88
18	3.72	4.62	14.42	14.76	4.40	4.66	16.38	10.56	4.26	4.94	17.46	20.84
19	3.86	4.70	14.20	14.20	4.40	4.60	15.86	10.44	4.40	5.02	17.16	20.24
20	3.68	4.68	13.82	14.04	4.42	4.60	15.20	10.30	4.30	5.26	16.50	19.88
21	3.66	4.74	13.52	13.76	4.70	4.62	15.08	10.30	4.40	5.18	15.84	19.32
22	3.68	4.80	13.04	13.60	4.38	4.54	14.94	9.70	4.28	5.32	15.36	19.14
23	3.46	4.98	12.70	13.62	4.30	4.96	14.42	9.98	4.34	5.42	15.04	18.70
24	3.42	4.98	12.54	13.36	4.36	5.08	14.30	9.88	4.30	5.38	14.66	18.68
25	3.32	5.04	12.62	13.18	4.30	5.20	14.12	10.08	4.30	5.40	14.54	18.42
26	3.28	5.74	12.50	13.04	4.12	5.34	13.76	9.80	4.42	5.56	13.96	17.80
27	3.24	5.90	12.42	12.96	4.06	5.60	13.54	9.84	4.40	5.54	13.74	17.28
28	3.36	6.12	12.44	12.74	4.22	5.74	13.28	9.68	4.58	6.00	13.90	17.70
29	3.40	6.36	12.40	12.72	4.30	6.00	13.42	9.24	4.86	6.24	13.64	17.08
30	3.54	6.84	12.18	12.64	4.60	6.18	13.18	9.14	4.58	6.70	13.82	17.10
31	3.50	7.38	11.88	12.80	4.60	6.42	13.00	9.22	4.76	6.60	13.36	16.76
32	3.50	7.80	11.74	12.54	4.66	6.66	12.68	8.90	4.72	7.14	13.18	16.40
33	3.66	8.10	11.60	12.28	4.70	6.88	12.56	9.02	4.86	7.22	12.82	16.42
34	3.70	8.30	11.48	12.26	4.62	7.12	12.82	9.04	4.80	7.36	12.70	16.36
35	3.66	9.00	11.86	12.06	4.52	7.62	12.48	8.98	5.02	7.52	12.84	15.88
36	3.88	8.80	11.74	11.72	4.42	7.74	12.08	8.88	5.08	8.12	12.82	15.96
37	3.88	9.72	11.52	11.98	4.58	8.02	12.04	8.72	5.34	8.26	12.74	15.92
38	4.00	10.22	11.42	11.88	4.38	8.50	12.00	8.68	5.20	8.84	12.58	15.48
39	4.16	10.74	11.62	11.66	4.46	8.90	11.88	8.64	5.38	9.16	12.44	15.46
40	4.02	11.22	11.70	11.32	4.78	9.24	11.66	8.32	5.56	9.82	12.42	15.00

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_t \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$.

Table 13: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lag k . Power of tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$, $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$, $t_{xy,k}$ and $t_{yx,k}$.

k	$x_t = r_{1t}, r_{1t} = \sigma_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ARCH $y_t = r_{2t}, r_{2t} = \sigma_{2t}\varepsilon_t$ GARCH				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ $y_t = x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t$				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ $y_t = m_{1t} + x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t$			
	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$
0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1	4.46	4.48	9.06	9.74	4.98	100	6.74	100	4.84	100	6.42	100
2	4.92	4.82	5.50	9.58	4.92	100	6.94	100	5.00	100	6.80	100
3	4.94	4.82	4.46	8.86	4.90	5.02	6.60	6.80	4.78	4.66	6.70	6.30
4	4.88	4.66	4.72	8.40	4.52	5.34	6.48	6.98	4.80	4.86	6.18	6.76
5	5.10	4.86	4.56	7.66	4.74	4.88	6.24	6.32	4.78	5.10	6.52	6.60
6	4.66	4.76	4.36	7.44	4.58	4.88	5.68	6.54	4.64	5.16	6.00	6.38
7	4.62	4.76	4.34	7.08	5.08	5.12	6.58	6.44	5.18	4.90	6.46	6.28
8	4.74	4.32	4.12	6.20	4.70	5.16	6.22	6.36	4.64	4.98	6.22	6.56
9	5.00	4.82	4.38	6.72	4.98	5.10	6.58	6.44	5.14	4.96	6.48	6.08
10	5.20	5.04	4.28	6.28	4.56	4.84	5.98	6.34	4.74	4.98	5.98	6.26
11	4.64	4.70	4.06	5.76	4.66	4.98	6.06	5.96	4.60	5.14	6.02	6.16
12	4.72	4.72	3.64	5.34	5.10	4.72	7.00	5.64	5.24	4.66	6.84	5.46
13	5.28	5.02	4.42	5.50	5.02	4.70	6.28	5.68	5.08	4.70	6.22	5.52
14	5.42	5.36	4.56	5.60	5.10	5.40	6.34	6.00	5.38	4.86	6.68	5.64
15	4.80	4.82	3.86	4.88	5.28	5.10	6.58	5.90	5.30	4.98	6.40	5.86
16	5.08	5.48	4.34	5.78	4.82	5.02	5.72	5.90	5.12	4.94	6.10	5.54
17	4.84	4.58	3.88	4.60	5.18	5.18	6.12	6.06	5.06	5.20	6.38	5.86
18	5.04	4.86	4.18	4.74	5.02	4.50	6.00	5.20	5.12	4.48	6.14	4.94
19	4.96	4.92	3.84	4.66	5.12	4.74	6.20	5.44	5.28	4.86	6.04	5.50
20	5.50	5.26	4.40	4.84	4.58	4.82	5.50	5.52	4.50	4.70	5.62	5.28

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim \text{GARCH}(1,1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 14: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $0, 1, \dots, m$. Power of tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$, $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, $HB_{xy,m}$ and $HB_{yx,m}$.

