arXiv:0707.0861v1 [math.ST] 5 Jul 2007

Data-driven efficient score tests for deconvolution problems.

Langovoy Mikhail*

Mikhail Langovoy, Institute for Mathematical Stochastics,
Georg-August-University at Göttingen, Maschmuellenweg 8/10,
37077 Goettingen, Germany
e-mail: langovoy@math.uni-goettingen.de

Abstract: We consider testing statistical hypotheses about densities of signals in deconvolution models. A new approach to this problem is proposed. We constructed score tests for the deconvolution with the known noise density and efficient score tests for the case of unknown density. The tests are incorporated with model selection rules to choose reasonable model dimensions automatically by the data. Consistency of the tests is proved.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62H15; secondary 62P30, 62E20.

Keywords and phrases: Hypothesis testing, statistical inverse problems, deconvolution, efficient score test, model selection, data-driven test.

1. Introduction

Constructing good tests for statistical hypotheses is an essential problem of statistics. There are two main approaches to constructing test statistics. In the first approach, roughly speaking, some measure of distance between the theoretical and the corresponding empirical distributions is proposed as the test statistic. Classical examples of this approach are the Cramer-von Mises and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics. Although, these tests works and are capable of giving very good results, but each of these tests is asymptotically optimal only in a finite number of directions of alternatives to a null hypothesis (see Nikitin (1995)).

*Financial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft GK 1023 "Identifikation in Mathematischen Modellen" is gratefully acknowledged.

Nowadays, there is an increasing interest to the second approach of constructing test statistics. The idea of this approach is to construct tests in such a way that the tests would be asymptotically optimal. Test statistics constructed following this approach are often called (efficient) score test statistics. The pioneer of this approach was Neyman (1937) and then many other works followed: Neyman (1959), Cox and Hinkley (1974), Bickel and Ritov (1992), Le Cam (1956), Ledwina (1994). This approach is also closely related to the theory of efficient (adaptive) estimation - Bickel et al. (1993), Ibragimov and Has′minskiĭ (1981). Score tests are asymptotically optimal in the sense of intermediate efficiency in an infinite number of directions of alternatives (see Inglot and Ledwina (1996)) and show good overall performance in practice (Kallenberg and Ledwina (1995), Kallenberg and Ledwina (1997)).

We described the situation in classical hypothesis testing, i.e., testing hypotheses about random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, whose values are directly observable. But, it is important from practical point of view to be able to construct tests for situations where $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are corrupted or can only be observed with an additional noise term. These kind of problems are termed *statistical inverse problems*. The most well-known example here is the deconvolution problem. This problem appears when one has noisy signals or measurements: in physics, seismology, optics and imaging, engineering. It is a building block for many complicated statistical inverse problems.

Due to importance of the deconvolution problem, testing statistical hypotheses related to this problem has been widely studied in the literature. But, to our knowledge, all the proposed tests were based on some kind of distance (usually a L_2-type distance) between the theoretical density function and the empirical estimate of the density (see, for example, Bickel and Rosenblatt (1973), Delaigle and Gijbels (2002), Holzmann et al. (2007)). Thus, only the first approach described above was implemented for the deconvolution problem.

In this paper, we treat the deconvolution problem with the second approach. We construct efficient score tests for the problem. From classical hypothesis testing, it was shown that for applications of efficient score tests, it is im-

portant to select the right number of components in the test statistic (see Bickel and Ritov (1992), Eubank et al. (1993), Kallenberg and Ledwina (1995), Fan (1996)). Thus, we provide corresponding refinement of our tests. Following the solution proposed in Kallenberg (2002), we make our tests data-driven, i.e., the tests are capable to choose a reasonable number of components in the test statistics automatically by the data.

In Section 2, we formulate the simple deconvolution problem. In Section 3, we construct the score tests for the parametric deconvolution hypothesis. In Section 5, we prove consistency of our tests against nonparametric alternatives. In Section 6, we turn to the deconvolution with an unknown error density. We derive the efficient scores for the composite parametric deconvolution hypothesis in Section 7. In Section 8, we construct the efficient score tests for this case. In Section 9, we make our tests data-driven. In Section 10, we prove consistency of the tests against nonparametric alternatives. Additionally, in Sections 5 and 10, we explicitly characterize the class of nonparametric alternatives such that our tests are inconsistent and therefore shouldn't be used for testing against the alternatives from this class. Some simple examples of applications of the theory are also presented in this paper.

2. Notation and basic assumptions

The problem of testing whether i.i.d. real-valued random variables $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are distributed according to a given density f is classical in statistics. We consider a more difficult problem, namely the case when X_i can only be observed with an additional noise term, i.e., instead of X_i one observes Y_i, where

$$Y_i = X_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

and ε_i's are i.i.d. with a known density h with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ; also X_i and ε_i are independent for each i and $E\,\varepsilon_i = 0$, $0 < E\,\varepsilon^2 < \infty$. For brevity of notation say that X_i, Y_i, ε_i have the same distribution as random variables X, Y, ε correspondingly. Assume that X has a density with respect to λ.

Our null hypothesis H_0 is the simple hypothesis that X has a known density f_0 with respect to λ. The most general possible nonparametric alternative hypothesis H_A is that $f \neq f_0$. Since this class of alternatives is too broad, first we would be concerned with a special class of submodels of the model described above. In this paper we will at first assume that all possible alternatives from H_A belong to some parametric family. Then we will propose a test that is expected to be asymptotically optimal (in some sense) against the alternatives from this parametric family. However, we will prove that our test is consistent also against other alternatives even if they do not belong to the initial parametric family. The test is therefore applicable in many nonparametric problems. Moreover, the test is expected to be asymptotically optimal (in some sense) for testing against an infinite number of directions of nonparametric alternatives (see Inglot and Ledwina (1996)). This is the general plan for our construction.

3. Score test for simple deconvolution

Suppose that all possible densities of X belong to some parametric family $\{f_\theta\}$, where θ is a $k-$dimensional Euclidean parameter, $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is a parameter set. Then all the possible densities $q\,(y\,;\theta)$ of Y have in such model the form

$$q\,(y\,;\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\, h(\,y - s)\, ds\,. \tag{1}$$

The *score function* $\dot{l}$ is defined as

$$\dot{l}\,(y\,;\theta) = \frac{\big(q\,(\theta)\big)_\theta^{'}}{q\,(\theta)}\, 1_{[q\,(\theta)>0]}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $q\,(\theta) := q\,(y;\theta)$ and $l\,(\theta) := l\,(y;\theta)$ for brevity. The *Fisher information matrix* of parameter θ is defined as

$$I(\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{l}\,(y\,;\theta)\dot{l}^T\,(y\,;\theta)\, dQ_\theta(y)\,. \tag{3}$$

Definition 1. Call our problem a *regular deconvolution problem* if

$\langle$**B1**$\rangle$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ $q\,(y;\theta)$ is continuously differentiable in θ for $\lambda-$almost all y with gradient $\dot{q}\,(\theta)$

$\langle$**B2**$\rangle$ $\left|\dot{l}\,(\theta)\right| \in L_2(\mathbb{R}, Q_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$

$\langle$**B3**$\rangle$ $I(\theta)$ is nonsingular for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and continuous in θ.

