

A test for the k sample Behrens-Fisher problem in high dimensional data

Mingxiang Cao^a, Junyong Park^{b,*}, Daojiang He^a

^a*School of Mathematics & Computer Science, Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241000, China*

^b*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maryland Baltimore County, 1000 Hilltop Circle, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA.*

Abstract

In this paper, the k sample Behrens-Fisher problem is investigated in high dimensional setting. We propose a new test statistic and demonstrate that the proposed test is expected to have more powers than some existing test especially when sample sizes are unbalanced. We provide theoretical investigation as well as numerical studies on both sizes and powers of the proposed tests and existing test. Both theoretical comparison of the asymptotic power functions and numerical studies show that the proposed test tends to have more powers than existing test in many cases of unbalanced sample sizes.

AMS 2010 subject classifications Primary 62H15; secondary 62E20

Keywords High dimensional data; Behrens-Fisher problem; Martingale central limit theorem; Asymptotic null and non-null distributions

1 Introduction

In many contemporary applications, high and ultrahigh dimensional data are increasingly available, such as molecular biology, genomics, fMRI, finance and transcriptomics. A common feature for high and ultrahigh dimensional data is that the data dimension is larger or much larger than the sample size, the so called “large p , small n ” phenomenon where p is the data dimension and n is the sample size. In high dimensional settings, classical methods may be invalid, or not applicable at all. Hence, there has been growing interest in developing testing procedures which are better suited to deal with statistical problems in high dimensional setting. Testing hypotheses in high dimension is one of important issues in high dimensional data which has attracted a great deal of attention in recent decades. In two sample testing in high dimension, there have been numerous studies such as [Bai and Saranadasa \(1996\)](#), [Srivastava et al. \(2008, 2009, 2013\)](#), [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#), [Aoshima and Yata \(2011\)](#), [Park and Ayyala \(2013\)](#), [Feng et al. \(2015\)](#), [Zhou and Kong \(2015\)](#), [Ma et al. \(2015\)](#), [Ghosh and Biswas](#)

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: junpark@umbc.edu (J.Y. Park).

(2016) and Zhao and Xu (2016). For multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), see Fujikoshi et al. (2004), Schott (2007), Srivastava et al. (2007), Cai and Xia (2014) and Cao and Xu (2015). More specifically, when there are k groups and $\mathbf{X}_{l1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{ln_l}$ represent $p \times 1$ random samples from the l th group with unknown mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and positive definite covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$, it is of interest to test

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\mu}_k \text{ versus } H_1 : H_0 \text{ is not true.} \quad (1)$$

In particular, when all covariance matrices are homogeneous such as $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$, testing (1) is known as MANOVA. On the other hand, Hu et al. (2015) and Cao (2014) recently proposed the same test statistic to test (1) when covariance matrices are not necessarily homogeneous. This is also known as the k sample Behrens-Fisher (BF) problem which does not require $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$. The homogeneity of covariance matrices is a strong condition in practice. In fact, it is not straightforward to verify the homogeneity of covariance matrices especially in high dimensional data. Therefore, unless there is any strong evidence supporting the homogeneity of covariance matrices, it is natural to allow different covariance matrices in practice.

The main goal of this paper is to propose a new test statistic in the k sample Behrens-Fisher problem. It will be shown that the proposed test behaves differently from existing test such as Hu et al. (2015) when sample sizes are unbalanced. We will discuss such differences between the proposed test and the test in Hu et al. (2015) through both theoretical and numerical comparisons under a variety of situations. We observe that the proposed test has some advantage in powers compared to Hu et al. (2015) in many cases situations through theoretical and numerical comparisons.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first presents conditions of statistical model. Some notations used throughout the paper are defined and assumptions are also announced for the theoretical study. In Section 3, we give the new test statistic and investigate its asymptotic behavior under H_0 and H_1 . Theoretical comparisons and numerical studies on the proposed test and the Hu's test are carried out in Section 4. Concluding remarks is presented in 5.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we give notations and the statistical model for the k sample BF problem. Some assumptions are also illustrated.

2.1 Notations

The following notations will be used in subsequent exposition. All vectors are column and \mathbf{M}^T denotes the transpose of \mathbf{M} . All vectors and matrices are bold-faced. For two sequences of real numbers $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists a constant c such that $|a_n| \leq c|b_n|$ holds for all sufficiently large n , and write $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$. For a random sequence Z_n and a random variable Z , $Z_n \xrightarrow{pr} Z$ and

$Z_n \xrightarrow{d} Z$ denote Z_n converges to Z in probability and in distribution, respectively, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_l$ and $\mathbf{S}_{l_{n_l}}$ be the sample mean vector and sample covariance matrix from the l th group for $l = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ be the pooled sample mean vector which is $\frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^k n_l} \sum_{l=1}^k n_l \mathbf{X}_l$. If we define $n_{l1} := [n_l/2] + 1$ and $n_{l2} := n_l - n_{l1}$ where $[x]$ is the integer part of x for $x \geq 0$, then $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{l_{n_{l1}}}$, $\mathbf{S}_{l_{n_{l1}}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{l_{n_{l2}}}$, $\mathbf{S}_{l_{n_{l2}}}$ stand for the sample mean vectors and covariances matrices of the first n_{l1} samples and the rest n_{l2} samples, respectively. We also define the pooled sample covariance denoted by

$$\mathbf{E}_1 = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} (\mathbf{X}_{li} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_l)(\mathbf{X}_{li} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_l)^\top \quad (2)$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_2 = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{l=1}^k n_l (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_l - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_l - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top. \quad (3)$$

Finally, we define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^k n_l \boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ as weighted mean vector and average mean vector of the population means $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$, respectively.

2.2 Model

We assume that random samples \mathbf{X}_{li} 's are generated from a factor model in multivariate analysis which are commonly used in many existing studies, for example, [Bai and Saranadasa \(1996\)](#), [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#). More formally, some moment conditions on the distributions of random samples \mathbf{X}_{li} are imposed as follows; for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n_l\}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we consider

$$\mathbf{X}_{li} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l \mathbf{Z}_{li} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_l \quad (4)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l$ is a $p \times r$ matrix for some $r \geq p$ such that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^\top = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l$ and $\{\mathbf{Z}_{li}\}_{i=1}^{n_l}$ are r -variate independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors with $E(\mathbf{Z}_{li}) = 0$ and $\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}_{li}) = \mathbf{I}_r$. Moreover, we assume $E(z_{lij}^4) = 3 + \gamma_l < +\infty$ and z_{lij} 's are independent for all $j = 1, \dots, r$; $i = 1, \dots, n_l$ and $l = 1, \dots, k$, where $\mathbf{Z}_{li} = (z_{li1}, \dots, z_{li r})^\top$.

