Optimal control of false discovery criteria in the two-group model
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Abstract. The highly influential two group model in testing a large number of statistical hypotheses assumes that the test statistics come from a mixture of a high probability null distribution and a low probability alternative. Optimal control of the marginal false discovery rate (mFDR), in the sense that it provides maximal power (expected true discoveries) subject to mFDR control, is known to be achieved by thresholding the local false discovery rate (locFDR) with a fixed threshold. In this paper we address the challenge of controlling optimally the popular false discovery rate (FDR) or positive FDR (pFDR) rather than mFDR in the two group model. These criteria are less conservative than the mFDR criterion, so they make more rejections in expectation. We derive the optimal multiple testing (OMT) policies for these two error criteria. These policies turn out to be thresholding the locFDR with a threshold that is a function of the entire set of statistics. By carefully studying the structure of the optimal policies, we develop an efficient algorithm for finding these policies. With this algorithm, we can easily derive and apply these OMT procedures for problems with thousands of hypotheses. We show that for $K = 5000$ hypotheses there can be significant power gain in OMT with FDR or pFDR versus mFDR control. The OMT policies with FDR and pFDR control coincide when the probability of zero rejections is zero for the OMT policy with FDR control. When the signal is weak, the OMT policy with pFDR control has a significantly lower probability of zero rejections than the OMT policy with FDR control. Our results lead us to suggest that the pFDR is (arguably) the preferred error measure to control optimally for the two group model.
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1 Introduction

In large scale inference problems, hundreds or thousands of hypotheses are tested in order to discover the set of non-null hypotheses. Such problems are ubiquitous in modern applications like medicine, genetics, particle physics, ecology, and psychology. Multiple testing procedures applied to these large scale problems should control for false discoveries, but they should not be over-conservative, since this limits the ability of scientists to make true discoveries. Thus it is natural to seek multiple testing procedures that control for false discoveries, while assuring as many discoveries as possible.

In order to guarantee that not too many false positives are among the discoveries, Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) introduced the false discovery rate (FDR). This error measure gained tremendous popularity in large scale testing, as it was less stringent than traditional measures like the familywise error rate. Given a rejection policy, denote the (random) number of rejected null hypotheses by $R$, and the number of falsely rejected hypotheses (true nulls) by $V$. The FDR is

$$\text{FDR}: \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V}{\max(R,1)}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V}{R} \mid R > 0\right) \Pr(R > 0).$$

In this paper, we assume that the test-statistics come from the “two-group model”, first introduced by Efron et al. (2001). This model has been widely used in large scale inference problems (Efron et al., 2001; Genovese and Wasserman, 2002; Storey, 2003; Sun and Cai, 2007; Efron, 2008; Cai and Sun, 2017). The observed test statistics $Z_1, \ldots, Z_K$ are assumed to be generated independently from the mixture model

$$Z_k \mid h_k \sim (1 - h_k)F + h_kG, \ k = 1, \ldots, K, \quad (1.1)$$

where $h_1, \ldots, h_K$ are independent Bernoulli($\pi$) random variables, and $F$ and $G$ are the null and non-null distributions respectively. Here $h_k = 0$ and $h_k = 1$ indicate, respectively, whether the null hypothesis is true (so $Z_k$ has distribution $F$) or false (so $Z_k$ has distribution $G$).
Two measures that are similar to the FDR became popular within the framework of the two-group model. The pFDR was introduced in Storey (2003). The marginal FDR (mFDR) was introduced in Genovese and Wasserman (2002); Sun and Cai (2007). Their formulas are:

\[
pFDR: \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V}{R} \mid R > 0\right); \quad mFDR: \frac{\mathbb{E}V}{\mathbb{E}R}.
\]

These measures were considered briefly in Benjamini and Hochberg (1995), but since the pFDR and mFDR are identically 1 if all null hypotheses are true, it is not possible to design a multiple testing procedure that controls these measures at level \( \alpha < 1 \) for any fixed configuration \((h_1, \ldots, h_K)\) of null and non-null hypothesis, including the complete null configuration \(\vec{0}\). Moreover, mFDR does not take the dependence between \(V\) and \(R\) into consideration. Therefore, Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) chose to control the FDR.

When test statistics come from the two group model, if the rejection policy is a fixed subset of the real line, then the pFDR and mFDR have been shown to be equivalent (Storey, 2003). Moreover, as \(K \to \infty\), all three measures are equivalent (Benjamini, 2008). According to Cai and Sun (2017), there is essentially no difference between the three measures in large-scale testing problems. They say the use of mFDR is mainly for technical considerations, since the ratio of two expectations is easier to handle. In this paper we show that for large values of \(K\) there can still be important differences when aiming at FDR control, pFDR control, or mFDR control.

The test statistic that plays a central role for inference on which hypotheses are false is the locFDR, defined for a test statistic value \(z\) as \(T(z) = \frac{(1-\pi)f(z)}{(1-\pi)f(z) + \pi g(z)}\), where \(f\) and \(g\) are the densities under the null distribution \(F\) and the non-null distribution \(G\), respectively. This statistic was originally introduced by Efron et al. (2001) as the a posteriori probability of a hypothesis being in the null group. Sun and Cai (2007) showed that the OMT procedure with mFDR control is to threshold the locFDR statistics with a fixed threshold.

In this paper, we consider OMT with FDR or pFDR control rather than mFDR control for the two-
group model. As Cai and Sun (2017) have noted, since mFDR is the ratio of two expectations, it is easier to handle when seeking an optimal policy. However, $V/R$ is the more fundamental quantity the investigator would like control over for finite $K$. Therefore a rejection policy that guarantees control over $V/R$ in expectation, while maximizing the expected number of true rejections, can be very useful. We can write the problem of finding the optimal rejection policy as an optimization problem. Briefly, let $\vec{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_K)$ be the test statistics for a family of $K$ hypotheses. Let $\vec{D} : \mathbb{R}^K \to \{0,1\}^K$ be the decision function based on $\vec{z}$, so the $i$th coordinate $D_i(\vec{z})$ receives the value of one if the $i$th null hypothesis is rejected, and zero otherwise. Let $\vec{h} = (h_1, \ldots, h_K)$, and $\vec{1}$ be the vector of ones. Then the number of rejected and falsely rejected hypotheses, respectively, are

$$R(\vec{D}(\vec{z})) = \vec{1}^t \vec{D} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} D_k(\vec{z})$$

and

$$V(\vec{D}(\vec{z})) = (\vec{1}^t - \vec{h}^t) \vec{D} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} (1 - h_k) D_k(\vec{z}).$$

We denote by $\text{Err}(\vec{D}) \in \{\text{FDR}(\vec{D}), \text{pFDR}(\vec{D})\}$ the error rate, FDR or pFDR, for policy $\vec{D}$. We seek to maximize the expected number of true discoveries,

$$\mathbb{E}(R(\vec{D}) - V(\vec{D})) = \mathbb{E}\left(\vec{h}^t \vec{D}\right),$$

subject to $\text{Err}(\vec{D}) \leq \alpha$. For $K = 1$, this problem reduces to the classic Neyman-Pearson (NP) problem,

$$\max_{D : \mathbb{R} \to \{0,1\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} D(z) g(z) dz \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} D(z) f(z) dz \leq \alpha.$$
the true “scientific” goal for inference and the type of discoveries we wish to make.

OMT problems in the two-group model can be viewed as an infinite-dimensional optimization problem, seeking to maximize one integral (the power), subject to an integral constraint expressing the measure we want to control — FDR, mFDR, pFDR, or any other measure. In this paper we adopt this view and demonstrate that for the two-group model we can solve the resulting optimization problem and practically compute the optimal rejection policy for dimension $K$ in the thousands. Recently, Rosset et al. (2018) applied the infinite-dimensional formulation to finding OMT policies under frequentist strong control of measures like family-wise error rate (FWER) and FDR. In that setting, it was possible to solve only relatively small problems up to $K = 3$, due to the fact that the problem has $2^K$ constraints for strong control. In contrast, the structure of the two-group model, with a single constraint, and the computational shortcuts we introduce below, allow us to find OMT policies for practically any $K$. Our main contributions are as follows.

1. We show how the problem of finding the optimal policy with FDR or pFDR control can be formulated as an infinite integer optimization problem with a single constraint.

2. We provide an efficient algorithm for solving the optimization problem.

3. We show that the OMT policy for FDR or pFDR control turns out to be thresholding the locFDR with a threshold that is a function of the entire set of statistics. This is in contrast to the OMT policy for mFDR control, where the threshold is fixed.

4. We prove that average power is greatest for the optimal rejection policy with FDR control, then for pFDR control, and only then for mFDR control. We show that the power gap can be non-negligible even for thousands of hypotheses. We compare in simulations the three optimal policies, as well as the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995), and we conclude that the optimal policy with pFDR control may be preferable over the others.

