

Signal detection via Phi-divergences for general mixtures

Marc Ditzhaus

Address of the author
Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf
Mathematical Institute
Universitätsstraße 1
40225 Düsseldorf, Germany
e-mail: marc.ditzhaus@uni-duesseldorf.de

Abstract: Summary: In this paper we are interested in testing whether there are any signals hidden in high dimensional noise data. Therefore we study the family of goodness-of-fit tests based on Φ -divergences including the test of Berk and Jones as well as Tukey's higher criticism test. The optimality of this family is already known for the heterogeneous normal mixture model. We now present a technique to transfer this optimality to more general models. For illustration we apply our results to dense signal and sparse signal models including the exponential- χ^2 mixture model and general exponential families as the normal, exponential and Gumbel distribution. Beside the optimality of the whole family we discuss the power behavior on the detection boundary and show that the whole family has no power there, whereas the likelihood ratio test does.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: 62G10, 62G20.

Keywords and phrases: Berk and Jones test, detection boundary, Φ -divergences, nonparametric statistic, Tukey's higher criticism.

1. Introduction

In several research areas it is of interest to detect rare and weak signals hidden in a huge noisy background. These areas are, among others, genomics [14, 22, 26], disease surveillance [34, 36], local anomaly detection [37] as well as cosmology and astronomy [10, 31]. E.g., in genomics we want to determine as early as possible whether a patient is healthy or affected by a common disease like cancer or leukemia. Many researchers assume that the majority of an affected patients' genes behaves like genes of a non-affected patient (noisy background) and only a small amount of genes displays a slightly different behavior (signals). In other words, if there are any signals at all then they are represented rarely and weakly. This combination makes it very difficult to detect the signals. In this paper we study tests for this detection problem. After introducing the mathematical model we give more details about tests which were already suggested in the literature and explain our new insights into these.

Let P_n be a known continuous noise distribution and μ_n be an unknown signal distribution on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$. E.g., $\mu_n((-\infty, x]) = P_n((-\infty, x - \vartheta_n])$ for $\vartheta_n \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. a

signal leads to a shift by ϑ_n . Now, let $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ be an i.i.d. sample with

$$X_{n,1} \sim Q_n = (1 - \varepsilon_n)P_n + \varepsilon_n\mu_n \text{ for some } \varepsilon_n \in [0, 1].$$

The parameter ε_n can be interpreted as the probability that $X_{n,1}$ follows the signal distribution μ_n instead of the noise distribution P_n . Hence, the number of signals is random and approximately the size of $n\varepsilon_n$. In this paper we are interested to test whether there are any signals, i.e. to test

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{H}_{0,n} : \varepsilon_n = 0 \text{ versus } \mathcal{H}_{1,n} : \varepsilon_n > 0.$$

We focus on the challenging case of rare signals $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, where we differ between the sparse signal case ($n\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$) and the dense signal case ($n\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \infty$). Throughout this paper, if not stated otherwise, all limits are meant as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Clearly, the likelihood ratio test, also called Neyman-Pearson test, is the best test for (1.1). Its power behavior was studied by Ingster [24] for a normal location model, i.e. $P_n = N(0, 1)$ and $\mu_n = N(\vartheta_n, 1)$. This model is also called the heterogeneous normal mixture model. Using the parametrization $\varepsilon_n = n^{-\beta}$, $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$, and $\vartheta_n = \sqrt{2r \log(n)}$, $r > 0$, he showed that there is a detection boundary $\rho(\beta)$, which splits the r - β -parametrization plane into the completely detectable and the undetectable area, see Figure 1:

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(\beta) = \begin{cases} \beta - \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \beta \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}], \\ (1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta})^2 & \text{if } \beta \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1). \end{cases}$$

If $r > \rho(\beta)$ then the likelihood ratio test can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically (completely detectable case), i.e. the sum of type 1 and 2 error probabilities tends to 0. Otherwise, if $r < \rho(\beta)$, the likelihood ratio test and, thus, any other test cannot distinguish between $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically (undetectable case). Later, Donoho and Jin [17] showed that Tukey's higher criticism [40, 41, 42] can also completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically if $r > \rho(\beta)$. This showed a certain optimality of the higher criticism test. In contrast to the likelihood ratio test the higher criticism test does not need the knowledge of the typically unknown signal probability ε_n and signal strength ϑ_n . Jager and Wellner [29] introduced a family of test statistics $\{S_n(s) : s \in [-1, 2]\}$ based on Φ -divergences including higher criticism test statistic and the test statistic of Berk and Jones [6]. They extended the optimality result of Donoho and Jin [17] to their whole family. But in contrast to the higher criticism test, see [2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 17, 25, 35], it is less known if this optimality also holds under more general model assumptions for the whole family. In this paper we want to give a positive answer to this uncertainty.

As already mentioned, we differ between dense and sparse signals, where the main focus in the literature lies on the latter one. There are only a few positive results about the higher criticism test for dense signals. E.g., Cai et al. [8] proved the optimality of the higher criticism test in the dense signal case for the normal location model introduced above with $\vartheta_n \rightarrow 0$. We will extend these results to




FIG 1. The detection boundary for the sparse heterogeneous normal mixture model $\beta \mapsto \rho(\beta)$, see (1.2), is plotted. It splits the r - β -parametrization plane into the completely detectable and the undetectable area, where the null $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and the alternative $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ can be completely separated and merge (asymptotically), respectively.

general exponential families and to the whole family of Jager and Wellner [29]. When we explained the results of Ingster [24] we omitted the case $r = \rho(\beta)$, the behavior on the detection boundary. Ingster [24] determined the limit distribution of the likelihood ratio test on the boundary under $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ as well as under $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$. An interesting observation is that non-Gaussian limits do also occur. In other words, he showed that there is a third area in the r - β -parametrization plane, namely the nontrivial power area on the boundary. Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] studied the asymptotic behavior of the likelihood ratio test and the higher criticism test on the detection boundary for general mixtures. In particular, they showed that the higher criticism test has no power on the boundary for various models, whereas the likelihood ratio test has nontrivial power there. We will extend this negative result to the whole family of Jager and Wellner [29].

In short, this paper gives the following new insights into the tests based on Φ -divergences introduced by Cai and Wu [9]:

- (i) In contrast to Jager and Wellner [29] we do not restrict the parameter s to the interval $[-1, 2]$ and consider the family of test statistics $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ instead. In particular, we extend the result of Jager and Wellner [29] about the asymptotic behavior of $S_n(s)$ under the null to the parameters $s \notin [-1, 2]$.
- (ii) The optimality of tests based on $S_n(s)$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ even holds beyond the assumption of normality. In particular, we verify the optimality for the model recently suggested by Cai and Wu [9] and for general dense mixtures

based on exponential families.

- (iii) On the detection boundary tests of the form $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ have no power asymptotically, whereas the likelihood ratio test does.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the family of test statistics $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and present the limit distribution under the null $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$, which is the same for the whole family. Section 3 contains our tools to discuss the asymptotic power of the whole family under the alternative $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$. These tools are applied in Section 4 to a sparse signal model class recently suggested by Cai and Wu [9] and a dense signal model based on general exponential families.

2. The test family and its limit under the null

2.1. The test statistics

This papers' focus lies on continuous noise distributions. That is why we can assume without loss of generality that $P_n = P_0$ for all n , e.g., having a transformation to p -values in mind. Denote the distribution function of P_0 by F_0 . The basic idea is to compare the empirical distribution function $\mathbb{F}_n(u) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_{n,i} \leq u\}$ with the noise distribution function $F_0(u)$ for $u \in (0, 1)$ by using one of the Φ -divergences tests proposed by Csiszár [13] based on a convex function Φ , see also [1, 12, 13]. To be more specific, we introduce a family $(\phi_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ of convex functions mapping $[0, \infty)$ to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$:

$$\phi_s(x) = \begin{cases} x - \log(x) - 1 & \text{for } s = 0, \\ x(\log(x) - 1) + 1 & \text{for } s = 1, \\ (1 - s + sx - x^s)/(s(1 - s)) & \text{for } s \neq 0, 1. \end{cases}$$

Based on these the family of Φ -divergences statistics $(K_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ is given by

$$K_s(u, v) = v\phi_s\left(\frac{u}{v}\right) + (1 - v)\phi_s\left(\frac{1 - u}{1 - v}\right)$$

for $u, v \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to see that $\mathbb{R} \ni s \mapsto \phi_s(x)$ is continuous for every fixed $x \in (0, \infty)$ and so is $\mathbb{R} \ni s \mapsto K_s(u, v)$ for all fixed $u, v \in (0, 1)$. Now, we consider the following family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of test statistics for (1.1) given by

$$(2.1) \quad S_n(s) = \sup_{X_{1:n} \leq x < X_{n:n}} K_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)),$$

where $X_{1:n} \leq X_{2:n} \leq \dots \leq X_{n:n}$ denote the order statistics of the observation vector $(X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n})$. As explained by Jager and Wellner [29] Tukey's higher criticism test ($s = 2$), the test of Berk and Jones [6] ($s = 1$), the "reversed Berk-Jones" statistic introduced by Jager and Wellner [28] ($s = 0$) and a studentized version of the higher criticism statistic studied by Eicker [20] ($s = -1$) are included in this family. Note that $S_n(s)$ does not always coincide with the

corresponding known test statistic but is equivalent to them for s given in the parenthesis. For all other s the test statistic $S_n(s)$ was new. Jager and Wellner [29] give a special emphasis to $S_n(1/2)$, which is equivalent to the supremum of the pointwise Hellinger divergences between two Bernoulli distributions with parameters $F_0(u)$ and $F_n(u)$, $u \in (0, 1)$.

