

Nonparametric Analysis of Clustered Multivariate Data

Jaakko Nevalainen, Denis Larocque, Hannu Oja and Ilkka Pörsti *

Version: October 24, 2021

Abstract

There has been a wide interest to extend univariate and multivariate nonparametric procedures to clustered and hierarchical data. Traditionally, parametric mixed models have been used to account for the correlation structures among the dependent observational units. In this work we extend multivariate nonparametric procedures for one-sample and several samples location problems to clustered data settings. The results are given for a general score function, but with an emphasis on spatial sign and rank methods. Mixed models notation involving design matrices for fixed and random

*Jaakko Nevalainen is Professor of Biostatistics, Statistics/Department of Social Research, 20014 University of Turku, Finland (email: jaakko.nevalainen@utu.fi). Denis Larocque is Professor of Statistics, Department of Management Sciences, HEC Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3T-2A7 (email: denis.larocque@hec.ca). Hannu Oja is Academy Professor, Tampere School of Public Health, 33014 University of Tampere, Finland (email: hannu.oja@uta.fi). Ilkka Pörsti is Professor of Internal Medicine, Medical School, 33014 University of Tampere, Finland. Constructive comments by the Associate Editor and two anonymous referees greatly improved the paper. This research was supported by the Academy of Finland, The Finnish Foundation of Cardiovascular Research and the Competitive Research Funding of the Pirkanmaa Hospital District. The research work of Denis Larocque was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

effects is used throughout. The asymptotic variance formulas and limiting distributions of the test statistics under the null hypothesis and under a sequence of alternatives are derived, as well as the limiting distributions for the corresponding estimates. The approach based on a general score function also shows, for example, how M -estimates behave with clustered data. Efficiency studies demonstrate practical advantages and disadvantages of the use of spatial sign and rank scores, and their weighted versions. Small sample procedures based on sign change and permutation principles are discussed. Further development of nonparametric methods for cluster correlated data would benefit from the notation already familiar to statisticians working under normality assumptions. Supplemental materials for the article are available online.

Key words and phrases: clustered data; mixed models; multivariate analysis; non-parametric methods.

1 Introduction

There has been a wide interest to extend univariate and multivariate nonparametric procedures to clustered and hierarchical data, which frequently arise in longitudinal studies for example. It is well known that unless the clustered structure is taken into account during the analysis, the tests and confidence intervals will not maintain their prescribed levels, leading to invalid inference. Traditionally, parametric mixed models have been used to account for the correlation structures among dependent observational units. The extensions of nonparametric methods to clustered data can roughly be divided into univariate (Rosner and Grove 1999; Rosner et al. 2003, 2006; Larocque et al. 2010; Williamson et al. 2003; Larocque 2005; Datta and Satten 2005; Werner and Brunner 2007; Datta and Satten

2008; Larocque et al. 2008; Kloke et al. 2009; Konietzschke and Brunner 2009) and multivariate approaches (Larocque 2003; Larocque et al. 2007; Nevalainen et al. 2007b,a; Haataja et al. 2009). In this paper we demonstrate that the nonparametric procedures, which may first seem a sparse collection of tests and estimates, can in fact be regarded as a class of score-based methods for clustered data problems. Strict assumptions on the distribution of the random effects or the random errors are unnecessary in this class. Our notation coincides with the one used in the mixed models framework.

Let $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)' = (\mathbf{y}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{(p)})$ be a sample of p -variate ($p > 1$) random vectors with sample size n . The data are assumed to be clustered throughout the paper. The cluster memberships are given by the $n \times d$ matrix $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)'$:

$$(\mathbf{Z})_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the } i\text{th observation is from cluster } j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is useful to note that

$$(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the } i\text{th and the } j\text{th observation are from the same cluster;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and that $\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}$ is a $d \times d$ diagonal matrix with the cluster sizes on the diagonal, say, m_1, \dots, m_d .

We also write $\mathbf{1}_n$ for a column n -vector of ones, $\text{vec}(\mathbf{Y})$ for the vector obtained by stacking the columns of \mathbf{Y} , and \otimes for the Kronecker product.

A parametric linear mixed effects model for multivariate clustered data can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{E}, \tag{1}$$

where \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} are design matrices corresponding to the fixed effects and cluster memberships, respectively, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a $d \times p$ random matrix of regression coefficients (random effects), $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $q \times p$ matrix of regression coefficients (fixed effects), and \mathbf{E} is an $n \times p$ matrix of

random errors. In a normality based model it is assumed that the rows of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ are i.i.d. from $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})$ and that the rows of \mathbf{E} are i.i.d. from $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. To better illustrate the dependency structure, rewrite the model as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{E}_*, \text{ where } \text{vec}(\mathbf{E}'_*) \sim N_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' \otimes \boldsymbol{\Omega}).$$

If $\mathbf{E}_* = (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n)'$ this means that

(P1) $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \boldsymbol{\Omega})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(P2) If $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 1$ then

$$\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j) \sim N_{2p} \left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} & \boldsymbol{\Omega} \\ \boldsymbol{\Omega} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

(P3) If $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 0$ then $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j$ are independent.

The problem with the parametric linear model are the strict distributional assumptions, which can be completely unrealistic. Its use outside of the assumed model can lead into inefficient or even invalid statistical inference. In section 2 of this paper we introduce an alternative semiparametric linear model to analyze clustered data under relaxed assumptions. Section 3 treats the multivariate one-sample location problem, both from the point of view of testing and estimation. The section has some review character in it but we now present the results for a general score function rather than focusing on a specific score. In section 4 the treatment is expanded to the multivariate several samples location problem, which has not appeared previously. Efficiency studies demonstrate the practical advantages and disadvantages of the proposed two-sample weighted nonparametric tests compared to the classical methods based on the sample mean and the sample covariance matrix in section 5. Finally, two data sets are analyzed with spatial sign and rank methods (provided as a supplemental file).

