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Abstract

E-values have gained attention as potential alternatives to p-values as measures of uncertainty, significance and evidence. In brief, e-values are random variables with expectation at most one under the null; examples include betting scores, inverse Bayes factors, likelihood ratios and stopped supermartingales. We design a natural analog of the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure for false discovery control (FDR) control that utilizes e-values (e-BH) and compare it with the standard procedure for p-values. One of our central results is that, unlike the usual BH procedure, the e-BH procedure controls the FDR at the desired level—without correction—for any dependence structure between the e-values. We show that the e-BH procedure includes the BH procedure as a special case through calibration between p-values and e-values. A new ‘soft-rank’ permutation test that uses smoothed ranks to yield an e-value is also proposed.

1 Introduction

We study procedures for controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) as in Benjamini and Hochberg [1]. We will encounter p-values in this paper, but focus more on e-values and e-tests by Vovk and Wang [18]. We use “e-value” as an abstract umbrella term which encompasses betting scores, likelihood ratios, and stopped supermartingales, which appear in the recent literature, e.g., Shafer [14], Grünwald et al. [9], Wasserman et al. [21] and Howard et al. [11].

Throughout, let \( H_1, \ldots, H_K \) be \( K \) hypotheses, and write \( K = \{1, \ldots, K\} \). Let the true (unknown) data-generating joint probability measure be denoted by \( \mathbb{P} \). For each \( k \in K \), it is useful to think of hypothesis \( H_k \) as implicitly defining a set of joint probability measures, and \( H_k \) is called a true null if \( \mathbb{P} \in H_k \).

Following Vovk and Wang [18], a p-variable \( P \) is a random variable that satisfies \( \mathbb{P}(P \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha \) (often with equality) for all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). In other words, a p-variable is stochastically larger than \( \text{U}[0, 1] \) (values of \( P > 1 \) can be treated as 1). An e-variable \( E \) is a \([0, \infty]\)-valued random variable satisfying \( \mathbb{E}[E] \leq 1 \).
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Let $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ be the set of indices of null cases, which is unknown to the decision maker, and $K_0$ be the number of null cases, thus the cardinality of $\mathcal{N}$. The ratio $K_0/K$ may be close to 1, meaning that the signals are sparse.

For reasons to use e-values over p-values, see Shafer [14], Vovk and Wang [18] and Grünwald et al. [9]; however, we summarize our own perspectives later in the introduction. We consider two settings of testing multiple hypotheses, and sometimes convert between them:

1. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $H_k$ is associated with p-value $p_k$, which is a realization of a random variable $P_k$. If $k \in \mathcal{N}$, then $P_k$ is a p-variable. A p-decision rule $D : [0, 1]^K \to 2^K$ gives the indices of rejected hypotheses based on observed p-values.

2. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $H_k$ is associated with e-value $e_k$, which is a realization of a random variable $E_k$. If $k \in \mathcal{N}$, then $E_k$ is an e-variable. An e-decision rule $G : [0, \infty)^K \to 2^K$ gives the indices of rejected hypotheses based on observed e-values.

We tacitly require that all decision rules are Borel functions. The terms “p-values/e-values” refer to both the random variables and their realized values; these should be clear from the context.

The rejected hypotheses by a p- or e-decision rule $D$ are called discoveries. We write $F_D$ as the number of null cases that are rejected (i.e., false discoveries), and $R_D$ as the total number of discoveries. The value of interest is $F_D/R_D$, called the false discovery proportion (FDP), which is the ratio of the number of false discoveries to that of all claimed discoveries, with the convention $0/0 = 0$ (i.e., FDP is 0 if there is no discovery). Since both quantities $F_D$ and $R_D$ are random, Benjamini and Hochberg [1] proposed to control FDR, which is the expected value of FDP, that is, $\text{FDR}_D := \mathbb{E}[F_D/R_D]$, where the expected value is taken under the true probability.

For those unfamiliar with e-values, we offer a couple of quick remarks. First, an e-variable $E$ can be converted to a p-variable $P = 1/E$; the validity of $P$ can be checked using Markov’s inequality. However, since Markov’s inequality is not tight, such a translation is not airtight. A p-variable $P$ can also be converted to an e-variable, but this is more complex; one simple example is to set $E = P^{-1/2}/2$ (and more generally $f(P)$ is an e-variable if $\int_0^1 f(u) \, du \leq 1$). Importantly, small p-values correspond to large e-values, so we will reject e-values above some threshold.

We now offer a brief summary of (some of) our contributions, and some perspectives on when e-values may be preferable to p-values.

### 1.1 A brief summary of our contributions

For $k \in \mathcal{K}$, let $e_{[k]}$ be the $k$-th order statistic of $e_1, \ldots, e_K$, from the largest to the smallest. We design a simple e-value analog of the standard BH procedure, which will be called the base e-BH procedure. For $\alpha > 0$, define the e-decision
rule $\mathcal{G}(\alpha) : [0, \infty)^K \rightarrow 2^K$ which rejects hypotheses with the largest $k^*_e$ e-values, where

$$k^*_e = \max \left\{ k \in K : \frac{ke[K]}{K} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\},$$

(1)

with the convention $\max(\emptyset) = 0$, and accepts the rest.

The astute reader will note that since $1/e_k$ is a valid p-value, the base e-BH procedure is simply the BH procedure applied to the corresponding p-values. Hence, at first pass, apparently nothing was gained with the e-value viewpoint.

However, one of our central results is the surprising property that the base e-BH procedure controls FDR at level $\alpha$ even under unknown arbitrary dependence between the e-values. It is well known that such a statement is not true for general arbitrarily dependent p-values. Moreover, the full e-BH procedure involves a pre-screening of e-values, allowing us to “boost” them up by a factor before feeding them to the base e-BH procedure; see Section 3 for details.

The paper contains several other contributions, including a study of how conservative the e-BH procedure is under arbitrary dependence, independence and PRDS (positive regression dependence on a subset), and the connections between the BH and e-BH procedures. However, it seems critical to first answer a motivating question: why use e-values in the first place?

1.2 When might one prefer e-values over p-values?

Given that the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure using p-values is so widely established and accepted in the sciences, one must first answer the question of why one should care about FDR control (or multiple testing) with e-values. This is a philosophically subjective, question and the opinions of the authors (and readers) are complementary to the contributions of this paper. For example, in his upcoming discussion paper, Shafer [14] eloquently provides various arguments for the use of ‘betting scores’, which are special cases of e-values, as measures of evidence and uncertainty in the scientific enterprise while Grünwald et al. [9] find them to be a middle ground between Bayesian and frequentist (and financial, when combined with the earlier view) interpretations of evidence. Other authors have also already weighed in on the subject, but rather than deferring to them, we wish to offer our own perspectives in light of recent research.

Below, we list some situations when one may potentially prefer to use e-values over p-values for non-philosophical, purely statistical, reasons. To avoid confusion, we note that the following discussion relates to the construction of a single e-value or a single p-values—in other words, it applies equally to single and multiple hypothesis testing.

1. **High-dimensional settings.** One of the most classical ways to compute p-values is to use the asymptotic distribution of the likelihood ratio test statistic, as given by Wilk’s theorem. However, the correctness of Wilk’s theorem is typically justified when the dimensionality $d$ of the data remains fixed, and the sample size $n$ tends to infinity. There are results studying the high-dimensional asymptotics of likelihood ratios, but the finer details
depend on the specific settings and assumptions. Thus, the use of asymptotic thresholds may be questionable, and may only be justified under certain relative scalings of $n$ and $d$, and quantifying this accurately has been the subject of much research; see Jiang and Yang [12] for example. In contrast, note that the likelihood ratio (for a point null hypothesis) is a valid e-value in finite samples, meaning that its expectation equals one under the null regardless of $d$ or $n$.

2. **Irregular (composite) models.** There are many composite null hypothesis testing problems for which we may know of no direct way to construct a valid (even asymptotic) p-value—this could happen because the model is singular or irregular and Wilk’s theorem fails to hold [6] and in such cases the validity of the bootstrap is also typically unknown—except to take the inverse of a very recently constructed e-value. This e-value is called the split likelihood ratio statistic [21]. Examples of settings in which one can now construct e-values under no regularity assumptions using include mixtures (e.g., testing if data comes from a mixture of $\leq k$ versus $> k$ components), shape-constraints (e.g., log-concavity), dependence structures (e.g., multivariate total positivity), and several latent variable models.

3. **Sequential inference.** The correctness of Wald’s sequential likelihood ratio test is based on noting that the likelihood ratio process ($L_t$) is a nonnegative martingale with initial value one. Thus, at the stopping time $\tau$, the optional stopping theorem gives us that $L_\tau$ is an e-value since its expectation is one. Moving beyond parametric settings, sequential inference is often enabled by designing nonparametric supermartingales [11] that immediately yield e-values at the stopping time. These have been called test martingales in prior work [16]. In summary, e-values arise very naturally in sequential inference as stopped supermartingales.