2.2. Limit distribution under the null

The limit distribution of the higher criticism statistic is already known, see Jaeschke [27] and also Section 16.1 of Shorack and Wellner [38], and so one can derive the limit distribution of $S_n(2)$. Jager and Wellner [29] showed that $nS_n(s) - nS_n(2)$ converges in probability to 0 under the null $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and, consequently, the limit distribution is the same for all $s \in [-1, 2]$. We now extend their result to all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Notation for convergences: By $\xrightarrow{d}, \xrightarrow{P_0^n}, \xrightarrow{Q_n^n}$ we denote convergence in distribution, in P_0^n -probability and in Q_n^n -probability, respectively.

Theorem 2.1. *Define*

$$r_n = \log \log(n) + \frac{1}{2} \log \log \log(n) - \frac{1}{2} \log(4\pi).$$

Then we have for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ that under the null $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$

$$(2.2) \quad nS_n(s) - r_n \xrightarrow{d} Y,$$

where $Y + \log(4)$ is standard Gumbel distributed, i.e. $x \mapsto \exp(-4 \exp(-x))$ is the distribution function of Y .

At least for $S_n(2)$ it is known that the convergence rate is really slow, see Khmaladze and Shinjikashvili [33]. Since the basic idea of the proof of Theorem 2.1 is to approximate $nS_n(s)$ by $nS_n(2)$ the same bad rate can be expected for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ or an even worse rate due to an additional approximation error. Consequently, we cannot recommend using a critical value based on the convergence result in Theorem 2.1 unless the sample size n is really huge. Since the noise distribution is assumed to be known, a possibility to estimate the α -quantile of $S_n(s)$ is to use a standard Monte-Carlo Simulation. Alternatively, you can find finite recursion formulas for the exact finite distribution in the literature, see Jager and Wellner [28] (for $s = 0$, up to $n = 1000$) and Khmaladze and Shinjikashvili [33] (for $s = 2$, up to $n = 10^4$).

3. Asymptotic power under the alternative

In this section we present a tool to analyze the asymptotic power behavior of all family members under the alternative $\mathcal{H}_{n,1}$. This was already done by Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] for the higher criticism test, i.e. for $s = 2$. We show that the

main tool to obtain their results can be used for general $s \in \mathbb{R}$. To be more specific, this tool is the following function $H_n : (0, 1/2) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ given by

$$(3.1) \quad H_n(v) = \frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon_n}{\sqrt{v}} \left(|\mu_n^{F_0}(0, v] - v| + |\mu_n^{F_0}(1 - v, 1) - v| \right), \quad v \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

where $\mu_n^{F_0}$ is the distribution of $F_0(X_{n,1})$ if $X_{n,1} \sim \mu_n$. The basic idea is to compare the tails near to 0 as well as near to 1 of the p -value $F_0(X_{n,1})$ if $X_{n,1}$ follows the signal distribution μ_n and the noise distribution P_0 , respectively. Due to symmetry $H_n(v)$ does not change if we consider the p -value $1 - F_0(X_{n,1})$ instead. Moreover, due to this it is sufficient to consider $v \in (0, 1/2)$ instead of $v \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 3.1 (Complete detection). *Suppose that there is a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1/2)$ such that $v_n n \rightarrow \infty$ and $(\log \log(n))^{-1} H_n(v_n) \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$(3.2) \quad nS_n(s) - r_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ in } Q_n^n\text{-probability.}$$

Under (3.2) there exists a sequence of critical values $c_n(s)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the sum of type 1 and 2 error probabilities of the test $\varphi_n(s) = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ tends to 0. In other words, by using $S_n(s)$ we can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.

For the next result recall that the null (product) distribution P_0^n and the alternative (product) distribution Q_n^n are said to be mutually contiguous if for all sequences $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sets: $P_0^n(A_n) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $Q_n^n(A_n) \rightarrow 0$. By the first Lemma of Le Cam P_0^n and Q_n^n are mutually contiguous if and only if the limits (in distribution) of the likelihood ratio test statistic are real-valued under the null P_0^n as well as under the alternative Q_n^n . This typically holds on the detection boundary, see Ditzhaus and Janssen [16]. Hence, mutual contiguity is no real restriction when discussing the behavior on this boundary.

Theorem 3.2 (No power). *Suppose that P_0^n and Q_n^n are mutual contiguous and that there are constants $\kappa, c_{1,n}, c_{2,n}, c_{3,n}, c_{4,n} \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad \sqrt{\log \log(n)} \sup\{H_n(v) : v \in [c_{1,n}, c_{2,n}] \cup [c_{3,n}, c_{4,n}]\} \rightarrow 0, \text{ where}$$

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{\log(c_{1,n})}{\log(n)} \rightarrow -1, \quad \frac{\log(c_{4,n})}{\log(n)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\log(c_{2,n})}{\log(n)}, \frac{\log(c_{3,n})}{\log(n)} \rightarrow -\kappa.$$

Then (2.2) also holds under the alternative $\mathcal{H}_{n,1}$.

Under (3.3) and (3.4) all tests of the form $\varphi_n(s) = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ cannot distinguish between $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically, i.e. the sum of type 1 and 2 error probabilities tends to 1. As we will prove, the supremum in (2.1) is not taken by values of x from the extreme tails or from the middle with probability tending to 1, in other words for x with $F_0(x), 1 - F_0(x) \notin C_n = [c_{1,n}, c_{2,n}] \cup [c_{3,n}, c_{4,n}]$. To be more specific, we verify that under $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ (and so under $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ if

P_0^n and Q_n^n are mutually contiguous)

$$n \left(\sup_{X_{1:n} \leq x < X_{n:n} : F_0(x), 1-F_0(x) \notin C_n} K_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)) \right) - r_n \rightarrow -\infty.$$

This briefly explains why in (3.3) we take the supremum over C_n instead over $(0, 1/2)$.

Remark 3.3 (Simplification for the sparse case). Typically, in the sparse case we even have $\sqrt{\log \log(n)} n \varepsilon_n^2 \rightarrow 0$. Then it is easy to see that the statements in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 remain true if $H_n(v)$ is replaced by

$$\tilde{H}_n(v) = \sqrt{n} \varepsilon_n v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mu_n(0, v] + \mu_n[1 - v, 1) \right).$$

4. Application

4.1. Extension of Cai and Wu [9]

Throughout this section we consider (only) the sparse case

$$\varepsilon_n = n^{-\beta}, \beta \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right].$$

Starting with a fixed noise distribution P_0 and a fixed sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of signal distributions, Cai and Wu [9] developed a technique to calculate a detection threshold $\beta^\#$ for the parameter β .

- (i) (Undetectable) If β exceeds $\beta^\#$ then there is no sequence of tests, which can distinguish between $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.
- (ii) (Completely detectable) If β is smaller than $\beta^\#$ then there is a sequence of likelihood ratio tests, which can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.

Let us begin this section by recalling the results of Cai and Wu [9]. We first present the special case of standard normal noise.

Theorem 4.1 (Theorem 1 and 4 in [9]). *Define for all $x > 0$*

$$\tilde{h}_n(x) = \log \left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(x \sqrt{2 \log(n)}) \right).$$

Suppose that

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)} - \alpha(x) \right| : x \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

for a measurable $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the detection boundary is given by

$$\beta^\# = \frac{1}{2} + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha(t) - t^2 + \frac{\min(t^2, 1)}{2} \right\},$$

where $\text{ess sup}_{x \geq 0} g(x) = \inf\{K \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda(g \geq K) = 0\}$ denotes the essential supremum of a measurable function $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, if $\beta < \beta^\#$ then there is a sequence $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of critical values such that $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(1/2) > c_n\}$ (higher criticism test) can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.

The results concerning the normal location model mentioned in Section 1 follow immediately from this Theorem, for details see Section V-A and V-C in [9]. More generally, Theorem 4.1 can be applied to the model given by $P_0 = N(0, 1)$ and $\mu_n = \tilde{\mu}_n * N(0, 1)$, where $*$ denotes the convolution. For details we refer the reader to Corollary 1 and Section V-B in [9]. An example for this convolution idea is the heteroscedastic normal location model, where the variance of the signal distribution $\mu_n = N(\vartheta_n, \sigma_0^2)$ may differ from 1, i.e. $\sigma_0^2 \neq 1$ is allowed. Note that Cai et al. [8] already studied the optimality for the higher criticism test under this model.

For non-normal noise distributions P_0 the following theorem can be applied:

Theorem 4.2 (Theorem 3 in [9]). Define for all $t > 0$

$$h_{n,1}(t) = \log\left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(n^{-t}))\right), \quad h_{n,2}(t) = \log\left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(1 - n^{-t}))\right)$$

and $h_n(t) = \max\{h_{n,1}(t), h_{n,2}(t)\}$.

