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#### Abstract

In this paper, I characterize the network formation process as a static game of incomplete information, where the latent payoff of forming a link between two individuals depends on the structure of the network, as well as private information on agents' attributes. I allow agents' private unobserved attributes to be correlated with observed attributes through individual fixed effects. Using data from a single large network, I propose a two-step estimator for the model primitives. In the first step, I estimate agents' equilibrium beliefs of other people's choice probabilities. In the second step, I plug in the first-step estimator to the conditional choice probability expression and estimate the model parameters and the unobserved individual fixed effects together using Joint MLE. Assuming that the observed attributes are discrete, I showed that the first step estimator is uniformly consistent with rate $N^{-1 / 4}$, where $N$ is the total number of linking proposals. I also show that the second-step estimator converges asymptotically to a normal distribution at the same rate.


## 1 Introduction

The social network is an important feature to take into account when studying many economic behaviors, from peer effects in education and crime to the dynamics of product adoption and financial contagions. However, most network studies of these behaviors are challenged by the endogeneity of the network. This highlights the importance of developing
econometric models of network formation. Moreover, the network formation process is itself an interesting subject to study, since it sheds light on real-world behaviors such as how people engage with each other on social media platforms.

Two features are crucial in a network formation model. The first feature is strategic interactions. The incentives of forming a link in a network are not only affected by the two agents' characteristics but also the linking decisions of other agents, such as the "popularity effect" - an agent is more likely to form a link with another agent who has many friends. The second feature involves unobserved agent-level heterogeneities, which are typically private information that is known only to the agent themselves, such as an individual's personality traits on a dating app. The agent-level unobserved heterogeneities are correlated with observed characteristics but are unobserved to other agents or researchers. Depicting these two features is essential for effectively modeling the network formation process and accurately inferring agents' preferences. Motivated by this, I study a directed network formation model with individual-specific unobserved heterogeneities and strategic interactions. In the incremental utility of a link from person $i$ to $j$, I include the linking choices of the person $j$ to capture the popularity effect, and include individual fixed effects to capture agent-level unobserved heterogeneities, while remaining agnostic about the conditional distribution of the agent-level unobservables, not requiring it to be known to the researchers.

There's growing literature on the estimation of network formation models. Among them, this paper is most related to Leung (2015) and Ridder and Sheng (2022). Both of them study the estimation of network formation games with incomplete information and strategic interactions and assume that the private information is independent of observed characteristics. Leung (2015) lets the payoff depend on network structure in a separable way, through the sum of incremental utilities from each link. Then the optimal link choices are myopic, in the sense that an agent chooses to form a link with another member if the expected utility of forming that link is greater than 0 . To be specific, let $G_{i j}$ denote the linking proposal from individual $i$ to $j$, and let $X_{i}, X_{j}$ denote observed characteristics of the two individuals; let $\epsilon_{i j}$ denote unobserved link-specific characteristics that are independent with $X$. Leung
(2015)'s model yields the following optimal linking decision:

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{i j}=1\left\{w\left(X_{i}, X_{j}\right) \beta_{0}+\mathbb{E}\left[G_{-i j} \mid X, \sigma\right]+\varepsilon_{i j} \geqslant 0\right\} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $w$ is a known function capturing the homophily effect, and $\sigma$ denotes the equilibrium. Ridder and Sheng (2022) considers a more general case in which the utility function depends on the choice of potential partners in a non-separable way, for example, allowing the utility to depend on links-in-common. Using the Legendre transform, they show that even under this general case, the optimal linking choice is still equivalent to a sequence of myopic link choices. For estimation, both of the two papers assume that the data observed comes from a symmetric equilibrium, whereby agents with the same observable characteristics have the same equilibrium linking probabilities, i.e. $P\left(G_{i j} \mid X_{i j}=x, X\right)=P\left(G_{k l} \mid X_{k l}=x, X\right)$. Then the conditional linking probabilities can be estimated in the first step, by taking the empirical frequency with which agents with the same observable characteristics link to each other. In terms of strategic interactions, this paper adopts the same framework as Leung (2015), including only the popularity effect and keeping the dependence on the network structure to be separable, which is simpler than Ridder and Sheng (2022)'s framework. Different from the two papers, this paper studies the case when private information is correlated with observables by including individual fixed effects in the utility. For estimation, this paper also adopts a two-step procedure and estimates the realized equilibrium beliefs in the first step. This allows us to circumvent the difficulty to specify the equilibrium selection mechanism when there might be multiple equilibria.

This paper is also closely related to Graham (2017), which studies a network formation model with dyadic link formation. In their model, the linking decision between individual $i$ and $j$ only depends on the characteristics of $i$ and $j$ and there are no strategic interactions. Let $A_{i}, A_{j}$ denote individual fixed effects unobserved to researchers. The linking decision in Graham (2017) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{i j}=1\left\{w\left(X_{i}, X_{j}\right) \beta_{0}+A_{i}+A_{j}+\varepsilon_{i j} \geqslant 0\right\} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Same as Graham (2017), this paper also incorporates unobserved individual fixed effects. The difference is that my model contains strategic interactions, so the information structure matters. I assume that individual fixed effects $A_{i}$ are private information that is i.i.d. across individuals. The agents know the distribution of the individual fixed effects so that they can form beliefs of the expected "type"1 of other people. From the modeling point of view, this paper studies a model which is a combination of (1) and (2). Note that a special case of (1) is when $\epsilon_{i j}$ can be written as the sum of an individual "random effect" $A_{i}$ and an idiosyncratic error $\nu_{i j}$. This is different from this paper's setting since $A_{i}$ is assumed to be independent with $X$ in Leung (2015).

Another strand of literature on estimating strategic network formation models assumes complete information, such as Miyauchi (2016) and Sheng (2020). These models are the hardest to deal with because they generally admit multiple equilibria and thus achieve set but not point identification of the model parameters. This paper shies away from these cases by assuming incomplete information.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I develop the model and derive the optimal link choices. In section 3, I propose a two-step estimation procedure and show the consistency of the first-step estimator. In section 4, I showed the asymptotic distribution of the estimators. The last section concludes.

