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Abstract

In a regression setting with observation vector \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and given finite collection \((x_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^*}\) of regressor vectors \( x_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \), a typical question is whether a given subset of these regressors is sufficient to approximate \( y \). A classical method for this question is the \( F \) test, assuming that \( y \) is a linear combination of the regressor vectors plus Gaussian white noise. In this note we show that the corresponding p-value has also a clear data-scientific interpretation without having to assume the data to be random. Then it is shown that such a dual interpretation is possible for a rather large family of tests, the underlying tool being normalized Haar measure on orthogonal groups.

1 Introduction

Let \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be an observation vector, and let \( x_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n, \nu \in \mathbb{N}^* \), be a given finite collection of regressor vectors. The question is how well \( y \) may be approximated by linear combinations of these regressors.

Specifically, suppose the raw data are given by a data matrix with \( n \) rows

\[
[y_i, z_i^\top] = [y_i, z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{id}], \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,
\]

containing the values of a response and \( d \) numerical covariables for each observation. Then the usual multiple linear regression model would consider the regressor vectors \( x_0 := (1)_{i=1}^n \) and \( x_j := (z_{ij})_{i=1}^n, 1 \leq j \leq d \). More complex models would also include the \( \binom{d}{2} \) interaction vectors \( x_{j,k} := (x_{ij}x_{ik})_{i=1}^n, 1 \leq j < k \leq d \). In general, with arbitrary types of covariables, one could think of \( x_\nu = (f_\nu(z_i))_{i=1}^n \) with given basis functions \( f_\nu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}^* \).

For any subset \( N \) of \( \mathbb{N}^* \), consider the linear space \( \mathbb{V}_N := \text{span}(x_\nu : \nu \in N) \) and the orthogonal projection

\[
\hat{y}_N := \arg \min_{\eta \in \mathbb{V}_N} ||y - \eta||^2
\]

of \( y \) onto \( \mathbb{V}_N \). This includes the case of \( N = \emptyset \) with \( \mathbb{V}_\emptyset := \{0\} \) and \( \hat{y}_\emptyset := 0 \). If \( \hat{y}_N \) is viewed as an approximation of \( y \), a raw measure of approximation error would be the sum of squared
residuals

\[ SS_N := \| y - \hat{y}_N \|^2 = \| y \|^2 - \| \hat{y}_N \|^2. \]

In case of \( \forall_N \neq \forall_{N*} \), a common question in linear regression is whether the approximation of \( y \) by \( \hat{y}_N \) is “substantially better” than the one by \( \hat{y}_{N*} \). Of course it follows from \( \forall_N \subset \forall_{N*} \) that \( SS_N \geq SS_{N*} \), so the question is whether the ratio \( SS_{N*}/SS_N \) is “significantly small”. Let us first recall the classical answer as presented in standard textbooks, e.g. [4].

**Classical approach: Gaussian model and F test.** Suppose that the regressor vectors \( x_\nu, \nu \in N_{\star} \), are fixed and linearly independent with \( 0 \leq p := \#N < p_\star := \#N_{\star} < n \). (In case of random regressors, we consider conditional distributions given \( (x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_{\star}} \).) Suppose that

\[ y = \sum_{\nu \in N_{\star}} \theta_\nu x_\nu + \epsilon \]

with unknown parameters \( \theta_\nu, \nu \in N_{\star} \), and a random vector

\[ \epsilon \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I_n), \]

the standard deviation \( \sigma > 0 \) being unknown as well. Here \( I_n \) denotes the identity matrix in \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). Under the null hypothesis that

\[ \theta_\nu = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \nu \in N_{\star} \setminus N, \quad (1) \]

the random variables \( SS_{N_{\star}} \) and \( SS_N - SS_{N_{\star}} \) are stochastically independent with

\[ \frac{SS_{N_{\star}}}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{n - p} \] and \[ \frac{SS_N - SS_{N_{\star}}}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{p_{\star} - p}. \]

With the F test statistic

\[ F := \frac{(SS_N - SS_{N_{\star}})/(p_{\star} - p)}{SS_{N_{\star}}/(n - p_{\star})}, \]

a corresponding p-value of the null hypothesis \( 1 \) is given by

\[ 1 - F_{p_{\star} - p, n - p_{\star}}(F), \quad (2) \]

where \( F_{k, \ell} \) denotes the distribution function of Fisher’s F distribution with \( k \) and \( \ell \) degrees of freedom.