Suppose that

$$(4.1) \quad \sup\left\{\left|\frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - \gamma(t)\right| : t \geq \frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)}\right\} \rightarrow 0$$

for a measurable $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the detection threshold for β is given by

$$(4.2) \quad \beta^\# = \frac{1}{2} + \text{ess sup}_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \gamma(t) - t + \frac{\min(t, 1)}{2} \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.2 can be applied to derive the detection boundary for the general Gaussian location mixture model and the exponential- χ^2 mixture model as explained by Cai and Wu [9]. Note that Donoho and Jin [17] already discussed these models and postulated the optimality of the higher criticism test for them. But it was not known if this optimality holds in general under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2. According to the next theorem it does, even for the whole family of test statistics $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Theorem 4.3 (Extension of Theorem 4.2). Let h_n be defined as in Theorem 4.2. Assume that there exists some $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\delta > 0$

$$(4.3) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{X}\left(t \geq \frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)} : \beta^* - \delta - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t + \frac{\min\{t, 1\}}{2}\right) > 0$$

$$(4.4) \quad \text{and } \mathbb{X}\left(t \geq \frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)} : \beta^* + \delta - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t + \frac{\min\{t, 1\}}{2}\right) = 0$$

for all sufficiently large $n \geq N_{1,\delta}$. Let $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $(0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_n n^\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\kappa > 0$. Suppose that for some $M \geq 1$:

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \geq M} \left| \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - \gamma(t) \right| = 0$$

for some $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ or for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $N_{2,\delta} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{X} \left(t \geq M : \beta^* + \delta - 1 \leq \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{\log(n)} \right) t \right) = 0$$

for all $n \geq N_{2,\delta}$. Then $\beta^\# = \beta^*$. Moreover, if $\beta < \beta^\#$ then for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a sequence $(c_n(s))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of critical values such that $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.

The conditions (4.3) and (4.4) together are mimicking the essential supremum in (4.2), where γ is replaced by $h_n/\log(n)$. The advantage is that we do not need the uniform convergence as in (4.1). During our study we had a look at a simple scale exponential distribution model, for which we expected that Theorem 4.2 can be applied. But for this model $h_n(t)/\log(n)$ tends to $-\infty$ for small $t > 0$ and so (4.1) is violated. Our (new) more general assumptions can handle this problem. Furthermore, we can treat the following exponential families including a scale exponential, a scale Fréchet and a location Gumbel distribution model. Before we can formulate the theorem let us recall that L is called *slowly varying* at infinity if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(\lambda x)/L(x) = 1$ for $\lambda > 0$.

Theorem 4.4. Let $(P_{(\vartheta)})_{\vartheta \in [0, \infty)}$ be a family of continuous distributions on $[0, \infty)$ with $P_{(\vartheta)} \ll P_{(0)}$ and Radon-Nikodym density

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{dP_{(\vartheta)}}{dP_{(0)}} = C(\vartheta) \exp(\vartheta T)$$

for appropriate functions $T : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $C : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $C(0) = 1$. Suppose that T is strictly decreasing on $[0, \eta]$ for some $\eta > 0$, $T(\eta) \geq T(x)$ for all $x \geq \eta$ and

$$T(F_0^{-1}(0)) - T(F_0^{-1}(u)) = u^{\frac{1}{p}} L\left(\frac{1}{u}\right) \text{ as } u \searrow 0$$

for a slowly varying function L at infinity, where F_0^{-1} is the left continuous quantile function of $P_{(0)}$. Let $P_0 = P_{(0)}$ be the noise distribution and $\mu_n = P_{(\vartheta_n)}$ the signal distribution for $\vartheta_n = n^r$ with $r > 0$. Then the conditions of Theorem 4.3 are fulfilled for

$$\beta^\# = \beta^\#(r, p) = \frac{\min\{rp, 1\} + 1}{2}.$$

Due to lack of space we do not discuss the asymptotic behavior of the tests on the detection boundary, i.e. $\beta = \beta^\#$. We refer the reader to Corollary 5.7 and

Theorem 8.19 of Ditzhaus [15]. In short, the likelihood ratio test has nontrivial power on the detection boundary, whereas the higher criticism test has no power. By Theorem 3.2 the latter can be extended to the whole family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. At the end of this section we present the extension of Theorem 4.1. This can be applied, e.g., to verify the optimality of the whole family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for the heteroscedastic ($\sigma_0^2 \neq 1$) and heterogeneous ($\sigma_0^2 = 1$) normal location model with $\mu_n = N(\vartheta_n, \sigma_0^2)$. The behavior of the likelihood ratio test and the higher criticism test on the detection boundary for this particular model is discussed in Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] and can be extended, using Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, to the whole family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Again, the likelihood ratio test has nontrivial power, whereas tests of the form $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ have no asymptotic power.

Theorem 4.5 (Extension of Theorem 4.1). *Let \tilde{h}_n be defined as in Theorem 4.1. Suppose that there is some $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\delta > 0$*

$$(4.8) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{X}\left(x \in \mathbb{R} : \beta^* - \delta - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)} - x^2 + \frac{\min\{x^2, 1\}}{2}\right) > 0$$

$$(4.9) \quad \text{and } \mathbb{X}\left(x \in \mathbb{R} : \beta^* + \delta - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)} - x^2 + \frac{\min\{x^2, 1\}}{2}\right) = 0$$

for all sufficiently large $n \geq N_{1,\delta}$. Let $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $(0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_n n^\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\kappa > 0$. Suppose that for some $M \geq 1$:

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq M} \left| \frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)} - \alpha(x) \right| = 0$$

for some $\alpha : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ or for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $N_{2,\delta} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.11) \quad \mathbb{X}\left(|x| \geq M : \beta^* + \delta - 1 \leq \frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)} - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{\log(n)}\right) x^2\right) = 0$$

for all $n \geq N_{2,\delta}$. Then $\beta^\# = \beta^$. Moreover, if $\beta < \beta^\#$ then for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a sequence $(c_n(s))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of critical values such that $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ can completely separate $\mathcal{H}_{0,n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}$ asymptotically.*

4.2. Dense exponential family

In this section we give a quite general example for a dense signal model and show the optimality of the whole family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for it. The normal location model, $P_0 = N(0, 1)$ and $\mu_n = N(\vartheta_n, 1)$ with $\vartheta_n \rightarrow 0$, is included in this consideration. This particular model was already discussed by Cai et al. [8] concerning the higher criticism test, i.e. for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Here, we extend their result to all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and to exponential families in a far more general form compared to Theorem 4.3. In contrast to the previous section we discuss the asymptotic power behavior on the detection boundary here in detail.




FIG 2. The detection boundary $\beta \mapsto \rho^*(\beta) = 1/2 - \beta$ for dense signal exponential family mixtures is plotted, see Theorem 4.6.

Theorem 4.6. Let $(P_{(\vartheta)})_{\vartheta \in [0, \infty)}$ be a family of continuous distributions on $[0, \infty)$ with Radon-Nikodym density given by (4.7) for $T : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $C : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $C(0) = 1$. Assume that $\text{Var}_{P_{(0)}}(T) > 0$. Consider the noise distribution $P_0 = P_{(0)}$ and the signal distribution $\mu_n = P_{(\vartheta_n)}$ with the parametrization

$$\varepsilon_n = n^{-\beta}, \beta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right), \text{ and } \vartheta_n = n^{-r}, r > 0,$$

then the detection boundary for the parameter r is given by

$$\rho^*(\beta) = \frac{1}{2} - \beta.$$

In particular, we have for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$:

- (a) If $r < \rho^*(\beta)$ then there is a sequence $(c_n(s))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of critical values such that $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ can completely separate P_0^n and Q_n^n asymptotically.
- (b) Suppose that $r = \rho^*(\beta)$. Then $2N(0, 1)((1/2)\text{Var}_{P_{(0)}}(T)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \infty)$ is the sharp lower bound of the limit of the sum of type 1 and 2 error probabilities for all tests testing P_0^n versus Q_n^n . But all tests of the form $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{S_n(s) > c_n(s)\}$ cannot distinguish between P_0^n and Q_n^n asymptotically.
- (c) If $r > \rho^*(\beta)$ then no test φ_n can distinguish between P_0^n and Q_n^n asymptotically.

5. Discussion

The higher criticism test statistic became quite popular recently. In this paper we showed that a whole class of test statistics shares the same optimal properties

of the higher criticism one under different model assumptions. The advantage of a whole class is more flexibility in choosing a test statistic which suits the specific problem best. Jager and Wellner [29] already pointed out that $S_n(s)$ is more sensible for signal distributions with heavy or light tails if $s \leq 0$ or $s \geq 1$, respectively. As a good compromise they suggested their "new" $S_n(1/2)$. In future we wish to conduct detailed simulation study in order to understand the differences between the test statistics and to be able to give an advice for practitioners how to choose "the best" s .

Beside the detection problem, a more in-depth analysis of the data as feature selection, estimation of the number of signals and classification is of great interest to practice, too. The detection problem discussed in this paper is closely related to the other problems, see [18, 19, 23, 30], for which the higher criticism statistic can be used, too. The results in this paper suggest that the whole class $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ may be used for these problems. The benefit would again be more flexibility. This could be a project for the future.

The function H_n serving as our tool for the asymptotic behavior under the alternative was already used by Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] for the higher criticism test. In particular, the results concerning their examples can be extended immediately to the whole family $\{S_n(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Beside the normal location model they also discussed a structure model for p -values based on the spike chimeric alternatives of Khmaladze [32].

6. Acknowledgments

The author thanks the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) for financial support (DFG Grant no. 618886).