## 2 The Model

I consider the directed network formation model in this paper. The formation process is a static game of incomplete information. An agent's payoff of forming a link depends on idiosyncratic private information. Given the belief of other people's linking decisions, agents form their own links simultaneously. Formally, the network formation game is set up as follows:

There are $n$ agents indexed by $i \in \mathcal{I}=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$. Each agent chooses whether or not to link with the other $n-1$ agents. Player $i$ 's action vector $G_{i}=\left(G_{i 1}, G_{i 2}, \ldots, G_{i j}, \ldots, G_{i n}\right)^{\prime}$ where $j \neq i$ is chosen from the action profile $A$ which has $2^{n-1}$ components. The payoff

[^0]function of individual $i$ is
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{i}\left(G, X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{n} G_{i j}\left(u_{i j}\left(G_{-i}, X, A_{i} ; \beta\right)+\varepsilon_{i j}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

The deterministic part of incremental utility from link $i j$ is specified as

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{i j}\left(G_{-i}, X, A_{i} ; \beta\right)=w\left(X_{i}, X_{j}\right) \beta_{1}+A_{i}+G_{j i} \beta_{2}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} G_{j k} \beta_{3} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the first term captures the homophily effect. $w$ is a known function. $X=\left(X_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, X_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$ is public information for all agents and is observable to researchers. For simplicity, write $w\left(X_{i}, X_{j}\right)=W_{i j}$ from now on. The second term $A_{i}$ is individual-specific heterogeneity, which is unobserved both to other agents and researchers. Let $F_{A \mid X}$ be the distribution of $A_{i}$ conditional on observables, which is assumed to be independent and identical across $i$, and known to all agents, but not necessarily known to researchers. $A_{i}$ can be correlated with $X$. The third and the last term capture the popularity effect. The realization of $\varepsilon_{i}=\left(\varepsilon_{i 1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{i n}\right)^{\prime}$ is agent $i$ 's private information which is also unobserved to researchers. The model is therefore a static game with incomplete information, and the solution concept is Bayesian Nash Equilibrium. Different from Leung (2015), my model allows private information to be correlated with common information while doesn't require the conditional distribution of private information to be known to researchers. Also, I allow "asymmetric" equilibrium which will be mentioned later in this part.

For the above model, I impose the following assumptions:

Assumption 1. (a) $X_{i} \perp X_{j}$ for $i \neq j . X_{i}$ is discrete distributed with finite support $\mathbb{X}=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{T_{x}}\right\}$. (b) $A_{i}$ are independently and identically distributed. The conditional $C D F F_{A \mid X}$ is known to all agents but unknown to researchers. (c) $\varepsilon_{i j}$ are i.i.d. with logit distribution $F_{\varepsilon}$, which is known to both agents and researchers. (d) $\varepsilon_{i} \perp\left(X^{\prime}, A\right)^{\prime}$ for all $i$.

Let $\delta_{j}\left(X, A_{j}, \varepsilon_{j}\right)$ denote agent $j$ 's (pure) strategy. Let $\sigma_{j}\left(a \mid X, A_{j}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(\delta_{j}\left(X, A_{j}, \varepsilon_{j}\right)=a \mid X, A_{j}\right)$ denote the agent $i$ 's belief that agent $j$ of type $A_{j}$ chooses action $a$, given commonly known information $X$ and agent $i$ 's private information. By Assumption 1 (b) and (c), actions $G_{i}$ and $G_{j}, i \neq j$ are independent given commonly known attributes $X$. This fact simplifies
the proof of consistency by weakening the correlation between links. Since agent $i$ actually doesn't known the realization of $A_{j}$, so agent $i$ 's expected utility from choosing action $g_{i} \in S$ is $\sum_{g_{-i}} U_{i}\left(g_{i}, g_{-i}, X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}\right) \mathbb{E}_{A_{-j}}\left[\sigma_{-i}\left(g_{-i} \mid X, A_{-j}\right)\right]$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{i}=g_{i} \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right) \\
& \qquad=\operatorname{Pr}\left(\sum_{g_{-i}}\left[U_{i}\left(g_{i}, g_{-i}, X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}\right)-U_{i}\left(\tilde{g}_{i}, g_{-i}, X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}\right)\right] \mathbb{E}_{A_{-j}}\left[\sigma_{-i}\left(g_{-i} \mid X, A_{-j}\right)\right]>0,\right. \\
& \left.\quad \forall \tilde{g}_{i} \in S \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

A (Bayesian) equilibrium $\sigma^{*}\left(X, A_{i}\right)$ is a belief function that solves the fixed point equation:

$$
\sigma_{i}^{*}\left(a \mid X, A_{i}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{i}=a \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma^{*}\right)
$$

for all $X \in \mathbf{X}$, agents $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and actions $a \in S$.
I consider "symmetric" equilibria in which pairs of agents with the same observable attributes and the same type $\left(A_{i}\right)$ have the same conditional linking probabilities. For any ( $\left.X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i j}\right)$ and "symmetric" belief profile $\sigma$ in a neighborhood of an "symmetric" equilibrium $\sigma^{*}$, player $i$ 's optimal strategy $G_{i}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)=\left(G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)\right)_{j \neq i}$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)=\mathbf{1}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[u_{i j}\left(G_{-i}, X, A_{i} ; \beta\right) \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right]+\varepsilon_{i j} \geqslant 0\right\} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming a symmetric equilibrium exists, the model is incomplete because there could be multiple equilibria for any realization of $(X, A, \varepsilon)$. For completeness of the model, I specify the equilibrium selection mechanism in the following assumption. The mechanism, however, is not explicitly used in writing the likelihood function in part 3 , because by using two-step estimation, I can avoid specifying the equilibrium theoretically. For the convenience of defining equilibrium selection mechanisms, I add subscript $n$ to $G, X, A$, and $\varepsilon$. The equilibrium selection mechanism is a measurable function $\lambda_{n}:\left(X_{n}, \nu_{n}, \beta_{0}\right) \mapsto \sigma_{n} \in \mathcal{G}\left(X_{n}, A_{n}, \beta_{0}\right)$, where $\mathcal{G}\left(X_{n}, A_{n}, \beta_{0}\right)$ is the set of symmetric equilibria.