In § 2, we develop the OMT procedure with FDR or pFDR control. We show that, as for mFDR control, the optimal decision function can be defined in terms of the locFDR statistics. However,
contrary to the optimal rejection policy for mFDR control, even when all parameters are assumed known, the threshold for selection depends on the other realized locFDRs. In § 3 we detail our efficient computational approach for implementing the OMT procedure with FDR or pFDR control. With this approach, it is feasible to compute the optimal rejection region on a standard PC when $K$ is in the tens of thousands. In § 4 we provide numerical examples that demonstrate the potential power gain from controlling the FDR or pFDR rather than the mFDR with an optimal rejection policy, as well as important differences in the optimal procedures for FDR versus pFDR control.

Although this paper is about achieving the OMT policy for FDR or pFDR control for the two group model, the mathematical and algorithmic developments can be easily adapted for developing the OMT policy for other measures considered in the literature, such as $\mathbb{E}(V)$ (Storey, 2007) and false discovery exceedance (FDX) (for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $FDX = Pr(FDP > \gamma)$, Lehmann and Romano 2005). Since controlling the FDX does not yield additional fundamental insight, we only relate to it briefly in our final remarks in § 5.

In the last part of the introduction, we review the optimal procedure for mFDR control, and argue that it is sub-optimal for FDR or pFDR control since by aiming at FDR or pFDR rather than mFDR control we necessarily gain power.

1.1 Optimal procedure for mFDR control in the two-group model

Many multiple testing procedures threshold the test statistics $Z_1, \ldots, Z_K$ (or their respective $p$-values) instead of thresholding the locFDRs $T(Z_1), \ldots, T(Z_K)$, and these procedures can have much lower power than procedures that threshold the locFDRs (Sun and Cai, 2007; Storey, 2007). Cai and Sun (2017) proved that the optimal mFDR controlling procedure is of the form $T \leq t$ for independent test statistics from the two group model (1.1). Specifically, in order to maximize the expected number of rejections with $mFDR \leq \alpha$, the optimal rejection policy is $T \leq t_{oracle}$, where $t_{oracle}$ is the largest value among all rejection policies of the form $T \leq t$ for which $mFDR(t) \leq \alpha$. 

5
We provide an alternative proof in §C.

Storey (2003) showed that when the rejection policy is a fixed region of the real line, \( pFDR = mFDR \). Therefore, the optimal rule has a nice Bayesian interpretation: by reporting a hypothesis as non-null if \( T \leq t_{oracle} \), then the mFDR is the chance that a false discovery was made, since pFDR can be written as the following posterior probability (Storey, 2003),

\[
pFDR = \Pr(h = 0 \mid T \leq t_{oracle}).
\]

It is easy to see that \( \Pr(h = 0 \mid T \leq t_{oracle}) = \mathbb{E}(T \mid T \leq t_{oracle}) \), where the expectation is taken over the marginal distribution of \( T \) (or \( Z \)), so the computation of \( t_{oracle} \) is straightforward (Efron, 2008).

Since \( FDR = pFDR \times \Pr(R > 0) \leq pFDR \), and since the OMT policy with mFDR control is a fixed region of the real line, it follows that the OMT policy with mFDR control at level \( \alpha \) also controls the FDR and the pFDR at level \( \alpha \). Therefore, the OMT policy with FDR or pFDR control at level \( \alpha \) will necessarily be at least as powerful as the OMT policy with mFDR control at level \( \alpha \). Interestingly, for any finite number of hypotheses \( K \) from the two group model, the OMT policies with pFDR or FDR control necessarily differ from the OMT policy with mFDR control. This difference exists even if the probability of zero rejections is one, and will become clear from the algorithm for constructing the OMT policies with pFDR and FDR control in §3. We formalize these interesting properties and few others in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.1.** For \( K \) test statistics independently drawn from the two-group model (1.1), if the null and non-null distributions have positive densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure on their region of support:

1. \( \Pi_{OMT-FDR} \geq \Pi_{OMT-pFDR} \geq \Pi_{OMT-mFDR} \), where \( \Pi_{OMT-Err} \) is the power, i.e., the expected number of true discoveries, for the OMT policy with level \( \alpha \) control of \( Err \in \{FDR, pFDR, mFDR\} \).

2. The OMT policy with mFDR control differs from the OMT policy with pFDR control.
3. \( mFDR > pFDR \) for the OMT policy with pFDR control.

4. If the OMT policy with FDR control has probability zero of no rejections, then its policy coincides with the OMT policy with pFDR control.

See Appendix A for the proof.

2 Optimal procedure for FDR or pFDR control in the two-group model

Given the selected power measure, the expected number of true positive findings, and false discovery measure to control \( Err \in \{FDR, pFDR\} \), we can write the OMT problem of finding the optimal policy subject to error control as an infinite dimensional integer program,

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{\tilde{D} : \mathbb{R}^K \to \{0,1\}^K} & \quad \mathbb{E}(\tilde{h}^t \tilde{D}) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad Err(\tilde{D}) \leq \alpha.
\end{align*}
\]

(2.1)

(2.2)

The objective is linear in \( \tilde{D} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}(\tilde{h}^t \tilde{D}) & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \sum_k \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\tilde{z}) h_i \right\} \prod_{l=1}^K [\pi g(z_l)]^{h_l} [(1 - \pi) f(z_l)]^{1-h_l} d\tilde{z} \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\pi g(z_i)}{\pi g(z_i) + (1 - \pi) f(z_i)} \prod_{l=1}^K [\pi g(z_l) + (1 - \pi) f(z_l)] d\tilde{z} \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\tilde{z}) (1 - T(z_i)) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{z}) d\tilde{z},
\end{align*}
\]
where we expressed the objective in terms of the locFDR values $T(z_i), \ldots, T(z_K)$ and the probability of $\vec{z}$ under the model

$$P(\vec{z}) = \prod_{i=1}^{K} ((1 - \pi) f(z_i) + \pi g(z_i)).$$

Note that given $\pi, f, g$, the locFDR values are monotone decreasing in the likelihood ratios $g(z_i)/f(z_i)$.

The constraint can also be expressed in terms of the locFDR values and $P(\vec{z})$:

$$\text{FDR}(\vec{D}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{\vec{h}} \left( \frac{(\vec{1} - \vec{h}^t) \vec{D}(\vec{z})}{\vec{1}^t \vec{D}(\vec{z})} \prod_{i=1}^{K} [\pi g(z_i)]^{h_i} [(1 - \pi) f(z_i)]^{1-h_i} \right) \vec{1}^t \vec{D}(\vec{z}) \vec{D}(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \leq \alpha, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\text{pFDR}(\vec{D}) = \frac{\text{FDR}(\vec{D})}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{I}\{\vec{1}^t \vec{D}(\vec{z}) > 0\} P(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}} \leq \alpha, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function. To simplify the notation, we employ in our FDR calculations the convention $0/0 = 0$.

Denote by $\vec{D}^*$ an optimal solution of this problem. As written, this is an integer infinite program, with objective that is linear but a constraint which is a non-linear function of $\vec{D}$. In this section, we prove that:

1. The optimal solution is symmetric, that is if $\vec{D}^*$ is a solution of Problem (2.1,2.2) then for any permutation $\sigma$ of $1, \ldots, K$ we have $\vec{D}^*(\sigma(\vec{z})) = \sigma(\vec{D}^*(\vec{z}))$ (Lemma 2.4).

2. The optimal solution has a structure which allows us to write the constraint as a linear functional of $\vec{D}$ (Lemma 2.1).

3. Once the problem is written in this linear fashion, the infinite linear program relaxation of the infinite integer problem is guaranteed to have a solution that is integer almost everywhere (Lemma 2.2).

4. This infinite linear program is guaranteed to have zero duality gap, and hence its solution can
be found by solving the Euler-Lagrange conditions, and a solution to these can be found via one-dimensional search (Lemma 2.3).

Taken together, these results establish a practical methodology to solve the two-group FDR or pFDR control problem. In the next section, we discuss the algorithmic and computational aspects, establishing that this problem can be practically solved for high dimensional settings, yielding the optimal FDR or pFDR controlling policy.

We give a relatively concise exposition of our mathematical results here, with proofs and further details deferred to Appendix A. Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4 follow from the structure imposed by the two group model. Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 are similar in nature, and employ similar techniques, to results in our previous work on multiple testing under strong control (Rosset et al., 2018), although some of the important details differ. Importantly, the infinite linear program in this work has only a single error constraint and thus can be solved for large $K$, whereas in Rosset et al. (2018) it has $K$ error constraints and thus can be solved only for a very low dimension $K$.