4. **Accumulation of information and evidence.** Given a set of data, if the ultimate goal of a scientist is to either reject (with level $\alpha$) or not reject a given hypothesis *in a single run*, then the most powerful method is to reject a p-value $p$ no larger than $\alpha$. This decision rule can also be achieved by a simple e-value $e := \mathbb{1}_{\{p \leq \alpha\}}/\alpha$, using a threshold $1/\alpha$ (called an all-or-nothing bet by Shafer [14]); in fact, no other e-values would be more powerful via the same threshold. The situation becomes quite different when the hypothesis (if seen as promising by the first experiment) will be tested with future evidence and possibly by other scientists: the all-or-nothing e-value carries little information for the next studies, whereas a generic e-value can provide a continuum of evidence strength. Even if the e-value is moderate (e.g., 1.5), it is useful and can be easily merged into the next experiment [18]. On the other hand, a p-value of 0.1 is difficult to use for future studies, and may be discarded (or worse, “p-hacked”) due to the all-or-nothing nature of the p-test. Hence, for a *dynamic flow* of experiments, which is common in modern sciences, it is beneficial to report e-values.
5. **Robustness to misspecification.** In genetics, it is not uncommon to encounter p-values with astronomically small values (like $10^{-20}$), or sometimes point masses near the value one, even though the sample sizes may not intuitively support such extreme evidence. This is often (but not always) reflective of utilizing a model that is not perfectly specified. The validity of p-values is quite sensitive to model misspecification, because they utilize the entire (hypothesized) distribution of the test statistic. In contrast, constructing e-values requires reasoning about the means of these distributions and not their tail quantiles, and so they are typically more robust than p-values to misspecification (but less powerful under perfect specification).

6. **Robustness to dependence.** To construct a single valid p-value, it is often assumed (for convenience of deriving limiting distributions) that the underlying observations are independent, and indeed their validity is often hurt if this assumption is violated. However, we can often construct an e-value quite easily in settings where the observations are dependent, and this is because we are requiring less of an e-value (just bounded in expectation) than of a p-value (knowledge of its whole distribution). As one example, suppose we observe non-negative data $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, and we wish to test $H_0: E[X_i] \leq \mu$ for all $i$. Then, $(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)/n\mu$ is an e-value for any dependence structure of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, and does not require making any distributional assumption. In addition, combination of multiple p-values relies heavily on dependence assumptions [19], unlike that of e-values [18]. In the field of risk management, analysis of risks with unknown and complicated dependence has recently been an active topic; see e.g., Embrechts et al. [7].

To reflect some of the above points, in a concrete example below, we will see that complicated dependence appears both within experiment and across experiments, and one can easily construct useful e-values in such situations, with almost no model assumptions on the test statistics.

**Example 1.1.** Suppose there are $K$ traders, and a researcher is interested in knowing which ones are skillful. This is a classic problem in finance; see e.g., Fama and French [8] in the context of detecting mutual fund skills. For $k = 1, \ldots, K$, the null hypothesis $H_k$ is that trader $k$ is not skillful, meaning that they make no profit on average (without loss of generality we can assume the market risk-free return rate is 0). The nonnegative random variables $X_{k,1}, \ldots, X_{k,n}$ are the monthly realized performance (i.e., the ratio of payoff to investment; $X_{k,j} > 1$ presents a profit and $X_{k,j} < 1$ means a loss) of agent $k$ from month 1 to month $n$. The no-skill null hypothesis is $E[X_{k,j} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] \leq 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, where the $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{F}_t$ represents the available market information up to time $t \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, and we naturally assume that $(X_{k,t})_t$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$.

Since the agents are changing investment strategies over time and all strategies depend on the financial market evolution, there is complicated serial dependence within $(X_{k,1}, \ldots, X_{k,n})$ for single $k$, as well as cross dependence among
agents $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Because of the complicated serial dependence and the lack of distributional assumptions of the performance data, it is difficult to obtain useful $p$-values for these agents. Nevertheless, we can easily obtain useful $e$-values: for instance, $E_k = \prod_{j=1}^{n} X_{k,j}$ is a valid $e$-value, as well as any mixture of U-statistics of $X_{k,1}, \ldots, X_{k,n}$, including the mean and the product $(X_{k,1}, \ldots, X_{k,n}$ are called sequential $e$-values by [18], who also propose methods to merge them into one $e$-value). Moreover, the obtained $e$-values $E_1, \ldots, E_K$ are dependent in a complicated way. Even if these $e$-values are not very large, they can be useful for other studies on these traders.

To summarize, there are several reasons to work with $e$-values: they arise naturally in sequential settings, we know how to construct $e$-values in settings where we do not know how to construct $p$-values, and $e$-values can be more robust to misspecification or uncertain asymptotics in high-dimensional settings. Of course, there are also many reasons not to work with $e$-values: in particular, $p$-values will often yield more ‘powerful’ (single/multiple) tests when the underlying modeling assumptions are true. Thus, $e$-values and $p$-values can also be viewed as picking different points on the validity-power curve: if one takes more risks with validity ($p$-values), one can gain more power, but if one questions one or more modeling assumptions, $e$-values may provide a safer choice.

Remark 1.2. Recall that we can always convert an $e$-value $e$ into a $p$-value $p = 1/e$. One can also transform a $p$-value $p$ into an $e$-value $e = f(p)$ using “calibrators”; recalling the definition by Shafer et al. [16], a calibrator is a decreasing function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\int_{0}^{1} f(u) \, du = 1$. If the only known way to construct an $e$-value is by calibrating a bonafide $p$-value, then $e$-BH will typically not be more powerful than BH. Nevertheless, in some of our examples, we will assume that we can construct $p$-values, and calibrate them to $e$-values and study the resulting $e$-BH procedure, in order to understand the difference between the two approaches. In contrast, if the only known way to construct a $p$-value is by inverting an $e$-value, then working with $e$-values directly is beneficial because the $e$-BH procedure is robust to arbitrary dependence without corrections, unlike the BH procedure.

2 Recap: the BH procedure

We briefly review the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) and the Benjamini-Yekutieli (BY) procedures (Benjamini and Hochberg [1], Benjamini and Yekutieli [3]) for FDR control, as the benchmark for our discussions.

To discuss the dependence structure among $p$-values and $e$-values, we rely on the notion of positive regression dependence on a subset (PRDS) of Benjamini and Yekutieli [3], flipped when imposed on $e$-values. A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ is said to be decreasing (resp. increasing) if $x \in A$ implies $y \in A$ for all $y \leq x$ (resp. all $y \geq x$). In this paper, all terms “increasing” and ”decreasing” are in the non-strict sense.
1. A random vector $\mathbf{P}$ of p-values satisfies PRDS if for any null index $k \in \mathcal{N}$ and increasing set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$, the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{P} \in A \mid P_k \leq x)$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$.

2. A random vector $\mathbf{E}$ of e-values satisfies PRDS if for any null index $k \in \mathcal{N}$ and decreasing set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$, the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{E} \in A \mid E_k \geq x)$ is decreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

If the null p-values (e-values) are mutually independent and independent of the non-null p-values (e-values), then PRDS holds; as such, PRDS is a generalization of independence. Moreover, increasing individual transforms do not affect the PRDS property. Further, the PRDS property is preserved when moving from p-values to e-values using calibrators, or vice versa by inversion. We record this fact below.

**Fact 2.1.** The PRDS property of p-values and that of e-values are equivalent in the following sense: If $\mathbf{P}$ is a vector of PRDS p-values, then $\mathbf{E}$ is a vector of PRDS e-values, where $E_k = f_k(P_k)$ for any calibrator $f_k$. Similarly, if $\mathbf{E}$ is a vector of PRDS e-values, then $\mathbf{P}$ is a vector of PRDS p-values, where $P_k = 1/E_k$. As an important example, PRDS holds if p-values/e-values are built on positively correlated (jointly) Gaussian test statistics $X_1, \ldots, X_K$ (themselves PRDS). For instance, this includes p-values obtained from Neyman-Pearson tests, i.e., $P_k = 1 - \Phi(X_k)$ where $\Phi$ is the standard Gaussian cdf, and e-values obtained from mixture likelihood ratios, $E_k = \int \exp(\delta X_k - \delta^2/2) \, d\nu_k(\delta)$ where $\nu_k$ is an arbitrary mixing distribution; see Example 4.3 for a special case of such e-values used in Vovk and Wang [18]. The PRDS property of these p-values and e-values directly follows from the invariance of PRDS under monotone transforms.

Following common practice in the literature, we will study FDR in both the case of PRDS and that of arbitrary dependence. The input of the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure includes three ingredients:

(a) $K$ realized p-values $p_1, \ldots, p_K$ associated to $H_1, \ldots, H_K$, respectively;

(b) an FDR level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$;

(c) (optional) dependence information or assumption on p-values, such as independence, PRDS or no information.

For $k \in K$, let $p_{(k)}$ be the $k$-th order statistics of $p_1, \ldots, p_K$, from the smallest to the largest. The (base) BH procedure $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ rejects all hypotheses with the smallest $k^*$ p-values, where

$$k^* = \max \left\{ k \in K : \frac{K p_{(k)}}{k} \leq \alpha \right\}$$

(2)

with the convention $\max(\emptyset) = 0$, and accepts the rest. We summarize some known results of Benjamini and Hochberg [1] and Benjamini and Yekutieli [3] on the procedure $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ below. Throughout, we write

$$\ell_K := \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k} \approx \log K.$$
Theorem 2.2. For arbitrary p-values and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), the base BH procedure \( D(\alpha) \) satisfies
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{F_{D(\alpha)}}{R_{D(\alpha)}} \right] \leq \frac{\ell_K K_0}{K} \leq \ell_K \alpha.
\]
Moreover, if the p-values satisfy PRDS, then
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{F_{D(\alpha)}}{R_{D(\alpha)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} \alpha \leq \alpha,
\]
and the first inequality is an equality if the null p-values are iid uniform on \([0, 1]\).

By Theorem 2.2, if the p-value are PRDS, then the base BH procedure has an FDR of at most \( \alpha \). If the p-values are arbitrarily dependent, then we need to replace \( \alpha \) in the base BH procedure by \( \alpha/\ell_K \), resulting in the Benjamini-Yekutieli (BY) procedure \( D'(\alpha) := D(\alpha/\ell_K) \), which rejects all hypotheses with the smallest \( k^* \) p-values, where
\[
k^* = \max \left\{ k \in \mathcal{K} : \frac{\ell_K K p(k)}{k} \leq \alpha \right\}.
\]

The extra factor \( \ell_K \) in the BY procedure reflects the fact that it is harder to justify discoveries without the PRDS assumption, which includes independence as a special case. It is well known that this factor cannot be improved in general, but for completeness see Example B.1 in Appendix B.