Assumption 2. (Equilibrium Selection) There exist sequences of equilibrium selection mechanisms $\left\{\lambda_{n}(\cdot) ; n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ and public signals $\left\{\nu_{n} ; n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ such that for $n$ sufficiently large,
$\mathcal{G}\left(X_{n}, \beta_{0}\right)$ is nonempty, and for any $g_{n} \in S^{n}$,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{n}=\mathbf{g}_{n} \mid X_{n}, A_{n}\right)=\sum_{\sigma_{n} \in \mathcal{G}\left(X_{n}, A_{n}, \beta_{0}\right)=\sigma_{n} \mid X_{n}, A_{n}} \operatorname{Pr}\left(\lambda\left(X_{n}, \nu_{n} ; \beta_{0}\right)=\sigma_{n} \mid X_{n}, A_{n}\right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_{i}\left(g_{i} \mid X_{n}, A_{i}\right)
$$

## 3 Estimation

Define $P_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \sigma\right)$ to be the probability that individual $i$ proposes to form a link with $j$ conditional on $X A_{i}$, and $\sigma$. According to (5) and Assumption 1 (c),

$$
\begin{align*}
& P_{i j}\left(X, A_{i, n}, \sigma\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)=1 \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right) \\
= & \frac{\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+\mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[\sigma_{j i}\left(G_{j i}=1 \mid X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[\sigma_{j k}\left(G_{j k}=1 \mid X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{2}\right)}{1+\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+\mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[\sigma_{j i}\left(G_{j i}=1 \mid X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[\sigma_{j k}\left(G_{j k}=1 \mid X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{2}\right)} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Define $p_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}\right)$ to be the equilibrium probability that agent $i$ proposes a link to agent $j$. which is realized in the data. Equilibrium condition requires that

$$
\begin{align*}
& p_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}\right)=P_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, p\left(X, A_{i}\right)\right) \\
= & \frac{\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+\mathbb{E}_{A_{j} \mid X}\left[p_{j i}\left(X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbb{E}_{A_{j} \mid X}\left[p_{j k}\left(X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{2}\right)}{1+\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+\mathbb{E}_{A_{j} \mid X}\left[p_{j i}\left(X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbb{E}_{A_{j} \mid X}\left[p_{j k}\left(X, A_{j}\right)\right] \beta_{2}\right)} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

For notation simplicity, denote $q_{j k}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right):=\mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{j k}\left(X, A_{j}, \varepsilon_{j}, \sigma\right)=1 \mid X, A_{j}, \sigma^{*}\right)\right]$, which is the probability that agent $j$ proposes a link to $k$ conditional on $X$ and the realized equilibrium $\sigma^{*}$. Then (7) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{align*}
& P_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, p\left(X, A_{i}\right)\right) \\
= & \frac{\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+q_{j i}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right) \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} q_{j k}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right) \beta_{2}\right)}{1+\exp \left(W_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i}+q_{j i}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right) \beta_{1}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} q_{j k}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right) \beta_{2}\right)} \\
:= & Q_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, q\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right)\right) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Although $p_{j k}\left(X, A_{j}\right)$ is not identified from data, $q_{i j}(X)$ is identified. With abuse of notations, let $q_{s t}(X)=\mathbb{E}_{A_{j}}\left[p_{j k}\left(X_{j}=x_{s}, X_{k}=x_{t}, X, A_{j}\right)\right]$.

Consider the empirical frequency of pairs with the same observable characteristics proposing to form a link:

$$
\hat{q}_{n, s t}=\frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}{\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}
$$

First, I want to show that $q_{s t}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right)$ can be consistently estimated by $\hat{q}_{n, s t}$ under the payoff function specified in 3, Formally, I want to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 1. For any $X$ and realized symmetric equilibrium $\sigma^{*}$,

$$
\sup _{s, t}\left|\hat{q}_{n, s t}-q_{s t}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right)\right|=O_{p}\left(n^{-1 / 2}\right) .
$$

Proof. See the Appendix.

For the convenience of the following analysis, I introduce a change of notation:

$$
Z_{i j}:=\left(W_{i j}^{\prime}, q_{j i}, \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} q_{j k}\right)^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
\hat{Z}_{i j}:=\left(W_{i j}^{\prime}, \hat{q}_{j i}, \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \hat{q}_{j k}\right)^{\prime}
$$

then by Lemma 1, $\sup _{s, t}\left|\hat{Z}_{s, t}-Z_{s, t}\right|=O_{p}\left(n^{-1 / 2}\right)$
With the estimates $\hat{q}_{n}=\left\{\hat{q}_{s t}\right\}_{\forall s, t}$, I propose to estimate the parameter $\beta$ and individual fixed effects $\left\{A_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$ jointly by MLE.

By Assumption 1 (c), the conditional likelihood of the network is

$$
P(G=\mathbf{g} \mid X, A)=\prod_{i \neq j} \operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)=g \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right)
$$

By (6) and (8),

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right)=g \mid X, A_{i}, \sigma\right)
$$

$$
=Q_{i j}(X, A, q(X))^{g}\left[1-Q_{i j}(X, A, q(X))\right]^{1-g}
$$

Construct the log-likelihood function:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, q)=\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j} \ln Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, q\right)+\left(1-G_{i j}\right) \ln \left(1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, q\right)\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{A}$ be the maximizer of the log-likelihood with $q$ replaced by $\hat{q}_{n}$.

$$
\max _{\beta, A} \mathcal{L}_{n}\left(\beta, A, \hat{q}_{n}\right) .
$$

By first concentrating out $A$, the estimators are given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\beta}=\arg \max _{\beta} \mathcal{L}_{n}^{c}\left(\beta, \hat{A}(\beta), \hat{q}_{n}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}(\beta) & =\arg \max _{A} \mathcal{L}_{n}\left(\beta, A, \hat{q}_{n}\right) \\
\Longrightarrow & \hat{A}_{i}(\beta)
\end{aligned}=\arg \max _{A_{i}} \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j} \ln Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}_{n}\right)+\left(1-G_{i j}\right) \ln \left(1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}_{n}\right)\right), ~ l
$$

By rearranging the sample score of (9), it can be shown that $\hat{A}(\beta)$, when it exists, is the unique solution to the fixed point problem:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{A}(\beta)=\varphi(\hat{A}(\beta)) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\varphi(A)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\ln \sum_{j \neq 1} G_{1 j}-\ln \sum_{j \neq 1} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{1 j}^{\prime} \beta\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{1 j} \beta+A_{1}\right)}  \tag{12}\\
\vdots \\
\ln \sum_{j \neq n} G_{n j}-\ln \sum_{j \neq n} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{n j}^{\prime} \beta\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{n j}^{\prime} \beta+A_{n}\right)}
\end{array}\right)
$$

## 4 Asymptotic Analysis

In this part, I first show the consistency of $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{A}$. Because link proposals from the same individual are correlated, the first step estimator has a slow convergence rate $\sqrt{n}$, which is equivalent to the usual convergence rate of $N^{1 / 4}$, since the number of summands in the likelihood function $N=n(n-1)$. As is well discussed in the nonlinear panel literature, there could be an estimation bias of $\hat{\beta}$ caused by the incidental parameters problem (e.g. Hahn and Newey (2004), Arellano and Hahn (2007)). However, as I will show in this part, the effect of second-step bias is dominated by the slow convergence rate of the first step, so a bias term won't show up in the asymptotic distribution.