Our first Lemma states a monotonicity property of the optimal solution:

**Lemma 2.1.** An optimal solution to Problem (2.1,2.2) is almost surely weakly monotone in the likelihood ratio:

\[
\frac{g(z_i)}{f(z_i)} \leq \frac{g(z_j)}{f(z_j)} \iff D^*_i(\tilde{z}) \leq D^*_j(\tilde{z}).
\]

The Problem (2.1,2.2) is symmetric between the $K$ hypotheses, so it is reasonable to assume that an optimal solution would also be symmetric. We start by assuming the solution we are looking for has this property, and once we derive the optimal solution under this assumption we confirm in Lemma 2.4 below that it is indeed optimal among all possible solutions, not only symmetric ones.

Using Lemma 2.1 and symmetry, we can define $\tilde{D}^*$ fully by its behavior on the set $Q \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of
ordered locFDR scores (or equivalently, likelihood ratio scores):

\[ Q = \left\{ \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K : \frac{g(z_1)}{f(z_1)} \geq \frac{g(z_2)}{f(z_2)} \geq \ldots \geq \frac{g(z_K)}{f(z_K)} \right\} = \left\{ \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K : T(z_1) \leq T(z_2) \leq \ldots \leq T(z_k) \right\}. \]

Because the Lemma tells us that the optimal policy always rejects the largest likelihood ratios, for a point \( \vec{z} \in Q \) we can characterize \( \vec{D}^*(\vec{z}) \) by the smallest likelihood ratio it rejects:

\[ k^*(\vec{z}) = \max\{ i : D_i^*(\vec{z}) = 1 \}, \vec{z} \in Q. \]

For \( \vec{z} \notin Q \), denote its sorting permutation by the likelihood ratios by \( \sigma_{\vec{z}} \), so that \( \sigma_{\vec{z}}(\vec{z}) \in Q \). By symmetry we have:

\[ \vec{D}^*(\vec{z}) = \sigma_{\vec{z}}^{-1} \left( \vec{D}^*(\sigma_{\vec{z}}(\vec{z})) \right). \]

With this characterization of the optimal solution, we can rewrite the constraint in Problem (2.1,2.2) so it is linear in \( \vec{D} \). The linear representation of \( FDR(\vec{D}) \) is derived from the nonlinear one in (2.3) by noticing that on \( Q \), if \( D_i(\vec{z}) = 1 \) it implies that \( D_1 = D_2 = \ldots = D_{i-1} = 1 \) by Lemma 2.1, and therefore:

\[ FDR(\vec{D}) = K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \left[ D_1(\vec{z})T(z_1) + \sum_{i=2}^K D_i(\vec{z}) \frac{1}{k} (T(z_i) - \bar{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z})) \right] d\vec{z}, \tag{2.5} \]

where \( \bar{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z}) = \frac{1}{i-1} \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \frac{T(z_l)}{i-1}. \) See Appendix B for the derivation of the formulation (2.5). Using this representation, the pFDR constraint in (2.4) has the following linear representation:

\[ FDR(\vec{D}) - \Pr(R > 0)\alpha = K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \left[ D_1(\vec{z})(T(z_1) - \alpha) + \sum_{i=2}^K D_i(\vec{z}) \frac{1}{k} (T(z_i) - \bar{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z})) \right] d\vec{z} \leq 0, \tag{2.6} \]

To emphasize the linearity of the objective and constraints, and simplify the followup, we rewrite
our formulation in a generic form:

\[
\max_{\vec{D}:Q\rightarrow\{0,1\}^K} K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \tag{2.7}
\]

s.t.  
\[
K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \leq c_{Err},
\]

\[
D_1(\vec{z}) \geq D_2(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_K(\vec{z}), \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q,
\]

where \(a_i, b_i, i = 1, \ldots, K\) are fixed functions that depend on \(f, g, \pi\) only through the locFDR scores, and \(c_{Err}\) is a fixed constant. Specifically, for \(Err(\vec{D}) = FDR(\vec{D})\): \(a_i(\vec{z}) = 1 - T(z_i), i = 1, \ldots, K\); \(b_i(\vec{z}) = (T(z_i) - \bar{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z}))/i, i = 2, \ldots, K\); \(b_1(\vec{z}) = T(z_1)\); \(c_{Err} = c_{FDR} = \alpha\). For \(Err(\vec{D}) = pFDR(\vec{D})\), the only differences are that \(b_1(\vec{z}) = T(z_1) - \alpha\) and \(c_{Err} = c_{pFDR} = 0\).

We now consider the relaxed linear program without the integer requirement on \(\vec{D}\), by writing the same problem, except optimizing over \(\vec{D} \in [0, 1]^K\):

\[
\max_{\vec{D}:Q\rightarrow[0,1]^K} K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \tag{2.8}
\]

s.t.  
\[
K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \leq \alpha
\]

\[
D_1(\vec{z}) \geq D_2(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_K(\vec{z}), \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q.
\]

To analyze this problem, we consider its Euler-Lagrange (EL) necessary optimality conditions (Korn and Korn, 2000). We derive the EL conditions for this problem in Appendix A, and also show there that they can be rephrased as requiring the following to hold almost everywhere for optimality, in
addition to the (primal feasibility) constraints of Problem (2.8):

\[ a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) - \lambda_i(\vec{z}) + \lambda_{i+1}(\vec{z}) = 0, \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q, i = 1, \ldots, K. \]  
\[ (2.9) \]

\[ \mu \left\{ K! \int_Q \left( \sum_{i=1}^K b_i(\vec{z}) D_i(\vec{z}) \right) \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} - \alpha \right\} = 0, \]  
\[ (2.10) \]

\[ \lambda_{K+1}(\vec{z}) D_K(\vec{z}) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q \]  
\[ (2.11) \]

\[ \lambda_j(\vec{z})(D_{j-1}(\vec{z}) - D_j(\vec{z})) = 0, \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q, \quad j = 2, \ldots, K \]  
\[ (2.12) \]

\[ \lambda_1(\vec{z})(D_1(\vec{z}) - 1) = 0, \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q, \]  
\[ (2.13) \]

where \( \mu \) and \( \lambda_j(\vec{z}), \quad j = 1, \ldots, K + 1, \quad \vec{z} \in Q \) are non-negative Lagrange multiplies. In analogy to the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions in finite convex optimization, we can term condition (2.9) the stationarity condition, and conditions (2.10–2.13) the complementary slackness conditions.

The following result clarifies that for this problem, we can solve the linear program relaxation instead of the integer program, and get an integer solution:

**Lemma 2.2.** For \( K \) test statistics independently drawn from the two-group model (1.1), if the null and non-null distributions have positive densities with respect to the Legesgue measure on their region of support, any solution to the EL conditions (2.9)–(2.13) is integer almost everywhere on \( Q \), and by extension on \( \mathbb{R}^K \).

Our next result shows that for our problem, the EL conditions are in fact not only necessary, but also sufficient (like the KKT conditions in finite linear programs), and we can thus find the infinite linear program solution by finding any solution that complies with these conditions.

**Lemma 2.3.** The infinite linear program (2.8) has zero duality gap, and therefore the conditions (2.9)–(2.13) together with primal feasibility are also sufficient, and a solution complying with these conditions is optimal.

For brevity, we defer explicit derivation of the dual together with the proof to Appendix A.
Finally, we use this last result to confirm that the optimal symmetric solution we find on $Q$ is in fact the global solution to Problem $(2.1,2.2)$.

**Lemma 2.4.** An optimal solution to Problem $(2.7)$, extended to $\mathbb{R}^K$ using the symmetry property:

$$\text{for } \vec{z} \in Q : \tilde{D}^* (\sigma(\vec{z})) = \sigma(\tilde{D}^*(\vec{z})),$$

is optimal for the original Problem $(2.1,2.2)$.

Putting our lemmas together, we obtain our main theoretical result:

**Theorem 2.1.** An optimal solution to Problem $(2.1,2.2)$ can be found by solving the EL conditions (2.9)–(2.13) together with primal feasibility of the infinite linear program (2.8).

We next show how this can be used to efficiently solve high-dimensional multiple testing problem with FDR or pFDR control for the two-group model.

### 3 Algorithm

We first characterize a generic algorithm for using Theorem 2.1 to solve the OMT problem with FDR or pFDR control. We then show how to efficiently implement this approach for high dimensional instances of the problem.

