1. Introduction.

1.1. FDR control versus simultaneous FDP bounds. The false discovery rate (FDR) of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) is a popular Type-I error criterion for multiple testing problems. Given a set of hypotheses \( \mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\} \) (which we identify with \([n] \equiv \{1, \ldots, n\}\)), the false discovery proportion of a set \( \mathcal{R} \subseteq [n] \) is defined

\[
\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{H}_0|}{|\mathcal{R}|} \equiv \frac{V}{R},
\]

where \( V \) and \( R \) are the number of false discoveries and the number of discoveries, respectively.
where $\mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is the set of nulls and $\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \equiv 0$ when $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ by convention (we use the $\equiv$ symbol for definitions). Given a multiple testing procedure mapping a set of p-values $p_1, \ldots, p_m$ to a rejection set $\mathcal{R}^* \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, the false discovery rate of this procedure is defined as the expected FDP of the rejection set: $\text{FDR} \equiv \mathbb{E}[\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}^*)]$. A procedure is said to control the FDR at a level $q$ if $\text{FDR} \leq q$.

Despite the popularity of FDR, this criterion is not without its pitfalls. The expectation of the FDP might or might not be a good proxy for the FDP of the data set at hand. Furthermore, Goeman and Solari (2011) (GS) argued eloquently that the existing FDR control paradigm is inflexible and therefore at odds with the exploratory nature of modern large-scale data analysis. Indeed, the current paradigm requires a level $q$ to be chosen before inspecting the data, and the set $\mathcal{R}^*$ cannot be grown or shrunk without invalidating the guarantee. This paradigm leaves no room for scientists with domain expertise to adaptively select a rejection set while maintaining valid inferential guarantees. Importantly, moving to the more conservative false discovery exceedance (FDX) control (for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\text{FDX} \equiv \mathbb{P}\{\text{FDP} > \gamma\}$) does not provide any additional flexibility.

Motivated by these considerations, GS proposed an alternative simultaneous inference paradigm. In this paradigm, one constructs FDP upper bounds $\overline{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R})$ that hold uniformly across all sets $\mathcal{R}$ with high-probability:

\begin{equation}
\Pr\{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \overline{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}) \text{ for all } \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{H}\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\end{equation}

Such bounds allow the scientist to inspect any pairs $(\mathcal{R}, \overline{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}))$ and freely choose the rejection set $\mathcal{R}^*$ whose content and FDP bound suits them. Given the simultaneous nature of statement (2), the upper bound on FDP continues to hold on the chosen set despite the user’s data-dependent decision:

\begin{equation}
\Pr\{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}^*) \leq \overline{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}^*)\} \geq \Pr\{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \overline{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}) \text{ for all } \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{H}\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\end{equation}

GS obtain such bounds by building on the closed testing principle, where a local test $\phi_\mathcal{R}$ (i.e. a test of the global null for a restricted set of hypotheses) is performed for each subset of hypotheses $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. The results of all these local tests are aggregated to form a bound $\overline{\text{FDP}}$ that provably satisfies (2).

1.2. A new class of simultaneous FDP bounds. In this paper, we show that a variety of FDR procedures can be repurposed to obtain simultaneous FDP bounds, establishing a novel connection between FDR control and simultaneous FDP control. In particular, note that many FDR algorithms,
including the Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) (BH) procedure as well as many others, construct a path, or nested sequence of $n$ potential rejection sets

$\Pi \equiv (\mathcal{R}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_n)$, such that $\emptyset \equiv \mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathcal{R}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{R}_n \subset [n]$.

Then, an estimate of the FDP

$$\hat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv \frac{a_0 + \hat{V}(\mathcal{R}_k)}{|\mathcal{R}_k|},$$

is constructed for each $\mathcal{R}_k \in \Pi$, where $\hat{V}(\mathcal{R}_k)$ is an estimate of $V(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv |\mathcal{R}_k \cap \mathcal{H}_0|$ and $a_0 \geq 0$ is an additive regularization constant. This estimate is then used to obtain a cutoff point

$$k^* \equiv \max\{k : \hat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \leq q\},$$

based on which the rejection set $\mathcal{R}^* \equiv \mathcal{R}_{k^*}$ is defined.

Repurposing the path $\Pi$ and the estimate $\hat{V}$, we propose the bound

$$\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv c(\alpha) \cdot \frac{a + \hat{V}(\mathcal{R}_k)}{|\mathcal{R}_k|},$$

where $c(\alpha)$ are tight, explicit, dimension-independent constants such that

$$\Pr\{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) \text{ for all } \mathcal{R} \in \Pi\} \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

as long as the p-values satisfy an independence assumption. The constant $c(\alpha)$ depends implicitly on the regularization $a > 0$, which does not need to be the same as the original regularization $a_0$. Usually, we set $a = 1$. If desired, $\text{FDP}$ can also be extended to all sets $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ to obtain a bound of the form (2) through the process of interpolation (Blanchard, Neuvial and Roquain, 2017; Goeman, Hemerik and Solari, 2019). Figure 1 summarizes the proposed FDP bounds and how they compare and contrast to FDR methods and GS’s simultaneous inference paradigm based on closed testing.

We prove our bounds by developing a simple yet versatile proof technique—based on a martingale argument rather different from those commonly used in the FDR literature—to obtain tight non-asymptotic bounds for the probability that the stochastic process $|\mathcal{R}_k \cap \mathcal{H}_0|$ of false discoveries hits certain boundaries. This technique is inspired by the proof of FDR control for the multilayer knockoff filter (Katsevich and Sabatti, 2019).

Several simultaneous bounds $\overline{\text{FDP}}$ for the sets $\mathcal{R}_t \equiv \{j : p_j \leq t\}$ are already available (Genovese and Wasserman, 2006; Meinshausen, 2006; Meinshausen and Rice, 2006; Blanchard, Neuvial and Roquain, 2017; Hemerik,
Fig 1: Schematic for proposed FDP bounds (shaded gray nodes), in the context of the usual FDR control framework (nodes with red borders) and the GS closed testing framework for simultaneous FDP control (nodes with blue borders). The proposed bounds borrow the path construction from FDR procedures to leverage side information, while obtaining simultaneous guarantees like the GS approach to permit exploration.

Solari and Goeman, 2019), in addition to bounds valid for all subsets (van der Laan, Dudoit and Pollard, 2004; Goeman and Solari, 2011). However, all of these bounds treat p-values exchangeably, whereas the link we establish between FDR and simultaneous FDP control allows us to leverage the rich recent literature (e.g. Li and Barber (2017); Lei and Fithian (2018)) on incorporating side information into FDR procedures to obtain powerful simultaneous FDP bounds. Importantly, our bounds apply also to the knockoffs procedure (Barber and Candès, 2015; Candès et al., 2018) for high-dimensional variable selection, which produces an ordered set of independent “one-bit p-values” to which we may apply one of our bounds. They also apply to the online setting, where p-values come in a stream and
decisions to accept or reject must be made before seeing future data. Our results can also be used as diagnostic tools for FDR procedures: one can run an FDR procedure at a certain level and then obtain a valid upper bound on the FDP of the resulting rejection set. Finally, all of our bounds (7) have an appealingly simple closed form.

Next, we preview our simultaneous FDP bound for the knockoffs procedure and demonstrate its utility on a large genome-wide association study data set (Section 2). Then, we state our main results and provide a high level proof sketch in Section 3. In Section 4, we compare and contrast our theoretical results with those in the FDR literature. We then compare the performance of our simultaneous FDP bounds with existing alternatives via numerical simulations (Section 5) and then conclude the paper in Section 6. The code to reproduce our numerical simulations and data analysis is available online at https://github.com/ekatsevi/simultaneous-fdp.

2. An illustration with real data. Before formally stating and proving our bounds, we first illustrate their utility in the context of an application to genome-wide association studies (GWAS). The goal of GWAS is to identify the genetic factors behind various human traits. For this purpose, genotype and trait data are collected from large cohorts of individuals and then scanned for association. The recently compiled UK Biobank resource (Bycroft et al., 2018) has data on half a million individuals.

GWAS represents a vast variable selection problem, with genotypes viewed as covariates and the trait as the outcome. Since nearby genotypes are strongly correlated with each other, the units of inference usually are spatially localized genomic regions instead of individual genetic variants (i.e. variables are grouped before testing). The knockoffs framework (Barber and Candes, 2015) for variable selection with FDR control has been proposed to analyze GWAS data (Sesia, Sabatti and Candès, 2018) and has recently been applied to several phenotypes in the UK Biobank data set (Sesia et al., 2019).

The knockoffs procedure falls into the class of FDR procedures introduced in the previous section. A set of knockoff statistics \(W_1, \ldots, W_p\) are constructed for each group of genetic variants, with the property that the distribution of \(W_k\) is symmetric about the origin for null groups \(k\). On the other hand, knockoff statistics for non-null groups should be large and positive. Therefore, an ordering \(\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(p)\) of the groups is constructed by sorting the knockoff statistics by decreasing magnitude. The \(k\)th rejection set along the path \(R_k\) is then defined as the set of groups among the first \(k\)
in the ordering whose knockoff statistics have positive signs:

\[
\mathcal{R}_k \equiv \{ \pi(j) \leq k : \text{sign}(W_{\pi(j)}) > 0 \}.
\]

FDR control is proved for regularization \( a_0 = 1 \) and the estimate

\[
\hat{V}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv |\{ \pi(j) \leq k : \text{sign}(W_{\pi(j)}) < 0 \}|,
\]

which leverages the sign-symmetry of \( W_k \) for null \( k \).

Our theoretical result (Corollary 1 in Section 3) shows that the bound

\[
\text{FDP}_{\text{knockoff}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv \frac{\log(\alpha^{-1})}{\log(2 - \alpha)} \cdot \frac{1 + |\{ \pi(j) \leq k : \text{sign}(W_{\pi(j)}) < 0 \}|}{|\mathcal{R}_k|},
\]

i.e. expression (7) with \( a = a_0 = 1 \), \( c(\alpha) = \frac{\log(\alpha^{-1})}{\log(2 - \alpha)} \), and \( \hat{V} \) as in definition (10), satisfies the uniform coverage statement (8). For \( \alpha = 0.05 \), we have \( c(\alpha) \approx 4.5 \). In other words, inflating the knockoffs FDP estimate by 4.5 allows us to upgrade from bounding the FDP of one set on average to confidently bounding the true FDP across the entire path.