If θ is a true parameter value, call such model $GM_k(\theta)$ and denote by Q_θ the probability distribution function and by E_θ the expectation corresponding to the density $q\,(\cdot;\theta)$.

If conditions $\langle B1\rangle - \langle B3\rangle$ holds, then by Proposition 1, p.13 of Bickel et al. (1993) we calculate for all $y \in supp\ q\,(\cdot;\theta)$

$$\dot{l}\,(\theta) = \dot{l}\,(y\,;\theta) = \frac{\left(q\,(y\,;\theta)\right)_\theta^{'}}{q\,(y\,;\theta)} = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\,h(\,y-s)\,ds}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\,h(\,y-s)\,ds}. \tag{4}$$

Then for $y \in supp\ q\,(\cdot;\theta)$ the *efficient score vector* for testing $H_0:\ \theta = 0$ is

$$l^*(y) := \dot{l}\,(y\,;0) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\,h(\,y-s)\,ds\right)\Big|_{\theta=0}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_0(s)\,h(\,y-s)\,ds}. \tag{5}$$

Set

$$L = \left\{E_0[l^*(Y)]^T l^*(Y)\right\}^{-1} \tag{6}$$

and

$$U_k = \left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j)\right\} L \left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j)\right\}^T. \tag{7}$$

Theorem 1. *For the regular deconvolution problem the efficient score vector l^* for testing $\theta = 0$ in $GM_k(\theta)$ is given for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by (5). Moreover, under $H_0 : \theta = 0$ we have $U_k \to_d \chi_k^2$ as $n \to \infty$.*

We construct the test based on the test statistic U_k as follows: the null hypothesis H_0 is rejected if the value of U_k exceeds standard critical points for χ_k^2-distribution. Note that we do not need to estimate the scores l^*.

Corollary 2. *If the deconvolution problem is regular and $f_\theta(\cdot)$ is differentiable in θ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, then the conclusions of Theorem 1 are valid and the efficient score vector for testing $H_0 : \theta = 0$ can be calculated by the formula*

$$l^*(y) \;=\; \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_\theta(s) \right)\Big|_{\theta=0} h(\,y-s)\,ds}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\, h(\,y-s)\,ds}\,. \tag{8}$$

Example 1. Consider one important special case. Assume that each submodel of interest is given by the following restriction: all possible densities f of X belong to a parametric exponential family, i.e., $f = f_\theta$ for some θ, where

$$f_\theta(x) \;=\; f_0(x)\, b(\theta) \exp(\theta \circ u(x))\,, \tag{9}$$

where the symbol $\circ$ denotes the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^k$, $u(x) = (u_1(x), \ldots, u_k(x))$ is a vector of known Lebesgue measurable functions, $b(\theta)$ is the normalizing factor and $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. We assume that the standard regularity assumptions on exponential families (see Barndorff-Nielsen (1978)) are satisfied. All the possible densities $q\,(y\,;\theta)$ of Y have in such model the form

$$q\,(y\,;\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_0(s)\, b(\theta) \exp(\theta \circ u(s))\; h(\,y-s)\,ds\,. \tag{10}$$

These densities no longer need to form an exponential family. If we assume, for example, that $h > 0 \quad \lambda-$almost everywhere on $\mathbb{R}$ and the functions f_0, h, $u_1, \ldots, u_k$ are bounded and $\lambda-$measurable and that there exists an open subset $\Theta_1 \subseteq \Theta$ such that $\left|\dot{l}\,(y\,;\theta)\right| \in L_2(Q_\theta)$ and the Fisher information matrix $I(\Theta)$ is nonsingular and continuous in θ, then conditions $\langle B1\rangle - \langle B3\rangle$ are satisfied for this problem and the previous results are applicable. The score vector for the problem is

$$l^*(y) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} u(s)\, f_0(s)\, h(\,y-s)\,ds}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_0(s)\, h(\,y-s)\,ds} \;-\; \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(s)\, f_0(s)\,ds\,. \tag{11}$$

In other words, if we denote by $*$ the standard convolution of functions,

$$l^*(y) = \frac{(uf_0) * h}{f_0 * h}(y) \;-\; E_0 u(X)\,. \tag{12}$$

Let L be defined by (6) and

$$V_k = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j) \right\} L \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j) \right\}^T . \tag{13}$$

This is the score test statistic designed to be asymptotically optimal for testing H_0 against the alternatives from the exponential family (9). Its asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis H_0 is given by Theorem 1.

4. Selection rule

For the use of score tests in classical hypotheses testing it was shown (see the Introduction) that it is important to select the right dimension k of the space of possible alternatives. Incorrect choice of the model dimension can substantially decrease the power of a test. In Section 5 we give a theoretical explanation of this fact for the case of deconvolution. The possible solution of this problem is to incorporate the test statistic of interest by some procedure (called a selection rule) that chooses a reasonable dimension of the model automatically by the data. See Kallenberg (2002) for an extensive discussion and practical examples. In this section we implement this idea for testing the deconvolution hypothesis. First we give a definition of selection rule, generalizing ideas from Inglot and Ledwina (2006).

Denote by $M_k(\theta)$ the model described in Section 3 such that the true parameter θ belongs to the parameter set, say Θ_k, and $\dim \Theta_k = k$. By a *nested family* of submodels $M_k(\theta)$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ we mean a sequence of these models such that for their parameter sets it holds that $\Theta_1 \subset \Theta_2 \subset \ldots$.

Definition 2. Consider a nested family of submodels $M_k(\theta)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, d$, where d is fixed but otherwise arbitrary. Choose a function $\pi(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers. Assume that $\pi(1, n) < \pi(2, n) < \ldots < \pi(d, n)$ for all n and $\pi(j, n) - \pi(1, n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $j = 2, \ldots, d$. Call $\pi(j, n)$ a *penalty attributed to the j-th model $M_j(\theta)$ and the sample size n.* Then a *selection rule* S for the test statistic U_k is an integer-valued random variable

satisfying the condition

$$S = \min\big\{k : 1 \le k \le d;\, U_k - \pi(k,n) \ge U_j - \pi(j,n),\, j = 1,\dots,d\big\}. \quad (14)$$

We call U_S a *data-driven efficient score test statistic* for testing validity of the initial model.

From Theorem 3 below it follows that for our problem (as well as in the classical case, see Kallenberg (2002)) many possible penalties lead to consistent tests. So the choice of the penalty should be dictated by external practical considerations. Our simulation study is not so vast to recommend the most practically suitable penalty for the deconvolution problem. Possible choices are, for example, Schwarz's penalty $\pi(j,n) = j\,\log n$, or Akaike's penalty $\pi(j,n) = j$.

Denote by P_0^n the probability measure corresponding to the case when $X_1,\dots,X_n$ all have the density f_0. For simplicity of notation we will further sometimes omit index "n" and write simply P_0. The main result about the asymptotic null distribution of U_S is the following

Theorem 3. *Suppose that assumptions $\langle B1\rangle - \langle B3\rangle$ holds. Then under the null hypothesis H_0 it holds that $P_0^n(S > 1) \to 0$ and $U_S \to_d \chi_1^2$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Remark 4. The selection rule S can be modified in order to make it possible to choose not only models of dimension less than some fixed d but to allow arbitrary large dimensions of $M_k(\theta)$ as n grows to infinity. In this case an analogue of Theorem 3 still holds, but the proof becomes more technical and one should take care about the possible rates of growth of the model dimension. Though, one can argue that even $d = 10$ is often enough for practical purposes (see Kallenberg and Ledwina (1995)).