m	$x_t = r_{1t}, r_{1t} = \sigma_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ARCH $y_t = r_{2t}, r_{2t} = \sigma_{2t}\varepsilon_t$ GARCH				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ $y_t = x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t$				$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ $y_t = m_{1t} + x_t + x_{t-1} + x_{t-2} + h_{1t}\eta_t$			
	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$
0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
3	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.98	100	100	100
5	100	100	100	100	99.96	100	99.98	100	99.96	100	99.98	100
6	99.98	100	100	100	99.94	100	99.96	100	99.86	100	99.96	100
7	99.98	100	100	100	99.90	100	99.94	100	99.90	100	99.94	100
8	99.98	100	100	100	99.86	100	99.94	100	99.82	100	99.94	100
9	99.98	100	100	100	99.80	100	99.94	100	99.68	100	99.94	100
10	99.98	100	100	100	99.68	100	99.94	100	99.34	100	99.94	100
11	99.98	100	100	100	99.64	100	99.94	100	99.28	100	99.94	100
12	100	100	100	100	99.46	100	99.94	100	99.04	100	99.94	100
13	100	100	100	100	99.46	100	99.90	100	98.76	100	99.90	100
14	99.98	100	100	100	99.14	100	99.92	100	98.56	100	99.90	100
15	99.96	100	100	100	98.96	100	99.92	100	98.28	100	99.90	100
16	99.96	99.98	100	100	98.68	100	99.92	100	97.58	100	99.90	100
17	99.96	99.98	100	100	98.40	100	99.92	100	97.40	100	99.86	100
18	99.98	99.96	100	100	98.12	100	99.88	100	96.98	100	99.84	100
19	99.98	99.96	100	100	97.68	100	99.88	100	96.12	100	99.80	100
20	99.98	99.96	100	100	97.36	100	99.88	100	95.46	100	99.78	100

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $r_{1t} \sim \text{ARCH}(1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $r_{2t} \sim \text{GARCH}(1,1)$, $\alpha = 0.2$, $\beta = 0.7$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 15: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lag k . Spurious power of tests $\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$, $\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$, $t_{xy,k}$ and $t_{yx,k}$.

	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{4t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = 0.7x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = 0.7y_{t-1} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid			
k	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{xy,k}$	$\tilde{t}_{yx,k}$	$t_{xy,k}$	$t_{yx,k}$
0	94.94	94.94	94.40	94.40	43.16	43.16	43.18	43.18	24.98	24.98	24.80	24.80
1	94.56	94.20	94.06	93.92	43.20	42.48	42.88	41.80	25.44	24.94	25.12	24.68
2	93.34	93.76	92.60	93.22	42.76	41.14	42.26	40.66	25.56	25.56	25.22	25.36
3	94.04	93.86	93.36	93.06	43.82	40.52	43.08	39.78	25.08	25.50	24.48	25.34
4	93.28	93.84	92.72	93.16	43.46	39.78	42.94	38.74	24.32	25.48	23.98	24.84
5	92.70	93.36	91.94	92.18	44.58	39.32	43.92	38.28	25.12	24.28	24.64	23.80
6	92.30	93.36	91.60	92.62	45.30	36.52	44.24	35.54	25.06	24.50	24.30	23.78
7	91.78	92.72	90.84	91.86	44.68	37.28	42.92	35.96	24.76	25.22	24.24	24.62
8	91.58	92.14	90.34	91.46	45.88	36.52	44.40	35.22	25.00	25.16	24.26	24.76
9	91.02	90.76	89.90	89.72	45.92	34.64	44.38	33.06	24.06	25.80	23.56	25.02
10	90.42	91.34	89.04	90.22	46.56	32.72	44.96	30.90	24.72	25.62	23.78	24.24
11	90.20	90.64	89.06	89.50	46.94	34.04	45.54	32.20	25.12	24.56	23.86	23.56
12	88.98	89.90	87.48	88.28	47.00	31.56	45.42	29.68	25.40	25.08	24.54	24.30
13	88.16	89.16	86.52	87.54	47.88	30.18	46.04	28.50	25.28	25.30	24.16	24.10
14	87.84	88.98	86.24	87.54	48.78	29.34	46.04	27.16	25.00	24.78	23.46	23.64
15	86.84	87.44	85.20	85.60	47.54	27.52	45.02	25.34	25.18	25.18	23.58	24.10
16	86.00	86.50	84.16	84.78	49.18	27.50	46.82	25.30	25.40	24.56	23.92	23.60
17	85.12	86.90	83.22	84.54	48.58	25.78	45.98	23.16	25.14	24.20	23.58	23.00
18	84.14	85.94	82.26	83.60	50.38	24.84	47.80	22.56	24.86	24.54	23.18	23.14
19	83.90	85.22	81.54	82.48	49.02	25.90	46.34	22.96	24.44	25.66	22.86	23.78
20	82.54	84.26	80.46	81.34	49.04	24.90	46.16	21.70	24.54	25.68	22.76	23.86

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $m_{4t} = I(t/n > 0.25)$.

Table 16: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $0, 1, \dots, m$. Spurious power of tests $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$, $\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$, $HB_{xy,m}$ and $HB_{yx,m}$.

	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{1t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = m_{4t} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid				$x_t = 0.7x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_t$ iid $y_t = 0.7y_{t-1} + \eta_t, \eta_t$ iid			
m	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{yx,m}$	$HB_{xy,m}$	$HB_{yx,m}$
0	94.94	94.94	94.40	94.40	43.16	43.16	43.18	43.18	24.98	24.98	24.82	24.82
1	98.96	98.98	99.08	99.02	55.78	53.10	58.18	57.44	20.62	20.60	30.90	31.08
2	99.62	99.72	99.72	99.82	62.00	57.94	66.62	65.98	19.10	19.56	34.56	34.88
3	99.84	99.88	99.86	99.90	66.58	60.26	73.52	71.30	18.02	18.88	37.78	38.26
4	99.88	99.94	99.92	99.98	70.50	61.88	77.58	75.42	18.36	19.10	40.88	40.98
5	99.96	99.98	100	100	73.26	62.64	81.04	77.88	18.44	19.18	43.60	43.52
6	99.96	99.98	100	100	74.80	62.26	83.70	80.10	19.04	19.38	46.00	46.34
7	99.98	100	100	100	76.62	62.74	85.86	81.60	19.56	20.32	48.70	48.56
8	100	100	100	100	77.48	63.06	87.48	82.76	20.32	20.86	50.98	51.12
9	100	100	100	100	78.98	63.40	88.68	83.58	20.72	22.32	53.30	53.14
10	99.98	100	100	100	79.44	63.20	89.54	84.38	21.90	22.50	55.28	55.06
11	99.98	99.98	100	100	80.12	63.20	90.26	85.14	23.26	22.86	57.12	57.16
12	99.94	99.94	100	100	81.04	62.64	91.36	85.56	23.62	23.88	58.64	59.04
13	99.88	99.84	100	100	81.62	63.12	92.20	85.92	24.88	23.90	60.50	61.12
14	99.82	99.84	100	100	82.82	63.28	92.84	85.90	24.80	24.44	61.76	62.98
15	99.60	99.54	100	100	83.42	64.10	93.60	86.06	24.74	24.38	63.56	64.08
16	99.12	99.22	100	100	83.60	63.98	94.12	86.32	24.20	25.02	65.14	65.46
17	98.34	98.58	100	100	84.10	63.56	94.60	86.58	24.94	24.84	66.36	66.76
18	97.60	97.78	100	100	83.76	64.12	95.22	86.60	24.64	25.10	67.56	67.96
19	96.74	96.86	100	100	83.74	63.10	95.62	86.78	24.60	25.62	68.78	69.38
20	95.96	95.40	100	100	83.88	61.36	95.92	86.60	24.60	26.14	70.10	70.74