2 A Semiparametric Linear Model

Suppose that the data is clustered and we wish to analyze it by the linear model

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{E}, \text{ where } \mathbf{E} = (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n)'.$$

However, we wish to avoid assumptions of normality, or any other parametric distribution, on the random errors. Instead we assume the following.

Assumption 2.1 *Distributional assumptions.*

(D1) *The marginal distributions are identical: $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \sim \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.*

(D2) *The pairwise joint distributions are identical: $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j) \sim \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i'}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j'})$ for all $i \neq j$ and $i' \neq j'$ and $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{i'j'}$.*

(D3) *The clusters are independent: if $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = \mathbf{0}$ then $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j$ are independent.*

Assumptions (D1) and (D2) fix the location, variance and covariance structure of the model.

Assumption (D3) is a natural and standard presumption, and also needed for finding the limiting distribution. Compared to the assumptions of the parametric linear model (P1)-(P3), these conditions are not restrictive.

To work under these assumptions it is often advantageous to use transformed observations instead of the original ones. Our approach is first to apply a vector-valued score function $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y})$ to the data points (or to the centered observations as discussed later). To prove the asymptotic results, it is sufficient that the score function has the following properties.

Assumption 2.2 *Sufficient conditions on the score function.*

(S1) *The score function satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y} + c\boldsymbol{\delta}) - \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}) - \dot{\mathbf{T}}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{y})c\| \leq R_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{y})c^{1+\zeta}$$

for some $\zeta > 0$, and $\exists K > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that $E \left[\sup_{\|\delta\| \leq K} R_\delta(\epsilon_i) \right] < M$.

(S2) $E(\|\mathbf{T}(\epsilon)\|^\nu) < \infty$ for some $\nu > 2$.

In the one-sample case, one additional condition is needed.

(S3) The score function is odd: $\mathbf{T}(-\mathbf{y}) = -\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y})$.

Note that if $\nabla \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y})$ is the matrix of partial derivatives $\partial \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{y}) / \partial \mathbf{y}_j$, then $\dot{\mathbf{T}}_\delta(\mathbf{y}) = \nabla \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}) \delta$ in (S1).

Tests and estimates can then be constructed on the transformed data. By choosing the score function well, tests and estimates can achieve desired properties for the problem at hand, like robustness against outliers, or improved efficiency for heavy-tailed distributions. Some examples of clever choices of scores are signs and ranks commonly used in nonparametric statistics, optimal scores from maximum likelihood theory, or Huber's score often applied in robust statistics. Thus, the proposed approach works for a general score function, and suggests how the tests and estimates could be constructed. Some authors have expressed interest towards this type of approach in univariate testing (Jin and Robinson 2003; Huang et al. 2009), but these tests are currently designed for independent observations only. The main motivation for the present paper is, however, multivariate sign and rank methods resulting from taking either the *spatial sign*

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y}_i) = \|\mathbf{y}_i\|^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i,$$

the centered *spatial rank*

$$\mathbf{R}_n(\mathbf{y}_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j),$$

or the centered *spatial signed rank*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Q}_n(\mathbf{y}_i) &= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j=1}^n [\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j) + \|\mathbf{y}_i + \mathbf{y}_j\|^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_i + \mathbf{y}_j)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{R}_n(\mathbf{y}_i) - \mathbf{R}_n(-\mathbf{y}_i)].\end{aligned}$$

By convention, $\|\mathbf{0}\|^{-1}\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$. Figure 1 illustrates how the transformations preserve the clustering structure. The methods based on spatial signs and ranks are more robust, more efficient for heavy-tailed distributions than normal theory based methods (Möttönen et al. 1997), and do not require assumptions on the existence of moments of \mathbf{y}_i . Spatial sign and rank methods have been criticized for their lack of affine invariance and equivariance properties, but this problem can be overcome by a modified transformation-retransformation procedure (section 6). The results of the paper have been written having these three score functions in mind but they hold more generally.

Conditions (S1)–(S3) hold for the identity score $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}$ if $E(\|\mathbf{y}\|^\nu) < \infty$ for some $\nu > 2$. For the spatial sign score $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y})$, (S2) and (S3) are trivially true. To verify (S1), one can first show that

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y} + c\boldsymbol{\delta}) - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y})\| \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{y}\|} [\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y})\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y})'] \boldsymbol{\delta} c\| \leq B \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^{1+\zeta}}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^{1+\zeta}} c^{1+\zeta}, 0 < \zeta < 1.$$

(Arcones 1998; Bai et al. 1990). (S1) then follows if $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ has a bounded density. The conditions can be established similarly for the spatial rank score.

3 One-Sample Case

Assume that

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{1}_n \boldsymbol{\mu}' + \mathbf{E},$$

where rows of \mathbf{E} satisfy assumptions (D1)-(D3). In the one-sample case it is natural to transform the data set $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)'$ to $\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_n))'$ using an odd score function $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y})$. We wish to test the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ without loss of generality, where the location parameter $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ satisfies $E(\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, its interpretation depends on the choice of the score. However, if the distribution is symmetric, $\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{y}_i$, all tests test the same null hypothesis and the corresponding estimates estimate the same population parameter with different statistical properties.