2.3 Assumptions

We first state the main conditions which will be used in the proof of asymptotic results of our proposed test. The three conditions, (A1), (A2) and (A3) are as follows:

$$(A1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n_l/n = \lambda_l \in (0, 1) \text{ for } l = 1, \dots, k.$$

$$(A2) \quad (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) = o \left\{ n^{-1} \text{tr} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right)^2 \right\} \text{ for } l, s \in \{1, \dots, k\} \text{ as } n \text{ and } p \rightarrow \infty.$$

$$(A3) \quad \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s \Sigma_i \Sigma_j) = o \left\{ \text{tr}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \Sigma_i \right)^2 \right\} \text{ for } l, s, i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \text{ as } p \rightarrow \infty.$$

(A1) implies that all sample sizes have the same increasing rate except constant terms. (A2) is used in a local alternative for the power function of the proposed test and it is actually an extension of (3.3) in [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) to the case of multi-groups ($k \geq 2$). Similarly, (A3) can be seen as an extension of the condition (3.6) in [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) to the case of multi-groups.

3 Main results

In this section we present a new proposed test statistic and its asymptotic properties under the conditions (A1)–(A3).

3.1 The proposed test statistic

Our proposed test is motivated by [Schott \(2007\)](#) and “leave-one-out” idea of [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#). [Schott \(2007\)](#) tested the hypothesis (1) under MANOVA based on

$$T_S := \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_2) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_1). \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{E}_1 and \mathbf{E}_2 are defined in (2) and (3). The asymptotic normality of T_S was derived in [Schott \(2007\)](#), hence a test statistic was formulated by standardizing T_S with an asymptotically ratio-consistent estimator of its standard deviation. The main assumptions in [Schott \(2007\)](#) are as follows:

(A4) The random samples \mathbf{X}_{li} ’s come from normal model $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_l, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_l$ and $l = 1, \dots, k$.

(A5) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n \in (0, 1)$.

(A6) $0 < \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{2i})/p < \infty$ for $i = 1$ or 2 .

With (A4), the asymptotic results in [Schott \(2007\)](#) were derived under MANOVA which is the case of homogeneous covariance matrices under multivariate normality of data. (A5) means that the sample dimension p and sample size n have the same order and the total number of samples should be larger than the dimension p . However, our proposed test and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) need some implicit relationship between n and p through the condition (A3) rather than explicit restriction on n and p as in (A5). Under $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_k = \Sigma$, (A6) is a stronger condition than (A3) since (A3) is $\text{tr}(\Sigma^4) = o(\text{tr}^2(\Sigma^2))$ showing that (A6) implies (A3) through $\text{tr}(\Sigma^4)/\text{tr}^2(\Sigma^2) = p^{-1}\text{tr}(\Sigma^4)/p / \text{tr}^2(\Sigma^2)/p^2 = o(1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, considering all these, it is clear that (A4)–(A6) are stronger conditions than (A1)–(A3).

We modify T_S in (5) by removing the terms $\mathbf{X}_{li}^\top \mathbf{X}_{li}$ which is also done in [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) and get a test statistic denoted by T as follows:

$$T := \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{n - n_l}{n(n_l - 1)} \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_l} \mathbf{X}_{li}^\top \mathbf{X}_{lj} - \sum_{l \neq s}^k \frac{n_l n_s}{n} \overline{\mathbf{X}}_l^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}}_s. \quad (6)$$

It is worth pointing out that, for two sample BF problem, the statistic T is the same as [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) except a constant factor $n_1 n_2 / n$. Elementary derivation shows

$$\mathbb{E}(T) = \sum_{l=1}^k n_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ for $\lambda_l = n_l / n$. In [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#), their test statistic is based on a statistic, say T_H , of which the expected value is $\mathbb{E}(T_H) = \sum_{l=1}^k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \boldsymbol{\mu}_l$. The deviation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in (7) is weighted by the corresponding sample size n_l which can emphasize the deviations of populations with large sample sizes. On the other hand, T_H in [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) gives all equal weight to the deviations of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ from overall mean $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. This difference leads to different asymptotic powers of test statistics based on T and T_H .

We now propose a test statistic based on T in (6). It can be shown that the variance of T is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(T) &= \frac{2}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k n_l n_s \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \right\} + 4 \sum_{l=1}^k n_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \\ &= \sigma_T^2 + 4 \sum_{l=1}^k n_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where

$$\sigma_T^2 := \frac{2}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k n_l n_s \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \right\}.$$

Note that $\text{Var}(T) = \sigma_T^2$ under H_0 . From (A1) and (A2), we have

$$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) = o \left\{ n^{-1} \text{tr} \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \right)^2 \right\} \quad (9)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, k$ and by combining $\text{Var}(T)$ and (9), we obtain

$$\text{Var}(T) = \sigma_T^2 \{1 + o(1)\}.$$

In order to formulate a test procedure, we should give an asymptotically ratio-consistent estimator of σ_T . There are many different estimators proposed in existing studies. We adopt two different estimators which are stated in the following two lemmas.

The first one is based on [Aoshima and Yata \(2011\)](#) which is given in Lemma 3.1. It should be noted that the requirements for obtaining asymptotically ratio-consistent estimator of σ_T in [Aoshima and Yata \(2011\)](#) are different from (A1)-(A3). Our assumption on Σ_i 's in (A3) is weaker than those assumptions (A-iv and A-v) in [Aoshima and Yata \(2011\)](#).

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose we have the following estimator of σ_T^2*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_T^2 := \frac{2}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2)} + \sum_{l \neq s}^k n_l n_s \widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)} \right\},$$

then we have the ratio consistency of $\widehat{\sigma}_T^2$, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_T / \sigma_T \xrightarrow{pr} 1$$

where $\widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2)} := \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}} \mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})$ and $\widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)} := \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_l} \mathbf{S}_{sn_s})$ are asymptotically ratio-consistent estimators of $\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2)$ and $\text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)$, respectively, for $l \neq s$ and $l, s = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof See Appendix.

The other estimator of σ_T is the estimator used in [Bai and Saranadasa \(1996\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) which is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. ([Hu et al. \(2015\)](#)) *Suppose*

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_T^2 := \frac{2}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \widetilde{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2)} + \sum_{l \neq s}^k n_l n_s \widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)} \right\},$$

then

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_T / \sigma_T \xrightarrow{pr} 1$$

where

$$\widetilde{\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2)} = \frac{(n_l - 1)^2}{(n_l + 1)(n_l - 2)} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_l}^2) - \frac{1}{n_l - 1} \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{S}_{ln_l}) \right\}.$$

On the basis of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we propose two test statistics which are

$$\widehat{T}_1 := \frac{T}{\widehat{\sigma}_T} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_2 := \frac{T}{\widetilde{\sigma}_T}. \quad (10)$$

In the following section, we prove the asymptotic normality of the proposed tests in (10) and their asymptotic power functions.

3.2 Asymptotic distributions of the proposed test statistic

The following theorems establish the asymptotic normality of the new test statistic (10) under the H_0 and their power function under the H_1 , when data dimension p and data size n increase to infinity.