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $m_{4t} = I(t/n > 0.25)$.

Table 17: Tests for i.i.d. property at lag k . Size of tests $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $J_{x,x^2,k}$.

k	x_t iid $N(0,1)$		x_t iid $t(6)$		x_t iid $\chi^2(3)$		$x_t = \exp(2\varepsilon_t)$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$
1	4.54	4.30	4.74	3.98	5.06	4.70	3.58	2.64
2	4.86	4.76	4.82	4.64	4.54	4.68	3.28	2.24
3	4.50	4.14	4.46	4.32	4.90	4.80	3.58	2.60
4	4.78	4.94	4.82	4.68	4.60	4.48	3.58	2.62
5	4.46	4.24	4.20	4.24	4.42	4.50	3.82	2.86
6	4.50	4.46	4.12	4.44	4.60	4.68	3.46	2.56
7	4.48	4.12	4.28	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.00	2.92
8	4.32	4.16	4.20	3.94	4.24	4.46	3.62	2.46
9	4.60	4.48	4.40	4.46	5.00	4.74	3.40	2.54
10	4.60	4.36	4.74	4.44	4.58	4.76	3.64	2.48
11	5.30	4.82	5.02	4.46	4.90	5.00	3.50	2.38
12	4.50	4.14	4.46	4.18	4.94	4.72	3.48	2.48
13	5.04	4.66	4.56	3.98	5.40	4.78	3.26	2.26
14	4.64	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.68	4.80	3.34	2.22
15	4.64	4.22	4.58	4.14	4.70	4.76	4.04	2.92
16	5.04	4.68	4.96	4.36	5.02	5.12	4.06	2.90
17	5.00	4.56	4.58	3.92	4.52	4.24	3.54	2.64
18	4.84	4.50	4.70	4.30	4.76	5.20	3.50	2.52
19	5.12	4.72	4.74	4.60	4.70	4.88	3.94	3.04
20	4.86	4.50	4.70	4.50	5.08	4.92	3.70	2.56
21	5.02	4.14	4.70	4.38	4.80	4.60	3.52	2.64
22	5.08	4.78	4.80	4.46	5.22	5.08	3.46	2.60
23	4.86	5.08	4.72	4.88	5.02	4.68	3.40	2.42
24	5.04	4.88	5.08	4.78	4.74	4.60	3.68	2.74
25	5.18	5.22	5.30	5.06	4.56	4.36	3.60	2.62
26	4.92	4.94	4.76	4.16	5.26	5.56	3.68	2.46
27	4.68	4.20	4.38	4.54	4.66	4.80	3.32	2.62
28	4.58	4.84	4.64	4.32	4.84	4.72	3.26	2.26
29	4.96	4.78	4.90	4.92	5.00	4.92	3.60	2.60
30	4.60	4.68	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.34	3.64	2.70
31	4.86	4.98	4.90	4.84	4.60	4.54	3.48	2.40
32	4.68	4.48	4.60	4.32	5.50	5.28	3.16	2.48
33	4.40	4.12	4.36	4.16	4.78	4.48	3.30	2.28
34	5.06	4.76	4.56	4.54	5.54	5.58	3.30	2.34
35	4.92	4.54	4.80	4.26	4.64	4.90	3.22	2.32
36	4.86	4.50	4.48	3.98	4.76	5.18	3.50	2.60
37	5.02	4.86	4.68	4.46	5.32	4.88	3.40	2.44
38	4.84	4.58	4.62	4.68	4.90	4.64	3.28	2.66
39	4.86	4.78	4.92	4.84	4.82	5.06	3.94	2.92
40	5.10	4.80	4.98	4.66	4.56	4.44	3.46	2.54

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$.

Table 18: Tests for i.i.d. property at lags 1, ..., m . Size of tests $C_{x,|x|,m}$ and $C_{x,x^2,m}$.