Let f be the density of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ and $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{y}_i)$ be the optimal score function, the gradient vector of $\log f(\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ at the origin. Note also that $E(\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_i)) = \mathbf{0}$ if H_0 is true. Define

$$\mathbf{A} = E(\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i)\mathbf{L}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i)') \text{ and } \mathbf{B} = E(\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i)\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i)')$$

and

$$\mathbf{C} = E(\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i)\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j)') \text{ where } i \neq j \text{ satisfy } (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 1.$$

The covariance structure of the weighted scores $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}$ is then

$$\text{Cov}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{W})) = \mathbf{W}^2 \otimes \mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{W}) \otimes \mathbf{C},$$

where $\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{w})$ is a $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with a non-negative weight associated with the i th observation as the i th diagonal element. For the sampling design and the weights, it is assumed that $\mathbf{1}_n'\mathbf{W}\mathbf{1}_n = n$ and that there exist constants D_B and D_C such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n'\mathbf{W}^2\mathbf{1}_n \rightarrow D_B \text{ and } \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n'\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{W}\mathbf{1}_n \rightarrow D_C$$

as d tends to infinity.

But how should the weights be chosen? It is natural that the members of the same cluster receive the same weight. Furthermore, it can be shown that if $\mathbf{C} = \rho\mathbf{B}$ and the covariance

matrix has the structure

$$\text{Cov}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{T}')) = \mathbf{I}_n \otimes \mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \otimes \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{\Sigma} \otimes \mathbf{B}, \text{ where } \mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_n + \rho(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n),$$

the optimal weights are given by $\mathbf{w} = \kappa \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_n$. The weights in the i th cluster are then proportional to $[1 + (m_i - 1)\rho]^{-1}$ (Larocque et al. 2007). These weights are optimal in the sense that they maximize the Pitman efficiency of a test based on $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{T}$. Here κ is the Lagrange multiplier chosen so that the constraint $\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{1}_n = n$ is satisfied.

3.1 Testing

The test statistic for testing $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ versus $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is the weighted average of the scores

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{1}_n = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{1}_n' \otimes \mathbf{I}_p) \text{vec}(\mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W}).$$

Then we have:

Result 3.1 *Under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$, as d tends to infinity*

$$Q^2 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{1}_n \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2,$$

where $n^{-1} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T}$ is a consistent estimate of $D_B \mathbf{B} + D_C \mathbf{C}$, the asymptotic covariance matrix of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{1}_n$.

The result follows from the generalization of the central limit theorem given as a corollary in Serfling (1980, p. 30), by noting that the cluster sums are independent but not identically distributed random variables.

For symmetric distributions, small sample (meaning here a small d) p -values can be based on the sign change principle. Under the null,

$$\mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{1}_d \sim \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{J}_d \mathbf{1}_d,$$

where \mathbf{J}_d is a $d \times d$ diagonal sign-change matrix, with ± 1 as diagonal entries, and changing all the signs within a cluster at the same time. The covariance matrix estimate is invariant under these sign changes, and the test statistic becomes

$$Q_J^2 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}'_d \mathbf{J}_d \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{J}_d \mathbf{1}_d.$$

Estimation of $E_J [I(Q_J^2 \geq Q^2) | \mathbf{Y}]$ over *e.g.* 1000 equiprobable random allocations of signs gives an estimated p -value for the conditionally distribution-free test.

Result 3.2 *The limiting distribution under the sequence of alternatives $H_n : \boldsymbol{\mu} = n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ is a non-central chi-square*

$$Q^2 \xrightarrow{d} \chi_p^2 (\boldsymbol{\delta}' \mathbf{A} (D_B \mathbf{B} + D_C \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\delta})$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

This result allows the computation of asymptotic relative efficiencies (Larocque et al. 2007; Haataja et al. 2009).

3.2 Estimation

The companion estimate of location is determined by the estimating equation

$$\mathbf{1}'_n \mathbf{W} \hat{\mathbf{T}} = \mathbf{0},$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = (\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_1 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}), \dots, \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_n - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}))'$. Thus, the solution is a location estimate with the property that the weighted scores of shifted observations add up to zero. If (S1) holds and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{O}_p(1)$, the Bahadur-type representation

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbf{o}_p(1)$$

shows the relationship between the test and the estimate. The connection has been established in detail for the spatial sign score (Nevalainen et al. 2007b,a) with clustered data, and for the spatial signed-rank score (Chaudhuri 1992) with independent observations. Now, the asymptotic distributions of the weighted spatial median or the weighted spatial Hodges-Lehmann estimate for example, are trivial:

Result 3.3 *The limiting distribution of the score-based estimate is*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \xrightarrow{d} N_p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}^{-1}(D_B \mathbf{B} + D_C \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{A}^{-1})$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

The estimation of the covariance matrix can be based on the residuals $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_i = \mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. The matrix $D_B \mathbf{B} + D_C \mathbf{C}$ can be consistently estimated by $n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{T}}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \hat{\mathbf{T}}$. For the weighted spatial median and the weighted Hodges-Lehmann estimate the \mathbf{A} matrix is estimated by

$$\text{ave}_i [\mathbf{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_i)] \text{ and } \text{ave}_{ij} \left[\mathbf{A} \left(\frac{1}{2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_i + \hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_j) \right) \right], \text{ where } \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i) = \frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i\|} \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i'}{\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i\|^2} \right),$$

and the second average is over the pairs with $(\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 0$. Estimation of precision of the estimates in small samples could potentially be based on bootstrap procedures for clustered data (Field and Welsh 2007), but more practical experience is needed on this approach.

