

On structure testing for component covariance matrices of a high-dimensional mixture

Weiming Li¹

School of Statistics and Management, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, Shanghai, China

Jianfeng Yao²

Department of Statistics and Actuarial Sciences, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

Abstract

By studying the family of p -dimensional scale mixtures, this paper shows for the first time a non trivial example where the eigenvalue distribution of the corresponding sample covariance matrix *does not converge* to the celebrated Marčenko-Pastur law. A different and new limit is found and characterized. The reasons of failure of the Marčenko-Pastur limit in this situation are found to be a strong dependence between the p -coordinates of the mixture. Next, we address the problem of testing whether the mixture has a spherical covariance matrix. To analyze the traditional John's type test we establish a novel and general CLT for linear statistics of eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix. It is shown that the John's test and its recent high-dimensional extensions both fail for high-dimensional mixtures, precisely due to the different spectral limit above. As a remedy, a new test procedure is constructed afterwards for the sphericity hypothesis. This test is then applied to identify the covariance structure in model-based clustering. It is shown that the test has much higher power than the widely used ICL and BIC criteria in detecting non spherical component covariance matrices of a high-dimensional mixture.

Keywords: Sphericity test, Marčenko-Pastur law, Large covariance matrix,

2010 MSC: 62H10; 62H15; 60F05

1. Introduction

Let $\phi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ be the density function of a p -dimensional normal distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. A p -dimensional vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a *multivariate normal mixture* (MNM) if its density function has the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^K \alpha_j \phi(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j). \quad (1)$$

Email addresses: li.weiming@shufe.edu.cn (Weiming Li), jeff Yao@hku.hk (Jianfeng Yao)

¹Weiming Li's research is partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 11401037 and Program of IRTSHUFE.

²Jianfeng Yao's research is partly supported by HKSAR Research Grants Council grant No. 17332416.

Here the (α_j) are the K mixing weights and $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j)$ are the parameters of the j th normal component. Such finite mixture models have a long history; yet they continue to attract considerable attention in recent years due to their wide usage in high-dimensional data analysis such as in pattern recognition, signal and image processing, machine learning in bioinformatics, to name a few. The popularity of an MNM is largely due to the fact that by construction the distribution can be interpreted as a mixture of K sub-populations (or groups, clusters) with respective parameters $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j)$ and this interpretation is particularly relevant for clustering or classifying heterogeneous data. For detailed account on these models, we refer to the monographs [McLachlan and Peel \(2000\)](#) and [Frühwirth-Schnatter \(2006\)](#).

When the number of features p in \mathbf{x} is large compared to the number n of available samples from an MNM, the inference of a general MNM becomes intricate. The reason is that the number of free parameters of an MNM model is $K(p+2)(p+1)/2 - 1$ which explodes quadratically with the dimension p . In order to have a concrete picture of this inflation, the numbers of parameters in four particular MNMs are detailed in Table 1 below ([Bouveyron et al. 2007](#)). We see from the table that the full MNM will require as many as 5303 parameters when 50 variables of interest and 4 clusters are involved although 50 is a quite small number in today's big data era. Even for a homogeneous MNM, 1478 parameters are still needed which almost excludes any standard procedure like the maximum likelihood estimation. This highlights that inference of a high-dimensional MNM remains an open and challenging problem even in the homogeneous case.

Table 1: Four standard covariance structures in an MNM with their number of parameters. Here $a = Kp + K - 1$ denotes the number of parameters in (α_j) and $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j)$.

Model	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j$'s	Number of parameters	[case of $(K, p) = (4, 50)$]
Full MNM	Unrestricted	$a + Kp(p+1)/2$	[5303]
Scale MNM	Proportional: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j = \sigma_j^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$	$a + p(p+1)/2 + K - 1$	[1481]
Homogeneous MNM	Identical: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j \equiv \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$	$a + p(p+1)/2$	[1478]
Spherical MNM	Spherical: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j = \sigma_j^2 \mathbf{I}_p$	$a + K$	[207]

Meanwhile, such difficulty for inference is not that surprising in lights of recent developments of high-dimensional statistics. Consider either the case there was no mixture at all, that is $K = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \equiv \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j \equiv \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, or the case of homogeneous MNM, $K > 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j \equiv \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. The inference of both models contains the estimation of a high-dimensional covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. This estimation problem has been widely studied recently and it is well-known that typically no *consistent* estimation exists for such a large covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ without further drastic constraints on its structure ([Bickel and Levina 2008](#)). Therefore, high-dimensional MNM cannot be consistently identified in general when the dimension is large compared to the sample size.

Notice that the literature contains extensive proposals for reduction of the model dimension

by using some parsimonious MNM models where the K component covariance matrices (Σ_j) are restricted to certain structure. The common approach introduces such restricted structure on the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of these component matrices (Banfield and Raftery 1993; Fraley and Raftery 1998; 2002). For example, Bensmail and Celeux (1996) and Bouveyron et al. (2007) proposed 14 and 28 such restricted models, respectively. These restricted models also include the so-called *mixtures of factor analyzers* (McLachlan and Peel 2000, Chapter 8) which are particularly popular in handling high-dimensional data. These mixtures specify that $\Sigma_i = \Lambda_i \Lambda_i' + \Psi_i$ where Λ_i is a $p \times d_i$ loading matrix with $d_i \ll p$ and Ψ_i a diagonal matrix representing the base component of Σ_i .

The other lesson learnt from recent developments in high-dimensional statistics is that although the estimation and identification of a high-dimensional covariance matrix are generically unfeasible, testing hypotheses on their structure is indeed possible. Such structure testing includes equality to the unit (identity matrix), proportional to the unit (sphericity test), equality to a diagonal matrix for the one-sample case, or equality between several high-dimensional covariance matrices in the case of a multiple-sample problem. To mention a few on this literature, we refer to Ledoit and Wolf (2002), Birke and Dette (2005), Bai et al. (2009), Chen et al. (2010), Wang and Yao (2013), Tian et al. (2015) and the review Paul and Aue (2014).

In this paper we investigate the structure testing problem for the component covariance matrices (Σ_j) in a high-dimensional MNM. Precisely, we assume that the K group means (μ_j) have been satisfactorily identified so that all our attention will be devoted at the study of the K component covariance matrices (Σ_j) and at their structure testing. We thus hereafter assume $\mu_j \equiv 0$. The p -variate population \mathbf{x} is assumed to be a *scale mixture* of the form

$$\mathbf{x} = w \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}, \quad (2)$$

where w is a scalar mixing random variable, $\mathbf{T}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a positive definite matrix, assuming $\text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_p^2) = p$ so that w and \mathbf{T}_p can be identified in the model, and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_p)'$ is a set of i.i.d. random variables, independent of w , having zero mean and unit variance. The mean and the covariance matrix of the scale mixture (2) are

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}) = E(w^2) \mathbf{T}_p^2 := \Sigma_p, \quad (3)$$

respectively. Notice that here w is a latent label variable, and if w takes values in a finite set of K values, say $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K\}$ with respective probability $\{\alpha_j\}$, the mixture \mathbf{x} becomes a *finite scale mixture*. If moreover the z_i 's are i.i.d. standard normal, then \mathbf{x} reduces to the scale MNM in Table 1 with mixing weight (α_j) and components covariance matrices $\Sigma_j = \sigma_j^2 \mathbf{T}_p^2$ ($1 \leq j \leq K$).

The scale mixture (2) can also be regarded as an extension of the standard elliptical model (Fang and Zhang 1990) where the vector \mathbf{z} is assumed to be uniformly distributed on the unit

sphere in \mathbb{R}^p . This extension allows the population to possess a heavier or lighter tail by controlling the fourth moment of \mathbf{z} . In [El Karoui \(2010\)](#), the scale mixture plus a non-zero mean vector was studied in the context of portfolio optimization. A major difference here is that Karoui's model makes Gaussian assumption on \mathbf{z} , while our model allows non-Gaussian distributions for \mathbf{z} . Recently, [Xia and Zheng \(2014\)](#) proposed a similar model in the study of high-dimensional integrated covolatility matrices. Their sample data can be modeled as $\mathbf{x}_i = w_i \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}_i$ which has the same form as the scale mixture (2), but w_i in their model is a non-random function of the index i and (\mathbf{z}_i) is again a sequence of i.i.d. Gaussian vectors.

Let $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ be a sample from the mixture (2). Our approach is based on the spectral properties of the sample covariance matrix

$$B_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i'. \quad (4)$$

Let $(\lambda_j)_{1 \leq j \leq p}$ be its eigenvalues, referred as *sample eigenvalues*. The *empirical spectral distribution* (ESD) of B_n is by definition $F_n = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{\lambda_j}$, where and throughout the paper δ_b denotes the Dirac measure at the point b .

Properties of eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices have been extensively studied in random matrix theory (RMT). Consider a p -variate population $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ of the form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \sigma \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}, \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{T}_p and \mathbf{z} are as before but σ is now a constant unlike the random mixing variable w in (2). Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n$ be a sample from the population and denote the corresponding sample covariance matrix by $\tilde{B}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i'$. To further simplify the discussion, let us assume that $\mathbf{T}_p = \mathbf{I}_p$ so here $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \sigma \mathbf{z}$ and $\text{Cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p$. It has been known since ([Marčenko and Pastur 1967](#); [Silverstein 1995](#)) that when p and n grow to infinity proportionally such that $c = \lim p/n > 0$, the ESD of the sample covariance matrix \tilde{B}_n will converge to the celebrated Marčenko-Pastur law (MP law) with parameter (c, σ^2) , i.e., $\nu_{(c, \sigma^2)}(dx) = f(x)dx + (1 - 1/c)\delta_0(dx)1_{\{c > 1\}}$ with the density function $f(x) = (2\pi c \sigma^2 x)^{-1} \sqrt{(b-x)(x-a)} 1_{[a, b]}(x)$, where $a = \sigma^2(1 - \sqrt{c})^2$ and $b = \sigma^2(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$. Consider next the scale mixture (2) where we let also $\mathbf{T}_p = \mathbf{I}_p$, that is,

$$\mathbf{x} = w \mathbf{z}. \quad (6)$$

Then $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p$ is spherical as before with here $\sigma^2 = E(w^2)$: in particular the p coordinates of \mathbf{x} are *uncorrelated*. A *striking finding* from this paper is that despite a same spherical covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p$, the sample covariance matrix B_n from the mixture (6) is very different of the sample covariance matrix \tilde{B}_n from the linear transformation model (5). In particular, the ESD of B_n will converge to a distribution which is not the MP law $\nu_{(c, \sigma^2)}$. An illustration of this difference is given in [Figure 1](#).




Figure 1: Left panel: histogram of eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix \tilde{B}_n from a population $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$ with i.i.d. standardized coordinates. The LSD is the Marčenko-Pastur law (solid line) with support $[0.0858, 2.9142]$. Middle panel: histogram of eigenvalues of sample covariance matrix B_n from a scale MNM $\mathbf{x} = w\mathbf{z}$ with density function $f(\mathbf{x}) = 0.25\phi(\mathbf{x}; 0, 2.5I_p) + 0.75\phi(\mathbf{x}; 0, 0.5I_p)$ whose covariance matrix is also unit. The LSD (dashed line) is not the Marčenko-Pastur law and has support $[0.0576, 4.0674]$. Right panel compares the two LSDs. Both histograms used dimensions $(p, n) = (500, 1000)$ with eigenvalues collected from 100 independent replications.