Assumption 3. (Compact Support) $\beta_{0} \in \operatorname{int}(\mathbb{B})$, with $\mathbb{B}$ a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{K}$.
Assumption 4. (Joint FE Identification) $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, q) \mid X, A_{0}\right]$ is uniquely maximized at $\beta=\beta_{0}$ and, $A=A_{0}$, for large enough $n$.

Compactness of the support (Assumption 1 (a)(b) and Assumption 3) implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, q\right) \in(\kappa, 1-\kappa) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $0<\kappa<1$ and for all $A_{i} \in \mathbb{A}, \beta \in \mathbb{B}$ and $\forall q \in(k, 1-k)$.
Theorem 1. (Consistency) Under Assumptions 1, 园, 8, and 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{p} \beta_{0} ; \\
& \hat{A} \xrightarrow{p} A_{0} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. See the Appendix.
With a more involved argument, I can actually show the uniform convergence rate of $\hat{A}$
Theorem 2. With probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$,

$$
\sup _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\hat{A}_{i}-A_{i 0}\right|<O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}\right) .
$$

Proof. See the Appendix.

To state the form of the asymptotic distribution, define

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_{0} & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}-\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{i j} Z_{i j}^{\prime} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}^{\prime}\right)}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions 1, 园, 3, and 4 ,

$$
\frac{\sqrt{n} a^{\prime}\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)}{\|a\|^{-1 / 2}\left(a^{\prime} \mathcal{I}_{0}^{-1} \Omega_{n} \mathcal{I}_{0}^{-1} a\right)^{1 / 2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1)
$$

for any $d \times 1$ vector of real constants $a$ and $\Omega_{n}$ as defined in the Appendix.

Proof. See the Appendix.

## 5 Monte Carlo Simulation

In this section, I implement the proposed method in a simulation study. Assume the following utility specification:

$$
U_{i}\left(G, X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{n} G_{i j}\left(\left|X_{i}-X_{j}\right| \beta_{1}+A_{i}+G_{j i} \beta_{2}+\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} G_{j k} \beta_{3}+\varepsilon_{i j}\right)
$$

where $X_{i}$ is a random variable taking values in $\{1,-1\}$ with equal probability, and $\epsilon_{i j}$ follows the Logistic distribution. The distribution of $A_{i}$ is generated according to

$$
A_{i}=\left(\alpha_{L}+\gamma a_{i}\right) \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=-1\right\}+\alpha_{H} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=1\right\}+V_{i},
$$

with $\alpha_{L}<\alpha_{H}$ and $a_{i} \sim N(0,0.1), V_{i} \sim N(0, \sqrt{0.1})$, and they are independent. In the simulation exercise, I consider three scenarios. In the first two scenarios, $A_{i}$ is correlated with $X$. In Scenario 1, I let $\alpha_{L}=-2 / 3, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 6$, and $\gamma=0$, so that the correlation between
$A_{i}$ and $X_{i}$ is only through the value of $X_{i}$. In Scenario 2, I let $\alpha_{L}=-2 / 3, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 6$, and $\gamma=1$, so that the correlation between $A_{i}$ and $X_{i}$ is determined not only by the value of $X_{i}$ but also by the identity of $i$ (captured by the random variable $a_{i}$ ). In Scenario 3, I let $\alpha_{L}=-1 / 2, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 2$ and $\gamma=0$, so that $A_{i}$ is independent with $X$. The true values of the parameters are $\left(\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}, \beta_{3}\right)=(-2,1,1)$. The network is generated according to the $n$-player incomplete information game described in Section 2, with $n$ taking values of $50,100,250$, and 500 . For each value of $n$, I generate a single network and use the method proposed in this paper and Leung (2015) to estimate the parameters. When using Leung (2015)'s estimator, the private information $\eta_{i j}$ is the sum of $A_{i}$ and $\epsilon_{i j}$ with $A_{i} \perp \epsilon_{i j}$. Each experiment is repeated 1000 times. I report the means and standard errors of the estimated parameters in the tables below.

Table 1: Scenario 1 Correlated Private Information $\left(\alpha_{L}=-2 / 3, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 6, \gamma=0\right)$ This paper's estimator Leung (2015)'s estimator

| $n$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | -1.922 | 0.966 | 0.936 | -2.092 | 0.827 | 1.390 |
|  | $(0.049)$ | $(0.101)$ | $(0.069)$ | $(0.249)$ | $(0.484)$ | $(1.024)$ |
| 100 | -1.930 | 0.951 | 0.926 | -2.085 | 0.807 | 1.435 |
|  | $(0.035)$ | $(0.058)$ | $(0.033)$ | $(0.198)$ | $(0.478)$ | $(0.985)$ |
| 250 | -1.967 | 1.050 | 0.973 | -2.065 | 0.864 | 1.334 |
|  | $(0.042)$ | $(0.101)$ | $(0.055)$ | $(0.170)$ | $(0.476)$ | $(0.961)$ |
| 500 | -2.015 | 1.065 | 0.975 | -2.047 | 0.919 | 1.237 |
|  | $(0.036)$ | $(0.057)$ | $(0.035)$ | $(0.160)$ | $(0.476)$ | $(0.950)$ |

This table gives the mean of each estimator across the 1000 Monte Carlo estimates. The standard deviation of the Monte Carlo estimates is reported below the mean value of the point estimates in parentheses (this is a quantile-based estimate which uses the 0.05 and 0.95 quantiles of the Monte Carlo distribution of point estimates and the assumption of Normality).