5. Consistency of tests

Let F be a true distribution function of X. Here F is *not* necessarily parametric and possibly doesn't have a density with respect to λ. Let us choose for every $k \le d$ an auxiliary parametric family $\{f_\theta\},\ \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ such that f_0 from this

family coincides with f_0 from the null hypothesis H_0. Suppose that the chosen family $\{f_\theta\}$ gives us the regular deconvolution problem in the sense of Definition 1. Then one is able to construct the score test statistic U_k defined by (7) despite the fact that the true F possibly has no relation to the chosen $\{f_\theta\}$. One can use the exponential family from Example 1 as $\{f_\theta\}$, or some other parametric family whatever is convenient. This is our goal in this section to determine under what conditions thus build U_k will be consistent for testing against F.

Suppose that the following condition holds

$\langle$**D1**$\rangle$ there exists an integer $K \geq 1$ such that $K \leq d$ and
$E_F\, l_1^* = 0, \ldots, E_F\, l_{K-1}^* = 0,\ E_F\, l_K^* = C_K \neq 0\,,$

where l_i^* is the $i-$th coordinate function of l^* and l^* is defined by (5), d is the maximal possible dimension of our model as in Definition 2 of Section 4, and E_F denotes the mathematical expectation with respect to $F * h$.

Condition $\langle D1\rangle$ is a weak analog of nondegeneracy: if for all k $\langle D1\rangle$ fails, then F is orthogonal to the whole system $\{l_i^*\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, and if this system is complete, then F is degenerate. Also $\langle D1\rangle$ is related to the identifiability of the model (see the beginning of Section 10 for more details).

We start with investigation of consistency of U_k, where k is some fixed number, $1 \leq k \leq d$. The following result shows why it is important to choose the right dimension of the model.

Proposition 5. *Let $\langle D1\rangle$ holds. Then for all $1 \leq k \leq K-1$, if F is the true distribution function of X, then $U_k \to_d \chi_k^2$ as $n \to \infty$.*

This result and Theorem 1 show that if the dimension of the model is too small, then the test doesn't work since it doesn't distinguish between F and f_0.

Proposition 6. *Let $\langle D1\rangle$ holds. Then for $k \geq K$, if F is the true distribution function of X, then $U_k \to \infty$ in probability as $n \to \infty$.*

Now we turn to the data-driven statistic U_S. Suppose that the selection rule S is defined as in Section 4. Assume that

$\langle$**S1**$\rangle$ for every fixed $k \geq 1$ it holds that $\pi(k,n) = o(n)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Denote by P_F the probability measure corresponding to the case when $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ all have the distribution F. Consider consistency of the "adaptive" test based on U_S.

Proposition 7. *Let $\langle D1\rangle$ and $\langle S1\rangle$ holds. If F is the true distribution function of X, then $P_F(S \geq K) \to 1$ and $U_S \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.*

The main result of this section is the following

Theorem 8.

1. *The test based on U_k is consistent for testing against all alternative distributions F such that $\langle D1\rangle$ is satisfied with $K \leq k$*
2. *The test based on U_k is inconsistent for testing against all alternative distributions F such that $\langle D1\rangle$ is satisfied with $K > k$*
3. *If the selection rule S satisfies $\langle S1\rangle$, then test based on U_S is consistent against all alternative distributions F such that $\langle D1\rangle$ is satisfied with some K.*

6. Composite deconvolution

In the previous sections, we treated the simplest case of the deconvolution problem. The next sections are devoted to the more realistic case of unknown error density. Our main ideas and constructions will be similar to the ones for the simple case. Our goal is to modify the technics and constructions from the simple hypothesis case in order to apply them in the new situation. In order to do this we will have to impose on our new model additional regularity assumptions of uniformity. These assumptions are quite standard in statistics. They are a necessary payment for our ability to keep simple and general constructions for the more complicated problem. We will have to modify the scores we used in the simple case. The modification we will use is called efficient scores.

Despite of all the changes, we will still be able to build a selection rule for the new problem. We will need a new and modified definition of the selection rule. Big part of the new model uniformity assumptions will be needed not to build an efficient score test, but to make such test data-driven (see section 9).

Consider the situation described in the first paragraph of Section 2, but with the following complication introduced. Suppose further on that the density h of ε is *unknown*.

Then the most general possible null hypothesis H_0 in this setup is that $f = f_0$ and the error ε has expectation 0 and finite variance. The most general alternative hypothesis H_A is that $f \neq f_0$. Since both H_0 and H_A are in this case too broad, we would first consider a special class of submodels of the model described above. At first we assume that all possible densities f of X belong to some specific and preassigned parametric family $\{f_\theta\}$, i.e., $f = f_\theta$ for some θ and θ is a $k-$dimensional Euclidian parameter and $\Theta \subseteq R^k$ is a parameter set for θ. Our starting assumption about the density of the error ε will be that h belongs to some specific parametric family $\{h_\eta\}$, where $\eta \in \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \subseteq R^m$ is a parameter set. Thus, η is a nuisance parameter. The null hypothesis H_0 is the following composite hypothesis: X has particular density f_0 with respect to λ.

Then we will propose a test that is expected to be asymptotically optimal (in some sense) for testing in this parametric situation. After that we will prove that our test is consistent also against a wide class of nonparametric alternatives. Moreover, the test is expected to be asymptotically optimal (in some sense) for testing against an infinite number of directions of nonparametric alternatives. This is essentially the same plan as for the simple case.

If (θ, η) is a true parameter value, we call such submodel $M_{k,m}(\theta, \eta)$. Denote in this case the density of Y by $g(\cdot; (\theta, \eta))$ and the corresponding expectation by $E_{(\theta,\eta)}$. Let the null hypothesis H_0 be $\theta = \theta_0$, where it is assumed that $\theta_0 \in \Theta$. Then the alternative hypothesis $\theta \neq \theta_0$ is a parametric subset of the original general and nonparametric alternative hypothesis H_A.

7. Efficient scores

All possible densities $g\,(y\,;(\theta,\eta))$ of Y have in our model the form

$$g\,(y\,;(\theta,\eta)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\theta(s)\, h_\eta(\,y-s)\, ds\,. \tag{15}$$

It is not always possible to identify θ or/and η in this model. Since we are concerned with testing hypotheses and not with estimation of parameters, it is not necessary for us to impose a restrictive assumption of identifiability on the model. We will need only a (weaker) consistency condition to build a sensible test (see Section 10).