**Outline of this note.** In Section 2 we present a new interpretation of the p-value \( 2 \). Instead of viewing \( y \) as a random vector with a rather specific distribution, we consider all vectors \( y \) and \( x_\nu, \nu \in N_{\star} \), as fixed. Then we compare the decrease \( SS_N - SS_{N_{\star}} \) with the random decrease which would result if we replaced the \( p_{\star} - p \) vectors \( x_\nu, \nu \in N_{\star} \setminus N \), with independent random vectors.
It turns out that the probability of this random decrease being greater than or equal to the actual decrease $SS_N - SS_{N*}$ is precisely the p-value (2). This provides a purely data-driven interpretation of this p-value.

The technical arguments for Section 2 are rather direct in the sense that we rely only on basic properties of standard Gaussian, beta and gamma distributions. There is, however, a more abstract approach based on Haar distributions on orthogonal groups. A good introduction to that topic can be found, for instance, in the monograph [3]. It is shown in Section 3 that both the classical and the new interpretation of the p-value (2) are a consequence of a basic invariance consideration. This viewpoint allows us to weaken our assumptions on the random noise vector $\epsilon$ in the classical setup and on the artificial random regressor vectors $z_\nu$ in the new approach. It also shows that several other tests, some of which are applicable for high-dimensional settings with $p_* \geq n$, have a purely data-driven interpretation, too.

Technical details and proofs are deferred to Section 4.

Based on the findings of Section 2 there is a simple stepwise procedure for selecting covariates which outperforms the lasso and knockoff procedures introduced in [5] and [1], respectively. As an example, consider the well-known Boston housing data with $n = 504$ observations and $d = 13$ covariables. A linear model with interactions of order at most seven gives a data set with $(n, p_* ) = (504, 77520)$. This is much too large for knockoff which exits with the error message “cannot allocate a vector of the size 44.8 GB”. Ten repetitions of lasso gave between 4 and 116 selected regressors with a mean of 58. The time for each selection was about 100 seconds. The selection method based on Section 2 selects 10 regressors in less than two seconds. It also selects 10 regressors with interactions of order at most eight giving $(n, p_* ) = (504, 203490)$. The time required was five seconds. Interactions of order at least nine exceed the memory capacity of the laptop. A detailed description of the method and comparison with lasso and knockoff is given in [2].

2 A model-free interpretation of the F test

Rephrasing the p-value (2). In view of the subsequent considerations it is useful to rewrite the p-value (2) in terms of beta distribution functions. Let $B_{a,b}$ be the distribution function of the beta distribution with parameters $a, b > 0$. Then

$$F_{p_*-p,n-p_*}(F) = 1 - B_{(p_*-p)/2,(n-p_*)/2} \left( \frac{SS_N - SS_{N*}}{SS_N} \right)$$

$$= B_{(n-p_*)/2,(p_*-p)/2} \left( \frac{SS_{N*}}{SS_N} \right).$$
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The new interpretation. As mentioned in the introduction, we now consider the data \( y \) and \( x_\nu \) as fixed vectors. To judge whether \( \hat{y}_N^* \) is substantially better than \( \hat{y}_N \), we compare the resulting reduction \( \frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} \) in the sum of squared residuals with the reduction one would obtain if \( (x_\nu)_{\nu \in N \setminus N} \) would be replaced with pure white noise.