To illustrate the utility of this result, we apply it to the analysis of the platelet count trait in the UK Biobank data, borrowing the knockoff statistics that were made publicly available by Sesia et al. (2019) at https://msesia.github.io/knockoffzoom/ukbiobank.html. While several correlation cutoffs were used to create groups in Sesia et al. (2019), here we consider the lowest resolution groups (of average width 0.226 megabases), whose size corresponds roughly to that yielded by current GWAS methodologies. In Figure 2, we plot \( \hat{V} \) and \( \text{FDP} \) as a function of the rejection set size. The dashed line shows the FDR target level \( q = 0.1 \) used by Sesia et al. (2019). The \( \hat{V} \) curve crosses this threshold at \( k^* \) with \( |\mathcal{R}_{k^*}| = 1460 \). By comparison, the FDP curve is (necessarily) more conservative, but clearly yields informative FDP bounds for many rejection sets. It crosses the line \( q = 0.1 \) at \( |\mathcal{R}_{k^*}| = 813 \), meaning that we are 95% confident that at least 90% of the top 813 genomic loci are associated with platelet count.

Importantly, though, we can do much more than this. Instead of committing to \( q = 0.1 \) before seeing the data, we can explore several rejection sets along the knockoffs path, examining their content and FDP bound. One strategy we might take is to choose a set of points along the knockoffs path that represent different compromises between FDP bound and rejection set size; these points are highlighted along the FDP curve in Figure 2. For example, the leftmost highlighted point represents a rejection set of size 270 with an FDP bound of 0.017 (that holds with 95% probability).
Fig 2: Knockoffs FDP estimate (dark blue) and proposed FDP upper bound (magenta) for GWAS analysis of platelet count, with highlighted points indicating interesting rejection sets. The degree of over-representation of two relevant Gene Ontology terms (orange and goldenrod) among genes in the neighborhood of genomic regions defined by each interesting rejection set.

A domain expert might inspect each of these points and choose one that makes the most sense. In genetics, a common first step to evaluate a set of discoveries is to see whether they fit with known associations. The Gene Ontology, or GO (Ashburner et al., 2000) is a collection of biological processes, each annotated with a set of genes known to be involved in that process. Given a set of genomic regions, the GREAT (McLean et al., 2010) tool computes the “enrichment” (i.e. overrepresentation) of genes annotated to any given GO term falling in those genomic regions. For the platelet count trait, we would expect associated regions to be overrepresented for genes annotated to processes like “blood coagulation” or “platelet activation.” We computed the fold enrichment (degree of overrepresentation) for these two terms, shown in Figure 2 as dashed goldenrod and orange lines. The fold enrichment generally decreases as we increase the size of the rejection set,
corresponding to our intuition that the strongest signals are generally in regions previously known to be associated with platelet count. A plot like Figure 2 would already go a long way towards helping a domain expert decide on a biologically meaningful rejection set with a statistically sound Type-I error guarantee.

Finally, to quantify the price we pay for this extra flexibility, we consider several traits analyzed by Sesia et al. (2019) and compare the numbers of rejections we get for the original analysis (FDR ≤ 0.1) with the numbers we get for controlling FDP at various levels based on $FDP_{\text{knockoff}}$. The results are shown in Table 1. As we can see, there is certainly a trade-off between analytical flexibility and statistical power. However, at least in this dataset, we can still make substantial numbers of discoveries while enjoying the benefit of improved flexibility.

Having previewed the utility of our theoretical results on a real dataset, in the next section we formally state these results.

### 3. Main results

In this section, we present a set of paths $\Pi$ along with corresponding bounds $\overline{FDP}$ of the form (7) and state conditions under which the guarantee (8) holds. As discussed in the introduction, both $\Pi$ and $\overline{V}$ will be borrowed directly from existing FDR procedures. We provide bounds for both the batch and online settings. In the batch setting, there is a finite number of hypotheses $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ for which the p-values are available all at once; in the online setting, where there is an infinite stream of hypotheses, which arrive one at a time and a decision must be made about each hypothesis as soon as its p-value arrives. The proofs for all our results are provided...
in the supplement, but a sketch of the main idea is given in Section 3.3.

3.1. **FDP bounds in the batch setting.** Here, we have a fixed, finite set of hypotheses \( H_1, \ldots, H_n \) and a set of p-values \( p_1, \ldots, p_n \). To construct a path, consider first ordering the hypotheses in some way \( \pi(1), \pi(2), \ldots, \pi(n) \), constructing \( \pi \) to encourage non-nulls to appear near the beginning of the order. Then, define a p-value cutoff \( p_* \in (0, 1] \). We form a path \( \Pi \) by traversing the ordering and choosing hypotheses whose p-values passed the cutoff:

\[
\Pi \equiv (R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_n) \text{ such that } R_k \equiv \{ \pi(j) : j \leq k, p_{\pi(j)} \leq p_* \}.
\]

There are three ways of defining the path \( \Pi \):

1. **sort:** \( \pi \) is formed by sorting p-values; in this case usually \( p_* \equiv 1 \).
2. **preorder:** \( \pi \) is fixed ahead of time using prior knowledge.
3. **interact:** \( \pi \) is built on the fly using prior knowledge and p-values.

Next, we elaborate on these path constructions in the batch setting and present FDP bounds for each of them.

3.1.1. **Sorted path.** Ordering hypotheses by p-value, \( p_{\pi(k)} = p(k) \), and setting \( p_* = 1 \) leads to

\[
R_k = \{ j : p_j \leq p(k) \}.
\]

This is the most common path construction among multiple testing procedures, serving as the basis for the BH algorithm and many other step up/down algorithms. It is the obvious choice when no side information is available. The BH algorithm is constructed based on the FDR control paradigm described in Section 1.2, with \( \hat{V}_{BH}(R_k) \equiv n \cdot p(k) \) and \( a_0 = 0 \), which leads to

\[
\hat{\text{FDP}}_{BH}(R_k) \equiv \frac{n \cdot p(k)}{|R_k|}.
\]

The following theorem presents our FDP bounds (7) for this path, based on the BH estimate \( \hat{V}_{BH} \).

**Theorem 1.** Let \( R_k \) be defined via (12), and let

\[
\text{FDP}_{\text{sort}}(R_k) \equiv \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\log \left( 1 + \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}) \right)} \cdot \frac{1 + n \cdot p(k)}{|R_k|}.
\]

If the null p-values are independent and stochastically larger than uniform, i.e. \( \Pr\{p_j \leq s\} \leq s \) for all \( j \in \mathcal{H}_0 \) and \( s \in [0, 1] \), then the uniform bound (8) holds for all \( \alpha \in (0, 0.31] \), i.e.

\[
\Pr\{\text{FDP}(R_k) \leq \text{FDP}_{\text{sort}}(R_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n]\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]
Remark 1. In Theorem 1, we require that $\alpha \leq 0.31$. However, strong numerical evidence shows that the bound is valid for all $\alpha$. The restriction on $\alpha$ is an artifact of our proof and does not represent an intrinsic breaking point of the bound. Despite this limitation in our proof, the range $\alpha \leq 0.31$ includes most confidence levels that would be used in practice (although the case $\alpha = 0.5$ might be of interest to bound the median of the FDP distribution and $\alpha = 1$ of interest to bound the null proportion).

3.1.2. Pre-ordered path. The pre-ordered setting applies when prior information (e.g. data from a similar experiment) sheds light on which hypotheses are more likely to be non-null, so a good ordering $\pi$ is known in advance. Several FDR methodologies taking advantage of pre-specified orderings have been developed; G’Sell et al. (2016) and Li and Barber (2017) build paths using $p^* = 1$ while Barber and Candès (2015) and Lei and Fithian (2016) use $p^* \in (0, 1)$.

For the case $p^* = 1$, we use a construction from the accumulation test of Li and Barber (2017): an accumulation function $h$ is a function $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that is non-decreasing and integrates to 1. Then, we define

$$
\hat{V}_{\text{preorder-acc}}(R_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} h(p_{\pi(j)}).
$$

Alternatively, for $p^* \in (0, 1)$, we can follow Selective SeqStep (Barber and Candès, 2015) and Adaptive SeqStep (Lei and Fithian, 2016) to define

$$
\hat{V}_{\text{preorder-sel}}(R_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{p^*}{1 - \lambda} I(p_{\pi(j)} > \lambda),
$$

where $\lambda \geq p^*$. The following theorem presents our FDP bounds (7) for the pre-ordered setting for the cases $p^* = 1$ and $p^* \in (0, 1)$, which rely on estimates (14) and (15), respectively.