The *score function* for (θ,η) at (θ_0,η_0) is defined as (see Bickel et al. (1993), p.28):

$$\dot{l}_{\theta_0,\eta_0}(y) \,= \big(\,\dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y),\, \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y)\,\big)\,, \tag{16}$$

where $\dot{l}_{\theta_0}$ is the score function for θ at θ_0 and $\dot{l}_{\eta_0}$ is the score function for η at η_0, i.e.

$$\dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\,\big(\,g\,(y\,;(\theta,\eta_0))\big)\big|_{\theta=\theta_0}}{g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))}\,1_{[y:\,g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))>0]} \tag{17}$$

$$= \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\,\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_\theta(s)\, h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\, ds\Big)\Big|_{\theta=\theta_0}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_{\theta_0}(s)\, h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\, ds}\,1_{[y:\,g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))>0]}\,,$$

$$\dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\,\big(\,g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta))\big)\big|_{\eta=\eta_0}}{g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))}\,1_{[y:\,g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))>0]} \tag{18}$$

$$= \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\,\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_{\theta_0}(s)\, h_{\eta}(\,y-s)\, ds\Big)\Big|_{\eta=\eta_0}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_{\theta_0}(s)\, h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\, ds}\,1_{[y:\,g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))>0]}\,.$$

The *Fisher information matrix* of parameter (θ,η) is defined as

$$I(\theta,\eta) \,=\, \int_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{l}^T_{\theta,\eta}(y)\, \dot{l}_{\theta,\eta}(y)\; dG_{\theta,\eta}(y)\,, \tag{19}$$

where $G_{\theta,\eta}(y)$ is the probability measure corresponding to the density $g\,(y\,;(\theta,\eta))$. The symbol 'T' denotes the transposition and all vectors are supposed to be row ones.

We assume that $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ is a regular parametric model in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 3. Call our problem a *regular deconvolution problem* if

$\langle\mathbf{A1}\rangle$ for all $(\theta,\eta)\in\Theta\times\Lambda$ $\quad g\,(y\,;(\theta,\eta))$ is continuously differentiable in (θ,η) for $\lambda-$ almost all y

$\langle\mathbf{A2}\rangle$ $\quad \left|\dot{l}\,(\theta,\eta)\right|\in L_2(\mathbb{R},G_{\theta,\eta})$ for all $(\theta,\eta)\in\Theta\times\Lambda$

$\langle\mathbf{A3}\rangle$ $\quad I(\theta,\eta)$ is nonsingular for all $(\theta,\eta)\in\Theta\times\Lambda$ and continuous in $(\theta,\eta)\,.$

This is a joint regularity condition and it is stronger than the assumption that the model is regular in θ and η separately. Let us write $I(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ in the block matrix form:

$$I(\theta_0,\eta_0)\;=\;\left(\begin{array}{cc} I_{11}(\theta_0,\eta_0) & I_{12}(\theta_0,\eta_0)\\ I_{21}(\theta_0,\eta_0) & I_{22}(\theta_0,\eta_0)\end{array}\right), \tag{20}$$

where $I_{11}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ is $k\times k$, $I_{12}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ is $k\times m$, $I_{21}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ is $m\times k$, $I_{11}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ is $m\times m$. Thus, denoting for simplicity of formulas $\Omega:=[y:\;g\,(y\,;(\theta_0,\eta_0))>0]$ we can write explicitly

$$I_{11}(\theta_0,\eta_0)\;=\;E_{\theta_0,\eta_0}\dot{l}^T_{\theta_0}\,\dot{l}_{\theta_0}\;=\;\int_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{l}^T_{\theta_0}(y)\,\dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y)\;dG_{\theta_0,\eta_0}(y) \tag{21}$$

$$=\int_{\Omega}\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\,f_{\theta}(s)\,h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\,ds\right)^T\Big|_{\theta=\theta_0}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\,f_{\theta}(s)\,h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\,ds\right)\Big|_{\theta=\theta_0}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\,f_{\theta_0}(s)\,h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\,ds}\,dy\,,$$

$$I_{12}(\theta_0,\eta_0) \;=\; E_{\theta_0,\eta_0} \dot{l}^T_{\theta_0}\, \dot{l}_{\eta_0} \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{l}^T_{\theta_0}(y)\, \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y)\; dG_{\theta_0,\eta_0}(y) \tag{22}$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_\theta(s)\, h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\, ds\Big)^T\Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_{\theta_0}(s)\, h_{\eta}(\,y-s)\, ds\Big)\Big|_{\eta=\eta_0}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\, f_{\theta_0}(s)\, h_{\eta_0}(\,y-s)\, ds}\, dy\,,$$

and analogously for $I_{21}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$ and $I_{22}(\theta_0,\eta_0)$. The *efficient score function* for θ in $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ is defined as (see Bickel et al. (1993), p.28):

$$l^*_{\theta_0}(y) \;=\; \dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y) \;-\; I_{12}(\theta_0,\eta_0)\, I^{-1}_{22}(\theta_0,\eta_0)\, \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y)\,, \tag{23}$$

and the *efficient Fisher information matrix* for θ in $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ is defined as

$$I^*_{\theta_0} \;=\; E_{\theta_0,\eta_0} l^{*\,T}_{\theta_0}\, l^*_{\theta_0} \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}} l^*_{\theta_0}(y)^T\, l^*_{\theta_0}(y)\, dG_{\theta_0,\eta_0}(y)\,. \tag{24}$$

Before closing this section we consider two simple examples.

Example 2. Suppose $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and, moreover, $\{f_\theta\}$ is a family $\{N(\theta,1)\}$ of normal densities with mean θ and variance 1, and $\{h_\eta\}$ is a family $\{N(0,\eta^2)\}$. Then $g(\theta,\eta) = f_\theta * h_\eta \sim N(\theta,\eta^2+1)$. Let θ be the parameter of interest and η the nuisance one. Let H_0 be $\theta=\theta_0$. By (17) and (18) for all y

$$\dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y) = \frac{y-\theta_0}{\eta_0^2+1}\,, \quad \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y) = \frac{(y-\theta_0)^2\,\eta_0}{(\eta_0^2+1)^2} - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2+1}\,. \tag{25}$$

By (22)

$$I_{12}(\theta,\eta) \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{y-\theta}{\eta^2+1}\left[\frac{(y-\theta)^2\eta}{(\eta^2+1)^2} - \frac{\eta}{\eta^2+1}\right] dN(\theta,\eta^2+1)(y) \;=\; 0\,,$$

for all θ,η. This means that adaptive estimation of θ is possible in this model, i.e., we can estimate θ equally well whether we know the true η_0 or not. Though, we will not be concerned with estimation here. From (21) we get

$$(I^*_\theta)^{-1} \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(y-\theta)^2}{(\eta^2+1)^2}\, dN(\theta,\eta^2+1)(y) \;=\; \frac{1}{\eta^2+1}\,. \tag{26}$$

Example 3. Suppose now that we are interested in the parameter η in the situation of Example 2 and the null hypothesis is $H_0 : \eta = \eta_0$. There is a sort of symmetry between signal and noise: "what is a signal for one person is a noise for the other" (see also Remark 9). From Example 2 we know that the score function $\dot{l}_{\eta_0}$ for η at η_0 is given by (25). Since we proved for this example $I_{12} = I_{21} = 0$, the efficient score function $l^*_{\eta_0}$ for η at η_0 is given by (25) as well. We calculate now

$$(I^*_{\eta_0})^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{(y-\theta)^2 \eta_0}{(\eta_0^2+1)^2} - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2+1} \right)^2 dN(\theta, \eta_0^2+1)(y) =: \frac{1}{C(\eta_0)}. \quad (27)$$

The constant $C(\eta_0)$ in (27) can be expressed explicitly in terms of η_0, but this is not the point of this example. By the symmetry of θ and η we have $l^*_{\eta_0}(y) = \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y) - I_{21}(\theta, \eta_0) I_{11}^{-1}(\theta, \eta_0) \dot{l}_{\theta_0}(y) = \dot{l}_{\eta_0}(y)$.