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that the \( p+1 \) vectors \( y \) and \( x_\nu, \nu \in N \), are fixed and linearly independent, and let \( p_* < n \). Suppose we replace the regressors \( x_\nu, \nu \in N_* \setminus N \), with independent random vectors \( z_\nu \sim N_n(0, I_n), \nu \in N_* \setminus N \). Then \( SS_{N^*} \) becomes a random variable such that

\[
\frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} \sim \text{Beta} \left( \frac{(n - p_*)}{2}, \frac{(p_* - p)}{2} \right).
\]

Consequently, if \( y \) and \( x_\nu, \nu \in N_* \), are linearly independent and viewed as fixed vectors, then the p-value

\[
B_{(n-p_*)/2,(p_*-p)/2} \left( \frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} \right),
\]

which is precisely the p-value (2), quantifies how extraordinary the reduction in the sum of squared residuals really is, without referring to a statistical model for \( y \).

**Remark.** The artificial regressor tuple \((z_\nu)_{\nu \in N_* \setminus N} \) in Theorem 1 need not be pure white noise.

The proof of Theorem 1 and the considerations in the next section reveal that the following property is sufficient: With the orthogonal projection \( \Pi \) from \( \mathbb{R}^n \) onto \( V_N^* \), consider the random linear space

\[
M := \text{span}(\Pi z_\nu : \nu \in N_* \setminus N).
\]

Then \( \dim(M) = p_* - p \) almost surely, and

\[
\mathcal{L}(SM) = \mathcal{L}(M)
\]

for any fixed orthogonal matrix \( S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) such that \( Sv = v \) for all \( v \in V_N \).

3 Further considerations in terms of orthogonal invariance

Let us first introduce some notation and recall some concepts from measure theory and algebra:

With \( \mathbb{O}_n \), we denote the set of all orthogonal matrices \( S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). For a linear subspace \( V \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( q := \dim(V) < n \) let

\[
\mathbb{O}_n(V) := \{ S \in \mathbb{O}_n : Sv = v \text{ for all } v \in V \}.
\]
If \( b_1, \ldots, b_n \) is an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( \mathbb{V} = \text{span}(b_i : 1 \leq i \leq q) \), then \( S \in \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}) \) may be represented as
\[
S = B \begin{bmatrix}
I_q & 0_{q \times (n-q)} \\
0_{(n-q) \times q} & S_0
\end{bmatrix} B^T
\]
with \( B := [b_1, \ldots, b_n] \) and an orthogonal matrix \( S_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-q) \times (n-q)} \).

Normalized Haar measure on \( \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}) \), denoted by \( \text{Haar}_{n,\mathbb{V}} \), is the unique probability distribution on \( \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}) \) such that a random variable \( T \sim \text{Haar}_{n,\mathbb{V}} \) satisfies
\[
L(ST) = L(T) \quad \text{for any fixed} \quad S \in \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}).
\]
The latter property also implies that
\[
L(T^T) = L(T) \quad \text{and} \quad L(TS) = L(T) \quad \text{for any fixed} \quad S \in \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}).
\]
Moreover, for any fixed vector \( x = v + w \) with \( v \in \mathbb{V} \) and \( w \in \mathbb{V}^\perp \), the random vector \( Tx \) has the same distribution as
\[
v + \|w\|u
\]
where \( u \) is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of \( \mathbb{V}^\perp_N \). Specifically, if \( b_{q+1}, \ldots, b_n \) is an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{V}^\perp_N \), then \( u \) is distributed as
\[
\left( \sum_{i=q+1}^{n} Z_i^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=q+1}^{n} Z_i b_i
\]
with independent random variables \( Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1) \), \( q < i \leq n \).

### 3.1 A generalization of the classical setting

Throughout this and the next subsection we consider a fixed subset \( N \) of \( N_* \) with \( p < n - 1 \) elements such that the vectors \( x_\nu, \nu \in N, \) are linearly independent. We write \( \hat{y} := \hat{y}_N \) and consider the residual vector
\[
\hat{e} := y - \hat{y},
\]
i.e. the orthogonal projection of \( y \) onto \( \mathbb{V}^\perp_N \). In the classical setting, \( y \) is viewed as a random vector. The next lemma specifies a null hypothesis which is appropriate for the F test as well as several other tests.