Given a candidate Lagrange multiplier $\mu \geq 0$, for $i = 1, \ldots, K$, define: $R_i(\vec{z}) = a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z})$. For $a_i(\vec{z})$ and $b_i(\vec{z})$ defined for the FDR and pFDR constraints, $R_i(\vec{z})$ is as follows:

$$R_i(\vec{z}) = \begin{cases} 
1 - T(z_i) - \mu T(z_1) & \text{if } Err(\tilde{D}) = FDR(\tilde{D}), \\
1 - T(z_i) - \mu(T(z_1) - \alpha) & \text{if } Err(\tilde{D}) = pFDR(\tilde{D}).
\end{cases}$$

$$R_i(\vec{z}) = a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) = 1 - T(z_i) - \frac{\mu}{i}(T(z_i) - T_{i-1}(\vec{z})) \text{ for } i = 2, \ldots, K.$$
Denote by $\bar{D}^\mu(\bar{z})$ a solution which complies with (2.9) and (2.11)–(2.13) for this value of $\mu$. It is easy to confirm that this dictates that almost surely:

$$D_i^\mu(\bar{z}) = \mathbb{I} \left\{ \bigcup_{k=1}^K \left( \sum_{k=1}^l R_k(\bar{z}) > 0 \right) \right\}$$ (3.1)

$$D_i^\mu(\bar{z}) = \mathbb{I} \left\{ D_{i-1}^\mu(\bar{z}) \cap \bigcup_{k=i}^K \left( \sum_{k=i}^l R_k(\bar{z}) > 0 \right) \right\}, \ i = 2, \ldots, K.$$ (3.2)

Now we have to ensure that primal feasibility and complementary slackness for $\mu$ hold, in other words find $\mu^* \geq 0$ such that the following holds:

$$K! \int_Q \mathbb{P}(\bar{z}) \left( \sum_{i=1}^K b_i(\bar{z}) D_i^{\mu^*}(\bar{z}) \right) d\bar{z} = \alpha.$$ (3.3)

It is easy to confirm that if we find such a solution, then it is feasible, it complies with conditions (2.9)–(2.13), and it is obviously binary. Thus, finding the optimal solution amounts to searching the one-dimensional space of $\mu$ values for a solution of Eq. (3.3), using the characterization in Eqs. (3.1), (3.2).

When naively implemented, the calculation in Eqs. (3.1),(3.2) requires $O(K^2)$ operations to calculate all partial sums. However we can rephrase it using a recursive representation to require only $O(K)$ calculations. We first calculate, in decreasing order:

$$m_K(\bar{z}) = \max(0, R_K(\bar{z}))$$

$$m_i(\bar{z}) = \max(0, m_{i+1} + R_i(\bar{z})) \ , \ i = K - 1, \ldots, 1,$$
and then, in increasing order:

\[ D_1^\mu = \mathbb{I} \{ m_1 > 0 \} \]
\[ D_i^\mu = \mathbb{I} \{ D_{i-1}^\mu \cap m_i > 0 \}, \quad i = 2, \ldots, K. \]

We see from the algorithm that the OMT procedure with FDR control starts by determining whether the hypothesis with the smallest locFDR can be rejected, and proceeds to decide whether to reject the hypothesis with the second smallest locFDR only if the decision at the first step was to reject (i.e., \( D_1^\mu = 1 \)). Proceeding similarly, only if the hypothesis with the \( l \)th smallest locFDR is rejected, the hypothesis with the \((l + 1)\)th smallest locFDR is tested, for \( l = 1, \ldots, K - 1 \). Thus, it is a step-down procedure (Lehmann and Romano, 2005). In contrast, the OMT procedure with mFDR control is a single step procedure since each hypothesis is rejected if its locFDR is less than a common cut-off value.

Implementing the algorithm allows us to find optimal solutions to two-group FDR problems with many thousands of hypotheses in minutes of CPU, as illustrated below.

4 Numerical Examples

We compare the performance of the OMT procedure with FDR control (henceforth, OMT-FDR) and the OMT procedure with positive FDR control (henceforth, OMT-pFDR), against two natural competitors: the OMT procedure with mFDR control (henceforth, OMT-mFDR, Sun and Cai 2007), and the oracle BH procedure, which applies the BH procedure assuming the probability of a null hypothesis is known (so the threshold for significance of the \( i \)th largest \( p \)-value is \( \frac{i\alpha}{K(1-\pi)} \) instead of the BH threshold \( \frac{\alpha}{K} \), Benjamini et al. 2006).

We generate test statistics from the following mixture model: with probability \( 1 - \pi \), \( Z \) is \( N(0, 1) \); with probability \( \pi \), \( Z \) is \( N(\theta, 1) \) with \( \theta < 0 \). We fix \( K = 5000 \) hypotheses, and experiment with a
range of values for $\pi, \theta$. We note that we carried out additional simulations that led to qualitatively similar conclusions, so we omitted them from the manuscript. In the additional simulations, the alternative hypothesis signal is not fixed but instead it is sampled from a Gaussian centered at zero (the unimodal assumption of Stephens (2017), also known as the spike and slab model, which is popular in genomics research).

Our results are summarized in Table 1. They show that the power advantage of the novel procedures (OMT-FDR and OMT-pFDR) over the competitors (OMT-mFDR and oracle BH) can be nonnegligible. They also show that the power advantage of the OMT-FDR procedure comes at a price: the probability of no rejections is large. However, the OMT-pFDR has a power advantage, without a large probability of no rejections. Specifics follow.

For a fixed probability of non-nulls $\pi$, the power advantage of the novel procedures is larger in configurations where $\theta$ is closer to zero. The power of the novel procedures is at least 30% greater than the natural competitors when the signal is $\theta = -1.5$. With $\theta = -2$, the power of the novel procedures is at least 4% greater than the natural competitors when $\pi = 0.1$, but for $\pi = 0.3$ or $\theta = -2.5$ the advantage is negligible.

As expected, $FDR \leq pFDR \leq mFDR$. When the gain in power is small, the mFDR of the novel procedures is only slightly above the nominal level. However, when the gain is large, the mFDR of the novel procedures can be large. The mFDR of the OMT-FDR and OMT-pFDR procedures is above 0.16 for $\theta = -1.5$, and above 0.07 for $\theta = -2, \pi = 0.1$. It is close to the nominal level in the three other settings. Interestingly, when the gain is large, the FDR of the OMT-mFDR procedure is not much smaller than the nominal level. So the OMT-mFDR has lower power, but approximately the same FDR level, as OMT-FDR. The Oracle BH procedure has FDR level identical to the nominal level, as expected, and its mFDR is only slightly above the nominal level except in the weakest setting with $\pi = 0.1$, where it is inflated to be 0.066.

The last column in Table 1 demonstrates clearly where OMT-FDR and OMT-pFDR differ. In order
to control the FDR, the OMT-FDR procedure either makes no rejections, or makes many rejections, when the signal is weak. As a consequence, the false discovery proportion (FDP) is either zero or much higher than the nominal level. This is perhaps an unattractive behavior of the OMT-FDR procedure. As the signal strengthens, the probability of no rejections decreases for OMT-FDR, and its policy approaches that of OMT-pFDR. Since (arguably) pFDR is a more appropriate error measure to control than FDR for the two group model, the more attractive OMT-pFDR policy may be preferred, see § 5 for further discussion.

Table 1: Results for $K = 5000$ z-scores generated independently from the two group model $(1 - \pi) \times N(0, 1) + \pi \times N(\theta, 1)$. For each $\theta \in \{-2.5, -2.0, -1.5\}$ and $\pi \in \{0.1, 0.3\}$, we provide the expected number of true positives (TP=$E(R-V)$), FDR, pFDR, mFDR, and probability of no rejection ($\Pr(R = 0)$), for the four procedures compared. Since $FDR = pFDR \times (1 - \Pr(R = 0))$ column 5 can be determined from columns 6 and 8. When the OMT-FDR policy has $\Pr(R > 0) = 1$, it coincides with the OMT-pFDR policy and therefore the OMT-pFDR line is omitted. TP is bold in the settings where the power advantage of OMT-FDR and OMT-pFDR over the alternatives is non-negligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\pi$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>FDR</th>
<th>pFDR</th>
<th>mFDR</th>
<th>$\Pr(R = 0)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td><strong>29.763</strong></td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-pFDR</td>
<td><strong>12.488</strong></td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>6.123</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td><strong>60.308</strong></td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-pFDR</td>
<td><strong>59.755</strong></td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>56.403</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>57.277</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td>179.468</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>178.992</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>179.346</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td><strong>167.662</strong></td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-pFDR</td>
<td><strong>155.652</strong></td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>117.088</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>118.419</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td>500.0330</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-pFDR</td>
<td>499.3813</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>499.7893</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>OMT-FDR</td>
<td>927.8398</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>927.7303</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracle BH</td>
<td>927.8105</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 The effect of estimation of the mixture components

In practice, the distributions $F$ and $G$ and the mixture proportion $\pi$ are typically unknown. The estimation of the marginal density of the $z$-scores and of $\pi$ can be difficult, and there are many different approaches. We shall limit our investigation to fitting a bivariate mixture of normals using the R package *mixfdr* available from CRAN (Muralidharan, 2010). The estimation is done using the EM algorithm with a penalization via a Dirichlet prior on $(1 - \pi, \pi)$. Estimation of the fraction of nulls is most conservative if the Dirichlet prior parameters are $(1,0)$. In addition to this prior, we also examined the results with the Dirichlet prior parameters $(1 - \hat{\pi}, \hat{\pi})$, where $\hat{\pi}$ is estimated by the method of Jin and Cai (2007), recommended in Sun and Cai (2007).