Theorem 2. Fix $a > 0$ and assume the null $p$-values are independent and stochastically larger than uniform. Given a prior ordering $\pi$, let

$$
R_k = \{\pi(j) : j \leq k, p_{\pi(j)} \leq p^*\}.
$$

1. Set $p^* = 1$, choose a (possibly unbounded) accumulation function $h$, and define

$$
\text{FDP}^h_{\text{preorder-acc}}(R_k) = \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{a \log \left( \int_0^1 a^{h(u)/a} du \right)^{-1}} \cdot \frac{a + \sum_{j=1}^{k} h(p_{\pi(j)})}{|R_k|}.
$$
Then, the uniform bound (8) holds for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$:

$$\Pr\left\{ \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k) \leq \text{FDP}^h_{\text{preorder-acc}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$  

Moreover, if $\sup_{u \in [0,1]} h(u) \equiv B < \infty$, then we may instead use

(17)

$$\text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-acc}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)}{a \log\left(1 - \frac{1-\alpha B/a}{B}\right)} \cdot \frac{a + \sum_{j=1}^{k} h(p_{\pi(j)})}{|\mathcal{R}_k|},$$  

where $B \equiv p_\star^\alpha$. Then, uniform bound (8) holds for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$:

$$\Pr\left\{ \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k) \leq \text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-acc}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$  

2. Set $p_\star \in (0,1)$ and fix $\lambda \geq p_\star$. Define

(18)

$$\text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-sel}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)}{a \log\left(1 + \frac{1-\alpha B/a}{B}\right)} \cdot \frac{a + \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_\star 1 - \lambda I(p_{\pi(j)} > \lambda)}{|\mathcal{R}_k|},$$  

where $B \equiv \frac{p_\star^\alpha}{1-\lambda}$. Then, uniform bound (8) holds for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$:

$$\Pr\left\{ \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k) \leq \text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-sel}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$  

As we previewed in Section 2, we can apply this bound to the knockoff filter (Barber and Candès, 2015), a variable selection methodology based on the idea of creating a knockoff variable for each original variable, and then using these knockoffs as controls for the originals. Instead of p-values, the knockoff filter produces knockoff statistics $W_j$ for each variable $j$. These are constructed so that

(19)

$$\{\text{sign}(W_j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \perp \{\text{sign}(W_j)\}_{j \in [p]}, \{\text{sign}(W_j)\}_{j \notin \mathcal{H}_0}: \{\text{sign}(W_j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Ber}(1/2).$$  

The signs of the knockoff statistics are therefore a set of independent “one-bit p-values”, to which the above theorem applies.

**Corollary 1.** Let $W_1, \ldots, W_p$ be a set of knockoff statistics satisfying property (19). Let $\pi$ be the ordering corresponding to sorting $W_j$ by decreasing magnitude, and define $\mathcal{R}_k = \{\pi(j) \leq k : \text{sign}(W_{\pi(j)}) > 0\}$. Then, bound (8) holds for

$$\text{FDP}^{\text{knockoff}}(\mathcal{R}_k) \equiv \frac{\log(\alpha^{-1})}{a \log(2 - \alpha^{-1}/a)} \cdot \frac{a + |\{\pi(j) \leq k : \text{sign}(W_{\pi(j)}) < 0\}|}{|\mathcal{R}_k|}.$$  

**Proof.** Define $p_j = 1/2$ for $W_j < 0$ and $p_j = 1$ for $W_j > 0$. By property (19), it is easy to see that these p-values are independent of the ordering
(so the ordering can be treated as fixed) and satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2. The rejection sets $R_k$ are defined via (11) with $p_* = 0.5$ and $\overline{\text{FDP}}$ is defined via (15) with $p_* = \lambda = 0.5$. Therefore, we may apply part 2 of Theorem 2, plugging in $B = \frac{p^*}{1 - \lambda} = 1$.

3.1.3.

Interactive path. In the interactive setting, p-values are split into “orthogonal” parts, with one part being used—together with side information—to determine a hypothesis ordering $\pi$ and the other part being used for FDR control. AdaPT (Lei and Fithian, 2018) uses the masked p-values $g(p_j) = \min(p_j, 1 - p_j)$ and side information $x_j$ to build up the ordering, defining a path based on (11) with $p_* = 0.5$. It then uses $\hat{V}_{\text{preorder-sel}}$ with $p_* = \lambda = 0.5$ to construct an FDP estimate based on which the algorithm chooses a rejection set. This procedure is like Selective SeqStep, but with the ordering constructed interactively. STAR (Lei, Ramdas and Fithian, 2017), on the other hand, is the interactive analog of the accumulation test, using $p_* = 1$ and $\hat{V}_{\text{preorder-acc}}$. It is shown that any bounded accumulation function $h$ has a corresponding orthogonal masking function $g$, based on which the ordering can be constructed.

For our simultaneous FDP bounds, we use a slightly different path definition than AdaPT and STAR: we build up the path $\pi$ from beginning to end, while these two methods proceed in the opposite direction. However, we do not expect this change to impact the quality of the constructed path. The path construction we consider is as follows. $\pi(1)$ is chosen based on the information $\sigma(\{x_j, g(p_j)\}_{j \in [n]})$. Once $\pi(1)$ is chosen, the corresponding p-value $p_{\pi(1)}$ is unmasked, so the information $\sigma(\{x_j, g(p_j)\}_{j \in [n]}, \{p_{\pi(j)}\}_{j \leq k})$ can be used to choose $\pi(2)$. In general, we can choose $\pi(k + 1)$ in any way based on the information

\begin{equation}
G_k = \sigma(\{x_j, g(p_j)\}_{j \in [n]}, \{p_{\pi(j)}\}_{j \leq k})\nonumber.
\end{equation}

Therefore, as in AdaPT and STAR, the ordering $\pi$ may be built up interactively, with a human in the loop deciding the order based on $G_k$. The following theorem provides FDP bounds for such interactively constructed paths.

**Theorem 3.** Let $\pi$ be any ordering predictable with respect to the filtration (20), where $g$ is a masking function as defined in the following cases, and let

$$R_k \equiv \{\pi(j) : j \leq k, p_{\pi(j)} \leq p_*\}.$$

1. Let $h$ be an accumulation function bounded by $B$ and let $g$ is its corresponding masking function (see Lei, Ramdas and Fithian (2017)). Set
Simultaneous high-probability FDP bounds

1. Fix \( p_* = 1 \), and define \( \text{FDP}^B_{\text{interact-acc}} \equiv \text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-acc}} \). If the null p-values are independent of each other and of the non-null p-values, and the null p-values have non-decreasing densities, then uniform bound (8) holds for all \( a > 0 \) and all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \):

\[
\Pr\left\{ \text{FDP}(R_k) \leq \text{FDP}^B_{\text{interact-acc}}(R_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]

2. Fix \( p_* \in (0, 1) \) and \( \lambda \geq p_* \). Define \( g(p) = \min(p, \frac{p_*}{1-p_*} p) \) and \( \text{FDP}^B_{\text{interact-sel}} \equiv \text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-sel}} \). If the null p-values are independent of each other and of the non-nulls, and the null p-values are mirror-conservative (see Lei and Fithian (2018)), then uniform bound (8) holds for all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \):

\[
\Pr\left\{ \text{FDP}(R_k) \leq \text{FDP}^B_{\text{interact-sel}}(R_k) \text{ for all } k \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]

These results are similar to the previous section’s bounds, but are more subtle due to the data-dependent ordering \( \pi \).

3.2. FDP bounds for any online algorithm. Now, we turn to FDP bounds for the online setting. In this setting, decisions about hypotheses must be made as they arrive one at a time in a stream. Moreover, the order in which hypotheses arrive might or might not be the in the experimenter’s control. Therefore, non-nulls might not necessarily occur early, and further the rejection decision for the \( H_k \) must be made without knowing the outcomes of future experiments. Hence, in general, online multiple testing procedures must proceed differently from batch ones: online procedures adaptively produce a sequence of levels \( \alpha_j \) at which to test hypotheses. Assuming for simplicity that \( \pi(j) = j \), these levels define the online path:

\[
\Pi_{\text{online}} \equiv (R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n, \ldots) \text{ where } R_k \equiv \{ j \leq k : p_j \leq \alpha_j \}.
\]

The levels \( \alpha_j \) are chosen based on the outcomes of past experiments, i.e.

\[
\alpha_{k+1} \in \mathcal{G}_k \supseteq \sigma(\{I(p_j \leq \alpha_j) ; j \leq k\}).
\]

The alpha-investing procedure of Foster and Stine (2008) and follow-up works (Aharoni and Rosset, 2014; Javanmard and Montanari, 2017; Rambdas et al., 2017) are built on the analogy of testing a hypothesis at level \( \alpha_j \) as spending wealth. One pays a price to test each hypothesis, and is rewarded for each rejected hypothesis. For each of these methods, the levels \( \alpha_j \) are adaptively constructed to ensure that the wealth always remains
non-negative. In this paper, we consider paths of the form (21) corresponding to arbitrary sequences \( \{\alpha_j\} \) satisfying requirement (22), including those constructed by existing algorithms but any others as well.

Until recently, online FDR methods were formulated without reference to any \( \hat{FDP} \). However, Ramdas et al. (2017) noted that LORD (Javanmard and Montanari, 2017) implicitly bounds \( \hat{FDP}(R_k) \) for \( a_0 = 0 \) and

\[
(23) \quad \hat{V}_{\text{online-simple}}(R_k) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j.
\]

They also used this fact to design a strictly more powerful algorithm called LORD++. Moving beyond LORD++, Ramdas et al. (2018) proposed an adaptive algorithm called SAFFRON, which uses \( a_0 = 0 \) and

\[
(24) \quad \hat{V}_{\text{online-adaptive}}(R_k) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_j}{1 - \lambda_j} I(p_j > \lambda_j).
\]

SAFFRON improves upon the LORD estimate by correcting for the proportion of nulls, making it the online analog of the Storey-BH procedure (Storey, Taylor and Siegmund, 2004). Like the levels \( \alpha_j \), the constants \( \lambda_j \) may also be chosen based on the outcomes of prior experiments.

The following theorem provides FDP bounds (7) corresponding to the above two choices for \( \hat{V}_{\text{online}} \).