7. Proofs

To prove Theorem 2.1 we use some results of Chang [11] and Wellner [43] about the asymptotic behavior of the empirical distribution function. We summarize them in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ be independent and identical distributed random variables on the same probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) with continuous distribution function F_n . Let \mathbb{F}_n be the corresponding empirical distribution function. Let $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence in \mathbb{R} , i.e. $d_n > d_{n+1}$, such that $nF_n(d_n) \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$(7.1) \quad \sup_{d_n \leq x < \infty} \left| \frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{F_n(x)} - 1 \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

If additionally $c_n = nF(d_n)/\log \log(n) \rightarrow \infty$ then

$$(7.2) \quad \sqrt{c_n} \sup_{d_n \leq x < \infty} \left| \frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{F_n(x)} - 1 \right| \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{2}.$$

Moreover, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(7.3) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(B_{n,\lambda,t}^c) = 0 \text{ with } B_{n,\lambda,t} = \left\{ \sup_{x \in (X_{1:n}, \infty)} \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{x} \right)^t < \lambda \right\}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.1. First, suppose that $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ are uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$. Then (7.1) was stated by Chang [11], see also Theorem 0 in [43], and (7.3) follows by combining (i) and (ii) of Remark 1 of Wellner [43]. Moreover, (7.2) follows from Theorem 1S of Wellner [43]. For general continuous distribution note that $F_n(X_{n,1}), \dots, F_n(X_{n,n})$ are independent and uniformly distributed random variables in $(0, 1)$. Consequently, it is easy to check that the statements for general distributions can be concluded from the ones for uniform distributions. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Having a transformation to p -values $p_{n,i} = F_0(X_{n,i})$ or $p_{n,i} = 1 - F_0(X_{n,i})$ in mind we can assume without loss of generality that $P_0 = \lambda \lambda_{|(0,1)}$ is the uniform distribution on the interval $(0, 1)$. The proof is based, as is the one of Theorem 3.1 of Jager and Wellner [29], on a Taylor expansion of $u \mapsto K_s(u, v)$ around $u = v$. It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} K_s(u, v)|_{u=v} &= 0 = K_s(v, v), & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 u} K_s(u, v)|_{u=v} &= \frac{1}{v(1-v)} \\ \text{and } \frac{\partial^3}{\partial^3 u} K_s(u, v) &= \frac{(s-2)}{v^2} \left(\frac{u}{v} \right)^{s-3} - \frac{(s-2)}{(1-v)^2} \left(\frac{1-u}{1-v} \right)^{s-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by a careful calculation we obtain for all $x \in [X_{1:n}, X_{n:n})$ that

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} K_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) &= K_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \left(1 + \frac{(s-2)}{3} R_{n,x,s} \right) \text{ with} \\ R_{n,x,s} &= \frac{(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - x)}{x(1-x)} \left((1-x)^2 \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_{n,x}^*}{x} \right)^{s-3} - x^2 \left(\frac{1 - \mathbb{F}_{n,x}^*}{1-x} \right)^{s-3} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{F}_{n,x}^*$ is a random variable satisfying $\min\{\mathbb{F}_n(x), x\} \leq \mathbb{F}_{n,x}^* \leq \max\{\mathbb{F}_n(x), x\}$. Clearly, $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow t^{3-s}$ is monotone for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. That is why we have $|R_{n,x,s}| \leq R_{n,x,s}^{(1)} + R_{n,x,s}^{(2)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,x,s}^{(1)} &= \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n(x) - x|}{x} \max \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{x} \right)^{s-3} \right\} \\ \text{and } R_{n,x,s}^{(2)} &= \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n(x) - x|}{1-x} \max \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{1 - \mathbb{F}_n(x)}{1-x} \right)^{s-3} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $d_n = n^{-1}(\log n)^5$. Obviously, $P_0^n(X_{1:n} > d_n) + P_0^n(X_{n:n} < 1 - d_n) = 2(1 - d_n)^n \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, observe that by (7.4)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) - r_n - (nK_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) - r_n) \right| \\ & \leq \left(R_{n,x,s}^{(1)} + R_{n,x,s}^{(2)} \right) \left(\left| nK_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) - r_n \right| + r_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for (2.2) it is sufficient to show that

$$(7.5) \quad n \left(\sup_{x \in (d_n, 1-d_n)} K_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \right) - r_n \xrightarrow{d} Y \text{ under } P_0^n,$$

$$(7.6) \quad r_n \sup_{x \in (d_n, 1-d_n)} R_{n,x,s}^{(j)} \xrightarrow{P_0^n} 0 \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \text{ and}$$

$$(7.7) \quad I_{n,s} = n \left(\sup_{x \in (X_{1:n}, d_n) \cup (1-d_n, X_{n:n})} K_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \right) - r_n \xrightarrow{P_0^n} -\infty.$$

Note that

$$I_{n,s} \leq r_n \left(-1 + \frac{n}{r_n} \sup_{x \in (X_{1:n}, d_n) \cup (1-d_n, X_{n:n})} K_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \left(1 + R_{n,x,s}^{(1)} + R_{n,x,s}^{(2)} \right) \right).$$

Hence, using the inequality

$$(7.8) \quad P(A_n) \leq P(A_n \cap B_{n,\lambda}) + P(B_{n,\lambda}^c)$$

with appropriate sets we can deduce (7.7) from (7.4) if

$$(7.9) \quad \frac{n}{r_n} \sup_{x \in (X_{1:n}, d_n) \cup (1-d_n, X_{n:n})} K_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \xrightarrow{P_0^n} 0 \text{ and}$$

$$(7.10) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0^n((B_{n,\lambda}^{(j)})^c) = 0 \text{ for both } j \in \{1, 2\},$$

where $B_{n,\lambda}^{(j)} = \left\{ \sup_{x \in (X_{1:n}, d_n) \cup (1-d_n, X_{n:n})} R_{n,x,s}^{(j)} < \lambda \right\}.$

Thus, it remains to verify (7.5), (7.6), (7.9) and (7.10). Note that by symmetry it is sufficient to show (7.6) and (7.10) for $j = 1$. Using again (7.8) we obtain (7.6) for $j = 1$ from (7.2) and (7.3) setting $t = s - 3$ since $c_n = nd_n / \log \log(n) = \log(n)^5 / \log \log(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sqrt{c_n}/r_n \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$R_{n,x,s}^{(1)} \leq 1 + \frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{x} + \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{x} \right)^{s-2} + \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(x)}{x} \right)^{s-3}$$

we can conclude (7.10) for $j = 1$ by applying (7.3) for $t = 1, s - 2, s - 3$.

In order to prove the remaining (7.5) and (7.9) we introduce the supremum statistic of the normalized uniform empirical process

$$(7.11) \quad \mathbb{Z}_n(a, b) = \sup_{a < x < b} \sqrt{n} \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n(x) - x|}{\sqrt{x(1-x)}}, \quad a, b \in (0, 1),$$

studied by Jaeschke [27], see also Chap. 16 of Shorack and Wellner [38]. In particular, by (19), (20), (25), (26) and (g) in Sec. 16.1 from Shorack and Wellner [38] and the symmetry $\mathbb{Z}_n(0, a) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{Z}_n(1 - a, 1)$ we have

$$(7.12) \quad \frac{\mathbb{Z}_n(d_n, 1 - d_n)}{b_n} \xrightarrow{P_0^n} 1 \text{ and } b_n \mathbb{Z}_n(d_n, 1 - d_n) - c_n \xrightarrow{d} Y \text{ under } P_0^n,$$

$$(7.13) \quad b_n^{-1} \mathbb{Z}_n(0, d_n) \xrightarrow{P_0^n} 0 \text{ and } b_n^{-1} \mathbb{Z}_n(1 - d_n, 1) \xrightarrow{P_0^n} 0, \text{ where}$$

$$(7.14) \quad b_n = \sqrt{2 \log \log(n)} \text{ and } c_n = b_n^2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \log \log(n) - \frac{1}{2} \log(4\pi).$$

Moreover, observe that

$$(7.15) \quad n \left(\sup_{x \in (a,b)} K_2(\mathbb{F}_n(x), x) \right) - r_n = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Z}_n(a, b)^2 - r_n$$

$$(7.16) \quad = \frac{1}{2} (b_n \mathbb{Z}_n(a, b) - c_n) \left(\frac{\mathbb{Z}_n(a, b)}{b_n} + \frac{c_n}{b_n^2} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{c_n^2}{b_n^2} - r_n \right), \quad a, b \in (0, 1).$$

Finally, (7.5) follows from (7.16) and (7.12). We can conclude (7.9) from (7.13) and (7.15) since $b_n^2/r_n \rightarrow 2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Similar to the previous proof we can assume $P_0 = \mathbb{A}_{|(0,1)}$. Set $l_n = \log \log(n)$. Due to symmetry it is sufficient to give the proof under the assumption

$$(7.17) \quad n^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon_n v_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} l_n^{-1} (\mu_n(0, v_n] - v_n) \rightarrow A \in \{-\infty, \infty\}.$$

Let G_n be the distribution function of Q_n , i.e. $G_n(v) = v + \varepsilon_n(\mu_n(0, v] - v)$ for all $v \in (0, 1)$. If $A = \infty$ then it is easy to see that

$$(7.18) \quad l_n^{-1} n G_n(v_n) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that $A = -\infty$ implies $l_n^{-1} \sqrt{nv_n} \rightarrow \infty$ and so $l_n^{-1} nv_n(1 - \varepsilon_n) \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, (7.18) holds in both cases for $A \in \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Due to (7.18) we obtain from Lemma 7.1 that

$$(7.19) \quad \frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{G_n(v_n)} \rightarrow 1 \text{ in } Q_n^n\text{-probability.}$$

Observe that $Q_n^n(X_{1:n} < v_n < X_{n:n}) \rightarrow 1$ and so

$$Q_n^n \left(n S_n(s) - r_n \geq l_n \left(\frac{nv_n}{l_n} \Phi_s \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n} \right) - \frac{r_n}{l_n} \right) \right) \rightarrow 1.$$

Since $r_n l_n^{-1} \rightarrow 1$ for proving (3.2) it is sufficient to verify that

$$(7.20) \quad Q_n^n \left(\frac{nv_n}{l_n} \Phi_s \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n} \right) > 2 \right) \rightarrow 1.$$

Since $v_n^{-1} G_n(v_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 1$ we can assume without loss of generality that

$$(7.21) \quad v_n^{-1} G_n(v_n) \rightarrow C \in [1, \infty],$$

otherwise we use standard subsequence arguments.