As can be seen in Table 1 and 2, when the private information is correlated with observed individual characteristics $X$, this paper's approach yields good estimates for the parameters, while Leung (2015)'s estimator doesn't perform well, both in terms of the mean and variance

Table 2: Scenario 2 Correlated Private Information $\left(\alpha_{L}=-2 / 3, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 6, \gamma=1\right)$

|  | This paper's estimator |  |  |  | Leung (2015)'s estimator |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $n$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ |  |
| 50 | -1.921 | 0.952 | 0.928 | -2.072 | 0.866 | 1.294 |  |
|  | $(0.043)$ | $(0.108)$ | $(0.069)$ | $(0.280)$ | $(0.698)$ | $(1.521)$ |  |
| 100 | -1.932 | 0.909 | 0.902 | -2.079 | 0.820 | 1.408 |  |
|  | $(0.048)$ | $(0.034)$ | $(0.021)$ | $(0.258)$ | $(0.732)$ | $(1.539)$ |  |
| 250 | -1.955 | 0.956 | 0.925 | -2.056 | 0.888 | 1.287 |  |
|  | $(0.045)$ | $(0.055)$ | $(0.029)$ | $(0.242)$ | $(0.738)$ | $(1.509)$ |  |
| 500 | -2.015 | 1.023 | 0.953 | -2.035 | 0.956 | 1.162 |  |
|  | $(0.047)$ | $(0.069)$ | $(0.038)$ | $(0.233)$ | $(0.724)$ | $(1.460)$ |  |

This table gives the mean of each estimator across the 1000 Monte Carlo estimates. The standard deviation of the Monte Carlo estimates is reported below the mean value of the point estimates in parentheses (this is a quantile-based estimate which uses the 0.05 and 0.95 quantiles of the Monte Carlo distribution of point estimates and the assumption of Normality).
of the estimators. This is not surprising since Leung (2015) assumes that private information and observable individual characteristics are independent. Under the correlated scenario, Leung (2015)'s estimator will not be consistent. Table 3 shows the simulation results when the individual private information $A$ is independent with observed characteristics $X$. Not surprisingly, both this paper's estimator and Leung (2015)'s estimator perform reasonably well, except that Leung (2015)'s estimator has larger variances.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, I characterize the network formation process as a static game of incomplete information, where the latent payoff of forming a link between two individuals depends on the structure of the network, as well as private information on agents' attributes. I allow agents' private unobserved attributes to be correlated with observables (i.e. existence of individual fixed effects). Using data from a single large network, I propose a two-step

Table 3: Scenario 3 Independent Private Information $\left(\alpha_{L}=-1 / 2, \alpha_{H}=-1 / 2, \gamma=0\right)$

| This paper's estimator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Leung |  |  | $(2015)$ 's estimator |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $n$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ | $\beta_{1}$ | $\beta_{2}$ | $\beta_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | -1.913 | 0.951 | 0.925 | -2.046 | 0.909 | 1.181 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $(0.040)$ | $(0.050)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.205)$ | $(0.482)$ | $(0.936)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | -1.921 | 0.925 | 0.911 | -2.014 | 0.956 | 1.085 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $(0.027)$ | $(0.030)$ | $(0.014)$ | $(0.154)$ | $(0.470)$ | $(0.901)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250 | -1.945 | 0.946 | 0.919 | -2.016 | 0.944 | 1.109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $(0.030)$ | $(0.030)$ | $(0.014)$ | $(0.140)$ | $(0.464)$ | $(0.901)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 500 | -1.994 | 1.043 | 0.965 | -2.010 | 0.967 | 1.064 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $(0.029)$ | $(0.042)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.134)$ | $(0.463)$ | $(0.892)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table gives the mean of each estimator across the 1000 Monte Carlo estimates. The standard deviation of the Monte Carlo estimates is reported below the mean value of the point estimates in parentheses (this is a quantile-based estimate which uses the 0.05 and 0.95 quantiles of the Monte Carlo distribution of point estimates and the assumption of Normality).
estimator for the model primitives. In the first step, I estimate agents' equilibrium beliefs of other people's choice probabilities. In the second step, I plug in the first-step estimator to the conditional choice probability expression and estimate the model parameters and the unobserved individual fixed effects together using Joint MLE. Assuming that the observed attributes are discrete, I showed that the first step estimator is uniformly consistent with the rate $n^{-1 / 2}$, where $n$ is the number of individuals in the network. This rate corresponds to the usual $N^{-1 / 4}$ rate where $N$ stands for the total number of linking proposals and is the effective sample size. The slow convergence rate is translated to the second step so that the usual asymptotic bias of order $N^{-1 / 2}$ caused by the "incidental parameter problem" won't show up in the asymptotic distribution. The second-step estimator $\hat{\beta}$ subtracted by its mean converges asymptotically to a normal distribution at the rate $N^{-1 / 4}$. Monte Carlo Simulation shows that the estimator proposed in this paper performs well in finite samples.

## Appendix

### 1.1 Lemmas

The next two lemmas are to be used in the proofs of the asymptotics.

Lemma 2. Under Assumptions 1,2 and 3,

$$
\sup _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)\right|<O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}\right)
$$

with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$, and

$$
\sup _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right|<O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}\right)
$$

with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q_{i j}:=Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i 0}, Z_{i j}\right) \\
& \hat{Q}_{i j}:=Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The first conclusion comes by applying Hoeffding's inequality

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)\right| \geqslant \epsilon\right) \leqslant 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2(n-1) \epsilon^{2}}{(1-2 \kappa)^{2}}\right)
$$

for $\kappa$ as defined by (13). Setting $\epsilon=\sqrt{\frac{3(1-2 \kappa)^{2}}{2} \frac{\ln n}{n}}$ gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr} \\
& \quad\left(\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3(1-2 \kappa)^{2}}{2} \frac{\ln n}{n}}\right) \\
& \quad \leqslant 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2(n-1)}{(1-2 \kappa)^{2}} \frac{3(1-2 \kappa)^{2}}{2} \frac{\ln n}{n}\right) \\
& \quad=2 \exp \left(\ln \left(\frac{1}{n^{3}}\right) \frac{(n-1)}{n}\right) \\
& \quad=2\left(\frac{1}{n^{3}}\right)^{\frac{(n-1)}{n}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=O\left(n^{-3}\right)
$$

Applying Boole's inequality then gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3(1-2 \kappa)^{2}}{2} \frac{\ln n}{n}}\right) \\
& \quad \leqslant n * O\left(n^{-3}\right) \\
& \quad=O\left(n^{-2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

from which the first conclusion follows.
To prove the second conclusion, first, observe that for any $i, j$

$$
\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right| \leqslant\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)\right|+\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(Q_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right| .
$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$
\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(Q_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right| \leqslant \sup _{i, j}\left|Q_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right|
$$

Applying mean value expansion gives that for any $i, j$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|Q_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right| & =\left|\frac{\exp \left(\bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i, 0}\right) \beta_{0}^{\prime}}{\left(1+\exp \left(\bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}+A_{i, 0}\right)\right)^{2}}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)\right| \\
& =O_{p}(1) O_{p}\left(n^{-1 / 2}\right) \\
& =O_{p}\left(n^{-1 / 2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second equality comes from condition (13), Assumption 3 and Lemma 1. The second conclusion follows from the first conclusion.

