

Diagonal Likelihood Ratio Test for Equality of Mean Vectors in High-Dimensional Data

Zongliang Hu¹, Tiejun Tong^{2,*} and Marc G. Genton³

¹ College of Mathematics and Statistics, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518060, China

² Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong

³ Statistics Program, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology,
Thuwal 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia

*Email: tongt@hkbu.edu.hk

Abstract

We propose a likelihood ratio test framework for testing normal mean vectors in high-dimensional data under two common scenarios: the one-sample test and the two-sample test with equal covariance matrices. We derive the test statistics under the assumption that the covariance matrices follow a diagonal matrix structure. In comparison with the diagonal Hotelling's tests, our proposed test statistics display some interesting characteristics. In particular, they are a summation of the log-transformed squared t -statistics rather than a direct summation of those components. More importantly, to derive the asymptotic normality of our test statistics under the null and local alternative hypotheses, we do not need the requirement that the covariance matrices follow a diagonal matrix structure. As a consequence, our proposed test methods are very flexible and readily applicable in practice. Simulation studies and a real data analysis are also carried out to demonstrate the advantages of our likelihood ratio test methods.

Key Words: High-dimensional data, Hotelling's test, Likelihood ratio test, Log-transformed squared t -statistic, Statistical power, Type I error

1 Introduction

In high-dimensional data analysis, it is often necessary to test whether a mean vector is equal to another vector in the one-sample case, or to test whether two mean vectors are equal to each other in the two-sample case. One such example is to test whether two gene sets, or pathways, have equal expression levels under two different experimental conditions. Given the two normal random samples, $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_1} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n_2} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, one well-known method for testing whether their mean vectors are equal is Hotelling's T^2 test,

$$T^2 = \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^T S^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ are the sample mean vectors and S is the pooled sample covariance matrix. Hotelling's T^2 test is well-behaved and has been extensively studied in the classical low-dimensional setting. However, this classic test may not perform well or may not even be applicable to high-dimensional data with a small sample size. Specifically, it suffers from the singularity problem because the sample covariance matrix S is singular when the dimension is larger than the sample size.

To overcome the singularity problem in Hotelling's T^2 test, Bai and Saranadasa (1996) replaced the sample covariance matrix in (1.1) with the identity matrix, so that their test statistic is essentially the same as $(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^T (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})$. Following their method, Chen and Qin (2010) and Ahmad (2014) proposed some U -statistics for testing whether two mean vectors are equal. These test methods were referred to as the *unscaled Hotelling's tests* in Dong et al. (2016). As an alternative, Chen et al. (2011) and Li et al. (2016) proposed replacing the inverse sample covariance matrix S^{-1} with the regularized estimator $(S + \lambda I_p)^{-1}$ in Hotelling's test statistic, where I_p is the identity matrix and $\lambda > 0$ is a regularization parameter. Lopes et al. (2011) proposed a random projection technique to estimate the sample covariance matrix. Specifically, they replaced S^{-1} in Hotelling's test statistic with $E_R^{-1}\{R(R^T S R)^{-1} R^T\}$, where R is a random matrix of size $p \times k$ and $E_R(\cdot)$ is the expectation operator over the distribution. The random projection technique was further explored by, for example, Thulin (2014), Srivastava et al. (2016) and Wei et al. (2016). Dong et al. (2016) referred to the test methods in this category as the *regularized Hotelling's tests*.

In addition to the aforementioned methods, replacing the sample covariance matrix with a diagonal sample covariance matrix is another popular approach to improving Hotelling's T^2 test. In particular, Wu et al. (2006), Srivastava and Du (2008) and Srivastava (2009)

considered the *diagonal Hotelling's test statistic*:

$$T_{\text{diag},2}^2 = \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^T \{\text{diag}(S)\}^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}). \quad (1.2)$$

Recently, Srivastava et al. (2013), Feng et al. (2015) and Gregory et al. (2015) also considered the diagonal Hotelling's tests under the assumption of unequal covariance matrices. Their test statistics essentially follow the diagonal structure in (1.2), $(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^T \{\text{diag}(S_1)/n_1 + \text{diag}(S_2)/n_2\}^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})$, where S_1 and S_2 are two sample covariance matrices. Park and Ayyala (2013) modified the diagonal Hotelling's test statistic (2) based on the idea of leave-out cross validation. Dong et al. (2016) proposed a shrinkage-based Hotelling's test that replaced the diagonal elements of the sample covariance matrix in (1.2) with some improved variance estimates. To summarize, the diagonal Hotelling's tests are popular in practice for several reasons. First, since a diagonal matrix is always invertible for nonzero variance estimates, the singularity problem in the classic test is circumvented. Second, the diagonal Hotelling's tests are scale transformation invariant tests. As suggested by Park and Ayyala (2013), the scale transformation invariant tests usually provide a better performance than the orthogonal transformation invariant tests including the unscaled Hotelling's tests and the regularized Hotelling's tests, especially when the variances of the signal components are small and the variances of the noise components are large. Last but not least, a diagonal covariance matrix assumption is also popular in the high-dimensional literature, e.g., in Dudoit et al. (2002), Bickel and Levina (2004) and Huang et al. (2010).

Note that Hotelling's test statistic originated from the likelihood ratio test in the classical setting when p is smaller than n . Recently, researchers have also applied the likelihood ratio test method to analyze high-dimensional data. For instance, Jiang and Yang (2013) and Jiang and Qi (2015) tested mean vectors and covariance matrices of normal distributions using the likelihood ratio test method, under the setting that p is smaller than n but in a way that allows $p/n \rightarrow 1$. Zhao and Xu (2016) proposed a generalized high-dimensional likelihood ratio test for the normal mean vector by a modified union-intersection method. Städler and Mukherjee (2017) provided a high-dimensional likelihood ratio test for the two-sample test based on sample splitting.

Following the diagonal matrix structure and the likelihood ratio test method, we propose a new test framework for high-dimensional data with a small sample size. Unlike the existing diagonal Hotelling's tests, in which the sample covariance matrix S was directly replaced with the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(S)$, our likelihood ratio test statistics are a summation of the log-transformed squared t -statistics, rather than a direct summation of those components. When the sample size is small, the standard t tests may be unreliable due to the unstable

variance estimates. As a remedy, our proposed tests use the log-transformed squared t -statistics and, consequently, provide more stable test statistics so that type I error rates are better controlled for small sample sizes. We demonstrate by simulation that our proposed tests are robust in terms of controlling the type I error rate at the nominal level in a wide range of settings.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose the diagonal likelihood ratio test method for the one-sample case. The asymptotic distributions of the test statistics are also derived as p tends to infinity under the null and local alternative hypotheses, respectively. In Section 3, we propose the diagonal likelihood ratio test method for the two-sample case and derive some asymptotic results, including the asymptotic null distribution and power. In Section 4, we conduct simulation studies to evaluate the proposed tests and to compare them with existing methods. We apply the proposed tests to a real data example in Section 5, and conclude the paper by providing a short summary and some future research directions in Section 6. The technical proofs are provided in the Appendices.

2 One-Sample Test

2.1 Diagonal LRT statistic

To illustrate the main idea of the diagonal likelihood ratio test method, we consider the one-sample test for a mean vector. Let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \dots, X_{ip})^T, i = 1, \dots, n$, be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors from the multivariate normal distribution $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the population mean vector and Σ is the population covariance matrix. In the one-sample case, for a given vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0$, we test the hypothesis,

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_0. \quad (2.1)$$

Our new likelihood ratio test statistic is based on the assumption that the covariance matrix follows a diagonal matrix structure, i.e., $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2)$. In Appendix A.1, we show that the likelihood ratio test statistic for hypothesis (2.1) is

$$\Lambda_n = \frac{\max_{\Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma)}{\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)} = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 \right\}^{n/2}}{\prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \mu_{0j})^2 \right\}^{n/2}},$$

where $\bar{X}_j = \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}/n$ are the sample means, and $s_j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2/(n-1)$ are the sample variances. Taking the log transformation, we derive that

$$-2\log(\Lambda_n) = n \sum_{j=1}^p \log[1 + n(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})^2/\{(n-1)s_j^2\}].$$

This suggests that the new test statistic is

$$T_1 = n \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{n(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})^2}{(n-1)s_j^2} \right\} = n \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left(1 + \frac{t_{nj}^2}{\nu_1} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where $t_{nj} = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})/s_j$ are the standard t -statistics for the one-sample test with $\nu_1 = n-1$ degrees of freedom. We refer to the diagonal likelihood ratio test statistic in (2.2) as the DLRT statistic.

Under the null hypothesis, it is easy to verify that $n \log(1 + t_{nj}^2/\nu_1) = t_{nj}^2 + O_p(1/n)$. Further, we have $T_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p t_{nj}^2 + O_p(p/n)$. So if p increases at such a rate that $p = o(n)$, then we have the following approximation:

$$T_1 \approx \sum_{j=1}^p t_{nj}^2 = n(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^T \{\text{diag}(s_1^2, \dots, s_p^2)\}^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0).$$

Thus, as a special case, our proposed DLRT statistic reduces to the diagonal Hotelling's test statistic in the one-sample case to which a direct summation of the squared t -statistics is applied.