**Lemma 2** (A null hypothesis \( H_N \)). The following three statements about the distribution of \( y \) are equivalent:

(i) For any fixed \( S \in \mathbb{O}_n(\mathbb{V}_N) \),
\[
L(Sy) = L(y).
\]
Let $T$ be a random matrix with distribution $\text{Haar}_{n,V_N}$ such that $y$ and $T$ are stochastically independent. Then
\[ L(Ty) = L(y). \]

Let $u$ be a random vector with uniform distribution on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{V}_N^\perp$ such that $y$ and $u$ are stochastically independent. Then
\[ L(y) = L(\hat{y} + \|\hat{e}\|u). \]

The null hypothesis $H_N$ described in Lemma 2 is satisfied, for instance, if
\[ y = \mu + \epsilon \]
with fixed vector $\mu \in \mathbb{V}_N$ and a random vector $\epsilon$ with orthogonally invariant distribution in the sense that
\[ L(Su) = L(u) \quad \text{for any fixed } S \in O_n. \]

A general test. Let $\tau : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary test statistic. Then a p-value for the null hypothesis $H_N$ specified in Lemma 2 is given by
\[ \pi(y) := \mathbb{P}(\tau(Ty) \geq \tau(y) \mid y) \]
\[ = \mathbb{P}(\tau(\hat{y} + \|\hat{e}\|u) \geq \tau(y) \mid y) \]
with $T$ and $u$ as in Lemma 2.

Example: F test. Suppose that the vectors $x_\nu, \nu \in N_*$, are linearly independent with $p < p_* = \#N_* < n$. Let $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that
\[ \text{span}(b_1, \ldots, b_p) = \mathbb{V}_N \quad \text{and} \quad \text{span}(b_1, \ldots, b_{p_*}) = \mathbb{V}_N^*. \]
Then the F test statistic $F$ may be written as $F = \tau(y)$ with
\[ \tau(y) = \frac{\sum_{i=p+1}^{p_*} (b_i^T y)^2 / (p_* - p)}{\sum_{i=p_*+1}^{n} (b_i^T y)^2 / (n - p_*)} \]
and the convention $0/0 := 0$. Now let’s replace $y$ with $\hat{y} + \|\hat{e}\|u$, where
\[ u = L\left(\sum_{i=p+1}^{n} Z_i^2\right)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=p+1}^{n} Z_i b_i \]
with independent random variables $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, independent from $y$. Then we obtain
\[ \tau(\hat{y} + \|\hat{e}\|u) = 1_{|\hat{e}| \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{i=p+1}^{p_*} Z_i^2 / (p_* - p)}{\sum_{j=p_*+1}^{n} Z_j^2 / (n - p_*)}, \]
and the latter fraction follows $F_{p_* - p, n - p_*}$. Hence the p-value (4) coincides with (2).
Example: Multiple T test. Suppose that $V_N \neq \mathbb{R}^n$. Further suppose that the vectors $x_\nu$, $\nu \in N_s \setminus N$, have been standardized to be orthogonal to $V_N$ and have unit length. Then a possible test statistic which is similar in spirit to Tukey’s studentized range statistic is given by

$$
\tau(y) := \max_{\nu \in N_s \setminus N} \frac{|x_\nu^\top y|}{SS_{N_s}^{1/2}}
$$

Note that the vectors $x_\nu$, $\nu \in N_s \setminus N$, need not be linearly independent.

Example: Multiple F test. If $V_{N_s} = \mathbb{R}^n$ or if $n - \dim(V_{N_s})$ is rather small, one could think about a finite collection $(M_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of subsets of $N_s \setminus N$ all of which satisfy $\dim(V_{N_s} \cup M_\lambda) = p + \#M_\lambda \ll n$. Then one could consider the test statistic

$$
\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} F_\lambda
$$

where $F_\lambda$ is defined as $F$ with $N \cup M_\lambda$ in place of $N_s$. The idea behind this test statistic is that possibly $y = \sum_{\nu \in N_s} \theta_\nu x_\nu + \epsilon$ with a random vector $\epsilon$ having orthogonally invariant distribution and fixed real parameters $\theta_\nu$, $\nu \in N_s$, such that