**Theorem 4.** Fix \( a > 0 \) and let \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots \) be any sequence of thresholds predictable with respect to filtration \( G_k \), as in (22). Suppose the null p-values are stochastically larger than uniform conditional on the past:

\[
(25) \quad \Pr\{p_k \leq s | G_{k-1}\} \leq s \quad \text{for each } k \in \mathcal{H}_0 \text{ and each } s \in [0,1].
\]

1. Define

\[
(26) \quad \text{FDP}_{\text{online-simple}}(R_k) \equiv \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{a \log \left( 1 + \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{a} \right)} \cdot \frac{a + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j}{|R_k|}.
\]

Then uniform bound (8) holds for all \( \alpha \in (0,1) \):

\[
\Pr\{\text{FDP}(R_k) \leq \text{FDP}_{\text{online-simple}}(R_k) \text{ for all } k \geq 0\} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]
2. Let $\lambda_j \geq \alpha_j$ for all $j$, $\{\lambda_j\}$ be predictable with respect to $\mathcal{G}_k$, and $\sup_j \frac{\alpha_j}{1-\lambda_j} \equiv B < \infty$. Define

$$FDP_{\text{online-adaptive}}(R_k) \equiv \log(\alpha) \cdot \frac{a + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\alpha_j}{1-\lambda_j} I(p_j > \lambda_j)}{a \log \left(1 + \frac{1-\alpha B/a}{B}\right) |R_k|}.$$

Then, uniform bound (8) holds for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\Pr\{\text{FDP}(R_k) \leq FDP_{\text{online-adaptive}}(R_k) \text{ for all } k \geq 0\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

The closest existing result to Theorem 4 is that of Javanmard and Montanari (2017) (JM). JM consider a truncated version of generalized alpha-investing rules that satisfy a uniform FDX bound like $\Pr\{\sup_k FDP_k \geq \gamma\} \leq \alpha$. Their result is similar in spirit to part 1 of Theorem 4, but there are some subtle differences. Their results, like most other FDX bounds, are pre hoc, meaning that given a $\gamma, \alpha \in (0, 1)$, their procedure produces a sequence of rejections satisfying the desired FDX guarantee. Our guarantees are post hoc, meaning that they would apply to any sequence of rejections produced by any online algorithm, that may or may not have been designed for FDR or FDP control.

3.3. A glimpse of the proof. In this section, we present a key exponential tail inequality lemma (Lemma 1) that underlies the proofs of Theorems 2, 3, and 4. The proof of Theorem 1 requires a more involved proof technique, which we defer to the supplementary materials (Section A), where we also show how Theorems 2, 3, and 4 follow from Lemma 1 below (Section B). We use a martingale-based proof technique that is distinct from the technique used to prove FDR control; see Section 4.2 for a comparison.

**Lemma 1.** Consider a (potentially infinite) set of hypotheses $H_1, H_2, \ldots$, an ordering $\pi(1), \pi(2), \ldots$, and a set of cutoffs $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots$. Let

$$R_k \equiv \{j \leq k : p_{\pi(j)} \leq \alpha_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\text{FDP}}_a(R_k) \equiv \frac{a + \sum_{j \leq k} h_j(p_{\pi(j)})}{|R_k|},$$

where $\{h_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ are functions on $[0, 1]$, and the subscript $a$ on $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_a$ makes the dependence on the regularization $a > 0$ explicit. Suppose there exists a filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_k \supseteq \sigma(\mathcal{H}_0, \{\pi(j)\}_{j \leq k}, \{h_j(p_{\pi(j)}), I(p_j \leq \alpha_j)\}_{j \leq k, \pi(j) \in \mathcal{H}_0}) (\text{27})$$
such that for all $\pi(k) \in \mathcal{H}_0$, we have

$$\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\} \leq \alpha_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \geq \alpha_k,$$

almost surely. Then, for each $x > 1$ and $a > 0$,

$$\Pr\left\{\sup_{k \geq 0} \frac{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k)}{\text{FDP}_a(\mathcal{R}_k)} \geq x \right\} \leq \exp(-a \theta_x x),$$

where $\theta_x$ is defined in the following four cases:

1. If $h_k = h$ for some accumulation function $h$, $\alpha_k = 1$, $\pi(k)$ is pre-specified (i.e. nonrandom), and $p_{\pi(k)} \perp \perp \mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ for all $\pi(k) \in \mathcal{H}_0$, then $\theta_x$ is the unique positive root of the equation

$$\int_0^1 \exp(-\theta x h(u)) du = \exp(-\theta).$$

2. If $h_k = h$ for some accumulation function $h$ bounded by $B$ and $\alpha_k = 1$, then $\theta_x$ is the unique positive root of the equation

$$\exp(-\theta) + \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta x B)}{B} = 1.$$

3. If $h_k(p) = 0$ for all $p \leq \alpha_k$, and $h_k(p) \leq B$ for all $k, p$, then $\theta_x$ is the unique positive root of the equation

$$\exp(\theta) - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta x B)}{B} = 1.$$

4. If $h_k(p_k) = \alpha_k$, then $\theta_x$ is the unique positive root of the equation

$$e^\theta = 1 + \theta x.$$

Let us outline the proof of the lemma. Fix any arbitrary $x > 1$ and $\theta > 0$. We first restrict our attention to only the nulls as follows:

$$\Pr\left\{\sup_{k \geq 0} \frac{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_k)}{\text{FDP}_a(\mathcal{R}_k)} \geq x \right\} = \Pr\left\{\sup_{k \geq 0} \frac{V(\mathcal{R}_k)}{a + \tilde{V}(\mathcal{R}_k)} \geq x \right\}$$

$$= \Pr\left\{\sum_{j=1}^k I(p_{\pi(j)} \leq \alpha_j) I(\pi(j) \in \mathcal{H}_0) \geq ax + x \sum_{j=1}^k h_j(p_{\pi(j)}), \text{ for some } k \geq 0 \right\}$$

$$\leq \Pr\left\{\sum_{j=1}^k I(p_{\pi(j)} \leq \alpha_j) I(\pi(j) \in \mathcal{H}_0) \geq ax + x \sum_{j=1}^k h_j(p_{\pi(j)}) I(\pi(j) \in \mathcal{H}_0), \text{ for some } k \geq 0 \right\}.$$
Now, we may rearrange terms and employ the Chernoff exponentiation trick, to conclude that:

\[
\Pr\left\{ \sup_{k \geq 0} \frac{\text{FDP}(R_k)}{\hat{\text{FDP}}_a(R_k)} \geq x \right\}
= \Pr\left\{ \sup_{k \geq 0} \exp\left( \theta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} I(p_{\pi(j)} \leq \alpha_j) - x h_j(p_{\pi(j)}) \right) I(\pi(j) \in \mathcal{H}_0) \right) \geq \exp(a \theta x) \right\}
\equiv \Pr\left\{ \sup_{k \geq 0} Z_k \geq \exp(a \theta x) \right\}.
\]

We claim that if \( \theta = \theta_x \), then \( Z_k \) is a supermartingale with respect to \( \mathcal{F}_k \). If this is the case, then the conclusion of the lemma would follow from the Ville (1939) maximal inequality for positive supermartingales:

\[
(34) \quad \Pr\left\{ \sup_{k \geq 0} Z_k \geq \exp(a \theta x) \right\} \leq \exp(-a \theta x) \mathbb{E}[Z_0] = \exp(-a \theta x).
\]

as desired. Hence, what remains is to show that in each of the four cases, the choices of \( \theta_x \) make \( Z_k \) a supermartingale. To derive the FDP bounds in Theorems 2, 3, and 4, we set

\[
(35) \quad \text{FDP}(R_k) \equiv x \cdot \hat{\text{FDP}}_a(R_k),
\]

where \( x \) is chosen such that \( \exp(-a \theta_x x) = \alpha \). We defer these derivations to Section B in the supplementary materials.

4. Comparisons to work on FDR control. The paths and FDP bounds we construct are closely tied to existing FDR control algorithms. Table 2 shows each of our bounds as well as the FDR methods they are related to. In this section, we explore the relationships between our results and those already existing in the FDR literature.

4.1. Comparing the roles of \( \hat{\text{FDP}} \). We start by recalling the definition (5) of \( \hat{\text{FDP}} \). Batch FDR algorithms use this estimate of FDP to automatically choose the rejection set \( \mathcal{R}^* \in \Pi \), which is done via (6). On the other hand, we use a regularized \( \hat{\text{FDP}}_a \) as a building block for our confidence envelopes \( \text{FDP} \) (recall definitions (7) and (35)), which the user may then inspect to choose \( \mathcal{R}^* \). It is important to remark here that while our bounds are inspired by existing FDR algorithms, they are not intrinsically tied to the use of those
ordering | p-val cutoffs | FDR method
--- | --- | ---
sort | $p_\ast = 1$ | BH
preorder | $p_\ast = 1$ | Accumulation test
preorder | $p_\ast \in (0,1)$ | Selective and Adaptive SeqStep
interact | $p_\ast = 1$ | STAR
interact | $p_\ast \in (0,1)$ | AdaPT
(online) | $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{G}_{j-1}$ | LORD, LORD++
(online) | $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{G}_{j-1}$ | SAFFRON, alpha-investing

Table 2
Overview of proposed FDP bounds and FDR procedures inspiring them
($h$ denotes an accumulation function).
argument to prove our FDP bounds (recall Section 3.3), the martingales we construct are fundamentally different: they are exponential and employ forward filtrations instead of backwards ones.

Note that the original supermartingales \((L_k, \Omega_k)\) used to prove FDR control for batch procedures can also be used to obtain tail bounds like (29), for original regularization \(a = a_0\). Indeed, using Ville’s maximal inequality again, we find

\[
\Pr\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \frac{\hat{FDP}(R_k)}{FDP(R_k)} \geq x \right\} \leq \Pr\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} L_k \geq x \right\} \leq \frac{1}{x} \mathbb{E}[L_n] = \frac{1}{x}.
\]

Therefore, for each batch procedure we consider, \(\frac{\hat{FDP}(R_k)}{FDP(R_k)} = c(\alpha) \cdot \hat{FDP}(R_k)\) for \(c(\alpha) = \alpha^{-1}\) is also a valid upper confidence band for FDP. Versions of this bound have been considered before in the case of BH, e.g. by Robbins (1954) and Goeman et al. (2016). This implies that for all considered batch procedures, we have

\[
\text{Median} \left[ \sup_{R \in \Pi} \frac{\hat{FDP}(R)}{\hat{FDP}(R)} \right] \leq 2.
\]

However, note that the constants \(c(\alpha) = \alpha^{-1}\) grow quickly as \(\alpha\) decays. On the other hand, the constants we provide scale logarithmically, rather than linearly, in \(\alpha^{-1}\).