4 Several Samples Case

Suppose now that the data consist of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$, where \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{Z} are matrices of response vectors and the cluster memberships, respectively, in the same way as in section 1, and that $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)'$ is an $n \times c$ matrix indicating group or sample membership such that

$$(\mathbf{X})_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the } i\text{th observation is from group } j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Again,

$$(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}')_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the } i\text{th and the } j\text{th observation are from the same group;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and that $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}$ is a $c \times c$ diagonal matrix with the group sizes on the diagonal, say, n_1, \dots, n_c , again assumed fixed by the design. Recall the cluster membership matrix \mathbf{Z} and the weight matrix \mathbf{W} from the previous section. Now $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}$ is a frequency table fixing the design.

Write the model as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{1}_n \boldsymbol{\mu}' + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Delta}' + \mathbf{E},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the overall location center (*e.g.* grand mean), $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ is a $p \times c$ contrast matrix representing the treatment effects or the deviations from that location center, and the rows of \mathbf{E} satisfy (D1)-(D3). The parameters in the model depend on the choice of the score, population, and the design. For now we are interested in the treatment effects only: the goal is to confront the hypotheses $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\Delta} = \mathbf{0}$ vs. $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\Delta} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

In the test construction we need estimated (or centered) scores $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ chosen to satisfy $\mathbf{1}_n' \mathbf{W} \hat{\mathbf{T}} = \mathbf{0}$. Different scores require different inner centering to fulfil this property. For example, for the identity or the spatial sign score, the estimated scores and the theoretical scores are $\hat{\mathbf{T}}_i = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ and $\mathbf{T}_i = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu})$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is estimated from the whole sample assuming absence of treatment effects. As will be seen in the next section, the test statistic can be expressed in two asymptotically equivalent forms, but only if the weighted estimate of location is based on the same score as the test. For these two scores, the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ should be the weighted sample mean (identity score) or the weighted spatial median (spatial sign score). Rank scores are automatically centered but the weighted ranks are not.

Thus, in the case of ranks we write

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_i = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j) \text{ and } \mathbf{T}_i = E(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j)),$$

where the expectation is taken over \mathbf{y}_j with $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 0$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \hat{\mathbf{T}}_i = \mathbf{0}$ and $E(\mathbf{T}_i) = \mathbf{0}$. Collect these and let $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = (\hat{\mathbf{T}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_n)'$ and $\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_n)'$ denote the matrices of estimated and theoretical scores, respectively. Under the null hypothesis, $E(\text{vec}(\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{W})) = \mathbf{0}$ and the covariance structure is given by

$$\text{Cov}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{W})) = \mathbf{W}^2 \otimes \mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{W}) \otimes \mathbf{C}.$$

Optimal weights are obtained for the two-sample problem in a similar way as for the one-sample problem: if again $\mathbf{C} = \rho\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{x}_{(1)} - \mathbf{x}_{(2)})$ the optimal weights are $\mathbf{w} = \Sigma^{-1}(\kappa_1 \mathbf{x}_{(1)} + \kappa_2 \mathbf{1}_n)$, where $\Sigma = (1 - \rho)\mathbf{I}_n + \rho\mathbf{G}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{G}$ with Lagrange multipliers κ_1 and κ_2 chosen such that $\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{x}_{(1)} = n_1$ and $\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{1}_n = n$.

4.1 Testing

The test to confront the hypotheses $H_0 : \Delta = \mathbf{0}$ and $H_1 : \Delta \neq \mathbf{0}$ is based on the $p(c-1)$ -vector

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{X}' \otimes \mathbf{I}_p) \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{T}}'\mathbf{W}),$$

where \mathbf{H} is a $c \times (c-1)$ matrix obtained from the identity matrix by dropping its c th column.

Under the null hypothesis,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{X}'_0 \otimes \mathbf{I}_p) \text{vec}(\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{W}) + \mathbf{o}_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{X}_0 = (\mathbf{I}_n - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n'\mathbf{W})\mathbf{X}$ is a centered version of the design matrix, which has enabled us to replace the estimated scores $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ by the theoretical scores \mathbf{T} .

Under the null hypothesis $E\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{X}'_0 \otimes \mathbf{I}_p) \text{vec}(\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{W})\right) = \mathbf{0}$ and correspondingly its nonsingular covariance matrix is

$$\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{H}) \otimes \mathbf{B} + \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{H}) \otimes \mathbf{C}.$$

A necessary assumption is that the matrices

$$\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{X}_0), \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}_0) \text{ and } \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}_0$$

converge to finite matrix-valued limits, \mathbf{D}_B , \mathbf{D}_C and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, say. Note the similarity of the requirement to the one-sample case: the limits now need to exist groupwise. Diagonal elements of the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ satisfy $0 < \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_c < 1$.

Result 4.1 *Under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\Delta} = \mathbf{0}$*

$$\begin{aligned} Q^2 = & \tilde{\mathbf{T}}' \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{H}' (\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{X}_0) \mathbf{H} \right) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{n} \hat{\mathbf{T}}' \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{H}' (\mathbf{X}'_0 \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}_0) \mathbf{H} \right) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{k} \hat{\mathbf{T}}' (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \right]^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2_{p(c-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where $k = \mathbf{1}'_n (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{1}_n$ and the part inside the brackets $[\cdot]$ is a consistent estimate of $(\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{D}_B \mathbf{H}) \otimes \mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{D}_C \mathbf{H}) \otimes \mathbf{C}$.