The failure of the Marčenko-Pasture law for the scale mixture (2) can be explained by the strong dependence between the p uncorrelated coordinates of the mixture. Indeed, Bai and Zhou (2008) proved that the MP law always holds for a population \mathbf{y} with *weakly dependent* coordinates in the following sense: for any sequence of symmetric matrices $\{A_p\}$ bounded in spectral norm,

$$\text{Var}(\mathbf{y}'A_p\mathbf{y}) = o(p^2). \quad (7)$$

In particular, the linear transformation model $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ in (5) has weakly dependent coordinates: indeed one can easily show that $\text{Var}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'A_p\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \kappa p \|\mathbf{T}_p' A_p \mathbf{T}_p\|^2$ where κ is a constant (function of $E(z_i^4)$), and this bound is of order $O(p)$ since the sequence (A_p) is bounded. Therefore the MP law applies for the sample covariance matrix \tilde{B}_n . Now we show that the scale mixture \mathbf{x} of (2) has *strongly dependent* coordinates. Indeed, for $A_p = (\mathbf{T}_p^2)^{-1}$ one easily finds (by conditioning on w) that $\text{Var}(\mathbf{x}'A_p\mathbf{x}) = pE(w^4)\text{Var}(z_1^2) + p^2\text{Var}(w^2)$, which is at least of order p^2 (unless the mixing variable w is degenerated). Therefore, it does not satisfy Bai-Zhou's weak dependence condition (7). Notice that other weak dependence condition guaranteeing a limiting MP law is also available as in Banna et al. (2015), but again this does not apply to the scale mixture (2).

To summarize, we have reached the following conclusions. (i) Structure testing on the component covariance matrices (Σ_j) of a high-dimensional mixture will involve ultimately the study of the eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix B_n in (4); (ii). Very unfortunately, existing results on high-dimensional covariance matrices from the existing random matrix theory do not apply to B_n .

The main contributions of this paper are presented as follows. First in Section 2, by using tools of random matrix theory, we develop new asymptotic results on the eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix B_n . This includes (i) the characterisation of the limits of the ESD F_n of B_n under fairly general moment conditions and (ii), a central limit theorem for linear spectral

statistics of the form $\int f(x)dF_n(x)$ for a class of smooth test function f . Then in Section 3, we apply this general theory to analyze the failure of the John's test for the hypothesis that the population \mathbf{x} is a spherical mixture. As a byproduct, we find that the John's statistic can test whether a spherical population is a mixture or not. In the light of this study, a new test procedure is then put forward for general spherical hypothesis. In Section 4, the two tests are numerically examined in the identification of the covariance structure in model-based clustering. Section 5 present a microarray data analysis on their covariance structure. All the technical proofs of the results of the paper are gathered in Section 6. The paper has also an on-line supplementary file which includes the following material: (i) a consistent estimator for the parameters of a centered spherical mixture (which is an exceptional case where the estimation can be carried out completely); (ii) procedures for numerical evaluation of the density function and the support set of the LSD of the sample covariance matrix found in Section 2. Finally, computing codes for reproduction of the numerical results of the paper and the related data sets are available at <http://web.hku.hk/~jeffyyao/papersInfo.html>.

2. High-dimensional theory for eigenvalues of B_n

2.1. Non standard limit of the sample eigenvalue distribution

Our interest is to study the convergence of the ESD sequence (F_n) in high-dimensional frameworks, as defined in the following assumptions. Throughout the paper, the distribution of the squared mixing variable w^2 is denoted as G and referred as *Mixing Distribution* (MD).

Assumption (a). The sample and population sizes n, p both tend to infinity with their ratio $c_n = p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumption (b). There are two independent arrays of i.i.d. random variables $(z_{ij})_{i,j \geq 1}$ and $(w_i)_{i \geq 1}$, satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}(z_{11}) = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(z_{11}^2) = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}(z_{11}^4) < \infty, \quad (8)$$

such that for each p and n the observation vectors can be represented as $\mathbf{x}_i = w_i \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}_i$ with $\mathbf{z}_i = (z_{i1}, \dots, z_{ip})'$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Assumption (c). The spectral distribution H_p of the matrix \mathbf{T}_p^2 weakly converges to a probability distribution H , as $p \rightarrow \infty$, referred as *Population Spectral Distribution* (PSD).

Assumption (d). The support set S_G of the MD G is bounded above and from below, that is $S_G \subset [a, b]$ for some $0 < a < b < \infty$.

The LSD of B_n will be derived under Assumptions (a)-(b)-(c) while Assumption (d) is required when establishing the CLT for linear spectral statistics. Recall that the Stieltjes transform of a

probability measure \mathcal{P} , supported on $S_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \mathbb{R}$, is defined as

$$m_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = \int \frac{1}{x-z} d\mathcal{P}(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(c) hold. Then, almost surely, the empirical spectral distribution F_n of B_n converges in distribution to a probability distribution $F^{c,G,H}$ whose Stieltjes transform $m = m_{F^{c,G,H}}(z)$ is a solution to the following system of equations, defined on the upper complex plane \mathbb{C}^+ ,*

$$\begin{cases} zm(z) = -1 + \int \frac{p(z)t}{1+cp(z)t} dG(t), \\ zm(z) = -\int \frac{1}{1+q(z)t} dH(t), \\ zm(z) = -1 - zp(z)q(z), \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ are two auxiliary analytic functions. The solution is also unique in the set

$$\{m(z) : -(1-c)/z + cm(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+, zp(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+, q(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+, z \in \mathbb{C}^+\}.$$

The proof is given in Section 6.1. To clarify the role of the two auxiliary functions in (9), we express the sample covariance matrix as $B_n = \mathbf{T}_p Z_n \Sigma_G Z_n' \mathbf{T}_p / n$ and denote its companion matrix as $\underline{B}_n = \Sigma_G^{1/2} Z_n' \mathbf{T}_p^2 Z_n \Sigma_G^{1/2} / n$, where $Z_n = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)$ and $\Sigma_G = \text{diag}(w_1^2, \dots, w_n^2)$ is a diagonal matrix. Then $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ are actually the limits of $\text{tr}[\mathbf{T}_n^2 (B_n - zI)^{-1}] / p$ and $\text{tr}[\Sigma_G (\underline{B}_n - zI)^{-1}] / n$, respectively, see Section 4.3.2 in Zhang (2006).

Important special cases include the following. If $H = G = \delta_1$ or just $G = \delta_1$, the system (9) reduces to a single equation which characterizes the standard MP law $\nu_{(c,1)}$ or the generalized MP law (Silverstein 1995). A case of particular interest is for $H = \delta_1$ where the equations reduce to

$$z = -\frac{1}{m} + \int \frac{t}{1+ctm} dG(t), \quad (10)$$

with $p(z) = m(z)$ and $q(z) = -(1 + zm(z))/(zm(z))$. Equation (10) defines a new type of LSD corresponding to a scale-mixture population with spherical covariance matrix.

We run a small simulation experiment to illustrate the LSD from a spherical mixture whose LSD is given in (10). Notice that the density function of the LSD as well as its support set can be determined using standard tools from random matrix theory; they are detailed in Section B of the supplementary file. The MD G is set to be $G = 0.5\delta_1 + 0.5\delta_9$ and the dimensional ratio is $c = 0.5$ or 2. Samples of $(z_{ij})_{p \times n}$ are drawn from standard normal $N(0, 1)$ with $(p, n) = (500, 1000)$ and $(1000, 500)$, respectively.

This mixture is made up of two normal distributions $N(0, I_p)$ and $N(0, 9I_p)$ with equal weights. The sample eigenvalues may form one or two clusters depending on the value of c . Theoretically, the critical value for the spectrum separation is $c = 1.1808$ under this MD. Therefore the support S_F is a unique interval for $c = 0.5$ and consists of two separate intervals for $c = 2$. The results are

shown in Figure 2 where we see that the empirical histograms match perfectly with their limiting density curves predicted by Theorem 1.




Figure 2: Comparison between sample eigenvalues (histogram) and their limit density (solid curve). Left panel: $(p, n, c) = (500, 1000, 0.5)$ with a unique support interval $[0.2, 18.5]$. Right panel: $(p, n, c) = (1000, 500, 2)$ and the support is $\{0\} \cup [0.26, 3.56] \cup [5.14, 41.04]$.

2.2. CLT for linear spectral statistics of B_n

In this section, we study the fluctuation of linear spectral statistics (LSS) of the sample covariance matrix B_n under the mixture model with a spherical covariance matrix. The LSS are quantities of the form

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p f(\lambda_j) = \int f(x) dF_n(x)$$

where f is a function on $[0, \infty)$. In [Bai and Silverstein \(2004\)](#) and [Pan and Zhou \(2008\)](#), the LSS under their settings are proved to be asymptotically normal distributions. As said in Introduction, the central limit theorem studied in these papers all assume the linear transformation form in (5), and thus is not applicable to the present model of scale mixtures.

Let G_n be the empirical distribution generated by w_1^2, \dots, w_n^2 which correspond to the sample data $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. Let also F^{c_n, G_n} and $F^{c_n, G}$ be the LSDs as defined in (10) for $F^{c, G}$ but with the parameters (c, G) replaced by (c_n, G_n) and (c_n, G) , respectively. Notice that F^{c_n, G_n} is a random measure while $F^{c_n, G}$ is deterministic. The aim here is to study the fluctuation of

$$\int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x) := \int f(x) d(F_n(x) - F^{c_n, G}(x)),$$

which has a decomposition

$$\int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x) = \int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n1}(x) + \int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n2}(x), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{n1}(x) = F_n(x) - F^{c_n, G_n}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{n2}(x) = F^{c_n, G_n}(x) - F^{c_n, G}(x).$$

We show that the first term in (11) converges in distribution to a normal variable at the rate of $1/n$, while the second term converges in distribution to another normal variable at the rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$.

Theorem 2. Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(d) hold. Let f_1, \dots, f_k be functions on \mathbb{R} analytic on an open interval containing $[aI_{(0,1)}(1/c)(1 - \sqrt{1/c})^2, b(1 + \sqrt{1/c})^2]$. Let $\Delta = E(z_{11}^4) - 3$ be the kurtosis coefficient. Then the random vector

$$n \left(\int f_1(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n1}(x), \dots, \int f_k(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n1}(x) \right) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(\mu, \Gamma_1),$$

where the mean vector $\mu = (\mu_j)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_j &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \frac{f_j(z) m^3(z) \int t^2 (1 + ctm(z))^{-3} dG(t)}{(1 - c \int m^2(z) t^2 (1 + ctm(z))^{-2} dG(t))^2} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \frac{f_j(z) m^3(z) \int t^2 (1 + ctm(z))^{-3} dG(t)}{1 - c \int m^2(z) t^2 (1 + ctm(z))^{-2} dG(t)} dz \end{aligned}$$

and the covariance matrix $\Gamma_1 = (\gamma_{1ij})$ has entries

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{1ij} &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2 c^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \frac{f_i(z_1) f_j(z_2)}{(m(z_1) - m(z_2))^2} m'(z_1) m'(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta}{4\pi^2 c} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} f_i(z_1) f_j(z_2) \left(\frac{d^2}{dz_1 dz_2} \int \frac{t^2 m(z_1) m(z_2) dG(t)}{(1 + ctm(z_1))(1 + ctm(z_2))} \right) dz_1 dz_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the contours \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are simple, closed, non-overlapping, and taken in the positive direction in the complex plane, each enclosing the support of $F^{c,G}$.

Theorem 3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, the random vector

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\int f_1(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n2}(x), \dots, \int f_k(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n2}(x) \right) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(0, \Gamma_2),$$

where the covariance matrix $\Gamma_2 = (\gamma_{2ij})$ has entries

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{2ij} &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f_i(z_1) f_j(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2) (z_1 - z_2)}{c(m(z_1) - m(z_2))} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f_i(z_1) f_j(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2)}{cm(z_1) m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f_i(z_1) f_j(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2) (1 + z_1 m(z_1)) (1 + z_2 m(z_2))}{m(z_1) m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the contours \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are as defined in Theorem 2.

Proposition 1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, the random vector

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\int f_1(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x), \dots, \int f_k(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x) \right) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(0, \Gamma_2), \quad (12)$$

where the covariance matrix Γ_2 is defined in Theorem 3.

Theorem 2 follows from Theorem 1.4 in Pan and Zhou (2008). A brief outline of the main arguments of its proof is given in Section 6.2. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Sections 6.3 and 6.4. Proposition 1 is a direct consequence of the two theorems.

