

# TESTING FOR INDEPENDENCE OF LARGE DIMENSIONAL VECTORS

BY TARAS BODNAR<sup>†</sup>, HOLGER DETTE<sup>\*,‡</sup> AND NESTOR PAROLYA<sup>§</sup>

*Stockholm University*<sup>†</sup>, *Ruhr University Bochum*<sup>‡</sup> and *Leibniz University Hannover*<sup>§</sup>

**Abstract** In this paper new tests for the independence of two high-dimensional vectors are investigated. We consider the case where the dimension of the vectors increases with the sample size and propose multivariate analysis of variance-type statistics for the hypothesis of a block diagonal covariance matrix. The asymptotic properties of the new test statistics are investigated under the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis using random matrix theory. For this purpose we study the weak convergence of linear spectral statistics of central and (conditionally) non-central Fisher matrices. In particular, a central limit theorem for linear spectral statistics of large dimensional (conditionally) non-central Fisher matrices is derived which is then used to analyse the power of the tests under the alternative.

The theoretical results are illustrated by means of a simulation study where we also compare the new tests with several alternative, in particular with the commonly used corrected likelihood ratio test. It is demonstrated that the latter test does not keep its nominal level, if the dimension of one sub-vector is relatively small compared to the dimension of the other sub-vector. On the other hand the tests proposed in this paper provide a reasonable approximation of the nominal level in such situations. Moreover, we observe that one of the proposed tests is most powerful under a variety of correlation scenarios.

**1. Introduction.** Estimation and testing the structure of the covariance matrix are important problems that have a number of applications in practice. For instance, the covariance matrix plays an important role in the determination of the optimal portfolio structure following the well-known mean-variance analysis of [Markowitz \(1952\)](#). It is also used in prediction theory where the problem of forecasting future values of the process based on its previous observations arises. In such applications misspecification of the covariance matrix might lead to significant errors in the optimal port-

---

\*DFG Research Unit 1735, DE 502/26-2

*MSC 2010 subject classifications:* Primary 60B20, 60F05, 62H15; secondary 62H20, 62F05

*Keywords and phrases:* testing for independence, large dimensional covariance matrix, non-central Fisher random matrix, linear spectral statistics, asymptotic normality

folio structure and predictions. The problem becomes even more difficult if the dimension is of similar order or even larger as the sample size. A number of such situations are present in biostatistics, wireless communications and finance (see, e.g., [Fan and Li \(2006\)](#), [Johnstone \(2006\)](#) and references therein).

The sample covariance matrix is the commonly used estimator in practice. However, in the case of large dimension (compared to the sample size), a number of studies demonstrate that the sample covariance does not perform well as an estimator of the population covariance matrix and numerous authors have recently addressed this problem. One approach is based on the construction of improved estimators in particular shrinkage type estimators which reduce the variability of the sample covariance matrix at the cost of an additional bias (see, [Ledoit and Wolf \(2012\)](#), [Wang et al. \(2015\)](#) or [Bodnar et al. \(2014, 2016\)](#) among others). Alternatively several authors impose structural assumptions on the population covariance matrix such as a block diagonal structure (e.g., [Devijver and Gallopin \(2016\)](#)), Toeplitz matrix (see, [Cai et al. \(2013\)](#)), band matrix (see, [Bickel and Levina \(2008\)](#)) or general sparsity assumptions (see [Cai et al. \(2011\)](#), [Cai and Shen \(2011\)](#), [Cai and Zhou \(2012\)](#) among others) and show, that the population covariance matrix can be estimated consistently in these cases, even for large dimensions. However, these techniques may fail if the structural assumptions are not satisfied and consequently it is desirable to validate the corresponding assumptions regarding the postulated structure of the covariance matrix.

In the present paper we consider the problem of testing for a block diagonal structure of the covariance, which has found considerable interest in the literature. Early work in this direction has been done by [Mauchly \(1940\)](#), who proposed a likelihood ratio test for the hypothesis of sphericity of a normal distribution, that is the independence of all components. This method has been extended by [Gupta and Xu \(2006\)](#) to the non-normal case and by [Bai et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Jiang and Yang \(2013\)](#) to the high-dimensional case. An alternative approach is based on the empirical distance between the sample covariance matrix and the target (e.g., a multiplicity of the identity matrix) and was initially suggested by [John \(1971\)](#) and [Nagao \(1973\)](#). These tests can also be extended for testing the corresponding hypotheses in the high-dimensional setup (see, [Ledoit and Wolf \(2002\)](#), [Birke and Dette \(2005\)](#), [Fisher et al. \(2010\)](#), [Chen et al. \(2010\)](#)). Other authors use the distributional properties of the largest eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix to construct tests (see [Johnstone \(2001, 2008\)](#) for example).

In the problem of testing the independence between two (or more) groups of random variables under the assumption of normality the likelihood ratio

approach has also found considerable interest in the literature. The main results for a fixed dimension can be found in the text books of [Muirhead \(1982\)](#) and [Anderson \(2003\)](#). Recently, [Jiang and Yang \(2013\)](#) have extended the likelihood ratio approach to the case of high-dimensional data, while [Hyodo et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Yamada et al. \(2017\)](#) used an empirical distance approach to test for a block diagonal covariance matrix.

In Section 2 we introduce the testing problem (in the case of two blocks) and demonstrate by means of a small simulation study that the likelihood ratio test does not yield a reliable approximation of the nominal level, if the size of one block is small compared to the other one. In Section 3 we introduce three alternative test statistics which are motivated from classical multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and are defined as linear spectral statistics of a Fisher matrix. We derive their asymptotic distributions under the null hypotheses and illustrate the approximation of the nominal level by means of a simulation study. A comparison with the commonly used likelihood ratio test shows that the new tests provide a reasonable approximation of the nominal level in situations where the likelihood ratio test fails. Section 4 is devoted to the analysis of statistical properties of the new tests under the alternative hypothesis. For this purpose, we present a new central limit theorem for a (conditionally) non-central Fisher random matrix which is of own interest and can be used to study some properties of the power of the new tests. Finally, most technical details and proofs are given in the appendix (see, Section 5) and in the supplementary material (see, [Bodnar et al. \(2018\)](#)).

**2. Testing for independence.** Let  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  be a sample of i.i.d. observations from a  $p$ -dimensional normal distribution with zero mean vector and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ . We define the  $p \times n$  dimensional observation matrix  $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  and denote by

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^\top$$

the sample covariance matrix which is used as an estimate of  $\Sigma$ . It is well known that  $n\mathbf{S}$  has a  $p$ -dimensional Wishart distribution with  $n$  degrees of freedom and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , i.e.,  $n\mathbf{S} \sim W_p(n, \Sigma)$ . In the following we consider partitions of the population and the sample covariance matrix given by

$$(2.1) \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad n\mathbf{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{11} & \mathbf{S}_{12} \\ \mathbf{S}_{21} & \mathbf{S}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively, where  $\Sigma_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times p_j}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times p_j}$  with  $i, j = \{1, 2\}$  and  $p_1 + p_2 = p$ . We are interested in the hypothesis that the sub-vectors  $\mathbf{x}_{1,1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{1,2}$  of size  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  in the vector  $\mathbf{x}_1 = (\mathbf{x}_{1,1}^\top, \mathbf{x}_{1,2}^\top)^\top$  are independent, or equivalently that the covariance matrix is block diagonal, i.e.

$$(2.2) \quad H_0 : \Sigma_{12} = \mathbf{O} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \Sigma_{12} \neq \mathbf{O}.$$

Here the symbol  $\mathbf{O}$  denotes a matrix of an appropriate order with all entries equal to 0. It is worthwhile to mention that the case of non-zero mean vector can be treated exactly in the same way observing that the centred sample covariance matrix, has a  $\frac{1}{n-1}W_p(n-1, \Sigma)$  distribution. Thus, one needs to normalize the sample covariance matrix by  $1/(n-1)$  instead of  $1/n$  due to the *substitution principle* of [Zheng et al. \(2015b\)](#) and the results presented in our paper will still remain valid.

Throughout this paper we consider the case where the dimension of the blocks is increasing with the sample size, that is  $p = p(n)$ ,  $p_i = p_i(n)$ , such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_i}{n} = c_i < 1, \quad i = 1, 2$$

and define  $c = c_1 + c_2$ . For further reference we also introduce the quantities

$$(2.3) \quad \gamma_{1,n} = \frac{p - p_1}{p_1},$$

$$(2.4) \quad \gamma_{2,n} = \frac{p - p_1}{n - p_1},$$

$$(2.5) \quad h_n = \sqrt{\gamma_{1,n} + \gamma_{2,n} - \gamma_{1,n}\gamma_{2,n}}.$$

A common approach in testing for independence is the likelihood ratio test based on the statistic

$$V_n = \frac{|\mathbf{S}|}{|\mathbf{S}_{11}||\mathbf{S}_{22}|} = \frac{|\mathbf{S}_{11}| |\mathbf{S}_{22} - \mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12}|}{|\mathbf{S}_{11}||\mathbf{S}_{22}|} = |\mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} - \mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12}\mathbf{S}_{22}^{-1}|.$$

The null hypothesis is rejected for small values of  $V_n$ . [Jiang et al. \(2013\)](#) showed that under the assumptions made in this section  $V_n$  can be written in terms of a determinant of a central Fisher matrix, that is

$$(2.6) \quad V_n = \left| \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{F} + \frac{\gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{2,n}}\mathbf{I}_{p-p_1})^{-1} \right| = \left| \frac{\gamma_{2,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}}\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right|^{-1},$$

where  $\mathbf{F} = \frac{1}{p_1}\mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12}(\frac{1}{n-p_1}(\mathbf{S}_{22} - \mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12}))^{-1}$ . Under the null hypothesis of independent blocks, the matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  is a "ratio" of two central Wishart

matrices with  $p_1$  and  $n - p_1$  degrees of freedom. Naturally, it is called a central Fisher matrix with  $p_1$  and  $n - p_1$  degrees of freedom, an analogue to its one dimensional counterpart (see, [Fisher \(1939\)](#)). In particular, we have the following result (see, Theorem 8.2 in [Yao et al. \(2015\)](#))

PROPOSITION 1. *Under the null hypothesis we have for  $T_{LR} = \log(V_n)$*

$$\frac{T_{LR} - (p - p_1)s_{LR} - \mu_{LR}}{\sigma_{LR}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where the quantities  $\mu_{LR}, \sigma_{LR}^2$  and  $s_{LR}$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{LR} &= 1/2 \log \left[ \frac{(w_n^{*2} - d_n^{*2})h_n^2}{(w_n^*h_n - \gamma_{2,n}d_n^{*2})^2} \right], & \sigma_{LR}^2 &= 2 \log \left[ \frac{w_n^{*2}}{w_n^{*2} - d_n^{*2}} \right], \\ s_{LR} &= \log \left( \frac{\gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{2,n}} (1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2 \right) + \frac{1 - \gamma_{2,n}}{\gamma_{2,n}} \log(w_n^*) - \frac{\gamma_{1,n} + \gamma_{2,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}\gamma_{2,n}} \log(w_n^* - d_n^* \gamma_{2,n}/h_n) \\ &+ \begin{cases} \frac{1 - \gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}} \log(w_n^* - d_n^* h_n), & \gamma_{1,n} \in (0, 1) \\ 0, & \gamma_{1,n} = 1 \\ -\frac{1 - \gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}} \log(w_n^* - d_n^*/h_n), & \gamma_{1,n} > 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

with  $w_n^* = \frac{h_n}{\sqrt{\gamma_{2,n}}}$  and  $d_n^* = \sqrt{\gamma_{2,n}}$ .

Proposition 1 shows that the likelihood ratio test, which rejects the null hypothesis, whenever

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{T_{LR} - (p - p_1)s_{LR} - \mu_{LR}}{\sigma_{LR}} < -u_{1-\alpha},$$

is an asymptotic level  $\alpha$  test (here and throughout this paper  $u_{1-\alpha}$  denotes the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution). In Figure 1 we illustrate the approximation of the nominal level of the test (2.7) by means of a small simulation study for the sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and different values of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . We considered a centered  $p$ -dimensional normal distribution where the blocks  $\Sigma_{11}$  and  $\Sigma_{22}$  in the block diagonal matrix  $\Sigma$  are constructed as follows. For the first block  $\Sigma_{11}$  we took  $p_1$  uniformly distributed eigenvalues on the interval  $(0, 1]$  while the corresponding eigenvectors are simulated from the Haar distribution on the unit sphere. The  $p_2$  eigenvalues of the second block  $\Sigma_{22}$  are drawn from a uniform distribution on the interval  $[1, 10]$  while the corresponding eigenvectors are again Haar distributed. The matrices  $\Sigma_{11}$  and  $\Sigma_{22}$  are then fixed for the generation of multivariate normal distributed random variables ( $\Sigma_{12} = \mathbf{O}$ ). The plots show the empirical distribution of the statistic  $(T_{LR} - (p - p_1)s_{LR} - \mu_{LR})/\sigma_{LR}$

using 1000 simulation runs and the density of a standard normal distribution. We observe a reasonable approximation if the dimension  $p_1$  of the sub-vector  $\mathbf{x}_{1,1}$  is large compared to the dimension  $p$  of the vector  $\mathbf{x}_1$ , that is  $\gamma_{1,n} \leq 1$  (see, the upper part of Figure 1). However, if  $\gamma_{1,n} \gg 1$ , there arises a strong bias (see, the lower part of Figure 1) and the asymptotic statement in Proposition 1 cannot be used to obtain critical value for the test (2.7).