First, consider $C < \infty$. Since $\Phi_s(1) = \Phi_s(1) = 0$ and $\Phi_s''(x) = x^{s-2}$, $x > 0$, we obtain from Taylor's Theorem that

$$(7.22) \quad v_n \Phi_s \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n} \right) = \frac{(\mathbb{F}_n(v_n) - v_n)^2}{2v_n} \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n^*}{v_n} \right)^{s-2},$$

where \mathbb{F}_n^* is a random variable fulfilling $\min\{v_n, \mathbb{F}_n(v_n)\} \leq \mathbb{F}_n^* \leq \max\{v_n, \mathbb{F}_n(v_n)\}$. We deduce from (7.19) that for all $0 < \delta < \min\{1, C^{s-2}\}$

$$(7.23) \quad Q_n^n\left(\left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n^*}{v_n}\right)^{s-2} > \delta\right) \geq Q_n^n\left(\min\left\{1, \left(\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n}\right)^{s-2}\right\} > \delta\right) \rightarrow 1.$$

Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] showed in the proof of their Theorem 4.1 that under (7.17)

$$(7.24) \quad Q_n^n\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n(v_n) - v_n|}{\sqrt{v_n(1-v_n)l_n}} > \gamma\right) \rightarrow 1 \text{ for all } \gamma > 0.$$

The main idea of proving this is a simple application of Chebyshev's inequality. Combining (7.22) to (7.24) yields (7.20).

Now consider $C = \infty$. From (7.18), (7.19) and (7.21) we obtain for all $\gamma > 0$:

$$(7.25) \quad Q_n^n(l_n^{-1}n\mathbb{F}_n(v_n) > \gamma) \rightarrow 1 \text{ and } Q_n^n(v_n^{-1}\mathbb{F}_n(v_n) > \gamma) \rightarrow 1.$$

Regarding the second statement of (7.25) we only need to analyse $\Phi_s(x)$ for sufficiently large x more closely to prove (7.20). It is easy to verify that there exists some $c_{1,s}, c_{2,s} > 0$ and $c_{3,s} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(7.26) \quad \Phi_s(x) \geq c_{2,s}x + c_{3,s} \text{ for all } x \geq c_{1,s}.$$

For this purpose consider the cases $s < 0, s = 0, s \in (0, 1), s > 1$ separately. E.g., if $s \in (0, 1)$ then $\Phi_s(x) \geq x(s - x^{s-1})/(s(1-s)) \geq x/(2(1-s))$ for all $x \geq (2^{-1}s)^{\frac{1}{s-1}}$. From (7.25) we get for all $\gamma_0 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_n^n\left(\frac{nv_n}{l_n}\left(c_{2,s}\frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n} + c_{3,s}\right) > \gamma_0\right) \\ & \geq Q_n^n\left(\frac{n\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{l_n} > \frac{2\gamma_0}{c_{2,s}}, \frac{\mathbb{F}_n(v_n)}{v_n} > \frac{2c_{3,s}}{c_{2,s}}\right) \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this, the second statement in (7.25) and (7.26) yields (7.20). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Similar to the two previous proofs we can assume that $P_0 = \mathbb{X}_{(0,1)}$. Let $d_n = n^{-1}(\log n)^5$. Keep in mind throughout the whole proof that due to mutual contiguity every statement which holds in P_0^n -probability does so in Q_n^n -probability and vice versa. Let $\mathbb{Z}_n(a, b)$ be defined as in (7.11). By Theorem 4.2 of Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] we have $b_n\mathbb{Z}_n(0, 1) - c_n \rightarrow Y$ in distribution under Q_n^n , where b_n and c_n are defined by (7.14). Consequently, all statements in (7.12) and (7.13) hold also under Q_n^n . Combining these statements and (7.16) we obtain that (2.2) holds under the alternative in the case of $s = 2$. Since (7.6) and (7.7) are also valid in Q_n^n -probability we deduce the statement for general $s \in \mathbb{R}$ from (7.4). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. The proof is divided into two parts. First, we discuss the case $\beta < \beta^*$ by applying our Theorem 3.1. Second, we discuss the case $\beta > \beta^*$ by applying Lemma 3.12 of Ditzhaus and Janssen [16]. To improve the readability, set $l_n = \log \log(n)$.

The case $\beta < \beta^*$

By Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.3 it is sufficient to show that

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) = n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta} v_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} l_n^{-1} \left(\int_0^{v_n} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(x)) + \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(1-x)) dx \right)$$

converges to ∞ for some $\log(n)n^{-1} \leq v_n \leq (\log(n))^{-1}$. Using the parametrization $v_n = n^{-\tau_n}$ with $\tau_n \in [\tilde{\tau}_n, 1 - \tilde{\tau}_n]$ and $\tilde{\tau}_n = l_n(\log(n))^{-1}$ we obtain from the substitution $n^{-t} = x$ that

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \geq n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta+\frac{1}{2}\tau_n} l_n^{-1} \log(n) \int_{\tau_n}^{\infty} \exp(h_n(t) - t \log(n)) dt.$$

Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with $\delta^{-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $2\delta \leq \beta^* - \beta$. By (4.3) there exists some $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$ such that for every sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(7.27) \quad \mathbb{X}(t \in (1, \infty) : (\beta^* - \delta - 1 + t) \log(n) \leq h_n(t)) \geq \kappa$$

$$(7.28) \quad \text{or } \mathbb{X}\left(t \in (0, 1) : \left(\beta^* - \delta + \frac{t}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log(n) \leq h_n(t)\right) \geq \kappa.$$

If (7.27) holds then we consider $\tau_n = 1 - \tilde{\tau}_n$ and get

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \geq \kappa \sqrt{\log(n)} l_n^{-1} n^\delta.$$

Otherwise, if (7.28) holds and n is sufficiently large then

$$\mathbb{X}\left(t \in (\delta(j_n - 1) + \tilde{\tau}_n, j_n \delta) : \left(\beta^* - \delta + \frac{t}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log(n) \leq h_n(t)\right) \geq \frac{\delta \kappa}{2}$$

for some $j_n \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1}\}$. In this case set $\tau_n = \delta(j_n - 1) + \tilde{\tau}_n$ and obtain

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \geq \frac{\kappa \delta}{2 l_n} \log(n) n^{\beta^* - \beta - \delta + \frac{1}{2}\tau_n - \frac{1}{2}j_n \delta} \geq \frac{\kappa \delta}{2 l_n} (\log(n))^{\frac{3}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}\delta}.$$

To sum up, we can conclude that $l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \rightarrow \infty$.

The case $\beta > \beta^*$

Fix $x > 0$. By Lemma 3.12 of Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] and the substitution $u = n^{-t}$ it is sufficient to show that

$$\begin{aligned} (7.29) \quad & n^{1-\beta} \mu_n \left(n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} > x \right) \\ &= n^{1-\beta} \int_{\{u \leq \frac{1}{2} : n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(u)) > x\}} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(u)) du \\ &+ n^{1-\beta} \int_{\{u \leq \frac{1}{2} : n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(1-u)) > x\}} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(F_0^{-1}(1-u)) du \\ &\leq 2n^{1-\beta} \log(n) \int_{\{t \geq \frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)} : n^{-\beta} \exp(h_n(t)) > x\}} \exp(h_n(t) - t \log(n)) dt \end{aligned}$$

converges to 0 and

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1-2\beta} \int_{\{n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} \leq x\}} \left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} \right)^2 dP_0 \\ & \leq 2n^{1-2\beta} \log(n) \int_{\{t \geq \frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)} : n^{-\beta} \exp(h_n(t)) \leq x\}} \exp(2h_n(t) - t \log(n)) dt \end{aligned}$$

does so as well. To verify this, set

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,1} &= \log(n) n^{1-2\beta} \int_{\frac{\log(2)}{\log(n)}}^1 \exp\left(\log(n) \left(\frac{2h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t \right)\right) dt, \\ I_{n,2} &= \log(n) n^{1-\beta} \int_1^M \exp\left(\log(n) \left(\frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t \right)\right) dt \\ \text{and } I_{n,3} &= \log(n) n^{1-\beta} \int_M^\infty \exp\left(\log(n) \left(\frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t \right)\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1-\beta} \mu_n\left(n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} > x\right) \leq 2x^{-1} I_{n,1} + 2(I_{n,2} + I_{n,3}) \\ \text{and } & n^{1-2\beta} \int_{\{n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} \leq x\}} \left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} \right)^2 dP_0 \leq 2I_{n,1} + 2x(I_{n,2} + I_{n,3}). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.4) with $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2 > 0$ we deduce for all $n \geq N_{1,\delta}$ that $I_{n,1} \leq \log(n) n^{-2\delta} \rightarrow 0$ and $I_{n,2} \leq \log(n) n^{-\delta} M \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, it remains to show that $I_{n,3} \rightarrow 0$.