Lemma 3. Under Assumptions 112 and 圂, $\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)$ has the asymptotically linear representation

$$
\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)=\frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+O_{P}\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right)
$$

Proof. Consider the first order condition with respect to $A$

$$
\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{n}\left(\beta_{0}, A, \hat{q}\right)}{\partial A}\right|_{A=\hat{A}\left(\beta_{0}\right)}=0
$$

a mean value expansion gives that for all $i$

$$
\begin{align*}
0= & \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right) \\
= & \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right) \\
& -\sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right) Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)^{2} Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]\left[1-2 Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right] \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

Denote the last term by $R_{i}$. The Triangle Inequality and Condition (13) then implies

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|R_{i}\right| & \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left|\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right|^{2} \sum_{j \neq i}\left|Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]\left[1-2 Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]\right|  \tag{16}\\
& \leqslant \lambda_{n}^{2} O_{p}(n-1), \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\lambda_{n}=\sup _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\hat{A}_{i}-A_{i 0}\right| \leqslant O_{p}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}\right)$ according to Theorem 2. From (15) I have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right) \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left[G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]}+\frac{R_{i}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]} \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left[G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left[1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]}+O_{p}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln n}}{n}\right)+O_{p}\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right) \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+O_{p}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln n}}{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second equality follows from (17) and Condition (13) and the third equality come from a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 2, More specifically, from the proof of

Lemma 2, I know that $\hat{Q}_{i j}=Q_{i j}+O_{p}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$, then applying Condition (13) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)} \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)} \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\left(\left[\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)\right]-\left[\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right]\right) \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\left[\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)\right]\left[\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right]} \\
& +\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)} \\
= & \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+O_{p}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

the conclusion thus follows.

### 1.2 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. As specified in (5), the optimal linking decision of agent $i$ with agent $j$ is $G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma^{*}\right)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{s, t}\left|\hat{q}_{n, s t}-q_{s t}\left(X, \sigma^{*}\right)\right| \\
= & \sup _{s, t}\left|\frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-P\left(G_{i j}=1 \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right)\right) \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}{\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} 1\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Denote the fraction term by $\Delta_{n, s t}$. It suffices to show that

$$
\lim _{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\sup _{s, t}\left|\Delta_{n, s t}\right|>\eta n^{-1 / 2}\right)=0
$$

By the law of iterated expectations and dominated convergence theorem, it suffices to show

$$
P\left(\sup _{s, t}\left|\Delta_{n, s t}\right|>\eta n^{-1 / 2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right) \xrightarrow{p} 0 \text { as } \eta, n \rightarrow \infty .
$$

Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
P\left(\sup _{s, t}\left|\Delta_{n, s t}\right|>\eta n^{-1 / 2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right) & \leqslant \sum_{s, t} P\left(\left|\Delta_{n, s t}\right|>\eta n^{-1 / 2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right) \\
& \leqslant \sum_{s, t} \frac{n \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta_{s t}^{2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right)}{\eta^{2}} \\
& \leqslant \frac{n T_{x}^{2}}{\eta^{2}} \max _{s, t} \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta_{s t}^{2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then it suffices to show $E\left(\Delta_{s t}^{2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right)=O\left(n^{-1}\right)$ for all $s, t$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta_{s t}^{2} \mid X, \sigma^{*}\right) \\
= & \frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{Var}\left(G_{i j} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right) \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}{\left(\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}\right)^{2}} \\
+ & \frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \operatorname{Cov}\left(G_{i j}, G_{i k} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right) \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}}{\left(\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}\right)^{2}} \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

where I used the fact that link proposals from different agents are independent, i.e. $G_{i j}\left(X, A_{i}, \varepsilon_{i}, \sigma\right) \perp$ $G_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime}}\left(X, A_{i^{\prime}}, \varepsilon_{i^{\prime}}, \sigma^{*}\right) \mid X, \sigma$, so $\operatorname{Cov}\left(G_{i j}, G_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime}} \mid X_{i}=X_{i^{\prime}}=x_{s}, X_{j}=X_{j^{\prime}}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right)=0$ for all $i \neq i^{\prime}$.

Since $G_{i j}$ is a binary random variable, $\operatorname{Var}\left(G_{i j} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{4}$. The first term is bounded by

$$
\frac{1}{4}\left(\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} 1\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}\right)^{-1}
$$

Then for the second term, by Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Cov}\left(G_{i j}, G_{i k} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=X_{k}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right) \\
\leqslant & \operatorname{Var}\left(G_{i j} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right)^{1 / 2} \operatorname{Var}\left(G_{i k} \mid X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{k}=x_{t}, X, \sigma^{*}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

so the second term is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4 n} \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=X_{k}=x_{t}\right\} \\
& \frac{n-1}{n-2}\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}\right)^{2} \\
& \leqslant \frac{1}{4 n} \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbf{1}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=X_{k}=x_{t}\right\} \\
&\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left\{X_{i}=x_{s}, X_{j}=x_{t}\right\}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Both the numerator and denominator are U-statistics. It's straightforward to show that they converge to their expectations. Therefore, the sum of the first and second terms are $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, and the proof is complete.

Proof of Theorem 1. According to Assumption 4 , $\beta_{0}, A_{0}$ uniquely maximizes $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, q) \mid X, A_{0}\right]$. Since $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{A})$ solves $\max _{\beta \in \mathbb{B}, A \in \mathbb{A}} \mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, \hat{q})$, it suffices to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{\beta, A}\left|\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, \hat{q})-\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, q) \mid X, A_{0}\right]\right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 . \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the triangle inequality, the left-hand side is less than or equal to


By Continuous Mapping Theorem and Lemma 1, $I I=o_{p}(1)$. By the Logit formalization of $Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
I & =\sup _{\beta, A}\left|\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, \hat{q})-\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_{n}(\beta, A, \hat{q}) \mid X, A_{0}\right]\right| \\
& =\sup _{\beta, A}\left|\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Q_{i j}:=Q_{i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{0}, \hat{q}\right)$
According to the Triangle Inequality,

$$
\left|\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right|
$$

$$
\leqslant \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right|
$$

Condition (13) implies that $\ln \left(\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}\right) \leqslant \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right) \leqslant \ln \left(\frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa}\right)$, thus $(\kappa-1) \ln \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa} \leqslant$ $\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right) \leqslant(1-\kappa) \ln \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa}$. According to Hoeffding's inequality,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \epsilon\right) \leqslant 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(n-1) \epsilon^{2}}{2(1-\kappa)^{2}\left(\ln \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa}\right)^{2}}\right)
$$