3 The e-BH procedure

In this section, we design an analog of the BH procedure for e-values, which we call the e-BH procedure. Similar to the BH procedure, the input of the e-BH procedure includes three ingredients:

(a) \( K \) realized e-values \( e_1, \ldots, e_K \) associated to \( H_1, \ldots, H_K \), respectively;
(b) an FDR level \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \);
(c) (optional) distributional information or assumption on e-values.

While (a) and (b) are the same as those of the BH procedure, (c) is somewhat different: in addition to dependence information, e-BH can also accommodate information of marginal distributions, since e-values have more freedom than p-values in terms of their distributions (the former are only constrained by their expectations under the null).

The e-BH procedure can be described in two simple steps.

1. (Optional) Boost the raw e-values in (a) using information in (c).

2. Apply the base e-BH procedure to the boosted e-values and level \( \alpha \).

We will first describe the base e-BH procedure in step 2 and then explain how to boost e-values in step 1. If there is no available information in (c), we can simply skip step 1 above, and directly apply the base e-BH procedure to the raw e-values, which always has a valid FDR control of \( \alpha \).
The base e-BH procedure

Let $e_1', \ldots, e_K'$ be the boosted $e$-values obtained from step 1 of the procedure. Keep in mind that they can be chosen as identical to the raw $e$-values $e_1, \ldots, e_K$ if there is no information in (c) or one opts to skip the boosting in step 1.

The base e-BH procedure is applying the BH procedure to $1/e_1', \ldots, 1/e_K'$. To be precise, for $k \in K$, let $e_{[k]}'$ be the $k$-th order statistic of $e_1', \ldots, e_K'$, sorted from the largest to the smallest so that $e_{[1]}'$ is the largest boosted $e$-value. The base e-BH procedure $G(\alpha) : [0, \infty]^K \rightarrow 2^K$ then rejects hypotheses with the largest $k_\alpha^*$ (boosted) $e$-values, where

$$k_\alpha^* = \max \left\{ k \in K : \frac{ke_{[k]}'}{K} \geq 1/\alpha \right\},$$

(4)

with the convention $\max(\emptyset) = 0$, and accepts the rest.

We note that, analogous to the BH procedure, there are many equivalent ways of describing the e-BH procedure, including using an estimate of the false discovery proportion as pioneered by Storey [17], or the self-consistency viewpoint of Blanchard and Roquain [4].

Boosting e-values

To boost $e$-values in step 1, there are two types of information we can use: marginal distributional information and joint dependence information. Below we first describe our standard choice of boosting, and then the more general choices which can be freely chosen by the user (Remark 3.2). Although we generally recommend the standard choice, the flexibility of choosing boosting functions allows us to include the p-based methods (like BH and BY) as special cases.

Let $K/K := \{ K/k : k \in K \}$, and define a truncation function $T : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, K]$ by letting $T(x)$ be the largest number in $K/K \cup \{0\}$ that is no larger than $x$. In other words,

$$T(x) = \frac{K}{\lceil K/x \rceil} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \geq 1\}} \quad \text{with} \quad T(\infty) = K.$$  

(5)

Note that $T$ truncates $x$ to take only values in $K/K$ (or zero). The truncation function $T$ will be frequently used in this paper. The standard boosting method is now described below. For each $k \in K$, take a boosting factor $b_k \geq 1$ (the larger, the better) such that, depending on dependence information,

$$\max_{x \in K/K} x \mathbb{P}(ab_k E_k \geq x) \leq \alpha \quad \text{if e-values are PRDS;}$$

(6)

$$\mathbb{E}[T(ab_k E_k)] \leq \alpha \quad \text{otherwise,}$$

(7)

where the expectation and the probability are computed under the null distribution of $E_k$, which is sometimes known. In case of a composite null, (6) and
(7) need to hold for all probability measures in $H_k$ (so an additional supremum over $H_k$ is appended to the left hand side). By Markov’s inequality, $b_k$ in (6) is larger or equal to that in (7), leading to a stronger boosting under PRDS. Since $E[E_k] \leq 1$ for a null e-value $E_k$, (6) and (7) always hold for $b_k = 1$, making $b_k = 1$ always a safe choice even if there is no additional (marginal or joint) distributional information. In either case, define the boosted e-values

$$e'_k = b_k e_k$$

for $k \in K$. On first reading, the reader may skip the next two remarks.

**Remark 3.1.** Note that the left-hand sides of (6) and (7) are increasing in $b_k$, and hence a practical value of $b_k$ can be obtained by simply trying a few choices of $b_k \geq 1$. It would be ideal to find the largest $b_k$ such that (6) or (7) becomes an equality. This is possible in some cases but it may not be possible if the null distribution of $E_k$ is not continuous or not completely specified; see Examples 4.2, 4.3, 6.3 and 6.4, where we either get a precise value or an analytical approximation of the best $b_k$. Under an extra assumption, we have a simple formula (Proposition 6.2) for the best $b_k$ in case e-values are PRDS.

**Remark 3.2.** Instead of using the standard method in (6) and (7) described above, the user can instead choose increasing functions $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_K : [0, \infty] \to [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\max_{x \in K/\kappa} x P(\alpha \phi_k(E_k) \geq x) \leq \alpha$$

if e-values are PRDS; (8)

$$E[T(\alpha \phi_k(E_k))] \leq \alpha$$

otherwise, (9)

and define the boosted e-values $e'_k = \phi_k(e_k)$ for $k \in K$. The choice $\phi_k : x \mapsto b_k x$ corresponds to the standard method explained earlier. Note that if e-values are PRDS, then so are the boosted e-values by any choice of boosting, since PRDS is invariant under monotone transforms.

We are now ready to state our main result.

**Theorem 3.3.** The e-BH procedure has FDR at most $\alpha$. In particular, the base e-BH procedure $G(\alpha)$ directly applied to raw e-values has FDR at most $\alpha$.

The proof of Theorem 3.3 follows from Theorems 4.1 and 6.1 in the next few sections, so we do not provide a proof here. One implication of this result is that for p-values derived from e-values (for example via universal inference [21]), the BH procedure does not need any correction even under arbitrary dependence.

**A few clarifying remarks**

1. Regardless of any available information, one can always opt to skip the boosting in step 1, and directly apply the base e-BH method. This gives a valid FDR of $\alpha$ under arbitrary setup of the e-values and arbitrary dependence, although it may cause a loss of detection power, as the boosting factor $b_k$ may be substantial (see Examples 4.2, 4.3, 6.3 and 6.4); a boosting factor between 1.3 and 10 is common in stylized settings.
2. The base e-BH procedure is precisely the BH procedure applied to the p-values $1/e_1, \ldots, 1/e_K$ (truncated to one if needed; such a truncation does not affect (4)). Therefore, if the e-values are independent (or PRDS), then by Theorem 2.2, the FDR of the based e-BH procedure is at most $\alpha$. This result is not of primary interest, but is worthy of note. The main advantage of e-BH is that, unlike the BH procedure, the above FDR guarantee holds under arbitrary dependence, where a conversion to p-values would be suboptimal due to the extra $\approx \log K$ correction factor.

3. The boosting in step 1 can easily incorporate partial information on distributions of the e-values. If we know a set of null possible distributions of $E_k$, then it suffices to calculate a boosting factor under each distribution, and take their infimum. Moreover, if only the null distributions of some e-values are known, we can simply choose $b_k = 1$ for the ones whose distributions we do not know.

4. Since $b_k$ may be different for each $k$, the boosted e-values may not have the same order as the raw e-values. Hence, the e-BH procedure may reject a hypothesis with a smaller e-value while accepting one with a larger e-value. This feature is intentional. For instance, an observation of $e_k = 1.99$ from a uniform distribution on $[0,2]$ carries stronger evidence against the null hypothesis, compared to an observation of $e_k = 2$ from an exponential distribution with mean 1, or from an unknown distribution.

5. In case both p-values and e-values are available for the hypotheses, we do not expect the e-BH procedure to beat the BH procedure. This is because e-values typically contain less information than p-values (the flip side of needing less assumptions/structure/knowledge/modeling in order to be constructed), and hence a simplistic comparison with the BH procedure is not particularly insightful. Nevertheless, if the distributions of null e-values are fully known, then the e-BH procedure performs comparably to the BH and the BY procedures; see Section 8 for their connection.

In practice, it may be desirable to assign weights based on prior knowledge of each hypothesis. Here, we describe an analog of the weighted BH procedure [2]. For arbitrary constant weights $w_1, \ldots, w_K$ summing up to $K$, a similar boosting scheme is obtained by each replacing $\alpha$ with $w_k \alpha$ in (6) and (7). We can alternatively skip the boosting in step 1 and directly use $w_1 E_1, \ldots, w_K E_K$ as the input e-values fed to the base e-BH procedure. In either case, the full e-BH procedure still has the valid FDR control of $\alpha$, under arbitrary dependence of the e-values as before. This claim is also justified by Theorems 4.1 and 6.1 (see the explanation after Theorem 4.1).