First, assume that (4.6) holds for $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2 > 0$. Then for all $n \geq N_{2,\delta}$

$$I_{n,3} \leq n^{-\delta} \log(n) \int_1^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n t) dt = \log(n) n^{-\delta} \lambda_n^{-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Second, suppose that (4.5) is fulfilled. Similar to the calculation in (7.29), we obtain $\log(n) \int \exp(h_{n,j}(t)) n^{-t} dt = 1$ and, thus, $\int \exp(h_n(t)) n^{-t} dt \leq 2$. For all $\kappa > 0$ there exists some $N_{3,\kappa} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_{3,\kappa}$ we have

$$(7.30) \quad \sup_{t \geq M} \left| \gamma(t) - \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} \right| \leq \kappa \text{ and, hence, } \int_M^\infty n^{\gamma(t)-t} dt \leq 2n^\kappa.$$

From the latter and a simple proof by contradiction we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{X}(t \geq M : \gamma(t) - t > 0) = 0.$$

We want to point out that Cai and Wu [9] already showed the two previous statements for $M = 1$ under the assumption (4.1). Let $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \leq x\}$ be the integer part of x and $\tau_n = l_n / \log(n)$. To show $I_{n,3} \rightarrow 0$ we divide $h_n(t)$ as follows: $h_n(t) = (1 - \tau_n)h_n(t) + \tau_n h_n(t)$. To get an upper bound, we

use (4.4) with $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2$ for the first summand and the first statement in (7.30) with $\kappa = 1$ for the second summand. Consequently, there is some $N_4 \geq N_{1,\delta} + \exp(N_{3,1})$ such that for all $n \geq N_4$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,3} &\leq \log(n) n^{1-\beta+(1-\tau_n)(\beta^*+\delta-1)} \int_M^\infty n^{\tau_n(\gamma(t)+1-t)} dt \\ &\leq \log(n)^{3-\beta^*-\delta} n^{-\delta} \int_M^\infty [\log(n)]^{\gamma(t)-t} dt \leq n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} 2[\log(n)] \rightarrow 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Without loss of generality we can assume that $P_0 = \mathbb{A}_{|(0,1)}$ and $T(0) = 0$. By assumption T restricted on $[0, \eta]$ is invertible. Denote by T^{-1} its inverse. We deduce from Theorem 1.5.12 of Bingham et al. [7] that for all $x \in [0, -T(\eta)]$ we have

$$\mathbb{A}_{|(0,1)}^{-T}(0, x) = T^{-1}(x) = x^p L_1\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$$

for a slowly varying function L_1 at infinity. Hence, from Theorems XIII.5.2 and XIII.5.3 of Feller [21] we obtain $C(n^r) = n^{rp} L_2(n^r)$ for a slowly varying function L_2 at infinity. Moreover, it is well known, see Proposition 1.3.6 of Bingham et al. [7], that $\log(L_2(x)) = o(\log(x))$ and $L(x)x^\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Let $h_{n,1}$, $h_{n,2}$ and h_n be defined as in Theorem 4.2. Fix $\delta \in (0, rp)$ and set $\lambda_n = \log \log(n)$. By the monotonicity of T we have

$$h_n(t) \leq \log(C(\vartheta_n)) + \vartheta_n T(n^{-rp+\frac{\delta}{2}}) = (rp + o(1)) \log(n) - n^{\frac{\delta}{2p}} L(n^{rp})$$

for all $t \leq rp - \delta/2$. Consequently, there is some constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in (\log(2)/\log(n), rp - \frac{\delta}{2})} \left\{ \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{\log(n)}\right)t + \frac{\min\{1, t\}}{2} \right\} \leq K - n^{\frac{\delta}{4p}} \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Furthermore, since $T \leq 0$ we have for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \geq rp - \frac{\delta}{2}} \left\{ \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{\log(n)}\right)t + \frac{\min\{1, t\}}{2} \right\} \\ &\leq rp + o(1) - \left(rp - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \frac{\min\{rp - \delta/2, 1\}}{2} < \beta^\#(r, p) - \frac{1}{2} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, (4.4) and (4.6) hold for $\beta^* = \beta^\#(r, p)$. Similar to the previous calculations,

$$\sup_{t \in (rp + \delta/4, rp + \delta/2)} \left\{ \frac{h_n(t)}{\log(n)} - t + \frac{\min\{1, t\}}{2} \right\} > \beta^\#(r, p) - \frac{1}{2} - \delta$$

for sufficiently large n and so (4.3) holds for $\beta^* = \beta^\#(r, p)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Due to the analogy to the proof of Theorem 4.3 we skip some details here. Set $l_n = \log \log(n)$. By Φ , Φ^{-1} , ϕ we denote the distribution function, the left continuous quantile function and the density of $N(0, 1)$, respectively.

The case $\beta < \beta^*$

By $\Phi^{-1}(1-x) = -\Phi^{-1}(x)$, Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.3 it remains to show for some $v_n = n^{-\tau_n}$ with $\tau_n \in [\tilde{\tau}_n, 1 - \tilde{\tau}_n]$ and $\tilde{\tau}_n = l_n/\log(n)$ that

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) = n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta+\frac{\tau_n}{2}} \frac{1}{l_n \sqrt{2\pi}} \int \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}(x) \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \mathbf{1}\{|x| \geq \Phi^{-1}(1-v_n)\} dx$$

converges to ∞ . A simple consequence of integration by parts is $\phi(x)(x/(1+x^2)) \leq 1-\Phi(x) \leq \phi(x)/x$ for all $x > 0$. By this it is easy to obtain $\Phi^{-1}(1-u) \leq \sqrt{-2\log(u)}$ for all sufficiently small $u > 0$ and so $\Phi^{-1}(1-v_n) \leq \sqrt{2\tau_n \log(n)}$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Combining this and the substitution $x = y\sqrt{2\log(n)}$ yields

$$l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \geq \int n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta+\frac{1}{2}\tau_n+\frac{\tilde{h}_n(y)}{\log(n)}-y^2} \mathbf{1}\{|y| \geq \sqrt{\tau_n}\} dy$$

for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with $\delta^{-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $2\delta \leq \beta^* - \beta$. By (4.8) there exists some $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$ such that for every sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(7.31) \quad \mathbb{X}\left(|y| > 1 : \beta^* - \delta - 1 + y^2 \leq \frac{\tilde{h}_n(y)}{\log(n)}\right) \geq \kappa$$

$$\text{or } \mathbb{X}\left(|y| \in (\sqrt{\delta(j_n-1)} + \tilde{\tau}_n, \sqrt{j_n\delta}) : \beta^* - \delta + \frac{y^2-1}{2} \leq \frac{\tilde{h}_n(y)}{\log(n)}\right) \geq \kappa$$

for some appropriate $j_n \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1}\}$. If (7.31) holds then set $\tau_n = 1 - \tilde{\tau}_n$ and otherwise set $\tau_n = \delta(j_n - 1) + \tilde{\tau}_n$. Consequently, we obtain analogously to the proof of Theorem 4.3 that $l_n^{-1} \tilde{H}_n(v_n) \rightarrow \infty$.

The case $\beta > \beta^*$

Set

$$I_{n,1} = n^{1-2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\pi}} \int_{-1}^1 n^{\frac{2\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)}-x^2} dx,$$

$$I_{n,2} = n^{1-\beta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\pi}} \int n^{\frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)}-x^2} \mathbf{1}\{|x| \in (1, M)\} dx$$

$$\text{and } I_{n,3} = n^{1-\beta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\pi}} \int n^{\frac{\tilde{h}_n(x)}{\log(n)}-x^2} \mathbf{1}\{|x| \geq M\} dx.$$

Fix $y > 0$. Set $P_0 = N(0, 1)$. As done in the proof of Theorem 4.3, it remains to verify that

$$n^{1-\beta} \mu_n\left(n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} > y\right) \leq \frac{1}{y} I_{n,1} + I_{n,2} + I_{n,3}$$

$$\text{and } n^{1-2\beta} \int \mathbf{1}\left\{n^{-\beta} \frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0} \leq y\right\} \left(\frac{d\mu_n}{dP_0}\right)^2 dP_0 \leq I_{n,1} + y(I_{n,2} + I_{n,3})$$

converges to 0, i.e. $I_{n,1}, I_{n,2}$ and $I_{n,3}$ converge to 0. From (4.9) with $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2 > 0$ we deduce that $I_{n,1} \leq 2n^{-2\delta} \sqrt{\log(n)/\pi} \rightarrow 0$ and $I_{n,2} \leq 2Mn^{-\delta} \sqrt{\log(n)/\pi} \rightarrow 0$. It remains to discuss $I_{n,3}$. First, assume that (4.11) holds for $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2 > 0$. Then

$$I_{n,3} \leq n^{-\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\pi}} \int \exp(-\lambda_n x^2) dx = n^{-\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\lambda_n}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Second, suppose that (4.10) is fulfilled. Analogously to the proof of Theorem 4.3, there is some $\tilde{N}_\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\int \mathbf{1}\{|x| \geq M\} n^{\alpha(x)-x^2} dx \leq 2n^\kappa$ for every $\kappa > 0$ and all $n \geq \tilde{N}_\kappa$. Moreover, $\mathbb{A}(|x| \geq M : \alpha(x) - x^2 > 0) = 0$. Let $\tau_n = l_n/\log(n)$. Finally, from (4.9) with $\delta = (\beta - \beta^*)/2$ and (4.10) we get for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,3} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{\pi}} n^{1-\beta+(1-\tau_n)(\beta^*+\delta-1)} \int \mathbf{1}\{|x| \geq M\} n^{\tau_n(\alpha(x)+1-x^2)} dx \\ &\leq n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \int \mathbf{1}\{|x| \geq M\} [\log(n)]^{\alpha(x)-x^2} dx \leq n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} 2[\log(n)] \rightarrow 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.6. We split the proof into two steps:

1. Likelihood ratio test sequences:

Let $r \geq \rho^*(\beta)$. Here, we give proof for (b) regarding to the likelihood ratio tests as well as (c). First, we introduce the variational distance $\|P - Q\|$ between to probability measures P and Q on the same measure space:

$$\|P - Q\| = \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \frac{dP}{d(P+Q)} - \frac{dQ}{d(P+Q)} \right| d(P+Q).$$

By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 of Strasser [39] we have for every fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that the sharp lower bound of the sum of error probabilities for all tests testing P_0^n versus Q_n^n is equal to $1 - \|P_0^n - Q_n^n\|$. Moreover, this bound is attained by the likelihood ratio test $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{dQ_n^n/dP_0^n \geq 1\}$. It is well known and easy to show that weak convergence of binary experiments $\{P_0^n, Q_n^n\} \xrightarrow{w} \{P, Q\}$ implies convergence of the variational distance $\|P_0^n - Q_n^n\| \rightarrow \|P - Q\|$. For more details about the convergence of binary or more general experiments we refer the reader to the book of Strasser [39]. To sum up, it is sufficient to show that $\{P_0^n, Q_n^n\}$ converges weakly to the uninformative experiment $\{\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0\}$ (if $r > \rho^*(\beta)$) and to the normal shift experiment $\{N(-\sigma^2/2, \sigma^2), N(\sigma^2/2, \sigma^2)\}$ with $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}_{P_{(0)}}(T)$ (if $r = \rho^*(\beta)$), respectively. For all $x > 0$ define

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,1,x} &= n^{1-\beta} P_{(\vartheta_n)} \left(\varepsilon_n \frac{dP_{(\vartheta_n)}}{dP_{(0)}} > x \right), \\ I_{n,2,x} &= n^{1-2\beta} \left(\frac{C(\vartheta_n)^2}{C(2\vartheta_n)} P_{(2\vartheta_n)} \left(\varepsilon_n \frac{dP_{(\vartheta_n)}}{dP_{(0)}} \leq x \right) - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.10 and Lemma 3.12 of Ditzhaus and Janssen [16] it remains to show that

$$(7.32) \quad I_{n,1,x} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad I_{n,2,x} \rightarrow \sigma^2 \mathbf{1}\{r = \rho^*(\beta)\} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma^2 = \text{Var}_{P_{(0)}}(T)$$

for all $x > 0$. For this purpose we introduce the Laplace transform ω defined

$$(7.33) \quad \omega(\vartheta) = C(\vartheta)^{-1} = \int \exp(\vartheta T) \, dP_{(0)}, \quad \vartheta \in \Theta.$$

By Corollary 7.1 of Barndorff-Nielsen [5] the Laplace transform ω is analytic in a neighborhood around 0 and the derivatives can be determined by differentiation under the integral sign. Hence, there is $M \in (1, \infty)$ such that for all $x > 0$ and $n \geq N_x$ we have

$$C(2\vartheta_n) \leq 2, \quad \frac{\varepsilon_n C(\vartheta_n)}{x} \leq e^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{(4)}(2\vartheta_n) = \int T^4 \exp(2\vartheta_n T) \, dP_{(0)} < M,$$

where $f^{(k)}$ denotes the derivative of order $k \in \mathbb{N}$ of the function f . From this we obtain for all $x > 0$ and $n \geq N_x$ that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(2\vartheta_n)} \left(\varepsilon_n \frac{dP_{(\vartheta_n)}}{dP_{(0)}} > x \right) &\leq 2 \int \mathbf{1} \left\{ \vartheta_n T > \log \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon_n C(\vartheta_n)} \right) \right\} \exp(2\vartheta_n T) \, dP_{(0)} \\ &\leq 2 \int (\vartheta_n T)^4 \exp(2\vartheta_n T) \, dP_{(0)} = o(n^{-2r}). \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor expansion around 0 we get as $\vartheta \rightarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(2\vartheta) &= 1 + 2\vartheta E_{P_{(0)}}(T) + 2\vartheta^2 E_{P_{(0)}}(T^2) + o(\vartheta^2) \quad \text{and so} \\ \omega(\vartheta)^2 &= \omega(2\vartheta) - \vartheta^2 \sigma^2 + o(\vartheta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for all $x > 0$

$$I_{n,2,x} = n^{1-2\beta} \left(\frac{\omega(2\vartheta_n)}{\omega(\vartheta_n)^2} (1 + o(\vartheta_n^2)) - 1 \right) = n^{1-2\beta-2r} \sigma^2 (1 + o(1)),$$

which proves the statement about $I_{n,2,x}$ in (7.32). Furthermore, the one about $I_{n,1,x}$ is fulfilled since for all $x > 0$

$$I_{n,1,x} \leq \frac{1}{x} n^{1-2\beta} \frac{C(\vartheta_n)^2}{C(2\vartheta_n)} P_{(2\vartheta_n)} \left(\varepsilon_n \frac{dP_{(\vartheta_n)}}{dP_{(0)}} > x \right) = o(n^{1-2\beta-2r}).$$

2. Test sequences based on $S_n(s)$:

Here, we give proof for (b) corresponding to the results about $S_n(s)$ and (a). Therefore, we apply Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. This requires a closer analysis of $H_n(v)$ given by (3.1). Without loss of generality we can assume $P_{(0)} = \mathbb{A}_{|(0,1)}$. Observe that for all $v \in (0, 1/2)$

$$\mu_n(0, v) - v = \int_{B_{1,v}} \chi_x(\vartheta_n) \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n(1 - v, 1) - v = \int_{B_{2,v}} \chi_x(\vartheta_n) \, dx,$$

where $\chi_x(\vartheta) = C(\vartheta) \exp(\vartheta T) - 1$, $B_{1,v} = (0, v)$ and $B_{2,v} = (1 - v, 1)$.

As already stated, the Laplace transform ω introduced in (7.33) is analytic in $(-\delta, \delta)$ for sufficiently small $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and so is C . For all $\vartheta \in (-\delta, \delta)$ and every $x \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_x^{(1)}(\vartheta) &= C^{(1)}(\vartheta) \exp(\vartheta T(x)) + C(\vartheta) T(x) \exp(\vartheta T(x)) \\ \text{and } \chi_x^{(2)}(\vartheta) &= \left[C^{(2)}(\vartheta) + 2C^{(1)}(\vartheta) T(x) + C(\vartheta) T^2(x) \right] \exp(\vartheta T(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Since $C^{(1)}(0) = -\omega^{(1)}(0) = -\int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X}$ we get from a Taylor expansion around 0 that for all sufficiently large n , such that $\vartheta_n < \delta$, we have

$$\chi_x(\vartheta_n) = \vartheta_n \left(-\int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X} + T(x) \right) + \frac{\vartheta_n^2}{2} \chi_x^{(2)}(r_n(x)) \text{ with } r_n(x) \in [0, \vartheta_n].$$

Since C, ω are analytic there exists $M > 1$ such that for all $\vartheta \in [-\delta/2, \delta/2]$

$$|C(\vartheta)| + |C^{(1)}(\vartheta)| + |C^{(2)}(\vartheta)| + \sum_{k=0}^2 \int_0^1 |T|^k \exp(\vartheta T) d\mathbb{X} \leq M.$$

By Hölder's inequality it holds for all $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\int_0^1 f^4 d\mathbb{X} \leq M$ that

$$\int_{B_{j,v}} |f| d\mathbb{X} \leq v^{\frac{3}{4}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq v^{\frac{3}{4}} M \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

Hence, for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $v \in (0, 1/2)$ and large n , such that $|\vartheta_n| \leq \delta/2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{j,v}} |\chi_x^{(2)}(r_n(x))| dx &\leq M \int_{B_{j,v}} \left(1 + 2|T| + T^2 \right) \left(\exp(\vartheta_n T) + \exp(-\vartheta_n T) \right) d\mathbb{X} \\ &\leq 8v^{\frac{3}{4}} M^2.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}H_n(v) &\geq n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_{B_{j,v}} \chi_x(\vartheta_n) dx \right| \\ (7.34) \quad &= n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta-r} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_{B_{j,v}} \left(T - \int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X} \right) d\mathbb{X} + o(1) \right|.\end{aligned}$$

If $\int_0^v (T - \int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X}) d\mathbb{X} = 0 = \int_{1-v}^1 (T - \int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X}) d\mathbb{X}$ would hold for every $v \in (0, 1/2)$ then $T \equiv \int_0^1 T d\mathbb{X}$ would be true $\mathbb{X}|_{(0,1)}$ -almost surely, which contradicts the assumption $\text{Var}_{P_{(0)}}(T) > 0$. Consequently, we can deduce from (7.34) that $(\log \log(n))^{-1} H_n(v^*) \rightarrow \infty$ for some $v^* \in (0, 1/2)$ if $r < \rho^*(\beta)$. Applying Theorem 3.1 with $v_n = v^*$ gives us (a).