A conditionally distribution-free permutation test is constructed as follows. Let \mathbf{P} be an “acceptable” $n \times n$ permutation matrix obtained by permuting the rows or columns of an identity matrix, uniform among acceptable permutations. The p -value of the permutation test is the estimate of

$$E_P [I(Q^2(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}) \geq Q^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})) | \mathbf{Y}].$$

The proper way to permute clustered data in an acceptable way depends on the design. Clearly, permutations which do not change the distribution of the test statistic when the

null hypothesis is true are guaranteed to provide a valid and distribution-free test. We say that two designs $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{Z}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ are *equivalent in structure* if there exist permutation matrices \mathbf{P}_c and \mathbf{P}_d of dimensions $c \times c$ and $d \times d$, respectively, such that

$$\mathbf{P}_c \mathbf{X}_1' \mathbf{Z}_1 \mathbf{P}_d = \mathbf{X}_2' \mathbf{Z}_2.$$

To ensure that the null distribution of the test statistic is invariant under permutations, the general condition on the permutation matrix is that $(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$ and (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) are equivalent in structure. In controlled trials the approach should also follow the randomization scheme. One can distinguish between three common designs:

Design A. A permutation fulfilling the general condition is natural for observational studies, where the researcher has no control over the group memberships.

Design B. Randomization of individuals inside the clusters. The permutation of the treatment assignments should be performed only within the clusters. More formally, so that the permutation matrices \mathbf{P} satisfy $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}$. The condition implies the general condition.

Design C. Randomization of clusters. The permutation should then maintain the members of the same cluster within the same treatment, and the permutation matrices \mathbf{P} should satisfy the general condition and $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'$. This allows the exchange of treatments between clusters of the same size only, and the permutation may not be very rich.

Consider next the sequence of alternatives $H_n : \boldsymbol{\Delta} = n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_0$, where $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_c)$ is chosen in such a way that $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0 \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}$. This fixes the location parameter $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ for asymptotic studies. Under H_n ,

$$E \left(\tilde{\mathbf{T}} \right) = \frac{1}{n} ((\mathbf{H}' \mathbf{X}_0' \mathbf{W}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_p) \text{vec} (\mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_0 \mathbf{X}') = \frac{1}{n} ((\mathbf{H}' \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}) \otimes \mathbf{A}) \text{vec} (\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0) + \mathbf{o}(1).$$

Therefore we have the following result.

Result 4.2 *Under H_n , the limiting distribution of Q^2 is a noncentral chi-square with $p(c-1)$ degrees of freedom and noncentrality parameter*

$$\text{vec}(\Delta_0 \Lambda \mathbf{H})' [(\mathbf{H}' \mathbf{D}_B \mathbf{H}) \otimes (\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1}) + (\mathbf{H}' \mathbf{D}_C \mathbf{H}) \otimes (\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1})]^{-1} \text{vec}(\Delta_0 \Lambda \mathbf{H}),$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

Alternatively, the noncentrality parameter can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\Delta_0)' [\mathbf{D}_B \otimes (\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1}) + \mathbf{D}_C \otimes (\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1})]^+ \text{vec}(\Delta_0) \\ = \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} \Delta_0)' [\mathbf{D}_B \otimes \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{D}_C \otimes \mathbf{C}]^+ \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} \Delta_0), \end{aligned}$$

which is of the same form as in the one-sample case.

4.2 Estimation

Until now we have parametrised the model with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and Δ , which depend not only on the underlying population but also on the design. Let us now reparametrize the model by $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_c)' = \mathbf{1}_c \boldsymbol{\mu}' + \Delta'$, and obtain the model

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{E}.$$

The weighted estimates of the group centers $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_c$ are found via solving the c estimating equations $\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{W} \hat{\mathbf{T}} = \mathbf{0}$, where now $\hat{\mathbf{T}}_i = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}' \mathbf{x}_i)$, and $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = (\hat{\mathbf{T}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_n)'$. In essence, this is simply a one-sample estimation problem repeated c times (section 3.2).

Estimation of group differences is a little more subtle issue. Due to clustering, the observations are correlated, and so are the estimates. Write $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_j - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i$, $i, j = 1, \dots, c$. With the identity, spatial sign and rank scores, the problem is reduced to computation of (i) the difference of the mean vectors, (ii) the difference of the spatial medians, or (iii) the two-sample

Hodges-Lehmann estimate (Hodges and Lehmann 1963; Möttönen and Oja 1995). Again, under sufficient conditions, the connection between the estimate and scores is

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) &= \sqrt{n}\mathbf{A}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_j} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{(j)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{(i)} \right) + \mathbf{o}_p(1) \\ &= \sqrt{n}\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{w}_{ij}^* + \mathbf{o}_p(1),\end{aligned}$$

where $n_i = \mathbf{x}_{(i)}' \mathbf{x}_{(i)}$ is the group size. Standard theory yields:

Result 4.3 *Under general assumptions, the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})$ is a p -variate normal distribution with expectation zero and covariance matrix*

$$\mathbf{A}^{-1} (\gamma_B \mathbf{B} + \gamma_C \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{A}^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$ and where

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_B &= \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{n}{n_i} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{(i)}' \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x}_{(i)}}{n_i} + \frac{n}{n_j} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{(j)}' \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{x}_{(j)}}{n_j} \right] \\ \gamma_C &= \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{n}{n_i} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{(i)}' \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{(i)}}{n_i} + \frac{n}{n_j} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{(j)}' \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{(j)}}{n_j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2 \frac{n}{\sqrt{n_i n_j}} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{(i)}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{(j)}}{\sqrt{n_i n_j}} \right].\end{aligned}$$

This covariance breakdown shows how the intracluster dependency affects the covariance structure via members of the same cluster receiving the same and different treatments. If all members of the cluster belong to the same group, the last part of γ_C disappears, and the total variance can be seriously underestimated if the clustering is ignored. The opposite may happen when treatments are assigned within the clusters.