2.2 Null distribution

For ease of notation, let $U_{nj} = n \log(1 + t_{nj}^2/\nu_1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$. In this section, we derive the asymptotic null distribution of the proposed DLRT statistic. To derive the limiting distribution, we first present a lemma; the proof is in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 1. *For the gamma function $\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$, let $\Psi(x) = \Gamma'(x)/\Gamma(x)$ be the digamma function. Also, let $D(x) = \Psi\{(x+1)/2\} - \Psi(x/2)$, $m_1 = nD(\nu_1)$, and $m_2 = n^2\{D^2(\nu_1) - 2D'(\nu_1)\}$.*

(a) *For any $n \geq 2$, we have $E(U_{nj}) = m_1$ and $\text{Var}(U_{nj}) = m_2 - m_1^2$.*

(b) *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $E(U_{nj}) \rightarrow 1$ and $\text{Var}(U_{nj}) \rightarrow 2$.*

Despite T_1 has an additive form of log-transformed squared t -statistics, our derivation of its limiting distribution needs to account for the dependence among $\{U_{n1}, \dots, U_{np}\}$. For example, the scaling parameter of T_1 may need to incorporate the information of $\text{Cov}(U_{n,j}, U_{n,j+k})$. We therefore need additional assumptions when establishing the asymptotic normality of the DLRT statistic. Let $\alpha(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \sup\{\|P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)\| : A \in \mathcal{F}, B \in \mathcal{G}\}$ be the strong mixing coefficient between two σ fields, \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , that measures

the degree of dependence between the two σ fields. We also assume that the following two regularity conditions hold for the sequence $\{U_{nj}, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$:

(C1) Let $\alpha(r) = \sup\{\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1^k, \mathcal{F}_{k+r}^p) : 1 \leq k \leq p - r\}$, where $\mathcal{F}_a^b = \mathcal{F}_{a,n}^b = \sigma\{U_{nj} : a \leq j \leq b\}$. Assume that the stationary sequence $\{U_{nj}\}$ satisfies the strong mixing condition such that $\alpha(r) \downarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, where \downarrow denotes the monotone decreasing convergence.

(C2) Suppose that $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \alpha(r)^{\delta/(2+\delta)} < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, and for any $k \geq 0$, $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p-k} \text{Cov}(U_{nj}, U_{n,j+k}) / (p - k) = \gamma(k)$ exists.

The following theorem establishes the asymptotic distribution of the DLRT statistic under the null hypothesis.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$. If the sequence $\{U_{nj}\}$ is stationary and satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), then under the null hypothesis, we have for any fixed $n \geq 2$,*

$$\frac{T_1 - pm_1}{\tau_1 \sqrt{p}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \infty$$

where $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$ denotes convergence in distribution, and $\tau_1^2 = m_2 - m_1^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma(k)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix A.3. In Theorem 1, we do not require Σ to follow a diagonal matrix structure. To derive the limiting distribution of the DLRT statistic under a general covariance matrix structure, we impose the mixing condition (C1) which implies a weak dependence structure in the data. Specifically, noting that $T_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p U_{nj}$, if the autocorrelation function of $\{U_{n1}, \dots, U_{np}\}$ decays rapidly as the lag increases, T_1 will converge to the standard normal distribution under appropriate centering and scaling. Finally, we note that similar mixing conditions were also adopted in Gregory et al. (2015) and Zhao and Xu (2016). The asymptotic variance of $p^{1/2}T_1$, τ_1^2 , depends on the autocovariance sequence $\{U_{n1}, U_{n2}, \dots\}$ and is unknown. To establish the null distribution in practice, we need an estimate, $\hat{\tau}_1^2$, to replace τ_1^2 . In spectrum analysis, under the condition (C2), we note that $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma(k) = 2\pi f(0)$, where $f(w)$ is a spectral density function defined as $f(w) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwk} \gamma(k)$ for $w \in [-\pi, \pi]$. Therefore, we only need an estimate of $f(0)$.

The estimation of $f(w)$ has been extensively studied (e.g., Bühlmann, 1996; Paparoditis and Politis,

2012). The traditional kernel estimator with a lag-window form is defined as

$$\hat{f}(w) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwk} \lambda(k/h) \hat{\gamma}(k),$$

where $\hat{\gamma}(k) = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-k} (U_{nj} - \tilde{T}_1)(U_{n(j+k)} - \tilde{T}_1)$ is the sample autocovariance and $\tilde{T}_1 = T_1/p$. We apply the Parzen window (Parzen, 1961) to determine the lag-window $\lambda(x)$ throughout the paper, where $\lambda(x) = 1 - 6x^2 + 6|x|^3$ if $|x| < 1/2$, and $\lambda(x) = 2(1 - |x|)^3$ if $1/2 \leq |x| < 1$, and $\lambda(x) = 0$ if $|x| \geq 1$. Finally, we estimate τ_1^2 as

$$\hat{\tau}_1^2 = 2\pi \hat{f}(0) = 2 \sum_{0 < k \leq h} \lambda(k/h) \hat{\gamma}(k) + \gamma(0),$$

where h is the lag-window size, and $\gamma(0) = \text{Var}(U_{nj}) = m_2 - m_1^2$.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ and assume that Σ is a diagonal matrix. Under the null hypothesis, we have the following asymptotic results:*

- (a) *For any fixed $n \geq 2$, $(T_1 - pm_1)/\sqrt{p(m_2 - m_1^2)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$.*
- (b) *If p increases at such a rate that $p = o(n^{2k})$, then for the given positive integer $k < \nu_1/2$,*

$$(T_1 - p\xi_k)/\sqrt{2p} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) \text{ as } (n, p) \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\xi_k = n\{a_1 - a_2/2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+1}a_k/k\}$ and $a_k = \prod_{i=1}^k \{(2i-1)/(\nu_1 - 2i)\}$.

The proof of Corollary 1 is given in Appendix A.4. This corollary defines asymptotic normality of the DLRT statistic for two scenarios under the diagonal covariance matrix assumption: the result from (a) establishes the asymptotic null distribution when n is fixed but p is large, and the result from (b) establishes the asymptotic null distribution when n and p are both large.

2.3 Statistical power

To derive the asymptotic power of the proposed DLRT statistic for the one-sample test, we consider the local alternative

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = \boldsymbol{\delta}_1/\sqrt{n}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}_1 = (\delta_{11}, \dots, \delta_{1p})^T$. Assume that $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_1 = (\Delta_{11}, \dots, \Delta_{1p})^T = (\delta_{11}/\sigma_{11}, \dots, \delta_{1p}/\sigma_{pp})^T$, with all of the components uniformly bounded such that

$$\Delta_{1j}^2 \leq M_0, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{2.4}$$

where σ_{jj}^2 are the diagonal elements of Σ , and M_0 is a constant independent of n and p . Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ and assume that p increases at such a rate that $p = o(n^2)$. Let z_α be the upper α th percentile such that $\Phi(z_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. If the sequence $\{U_{nj}\}$ is stationary and satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), then under the local alternative (2.3) and condition (2.4), the asymptotic power of the level α test is*

$$\beta(T_1) = 1 - \Phi\left(z_\alpha - \frac{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_1^T \boldsymbol{\Delta}_1 / \sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\tau_1^2}}\right) \quad \text{as } (n, p) \rightarrow \infty,$$

and hence $\beta(T_1) \rightarrow 1$ if $\sqrt{p} = o(\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{1j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2)$, and $\beta(T_1) \rightarrow \alpha$ if $\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{1j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2 = o(\sqrt{p})$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Appendix A.5. If the true mean differences are dense but small such as the standardized signals $(\mu_{1j} - \mu_{0j}) / \sigma_{jj} = \delta_0 p^{-1/2}$ with the constant $\delta_0 > 0$, then the asymptotic power will increase towards 1 as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$.

3 Two-Sample Test

In this section, we consider the two-sample test for mean vectors with equal covariance matrices. Let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \dots, X_{ip})^T$, $i = 1, \dots, n_1$, be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$, and $\mathbf{Y}_k = (Y_{k1}, Y_{k2}, \dots, Y_{kp})^T$, $k = 1, \dots, n_2$, be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ are two population mean vectors and Σ is the common covariance matrix. For ease of notation, let $N = n_1 + n_2$ and assume that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_1 / N = c \in (0, 1)$. Let also $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbf{X}_i / n_1$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} \mathbf{Y}_k / n_2$ be two sample mean vectors, and

$$S = \frac{1}{N-2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^T + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (\mathbf{Y}_k - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})(\mathbf{Y}_k - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^T \right\}.$$

be the pooled sample covariance matrix.

In the two-sample case, we test the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_2. \quad (3.1)$$

In Appendix B.1, we show that the DLRT statistic for hypothesis (3.1) is

$$T_2 = N \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{n_1 n_2}{N(N-2)} \frac{(\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j)^2}{s_{j,\text{pool}}^2} \right\} = N \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left(1 + \frac{t_{Nj}^2}{\nu_2} \right), \quad (3.2)$$

where $t_{Nj} = \sqrt{n_1 n_2 / N} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j) / s_{j,\text{pool}}$ are the standard t -statistics for the two-sample case with $\nu_2 = N - 2$ degrees of freedom, and $s_{j,\text{pool}}^2$ are the pooled sample variances, i.e., the diagonal elements of S .

For ease of notation, let $V_{Nj} = N \log(1 + t_{Nj}^2 / \nu_2)$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$. The following theorem establishes the asymptotic null distribution of the DLRT statistic for the two-sample case under centering and scaling.

Theorem 3. *Let $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$ and $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$, respectively. If the sequence $\{V_{Nj}\}$ is stationary and satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), then under the null hypothesis, we have for any fixed $N \geq 4$,*

$$\frac{T_2 - pG_1}{\tau_2 \sqrt{p}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \infty$$

where $\tau_2^2 = G_2 - G_1^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma(k)$, with $G_1 = ND(\nu_2)$ and $G_2 = N^2\{D^2(\nu_2) - 2D'(\nu_2)\}$.