As in the known distribution case, est-OMT-FDR appears to have the most power, with est-OMT-pFDR a close second, even though it is no longer a necessary guarantee since the rejection region is computed using the estimated parameters from the data. For example, in Table 2, with $\pi = 0.3$ the procedure est-OMT-FDR (which coincides with est-OMT-pFDR) has an FDR (which coincides with pFDR) below the nominal level, and it rejects few more hypotheses on average if the non-conservative method is used for estimating the fraction of nulls, and many more hypotheses if the conservative method is used. However, the estimated OMT FDR can have an inflated FDR level when the fraction of nulls is fairly small (making the estimation problem more difficult). This problem is present to a lesser degree with the estimated OMT pFDR. In Table 2, with $\pi = 0.1$: the procedure est-OMT-FDR has an FDR level of 0.12 if the non-conservative method is used for estimating the fraction of nulls, and 0.06 if the conservative method is used; the procedure est-OMT-pFDR has a pFDR level of 0.11 if the non-conservative method is used for estimating the fraction of nulls, and 0.06 if the conservative method is used.
Table 2: Results for $K = 5000$ z-scores generated independently from the two group model $(1 - \pi) \times N(0,1) + \pi \times N(-2,1)$. We provide the FDR, pFDR, mFDR, and expected number of true positives (TP = $\mathbb{E}(R - V)$), for the estimated OMT procedure with FDR control (est-OMT-FDR), with pFDR control (est-OMT-pFDR), with mFDR control (est-OMT-mFDR), and for adaptive BH. The conservative estimation method uses the default prior $\text{Dirichlet}(1,0)$ for $(1 - \pi, \pi)$; the non-conservative estimation method uses the estimator of Jin and Cai (2007), which was recommended in Sun and Cai (2007) with supplementary R code. The standard error of the estimated FDR is at most 0.004. The est-OMT-FDR policy has $\Pr(R > 0) = 1$ for every simulated dataset in the last two settings, so it coincides with the est-OMT-pFDR policy and therefore the OMT-pFDR line is omitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\pi$</th>
<th>$(1 - \pi)$ estimation method</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>FDR</th>
<th>pFDR</th>
<th>mFDR</th>
<th>$\Pr(R = 0)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>non-conservative</td>
<td>est-OMT-FDR</td>
<td>113.44</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-pFDR</td>
<td>103.826</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>49.769</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive BH</td>
<td>56.875</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>est-OMT-FDR</td>
<td>68.100</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-pFDR</td>
<td>67.740</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>47.199</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive BH</td>
<td>53.833</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>non-conservative</td>
<td>est-OMT-FDR</td>
<td>499.887</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-pFDR</td>
<td>491.689</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>491.706</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive BH</td>
<td>495.706</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>est-OMT-FDR</td>
<td>496.375</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-pFDR</td>
<td>387.820</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est-OMT-mFDR</td>
<td>452.535</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive BH</td>
<td>452.535</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Discussion

In this paper, we provide the first practical approach to the problem of maximizing an objective which is linear in the decision functions, subject to FDR or pFDR control in the two group model. Similarly, it is possible to solve the optimization problem with other error measures for control such as FWER control ($\Pr(V > 0) \leq \alpha$), or false discovery exceedance control ($\Pr(FDP > \gamma) \leq \alpha$). As with FDR control, the solution will be a single threshold for rejection that depends on the $K$ realized locFDR statistics. The error measures $\mathbb{E}(V)$ and mFDR result in a much simpler solution (see derivation in § C for mFDR control), where the threshold for rejection depends only on the mixture distribution.

We demonstrate the potential large power gain in aiming for optimal testing with FDR control, in
comparison with the current state of the art of optimal testing with mFDR control. However, we observe that the optimal procedure for FDR control can be problematic when the signal is weak. At the extreme, it appears that the optimal policy is to either reject no hypotheses or to have a very high FDP. A similar behavior has been observed in Rosset et al. (2018), where in certain situations the optimal multiple testing policy with strong frequentist FDR control is to reject all hypotheses if the optimal test of the global null is rejected, and to reject none otherwise. This may indicate a potentially problematic aspect of the FDR error criterion. An error measure such as false discovery exceedance control will also exhibit this bimodal behavior (results not shown). In order to avoid a policy that with high probability makes no rejections, but when making rejections can have a high FDP, the measure for control should aim at a small FDP only when rejections are made. One such measure is the pFDR. Although the optimal policy with pFDR control has lower average power than the optimal policy with FDR control, its probability of making no rejections at all can be far lower and in these cases the resulting policy is more attractive. Our results suggest that pFDR control is the preferred error rate to control in the two-group model.

The potential gain is maintained also when the parameters are estimated, but care has to be taken in proper estimation of the mixture parameters. In particular, it appears that the estimation of the fraction of nulls has to be conservative when the actual fraction is fairly small. Further research into estimation methods tailored towards est-OMT-FDR and est-OMT-pFDR is needed.

The generic form of our formulation for finding the OMT policies in (2.7) opens up the possibility to consider other potentially relevant error criteria that are weakly monotone in the likelihood ratio. For example, the probability of false discovery exceedance given that at least one rejection occurred, \( \Pr \left( \frac{V}{R} > \gamma \mid R > 0 \right) \). Moreover, the formulation can be extended in a straightforward manner to control more than one error rate. For example, seek the OMT policy which controls for the false discovery proportion both its expectation and its tail probability.

We provide an efficient algorithm for computing the optimal policy for independent test statistics. While the theoretical results also work for exchangeable hypotheses, the efficient algorithm does not.
In principle, we can find the optimal symmetric solution even without requiring exchangeability, but the computational complexity may be exponential in the number of hypotheses $K$. Deriving solutions for dependent test statistics with known local dependence (e.g., in genomic applications with known linkage disequilibrium) is an interesting direction for future work.
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A Proofs and additional mathematical details

Proof of Proposition 1.1

Item 1 follows straightforwardly from the explanation in the paragraph leading to the proposition.

Item 2 follows from the fact that OMT-mFDR is a single step procedure, yet OMT-pFDR is by construction the step-down procedure described in § 3. Put another way, the necessary conditions for the OMT-mFDR policy lead to the single step procedure, and the OMT-pFDR policy does not satisfy these necessary conditions. For example, for $K = 2$, let $\vec{E}(\vec{z})$ and $\vec{D}(\vec{z})$ be the OMT-mFDR and OMT-pFDR policies, respectively. Then $\{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : E_1(\vec{z}) = 1\} = \{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : T(z_1) \leq c\}$ for a constant $c$ which guarantees $mFDR(\vec{E}) = \alpha$, but $\{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : D_1(\vec{z}) = 1\} = \{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : T(z_1) \leq \frac{1+\alpha}{1+\mu} \text{ or } T(z_1) + T(z_2) \leq \frac{2}{1+\mu/2}\}$ for a constant $\mu$ which guarantees $pFDR(\vec{D}) = \alpha$. Clearly, the symmetric difference between the sets $\{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : E_1(\vec{z}) = 1\}$ and $\{(T(z_1), T(z_2)) : D_1(\vec{z}) = 1\}$ has positive Lebesgue measure.

For item 3, suppose by contradiction that $mFDR \leq pFDR$ for the OMT-pFDR policy. The OMT-pFDR policy is necessarily at least as powerful as the OMT-mFDR policy since the OMT-mFDR policy controls the pFDR. So the OMT-pFDR policy is optimal for mFDR control if it satisfies $mFDR \leq pFDR$. But to achieve optimal mFDR control, a policy has to satisfy necessary conditions which lead to the single step procedure. This contradicts the fact that the OMT-pFDR policy is necessarily not a single step procedure, as shown for item 2 above.

Item 4 follows by the same reasoning as that of item 1. The OMT-FDR policy is necessarily at least as powerful as the OMT-pFDR policy since the OMT-pFDR policy controls the FDR (which is bounded above by the pFDR). Therefore, if the OMT-FDR policy controls the pFDR (since the probability of no rejections is zero), this must be the OMT-pFDR policy as well. Indeed, it is easy to see that the step-down procedures for optimal pFDR and optimal FDR control in § 3 coincide when the hypothesis with minimal locFDR is rejected with probability one.
Proof of Lemma 2.1

Denote \( l(z_i) := \frac{g(z_i)}{f(z_i)}, \ i = 1, \ldots, K \) the likelihood ratios for the observations.