Take $\epsilon=\sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}$, applying Boole's inequality, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{B}, A \in \mathbb{A}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \\
\leqslant & n \operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \\
\leqslant & \left(\frac{2}{n^{2}}\right)^{-\frac{(n-1)}{2 n(1-\kappa)^{2}\left(\ln \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa}\right)^{2}}} \\
= & O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2}}\right) \\
\Longrightarrow & \operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \\
\leqslant & \operatorname{Pr}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \\
\leqslant & \operatorname{Pr}\left(\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \leqslant O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies the uniform convergence result:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\sup _{\beta, A}\left|\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \ln \left(\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}{1-Q_{i j}\left(\beta, A_{i}, \hat{q}\right)}\right)\right| \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{3 \ln n}{n}}\right) \leqslant O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2}}\right) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence $I=o_{p}(1)$ and (19) follows.
Proof of Theorem 2, Let $A_{0}$ denote the population vector of heterogeneity terms and
$A_{1}=\varphi\left(A_{0}\right)$. From (12), I have

$$
A_{1, i}-A_{0, i}=\ln \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}-\ln \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}+A_{0 i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}+A_{0 i}\right)}
$$

A Taylor expansion of the second term on the right-hand side gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ln \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}+A_{0 i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}+A_{0 i}\right)} \\
= & \ln \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\left(1-Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime}}{\sum_{i \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)}\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using (13), the compact support of $Z_{i j}$, and Theorem 11,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\left(1-Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime}}{\sum_{i \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)}\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)\right| \\
\leqslant & \sum_{j \neq i}\left|\frac{Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\left(1-Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime}}{\sum_{i \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, A_{i 0}, \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)}\right|\left|\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)\right| \\
\leqslant & \frac{\sup _{z \in \mathbb{Z}}\left|z^{\prime}\right|}{4 \kappa}\left|\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)\right| \\
= & O_{p}(1) \cdot o_{p}(1) \\
= & o_{p}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

I can conclude that

$$
A_{1, i}-A_{0, i}=\ln \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}-\ln \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}+o_{p}(1) .
$$

Denote $\hat{Q}_{i j}:=\frac{\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{0 i}\right)}$, a mean value expansion around $\hat{Q}_{i j}$ gives

$$
\ln \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}=\ln \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}}{\lambda \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}+(1-\lambda) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}},
$$

for some $\lambda \in(0,1)$. By (13), for all $i$

$$
\left|\frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)}{\lambda \sum_{j \neq i} G_{i j}+(1-\lambda) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}}\right| \leqslant \frac{\left|\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)\right|}{(n-1)(1-\lambda) \kappa}
$$

Lemma 2 then gives, with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$, the uniform bound

$$
\sup _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}\left|A_{1, i}-A_{0, i}\right|<O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}\right)
$$

Then the conclusion follows by applying Lemma 4 in Graham (2017).
Proof of Theorem 3. Step 1. Characterizing the probability limit of the Hessian of the concentrated log-likelihood.

First define the following notations. The Hessian matrix of the joint log-likelihood is given by

$$
H_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
H_{n, \beta \beta} & H_{n, \beta A} \\
H_{n, \beta A}^{\prime} & H_{n, A A}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{n, \beta \beta}=-\sum_{i} \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{i j} Z i j^{\prime} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)  \tag{21}\\
& H_{n, \beta A}^{\prime}=-\left(\begin{array}{c}
\sum_{j \neq 1} Q_{1 j}\left(1-Q_{1 j}\right) Z_{1 j}^{\prime} \\
\vdots \\
\sum_{j \neq n} Q_{n j}\left(1-Q_{n j}\right) Z_{n j}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)  \tag{22}\\
& H_{n, A A}=-\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\sum_{j \neq 1} Q_{1 j}\left(1-Q_{1 j}\right) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & \sum_{j \neq n} Q_{n j}\left(1-Q_{n j}\right)
\end{array}\right) \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

and $\hat{H}_{n, \beta \beta}, \hat{H}_{n, \beta A}^{\prime}$, and $\hat{H}_{n, A A}$ are defined by (21), (22), (23)) respectively with $Z_{i j}$ replaced by $\hat{Z}_{i j}$.

Following Amemiya (1985, pp. 125-127), the Hessian of the concentrated likelihood is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}_{n}^{c}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}\right)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta^{\prime}}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^{\prime}} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right) \\
= & \hat{H}_{n, \beta \beta}-\hat{H}_{n, \beta A} \hat{H}_{n, A A}^{-1} \hat{H}_{n, \beta A}^{\prime} \\
= & -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Z}_{i j} \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\left(\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)},
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^{\prime}} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right) \\
= & -\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Z}_{i j} \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right) \hat{Z}_{i j}^{\prime}\right)}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{Q}_{i j}\right)} \\
= & -\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{i j} Z_{i j}^{\prime} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}^{\prime}\right)}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+o_{p}(1) \\
= & \mathcal{I}_{0}+o_{p}(1), \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{0}$ is as defined in (14). The second equality in (24) is given by the same logic as the proof of Lemma 2 and more involved calculations.

Step 2. Asymptotic Linear Representation
Consider the first-order condition associated with the concentrated log-likelihood

$$
\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{n}^{c}(\beta, \hat{A}(\beta), \hat{q})}{\partial \beta}\right|_{\beta=\hat{\beta}}=0
$$

a mean value expansion gives

$$
0=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\hat{\beta}, \hat{A}_{i}(\hat{\beta}), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^{\prime}} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, \hat{A}_{i}(\bar{\beta}), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right),
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right) \\
= & \underbrace{-\left[\frac{1}{n^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^{\prime}} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\bar{\beta}, \hat{A}_{i}(\bar{\beta}), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]^{-1}}_{I^{-1}} \underbrace{\left[\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right)\right]}_{I I} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term $I$ converges in probability to $\mathcal{I}_{0}$ as defined in (14). I cannot apply a CLT directly to $I I$ because of the strong correlation between summands caused by using the same set of data to get $\hat{q}, \hat{A}$ and estimator of $\beta$.