Remark 9. Note that the problem is symmetric in θ and η in the sense that it is possible to consider estimating and testing for each parameter, θ or η. Physically this means that from the noisy signal one can recover some "information" not only about the pure signal but also about the noise. This is actually natural since a noise is in fact also a signal. We are observing two signals at once. The payment for this possibility is that except for some trivial cases one can't recover full information about both the signal of interest as well as about the noise.

8. Efficient score test

Let $l^*_{\theta_0}$ be defined by (23) and $I^*_{\theta_0}$ by (24). Note that both $l^*_{\theta_0}$ and $I^*_{\theta_0}$ depends (at least in principle) on the unknown nuisance parameter η_0. Let l^*_j and L be some estimators of $l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j)$ and $(I^*_{\theta_0})^{-1}$ correspondingly. These estimators are supposed to depend only on the observable $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$, but not on the $X_1, \ldots, X_n$.

Definition 4. We say that l^*_j is a *sufficiently good* estimator of $l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j)$ if for each $(\theta_0, \eta_0) \in \Theta \times \Lambda$ it holds that for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$G^n_{\theta_0,\eta_0} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} (l^*_j - l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j)) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \quad (28)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidian norm of a given vector.

In other words, condition (28) means that the average $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j) \approx E_{\theta_0,\eta_0} l^*_{\theta_0}$ is $\sqrt{n}-$consistently estimated. We illustrate this definition by some examples.

Example 2 (continued). We have (denoting variance of Y by $\sigma^2(Y)$):

$$l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j) = \frac{Y_j - \theta_0}{\sigma^2(Y)}.$$

Define

$$l^*_j := \frac{Y_j - \theta_0}{\widehat{\sigma}^2_n},$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}^2_n$ is any $\sqrt{n}-$consistent estimator of the variance of Y. One can take, for example, the sample variance $s^2_n = s^2_n(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ as such an estimate. Then, since by the model assumptions $\sigma^2(Y) > 0$, thus constructed l^*_j satisfies Definition 4. See Appendix for the proof. □

Example 3 (continued). We have in this case

$$l^*_{\eta_0}(Y_j) = \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2 + 1}(Y_j - \theta_0)^2 - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2 + 1}.$$

For simplicity of notations we write $l^*_{\eta_0}(Y_j) = C_1(\eta_0)(Y_j - \theta_0)^2 - C_2(\eta_0)$. Let $\widehat{\theta}_n$ be any $\sqrt{n}-$consistent estimate of θ_0 and put $l^*_j := C_1(\eta_0)(Y_j - \widehat{\theta}_n)^2 - C_2(\eta_0)$. Then Definition 4 is satisfied in this Example also. This is proved in Appendix. □

Definition 4 reflects the basic idea of the method of estimated scores. This method is widely used in statistics (see Bickel et al. (1993), Schick (1986), Ibragimov and Has′minskiĭ (1981), Inglot and Ledwina (2006) and others). These authors show that for different problems it is possible to construct nontrivial parametric, semi- and nonparametric estimators of scores such that these estimators will satisfy (28).

Definition 5. Define

$$W_k = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*_j \right\} \widehat{L} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*_j \right\}^T, \tag{29}$$

where $\widehat{L}$ is an estimate of $(I^*_{\theta_0})^{-1}$ depending only on $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. Note that l^*_j is a $k-$dimensional vector and $\widehat{L}$ is a $k \times k$ matrix. We call W_k the *efficient score*

test statistic for testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ in $M_{k,m}(\theta, \eta)$. It is assumed that the null hypothesis is rejected for large values of W_k.

Normally it should be possible to construct reasonably good estimators $\widehat{\eta}_n$ of η by standard methods since at this point our construction is parametric. After that it would be enough to plug in these estimates in (23) and get the desired $l^{*\prime}_j$s satisfying (28).

Example 2 (continued). Let $\widehat{\sigma}^2(Y)$ be any $\sqrt{n}-$consistent estimate of $\eta^2 + 1$ such that this estimate is based on $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. Then by (26), (25) and definition (29) the efficient score test statistic for testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ (in the model $M_{1,1}(\theta, \eta)$) is

$$W_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{Y_j - \theta_0}{\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(Y)} \right)^2 \widehat{\sigma}_n^2(Y) \, = \, \frac{1}{\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(Y)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (Y_j - \theta_0) \right)^2 . \qquad (30)$$

Example 3 (continued). Using any $\sqrt{n}-$ consistent estimate $\widehat{\theta}$ of θ, we get the efficient score test statistic

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[\frac{(Y_j - \widehat{\theta}_n)^2 \, \eta_0}{(\eta_0^2 + 1)^2} - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2 + 1} \right] \right)^2 C(\eta_0) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \, \frac{\eta_0}{(\eta_0^2 + 1)^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (Y_j - \widehat{\theta}_n)^2 \, - \, \sqrt{n} \, \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2 + 1} \right)^2 C(\eta_0) \, . \qquad (31) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 10. We make now the following remark to avoid possible confusions. For the simple deconvolution we had the score test statistics and now we have the *efficient* score test statistics. This does not mean that the statistics for simple deconvolution is "inefficient". Here the word "efficient" has a strictly technical meaning. Because of the presence of the nuisance parameter we have to extract information about the parameter of interest. We want to do this efficiently in some sense. This is the explanation of the terminology.

The following theorem describes asymptotic behavior of W_k under the null hypothesis.

Theorem 11. *Assume the null hypothesis $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ holds true, $\langle A1 \rangle$-$\langle A3 \rangle$ are fulfilled, (28) is satisfied, and $\widehat{L}$ is any consistent estimate of $(I^*_{\theta_0})^{-1}$. Then*

$$W_k \to_d \chi^2_k \quad as \quad n \to \infty\,,$$

where χ^2_k denotes a random variable with central chi-square distribution with k degrees of freedom.

9. Selection rule

In this section we extend the construction of Section 4 to the case of composite hypotheses. First we give a general definition of a selection rule.

Denote by $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ the model described in Section 6 and such that the true parameter (θ,η) belongs to a parameter set, say $\Theta_k \times \Lambda$, and $\dim \Theta_k = k$. By a *nested family* of submodels $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ for $k = 1,\dots$ we would mean a sequence of these models such that for their parameter sets it holds that $\Theta_1 \times \Lambda \subset \Theta_2 \times \Lambda \subset \dots$.

Definition 6. Consider a nested family of submodels $M_{k,m}(\theta,\eta)$ for $k = 1,\dots,d$, where d is fixed but otherwise arbitrary, and m is fixed. Choose a function $\pi(\cdot,\cdot) : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers. Assume that $\pi(1,n) < \pi(2,n) < \ldots < \pi(d,n)$ for all n and $\pi(j,n) - \pi(1,n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $j = 2,\dots,d$. Call $\pi(j,n)$ a *penalty attributed to the j-th model $M_j(\theta)$ and the sample size n.* Then a *selection rule* $S(l^*)$ for the test statistic W_k is an integer-valued random variable satisfying the condition

$$S(l^*) = \min\big\{k :\, 1 \le k \le d;\, W_k - \pi(k,n) \ge W_j - \pi(j,n),\, j = 1,\dots,d\big\}\,. \quad (32)$$

We call the random variable W_S a *data-driven efficient score test statistic* for testing validity of the initial model. In this paper we also assume that the following condition holds.