FIGURE 1. *Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_{LR} - (p - p_1)s_{LR} - \mu_{LR})/\sigma_{LR}$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 45, 40, 30, 15, 10$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.*

Motivated by the poor quality of the approximation of the finite sample distribution of the likelihood ratio test by a normal distribution if the dimension  $p_1$  is small compared to the dimension  $p_2$  we now construct alternative tests for the hypothesis (2.2), which will yield a more stable approximation of the nominal level. For this purpose, we first note that a non-singular partitioned matrix  $\Sigma$  in (2.1) is block diagonal (i.e.  $\Sigma_{21} = \mathbf{O}$ ) if and only if  $\Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12} = \mathbf{O}$ . Therefore, a test for independence can also be obtained by testing the hypotheses

$$(2.8) \quad H_0 : \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12} = \mathbf{O} \text{ versus } H_1 : \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12} \neq \mathbf{O}.$$

In the following section we will propose three tests for the hypothesis (2.8) as an alternative to the likelihood ratio test.

**3. Alternative tests for independence and their null distribution.** Recall the definition of the matrices  $\Sigma$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  in (2.1) and denote by  $\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1} = \Sigma_{22} - \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{22 \cdot 1} = \mathbf{S}_{22} - \mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12}$  the corresponding Schur complements. From Theorem 3.2.10 of Muirhead (1982), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1/2}|\mathbf{S}_{11} &\sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, p_1}(\Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{1/2}, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{p_1}), \\ \mathbf{S}_{22 \cdot 1} &\sim W_{p-p_1}(n-p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}),\end{aligned}$$

and the Schur complement  $\mathbf{S}_{22 \cdot 1}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1/2}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$ . Hence, under the null hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathbf{W}} &= \mathbf{S}_{21}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{12} \sim W_{p-p_1}(p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}), \\ \widehat{\mathbf{T}} &= \mathbf{S}_{22 \cdot 1} \sim W_{p-p_1}(n-p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}),\end{aligned}$$

and  $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$  are independent. Under the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$  are still independent as well as  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}} \sim W_{p-p_1}(n-p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1})$ , but  $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$  has a non-central Wishart distribution conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$ , i.e.,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}|\mathbf{S}_{11} \sim W_{p-p_1}(p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}, \Omega_1(\mathbf{S}_{11}))$$

where the non-centrality parameter is given by

$$\Omega_1 = \Omega_1(\mathbf{S}_{11}) = \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{11}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12}.$$

For technical reasons we will use the normalized versions of  $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$  throughout this paper. Thus, the distributional properties of  $\mathbf{W} = \frac{1}{p_1}\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$  and  $\mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{n-p_1}\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$  are very similar to the ones observed for the within and between covariance matrices in the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) model (see Fujikoshi et al. (2004), Schott (2007), Kakizawa and Iwashita (2008)). More precisely,  $p_1\mathbf{W}$  and  $(n-p_1)\mathbf{T}$  are independent (under both hypotheses) and they possess Wishart distributions under the null hypothesis. However under the alternative hypothesis the matrix  $p_1\mathbf{W}$  has only conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  a non-central Wishart distribution, while the unconditional distribution appears to be a more complicated matrix-variate distribution. The similarity to MANOVA motivates the application of three tests which are usually used in this context and are given by

(i) Wilks'  $\Lambda$  statistic:

$$(3.1) \quad T_W = -\log(|\mathbf{T}|/|\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{W}|) = \log(|\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}|) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} \log(1 + v_i)$$

(ii) Lawley-Hotelling's trace criterion:

$$(3.2) \quad T_{LH} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} v_i$$

(iii) Bartlett-Nanda-Pillai's trace criterion:

$$(3.3) \quad T_{BNP} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1})^{-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} \frac{v_i}{1 + v_i}$$

where  $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_{p-p_1}$  denote the ordered eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ . A statistic very similar to (3.3) was proposed by [Jiang et al. \(2013\)](#), who used

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}(\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2}\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1})^{-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} \frac{v_i}{\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2} + v_i}$$

instead of  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1})^{-1})$ . It is remarkable that all proposed test statistics are functions of the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  and can be presented as linear spectral statistics calculated for the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ , which is the so-called Fisher matrix under the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (see [Zheng \(2012\)](#)).

A linear spectral statistics for the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  is generally defined by

$$(3.4) \quad LSS_n = (p - p_1) \int_0^\infty f(x) dF_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} f(v_i),$$

where  $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_{p-p_1}$  are the ordered eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ . The symbol

$$F_n(x) = \frac{1}{p - p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, x]}(v_i)$$

denotes the corresponding empirical spectral distribution and the symbol  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the indicator function of the set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Define

$$F_n^*(dx) = q_n(x) \mathbb{1}_{[a_n, b_n]}(x) dx + (1 - 1/\gamma_{1,n}) \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_{1,n} > 1} \delta_0(dx) \quad \text{with}$$

$$\begin{aligned} q_n(x) &= \frac{1 - \gamma_{2,n}}{2\pi x(\gamma_{1,n} + \gamma_{2,n}x)} \sqrt{(b_n - x)(x - a_n)}, \\ a_n &= \frac{(1 - h_n)^2}{(1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2}, \quad b_n = \frac{(1 + h_n)^2}{(1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2}, \end{aligned}$$



where  $\gamma_{1,n}$ ,  $\gamma_{2,n}$  and  $h_n$  are defined by (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5), respectively. Note that  $F_n^*$  is a finite sample proxy of limiting spectral distribution  $F$  of  $F_n$ , which is obtained by replacing  $\gamma_{1,n}$  and  $\gamma_{2,n}$  by their corresponding limits (see Bai and Silverstein (2010)), that is

$$(3.5) \quad F(dx) = q(x)\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(x)dx + (1 - 1/\gamma_1)\mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1 > 1}\delta_0(dx) \quad \text{with}$$

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} q(x) &= \frac{1 - \gamma_2}{2\pi x(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 x)} \sqrt{(b - x)(x - a)}, \\ a &= \frac{(1 - h)^2}{(1 - \gamma_2)^2}, \quad b = \frac{(1 + h)^2}{(1 - \gamma_2)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{1,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p - p_1}{p_1}, \quad \gamma_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{2,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p - p_1}{n - p_1}, \\ h &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n = \sqrt{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2}. \end{aligned}$$

The representations of  $T_W$ ,  $T_{LH}$ , and  $T_{BNP}$  in terms of the eigenvalues of the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  are used intensively in the proof of our first main result, which provides their asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis in (2.8). The details of the proof are deferred to Appendix B of the supplementary material (see, Bodnar et al. (2018)).

**THEOREM 1.** *Under the assumptions stated in Section 2 we have*

$$\frac{T_a - (p - p_1)s_\alpha - \mu_a}{\sigma_a} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where the index  $a \in \{W, LH, BNP\}$  represents the statistic under consideration defined in (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), respectively. The asymptotic means and variances are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_W &= 1/2 \log \left[ \frac{(w_n^2 - d_n^2)h_n^2}{(w_n h_n - \gamma_{2,n} d_n)^2} \right], & \sigma_W^2 &= 2 \log \left[ \frac{w_n^2}{w_n^2 - d_n^2} \right], \\ \mu_{LH} &= \frac{\gamma_{2,n}}{(1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2}, & \sigma_{LH}^2 &= \frac{2h_n^2}{(1 - \gamma_{2,n})^4}, \\ \mu_{BNP} &= -\frac{(1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2 w_n^2 (d_n^2 - \gamma_{2,n})}{(w_n^2 - d_n^2)^2}, \\ \sigma_{BNP}^2 &= 2 \frac{d^2 (1 - \gamma_{2,n})^4 (w_n^2 (w_n^2 + d_n) + d_n^3 (w_n^2 - 1))}{w_n^2 (1 + d_n) (w_n^2 - d_n^2)^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $w_n > d_n > 0$  satisfy  $w_n^2 + d_n^2 = (1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2 + 1 + h_n^2$ ,  $w_n d_n = h_n$ , and the quantities  $\gamma_{1,n}$ ,  $\gamma_{2,n}$  and  $h_n$  are defined by (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5),

respectively. The centering parameters are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
s_W &= -\log((1 - \gamma_{2,n})^2) - \frac{1 - \gamma_{2,n}}{\gamma_{2,n}} \log(w_n) + \frac{\gamma_{1,n} + \gamma_{2,n}}{\gamma_{1,n} \gamma_{2,n}} \log(w_n - d_n \gamma_{2,n} / h_n) \\
&\quad - \begin{cases} \frac{1 - \gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}} \log(w_n - d_n h_n), & \gamma_{1,n} \in (0, 1) \\ 0, & \gamma_{1,n} = 1 \\ -\frac{1 - \gamma_{1,n}}{\gamma_{1,n}} \log(w_n - d_n / h_n), & \gamma_{1,n} > 1 \end{cases}, \\
s_{LH} &= \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_{2,n}}, \\
s_{BNP} &= \frac{1 - \gamma_{2,n}}{w_n^2 - \gamma_{2,n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 provides a simple asymptotic level  $\alpha$  test by rejecting the null hypothesis  $H_0$  if

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{T_a - (p - p_1)s_a - \mu_a}{\sigma_a} > u_{1-\alpha}$$

We illustrate the quality of the approximation in Theorem 1 by means of a small simulation study. For the sake of comparison with the likelihood ratio test, we use the same scenario as in Section 2, that is  $n = 100$ ,  $p = 60$  and different values for  $p_1$ . In Figure 2 - 4 we display the rejection probabilities of the test (3.7) under the null hypothesis in the case of the Wilk test, the Lawley-Hotelling's, and the Bartlett-Nanda-Pillai's trace criterion. From the results depicted in Figure 2 we observe that the statistic  $T_W$  exhibits similar problems as the statistic of the likelihood ratio test. If the dimension  $p_1$  is too small the approximation provided by Theorem 1 is not reliable. This fact seems to be related to the use of the log determinant criterion. On the other hand, the Lawley-Hotelling's and the Bartlett-Nanda-Pillai's trace criterion yield test statistics which do not possess these drawbacks. The results in Figures 3 and 4 show a reasonable approximation of the nominal level in all considered scenarios.




FIGURE 2. Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_W - (p - p_1)s_W - \mu_W)/\sigma_W$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.




FIGURE 3. Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_{LH} - (p - p_1)s_{LH} - \mu_{LH})/\sigma_{LH}$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.




FIGURE 4. Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_{BNP} - (p - p_1)s_{BNP} - \mu_{BNP})/\sigma_{BNP}$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.

In order to investigate the properties of two adjusted tests  $T_{BNP}$  and  $T_{LH}$  for small dimensions and small sample sizes we provide additional results for  $p = 16$ ,  $n = 25$  and different values of  $p_1 = 13, 8, 3$ . The results are depicted in Figures 5 and 6 and indicate a good approximation of the nominal level

although a small-sample effect is present. Note that this effect is more pronounced for the LH test as for the BNP. Thus the results are still reliable and there is again no large bias as in case of LR and Wilk's statistics when the dimension  $p_1$  is much smaller than  $p - p_1$ .




FIGURE 5. Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_{LH} - (p - p_1)s_{LH} - \mu_{LH})/\sigma_{LH}$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 25$ , dimension  $p = 16$  and various values of  $p_1 = 13, 8, 3$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.




FIGURE 6. Simulated distribution of the statistic  $(T_{BNP} - (p - p_1)s_{BNP} - \mu_{BNP})/\sigma_{BNP}$  and the null hypothesis for sample size  $n = 25$ , dimension  $p = 16$  and various values of  $p_1 = 13, 8, 3$ . The solid curve shows the standard normal distribution.

**4. Distributional properties under alternative hypothesis.** In this section we derive the distribution of the considered linear spectral statistics under the alternative hypothesis. The main difficulty consists in the fact that under the alternative the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  has a (conditionally) non-central Fisher distribution in this case.

The following two results, which are proved in the Appendix and of independent interest, specify the asymptotic distribution of the empirical spectral distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  under  $H_1$ . Throughout the paper

$$m_Q(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dQ(t)}{t - z}$$

denotes the Stieltjes transform of a distribution function  $Q$ .