4.3. Comparing assumptions. This martingale argument for FDR control and the argument we employ here both require some form of independence among the p-values. Furthermore, our assumptions for each of these theorems are identical to or weaker than the ones needed to prove FDR control. For Theorem 1, we only need to make assumptions on the distribution \((p_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}\), so unlike existing proofs of FDR control for BH, we do not make any assumptions on the dependence of the nulls on the non-nulls (see Dwork, Su and Zhang (2018) for another example of such a result). In Theorem 2, we assume that the nulls are independent and stochastically larger than uniform, whereas for the original FDR control results (Barber and Candès, 2015; Li and Barber, 2017) it was also required that nulls be independent of non-nulls. Furthermore, part 1 of Theorem 2 provides an FDP bound for possibly unbounded accumulation functions, whereas the original work proposing accumulation tests (Li and Barber, 2017) requires accumulation functions to be bounded. In Theorems 3 and 4, our assumptions are identical to those in the original works. Finally, we remark that the only
FDR procedure which has a guarantee under dependence is BH, for which a non-martingale proof was proposed by (Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2001).

Next, we illustrate the performance of some of our bounds in simulations.

5. Numerical simulations. In this section, we compare the proposed FDP bounds to existing bounds, in the sorted and pre-ordered settings. We also examine the effect of correlation on the proposed bounds. In all cases, we take \( n = 2500 \) and \( \alpha = 0.1 \). For the proposed bounds, we take \( a = 1 \).

5.1. Sorted setting. As discussed in the introduction, the setting in which the most prior work has been done is when hypotheses are ordered based on p-value. In other words, we are concerned with bounds \( \text{FDP} \) for the sets \( \mathcal{R}_t \equiv \{ j : p_j \leq t \} \) such that

\[
\Pr \{ \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_t) \leq \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_t) \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1] \} \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]

5.1.1. Comparing to other explicit, finite-sample bounds. The bounds most comparable to ours are explicit, finite-sample bounds. Two such bounds were proposed by Meinshausen and Rice (2006): \( \text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_t) \equiv \frac{V(t)}{|\mathcal{R}_t|} \) for

\[
V_{\text{Robbins}}(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\alpha} nt; \quad V_{\text{DKW}}(t) \equiv \sqrt{n \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + nt}.
\]

These bounds derive from inequalities by Robbins (1954) and Dvoretzky, Kiefer and Wolfowitz (1956), respectively. Note that inequality (38) for \( V_{\text{DKW}} \) is based on the one-sided DKW inequality and is valid for \( \alpha < 0.5 \).

Compare these to our bound, which is

\[
V_{\text{sort}}(t) \equiv \frac{\log \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \right)}{\log \left( 1 + \log \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right)} \cdot (1 + nt).
\]

By inspecting these three bounds, we see that the DKW bound is the tightest when \( t \) is large, the Robbins bound is the tightest when \( t \) is small, and our bound is the tightest in an intermediate range. The left panel of Figure 3 depicts the three bounds, with dotted vertical lines indicating the Bonferroni level and the nominal level, respectively. The interval between these two levels is often the most interesting for multiple testing purposes, and the proposed bound is the tightest over most of this range (in particular, it is tighter than the Robbins bound as long as \( V_{\text{Robbins}}(t) \geq 2.4 \)). In fact, the proposed bound is not too far from the pointwise \( 1 - \alpha \) quantile of \( V(t) \), which is plotted for reference in black in the left panel. The right panel of Figure 3 shows a histogram of the value of \( t \) at which the bound (38) is tightest. We see that the majority of the time (about 87%), our bound is tightest in the interesting range.
5.1.2. Comparison to GS bound. As discussed in the introduction, the GS bound is based on a suite of local tests \( \{\phi_R\}_{R \in 2^n} \). Therefore, different bounds can be obtained for different local tests. Here, we compare the proposed bound to the GS bound based on the Simes and Fisher local tests. We note that the Simes local test rejects if and only if the Robbins bound is nontrivial for any \( t \). In fact, the GS-Simes bound is the closure of the Robbins bound and therefore dominates it (Goeman, Hemerik and Solari, 2019), so we remove the latter from consideration in this section.

Since the GS bound is not explicit, we must make the comparison by inspecting the average shape of FDP on simulated data. We simulate independent test statistics \( X_j \sim N(\mu_j, 1) \), where \( \mu_j = \mu I(j \in H_1) \) for some signal strength \( \mu > 0 \) and set of non-nulls \( H_1 \). We then compute one-side p-values \( p_j = 1 - \Phi(X_j) \). To cover a broad range of data-generating distributions, we consider the values \( \mu = 2, 3, 4 \) (weak, medium, and strong signal) and \( |H_1| = 100, 200, 300 \).

Figure 4 shows the average FDP curves (over 100 repetitions) in each of the nine simulation scenarios for the proposed and GS bounds, as well as
the DKW bound introduced before. For reference, the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the true FDP is also shown. We see that the GS bounds inherit the properties of their underlying local tests. The GS-Simes bound behaves like the Robbins bound: it is tightest for small rejection set sizes, yielding highly nontrivial bounds near the beginning of the path for most simulation scenarios. The GS-Fisher bound behaves the opposite way: it is tightest for large rejection set sizes, even more so than the DKW bound. Neither the GS-Fisher bound nor the DKW bound yield very informative bounds in most of the simulation settings considered. Finally, the proposed bound is an intermediate between these two extremes, yielding the tightest estimates for intermediate rejection set sizes. For the simulation settings considered, the proposed bounds are tightest in interesting regions of the path: where many rejections are made but the FDP bound is still fairly low (e.g. below 0.2).

5.1.3. Coverage properties of FDP estimate. The estimate $\hat{FDP}_{BH}(t) = m \cdot t / |R_t|$ from equation (13) and the related q-value proposed by Storey, Taylor and Siegmund (2004) have been shown to have asymptotic uniform coverage properties. In particular, their Theorem 6 states that for all $\delta > 0$,

\begin{equation}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \inf_{t \geq \delta} \left\{ \hat{FDP}(t) - FDP(t) \right\} \geq 0 \text{ with probability 1.}
\end{equation}

At first glance, this result might suggest that there is no reason to use conservative bounds for the FDP, if asymptotically, the much smaller point estimate bounds the FDP from above across the entire path. However, such a conclusion is unfounded. Note first that the infimum in the bound (39) excludes $t \in [0, \delta)$, so for the bound to be interesting the value of $\delta$ must be small. However, the convergence becomes slower as $\delta \to 0$. Furthermore, since the multiplicity burden increases as $n \to \infty$, the relevant values of $\delta$ may need to decrease as $n$ increases. For example, a reasonable choice would be $\delta = \alpha / n$, i.e. the Bonferroni threshold. To illustrate the coverage properties of the FDP estimate in finite samples, we compute the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the ratio $\sup_{t \geq \delta} FDP(t) / \hat{FDP}(t)$ for various values of $\delta$ and $n = 1000, 2500, 5000$. This ratio will of course be smaller as the proportion of non-nulls increases, but if we use Storey’s correction for the null proportion then this effect will largely disappear. Therefore, we simulate the p-values under the global null. Figure 5 shows the results.

We see that the true FDP can significantly exceed the FDP estimate for most interesting values of $\delta$; i.e. $\delta \ll \alpha = 0.1$. The points on each of the curves represent the value of the overshoot at the Bonferroni thresholds for each value of $n$. All these values are above 5 and do not seem to be decreasing as sample size increases. We conclude that point estimates of the
Simultaneous High-probability FDP bounds

Fig 4: Comparing the proposed FDP bound with the GS bound (based on Simes or Fisher local tests) and the DKW bound in the sorted setting. The $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the true FDP is also shown. The panels correspond to the three signal strengths and numbers of non-nulls. The proposed bounds are tightest in an intermediate range of rejection set sizes.

FDP cannot be relied upon in the context of exploration, and that the price for exploration must be paid in the form of more conservative FDP bounds.

We note in passing that there has also been work on providing confidence envelopes such that the bound (38) holds asymptotically (for all $t$) as $n \to \infty$, e.g. by Genovese and Wasserman (2004) and Meinshausen and Rice (2006). However, we do not review these here for the sake of brevity.
5.2. Pre-ordered setting. Next, we consider the pre-ordered setting (fixing \( \pi(j) = j \) without loss of generality). Here, we fix the number of non-nulls at \(|H_1| = 100\) and instead vary the degree to which the non-nulls tend to occur near the beginning of the ordering. We sample the non-nulls without replacement from \([n]\) according to a distribution with probability mass function proportional to the density of an exponential random variable with rate \(\theta/n\). The greater \(\theta\) is, the more informative the ordering is. We consider \(\theta = 15, 35, 55\) (weak, medium, and strong ordering) and \(\mu = 2, 3, 4\) (weak, medium, and strong signal, as before). Here, the DKW and Robbins bounds are not applicable, so we only compare to GS-Simes and GS-Fisher. We apply our bound based on \(\hat{V}_{\text{preorder-acc}}\), with accumulation function \(h(p) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} I(p > \lambda)\) with \(\lambda = 0.1\). We use the definition (18) of \(\text{FDP}^B_{\text{preorder-acc}}\).

Figure 6 shows the results. We see that the proposed bound effectively leverages the ordering information to obtain tighter FDP bounds than the GS-based methods. Predictably, the stronger the ordering information, the
greater the advantage of our bound. Consistent with the previous simulation, GS-Simes outperforms GS-Fisher; the latter bound is nearly trivial for all simulation settings. Of course, an interesting direction of future work is to derive tighter GS-style bounds for settings with prior information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak signal</th>
<th>Medium signal</th>
<th>Strong signal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak ordering</td>
<td>Medium ordering</td>
<td>Strong ordering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 6: Comparing the proposed FDP bound with the GS bound based on Simes or Fisher local tests in the pre-ordered setting. The $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the true FDP is also shown. The panels correspond to the three signal strengths and degrees to which non-nulls occur near the beginning of the ordering. Non-nulls are shown in the rug plots at the bottom of each panel. The proposed bounds leverage the ordering information to boost power.
5.3. The effect of correlation. Finally, note that all our FDP bounds rely on some notion of independence among the p-values. Many of the FDR procedures considered here also only have guarantees under independence, though BH is a notable exception. Aside from online testing applications, independent p-values are hard to come by in practice, so more robust guarantees are necessary. BH is known to control FDR under the PRDS criterion (Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2001), a form of positive dependence that contains no information about the strength of the dependence. However, it is known that while the mean of FDP might not change much as dependence increases, the variance of the FDP will increase (Owen, 2005; Efron, 2010). Hence, high-probability bounds on FDP under dependence are likely to use criteria other than PRDS to capture this dependence.