Given a candidate solution \( \vec{D} \), we prove the lemma by constructing an alternative solution \( \vec{E} \) that complies with the condition and has no lower objective and no higher constraint than \( \vec{D} \).

For every pair of indexes \( 1 \leq i < j \leq K \), define:

\[
A_{ij} = \{ \vec{z} : l(z_i) > l(z_j), \ D_i(\vec{z}) = 0, D_j(\vec{z}) = 1 \}.
\]

We will now examine the solution \( \vec{E} \) which is equal to \( \vec{D} \) everywhere, except on the set \( A_{ij} \), where it switches the value of coordinates \( i, j \):

\[
E_k(\vec{z}) = \begin{cases} 
D_k(\vec{z}) & \text{if } \vec{z} \notin A_{ij} \text{ or } k \notin \{i, j\} \\
1 - D_k(\vec{z}) & \text{if } \vec{z} \in A_{ij} \text{ and } k \in \{i, j\} 
\end{cases}
\]

We now show the following:

1. For the integrated power in Eq. (2.1), \( \Pi(\vec{E}) \geq \Pi(\vec{D}) \).

2. For the Error constraint in Eq. (2.2), \( Err(\vec{E}) \leq Err(\vec{D}) \).

Therefore \( \vec{E} \) is an improved solution compared to \( \vec{D} \). This can be done for all \( i, j \) pairs repeatedly until \( P(A_{ij}) = 0 \forall i, j \), and we end up with \( \vec{E} \) which has the desired monotonicity property and is superior to \( \vec{D} \). Since \( \vec{D}^* \) the optimal solution cannot be improved, it must have this monotonicity property.

It remains to prove properties 1,2 above. For the power, we write the expression in Eq. (2.1) for \( \vec{E} \)
and \(\tilde{D}\) and subtract them:

\[
\Pi(\tilde{E}) - \Pi(\tilde{D}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \sum_{i=1}^K E_i(\tilde{z})(1 - T(z_i))\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \sum_{i=1}^K D_i(\tilde{z})(1 - T(z_i))\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = \int_{A_{ij}} (T(z_j) - T(z_i))\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} \geq 0,
\]

where the second equality uses the definition of \(\tilde{E}\) , and the inequality uses the equivalence between the likelihood ratio relationship \(l(z_i) > l(z_j)\) and locFDR scores relationship \(T(z_i) < T(z_j)\).

The same idea with slightly more complex algebra applies to the FDR constraint:

\[
FDR(\tilde{D}) - FDR(\tilde{E}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \left( \sum_{\tilde{h}} \left( \frac{(1 - \tilde{h}^t)\tilde{D}(\tilde{z})}{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z})} - \frac{(1 - \tilde{h}^t)\tilde{E}(\tilde{z})}{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z})} \right) \prod_{l=1}^K [1 - T(z_l)]^{h_l} T(z_l)^{1-h_l} \right) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = \\
\int_{A_{ij}} \left( \sum_{\tilde{h}} \frac{h_i - h_j}{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z})} \prod_{l=1}^K [1 - T(z_l)]^{h_l} T(z_l)^{1-h_l} \right) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = \\
\int_{A_{ij}} \sum_{\tilde{h} \in H_{ij}} \frac{1}{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z})} \left( \prod_{l=1, l \notin \{i,j\}}^K [1 - T(z_l)]^{h_l} T(z_l)^{1-h_l} \right) \times \left( [1 - T(z_i)] T(z_j) - [1 - T(z_j)] T(z_i) \right) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} \geq 0,
\]

where the second equality follows since the difference of the two ratios is nonzero only on \(A_{ij}\), and the difference is only in the numerator, with \((1 - \tilde{h}^t)\tilde{D}(\tilde{z}) - (1 - \tilde{h}^t)\tilde{E}(\tilde{z}) = (1 - h_i) - (1 - h_j)\). The last inequality follows since \(T(z_i) < T(z_j), \forall \tilde{z} \in A_{ij}\).

It remains to show that \(pFDR(\tilde{D}) - pFDR(\tilde{E}) \geq 0\). This clearly follows since for \(\tilde{z} \in A_{ij}\), \(\tilde{E}(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{E}(\tilde{z})\), so

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z}) > 0\}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{D}(\tilde{z}) > 0\}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = \int_{A_{ij}} (\mathbb{I}\{\tilde{E}(\tilde{z}) > 0\} - \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{D}(\tilde{z}) > 0\})\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = \int_{A_{ij}} 0\mathbb{P}(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z} = 0.
\]
So the denominators in $pFDR(\vec{D})$ and $pFDR(\vec{E})$ are the same, and hence

$$pFDR(\vec{D}) - pFDR(\vec{E}) = \frac{FDR(\vec{D}) - FDR(\vec{E})}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{I}(\vec{1}^t \vec{E}^\top(\vec{z}) > 0) \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}} \geq 0.$$  

**Derivation of Euler-Lagrange conditions for Problem (2.8)**

Our optimization problem is:

$$\max \int_Q \sum_k a_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}$$

s.t. \( \int_Q \sum_k b_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \leq \alpha \)

\[ 0 \leq D_K(\vec{z}) \leq \cdots \leq D_j(\vec{z}) \leq D_i(\vec{z}) \leq \cdots \leq D_1(\vec{z}) \leq 1 \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q. \]

We eliminate the inequality constraints, by introducing non-negative auxiliary variables, and then square those variables to also eliminate non-negativity constraints:

$$\max \int_Q \sum_k a_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}$$

s.t. \( \int_Q \sum_k b_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} + E^2 = \alpha \)

\[ D_K(\vec{z}) = e^2_K(\vec{z}) \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q \]

\[ D_k(\vec{z}) - D_{k+1}(\vec{z}) = e^2_k(\vec{z}) \quad \forall 0 < k < K, \vec{z} \in Q \]

\[ 1 - D_1(\vec{z}) = e^2_0(\vec{z}) \quad \forall \vec{z} \in Q \]

The Euler-Lagrange (EL) necessary conditions for a solution to this optimization problem may be obtained through calculus of variations (Korn and Korn, 2000). Let \( y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) be a set of \( n \) functions and

$$I = \int_{x_0}^{x_F} F(y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x); y'_1(x), y'_2(x), \ldots, y'_n(x); x) dx \quad (A.2)$$
be a definite integral over fixed boundaries $x_0, x_F$. Every set of $y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x)$ which maximize or minimize (A.2) must satisfy a set of $n$ equations

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i'} \right) - \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} = 0 \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3)

In addition, let

$$\varphi_j(y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x); x) = 0 \quad j_1 = 1, \ldots, m_1 < n,$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.4)

be a set of $m_1 < n$ point-wise equality constraints on $y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x)$ and

$$\int^{x_F}_{x_0} \psi_{j_2}(y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x); y_1'(x), y_2'(x), \ldots, y_n'(x); x) = C_{j_2} \quad j_2 = 1, \ldots, m_2.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

be a set of $m_2$ integral equality constraints on $y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x)$. Then, every set of $n$ functions $y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x)$ which maximize (A.2), subject to the constraints (A.4, A.5) must satisfy the EL equations,

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_i'} \right) - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_i} = 0 \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

where

$$\Phi = F - \sum_{j_1=1}^{m_1} \lambda_{j_1}(x) \varphi_{j_1} - \sum_{j_2=1}^{m_2} \mu_{j_2} \psi_{j_2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.7)

The unknown functions $\lambda_{j_1}(x)$ and constants $\mu_{j_2}$ are called the Lagrange multipliers. The differential equations in (A.6) are necessary conditions for a maximum, provided that all the quantities on the left hand side of (A.6) exist and are continuous.

Hence, the set of $y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x)$ which maximize (A.2) subject to the constraints (A.4, A.5), is to be determined, together with unknown Lagrange multipliers, from (A.4,A.5,A.6).