**THEOREM 2.** *Consider the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  in (2.2) and assume that the assumptions of Section 2 are satisfied. If the matrix  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22,1}^{-1/2}$  is bounded in spectral norm and its spectral distribution converges weakly to some function  $G$ , then for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  the Stieltjes transform of the empirical spectral distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1}$  converges almost surely to some deterministic function  $s$ , which is the unique solution of the following system of equations*

$$\frac{s(z)}{1 + \gamma_2 z s(z)} = m_H(z(1 + \gamma_2 z s(z))),$$

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{m_H(z)}{1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z)} = m_{\tilde{H}}((1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))[(1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))z - (1 - \gamma_1)]),$$

$$(4.2) \quad m_{\tilde{H}}(z)(1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)z m_{\tilde{H}}(z))c_1^{-1} = m_G\left(\frac{c_1 z}{1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)z m_{\tilde{H}}(z)}\right),$$

subject to the condition that  $\Im\{s(z)\}$  is of the same sign as  $\Im\{z\}$ . The functions  $H$  and  $\tilde{H}$  denote the limiting spectral distributions of the matrices  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = 1/p_1 \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22,1}^{-1/2}$ , respectively.

Note that the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$  from Theorem 2 can be interpreted as the sample covariance matrix generated from a population with the covariance matrix equal to  $\frac{p_1}{n} \mathbf{R}$ .

We will use this result to derive a CLT for the linear spectral statistics of the matrix  $\mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1}$ , which can be used for the analysis of the test proposed in Section 3 under the alternative hypothesis. For this purpose we introduce some useful notations as follows

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta(z) &= \gamma_1 m_H(z) \\ \tilde{\delta}(z) &= \delta(z) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{z} \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.4) \quad \eta(z) = (1 + \delta(z))(1 + \tilde{\delta}(z))$$

$$(4.5) \quad \xi(z) = \frac{\delta'(z)}{(z\eta(z))'}$$

$$(4.6) \quad \Psi(z) = \left( \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - 2\xi(z)z + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z) \right)^{-1},$$

$$(4.7) \quad r = 2 \frac{(1 + \sqrt{\gamma_1})^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})(1 + \sqrt{c_1})^2}{(1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2})^2}$$

THEOREM 3. *If the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied, then for any pair  $f, g$  of analytic functions in an open region of the complex plane containing the interval  $[0, r]$  the random vector*

$$\left( (p - p_1) \int_0^\infty f(x) d(F_n(x) - F_n^*(x)), (p - p_1) \int_0^\infty g(x) d(F_n(x) - F_n^*(x)) \right)^\top$$

*converges weakly to a Gaussian vector  $(X_f, X_g)^\top$  with mean and covariances given by*

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_f] &= \frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint f(z) d\log(q(z)) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f(z) B(zb(z)) dz \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f(z) \theta_{b, \tilde{H}}(z) \\ &\times \left( \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(zb(z)) \frac{c_1^2 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^3(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-3} dG(t)}{(1 - c_1 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^2(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-2} dG(t))^2} \right) dz \\ (4.8) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Cov[X_f, X_g] &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint \oint f(z_1) g(z_2) \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &- \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint \oint f(z_1) g(z_2) \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1) \eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2) \eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_1} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &- \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint \oint f(z_1) g(z_2) \\ &\times \left[ \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)) \left( \frac{\partial^2 \log \left[ \frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1))}{(z_2 b(z_2) - z_1 b(z_1))} \right]}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \right) \right] dz_1 dz_2 \\ (4.9) \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= 1 + \gamma_2 z s(z) \\ \tilde{b}(z) &= 1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z) \\ q(z) &= 1 - \gamma_2 \int \frac{b^2(z) dH(t)}{(t/z - b(z))^2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z) \\ &= \frac{\tilde{b}(z)}{1 - \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}} \left( \tilde{b}(z)(\tilde{b}(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)) \right) - \tilde{b}(z) \gamma_1 (2z\tilde{b}(z) - (1 - \gamma_1)) \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{[t - (\tilde{b}(z)(\tilde{b}(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)))]^2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z) &= -\frac{1-c_1}{z} + c_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z) \\
B(z) &= \Psi^2(z) \left[ -\tilde{\omega}(z)N(z)(1-\delta(z)) + \frac{1}{1+\delta(z)}N(z) + \xi(z)\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi^2(z) \right. \\
(4.11) \quad &+ \left. z^2\delta^2(z) \left( \xi^2(z) - \delta(z)N(z) \left( z - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{1+\delta(z)} + 1 \right) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$N(z) = \frac{\xi'(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\omega}(z) = z^2\xi(z) + \frac{1-\gamma_1}{1+\delta(z)}\Psi^{-1}(z).$$

Here the integrals are taken over an arbitrary positively oriented contour which contains the interval  $[0, r]$ , moreover the contours in (4.9) are non-overlapping.

There are substantial differences between the CLT derived here and the recent results in Zheng et al. (2017). In particular the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  does not possess the usual properties of the covariance matrix under normality anymore. Indeed, the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$  given  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  is a non-central Wishart distribution, while the unconditional distribution is defined by a very complicated integral expression. As a consequence  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  can be interpreted as a conditionally non-central Fisher matrix, while Zheng et al. (2017) considered a rescaled Fisher matrix. In general, the CLT presented in Zheng et al. (2017) is constructed for studying the asymptotic power of the test for the equality of two population covariance matrices. In contrast, the CLT derived in Theorem 3 is used to investigate the power of the test for block-diagonality, i.e.,  $H_0 : \Sigma_{12} = \mathbf{O}$ .

It follows from the proof of Theorem 2 that

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbf{W} \stackrel{d}{\leq} 2\left(\frac{1}{p_1}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top + \mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^\top\right),$$

where  $n\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^\top \sim \mathcal{W}_{p-p_1}(n, \mathbf{R})$  and all entries of  $\mathbf{X}$  are independent and standard normally distributed. Consequently the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  will asymptotically be smaller than

$$2\left((1 + \sqrt{\gamma_1})^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})(1 + \sqrt{c_1})^2\right)$$

and the quantity  $r$  defined in (4.7) is an upper bound for the limiting spectrum of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ .

This observation is quite important for controlling the tail estimates of the extreme eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ , which play a vital role for the application of the Cauchy's integral formula (5.19) at the end of the proof of Theorem 3. The proof of the following result is given in the appendix.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let  $l_r > r$ , where  $r$  is given in (4.7), then*

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \quad \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}) > l_r) = o(n^{-k}).$$

Although, the limiting mean and variance presented in Theorem 3 are very difficult to calculate in a closed form even for simple cases, there are several important implications of Theorem 3.

REMARK 1 (Eigenvectors). Going through the proof of Theorem 3 one can see that Lemma 1 in Section 5 reveals an interesting though quite expected fact that the resulting asymptotic distributions depend neither on the eigenvectors of the non-centrality matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$  nor on the eigenvectors of the matrix  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1/2}$  for the normally distributed data. Loosely speaking, without loss of generality (w.l.g.), we can restrict ourselves to the case when  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are diagonal matrices, which simplifies the simulations in a remarkable way.

REMARK 2 (Generalizations and simplifications). The non-central Fisher matrix in our case arises only conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  where the non-centrality matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$  is random in our framework. As a consequence Theorem 3 generalizes the result of Yao (2013), where a deterministic non-centrality matrix was considered. Moreover, all the asymptotic quantities including  $\delta(z)$  are expressed in a more convenient form, like,  $\delta(z) = \gamma_1 m_H(z)$ . Finally, the expression of the bias term  $B(z)$  is significantly simplified which makes it possible to do numerical computations more efficiently and to investigate the results of Theorem 3 deeper in the future.

REMARK 3 (Finite rank alternatives). Combining Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 one observes that finite rank alternatives with a bounded spectrum have no influence on the asymptotic power of the tests, because the asymptotic means and variances under the null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis coincide. Indeed, assuming that the matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  has a finite rank, say  $k$ ,



and a bounded spectrum we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_{F^{\mathbf{R}}}(z) &= \int \frac{dF^{\mathbf{R}}(t)}{t-z} = \frac{1}{p-p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} \frac{1}{\lambda_i(\mathbf{R})-z} \\ &= \frac{1}{p-p_1} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\lambda_i(\mathbf{R})-z} - \frac{p-p_1-k}{p-p_1} \frac{1}{z} \rightarrow -\frac{1}{z}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows that  $m_G(z) = -\frac{1}{z}$ , and therefore  $G$  is the distribution function of the Dirac measure concentrated at the point 0. Consequently we obtain  $\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z) = -1/z$  and the third summands in (4.8) and in (4.9) vanish, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{t^2}{(c_1 + t\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z))^3} dG(t) &= \int \frac{t^2}{(c_1 + t\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z))^3} \delta_0(t) d(t) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial^2 \log \left[ \frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1)}{z_2 - z_1} \right]}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} &= \frac{m'_{\tilde{H}}(z_1) m'_{\tilde{H}}(z_2)}{(\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2))^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)^2} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $z, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^+$ . The other summands in (4.8) and in (4.9) do not depend on the eigenvalues of matrix  $\mathbf{R}$ , which reflects the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  via  $\Sigma_{12}$ , thus, they are expected to be equal to the corresponding quantities under the null hypothesis  $H_0$  given in Theorem 1. Consequently, all tests based on a linear spectral statistic cannot detect the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  if the matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  has no large eigenvalues.

On the other hand, if  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})$  is an increasing function of the dimension  $p - p_1$  the spectrum of  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})$  is not bounded and Theorem 3 is not applicable. Although we have no theoretical result in this case we expect that the power of the tests will be an increasing function of  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})$ . These properties have been verified numerically by means of a simulation study.

REMARK 4 (Full rank alternatives). As we have already mentioned, the formulas in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 are very complex, which makes it difficult to calculate the power functions of the considered tests in an analytic form. For instance, we need to solve the system of three equations in Theorem 2 which leads to the cubic equation already for  $m_H(z)$  even in the simple case  $\mathbf{R} = \rho^2 \mathbf{I}$ . On the other hand, the whole system in Theorem 2 simplifies to a quadratic equation under the null hypothesis  $H_0$ . Nevertheless, we believe that these results may be useful for future investigations of the power of the considered tests on the block diagonality of the covariance matrix. For example, one may consider the numerical approximations discussed in Zheng et al. (2017).




FIGURE 7. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.0325]$ .

To illustrate these remarks and comments, we present a comparison of the power of the different tests under consideration by means of a small simulation study. In order to demonstrate the results in a clear way we assume for simplicity that  $\Sigma_{11} = \Sigma_{22} = \sigma \mathbf{I}$  which yields

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{1}{\sigma}(\sigma \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\sigma} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{12})^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{12} (\sigma \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\sigma} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{12})^{-1/2}.$$

Note that the spectrum of matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is the same as that of the matrix  $\Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{12} (\sigma^2 \mathbf{I} - \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{12})^{-1}$ . First, we take  $\Sigma_{12}$  as a rank 1 matrix with all components equal to  $\sigma_{12} \in [0, 1.3]$  (equicorrelation) and in order to assure positive definiteness of  $\Sigma$  in that range we choose  $\sigma = 40$ . Note that if  $\sigma_{12}$  varies in the interval  $[0, 1.3]$  the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \sigma_{12}/\sigma$  will change in the interval  $[0, 0.0325]$ . Further, we increase the rank of  $\Sigma_{12}$  by setting some of its elements to zero (sparsifying). The empirical rejection probabilities of the proposed tests in the case of rank 1 alternatives are given in Figure 7.

For the sake of comparison we also included the trace criterion recently proposed by Jiang et al. (2013), the test introduced by Yamada et al. (2017), which is based on an empirical distance between the full and a block diagonal covariance matrix; and the test suggested by Yang and Pan (2015) built on the sum of the canonical correlations coefficients. Note that there exists a regularized and a non-regularized version of the latter test. In general, the statistic of Yang and Pan (2015) is defined by the sum of eigenvalues of the matrix  $(\mathbf{S}_{22} + t\mathbf{I}_{p-p_1})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{12}$  for some  $t \geq 0$ . Thus, in case  $t = 0$  this test is equivalent to the sum of canonical correlation coefficients. Moreover, the test of Jiang et al. (2013) and Yang and Pan (2015) coincide for  $t = 0$  because the matrix  $\mathbf{S}_{22}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{21} \mathbf{S}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{12}$  can be written in form  $\mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1} (\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1})^{-1}$  under  $H_0$  (see, e.g., Yao et al. (2015) Section 8.5.1). Thus, in order to visualize difference between them we take  $t = 10$  and  $t = 40$  for

the test proposed by [Yang and Pan \(2015\)](#). Further, the simulations showed that taking larger  $t$  will lead only to a slight increase of power in the case where  $p_1$  is not equal to  $p - p_1$ . Nevertheless, it must be mentioned that the regularized test is applicable even in the case  $p - p_1 > n$  while all of other considered tests need both  $p_1 < n$  and  $p - p_1 < n$ .