$$
\sum_{\nu \in M_\lambda} \theta_\nu^2 \gg \sum_{\nu \in N_s \setminus (N \cup M_\lambda)} \theta_\nu^2
$$

for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

3.2 A model-free interpretation of the p-value

Again we consider the data $y$ and $(x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_s}$ as fixed. All examples of the test statistic $\tau$ may be written as

$$
\tau(y) = \tau(y, (x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_s}),
$$

and one can verify in each case that the latter value depends only on the inner products

$$
y^\top y, \ y^\top x_\nu \text{ and } x_\nu^\top x_\omega
$$

for certain $\nu, \omega \in N_s$. For instance, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ contains linearly independent regressors $x_\nu$, $\nu \in M$, then

$$
SS_M = y^\top y - y^\top X (X^\top X)^{-1} X^\top y.
$$

Now let $T$ be a random matrix with distribution Haar$_{n, V_N}$. Since

$$
(Ty)^\top (Ty) = y^\top y, \quad (Ty)^\top x_\nu = y^\top (T^\top x_\nu) \text{ and } x_\nu^\top x_\omega = (T^\top x_\nu)^\top (T^\top x_\omega)
$$
for arbitrary \( \nu, \omega \in N_* \), and since \( \mathcal{L}(T^\top) = \mathcal{L}(T) \), we may rewrite the p-value (4) as

\[
\pi(y) = \mathbb{P}(\tau(y, (T x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}) \geq \tau(y, (x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*})).
\]

In other words, the p-value (4) results from comparing the relation between \( y \) and \((x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\) with the relation between \( y \) and the randomized regressor tuple \((T x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\). Note that

\[
T x_\nu = x_\nu \quad \text{for} \ \nu \in N
\]

and

\[
(T x_\nu)^\top (T x_\omega) = x_\nu^\top x_\omega \quad \text{for} \ \nu, \omega \in N_*.
\]

So the randomized tuple \((T x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\) has the same geometry as the original \((x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\), and the linear space \( V_N \) remains unchanged.

### 3.3 Confidence and plausibility regions

Consider the classical setting with observation vector

\[
y = \mu + \epsilon,
\]

where \( \mu \) is an unknown fixed vector in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \epsilon \) is a random vector with orthogonally invariant distribution on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Let \( \beta \) be the orthogonal projection of \( \mu \) onto \( V_{N_*} \cap V_{N_*}^\perp \). The p-value (4) gives rise to a \((1 - \alpha)\)-confidence region for \( \beta \):

\[
C_\alpha(y) := \{ \beta \in V_{N_*} \cap V_{N_*}^\perp : \pi(y - \beta) \geq \alpha \}.
\]

In case of the usual F-test, this yields Scheffé's confidence ellipsoid for \( \beta \). The coverage probability of \( C_\alpha(y) \) equals

\[
\mathbb{P}(\beta \in C_\alpha(y)) = \begin{cases} 1 - \alpha & \text{if } \mathbb{P}(\epsilon = 0) = 0 \text{ and } \mu \in V_{N_*}, \\ 1 - \alpha & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

If we view all data as fixed, and if the test statistic \( \tau \) in (4) depends only on inner products of the data vectors, we may interpret \( C_\alpha(y) \) as a \((1 - \alpha)\)-plausibility region. It consists of all vectors \( \beta \in V_{N_*} \cap V_{N_*}^\perp \) such that the association between \( y - \beta \) and \((x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\), as measured by \( \tau \), is not significantly stronger than the association between \( y - \beta \) and the randomized regressor tuple \((T x_\nu)_{\nu \in N_*}\), where \( T \sim \text{Haar}_n V_N \).
4 Technical details and proofs