In this section, we use simulations to examine the extent to which our bounds continue to hold in the presence of p-value correlation. To model correlation, we draw the test statistics $X_j$ from an AR(1) process parameterized by correlation $\rho = -0.9, -0.8, \ldots, 0.8, 0.9$. We consider four representative settings: the sorted setting from Theorem 1 and Section 5.1, the pre-ordered setting with $p_\star = 1$ from Theorem 2 part 1 and Section 5.2, the pre-ordered setting with $p_\star = \lambda = 0.1$ from Theorem 2 part 2, and the online setting with $\alpha_j = 0.05$ for all $j$ from Theorem 4 part 1. For each setting and each value of $\rho$, we compute the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $\max_k \frac{\text{FDP}(R_k)}{\text{FDP}(R_k)}$, the maximum extent to which FDP can exceed our bound. We operate under the global null, since this is the worst case scenario.

Figure 7 shows the simulation results. Reassuringly, all curves pass through 1 at $\rho = 0$, the independent case covered by our theorems. We see that different bounds have different tolerances for correlation, but negative correlation is tolerated better than positive correlation. All bounds continue to hold for $\rho \in [-0.7, 0.1]$. The bound in the sorted setting is particularly robust, continuing to be valid for $\rho \in [-0.7, 0.6]$. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that all the bounds are no longer valid once the correlation becomes strong enough. Indeed, under strong correlations the variability of the FDP necessitates more conservative bounds. We leave the extension of our results to the correlated setting for future work.

6. Conclusion. In this paper, we establish a novel bridge between the realms of FDR control and simultaneous FDP control. While FDR procedures rely on estimates of the FDP to choose one rejection set from a path, we repurpose these estimates to obtain closed form simultaneous bounds on the FDP that are valid across the entire path with high probability. These novel bounds allow for the kind of simultaneous inference proposed by Goe-
Fig 7: The extent to which FDP can exceed FDP for the proposed bounds under p-value correlation, generated from an AR(1) model parameterized by $\rho$. The bounds are more tolerant of negative than positive correlation.
power is desired. We found in our numerical simulations in Section 5 that under a variety of data-generating distributions, the proposed bounds often performed favorably compared to existing bounds in the parts of the path where the FDP bounds are most interesting. We found that our bounds effectively leverage side information, like hypothesis ordering, to boost power.

Recently, Goeman, Hemerik and Solari (2019) provided more insight into the question of optimality among simultaneous inference procedures by proposing a natural admissibility criterion for such procedures. In addition, these authors proved that only closed testing procedures, i.e. those of the kind proposed by Goeman and Solari (2011), are admissible. Given any simultaneous inference procedure, like those proposed here, they showed how to improve the procedure by “closing” it. From this perspective, the results in this paper can be viewed as building blocks from which to construct more sophisticated closed testing based procedures. It is not always the case that a closed testing procedure can be implemented in polynomial time, however, so it is still not clear which simultaneous bounds are dominated by other computationally efficient bounds.

As pointed out to us by a referee, our bounds may also be used to construct new tests of the global null. Moreover, following Meinshausen and Rice (2006), our uniform bounds can also be used to estimate the null proportion among a set of hypotheses. Exploring these consequences of the proposed bounds is an interesting direction for future work.

Finally, the proof technique we developed in this paper is versatile enough to cover a large portion of the currently available FDR procedures. Importantly, this includes the knockoffs procedure for variable selection in high dimensions. Like Genovese and Wasserman (2004), we employ a stochastic process approach to analyze the FDP. However, while GW’s bounds are asymptotic, we have used martingale arguments instead to obtain tight, non-asymptotic bounds. Perhaps these proof techniques may be extended further to apply to other multiple testing scenarios as well.
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SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The method we employ to obtain all our FDP bounds is to investigate the properties of the stochastic process \( FDP(R_k) \). Below, we prove the proposed FDP bounds. We start with the sorted path construction, for which we must proceed differently since the hypotheses are ordered according to the p-values, while for all other settings, the hypothesis order is either pre-specified or is in some sense “orthogonal” to FDP.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let \( V_t \equiv \sum_{j \in H_0} I(p_j \leq t) \), and let \( V'_t \) be distributed as the unscaled empirical process of \( n \) independent uniformly distributed random variables. Then, for any fixed \( x > 1 \) and \( a = 1 \) we have

\[
\Pr \left\{ \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{\text{FDP}(R_k)}{\text{FDP}_a(R_k)} \geq x \right\} = \Pr \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{V_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \right\} 
\leq \Pr \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{V'_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \right\} = \Pr \{ V'_t \geq x + xnt, \text{ for some } t \in [0,1] \}.
\]

The second inequality holds because \( V'_t \) is stochastically larger than \( V_t \) because \( n \geq |H_0| \) and because the p-values are assumed to be stochastically larger than uniform. Hence, the quantity of interest is the probability that the stochastic process \( V'_t \) hits the linear boundary \( x + xnt \). This event is illustrated in Figure 8.

However, it is somewhat difficult to obtain non-asymptotic bounds for probabilities that empirical processes like \( V'_t \) hit certain boundaries. Instead, we claim that for \( x \geq 1.5 \), replacing \( V'_t \) with a rate \( n \) Poisson process \( N_t \) only further increases the hitting probability:

\[
\Pr \{ V'_t \geq x + xnt, \text{ for some } t \in [0,1] \} \leq \Pr \{ N_t \geq x + xnt, \text{ for some } t \in [0,1] \}.
\]

Lemma 2. Let \( V'_t \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(p_j \leq t) \) for \( p_j \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0,1] \). Let \( N_t \) be a rate \( n \) Poisson process. Then, for \( x \geq 1.5 \),

\[
\Pr \{ V'_t \geq x + xnt, \text{ for some } t \in [0,1] \} \leq \Pr \{ N_t \geq x + xnt, \text{ for some } t \in [0,1] \}.
\]

See Section C for the proof of this lemma. To understand why the lemma holds, note that \( V'_t \overset{d}{=} N_t | N_1 = n \); i.e. the distribution of the empirical process is the same as that of the Poisson process, conditioned on observing exactly \( n \) events at time \( t = 1 \). Hence, Lemma 2 states that for sufficiently
large $x$, a Poisson process is less likely to hit the line $t \mapsto x + xnt$ if we know that it is equal to its mean at time $t = 1$. This makes intuitive sense because the process needs to be far above its mean to hit this line for large $x$, which is less likely to happen if it must be equal to its mean at time $t = 1$.

Now, we may use the martingale properties of Poisson processes to bound the probability a Poisson process hits a linear boundary:

**Lemma 3** (Katsevich and Sabatti (2019)). If $N_t$ is a rate $n$ Poisson process, then for any $x > 1$, we have

$$\Pr\{N_t \geq x + xnt \text{ for some } t \in [0, 1]\} \leq \exp(-x\theta_x),$$

where $\theta_x$ is the unique positive root of the equation (33) in the main text.

Therefore,

$$\Pr\left\{\sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{\text{FDP}(R_k)}{\text{FDP}_a(R_k)} \geq \frac{\text{FDP}(R_k)}{\text{FDP}_a(R_k)} \right\} \leq \exp(-x\theta_x).$$

To complete the derivation of the proof, suppose we choose $x$ such that $\alpha = \exp(-x\theta_x)$. Then, plugging this choice of $x$ into the definition of $\theta_x$ implies that

$$(42) \quad x = \frac{-\log \alpha}{\theta_x} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{\log(1 + \theta_x x)} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{\log(1 - \log \alpha)}.$$
Hence, statement (8) holds for all $\alpha$ corresponding to $x \geq 1.5$, which translates to holding for all $\alpha \leq 0.31$.

**APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2, 3, AND 4**

Next, we finish the proof of Lemma 1 in the main text and derive Theorems 2, 3, and 4 as corollaries.

**Proof of Lemma 1.** What remains to show is that $Z_k$ is a supermartingale. Note first of all that $Z_k$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$ by assumption (27). Hence, it suffices to show that
\[
E \left[ \frac{Z_k}{Z_{k-1}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = E \left[ \exp \left\{ \left[ \theta \left( I(p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k) - xh_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \right) \right] I(\pi(k) \in H_0) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \leq 1.
\]

Clearly, this inequality holds for any $k$ such that $\pi(k) \not\in H_0$. For $k$ such that $\pi(k) \in H_0$, we find that
\[
E \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta(I(p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k) - xh_k(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]
= E \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ \theta(1 - xh_k(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] + E \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ -\theta xh_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right].
\]

To show that the above quantity is at most one, we consider the four cases defined in the statement of the lemma.

**Case 1.** Since $\alpha_k = 1$, the second term of equation (43) equals zero. Since $h_k = h$, $\pi(k)$ is fixed, and $p_{\pi(k)} \perp \mathcal{F}_{k-1}$, the first term simplifies to
\[
E \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta (1 - xh(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = E \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta_x (1 - xh(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \right] \leq \exp(\theta_x) E_{U \sim U[0,1]} [\exp(-\theta_x xh(U))]
= 1,
\]

The inequality holds because $p_{\pi(k)}$ is superuniformly distributed by assumption and $u \mapsto \exp(-\theta_x xh(u))$ is a nonincreasing function (since $h$ is nondecreasing by definition), and the last step holds because $\theta_x$ satisfies equation (30) by definition.