Figure 7 justifies our theoretical findings, i.e., none of the tests can detect the alternatives for  $\rho \in [0, 0.01]$  (the power function in this region is basically flat and close to the nominal level 0.05). On the other hand, if the correlation is greater than 0.01, then all of the tests gain power. For  $p_1 = 30$  (case of equal blocks) all test are powerful enough to reject  $H_0$  if the correlation is greater than 0.03. These results are in accordance with the discussion in Remark 3, because in the considered scenario the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is given by

$$\frac{p_1(p - p_1)\rho^2}{1 - p_1(p - p_1)\rho^2}.$$

Thus, if the correlation coefficient  $\rho$  is close to  $1/\sqrt{p_1(p - p_1)}$  we will get a spike (note that  $1/\sqrt{p_1(p - p_1)} \approx 0.0333$  if  $p_1 = 30, p = 60$ ). Moreover, here we have a clear winner - the Lawley-Hotelling's (LH) trace criterion. The test of [Yamada et al. \(2017\)](#) and Wilk's test with the corrected likelihood ratio (LR) criterion are ranked on the second and third, respectively. The regularized test of [Yang and Pan \(2015\)](#) together with the trace criterion of [Jiang et al. \(2013\)](#) are on the fourth position, while the the Bartlett-Nanda-Pillai's (BNP) trace criterion shows the worst performance. Interestingly, the tests [Jiang et al. \(2013\)](#) and [Yang and Pan \(2015\)](#) can not be visually distinguished neither for  $t = 10$  nor for  $t = 40$ .

A similar ranking was observed for  $p_1 = 50$  with the difference of a decreasing power of all tests and a slight increase of power for [Yang and Pan \(2015\)](#) with respect to its benchmark for  $t = 0$ , i.e., [Jiang et al. \(2013\)](#). Note that Wilk's test and the LR test have the same power for  $p_1 = 50$ . In light of the previous findings obtained under the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , the case  $p_1 = 10$  is the most interesting one. Indeed, here we observe that Wilk's and the LR test are not reliable anymore (they either always (Wilk's) or never (LR) reject  $H_0$ ). On the other hand the other tests show a similar behaviour as in the case  $p_1 = 50$ . As before, the LH test is the most powerful in all three situations.




FIGURE 8. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.04]$  and sparsity level of 20%.




FIGURE 9. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 100$ , dimension  $p = 60$  and various values of  $p_1 = 50, 30, 10$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.06]$  and sparsity level of 50%.

In order to investigate the robustness of the tests we increase the sparsity of the matrix  $\Sigma_{12}$ , where 20% and 50% of the elements are set randomly to zero, while all other elements are still equal to  $\sigma_{12}$ . By this procedure we increase the probability that  $\Sigma_{12}$  has full rank. The results are summarized in Figures 8 and 9.

We observe a similar behaviour as in the non-sparse case (see Figure 7). The LH test and the test proposed in Yamada et al. (2017) show the best performance. The latter is slightly better than the LH test for the sparsity level 50%, while a superiority of the LH test could be observed for a sparsity level of 20%. Of course, by increasing the sparsity level we make the alternative hypothesis harder to detect. For this reason the non-sensitivity interval  $[0, 0.01]$  (the interval where the test is not sensitive to the alternative  $H_1$ ) is increased to  $[0, 0.02]$  and  $[0, 0.03]$  in case of 20% and 50% sparsity levels, respectively.

Moreover, in the supplementary material (see, Bodnar et al. (2018)) we have also investigated the performance of the different tests for  $p = 10$ ,

100, 200, 250, 290 and  $n = 300$  (see, Figures 10 - 14 in Appendix B of the supplementary material). Our findings still remain unchanged except for the case  $p = 290$ : here all tests have a substantial loss in power and the LH test does not keep the nominal level. Indeed, this is an expected result, because in the case  $p = 290$  and  $n = 300$  the ratio  $p/n$  is close to one, and the sample covariance matrix is a very unstable estimator.

As a conclusion, although the LH trace criterion is the most simple one among the linear spectral statistics of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  ( $f = id$ ), it seems to be the most robust and powerful test on the block diagonality of the large-dimensional covariance matrix. On the other hand the corrected LR and Wilk's criteria can not be recommended, if the size of the first block is much smaller than the size of the second one.

**REMARK 5.** A possible reason for the superior performance of the LH test are the specific alternatives considered in our numerical experiments. In particular results coincide with the findings in Pillai and Jayachandran (1967), where the LH test showed the best performance in the case, where the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12}$  are far apart. Thus, taking very sparse or other full rank alternatives could have an considerable impact on the dominance property of the LH test.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Professor Tailen Hsing and two anonymous referees for the valuable comments and remarks which have significantly improved the previous version of this paper. Additionally, we want to thank M. Stein who typed parts of this manuscript with considerable technical expertise. The work of H. Dette was supported by the DFG Research Unit 1735, DE 502/26-2.

## 5. Appendix: Proofs.

**Proof of Proposition 2:** Because  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  are positive semi-definite we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}) > l_r) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W})\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{T}^{-1}) > l_r) \\ (5.1) \quad &\leq \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W}) > l_r(1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2})^2) + o(n^{-k}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from inequality (1.9b) in Bai and Silverstein (2004). Furthermore, using this inequality again and (4.12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (5.2) \quad &\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W}) > l_r(1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2})^2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2\lambda_{\max}(1/p_1\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) + 2\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^\top) > l_r(1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2})^2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{\max}(1/p_1\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) > \frac{l_r}{2}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2})^2 - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R})(1 + \sqrt{c_1})^2\right) + o(n^{-k}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining (5.1), (5.2) and using (4.7) with  $l_r > r$  we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}) > l_r) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{\max}(1/p_1 \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) > (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_1})^2\right) + o(n^{-k}) = o(n^{-k}),$$

where the last equality follows again from (1.9a) of [Bai and Silverstein \(2004\)](#).  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2:** Since  $(n-p_1)\mathbf{T} \sim W_{p-p_1}(n-p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1})$ ,  $p_1 \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{S}_{11} \sim W_{p-p_1}(p_1, \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}, \mathbf{\Omega}_1)$  with  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1 = \mathbf{\Omega}_1(\mathbf{S}_{11}) = \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{11} \sim W_{p_1}(n, \Sigma_{11})$ , and  $\mathbf{T}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  we get the following stochastic representations for  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  expressed as<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W} &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{p_1} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}) (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} \\ \mathbf{T} &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{n-p_1} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, n-p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ , and  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  are mutually independent. Then, the stochastic representation of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1} &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{p_1} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}) (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{n-p_1} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{1/2} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality in distribution implies that the spectral distribution of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  is the same as the spectral distribution of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}$  with

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}) (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{1}{n-p_1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top.$$

From Theorem 2.1 of [Zheng et al. \(2015a\)](#) it holds that the Stieltjes transform of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}$  given  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} m_{F_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}}|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(z)$  converges to  $s_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(z)$  which satisfies the following equation

$$(5.3) \quad z s_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(z) = -1 + \int \frac{t dH(t)}{t - z(1 + \gamma_2 z s_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(z))},$$

where  $H(t) = H_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(t)$  is the limiting spectral distribution of the matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ , which is a deterministic function following Theorem 1.1 of [Dozier and Silverstein \(2007\)](#). Noting that the right hand-side of (5.3) does not depend on the

<sup>1</sup>Here we use the definition of the non-central Wishart distribution given by ([Muirhead, 1982](#), Definition 10.3.1).

condition  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$  and rewriting (5.3), we get the limiting spectral distribution of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ , which is equal to  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}$ , is given by  $s(z) = s_{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}}(z)$  expressed as

$$zs(z) = \int \frac{z\gamma_2(zs(z) + 1)dH(t)}{t - z(1 + \gamma_2zs(z))} = z(\gamma_2zs(z) + 1)m_H(z(\gamma_2zs(z) + 1)),$$

where (see Theorem 1.1 of Dozier and Silverstein (2007))

$$\begin{aligned} m_H(z) &= \int \frac{(1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))d\tilde{H}(t)}{t - (1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))[(1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))z - (1 - \gamma_1)]} \\ &= (1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))m_{\tilde{H}}((1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))[(1 + \gamma_1 m_H(z))z - (1 - \gamma_1)]) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\tilde{H}$  the limiting spectral distribution of

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{R}} &= 1/p_1 \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \\ &= c_{1,n}^{-1} 1/n \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

satisfying the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\tilde{H}}(z) &= \int \frac{(1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)zm_{\tilde{H}}(z))^{-1}dG(t)}{c_1^{-1}t - \frac{z}{1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)zm_{\tilde{H}}(z)}} \\ &= c_1^{-1}(1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)zm_{\tilde{H}}(z))^{-1} \\ &\quad \times m_G\left(\frac{c_1 z}{1 - (c - c_1) - (c - c_1)zm_{\tilde{H}}(z)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $G(t)$  is the limiting spectral distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{R} = \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2}$  which is deterministic as well.  $\square$

In the proof of Theorem 3 we make use of the following lemma which simplifies the conditions used in Theorem 2.2 of Zheng et al. (2015a) and is proved in Appendix B of the supplementary material (see, Bodnar et al. (2018)).

**LEMMA 1.** *Conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  the distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  solely depends on the eigenvalues of the non-centrality matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  and does not depend on the corresponding eigenvectors. Moreover, the unconditional distribution of the eigenvalues of matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  depends only on the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1} \Sigma_{21}$ .*

The results of Lemma 1 shows that both the unconditional distribution of the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  and its conditional distribution given  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  depend

only on the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  and of  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$ , respectively, for any fixed dimension  $p$  and sample size  $n$ . Consequently, without loss of generality both matrices  $\mathbf{\Omega}_1(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  and of  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$  can be taken as diagonal. These simplify the validation of the conditions present in Theorem 2.2.1 and Theorem 2.2.2 of Yao (2013).

**Proof of Theorem 3:** Throughout the proof of Theorem 3, we assume that the complex number  $z$  belongs to the arbitrary positively oriented contour  $\mathcal{C}$ , which contains the limiting support  $[0, r]$ . We consider

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & (p - p_1) (m_{F\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(z) - s_n(z)) \\ &= (p - p_1) (m_{F\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(z) - s_n^*(z)) + (p - p_1) (s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_n(z)$  and  $s_n^*(z)$  are unique roots of the following equations

$$(5.5) \quad z s_n(z) = -1 + \int \frac{tdH_n(t)}{t - z(1 + \gamma_{2,n} z s_n(z))}$$

$$(5.6) \quad z s_n^*(z) = -1 + \int \frac{tdF_n^{\mathbf{W}}(t)}{t - z(1 + \gamma_{2,n} z s_n^*(z))}$$

with  $\gamma_{2,n} = \frac{p-p_1}{n-p_1}$ . The symbol  $H_n$  denotes the discretized limiting distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$  with  $\gamma_2$  replaced by  $\gamma_{2,n}$  and  $F_n^{\mathbf{W}}$  stands for the empirical spectral distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$ .

Following the proof of Theorem 2.2 by Zheng et al. (2015a), we get that the first summand  $(p-p_1) (m_{F\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(z) - s_n^*(z))$  in (5.4) conditionally on the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  converges to a Gaussian process  $M_1(z)$  with the mean function

$$(5.7) \quad E(M_1(z)) = \frac{\gamma_2 b^3(z)}{z^2 q^2(z)} \int \frac{tdH(t)}{(t/z - b(z))^3} = \frac{1}{2} (\log(q(z)))'$$

and the covariance function

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} Cov(M_1(z_1), M_1(z_2)) &= 2 \frac{(z_1 b(z_1))' (z_2 b(z_2))'}{(z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2))^2} \\ &= 2 \frac{\partial \log((z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} b(z) &= 1 + \gamma_2 z s(z), \\ q(z) &= 1 - \gamma_2 \int \frac{b^2(z) dH(t)}{(t/z - b(z))^2} \end{aligned}$$



for  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  from  $\mathcal{C}$ . Since all quantities in (5.7)-(5.9) do not depend on the condition  $\mathbf{W}$ , we get that this is also the unconditional distribution and both summands in (5.4) are independent.