An interesting application: the soft-rank permutation test

There is a large class of classical and modern testing procedures that use some form of Monte-Carlo sampling in order to produce test statistics that are exchangeable under the null, and use the rank of the original test statistic as a
corresponding p-value. Examples include the permutation test, the conditional randomization test \cite{5} and conformal prediction \cite{15}. Then one can construct a natural e-value as well, as we show next. To keep the notation simple, consider for now a single hypothesis and let $L_0$ be the original test statistic, $L_1, \ldots, L_B$ be $B$ statistics that are exchangeable with $L_0$ under the null, and $r > 0$ be a prespecified constant. Define $L_* := \min_{b=0, \ldots, B} L_b$ to be the smallest of the $(B+1)$ test statistics. For $b = 0, \ldots, B$, define the transformed statistic $R_b := \exp(rL_b) - \exp(rL_*)$, so that $R_b$ is nonnegative and the ordering amongst the test statistics is preserved. The limiting case of $r = 0$ yields $R_b = L_b - L_*$. Most importantly, $\{R_b\}_{b=0}^B$ are also exchangeable under the null. Then it is easy to check that $E := (B+1) \frac{R_0}{\sum_{i=0}^B R_i}$ is an e-variable, since under the null $E[R_0] \sum_{b=0}^B R_i = \sum_{b=0}^B R_b/(B+1)$. Contrasting this with the usual p-variable, we find that $P := \frac{\sum_{b=0}^B \chi_{L_b/L_0 \geq 1}}{B+1} = \frac{\sum_{b=0}^B \chi_{R_b/R_0 \geq 1}}{B+1} \leq \frac{\sum_{b=0}^B R_b/R_0}{B+1} = 1/E,$ where the latter quantity can be seen as a smoothed notion of rank, or ‘soft-rank’ for short (much like the ‘soft-max’ is achieved by exponentiation). Hence, we call this method the soft-rank permutation test (or soft-rank conditional randomization test, and so on). Correspondingly, we call $E$ and $1/E$ as the soft-rank e-value and p-value. Since the direct p-value $P$ is always smaller than the soft-rank p-value $1/E$, there is apparently no advantage to using the latter for testing single hypothesis.

However, the situation changes when dealing with multiple such p-variables that are arbitrarily dependent, as may happen in application areas like neuroscience or genetics. In this case, applying the BY procedure to the p-values may be less powerful than applying the e-BH procedure to the e-values (because the \( \approx \log K \) correction factor could outweigh the benefit of using p-values); however it is hard to in general compare their powers. When strong signals are expected, then it is beneficial to using e-values since $1/E \approx P$ if $R_b \ll R_0$ for almost all $b \neq 0$. One simple example of a turning point in comparing the powers of BY to e-BH occurs, for example, when $R_0 \approx 2R_1 \approx 3R_2 \approx 4R_3 \ldots$, where $R_{(b)}$ is the $b$-th largest value amongst $R_1, \ldots, R_B$. This results in $P$ being to equal $1/(K+1)$ while we have $1/E \approx \ell_K/(B+1)$, so the benefit of using e-BH would then be washed out.

In summary, if handling arbitrary dependence is a concern in practice and ranks of exchangeable statistics are being used as p-values, then switching to e-values may be a competitive alternative. Further examination of this special case, including the role of the free parameter $r$, is left to future work. Naturally,
the soft-rank permutation test may itself be of interest in other settings like closed testing.

At this point, most (but not all) messages for the practitioner have been delivered and the casual reader may be warned that the paper intentionally takes a rather theoretical turn, and analyzes the e-BH procedure more carefully, comparing repeatedly to the BH procedure or to the case when e-values are simply calibrated p-values (unadvisable in practice, but instructive in theory).

4 FDR of e-BH for arbitrary e-values

We first analyze some properties of the base e-BH procedure. Below, the e-values we feed into the base e-BH procedure are the boosted e-values from step 1 of the BH procedure. We will omit the term “boosted” while keeping in mind that the base e-BH can also be directly applied to the raw e-values. Let \((E'_1, \ldots, E'_K)\) be the random vector of (boosted) e-values and \((e'_1, \ldots, e'_K)\) be its realized value.

The only property we will use on \(E'_1, \ldots, E'_K\) is that they are nonnegative. For \(t \in [0, \infty)\), let \(f(t)\) be the number of null cases with an e-value \(e'_k\) larger than or equal to \(t\), and \(R(t)\) be the total number of e-values larger than or equal to \(t\), but it is set to 1 if there is no such e-value. Define the quantity

\[
Q(t) = \frac{tR(t)}{K}
\]

and let

\[
t_\alpha = \inf\{t \in [0, \infty) : Q(t) \geq 1/\alpha\}.
\]

Clearly \(t_\alpha \in [1/\alpha, K/\alpha]\) since \(Q(t) \leq t\) and \(R(t) \geq 1\). Since \(Q\) only has downside jumps and \(Q(0) = 0\), we know \(Q(t_\alpha) = 1/\alpha\), and thus

\[
t_\alpha R(t_\alpha) = \frac{K}{\alpha}.
\]

From (10), \(\alpha t_\alpha\) takes values in the set \(K/K\). We will use the notation \(t_\alpha\) for both the random variable, which is a decreasing function of \((E'_1, \ldots, E'_K)\) by (10), and its realization, which is the same function applied to \((e'_1, \ldots, e'_K)\).

If \(e'_{[k]} < t_\alpha\), then by definition of \(Q\), we have

\[
\frac{ke'_{[k]}}{K} \leq \frac{R(e'_{[k]})e'_{[k]}}{K} = Q(e'_{[k]}) \leq 1/\alpha.
\]

Thus, each \(H_k\) is rejected by \(G(\alpha)\) if and only if \(e'_{[k]} \geq t_\alpha\). Therefore, we obtain the FDR equals

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F_{G(\alpha)}}{R_{G(\alpha)}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{f(t_\alpha)}{R(t_\alpha)}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{t_\alpha f(t_\alpha)}{KQ(t_\alpha)}\right] = \frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E}\left[t_\alpha f(t_\alpha)\right].
\]
In the case that \( E'_k \) is an e-variable for \( k \in \mathcal{N} \), then \( \mathbb{E}[E'_k] \leq 1 \), and we can immediately derive the pleasant fact that

\[
\frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E}[t_\alpha f(t_\alpha)] = \frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} t_\alpha \mathbb{1}_{\{E'_k \geq t_\alpha\}} \right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} E'_k \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} \alpha.
\]

Hence, the FDR of the base e-BH procedure is controlled to be at most \( K_0 \alpha/K \) if it is directly applied to the raw e-values, regardless of the dependence structure among e-values and how these e-values are computed. Next, we give a more precise analysis of the FDR of the base e-BH procedure for boosted e-values under arbitrary dependence. Similarly to the observation made by Vovk and Wang [18], arbitrarily dependent e-values are nicer to work with than independent e-values, in sharp contrast to the case of p-values.

**Theorem 4.1.** Applied to arbitrary non-negative random variables \( E'_1, \ldots, E'_K \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), the base e-BH procedure \( G(\alpha) \) satisfies

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{G(\alpha)}}{R_{G(\alpha)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} y_\alpha,
\]

where

\[
y_\alpha = \frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha E'_k)].
\]

In particular, if \( E'_1, \ldots, E'_K \) are the raw e-values or the boosted e-values via (7) or (9), then \( y_\alpha \leq \alpha \).

**Proof.** By (10), \( at_\alpha \) only takes values \( K/k \) for \( k \in \mathcal{K} \). Therefore, on the event \( E'_k \geq t_\alpha \), we have \( at_\alpha = T(at_\alpha) \leq T(\alpha E'_k) \). By (11), we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{G(\alpha)}}{R_{G(\alpha)}} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} t_\alpha \mathbb{1}_{\{E'_k \geq t_\alpha\}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} T(\alpha E'_k) \right] = \frac{K_0}{K} y_\alpha,
\]

thus showing the first inequality. If the input random variables are raw e-values, then \( \mathbb{E}[E'_k] \leq 1 \) for \( k \in \mathcal{N} \). Since \( T(x) \leq x \) for \( x \geq 0 \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} T(\alpha E'_k) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \alpha \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} E'_k \right] \leq K_0 \alpha,
\]

showing the inequality \( y_\alpha \leq \alpha \). If \( E'_1, \ldots, E'_K \) are the boosted e-values obtained by (7) or (9), then \( y_\alpha \leq \alpha \) by construction.

Let \( (E_1, \ldots, E_K) \) be the vector of raw e-values. Theorem 4.1 shows that for any choice of \( b_1 E_1, \ldots, b_K E_K \) satisfying (7) or \( \phi_1(E_1), \ldots, \phi_K(E_K) \) satisfying (9), the FDR of the e-BH procedure is at most \( \alpha \) under arbitrary dependence. Moreover, the FDR control of the weighted e-BH follows from

\[
\frac{K_0}{K} y_\alpha = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha E'_k)] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} w_k \alpha \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} w_k \alpha = \alpha.
\]
The value of \( y_\alpha \) depends on the distribution of the boosted e-values as well as the number \( K \) of hypotheses. In case the null distributions of the e-values are known, we would ideally set \( y_\alpha \) to \( \alpha \) (or close to \( \alpha \)) by properly choosing \( b_k \) in (7) or \( \phi_k \) in (9).

In case \( \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha b_k E_k)] \) is not easy to compute, it might be convenient to use a weaker bound

\[
\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) := \mathbb{E}[\alpha b_k E_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\alpha b_k E_k \geq 1\}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha b_k E_k)], \tag{14}
\]

and set \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) \leq \alpha \) (ideally an equality) by choosing \( b_k \geq 1 \). Such a choice of \( b_k \) always guarantees the FDR of the e-BH procedure to be at most \( \alpha \) by Theorem 4.1, since

\[
\frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha b_k E_k)] \leq \frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) \leq \alpha.
\]

In addition to being easier to compute, an advantage of \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) \) is that it depends purely on the distribution of \( E_k \) and not on \( K \), and hence the boosted e-value \( b_k E_k \) is ready to use for other experiments.