The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix B.2. By imposing conditions (C1) and (C2) on the sequence $\{V_{Nj}\}$, Theorem 3 also does not require the assumption that each of the covariance matrices follows a diagonal matrix structure. Similar to the one-sample case, a consistent estimator for τ_2^2 is given as

$$\hat{\tau}_2^2 = 2 \sum_{0 < k \leq h} \lambda(k/h) \hat{\gamma}(k) + \gamma(0),$$

where $\lambda(x)$ is the Parzen window, h is the lag-window size, $\gamma(0) = \text{Var}(V_{Nj}) = G_2 - G_1^2$, and $\hat{\gamma}(k) = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-k} (V_{Nj} - \tilde{T}_2)(V_{N(j+k)} - \tilde{T}_2)$ is the sample autocovariance for $\{V_{Nj}, j = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and $\tilde{T}_2 = T_2/p$.

Corollary 2. *Let $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$ and $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$, respectively, and assume that Σ is a diagonal matrix. Under the null hypothesis, we have the following asymptotic results:*

- (a) *For any fixed $N \geq 4$, $(T_1 - pG_1) / \sqrt{p(G_2 - G_1^2)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$.*
- (b) *If p increases at such a rate that $p = o(N^{2k})$, then for the given positive integer $k < \nu_2/2$,*

$$(T_2 - p\eta_k) / \sqrt{2p} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } (N, p) \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\eta_k = N\{b_1 - b_2/2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+1}b_k/k\}$ and $b_k = \prod_{i=1}^k \{(2i-1)/(\nu_2 - 2i)\}$.

The proof of Corollary 2 is given in Appendix B.3. This corollary defines asymptotic normality of the DLRT statistic for two scenarios under the diagonal covariance matrix assumption: the result from (a) establishes the asymptotic null distribution when N is fixed but p is large, and the result from (b) establishes the asymptotic null distribution when N and p are both large.

When $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_2$, we consider the local alternative

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \sqrt{\frac{N}{n_1 n_2}} \boldsymbol{\delta}_2, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}_2 = (\delta_{21}, \dots, \delta_{2p})^T$. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_2 = (\Delta_{21}, \dots, \Delta_{2p})^T = (\delta_{21}/\sigma_{11}, \dots, \delta_{2p}/\sigma_{pp})^T$, with all of the components uniformly bounded such that

$$\Delta_{2j}^2 \leq M_1, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.4)$$

where σ_{jj}^2 are the diagonal elements of Σ , and M_1 is a constant independent of N and p . The following theorem establishes the asymptotic power of our proposed DLRT statistic for the two-sample test.

Theorem 4. *Let $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$ be i.i.d. random vectors from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$ and $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$, respectively. Assume that p increases at such a rate that $p = o(N^2)$. If the sequence $\{V_{Nj}, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is stationary and satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), then under the local alternative (3.3) and condition (3.4), the asymptotic power of the level α test is*

$$\beta(T_2) = 1 - \Phi\left(z_\alpha - \frac{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_2^T \boldsymbol{\Delta}_2 / \sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\tau_2^2}}\right) \text{ as } (N, p) \rightarrow \infty,$$

and hence, $\beta(T_2) \rightarrow 1$ if $\sqrt{p} = o(\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{2j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2)$, and $\beta(T_2) \rightarrow \alpha$ if $\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{2j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2 = o(\sqrt{p})$.

4 Monte Carlo Simulation Studies

In this section, we carry out simulations to evaluate the performance of our DLRT method. For ease of presentation, we consider the proposed DLRT test for the two-sample case only. We compare DLRT with five existing tests from the aforementioned three categories: one unscaled Hotelling's test including the CQ test from Chen and Qin (2010), one regularized Hotelling's test including the RHT test from Chen et al. (2011), and two diagonal Hotelling's tests including the SD test from Srivastava and Du (2008), and the GCT test from Gregory et al. (2015). Gregory et al. (2015) considered two different versions of the GCT test with centering corrections that allowed the dimension to grow at either a moderate or large order of the sample size, which are denoted as GCT_{md} and GCT_{lg} , respectively. The lag-window size throughout the simulations is $h = 5$.

4.1 Normal data

In the first simulation, we generate $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_1}$ from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$, and $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n_2}$ from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$. For simplicity, let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \mathbf{0}$. Under the alternative hypothesis, we assume that the first p_0 elements in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ are nonzero, where $p_0 = \beta p$ with $\beta \in [0, 1]$ being the tuning parameter that controls the signal sparsity. When $\beta = 0$, the null hypothesis holds. The common covariance matrix is $\Sigma = D^T R D$, where R is the correlation matrix and D is a diagonal matrix such that $D = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{22}, \dots, \sigma_{pp})$. To account for the heterogeneity of variances, $\sigma_{11}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2$ are randomly sampled from the scaled chi-square distribution $\chi_5^2/5$. For the dependence structure in the matrix R , we consider the following three scenarios:

- (a) Independent (IND) structure: R is the $p \times p$ identity matrix.
- (b) Short range dependence (SRD) structure: $R = (\rho^{|i-j|})_{p \times p}$ follows the first-order autoregressive structure, in which the correlation among the observations decay exponentially with distance. We consider $\rho = 0.3$ or 0.6 to represent two different levels of correlation.
- (c) Long range dependence (LRD) structure: We follow the same setting as in Gregory et al. (2015). Specifically, we consider the (i, j) th element of R as $r_{ij} = [(k+1)^{2H} + (k-1)^{2H} - 2k^{2H}]/2$ with $k = |j-i|$, and the self-similarity parameter as $H = 0.625$.

For the power comparison, we set the j th nonzero component in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ as $\mu_{2j} = \theta \sigma_{jj}$, $j = 1, \dots, p_0$, where θ is the effect size of the corresponding component. The other parameters are set as $(n_1, n_2, \theta) \times p = \{(3, 3, 0.5) \text{ or } (5, 5, 0.5) \text{ or } (15, 15, 0.25)\} \times \{100 \text{ or } 500\}$, respectively.

Figure 1 shows the simulated null distributions of the DLRT, SD, GCT_{md} , GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests under the independent structure, when the sample size is small (e.g., $n_1 = n_2 = 3$) and the dimension is large. The histograms are based on 5000 simulations. For comparison, their limiting distributions are also plotted. However, the null distributions of the other three tests, and especially the GCT_{md} test, are either skewed or shifted away from the standard normal distribution.

We summarize the type I error rates from the simulations for each of the six tests, with different sample sizes and dependence structures, in Table 1. When the variables are uncorrelated or weakly correlated with each other, the type I error rates of DLRT are closer to the nominal level ($\alpha = 0.05$) than the other five tests under most settings. In addition, DLRT provides a more stable test statistic and better control over the type I error rate when the sample size is not large; the SD, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests have inflated type I error rates when the sample size is relatively small (e.g., $n_1 = n_2 = 3$). The GCT_{md} test in

particular fails to keep the type I error rate within the nominal level under each setting, and performs more poorly when the sample size is small and the dimension is large. Therefore, we exclude the GCT_{md} test from the following power comparison.

Figure 2 presents the simulated power of the DLRT, SD, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. When the dimension is low (e.g., $p = 100$), the DLRT, CQ and RHT tests are able to control the type I error rates well, whereas the SD and GCT_{lg} tests suffer from inflated type I error rates. In particular for the GCT_{lg} test, it exhibits a relatively low power when the sample size is small. This coincides with the findings in Figure 1. As the dimension is large and the sample size is not small, the DLRT, SD, CQ and RHT tests control the type I error rate close to the nominal level, whereas, the GCT_{lg} test still fails. DLRT also provides a higher power in most settings. To conclude, DLRT performs comparably to the existing tests for normal data.

4.2 Heavy-tailed data

To evaluate the robustness of DLRT, we also conduct simulations with heavy-tailed data. Following Gregory et al. (2015), the data are generated based on a “double” Pareto distribution with parameters a and b . The algorithm is as follows:

- (i) Generate two independent random variables U and V , where U is from the Pareto distribution with the cumulative distribution function $F(x) = 1 - (1 + x/b)^{-a}$ for $x \geq 0$, and V is a binary random variable with $P(V = 1) = P(V = -1) = 0.5$. Then $Z = UV$ follows the double Pareto distribution with parameters a and b .
- (ii) Generate random vectors $\{\mathbf{X}_i^{(0)} = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})^T\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$, and random vectors $\{\mathbf{Y}_k^{(0)} = (y_{k1}, \dots, y_{kp})^T\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$, where all the components of $\mathbf{X}_i^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_k^{(0)}$ are sampled independently from the double Pareto distribution with parameters $a = 16.5$ and $b = 8$.
- (iii) Let $\mathbf{X}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 + \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{X}_i^{(0)} / c_0$ and $\mathbf{Y}_k = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 + \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{Y}_k^{(0)} / c_0$, where $c_0^2 = 512/899$ is the variance of the double Pareto distribution with $a = 16.5$ and $b = 8$, and $\Sigma = D^T R D$ with $D = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}, \dots, \sigma_{pp})$. Consequently, \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{Y}_k have a common correlation matrix R .