Next, we derive the asymptotic distribution of the second summand  $(p - p_1)(s_n^*(z) - s_n(z))$  in (5.4). Let

$$b_n^*(z) = 1 + \gamma_{2,n} z s_n^*(z) \quad \text{and} \quad b_n(z) = 1 + \gamma_{2,n} z s_n(z).$$

Then, by using the definition of the Stieltjes transform, (5.5), and (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (p - p_1)(s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)) \\ &= (p - p_1) \left( b_n^*(z) m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) - b_n(z) m_{H_n}(z b_n(z)) \right) \\ &= (p - p_1) (b_n^*(z) - b_n(z)) m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) \\ &+ (p - p_1) b_n(z) (m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) - m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n(z))) \\ &+ (p - p_1) b_n(z) (m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(z b_n(z))) \\ &= (p - p_1) \gamma_{2,n} z (s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)) m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) \\ &+ (p - p_1) b_n(z) \gamma_{2,n} z^2 (s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)) \int \frac{dF_n^{\mathbf{W}}(t)}{(t - z b_n^*(z))(t - z b_n(z))} \\ &+ (p - p_1) b_n(z) (m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(z b_n(z))). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & (p - p_1)(s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)) = (p - p_1) (m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(z b_n(z))) \\ & \times \frac{b_n(z)}{1 - \gamma_{2,n} z m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) - b_n(z) \gamma_{2,n} z^2 \int \frac{dF_n^{\mathbf{W}}(t)}{(t - z b_n^*(z))(t - z b_n(z))}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b_n(z)}{1 - \gamma_{2,n} z m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(z b_n^*(z)) - b_n(z) \gamma_{2,n} z^2 \int \frac{dF_n^{\mathbf{W}}(t)}{(t - z b_n^*(z))(t - z b_n(z))}} \\ & \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_{b,H}(z) = \frac{b(z)}{1 - \gamma_2 z m_H(z b(z)) - b(z) \gamma_2 z^2 \int \frac{dH(t)}{(t - z b(z))^2}} = \frac{b^2(z)}{q(z)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (5.9) and

$$(5.10) \quad \gamma_2 z b(z) m_H(z b(z)) = b(z) - 1.$$

Next, we derive the asymptotic distribution of  $(p - p_1)(m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(zb_n(z)))$ . It holds that

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & (p - p_1)(m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(zb_n(z))) \\ &= (p - p_1)(m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(zb_n(z))) \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.12) \quad + (p - p_1)(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(zb_n(z)))$$

where  $m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z)$  and  $m_{H_n}(z)$  are the unique solutions of the equations

$$(5.13) \quad \frac{m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z)}{(1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z))} = \int \frac{dF_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}(t)}{t - (1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z)) \left[ (1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z))z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}) \right]}$$

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{m_{H_n}(z)}{(1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n}(z))} = \int \frac{d\tilde{H}_n(t)}{t - (1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n}(z)) \left[ (1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n}(z))z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}) \right]},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = 1/p_1 \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{11} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2}$ ,  $\tilde{H}_n(t)$  stands for its discretized limiting spectral distribution, and  $F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}(t)$  is the empirical spectral distribution of  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ .

First, we consider the second summand in (5.12). Let

$$\tilde{b}_n^*(z) = 1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{b}_n(z) = 1 + \gamma_{1,n}m_{H_n}(z).$$

Similarly, using the definition of Stieltjes transform, (5.13) and (5.14) one can write

$$\begin{aligned} & (p - p_1)(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z) - m_{H_n}(z)) \\ &= (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n^*(z)m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) \\ &- (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n(z)m_{\tilde{H}_n}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) \\ &= (p - p_1)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z) - \tilde{b}_n(z))m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) \\ &+ (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n(z)\left[m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) - m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right)\right] \\ &+ (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n(z)\left[m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) - m_{\tilde{H}_n}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right)\right] \\ &= (p - p_1)\gamma_{1,n}(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z) - m_{H_n}(z))m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) \\ &+ (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n(z)\gamma_{1,n}\left(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z) - m_{H_n}(z)\right)(z(\tilde{b}_n^* + \tilde{b}_n) - (1 - \gamma_{1,n})) \\ &\times \int \frac{dF_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}(t)}{\left[t - (\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n})))\right] \left[t - (\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n})))\right]} \\ &+ (p - p_1)\tilde{b}_n(z)\left[m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right) - m_{\tilde{H}_n}\left(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (p - p_1)(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(z) - m_{H_n}(z)) \\
&= (p - p_1) \left[ m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) - m_{\tilde{H}_n}(\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) \right] \\
&\times \tilde{b}_n(z) \left( 1 - \gamma_{1,n} m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) - \tilde{b}_n(z) \gamma_{1,n} (z(\tilde{b}_n^* + \tilde{b}_n) - (1 - \gamma_{1,n})) \right) \\
&\times \int \frac{dF_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}(t)}{\left[ t - (\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) \right] \left[ t - (\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) \right]} \Big)^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{b}_n(z) \left( 1 - \gamma_{1,n} m_{F_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}}(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) - \tilde{b}_n(z) \gamma_{1,n} (z(\tilde{b}_n^* + \tilde{b}_n) - (1 - \gamma_{1,n})) \right) \\
&\times \int \frac{dF_n^{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}}(t)}{\left[ t - (\tilde{b}_n^*(z)(\tilde{b}_n^*(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) \right] \left[ t - (\tilde{b}_n(z)(\tilde{b}_n(z)z - (1 - \gamma_{1,n}))) \right]} \Big)^{-1} \\
&\xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z) \\
&= \frac{\tilde{b}(z)}{1 - \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(\tilde{b}(z)[\tilde{b}(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)]) - \tilde{b}(z) \gamma_1 (2z\tilde{b}(z) - (1 - \gamma_1)) \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{[t - (\tilde{b}(z)(\tilde{b}(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)))]^2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{b}(z)$  is given in (4.10).

The application of Lemma 1.1 in [Bai and Silverstein \(2004\)](#) proves that  $(p - p_1)(m_{H_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{H_n}(zb_n(z)))$  converges to a Gaussian process  $M_3(z)$  with the mean function

$$\mathbb{E}(M_3(z)) = \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(zb(z)) \frac{c_1^2 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^3(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-3} dG(t)}{(1 - c_1 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^2(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-2} dG(t))^2}$$

and the covariance function

$$\begin{aligned}
& Cov(M_3(z_1), M_3(z_2)) = 2\theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \theta_{\tilde{b}, \tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)) \\
&\times \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1))} \frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \frac{\partial}{\partial(z_2 b(z_2))} \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{(\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)))^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2))^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z) = -\frac{1-c_1}{z} + c_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z)$  and  $G(t)$  is the limiting spectral distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{R} = \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$ .

In order to derive the asymptotic distribution of the first summand in (5.11), we use the results in [Yao \(2013\)](#) to the conditional distribution of  $(p - p_1)(m_{F_n^{\mathbf{W}}}(zb_n(z)) - m_{F_n^{\mathbf{S}_{11}}}(zb_n(z)))$  given  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$ .

From the proof of Theorem 2, we know that the empirical spectral distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$  is the same as of  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$  given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1}} \mathbf{X} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1}} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1}} \mathbf{X} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1}} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \right)^\top.$$

with  $\mathbf{M} = \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{11}^{1/2}$ . Furthermore, following Lemma 1 it is enough to consider the case where  $\Sigma_{22.1}^{-1/2}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^T\Sigma_{22.1}^{-1/2}$  is diagonal and, consequently,  $\Sigma_{22.1}^{-1/2}\mathbf{M}$  is pseudo-diagonal.

Finally, in using that  $\mathbf{X}$  consists of i.i.d. entries which are normally distributed and applying the results of Section 2.2.2 in Yao (2013), we get that  $(p - p_1)(m_{F_n^W}(zb_n(z)) - m_{F_n^{S_{11}}}(zb_n(z)))$  converges to a Gaussian process  $M_2(z)$  with the mean function  $E(M_2(z))$  and  $Cov(M_2(z_1), M_2(z_2))$  given in the following lemma which is proved below the proof of the theorem.

LEMMA 2. *The random process  $(p - p_1)(m_{F_n^W}(zb_n(z)) - m_{F_n^{S_{11}}}(zb_n(z)))$  converges to a Gaussian process  $M_2(z)$  with the mean function  $E(M_2(z))$  and  $Cov(M_2(z_1), M_2(z_2))$  given by*

$$E(M_2(z)) = B(zb(z))$$

and the covariance function

$$Cov(M_2(z_1), M_2(z_2)) = 2 \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1) \eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2) \eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1)) \partial(z_2 b(z_2))}$$

which are independent of  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$ . The functions  $B(z)$ ,  $\delta(z)$ ,  $\Psi(z)$ ,  $\xi(z)$  and  $\eta(z)$  are given by (4.11), (4.3), (4.6), (4.5) and (4.4), respectively.

The proof of Lemma 2 can be found in Appendix B of the supplementary material (see, Bodnar et al. (2018)). Thus, merging the results for the independent asymptotic processes  $M_2(z)$  and  $M_3(z)$ , we get

$$(p - p_1)(s_n^*(z) - s_n(z)) \rightarrow \theta_{b,H}(z) (M_2(z) + M_3(z)) ,$$

i.e., converges to a Gaussian process with mean and covariance functions given by

$$\theta_{b,H}(z) \left( B(zb(z)) + \theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(zb(z)) \frac{c_1^2 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^3(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-3} dG(t)}{(1 - c_1 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^2(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-2} dG(t))^2} \right) \quad (5.15)$$

and

$$2\theta_{b,H}(z_1)\theta_{b,H}(z_2) \left[ \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1) \eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2) \eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1)) \partial(z_2 b(z_2))} + \theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)) \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1))} \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \frac{\partial}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1))} \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{(\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)))^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2))^2} \right) \right], \quad (5.16)$$

respectively. Remind that  $H$  is the asymptotic spectral distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  (and, thus, of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ ). Furthermore, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \theta_{b,H}(z_1)\theta_{b,H}(z_2) \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1)\eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2)\eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial(z_1 b(z_1))\partial(z_2 b(z_2))} \\
 &= \frac{b^2(z_1)}{q(z_1)(z_1 b(z_1))'} \frac{b^2(z_2)}{q(z_2)(z_2 b(z_2))'} \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1)\eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2)\eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \\
 (5.17) &= \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1)\eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2)\eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality in (5.17) follows from (5.10) and

$$\begin{aligned}
 q(z)(zb(z))' &= \left(1 - \gamma_2(b(z)z)^2 \frac{m'_H(zb(z))}{(zb(z))'}\right) (zb(z))' \\
 &= (zb(z))' - (zb(z))^2 \left(-\frac{1}{z^2} + \frac{(zb(z))'}{(zb(z))^2}\right) = b^2(z).
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \theta_{b,H}(z_1)\theta_{b,H}(z_2) \\
 & \times \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1 b(z_1)} \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2 b(z_2)} \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{(\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)))^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2))^2} \right) \\
 &= \frac{b^2(z_1)}{q(z_1)(z_1 b(z_1))'} \frac{b^2(z_2)}{q(z_2)(z_2 b(z_2))'} \frac{\partial^2 \log\left(\frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2)}\right)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \\
 (5.18) &= \frac{\partial^2 \log\left(\frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2)}\right)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

At last, combining the results (5.7), (5.8), (5.15), (5.16) together with (5.17) and (5.18) we get that the process  $(p - p_1)(m_{F\mathbf{WT}^{-1}}(z) - s_n(z))$  is asymptotically Gaussian with mean and covariance functions given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \text{dlog}(q(z)) + \theta_{b,H}(z) \\
 & \times \left( B(zb(z)) + \theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(zb(z)) \frac{c_1^2 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^3(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-3} dG(t)}{(1 - c_1 \int \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}^2(zb(z)) t^2 (c_1 + t \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(zb(z)))^{-2} dG(t))^2} \right) \\
 & \text{and} \\
 & 2 \left[ \frac{\partial^2 \log(z_1 b(z_1)\eta(z_1 b(z_1)) - z_2 b(z_2)\eta(z_2 b(z_2)))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \right. \\
 & \left. + \theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1))\theta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2)) \left( \frac{\partial^2 \log\left(\frac{\underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 b(z_1)) - \underline{m}_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 b(z_2))}{z_1 b(z_1) - z_2 b(z_2)}\right)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the process of interest  $(p - p_1)(m_{F\mathbf{WT}^{-1}}(z) - s_n(z)) = M_{1,n} + M_{2,n} + M_{3,n}$  forms a tight sequence (see, Bai and Silverstein (2004), Yao (2013) and

[Zheng et al. \(2015a\)](#)), the Cauchy integral formula leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.19) \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{p-p_1} f(\lambda_i) - (p-p_1) \int f(x) F_n(dx) \\
 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f(z) (p-p_1) (m_{F\mathbf{WT}^{-1}}(z) - s_n(z)) dz,
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_i$  is the  $i$ th eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{WT}^{-1}$  and  $f$  is an arbitrary analytic function with support containing the interval  $[0, r]$ , which itself contains the asymptotic spectrum of the matrix  $\mathbf{WT}^{-1}$ . The application of (5.19) to our process together with some elementary calculus lead to the result of the theorem.  $\square$

## TESTING FOR INDEPENDENCE OF LARGE DIMENSIONAL VECTORS APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

**Proof of Theorem 1.** The asymptotic properties of a centred version of (3.5) have been determined by Zheng (2012), who showed that for any functions  $f, g$ , which are analytic in an open region of the complex plane containing the interval  $[a, b]$ , the random vector

$$\left( (p - p_1) \int_0^\infty f(x) d(F_n(x) - F_n^*(x)), (p - p_1) \int_0^\infty g(x) d(F_n(x) - F_n^*(x)) \right)^\top$$

converges weakly to a Gaussian vector  $(X_f, X_g)^\top$  with means and covariances given by