$\langle$**S1**$\rangle$ for every fixed $k \ge 1$ it holds that $\pi(k,n) = o(n)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Unlike the case of the simple null hypothesis, in the case of the composite hypotheses the selection rule depends on the estimator l_j^* of the unknown values $l_{\theta_0}^*(Y_j)$ of the efficient score function. This means that we need to estimate the nuisance parameter η, or corresponding scores, or their sum. Surprising result follows from Theorem 12 below: for our problem many possible penalties and, moreover, essentially all sensible estimators plugged in W_k, give consistent selection rules. Possible choices of penalties are, for instance, Shwarz's penalty $\pi(j,n) = j \log n$, or Akaike's penalty $\pi(j,n) = j$.

Denote by $P^n_{\theta_0,\eta_0}$ the probability measure corresponding to the case when $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ all have the density $f(\theta_0, \eta_0)$. The main result about the asymptotic null distribution of W_S is the following theorem (it is proved analogously to Theorem 3).

Theorem 12. *Under the conditions of Theorem 11, as $n \to \infty$ it holds that*

$$P^n_{\theta_0,\eta_0}(S(l^*) > 1) \to 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad W_S \to_d \chi^2_1.$$

Condition (28) is what makes this direct reference to the case of the simple hypothesis possible. Estimation of the efficient score function $l^*_{\theta_0}$ can be done by different ways. First way is to estimate the whole expression from the right side of (23). For this method of estimation condition (28) is natural. The second and probably more convenient method of estimating $l^*_{\theta_0}$ is via estimation of the nuisance parameter η by some estimator $\widehat{\eta}$. But for this approach condition (28) becomes something that have to be proved for each particular estimator. We hope that this inconvenience is excused by the fact that we are only introducing the new test here. It is possible to reformulate condition (28) explicitly in terms of conditions on $\widehat{\eta}$, $\{f_\theta\}$, and $\{h_\eta\}$ (see an analogue in Inglot et al. (1997)).

Remark 13. The selection rule $S(l^*)$ can be modified in order to make it possible to choose not only models of dimension less than some fixed d, but to allow arbitrary large dimensions of $M_{k,m}(\theta, \eta)$ as the number of observations grows. See Remark 4.

Remark 14. It is possible to modify the definition of selection rule so that both dimensions k and m would be selected by the test from the data. A corresponding

test statistic will be of the form W_S, where this time $S = (S_1, S_2)$. Proofs of the asymptotic properties for this statistic are analogous to those presented in this paper. Possibly this statistic could be useful since the situation with the noise of an unknown dimension often seems to be more realistic. On the other hand, this statistic will also have some disadvantages. One will have to impose more strict assumptions on both signal and noise (including an analogue of the double-identifiability assumption). Also the final result will be weaker than the result of this section. This will be a payment for an attempt to extract information about a larger number of parameters from the same amount of observations Y_1, $\ldots$, Y_n .

10. Consistency of tests

Let F be a true distribution function of X and H a true distribution of ε. Here F and H are *not* necessarily parametric and possibly these distribution functions do not have densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ. Let us choose for every $k \leq d$ an auxiliary parametric family $\{f_\theta\},\ \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ such that f_0 from this family coincides with f_0 from the null hypothesis H_0. Correspondingly, let us fix an integer m and choose an auxiliary parametric family $\{h_\eta\},\ \eta \in \Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$. Suppose that the chosen families $\{f_\theta\}$ and $\{h_\eta\}$ give us the regular deconvolution problem in the sense of Definition 3. Then one is able to construct the score test statistic W_k defined by (29) despite the fact that the true F and H possibly do not have any relation to the chosen $\{f_\theta\}$ and $\{h_\eta\}$. This is our goal in this section to determine under what conditions thus build W_k will be consistent for testing against H_A.

Suppose that the following condition holds

$\langle$**C1**$\rangle$ there exists integer $K \geq 1$ such that $K \leq d$ and
$$E_{F*H}\, l^*_{\theta_0(1)} = 0, \ldots, E_{F*H}\, l^*_{\theta_0(K-1)} = 0,\ E_{F*H}\, l^*_{\theta_0(K)} = C_K \neq 0\,,$$

where $l^*_{\theta_0(i)}$ is the $i-$th coordinate function of $l^*_{\theta_0}$ and $l^*_{\theta_0}$ is defined by (23), d is the maximal possible dimension of our model as in Definition 3 of Section 9,

and E_{F*H} denotes the mathematical expectation with respect to $F * H$.

Condition $\langle C1 \rangle$ is a weak analog of nondegeneracy: if for all k $\langle C1 \rangle$ fails, then F is orthogonal to the whole system $l^*_{\theta_0(i)}{}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and if this system is complete, then $F * H$ is degenerate. Also $\langle C1 \rangle$ is related to the identifiability of the model: if the model is not identifiable, then $F * H = F_0 * H$ can happen and $\langle C1 \rangle$ fails. Establishing identifiability for the parametric deconvolution is not trivial (see Sclove and Van Ryzin (1969), e.g.). It is important to note also that although $\langle C1 \rangle$ has something common with both nondegeneracy and identifiability, it is in general pretty far from both these notions.

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 15. *If (28) is satisfied and $\widehat{L}$ is any consistent estimate of $(I^*_{\theta_0})^{-1}$, then*

1. *the test based on W_k is consistent for testing against all alternative distributions F, H such that $\langle C1 \rangle$ is satisfied with $K \leq k$*
2. *the test based on W_k is inconsistent for testing against alternative distributions F, H such that $\langle C1 \rangle$ is satisfied with $K > k$*
3. *if the selection rule $S(l^*)$ satisfies $\langle S1 \rangle$, then test based on W_S is consistent against all alternative distributions $F * H$ such that $\langle C1 \rangle$ is satisfied with some K.*

Part 2 of Theorem 15 shows why it is important to choose the suitable model dimension. Now we give two specific examples.

Example 2 (continued). By Theorem 15 the test based on W_1 is consistent if and only if for true F and H it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 1} E_{F*H}(Y - \theta_0) \neq 0\,, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad E_{F*H}(Y) \neq \theta_0\,. \tag{33}$$

For example, W_1 doesn't work when the true H is symmetric about 0 and the true $F \neq F_0$ has the mean equal to θ_0.

Example 3 (continued). By Theorem 15 W_1 is consistent if and only if for true F and H it holds that

$$E_{F*H}\left[\frac{(y-\theta)^2\,\eta_0}{\left(\eta_0^2+1\right)^2}-\frac{\eta_0}{\eta_0^2+1}\right]\neq 0\,,\quad \text{i.e.}$$

$$E_{F*H}\,(y-\theta)^2\neq\eta_0^2+1,\quad \text{or equivalently}\quad Var_{F*H}\,Y\neq Var_{F*H_0}\,Y\,. \tag{34}$$

Note that condition (33) can be interpreted as "W_1 is consistent for testing the hypothesis about the mean in this model iff the expectation of Y under alternative is different from the expectation under the null hypothesis" and (34) as "W_1 is consistent for testing the hypothesis about the variance in this model iff the variance of Y under alternative is different from the variance under the null hypothesis". One cannot expect more from such a simple test as W_1. On contrary, the data-driven test statistic W_S provides a consistent testing procedure.