**Gamma, beta and chi-squared distributions.** Recall that the gamma distribution with shape parameter $a > 0$ and scale parameter $c > 0$, denoted by $\text{Gamma}(a, c)$, is the distribution on $(0, \infty)$ with density
\[
\gamma_{a,c}(y) := \Gamma(a)^{-1}c^{-1}(y/c)^{a-1}e^{-y/c}, \quad y > 0,
\]
where $\Gamma(a) := \int_0^\infty x^{a-1}e^{-x} \, dx$. We also write $\text{Gamma}(a) = \text{Gamma}(a, 1)$. Furthermore, the beta distribution with parameters $a, b > 0$, denoted by $\text{Beta}(a, b)$, is the distribution on $(0, 1)$ with density
\[
\beta_{a,b}(u) := B(a, b)^{-1}u^{a-1}(1-u)^{b-1}, \quad 0 < u < 1,
\]
where $B(a, b) := \int_0^1 u^{a-1}(1-u)^{b-1} \, du$. The following two results are well-known:

**Lemma 3.** For arbitrary integers $\ell \geq 1$,
\[
\chi^2_\ell = \text{Gamma}(\ell/2, 2).
\]

**Lemma 4.** For $a, b, c > 0$ let $Y_a$ and $Y_b$ be independent random variables with distribution $\text{Gamma}(a, c)$ and $\text{Gamma}(b, c)$, respectively. Then the random variables $Y_a + Y_b$ and $U := Y_a/(Y_a + Y_b)$ are stochastically independent, where
\[
Y_a + Y_b \sim \text{Gamma}(a + b, c) \quad \text{and} \quad U \sim \text{Beta}(a, b).
\]

**Proof of (3).** By definition of Fisher’s F distribution and Lemma 3, $F_{k,\ell}$ describes the distribution of
\[
\tilde{F} := \frac{Y_{k/2}/k}{Y_{\ell/2}/\ell}
\]
with independent random variables $Y_{k/2} \sim \Gamma(k/2, 2)$ and $Y_{\ell/2} \sim \Gamma(\ell/2, 2)$. But then Lemma 4 implies that
\[
\frac{Y_{k/2}}{Y_{k/2} + Y_{\ell/2}} = \frac{(k/\ell)\tilde{F}}{(k/\ell)\tilde{F} + 1} \sim \text{Beta}(k/2, \ell/2),
\]
and the latter random variable is a strictly increasing function of $\tilde{F}$. Hence
\[
F_{k,\ell}(x) = B(k/2, \ell/2) \left( \frac{(k/\ell)x}{(k/\ell)x + 1} \right) \quad \text{for} \ x \geq 0.
\]
With $k := p^* - p$, $\ell := n - p^*$ and $x := F$, these considerations show that the p-value (2) is equal to
\[
1 - F_{p^*-p,n-p^*}(F) = 1 - B((p^*-p)/2,(n-p^*)/2) \left( \frac{SS_N - SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} \right)
= B((n-p^*)/2,(p^*-p)/2) \left( \frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} \right).
\]
The latter equation follows from the elementary fact that \( U \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \) if, and only if, \( 1 - U \sim \text{Beta}(b, a) \).

In the proof of Theorem 1, we utilize another well-known result about beta distributions which is an easy consequence of Lemma 4:

**Lemma 5.** For \( a, b, c > 0 \) let \( U \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \) and \( V \sim \text{Beta}(a + b, c) \) be independent random variables. Then \( UV \sim \text{Beta}(a, b + c) \).

**Corollary 6.** For \( a, \delta > 0 \) and an integer \( k \geq 2 \) let \( U_1, \ldots, U_k \) be independent with \( U_j \sim \text{Beta}(a + (j - 1)\delta, \delta) \). Then \( \prod_{j=1}^k U_j \sim \text{Beta}(a, k\delta) \).