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_f] &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f(z) d \log \left( \frac{\frac{1-c}{1-c_1} m_0^2(z) + 2m_0(z) + 2 - c/c_1}{\frac{1-c}{1-c_1} m_0^2(z) + 2m_0(z) + 1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f(z) d \log \left( \frac{1 - \frac{c-c_1}{1-c_1} m_0^2(z)}{(1 + m_0^2(z))^2} \right) \\ \text{Cov}[X_f, X_g] &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint \oint \frac{f(z_1)g(z_2)}{(m_0(z_1) - m_0(z_2))^2} dm_0(z_1) dm_0(z_2) \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here  $m_0(z) = \underline{m}_{\gamma_2}(-\underline{m}(z))$  with  $\underline{m}_{\gamma_2}(z) = -\frac{1-\gamma_2}{z} + \gamma_2 m_{\gamma_2}(z)$  and  $\underline{m}(z) = -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z} + \gamma_1 m(z)$ , where  $m(z)$  denotes the Stieltjes transform of the function (3.5) and  $m_{\gamma_2}(z)$  is the Stieltjes transformation of the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  under  $H_0$ . The integrals are taken over arbitrary positively oriented contour which contains the interval  $[a, b]$ . Note that this result is only applicable under the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , because under  $H_1$  the unconditional distribution of the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  is no longer a central Wishart distribution. Therefore further investigation are needed in this situation (see the proof of Theorem 2)

The distributions of the test statistics  $T_W$ ,  $T_{LH}$ , and  $T_{BNP}$  are obtained as special cases using the functions  $f_W(x) = \log(1+x)$ ,  $f_{LH}(x) = x$  and  $f_{BNP}(x) = \frac{x}{1+x}$ , respectively. Thus, we need to calculate the asymptotic

means, variances and the terms  $\int f(x)dF(x)$  in these cases. The asymptotic means and variances for  $f_W$  and  $f_{LH}$  can be deduced from Examples 4.1 and 4.2 in [Zheng \(2012\)](#) and we only need to find the corresponding quantities for  $f_{BNP}$ .

Let  $w$  and  $d$  be the positive solutions of the equation

$$(B.1) \quad |1 + hz|^2 + (1 - \gamma_2)^2 = |w + dz|^2$$

for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|z| = 1$  which also satisfy

$$w^2 + d^2 = h^2 + 1 + (1 - \gamma_2)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad wd = h$$

and, consequently, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \gamma_2)^2 &= (1 - d^2)(w^2 - 1), \\ (1 + h)^2 &= (w + d)^2 - (1 - \gamma_2)^2, \\ (1 - h)^2 &= (w - d)^2 - (1 - \gamma_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Further, without loss of generality<sup>1</sup> we assume that  $w > d$ .

In using that  $|1 + hz|^2 = (1 + hz)(h + z)/z$ ,  $|w + dz|^2 = (w + dz)(d + wz)$  and due to Corollary 3.2 of [Zheng \(2012\)](#), we get

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_{f_{BNP}}] &= \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{|1 + hz|^2 / (1 - \gamma_2)^2}{|1 + hz|^2 / (1 - \gamma_2)^2 + 1} \left[ \frac{1}{z - r^{-1}} + \frac{1}{z + r^{-1}} - \frac{2}{z + \gamma_2/h} \right] dz \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{|1 + hz|^2}{|w + dz|^2} \left[ \frac{1}{z - r^{-1}} + \frac{1}{z + r^{-1}} - \frac{2}{z + \gamma_2/h} \right] dz \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{(1 + hz)(h + z)}{(w + dz)(d + wz)} \left[ \frac{1}{z - r^{-1}} + \frac{1}{z + r^{-1}} - \frac{2}{z + \gamma_2/h} \right] dz \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{(1 + hz)(h + z)}{(w + dz)(d + wz)} \Big|_{z=r^{-1}} + \frac{(1 + hz)(h + z)}{(w + dz)(d + wz)} \Big|_{z=-r^{-1}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2 \frac{(1 + hz)(h + z)}{(w + dz)(d + wz)} \Big|_{z=-\gamma_2^2/h} \right] \\ &\quad + \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{2w} \frac{(1 + hz)(h + z)}{(w + dz)} \left[ \frac{1}{z - r^{-1}} + \frac{1}{z + r^{-1}} - \frac{2}{z + \gamma_2/h} \right] \Big|_{z=-d/w} \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>It holds that  $|w + dz|^2 = |d + wz|^2$  for  $|z| = 1$ .



Thus, after calculating the residuals we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[X_{f_{BNP}}] &= \lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{(1 + hr^{-1})(h + r^{-1})}{(w + dr^{-1})(d + wr^{-1})} + \frac{(1 - hr^{-1})(h - r^{-1})}{(w - dr^{-1})(d - wr^{-1})} \right. \\
 &\quad - 2 \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)(h - \gamma_2/h)}{(w - \gamma_2 d/h)(d - \gamma_2 w/h)} + 2 \frac{(1 - dh/w)(h - d/w)}{(w^2 - d^2)} \\
 &\quad \times \left. \left( -\frac{d/w}{(d/w)^2 - r^{-2}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_2/h - d/w} \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{B.2}$$

Taking now the limit  $r \downarrow 1$  in (B.2) we obtain the following result for the mean

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[X_{f_{BNP}}] &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{(1 + h)^2}{(w + d)^2} + \frac{(1 - h)^2}{(w - d)^2} \right] - \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)(h^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - \gamma_2)(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \\
 &\quad + \frac{(1 - d^2)(w^2 - 1)d^2(w^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \\
 &= \left( 1 - \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2(w^2 + d^2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2} \right) - \left( 1 + \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2 \gamma_2}{(w^2 - \gamma_2)(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2 d^2(w^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \\
 &= -\frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2(w^2 + d^2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2} - \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2 \gamma_2}{(w^2 - \gamma_2)(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \\
 &\quad + \left( \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2 \gamma_2(w^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2(d^2 - \gamma_2)} + \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2(w^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2} \right) \\
 &= \frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2}{(w^2 - d^2)^2} \left( -(d^2 + \gamma_2) - \gamma_2 \left[ \frac{(w^2 - d^2)^2 - (w^2 - \gamma_2)^2}{(w^2 - \gamma_2)(d^2 - \gamma_2)} \right] \right) \\
 &= -\frac{(1 - \gamma_2)^2 w^2 (d^2 - \gamma_2)}{(w^2 - d^2)^2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have for the variance

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{Var}[X_{f_{BNP}}] \\
 &= -\lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint_{|z_2|=1} \frac{(1 + hz_2)(h + z_2)}{(w + dz_2)(d + wz_2)} \oint_{|z_1|=1} \frac{(1 + hz_1)(h + z_1)}{(w + dz_1)(d + wz_1)(z_1 - rz_2)^2} dz_1 dz_2 \\
 &= -\lim_{r \downarrow 1} \frac{i}{\pi} \oint_{|z_2|=1} \frac{(1 + hz_2)(h + z_2)}{(w + dz_2)(d + wz_2)} \left( \frac{(1 + hz_1)(h + z_1)}{w(w + dz_1)(z_1 - rz_2)^2} \Big|_{z_1 = -\frac{d}{w}} \right) dz_2 \\
 &= -\frac{i}{\pi} \oint_{|z_2|=1} \frac{(1 + hz_2)(h + z_2)}{(w + dz_2)(d + wz_2)} \left( -\frac{dw(1 - d^2)(w^2 - 1)}{(w^2 - d^2)(d + wz_2)^2} \right) dz_2,
 \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[X_{f_{BNP}}] &= -\frac{h(1-\gamma_2)^2}{w^3(w^2-d^2)} \left[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_2^2} \frac{(1+hz_2)(h+z_2)}{(w+dz_2)} \Big|_{z_2=-d/w} \right] \\
&= -2 \frac{hd(w^2-1)(1-\gamma_2)^2}{w^3(w^2-d^2)^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{(w^2-1)d}{w^2-d^2} + \frac{d^2 w^2(1-d^2)}{(w^2-d^2)^2} \right] \\
&= 2 \frac{d^2(1-\gamma_2)^4}{w^2(1+d)(w^2-d^2)^4} (w^2(w^2+d) + d^3(w^2-1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Theorem 2.23 in [Yao et al. \(2015\)](#), the terms  $\int_b^b f(x) dF(x)$  can be calculated in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_b^b f(x) dF(x) \\
&= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} f\left(\frac{|1+hz|^2}{(1-\gamma_2)^2}\right) \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz,
\end{aligned}$$

where the interval  $[a, b]$  is the support of limiting spectral distribution  $F$  of the Fisher matrix  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  defined in (3.6). The function  $f_{LH}$  has already been considered in [Yao et al. \(2015\)](#), Example 2.25, that is  $s_{LH} = \int_b^b x dF(x) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma_2}$ . Next we determine the corresponding terms for  $f_W$  and  $f_{BNP}$  noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
s_W &= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{\log((1-\gamma_2)^{-2}|w+dz|^2) (1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz \\
&= -\log((1-\gamma_2)^2) + I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used again (B.1) and the terms  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{\log(w+dz)(1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz \\
I_2 &= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{\log(w+d\bar{z})(1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz.
\end{aligned}$$

A change of variables yields  $I_1 = I_2$  and we obtain (see [Yao et al. \(2015\)](#) for

detailed calculation)

$$\begin{aligned}
2I_1 &= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{\log(w+dz)(1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_1} \log(w-dh), & \gamma_1 \in (0,1) \\ 0, & \gamma_1 = 1 \\ -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_1} \log(w-d/h), & \gamma_1 > 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired representation of  $s_W$ . Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{BNP} &= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{(1+hz)(h+z)}{(w+dz)(d+wz)} \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{z(1+hz)(z+h)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz \\
&= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{4\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{z(w+dz)(d+wz)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} dz \\
&= -\frac{h^2(1-\gamma_2)}{2} \left( \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{hz(w+dz)(d+wz)(\gamma_2 z+h)} \Big|_{z=-\frac{\gamma_2}{h}} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{zw(w+dz)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} \Big|_{z=-\frac{d}{w}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(1-z^2)^2}{(w+dz)(d+wz)(\gamma_2 z+h)(\gamma_2+hz)} \Big|_{z=0} \right) \\
&= \frac{1-\gamma_2}{w^2-\gamma_2},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 1.** First, we note that this distribution is independent of  $\Sigma_{22,1}$  since the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  coincide with the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}$ , where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{T} \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2},$$

$\Sigma_{22,1}^{1/2}$  denotes the symmetric square root of the matrix  $\Sigma_{22,1}$ ;  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}} \sim W_{p-p_1}(n-p_1, \mathbf{I})$ ;  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}|\mathbf{S}_{11} \sim W_{p-p_1}(p_1, \mathbf{I}, \Omega_1(\mathbf{S}_{11}))$ ; and the random variables  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  and  $(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{S}_{11})$  are independent. Moreover, from the proof of Theorem 2, we obtain the stochastic representations

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22,1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{1}{n-p_1} \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^\top.$$

where  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, n-p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ , and  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  are mutually independent;  $\mathbf{M} = \Sigma_{21}(\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11}^{1/2}$  with  $\mathbf{S}_{11} = \Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11}(\Sigma_{11}^{1/2})^\top$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11} \sim W_{p_1}(n, \mathbf{I})$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{1/2}$  is the Cholesky root of the positive definite symmetric matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11}^{1/2}$  is the symmetric square root of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11}$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{11} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top$  with  $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p_1, n}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ .

**Case (a): conditional distribution:** Let

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{D}_{11} \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top$$

be the singular-value decomposition of the matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}$  where

- $\mathbf{D}_{11} = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  is a rectangular diagonal matrix with non-negative real numbers on the diagonal equal to the non-zero eigenvalues of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$  or of  $\mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \mathbf{M}$ ;
- $\mathbf{U}_{11} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  is the orthogonal matrix consisting of eigenvectors of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$ ;
- $\mathbf{P}_{11} = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{S}_{11})$  is the orthogonal matrix consisting of eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \mathbf{M}$ .

Since  $\mathbf{U}_{11}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_{11}$  are orthogonal it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{T}^{-1} &= \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{X} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}) (\mathbf{X} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top + \mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{D}_{11} \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top) \\ &\quad \times (\mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top + \mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{D}_{11} \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top)^\top \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{U}_{11} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{U}_{11} (\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{D}_{11}) \mathbf{P}_{11}^\top \mathbf{P}_{11} (\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{D}_{11})^\top \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{U}_{11} \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{U}_{11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues of this matrix coincide with the eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{D}_{11}) (\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{D}_{11})^\top \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{Y})^\top \right)^{-1},$$

where  $\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_{11} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{11}^\top \mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, n-p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$  since the matrix-variate standard normal distribution is invariant to orthogonal transformations. Hence, conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_{11}$  the distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1}$  depends only on the eigenvalues of the non-centrality matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1(\mathbf{S}_{11})$ .