These CLTs demonstrate that the limiting distributions of $\sqrt{n} \int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x)$ and $\sqrt{n} \int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n2}(x)$ coincide since their difference $\sqrt{n} \int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n1}(x)$ is of order $O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Notice that the asymptotic limit in Theorem 2 is stochastically independent of the sequence (G_n) . Therefore the two

components in (11) are asymptotically independent. Consequently, the CLT in (12) always *underestimates* the variation and the absolute mean of corresponding statistics in finite samples. Fortunately, such differences can be estimated using Theorem 2, and their incorporation to the CLT in Proposition 1 leads to a finite-sample corrected CLT

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\int f_1(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x), \dots, \int f_k(x) d\mathcal{F}_n(x) \right) \sim N_k(\mu/\sqrt{n}, \Gamma_1/n + \Gamma_2). \quad (13)$$

This corrected CLT is deemed to provide a better approximation than the CLT in Proposition 1 in finite-sample situations.

2.3. Application of the CLTs to moments of sample eigenvalues

Among all the LSS, the moments of sample eigenvalues are ones of the most important statistics. They have been well studied in the literature again under the linear transformation model (5), see Pan and Zhou (2008), Bai et al. (2010), Li and Yao (2014), Tian et al. (2015), and the references therein. In our context, the j th moment statistic can be expressed as

$$\hat{\beta}_{nj} = \int x^j dF_n(x), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (14)$$

and its limit is related to the following four quantities

$$\beta_{nj} = \int x^j dF^{c_n, G_n}(x), \quad \beta_j = \int x^j dF^{c_n, G}(x), \quad \gamma_{nj} = \int t^j dG_n(t), \quad \gamma_j = \int t^j dG(t),$$

which are the j th moments of corresponding measures. From Theorem 1 and the convergence of the empirical distribution G_n , we may conclude that $\hat{\beta}_{nj} - \beta_j \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, $\beta_{nj} - \beta_j \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, and $\gamma_{nj} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \gamma_j$, for $j \geq 1$. Moreover, the deterministic sequence (β_j) can be explicitly expressed in terms of (γ_j) as

$$\beta_j = c_n^j \sum (\gamma_1/c_n)^{i_1} (\gamma_2/c_n)^{i_2} \cdots (\gamma_j/c_n)^{i_j} \phi(i_1, \dots, i_j), \quad j \geq 1, \quad (15)$$

where $\phi(i_1, \dots, i_j) = j!/[i_1! \cdots i_j!(j+1-i_1-\cdots-i_j)!]$ and the sum runs over the following partitions of j :

$$(i_1, \dots, i_j) : j = i_1 + 2i_2 + \cdots + ji_j, \quad i_l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

These recursive formulae are well known in random matrix theory (Bai et al. 2010); they can also be easily derived from the equation (10). The formulae also hold if (β_j, γ_j) is replaced by $(\beta_{nj}, \gamma_{nj})$.

The joint CLT for the first k moments $(\hat{\beta}_{nj})_{1 \leq j \leq k}$ can be derived by applying Theorems 2 and 3 to functions $f_j(x) = x^j, 1 \leq j \leq k$. A major task here is to determine the integrals involved in their limiting mean vector and covariance matrix which, as shown below, can be converted to the calculation of derivatives of certain functions. These functions are

$$P(z) = -1 + \int \frac{tz dG(t)}{1+ctz}, \quad Q(z) = \int \frac{t^2 dG(t)}{(1+ctz)^3}, \quad \text{and} \quad R(z) = 1 - c \int \frac{(zt)^2 dG(t)}{(1+ctz)^2}.$$

Proposition 2. Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(d) hold and let $\Delta = E(z_{11}^4) - 3$. Then the random vector

$$n(\widehat{\beta}_{n1} - \beta_{n1}, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{nk} - \beta_{nk}) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(v, \Psi_1),$$

where the mean vector $v = (v_j)$ has coordinates $v_1 = 0$ and

$$v_j = \frac{1}{(j-2)!} \left[P^j(z) Q(z) \left(\frac{1}{R(z)} + \Delta \right) \right]^{(j-2)} \Big|_{z=0}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq k,$$

and the covariance matrix $\Psi_1 = (\psi_{1ij})$ has entries

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{1ij} &= \frac{2}{c^2} \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} (i-l) u_{i,l} u_{j,i+j-l} \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta}{c} \int \frac{t^2}{(i-1)!(j-1)!} \left[\frac{P^i(z)}{(1+ctz)^2} \right]^{(i-1)} \Big|_{z=0} \left[\frac{P^j(z)}{(1+ctz)^2} \right]^{(j-1)} \Big|_{z=0} dG(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $u_{s,t}$ is the coefficient of z^t in the Taylor expansion of $P^s(z)$.

Proposition 3. Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(d) hold, then the random vector

$$\sqrt{n}(\beta_{n1} - \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{nk} - \beta_k) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(0, \Psi_2),$$

where the covariance matrix $\Psi_2 = (\psi_{2ij})$ has entries

$$\psi_{2ij} = \frac{1}{c} \left(\sum_{l=0}^i u_{i+1,l} u_{j,i+j-l} - \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} u_{i,l} u_{j+1,i+j-l} + u_{i,i} u_{j,j} \right) - (u_{i,i} + u_{i+1,i})(u_{j,j} + u_{j+1,j}),$$

where $u_{s,t}$ is defined in Proposition 2.

Proposition 4. Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(d) hold, then the random vector

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\beta}_{n1} - \beta_1, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{nk} - \beta_k) \xrightarrow{D} N_k(0, \Psi_2), \quad (16)$$

where the covariance matrix Ψ_2 is defined in Proposition 3.

Proposition 2 is a straightforward application of Theorem 3 in this paper in combination with Lemma 2 in Tian et al. (2015) and Theorem 1 in Qin and Li (2017). We thus omit its proof here. The proof of Proposition 3 is presented in Section 6.5. Proposition 4 easily follows from Propositions 2 and 3. Next, similarly to the correction in (13) for finite samples, we have the corrected CLT

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\beta}_{n1} - \beta_1, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{nk} - \beta_k) \dot{\sim} N_k(v/\sqrt{n}, \Psi_1/n + \Psi_2). \quad (17)$$

Simulation results show that this corrected CLT indeed provides a generally more accurate approximation in finite sample situations.

As an example we consider the fluctuation of the first two moments. From Propositions 2-4, their finite-sample corrected CLT is

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\beta}_{n1} - \beta_1 \\ \widehat{\beta}_{n2} - \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \dot{\sim} N \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2/\sqrt{n} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{111}/n + \psi_{211} & \psi_{112}/n + \psi_{212} \\ \psi_{112}/n + \psi_{212} & \psi_{122}/n + \psi_{222} \end{pmatrix} \right) \quad (18)$$

where the parameters are respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_1 &= \gamma_1, \quad \beta_2 = c_n \gamma_2 + \gamma_1^2, \quad v_2 = (1 + \Delta) \gamma_2, \quad \psi_{111} = (2 + \Delta) \gamma_2 / c, \quad \psi_{211} = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1^2, \\
\psi_{112} &= 2(2 + \Delta)(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 / c + \gamma_3), \quad \psi_{212} = c(\gamma_3 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2) + 2(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 - \gamma_1^3), \\
\psi_{122} &= 4((2 + \Delta) \gamma_1^2 \gamma_2 / c + 8(2 + \Delta) \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + 4(\gamma_2^2 + c(2 + \Delta) \gamma_4)), \\
\psi_{222} &= c^2(\gamma_4 - \gamma_2^2) + 4c \gamma_1 \gamma_3 + 4(1 - c) \gamma_1^2 \gamma_2 - 4 \gamma_1^4.
\end{aligned}$$

We have run a simulation experiment for various scale mixtures to check the finite-sample properties of these two moment estimators $\hat{\beta}_{n1}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{n2}$. The results are reported in Appendix C of the supplementary material. Their asymptotic normality is well confirmed in many tested situations. The results also reveal that the correction of the CLT in (17) is significant. For example, under a tested scenario (with standardized chi-square distributed z_{ij} 's), the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{n2} - \beta_2)$ is $N(0, 39.32)$, while the corrected distribution is $N(3.48, 48.88)$ for dimensions $(p, n) = (200, 400)$: the difference is quite significant.

It is worth noting that the CLTs established in this section are based on the scale-mixture model (2) with mean zero. These results can be extended without difficulties to a general population with a non-zero mean μ , i.e. $\mathbf{x} = \mu + w \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}$. The required adjustments are the replacements of the covariance matrix B_n and the dimensional ratio $c_n = p/n$ by $B_n^* = \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{x}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}})' / (n - 1)$ and $c_n^* = p/(n - 1)$, respectively. All the CLTs then remain valid following the substitution principle established in Zheng et al. (2015).

3. Testing the sphericity of a high-dimensional mixture

In this section, using the results developed in Section 2, we theoretically investigate the reliability of John's test for the sphericity of a covariance matrix (John 1972) and its high-dimensional corrected version (Wang and Yao 2013) when the underlying distribution is a high-dimensional mixture. Our findings show neither John's test nor its corrected version is thus valid any more. This motivates us to propose a new test procedure.

3.1. Failure of the high-dimensional John's test for mixtures

In John (1972), the author proposed a locally most powerful invariant test for the sphericity of a normal population covariance matrix. Let Σ_p be the population covariance matrix. The sphericity hypothesis to test is $H_0 : \Sigma_p = \sigma^2 I_p$ for some unknown positive constant σ^2 . John's test statistic is

$$U = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p (\lambda_i - \sum \lambda_i / p)^2 / p}{(\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i / p)^2} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{n2}}{\hat{\beta}_{n1}^2} - 1,$$

where (λ_i) are the sample eigenvalues and $\hat{\beta}_{nj}$ is their j th empirical moment for $j = 1, 2$. When the dimension p is assumed fixed, [John \(1972\)](#) proved that, under H_0 ,

$$nU - p \xrightarrow{D} \frac{2}{p}\chi_f^2 - p, \quad (19)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where χ_f^2 denotes the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom $f = p(p+1)/2 - 1$.

This test has been extended to the high-dimensional framework in a series of recent works such as [Ledoit and Wolf \(2002\)](#); [Birke and Dette \(2005\)](#); [Srivastava et al. \(2011\)](#); [Wang and Yao \(2013\)](#) and [Tian et al. \(2015\)](#). These extensions have a common assumption that the population follows the linear transformation model (5) with $\sigma \mathbf{T}_p = \Sigma_p^{1/2}$ and satisfy the moment conditions in (8). Under the null hypothesis, it is proved that

$$nU - p \xrightarrow{D} N(\Delta + 1, 4), \quad (20)$$

as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Delta = E(z_{11}^4) - 3$ is the kurtosis of z_{11} . We can see that the distribution $2\chi_f^2/p - p$ in (19) tends to the normal distribution $N(1, 4)$ if $p \rightarrow \infty$, which is consistent with the CLT in (20) in the normal case ($\Delta = 0$).

However, when the population follows the mixture model defined in (2) with a spherical covariance matrix $\Sigma_p = \sigma^2 I_p$, the tests based on (19) and (20) will fail and reject the sphericity hypothesis with a probability close to one for all large (n, p) . This phenomenon can be intuitively explained by the point limit of their test statistic. Specifically, for general PSD H and MD G , it can be shown that

$$\hat{\beta}_{n1} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \gamma_1 \tilde{\gamma}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_{n2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} c\gamma_2 \tilde{\gamma}_1^2 + \gamma_1^2 \tilde{\gamma}_2, \quad (21)$$

as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$, where $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \int t dH(t)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_2 = \int t^2 dH(t)$ are the first and second moments of H , respectively. Note that $\tilde{\gamma}_1 \equiv 1$ in our settings. Therefore, the statistic

$$U - c_n = \hat{\beta}_{n2}/\hat{\beta}_{n1}^2 - 1 - c_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} c(\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2 - 1) + (\tilde{\gamma}_2/\tilde{\gamma}_1^2 - 1),$$

which is positive when the population is a mixture. This implies that John's test statistic $nU - p = n(U - c_n)$ will tend to infinity for spherical mixture and thus entirely lose the control of the type I error. Analytically, from the corrected CLT in (18) and a standard application of the delta-method, we get

$$\sqrt{n}(U - c_n \gamma_2/\gamma_1^2) \sim N(\mu_U/\sqrt{n}, \sigma_{1U}^2/n + \sigma_{2U}^2), \quad (22)$$

under H_0 , where $\mu_U = (1 + \Delta)\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{1U}^2 &= 4(c\Delta(\gamma_1^2\gamma_4 - 2\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 + \gamma_2^3) + (2c\gamma_1^2\gamma_4 - 4c\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 + 2c\gamma_2^3 + \gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2))/\gamma_1^6, \\ \sigma_{2U}^2 &= c^2(\gamma_1^2(\gamma_4 - \gamma_2^2) + 4(\gamma_2^3 - \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3))/\gamma_1^6. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any fixed critical value z_α of the test, the type I error of T_J^c is

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\frac{nU - p - \Delta - 1}{2} > z_\alpha\right) \\ &= P\left(\sqrt{n}(U - c_n\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2) > \frac{2z_\alpha + \Delta + 1 + p(1 - \gamma_2/\gamma_1^2)}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \rightarrow 1, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$, which describes the exploded trends of the type I error.