	x_t iid $N(0,1)$		x_t iid $t(6)$		x_t iid $\chi^2(3)$		$x_t = \exp(2\varepsilon_t)$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
m	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$
1	4.54	4.30	4.74	3.98	5.06	4.70	3.58	2.64
2	4.88	4.48	4.66	4.52	4.96	5.30	4.72	3.42
3	4.66	4.66	4.76	4.90	5.30	5.98	6.18	4.52
4	4.84	4.76	4.56	5.38	5.22	6.44	6.82	5.08
5	5.02	4.68	4.50	5.56	5.42	6.74	7.76	5.96
6	4.78	4.84	4.50	5.66	5.82	7.10	8.18	6.12
7	4.88	4.52	4.50	5.64	5.66	6.96	8.60	6.44
8	4.94	4.66	4.56	5.78	5.62	7.12	8.86	6.86
9	4.68	4.78	4.46	5.70	5.68	7.16	9.08	7.08
10	5.04	4.90	4.76	5.70	5.86	7.46	9.10	7.06
11	5.40	4.92	4.86	5.48	5.56	7.46	9.40	7.34
12	5.54	4.90	4.94	5.44	5.46	7.38	9.74	7.52
13	5.62	4.94	4.98	5.32	5.52	7.46	9.70	7.48
14	5.36	4.78	4.80	5.24	5.46	7.14	9.64	7.50
15	5.44	4.72	4.94	5.22	5.54	6.94	9.82	7.88
16	5.48	4.78	4.74	5.10	5.38	7.16	9.96	7.80
17	5.54	4.62	4.86	5.08	5.68	6.92	9.96	7.84
18	5.50	4.82	4.76	4.82	5.76	6.76	9.84	7.84
19	5.74	4.70	5.00	4.88	5.76	6.82	9.88	7.76
20	5.70	4.86	5.04	4.92	5.56	7.02	9.78	7.82
21	5.86	4.86	5.06	4.82	5.84	6.74	9.70	7.96
22	5.30	4.80	4.86	4.80	5.70	6.76	9.50	7.98
23	5.58	4.98	4.78	4.78	6.06	6.86	9.68	7.84
24	5.82	5.18	5.12	4.96	6.08	7.02	9.76	7.90
25	5.88	5.24	5.08	4.92	6.28	6.82	9.76	7.72
26	5.82	5.54	5.16	4.86	6.32	6.84	9.46	7.60
27	6.06	5.26	5.30	4.86	6.20	6.80	9.46	7.62
28	6.10	5.28	5.48	5.16	6.34	7.00	9.32	7.32
29	6.28	5.50	5.66	5.28	6.60	6.96	9.30	7.20
30	6.02	5.38	5.58	5.20	6.62	6.88	9.26	7.14
31	6.36	5.56	5.84	5.32	6.74	6.62	9.28	7.08
32	6.64	5.80	5.90	5.48	6.60	6.60	9.20	7.14
33	6.28	5.72	5.78	5.20	6.60	6.72	9.10	7.10
34	6.42	5.88	5.72	5.28	6.64	6.62	8.88	6.98
35	6.44	5.72	5.72	5.08	6.92	6.56	8.84	7.18
36	6.34	5.62	5.90	5.22	6.64	6.66	8.50	7.08
37	6.58	5.64	5.86	5.04	6.70	6.54	8.58	6.88
38	6.74	5.66	6.02	4.94	6.90	6.56	8.70	6.94
39	6.92	6.04	6.12	5.12	7.16	6.62	8.72	6.76
40	6.98	6.00	6.28	5.10	7.08	6.64	8.60	6.82

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$.

Table 19: Tests for i.i.d. property at lag k . Power of tests $J_{x,|x|,k}$ and $J_{x,x^2,k}$.

	x_t AR(1) $\phi = 0.2$		x_t ARCH(1) $\alpha = 0.2$		x_t GARCH(1,1) $\alpha = 0.2, \beta = 0.7$		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
k	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$
1	86.50	86.52	63.42	68.64	80.12	79.48	99.98	89.64
2	8.58	8.20	8.68	10.36	71.84	70.50	7.44	4.50
3	5.10	4.84	5.54	5.22	61.84	60.64	6.34	4.72
4	5.54	5.46	5.12	4.98	53.90	52.44	6.06	4.84
5	5.28	5.46	4.80	4.54	45.84	44.00	6.04	5.12
6	4.96	4.92	4.58	4.46	38.30	36.94	6.24	4.84
7	5.08	4.80	4.62	4.38	33.06	31.48	6.18	4.42
8	5.32	4.60	5.14	4.00	27.66	26.02	6.94	5.12
9	5.22	5.12	5.04	4.72	24.14	22.22	7.18	5.16
10	4.80	5.10	4.94	4.90	20.76	19.34	6.32	4.98
11	5.74	5.48	5.30	4.80	18.30	16.74	6.06	4.54
12	5.30	4.76	5.26	4.72	15.48	13.64	6.40	4.66
13	5.64	5.28	5.22	4.78	14.58	12.92	6.48	4.70
14	5.42	4.92	4.84	3.86	12.16	10.40	6.38	4.94
15	4.94	5.32	5.04	4.68	11.36	9.86	6.28	4.90
16	5.66	5.28	5.66	4.94	10.74	9.18	6.56	5.22
17	5.62	4.86	5.10	4.40	10.30	8.12	6.30	4.60
18	5.16	4.74	5.14	4.66	9.34	7.92	6.02	4.44
19	5.60	5.54	5.50	4.72	9.42	7.34	6.20	4.74
20	5.14	5.40	5.28	4.66	8.06	6.56	6.44	4.80
	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$		$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$		$x_t = h_{1t}y_t$ y_t AR(1), $\phi = 0.2$		$x_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
k	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$	$J_{x, x ,k}$	$J_{x,x^2,k}$
1	86.06	85.64	59.22	41.00	95.58	91.86	61.22	51.08
2	85.70	85.40	58.84	41.74	61.34	45.30	61.00	51.94
3	85.32	85.06	59.44	41.02	59.00	40.98	58.68	49.18
4	85.26	85.04	58.88	41.72	58.20	42.20	60.12	51.20
5	83.98	83.80	57.74	40.08	58.02	41.04	58.80	49.32
6	83.36	83.12	55.76	39.34	56.96	40.30	57.42	48.56
7	82.64	82.26	55.78	39.82	55.28	39.14	56.38	46.40
8	82.76	82.32	55.64	38.64	56.96	39.88	55.22	46.22
9	80.96	80.58	55.24	37.58	54.54	38.74	53.74	44.80
10	79.80	79.96	53.76	36.80	53.82	37.84	52.32	44.00
11	79.54	79.10	52.28	36.22	53.24	36.66	51.00	43.42
12	79.42	79.12	51.38	35.86	51.72	36.34	49.86	41.44
13	77.94	78.02	52.36	36.12	52.58	36.98	49.40	41.94
14	76.78	76.54	50.58	35.10	50.56	36.26	48.90	40.48
15	76.44	76.30	50.92	35.58	51.16	35.52	49.12	41.08
16	75.12	74.72	49.00	34.44	49.86	35.38	47.58	40.06
17	74.92	74.30	48.08	33.82	47.98	34.22	45.24	38.06
18	72.94	72.70	47.36	33.28	47.98	33.84	45.08	37.40
19	72.88	72.88	46.98	32.70	47.68	33.28	44.50	36.58
20	71.44	71.00	46.76	33.06	46.96	34.10	43.48	35.70

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 20: Tests for i.i.d. property at lag k . Power of tests $C_{x,|x|,m}$ and $C_{x,x^2,m}$.