For the matrix R , we also consider three scenarios: (a) the IND structure, (b) the SRD structure, and (c) the LRD structure. In each scenario, the generating algorithms for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ and Σ follow the simulation procedure described in Section 4.1. The parameters used in the algorithms are $(n_1, n_2, \theta) \times p = \{(5, 5, 0.5) \text{ or } (15, 15, 0.25)\} \times \{100 \text{ or } 500\}$, respectively.

Figure 3 presents the simulation results for the five tests with heavy-tailed data at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. When the dimension is large and the sample size is small, the DLRT, SD and RHT tests control the type I error rate well, whereas the GCT_{lg} test exhibits a substantially inflated type I error rate and a low power for detection. One possible explanation is that the GCT_{lg} statistic involves the estimation of high order moments which leads to instability when the sample size is small. DLRT is again more powerful than the CQ and RHT tests in most settings. In summary, it is evident that the DLRT test provides a more robust performance with heavy-tailed data than the existing five tests, especially when the dimension is large.

5 Brain Cancer Data Analysis

In this section, we apply DLRT to a data set from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). This data set contains the copy number measurements from genomic locations of the probes on chromosomes in 92 long-term survivors and 138 short-term survivors with a brain cancer called glioblastoma multiforme. The long-term brain cancer survivors lived for more than two years after their first diagnosis, and the short-term survivors lived for less than two years after their first diagnosis. According to Olshen et al. (2004) and Baladandayuthapani et al. (2010), the copy number variations between the patient groups will occur across multiple probes rather than at a single probe. That is, the signal structure is dense-but-small rather than sparse-but-strong. To identify the particular regions in the genome where the genes were differentially expressed, we apply the following tests: the DLRT, SD, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests. Gregory et al. (2015) separated the whole chromosome into 26 segments of varying lengths. We focus our analysis on one segment of the q arm of chromosome 1, which contains measurements of probes at 400 locations. The copy number data at 400 locations are summarized in “chr1qseg.rda” which is available from the R package “highD2pop”.

To compare the performance of the tests, we first perform the two-sample t -tests to screen top p significant genes, and then calculate the empirical power with $p = 100, 200$ or 400 , respectively. To determine the empirical critical values corresponding to a given nominal level α , we bootstrap two distinct classes from the short-term survival group to compute the test statistics. Since both classes are partitioned from the short-term survival group, the null hypothesis can be regarded as the truth. Therefore, we repeat the procedure 10,000 times for each test method, and select the $(10,000\alpha)$ th largest value of the test statistics as the empirical critical values. To determine the empirical power, we bootstrap one class from the short-term survival group and another class from the long-term survival group. For both

classes, we consider $n_1 = n_2 = 8$ for computing the empirical critical values and power.

Table 2 shows the empirical power of the DLRT, SD, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests. We note that the DLRT test performs nearly as well as the RHT test, and it has a higher empirical power than the other three tests under all the settings.

6 Conclusion

In the classical low-dimensional setting, Hotelling’s T^2 test is an important and useful tool for testing the equality of one or two mean vectors from multivariate normal distributions. However, this classic test may not be applicable when the dimension is larger than the sample size, as the sample covariance matrix is no longer invertible. This motivates the development of new methods to address the testing problems for high-dimensional data with a small sample size. According to how the covariance matrices are estimated, most available methods can be classified into three categories: the unscaled Hotelling’s tests, the regularized Hotelling’s tests, and the diagonal Hotelling’s tests.

In this paper, we proposed a new test framework based on the likelihood ratio test for both one- and two-sample cases. The proposed test statistics are derived under the assumption that the covariance matrices follow a diagonal matrix structure. Our tests use the log-transformed squared t -statistics and provide more stable test statistics than the standard t -statistics when the sample size is small. Through simulation studies, we showed that DLRT is also more robust than the existing test methods when the data are heavy-tailed or weakly correlated. In other words, when the dimension is large and the sample size is small, DLRT is able to keep the type I error rate within the nominal level and, at the same time, maintains a high power for detection.

The proposed new test assumes a natural ordering of the components in the p -dimensional random vector, e.g., the correlation among the components are related to their positions, and hence we can take into account the additional structure information to avoid an estimation of the full covariance matrix. When the ordering of the components is not available, we propose to reorder the components from the sample data using some well known ordering methods before applying our proposed tests. For instance, with the best permutation algorithm in Rajaratnam and Salzman (2013), the strongly correlated elements can be reordered close to each other. For other ordering methods of random variables, one may refer to, for example, Gilbert et al. (1992), Wagaman and Levina (2009), and the references therein.

When the sample size is relatively small and the correlation is very high, our proposed tests will have slightly inflated type I error rates, especially when the dimension is also large.

This is mainly because the test statistics are derived under the assumption that the covariance matrices follow a diagonal matrix structure. When the diagonal matrix assumption is violated, the asymptotic null distributions may not follow the standard normal distribution, or the asymptotic properties may require more restrictive assumptions including a larger sample size. To overcome these limitations, future research is warranted to improve our current version of DLRT or to derive more accurate asymptotic distributions when the underlying assumptions are violated.

We also note that our current paper has focused on testing high-dimensional mean vectors under the parametric setting. More recently, some nonparametric tests have also been developed in the literature for the same testing problems; see, for example, Wang et al. (2015), Ghosh and Biswas (2016) and Chakraborty and Chaudhuri (2017).

7 Supplementary Materials

Web Appendix referenced in Sections 2 and 3 is available with this paper at the *Biometrics* website on Wiley Online Library.

8 Acknowledgements

The authors thank the editor, the associate editor and three reviewers for their constructive comments that have led to a substantial improvement of the paper. Tiejun Tong's research was supported by the Hong Kong RGC Grant (No. HKBU12303918), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11671338), the Health and Medical Research Fund (No. 04150476), and two Hong Kong Baptist University grants (FRG1/17-18/045 and FRG2/17-18/020). Marc G. Genton's research was supported by the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST).





Figure 1: Comparison with the standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis for the DLRT, SD, CQ, GCT_{md}, GCT_{lg} and RHT tests with $n_1 = n_2 = 3$ and $p = 500$. The histograms are based on 5000 simulations.

Table 1: Type I error rates over 2000 simulations for the DLRT, GCT_{md} , GCT_{lg} , SD, CQ, RHT tests under three dependence structures. The significance level is $\alpha = 0.05$. Two different correlation, $\rho = 0.3$ or 0.6 , are considered for the SRD structure.


Cov	Method \ (n_1, n_2)	$p = 100$			$p = 500$		
		(3, 3)	(5, 5)	(15, 15)	(3, 3)	(5, 5)	(15, 15)
IND	DLRT	0.060	0.056	0.058	0.055	0.043	0.048
	SD	0.403	0.111	0.044	0.342	0.038	0.024
	GCT_{md}	0.608	0.233	0.063	0.983	0.922	0.151
	GCT_{lg}	0.101	0.124	0.092	0.047	0.110	0.060
	CQ	0.092	0.066	0.056	0.084	0.058	0.051
	RHT	0.097	0.068	0.058	0.105	0.070	0.053
SRD ($\rho = 0.3$)	DLRT	0.067	0.058	0.054	0.054	0.053	0.061
	SD	0.387	0.105	0.038	0.309	0.046	0.023
	GCT_{md}	0.548	0.203	0.071	0.986	0.893	0.143
	GCT_{lg}	0.116	0.119	0.094	0.05	0.106	0.070
	CQ	0.076	0.054	0.052	0.078	0.059	0.051
	RHT	0.099	0.067	0.058	0.098	0.060	0.060
SRD ($\rho = 0.6$)	DLRT	0.072	0.076	0.078	0.080	0.072	0.078
	SD	0.351	0.082	0.031	0.28	0.041	0.023
	GCT_{md}	0.421	0.152	0.091	0.980	0.749	0.116
	GCT_{lg}	0.130	0.164	0.129	0.064	0.122	0.095
	CQ	0.079	0.050	0.056	0.080	0.051	0.053
	RHT	0.110	0.067	0.060	0.099	0.063	0.048
LRD	DLRT	0.061	0.065	0.054	0.052	0.071	0.056
	SD	0.383	0.112	0.034	0.332	0.054	0.025
	GCT_{md}	0.594	0.222	0.067	0.983	0.913	0.143
	GCT_{lg}	0.104	0.152	0.095	0.047	0.109	0.077
	CQ	0.092	0.058	0.052	0.082	0.062	0.057
	RHT	0.108	0.058	0.060	0.102	0.063	0.052

Table 2: Empirical power for testing the equality of gene expressions in the TCGA data, when $p = 100, 200$ or 400 . The nominal level is α and the sample sizes of the two classes are $n_1 = n_2 = 8$.

		DLRT	SD	GCT_{lg}	CQ	RHT
$\alpha = 0.05$	$p = 100$	0.165	0.121	0.082	0.143	0.189
	$p = 200$	0.158	0.096	0.094	0.116	0.194
	$p = 400$	0.144	0.081	0.119	0.106	0.136
$\alpha = 0.10$	$p = 100$	0.274	0.201	0.165	0.233	0.345
	$p = 200$	0.261	0.157	0.190	0.192	0.354
	$p = 400$	0.258	0.154	0.212	0.181	0.295




(a) $n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100$




(b) $n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500$

Figure 2: Power comparisons among the DLRT, SD, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests with $(n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100)$ or $(n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500)$, respectively. The horizontal dashed red lines represent the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The results are based on 2000 simulations with data from the normal distribution.



(a) $n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100$



(b) $n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500$

Figure 3: Power comparisons among the DLRT, SD, GCT_{lg}, CQ and RHT tests with $(n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100)$ or $(n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500)$, respectively. The horizontal dashed red lines represent the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The results are based on 2000 simulations with data from a heavy-tailed distribution.