**Proof of Lemma 5.** Our starting point are independent random variables \( G_a \sim \text{Gamma}(a) \), \( G_b \sim \text{Gamma}(b) \) and \( G_c \sim \text{Gamma}(c) \). Now we apply Lemma 4 three times: We first conclude that \( U := \frac{G_a}{G_a + G_b}, G_a + G_b \) and \( G_c \) are independent, where \( U \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \) and \( G_a + G_b \sim \text{Gamma}(a + b) \). Then we may conclude that \( U \) and \( V := \frac{(G_a + G_b)}{(G_a + G_b + G_c)} \) are independent with \( V \sim \text{Beta}(a + b, c) \). Finally, \( UV = \frac{G_a}{G_a + G_b + G_c} \) has distribution \( \text{Beta}(a, b + c) \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Let us first consider the case \( p_* = p + 1 \), so \( \{x_\nu : \nu \in N_* \setminus N\} = \{z\} \) with only one random vector \( z \sim \mathcal{N}_n(0, I_n) \). Note that \( y - \hat{y}_N \) is a nonzero vector in the linear space

\[
\mathbb{V}_N^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\top \eta = 0 \text{ for all } \eta \in \mathbb{V}_N\}.
\]

Let \( b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n \) be an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) such that

\[
\mathbb{V}_N = \text{span}(b_1, \ldots, b_p) \quad \text{and} \quad y - \hat{y}_N = \frac{SS_N^{1/2} b_{p+1}}{ \| \tilde{z} \|^2} \tilde{z}.
\]

By rotational symmetry of the standard Gaussian distribution on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), \( Z_j := b_j^\top z \) defines stochastically independent, standard Gaussian random variables \( Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_n \), and the orthogonal projection of \( z \) onto \( \mathbb{V}_N^\perp \) is given by

\[
\tilde{z} := \sum_{j=p+1}^n Z_j b_j.
\]

In particular,

\[
\mathbb{V}_{N_*} = \text{span}(1, \ldots, b_p, z) = \text{span}(1, \ldots, b_p, \tilde{z})
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
y &= \hat{y}_N + SS_N^{1/2} b_{p+1}, \\
\tilde{y}_{N_*} &= \hat{y}_N + \frac{\tilde{z}^\top y}{\| \tilde{z} \|^2} \tilde{z} = \hat{y}_N + SS_N^{1/2} \frac{\tilde{z}^\top b_{p+1}}{\| \tilde{z} \|^2} \tilde{z}.
\end{align*}
\]
Consequently,

$$\frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} = \left\| b_{p+1} - \frac{\bar{z}}{\|\bar{z}\|^2} \bar{z} b_{p+1} \right\|^2 = 1 - \frac{(\bar{z}^\top b_{p+1})^2}{\|\bar{z}\|^2} = \frac{\sum_{j=p+2}^n Z_j^2}{\sum_{j=p+1}^n Z_j^2} \sim \text{Beta}\left((n - p - 1)/2, 1/2\right) = \text{Beta}\left((n - p_*)/2, (p_*)/2\right)$$

by Lemmas 3 and 4.

In case of $k := p_* - p > 1$, one may apply the previous argument inductively to show that

$$\frac{SS_{N^*}}{SS_N} = \prod_{\ell=1}^k U_\ell$$

in distribution, where $U_1, \ldots, U_k$ are stochastically independent with

$$U_\ell \sim \text{Beta}\left((n - p - \ell)/2, 1/2\right).$$

In other words, for $j = 1, \ldots, k$,

$$U_{k+1-j} \sim \text{Beta}\left((n - p_*)/2 + (j - 1)/2, 1/2\right).$$

Applying Corollary 6 with $a = (n - p_*)/2$ and $\delta = 1/2$ yields the assertion that $SS_{N^*}/SS_N$ follows $\text{Beta}\left((n - p_*)/2, k/2\right)$. □

**Haar measure on $\mathbb{O}_n$.** For the reader’s convenience we collect some standard arguments to provide a self-contained account of that topic. We start with two specific constructions of a random matrix $T \in \mathbb{O}_n$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}(ST) = \mathcal{L}(T) \text{ for any fixed } S \in \mathbb{O}_n. \tag{5}$$