**Example 4.2.** We illustrate \( y_\alpha \) and \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) \) with a popular class of calibrators in Shafer [14] and Vovk and Wang [18]. Take \( \lambda \in (0,1) \) and assume the raw e-values are given by, for \( k \in \mathcal{K} \),

\[
E_k = \lambda P_k^{\lambda - 1}, \tag{15}
\]

where \( P_k \) is a uniform random variable on \([0,1]\) if \( k \in \mathcal{N} \). We will consider the boosted e-values \( bE_1, \ldots, bE_K \) where \( b \) is a common boosting factor since the null e-values are identically distributed. In this case,

\[
y_\alpha = \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha b E_1)] = \int_0^1 T(\alpha b \lambda u^{\lambda - 1}) \, du.
\]

A formula for \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) \) is simple:

\[
\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \alpha b \int_0^{(\alpha b \lambda)^{1/(1-\lambda)}} \lambda u^{\lambda - 1} \, du = (\lambda^\lambda \alpha b)^{1/(1-\lambda)}.
\]

For instance, if \( \lambda = 1/2 \), then \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = (\alpha b)^2/2 \). Setting \( \bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \alpha \) yields \( b = (2/\alpha)^{1/2} \). In this example, all e-values are boosted by a multiplier of \((2/\alpha)^{1/2}\), which is substantial; e.g., \( b \approx 6.32 \) if \( \alpha = 0.05 \). Finally, note that the same boosting factor \( b \) above is also valid whenever the p-values are not exactly uniform but instead stochastically larger than uniform.

**Example 4.3.** We consider e-values obtained from the likelihood ratio between two normal distributions with different mean and variance 1 as used in the numerical experiment of Vovk and Wang [18]. Take \( \delta > 0 \) which represents the
difference in the alternative and the null means, and assume the raw e-values are given by, for $k \in K$,

$$E_k = e^\delta X_k - \delta^2 / 2$$

where $X_k$ is a standard normal random variable if $k \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that each null e-value is a log-normal random variable with parameter $(-\delta^2 / 2, \delta)$. For the boosted e-values $bE_1, \ldots, bE_K$, We have

$$\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \alpha b \Phi\left(\delta + \log(\alpha b) \frac{\delta}{\delta}\right),$$

where $\Phi$ is the standard Gaussian cdf. Setting $\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \alpha$ yields the equation

$$b \Phi\left(\delta + \log(\alpha b) \frac{\delta}{\delta}\right) = 1,$$

which can be easily solved numerically. For instance, if $\delta = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$, then $b \approx 1.37$, and if $\delta = 4$ and $\alpha = 0.05$, then $b \approx 1.11$. Note that these choices of $b$ are all slightly conservative since $\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b)$ is a conservative bound for $y_{\alpha}$. For raw e-values ($E_1, \ldots, E_K$) with unspecified distributions, Theorem 4.1 gives an upper bound $\alpha K_0 / K$ on the FDR of the base e-BH procedure. This upper bound is usually quite loose since $y_{\alpha}$ in (12) is typically much smaller than $\alpha$; see e.g., Example 4.2. This upper bound cannot be improved in general without any additional information; see Example B.2 in Appendix B.

5 Why does e-BH work under any dependence?

While we have provided a direct (and simple) proof for FDR control of e-BH that does not require any correction under arbitrary dependence, the reader may be curious to understand better why exactly BH has to pay an extra $\approx \log K$ factor, but e-BH does not. We provide one technical answer here in the form of a lemma, similar to Ramdas et al. [13, Lemma 1] in the setting of p-values, which was a direct inspiration for our result below.

For $k \in K$, a random vector $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_K)$ satisfies PRDS on $X_k$ if for any decreasing set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$, the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X \in A \mid X_k \geq x)$ is decreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

In order to prepare for the lemma that follows, note that for any positive constant $c$, we have that

$$E[c 1_{\{X_k \geq c\}}] \leq E[X_k],$$

which is simply a restatement of Markov’s inequality. The following lemma addresses the situation where $c$ is a random data-dependent quantity $f(X)$, as in the computation of FDR of the e-BH procedure.

**Lemma 5.1.** Take an arbitrary random vector $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_K) : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]^K$ and fix $k \in K$. Let $f : [0, \infty]^K \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a measurable function with range $I_f$, and $X_k' := \sup\{x \in I_f \cup \{0\} : x \leq X_k\} \leq X_k$. 
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(i) If $X_k$ is independent of $X^{-k} := (X_j)_{j\neq k}$, then
\[ E\left[ f(X) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k \geq f(X)\}} \mid X^{-k} \right] \leq E[X'_k] \leq E[X_k]. \]

(ii) If $f$ is decreasing and $X$ satisfies PRDS on $X_k$, then
\[ E\left[ f(X) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k \geq f(X)\}} \right] \leq \sup_{x \geq 0} x \mathbb{P}(X'_k \geq x) \leq E[X_k]. \]

(iii) For any dependence structure, it always holds that
\[ E\left[ f(X) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k \geq f(X)\}} \right] \leq E[X'_k] \leq E[X_k]. \]
In particular, if $X_k$ is a null e-value, all expectations above are bounded by 1.

Note that for $X = E'$ and the choice of $f$ such that $f(X) = t_{\alpha}$ in Section 4, we have $I_f = \alpha^{-1}K/K$. In this case, $X'_k = T(\alpha X_k)/\alpha$ for $T$ defined by (5). The result in Theorem 4.1 follows directly from Lemma 5.1 (iii).

Comparing Lemma 5.1 to Ramdas et al. [13, Lemma 1] for the p-value setting, we observe that the first two statements have a very direct parallel. However, the third statements are where the difference appears; the p-value statement requires a correction while the above e-value statement does not. We anticipate this lemma to aid with the design and proof of FDR procedures with e-values in other contexts (just as the corresponding p-value lemma did), if e-values end up being more widely accepted by the statistical community.

6 FDR of e-BH for PRDS e-values

In case p-values are independent or positively dependent, the BH procedure has a lower FDR guarantee than the one obtained with arbitrary dependence.

We investigate a similar matter for e-values, aiming for a bound better than that of Theorem 4.1. This is possible via the result of Lemma 5.1. To summarize, if e-values are PRDS, the base e-BH procedure has a smaller FDR guarantee, and, consequently, the e-BH procedure allows a more powerful boosting in its step 1.

**Theorem 6.1.** Suppose that the raw e-values are PRDS. Applied to arbitrary boosted e-values $(E'_1, \ldots, E'_K)$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the base e-BH procedure $G(\alpha)$ satisfies
\[ E\left[ \frac{F_{G(\alpha)}}{R_{G(\alpha)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} z_{\alpha}. \] (17)
where
\[ z_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{x \in [0,K]} x \mathbb{P}(\alpha E'_k \geq x). \] (18)
In particular, if $E'_1, \ldots, E'_K$ are the raw e-values or the boosted e-values via (6) or (8), then $z_{\alpha} \leq \alpha$. 
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Proof. Write $E' = (E'_1, \ldots, E'_K)$. For each $k \in N$, denote by
\[ z_{\alpha,k} := \max_{x \in K/K} x \mathbb{P}(\alpha E'_k \geq x) = \max_{x \geq 1} x \mathbb{P}(T(\alpha E'_k) \geq x) \leq \mathbb{E}[T(\alpha E'_k)]. \]

Note that $t_{\alpha} = f(E')$ for a decreasing function $f$ with range $I_f = \alpha^{-1} K/K$. Using the notation in Lemma 5.1 with $X = E'$, we have
\[ X'_k = \sup\{x \in I_f \cup \{0\} : x \leq E'_k\} = \frac{T(\alpha E'_k)}{\alpha}. \]

Lemma 5.1 (ii) gives
\[ \mathbb{E}[t_{\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{E'_k \geq t_{\alpha}\}}] \leq \sup_{x \geq 0} x \mathbb{P}(X'_k \geq x) = \max_{x \geq 1} x \mathbb{P}(T(\alpha E'_k) \geq x) = \frac{z_{\alpha,k}}{\alpha}. \]

Hence, by (11),
\[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{F_{\hat{G}(\alpha)}}{R_{\hat{G}(\alpha)}} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{K} \mathbb{E}[t_{\alpha} f(t_{\alpha})] = \frac{\alpha}{K} \sum_{k \in N} \mathbb{E}[t_{\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{E'_k \geq t_{\alpha}\}}] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in N} z_{\alpha,k}. \]

Note that $z_{\alpha} \leq y_{\alpha}$ by Markov’s inequality. Hence, if $E'_1, \ldots, E'_K$ are raw e-values, then $z_{\alpha} \leq y_{\alpha} \leq \alpha$. If $E'_1, \ldots, E'_K$ are boosted e-values, then $z_{\alpha} \leq \alpha$ by construction. 

Theorem 6.1 shows that using the boosted e-values $b_1 E_1, \ldots, b_K E_K$ satisfying (6) or $\phi_1(E_1), \ldots, \phi_K(E_K)$ satisfying (8), the FDR of the e-BH procedure is at most $\alpha$ under the assumption of PRDS. For $b_k \geq 1$, let
\[ z_{\alpha,k}(b_k) = \max_{x \in K/K} x \mathbb{P}(\alpha b_k E_k \geq x). \]

In step 1 of the e-BH procedure, we need to choose a boosting factor $b_k \geq 1$ such that $z_{\alpha,k}(b_k) \leq \alpha$ (ideally, an equality). Under an extra condition, a suitable choice of $b_k$ admits a simple formula.