Acknowledgments

Author would like to thank Axel Munk for suggesting this topic of research and Fadoua Balabdaoui, Ta-Chao Kao, Wilbert Kallenberg and Janis Valeinis for helpful discussions.

References

O. Barndorff-Nielsen. *Information and exponential families in statistical theory.* John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1978. ISBN 0-471-99545-2. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

P. J. Bickel, C. A. J. Klaassen, Y. Ritov, and J. A. Wellner. *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models.* Johns Hopkins Series in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1993. ISBN 0-8018-4541-6.

P. J. Bickel and Y. Ritov. Testing for goodness of fit: a new approach. In *Nonparametric statistics and related topics (Ottawa, ON, 1991)*, pages 51–57. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.

P. J. Bickel and M. Rosenblatt. On some global measures of the deviations of density function estimates. *Ann. Statist.*, 1:1071–1095, 1973. ISSN 0090-5364.

D. R. Cox and D. V. Hinkley. *Theoretical statistics*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1974.

A. Delaigle and I. Gijbels. Estimation of integrated squared density derivatives from a contaminated sample. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 64(4): 869–886, 2002. ISSN 1369-7412.

R. L. Eubank, J. D. Hart, and V. N. LaRiccia. Testing goodness of fit via nonparametric function estimation techniques. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods*, 22(12):3327–3354, 1993. ISSN 0361-0926.

J. Fan. Test of significance based on wavelet thresholding and Neyman's truncation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 91(434):674–688, 1996. ISSN 0162-1459.

H. Holzmann, N. Bissantz, and A. Munk. Density testing in a contaminated sample. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 98(1):57–75, 2007.

I. A. Ibragimov and R. Z. Has′minskiĭ. *Statistical estimation*, volume 16 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1981. ISBN 0-387-90523-5. Asymptotic theory, Translated from the Russian by Samuel Kotz.

T. Inglot, W. C. M. Kallenberg, and T. Ledwina. Data driven smooth tests for composite hypotheses. *Ann. Statist.*, 25(3):1222–1250, 1997. ISSN 0090-5364.

T. Inglot and T. Ledwina. Asymptotic optimality of data-driven Neyman's tests for uniformity. *Ann. Statist.*, 24(5):1982–2019, 1996. ISSN 0090-5364.

T. Inglot and T. Ledwina. Asymptotic optimality of new adaptive test in regression model. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 42(5):579–590, 2006. ISSN 0246-0203.

W. C. M. Kallenberg. The penalty in data driven Neyman's tests. *Math. Methods Statist.*, 11(3):323–340 (2003), 2002. ISSN 1066-5307.

W. C. M. Kallenberg and T. Ledwina. Consistency and Monte Carlo simulation of a data driven version of smooth goodness-of-fit tests. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(5): 1594–1608, 1995. ISSN 0090-5364.

W. C. M. Kallenberg and T. Ledwina. Data driven smooth tests for composite hypotheses: comparison of powers. *J. Statist. Comput. Simulation*, 59(2):

101–121, 1997. ISSN 0094-9655.

L. Le Cam. On the asymptotic theory of estimation and testing hypotheses. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. I*, pages 129–156, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956. University of California Press.

T. Ledwina. Data-driven version of Neyman's smooth test of fit. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 89(427):1000–1005, 1994. ISSN 0162-1459.

J. Neyman. Smooth test for goodness of fit. *Skand. Aktuarietidskr.*, 20:150–199, 1937.

J. Neyman. Optimal asymptotic tests of composite statistical hypotheses. In *Probability and statistics: The Harald Cramér volume (edited by Ulf Grenander)*, pages 213–234. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1959.

Y. Nikitin. *Asymptotic efficiency of nonparametric tests*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. ISBN 0-521-47029-3.

A. Schick. On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *Ann. Statist.*, 14(3):1139–1151, 1986. ISSN 0090-5364.

S. L. Sclove and J. Van Ryzin. Estimating the parameters of a convolution. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 31:181–191, 1969. ISSN 0035-9246.

Appendix.

Proof. (Theorem 1). We calculated the efficient score vector in (4)-(5). By Proposition 1, p.13 of Bickel et al. (1993) and our regularity assumptions matrix L exists and is positive definite and nondegenerate of rank k. Under $\langle B1\rangle - \langle B3\rangle$ $E_0 l^*(y) = 0$ (see Bickel et al. (1993), p.15) and our statement follows. □

Proof. (Proposition 5). Follows by the multivariate Central Limit Theorem. □

Proof. (Theorem 3). Denote $\Delta(k,n) := \pi(k,n) - \pi(1,n)$. For any $k = 2, \dots, d$

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^n(S=k) &\leq P_0^n\big(U_k - \pi(k,n) \geq U_1 - \pi(1,n)\big) \\ &\leq P_0^n\big(U_k \geq \pi(k,n) - \pi(1,n)\big) \\ &= P_0^n\big(U_k \geq \Delta(k,n)\big)\,. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1 $U_k \to_d \chi^2_k$ as $n \to \infty$, thus for $\Delta(k,n) \uparrow \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ we have $P_0^n\big(U_k \geq \Delta(k,n)\big) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, so for any $k = 2, \ldots, d$ we have $P_0^n(S = k) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. This proves that

$$P_0^n(S \geq 2) = \sum_{k=2}^{d} P_0^n(S = k) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty,$$

and so $P_0^n(S = 1) \to 1$. Now write for arbitrary real $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^n(|U_S - U_1| \geq t) &= P_0^n(|U_1 - U_1| \geq t;\, S = 1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=2}^{d} P_0^n(|U_m - U_1| \geq t;\, S = m) \\ &= \sum_{m=2}^{d} P_0^n(|U_m - U_1| \geq t;\, S = m). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

For $m = 2, \ldots, d$ we have $P_0^n(S = m) \to 0$, so

$$0 \leq \sum_{m=2}^{d} P_0^n(|U_m - U_1| \geq t;\, S = m) \leq \sum_{m=2}^{d} P_0^n(S = m) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ and thus by (35) it follows that U_S tends to U_1 in probability as $n \to \infty$. But $U_1 \to_d \chi^2_1$ by Theorem 1, so $U_S \to_d \chi^2_1$ as $n \to \infty$. □

We shall use the following standard lemma from linear algebra.