A second order Taylor expansion of $I I$ gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \hat{q}_{i j}\right) \\
= & \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), q_{i j}\right) \\
& -\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right) Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \\
& -\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \beta_{0}^{\prime}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)+Q_{i j}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right) \\
& -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)^{2} \bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(1-2 \bar{Q}_{i j}\right) \bar{Z}_{i j} \\
& -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)^{\prime} \nabla_{Z_{i j}} Z_{i j}^{\prime} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \bar{q}_{i j}\right)\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right) \\
& -\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)\left[\bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(1-2 \bar{Q}_{i j}\right) \bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}^{\prime}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)+\bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)\right], \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\bar{Q}_{i j}=\frac{\exp \left(\bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}+\bar{A}_{i}\right)}{1+\exp \left(\bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}+\bar{A}_{i}\right)}$, with $\bar{A}_{i}$ between $\hat{A}$ and $A, \bar{Z}_{i j}$ between $\hat{Z}_{i j}$ and $Z_{i j}$, for all $i, j$. The main result follows by showing that
(i) A CLT can be applied to the second and third terms of (25).
(ii) The first term converges in probability to 0 .
(iii) The last three terms (second-order terms) converge in probability to 0 .

I start from the last three terms in (25). Condition (13), compact support and Theorem 2 implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|-\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)^{2} \bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(1-2 \bar{Q}_{i j}\right) \bar{Z}_{i j}\right| \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{n}\left|\lambda_{n}\right|^{2} O_{p}\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right) \\
= & O_{p}\left(\frac{\ln n}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
= & o_{p}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By the same argument, it can be shown that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|-\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)^{\prime} \nabla_{Z_{i j} Z_{i j}^{\prime}} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, \bar{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), \bar{q}_{i j}\right)\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)\right|=o_{p}(1) \\
& \left|-\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)\left[\bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(1-2 \bar{Q}_{i j}\right) \bar{Z}_{i j} \beta_{0}^{\prime}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)+\bar{Q}_{i j}\left(1-\bar{Q}_{i j}\right)\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)\right]\right| \\
& =o_{p}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then I consider the first term in (25). By Lemma 2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} s_{\beta, i j}\left(\beta_{0}, A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right), q_{i j}\right) \\
= & \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup _{Z \in \mathbb{Z}}|Z| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right) \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} O_{p}(1) \\
= & o_{p}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)=O_{p}(1)$. This is true because $G_{i j}$ are independent conditional on $A$ and $X$. Applying the central limit
theorem yields the desired conclusion.
Then look at the second term. Applying Lemma 2 and 3 yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\hat{A}_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)-A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right) Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \\
= & \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(G_{i j}-Q_{i j}\right)}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}+O_{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \\
= & \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{Q}_{i j}-Q_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}\right) Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}+o_{p}(1) \\
= & \frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}\right) \sum_{j \neq i}\left(\frac{\exp \left(Z_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)}{1+\exp \left(Z_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)\right)+o_{p}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The sum of the second and third terms can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} M_{i j}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)+o_{p}(1), \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $M_{i j}=\left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j}}{\sum_{j \neq i} Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right)}\right) \frac{\exp \left(Z_{j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)}{1+\exp \left(Z_{i j}^{\prime} \beta_{0}+A_{i}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)} I_{d}+\left[Q_{i j}\left(1-Q_{i j}\right) Z_{i j} \beta_{0}^{\prime}+Q_{i j} I_{d}\right]$.
Define $\zeta_{i j}=\left(W_{i j}^{\prime}, G_{j i}, \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} G_{j k}\right)^{\prime}$. As defined in Section 3, $\hat{Z}_{i j}:=\left(W_{i j}^{\prime}, \hat{q}_{j i}, \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \hat{q}_{j k}\right)^{\prime}$. I will show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} M_{i j}\left(\hat{q}_{i j}-G_{i j}\right)=0 \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that

$$
\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} M_{i j}\left(\hat{Z}_{i j}-\zeta_{i j}\right)=0
$$

and hence I can replace $\hat{Z}_{i j}$ in (26) with $\zeta_{i j}$. To see why (27) holds, observe that

$$
\frac{1}{n^{3 / 2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} M_{i j}\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{l \neq k} G_{i j} 1\left\{W_{k, l}=W_{i j}\right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{l \neq k} \mathbf{1}\left\{W_{k, l}=W_{i j}\right\}}-G_{i j}\right)=0,
$$

and the claim follows. Define $V_{i}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} M_{i j}\left(\zeta_{i j}-Z_{i j}\right)$. Then (26) can be written as

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{i}+o_{p}(1)
$$

where $\left\{V_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is independently distributed, conditional on $X, \sigma$.

Step 3. Demonstration of Asymptotic Normality of the second and third term in (25).
To apply CLT, I need to check the Lindeberg condition. Take any vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, the conditional mean of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i}$ is 0

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right]=0
$$

The conditional variance of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i} a^{\prime} V_{i}$ given $X, \sigma$ is

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left(\left.\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i} a^{\prime} V_{i} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(a^{\prime} V_{i}\right)^{2} \mid X, \sigma\right]:=\Omega_{n}
$$

By compact support, Condition (13), and Lemma 1,

$$
\frac{\max _{i}\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i}\right|}{\sqrt{\Omega_{n}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0
$$

To check the Lindeberg condition, note that for any $\epsilon>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\Omega_{n}} \sum_{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{1}{n}\left(a^{\prime} V_{i}\right)^{2} \mathbf{1}\left\{\frac{\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i}\right|}{\sqrt{\Omega_{n}}}>\epsilon\right\} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right] \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{\Omega_{n}} \sum_{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{1}{n}\left(a^{\prime} V_{i}\right)^{2} \mathbf{1}\left\{\frac{\max _{i}\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i}\right|}{\sqrt{\Omega_{n}}}>\epsilon\right\} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right] \\
\leqslant & \frac{1}{\Omega_{n}} \sum_{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{1}{n}\left(a^{\prime} V_{i}\right)^{2} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right]=1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

By the dominated convergence theorem, the Lindeberg condition follows, i.e. for any $\epsilon>0$

$$
\frac{1}{\Omega_{n}} \sum_{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{1}{n}\left(a^{\prime} V_{i}\right)^{2} \mathbf{1}\left\{\frac{\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a^{\prime} V_{i}\right|}{\sqrt{\Omega_{n}}}>\epsilon\right\} \right\rvert\, X, \sigma\right] \xrightarrow{p} 0
$$

By Lindeberg-Feller CLT, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$,

$$
\Omega_{n}^{-1 / 2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i} a^{\prime} V_{i} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1)
$$

Combining with the result in Step 1 , this yields the desired conclusion that for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$,

$$
\frac{\sqrt{n} a^{\prime}\left(\hat{\beta}-\beta_{0}\right)}{\|a\|^{-1 / 2}\left(a^{\prime} \mathcal{I}_{0}^{-1} \Omega_{n} \mathcal{I}_{0}^{-1} a\right)^{1 / 2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1) .
$$
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ I don't assume $A_{i}$ to have discrete distribution, though.