	x_t AR(1) $\phi = 0.2$		x_t ARCH(1) $\alpha = 0.2$		x_t GARCH(1,1) $\alpha = 0.2, \beta = 0.7$		$x_t = \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-1}$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
m	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$
1	86.50	86.52	63.42	68.64	80.12	79.48	99.98	89.64
2	78.48	78.64	54.30	61.02	86.70	87.96	99.98	83.66
3	72.32	72.16	48.50	56.10	88.46	90.08	99.96	79.46
4	66.48	66.14	43.88	51.98	88.96	90.86	99.98	76.32
5	62.18	61.34	41.34	48.42	89.46	91.28	99.94	73.82
6	57.90	57.10	38.54	46.18	89.24	91.46	99.88	71.12
7	54.76	54.70	36.22	43.46	88.68	91.04	99.74	67.80
8	52.04	51.68	34.28	41.44	88.24	90.52	99.62	66.02
9	50.42	49.94	33.04	40.06	87.68	90.14	99.42	64.50
10	48.22	47.92	31.96	38.70	87.04	89.42	99.16	62.50
11	46.30	45.74	31.12	37.88	86.42	88.96	98.94	60.98
12	44.64	43.92	30.48	36.90	85.64	88.74	98.68	59.48
13	43.58	42.34	29.34	36.22	84.90	87.92	98.62	58.06
14	42.20	41.14	28.72	35.48	84.56	87.22	98.22	57.02
15	41.64	40.24	27.62	34.40	84.32	86.94	98.02	55.68
16	40.50	38.90	26.86	33.76	83.80	86.26	97.88	54.50
17	39.78	38.12	26.14	33.28	83.12	85.64	97.68	53.42
18	39.06	37.74	25.52	32.04	82.82	84.92	97.10	52.16
19	38.20	36.58	25.46	31.68	82.04	84.72	96.74	50.90
20	37.58	36.20	25.30	31.00	81.84	84.12	96.20	50.30
	$x_t = m_{1t} + \varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$		$x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$		$x_t = h_{1t}y_t$ y_t AR(1), $\phi = 0.2$		$x_t = m_{1t} + h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$ ε_t iid $N(0,1)$	
m	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$	$C_{x, x ,m}$	$C_{x,x^2,m}$
1	86.06	85.64	59.22	41.00	95.58	91.86	61.22	51.08
2	95.58	95.26	77.86	58.76	96.90	93.28	79.38	70.78
3	98.36	98.14	86.76	70.20	97.84	95.00	88.30	81.36
4	99.10	98.82	91.16	77.86	98.44	96.18	93.36	87.88
5	99.44	99.28	94.56	83.82	99.02	96.90	96.14	91.94
6	99.64	99.58	96.02	87.32	99.34	97.44	97.32	94.08
7	99.76	99.76	97.34	90.52	99.48	98.04	98.00	96.02
8	99.78	99.78	97.62	92.40	99.52	98.44	98.56	96.86
9	99.86	99.84	98.22	93.64	99.62	98.44	98.92	97.64
10	99.86	99.86	98.78	94.78	99.66	98.88	99.16	98.22
11	99.92	99.88	99.02	95.74	99.64	98.82	99.36	98.62
12	99.94	99.90	99.18	96.24	99.74	99.04	99.40	98.92
13	99.94	99.90	99.38	96.70	99.76	99.12	99.50	99.14
14	99.94	99.92	99.48	97.34	99.80	99.34	99.70	99.28
15	99.96	99.94	99.52	97.78	99.84	99.54	99.72	99.44
16	99.94	99.94	99.58	98.08	99.84	99.66	99.76	99.52
17	99.94	99.92	99.56	98.30	99.82	99.56	99.78	99.62
18	99.94	99.92	99.62	98.42	99.86	99.66	99.78	99.62
19	99.92	99.94	99.68	98.60	99.82	99.58	99.76	99.66
20	99.94	99.92	99.68	98.66	99.84	99.62	99.82	99.76

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 5% significance level, $n = 300$. In models: $m_{1t} = I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$.

Table 21: Tests for zero serial correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Size of tests Q_m and \tilde{Q}_m with different thresholds λ .

m	$\alpha = 10\%$				$\alpha = 5\%$				$\alpha = 1\%$			
	Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$			Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$			Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$		
		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$
1	9.74	9.74	9.74	9.74	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80
2	9.92	9.68	9.72	9.76	4.84	4.84	4.78	4.76	0.76	0.70	0.66	0.68
3	9.82	9.64	9.72	9.78	4.28	4.52	4.66	4.60	0.88	0.82	0.80	0.86
4	9.80	9.44	9.56	9.36	4.38	4.52	4.58	4.68	0.82	0.86	0.80	0.94
5	9.28	9.46	9.44	9.50	4.58	4.26	4.34	4.40	1.00	1.06	1.02	1.06
6	9.32	9.18	9.52	9.50	4.36	4.34	4.40	4.54	0.90	0.94	1.04	1.16
7	8.76	8.82	9.16	9.48	4.12	4.42	4.52	4.64	0.76	0.86	0.82	1.08
8	8.10	8.82	8.94	9.26	4.12	4.20	4.26	4.44	0.72	0.72	0.76	0.86
9	8.42	8.60	8.82	9.06	3.72	4.22	4.26	4.74	0.72	0.84	0.84	0.96
10	8.28	8.68	8.86	9.24	3.80	4.24	4.28	4.64	0.82	0.94	0.90	1.10
11	8.10	8.90	8.92	9.08	3.72	4.10	4.30	4.66	0.64	0.90	0.98	1.10
12	8.08	9.00	8.90	9.40	3.88	4.06	4.28	4.72	0.66	0.90	1.02	1.12
13	7.90	8.72	9.14	9.48	3.92	4.14	4.20	4.66	0.56	0.86	0.94	1.04
14	8.04	8.72	9.24	9.76	3.88	4.40	4.60	4.76	0.50	0.84	1.00	1.22
15	8.08	8.76	9.26	9.54	3.86	4.40	4.60	5.04	0.50	0.76	0.88	1.14
16	8.22	9.28	9.56	9.88	3.48	4.44	4.66	5.22	0.44	0.76	0.90	1.14
17	7.68	8.74	9.12	9.84	3.32	4.40	4.60	5.02	0.46	0.80	0.94	1.22
18	7.18	8.60	8.68	9.70	3.18	4.24	4.64	5.12	0.42	0.76	0.88	1.24
19	7.18	8.46	8.70	9.70	3.24	4.42	4.72	5.26	0.44	0.94	0.98	1.30
20	7.24	8.30	8.68	9.50	2.90	4.38	4.50	5.04	0.38	0.86	1.00	1.28
21	7.08	8.52	8.80	9.66	2.92	4.40	4.76	5.08	0.44	0.80	0.96	1.26
22	6.82	8.60	9.02	9.72	2.94	4.14	4.68	5.32	0.36	0.80	0.92	1.20
23	7.06	8.58	9.24	9.98	2.88	4.64	4.44	5.18	0.30	0.98	0.96	1.24
24	7.00	8.86	9.42	10.24	2.92	4.52	4.76	5.16	0.28	0.84	1.02	1.46
25	6.84	9.08	9.32	10.28	2.74	4.66	4.96	5.64	0.16	0.86	1.02	1.40
26	6.52	9.06	8.98	10.22	2.54	4.60	4.74	5.64	0.18	0.82	1.04	1.46
27	6.16	8.96	9.16	9.96	2.62	4.64	4.72	5.58	0.24	0.86	1.10	1.36
28	6.12	8.96	9.22	9.88	2.28	4.68	4.76	5.56	0.20	0.80	1.12	1.46
29	5.92	9.32	9.22	10.36	2.44	4.74	4.66	5.74	0.16	0.84	1.20	1.52
30	5.68	9.36	9.88	10.50	2.40	4.92	4.62	5.68	0.20	0.98	1.10	1.46
31	5.84	9.56	9.62	10.68	2.28	5.02	4.78	5.68	0.20	1.10	1.16	1.52
32	5.74	9.54	9.56	10.88	2.08	5.04	4.62	5.66	0.16	1.16	1.16	1.48
33	5.66	9.86	9.52	10.72	1.84	5.04	4.60	5.70	0.18	1.14	1.20	1.52
34	5.60	10.02	9.72	11.14	2.00	5.16	5.00	5.88	0.16	1.24	1.16	1.54
35	5.46	9.90	9.56	11.10	1.98	5.24	4.86	5.88	0.14	1.20	1.06	1.56
36	5.08	10.06	9.62	10.96	2.08	5.46	5.06	5.70	0.20	1.42	1.20	1.46
37	5.12	10.22	9.36	11.02	2.10	5.60	5.06	5.74	0.18	1.42	1.22	1.58
38	5.24	10.62	9.52	10.96	2.00	5.72	5.20	6.00	0.10	1.50	1.22	1.68
39	4.90	10.70	9.70	11.00	1.88	5.82	5.10	6.22	0.10	1.44	1.40	1.56
40	5.20	11.34	9.94	10.88	1.82	6.06	5.04	6.06	0.08	1.84	1.30	1.66

