

# Reliable Covariance Estimation

Ilya Soloveychik

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

## Abstract

Covariance or scatter matrix estimation is ubiquitous in most modern statistical and machine learning applications. The task becomes especially challenging since most real-world datasets are essentially non-Gaussian. The data is often contaminated by outliers and/or has heavy-tailed distribution causing the sample covariance to behave very poorly and calling for robust estimation methodology. The natural framework for the robust scatter matrix estimation is based on elliptical populations. Here, Tyler's estimator stands out by being distribution-free within the elliptical family and easy to compute. The existing works thoroughly study the performance of Tyler's estimator assuming ellipticity but without providing any tools to verify this assumption when the covariance is unknown in advance. We address the following open question: Given the sampled data and having no prior on the data generating process, how to assess the quality of the scatter matrix estimator? In this work we show that this question can be reformulated as an asymptotic uniformity test for certain sequences of exchangeable vectors on the unit sphere. We develop a consistent and easily applicable goodness-of-fit test against all alternatives to ellipticity when the scatter matrix is unknown. The findings are supported by numerical simulations demonstrating the power of the suggest technique.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Parameter estimation from the observed data is one of the main focuses of statistics and data science. All models used for parameter inference rely on various assumptions such as independence of the samples, certain parametric families of possible distributions, etc. Very rarely these assumptions are verified on the observed data and even if such attempt is made the data almost never agrees with the assumptions. This leads to a poor estimation, or even to situations when the researcher does not know the quality of the achieved estimate. The main reason for the lack of such tests is the technical complexity of their analysis especially when the data is far from being Gaussian. In this paper, we focus on the covariance matrix estimation in multivariate populations under quite weak assumptions. We suggest a consistent and easy to

apply goodness-of-fit test reliably validating the exploited assumptions and thus quantitatively assessing the quality of the estimator based on the data.

### A. Covariance Estimation

Covariance estimation is a fundamental problem in multivariate statistical analysis. It arises in diverse applications such as signal processing, where knowledge of the covariance matrix is unavoidable in constructing optimal detectors [1], genomics, where it is widely used to measure correlations between gene expression values [2–4], and functional MRI [5]. Most of the modern algorithms analyzing social networks are based on Gaussian graphical models [6], where the independences between the graph nodes are completely determined by the sparsity structure of the inverse covariance matrix [7]. In empirical finance, knowledge of the covariance matrix of stock returns is a fundamental question with implications for portfolio selection and for tests of asset pricing models such as the CAPM [8, 9]. Application of structured covariance matrices instead of Bayesian classifiers based on Gaussian mixture densities or kernel densities proved to be very efficient for many pattern recognition tasks, among them speech recognition, machine translation and object recognition in images [10]. In geometric functional analysis and computational geometry [11], the exact estimation of covariance matrix is necessary to efficiently compute volume of a body in high dimension. The classical problems of clustering and discriminant analysis are entirely based on precise knowledge of covariance matrices of the involved populations [12], etc.

Most practically important covariance matrix estimators are formulated as Maximum Likelihood (ML) solutions making the choice of the parametric model essential. For example, the sample covariance is the ML of the Gaussian population when the number of samples is not less than the dimension of the ambient space. However, in many real world applications the underlying multivariate distribution is non-Gaussian and robust covariance estimation methods are required. This occurs whenever the distribution of the measurements is heavy-tailed or a small proportion of the samples exhibits outlier behavior [13, 14]. Probably the most common extension of the Gaussian family of distributions allowing for the treatment of heavy-tailed populations is the class of elliptically shaped distributions [15]. Elliptical populations served as the basis for defining a family of the so-called scatter matrix  $M$ -estimators [14], of which we focus on Tyler’s estimator [16, 17]. Given  $n$  samples  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , Tyler’s scatter matrix

estimator is defined as a solution to the fixed point equation

$$\mathbf{T} = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top}{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i}, \quad (1)$$

satisfying some scaling constraint to avoid the apparent ambiguity (for a solution  $\mathbf{T}$  to (1),  $c \cdot \mathbf{T}$  is also a solution whenever  $c > 0$ ), e.g.  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}) = p$ . Note that in elliptical populations the scatter matrix is equal to a positive multiple of the covariance matrix when the latter exists. This scaling factor is unimportant in most applications therefore we focus on the scatter matrix estimation instead of the covariance without loss of generality.

When  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) elliptical [15], their true scatter matrix  $\Omega$  is positive definite and  $n > p$ , Tyler's estimator exists with probability one and is a consistent estimator of  $\Omega$ . In [16] Tyler also demonstrated that his estimator can be viewed as an ML estimator of a certain distribution over a unit sphere.

The behavior of Tyler's estimator had been thoroughly investigated in various asymptotic regimes and multiple high-probability performance bounds have been developed for its analysis [18–28]. However, all of these results only hold if the samples are elliptically distributed, which is never known in applications. Therefore a much more practical question can be formulated as follows: Given the data, verify that Tyler's estimator indeed provides a reliable estimator of the scatter matrix. This is the question we address in our work.

## B. Approach

In this article, we develop an asymptotically consistent goodness-of-fit test against all alternatives to the ellipticity of the samples when the scatter matrix is unknown. To enable analytical treatment of this hypothesis test, we reformulate it as an asymptotic uniformity test for a certain stochastically dependent sequence of unit random vectors. The main tool used in the construction and analysis of the uniformity tests for i.i.d. scenario is the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) [29–31] which is clearly not applicable when the measurements are not independent. For our setup, we develop a novel toolbox that allows verification of the null hypothesis by resorting to the concept of *exchangeability*.