Theorem 3.1. *Under (A1), (A3) and H_0 , as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, $P(\hat{T} \geq \xi_\alpha) = \alpha + o(1)$, where ξ_α is the upper α quantile of standard normal distribution where \hat{T} is either \hat{T}_1 or \hat{T}_2 in (10).*

Proof See Appendix.

The following theorem shows the asymptotic power function of the proposed test.

Theorem 3.2. *Under (A1)-(A3) as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic power function of \hat{T} (\hat{T}_1 or \hat{T}_2) is*

$$P(\hat{T} \geq \xi_\alpha) = \Phi \left\{ -\xi_\alpha + \frac{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} n \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^k (1 - \lambda_l)^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k \lambda_l \lambda_s \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s)}} \right\} + o(1), \quad (11)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

Proof See Appendix.

Since MANOVA is a special situation of the k sample BF problem, we have the following two corollaries which are immediate results from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Corollary 3.1. *If $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \cdots = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$ and assumptions (A1) and (A3) hold, under the null hypothesis H_0 , as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, we get $P(\hat{T} \geq \xi_\alpha) = \alpha + o(1)$.*

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \cdots = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$ and assumptions (A1) and (A3) hold. Under the local alternative (A2), as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$P(\hat{T} \geq \xi_\alpha) = \Phi \left\{ -\xi_\alpha + \frac{n \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{2(k-1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^2)}} \right\} + o(1).$$

4 Theoretical comparisons and simulations

In this section, we provide theoretical comparisons between the proposed test and some existing test. For k sample BF problem, [Cao \(2014\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) construct test statistics via the same statistic

$$T_{CH} = (k-1) \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_l} \mathbf{X}_{li}^T \mathbf{X}_{lj} / n_l(n_l-1) - \sum_{l \neq s}^k \bar{\mathbf{X}}_l^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s,$$

which is an extension of the two sample test in [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) to the case of k samples. Depending on different estimators of variance of T_{CH} , different test statistics have been proposed. [Cao \(2014\)](#) used two different estimators of variance of T_{CH} . One is similar to that in [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#) and the other is the same as that in Lemma 3.1. On the other hand, [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) used the similar estimator to that in [Bai and Saranadasa \(1996\)](#). Under the assumptions similar to (A1)-(A3), [Cao \(2014\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) obtained the same asymptotic distribution of their test statistics, say $\hat{T}_{CH} = T_{CH} / \hat{\sigma}_{CH}$ where $\hat{\sigma}_{CH}$ represents the estimators of variance of T_{CH} considered in [Cao \(2014\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#), as follows:

$$P(\hat{T}_{CH} \geq \xi_\alpha) = \Phi \left\{ -\xi_\alpha + \frac{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} k n \sum_{l=1}^k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{(k-1)^2 \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l^{-2} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s} (\lambda_l \lambda_s)^{-1} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s)}} \right\} + o(1). \quad (12)$$

Since all tests in [Cao \(2014\)](#) and [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#) have the same asymptotic distribution, we use the test statistic in [Hu et al. \(2015\)](#), $\hat{T}_H := T_{CH} / \tilde{\sigma}$ where

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 2(k-1)^2 \sum_{l=1}^k \widetilde{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2)} / n_l(n_l-1) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k 2 \widetilde{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s)} / n_l n_s.$$

We provide numerical studies and theoretical comparisons between our proposed test statistic in (10) and \hat{T}_H in the following sections.

4.1 Theoretical comparisons

We first compare the power functions of the proposed test \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H when all sample sizes are the same, where \hat{T} is either \hat{T}_1 or \hat{T}_2 in (10). The following Corollary 4.1 states that \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H have the same asymptotic power under balanced model. This can be shown directly from (11) and (12).

Corollary 4.1. *The test statistics \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H have the same asymptotic power under balanced model which means each group has equal sample sizes.*

For more general cases such as unbalanced sample sizes, it is not easy to compare the asymptotic power functions of \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H . We compare all test statistics under simple and typical situations so that we can compare the power functions analytically. To obtain rough depiction, we assume $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_k$ for the following cases. We define the asymptotic relative efficiency (ARE) of \hat{T} to \hat{T}_H which is the ratio of two signal-to-noise ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) &:= \frac{E(\hat{T})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{T})}} \bigg/ \frac{E(\hat{T}_H)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{T}_H)}} \\ &= \frac{n \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{2(k-1)\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)}} \bigg/ \frac{kn \sum_{l=1}^k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{2\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)} \sqrt{(k-1)^2 \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l^{-2} + \sum_{l \neq s} (\lambda_l \lambda_s)^{-1}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

If the $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) > 1$, the asymptotic power of \hat{T} is larger than that of \hat{T}_H from (11) and (12).

Based on the ARE (13), we consider the following two representative cases:

- (i) $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k-1} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$. Without loss of generality, we set $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k-1} = \mathbf{0} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$. Then, we have

$$\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = \frac{\lambda_k(1 - \lambda_k)}{(k-1)\sqrt{k-1}} \sqrt{k(k-2) \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l^{-2} + \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l^{-1} \right)^2}.$$

From this, we see that $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ is larger than 1 if there exists at least one $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ such that λ_l is very small, for example λ_l is close to 0 for some $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. This is because the right hand side of $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ is unbounded as λ_l is close to 0 for at least one $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. Since $\sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l = 1$, it indicates that if λ_k is close to 1, then most of λ_l s for $1 \leq l \leq k-1$ are close to 0 which results in $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) > 1$. Furthermore, we can get another low bound of $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ such as $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) > k^2 \lambda_k(1 - \lambda_k)/(k-1)$ based on mean value and Jensen's inequality (Mitrinović et al. (1993)). The low bound depends on only λ_k and it shows that if $\lambda_k \in (1/k, (k-1)/k)$, then we have $k^2 \lambda_k(1 - \lambda_k)/(k-1) > 1$ regardless of configurations of all other λ_l for $1 \leq l \leq k-1$. This shows that as the number of groups (k) increases, the interval $(1/k, (k-1)/k)$ is getting wider, so \hat{T} is expected to have more power than \hat{T}_H as the number of groups (k) increases.