**Proposition 6.2.** Suppose that $E_k$ is a continuously distributed null e-value. Let $q_{1-\alpha}(E_k)$ be the left $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of $E_k$. If
\[ t \mapsto t \mathbb{P}(E_k \geq t) \text{ is decreasing on } [q_{1-\alpha}(E_k), \infty), \]
then $b_k := (\alpha q_{1-\alpha}(E_k))^{-1}$ is the largest boosting factor which satisfies (6).

Proof. Since $b_k = (\alpha q_{1-\alpha}(E_k))^{-1}$, (20) implies
\[ t \mapsto t \mathbb{P}(b_k E_k \geq t) \text{ is decreasing on } [1/\alpha, \infty). \]

Therefore, $z_{\alpha,k}(b_k)$ in (19) satisfies $z_{\alpha,k}(b_k) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha b_k E_k \geq 1)$. Direct calculation gives
\[ z_{\alpha,k}(b_k) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha E_k \geq 1/b_k) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha E_k \geq \alpha q_{1-\alpha}(E_k)) = \alpha. \]

Since $E_k$ is continuously distributed, $b_k$ cannot be enlarged without violating (6).
Condition (20) is not uncommon as $\alpha$ is typically small, and the value $t\mathbb{P}(E_k \geq t)$ goes to 0 as $t \to \infty$ since $E_k$ has a finite mean. Condition (20) is satisfied by, for instance, the e-values in Example 4.2 as well as their distributional mixtures. For a continuously distributed $E_k$, condition (20) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\beta \mapsto \beta q_{1-\beta}(E_k)$$
is decreasing on $[1-\alpha, 1)$.

Similar to $\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}$ in (14), there is a conservative version of $z_{\alpha,k}$ which does not depend on $K$, given by

$$\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) = \sup_{x \geq 1} x\mathbb{P}(\alpha b_k E_k \geq x).$$

In particular, if (20) holds, then $\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b_k) = z_{\alpha,k}(b_k)$ for the choice $b_k$ in Proposition 6.2.

Example 6.3. We look at the e-values in Example 4.2. For $k \in \mathcal{N}$, we have

$$t\mathbb{P}(E_k \geq t) = t(\lambda/t)^{1/(1-\lambda)} = (\lambda t^{-\lambda})^{1/(1-\lambda)},$$

which is a decreasing function in $t$, and thus (20) holds. In this case, for $b \geq 1$,

$$z_{\alpha,k}(b) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha b E_k \geq 1) = (\lambda \alpha b)^{1/(1-\lambda)},$$

and by Proposition 6.2, the best choice of $b_k$ is

$$b = (aq_{1-\alpha}(E_k))^{-1} = (\lambda \alpha)^{-1}.$$

Since $\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = (\lambda^\lambda \alpha b)^{1/(1-\lambda)}$ in Example 4.2, we get $z_{\alpha,k}(b)/\bar{y}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \lambda$. Hence, the FDR is improved by a factor of roughly $\lambda$ from Theorem 4.1 (arbitrary dependence) to Theorem 6.1 (PRDS), which could be substantial if $\lambda$ is small. For instance, if $\lambda = 1/2$, then $b = 2\alpha^{-1/2}$. For $\alpha = 0.05$, we have $b \approx 8.94$, which should be compared with $b \approx 6.32$ in Example 4.2 under arbitrary dependence.

Example 6.4. We look at the e-values in Example 4.3. For this setup of e-values, (20) does not always hold. Nevertheless, for $b \geq 1$, $z_{\alpha,k}(b)$ and $\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b)$ in (19) and (21) have simple formulas

$$z_{\alpha,k}(b) = \max_{x \in K/K} x\Phi \left( \frac{\log(\alpha b)}{\delta} - \frac{\log x}{\delta} - \frac{\delta}{2} \right),$$

and

$$\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \max_{x \geq 1} x\Phi \left( \frac{\log(\alpha b)}{\delta} - \frac{\log x}{\delta} - \frac{\delta}{2} \right).$$

Without specifying $K$, we use $\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b)$, and the value $b$ for $\bar{z}_{\alpha,k}(b) = \alpha$ can be easily computed numerically. For instance, if $\delta = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$, then $b \approx 7.88$ (compared with $b \approx 1.37$ in Example 4.3), and if $\delta = 4$ and $\alpha = 0.05$, then $b \approx 10.31$ (compared with $b \approx 1.11$ in Example 4.3).
7 An optimality result

There is a simple way of generating other e-decision rules similar to the base e-BH procedure by transforming the e-values. In this section, working under the assumption that no distributional information on e-values is available, we focus on a procedure resulted from applying a common transform to all raw e-values. We obtain an optimality of the base e-BH procedure among all such transforms.

Take a strictly increasing and continuous function \( \phi : [0, \infty] \to [0, \infty] \) with \( \phi(\infty) = \infty \) and \( \phi(0) < 1 \). We shall call \( \phi \) an increasing transform. Define

\[
\tau_\phi = \inf \{ \tau \geq 0 : \phi(\tau) R(\tau) \geq K \}.
\]

Since \( R \) only has downside jumps, and \( \phi(0) R(0) < K \), we have \( \phi(\tau_\phi) R(\tau_\phi) = K \), and \( \phi(\tau_\phi) \in K/K \).

We design an e-decision rule \( G(\phi) \) by rejecting all hypotheses with an e-value larger than or equal to \( \tau_\phi \). Alternatively, we can describe \( G(\phi) \) in the following way, more similar to the base e-BH procedure: we reject \( k_{e,\phi}^* \) hypotheses with the largest e-values, where

\[
k_{e,\phi}^* = \max \left\{ k \in K : \frac{k \phi(e_k)}{K} \geq 1 \right\}.
\]  

(22)

It is clear that the choice of \( \phi : t \mapsto \alpha t \) corresponds to \( \tau_\phi = \tau_\alpha \) in Section 3, which yields the base e-BH procedure \( G(\alpha) \).

The FDR of \( G(\phi) \) can be calculated as

\[
E \left[ \frac{F_{G(\phi)}}{R_{G(\phi)}} \right] = E \left[ \frac{f(\tau_\phi)}{R(\tau_\phi)} \right] = E \left[ \frac{\phi(\tau_\phi)f(\tau_\phi)}{K} \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in N} E[\phi(\tau_\phi) I_{(E_k \geq \tau_\phi)}].
\]  

(23)

Hence, using the fact that \( \phi(\tau_\phi) \in K/K \) and Lemma 5.1, we obtain

\[
E \left[ \frac{F_{G(\phi)}}{R_{G(\phi)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} y_\phi,
\]  

(24)

where

\[
y_\phi := \frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in N} E[T(\phi(E_k))].
\]

The FDR control (24) also follows from Theorem 4.1 by choosing the boosted e-values as \( \phi(E_k)/\alpha \), \( k \in K \).

The special choice \( \phi : t \mapsto \alpha t \), corresponding to the e-BH procedure, always guarantees \( y_\phi = y_\alpha \leq \alpha \), where \( y_\alpha \) is defined in (12). For a general choice of \( \phi \), the FDR of \( G(\phi) \) requires the knowledge of \( y_\phi \), or at least an upper bound.

In the next result, we show that, if we require an FDR guarantee for arbitrary e-values, then the base e-BH procedure is optimal among the class \( G(\phi) \). This is reassuring for us to use the base e-BH procedure as a canonical candidate for handling arbitrarily dependent e-values without further information.
Theorem 7.1. Fix $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $K$. For any increasing transform $\phi$, if $G(\phi)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F_{G(\phi)}}{R_{G(\phi)}}\right] \leq \alpha$$

for arbitrary configurations of $e$-values, then $G(\phi) \subseteq G(\alpha)$.

Proof. First, from (22), only the values of $\phi^{-1}(K/k)$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$ affects the decision rule $G(\phi)$. Note that $G(\alpha)$ uses the linear transform $t \mapsto at$. Therefore, if $\phi^{-1}(x) \geq x/\alpha$ for all $x \in K/\mathcal{K}$, then $G(\phi)$ is dominated by the e-BH procedure $G(\alpha)$, i.e., $G(\phi) \subseteq G(\alpha)$.

Next, suppose for the purpose of contradiction that $\phi^{-1}(K/k_0) < K/(k_0\alpha)$ for some $k_0 \in \mathcal{K}$. Write

$$m = \phi^{-1}(K/k_0) \quad \text{and} \quad m' = \max\{m, K/k_0\}.$$  

Note that $m \leq m' < K/(k_0\alpha)$. Consider the following setting of $e$-values: Let $N = \mathcal{K}$, i.e., all $e$-values are null. For $k \in \mathcal{K}$, set $E_k = m'\mathbb{1}_{A_k}$ for some set $A_k$ with $\mathbb{P}(A_k) = 1/m'$. We design the sets $A_k$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, in the following way: for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $|\{k \in \mathcal{K} : \omega \in A_k\}| = k_0$, i.e., exactly $k_0$ events out of $A_1, \ldots, A_K$ occur together (the existence of such an arrangement is easy to verify). Let $A = \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} A_k$, and we have $\mathbb{P}(A) = K/(k_0m') \in (\alpha, 1]$.

If event $A$ happens, then exactly $k_0$ of $E_1, \ldots, E_K$ take the value $m'$, and the rest take the value 0. Hence, for $\tau > 0$, we have $R(\tau) = \max(k_0\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \leq m'\}} \mathbb{1}_{A_k})$. If event $A$ happens, then $\tau_\phi \leq m'$ since $\phi(m')R(m') \geq \phi(m)k_0 = K$, and $\tau_\phi \geq m$ since $\phi(\tau_\phi) \geq K/k_0$. Therefore, $\tau_\phi \in [m, m']$ if $A$ happens. It follows that, for each $k$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(\tau_\phi)\mathbb{1}_{\{E_k \geq \tau_\phi\}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\phi(m)\mathbb{1}_{\{E_k \geq m'\}} \mathbb{1}_{A_k}] = \mathbb{E}[\phi(m)\mathbb{1}_{A_k}] = \frac{K}{k_0m'} > \alpha.$$  

Using the FDR control of $G(\phi)$ and (23), this leads to

$$\alpha \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F_{G(\phi)}}{R_{G(\phi)}}\right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[\phi(\tau_\phi)\mathbb{1}_{\{E_k \geq \tau_\phi\}}] > \alpha,$$

a contradiction. Hence, $G(\phi)$ is dominated by $G(\alpha)$.