A sequence of variables is called *exchangeable* if the joint distribution of any finite subset of these variables is invariant under arbitrary permutations of their indices. Exchangeable random variables were first introduced by de Finetti [32, 33] as a direct and natural generalization of i.i.d. sequences. Interestingly, exchangeable random variables serve as one of the fundamental

building blocks of the Bayesian statistics [34]. Unlike the i.i.d. case, the behavior of exchangeable sequences is much harder to analyze. We exploit certain versions of CLT and the Strong Law of Large Numbers (SLLN) for exchangeable variables to demonstrate asymptotic consistency of our test statistics built analogously to the generalized Ajne and Giné statistics [29, 30, 35] developed for the i.i.d. case.<sup>1</sup>

Our view on the problem at hand makes this article significantly different from the related body of literature proposing ellipticity hypothesis testing (see [37] for a summary of the existing techniques). Following Tyler, our approach becomes essentially *distribution-free* within the elliptical family since we do not focus on estimating the radial density function [37]. We offer a test which is consistent against *all* alternatives to elliptical symmetry and not only certain classes of densities [37–39]. We do not use the sample covariance matrix as a plug-in estimator in particular because its convergence to the true covariance in elliptical populations maybe very slow due to heavy tails [38], however, we emphasize that our technique *allows* the use of the sample covariance instead of Tyler’s estimator. Our test is not limited to certain moments which makes it more natural and less computationally demanding [40]. Finally, unlike all previously mentioned works (and all works referenced in [37]) we believe that the methodology based on the *exchangeability* framework is the most suitable for the analysis of populations transformed by plug-in estimators. This type of analysis is usually technically more complex but in our eyes it represents the natural approach to the problem.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the setup and the main notation. The problem is formulated in Section III where we also present some of the existing hypothesis tests for the known scatter case. In Section IV, we reformulate the problem and introduce necessary background on exchangeable variables. Section V provides some additional notation and auxiliary results. In Section VI, we formulate the main result and in Section VII we support it by the numerical experiments. The conclusion is provided in Section VIII. Some of the proofs are postponed to the Appendix.

<sup>1</sup>The Ajne statistic was originally introduced for distributions on a circle [35], the idea was extended by [36] to the 2-dimensional unit sphere and later generalized by [30] for the  $p - 1$ -dimensional spheres. Similarly, Giné’s statistic was originally defined for 1- and 2-dimensional spheres and later extended by [30] to the general dimension.

## II. NOTATION AND SETUP

**Definition 1** ([41]). A vector  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is elliptically distributed with the scatter matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega} \succ 0$  and mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  if there exists a random vector  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$  uniformly distributed over the unit  $p - 1$ -dimensional sphere and an independent random variable  $r \geq 0$ , such that

$$\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + r \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}. \quad (2)$$

For example, if  $r \sim \sqrt{\chi_p^2}$ , then  $\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Omega})$ . In what follows we always assume that the data is centered,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$ . Let us consider the normalized vector,

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{y}\|} = \frac{\mathbf{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}\|}, \quad (3)$$

which can be equivalently viewed as disregarding the information stored in the scalar variable  $r$  but keeping the information provided by the scatter matrix. As we see below, the distribution of  $\mathbf{x}$  contains all the information about the scatter matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$ . We are going to recover the scatter matrix by sampling from the distribution of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{I}_p$  the  $p$ -dimensional identity matrix.

**Definition 2** ([16]). The family of real Angular Central Gaussian (ACG) distributions on  $\mathcal{S}^{p-1}$  is defined by the densities of the form

$$p(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{\Omega}) = \frac{\Gamma(p/2)}{2\pi^{p/2} |\mathbf{\Omega}|^{1/2}} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{x})^{p/2}}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}, \quad (4)$$

for  $\mathbf{\Omega} \succ 0$  which is called the scatter matrix.

When  $\mathbf{x}$  is ACG distributed with the scatter matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$ , we write

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{\Omega}), \quad (5)$$

in particular when  $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{I}$  we get the uniform distribution over the unit sphere  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I})$ . Note that ACG is not a member of the elliptical family but actually belongs to a wider class of *generalized* elliptical populations whose definition is identical to Definition 1 except for weakened assumptions on  $r$  [41]. In generalized elliptical population,  $r$  does not have to be stochastically independent of  $\mathbf{w}$  and does not have to be non-negative. The following result allows us to reduce estimation of the scatter matrices of elliptical populations to the estimation of the scatter matrices of ACG vectors.

**Lemma 1** ([41]). *For a random vector  $\mathbf{y}$  sampled from a centered elliptical population with the scatter matrix  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{x}$  defined in (3) is ACG distributed with the same scatter matrix.*

Now assume  $n > p$  i.i.d. random vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  are sampled from  $\mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ , then as shown in [16] the ML estimator of the scatter matrix exists almost surely and is given by the fixed point equation (1). The solutions to this equation form a ray since the latter is invariant under multiplication of the matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  by a positive constant. To resolve the ambiguity we choose  $\mathbf{T}$  to satisfy  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}) = p$ , however, we note that the specific choice of the scaling does not affect any of the results presented below.

### III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND STATE OF THE ART

#### A. Main Goal

The problem considered in this article can be formulated as follows. Given a sequence of vectors  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  sampled independently, we want to test two alternative hypotheses,

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(\Omega), \text{ for some } \Omega, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_1 : \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\not\sim} \mathcal{U}(\Omega), \text{ for any } \Omega, \quad (7)$$

and in the case of  $\mathcal{H}_0$  we want to estimate the scatter matrix  $\Omega$ , as well.

A remarkable feature of the hypothesis test (6)-(7) is that  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is a composite hypothesis and the scatter matrix under it is unknown. When the scatter matrix is known, the problem can be equivalently reformulated as a uniformity test on the sphere as shown below.