Despite the invalidation of the corrected John's test for the sphericity hypothesis, one may be surprised to see that the statistic $nU - p$ can be employed to distinguish degenerate spherical mixture (with only one component) from general spherical mixtures. In this situation, the null distribution of the test is provided by the CLT in (20). The power function of the test as well as its consistency are declared by (23).

We conclude this section by the following observation. Assume that the MD G degenerates to a Dirac point measure at $\sigma^2 = E(w^2)$, that is the population is not a mixture but the linear transformation model (5), we have $\sigma_{1U}^2 = 4$ and $\sigma_{2U}^2 = 0$, and thus the CLT in (22) reduces to

$$\sqrt{n}(U - c_n) \sim N((\Delta + 1)/\sqrt{n}, 4/n),$$

which coincides with the one in (20) as it must be. This pleasant coincidence shows also that the smaller order terms μ_U/\sqrt{n} and σ_{1U}^2/n appearing in the asymptotic parameters of (22) have been precisely evaluated: no other terms of similar order could be added in.

3.2. A sphericity test for high-dimensional mixtures

We next develop new corrections to John's test for high-dimensional mixtures. From the above analysis, John's test may still be valid if we consider the quantity $nU - p\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2$ and apply its approximated distribution in (22). However, the centralization term $p\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2$ is unknown in practice since the MD G is unobserved. We thus have to replace it with some suitable statistic and find the resulting asymptotic null distribution. To this end, we first transform the sample $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ into a permuted counterpart $(\check{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \check{\mathbf{x}}_n)$ as follows: for each sample \mathbf{x}_i , we randomly permute its p coordinates. That is $\check{\mathbf{x}}_i = Q_i \mathbf{x}_i$ and (Q_i) stand for a sequence of independent $p \times p$ random permutation matrices. Next we calculate the k th moment statistic $\check{\beta}_{nk} := \text{tr}(\check{B}_n^k)/p$ for $k = 1, 2$, where $\check{B}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \check{\mathbf{x}}_i \check{\mathbf{x}}_i' / n$ is the covariance matrix of the permuted samples, and then let $\check{U} = \check{\beta}_{n2}/\check{\beta}_{n1}^2 - 1$. Notice that \check{U} is a substitute for $c_n\gamma_2/\gamma_1^2$ and we have $\check{\beta}_{n1} \equiv \hat{\beta}_{n1}$. Finally we define a new test statistic

$$T_n = \hat{\beta}_{n2} - \check{\beta}_{n2} = \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{i \neq j} ((\mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_j)^2 - (\check{\mathbf{x}}_i' \check{\mathbf{x}}_j)^2). \quad (24)$$

To examine the soundness of T_n , we calculate its expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
E(T_n) &= \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{i \neq j} E((\mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j)^2 - (\check{\mathbf{x}}'_i \check{\mathbf{x}}_j)^2) \\
&= \frac{n-1}{np} \left(\text{tr}(\Sigma_p^2) - p D_{\Sigma_p}^2 - p(p-1) R_{\Sigma_p}^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{n-1}{np} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p (\sigma_{ii} - D_{\Sigma_p})^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} (\sigma_{ij} - R_{\Sigma_p})^2 \right) \\
&:= \delta_n \geq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\Sigma_p = E(w^2) \mathbf{T}_p^2 := (\sigma_{ij})$, $D_{\Sigma_p} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sigma_{ii}/p$, and $R_{\Sigma_p} = \sum_{i \neq j} \sigma_{ij}/(p(p-1))$. Moreover, $\delta_n = 0$ if and only if $\Sigma_p = aI_p + b\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'$ for some parameters a and b : this is the commonly called *compound symmetric covariance matrix*. However, in this case $b > 0$ and the largest eigenvalue of Σ_p is $a + (p-1)b \rightarrow \infty$; it can then be easily recognized from sample data as the largest sample eigenvalue must be far away from the remaining eigenvalues for large p . We thus exclude this case from our alternative hypothesis. Consequently, $\delta_n = 0$ under H_0 and $\delta_n > 0$ under H_1 (with the compound symmetric case excluded) so that T_n is a potentially reasonable test statistic.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(d) hold.*

1). *Under the null hypothesis, suppose that $E(z_{11}^8) < \infty$, then*

$$\frac{nT_n}{\sqrt{8}\hat{\gamma}_{n2}} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_{n2} = (\hat{\beta}_{n2} - \hat{\beta}_{n1}^2)/c_n$.

2). *Under the alternative hypothesis, if $\text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_p^4)/p \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma}_2 = \int t^2 dH(t) < \infty$ and $n\delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ then the asymptotic power of the test tends to 1, where δ_n is the expectation of T_n defined in (25).*

In the first conclusion of Theorem 4, $\hat{\gamma}_{n2}$ is a consistent estimator of γ_2 under H_0 . This is from Theorem 1 and the recursive formulae (15). A substitution of $\hat{\gamma}_{n2}$ is $\check{\gamma}_{n2} = (\check{\beta}_{n2} - \check{\beta}_{n1}^2)/c_n$. These two estimators are equivalent under H_0 , but $E(\check{\gamma}_{n2} - \hat{\gamma}_{n2}) = \delta_n/c_n > 0$ under H_1 . Therefore, the use of $\check{\gamma}_{n2}$ is expected to improve the power of the test. Noticing that the moment condition $E(z_{11}^8) < \infty$ is used to verify the Lindeberg's condition in Martingale CLT.

3.3. Numerical results

We report on simulations which are carried out to evaluate the performance of the high-dimensional John's test based on the existing null distribution in (20), referred as T_J^c , and the proposed test T_n using the asymptotic null distribution of Theorem 4. For comparison, we also conduct the ideal (though impracticable) John's test based on (22), referred as T_J^* , by assuming MDs G known. Results from T_J^* can be regarded as a benchmark of the sphericity test in an ideal

situation. Throughout the experiments, the significance level is fixed at $\alpha = 0.05$ and the number of independent replications is 10,000. Samples of (z_{ij}) are drawn from standard normal $N(0, 1)$ or scale t , i.e. $\sqrt{4/6} \cdot t_6$.

As we discussed, the test T_J^c suffers serious size distortion under mixture models, we now numerically illustrate this phenomenon. The model is a two-components spherical mixture of the form $G = 0.5\delta_1 + 0.5\delta_{\sigma_2^2}$, where the parameter σ_2^2 ranges from 1 to 1.6 by steps of 0.05. Specifically, the population covariance matrix here is $\Sigma_p = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sigma_2^2)I_p$. The dimensional setting is $(p, n) = (200, 400)$. The exploding factor in (23) is

$$\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1^2} \right) = 10 \left(\frac{1 - \sigma_2^2}{1 + \sigma_2^2} \right)$$

ranging from 0 to -2.13. Results are plotted in Figure 3, where the circled line (in blue) shows empirical sizes and the raw line (in red) is the theoretical one based on (22). We can see that the empirical sizes grow from 0.05 to 1, which are perfectly fitted by the theoretical curve.




Figure 3: Empirical sizes T_J^c under populations of normal mixture (left panel) and student-t mixture (right panel), respectively, where the blue lines marked with circles are simulated probabilities and the red lines are theoretical ones.

Next we compare the performance of T_n with T_J^* in terms of both the empirical size and power. To study their empirical sizes, we employ three models of the MD under H_0 ,

$$G_1 = 0.5\delta_1 + 0.5\delta_2, \quad G_2 = 0.3\delta_1 + 0.4\delta_2 + 0.3\delta_3, \quad G_3 = 0.2\delta_1 + 0.3\delta_2 + 0.3\delta_3 + 0.2\delta_4.$$

The dimensional ratios are $p/n = 1/2, 1, 2$, and the sample sizes are $n = 100, 200, 400$. Results collected in Table 2 show that the empirical size of T_J^* is around the nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$ under normal mixture but contains a bias under student t mixture when the dimensions are small. The bias decreases as the dimensions increase. In contrast, the size of T_n is more favorable under both normal and student-t mixtures. As it has only slightly downward bias when the dimensions are small.

To compare the powers of the two tests, we design a diagonal shape matrix \mathbf{T}_p^2 with its PSD being $H = 0.5\delta_{\sigma_1^2} + 0.5\delta_{\sigma_2^2}$ where $\sigma_1^2 = 1 - x$ and $\sigma_2^2 = 1 + x$ with x ranging from $[0, 0.3]$ by steps of

Table 2: Empirical sizes of T_J^* and T_n (in percent) under normal mixture with the three MDs G_1 , G_2 , and G_3 . The nominal significant level is $\alpha = 0.05$. Upper block: normal mixtures. Lower block: Student- t mixtures.

	n	$p/n = 1/2$			$p/n = 1$			$p/n = 2$		
		G_1	G_2	G_3	G_1	G_2	G_3	G_1	G_2	G_3
T_J^*	100	4.85	4.88	5.47	4.91	5.24	5.15	4.27	4.76	4.92
	200	5.00	5.05	5.27	4.71	5.13	5.33	4.40	5.00	4.78
	400	5.05	5.04	5.08	4.72	4.92	5.12	3.93	4.85	4.92
T_n	100	3.83	3.71	3.79	4.31	4.61	4.28	4.77	4.77	4.45
	200	4.59	4.64	4.52	4.31	4.95	4.61	4.94	4.89	4.56
	400	4.78	4.74	4.99	5.38	4.70	5.01	4.99	4.92	4.69
T_J^*	100	8.41	8.33	8.94	7.61	7.11	7.39	6.75	6.16	6.54
	200	7.15	7.00	7.62	6.91	6.70	6.16	5.67	5.82	5.27
	400	6.46	6.53	6.19	5.34	5.71	5.67	5.26	5.32	5.35
T_n	100	4.48	4.21	4.37	4.83	4.67	4.46	4.89	4.60	5.06
	200	4.44	4.53	4.83	4.80	5.05	4.62	4.95	4.85	5.14
	400	4.77	4.72	4.99	4.44	5.01	5.35	5.05	4.69	4.83

0.03. For this model, the factor δ_n in (25) is $(1 - 1/n)x^2 \in [0, 0.08955]$. The MD model is simply taken as G_3 . The dimensions are $(p, n) = (400, 200)$ and 10,000 independent replications are used (as previously). Figure 4 illustrates that the empirical powers of T_n and T_J^* are both grow to 1 as the parameter x gets away from zero. Moreover, the power of T_n dominates that of T_J^* . This can be partially explained by the fact that T_n efficiently reduces the effect caused by the fluctuation of G_n around the MD G .