Web-based Supplementary Materials for “Diagonal Likelihood Ratio Test for Equality of Mean Vectors in High-Dimensional Data”

A DLRT for One-Sample Test

A.1 Derivation of Formula (4)

Under the assumption $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}^2, \sigma_{22}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2)$, we can write the likelihood function as

$$L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) = \prod_{j=1}^p L_j(\mu_j, \sigma_{jj}^2),$$

where $L_j(\mu_j, \sigma_{jj}^2) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\sigma_{jj}^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \mu_j)^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2}$ is the likelihood function for the j th component with data X_{1j}, \dots, X_{nj} . Deriving the maximum likelihood estimator of $L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ is equivalent to finding the maximum likelihood estimators of $L_j(\mu_j, \sigma_{jj}^2)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, respectively.

It is known that the maximum of $L_j(\mu_j, \sigma_{jj}^2)$ is achieved when $\hat{\mu}_j = \bar{X}_j = \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}/n$ and $s_j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 / (n-1)$. Hence, under the alternative hypothesis,

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} e^{-\frac{np}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 \right\}^{-\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Similarly, under the null hypothesis,

$$\max_{\Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} e^{-\frac{np}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \mu_{0j})^2 \right\}^{-\frac{n}{2}}.$$

From the above results, the likelihood ratio test statistic is given as

$$\Lambda_n = \frac{\max_{\Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma)}{\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)} = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 \right\}^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \mu_{0j})^2 \right\}^{\frac{n}{2}}}.$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_n^{2/n} &= \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \mu_{0j})^2} = \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{(n-1)s_j^2}{(n-1)s_j^2 + n(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})^2} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^p \left\{ 1 + \frac{n}{n-1} (\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})^2 \right\}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the test statistic

$$-2 \log(\Lambda_n) = n \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{n}{n-1} (\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})^2 / s_j^2 \right\} = n \sum_{j=1}^p \log(1 + t_{nj}^2 / \nu_1),$$

where $t_{nj} = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})/s_j$ are the standard t -statistics for the one-sample test with $\nu_1 = n - 1$ degrees of freedom.

Lemma 2. *Let the gamma and digamma functions be the same as in Lemma 1. For any $\nu > 0$, we have the following integral equalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty (1+z^2)^{-(\nu+1)/2} dz &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\nu}K(\nu)}, \\ \int_0^\infty (1+z^2)^{-(\nu+1)/2} \log(1+z^2) dz &= \frac{D(\nu)}{2\sqrt{\nu}K(\nu)}, \\ \int_0^\infty (1+z^2)^{-(\nu+1)/2} \{\log(1+z^2)\}^2 dz &= \frac{D^2(\nu) - 2D'(\nu)}{2\sqrt{\nu}K(\nu)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K(\nu) = \Gamma\{(\nu+1)/2\} / \{\sqrt{\pi\nu}\Gamma(\nu/2)\}$.

We note that this lemma essentially follows the results of Lemmas 4 to 6 in Zhu and Galbraith (2010), and hence the proof is omitted.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 1

For simplicity, we omit the subscript n in the terms U_{nj} and t_{nj} . Noting that $\nu_1 = n - 1$ and $U_j = n \log(1 + t_j^2 / \nu_1)$, where $t_j = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})/s_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_j) &= \frac{2n}{\sqrt{\nu_1\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} \int_0^\infty \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} dt, \\ E(U_j^2) &= \frac{2n^2}{\sqrt{\nu_1\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} \int_0^\infty \left\{ \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right) \right\}^2 \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $z = t/\sqrt{\nu_1}$ and by the method of substitution,

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_j) &= 2n\sqrt{\nu_1}K(\nu_1) \int_0^\infty \log(1+z^2)(1+z^2)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} dz, \\ E(U_j^2) &= 2n^2\sqrt{\nu_1}K(\nu_1) \int_0^\infty \{\log(1+z^2)\}^2 (1+z^2)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} dz. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, we have $E(U_j) = nD(\nu_1)$ and $E(U_j^2) = n^2\{D^2(\nu_1) - 2D'(\nu_1)\}$. This shows that $E(U_j) = m_1$ and $E(U_j^2) = m_2$, consequently, $\text{Var}(U_j) = m_2 - m_1^2$.

We note that $n \log(1 + t^2/\nu_1) \leq nt^2/\nu_1 < 2t^2$, and that $(1 + t^2/\nu_1)^{-n/2}$ converges to $e^{-t^2/2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n}{\sqrt{\nu_1 \pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1 + 1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} \int_0^\infty \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} dt \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\nu_1 \pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1 + 1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} \int_0^\infty t^2 e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\nu_1}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1 + 1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is obtained by Stirling's formula, $\Gamma(x) = \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x-1/2} e^{-x} \{1 + O(1/x)\}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ (Spira, 1971). This shows that $m_1 \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, $m_2 \rightarrow 3$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, $\text{Var}(U_j) = m_2 - m_1^2 \rightarrow 2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

As the sequence $\{U_{nj}\}$ satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), we only need to prove that $E|U_{nj} - E(U_{nj})|^{2+\delta} < \infty$ for any fixed n . We note that

$$E|U_{nj} - E(U_{nj})|^{2+\delta} = \frac{2n^{2+\delta}}{\sqrt{\nu_1 \pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_1 + 1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_1/2)} \int_0^\infty \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} \left\{ \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_1}\right) - D(\nu_1) \right\}^{2+\delta} dt.$$

Then we only need to verify that, for any fixed $n \geq 2$,

$$\int_0^\infty (1 + x^2)^{-\frac{\nu_1+1}{2}} \{ \log(1 + x^2) - D(\nu_1) \}^{2+\delta} dx < \infty.$$

The inequality clearly holds.

Finally, by the central limit theorem under the strong mixing condition (see Corollary 5.1 in Hall and Heyde (1980)), we have $(T_1 - pm_1)/(\tau_1 \sqrt{p}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

A.4 Proof of Corollary 1

(a) When the covariance matrix is a diagonal matrix, $\{t_{nj} = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_j - \mu_{0j})/s_j, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are i.i.d. random variables. Consequently, $\{U_{nj}, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are also i.i.d. random variables with mean m_1 and variance $m_2 - m_1^2$. By the central limit theorem, we have $(\tilde{T}_1 - m_1)/\sqrt{p(m_2 - m_1^2)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) For simplicity, we omit the subscript n in the terms U_{nj} and t_{nj} . We note that $\log(1 + t_j^2/\nu_1)$ is sandwiched between $t_j^2/\nu_1 - (t_j^2)^2/2\nu_1^2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+2}(t_j^2)^{k+1}/\{(k+1)\nu_1^{k+1}\}$ and

$t_j^2/\nu_1 - (t_j^2)^2/2\nu_1^2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+3}(t_j^2)^{k+2}/\{(k+2)\nu_1^{k+2}\}$. For any $n > 2k+6$,

$$E(U_j) = m_1 = \frac{n}{\nu_1}E(t_j^2) - \frac{n}{2\nu_1^2}E\{(t_j^2)^2\} + \dots + (-1)^{k+1}\frac{n}{k\nu_1^k}E\{(t_j^2)^k\} + O(1/n^k).$$

Noting that $E\{(t_j^2/\nu_1)^k\} = a_k$, and $m_2 - m_1 \rightarrow 2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_1 - p\xi_k}{\sqrt{2p}} &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(\tilde{T}_1 - m_1)}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{p}(m_1 - \xi_k)}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(\tilde{T}_1 - m_1)}{\sqrt{m_2 - m_1^2}} \frac{\sqrt{m_2 - m_1^2}}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{p}O(1/n^k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

A.5 Proof of Theorem 2

First of all, we have

$$\frac{\tilde{T}_1 - 1}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}} = \frac{\tilde{T}_1 - \bar{m}_1}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}} + \frac{\sqrt{p}(\bar{m}_1 - 1)}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\bar{m}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{m}_{1j}/p$ and $\tilde{m}_{1j} = E(U_j|H_1) = E\{n \log(1 + t_j^2/\nu_1)|H_1\}$.

We note that $nt_j^2/\nu_1 - n(t_j^2)^2/(2\nu_1^2) \leq U_j \leq nt_j^2/\nu_1$. Then, for any $n > 6$, we have $nE(t_j^2|H_1)/\nu_1 - nE\{(t_j^2)^2|H_1\}/(2\nu_1^2) \leq E(U_j|H_1) \leq nE(t_j^2|H_1)/\nu_1$. Under the local alternative (5) and condition (6), we have $\tilde{m}_{1j} = nE(t_j^2|H_1)/\nu_1 + O(1/n)$. We also note that t_j follows a noncentral t distribution with $\nu_1 = n-1$ degrees of freedom and a noncentrality parameter Δ_{1j} . Its second moment is $E(t_j^2|H_1) = \nu_1(1 + \Delta_{1j}^2)/(\nu_1 - 2)$; hence, $\tilde{m}_{1j} = 1 + \Delta_{1j}^2 + O(1/n)$. Consequently, $\bar{m}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{m}_{1j}/p = 1 + \Delta_1^T \Delta_1/p + O(1/n)$.