#### B. Uniformity Tests on $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$

Assume the scatter matrix  $\Omega$  in the hypothesis test (6)-(7) is known and introduce a derived i.i.d. sequence,

$$\mathbf{w}_i = \frac{\Omega^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i}{\|\Omega^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (8)$$

Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I})$  and therefore the test (6)-(7) becomes actually a uniformity test on the unit sphere,

$$\mathcal{G}_0 : \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I}), \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_1 : \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\not\sim} \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I}). \quad (10)$$

Next, we summarize two uniformity tests on  $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  concluding this section with Proposition 3 providing a uniformity test consistent against all alternatives. Based on it we will develop an analogous test for (6)-(7) with unknown scatter matrix in the subsequent sections. Denote by

$$V_{p-1} = \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} d\mathbf{x} = \frac{2\pi}{\Gamma\left(\frac{p}{2}\right)} \quad (11)$$

the area of the unit sphere. In addition, by

$$\psi_{ij} = \arccos(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_j) \quad (12)$$

we denote the angular separation (the shortest great circle distance) between  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_j$  and by

$$N(\mathbf{y}) = |\{\mathbf{x}_i \mid \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \geq 0\}|, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}, \quad (13)$$

the number of points falling into the hemisphere with the pole at  $\mathbf{y}$ . Denote also

$$\alpha = \frac{p}{2} - 1, \quad (14)$$

$$\nu(a, b) = \binom{a+b-2}{a-1} + \binom{a+b-1}{a-1}. \quad (15)$$

The following two popular statistics and detailed investigation of their behavior can be found in [29, 35]. These results were later generalized in [30] and summarized in [31].

**Proposition 1** (Generalized Ajne Test, [30, 35]). *Under the uniformity hypothesis, the Ajne statistic*

$$t_A = \frac{1}{nV_{p-1}} \int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \left(N(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{n}{2}\right)^2 d\mathbf{y} = \frac{n}{4} - \frac{1}{\pi n} \sum_{i < j} \psi_{ij} \quad (16)$$

is asymptotically distributed as  $\mathcal{L}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} a_{2q-1}^2 K_{\nu(p-1, 2q-1)}\right)$ , where  $K_\xi$  are independent random variables distributed as  $\chi_\xi^2$  and

$$a_{2q-1} = \frac{(-1)^{q-1} 2^{p-2} \Gamma(\alpha+1) \Gamma(q+\alpha) (2q-2)}{\pi (q-1)! (2q+p-3)!}. \quad (17)$$

**Proposition 2** (Generalized Giné Test, [29, 30]). *Under the uniformity hypothesis, the Giné statistic*

$$t_G = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2n} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}\right)^2 \sum_{i < j} \sin(\psi_{ij}) \quad (18)$$

is asymptotically distributed as  $\mathcal{L}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} a_{2q}^2 K_{\nu(p-1, 2q)}\right)$ , where  $K_\xi$  are independent random variables distributed as  $\chi_\xi^2$  and

$$a_{2q}^2 = \frac{(p-1)(2q-1)}{8\pi(2q+p-1)} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(q - \frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(q + \alpha + \frac{1}{2}\right)}\right)^2. \quad (19)$$

The following statement provides a concise and directly applicable test for uniformity under the assumption that the random vectors are sampled i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I})$ .

**Proposition 3** (Uniformity test, [29, 30]). *Any weighted sum of  $t_A$  and  $t_G$  is consistent against all alternatives to uniformity on  $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ .*

In practice, one way to make the decision about accepting or rejecting  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is as follows. The statistician truncates the series mentioned in the last two propositions in a data-driven manner and compares the sample values of  $t_A$  and  $t_G$  with the tables (or explicit numerical approximations) of the corresponding distributions. Another more general approach consists in replacing  $t_A$  and  $t_G$  by statistics whose expansions only have finite number of non-zero coefficients  $a_k$  (see [29] for more details). An efficient data-driven approach to the design of the uniformity tests based on a modification of the Bayesian Information Criterion was developed by [42].

In this paper we are interested in the case of unknown scatter matrix in (6)-(7). As we see below this makes the hypothesis test much more involved. In the next sections we develop analogs of generalized Ajne and Giné uniformity tests for this scenario.

#### IV. PROBLEM REFORMULATION AND EXCHANGEABILITY

##### A. Methodology

From Theorem 3.1 from [17] we know that under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  Tyler's estimator converges almost surely to the true scatter matrix when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This idea motivated our study of a new sequence of vectors, defined as follows. Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  introduced in (6), we now consider the sequence

$$\mathbf{t}_i = \frac{\mathbf{T}^{-1/2}\mathbf{x}_i}{\|\mathbf{T}^{-1/2}\mathbf{x}_i\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}$  is defined in (1). The main challenge we face in the study of  $\{\mathbf{t}_i\}$  is the lack of stochastic independence unlike the case of  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}$  defined in (8). Indeed, most existing convergence results explicitly rely on independence in their derivations in such a way that any deviation from this assumption ruins the performance analysis. For example, all the results of Ajne, Giné, and Prentice utilize the CLT and thus require independence as the most crucial assumption [29–31, 35].

Next we include a brief summary of the exchangeability concept and the related toolbox. We then use it in Section V to overcome the loss of independence in our analysis of the consistency of  $\{\mathbf{t}_i\}$  and their statistics.



## B. Exchangeable Random Variables

**Definition 3.** Given a sequence  $\{X_i\}$  (finite or infinite) of random variables, we say that it is exchangeable if the joint distribution of any finite subset of variables is invariant under arbitrary permutations of their indices.

In other words, exchangeability is our indifference to the order of the measurements. This is clearly a much weaker hypothesis than independence, as any i.i.d. sequence is obviously exchangeable. In his seminal works de Finetti [32, 33] demonstrated that in certain sense every (infinite) exchangeable sequence can be represented as a composition of sequences of i.i.d. variables. This result can be viewed as the analog of Fourier decomposition in analysis, as it allows one to represent a *more complicated* exchangeable sequence as a superposition of basic building blocks - independent sequences - objects much easier accessible for analysis and reasoning.