4. Application in model-based clustering

Gaussian mixture with finite components are widely applied in model-based cluster analysis. Considering the mixture model in (1) with K components, the k th component covariance can be decomposed as

$$\Sigma_k = \sigma_k^2 U_k \Lambda_k U_k',$$

where U_k is the matrix of eigenvectors representing the orientation, Λ_k is a diagonal matrix proportional to that of the eigenvalues and representing the shape, and σ_k^2 is a scalar standing for the volume of the cluster. Based on this decomposition, Banfield and Raftery (1993) classified the covariance structure into 14 types in the light of that whether mixture components share a common shape, volume, and/or orientation, which yields a family of parsimonious mixture models. See




Figure 4: Empirical powers of T_J^* (red line marked with circles) and T_n (blue line marked with triangles) under populations of normal mixture (left panel) and student- t mixture (right panel), respectively.

also [Celeux and Govaert \(1995\)](#); [Bensmail and Celeux \(1996\)](#); [Biernacki et al. \(2000\)](#); [Bouveyron et al. \(2007\)](#), and [Fraley and Raftery \(2007\)](#). In high-dimensional scenarios where $p \geq n$, only 6 parsimonious models are concerned:

Spherical types: $\Sigma_k = \sigma^2 I_p$ (EII), $\Sigma_k = \sigma_k^2 I_p$ (VII);

Diagonal types: $\Sigma_k = \sigma^2 \Lambda$ (EEI), $\Sigma_k = \sigma_k^2 \Lambda$ (VEI), $\Sigma_k = \sigma^2 \Lambda_k$ (EVI), $\Sigma_k = \sigma_k^2 \Lambda_k$ (VVI),

which are labeled by three letters “E”, “V”, and “I” ([Banfield and Raftery 1993](#); [Fraley and Raftery 2007](#)). The letters “E”, “V” and “I” here designate various combinations in shape, volume and orientation for the component covariance matrices Σ_k ’s.

An important task in data clustering with mixture models is to properly identify the covariance structure of the mixture. [Biernacki et al. \(2000\)](#) developed a so-called *Integrated Classification Likelihood* (ICL) criterion to select the type of covariance structure and the number of components. Under Gaussian assumption, [Fraley and Raftery \(2007\)](#) proposed a *Bayesian Information Criterion* (BIC) to deal with this problem. Here we apply the corrected John’s test T_J^c and our proposed test T_n to the structure identification among EII, VII, and other diagonal types when the dimension p is larger than the sample size n . For comparison, we also included the BIC and ICL criteria in our experiments by using two ready-made functions `mclustBIC` and `mclustICL` from the free R package `mclust`. Samples of (z_{ij}) are drawn from standard normal $N(0, 1)$. The dimensions are fixed at $(p, n) = (400, 200)$. All statistics are calculated from 10,000 independent replications.

Our first experiment is to recognize the structure between EII and VII by T_J^c . We take the MD model $G = 0.5\delta_1 + 0.5\delta_{\sigma_2^2}$ as used in Section 3, where $\sigma_2^2 \in [1, 2]$. Thus the mixture has (at most) two components with their covariance matrices being $\Sigma_1 = I_p$ and $\Sigma_2 = \sigma_2^2 I_p$, respectively. Results collected in Table 3 show that when Σ_k is EII ($\sigma_2^2 = 1$), the empirical size of T_J^c is around the nominal level α . For this case, BIC and ICL choose the true model with probability 1. As Σ_k moves away from the EII structure, T_J^c can detect this change with an increasing probability up

Table 3: Probability of rejecting the EII structure using T_J^c , BIC , and ICL . The nominal significant level for T_J^c is $\alpha = 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.005, 0.001$.

	$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.005$	$\alpha = 0.001$	BIC	ICL
$\sigma_2^2 = 1.0$	0.1006	0.0471	0.0087	0.0048	0.0002	0	0
$\sigma_2^2 = 1.2$	0.6340	0.4964	0.2494	0.1824	0.0238	0	0
$\sigma_2^2 = 1.4$	1	0.9999	0.9987	0.9975	0.9956	0	0
$\sigma_2^2 = 1.6$	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
$\sigma_2^2 = 1.8$	1	1	1	1	1	0.6340	0.6340
$\sigma_2^2 = 2.0$	1	1	1	1	1	0.7635	0.7635

to 1. In comparison to T_J^c , both BIC and ICL completely fail to identify the VII structure when σ_2^2 is smaller than 1.6.

In the second experiment, we aim to distinguish the spherical VII structure from the group of non-spherical structures VEI, EVI, and VVI for the component matrices by the proposed test T_n . We employ a mixture of four components with mixing proportions $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) = (0.2, 0.3, 0.3, 0.2)$. The component covariance matrices are

$$\Sigma_k = kI_p + k * \text{diag}(\underbrace{a, \dots, a}_{[p/100]}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p-[p/100]}), \quad k = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

where the parameter $a \in [0, 4.5]$. When $a > 0$, the covariance structure is VEI and there are only 4 entries different from the spherical basis kI_p for the studied dimension $p = 400$. Results are exhibited in Table 4. It shows that when $\Sigma_k = kI_p$ ($a = 0$), the empirical size of T_n can be well controlled and close to α . Also when $1 \leq a \leq 3$ BIC and ICL wrongly choose the spherical model with probabilities near 1. This confirms a widely reported behaviour of such information-based criteria in high-dimensional clustering, namely as the dimension of the models increase very quickly with the data dimension (see Table 1), these criteria heavily drive to *over-simplistic models* such as a spherical structure. As Σ_k drifts away from kI_p , the probability of T_n rejecting the VII structure grows to 1. Compared with BIC and ICL, except one case ($a = 1, \alpha = 0.001$) where Type I error is kept extremely low, T_n has overwhelming superiority in capturing small shifts of the covariance structure.

5. An empirical study

In this section, we analyze a classic microarray data set for colon cancer (Alon et al. 1999). The preprocessed data can be found in the R package “rda”. There are 40 tumor and 22 normal colon tissue samples. The dimension of each observation is $p = 2000$. Here we model these data

Table 4: Probability of rejecting the VII structure using T_n , BIC , and ICL . The nominal significant level for T_n is $\alpha = 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.005, 0.001$.

	$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.005$	$\alpha = 0.001$	BIC	ICL
$a = 0$	0.0996	0.0507	0.0108	0.0063	0.0003	0.0006	0.0006
$a = 1.0$	0.2408	0.1457	0.0431	0.0254	0.0012	0.0078	0.0078
$a = 2.0$	0.8196	0.7184	0.4874	0.3940	0.0941	0.0182	0.0182
$a = 3.0$	0.9990	0.9965	0.9872	0.9786	0.8596	0.0257	0.0257
$a = 4.0$	1	1	1	1	0.9995	0.7872	0.7876
$a = 4.5$	1	1	1	1	1	0.9794	0.9794

Table 5: Structure identification for 6 principle submatrices.

Submatrices	\mathbf{T}_{p_1}	\mathbf{T}_{p_2}	\mathbf{T}_{p_3}	\mathbf{T}_{p_4}	\mathbf{T}_{p_5}	\mathbf{T}_{p_6}
BIC	VII	VII	VII	VII	VII	VVI
ICL	VII	VII	VII	VII	VII	VVI
Standardized T_J^c	655.9	881.7	656.9	1030.7	345.8	48.0
Standardized T_n	364.5	561.6	404.8	639.6	208.3	24.7

as:

$$\text{Tumor tissue: } \mathbf{x}_1 = \mu_1 + w_1 \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}, \quad \text{Normal tissue: } \mathbf{x}_2 = \mu_2 + w_2 \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}.$$

Our first interest is to examine whether the shape matrix \mathbf{T}_p is spherical. To this end, the unknown mean vector in each group is eliminated by subtracting their sample mean. The centralized data are denoted by $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$, $n = 62$, and their covariance matrix is calculated as the unbiased one $B_n^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i' / (n-2)$. It turns out that the p -values of T_J^c and T_n are both smaller than 10^{-100} . Besides, BIC and ICL also support that \mathbf{T}_p is not spherical.

Next we consider principal submatrices of \mathbf{T}_p and check whether some of these submatrices can be considered spherical. Applying BIC clustering to all diagonal elements of B_n^* , they are then grouped into 6 clusters. Based on this information, we get 6 principal submatrices of \mathbf{T}_p and their corresponding sample fragments. These matrices are denoted by $\mathbf{T}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{p_6}$, and their dimensions are $p_1 = 308$, $p_2 = 444$, $p_3 = 343$, $p_4 = 674$, $p_5 = 203$, and $p_6 = 28$ ($\sum p_i = p = 2000$). Results on identifying the structure of these matrices are presented in Table 5. It shows that BIC and ICL suggest spherical structure for $\mathbf{T}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{p_5}$, and diagonal structure for \mathbf{T}_{p_6} . On the contrary, tests of T_J^c and T_n reject the spherical structure for all these submatrices with p -values near 0. Given the over-simplistic nature of BIC and ICL discussed in Section 4, the submatrices $\mathbf{T}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{p_5}$ are more likely non-spherical as predicted by the test statistics T_J^c and T_n .

6. Proofs

6.1. Proof of Theorem 1

The sample covariance matrix can be represented as

$$B_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i' = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \mathbf{T}_p \mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_i' \mathbf{T}_p := \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{T}_p Z_n \Sigma_G Z_n' \mathbf{T}_p, \quad (26)$$

where $Z_n = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)$ and $\Sigma_G = \text{diag}(w_1^2, \dots, w_n^2)$. From Assumption (c), the spectral distribution of Σ_G is

$$F^{\Sigma_G}(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{w_i^2}(t) \rightarrow G(t), \quad (27)$$

where the convergence holds almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From Theorem 4.1.1 in Zhang (2006) and using the independence between Σ_G and Z_n , we obtain the result of the theorem.

6.2. Proof of Theorem 2

When \mathbf{T}_p is an identity matrix, the covariance matrix B_n in (26) reduce to $B_n = Z_n \Sigma_G Z_n' / n$. Let $\mathbf{w} = (w_i)$ be the sequence of the mixing variables. Given \mathbf{w} , the matrix Σ_G becomes non-random and the convergence in (27) still holds. As Σ_G is diagonal, when \mathbf{w} is fixed, the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 in Pan and Zhou (2008) holds automatically. Applying this theorem, we get the CLT of the LSS conditioning on \mathbf{w} . As this limiting distribution is free of \mathbf{w} , Theorem 2 is thus verified unconditionally.

6.3. A key lemma

The lemma below on asymptotic fluctuations of some related Stieltjes transforms form the core basis for the proof of Theorem 3 In Section 6.4.

Let $m_{F^{c_n, G_n}}(z)$ and $m_{F^{c_n, G}}(z)$ be the Stieltjes transforms of the LSDs F^{c_n, G_n} and $F^{c_n, G}$, respectively. Define the random process

$$M_n(z) = \sqrt{n} [m_{F^{c_n, G_n}}(z) - m_{F^{c_n, G}}(z)], \quad z \in \mathcal{C},$$

where the contour \mathcal{C} is

$$\mathcal{C} = \{x \pm iv_0 : x \in [x_l, x_r]\} \cup \{x \pm iv : x \in \{x_l, x_r\}, v \in [0, v_0]\}, \quad (28)$$

with real numbers $v_0 > 0$, $x_r > b(1 + 1/\sqrt{c})^2$, and $x_l < aI_{(0,1)}(1/c)(1 - 1/\sqrt{c})^2$.

Lemma 1. *Under Assumptions (a)-(d), the random process $M_n(\cdot)$ converges weakly to a two-dimensional mean-zero Gaussian process $M(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{C} , whose covariance function is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(M(z_1), M(z_2)) &= m'(z_1)m'(z_2) \left(\frac{z_1 - z_2}{c(m(z_2) - m(z_1))} + \frac{1}{cm(z_1)m(z_2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(1 + z_1m(z_1))(1 + z_2m(z_2))}{m(z_1)m(z_2)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $m(z)$ is the Stieltjes transform of the LSD $F^{c, G}$.

The proof of this Lemma is lengthy and technical. It is relegated to the supplementary file (Appendix D).

6.4. Proof of Theorem 3

For all n large, with probability one,

$$S_{F^{c_n}, G_n} \cup S_{F^{c_n}, G} \subset \left[aI_{(0,1)}(1/c)(1 - \sqrt{1/c})^2, b(1 + \sqrt{1/c})^2 \right].$$

Therefore, for any $f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$, with probability one,

$$\int f(x) d\mathcal{F}_{n2}(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f(z) M_n(z) dz,$$

for all n large, where the contour \mathcal{C} is defined in (28) and takes the positive direction in the complex plane. From Lemma 1 and the arguments on Page 563 of Bai and Silverstein (2004), the random vector (12) converges weakly to

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f_1(z) M(z) dz, \dots, -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f_k(z) M(z) dz \right),$$

which is a zero-mean Gaussian vector whose covariance function is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov} \left(-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f(z) M(z) dz, -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} g(z) M(z) dz \right) \\ &= \frac{-1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} f(z_1) g(z_2) \text{Cov}(M(z_1), M(z_2)) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &= \frac{-1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1) g(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2) (z_1 - z_2)}{c(m(z_2) - m(z_1))} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1) g(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2)}{cm(z_1) m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1) g(z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2) (1 + z_1 m(z_1)) (1 + z_2 m(z_2))}{m(z_1) m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $f, g \in \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are two non-overlapping contours having the same properties as \mathcal{C} .