It remains to discuss the case $r = \rho^*(\beta)$. Set $c_{n,1} = 1/n$, $c_{n,2} = c_{n,3} = 1/\sqrt{n}$ and $c_{n,4} = (\log(n))^{-4}$. Clearly, (3.4) holds with $\kappa = 1/2$. Moreover, we can deduce

from our previous considerations that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\vartheta_n \leq \delta/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v \in [c_{n,1}, c_{n,4}]} H_n(v) &\leq 2n^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta-r} \sup_{v \in [c_{n,1}, c_{n,4}]} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(vM + v^{\frac{3}{4}}M + 8\frac{\vartheta_n}{2}v^{\frac{3}{4}}M^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{v \in [c_{n,1}, c_{n,4}]} v^{\frac{1}{4}} 10M^2 = 20M^2(\log(n))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3.3) is fulfilled. Recall that by the first step $\{P_0^n, Q_n^n\}$ converges weakly to $\{N(-\sigma^2/2, \sigma^2), N(\sigma^2/2, \sigma^2)\}$ for some $\sigma^2 > 0$ and, hence, by the first Lemma of Le Cam P_0^n and Q_n^n are mutually contiguous. Finally, applying Theorem 3.2 yields the corresponding statement in (b). \square

References

- [1] ALI, S. M. AND SILVEY, S. D. (1966). A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **28**, 131–142. [MR0196777](#)
- [2] ARIAS-CASTRO, E. AND CANDÈS, E. J. AND PLAN, Y. (2015). Global testing under sparse alternatives: ANOVA, multiple comparisons and the higher criticism. *Ann. Statist.* **39**, 2533–2556. [MR2906877](#),
- [3] ARIAS-CASTRO, E. AND WANG, M. (2015). The sparse Poisson means model. *Electron. J. Stat.* **9**, 2170–2201. [MR3406276](#)
- [4] ARIAS-CASTRO, E. AND WANG, M. (2017). Distribution-free tests for sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *TEST* **26**, 71–94. [MR3613606](#)
- [5] BARNDORFF-NIELSEN, O. (1978). *Information and exponential families in statistical theory*. Wiley, Chichester. [MR489333](#)
- [6] BERK, R. H. AND JONES, D. H. (1979). Goodness-of-fit test statistics that dominate the Kolmogorov statistics. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **47**, 47–59. [MR0521531](#)
- [7] BINGHAM, N., GOLDIE, C. AND TEUGELS, J. (1987). *Regular Variation* Cambridge University Press. [MR0898871](#)
- [8] CAI, T., JENG, J. AND JIN, J. (2011). Optimal detection of heterogeneous and heteroscedastic mixtures. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **73**, 629–662. [MR2867452](#)
- [9] CAI, T. AND WU, Y. (2014). Optimal Detection of Sparse Mixtures Against a Given Null Distribution. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **60**, 2217–2232. [MR3181520](#)
- [10] CAYON, L., JIN, J. AND TREASTER, A. (2004). Higher Criticism statistic: Detecting and identifying non-Gaussianity in the WMAP first year data. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **362**, 826–832.
- [11] CHANG, L.-C. (1955). On the ratio of an empirical distribution function to the theoretical distribution function. (Chinese) *Acta Math. Sinica* **5**, 347–368. [MR0076213](#)
- [12] CRESSIE, N. AND READ, T. R. C. (1984). Multinomial goodness-of-fit tests. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **46**, 440–464. [MR079063](#)

- [13] CSISZÁR, I. (1967). Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **2**, 299–318. [MR0219345](#)
- [14] DAI, H., CHARNIGO, R., SRIVASTAVA, T., TALEBIZADEH, Z. AND QING, S. (2012). Integrating P-values for genetic and genomic data analysis. *J. Biom. Biostat.*, 3–7.
- [15] DITZHAUS, M. (2017). *The power of tests for signal detection under high-dimensional data*. PhD-thesis, Heinrich-Heine-University Duesseldorf. <https://docserv.uni-duesseldorf.de/servlets/DocumentServlet?id=42808>
- [16] DITZHAUS, M. AND JANSSEN, A. (2017). The power of big data sparse signal detection tests on nonparametric detection boundaries. ArXiv identifier 1709.07264.
- [17] DONOHO, D. AND JIN, J. (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *Ann. Statist.* **32**, 962–994. [MR2065195](#)
- [18] DONOHO, D. AND JIN, J. (2009). Feature selection by higher criticism thresholding achieves the optimal phase diagram. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **367**, 4449–4470. [MR2546396](#)
- [19] DONOHO, D. AND JIN, J. (2015). Higher Criticism for Large-Scale Inference, Especially for Rare and Weak Effects. *Statist. Sci.* **30**, 1–25. [MR3317751](#)
- [20] EICKER, F. (1979). The asymptotic distribution of the suprema of the standardized empirical processes. *Ann. Statist.* **7**, 116–138. [MR0515688](#)
- [21] FELLER, W. (1966). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Application. Volume 2*. John Wiley and Sons. [MR0210154](#)
- [22] GOLDSTEIN, D.B. (2009). Common genetic variation and human traits. *New England J. Med.* **360**, 1696–1698.
- [23] HALL, P., PITTELKOW, Y. AND GHOSH, M. (2008). Theoretical measures of relative performance of classifiers for high dimensional data with small sample sizes. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **70**, 159–173. [MR2412636](#)
- [24] INGSTER, Y. (1997). Some problems of hypothesis testing leading to infinitely divisible distributions. *Math. Methods Statist.* **6**, 47–69. [MR1456646](#)
- [25] INGSTER, Y. I. AND TSYBAKOV, A. B. AND VERZELEN, N. (2010). Detection boundary in sparse regression. *Electron. J. Stat.* **4**, 1476–1526. [MR2747131](#)
- [26] IYENGAR, S. K. AND ELSTON, R.C. (2007). The genetic basis of complex traits: Rare vvariant or "common gene, common disease"? *Methods Mol. Biol.* **376**, 71–84.
- [27] JAESCHKE, D. (1979). The asymptotic distribution of the suprema of the standardized empirical distribution function on subintervals. *Ann. Stat.* **7**, 108–115. [MR0515687](#)
- [28] JAGER, L. AND WELLNER, J. (2004). A new goodness of fit test: The reversed Berk-Jones statistic. Technical report, Dept. Statistics, Univ. Washington.

- [29] JAGER, L. AND WELLNER, J. (2007). Goodness-of-fit tests via phi-divergences. *Ann. Stat.* **35**, 2008–2053. [MR2363962](#)
- [30] JIN, J. (2009). Impossibility of successful classification when useful features are rare and weak. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 8859–8864, [MR2520682](#)
- [31] JIN, J., STARK, J.-L., DONOHO, D., AGHANIM, N. AND FORNI, O. (2005). Cosmological non-Gaussian signature detection: Comparing performance of different statistical tests. *J. Appl. Signal Processing* **15**, 2470–2485. [MR2210857](#)
- [32] KHMALADZE, E. V. (1998). Goodness of fit tests for Chimeric alternatives. *Statist. Neerlandica* **52**, 90–111. [MR1615550](#)
- [33] KHMALADZE, E. AND SHINJIKASHVILI, E. (2001). Calculation of non-crossing probabilities for Poisson processes and its corollaries. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **33**, 702–716. [MR1860097](#)
- [34] KULLDORFF, M., HEFFERNAN, R., HARTMAN, J., ASSUNCAO, R. AND MOSTASHARI, F. (2005). A space-time permutation scan statistic for disease outbreak detection. *PLoS Med* **2**, e59.
- [35] MUKHERJEE, R., PILLAI, N. S. AND LIN, X (2015). Hypothesis testing for high-dimensional sparse binary regression. *Ann. Statist.* **43**, 352–381. [MR3311863](#)
- [36] NEILL, D. AND LINGWALL, J. (2007). A nonparametric scan statistic for multivariate disease surveillance. *Advances in Disease Surveillance* **4**, 106–116.
- [37] SALIGRAMA, V. and ZHAO, M. (2012). Local anomaly detection. *JMLR W&CP* **22**, 969–983.
- [38] SHORACK, G. R. AND WELLNER, J. A. (1986). *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. [MR0838963](#).
- [39] STRASSER, H. (1985). *Mathematical Theory of Statistics*, De Gruyter, Berlin/New York. [MR0812467](#)
- [40] TUKEY, J. W. (1976). *T13 N: The higher Criticism*. Coures Notes. Stat 411. Princeton Univ.
- [41] TUKEY, J. W. (1989). *Higher Criticism for individual significances in serveral tables or parts of tables*. Internal working paper, Princeton Univ.
- [42] TUKEY, J. W. (1994). *The Collected Works of John W. Tukey: Multiple Comparisons, Volume VIII*. Chapman and Hall, London. [MR1263027](#)
- [43] WELLNER, J. A. (1978). Limit theorems for the ratio of the empirical distribution function to the true distribution function. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **45**, 73–88. [MR0651392](#)