De Finetti [32, 33] and some of his followers focused on infinite exchangeable sequences. There exist, however, finite sets of exchangeable random variables which cannot be embedded into infinite sequences, these are called *finitely exchangeable* or *non-extendable*. The analysis of extendable sequences can be reduced to the analysis of infinite sequences. On the other hand, the non-extendable sequences require quite different approaches [43]. Our sequence of samples  $\{\mathbf{t}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is an example of a non-extendable exchangeable sequence of random vectors. Indeed, their order obviously does not matter since  $\mathbf{T}$  is not affected by permutations of the measurements  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . We can also see that this sequence is non-extendable, since addition of new random vectors  $\mathbf{x}_j$  without an amendment of  $\mathbf{T}$  will turn the sequence into non-exchangeable. For a detailed study of non-extendability we refer the reader to [43] and references therein.

The main result of our paper can be briefly summarized as follows. We demonstrate that the limiting behavior of the samples  $\{\mathbf{t}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is in certain sense analogous to the behavior of the vectors uniformly distributed over the unit sphere and therefore, we can apply similar tools for the hypothesis tests. Below we show how to overcome the technical challenges on this way.

## C. Limit Theorems for Exchangeable Variables

To illustrate the previous section and better describe the nature of the exchangeability phenomenon and its relation to the stochastic independence, in this section we present analogs of the SLLN and CLT for triangular arrays of exchangeable variables.

**Lemma 2** (Strong Law of Large Numbers for Exchangeable Arrays). *Let  $\{X_{ni}\}_{n,i=1}^{\infty,n}$  be a triangular array of row-wise exchangeable random variables and  $\{X_{\infty i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of exchangeable random variables of bounded second moment such that*

- 1)  $X_{n1} \xrightarrow{a.s.} X_{\infty 1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$
- 2)  $\text{var}(X_{n1} - X_{\infty 1}) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$
- 3)  $\mathbb{E}[X_{n1}X_{n2}] \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$

Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* The proof can be found in the Appendix. □

Let  $k_n < n$  be two sequences of natural numbers such that

$$\frac{k_n}{n} \rightarrow \gamma \in [0, 1). \quad (22)$$

**Lemma 3** (Central Limit Theorem for Exchangeable Arrays, Theorem 2 from [44]<sup>2</sup>). *Let  $\{X_{ni}\}_{n,i=1}^{\infty,n}$  be a triangular array of row-wise exchangeable random variables such that*

- 1)  $\mathbb{E}[X_{n1}X_{n2}] \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$
- 2)  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{|X_{ni}|}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \forall n,$
- 3)  $\frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni}^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$

Then

$$\sqrt{k_n} \left[ \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni} \right] \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N}(0, 1 - \gamma), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (23)$$

As mentioned earlier this result provides an analog of the CLT for exchangeable sequences. However, it is important to stress its distinction from the classical CLT-type claims for the i.i.d. variables. Indeed, Lemma 3 only allows us to consider a subset of the sample of cardinality  $k_n$  smaller than the number of variables  $n$  in the row so that even their ratio must not approach one. This is a reflection of the essential difference between non-extendable exchangeable sequences and their extendable counterparts that include i.i.d. sequences as a particular case [43].

<sup>2</sup>To simplify the notation we assume the number of the elements in the  $n$ -th row to be  $n$  unlike the seemingly more general case of  $m_n$  variables considered in [44].

## V. ADDITIONAL NOTATION AND AUXILIARY RESULTS

Assume that an infinite i.i.d. sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is sampled under the composite  $\mathcal{H}_0$  with the true scatter matrix is unknown. For every  $n > p$ , let the sequence of corresponding Tyler's estimators be

$$\mathbf{T}_n = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top}{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{T}_n^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i}, \quad n = p+1, \dots, \quad (24)$$

which exist almost surely for a random sample [45, 46]. Consider a triangular array of row-wise exchangeable random vectors

$$\mathbf{t}_{ni} = \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i \right\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad n = p+1, \dots \quad (25)$$

Note that by Definition 1, the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  can equivalently be defined as follows. Given a sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{I}_p)$  of uniform i.i.d. random vectors, we look at their transforms

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i}{\left\| \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|}, \quad (26)$$

for some fixed but unknown  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \succ 0$ . Define also an auxiliary sequence

$$\mathbf{t}_{\infty i} = \mathbf{w}_i. \quad (27)$$

**Lemma 4.** *With the notation introduced above,*

$$\mathbf{t}_{ni} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{t}_{\infty i}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (28)$$

*Proof.* The proof can be found in the Appendix.  $\square$

We are now interested in the empirical distributions of the rows of the obtained triangular array, which are the finite sets  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}_{i=1}^n$  for every fixed  $n > p$ . The following CLT-type result holds in our scenario.

**Proposition 4.** *For the triangular array of vectors  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}_{n=p+1, i=1}^{\infty, n}$  defined above,*

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{t}_{ni} \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (29)$$

*Proof.* The proof can be found in the Appendix.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , for any differentiable function  $f: \mathbb{S}^{p-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{t}_{ni}) \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N}(0, \|\nabla f(0)\|^2), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* The proof follows the i.i.d. case verbatim using the Maclaurin expansion of  $f$ .  $\square$

## VI. ASYMPTOTIC UNIFORMITY TESTS FOR EXCHANGEABLE VECTORS

In Section III-B we introduced statistics  $t_A$  and  $t_G$  to test the null hypothesis of uniformity for independent samples over the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ . Our next statements constitute analogs of those result for the row-wise exchangeable array  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}_{n=p+1, i=1}^{\infty, n}$ . Denote

$$\psi_{n,ij} = \arccos(\mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{t}_{nj}). \quad (31)$$

**Proposition 5** (Generalized Ajne Test for  $\mathbf{t}_{ni}$ ). *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the Ajne statistic*

$$t_A(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}) = \frac{n}{4} - \frac{1}{\pi n} \sum_{i < j} \psi_{n,ij} \quad (32)$$

is asymptotically distributed as  $\mathcal{L}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} a_{2q-1}^2 K_{\nu(p-1, 2q-1)}\right)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $K_\xi$  are independent random variables distributed as  $\chi_\xi^2$  and

$$a_{2q-1} = \frac{(-1)^{q-1} 2^{p-2} \Gamma(\alpha+1) \Gamma(q+\alpha) (2q-2)}{\pi (q-1)! (2q+p-3)!}. \quad (33)$$