- (ii) As a second case, we assume all mean vectors have the same direction such that $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) = \tau_l(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)$ for $2 \leq l \leq k-1$ and some constants τ_l . For simplicity, we consider $k = 3$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. For $k = 3$, without loss of generality, we can assume

$\mu_3 \neq 0$, $\mu_1 = 0$ and $\mu_2 = \tau\mu_3$ with $\tau \neq 0$. From $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = (1 - \lambda_3)/2$ and , we have

$$\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = \frac{\tau^2 \lambda_3^{-1} + (\tau - 2)^2}{4\sqrt{2}(\tau^2 - \tau + 1)} \sqrt{9\lambda_3^2 + 1}.$$

For all $\tau (\neq 0)$, the equation $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = 1$ has a fixed solution $\lambda_3 = 1/3$. In addition to this solution, there are more solutions and we provide approximate solutions by numerical studies as follows:

- (a) The case of $\tau \in (0.009, 0.732] \cup [-2.732, -0.009]$: In this case, there are two solutions of $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = 1$ which are $(1/3, 1)$ and $(\lambda_3^0, 1)$, where $0 < \lambda_3^0 < 1/3$. Note that λ_3^0 depends on τ . If $\lambda_3 \in (\lambda_3^0, 1/3)$, $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) < 1$; otherwise $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) \geq 1$. This implies that \hat{T} has more powers than \hat{T}_H when $\lambda_3 \in [\lambda_3^0, 1/3]^c$. The left panel in Figure 1 shows this case.
- (b) The case of $\tau \in (0.724, 1.119] \cup (9.353, \infty) \cup (-\infty, -2.732]$: The solutions of $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = 1$ are $(1/3, 1)$ and $(\lambda_3^1, 1)$ with $\lambda_3^1 > 1/3$. The right panel in Figure 1 shows that λ_3^1 reaches 1 very rapidly when $\tau > 0.724$ and $\tau \neq 2$. We see that $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ is significantly larger than 1 when $\lambda_3 < 1/3$ while $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ is slightly less than 1 when $1/3 < \lambda_3 < \lambda_3^1$. This shows that \hat{T} has significantly larger powers than \hat{T}_H in most cases while \hat{T}_H can have slightly more powers; on the other hand, even when \hat{T}_H has more powers than \hat{T} , the difference is not that significant. This case is shown in the right panel in Figure 1.
- (c) The case of $\tau \in (1.119, 9.353]$: There is only one solution of the equation $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = 1$ which is $(1/3, 1)$. When λ_3 is less than $1/3$, $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) > 1$ which means that \hat{T} has larger powers than those of \hat{T}_H . Moreover, we see that $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ is increasing as λ_3 decreases. This case is shown in the left panel in Figure 2.
- (d) The case of $\tau \in (0, 0.009] \cup [-0.009, 0]$: The equation $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) = 1$ has only one solution $(1/3, 1)$. When λ_3 is more than $1/3$, $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H) > 1$ which illustrates \hat{T} has larger powers than those of \hat{T}_H . See the right panel in Figure 2 for this case.

To summarize, we see that the proposed test \hat{T} has potential to have more power than \hat{T}_H when sample sizes are highly unbalanced while \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H have the same asymptotic power from Corollary 4.1. . We provide numerical studies to demonstrate this point in the following section.




Fig. 1 $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ for $\tau = 0.2$ (the left) and $\tau = -25$ (the right).




Fig. 2 $\text{ARE}(\hat{T}, \hat{T}_H)$ for $\tau = 2$ (the left) and $\tau = 0.002$ (the right).

4.2 Simulations

As shown in Corollary 4.1, \hat{T} and \hat{T}_H have the same asymptotic power function for balanced sample sizes. Therefore, we conduct simulations only for unbalanced sample sizes to compare \hat{T} (\hat{T}_1 and \hat{T}_2) with \hat{T}_H . We set $k = 3$ and generate X_{lij} from the following two models.

- The first model: we consider “Two-dependence” moving average model

$$X_{lij} = \rho_{l1}Z_{lij} + \rho_{l2}Z_{l,i,j+1} + \rho_{l3}Z_{l,i,j+2} + \mu_{lj}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n_l$, $l = 1, 2, 3$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$, where Z 's are i.i.d. random variables distributed with centered $\chi^2(4)$ and $N(0, 1)$, respectively. ρ 's and μ 's are constants such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l = (\mu_{l1}, \dots, \mu_{lp})^T$. Moreover, ρ 's were generated independently from $U(2, 3)$ with $\rho_{11} = 2.1984$, $\rho_{12} = 2.5743$, $\rho_{13} = 2.1316$, $\rho_{21} = 2.8147$, $\rho_{22} = 2.9058$,

$\rho_{23} = 2.1270$, $\rho_{31} = 2.9134$, $\rho_{32} = 2.6324$ and $\rho_{33} = 2.0975$, and were kept fixed throughout the simulations. For power studies, population means are fixed as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = 0$, while the third mean vector consists of $[0.05 * p]$ components equal to δ and the others equal to zero where δ is related to the following standard parameter

$$\theta = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^3 (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})}{\sqrt{4 \sum_{l=1}^3 \lambda_l^{-2} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^3 (\lambda_l \lambda_s)^{-1} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s)}}. \quad (14)$$

- The second model: for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n_l\}$ and $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we consider

$$\mathbf{X}_{li} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l \mathbf{Z}_{li} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_l,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^2 = \mathbf{W}_l \boldsymbol{\Psi}_l \mathbf{W}_l$, $\mathbf{W}_l = \text{diag}(w_{l1}, \dots, w_{lp})$ with $w_{lj} = l - (j - 1)/p$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_l = (\psi_{ljk})$ with $\psi_{ljj} = 1$, $\psi_{ljk} = (-1)^{j+k} (0.05 * b_l)^{|j-k|^{0.1}}$ when $j \neq k$, where $b_1 = 2$, $b_2 = 1$ and $b_3 = 3$. In power simulation, we set $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = 0$, $-\boldsymbol{\mu}_3 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = (u_1, \dots, u_p)^T$, where $u_i = (-1)^i v_i$ with v_i 's are i.i.d. $U(0, a)$ which denotes uniform distribution with the support $(0, a)$.

We consider three cases for data dimensions and sample sizes.

- **Case 1** Let $p=50, 100, 200, 400, 800, 1000$ and $n_1 = 2m$, $n_2 = 3m$ and $n_3 = 5m$ with $m \in \{5, 10, 20\}$.
- **Case 2** Let $p=400$, $n_1 = n_2=10$, $n_3 = 80$ and $n_1 = n_2 = 15$, $n_3 = 70$, respectively.
- **Case 3** Let $p=400$, $n_1=10$, $n_2=20$, $n_3 = 70$ and $n_1 = 10$, $n_2 = 30$, $n_3 = 60$, respectively.

Empirical sizes and powers are computed under the nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$ with 5,000 replications. For the first model, the standard parameter θ in (14) is selected as 0 and 0.005 for size and power, respectively for **Case 1**. For the second model, a is taken as 0 and 0.2 for size and power, respectively in **Case 1**. For the two models, we also consider the cases of H_1 for different configurations of θ and a in **Case 2** and **Case 3**.