**Case 2.** Again, the second term of equation (43) equals zero because $\alpha_k = 1$. We may bound the first term as:
\[
E \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta_x (1 - xh(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \leq \exp(\theta_x) E \left[ 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x xB)}{B} h(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]
\leq \exp(\theta_x) \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x xB)}{B} \right)
= 1.
\]
In the first line, we used the fact that \( h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) = h(p_{\pi(k)}) \leq B \), and we bounded the convex function \( z \mapsto \exp(-\theta_x x z) \) on \([0, B]\) with the line \( z \mapsto 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} z \). In the second step, we used the assumption \( \mathbb{E} \left[ h(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \geq \alpha_k = 1 \), and in the third line we used the definition of \( \theta_x \).

**Case 3.** Because \( h_k(p) I(p \leq \alpha_k) = 0 \), the first term of equation (43) simplifies to

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ \theta_x (1 - x h_k(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \ \bigg| \ \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = \exp(\theta_x) \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \}.
\]

To bound the second term, we write

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E} \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ -\theta_x x h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \right\} \ \bigg| \ \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k) \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \right) \ \bigg| \ \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\
& = \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \mathbb{E} \left[ h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) I(p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right) \\
& = \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} \\
& \leq \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \alpha_k.
\end{align*}
\]

The inequality in the second line follows from the same convexity argument as in Case 2, the fourth line is a consequence of the fact that \( h_k(p) I(p \leq \alpha_k) = 0 \), and the last line follows from \( \mathbb{E} \left[ h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \geq \alpha_k \).

Combining the results of the previous two equations, we obtain that

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E} \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ \theta_x (1 - x h_k(p_{\pi(k)})) \right\} \ \bigg| \ \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ I(p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k) \exp \left\{ -\theta_x x h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \right\} \ \bigg| \ \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] & \leq \exp(\theta_x) \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} + \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \alpha_k \\
& = (\exp(\theta_x) - 1) \Pr \{ p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \} + 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \alpha_k \\
& \leq (\exp(\theta_x) - 1) \alpha_k + 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \alpha_k \\
& = \alpha_k \left( \exp(\theta_x) - 1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x B)}{B} \right) + 1 \\
& = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

The inequality in the fourth line follows from the first part of assumption (28), and the last equality follows from the definition of \( \theta_x \).
Case 4: Since $h_k(p) = \alpha_k$, equation (43) simplifies to:

$$
\exp(\theta_x(1 - x\alpha_k))\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid F_{k-1}\} + \exp(-\theta_x x\alpha_k)\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} > \alpha_k \mid F_{k-1}\}
$$

$$
= \exp(-\theta_x x\alpha_k)((\exp(\theta_x) - 1)\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid F_{k-1}\} + 1)
$$

$$
\leq \exp(-\theta_x x\alpha_k)((\exp(\theta_x) - 1)\alpha_k + 1).
$$

Noting that $\theta_x$ satisfies (33), we see that the above expression can be bounded by one:

$$
\exp(-\theta_x x\alpha_k)(\theta_x x\alpha_k + 1) \leq 1,
$$

as desired, where the inequality follows because the function $z \mapsto e^{-z}(z + 1)$ is decreasing and takes the value 1 at $z = 0$.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** In this case, the ordering $\pi$ is pre-specified, so we may assume without loss of generality that $\pi(j) = j$. First we note that the filtration

$$(44) \quad \mathcal{F}_k = \sigma(\mathcal{H}_0, \{p_j\}_{j \leq k, j \in \mathcal{H}_0})$$

satisfies the required condition (27). Next, we consider cases preorder-acc and preorder-sel separately.

1. preorder-acc: For any $k \in \mathcal{H}_0$, since $\alpha_k = 1$, the first part of the requirement (28) is trivially satisfied. To show the second part, we use the independence assumption in Theorem 2 and the assumed superuniformity of null p-values to derive

$$
E[h_k(p_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = E[h(p_k)] \geq E_{U \sim U[0,1]}[h(U)] = \int_0^1 h(u)du = 1 = \alpha_k.
$$

The inequality follows because $p_k$ is superuniform and $h$ is nondecreasing. Hence, the assumptions of Lemma 1, case 1 are satisfied. Hence, the bound (29) holds with $\theta_x$ satisfying equation (30). In order to derive the constant (16), we simply note that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we may choose $x$ such that $\exp(-a\theta_x x) = \alpha$, from which it follows that

$$
x = -\frac{\log \alpha}{a\theta_x} = \frac{\log \alpha}{a \log \int_0^1 \exp(-\theta_x x h(u))du} = \frac{\log \alpha}{a \log \int_0^1 \alpha^{h(u)/a}du},
$$

as desired.

If the accumulation function is bounded by $B$, then the assumptions of Lemma 1, case 2 are also satisfied, so the bound (29) holds with $\theta_x$.
satisfying equation (31). In order to derive the constant (17), we note that for any \( \alpha \in (0,1) \), we may choose \( x \) such that \( \exp(-\theta_x x) = \alpha \), from which it follows that

\[
x = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a\theta_x} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a \log \left(1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x) B}{B}\right)} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a \log \left(1 - \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x) B}{B}\right)},
\]

as desired.

2. preorder-sel: We claim that the assumptions of Lemma 1 are satisfied with \( F_k \) defined as in equation (44). Indeed, fix \( k \in H_0 \). Then, the assumed superuniformity of null p-values implies that

\[
\Pr\{p_k \leq \alpha_k \mid F_{k-1}\} = \Pr\{p_k \leq p_* \} \leq p_* = \alpha_k
\]

and

\[
E[h_k(p_k) \mid F_{k-1}] = E\left[\frac{p_*}{1 - \lambda} I(p > \lambda)\right] \geq p_* = \alpha_k.
\]

Hence, by case 3 of Lemma 1, it follows that (29) holds for \( \theta_x \) satisfying (32). For fixed \( \alpha \in (0,1) \), define \( x \) such that \( \exp(-\theta_x x) = \alpha \). Then,

\[
x = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a\theta_x} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a \log \left(1 + \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x) B}{B}\right)} = \frac{-\log \alpha}{a \log \left(1 + \frac{1 - \exp(-\theta_x x) B}{B}\right)},
\]

which justifies the constant in equation (18).

\[ \square \]

Proof of Theorem 3. This proof is similar to that of Theorem 2, except the filtrations must be somewhat more complicated to accommodate the interactivity of the path. For both the interact-acc and interact-sel path constructions, define the filtration

\[
F_k = \sigma(H_0, \{x_j, g(p_j)\}_{j \in [n]}, \{p_{\pi(j)}\}_{j \leq k}).
\]

Since \( \pi \) is predictable with respect to the filtration \( G_k \) (20) by its definition and since \( F_k \supseteq G_k \), it follows that \( \pi \) is also predictable with respect to \( F_k \). Hence, requirement (27) holds for \( F_k \) as defined above. Now, let \( \pi(k) \in H_0 \).

For case interact-sel, the first part of condition (28) holds because

\[
\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} \leq \alpha_k \mid F_{k-1}\} = E\left[\Pr\{p_{\pi(k)} \leq p_* \mid g(p_{\pi(k)}), \pi(k)\} \mid \pi(k)\right] \\
\leq \Pr_U \sim U[0,1] \{U \leq p_* \mid g(U)\} \\
= p_* \\
= \alpha_k.
\]
The first equality follows from the independence assumption on the p-values, the first inequality follows from the predictability of $\pi(k)$ and from the assumption that the null p-values have increasing densities (see the proof of Proposition 1 in Lei, Ramdas and Fithian (2017)). Similarly,

$$
E \left[ h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = E \left[ E \left[ \frac{p_*}{1 - \lambda} I(p_{\pi(k)} > \lambda) \mid g(p_{\pi(k)}, \pi(k)) \right] \mid \pi(k) \right] \\
\geq \frac{p_*}{1 - \lambda} \Pr_{U \sim U[0,1]} \{ U > \lambda \mid g(U) \} = p_* = \alpha_k.
$$

For case interact-acc, the first part of condition (28) is trivially satisfied. To derive the second part, we write

$$
E \left[ h_k(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = E \left[ E \left[ h(p_{\pi(k)}) \mid g(p_{\pi(k)}, \pi(k)) \right] \mid \pi(k) \right] \\
\geq E_{U \sim U[0,1]} \left[ h(U) \mid g(U) \right] \\
= 1 \\
= \alpha_k.
$$

The justification for this derivation is similar to that for interact-sel, noting in addition that $E_{U \sim U[0,1]} \left[ h(U) \mid g(U) \right] = 1$ by construction.

Having established that the assumptions of Lemma 1 are satisfied, the rest of the proof follows exactly as in the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 4. Let $G_k$ be the filtration defined in the statement of Theorem 4. Define

$$
\mathcal{F}_k \equiv \sigma(G_k, \mathcal{H}_0).
$$

Then, assumption (27) clearly holds for cases online-simple and online-adaptive by requirement (22). The first part of (28) holds for both online procedures considered by assumption (25). For case online-simple, the second part holds because $h_k(p_k) = \alpha_k$. For case online-adaptive, the second part holds because for $k \in \mathcal{H}_0$,

$$
E \left[ h_k(p_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = E \left[ \frac{\alpha_k}{1 - \lambda_k} I(p_k > \lambda_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \geq \alpha_k,
$$

where the last step follows from the predictability of $\alpha_k$ and $\lambda_k$ and the assumption (25).

Hence, online-simple and online-adaptive satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 1. The remainder of the proof corresponds exactly to analogous parts of the earlier proofs described for cases sort and preorder-sel, respectively.
APPENDIX C: LEMMAS SUPPORTING PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof of Lemma 2. Let \( \{N_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) be a Poisson process with rate \( n \). It suffices to show that for \( x \geq 1.5 \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{N_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \left| N_1 = n \right. \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{N_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \right].
\]

Let us define \( \tau = \inf \left\{ t : \frac{N_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \right\} \).