*Proof.* The proof follows [29] and [30] verbatim using Corollary 1.  $\square$

**Proposition 6** (Generalized Giné Test for  $\bar{\mathbf{t}}_{nk}$ ). *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the Giné statistic*

$$t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}) = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2n} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sum_{i < j} \sin(\psi_{n,ij}) \quad (34)$$

is asymptotically first-order stochastically dominated by the random variable distributed as  $\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} a_{2q}^2 K_{\nu(p-1, 2q)}$ , where  $K_\xi$  are independent random variables distributed as  $\chi_\xi^2$  and

$$a_{2q}^2 = \frac{(p-1)(2q-1)}{8\pi(2q+p-1)} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(q - \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(q + \alpha + \frac{1}{2})} \right)^2, \quad (35)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})] - \mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})] \sim \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* The proof can be found in the Appendix.  $\square$

It is important to emphasize the main difference between Propositions 2 and 6. Indeed, in the former the asymptotic distribution is given by a sum of scaled  $\chi^2$ -variables, while in the second one the limiting distribution is first-order stochastically dominated by the same distribution and is in fact significantly *thinner*. This discrepancy is due to the fact that  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$  are dependent in such a special way that their sample covariance matrix is exactly  $\mathbf{I}$ . For more details and the exact explanation we refer the readers to the proof of Proposition 6 given below.

**Theorem 1** (Uniformity Test for  $\mathbf{t}_{ni}$ ). *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , any weighted sum of  $t_A(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  and  $t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  is consistent against all alternatives to the asymptotic uniformity of  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$  on  $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows [29] and [30] verbatim using Propositions 5 and 6.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *It is also important to emphasize that an asymptotic bound to the power of the uniformity test suggested by Theorem 1 against any alternative can be easily constructed using the asymptotic normality of the scaled deviations of the Ajne and Giné statistics as shown in Section 4 of [29]. These derivations are also valid in our case, and therefore we omit them due to the lack of space.*

## VII. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we investigate the behavior and advantages of the criterion proposed in Theorem 1 through numerical simulations.

### A. Distributions of the Statistics under the Null Hypotheses

In the first experiment, we compared the empirical distributions of  $t_A(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  and  $t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  with their counterparts  $t_A(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})$  and  $t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})$  for the independent samples playing the role of the benchmarks. In this simulation we took the true scatter matrix to be the identity  $\Omega = \mathbf{I}$ . Figure 1 demonstrates the anticipated in Section VI difference in the behavior of the Ajne and Giné statistics. More specifically, as claimed in Proposition 6 and discussed in detail in its proof, the statistic  $t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  is first-order stochastically dominated by  $t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})$  due to the difference in the behavior of the quadratic term in the expansion of the statistic (76) caused by dependencies among  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$ . This is in contrast to the Ajne statistic whose distributions in both cases coincide since a similar expansion into Gegenbauer polynomials involves odd degree polynomials only (for more details see the proof of Proposition 6). Note also that the theoretically predicted by Theorem 1 difference between the expected values for  $p = 8$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})] - \mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})] \sim \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \approx 0.133 \quad (37)$$

is confirmed by the numerical simulation yielding the value of 0.131.




Fig. 1: Comparison of the empirical distributions of the Ajne and Giné test statistics computed for the sequences  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$  defined in Section V with the true scatter matrix being  $\mathbf{I}$ .

### B. Criterion Performance for Alternatives

Following Theorem 1, to demonstrate the power of the suggested methodology in our second experiment we compared the empirical distributions of the statistics

$$s(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}) = t_A(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}) + t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}), \quad s(\{\mathbf{w}_i\}) = t_A(\{\mathbf{w}_i\}) + t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\}) \quad (38)$$

under the null hypotheses  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_0$  versus their distributions under specific non-elliptical alternatives  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$ . The alternatives were constructed as follows. We generated the uniform sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}$  as before, added a constant offset to all the obtained vectors and re-normalized them,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i = \frac{\mathbf{w}_i + \mathbf{a}}{\|\mathbf{w}_i + \mathbf{a}\|}. \quad (39)$$

Note that the distributions of  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i$  and of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  constructed from it via (26)

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i}{\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i\|}, \quad (40)$$




Fig. 2: Comparison of the 0.95-confidence bands for  $\mathcal{H}_0$  versus  $\mathcal{H}_1$  designed in section VII-B for the i.i.d.  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}$  samples and their exchangeable  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$  counterparts.

are not ACG and therefore our test should be able to discriminate between the hypotheses. In this experiment we chose  $p = 5$ ,  $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{I}$  and

$$\mathbf{a} = 0.05 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

Figure 2 demonstrates the 0.95-confidence bands for the distributions of the statistics  $s(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$  and  $s(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})$  as functions of the number of measurements  $n$  in the sample. We see from the graph that despite the small size of  $\mathbf{a}$ , already with  $n = 15$  measurements the criterion allows us to easily discriminate between the hypotheses and its power is similar for both the i.i.d. (known scatter matrix) and Tyler's (unknown scatter matrix) cases.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

A very common question arising in almost any multi-dimensional statistical application can be briefly formulated as: Is the empirically estimated covariance (scatter) matrix close to the true covariance of the population? This natural question has been addressed by numerous publications since the very inception of statistical science. However, all the existing performance bounds clearly rely on numerous assumptions such as normality or any other parametric family of

distributions which do not verify in real-world data and are rarely even checked in practice mostly due to the complexity of such tests. In this article, we focus on the family of elliptical distributions leading to ubiquitous robust scatter M-estimators and specifically on the distribution-free within this family Tyler's estimator. Given the data and making no assumptions on the unknown scatter matrix, we develop a hypothesis test consistent against all alternatives to the ellipticity assumption. On the way to this result we also introduce a novel general framework based on the theory of exchangeable random variables for the analysis of such non-Gaussian cases that can be applied much broadly than covariance estimation.