6.5. Proof of Proposition 4

Without loss of generality, let \mathcal{C} be a contour as defined in (28), taking positive direction and satisfying

$$\max_{t \in S_G, z \in \mathcal{C}} |ctm(z)| < 1,$$

where S_G is the support of G . This can be easily done by choosing z with large modulus, since $m(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote the image of \mathcal{C} under $m(z)$ by

$$m(\mathcal{C}) = \{m(z) : z \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Since $m(z)$ is a univalent analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (S_F \cup \{0\})$, the contour \mathcal{C} and its image $m(\mathcal{C})$ are homeomorphic, which implies $m(\mathcal{C})$ is also a simple and closed contour. In addition, from the open mapping theorem and the fact $m(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $m(\mathcal{C})$ has negative direction and encloses zero.

Let $P(m) = zm$ where $z = z(m)$ is a function of m defined by the equation (10), then $P(m)$ has Taylor expansion on $m(\mathcal{C})$,

$$P(m) = -1 + \int \frac{tm}{1+ctm} dG(t) = -1 - \frac{1}{c} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k (-cm)^k,$$

where $\gamma_k = \int t^k dG(t)$ is the k th moment of G . Moreover, the quantities $u_{s,t}$ defined in the theorem is the coefficient of m^t in the Taylor expansion of $P^s(m)$.

Let \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 be two non-overlapping contours having the same properties as \mathcal{C} defined above. From Theorem 1, we need to calculate the following three integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{z_1^i z_2^j (z_1 - z_2) m'(z_1) m'(z_2)}{c(m(z_2) - m(z_1))} dz_1 dz_2, \\ I_2 &= -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{z_1^i z_2^j m'(z_1) m'(z_2)}{cm(z_1)m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2, \\ I_3 &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1)g(z_2)m'(z_1)m'(z_2)(1+z_1m(z_1))(1+z_2m(z_2))}{m(z_1)m(z_2)} dz_1 dz_2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{z_1^i z_2^j}{c(m(z_1) - m(z_2))} dm(z_1) dm(z_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{4c\pi^2} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_2)} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_1)} \frac{P^i(m_1)P^j(m_2)}{m_1^i m_2^j (m_1 - m_2)} dm_1 dm_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4c\pi^2} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_2)} \frac{P^j(m_2)}{m_2^j} \left(\oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_1)} \frac{P^i(m_1)}{m_1^i (m_1 - m_2)} dm_1 \right) dm_2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2c\pi i} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_2)} \frac{P^j(m_2)}{m_2^j} \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} \frac{u_{i,l}}{m_2^{i-l}} dm_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} u_{i,l} u_{j,i+j-l-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{1}{c} \sum_{l=0}^i u_{i+1,l} u_{j,i+j-l} - \frac{1}{c} \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} u_{i,l} u_{j+1,i+j-l}, \\ I_2 &= -\frac{1}{4c\pi^2} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_1)} \frac{z_1^i}{m_1} dm_1 \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_2)} \frac{z_2^j}{m_2} dm_2 = u_{i,i} u_{j,j} / c, \\ I_3 &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_1)} \frac{P^i(m_1)(1+P(m_1))}{m_1^{i+1}} dm_1 \oint_{m(\mathcal{C}_2)} \frac{P^j(m_2)(1+P(m_2))}{m_2^{j+1}} dm_2 \\ &= -(u_{i,i} + u_{i+1,i})(u_{j,j} + u_{j+1,j}). \end{aligned}$$

6.6. Proof of Theorem 4

From the fact that $\tilde{\gamma}_{n2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \gamma_2$ under H_0 , the first conclusion of the theorem holds if $nT_n \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 8\gamma_2^2)$. We prove this convergence by the Martingale CLT. Let $\mathbf{w} = (w_i)$ be the sequence of the mixing variables. We first condition on this sequence and show that the limiting results are independent of the conditioning \mathbf{w} , thus establish their validity unconditionally.

Let $\mathbb{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, $\mathbb{F}_k = \sigma\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$ the σ -field generated by $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$, and $E_k(\cdot)$ denote the conditional expectation with respect to \mathbb{F}_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$. By martingale decomposition,

$$\begin{aligned} nT_n &= n \sum_{k=1}^n (E_k - E_{k-1})(\hat{\beta}_{n2} - \check{\beta}_{n2}) \\ &= \frac{2}{np} \sum_{k=2}^n [(\mathbf{x}'_k S_{k-1} \mathbf{x}_k - w_k^2 \text{tr} S_{k-1}) - (\check{\mathbf{x}}'_k \check{S}_{k-1} \check{\mathbf{x}}_k - w_k^2 \text{tr} \check{S}_{k-1})] \\ &:= \sum_{k=2}^n (D_{nk} - \check{D}_{nk}), \end{aligned}$$

where $S_{k-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i - w_i^2 I_p)$ and $\check{S}_{k-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\check{\mathbf{x}}_i \check{\mathbf{x}}'_i - w_i^2 I_p)$. It's clear that $\{D_{nk} - \check{D}_{nk}, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$ is a sequence of martingale difference with respect to $\{\mathbb{F}_k, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$. From the martingale CLT, say Theorem 35.12 in Billingsley (1995), if

$$\sum_{k=2}^n E_{k-1} (D_{nk} - \check{D}_{nk})^2 \xrightarrow{i.p.} \sigma^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=2}^n E (D_{nk} - \check{D}_{nk})^4 \rightarrow 0,$$

then nT_n converges in distribution to a normal variable $N(0, \sigma^2)$. Notice that D_{nk} and \check{D}_{nk} are identically distributed, we verify the above conditions by showing that

$$\sum_{k=2}^n E_{k-1} D_{nk}^2 \xrightarrow{i.p.} 4\gamma_2^2, \quad \sum_{k=2}^n E_{k-1} D_{nk} \check{D}_{nk} \xrightarrow{i.p.} 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=2}^n E D_{nk}^4 \rightarrow 0, \quad (29)$$

and hence $\sigma^2 = 8\gamma_2^2$. We note that the proof of the first two terms are similar, so we present only the details for the first one.

From the expression of D_{nk} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^n E_{k-1} D_{nk}^2 &= \frac{4}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n E_{k-1} (\mathbf{x}'_k S_{k-1} \mathbf{x}_k - w_k^2 \text{tr} S_{k-1})^2 \\ &= \frac{4}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 (2\text{tr} S_{k-1}^2 + \Delta \text{tr} (S_{k-1} \circ S_{k-1})) \\ &= \frac{4(2 + \Delta)}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u=1}^p \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2) \right]^2 + \frac{8}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u \neq v}^p \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_{iu} x_{iv} \right]^2 \\ &:= M_{n1} + M_{n2}, \end{aligned}$$

where \circ denotes the Hadamard product. Elementary calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} EM_{n1} &= \frac{4(2+\Delta)}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E(x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)^2 \rightarrow 0, \\ EM_{n2} &= \frac{8}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u \neq v}^p \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E x_{iu}^2 x_{iv}^2 = \frac{4p(p-1)}{n^2 p^2} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^n w_k^4 \right)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^n w_k^8 \right] \rightarrow 4\gamma_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

We next deal with the variances of M_{n1} and M_{n2} . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n1} &= \frac{4(2+\Delta)}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j}^{k-1} (x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)(x_{ju}^2 - w_j^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{4(2+\Delta)}{n^2 p^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=i+1}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u=1}^p (x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j}^{n-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^n w_k^4 \sum_{u=1}^p (x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)(x_{ju}^2 - w_j^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(M_{n1}) &\leq \frac{32(2+\Delta)^2}{n^4 p^4} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{k=i+1}^n w_k^4 \right)^2 \sum_{u=1}^p \text{Var}(x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4 \sum_{i < j}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{k=j+1}^n w_k^4 \right)^2 \sum_{u=1}^p E(x_{iu}^2 - w_i^2)^2 (x_{ju}^2 - w_j^2)^2 \right] \\ &= O(n^{-4}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar discussions on M_{n2} reveal its variance is $O(n^{-2})$. Thus we get $\text{Var}(M_{n1} + M_{n2}) \rightarrow 0$ and the first condition in (29) is verified.

For the third condition in (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^n E D_{nk}^4 &= \frac{16}{n^4 p^4} \sum_{k=2}^n E (\mathbf{x}'_k S_{k-1} \mathbf{x}_k - w_k^2 \text{tr} S_{k-1})^4 \\ &\leq \frac{16K}{n^4 p^4} \sum_{k=2}^n w_k^8 E \text{tr}^2 (S_{k-1}^2) = O(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is from the fact $E(\mathbf{x}'_k A \mathbf{x}_k - w_k^2 \text{tr}(A))^4 \leq w_k^8 K \text{tr}^2(A^2)$ with K a constant for any non-random positive definite matrix A and the final order is from elementary calculations.

Next we consider the consistency of the test. From Theorem 1, $\hat{\gamma}_{n2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \gamma_2 + \gamma_1^2(\tilde{\gamma}_2 - 1)/c$. Thus, for all n large, almost surely, there is a constant K_1 such that $\hat{\gamma}_{n2} < K_1$. Under the alternative hypothesis, letting $\mathbf{w} = (w_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(T_n | \mathbf{w}) &\leq \frac{K_2}{n^2 p} \sum_{i \neq j} w_i^2 w_j^2, \\ \text{Var}(T_n | \mathbf{w}) &\leq \frac{2}{n^4 p^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} (\mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j)^2 \middle| \mathbf{w} \right) + \frac{2}{n^4 p^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j)^2 \middle| \mathbf{w} \right) = O(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where K_2 is a constant and the order of $\text{Var}(T_n|\mathbf{w})$ is from Theorem 2.2 in [Srivastava et al. \(2011\)](#). Then, by $\text{Var}(T_n) = \text{E}(\text{Var}(T_n|\mathbf{w})) + \text{Var}(\text{E}(T_n|\mathbf{w}))$, we get $\text{Var}(T_n) \rightarrow 0$, which is followed by $T_n - \delta_n \xrightarrow{i.p.} 0$. Let z_α be the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of $N(0, 1)$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} P(nT_n > \sqrt{8}\hat{\gamma}_2 z_\alpha) &\geq P(n(T_n - \delta_n/2) + n\delta_n/2 > \sqrt{8}\hat{\gamma}_2 z_\alpha, T_n > \delta_n/2, \hat{\gamma}_2 < K_1) \\ &\geq P(n\delta_n/2 > \sqrt{8}K_1 z_\alpha, T_n > \delta_n/2) \longrightarrow 1, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Steve Marron for his suggestion of investigating the tricky universe of high-dimensional mixtures, and to Charles Bouveyron for discussions on the model-based cluster analysis reported in Section 4.

Reference

References

- Alon, U., Barkai, N., Notterman, D. A., Gish, K., Ybarra, S., Mack, D., and Levine, A. J. (1999). Broad patterns of gene expression revealed by clustering analysis of tumor and normal colon tissues probed by oligonucleotide arrays. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **96**, 6745–6750.
- Bai, Z. D., Chen, J. Q., and Yao, J. F. (2010). On estimation of the population spectral distribution from a high-dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Aust. N. Z. J. Stat.*, **52**, 423–437.
- Bai, Z. D., Yao, J. F., and Zheng, S. R. (2009). Corrections to LRT on large-dimensional covariance matrix by RMT. *Ann. Statist.*, **37**, 3822–3840.
- Bai, Z. D. and Silverstein, J. W. (2004). CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, **32**, 553–605.
- Bai, Z. D. and Zhou, W. (2008). Large sample covariance matrices without independence structures in columns. *Statist. Sinica*, **18**, 425–442.
- Banfield, J. D. and Raftery, A. E. (1993). Model-based Gaussian and non-Gaussian clustering. *Biometrics*, **49**, 803–821.
- Banna, M., Merlevède, F., and Peligrad, M. (2015). On the limiting spectral distribution for a large class of symmetric random matrices with correlated entries. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **125**, 2700–2726.