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 10%, 5% and 1% significance level, $n = 300$. Model: $x_t = \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0,1)$.

Table 22: Tests for zero serial correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Size of tests Q_m and \tilde{Q}_m with different thresholds λ .

m	$\alpha = 10\%$				$\alpha = 5\%$				$\alpha = 1\%$			
	Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$			Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$			Q_m	$\tilde{Q}_m = \tilde{Q}_m(\lambda)$		
		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$
1	9.66	9.66	9.66	9.66	4.76	4.76	4.76	4.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76
2	9.66	9.78	9.74	9.80	4.44	4.44	4.46	4.54	0.64	0.72	0.76	0.90
3	9.52	9.42	9.36	9.60	4.38	4.52	4.46	4.46	0.64	0.64	0.70	0.80
4	9.26	9.34	9.64	9.54	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.36	0.48	0.62	0.64	0.76
5	8.38	9.18	9.34	9.60	3.82	4.04	4.40	4.86	0.48	0.64	0.76	0.80
6	7.90	8.46	8.76	9.26	3.64	3.88	4.36	4.76	0.54	0.70	0.96	1.08
7	7.84	8.30	9.04	9.48	3.36	4.04	4.36	4.94	0.50	0.64	0.90	1.14
8	7.54	8.62	9.08	9.58	3.30	4.28	4.52	5.22	0.52	0.76	0.98	1.18
9	6.90	8.56	9.00	9.58	3.06	4.08	4.34	4.88	0.46	0.86	0.98	1.16
10	6.72	8.78	9.06	9.62	2.72	3.80	4.10	4.68	0.36	0.64	1.00	1.16
11	6.16	8.56	8.94	9.64	2.58	3.70	4.32	4.82	0.28	0.74	0.96	1.14
12	5.84	8.34	8.54	9.56	2.48	3.78	4.20	4.98	0.18	0.64	0.90	1.18
13	5.88	8.40	8.92	9.90	2.58	3.94	4.52	5.34	0.18	0.72	1.04	1.28
14	5.82	9.26	8.96	10.06	2.28	4.42	4.68	5.58	0.26	0.94	1.16	1.56
15	5.50	9.22	9.14	10.34	2.02	4.22	4.58	5.64	0.28	1.04	1.02	1.50
16	5.54	9.38	9.32	10.68	1.84	4.36	4.76	5.52	0.20	1.12	1.02	1.54
17	5.06	9.38	9.14	10.52	1.68	4.84	4.90	5.52	0.14	1.28	1.10	1.62
18	4.74	9.26	9.54	10.60	1.70	4.76	4.64	5.72	0.12	1.38	1.22	1.50
19	4.48	9.60	9.58	10.38	1.56	5.06	4.96	5.96	0.20	1.58	1.14	1.68
20	4.36	10.02	9.72	10.38	1.58	5.04	4.94	5.92	0.18	1.76	1.14	1.68
21	3.96	10.36	9.74	10.52	1.38	5.74	5.02	6.04	0.12	2.02	1.26	1.78
22	3.78	10.54	10.20	10.80	1.32	5.94	5.26	6.00	0.10	2.38	1.30	1.88
23	3.58	10.96	10.06	10.98	1.22	6.84	5.20	6.04	0.10	2.66	1.26	2.00
24	3.70	11.66	10.26	11.42	1.04	7.22	5.58	6.14	0.12	3.16	1.50	2.04
25	3.44	12.66	10.62	11.62	1.08	7.94	5.74	6.32	0.02	3.64	1.68	2.12
26	3.28	13.16	10.70	11.42	1.06	8.30	5.86	6.42	0.02	3.98	1.80	2.10
27	3.08	13.84	11.00	11.52	0.92	8.86	6.00	6.60	0.04	4.30	1.80	2.00
28	2.90	14.82	11.04	11.78	0.90	9.64	6.06	6.60	0.04	4.80	1.98	2.16
29	2.80	15.52	11.42	11.58	0.94	10.44	6.52	6.80	0.02	5.36	2.10	2.24
30	2.70	15.82	11.24	11.38	0.92	11.02	6.34	6.80	0.02	6.00	2.18	2.20
31	2.42	16.64	11.32	11.60	0.80	11.84	6.52	6.94	0.04	6.36	2.40	2.40
32	2.46	17.52	11.70	11.72	0.74	12.36	6.96	7.12	0.04	6.80	2.60	2.28
33	2.32	17.76	11.68	11.86	0.76	12.50	7.28	7.02	0.06	6.66	2.52	2.46
34	2.36	18.94	12.34	11.90	0.62	13.52	7.62	7.28	0.04	7.38	2.68	2.38
35	2.22	19.14	12.36	11.78	0.58	14.18	7.48	7.26	0.06	8.12	2.70	2.40
36	2.02	19.66	12.70	12.16	0.56	14.66	7.48	7.34	0.02	8.80	2.82	2.46
37	2.10	20.54	13.22	12.08	0.50	15.70	7.96	7.36	0.02	9.64	3.22	2.62
38	1.94	21.38	13.60	12.08	0.50	16.44	8.12	7.30	0.04	10.10	3.18	2.58
39	1.78	22.74	13.72	12.32	0.44	17.10	8.56	7.50	0.04	10.94	3.78	2.54
40	1.62	23.46	14.02	12.48	0.46	17.96	8.96	7.60	0.04	11.48	4.12	2.50