Lemma 16. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and let A be a $k \times k$ positive definite matrix; if for some real number $\delta > 0$ we have $A > \delta$ (in the sense that the matrix $(A - \delta\, I_{k\times k})$ is positive definite, where $I_{k\times k}$ is the $k \times k$ identity matrix), then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ it holds that $xAx^T > \delta \|x\|^2$.*

Proof. (Proposition 6). From $\langle D1 \rangle$ by the law of large numbers we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l_i^*(Y_j) \to_P 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq K - 1 \tag{36}$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} l_i^*(Y_j) \to_P C_K \neq 0. \tag{37}$$

We apply Lemma 16 to the matrix L defined in (6); since all the eigenvalues of L are positive we can choose δ to be any fixed positive number less than the smallest eigenvalue of L. We obtain the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} U_k &= \left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j)\right\} L \left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j)\right\}^T \\ &> \delta\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l^*(Y_j)\right\|^2 = \delta\, n \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_i^*(Y_j)\right)^2 \\ &\geq \delta\, n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_K^*(Y_j)\right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Now by (36) and (37) we get for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} P(U_k \leq s) &\leq P\left(\delta\, n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_K^*(Y_j)\right)^2 \leq s\right) \\ &= P\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_K^*(Y_j)\right)^2 \leq \frac{s}{\delta\, n}\right) \\ &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_K^*(Y_j)\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{s}{\delta\, n}}\right) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and this proves the Proposition.

□

Proof. (Proposition 7). Let $\pi(k,n)$ and $\Delta(k,n)$ be defined as in Section 4. For any $i = 1, \ldots, K-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_F\left(S = i\right) &\leq P_F\left(U_i - \pi(i,n) \geq U_K - \pi(K,n)\right) \\ &= P_F\left(U_i \geq U_K - (\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n))\right). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

By (37) and (38) we get

$$P_F\left(U_K \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\, n\right) \to 1 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \tag{40}$$

Note that

$$P_F\left(U_i \geq U_K - (\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n))\right) \tag{41}$$

$$\leq \quad P_F\left(U_i \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n - (\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n));\, U_K \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n\right)$$
$$+\; P_F\left(U_K \leq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n\right).$$

Since by $\langle S1\rangle$ it holds that $\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n) = o(n)$, we get

$$P_F\left(U_i \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n - (\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n));\, U_K \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n\right) \tag{42}$$

$$\leq \quad P_F\left(U_i \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n - (\pi(K,n) - \pi(i,n))\right)$$
$$\leq \quad P_F\left(U_i \geq \delta\,\frac{C_K}{2}\,n\right) \to\, 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ by Chebyshev's inequality since by Proposition 5 we have $U_i \to_d \chi^2_i$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, K-1$. Substituting (40) and (42) to (41) we get $P_F(S = i) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, K-1$. This means that $P_F(S \geq K) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

Now write for $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$P_F(U_S \leq t) = P_F(U_S \leq t; S \leq K-1) + P_F(U_S \leq t; S \geq K) =: R_1 + R_2.$$

But $R_1 \to 0$ since $P_F(S = i) \to 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, K-1$ and $K \leq d < \infty$. Since $U_{l_1} \geq U_{l_2}$ for $l_1 \geq l_2$, we get

$$R_2 \leq \sum_{l=K}^{d} P_F(U_K \leq t) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ by Proposition 6. Thus $P_F(U_S \leq t) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. □

Proof. (Theorem 8). Part 1 follows from Theorem 1 and Proposition 6, part 2 from Theorem 1 and Proposition 5, part 3 from Theorem 3 and Proposition 7. □

Proof. (The statement about l_j^* from Example 2). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(l_j^*-l_{\theta_0}^*(Y_j))\Big| = & \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_j-\theta_0)\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma^2(Y)}-\frac{1}{\widehat{\sigma}_n^2}\Big)\Big| \\ = & \quad \sqrt{n}\Big|\frac{1}{\sigma^2(Y)}-\frac{1}{\widehat{\sigma}_n^2}\Big|\cdot\frac{1}{n}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_j-\theta_0)\Big|.\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\frac{1}{n}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_j-\theta_0)\Big| = \big|\overline{Y}-\theta_0\big| = \big|\overline{Y}-E_Y\big| \to 0$$

in $G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-$probability, therefore Definition 4 is satisfied if $\sqrt{n}\,\big|\frac{1}{\sigma^2(Y)}-\frac{1}{\widehat{\sigma}_n^2}\big|$ is bounded in $G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-$probability, and this holds if $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$ is a $\sqrt{n}-$consistent estimate of $\sigma^2(Y)$. Here $\overline{Y}$ denotes the sample mean $\overline{Y}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}Y_j$. □

Proof. (The statement about l_j^* from Example 3).

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(l_j^*-l_{\eta_0}^*(Y_j))\Big| \\ = & \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big|C_1(\eta_0)\big|\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big((Y_j-\widehat{\theta}_n)^2-(Y_j-\theta_0)^2\big)\Big| \\ = & \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big|C_1(\eta_0)\big|\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta_0)(-2Y_j+\widehat{\theta}_n+\theta_0)\Big| \\ = & \quad \big|C_1(\eta_0)\big|\,\sqrt{n}\big|\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta_0\big|\,\frac{1}{n}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_j-\widehat{\theta}_n)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_j-\theta_0)\Big| \\ = & \quad \big|C_1(\eta_0)\big|\,\sqrt{n}\big|\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta_0\big|\,\big|(\overline{Y}-\widehat{\theta}_n)+(\overline{Y}-\theta_0)\big| \\ \le & \quad \big|C_1(\eta_0)\big|\,\sqrt{n}\big|\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta_0\big|\,\Big(\big|\overline{Y}-\widehat{\theta}_n\big|+\big|\overline{Y}-\theta_0\big|\Big)\to 0\end{aligned}$$

in $G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-$probability since for $n\to\infty$ it holds that $\big|\overline{Y}-\widehat{\theta}_n\big|\to 0$ and $\big|\overline{Y}-\theta_0\big|\to 0$, both in $G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-$probability, and $\sqrt{n}\big|\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta_0\big|$ is bounded in $G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-$probability. □

Proof. (Theorem 11). Put

$$V_k = \Big\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}l_{\theta_0}^*(Y_j)\Big\}\,(I_{\theta_0}^*)^{-1}\,\Big\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}l_{\theta_0}^*(Y_j)\Big\}^T, \tag{43}$$

where $l^*_{\theta_0}$ is defined by (23) and $I^*_{\theta_0}$ by (24). Of course, V_k is *not* a statistic since it depends on the unknown η_0. But if the true η_0 is known, then because of $\langle B1\rangle$-$\langle B3\rangle$ we can apply the multivariate Central Limit Theorem and obtain $V_k \to_d \chi^2_k$ as $n \to \infty$. Condition (28) implies that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l^*_j \;\to\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l^*_{\theta_0}(Y_j) \quad \text{in } G_{\theta_0,\eta_0}-\text{probability as } n \to \infty$$

and by consistency of $\widehat{L}$ we get the statement of the theorem by Slutsky's Lemma. □

Proof. (Theorem 15). Because of condition (28) the proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 8. Indeed, after obvious change of notations Propositions 5, 6, and 7 are true for W_k, $W_{S(l^*)}$, $S(l^*)$ instead of U_k, U_S, S. Proofs of the new versions of propositions are analogous to the proofs of the previous versions. The only difference is that the proof of the key inequality analogous to (38) requires the use of the following lemma.

Lemma 17. *Let A be a $k \times k$ positive definite matrix and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequence of $k \times k$ matrices such that $A_n \to A$ in the Euclidian matrix norm. Suppose that for some real number $\delta > 0$ we have $A > \delta$ in the sense that the matrix $(A - \delta I_{k\times k})$ is positive definite, where $I_{k\times k}$ is the $k \times k$ identity matrix. Then for all sufficiently large n it holds that $A_n > \delta$.*

□