- Bensmail, H. and Celeux, G. (1996). Regularized Gaussian discriminant analysis through eigenvalue decomposition. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **91**, 1743–1748.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *Ann. Statist.*, **36**, 199–227.
- Biernacki, C., Celeux, G., and Govaert, G. (2000). Assessing a mixture model for clustering with the integrated classification likelihood. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, **22**, 719–725.
- Billingsley, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure*, 3rd ed. Wiley, New York.
- Birke, M. and Dette, H. (2005). A note on testing the covariance matrix for large dimension. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **74**, 281–289.
- Bouveyron, C., Girard, S., and Schmid, C. (2007). High-dimensional data clustering. *Comput. Stat. & Data An.*, **52**, 502–519.
- Celeux, G. and Govaert, G. (1995). Gaussian parsimonious clustering models. *Pattern Recognition*, **28**, 781–793.
- Chen, S. X., Zhang, L. X. and Zhong, P. X. (2010). Tests for high-dimensional covariance matrices. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 810–819.
- El Karoui, N. (2010). High-dimensionality effects in the Markowitz problem and other quadratic programs with linear constraints: risk underestimation. *Ann. Statist.*, **38**, 3487–3566.
- Fang, K. T., Zhang, Y. T. (1990). *Generalized Multivariate Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Science Press, Beijing.
- Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. E. (1998). How many clusters? Which clustering method? Answers via model-based cluster analysis. *Computer Journal*, **41**, 586–588.
- Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. E. (2002). Model-based clustering, discriminant analysis, and density estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **97**, 611–631.
- Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. E. (2007). Bayesian regularization for normal mixture estimation and model-based clustering. *J. Classification*, **24**, 155–181.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (2006). *Finite Mixture and Markov Switching Models*. Springer, New York.
- John, S. (1972). The distribution of a statistic used for testing sphericity of normal distributions, *Biometrika*, **59**, 169–173.

- Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2002). Some hypothesis tests for the covariance matrix when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *Ann. Statist.*, **30**, 1081–1102.
- Li, W. M. and Yao, J. F. (2014). A local moment estimator of the spectrum of a large dimensional covariance matrix. *Statistica Sinica*, **24**, 919–936.
- McLachlan, G. J. and Peel, D. (2000). *Finite Mixture Models*. Wiley, New York.
- Marčenko, V. A. and Pastur, L. A. (1967). Distribution of eigenvalues in certain sets of random matrices. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, **72**, 507–536.
- Pan, G. M. and Zhou, W. (2008). Central limit theorem for signal-to-interference ratio of reduced rank linear receiver. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **18**, 1232–1270.
- Paul, D. and Aue, A. (2014). Random matrix theory in statistics: A review. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **150**, 1–29.
- Qin, Y. L. and Li, W. M. (2017). “Bias-reduced estimators of moments of a population spectral distribution and their applications”, In *Big and Complex Data Analysis: Statistical Methodologies and Applications* (Ejaz Ahmed ed.), Springer.
- Silverstein, J. W. (1995). Strong convergence of the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large-dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **55**, 331–339.
- Silverstein, J. W. and Choi, S. I. (1995). Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **54**, 295–309.
- Srivastava, M. S., Kollo, T., and von Rosen, D. (2011). Some tests for the covariance matrix with fewer observations than the dimension under non-normality, *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **102**, 1090–1103.
- Tian, X. T., Lu, Y. T., and Li, W. M. (2015). A robust test for sphericity of high dimensional covariance matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **141**, 217–227.
- Wang, Q. W. and Yao, J. F. (2013). On the sphericity test with large-dimensional observations. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **7**, 2164–2192.
- Xia, N. N. and Zheng, X. H. (2014). On the inference about the spectra of high-dimensional covariance matrix based on noisy observations. Arxiv:1409.2121.
- Zhang, L. X. (2006). *Large Dimensional General Sample Covariance Matrices*. PHD thesis. National University of Singapore.

Zheng, S. R., Bai, Z. D., and Yao, J. F. (2015). Substitution principle for CLT of linear spectral statistics of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices with applications to hypothesis testing. *Ann. Statist.*, **43**, 546–591.

On-line supplementary material

Appendix A. Estimating a high-dimensional spherical mixture

Appendix A.1. Estimation of a PMD

Consider a scale mixture population with a spherical covariance matrix, that is with $H = \delta_1$. As for the PMD G , we consider a class of discrete distributions with finite support on \mathbb{R}^+ ,

$$G(\theta) = \alpha_1 \delta_{\sigma_1^2} + \cdots + \alpha_m \delta_{\sigma_m^2}, \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$

where the order m is assumed known and the parameter space Θ is

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta = (\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_m^2, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) : 0 < \sigma_1^2 < \cdots < \sigma_m^2 < \infty, \alpha_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1 \right\}.$$

The aim is to find a consistent estimator for the vector parameter θ . From [Bai et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Li and Yao \(2014\)](#), the parameter θ of G is uniquely determined by its moments (γ_j) , $\gamma_j = \int t^j dG(t)$, that is, the map from θ to $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2m-1}$,

$$g_1 : \theta \rightarrow (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2m-1})'$$

is a bijection. Moreover, the recursion formulae in [15] (here and below, $[x]$ with brackets refers to Equation (x) of the main paper) shows that there is also a one to one map g_2 from γ_j 's to β_j 's,

$$g_2 : (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{2m-1})' \rightarrow (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{2m-1})'.$$

From the convergence of $\hat{\beta}_{nk}$ to β_k and the maps g_1 and g_2 defined above, we propose a moment estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ of θ , which is defined to be

$$\hat{\theta}_n = (g_2 \circ g_1)^{-1}(\hat{\beta}_{n0}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{n,2m-1}).$$

Note that this estimator exists for all n large, and thus we immediately get the following convergence theorem.

Theorem 5. *In addition to Assumptions (a)-(c), suppose that the true value θ_0 of θ is an inner point of Θ . Then $\hat{\theta}_n \rightarrow \theta_0$ almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Appendix A.2. Numerical results

We undertake a simulation study to assess the performance of the proposed estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ of a PMD. Two models are studied:

- Model 1: $G = 0.8\delta_1 + 0.2\delta_2$ and $c = 1$.

Table A.6: Estimates for $(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \alpha_1) = (1, 2, 0.8)$ in Model 1 with $p = n = 300, 500, 800, 1200$. Upper panel: normal samples. Lower panel: $\sqrt{4/6}t_6$ samples.

θ	$n = 300$		$n = 500$		$n = 800$		$n = 1200$	
	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.
σ_1^2	0.9943	0.0270	0.9969	0.0159	0.9982	0.0099	0.9989	0.0065
σ_2^2	2.0142	0.1063	2.0067	0.0634	2.0042	0.0396	2.0030	0.0262
α_1	0.7956	0.0461	0.7978	0.0296	0.7989	0.0203	0.7994	0.0151
σ_1^2	0.9885	0.0276	0.9931	0.0167	0.9955	0.0106	0.9971	0.0076
σ_2^2	2.0690	0.1821	2.0396	0.1019	2.0237	0.0767	2.0162	0.0492
α_1	0.8005	0.0438	0.8005	0.0289	0.8004	0.0206	0.8005	0.0156

Table A.7: Estimates for $(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \sigma_3^2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1, 4, 7, 0.3, 0.4)$ in Model 2 with $p = n = 300, 500, 800, 1200$. Upper panel: normal samples. Lower panel: $U(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$ samples.

θ	$n = 300$		$n = 500$		$n = 800$		$n = 1200$	
	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.	Mean	St. D.
σ_1^2	0.9749	0.2152	1.0042	0.0838	1.0075	0.0486	1.0071	0.0320
σ_2^2	4.0467	0.5396	4.0652	0.3298	4.0526	0.2097	4.0408	0.1408
σ_3^2	7.1356	0.3386	7.0827	0.2001	7.0503	0.1255	7.0341	0.0832
α_1	0.2964	0.0555	0.3023	0.0330	0.3030	0.0227	0.3028	0.0169
α_2	0.4225	0.0450	0.4121	0.0314	0.4065	0.0228	0.4042	0.0175
σ_1^2	0.9473	0.3065	0.9937	0.0878	1.0005	0.0504	1.0027	0.0324
σ_2^2	3.9626	0.5750	4.0114	0.3419	4.0152	0.2134	4.0171	0.1436
σ_3^2	7.0473	0.3288	7.0252	0.1959	7.0140	0.1218	7.0100	0.0822
α_1	0.2896	0.0607	0.2987	0.0344	0.3007	0.0231	0.3011	0.0172
α_2	0.4156	0.0445	0.4061	0.0312	0.4025	0.0227	0.4013	0.0175

- Model 2: $G = 0.3\delta_1 + 0.4\delta_4 + 0.3\delta_7$ and $c = 1$.

Samples of (z_{ij}) are drawn from $N(0, 1)$ and $\sqrt{4/6} \cdot t_6$ for Model 1, and from $N(0, 1)$ and $U(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$ for Model 2. The dimensions are $(p, n) = (300, 300), (500, 500), (800, 800)$, and $(1200, 1200)$. Statistics of the estimators from 10000 independent replications are collected in Table A.6 for Model 1 and Table A.7 for Model 2. The results show that, in almost all cases, both the empirical biases and the standard deviations of all estimators reduce along with a growing dimension, which clearly demonstrates the consistency of the proposed estimator.

Appendix B. Numerical calculations of an LSD

General forms of the LSD defined in [9] are quite complex, so we take its simplified version as an example, which is defined in [10] with the PSD $H = \delta_1$. Given a model (c, G) , one may find the support S_F of the LSD $F^{c,G}$ with the help of the function $u = u(x)$,

$$u(x) = -\frac{1}{x} + \int \frac{t}{1+ctx} dG(t), \quad x \in A,$$

where $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, x \neq 0, x \neq -1/(ct), \forall t \in S_H\}$. This function can be seen as a “projection” of the equation [10] on the real line. Following [Silverstein and Choi \(1995\)](#), the support is $S_F = \mathbb{R} \setminus B$ where the set $B = \{u : du/dx > 0, x \in A\}$. In addition, the support should also exclude zero when $c < 1$.

After finding the support, the LSD can be obtained by inversion of the Stieltjes transform coupled with the equation [10]. Here we illustrate two examples:

- Model 1: $G = 0.4\delta_{0.5} + 0.6\delta_5$ and $c = 2$;
- Model 2: $G = 0.3\delta_{0.2} + 0.4\delta_{0.7} + 0.3\delta_1$ and $c = 10$.

In Model 1, the mixture is a combination of two distributions with a proportion of 2:3 and the corresponding covariance matrices are $0.5I_p$ and $5I_p$, respectively. It turns out that the support S_F is consist of a mass point at zero and two continuous intervals $[0.1450, 1.5618]$ and $[2.3027, 24.1683]$. In Model 2, the mixture is made up of three distributions with a proportion 3:4:3. The support of $F^{c,G}$ is $S_F = \{0\} \cup [1.2223, 2.5178] \cup [4.2013, 14.5272]$.




Figure B.5: Density curve of the LSD $F^{c,G}$ and the graph of $u = u(x)$ for Model 1.

One may see from Figures [B.5](#) and [B.6](#) that the support S_F of $F^{c,G}$ is a combination of several disjoint intervals. This phenomenon of separation is not new and has been observed in traditional generalized MP distributions ([Silverstein and Choi 1995](#)). It is reported that, for a discrete PMD concentrated in m mass points, the number of disjoint intervals contained in the support of the corresponding LSD grows to m as the dimensional ratio c becomes small. However, the conclusion

for the mixture model is just opposite, that is, the number of the disjoint intervals is equal to that of the components in the mixture if the ratio c is large enough. We explain this by considering a mixture model of two component.