$\square$

8 Applying the e-BH procedure to p-values

It would be interesting to comparing the BY procedure $\mathcal{D'}(\alpha) = \mathcal{D}(\alpha/\ell_K)$ with the e-BH procedure $G(\alpha)$, since both require no assumptions on the dependence structure. Although the two procedures are comparable on the dependence assumption, we remark that $e$-values generally use less information than p-values, as p-values require full specification of the distributions of the test statistics,
whereas e-values only require the information of a known mean. Note that information on the boosting factors \( b_k, k \in \mathcal{K} \) is contained in the null distribution of the test statistics.

To properly compare the p- and e-based procedures, we need to calibrate between p-values and e-values using calibrators. With such a calibration, the e-BH procedure gives rise to a general class of p-decision rules with FDR guarantee for arbitrary p-values similar to \( G(\phi) \) in Section 7, and this class includes the base BH and the BY procedures as special cases. On a related subject, calibration to e-values serves as a crucial intermediate step in combining p-values under arbitrary dependence for testing a global null; see [20, Section 5].

Let \( \psi : [0, 1] \to [0, \infty) \) be a strictly decreasing and continuous function with \( \psi(0) = \infty \). We shall call \( \psi \) a decreasing transform. Define

\[
\tau_\psi = \sup \{ \tau \in [0, 1] : \psi(\tau) R(\tau) \geq K \},
\]

where \( R(t) \) is the number of p-values no larger than \( t \in [0, 1] \) (and set to 1 if there is no such p-value). We design a p-decision rule \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) by rejecting all hypotheses with a p-value no larger than \( \tau_\psi \). Alternatively, \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) can be described as rejecting the \( k^*_\psi \) hypotheses with the smallest p-values, where

\[
k^*_\psi = \max \left\{ k \in \mathcal{K} : \psi(p_k) \geq \frac{K}{k} \right\},
\]

with the convention \( \max(\emptyset) = 0 \). A smaller transform function leads to less power of the decision rule. A similar procedure using different transforms on individual p-values is analyzed in Appendix C.

An important example of \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) is to choose \( \psi: p \to \alpha/p \) for some \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Note that

\[
\psi(p_k) \geq \frac{K}{k} \iff \frac{Kp_k}{k} \leq \alpha.
\]

In this case, \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) is precisely the BH procedure \( \mathcal{D}(\alpha) \).

**Remark 8.1.** The p-decision rule \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) is equal to the step-up procedure of Benjamini and Yekutieli [3] which rejects \( k^* := \max\{k \in \mathcal{K} : p_k \leq \alpha_k\} \) hypotheses with the smallest p-values, where \( \alpha_k = \psi^{-1}(K/k) \), \( k \in \mathcal{K} \). From here, it is clear that only the values of \( \psi^{-1} \) on \( K/\mathcal{K} \) matter for \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \).

The objects \( \phi(p_1), \ldots, \phi(p_K) \) can be treated as boosted e-values. Hence, using Theorems 4.1 and 6.1, we can easily calculate the FDR of \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \).

**Proposition 8.2.** For arbitrary p-values and a decreasing transform \( \psi \), the decision rule \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) satisfies

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}}{R_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} y_\psi,
\]

where

\[
y_\psi := \psi^{-1}(1) + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \frac{K}{j(j+1)} \psi^{-1}(K/j).
\]
If the p-values are PRDS, then
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}}{R_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} z_{\psi},
\]
where
\[
z_{\psi} := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} t \psi^{-1}(t).
\] (27)

Proof. For \( k \in \mathcal{N} \), let \( \alpha = \mathbb{E}[T(\psi(P))] \) where \( P \) is uniform on \([0, 1]\). If \( \psi^{-1}(1) = 0 \), then \( \mathbb{P}(\psi(P_k) \geq 1) = 0 \) for \( k \in \mathcal{N} \), and thus \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) will never reject any hypotheses with a non-zero p-value, leading to a zero FDR for both PRDS and arbitrarily dependent p-values. Next, assume \( \psi^{-1}(1) > 0 \), which implies \( \alpha > 0 \).

Define
\[
E_k = \frac{T(\psi(P_k))}{\alpha}, \quad k \in \mathcal{K},
\] (28)
which is a null e-value for \( k \in \mathcal{N} \). Note that
\[
\psi(P_k) \geq \frac{K}{k} \quad \iff \quad e_{|k|} \geq \frac{K}{k\alpha}.
\]
Hence, \( G(\alpha) \) applied to \((e_1, \ldots, e_K)\) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) applied to \((p_1, \ldots, p_K)\). Note that
\[
y_\alpha = \frac{1}{K_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[T(\psi(P_k))] \\
\leq \sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{K}{j} \left( \psi^{-1} \left( \frac{K}{j} \right) - \psi^{-1} \left( \frac{K}{j-1} \right) \right) = y_{\psi},
\]
and
\[
z_{\alpha} = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x \mathbb{P}(\psi(P_k) \geq x) \leq \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x \psi^{-1}(x) = z_{\psi}.
\]
Using Theorems 4.1 and 6.1, the decision rule \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) satisfies
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}}{R_{\mathcal{D}(\psi)}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_{\mathcal{G}(\alpha)}}{R_{\mathcal{G}(\alpha)}} \right] \leq \frac{K_0}{K} y_\alpha \leq \frac{K_0}{K} y_{\psi},
\]
and \( y_{\psi} \) can be replaced by \( z_{\psi} \) if the p-values are PRDS.

If the decreasing transform \( \psi \) satisfies
\[
t \mapsto t \psi^{-1}(t)
\]
is decreasing on \([1, \infty)\),
\] (29)
similarly to condition (20), we have \( z_{\psi} = \psi^{-1}(1) \). We can replace \([1, \infty)\) by \([1, K] \) or \( K/K \) in (29); the current condition (29) is slightly stronger but it does not depend on \( K \).

For the specific choice \( \psi : p \mapsto \alpha/p \) which gives the BH procedure, we have \( \psi^{-1} = \psi \),
\[
y_{\psi} = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha}{j+1} = \alpha \ell_K,
\]
and
\[
z_{\psi} = \max_{x \in [1, \infty)} x \psi^{-1}(x) = \psi^{-1}(1).
\]
and
\[ z_\psi = \max_{t \in K/K} t\psi^{-1}(t) = \alpha. \]

By Proposition 8.2, \( D(\psi) = D(\alpha) \) has FDR guarantee \( K_0\ell_K\alpha/K \) for arbitrarily dependent p-values, and FDR guarantee \( K_0\alpha/K \) for PRDS p-values. This gives an analytical proof of the FDR guarantee of the BH and BY procedures in Theorem 2.2. Further, from Theorem 2.2, we know that the FDR bound in (17) is an equality if the raw e-values are given by (28) for iid p-values that are uniform on \([0, 1]\).

For other choices of \( \psi \), the inequality \( \alpha \mathbb{E}[t_\alpha f(t_\alpha)] \leq K_0 z_\alpha \) in the proof of Theorem 6.1 is generally not an equality. Hence, the FDR bound provided by Proposition 8.2 may not be sharp in the case of PRDS p-values. Nevertheless, in the next proposition we shall see that this bound is almost sharp under some extra conditions. From there, we obtain a weak optimality result on the base BH procedure.

**Proposition 8.3.** Fix \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and \( K \). For any decreasing transform \( \psi \), if \( D(\psi) \) satisfies
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{F_{D(\psi)}}{R_{D(\psi)}} \right] \leq \alpha
\]
for arbitrary configurations of PRDS p-values, then \( \psi^{-1}(1) \leq \alpha \). Moreover, if \( \psi \) satisfies (29), then \( D(\psi) \subseteq D(\alpha) \).

**Proof.** Consider the setup where all all p-values are null, and they are identical following a uniform distribution on \([0, 1]\). Note that identical p-values satisfy PRDS. In this case, \( F_{D(\psi)}/R_{D(\psi)} = 1 \) as soon as there is any discovery. If \( \psi^{-1}(1) > \alpha \), then
\[
\mathbb{P}(\psi(p(K)) \geq 1) = \mathbb{P}(p(K) \leq \psi^{-1}(1)) = \min\{\psi^{-1}(1), 1\} > \alpha.
\]
Hence, the probability of having a false discovery is more than \( \alpha \), violating the assumption \( \mathbb{E}[F_{D(\psi)}/R_{D(\psi)}] \leq \alpha \). Hence, \( \psi^{-1}(1) \leq \alpha \).

If \( \psi \) satisfies (29) and \( \psi^{-1}(1) \leq \alpha \), then we have \( t\psi^{-1}(t) \leq \alpha \) for all \( t \geq 1 \). Hence, \( \psi(p) \leq \alpha/p \) for \( p \in (0, \alpha] \). As a consequence, \( D(\psi) \subseteq D(\alpha) \).

Comparing the optimality of the e-BH procedure in Theorem 7.1 with the optimality of the BH procedure in Proposition 8.3, we note two differences: Theorem 7.1 is stated for arbitrary e-values whereas Proposition 8.3 is stated for PRDS p-values; Theorem 7.1 imposes no assumption on \( \phi \) whereas Proposition 8.3 requires \( \psi \) to satisfy (29).