Table 1 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 1** under the first model.

p	n	sizes			powers		
		\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
50	50	0.0626	0.0594	0.0600	0.0896	0.0850	0.0808
	100	0.0564	0.0534	0.0584	0.0830	0.0810	0.0702
	200	0.0576	0.0570	0.0590	0.0830	0.0806	0.0760
100	50	0.0588	0.0546	0.0564	0.1218	0.1176	0.0936
	100	0.0630	0.0598	0.0494	0.1204	0.1178	0.1022
	200	0.0550	0.0544	0.0560	0.1282	0.1252	0.1054
200	50	0.0590	0.0562	0.0604	0.2190	0.2060	0.1604
	100	0.0528	0.0502	0.0548	0.2240	0.2150	0.1618
	200	0.0558	0.0552	0.0536	0.2224	0.2172	0.1664
400	50	0.0536	0.0492	0.0510	0.4848	0.4656	0.3394
	100	0.0612	0.0580	0.0604	0.4624	0.4536	0.3412
	200	0.0578	0.0556	0.0576	0.4870	0.4812	0.3524
800	50	0.0580	0.0522	0.0512	0.9146	0.9060	0.7688
	100	0.0600	0.0560	0.0572	0.9080	0.9040	0.7634
	200	0.0534	0.0514	0.0516	0.9106	0.9078	0.7778
1000	50	0.0552	0.0488	0.0478	0.9766	0.9732	0.8940
	100	0.0524	0.0500	0.0462	0.9776	0.9764	0.8994
	200	0.0550	0.0532	0.0534	0.9752	0.9746	0.9060

Table 2 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 1** under the second model.

p	n	sizes			powers		
		\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
50	55	0.0617	0.0557	0.0560	0.1782	0.1697	0.1573
	110	0.0602	0.0578	0.0572	0.2828	0.2774	0.2588
	220	0.0608	0.0594	0.0598	0.5153	0.5119	0.4848
100	55	0.0634	0.0608	0.0620	0.2276	0.2182	0.2023
	110	0.0660	0.0640	0.0658	0.4077	0.4002	0.3698
	220	0.0628	0.0622	0.0640	0.7933	0.7909	0.7705
200	55	0.0588	0.0550	0.0564	0.2838	0.2742	0.2556
	110	0.0614	0.0604	0.0604	0.5548	0.5484	0.5202
	220	0.0598	0.0588	0.0588	0.8710	0.8692	0.8566
400	55	0.0626	0.0610	0.0612	0.3494	0.3406	0.3226
	110	0.0644	0.0630	0.0636	0.6632	0.6596	0.6360
	220	0.0586	0.0580	0.0608	0.9424	0.9418	0.9328
800	55	0.0667	0.0658	0.0652	0.4122	0.4046	0.3780
	110	0.0628	0.0614	0.0610	0.7762	0.7734	0.7512
	220	0.0562	0.0554	0.0564	0.9928	0.9926	0.9912
1000	55	0.0574	0.0564	0.0554	0.4592	0.4516	0.4236
	110	0.0588	0.0578	0.0594	0.8406	0.8380	0.8212
	220	0.0566	0.0558	0.0571	0.9952	0.9952	0.9950

Table 3 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 2** under the first model.

θ	$p = 400, n = 100$					
	$n_1 = n_2 = 10, n_3 = 80$			$n_1 = n_2 = 15, n_3 = 70$		
	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
0	0.0572	0.0494	0.0500	0.0606	0.0564	0.0584
0.002	0.0840	0.0752	0.0670	0.0886	0.0814	0.0678
0.003	0.1408	0.1234	0.0850	0.1400	0.1304	0.0936
0.004	0.2358	0.2146	0.1242	0.2444	0.2350	0.1430
0.005	0.3990	0.3768	0.1884	0.4172	0.3994	0.2248
0.006	0.6042	0.5786	0.2630	0.6506	0.6316	0.3414
0.007	0.8098	0.7948	0.4140	0.8340	0.8242	0.5066
0.008	0.9324	0.9232	0.5828	0.9442	0.9390	0.6870
0.009	0.9840	0.9816	0.7376	0.9898	0.9882	0.8414

Table 4 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 2** under the second model.

a	$p = 400, n = 100$					
	$n_1 = n_2 = 10, n_3 = 80$			$n_1 = n_2 = 15, n_3 = 70$		
	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
0	0.0620	0.0560	0.0546	0.0546	0.0508	0.0516
0.05	0.0844	0.0756	0.0690	0.0816	0.0774	0.0732
0.10	0.1794	0.1640	0.1314	0.1540	0.1468	0.1380
0.15	0.3424	0.3254	0.2600	0.3812	0.3718	0.3456
0.20	0.5314	0.5110	0.4190	0.6314	0.6188	0.6086
0.25	0.8102	0.7954	0.7182	0.8066	0.7996	0.7902
0.30	0.9276	0.9178	0.8710	0.9646	0.9626	0.9552

Table 5 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 3** under the first model.

θ	$p = 400, n = 100$					
	$n_1 = 10, n_2 = 20, n_3 = 70$			$n_1 = 10, n_2 = 30, n_3 = 60$		
	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
0	0.0604	0.0507	0.0512	0.0538	0.0440	0.0508
0.002	0.0944	0.0826	0.0670	0.0974	0.0834	0.0698
0.003	0.1572	0.1402	0.0916	0.1850	0.1590	0.1034
0.004	0.2736	0.2510	0.1314	0.3290	0.2928	0.1476
0.005	0.4598	0.4318	0.2098	0.5628	0.5282	0.2548
0.006	0.6736	0.6462	0.3144	0.7990	0.7714	0.4034
0.007	0.8716	0.8554	0.4910	0.9458	0.9364	0.5934
0.008	0.9586	0.9526	0.6704	0.9902	0.9874	0.7566
0.009	0.9934	0.9922	0.8254	0.9996	0.9996	0.9002

Table 6 Empirical sizes and powers of \hat{T}_1 , \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_H in **Case 3** under the second model.

a	$p = 400, n = 100$					
	$n_1 = 10, n_2 = 20, n_3 = 70$			$n_1 = 10, n_2 = 30, n_3 = 60$		
	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H	\hat{T}_1	\hat{T}_2	\hat{T}_H
0	0.0554	0.0526	0.0516	0.0608	0.0588	0.0568
0.05	0.0836	0.0792	0.0762	0.0954	0.0942	0.0876
0.10	0.2226	0.2164	0.1928	0.2160	0.2132	0.1820
0.15	0.4210	0.4136	0.3666	0.4394	0.4352	0.3818
0.20	0.6726	0.6672	0.6236	0.6872	0.6816	0.6288
0.25	0.8964	0.8926	0.8660	0.9110	0.9082	0.8804
0.30	0.9754	0.9746	0.9638	0.9822	0.9814	0.9740

Tables 1-6 illustrate that the three tests can control the nominal size $\alpha = 0.05$. Especially, when p is larger than n , empirical sizes are closer to the nominal level. Furthermore, the test \hat{T}_1 and \hat{T}_2 have similar powers and they are more powerful than \hat{T}_H for Cases 1-3. According to our theoretical comparisons in the Section 4.1, we observed that \hat{T} tends to have more powers than \hat{T}_H when we assume homogeneous covariance matrices. Similarly, our numerical result shows that \hat{T} has more powers than \hat{T}_H even under inhomogeneous covariance matrices when sample sizes are unbalanced.

We also collect the information on the ratios $\widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2)}/\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2)$ and $\widetilde{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2)}/\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2)$, respectively. Without loss of generality, we here select $l = 1$ for different cases, where $p = 50, 200, 500$ and 1000 , and n_1 is from 10 to 160 with adding 30 each time, respectively. Table 7 reports the results of empirical averages and standard deviations of ratios, respectively. It shows that the proposed estimator of $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^2)$ owns much smaller bias than that in Hu et al. (2015) in all cases. Meanwhile, standard deviations of the new estimator are better than those of Hu's estimator in most cases.