**Case (b): unconditional distribution:** Similarly to case (a), let

$$\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^\top$$

be the singular-value decomposition of  $\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top$  where

- $\mathbf{D}$  is a rectangular diagonal matrix with non-negative real numbers on the diagonal equal to the non-zero eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{21}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$  or of  $\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top$ ;
- $\mathbf{U}$  is the orthogonal matrix consisting of eigenvectors of  $\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{21}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}$ ;
- $\mathbf{P}$  is the orthogonal matrix consisting of eigenvectors of  $\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top$ .

Since  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  are orthogonal we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}^{-1} &= \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top)) (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{21} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1/2})^\top (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top))^\top \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top + \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^\top (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top) \\ &\quad \times (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top + \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^\top (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top)^\top \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{U} (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P})) \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}))^\top \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{U} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{U}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues of this matrix coincide with the eigenvalues of

$$\frac{1}{p_1} (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z})^\top)) (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z})^\top))^\top \left( \frac{1}{n - p_1} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Y})^\top \right)^{-1},$$

where  $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ ,  $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p-p_1, n-p_1}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ , and  $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}_{p_1, n}(\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I})$ , since the matrix-variate standard normal distribution is invariant to orthogonal transformations. Hence, the unconditional distribution of the matrix  $\mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}^{-1}$  depends only on the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}} = \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{12} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \Sigma_{21}$ .

□

**Proof of Lemma 2.** Let

$$\begin{aligned} T_n(z) &= \left( \frac{1}{1 + \delta_n(z)} \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} - z(1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z)) \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right)^{-1} \\ \tilde{T}_n(z) &= \left( \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z)} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \mathbf{M} - z(1 + \delta_n(z)) \mathbf{I}_{p_1} \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_n(z)$  and  $\tilde{\delta}_n(z)$  are the unique solutions of the following system of equations

$$\delta_n(z) = \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr} \left( T_n(z) \right), \quad \tilde{\delta}_n(z) = \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr} \left( \tilde{T}_n(z) \right)$$

in the class of Stieltjes transforms of non-negative measures<sup>2</sup> with support in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .

The functions  $T_n(z)$  and  $\tilde{T}_n(z)$  are the deterministic approximations of the resolvents

$$Q_n(z) = \left( (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top - z \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right)^{-1},$$

$$\tilde{Q}_n(z) = \left( (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M})^\top (\mathbf{X} + \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}) - z \mathbf{I}_{p_1} \right)^{-1},$$

respectively, in the sense that

$$\frac{1}{p-p_1} \text{tr}(Q_n(z) - T_n(z)) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(\tilde{Q}_n(z) - \tilde{T}_n(z)) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

First, we find the connection between  $\delta_n(z)$  and the Stieltjes transform  $m_H(z)$ , where  $H$  is the limiting spectral distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$ . For that reason, we consider the asymptotic values of  $\delta_n(z)$  and  $\tilde{\delta}_n(z)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(z) &= \frac{p-p_1}{p_1} (1 + \delta_n(z)) \frac{1}{p-p_1} \text{tr} \left( \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} - z(1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z))(1 + \delta_n(z)) \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right)^{-1} \\ &= (1 + \delta_n(z)) \frac{p-p_1}{p_1} \int \frac{d\tilde{H}_n(t)}{t - z\eta_n(z)} \longrightarrow \delta(z) = (1 + \delta(z)) \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) \\ \tilde{\delta}_n(z) &= \frac{1}{p_1} (1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z)) \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1} \mathbf{M} - z(1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z))(1 + \delta_n(z)) \mathbf{I}_{p_1} \right)^{-1} \\ &= (1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z)) \frac{1}{p_1} \int \frac{d\tilde{H}_n(t)}{t - z\eta(z)} \longrightarrow \tilde{\delta}(z) = (1 + \tilde{\delta}(z)) m_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta_n(z)) \\ &= (1 + \tilde{\delta}(z)) \left( -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z\eta(z)} + \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\eta_n(z) = (1 + \delta_n(z))(1 + \tilde{\delta}_n(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(z) = (1 + \delta(z))(1 + \tilde{\delta}(z)).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>In fact,  $\delta_n$  is the Stieltjes transform of a measure with total mass equal to  $\frac{p-p_1}{p_1}$  while  $\tilde{\delta}_n$  is the Stieltjes transform of a measure with total mass equal to 1 (see, [Hachem et al. \(2012\)](#))

Equivalently, we have

$$\frac{\delta(z)}{1+\delta(z)} = \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\tilde{\delta}(z)}{1+\tilde{\delta}(z)} = m_{\underline{H}}(z\eta(z)) = -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z\eta(z)} + \gamma_1 m_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

which leads to

$$\tilde{\delta}(z) = -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z} + \delta(z). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We claim that in fact we have

$$\delta(z) = \gamma_1 m_H(z) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and, consequently,  $\tilde{\delta}(z) = -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z} + \gamma_1 m_H(z)$ . In order to prove (B.5), we plug  $\delta(z) = \gamma_1 m_H(z)$  into (B.3) and use (B.4). It leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_H(z)}{1+\gamma_1 m_H(z)} &= m_{\tilde{H}} \left( z[1+\gamma_1 m_H(z)] \left[ 1+\gamma_1 m_H(z) - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{z} \right] \right) \\ &= m_{\tilde{H}} \left( [1+\gamma_1 m_H(z)][z(1+\gamma_1 m_H(z)) - (1-\gamma_1)] \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly (4.1). From the uniqueness of the solution the claim (B.5) follows. Thus, in light of Theorem 2 we get as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(z) &\longrightarrow \gamma_1 m_H(z), \\ \tilde{\delta}_n(z) &\longrightarrow -\frac{1-\gamma_1}{z} + \gamma_1 m_H(z) = m_{\underline{H}}(z). \end{aligned}$$

For all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n(z) &= \left( 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}[T_n^2(z) \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2}]}{(1+\delta_n(z))^2} \right)^2 - z^2 \xi_n(z) \tilde{\xi}_n(z) \\ \Psi_n(z) &= \left( 1 - z \xi_n(z) - \frac{\frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr} \left( T_n^2(z) \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \right)}{(1+\delta_n(z))^2} \right)^{-1} \\ \omega_n(z) &= \frac{1}{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_1} z^2 \tilde{t}_{jj}^2 \\ \zeta_n(z) &= \frac{1}{p-p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p-p_1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^{p-p_1} (\mathbf{m}_k^\top T_n(z) \mathbf{m}_l)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with  $\tilde{t}_{jj}$  being the diagonal elements of the matrix  $\tilde{T}_n$  and  $\mathbf{m}_k$  - the  $k$ th column of matrix  $\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}$ , while

$$(B.6) \quad \xi_n(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(T_n(z_1)T_n(z_2)), \quad \tilde{\xi}_n(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(\tilde{T}_n(z_1)\tilde{T}_n(z_2))$$

and, obviously,  $\xi_n(z) \equiv \xi_n(z, z)$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_n(z) \equiv \tilde{\xi}_n(z, z)$ .

Next, we simplify the above expressions. In using (B.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{p - p_1}{p_1} \frac{(1 + \delta_n(z_1))(1 + \delta_n(z_2))}{p - p_1} \\ &\times \text{tr} \left( \left[ \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} - z_1 \eta_n(z_1) \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right]^{-1} \left[ \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} - z_2 \eta_n(z_2) \mathbf{I}_{p-p_1} \right]^{-1} \right) \\ &\longrightarrow \xi(z_1, z_2) = \gamma_1 (1 + \delta(z_1))(1 + \delta(z_2)) \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z_1 \eta(z_1))(t - z_2 \eta(z_2))} \\ &= \gamma_1 (1 + \delta(z_1))(1 + \delta(z_2)) \frac{m_{\tilde{H}}(z_1 \eta(z_1)) - m_{\tilde{H}}(z_2 \eta(z_2))}{z_1 \eta(z_1) - z_2 \eta(z_2)} \\ &= \frac{\delta(z_1) - \delta(z_2)}{z_1 \eta(z_1) - z_2 \eta(z_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of  $z_1 = z_2 = z$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n(z) &\longrightarrow \xi(z) = \gamma_1 (1 + \delta(z))^2 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z \eta(z))^2} \\ &= \gamma_1 \frac{m'_{\tilde{H}}(z \eta(z))}{z \eta'(z) + \eta(z)} (1 + \delta(z))^2 = \frac{\delta'(z)}{(z \eta(z))'}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (B.3) we get for  $\tilde{\xi}_n(z_1, z_2)$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}_n(z_1, z_2) &\longrightarrow \tilde{\xi}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\tilde{\delta}(z_1) - \tilde{\delta}(z_2)}{z_2 \eta(z_2) - z_1 \eta(z_1)} = (1 - \gamma_1) \frac{z_1 - z_2}{(z_1 \eta(z_1) - z_2 \eta(z_2)) z_1 z_2} + \frac{\delta(z_1) - \delta(z_2)}{z_1 \eta(z_1) - z_2 \eta(z_2)} \\ &= \frac{(1 - \gamma_1)}{z_1 z_2} \frac{z_1 - z_2}{z_1 \eta(z_1) - z_2 \eta(z_2)} + \xi(z_1, z_2) \\ \tilde{\xi}_n(z) &\longrightarrow \tilde{\xi}(z) = \frac{\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_1}{z^2} + \delta'(z)\right)}{(z \eta(z))'} = \frac{(1 - \gamma_1)}{z^2 (z \eta(z))'} + \xi(z). \end{aligned}$$

In using these results as well as

$$(B.7) \quad m'_{\tilde{H}}(z \eta(z)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z \eta(z))} = \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z \eta(z))^2} (z \eta(z))',$$

$$(B.8) \quad \gamma_1 m'_{\tilde{H}}(z \eta(z)) = \frac{\delta'(z)}{(1 + \delta)^2}$$



and applying

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} &= \frac{\delta'(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} \frac{1}{(z\eta(z))'} = \frac{\xi(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2}, \\ \gamma_1 \int \frac{td\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} &= \gamma_1 \int \frac{\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))} + \gamma_1 z\eta(z) \int \frac{\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} = \frac{\delta(z)}{1 + \delta(z)} + \frac{\xi(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} z\eta(z),\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_n(z) &\longrightarrow \Delta(z) = \left(1 - \gamma_1 \int \frac{t\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2}\right)^2 - z^2\xi(z)\tilde{\xi}(z) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - \frac{z\eta(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2}\xi(z)\right)^2 - z^2\xi(z)\tilde{\xi}(z) \\ \text{(B.9)} &= \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - z\xi(z) + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\right)^2 - z^2\xi^2(z) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{(z\eta(z))'}\xi(z).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the term  $(z\eta(z))'$  can be rewritten further as follows

$$\begin{aligned}(z\eta(z))' &= (z(1 + \delta(z))(1 + \tilde{\delta}(z)))' = \left(z(1 + \delta(z)) \left(1 + \delta(z) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{z}\right)\right)' \\ &= (z(1 + \delta(z))^2 - (1 - \gamma_1)(1 + \delta(z)))' = (1 + \delta(z))^2 + 2(1 + \delta(z))\delta'(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)\delta'(z) \\ &= (1 + \delta(z))^2 + 2(z\eta(z))'(1 + \delta(z))\xi(z)z - (1 - \gamma_1)(z\eta(z))'\xi(z),\end{aligned}$$

which yields to

$$\frac{1}{(z\eta(z))'} = \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - 2\xi(z)z + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\right)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_n^{-1}(z) &\longrightarrow \Psi^{-1}(z) = \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - \frac{z\eta(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2}\xi(z) - z\xi(z) \\ \text{(B.10)} &= \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - 2\xi(z)z + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z),\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly equal to  $(1 + \delta(z))/(z\eta(z))'$ . Now, (B.10) and (B.9) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(z) &= \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} - 2\xi(z)z + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\right) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{(z\eta(z))'}\xi(z) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\right) \Psi^{-1}(z) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z)\Psi^{-1}(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)}\Psi^{-1}(z). \\ \text{(B.11)}\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 1 we get that the matrices  $T_n(z)$  and  $\tilde{T}_n(z)$  could be chosen without loss of generality as diagonal matrices, which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_n(z) &= z^2 \frac{1}{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_1} \tilde{t}_{jj}^2 = z^2 \text{tr}(\tilde{T}_n^2(z)) \rightarrow z^2 \tilde{\delta}^2(z), \\ \zeta_n(z) &= \frac{1}{p - p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p-p_1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^{p-p_1} (\mathbf{m}_k^\top T_n(z) \mathbf{m}_l)^2 = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now, Theorems 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 by Yao (2013) reveal that  $M_{2,n}(z) = (p - p_1)(m_{F\mathbf{W}}(z) - m_{H_n}(z))$  converges to a Gaussian process  $M_2(z)$  with mean function and covariance function given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(M_2(z)) &= \frac{\Psi_n(z)}{\Delta_n(z)} \left( z^2 \tilde{\xi}_n(z) \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(T_n^3(z)) + \zeta_n(z) \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(T_n^3(z)) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{\frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} T_n^3(z))}{(1 + \delta_n(z))^2} \left( 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} T_n^2(z))}{(1 + \delta_n(z))^2} \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\omega_n(z)}{(1 + \delta_n(z))^2} \left( \frac{1}{p_1} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} T_n^3(z)) \xi_n(z) - \frac{1}{p_1^2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^\top \Sigma_{22 \cdot 1}^{-1/2} T_n^2(z)) \text{tr}(T_n^3(z)) \right) \right) \\ \text{Cov}(M_2(z_1), M_2(z_2)) &= 2 \frac{(z_1 \eta_n(z_1))' (z_2 \eta_n(z_2))'}{(z_1 \eta_n(z_1) - z_2 \eta_n(z_2))^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\eta_n(z) \rightarrow \eta(z)$ , we get that

