

By substituting $\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l_n}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}$ for $\mathbf{u}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} &= -(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial^2 l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \\ &\quad + n (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top I_n^o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + n (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} n (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) &= \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \sqrt{n} o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= O_p(1) o_p(1) = o_p(1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

it follows from (2.39) and (2.40) that

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top I_n^o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p(1) \quad (2.41)$$

Now, expand $l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ around $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial^2 l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p(1) \\ &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} - \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top I_n^o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p(1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

By combining (2.41) and (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \ln R(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) &= 2 (l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top I_n^o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p(1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Since

$$\sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \rightarrow_d N(0, (I_1^e(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1}), \quad \frac{1}{n} I_n^o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rightarrow_p I_1^e(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (2.44)$$

the conclusion follows from (2.43), (2.44), and an application of Slutsky's theorem.

Case 2. Assume $K = (I_l, \mathbf{0})$ with I_l denoting the $l \times l$ identity matrix. Then, the null becomes $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \mathbf{b}$. In this case, the first $l \times 1$ subvector