Table 7 Empirical averages of $\widehat{\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)}/\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)$ (NEW) and $\widetilde{\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)}/\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)$ in Hu et al. (2015) with standard deviations in the parentheses, respectively.

p	n_1	New	HB	$\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)$
50	10	1.0807 (0.4031)	1.2045 (0.4650)	25000
	40	1.0850 (0.1575)	1.1211 (0.1682)	
	70	1.0852 (0.1147)	1.1059 (0.1194)	
	100	1.0849 (0.0958)	1.0998 (0.0986)	
	130	1.0858 (0.0853)	1.0974 (0.0872)	
	160	1.0828 (0.0738)	1.0921 (0.0751)	
200	10	1.0836 (0.3212)	1.2058 (0.3316)	100900
	40	1.0854 (0.0955)	1.1220 (0.0986)	
	70	1.0847 (0.0640)	1.1056 (0.0653)	
	100	1.0839 (0.0519)	1.0987 (0.0530)	
	130	1.0852 (0.0440)	1.0967 (0.0445)	
	160	1.0837 (0.0390)	1.0931 (0.0394)	
500	10	1.0773 (0.2930)	1.2029 (0.2947)	252700
	40	1.0861 (0.0747)	1.1220 (0.0756)	
	70	1.0832 (0.0482)	1.1040 (0.0482)	
	100	1.0837 (0.0366)	1.0987 (0.0367)	
	130	1.0841 (0.0311)	1.0955 (0.0313)	
	160	1.0840 (0.0272)	1.0932 (0.0273)	
1000	10	1.0846 (0.2868)	1.2045 (0.2822)	505700
	40	1.0843 (0.0675)	1.1209 (0.0673)	
	70	1.0845 (0.0407)	1.1054 (0.0405)	
	100	1.0843 (0.0312)	1.0991 (0.0309)	
	130	1.0844 (0.0258)	1.0957 (0.0256)	
	160	1.0840 (0.0217)	1.0933 (0.0215)	

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we propose a new test for k sample BF problem and provide the theoretical results and numerical studies. The new test procedure is modified from T_S in Schott (2007) under weaker conditions than those in Schott (2007) and the proposed test has the same asymptotic properties. The theoretical results illustrate that our proposed test has the same asymptotic power as that of T_H for the case of balanced sample sizes. The theoretical and numerical studies in this paper further show that our proposed test can control the nominal level and has larger powers than those of T_H in many cases of unbalanced sample sizes. It is expected that the proposed test can detect the H_1 more efficiently than T_H when sample sizes are unbalanced.

Acknowledgments

Cao's research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11526070, 11601008), Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation (No. 1508085QA11) and Doctor Startup Foundation of Anhui Normal University (No. 2016XJJ101), which facilitated the research visit of the first author to University of Maryland Baltimore County, USA. He's research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11201005).

Appendix

A Proof of Lemma 3.1

We only need to prove $\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})/\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) \xrightarrow{pr} 1$ because the proof of ratio-consistent estimator of $\text{tr}(\Sigma_l\Sigma_s)$ is similar.

Note that

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}}) = \frac{1}{(n_{l1}-1)(n_{l2}-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{l1}} (\mathbf{Z}_{li} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ln_{l1}})^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Gamma}_l (\mathbf{Z}_{li} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ln_{l1}})$$

where $\mathbf{U} := \sum_{j=n_{l1}+1}^{n_l} (\mathbf{X}_{lj} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{ln_{l2}})(\mathbf{X}_{lj} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{ln_{l2}})^T$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ln_{l1}}$ is the sample mean of $\mathbf{Z}_{l1}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_{ln_{l1}}$.

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})\right\} = \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2). \quad (15)$$

In order to prove the conclusion of Lemma 3.1, it is sufficient to prove

$$\text{Var}\left\{\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})\right\} = o\left\{\text{tr}^2(\Sigma_l^2)\right\}. \quad (16)$$

It is easy to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\left\{\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})\right\} &= \text{Var}\left\{\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})|\mathbf{U}]\right\} + \mathbb{E}\left\{\text{Var}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l1}}\mathbf{S}_{ln_{l2}})|\mathbf{U}]\right\} \\ &=: \frac{1}{(n_{l1}-1)^2(n_{l2}-1)^2}(\text{I} + \text{II}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{I} &= (n_{l1} - 1)^2 \text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{j=n_{l1}+1}^{n_l} (\mathbf{Z}_{lj} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ln_{l2}})^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l (\mathbf{Z}_{lj} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ln_{l2}}) \right\} \\
&= (n_{l1} - 1)^2 \left\{ \frac{\gamma(n_{l2} - 1)^2}{n_{l2}} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l)] + 2(n_{l2} - 1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^4) \right\} \\
&\leq (n_{l1} - 1)^2 \left\{ \frac{\gamma(n_{l2} - 1)^2}{n_{l2}} \text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) + 2(n_{l2} - 1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^4) \right\} \\
&= O(n^3) \text{tr}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{II} &= \text{E} \left\{ \frac{\gamma(n_{l1} - 1)^2}{n_{l1}} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l)] + 2(n_{l1} - 1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_l)^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{(n_{l1} - 1)(n_{l2} - 1)[\gamma(n_{l2} - 1)(2n_{l1} + \gamma n_{l1} - \gamma + n_{l1} n_{l2} - n_{l2}) + 2n_{l1} n_{l2}]}{n_{l1} n_{l2}} \text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^2) \\
&\quad + \frac{2(n_{l1} - 1)(n_{l2} - 1)(n_{l1} n_{l2} + \gamma(n_{l1} - 1))}{n_{l1}} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l^4) \\
&= O(n^3) \text{tr}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Equations (17) and (18) show that equation (16) holds. Thus, the proof of lemma is completed.

For convenience, let $\mathbf{C}_{j+\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} n_i} = \mathbf{X}_{lj}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n_l$ with $\sum_{i=1}^0 n_i = 0$, and

$$\eta_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{n - n_l}{n(n_l - 1)} \mathbf{C}'_i \mathbf{C}_j, & i, j \in \Lambda_l, l = 1, \dots, k, \\ -\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{C}'_i \mathbf{C}_j, & (i, j) \in \Lambda_l \times \Lambda_s, 1 \leq l < s \leq k, \end{cases}$$

where $\Lambda_l = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} n_j + 1, \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} n_j + 2, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^l n_j \right\}$ with $l = 1, \dots, k$.

Define further $D_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \eta_{ij}$, $F_m = \sum_{j=2}^m D_j$ and $\mathcal{C}_m = \sigma(\mathbf{C}_1, \dots, \mathbf{C}_m)$ which is the σ -field generated by $\mathbf{C}_1, \dots, \mathbf{C}_m$.