This derivation may also be extended to a higher dimensional case, $x, y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,
as appears in Korn and Korn (2000). In this case the EL equations are

$$\sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_{i,k}} \right) - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_i} = 0 \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

(A.8)

where \( y_{i,k} \equiv \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_k} \) and \( \Phi \) follows the same definition as in (A.7), with

$$\int \Psi_{j_2}(y_1(x), y_2(x), \ldots, y_n(x); y_{1,1}(x), y_{1,2}(x), \ldots, y_{1,d}(x), \ldots, y_{n,1}(x), y_{n,2}(x), \ldots, y_{n,d}(x); x) = C_{j_2} \quad j_2 = 1, \ldots, m_2.$$ 

Therefore, the Lagrangian \( \Phi \) for our optimization problem (A.1) is

$$\Phi = \sum_k a_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) - \mu \left( \sum_k b_k(\vec{z}) D_k(\vec{z}) + E^2 \right) - \lambda_k(\vec{z}) \left( e_k^2(\vec{z}) - D_k(\vec{z}) \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \lambda_k(\vec{z}) \left( e_k^2(\vec{z}) + D_{k+1}(\vec{z}) - D_k(\vec{z}) \right) - \lambda_0(\vec{z}) \left( D_1(\vec{z}) + e_0^2(\vec{z}) - 1 \right).$$

(A.9)

The necessary conditions for the minimizers of (A.1) are that the original constraints are met with equality, and additionally

1. \( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial D_k(\vec{z})} = a_k(\vec{z}) - \mu b_k(\vec{z}) + \lambda_k(\vec{z}) - \lambda_{k-1}(\vec{z}) = 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq K, \; \vec{z} \in Q K \)
2. \( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial e_k(\vec{z})} = 2e_k(\vec{z}) \lambda_k(\vec{z}) = 0 \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq K, \; \vec{z} \in Q \)
3. \( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial E} = 2\mu E = 0 \)

It is interesting to notice that these condition are exactly the KKT conditions for the discrete optimization case, where \( \vec{z} \) is over a finite grid. Specifically, the first condition corresponds to the derivatives of the Lagrangian, while conditions (2), (3), are equivalent to the complementary slackness property.
Proof of Lemma 2.2

Assume that for some \( \vec{z} \in Q \) and index \( j \) we have that \( 0 < D_j(\vec{z}) < 1 \). Then it is easy to see that out of the \( K + 1 \) constraints implied by conditions (2.11)–(2.13), at least two will require \( \lambda_i = 0 \) to hold: for example, if \( 0 < D_1(\vec{z}) < 1 \) and \( D_2(\vec{z}) = \ldots = D_K(\vec{z}) = 0 \), we will have that \( \lambda_1(\vec{z}) = \lambda_2(\vec{z}) = 0 \) to maintain complementary slackness.

Assume wlog that \( \lambda_l(\vec{z}) = \lambda_j(\vec{z}) = 0 \) for some \( l < j \). Now we can sum the equations between \( l \) and \( j - 1 \) in the stationarity condition (2.9):

\[
\sum_{i=l}^{j-1} \left[ a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) - \lambda_i(\vec{z}) + \lambda_{i+1}(\vec{z}) \right] = \sum_{i=l}^{j-1} [a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{u})] = 0,
\]

where all the \( \lambda \) terms have cancelled out due to the telescopic nature of the sum, and \( \lambda_l = \lambda_j = 0 \).

Hence we have concluded that having any non-binary value in the optimal solution \( \vec{D}^*(\vec{z}) \) implies

\[
\sum_{i=l}^{j-1} \{a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z})\} = 0,
\]

which has probability zero since, by our assumption for the two group model, \( \sum_{i=l}^{j-1} \left\{ a_i(\vec{Z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{Z}) \right\} \) is a continuous random variable.
Derivation of dual to Problem (2.8) and proof of Lemma 2.3

The result in Lemma 2.3 relies on explicit derivation of the dual to the infinite linear program (2.8) (see Anderson and Nash (1987) for details on derivation of dual to infinite linear programs):

$$\min_{\mu, \lambda} \alpha \mu + \int_Q \lambda_1(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}$$

(A.10)

s.t.

$$a_k(\vec{z}) - \mu b_k(\vec{z}) + \lambda_{k+1}(\vec{z}) - \lambda_k(\vec{z}) \leq 0, \forall k, \vec{z}$$

$$\lambda_k(\vec{z}) \geq 0, \forall k, \vec{z}; \mu \geq 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3: Feasibility of dual solution holds by construction: $\mu, \lambda$ are non-negative Lagrange multipliers by definition, and the EL conditions require that

$$a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu^* b_i(\vec{z}) - \lambda_i^*(\vec{z}) + \lambda_{i+1}^*(\vec{z}) = 0, \forall i, \vec{z}.$$

To calculate the dual objective, we explicitly derive the value of $\lambda_1^*(\vec{z})$ as a function of the other variables. If $D_K^*(\vec{z}) = 1$, then $\lambda_{K+1}^*(\vec{z}) = 0$ and it is easy to see from (2.9)–(2.13) that $\lambda_1^*(\vec{z})$ is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K} (a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu^* b_i(\vec{z})).$$

Similarly, if $D_{j-1}^*(\vec{z}) - D_j^*(\vec{z}) = 1$ for $j \in \{2, \ldots, K-1\}$, then $\lambda_j^*(\vec{z}) = 0$ and $\lambda_1^*(\vec{z})$ is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu^* b_i(\vec{z})).$$

It thus follows that

$$\lambda_1^*(\vec{z}) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} D_j^*(\vec{z}) (a_j(\vec{z}) - \mu^* b_j(\vec{z})).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_Q \lambda_1^*(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} = \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^{K} a_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z} - \mu^* \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^{K} b_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) .$$
Therefore the dual objective is equal to the primal objective:

\[
\sum_{L=0}^{K-1} \mu^* \alpha + \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^K a_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z} - \mu^* \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^K b_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z} \\
= \mu^* \left\{ \alpha - \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^K b_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z} \right\} + \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^K a_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z} \\
= \int_Q \left( \sum_{j=1}^K a_j(\vec{z}) D_j^*(\vec{z}) \right) d\vec{z},
\]

where we have used the complementary slackness condition for the \( \mu^* \) in the last equality.

**Proof of Lemma 2.4**

Let \( S \) be the set of \( K! \) permutations of the vector of indices \((1, \ldots, K)\), and let \( Q_\vec{s} \subset \mathbb{R}^K \) be the “quadrant” where locFDR scores are ordered according to \( \vec{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_K) \in S \):

\[
Q_\vec{s} = \{ \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K : T(z_{s_1}) \leq \ldots \leq T(z_{s_K}) \}.
\]

For the identity order \( Q = Q_{1, \ldots, K} \), we proved in Lemma 2.3 that the infinite linear program Eq. (2.8), which assumes the decision rule is symmetric, has zero duality gap. Let \( \vec{D}^* \) denote the optimal policy and \( f_Q^* \) the corresponding optimal value of the objective in Eq. (2.8). We shall now show that this is the optimal solution also to the infinite linear program that does not restrict the decision rule to be symmetric.
Our optimization problem is

\[ f^* = \max_{\vec{D}: K \rightarrow [0, 1]^K} \sum_{\vec{s} \in S} \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \]

\[ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{\vec{s} \in S} \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \leq \alpha \]

\[ D_{s_1}(\vec{z}) \geq D_{s_2}(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_{s_K}(\vec{z}), \forall \vec{z} \in Q_{\vec{s}}, \vec{s} \in S. \]

Consider the Lagrangian

\[ L(\vec{D}, \mu) = \sum_{\vec{s} \in S} \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} + \mu \left( \alpha - \sum_{\vec{s} \in S} \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{\vec{s} \in S} \left\{ \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} + \mu \left( \frac{\alpha}{K!} - \int_{Q_{\vec{s}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \right) \right\} \]

The following optimization problem, which integrates the integral constraint into the objective, will have a solution \( q(\mu) \geq f^* \) for any \( \mu > 0 \):

\[ q(\mu) = \max_{\vec{D}: K \rightarrow [0, 1]^K} L(\vec{D}, \mu) \]

\[ \text{s.t.} \quad D_{s_1}(\vec{z}) \geq D_{s_2}(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_{s_K}(\vec{z}), \forall \vec{z} \in Q_{\vec{s}}, \vec{s} \in S. \]
Since expression (A.12) shows that problem (A.13) is separable, it can be written as follows:

$$q(\mu) = \sum_{\vec{s} \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{\vec{D}(\vec{z}) \in [0,1]^K} \left\{ \int_{Q_\vec{z}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} + \mu(\alpha K! - \int_{Q_\vec{z}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}) \right\} \right. $$

$$D_{s_1}(\vec{z}) \geq D_{s_2}(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_{s_K}(\vec{z})$$
$$\forall \vec{z} \in Q_\vec{z}$$

$$= K! \max_{\vec{D}(\vec{z}) \in [0,1]^K, \vec{D} \text{ symmetric}} \left\{ \int_{Q} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) a_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} + \mu(\alpha K! - \int_{Q} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(\vec{z}) d\vec{z}) \right\} \right. $$

$$D_1(\vec{z}) \geq D_2(\vec{z}) \geq \ldots \geq D_K(\vec{z})$$
$$\forall \vec{z} \in Q$$