$$\text{Cov}(M_2(z_1), M_2(z_2)) \rightarrow 2 \frac{\eta'(z_1) \eta'(z_2)}{(\eta(z_1) - \eta(z_2))^2} = 2 \frac{\partial \log(\eta(z_1) - \eta(z_2))}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(M_2(z)) &\rightarrow B(z) = \frac{\Psi(z)}{\Delta(z)} \left( z^2 \tilde{\xi}(z) \gamma_1 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} (1 + \delta(z))^3 + 2\gamma_1 \frac{\int \frac{td\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} (1 + \delta(z))^3}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} [\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi(z)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{z^2 \tilde{\delta}^2(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} \left( \gamma_1 \int \frac{td\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} (1 + \delta(z))^3 \xi_n(z) - \gamma_1^2 \int \frac{td\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} (1 + \delta(z))^5 \right) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where from (B.11) it follows that

$$\frac{\Psi(z)}{\Delta(z)} = (1 + \delta(z)) \Psi^2(z).$$

Because of (B.7), (B.8) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \int \frac{t d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))} &= 2 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} [(z\eta(z))^\top]^2 + \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} (z\eta(z))'' \\
&= 2 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} [(z\eta(z))']^2 + m'_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) \frac{(z\eta(z))''}{(z\eta(z))'} \\
&= 2 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} [(z\eta(z))']^2 + \gamma^{-1} \frac{\delta'(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} \frac{(z\eta(z))''}{(z\eta(z))'}, \\
\gamma_1 m''_{\tilde{H}}(z\eta(z)) &= \frac{\delta''(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} - 2 \frac{\delta'^2(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^3},
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\gamma_1 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} = \frac{\frac{\delta''(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} - 2 \frac{\delta'^2(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^3} - \frac{\delta'(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} \frac{(z\eta(z))''}{(z\eta(z))'}}{2(z\eta(z))'^2}.$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$\xi'(z) = \frac{\delta''(z)}{(z\eta(z))'} - \delta'(z) \frac{(z\eta(z))''}{(z\eta(z))'^2} = \frac{\delta''(z)}{(z\eta(z))'} - \xi(z) \frac{(z\eta(z))''}{(z\eta(z))'}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} &= \frac{\xi'(z)}{2(1 + \delta(z))^2 (z\eta(z))'} - \frac{\xi^2(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))^3} \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 + \delta(z))^3} \left( \frac{\xi'(z) \Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 \int \frac{t d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} &= \gamma_1 \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^2} + \gamma_1 z\eta(z) \int \frac{d\tilde{H}(t)}{(t - z\eta(z))^3} \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 + \delta(z))^2} \left( \xi(z) + \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right) \left( \frac{\xi'(z) \Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
B(z) &= (1 + \delta(z))\Psi^2(z) \left( \left( z^2\xi(z) + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\Psi^{-1}(z) \right) \left( \frac{\xi^\top(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \xi(z) + \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right) \left( \frac{\xi'(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right) \right) (\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi(z)) \\
&\quad + \frac{\omega(z)}{(1 + \delta(z))} \left( \xi(z) \left( \xi(z) + \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right) \left( \frac{\xi'(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (\delta(z) + \xi(z)(z(1 + \delta(z)) - (1 - \gamma_1))) \left( \frac{\xi'(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \right) \right) \\
&= (1 + \delta(z))\Psi^2(z) \left[ \tilde{\omega}(z)N(z) + \frac{2}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \xi(z) + \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right) N(z) \right) [\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi(z)] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\omega(z)}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \xi^2(z) - \delta(z)N(z) \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} + 1 \right) \right) \right] \\
&= (1 + \delta(z))\Psi^2(z) \left[ \tilde{\omega}(z)N(z) + \frac{2}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( -\tilde{\omega}(z)N(z) + \xi(z)(\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi(z)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + z \underbrace{\left( 2z\xi(z) - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\xi(z) - \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right)}_{-\Psi^{-1}(z)} N(z) + \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} N(z) + z\Psi^{-1}(z)N(z) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\omega(z)}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \xi^2(z) - \delta(z)N(z) \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} + 1 \right) \right) \right] \\
&= (1 + \delta(z))\Psi^2(z) \left[ \tilde{\omega}(z)N(z) \frac{\delta(z) - 1}{1 + \delta(z)} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \frac{1}{(1 + \delta(z))} N(z) + \xi(z) (\Psi^{-1}(z) + z\xi(z)) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\omega(z)}{1 + \delta(z)} \left( \xi^2(z) - \delta(z)N(z) \left( z - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)} + 1 \right) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$N(z) = \frac{\xi'(z)\Psi^{-1}(z)}{2} - \xi^2(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\omega}(z) = z^2\xi(z) + \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{1 + \delta(z)}\Psi^{-1}(z).$$

□

## References.

- Anderson, T. W. (2003). *Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Bai, Z., Jiang, D., Yao, J.-F., and Zheng, S. (2009). Corrections to LRT on large-dimensional covariance matrix by RMT. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:3822–3840.
- Bai, Z. D. and Silverstein, J. W. (2004). CLT for linear spectral statistics of large dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Annals of Probability*, 32:553–605.
- Bai, Z. D. and Silverstein, J. W. (2010). *Spectral Analysis of Large Dimensional Random Matrices*. Springer, New York.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *Annals of Statistics*, 36:199–227.




FIGURE 10. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 300$ , dimension  $p = 10$  and various values of  $p_1 = 8, 5, 4$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.2]$ .




FIGURE 11. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 300$ , dimension  $p = 100$  and various values of  $p_1 = 80, 50, 20$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.02]$ .




FIGURE 12. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 300$ , dimension  $p = 200$  and various values of  $p_1 = 160, 100, 40$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.019]$ .




FIGURE 13. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 300$ , dimension  $p = 250$  and various values of  $p_1 = 200, 125, 50$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.0095]$ .






FIGURE 14. Empirical power of different tests for block diagonality for sample size  $n = 300$ , dimension  $p = 290$  and various values of  $p_1 = 232, 145, 58$  as a function of the correlation coefficient  $\rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma}$  in  $[0, 0.00675]$ .

- Birke, M. and Dette, H. (2005). A note on testing the covariance matrix for large dimension. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 74:281–289.
- Bodnar, T., Dette, H., and Parolya, N. (2018). Supplement to "Testing for independence of large dimensional vectors". *Annals of Statistics*.
- Bodnar, T., Gupta, A. K., and Parolya, N. (2014). On the strong convergence of the optimal linear shrinkage estimator for large dimensional covariance matrix. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 132:215–228.
- Bodnar, T., Gupta, A. K., and Parolya, N. (2016). Direct shrinkage estimation of large dimensional precision matrix. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 146:223–236.
- Cai, T., Lui, W., and Luo, X. (2011). A constrained  $l_1$  minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106:594–607.
- Cai, T., Ren, Z., and Zhou, H. H. (2013). Optimal rates of convergence for estimating Toeplitz covariance matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 156(1):101–143.
- Cai, T. and Shen, X. (2011). *High-Dimensional Data Analysis, Volume 2, Frontiers of Statistics*. World Scientific, Singapore.
- Cai, T. and Zhou, H. (2012). Minimax estimation of large covariance matrices under  $l_1$  norm. *Statistica Sinica*, 22:1319–1378.
- Chen, S. X., Zhang, L.-X., and Zhong, P.-S. (2010). Testing high dimensional covariance matrices. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105:810–819.
- Devijver, E. and Gallopin, M. (2016). Block-diagonal covariance selection for high-dimensional Gaussian graphical models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, to appear.
- Dozier, R. B. and Silverstein, J. W. (2007). On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional information-plus-noise-type matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98:678–694.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2006). Statistical challenges with high dimensionality: feature selection in knowledge discovery.
- Fisher, R. A. (1939). The sampling distribution of some statistics obtained from non-linear equations. *Annals of Eugenics*, 9(3):238–249.
- Fisher, T. J., Sun, X., and Gallagher, C. M. (2010). A new test for sphericity of the covariance matrix for high dimensional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 101:2554–2570.
- Fujikoshi, Y., Himeno, T., and Wakaki, H. (2004). Asymptotic results of a high dimensional MANOVA test and power comparison when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society*, 34(1):19–26.
- Gupta, A. K. and Xu, J. (2006). On some tests of the covariance matrix under general conditions. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 58:101–114.
- Hachem, W., Kharouf, J., Najim, J., and Silverstein, J. W. (2012). A CLT for information-theoretic statistics of non-centered Gram random matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 1(2):1150010.
- Hyodo, M., Shutoh, N., Nishiyama, T., and Pavlenko, T. (2015). Testing block-diagonal covariance structure for high-dimensional data. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 69(4):460–482.
- Jiang, D., Bai, Z., and Zheng, S. (2013). Testing the independence of sets of large-dimensional variables. *Sci. China Math.*, 56(1):135–147.
- Jiang, T. and Yang, F. (2013). Central limit theorems for classical likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *Annals of Statistics*, 41:2029–2074.
- John, S. (1971). Some optimal multivariate tests. *Biometrika*, 58:123–127.
- Johnstone, I. (2006). High dimensional statistical inference and random matrices.
- Johnstone, I. M. (2001). On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 29:295–327.

- Johnstone, I. M. (2008). Multivariate analysis and Jacobi ensembles: Largest eigenvalue, Tracy-Widom limits and rates of convergence. *Annals of Statistics*, 36:2638–2716.
- Kakizawa, Y. and Iwashita, T. (2008). A comparison of higher-order local powers of a class of one-way MANOVA tests under general distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 99(6):1128–1153.
- Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2002). Some hypothesis tests for the covariance matrix when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *Annals of Statistics*, 30:1081–1102.
- Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2012). Nonlinear shrinkage estimation of large-dimensional covariance matrices. *Annals of Statistics*, 40:1024–1060.
- Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91.
- Mauchly, J. W. (1940). Significance test for sphericity of a normal N-variate distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 11:204–209.
- Muirhead, R. J. (1982). *Aspects of Multivariate Statistical Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Nagao, H. (1973). On some test criteria for covariance matrix. *Annals of Statistics*, 1:700–709.
- Pillai, K. C. S. and Jayachandran, K. (1967). Power comparisons of tests of two multivariate hypotheses based on four criteria. *Biometrika*, 54(1/2):195–210.
- Schott, J. R. (2007). Some high-dimensional tests for a one-way MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98(9):1825–1839.
- Wang, C., Pan, G. M., Tong, T. J., and Zhu, L. (2015). Shrinkage estimator of large dimensional precision matrix using random matrix theory. *Statistica Sinica*, 25:993–1008.
- Yamada, Y., Hyodo, M., Shutoh, N., and Nishiyama, T. (2017). Testing block-diagonal covariance structure for high-dimensional data under non-normality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 155:305–316.
- Yang, Y. and Pan, G. (2015). Independence test for high dimensional data based on regularized canonical correlation coefficients. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(2):467–500.
- Yao, J. (2013). Estimation and fluctuations of functionals of large random matrices. Telecom ParisTech, tel-00909521v1.
- Yao, J., Bai, Z., and Zheng, S. (2015). *Large Sample Covariance Matrices and High-Dimensional Data Analysis* (No. 39). Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Zheng, S. (2012). Central limit theorems for linear spectral statistics of large dimensional F-matrices. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 48(2):444–476.
- Zheng, S., Bai, Z., and Yao, J. (2017). CLT for eigenvalue statistics of large-dimensional general fisher matrices with applications. *Bernoulli*, 23(2):1130–1178.
- Zheng, Z., Bai, Z. D., and Yao, J. (2015a). CLT for linear spectral statistics of a rescaled sample precision matrix. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 04(04):1550014.
- Zheng, Z., Bai, Z. D., and Yao, J. (2015b). Substitution principle for CLT of linear spectral statistics of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices with applications to hypothesis testing. *Annals of Statistics*, 43:546–591.