Combining \mathbf{C}_j , η_{ij} with D_j , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T &= 2 \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{\substack{j=2+ \\ m=1}}^{\sum_{m=1}^l n_m} \sum_{\substack{i=1+ \\ m=1}}^{j-1} \sum_{\substack{l-1 \\ m=1}}^{l-1} \eta_{ij} + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \sum_{s=l+1}^k \sum_{\substack{i=1+ \\ m=1}}^{\sum_{m=1}^l n_m} \sum_{\substack{j=1+ \\ m=1}}^{\sum_{m=1}^s n_m} \eta_{ij} \\
&= 2 \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \eta_{ij} = \sum_{j=2}^n D_j.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to prove our main results, the following lemmas are firstly given. Without loss of generality, we here assume that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \cdots = \boldsymbol{\mu}_k = 0$ in the process of proving lemmas.

Lemma A.1. $\{D_j, \mathcal{C}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is the sequence of zero mean and a square integrable martingale for all n .

Proof Firstly, we have $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{C}_n$, and $\{D_j, \mathcal{C}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is a square integrable sequence with zero mean. Hence, we only need to prove $E(F_m | \mathcal{C}_j) = F_j$ for $\forall m \geq j$.

Notice that $E(D_q | \mathcal{C}_j) = 0$ for $\forall q > j$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(F_m | \mathcal{C}_j) &= F_j + E\left(\sum_{q=j+1}^m D_q | \mathcal{C}_j\right) \\
&= F_j + \sum_{q=j+1}^m E(D_q | \mathcal{C}_j) = F_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, this completes the proof of Lemma A.1.

Lemma A.2. Under the assumptions of (A1) and (A3), as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, it gets

$$\sum_{j=2}^n E(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \xrightarrow{pr} \frac{1}{4} \sigma_T^2.$$

Proof For $\forall j \in \Lambda_l$,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) &= E\left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \eta_{ij}\right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{C}_{j-1}\right\} \\
&= n^{-2} E\left\{\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{C}_j^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \middle| \mathcal{C}_{j-1}\right\} = n^{-2} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1}, \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{H}_{j-1} = \sum_{\substack{i=1+ \\ s=1}}^{j-1} \sum_{\substack{l-1 \\ s=1}}^{l-1} \frac{n-n_l}{n_l-1} \mathbf{C}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s} \mathbf{C}_i.$$

If we define $G_l = \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} E(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1})$, then we get from (19)

$$\begin{aligned} E(G_l) &= n^{-2} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \left\{ \frac{(n - n_l)^2}{(n_l - 1)^2} \left(j - 1 - \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \right) \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) + \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s) \right\} \\ &= n^{-2} \left\{ \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{2(n_l - 1)} \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) + n_l \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Therefore,

$$E \left\{ \sum_{j=2}^n E(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \right\} = \sum_{l=1}^k E(G_l) = \frac{1}{4} \sigma_T^2.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(G_l^2) &= E \left\{ \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} E(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \right\}^2 = n^{-4} E \left\{ \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \right\}^2 \\ &= n^{-4} E \left\{ \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \left(\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \right)^2 + \sum_{j \neq h \in \Lambda_l} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{h-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{h-1} \right\} \\ &=: n^{-4} (\text{III} + \text{IV}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Further calculations result in

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \frac{\gamma n_l(n - n_l)^4}{2(n_l - 1)^3} \text{tr} \left\{ \Gamma_l^T \Sigma_l \Gamma_l \text{diag}(\Gamma_l^T \Sigma_l \Gamma_l) \right\} + \frac{n_l(2n_l - 1)(n - n_l)^4}{6(n_l - 1)^3} \{ 2\text{tr}(\Sigma_l^4) + \text{tr}^2(\Sigma_l^2) \} \\ &\quad + \gamma n_l \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr} \left\{ \Gamma_s^T \Sigma_l \Gamma_s \text{diag}(\Gamma_s^T \Sigma_l \Gamma_s) \right\} + n_l \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s^2 \{ 2\text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)^2 + \text{tr}^2(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s) \} \\ &\quad + n_l \sum_{s \neq h}^{l-1} n_s n_h \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s) \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_h) + 2n_l \sum_{s \neq h}^{l-1} n_s n_h \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s \Sigma_l \Sigma_h) \\ &\quad + \frac{n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s) \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) + \frac{2n_l(n - n_l)^2}{n_l - 1} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^3 \Sigma_s), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV} &= 2 \sum_{j < h \in \Lambda_l} E \left(\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{h-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{h-1} \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j < h \in \Lambda_l} E \left(\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \right)^2 + 4 \sum_{j < h \in \Lambda_l} E \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \left(\sum_{i=j}^{h-1} \frac{n - n_l}{n_l - 1} \mathbf{C}_i \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j < h \in \Lambda_l} E \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \Sigma_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \left(\sum_{i=j}^{h-1} \frac{n - n_l}{n_l - 1} \mathbf{C}_i \right)^T \Sigma_l \left(\sum_{i=j}^{h-1} \frac{n - n_l}{n_l - 1} \mathbf{C}_i \right) \right\} \\ &=: \text{V} + \text{VI} + \text{VII}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \frac{\gamma n_l(n_l - 2)(n - n_l)^4}{3(n_l - 1)^3} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_l) \right\} + \frac{n_l(n_l - 2)(n - n_l)^4}{6(n_l - 1)^2} \{ 2\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^4) \\
& + \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^2) \} + \gamma n_l(n_l - 1) \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s) \right\} \\
& + n_l(n_l - 1) \sum_{s \neq h}^{l-1} n_s n_h \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_h) + 2n_l(n_l - 1) \sum_{s \neq h}^{l-1} n_s n_h \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_h) \\
& + \frac{2n_l(n_l - 2)(n - n_l)^2}{3(n_l - 1)} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^2) + \frac{4n_l(n_l - 2)(n - n_l)^2}{3(n_l - 1)} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^3 \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \\
& + n_l(n_l - 1) \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s^2 \{ 2\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s)^2 + \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \} \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{VII} = \frac{n_l(n_l - 2)(n_l + 1)(n - n_l)^4}{12(n_l - 1)^3} \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^2) + \frac{n_l(n_l + 1)(n - n_l)^2}{3(n_l - 1)} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^2). \tag{25}$$

Thus by equations (20)-(25) and VI = 0, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(G_l) = & \frac{\gamma n_l(2n_l - 1)(n - n_l)^4}{6n^4(n_l - 1)^3} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_l) \right\} \\
& + \frac{\gamma n_l^2}{n^4} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s) \right\} \\
& + \frac{n_l(n_l^2 - n_l + 1)(n - n_l)^4}{3n^4(n_l - 1)^3} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^4) + \frac{2n_l^2}{n^4} \sum_{s \neq h}^{l-1} n_s n_h \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_h) \\
& + \frac{2n_l(2n_l - 1)(n - n_l)^2}{3n^4(n_l - 1)} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l^3 \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) + \frac{2n_l^2}{n^4} \sum_{s=1}^{l-1} n_s^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_s^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Gamma}_s) \right\} \leq \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{\Sigma}_s) \leq \text{tr}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \right)^2. \tag{26}$$

So, it easily gets, from (A1), (A3) and equation (26),

$$\text{Var}(G_l) = o(\sigma_T^4).$$

Lastly, via Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\text{Cov}^2(G_l, G_s) \leq \text{Var}(G_l)\text{Var}(G_s)$, we have

$$\text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{j=2}^n \mathbb{E}(D_j^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \right\} = \text{Var} \left(\sum_{l=1}^k G_l \right) = o(\sigma_T^4).$$

This completes the proof of lemma [A.2](#).