(A.14)

where the last equality in (A.14) follows since the $K!$ maximization problems have identical solutions by the symmetry of the problem. Let $\vec{D}^\mu$ be the (necessarily symmetric) optimal policy for problem (A.13) with solution $q(\mu) = L(\vec{D}^\mu, \mu)$. Then $\min_{\mu > 0} q(\mu) \geq f^*$. The inequality is in fact an equality by the following argument. First, we note that the symmetric policy $\vec{D}^*$ achieves the value $f^*_Q$ for the objective function in (A.11), so necessarily $f^*_Q \leq f^*$. However, from (A.14) and the zero duality gap in Lemma (2.3), it follows that $\min_{\mu > 0} q(\mu) = f^*_Q$, so $\vec{D}^*$ is the policy that attains a value at least as large as $f^*$. Therefore, it follows that $f^*_Q = f^*$ and that $\vec{D}^*$ is the optimal policy for the general problem (A.11), thus proving that the optimal policy is one with a symmetric decision rule.
B Derivation of the expression for $FDR(\vec{D})$ in (2.5)

The false discovery proportion (FDP) is linear in $\vec{D}$ for decision functions that are weakly monotone in the likelihood ratio\(^1\):

$$FDP = D_1(\vec{z})(1 - h_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i-1}(1 - h_i)}{i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i-1}(1 - h_i)}{i-1} \right).$$

Recall that for the two group model, the joint density of $(\vec{z}, \vec{h})$ can be expressed in terms of the locFDR values and $P(\vec{z})$:

$$\Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{(1 - \pi)f(z_i)\}^{(1-h_i)}\{\pi g(z_i)\}^{h_i} = P(\vec{z})\Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{T(z_i)\}^{(1-h_i)}\{1 - T(z_i)\}^{h_i}.$$ 

Therefore, $FDR(\vec{D}) = \mathbb{E} \left( FDP(\vec{D}) \right)$ is equal to

$$K! \int_{Q} P(\vec{z}) \left\{ D_1(\vec{z})T(z_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) \left[ \sum_{\vec{h}} \Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{T(z_i)\}^{(1-h_i)}\{1 - T(z_i)\}^{h_i} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i-1}(1 - h_i)}{i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i-1}(1 - h_i)}{i-1} \right) \right] \right\} d\vec{z}.$$

We can simplify the expression in the square bracket using the following notation,

$$P_{i-1}^{(m)} = \{\vec{h} \in \{0, 1\}^{i-1} : \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - h_j) = m\}, \ m = 0, \ldots, i - 1,$$

---

\(^1\)This was first observed in Rosset et al. 2018, for decision functions that are weakly monotone in the $p$-values, see their § S2.
as follows:

\[
\sum_{\vec{h}} \prod_{l=1}^{K} \{T(z_l)\}^{1-h_l}\{1 - T(z_l)\}^{h_l} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} (1 - h_l)}{i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} (1 - h_l)}{i-1} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\vec{h}} \prod_{l=1}^{K} \{T(z_l)\}^{1-h_l}\{1 - T(z_l)\}^{h_l} \left( \frac{1 - h_l}{i} - \frac{1}{i(i-1)} \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} (1 - h_l) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=0}^{i-1} \sum_{(h_1,\ldots,h_{i-1}) \in P_{i-1}} \prod_{l=1}^{i} \{T(z_l)\}^{1-h_l}\{1 - T(z_l)\}^{h_l} \left( \frac{T(z_i)}{i} - \frac{1}{i(i-1)} \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} (1 - h_l) \right)
\]

We can simplify this expression further by using Bernoulli calculations to notice that:

\[
\sum_{m=0}^{i-1} \sum_{\vec{h} \in P_{i-1}} \prod_{l=1}^{i} \{1 - T(z_l)\}^{h_l} T(z_l)^{1-h_l} = 1
\]

\[
\sum_{m=0}^{i-1} \sum_{\vec{h} \in P_{i-1}} \prod_{l=1}^{i} \{1 - T(z_l)\}^{1-h_l} T(z_l)^{1-h_l} = \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \frac{T(z_i)}{i} = \tilde{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z}),
\]

where we use \(\tilde{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z})\) in the obvious way to denote the average of the first \(i - 1\) locFDR scores. This yields:

\[
\text{FDR}(\vec{D}) = K! \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \left\{ D_1(\vec{z}) T(z_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) \frac{1}{i} (T(z_i) - \tilde{T}_{i-1}(\vec{z})) \right\} d\vec{z}.
\]

C An alternative proof of the rejection policy for OMT with mFDR control

We shall show that the solution to the optimization problem of finding the optimal decision rule with the expected number of true rejections as the objective and the mFDR at most level \(\alpha\) as
the constraint, coincides with the rule of Cai and Sun (2017) for the two group model. This is an alternative proof to the proof presented in Cai and Sun (2017) about the optimality of the rule that thresholds the locFDR using a fixed cut-off.

The constraint \( mFDR \leq \alpha \) is equivalent to 
\[
\mathbb{E}[V(\vec{D})] - \mathbb{E}(R(\vec{D})) \alpha \leq 0,
\]
where 
\[
\mathbb{E}[V(\vec{D})] - \alpha \mathbb{E}(R(\vec{D})) = \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{K} (1 - h_i)D_i) - \alpha \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i) = \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{K} ((1 - h_i) - \alpha)D_i).
\]

\[
\mathbb{E}[V(\vec{D})] - \alpha \mathbb{E}(R(\vec{D})) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) \left[ \sum_{h} \Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{T(z_i)\}^{(1 - h_i)}\{1 - T(z_i)\}^{h_i} ((1 - h_i) - \alpha) \right] d\vec{z}
\]
\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) [(1 - \alpha) - (1 - T(z_i))] d\vec{z},
\]

(C.1)

where the last equality follows since
\[
\sum_{h} \Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{T(z_i)\}^{(1 - h_i)}\{1 - T(z_i)\}^{h_i} = 1 \text{ and } \sum_{h} \Pi_{i=1}^{K} \{T(z_i)\}^{(1 - h_i)}\{1 - T(z_i)\}^{h_i} h_i = 1 - T(z_i).
\]

Therefore, the linear program for maximizing the objective subject to mFDR control is:

\[
\max_{\vec{D}:\mathbb{R}^K \to [0,1]^K} \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{K} a_i(z_i)D_i(\vec{z}) \right) \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) d\vec{z} \tag{C.2}
\]

s.t. \[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(z_i) d\vec{z} \leq 0.,
\]

where \( b_i = (1 - \alpha) - (1 - T(z_i)) = T(z_i) - \alpha \) and \( a_i = 1 - T(z_i) \).
As in the FDR proof, the EL necessary optimality conditions are:

\begin{align*}
    a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) - \lambda_{i1}(\vec{z}) + \lambda_{i2}(\vec{z}) &= 0, \quad \forall \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K, i = 1, \ldots, K. \quad (C.3) \\
    \mu \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_i(\vec{z}) b_i(z_i) d\vec{z} \right\} &= 0, \quad (C.4) \\
    \lambda_{i1}(\vec{z}) D_i(\vec{z}) &= 0 \quad \forall \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K, i = 1, \ldots, K. \quad (C.5) \\
    \lambda_{i2}(\vec{z}) (D_i(\vec{z}) - 1) &= 0 \quad \forall \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K, i = 1, \ldots, K. \quad (C.6)
\end{align*}

where $\mu, \lambda_{ij}(\vec{z}), i = 1, \ldots, K, j = 1, 2$, $\vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ are non-negative Lagrange multiplies. The solution that satisfies (C.3), (C.5), and (C.6) is guaranteed to be an integer solution, since if $0 < D_i(\vec{z}) < 1$ it follows that $\lambda_{i1}(\vec{z}) = \lambda_{i2}(\vec{z}) = 0$ and therefore that $a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) = 0$. Moreover, following steps similar to the ones in the FDR proof of Lemma 2.3, it can be shown that conditions (C.3)-(C.6) together with primal feasibility are sufficient.

Clearly, given $\mu > 0$, almost surely the rejection policy that satisfies (C.3), (C.5), and (C.6) is

\[ D_{\mu}^i(\vec{z}) = D_{\mu}^i(z_i) = \mathbb{I}\{a_i(\vec{z}) - \mu b_i(\vec{z}) > 0\} = \mathbb{I}\{T(z_i) < \frac{1 + \mu \alpha}{1 + \mu}\}. \]

Therefore, all that remains is to find $\mu$ that satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}^K} \mathbb{P}(\vec{z}) \sum_{i=1}^{K} D_{\mu}^i(\vec{z}) b_i(z_i) d\vec{z} = 0$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}(V(\vec{D}_{\mu})) - \mathbb{E}(R(\vec{D}_{\mu})) \alpha = 0$. 

37