## APPENDIX

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Our proof is based on an analogous result in [47]. Both Lemmas 1 and 2 from [47] can be easily restated for our setup after replacing the Banach space  $E$  by  $\mathbb{R}$  and linear functionals by scalar multiplication. In addition, note that our condition 1) immediately implies requirement (2.5) from [47]. Now, the reasoning from the proof of Theorem 1 from [47] applies verbatim.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* As shown in Theorem 3.1 from [17],

$$\mathbf{T}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \succ 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (42)$$

therefore, starting from some  $n_0$ ,  $\mathbf{T}_n$  is almost surely invertible for  $n \geq n_0$  and

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{I}_p, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (43)$$

Now the claim follows from the definition of the sequence  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}_n$ ,

$$\mathbf{t}_{ni} = \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i \right\|} = \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{w}_i, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (44)$$

$\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* As above, we can equivalently rewrite  $\mathbf{t}_{ni}$  as

$$\mathbf{t}_{ni} = \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad n = p + 1, \dots, \quad (45)$$

which is just a useful representation as clearly  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  is not revealed to the researcher. Fix a vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  of unit norm  $\|\mathbf{a}\| = 1$  and consider the following triangular array of row-wise exchangeable random variables

$$X_{ni} = \sqrt{p} \cdot \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{t}_{ni}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad n = p + 1, \dots \quad (46)$$



Let us study the properties of  $\{X_{ni}\}_{n=p+1, i=1}^{\infty, n}$ . First, consider

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{n1}X_{n2}] = p \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{t}_{n1}\mathbf{t}_{n2}^\top] \mathbf{a}, \quad (47)$$

Lemma 4 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{t}_{n1}\mathbf{t}_{n2}^\top] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}_1\mathbf{w}_2^\top] = 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (48)$$

therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{n1}X_{n2}] \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (49)$$

Next, note that

$$\frac{|X_{ni}|}{\sqrt{n}} = \sqrt{p} \frac{|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{t}_{ni}|}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \sqrt{p} \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\| \|\mathbf{t}_{ni}\|}{\sqrt{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (50)$$

Finally, let us show that

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni}^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (51)$$

Indeed,

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni}^2 = p \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{t}_{ni} \mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{a} = p \mathbf{a}^\top \left[ \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbf{t}_{ni} \mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \right] \mathbf{a}. \quad (52)$$

By Lemma 4, for the sample covariance we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbf{t}_{ni} \mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top &= \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2}}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|^2} \\ &= \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \left[ \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \frac{\mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|^2} \right] \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2} \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

and therefore,

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{I} \mathbf{a} = \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 = 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (54)$$

The rest of the proof is based on the argument proposed in [48]. Assume without loss of generality that  $n$  is an even number and set

$$k_n = \frac{n}{2}. \quad (55)$$

Consider now the following sequence,

$$Y_{ni} = \begin{cases} X_{ni}, & i \leq k_n, \\ -X_{ni}, & i > k_n. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

Clearly, the new sequence is exchangeable with the same joint distribution as the original sequence. Indeed, under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  the joint distribution of  $\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}$  is invariant under multiplication of any of the random vectors by  $-1$  and  $\mathbf{T}_n$  is an even function of  $\mathbf{t}_{ni}$ . Now all the conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied for the new sequence  $\{Y_{ni}\}$  and we obtain,

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} Y_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{ni} \right] \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (57)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} Y_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{ni} &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} X_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} X_{ni} - \sum_{i=n/2+1}^n X_{ni} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} X_{ni} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n/2+1}^n X_{ni} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni}, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

to obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni} \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (59)$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni} \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (60)$$

By the definition of  $X_{ni}$  we get

$$\sqrt{p} \cdot \mathbf{a}^\top \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{t}_{ni} \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (61)$$

Finally, recall that the vector  $\mathbf{a}$  was chosen arbitrarily to conclude the proof.  $\square$

For a sequence of vectors  $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , denote their sample covariance by

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{y},n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top. \quad (62)$$

**Lemma 5** (Theorem 6.2 from [49]). *Let  $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  be a set of  $n \geq p$  vectors, then*

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{y},n}^2) \geq \frac{1}{p}. \quad (63)$$

*Proof of Proposition 6.* The difference in the behavior of the Ajne and Giné statistics stems from the fact that the former is a sum of Gegenbauer polynomials of odd orders involving only monomials of odd powers, while the latter reads as a sum of Gegenbauer polynomials of even orders involving only monomials of even powers [29, 30]. Next we explain this in more detail.

Gegenbauer (ultraspherical) polynomial [50] of index  $\alpha$  and order  $q \geq 2$  is defined as

$$C_q^\alpha(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor q/2 \rfloor} (-1)^k \frac{\Gamma(q-k+\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha)k!(q-2k)!} (2z)^{q-2k}. \quad (64)$$

Note that the Gegenbauer polynomials of odd/even order involves monomials of only odd/even order, respectively.

In order to analyze the Giné statistic (34), we use the following expansion of  $\sin \theta$  into Gegenbauer polynomials in  $\cos \theta$  from [30],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sin \theta \\ = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{(p-1)(2q-1)(4q+p-2)}{(p-2)(2q+p-1)8\pi} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(q - \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(q + \alpha + \frac{1}{2})} \right)^2 C_{2q}^\alpha(\cos \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where we remind the reader that

$$\alpha = \frac{p}{2} - 1. \quad (66)$$

Using (64) we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sin \theta &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{2r}(\alpha, p) \cos^{2r} \theta \\ &= \gamma_0(\alpha, p) + \gamma_2(\alpha, p) \cos^2 \theta + \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \gamma_{2r}(\alpha, p) \cos^{2r} \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Below we use the explicit form of  $\gamma_2(\alpha, p)$ ,

$$\gamma_2(\alpha, p) = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{(p-1)(2q-1)(4q+p-2)}{(p-2)(2q+p-1)8\pi} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(q - \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(q + \alpha + \frac{1}{2})} \right)^2 \zeta_{2q,2}^\alpha, \quad (68)$$

where

$$\zeta_{2q,2}^\alpha = 2(-1)^{q-1} \frac{\Gamma(q+1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha)(q-1)!}, \quad (69)$$

is the weight of  $z^2$  in  $C_{2q}^\alpha(z)$  defined as in (64). Thus, we obtain

$$\gamma_2(\alpha, p) = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{q-1} \frac{(p-1)(2q-1)(4q+p-2)}{(p-2)(2q+p-1)4\pi} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p}{2} - \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(q - \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(q + \frac{p}{2} - \frac{1}{2})} \right)^2 \frac{\Gamma(q + \frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{p}{2} - 1)(q-1)!}. \quad (70)$$