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 10%, 5% and 1% significance level, $n = 300$. Model: $x_t = h_{2t}\varepsilon_t$, $h_{2t} = t/n$, $\varepsilon_t \sim$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$.

Table 23: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Size of tests $Q_{xy,m}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$ with different thresholds λ .

m	$\alpha = 10\%$				$\alpha = 5\%$				$\alpha = 1\%$			
	$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$			$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$			$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$		
		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$
0	10.06	10.06	10.06	10.06	4.92	4.92	4.92	4.92	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
1	9.80	9.96	9.88	9.90	4.98	5.14	5.16	5.22	1.00	1.08	1.08	1.08
2	10.24	10.00	10.00	10.08	5.38	5.52	5.44	5.48	1.18	1.08	1.10	1.12
3	10.20	10.22	10.18	10.26	5.50	5.44	5.34	5.40	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
4	9.86	9.64	9.62	9.90	5.08	5.08	5.12	5.12	0.72	0.70	0.76	0.70
5	9.86	9.92	10.02	10.38	4.62	4.96	4.94	5.06	0.78	0.76	0.82	0.88
6	10.04	10.30	10.22	10.40	4.88	5.08	4.86	5.02	0.78	0.86	0.90	0.82
7	10.08	9.98	10.16	10.18	4.72	4.96	4.76	4.72	0.58	0.84	0.90	0.90
8	9.44	9.74	9.98	10.08	4.48	4.64	4.52	4.70	0.54	0.82	0.86	0.92
9	9.32	9.52	9.42	9.38	4.10	4.44	4.80	4.78	0.56	0.78	0.78	0.78
10	9.12	9.58	9.34	9.44	4.06	4.48	4.38	4.48	0.64	0.84	0.90	0.92
11	8.80	9.08	9.04	9.24	3.76	4.20	4.40	4.32	0.54	0.78	0.90	0.92
12	8.62	9.14	9.22	9.40	3.66	4.24	4.28	4.66	0.48	0.72	0.80	0.84
13	8.60	9.22	9.34	9.32	3.70	4.36	4.48	4.62	0.42	0.58	0.64	0.82
14	8.54	9.28	9.24	9.28	3.56	4.46	4.40	4.62	0.42	0.58	0.62	0.80
15	8.36	8.92	9.22	9.42	3.44	4.40	4.38	4.56	0.42	0.72	0.70	0.78
16	8.56	9.22	9.38	9.66	3.68	4.40	4.38	4.60	0.36	0.68	0.78	0.88
17	8.38	9.36	9.12	9.30	3.56	4.46	4.60	4.92	0.46	0.68	0.64	0.88
18	8.36	9.56	9.16	9.42	3.68	4.78	4.90	5.00	0.52	0.78	0.74	0.86
19	8.48	9.92	9.76	9.70	3.42	4.64	4.80	5.08	0.44	0.82	0.72	0.92
20	8.54	10.28	9.82	10.30	3.46	4.90	4.94	5.16	0.40	0.76	0.62	0.80
21	8.22	10.24	9.92	10.26	3.56	4.86	5.00	5.02	0.50	0.82	0.64	0.98
22	7.88	10.36	9.78	10.10	3.50	4.90	4.82	4.88	0.48	0.78	0.72	0.94
23	7.86	9.92	9.78	9.84	3.48	4.90	4.68	4.78	0.38	0.82	0.82	0.90
24	7.90	10.12	9.42	9.52	3.36	4.84	4.38	4.60	0.36	0.94	0.76	0.96
25	7.52	9.76	9.34	9.34	3.30	4.72	4.54	4.74	0.38	1.00	0.76	0.90
26	7.32	9.90	9.34	9.34	3.02	4.84	4.16	4.80	0.32	0.96	0.88	0.94
27	7.28	9.74	9.24	9.22	2.90	4.80	4.38	4.74	0.30	0.92	0.88	1.04
28	7.56	10.44	9.50	9.50	2.90	5.00	4.36	4.68	0.20	0.92	0.82	0.82
29	7.54	10.48	9.64	9.62	2.88	5.16	4.56	4.58	0.36	0.90	0.72	0.82
30	7.30	10.52	9.22	9.22	2.74	5.28	4.46	4.32	0.38	0.84	0.76	0.82
31	7.30	10.84	9.38	9.44	2.72	5.40	4.34	4.54	0.36	0.86	0.72	0.82
32	7.36	10.98	9.68	9.54	2.70	5.56	4.30	4.42	0.34	0.88	0.80	0.76
33	7.28	11.16	9.46	9.72	2.72	5.86	4.40	4.44	0.30	1.00	0.82	0.74
34	7.28	11.60	9.72	9.36	2.58	5.90	4.42	4.58	0.32	0.98	0.94	0.80
35	7.10	11.70	9.68	9.20	2.64	5.98	4.42	4.72	0.28	1.12	0.86	0.84
36	7.10	11.76	9.98	9.46	2.72	5.98	4.48	4.86	0.26	0.98	0.88	0.80
37	7.06	12.66	9.84	9.38	2.78	6.16	4.50	4.84	0.30	1.06	0.82	0.84
38	7.18	13.00	9.92	9.70	2.86	6.56	4.58	4.84	0.30	1.26	0.80	0.76
39	7.14	13.42	10.24	9.62	2.84	6.90	4.72	4.74	0.30	1.38	0.78	0.84
40	7.08	13.96	10.14	9.38	2.78	6.88	4.86	4.62	0.28	1.48	0.82	0.74

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 10%, 5% and 1% significance level, $n = 300$. Model: $x_t = \varepsilon_t, y_t = \eta_t, \{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$.