Let G be a discrete PMD of order 2, i.e.,

$$G = \alpha_1 \delta_{\sigma_1^2} + \alpha_2 \delta_{\sigma_2^2}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$, $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$, and $\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$. In this case, there are one or two continuous intervals in the support S_F depending on the value of the dimensional ratio c for any fixed G .

Proposition 5. *Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(c) hold. For the mixture model (B.1), the support $S_F^* := S_F \setminus \{0\}$ has the form*

$$S_F^* = \begin{cases} [s_1, s_2] \cup [s_3, s_4] & c > c_0, \\ [s_1, s_4] & c \leq c_0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $c_0 = \int (tx^*)^2 / (1 + tx^*)^2 dG(t)$ with x^* the only real root of $\int t^2 / (1 + tx)^3 dG(t) = 0$ and $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < s_3 < s_4$ are real numbers given in the proof.

Proof. For the PMD in (B.1) and $c \neq 1$, the equation $u'(x) = 0$ is quartic and thus has two or four real roots which correspond to the boundary points of S_F^* . Let

$$f(x) = c - \alpha_1 \left(\frac{c\sigma_1^2 x}{1 + c\sigma_1^2 x} \right)^2 - \alpha_2 \left(\frac{c\sigma_2^2 x}{1 + c\sigma_2^2 x} \right)^2, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

then $f(x) = 0$ shares the same roots with $u'(x) = 0$. Notice that the equation $f'(x) = 0$ can be reduced to

$$\frac{\alpha_1 \sigma_1^4}{(1 + c\sigma_1^2 x)^3} + \frac{\alpha_2 \sigma_2^4}{(1 + c\sigma_2^2 x)^3} = 0,$$

which is a cubic equation and has only one real root $x_0 = x^*/c$. Note that this root is a minimum point of $f(x)$. Therefore, the function $f(x)$ has four real zeros $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$ if $f(x_0) > 0$, three zeros $x_1 < x_0 < x_4$ if $f(x_0) = 0$, and two zeros $x_1 < x_4$ if $f(x_0) < 0$. From Silverstein and Choi (1995) and the fact $f(x_0) = c - c_0$, we get

$$S_F^* = \begin{cases} [u(x_1), u(x_2)] \cup [u(x_3), u(x_4)] & c > c_0, \\ [u(x_1), u(x_4)] & c \leq c_0. \end{cases}$$

For the case $c = 1$, $f(x) = 0$ is a cubic function and thus has one or three real roots, denoted by x_2 and $x_2 \leq x_3 < x_4$ respectively. Following similar arguments, the support S_F^* is

$$S_F^* = \begin{cases} [0, u(x_2)] \cup [u(x_3), u(x_4)] & c > c_0, \\ [0, u(x_4)] & c \leq c_0. \end{cases}$$

□

Figure B.7 shows the evolution of the support S_F^* with respect to the ratio c under four models, where their parameters are $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (0.9, 0.1)$, $(0.99, 0.01)$ and $(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2) = (1, 5)$, $(1, 10)$, respectively. The shadowed area exhibits the support S_F^* , from which we see that the support is a single interval (blue color) when $c \leq c_0$ and is a union of two separate intervals (red color) when $c > c_0$. When c tends to zero, the support shrinkages to the point $E(w^2) = \int t dG(t)$. Notice that in the classical low dimensional setting where p is fixed while n grows to infinity, the sample covariance matrix converges almost surely to its population counterpart $E(w^2) \cdot I_p$ so that all eigenvalues converge to $E(w^2)$. Therefore, the above high-dimensional case with c small just mimics this low-dimensional setting. In addition, comparing the four models, the critical value c_0 for the separation of S_F^* becomes small when α_1 and/or σ_2^2 increase. At last, corresponding to these supports, we present also some density curves of the LSD in Figure B.8.




Figure B.6: Density curve of the LSD $F^{c,G}$ and the graph of $u = u(x)$ for Model 2.




Figure B.7: Evolution of the support S_F as the increase of the dimensional ratio c .




Figure B.8: Density curves of the LSD associated with different combinations of G and c .

Appendix C. QQ-plots for the simulaion experiment of Section 2.3

We refer to Section 2.3 of the main paper for the asymptotic distribution of the the first two moments of the sample eigenvalues. Here we report numerical results from a detailed simulation experiment.

We adopt a PMD $G = 0.4\delta_1 + 0.6\delta_3$ and a ratio $c = 0.5$. For this model, $v_2 = 5.8(1 + \Delta)$, $\psi_{111} = 11.6(2 + \Delta)$, $\psi_{211} = 0.96$, $\psi_{122} = 1364.03 + 614.736\Delta$, and $\psi_{222} = 39.3216$. Samples of (z_{ij}) are drawn from standard normal $N(0, 1)$, scaled t , i.e. $\sqrt{4/6} \cdot t_6$, standardized χ^2 , i.e. $\sqrt{1/6} \cdot (\chi_3^2 - 3)$, and uniform distribution $U(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$, where $\Delta = 0, 3, 4, -1.2$, respectively. Notice that the last three distributions have heavy tail, skewed and heavy tail, and null tail, respectively. The dimensions are fixed at $(p, n) = (200, 400)$ and the number of independent replications is 10000.

We exhibit QQ-plots of moment statistics normalized using the euqation (18) of the main paper with respect to standard normal $N(0, 1)$ in Figure C.9 under the four distributions for the base variables (z_{ij}) . It shows that the empirical distributions of the statistics match the standard normal very well.

Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 1 of the main paper

We follow the strategy developed in Bai and Silverstein (2004). The convergence of $M_n(z)$ can be obtained by showing the following two facts:

Fact 1: Finite dimensional convergence of $M_n(z)$ in distribution;

Fact 2: Tightness of $M_n(z)$ on \mathcal{C}_n .

Appendix D.0.1. Finite dimensional convergence of $M_n(z)$ in distribution

In this part we will show that for any positive integer r and real constants $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$, the sum

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_n(z_i)$$

will converge in distribution to a Gaussian random variable.

Denote $m_{nn} = m_{F^{c_n}, G_n}$ and $m_n = m_{F^{c_n}, G}$, then these two Stieltjes transform satisfy

$$z = -\frac{1}{m_{nn}} + \int \frac{t}{1 + c_n t m_{nn}} dG_n(t), \quad z = -\frac{1}{m_n} + \int \frac{t}{1 + c_n t m_n} dG(t),$$

respectively. Taking the difference of the two identities yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_n - m_{nn}}{m_n m_{nn}} &= \int \frac{t}{1 + c_n t m_{nn}} dG_n(t) - \int \frac{t}{1 + c_n t m_n} dG(t), \\ &= \int \frac{c_n t^2 (m_n - m_{nn})}{(1 + c_n t m_{nn})(1 + c_n t m_n)} dG_n(t) + \int \frac{t[dG_n(t) - dG(t)]}{1 + c_n t m_n}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure C.9: QQ-plots of normalized $\hat{\beta}_{n1}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{n2}$ with respect to standard normal distribution under normal, Student- t , chi-square and uniform population (top to bottom).

Therefore, we get

$$M_n(z) = \sqrt{n}(m_{nn}(z) - m_n(z)) = \beta_n(z)\sqrt{n} \int \frac{t[dG_n(t) - dG(t)]}{1 + c_n t m_n(z)},$$

where $\beta_n^{-1}(z) = \int c_n t^2 / [(1 + c_n t m_{nn}(z))(1 + c_n t m_n(z))] dG_n(t) - 1/(m_n(z)m_{nn}(z))$. From [Silverstein and Choi \(1995\)](#), for any $z \in \mathcal{C}$, $1/|1 + c t m(z)|$ is uniformly bounded in $t \in S_G$. Notice that

$$m_{nn}(z) \xrightarrow{a.s.} m(z), \quad m_n(z) \xrightarrow{a.s.} m(z), \quad G_n(t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} G(t), \quad c_n \rightarrow c,$$

then, for all n large, almost surely, the quantities $1/|1 + c_n t m_{nn}(z)|$ and $1/|1 + c_n t m_n(z)|$ are both uniformly bounded in $t \in S_G$. From this and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem,

$$\beta_n(z) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \left(\int \frac{c t^2}{(1 + c t m(z))^2} dG(t) - \frac{1}{m^2(z)} \right)^{-1} = -m'(z),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $g(x, z) = x/(1 + c x m(z))$, from the convergence of c_n , $m_n(z)$, and $\beta_n(z)$, the linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_n(z_i)$ has the same limiting distribution as

$$\begin{aligned} & -\sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i m'(z_i) \int g(t, z_i) (dG_n(t) - dG(t)) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i m'(z_i) (g(w_j^2, z_i) - E g(w_j^2, z_i)), \end{aligned}$$

which is a sum of centralized i.i.d. random variables with finite variance and thus converges in distribution to a zero-mean normal variable. Moreover, for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq r$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}[M_n(z_i), M_n(z_j)] \\ &= n m'(z_i) m'(z_j) \text{Cov} \left[\int g(t, z_i) dG_n(t), \int g(t, z_j) dG_n(t) \right] + o(1) \\ &= m'(z_i) m'(z_j) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Cov}[g(w_k^2, z_i), g(w_k^2, z_j)] + o(1) \\ &= m'(z_i) m'(z_j) (E(g(w^2, z_i)g(w^2, z_j)) - E g(w^2, z_i) E g(w^2, z_j)) + o(1) \\ &\rightarrow m'(z_i) m'(z_j) \left(\int g(t, z_i) g(t, z_j) dG(t) - \int g(t, z_i) dG(t) \int g(t, z_j) dG(t) \right) \\ &= m'(z_i) m'(z_j) \left(\frac{z_i + 1/m(z_i) - z_j - 1/m(z_j)}{c(m(z_j) - m(z_i))} - \frac{(1 + z_i m(z_i))(1 + z_j m(z_j))}{m(z_i) m(z_j)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where the last equality is obtained from the equation (10) of the main paper.

Appendix D.0.2. Tightness of $M_n(z)$

The tightness of $M_n(z)$ on \mathcal{C}_n can be established by verifying the moment condition (12.51) of [Billingsley \(1968\)](#), i.e.,

$$\sup_{n, z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{E|M_n(z_1) - M_n(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} < \infty. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Taking the partial derivative of $g(x, z)$ with respect to z , we get

$$g'_z(x, z) := \frac{\partial g(x, z)}{\partial z} = -\frac{cx^2m'(z)}{(1 + cxm(z))^2} < K,$$

where K is an upper bound of $g'_z(x, z)$ on $S_G \times \mathcal{C}$. From this, for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $x \in S_G$, there is a constant ξ such that

$$|g(x, z_1) - g(x, z_2)| \leq |g'_z(x, \xi)||z_1 - z_2| \leq K|z_1 - z_2|,$$

where $\xi = z_1 + \theta(z_2 - z_1)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Let $\tilde{g}(w^2, z) = g(w^2, z) - \mathbb{E}(g(w^2, z))$, we have then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{M_n(z_1) - M_n(z_2)}{z_1 - z_2} \right|^2 &= \frac{1}{n|z_1 - z_2|^2} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{g}(w_j^2, z_1) - \tilde{g}(w_j^2, z_2) \right|^2 + o(1) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{E} |\tilde{g}(w_1^2, z_1) - \tilde{g}(w_1^2, z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{g(w_1^2, z_1) - g(w_1^2, z_2)}{z_1 - z_2} \right|^2 \leq K^2, \end{aligned}$$

which confirms the inequality in (D.1).

Reference

References

- Bai, Z. D., Chen, J. Q., and Yao, J. F. (2010). On estimation of the population spectral distribution from a high-dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Aust. N. Z. J. Stat.* **52**, 423–437.
- Bai, Z. D. and Silverstein, J. W. (2004). CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.* **32**, 553–605.
- Billingsley, P. (1968). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, New York.
- Li, W. M. and Yao, J. F. (2014). A local moment estimator of the spectrum of a large dimensional covariance matrix. *Statistica Sinica*, **24**, 919–936.
- Silverstein, J. W. and Choi, S. I. (1995). Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **54**, 295–309.