Now attentions are paid to proving the Lindeberg condition.

Lemma A.3. *Under the assumptions of [\(A1\)](#) and [\(A3\)](#), for $\forall \epsilon > 0$, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, it takes*

$$\sum_{j=2}^n \sigma_T^{-2} \mathbb{E} \{ D_j^2 I(|D_j| > \epsilon \sigma_T) | \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \} \xrightarrow{pr} 0.$$

Proof Firstly, it is easy to obtain

$$\sum_{j=2}^n \sigma_T^{-2} \mathbb{E} \{ D_j^2 I(|D_j| > \epsilon \sigma_T) | \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \} \leq \sum_{j=2}^n \epsilon^{-2} \sigma_T^{-4} \mathbb{E}(D_j^4 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}).$$

So, we only need to prove

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=2}^n \mathbb{E}(D_j^4 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \right\} = o(\sigma_T^4). \quad (27)$$

Let $K_l = \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \mathbb{E}(D_j^4 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1})$, then $\sum_{j=2}^n \mathbb{E}(D_j^4 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) = \sum_{l=1}^k K_l$. Further calculations can lead to

$$\begin{aligned} K_l &= n^{-4} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\mathbf{C}_j^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{C}_j)^2 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \right\} \\ &= n^{-4} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} \left\{ \gamma \text{tr} \left[\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l)^2 + (\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1})^2 \right\} \\ &\leq (3 + \gamma) n^{-4} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_l} (\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is based on $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l)^2 \leq (\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1})^2$ and

$$\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l) \right\} \leq \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}_l^T \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_l) = (\mathbf{H}_{j-1}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{H}_{j-1})^2.$$

According to equations [\(21\)](#) and [\(22\)](#), we get

$$\mathbb{E}(K_l) \leq (3 + \gamma) n^{-4} \text{III} = o(\sigma_T^4),$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=2}^n \mathbb{E}(D_j^4 | \mathcal{C}_{j-1}) \right\} = \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}(K_l) = o(\sigma_T^4).$$

Then the required result follows.

B Proof of Theorem 3.1

From Lemmas A.1-A.3, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{T}{\sigma_T} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we obtain

$$\widehat{T}_1 = \frac{T}{\sigma_T} \frac{\sigma_T}{\widehat{\sigma_T}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{T}_2 = \frac{T}{\sigma_T} \frac{\sigma_T}{\widehat{\sigma_T}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

from Slutsky's Theorem (Ferguson (1996)).

C Proof of Theorem 3.2

According to Lemmas A.1-A.3, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\frac{T - \mathbb{E}(T)}{\sigma_T} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(T)}{\sigma_T} - \frac{\frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l (\mu_l - \tilde{\mu})^\top (\mu_l - \tilde{\mu})}{\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^k (1 - \lambda_l)^2 \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k \lambda_l \lambda_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$P(\widehat{T} \geq \xi_\alpha) - \Phi \left\{ -\xi_\alpha + \frac{\frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l (\mu_l - \tilde{\mu})^\top (\mu_l - \tilde{\mu})}{\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^k (1 - \lambda_l)^2 \text{tr}(\Sigma_l^2) + \sum_{l \neq s}^k \lambda_l \lambda_s \text{tr}(\Sigma_l \Sigma_s)}} \right\} \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies the result is right.

References

- Aoshima, M. and Yata, K. (2011). Two-stage procedures for high-dimensional data. *Sequential Analysis*, **30**, 356-399.
- Cai, T. and Xia, Y. (2014). High-dimensional sparse MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **131**, 174-196.
- Cao, M. (2014). Tests for mean vectors in high dimensional k -sample with unequal covariance matrices[D]. *Beijing: Beijing Institute of Technology*. (in Chinese)
- Cao, M. and Xu, X. (2015). A test for MANOVA in high dimensional data. *Transactions of Beijing Institute of Technology*, **35**, 868-871. (in Chinese)
- Chen, S. and Qin, Y. (2010). A two-sample test of high dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 808-835.
- Bai, Z. and Saranadasa, H. (1996). Effect of high dimension: by an example of a two sample problem. *Statistica Sinica*, **6**, 311-329.
- Feng, L., Zou, C., Wang, Z. and Zhu, L. (2015). Two sample Behrens-Fisher problem for high-dimensional data. *Statistica Sinica*, **25**, 1297-1312.
- Ferguson, T.S. (1996). A course in large sample theory. Chapman & Hall.
- Fujikoshi, Y., Himeno, T. and Wakaki, H. (2004). Asymptotic results of a high dimensional MANOVA test and power comparisons when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *Journal of Japan Statistical Society*, **34**, 19-26.
- Ghosh, A. and Biswas, M. (2016). Distribution-free high-dimensional two-sample tests based on discriminating hyperplanes. *Test*, **125**, 525-547.
- Hu, J., Bai, Z., Wang, C. and Wang, W. (2015). On testing the equality of high dimensional mean vectors with unequal covariance matrices. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **67**, 1-23.
- Ma, Y., Lan, W. and Wang, H. (2015). A high dimensional two-sample test under a low dimensional factor structure. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **140**, 162-170.
- Mitrinović, D.S., Pečarić, J.E. and Fink, A.M. (1993). Classical and new inequalities in analysis. *Springer*, New York, pp. 9-16.
- Park, J. and Ayyala, D. (2013). A test for the mean vector in large dimension and small samples. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **143**, 929-943.
- Schott, J. (2007). Some high dimensional tests for a one-way MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **98**, 1825-1839.

- Srivastava, M. (2007). Multivariate theory for analyzing high dimensional data. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society*, **37**, 53-86.
- Srivastava, M. (2009). A test for the mean vector with fewer observations than the dimension under non-normality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **100**, 518-532.
- Srivastava, M. and Du, M. (2008). A test for the mean vector with fewer observations than the dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **99**, 386-402.
- Srivastava, M., Katayama, S. and Kano, Y. (2013). A two sample test in high dimensional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **114**, 349-358.
- Zhang, T., Guo J. and Zhou B. (2017). Linear hypothesis testing in high-dimensional one-way MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **155**, 200-216.
- Zhao, J. and Xu, X. (2016). A generalized likelihood ratio test for normal mean when p is greater than n . *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **99**, 91-104.
- Zhou, C. and Kong, X. (2015). Testing of high dimensional mean vectors via approximate factor model. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **167**, 216-227.