Since the last series is telescopic we conclude that in particular

$$\gamma_2(\alpha, p) > 0. \quad (71)$$

Let us compute the first few terms of this series,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_2(\alpha, p) &= \frac{p(p+2)}{4(p+1)(p-1)} - \frac{3p(p+2)(p+6)}{8(p-1)(p+1)^2(p+3)} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right).\end{aligned}\quad (72)$$

Recall that due to (31),

$$\cos(\psi_{n,ij}) = \mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{t}_{nj}, \quad (73)$$

and therefore,

$$\sin(\psi_{n,ij}) = \sin(\psi_{n,ji}), \quad (74)$$

together with

$$\sin(\psi_{n,ii}) = 0. \quad (75)$$

Now we can see that the Giné statistic reads as

$$\begin{aligned}t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\}) &= \frac{n}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2n} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sum_{i < j} \sin(\psi_{n,ij}) \\ &= \frac{n}{2} - \frac{p-1}{4n} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sin(\psi_{n,ij}) \\ &= \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} \left[ \frac{p-1}{2} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \right)^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sin(\psi_{n,ij}) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left[ \gamma_0(\alpha, p) + \gamma_2(\alpha, p) \cos^2 \theta + \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \gamma_{2r}(\alpha, p) \cos^{2r} \theta - \frac{1}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{4} + \frac{n\gamma_0(\alpha, p)}{2} + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left[ \gamma_2(\alpha, p) (\mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{t}_{nj})^2 + \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \gamma_{2r}(\alpha, p) (\mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{t}_{nj})^{2r} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (76)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n (\mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top \mathbf{t}_{nj})^2 = \sum_{k,l=1}^p \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{t}_{ni}^{(k)} \mathbf{t}_{ni}^{(l)} \right]^2 = \text{Tr}([n\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n}]^2) = n^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n}^2), \quad (77)$$

where we denote

$$\mathbf{t} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t}^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{t}^{(p)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (78)$$

In our setup, the sample covariance matrix satisfies the following relation,

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{t}_{ni} \mathbf{t}_{ni}^\top = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2}}{\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i \right\|^2} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top}{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{T}_n^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i} \mathbf{T}_n^{-1/2} = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}, \quad (79)$$

and therefore,

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n}^2) = \frac{1}{p^2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{I}) = \frac{1}{p}. \quad (80)$$

By Lemma 5, for  $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  i.i.d. uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  with  $n \geq p$ ,

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w},n}^2) \geq \frac{1}{p} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n}^2). \quad (81)$$

Since  $\gamma_2(\alpha, p) > 0$ , from (76) we infer that  $t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})$  first-order stochastically dominates  $t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})$ .

Recall that the limiting distribution of the spectrum of  $p \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w},n}$  is given by the Marchenko-Pastur law [51] whose second moment gives us the following asymptotic equivalence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}([p \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w},n}]^2)] \sim p + \frac{p^2}{n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (82)$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{1}{2n} (n^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w},n}^2)] - n^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{t},n}^2)]) \sim \frac{n^2}{2n} \left( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \sim \frac{1}{2}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (83)$$

and from (76) we conclude,

$$\mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{w}_i\})] - \mathbb{E}[t_G(\{\mathbf{t}_{ni}\})] \sim \frac{\gamma_2(\alpha, p)}{2} \sim \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (84)$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. J. Kelly, “An adaptive detection algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, no. 2, pp. 115–127, 1986.
- [2] J. Schäfer and K. Strimmer, “A shrinkage approach to large-scale covariance matrix estimation and implications for functional genomics,” *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2005.
- [3] J. Xie and P. M. Bentler, “Covariance structure models for gene expression microarray data,” *Structural Equation Modeling*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 566–582, 2003.
- [4] A. Hero and B. Rajaratnam, “Hub discovery in partial correlation graphs,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 6064–6078, 2012.

- [5] G. Derado, F. D. Bowman, and C. D. Kilts, “Modeling the spatial and temporal dependence in fMRI data,” *Biometrics*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 949–957, 2010.
- [6] S. L. Lauritzen, “Graphical models,” *Oxford University Press*, 1996.
- [7] O. Banerjee, L. El Ghaoui, and A. d’Aspremont, “Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation for multivariate Gaussian or binary data,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, pp. 485–516, 2008.
- [8] J. Bai and S. Shi, “Estimating high dimensional covariance matrices and its applications,” *Annals of Economics and Finance*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 199–215, 2011.
- [9] O. Ledoit and M. Wolf, “Improved estimation of the covariance matrix of stock returns with an application to portfolio selection,” *Journal of Empirical Finance*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 603–621, 2003.
- [10] J. Dahmen, D. Keysers, M. Pitz, and H. Ney, “Structured covariance matrices for statistical image object recognition,” *Mustererkennung*, pp. 99–106, 2000.
- [11] R. Adameczak, A. Litvak, A. Pajor, and N. Tomczak-Jaegermann, “Quantitative estimates of the convergence of the empirical covariance matrix in log-concave ensembles,” *Journal of American Mathematic Society*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 535–561, 2010.
- [12] J. H. Friedman, “Regularized discriminant analysis,” *Journal of the American statistical association*, vol. 84, no. 405, pp. 165–175, 1989.
- [13] P. J. Huber, “Robust estimation of a location parameter,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 73–101, 1964.
- [14] R. A. Maronna, “Robust M-estimators of multivariate location and scatter,” *The annals of statistics*, pp. 51–67, 1976.
- [15] G. Frahm, “Generalized elliptical distributions: theory and applications,” *Universität zu Köln*, 2004.
- [16] D. E. Tyler, “Statistical analysis for the angular central Gaussian distribution on the sphere,” *Biometrika*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 579–589, 1987.
- [17] ———, “A distribution-free M-estimator of multivariate scatter,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 234–251, 1987.
- [18] I. Soloveychik and A. Wiesel, “Performance analysis of Tyler’s covariance estimator,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 418–426, 2015.
- [19] O. Besson and Y. I. Abramovich, “On the fisher information matrix for multivariate elliptically contoured distributions,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp.