In practice, the limiting constants γ_B and γ_C can be replaced by their empirical counterparts. The estimation of the matrices \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} is based on the residuals. For the spatial sign score, obvious estimates are

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \text{ave} \left[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}' \mathbf{x}_i) \right], \quad \hat{\mathbf{B}} = \frac{1}{n} \hat{\mathbf{T}}' \hat{\mathbf{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{C}} = \frac{1}{k} \hat{\mathbf{T}}' (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \hat{\mathbf{T}}$$

where $k = \mathbf{1}'_n (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{1}_n$. For spatial ranks one could use $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \text{ave}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{sr})]$ in which $(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}')_{ij} = 0$ and observation i belongs to sample r and j to sample s . An alternative and simpler route is to estimate (2) by a similar estimate as in the one-sample case:

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \left(n \hat{\mathbf{T}}' \mathbf{W}_{ij}^* \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{W}_{ij}^* \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1}, \text{ where } \mathbf{W}_{ij}^* = \text{diag}(\mathbf{w}_{ij}^*).$$

This estimate uses only two samples in the estimation of the middle part and is more reliable when the variances are heterogeneous across samples.

5 Efficiency Studies

In this section we focus on the efficiency of two-sample tests. For earlier efficiency studies of the multivariate one-sample problem with spatial sign and rank scores we refer to Larocque (2003), Larocque et al. (2007) and Haataja et al. (2009).

We generated clustered multivariate data from a linear mixed model setting up a trivariate t_ν -distribution. Full details of the model, designs and cluster size configurations are given in the supplemental file.

The performance of six two-sample tests, Hotelling's T^2 , spatial sign test, spatial rank test, and their weighted versions was investigated. The weights optimal for the classical Hotelling's T^2 test were used for all the weighted tests. Practical experience has shown that the three optimal weight matrices of the tests are very similar, and the rationale for choosing these weights lies in their appealing ease of computation. The tests were studied under three frequently encountered designs (section 4.1) for different values of the intracluster correlation ρ .

5.1 Asymptotic relative efficiency

Asymptotic relative efficiencies (ARE), using the unweighted Hotelling's T^2 as the benchmark test, for the three different designs are shown in Figure 2. At $\rho = 0$, the tests inherit the efficiencies from the i.i.d. case. Hotelling's T^2 test is the optimal for the multinormal distribution, but the spatial sign test is the best for the t_3 -distribution. The ARE of the weighted Hotelling's T^2 relative to the unweighted Hotelling's T^2 does not depend on the degrees of freedom. The spatial rank test has a good ARE for both distributions. The behavior of the tests is remarkably different from design to another when $\rho > 0$.

In Design A, the AREs of the unweighted tests do not depend on ρ , because \mathbf{D}_C is here a zero matrix. Weighted tests behave gorgeously, however. Optimal weighting assigns large weights to observations in clusters with both groups present, and less weight to clusters with members only from one group. As $\rho \rightarrow 1$, these within-cluster comparisons tend to receive all the weight, because the treatment effect can be recovered most accurately from them. The unweighted tests still suffer from the error in between-clusters comparisons, and thus the AREs of the weighted tests are dramatically better. Design B is an example of a design where the efficiency cannot be improved by weighting. Thus, the efficiencies of the unweighted and weighted tests overlap. For both spatial sign and rank tests the AREs decrease as a function of ρ . The AREs in Design C are similar to the ones in the one-sample case (Larocque et al. 2007, *e.g.*). AREs of the unweighted tests at $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = 1$ are identical since a cluster becomes a singleton observation at $\rho = 1$. In between, spatial sign and rank tests suffer less from intraclass correlation than Hotelling's T^2 . Notable improvements can be obtained by weighting.

5.2 Simulations

Results on the empirical size and power are presented in Table 1 for $d = 30$. All six tests generally maintain their nominal size well with a few exceptions. Hotelling’s T^2 and its weighted version are conservative for the t_3 error distribution. The distribution has very heavy tails, and in such a setting the convergence of the moment-based test to its limiting distribution is slower. All unweighted tests seem conservative in Design C. This suggests that designs without within-cluster comparisons between treatments need a larger sample size for a good χ_3^2 -approximation. Interestingly, corresponding weighted tests are liberal for the same design in particular with larger values of ρ . Of course, with $\rho = 0.05$ the unweighted and the weighted test are almost the same. It is worth noting that at $d = 14$ (supplemental Table 3), spatial sign and rank tests still maintain their size fairly well in Design A, regardless of the values of ν and ρ , but not as generally in Designs B and C. Curiously, the direction from which the tests converge to meet their target level seems to depend on all parameters of the configuration: score, design, weights, error distribution and intracluster correlation. At $d = 60$ the levels overall have improved substantially (supplemental Table 4).

Spatial sign and rank tests have a good power among all the studied error distributions and designs, whereas Hotelling’s T^2 is the best unweighted test in the normal case, but has almost no power for the t_3 -distribution. This problem cannot be solved by selecting a different design, or by weighting. As for the AREs, use of weights enhance the power of the tests for large values of ρ : modestly in Design A and more effectively in Design C. No gains of power can be obtained by weighting in Design B.