Different from the case of PRDS p-values, \( D'(\alpha) \) and \( D(\psi) \) may not be strictly comparable for arbitrarily dependent p-values. We discuss this issue in Example 8.4 below. The general message is that, in contrast to the case of PRDS p-values as shown in Proposition 8.3, the BY procedure is not necessarily always the best for arbitrarily dependent p-values.
Example 8.4. We consider the calibrators in (15) by choosing \( \psi : p \mapsto \beta \lambda p^{\lambda-1} \) for some \( \beta > 0 \). For simplicity, we take \( \lambda = 1/2 \). As we see from Example 4.2, \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) has an FDR guarantee of \( y_\psi \leq \beta^2/2 \). To compare with \( \mathcal{D}'(\alpha) \), we choose \( \beta = (2\alpha)^{1/2} \), so that both procedures have FDR guarantee of \( \alpha \). Let \( k^* \) be the number of hypotheses rejected by \( \mathcal{D}'(\alpha) \). Note that a sufficient condition for \( k^*_\psi \geq k^* \) is \( \psi(p_{k^*}) \geq K/k^* \). If we set

\[
\gamma := \frac{k^* \alpha}{K \ell_K} \approx p_{k^*},
\]

then, approximately, the above condition is

\[
\psi(\gamma) \geq \frac{K}{k^*} \iff \frac{k^*}{K} \geq \frac{2}{\ell_K}.
\]

Note that \( \ell_K \sim \log K \), and \( k^*/K \) is the proportion of rejection among all hypotheses. Hence, \( \mathcal{D}(\psi) \) is more powerful than \( \mathcal{D}'(\alpha) \) roughly when the proportion of rejections exceeds \( 2/\log K \). This conclusion is independent of \( \alpha \).

9 Conclusion

We have introduced the e-BH procedure to achieve FDR control with e-values. Some highlights of the e-BH procedure are summarized below:

1. It works for arbitrarily dependent e-values;
2. It requires no information on the configuration of the input e-values, and works well for weighted e-values;
3. It allows for boosting e-values if partial distributional information is available on some e-values;
4. It gives rise to a class of p-decision rules which include both the BH procedure and the BY procedure as special cases (along with proofs of FDR control);
5. It is optimal among the class of e-decision rules \( \mathcal{G}(\phi) \) (Theorem 7.1) in the setting of arbitrary e-values.

Although the e-BH procedure is primarily designed for cases where e-values are directly available (not calibrated from bonafide p-values), even the p-value calibrated e-BH procedure may outperform the BY procedure in specific settings. Based on our results, the overall recommendation on using e-BH is very simple, assuming that one is not willing to risk violating FDR control:

1. If e-values are directly available and p-values are calibrated from e-values (e.g., those obtained from stopped test supermartingales or universal inference), then one should use the e-BH procedure.
2. If bonafide p-values are available but arbitrarily dependent, then one can use the e-BH procedure with calibrated e-values, which include the BY procedure as a special case; these methods are generally not comparable.

3. If bonafide p-values are available and known to be PRDS, then the base BH procedure should be used (it is a special case of the calibrated e-BH, but an optimal one in the sense of Proposition 8.3).

Finally, we remark that there are two more complicated situations where the e-BH procedure can be applied:

1. Natural e-values are available for some hypotheses, whereas natural p-values are available for the others. Depending on proportion, one may calibrate them all to p-values or all to e-values.

2. A hypothesis has both an e-value and a p-value (or even multiple p-values and e-values), which may be dependent and obtained from different experiments. In such a situation, the power comparison of e- and p-based procedures depends on the quality of those e-values and p-values. One may choose to combine them into a single e-value or p-value for each hypothesis (e.g., using the methods in [18]).

A more detailed theoretical and empirical comparison is left for future work.
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A Proof of Lemma 5.1

Proof. Note that $f(X) \leq X'_k$ on the event $\{X_k \geq f(X)\}$.

(i) If $X_k$ is independent of $X^{-k}$, then
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ f(X) 1_{\{X_k \geq f(X)\} | X^{-k}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ X'_k 1_{\{X_k \geq f(X)\} | X^{-k}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ X'_k \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ X_k \right].
\]

(ii) Let $g : x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X'_k \geq x)$ and $P_k := g(X'_k)$. Clearly $P_k$ is a null p-value. For each $y \geq 0$, since $X$ is PRDS on $X_k$ and $g \circ f$ is an increasing function, the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(g \circ f(X) \leq y | X_k \geq x)$ is decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. Noting that $P_k$ is a decreasing function of $X_k$, the function $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(g \circ f(X) \leq y | P_k \leq t)$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$. Using Lemma 1 of Ramdas et al. [13], we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1_{\{P_k \leq g \circ f(X)\}}}{g \circ f(X)} \right] \leq 1.
\]
It follows that
\[
\mathbb{E}[f(X)\mathbb{1}_{(E_k \geq f(X))}] = \mathbb{E}[f(X)\mathbb{1}_{(E'_k \geq f(X))}]
\leq \mathbb{E}[f(X)\mathbb{1}_{(P_k \leq g \circ f(X))}]
= \mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{f(X)\mathbb{1}_{(P_k \leq g \circ f(X))}}{g \circ f(X)}
\right]
\leq \sup_{x \geq 0} x \mathbb{P}(X'_k \geq x) \mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{\mathbb{1}_{(P_k \leq g \circ f(X))}}{g \circ f(X)}
\right]
\leq \sup_{x \geq 0} x \mathbb{P}(X'_k \geq x).
\]

This completes the proof.

(iii) It follows directly that
\[
\mathbb{E}[f(X)\mathbb{1}_{(X_k \geq f(X))}] \leq \mathbb{E}[X'_k \mathbb{1}_{(X_k \geq f(X))}] \leq \mathbb{E}[X'_k] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_k].
\]

This completes the proof. \(\square\)

### B Additional examples

**Example B.1** (Sharpness of the coefficient \(\ell_K\) in the BY procedure). We briefly verify that the coefficient \(\ell_K\) in Theorem 2.2 cannot be improved if we allow all possible configurations of p-values. Suppose that \((P_1, \ldots, P_K)\) follows an exchangeable distribution. In this case, it is not possible to distinguish null and non-null cases (they are just labels), and each rejection has a probability \(K_0/K\) to be a null. By writing \(A\) as the event of at least one rejection, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\frac{P_{D}(\alpha)}{R_{D}(\alpha)}
\right]
= \frac{K_0}{K} \mathbb{P}(A)
= \frac{K_0}{K} \mathbb{P}
\left(
\bigwedge_{k=1}^{K} \frac{K}{k} P_k \leq \alpha
\right).
\]

The result of Hommel [10], which is immune to the exchangeability assumption, says that for arbitrarily dependent p-values, the largest value for \(\mathbb{P}(A)\) is \(\ell_K\alpha\). Hence, the bound in Theorem 2.2 cannot be improved.

**Example B.2** (Sharpness of the upper FDR bound in Theorem 4.1). Consider the following setup. Let the \(K_0\) null raw e-values be given by \(E_k = K/(K_0 \alpha) \mathbb{1}_A\), \(k \in \mathcal{N}\), where \(A\) is an event with \(\mathbb{P}(A) = \alpha K_0/K\). Moreover, we set all other e-values to 0, which means that they cannot be rejected. Hence, the false discovery proportion is 1 as soon as there is any rejection. It follows that
\[
\text{FDR}_G(\alpha) = \mathbb{P}(R_G(\alpha) > 0) = \mathbb{P}(A) = \alpha K_0/K,
\]
which is the upper bound provided by Theorem 4.1.
C Using multiple decreasing transforms

We can generalize the p-decision rule $D(\psi)$ in Section 8 to the case of multiple decreasing transforms, which we briefly describe here.

Let $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K$ be decreasing transforms, and write $r_k := \psi_k(p_k), k \in K$. Design a p-decision rule $D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)$ by rejecting the $k^*$ hypotheses with the largest $r_k$, where

$$k^* = \max \left\{ k \in K : r_k \geq \frac{K}{k} \right\},$$

with the convention $\max(\emptyset) = 0$. Here, we are not rejecting hypotheses with the smallest p-values (a hypothesis with a smaller p-value may not be rejected before one with a larger p-value), but rather those with the largest values of $r_k$. Recall that for a decreasing transform $\psi$, $y_\psi$ is defined by (26), and $z_\psi$ is defined by (27). The following result is a stronger version of Proposition 8.2.

**Proposition C.1.** For arbitrary p-values and decreasing transforms $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K$, the decision rule $D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)}{R_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in K} y_{\psi_k}.$$

If the p-values are PRDS, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)}{R_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in K} z_{\psi_k}.$$

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of Proposition 8.2. Define

$$E_k = \frac{T(\psi_k(P_k))}{\beta}, \quad k \in K,$$

where $\beta = \max_{k \in K} \mathbb{E}[T(\psi_k(P_k))]$. Clearly, $E_k$ is an e-value for $k \in K$. Note that

$$r_{\lceil k \rceil} \geq \frac{K}{k} \iff e_{\lceil k \rceil} \geq \frac{K}{k\beta}.$$

Therefore, $G(\beta)$ applied to $(e_1, \ldots, e_K)$ is equal to $D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)$ applied to $(p_1, \ldots, p_K)$. Using Theorems 4.1 and 6.1, $D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)}{R_D(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_K)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F_G(\beta)}{R_G(\beta)} \right] \leq \frac{K}{K\beta} y_\beta = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in K} y_{\psi_k},$$

and $y_{\psi_k}$ can be replaced by $z_{\psi_k}$ if the p-values are PRDS.
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