Under conditions (C1) and (C2), for any consistent estimator $\hat{\tau}_1^2$ for τ_1^2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_1 - p}{\sqrt{p\hat{\tau}_1^2}} &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(\tilde{T}_1 - \bar{m}_1)}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}} + \frac{\Delta_1^T \Delta_1/\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}} + \frac{\sqrt{p}O(1/n)}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_1^2}} \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) + \frac{\Delta_1^T \Delta_1/\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\tau_1^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\Delta_1^T \Delta_1/\sqrt{p} = \sum_{j=1}^p (\delta_{1j}/\sigma_{jj})^2/\sqrt{p}$. Thus, if $\sqrt{p} = o(\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{1j}^2/\sigma_{jj}^2)$, then the power of the one-sample test will increase towards 1 as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, if $\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{1j}^2/\sigma_{jj}^2 = o(\sqrt{p})$, then the test will have little power as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$.

B DLRT for Two-Sample Test

B.1 Derivation of Formula (8)

For the two-sample test, we derive the DLRT statistic based on the assumption that the two covariance matrices are equal and they follow a diagonal matrix structure, i.e., $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}^2, \sigma_{22}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2)$.

Under the alternative hypothesis, the maximum of the likelihood function is

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma | H_1) \\ &= (2\pi e)^{-\frac{p}{2}(n_1+n_2)} \prod_{j=1}^p \left[\frac{1}{n_1+n_2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \bar{Y}_j)^2 \right\} \right]^{-\frac{(n_1+n_2)}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma | H_0) \\ &= (2\pi e)^{-\frac{p}{2}(n_1+n_2)} \prod_{j=1}^p \left[\frac{1}{n_1+n_2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{0j})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \hat{\mu}_{0j})^2 \right\} \right]^{-\frac{(n_1+n_2)}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mu}_{0j} = (n_1\bar{X}_j + n_2\bar{Y}_j)/(n_1 + n_2)$, $\bar{X}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} X_{ij}/n_1$, and $\bar{Y}_j = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} Y_{kj}/n_2$.

We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{0j})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \hat{\mu}_{0j})^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \bar{Y}_j)^2 + \frac{n_1 n_2^2}{(n_1 + n_2)^2} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j)^2 + \frac{n_2 n_1^2}{(n_1 + n_2)^2} (\bar{Y}_j - \bar{X}_j)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\Lambda_N = \frac{\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma | H_0)}{\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma} L(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma | H_1)} = \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{\left\{ \frac{n_1+n_2-2}{n_1+n_2} s_{j,\text{pool}}^2 + \frac{n_1 n_2}{(n_1+n_2)^2} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j)^2 \right\}^{-\frac{(n_1+n_2)}{2}}}{\left[\frac{1}{n_1+n_2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \bar{Y}_j)^2 \right\} \right]^{-\frac{(n_1+n_2)}{2}}},$$

where $s_{j,\text{pool}}^2 = \{(n_1 - 1)s_{1j}^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_{2j}^2\}/(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$ are the pooled sample variances with $s_{1j}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2/(n_1 - 1)$ and $s_{2j}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (Y_{kj} - \bar{Y}_j)^2/(n_2 - 1)$. This leads to the test statistic

$$-2 \log(\Lambda_N) = (n_1 + n_2) \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{\frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1+n_2} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j)^2}{s_{j,\text{pool}}^2} \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \right\} = N \sum_{j=1}^p \log \left(1 + \frac{t_{Nj}^2}{\nu_2} \right),$$

where $t_{Nj} = \sqrt{n_1 n_2 / (n_1 + n_2)} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j) / s_{j,\text{pool}}$ are the standard t -statistics for the two-sample test with $\nu_2 = N - 2$ degrees of freedom.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3

We first show that $E(V_{Nj}) = G_1 \rightarrow 1$ and $\text{Var}(V_{Nj}) = G_2 - G_1^2 \rightarrow 2$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For simplicity, we omit the subscript N in the terms V_{Nj} and t_{Nj} . As $V_j = N \log(1 + t_j^2/\nu_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(V_j) &= \frac{2N}{\sqrt{\nu_2\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} \int_0^\infty \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} dt, \\ E(V_j^2) &= \frac{2N^2}{\sqrt{\nu_2\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} \int_0^\infty \left\{\log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right)\right\}^2 \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Let $z = t/\sqrt{\nu_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(V_j) &= 2N\sqrt{\nu_2}K(\nu_2) \int_0^\infty \log(1+z^2)(1+z^2)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} dz, \\ E(V_j^2) &= 2N^2\sqrt{\nu_2}K(\nu_2) \int_0^\infty \{\log(1+z^2)\}^2 (1+z^2)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} dz. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, we have $E(V_j) = G_1 = ND(\nu_2)$ and $E(V_j^2) = G_2 = N^2\{D^2(\nu_2) - 2D'(\nu_2)\}$.

We note that $N \log(1 + t^2/\nu_2) \leq Nt^2/\nu_2 \leq 2t^2$, and that $(1 + t^2/\nu_2)^{-N/2}$ converges to $e^{-t^2/2}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2N}{\sqrt{\nu_2\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} \int_0^\infty \log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} dt \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\nu_2\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} \int_0^\infty t^2 e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\nu_2}} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $E(V_j) = G_1 \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, $E(V_j^2) = G_2 \rightarrow 3$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, $\text{Var}(V_j) = G_2 - G_1^2 \rightarrow 2$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Second, we prove that $(T_2 - pG_1)/(\tau_2\sqrt{p}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. As the sequence $\{V_j\}$ satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), we only need to prove that, for any fixed $N \geq 4$, $E|V_j - E(V_j)|^{2+\delta} < \infty$. We note that

$$E|V_j - E(V_j)|^{2+\delta} = \frac{2N^{2+\delta}}{\sqrt{\nu_2\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\{(\nu_2+1)/2\}}{\Gamma(\nu_2/2)} \int_0^\infty \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right)^{-\frac{\nu_2+1}{2}} \left\{\log\left(1 + \frac{t^2}{\nu_2}\right) - D(\nu_2)\right\}^{2+\delta} dt.$$

Then, by the similar arguments to those in the proof of Theorem 1, we have $E|V_j - E(V_j)|^{2+\delta} < \infty$.

B.3 Proof of Corollary 2

(a) When the covariance matrix is a diagonal matrix, $\{t_{Nj} = \sqrt{n_1 n_2 / (n_1 + n_2)} (\bar{X}_j - \bar{Y}_j) / s_{j, \text{pool}}, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are i.i.d. random variables. Consequently, $\{V_{Nj}, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are also i.i.d. random variables with mean G_1 and variance $G_2 - G_1^2$. By the central limit theorem, we have $(T_2 - pG_1) / \sqrt{p(G_2 - G_1^2)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) For simplicity, we omit the subscript N in the terms t_{Nj} and V_{Nj} . We note that $\log(1 + t_j^2 / \nu_2)$ is sandwiched between $t_j^2 / \nu_2 - (t_j^2)^2 / 2\nu_2^2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+2} (t_j^2)^{k+1} / \{(k+1)\nu_2^{k+1}\}$ and $t_j^2 / \nu_2 - (t_j^2)^2 / 2\nu_2^2 + \dots + (-1)^{k+3} (t_j^2)^{k+2} / \{(k+2)\nu_2^{k+2}\}$. Then, for any $N > 2k + 6$,

$$E(V_j) = G_1 = \frac{N}{\nu_2} E(t_j^2) - \frac{N}{2\nu_2^2} E\{(t_j^2)^2\} - \dots - \frac{N}{k\nu_2^k} E\{(t_j^2)^k\} + O(1/N^k).$$

Following the proof of Theorem 3, we have $G_2 - G_1^2 \rightarrow 2$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_2 - p\xi_k}{\sqrt{2p}} &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(T_2/p - G_1)}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{p}(G_1 - \eta_k)}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(T_2/p - G_1)}{\sqrt{G_2 - G_1^2}} \frac{\sqrt{G_2 - G_1^2}}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{p}O(1/N^k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4

First of all, we have

$$\frac{\tilde{T}_2 - 1}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}} = \frac{\tilde{T}_2 - \bar{G}_1}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}} + \frac{\bar{G}_1 - 1}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\bar{G}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{G}_{1j} / p$ and $\tilde{G}_{1j} = E(V_j | H_1) = E\{N \log(1 + t_j^2 / \nu_2) | H_1\}$.

We note that $N\{t_j^2 / \nu_2 - (t_j^2)^2 / (2\nu_2^2)\} \leq V_j \leq Nt_j^2 / \nu_2$. Then, for any $N > 6$, we have $N[E(t_j^2 | H_1) / \nu_2 - E\{(t_j^2)^2 | H_1\} / (2\nu_2^2)] \leq E(V_j | H_1) \leq NE(t_j^2 | H_1) / \nu_2$. Under the local alternative (9) and condition (10), we have $\tilde{G}_{1j} = NE(t_j^2 | H_1) / \nu_2 + O(1/N)$. We also note that t_j follows a noncentral t distribution with $\nu_2 = N - 2$ degrees of freedom and a non-centrality parameter Δ_{2j} . Its second moment is $E(t_j^2 | H_1) = \nu_2(1 + \Delta_{2j}^2) / (\nu_2 - 2)$; hence, $\tilde{G}_{1j} = 1 + \Delta_{2j}^2 + O(1/N)$. Consequently, $\bar{G}_1 = 1 + \Delta_2^T \Delta_2 / p + O(1/N)$.