We claim that it suffices to show that for \( x \geq 1.5 \),

\[
\mathbb{P}[N_1 = n \mid \tau] \leq \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n] \quad \text{for all } \tau \geq 0.
\]

Indeed, it would then follow that

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{N_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \left| N_1 = n \right. \right] = \mathbb{P} \left[ \tau \leq 1 \left| N_1 = n \right. \right] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[\tau \leq 1] \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n \mid \tau \leq 1]}{\mathbb{P}[N_1 = n]} \leq \mathbb{P}[\tau \leq 1] = \mathbb{P} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{N_t}{1 + nt} \geq x \right].
\]

Note that for a given \( x \), \( x(1 + nt) > n \) for \( t > \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{n} \). Hence, statement (47) is trivial for \( \tau > \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{n} \), so we need only consider

\[
\tau \leq \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{n}.
\]

Define

\[
f(\lambda, y) = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^y}{\Gamma(y + 1)}.
\]

This function \( f : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \) is equal to the probability mass function of the Poisson with parameter \( \lambda \) when \( y \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \). We have

\[
\mathbb{P}[N_1 = n \mid \tau] = \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n \mid N_\tau = \lceil x(1 + n\tau) \rceil] = \mathbb{P}[N_{1-\tau} = n - \lceil x(1 + n\tau) \rceil] = f(n(1-\tau), n - \lceil x(1 + n\tau) \rceil) \leq f(n(1-\tau), n - x(1 + n\tau)) \equiv g(\tau, x).
\]
The inequality follows by Lemma 5 because $n - x(1 + n\tau) \leq n(1 - \tau) - x \leq n(1 - \tau) - 1.5$. Define

\begin{equation}
\tag{51}
h(\tau, x) = \log g(\tau, x) = \log \left( \exp(-n(1 - \tau)) \frac{(n(1 - \tau))^{n-x(1+n\tau)}}{\Gamma(1+n-x(1+n\tau))} \right) = -n(1 - \tau) + (n - x(1 + n\tau)) \log(n(1 - \tau)) - \log \Gamma(1 + n - x(1 + n\tau)).
\end{equation}

Note that

\begin{equation}
\tag{52}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} h(\tau, x)
= n - x n \log(n(1 - \tau)) - \frac{n - x(1 + n\tau)}{1 - \tau} + x(n - x(1 + n\tau))
\leq n - x n \log(n(1 - \tau)) - \frac{n - x(1 + n\tau)}{1 - \tau} + x n \left( \log(1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)) - \frac{1}{1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)} \right)
\equiv r(\tau, x).
\end{equation}

The inequality follows by Lemma 4.

To prove the inequality (47), it suffices to show that

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(a)] $g(0, x) \leq \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n]$ for all $x \geq 1.5$;
\item[(b)] $r(\tau, 1.5) \leq 0$ for each $\tau \leq \frac{1}{1.5} - \frac{1}{n}$;
\item[(c)] $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} r(\tau, 1.5) \leq 0$ for each $\tau \leq \frac{1}{1.5} - \frac{1}{n}$;
\item[(d)] $r(\tau, x)$ is concave in $x$ for each $\tau$.
\end{enumerate}

Indeed, note that (c) and (d) imply that for each $\tau \leq \frac{1}{1.5} - \frac{1}{n}$, $r(\tau, x)$ is a decreasing function of $x$ for $x \geq 1.5$. Hence, for each $x \geq 1.5$ and each $\tau$, we have $r(\tau, x) \leq r(\tau, 1.5) \leq 0$, where the last inequality follows from (b). Hence, by inequality (52), $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} h(\tau, x) \leq r(\tau, x) \leq 0$ for each $x \geq 1.5$. This means that $h(\tau, x)$ is decreasing in $\tau$ for each $x \geq 1.5$, so $g(\tau, x)$ is decreasing in $\tau$ for each $x \geq 1.5$, from which it follows that $g(\tau, x) \leq g(0, x) \leq \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n]$, where the last inequality follows by (a).

Proof of (a). We have

$$g(0, x) = f(n, n - x) \leq f(n, n - 1) = f(n, n) = \mathbb{P}[N_1 = n].$$

where the inequality follows by Lemma 5 and the equality $f(n - 1, n) = f(n, n)$ holds because

$$\frac{f(n, n - 1)}{f(n, n)} = \frac{n^{n-1}}{n^n} \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma(n+1)} = \frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{n\Gamma(n)} = 1.$$
Proof of (b). We have

\[ r(\tau, 1.5) = n - 1.5n \log(n(1 - \tau)) - \frac{n - 1.5(1 + n\tau)}{1 - \tau} \]
\[ + 1.5n \left( \log(1.5 + n - 1.5(1 + n\tau)) - \frac{1}{1.5 + n - 1.5(1 + n\tau)} \right) \]
\[ = n - 1.5n \log(n(1 - \tau)) - \frac{n - n\tau - 1.5 - 0.5n\tau}{1 - \tau} + 1.5n \left( \log(n(1 - 1.5\tau)) - \frac{1}{n(1 - 1.5\tau)} \right) \]
\[ = 1.5n \log \left( \frac{1 - 1.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + \frac{1.5 + 0.5n\tau}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5}{1 - 1.5\tau} \]
\[ = n \left( 1.5 \log \left( \frac{1 - 1.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + \frac{0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + 1.5 \left( \frac{1}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1}{1 - 1.5\tau} \right) \]
\[ \leq n \left( 1.5 \log \left( \frac{1 - 0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + \frac{0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) \]
\[ \leq n \left( -1.5 \frac{0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} + \frac{0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) \]
\[ = -\frac{0.25\tau}{1 - \tau} \]
\[ \leq 0. \]

Proof of (c). We have

\[ \frac{\partial r}{\partial x}(\tau, x) = -n \log(n(1 - \tau)) + \frac{1 + n\tau}{1 - \tau} + n \log(1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)) \]
\[ - \frac{(1 + n\tau)xn}{1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)} - n \frac{1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau) + x(1 + n\tau)}{(1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau))^2} \]
\[ = -n \log(n(1 - \tau)) + \frac{1 + n\tau}{1 - \tau} + n \log(1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)) \]
\[ - \frac{(1 + n\tau)xn}{1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)} - n \frac{1.5 + n}{(1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau))^2}. \]
Plugging in $x = 1.5$, we have
\[
\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}(\tau, 1.5) = -n \log(n(1 - \tau)) + \frac{1 + n\tau}{1 - \tau} + n \log(n(1 - 1.5\tau)) - \frac{1.5(1 + n\tau)n}{n(1 - 1.5\tau)} - n \frac{1.5 + n}{(n(1 - 1.5\tau))^2} \\
= n \log \left( \frac{1 - 1.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + \frac{1}{1 - \tau} + n \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5}{1 - 1.5\tau} (1 + n\tau) - \frac{1.5}{n (1 - 1.5\tau)^2} - \frac{1.5}{(1 - 1.5\tau)^2} \\
\leq n \left( \log \left( \frac{1 - 1.5\tau}{1 - \tau} \right) + \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5\tau}{1 - 1.5\tau} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5}{1 - 1.5\tau} \right) \\
\leq n \left( -0.5\tau \frac{1}{1 - \tau} + \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5\tau}{1 - 1.5\tau} \right) \\
= n \left( \frac{0.5\tau}{1 - \tau} - \frac{1.5\tau}{1 - 1.5\tau} \right) \\
\leq n \frac{\tau(0.75\tau - 1)}{(1 - \tau)(1 - 1.5\tau)} \\
\leq 0,
\]
where the last inequality follows because $\tau \leq \frac{1}{1.5} - \frac{1}{n} \leq 4/3$.

**Proof of (d).** Modulo terms linear in $x$ and the scaling factor $n$, $r(\tau, x)$ is equal to
\[
x \log (1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)) - \frac{x}{1.5 + n - x(1 + n\tau)}.
\]
We claim that the first term is concave in $x$ and the second term is convex, from which it will follow that their difference is concave. By linear transformations, the concavity of the first term will follow from the concavity of $x \log(1 - x)$, which follows because its first derivative $\log(1 - x) - \frac{x}{1 - x}$ is decreasing in $x$. Again by linear transformations, the convexity of the second term will follow from the convexity of $\frac{x}{1 - x} = -1 + \frac{1}{1 - x}$ on $x < 1$, which is clear. 

**Lemma 4.** Let $\psi(x) = \Gamma'(x)/\Gamma(x)$ be the digamma function. Then, $\psi$ is increasing, and for $x \geq 1$,
\[
(53) \quad \psi(x) \leq \log(x) - \frac{1}{2x} \leq \log(x + 0.5) - \frac{1}{x + 0.5} \leq \log x.
\]

**Proof.** The fact that $\psi$ is increasing is well-known. The first inequality follows directly from Theorem 3.1 of Anderson et al. (1995). To prove the
second inequality, write
\[ \log(x + 0.5) - \log(x) = \log \left( 1 + \frac{0.5}{x} \right) \geq \frac{0.5}{x} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{0.5}{x} \right)^2, \]
and the conclusion follows because
\[ \frac{0.5}{x} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{0.5}{x} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{x + 0.5} \iff \frac{1}{2}x - \frac{1}{8x^2} \geq \frac{x - 0.5}{2x(x + 0.5)} \iff x \geq 1/6. \]

To prove the third inequality, write
\[ \log(x + 0.5) - \log(x) = \log \left( 1 + \frac{0.5}{x} \right) \leq \frac{0.5}{x}, \]
and the conclusion follows because
\[ \frac{0.5}{x} \leq \frac{1}{x + 0.5} \iff x \geq 0.5. \]

**Lemma 5.** Let \( f \) be as defined in equation (49). Then,
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(\lambda, y) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } y \leq \lambda - 1. \]

**Proof.** To prove this, it suffices to show that for \( y \leq \lambda - 1, \)
\[ 0 \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \log f(\lambda, y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( -\lambda + y \log \lambda - \log \Gamma(y + 1) \right) = \log \lambda - \psi(y + 1). \]
Indeed, by Lemma 4, for \( y \leq \lambda - 1 \) we have \( \psi(y + 1) \leq \psi(\lambda) \leq \log \lambda. \]