



University of Essex

Professor Robert Taylor
Essex Business School
University of Essex
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester
Essex CO4 3SQ

Tel: +44 (0)1206 873973
Email: rtaylor@essex.ac.uk

Dr Gray Calhoun
Department of Economics
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa, USA

Monday, 07 October 2013

Dear Gray,

Thank you for submitting the revision of your paper, "Block bootstrap consistency under weak assumptions", for further consideration for publication in *Econometric Theory*.

I have now heard back from the original referees on your revision. Now that your submission is on the Editorial Express system (you opted to resubmit through this route) the referees are unfortunately not labelled the same as in the previous round. Referee 3 is now referee 2, Referee 1 is now Referee 3 and finally Referee 2 is now Referee 1.

You will recall that (under the new labelling of referees) Referee 1 was the most positive of the three, Referee 2 was positive on contribution but had serious technical concerns, and Referee 3 was the most negative, recommending rejection. The views of the three referees and their relative assessments of your paper have not changed hugely. Referee 1 now believes your paper is publishable (he makes some suggestions on presentation but I think you can safely ignore these if you wish). Referee 3 is not quite as negative as last time and writes to me in a cover letter as follows:

"I recommend an encouraging (but maybe not "strong") R&R. This is basically, potentially, very nice work, but in my view there is substantial notational overkill, as my report details. I got fed up with grinding through it, and other readers may too. More worrying is whether the implications of the generality have really been thought through. I would like, either a revamping/simplifying of the notation, or else a new section explaining why the generality is necessary, with interesting examples. Not too much to ask?"

Referee 2 stills thinks your paper is potentially publishable but again points to serious technical problems which remain (and in some cases have newly appeared) in the revision. More specifically, he/she wrote to me in a cover letter as follows:

"The paper has been overhauled quite a bit in response to my earlier report. To his credit, the author has been quite forthcoming about this and has tried to remedy the issues that arose. However, after the revision, there seem to be problems that remain and problems that have been newly introduced. Of the issues that I list in my report, I expect that some can be remedied by more explanation of the argument. For some arguments, the author appears to take arguments that are known to hold in a non-random setting and transplants

them to a random setting. Such reasoning is not necessarily formally correct, and it is not clear to me if the author is sloppy or simply omitting steps that I cannot reconstruct. This is the case with my points 2 (the CLT in a conditional setting) and my point 5 (uniform convergence of conditional distributions by using a result by Van der Vaart on unconditional distributions). In a similar vein, for Theorem 1 and 2, the author immediately starts to prove results that I do not see imply the results. I think that some explanation is in order in both cases. However, I suspect that some of the points that I raised cannot be remedied without serious repair work. The error made in the stochastic equicontinuity proof is elementary and suggests that the author has not understood the nature of the stochastic equicontinuity proof for partial sums. Therefore, this aspect of the proof will certainly need to be modified. I recommend that you give this author a chance at revising his paper once more, while at the same time warning the author that it is absolutely imperative that this time a manuscript is produced that is problem-free."

As with my decision letter at the previous round with your paper, I find myself in closest agreement with Referee 2. Given that your submission is to *Econometric Theory* it is absolutely essential that your theoretical results are both fully and correctly proved. My own reading of your paper leads me to agree with Referee 2 on the technical inadequacies with the current proofs, and after a Major Revision was offered this could easily justify a decision to reject your paper at this stage. However, I do still think that there is merit in the subject matter of your paper and it tackles an interesting area of research. I have therefore decided to give you the opportunity to submit a further Major Revision of your paper. I would send your revision back to Referees 2 and 3. It is therefore imperative that you rigorously address the technical problems raised by Referee 2 as well as seriously addressing all the other comments from Referee 2 and from Referee 3. Because this is now the second opportunity to undertake a Major Revision, if Referee 2 and I still find serious technical flaws in your second revision I will have no option but to terminate the review process at that stage.

Please let me know if you would like to take up my offer. As is standard, if you do decide to submit a revision of your paper, please also include with your re-submission memoranda of responses to each of Referees 2 and 3 and a separate covering letter to me detailing how you have revised your paper to address their comments.

Thank you for submitting your research to *Econometric Theory*. I look forward to receiving your revision in due course. Please note that your revision must be received within 12 months of the date of this letter. Failure to do so will result in it having to be treated as a fresh submission.

Best wishes,

Robert Taylor
Co-Editor, *Econometric Theory*