Under conditions (C1) and (C2), for any consistent estimator $\hat{\tau}_2^2$ for τ_2^2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_2 - p}{\sqrt{p\hat{\tau}_2^2}} &= \frac{\sqrt{p}(\tilde{T}_2 - \bar{G}_1)}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}} + \frac{\Delta_2^T \Delta_2 / \sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}} + \frac{\sqrt{p}O(1/N)}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}_2^2}} \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1) + \frac{\Delta_2^T \Delta_2 / \sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{\tau_2^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\Delta_2^T \Delta_2 / \sqrt{p} = p^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^p (\delta_{2j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2)$. Thus, if $\sqrt{p} = o(\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{2j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2)$, then the power of the two-sample test will increase towards 1 as $(N, p) \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, if $\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{2j}^2 / \sigma_{jj}^2 = o(\sqrt{p})$, then the test will have little power as $(N, p) \rightarrow \infty$.

C Additional Simulations

C.1 Simulations for the comparison between the DLRT and PA tests


As mentioned by the reviewer, Park and Ayyala (2013) also proposed a scale invariant test, referred to as the PA test, which uses the idea of leave-out cross validation. To evaluate the performance of the DLRT and PA tests, we conduct simulations based on the same settings as Section 4.1 in the main paper.

Figure 4 presents the power of the DLRT and PA tests with the nominal level of $\alpha = 0.05$. When the sample size is small (e.g., $n = 5$), the PA test has some inflated type I error rate, and also suffers from a low power of detection. When the sample size is not small (e.g., $n = 15$), the DLRT and PA tests are able to simultaneously control the type I error rate, and at the same time keep a high power of detection. To conclude, when the sample size is not large, DLRT performs better than or at least as well as the PA test for normal distributed data.


In addition, the PA test is not a shift invariant test, which indicates that if the mean vectors under the null hypothesis are not located at the origin, the PA test may not keep the type I error rate at the nominal level. To further demonstrate this point, let $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = (100, \dots, 100)^T \in R^p$. We consider $p = 100, 300$ or 500 and $n_1 = n_2 = 5$ or 15 , respectively. The other settings are the same as Section 4.1 in the main paper. The simulation results are reported in Table 3. From Table 3, we can see that the PA test suffers from significant inflated type I error rate, whereas, the DLRT test still has a well control type I error rate.

C.2 Additional simulations with highly heterogeneous variances

In Section 4.1 in the main paper, the variances, $\sigma_{11}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2$, are randomly sampled from the scaled chi-square distribution $\chi_5^2/5$. To account for highly heterogeneous variances, we let $\sigma_{11}^2 < \sigma_{11}^2 < \dots < \sigma_{pp}^2$ be equally spaced on the interval $[0.01, 150]$. The other settings are all the same as Section 4.1. Accordingly, the variances of the signal components are small, whereas the variances of the noise components are large.



(a) $n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100$



(b) $n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500$

Figure 4: Power comparisons between the DLRT and PA tests with $(n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100)$ or $(n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500)$, respectively. The horizontal dashed red lines represent the nominal level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The results are based on 2000 simulations with data from the normal distribution.

Table 3: Type I error rates over 2000 simulations for the DLRT and PA tests under the IND or SRD structure. The nominal level is $\alpha = 0.05$. In the SRD structure, we consider the correlation, $\rho = 0.6$.


Cov	Method	$n_1 = n_2 = 5$			$n_1 = n_2 = 15$		
		$p = 100$	$p = 300$	$p = 500$	$p = 100$	$p = 300$	$p = 500$
IND	DLRT	0.056	0.052	0.043	0.058	0.049	0.048
	PA	0.981	0.985	0.987	0.763	0.795	0.779
SRD $\rho = 0.6$	DLRT	0.076	0.080	0.072	0.078	0.081	0.078
	PA	0.969	0.980	0.967	0.601	0.649	0.631

Figure 5 shows the simulation results. When the sample size is small, e.g., $n = 5$, the SD, PA, GCT_{lg} tests suffer from inflated type I error rates, whereas, the DLRT is able to control the type I error rate and exhibits high power than the CQ and RHT tests. As the dimension is large and the sample size is not small, the DLRT and PA tests are both able to control the type I error rates and at the same time exhibit high power than the other tests such as CQ and RHT. In addition, from Figure 5, we can also see that the diagonal Hotelling’s tests like our proposed DLRT perform better than the unscaled Hotelling’s tests like CQ, and the regularized Hotelling’s tests like RHT. As mentioned in the Introduction of the main paper, when the variances of the signal components are small and the variances of the noise components are large, the scale transformation invariant tests such as the diagonal Hotelling’s tests usually provide a better performance than the orthogonal transformation invariant tests such as the unscaled Hotelling’s tests and the regularized Hotelling’s tests.


C.3 Additional simulations with general multivariate data

The proposed new test assumes a natural ordering of the components in the p -dimensional random vector, e.g., the correlation among the components are related to their positions, and hence we can take into account the additional structure information to avoid an estimation of the full covariance matrix. When the ordering of the components is not available, we propose to reorder the components from the sample data using some well known ordering methods before applying our proposed tests. For instance, with the best permutation algorithm in Rajaratnam and Salzman (2013), the strongly correlated elements can be reordered close to each other. For other ordering methods of random variables, one may refer to, for example, Gilbert et al. (1992), Wagaman and Levina (2009), and the references therein.

We have also conducted simulations to evaluate the performance of DLRT after re-



(a) $n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100$



(b) $n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500$

Figure 5: Power comparisons among the DLRT, SD, PA, GCT_{lg} , CQ and RHT tests with $(n_1 = n_2 = 5, p = 100)$ or $(n_1 = n_2 = 15, p = 500)$, respectively. The horizontal dashed red lines represent the nominal level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The results are based on 2000 simulations with data from the normal distribution.

ordering the components by the best permutation algorithm. Specifically, we first generate $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_1}$ from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \Sigma)$, and $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n_2}$ from $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \Sigma)$, where the common covariance matrix, Σ , follows the same setting as Section 4.1 of our main paper. For simplicity, let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \mathbf{0}$. Under the alternative hypothesis, we assume that the first p_0 elements in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ are nonzero, where $p_0 = \beta p$ with $\beta \in [0, 1]$ being the tuning parameter that controls the signal sparsity. We consider two dependence structures including the independent (IND) structure and the short range dependence (SRD) structure. To represent different levels of correlation in the SRD structure, we consider two levels of correlation $\rho = 0.3$ and 0.6 , respectively. For the power comparison, we set the j th nonzero component in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ as $\mu_{2j} = \theta \sigma_{jj}$, $j = 1, \dots, p_0$, where θ is the effect size of the corresponding component. The other parameters are set as $(n_1, n_2, \theta) \times p = \{(30, 30, 0.25)\} \times \{500 \text{ or } 800\}$, respectively. In addition, we let $\tilde{X}_i = P\mathbf{X}_i$ and $\tilde{Y}_k = P\mathbf{Y}_k$, where $P \in R^{p \times p}$ is a permutation matrix. Consequently, the components of \tilde{X}_i and \tilde{Y}_k do not follow a natural ordering.

Next, we apply the BP-DLRT, SD, PA, BP-GCT_{lg}, CQ and RHT tests to the data $\{\tilde{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ and $\{\tilde{Y}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$, where BP-DLRT and BP-GCT_{lg} are formed by first reordering \tilde{X}_i and \tilde{Y}_k with the best permutation method, and then applying the DLRT and GCT_{lg} to the reordered variables (note that GCT_{lg} also assumes a natural ordering).

The simulation results are shown in Table 4 with nominal level of 5%. When the correlation is weak, the type I error rates of BP-DLRT are still more close to the nominal level than the BP-GCT_{lg} test. The power of the BP-DLRT test is usually larger than the SD, PA, BP-GCT_{lg}, CQ and RHT tests. When the correlation becomes stronger, we note that BP-GCT_{lg} and BP-GCT_{lg} both have inflated type I error rates.

In conclusion, when the natural ordering among the components is unknown, the BP-DLRT test can be recommended for the un-ordered variables. In particular, when the correlation among the components are not strong, the BP-DLRT test is able to provide a satisfactory power performance.

D Properties of the DLRT, SD, PA, GCT, CQ and RHT tests

D.1 A summary of asymptotic power

In this paper we focus on the testing problem with dense but weak signals, the asymptotic power of the considered tests depend heavily on the total amount of the signals. To specify

Table 4: Power comparisons over 2000 simulations for the BP-DLRT, BP-GCT_{lg}, PA, SD, CQ and RHT tests under the IND or SRD structure, respectively. Two different correlation, $\rho = 0.3$ or 0.6 , are considered for the SRD structure. The nominal level is 5%.

Cov	Method	$p = 500$			$p = 800$		
		$\beta = 0$	$\beta = 0.15$	$\beta = 0.30$	$\beta = 0$	$\beta = 0.15$	$\beta = 0.30$
IND	BP-DLRT	0.051	0.509	0.967	0.044	0.695	0.998
	SD	0.032	0.478	0.966	0.030	0.654	0.997
	PA	0.050	0.544	0.974	0.045	0.745	0.999
	BP-GCT _{lg}	0.063	0.393	0.947	0.045	0.612	0.995
	CQ	0.049	0.466	0.920	0.051	0.568	0.979
	RHT	0.050	0.434	0.905	0.054	0.566	0.979
SRD ($\rho = 0.3$)	BP-DLRT	0.064	0.536	0.937	0.071	0.717	0.993
	SD	0.039	0.430	0.896	0.032	0.585	0.986
	PA	0.048	0.499	0.924	0.061	0.678	0.993
	BP-GCT _{lg}	0.081	0.430	0.908	0.077	0.637	0.991
	CQ	0.049	0.426	0.844	0.056	0.544	0.966
	RHT	0.064	0.381	0.791	0.058	0.502	0.958
SRD ($\rho = 0.6$)	BP-DLRT	0.089	0.311	0.722	0.082	0.486	0.913
	SD	0.042	0.251	0.690	0.039	0.035	0.837
	PA	0.055	0.343	0.748	0.053	0.446	0.901
	BP-GCT _{lg}	0.112	0.265	0.678	0.093	0.419	0.889
	CQ	0.054	0.301	0.690	0.056	0.359	0.836
	RHT	0.056	0.235	0.546	0.045	0.327	0.765

the necessary order of the respective tests, we have reported their asymptotic power in Table 5. In the third column of Table 5, we present the necessary order of the signal for each test.