- 1130–1133, 2013.
- [20] M. Greco and F. Gini, “Cramér-Rao lower bounds on covariance matrix estimation for complex elliptically symmetric distributions,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 24, pp. 6401–6409, 2013.
- [21] L. Duembgen, “The asymptotic behavior of Tylers M-estimator of scatter in high dimension,” *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math*, vol. 50, pp. 471–491, 1997.
- [22] G. Frahm and K. Glombek, “Semicircle law of Tylers M-estimator for scatter,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 82, no. 5, pp. 959–964, 2012.
- [23] T. Zhang, X. Cheng, and A. Singer, “Marchenko-Pastur Law for Tyler’s and Maronna’s M-estimators,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.3424*, 2014.
- [24] R. Couillet, F. Pascal, and J. W. Silverstein, “Robust M-estimation for array processing: a random matrix approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Process*, 2012.
- [25] ———, “Robust estimates of covariance matrices in the large dimensional regime,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 7269–7278, 2014.
- [26] R. Couillet and M. R. McKay, “Large dimensional analysis and optimization of robust shrinkage covariance matrix estimators,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.4083*, 2014.
- [27] F. Pascal, Y. Chitour, J.-P. Ovarlez, P. Forster, and P. Larzabal, “Covariance structure maximum-likelihood estimates in compound Gaussian noise: Existence and algorithm analysis,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 34–48, 2007.
- [28] F. Bandiera, O. Besson, and G. Ricci, “Knowledge-aided covariance matrix estimation and adaptive detection in compound-Gaussian noise,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 5391–5396, 2010.
- [29] E. Giné, “Invariant tests for uniformity on compact Riemannian manifolds based on Sobolev norms,” *The Annals of statistics*, pp. 1243–1266, 1975.
- [30] M. J. Prentice, “On invariant tests of uniformity for directions and orientations,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 169–176, 1978.
- [31] E. Garcia-Portugués and T. Verdebout, “An overview of uniformity tests on the hypersphere,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.00286*, 2018.
- [32] B. De Finetti, “Funzione caratteristica di un fenomeno aleatorio,” *Atti del Congresso Internazionale dei Matematici: Bologna del 3 al 10 de settembre di 1928*, pp. 179–190, 1929.
- [33] ———, “La prévision: ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives,” *Annales de l’institut Henri*

- Poincaré*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–68, 1937.
- [34] D. M. Cifarelli and E. Regazzini, “De finetti’s contribution to probability and statistics,” *Statistical Science*, pp. 253–282, 1996.
- [35] B. Ajne, “A simple test for uniformity of a circular distribution,” *Biometrika*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 343–354, 1968.
- [36] R. J. Beran, “Testing for uniformity on a compact homogeneous space,” *Journal of Applied Probability*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 177–195, 1968.
- [37] S. Babic, L. Gelbgras, M. Hallin, and C. Ley, “Optimal tests for elliptical symmetry: specified and unspecified location,” *ULB–Universite Libre de Bruxelles*, 2019.
- [38] A. Manzotti, F. J. Pérez, and A. J. Quiroz, “A statistic for testing the null hypothesis of elliptical symmetry,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 274–285, 2002.
- [39] D. Cassart, M. Hallin, and D. Paindaveine, “Optimal detection of Fechner-asymmetry,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, vol. 138, no. 8, pp. 2499–2525, 2008.
- [40] J. R. Schott, “Testing for elliptical symmetry in covariance-matrix-based analyses,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 395–404, 2002.
- [41] G. Frahm and U. Jaekel, “Tyler’s M-estimator, random matrix theory, and generalized elliptical distributions with applications to finance,” *Technical report, Helmut Schmidt University*, 2007.
- [42] P. E. Jupp, “Data-driven Sobolev tests of uniformity on compact Riemannian manifolds,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 1246–1260, 2008.
- [43] T. Konstantopoulos and L. Yuan, “On the extendibility of finitely exchangeable probability measures,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 371, no. 10, pp. 7067–7092, 2019.
- [44] N. C. Weber, “A martingale approach to central limit theorems for exchangeable random variables,” *Journal of Applied Probability*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 662–673, 1980.
- [45] A. Wiesel, “Geodesic convexity and covariance estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 6182–6189, 2012.
- [46] ———, “Unified framework to regularized covariance estimation in scaled gaussian models,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 29–38, 2012.
- [47] R. L. Taylor and R. F. Patterson, “Strong laws of large numbers for arrays of row-wise exchangeable random elements,” *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 135–144, 1985.



- [48] I. Soloveychik, “Central limit theorem for symmetric exchangeable random variables,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10819*, 2020.
- [49] J. J. Benedetto and M. Fickus, “Finite normalized tight frames,” *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, vol. 18, no. 2-4, pp. 357–385, 2003.
- [50] M. Reimer, “Multivariate polynomial approximation,” *Birkhäuser*, vol. 144, 2012.
- [51] V. A. Marcenko and L. A. Pastur, “Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices,” *Sbornik: Mathematics*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 457–483, 1967.