6 Concluding Remarks

It is commonly acknowledged that in the one-sample case ignoring a positive intraclass correlation leads to too liberal analyses because of underestimation of the variance. However, our variance breakdown and the supplemental example demonstrate that the opposite can also take place in a multi-treatments study. Therefore, the analysis may either be too liberal or too conservative depending on the design of the study.

The proposed score-based procedures are not necessarily affine invariant and equivariant. Affine invariant and equivariant versions of spatial sign and rank methods can be developed by using the well-established transformation-retransformation techniques with an inner standardization (Chakraborty and Chaudhuri 1996; Chakraborty et al. 1998; Chakraborty and Chaudhuri 1998). Larocque (2003) and Nevalainen et al. (2007b) present ideas how to do so with clustered data for the testing and estimation problems, respectively. These computationally intensive modifications of the transformation-retransformation procedures can be used as general tools to achieve affine invariance/equivariance with these type of data.

This paper provided a general treatment of score-based testing and estimation methods for multivariate location problems with clustered data. Asymptotic results were confirmed with simulation studies, which also clearly demonstrate the gains obtained by the use of scores and weights. In future research we intend to work with multilevel or hierarchical data, and on regression problems.

Acknowledgements

Constructive comments by the Associate Editor and two anonymous referees greatly improved the paper. This research was supported by the Academy of Finland, The Finnish Foundation

of Cardiovascular Research and the Competitive Research Funding of the Pirkanmaa Hospital District. The research work of Denis Larocque was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

7 Supplemental Materials

Supplemental tables: Details for the efficiency studies and simulation results with $d = 14$ and $d = 60$. (.pdf)

R-functions used for the simulations: Functions that generate data from the model of section 5, perform the tests, and collect the results into external files. (.zip)

Examples: Description and analysis of two example data sets. (.pdf)

R-functions used for the examples: Functions that perform the analyses of the example data sets. (.zip)

References

- Arcones, M. A. (1998), “Asymptotic theory for M -estimators over a convex kernel,” *Econometric Theory*, 14, 387–422.
- Bai, Z. D., Chen, R., Miao, B. Q., and Rao, C. R. (1990), “Asymptotic theory of least distances estimate in multivariate linear models,” *Statistics*, 4, 503–519.
- Chakraborty, B. and Chaudhuri, P. (1996), “On a transformation and re-transformation technique for constructing affine equivariant multivariate median,” in *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 124, pp. 2539–2547.

- (1998), “On an adaptive transformation and retransformation estimate of multivariate location,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 60, 145–157.
- Chakraborty, B., Chaudhuri, P., and Oja, H. (1998), “Operating transformation retransformation on spatial median and angle test,” *Statistica Sinica*, 8, 767–784.
- Chaudhuri, P. (1992), “Multivariate location estimation using extension of R -estimates through U -statistics type approach,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 20, 897–916.
- Datta, S. and Satten, G. A. (2005), “Rank-sum tests for clustered data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 908–915.
- (2008), “A signed-rank test for clustered data,” *Biometrics*, 64, 501–507.
- Field, C. A. and Welsh, A. H. (2007), “Bootstrapping clustered data,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 69, 369–390.
- Haataja, R., Larocque, D., Nevalainen, J., and Oja, H. (2009), “A weighted multivariate signed-rank test for cluster-correlated data,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100, 1107–1119.
- Hodges, J. L. and Lehmann, E. L. (1963), “Estimates of location based on rank tests,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 34, 598–611.
- Huang, A., Jin, R., and Robinson, J. (2009), “Robust permutation tests for two samples,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139, 2631–2642.
- Jin, R. and Robinson, J. (2003), “Robust permutation tests for one sample,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 116, 475–487.

- Kloke, J. D., McKean, J. W., and Rashid, M. M. (2009), “Rank-based estimation and associated inferences for linear models with cluster correlated errors,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 384–390.
- Konietschke, F. and Brunner, E. (2009), “Nonparametric analysis of clustered data in diagnostic trials: estimation problems in small sample sizes,” *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 53, 730–741.
- Larocque, D. (2003), “An affine-invariant multivariate sign test for cluster correlated data,” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 31, 437–455.
- (2005), “The Wilcoxon signed-rank test for cluster correlated data,” in *Statistical Modeling and Analysis for Complex Data Problems*, eds. Duchesne, P. and Rémillard, B., New York, USA: Springer, pp. 309–323.
- Larocque, D., Haataja, R., Nevalainen, J., and Oja, H. (in press), “Two sample tests for the nonparametric Behrens-Fisher problem with clustered data,” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*. First published online on: 26 January 2010.
- Larocque, D., Nevalainen, J., and Oja, H. (2007), “A weighted multivariate sign test for cluster correlated data,” *Biometrika*, 94, 267–283.
- (2008), “One-sample location tests for multilevel data,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 138, 2469–2482.
- Möttönen, J. and Oja, H. (1995), “Multivariate spatial sign and rank methods,” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 5, 201–213.