Specifically, we assume $\kappa_0 = n_1 n_2 / (n_1 + n_2)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ are two population mean vectors, Σ and R be the common covariance matrix and correlation matrix, respectively. Let $D_\sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_{11}^2, \dots, \sigma_{pp}^2)$ be the diagonal matrix of Σ , $\tau_D^2 = 2\pi f_d(0)$ and $\tau_G^2 = 2\pi f_g(0)$, where $f_d(\cdot)$ and $f_g(\cdot)$ are the spectrum density functions of $\{V_{Nj}\}_{j=1}^p$ and $\{t_{Nj}\}_{j=1}^p$, respectively. Let

$$H_\lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma \Theta_1(\lambda, \gamma)} \Sigma + \lambda I_p,$$

where

$$\Theta_1(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{1 - \lambda m_F(-\lambda)}{1 - \gamma \{1 - \lambda m_F(-\lambda)\}},$$

with $\gamma = p/n$, $\lambda > 0$, and $m_F(z)$ is the solution of Marchenko–Pastur equation (Chen et al., 2011). In addition, let

$$\Theta_2(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{1 - \lambda m_F(-\lambda)}{[1 - \gamma \{1 - \lambda m_F(-\lambda)\}]^3} - \lambda \frac{m_F(-\lambda) - \lambda m'_F(-\lambda)}{[1 - \gamma \{1 - \lambda m_F(-\lambda)\}]^4},$$

where $m'_F(z)$ is the derivative of $m_F(z)$.

The asymptotic power and the necessary order of the signal for each test are reported in Table 5.

D.2 A summary of the transformation invariance properties

The transformation invariant is a desirable property when constructing the test statistics. To cater for demand, let $\mathbf{X} \in R^p$ is a random vector, we consider the following three types of transformation:

- (1) the orthogonal transformation: $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \Gamma \mathbf{X}$, where $\Gamma^T \Gamma = I$ is an identity matrix;
- (2) the scale transformation: $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow D \mathbf{X}$, where $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_p)$ without any zero entries;
- (3) the shift transformation: $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_0 + \mathbf{X}$, where $\mathbf{d}_0 \in R^p$ is a constant vector.

We summarize the transformation invariance properties of the DLRT, SD, PA, GCT, CQ and RHT tests into Table 6. Interestingly, none of the six tests possesses all the three invariance properties. Future research may be warranted to investigate whether there exists a new test that possesses all the three invariance properties.

Table 5: Asymptotic power and the necessary order of signal for the DLRT, SD, PA, GCT, CQ and RHT tests.

test method	asymptotic power	the necessary order of signal
DLRT	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{p\tau_D^2}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{p\tau_D^2})$
SD	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{2\text{tr}(R^2)}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{2\text{tr}(R^2)})$
PA	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{2\text{tr}(R^2)}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{2\text{tr}(R^2)})$
GCT	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{p\tau_G^2}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{p\tau_G^2})$
CQ	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{2\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T D_\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{2\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)})$
RHT	$\Phi\left(-z_\alpha + \kappa_0 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T H_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)}{\sqrt{2p\Theta_2(\lambda, \gamma)}}\right)$	$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T H_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = O(\sqrt{2p\Theta_2(\lambda, \gamma)})$

Table 6: The transformation invariance properties of the DLRT, SD, PA, GCT, CQ and RHT tests

	DLRT	SD	PA	GCT	CQ	RHT
orthogonal invariance	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
scale invariance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
shift invariance	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

References

- Ahmad, M. R. (2014). A U -statistic approach for a high-dimensional two-sample mean testing problem under non-normality and Behrens-Fisher setting. *The Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **66**, 33–61.
- Bai, Z. and Saranadasa, H. (1996). Effect of high dimension: by an example of a two sample problem. *Statistica Sinica* **6**, 311–329.
- Baladandayuthapani, V., Ji, Y., Talluri, R., Nieto-Barajas, L. E., and Morris, J. S. (2010). Bayesian random segmentation models to identify shared copy number aberrations for array CGH data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **105**, 1358–1375.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2004). Some theory for Fisher’s linear discriminant function, ‘naive Bayes’, and some alternatives when there are many more variables than observations. *Bernoulli* **10**, 989–1010.
- Bühlmann, P. (1996). Locally adaptive lag-window spectral estimation. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **17**, 247–270.
- Chakraborty, A. and Chaudhuri, P. (2017). Tests for high-dimensional data based on means, spatial signs and spatial ranks. *The Annals of Statistics* **45**, 771–799.
- Chen, L. S., Paul, D., Prentice, R. L., and Wang, P. (2011). A regularized Hotelling’s T^2 test for pathway analysis in proteomic studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**, 1345–1360.
- Chen, S. and Qin, Y. (2010). A two-sample test for high-dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *The Annals of Statistics* **38**, 808–835.
- Dong, K., Pang, H., Tong, T., and Genton, M. G. (2016). Shrinkage-based diagonal Hotelling’s tests for high-dimensional small sample size data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **143**, 127–142.
- Dudoit, S., Fridlyand, J., and Speed, T. P. (2002). Comparison of discrimination methods for the classification of tumors using gene expression data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **97**, 77–87.
- Feng, L., Zou, C., Wang, Z., and Zhu, L. (2015). Two-sample Behrens-Fisher problem for high-dimensional data. *Statistica Sinica* **25**, 1297–1312.

- Ghosh, A. K. and Biswas, M. (2016). Distribution-free high-dimensional two-sample tests based on discriminating hyperplanes. *TEST* **25**, 525–547.
- Gilbert, J. R., Moler, C., and Schreiber, R. (1992). Sparse matrices in MATLAB: design and implementation. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **13**, 333–356.
- Gregory, K. B., Carroll, R. J., Baladandayuthapani, V., and Lahiri, S. N. (2015). A two-sample test for equality of means in high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**, 837–849.
- Hall, P. and Heyde, C. C. (1980). *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*. Academic Press, New York.
- Huang, S., Tong, T., and Zhao, H. (2010). Bias-corrected diagonal discriminant rules for high-dimensional classification. *Biometrics* **66**, 1096–1106.
- Jiang, T. and Qi, Y. (2015). Likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **42**, 988–1009.
- Jiang, T. and Yang, F. (2013). Central limit theorems for classical likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 2029–2074.
- Li, H., Aue, A., Paul, D., Peng, J., and Wang, P. (2016). An adaptable generalization of Hotelling’s T^2 test in high dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08725*.
- Lopes, M. E., Jacob, L., and Wainwright, M. J. (2011). A more powerful two-sample test in high dimensions using random projection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **24**, 1206–1214.
- Olshen, A. B., Venkatraman, E., Lucito, R., and Wigler, M. (2004). Circular binary segmentation for the analysis of array-based DNA copy number data. *Biostatistics* **5**, 557–572.
- Paparoditis, E. and Politis, D. N. (2012). Nonlinear spectral density estimation: thresholding the correlogram. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **33**, 386–397.
- Park, J. and Ayyala, D. N. (2013). A test for the mean vector in large dimension and small samples. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **143**, 929–943.
- Parzen, E. (1961). Mathematical considerations in the estimation of spectra. *Technometrics* **3**, 167–190.

- Rajaratnam, B. and Salzman, J. (2013). Best permutation analysis. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **121**, 193–223.
- Spira, R. (1971). Calculation of the gamma function by Stirling’s formula. *Mathematics of Computation* **25**, 317–322.
- Srivastava, M. S. (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. S. 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. S., Katayama, S., and Kano, Y. (2013). A two sample test in high dimensional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **114**, 349–358.
- Srivastava, R., Li, P., and Ruppert, D. (2016). RAPTT: an exact two-sample test in high dimensions using random projections. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **23**, 954–970.
- Städler, N. and Mukherjee, S. (2017). Two-sample testing in high dimensions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **79**, 225–246.
- Thulin, M. (2014). A high-dimensional two-sample test for the mean using random subspaces. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **74**, 26–38.
- Wagaman, A. and Levina, E. (2009). Discovering sparse covariance structures with the Isomap. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **18**, 551–572.
- Wang, L., Peng, B., and Li, R. (2015). A high-dimensional nonparametric multivariate test for mean vector. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**, 1658–1669.
- Wei, S., Lee, C., Wichers, L., and Marron, J. (2016). Direction-projection-permutation for high-dimensional hypothesis tests. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **25**, 549–569.
- Wu, Y., Genton, M. G., and Stefanski, L. A. (2006). A multivariate two-sample mean test for small sample size and missing data. *Biometrics* **62**, 877–885.
- Zhao, J. and Xu, X. (2016). A generalized likelihood ratio test for normal mean when p is greater than n . *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **99**, 91–104.

Zhu, D. and Galbraith, J. W. (2010). A generalized asymmetric Student- t distribution with application to financial econometrics. *Journal of Econometrics* **157**, 297–305.