Table 24: Tests for zero cross-correlation at lags $1, \dots, m$. Size of tests $Q_{xy,m}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{xy,m}$ with different thresholds λ .

m	$\alpha = 10\%$				$\alpha = 5\%$				$\alpha = 1\%$			
	$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$			$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$			$Q_{xy,m}$	$\tilde{Q}_{xy,m} = \tilde{Q}_{xy,m}(\lambda)$		
		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$		$\lambda = 1.645$	$\lambda = 1.96$	$\lambda = 2.576$
0	9.56	9.56	9.56	9.56	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.64	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
1	9.22	9.44	9.52	9.52	4.40	4.56	4.58	4.56	0.72	0.76	0.76	0.72
2	9.82	9.94	9.94	9.90	4.32	4.38	4.38	4.46	0.54	0.70	0.72	0.74
3	9.86	10.14	10.16	10.24	4.54	5.02	4.82	4.84	0.60	0.72	0.78	0.78
4	9.80	10.14	10.14	10.30	4.10	4.54	4.54	4.50	0.58	0.62	0.70	0.68
5	8.96	9.96	9.80	9.80	3.86	4.36	4.40	4.58	0.60	0.60	0.68	0.74
6	8.84	9.62	9.72	9.84	4.02	4.54	4.54	4.82	0.54	0.62	0.64	0.72
7	8.92	9.74	9.48	9.64	3.96	4.70	4.88	5.00	0.34	0.52	0.64	0.74
8	8.88	9.86	9.90	9.82	3.82	4.52	4.70	4.78	0.34	0.64	0.64	0.64
9	8.30	9.68	9.64	9.92	3.82	4.76	4.90	4.80	0.32	0.66	0.68	0.70
10	8.46	9.80	9.74	9.68	3.60	4.54	4.70	4.84	0.36	0.60	0.66	0.60
11	8.18	9.74	9.72	9.70	3.30	4.48	4.66	4.70	0.26	0.60	0.52	0.56
12	7.82	9.14	9.04	9.32	3.00	4.44	4.68	4.88	0.28	0.52	0.50	0.62
13	7.76	9.70	9.62	9.54	2.98	4.48	4.52	4.94	0.36	0.58	0.64	0.64
14	7.44	9.28	9.66	9.74	2.78	4.30	4.24	4.62	0.30	0.70	0.80	0.68
15	7.32	9.56	9.12	9.54	2.72	4.26	4.16	4.44	0.20	0.78	0.82	0.76
16	6.82	9.92	9.56	9.84	2.74	4.26	4.46	4.48	0.16	0.82	0.74	0.80
17	7.14	9.90	9.56	9.96	2.76	4.44	4.34	4.38	0.20	0.76	0.74	0.82
18	7.18	10.28	9.48	9.76	2.54	4.56	4.26	4.40	0.16	0.74	0.64	0.72
19	7.16	10.22	9.68	9.44	2.36	4.86	4.20	4.34	0.14	0.84	0.80	0.84
20	6.94	10.62	9.78	9.50	2.34	4.94	4.32	4.26	0.14	0.92	0.90	0.82
21	6.62	10.66	9.64	9.54	2.32	5.40	4.32	4.12	0.14	1.14	0.94	0.80
22	6.58	11.08	10.08	9.26	2.28	5.68	4.38	3.92	0.04	1.16	0.96	0.72
23	6.24	11.48	10.10	9.46	2.18	5.72	4.26	3.86	0.10	1.24	1.00	0.72
24	5.94	11.76	10.02	9.08	2.08	6.40	4.58	4.08	0.06	1.52	0.96	0.72
25	6.00	12.70	10.08	9.22	1.86	6.78	4.28	4.08	0.02	1.64	0.94	0.72
26	5.70	13.44	9.88	9.02	1.92	7.42	4.46	4.08	0.02	2.28	0.96	0.62
27	5.58	14.30	10.04	9.10	1.78	7.84	4.48	4.02	0.04	2.50	0.94	0.56
28	5.34	14.66	10.02	9.38	1.68	8.70	4.70	4.18	0.02	2.90	0.94	0.58
29	5.22	15.74	10.30	9.16	1.46	9.26	4.74	4.12	0.00	3.44	1.14	0.68
30	5.16	16.72	10.94	9.04	1.58	9.92	5.02	4.24	0.04	3.96	1.20	0.70
31	4.94	17.88	10.80	9.06	1.62	10.68	5.24	4.08	0.04	4.40	1.36	0.78
32	5.12	18.94	10.96	9.42	1.48	12.14	5.70	4.22	0.02	5.12	1.36	0.72
33	4.86	19.98	11.26	9.18	1.26	13.10	5.78	4.08	0.02	5.84	1.46	0.76
34	4.90	21.04	11.80	9.26	1.32	14.04	6.12	4.08	0.00	6.34	1.74	0.82
35	4.66	22.32	12.28	9.44	1.22	15.30	6.34	4.26	0.00	7.12	1.80	0.80
36	4.52	23.76	12.80	9.26	1.36	16.40	6.58	4.32	0.00	8.08	1.92	0.80
37	4.30	24.62	13.02	9.04	1.42	16.96	7.04	4.30	0.02	8.82	2.14	0.82
38	4.24	26.12	13.34	8.80	1.12	18.58	7.36	4.40	0.02	10.16	2.26	0.68
39	4.24	26.78	13.94	9.22	1.16	19.16	7.58	4.70	0.04	10.70	2.38	0.72
40	4.16	27.14	14.38	9.02	1.08	20.06	8.14	4.64	0.04	11.80	2.70	0.76

Rejection frequency (in %) at the 10%, 5% and 1% significance level, $n = 300$. Model: $x_t = h_{1t}\varepsilon_t$, $y_t = h_{3t}\varepsilon_t$, $h_{1t} = 1 + I(t/n > 0.5)$, $h_{3t} = 1 + 3I(t/n > 0.5)$, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ mutually independent i.i.d. $N(0,1)$.