In both cases the starting point is a random matrix $Z = [z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ with $d^2$ independent components with standard Gaussian distribution. With probability one, the columns $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ are linearly independent. Hence

$$T := Z(Z^\top Z)^{-1/2}$$

is well-defined almost surely and easily seen to belong to $\mathbb{O}_n$. For fixed $S \in \mathbb{O}_n$ it follows from $\mathcal{L}(SZ) = \mathcal{L}(Z)$ that the distribution of $T$ coincides with the distribution of

$$(SZ)((SZ)^\top (SZ))^{-1/2} = SZ(Z^\top Z)^{-1/2} = ST.$$ 

Thus $T$ satisfies (5).
The same conclusion holds true if we construct \( T = [t_1, \ldots, t_n] \) by means of the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization: We start with \( t_1 := \|z_1\|^{-1}z_1 \) and then set
\[
t_k := \left( \|z_k\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (t_j^\top z_k)^2 \right)^{-1/2} \left( z_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (t_j^\top z_k) t_j \right)
\]
for \( k = 2, \ldots, n \). This representation shows that the first column of \( T \) has the same distribution as a standard Gaussian random vector normalized to have length one.

Now let \( T_1, T_2 \) be stochastically independent random matrices in \( O_n \) satisfying (5). Then for any Borel set \( B \subset O_n \),
\[
\Pr(T_1^\top T_2 \in B) = \mathbb{E} \Pr(T_1^\top T_2 \in B \mid T_1) = \Pr(T_2 \in B),
\]
and
\[
\Pr(T_1^\top T_2 \in B) = \mathbb{E} \Pr((T_2^\top T_1)^\top \in B \mid T_2) = \Pr(T_1^\top \in B).
\]
Hence \( T_1^\top \) and \( T_2 \) have the same distribution. From this one can easily deduce that there is only one distribution \( \text{Haar}_n \) on \( O_n \) such that a random matrix \( T \) with that distribution satisfies (5).

The previous considerations show that a random matrix \( T \sim \text{Haar}_n \) satisfies also
\[
\mathcal{L}(T^\top) = \mathcal{L}(T) = \mathcal{L}(TS) \quad \text{for any fixed } S \in O_n. \tag{6}
\]
Moreover, if \( s_1, \ldots, s_q \) are fixed orthonormal vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), \( 1 \leq q < n \), then
\[
\mathcal{L}([Ts_1, \ldots, Ts_q]) = \mathcal{L}([t_1, \ldots, t_q]),
\]
where \( t_1, \ldots, t_n \) are the columns of \( T \). This follows by extending \( s_1, \ldots, s_q \) to an orthonormal basis \( s_1, \ldots, s_n \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and applying (6) with \( S = [s_1, \ldots, s_n] \in O_n \). In particular, for any fixed unit vector \( s \in \mathbb{R}^n \), the random vector \( Ts \) has the same distribution as \( u := \|z\|^{-1}z \) with a standard Gaussian random vector \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

**Proof of Lemma 2** Suppose that \( y \) satisfies (i). Then for any Borel set \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^n \),
\[
\Pr(Ty \in B) = \mathbb{E} \Pr(Ty \in B \mid T) = \Pr(y \in B),
\]
Hence (ii) is satisfied as well.

Now suppose that \( y \) satisfies (ii). That means \( y \) has the same distribution as \( Ty \), where \( T \sim \text{Haar}_{n,\sqrt{n}} \) is stochastically independent from \( y \). By conditioning on \( y = \hat{y} + \hat{\epsilon} \) one sees that
$Ty$ has the same distribution as $\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|u$, where $u$ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $V_{N}^\perp$. Thus $y$ satisfies (iii) as well.

Finally, suppose that $y$ satisfies (iii), that means, $y$ has the same distribution as $\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|u$, where $u$ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $V_{N}^\perp$ and stochastically independent from $y$. But for any fixed $S \in \mathbb{O}_{n}$ the distributions of $Su$ and $u$ are identical, so for any Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
\mathbb{P}(Sy \in B) = \mathbb{P}(S(\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|u) \in B)
= \mathbb{P}(\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|Su \in B)
= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}(\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|Su \in B \mid y)
= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}(\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|u \in B \mid y)
= \mathbb{P}(\hat{y} + \|\hat{\epsilon}\|u \in B)
= \mathbb{P}(y \in B).
$$

Consequently, $y$ satisfies (i) as well. \hfill \square
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