- Möttönen, J., Oja, H., and Tienari, J. (1997), “On the efficiency of multivariate spatial sign and rank tests,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 25, 542–552.
- Nevalainen, J., Larocque, D., and Oja, H. (2007a), “On the multivariate spatial median for clustered data,” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 35, 215–283.
- (2007b), “A weighted spatial median for clustered data,” *Statistical Methods & Applications*, 15, 355–379.
- Rosner, B., Glynn, R. J., and Lee, M.-L. T. (2003), “Incorporation of clustering effects for the Wilcoxon rank sum test: a large sample approach,” *Biometrics*, 59, 1089–1098.
- (2006), “The Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test for Paired Comparisons of Clustered Data,” *Biometrics*, 62, 185–192.
- Rosner, B. and Grove, D. (1999), “Use of the Mann-Whitney U -test for clustered data,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 18, 1387–1400.
- Serfling, R. J. (1980), *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*, New York: Wiley.
- Werner, C. and Brunner, E. (2007), “Rank methods for the analysis of clustered data in diagnostic trials,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51, 5041–5054.
- Williamson, J. M., Datta, S., and Satten, G. A. (2003), “Marginal analyses of clustered data when cluster size is informative,” *Biometrics*, 59, 36–42.




Figure 1: Clustered data from a bivariate spherical normal distribution with intraclass correlation of $2/3$. The three clusters are indicated by different symbols. The spatial signs of the observations from the same cluster tend to lie on the same regions of the unit circle, whereas the signed ranks also preserve the shape of the data cloud, and the cluster structure remains clearly visible.




Figure 2: AREs of different tests relative to Hotelling's T^2 test for different designs under trivariate t_3 (dotted lines) and normal distributions (solid lines). The tests are spatial sign tests (S), spatial rank tests (R), weighted Hotelling's T^2 tests (WH), weighted spatial sign tests (WS) and weighted spatial rank tests (WR).

Table 1: Empirical size and power of the six two-sample tests under trivariate t -distributions with 30 clusters.

$\rho = 0.05$													
Design	ν	$\Delta = \mathbf{0}$						$\Delta = \Delta_0/\sqrt{N}$					
		H	S	R	WH	WS	WR	H	S	R	WH	WS	WR
A	3	0.044	0.050	0.051	0.044	0.051	0.050	0.084	0.779	0.553	0.085	0.779	0.555
	10	0.047	0.047	0.047	0.046	0.047	0.048	0.560	0.798	0.755	0.561	0.799	0.757
	∞	0.048	0.046	0.045	0.047	0.045	0.046	0.873	0.808	0.864	0.875	0.811	0.867
B	3	0.043	0.050	0.050	0.043	0.050	0.050	0.082	0.792	0.564	0.082	0.792	0.564
	10	0.048	0.048	0.050	0.048	0.048	0.050	0.571	0.810	0.767	0.571	0.810	0.767
	∞	0.048	0.050	0.049	0.048	0.050	0.049	0.886	0.825	0.880	0.886	0.825	0.880
C	3	0.039	0.045	0.043	0.042	0.049	0.047	0.060	0.551	0.356	0.061	0.567	0.374
	10	0.041	0.044	0.042	0.046	0.047	0.046	0.371	0.575	0.520	0.385	0.593	0.541
	∞	0.044	0.046	0.045	0.047	0.049	0.048	0.634	0.580	0.625	0.652	0.600	0.644
$\rho = 0.2$													
A	3	0.044	0.050	0.052	0.043	0.051	0.049	0.084	0.793	0.575	0.083	0.817	0.602
	10	0.049	0.049	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.579	0.819	0.778	0.598	0.840	0.805
	∞	0.047	0.049	0.047	0.048	0.046	0.047	0.891	0.826	0.883	0.917	0.852	0.908
B	3	0.044	0.050	0.049	0.044	0.050	0.049	0.086	0.844	0.630	0.086	0.844	0.630
	10	0.049	0.050	0.050	0.049	0.050	0.050	0.631	0.864	0.834	0.631	0.864	0.834
	∞	0.050	0.049	0.050	0.050	0.049	0.050	0.936	0.877	0.928	0.936	0.877	0.928
C	3	0.038	0.044	0.041	0.053	0.056	0.057	0.052	0.345	0.216	0.061	0.405	0.263
	10	0.041	0.044	0.042	0.057	0.057	0.057	0.233	0.369	0.320	0.282	0.423	0.378
	∞	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.059	0.058	0.057	0.384	0.368	0.389	0.451	0.422	0.449
$\rho = 0.4$													
A	3	0.044	0.050	0.052	0.046	0.052	0.053	0.086	0.817	0.607	0.087	0.888	0.693
	10	0.049	0.050	0.049	0.053	0.051	0.053	0.607	0.844	0.808	0.680	0.915	0.894
	∞	0.048	0.051	0.048	0.054	0.050	0.053	0.914	0.850	0.903	0.970	0.923	0.965
B	3	0.045	0.053	0.052	0.045	0.053	0.052	0.092	0.914	0.739	0.092	0.914	0.739
	10	0.057	0.054	0.057	0.057	0.054	0.057	0.724	0.935	0.918	0.724	0.935	0.918
	∞	0.058	0.052	0.057	0.058	0.052	0.057	0.980	0.945	0.977	0.980	0.945	0.977
C	3	0.037	0.043	0.042	0.062	0.064	0.066	0.046	0.231	0.148	0.067	0.304	0.204
	10	0.041	0.044	0.043	0.068	0.065	0.066	0.157	0.249	0.213	0.223	0.319	0.285
	∞	0.041	0.043	0.042	0.069	0.064	0.066	0.249	0.248	0.253	0.336	0.315	0.333

H = Hotelling's T^2 test; S = Spatial sign test; R = Spatial rank test

WH = Weighted Hotelling's T^2 test; WS = Weighted spatial sign test; WR = Weighted spatial rank test