arXiv:2106.12768v1 [stat.AP] 24 Jun 2021

TWO-SAMPLE TESTS FOR REPEATED MEASUREMENTS OF HISTOGRAM OBJECTS WITH APPLICATIONS TO WEARABLE DEVICE DATA

By Jingru Zhang[1], Kathleen R. Merikangas[2], Hongzhe Li[*1] and Haochang Shou[*1]

[1]*University of Pennsylvania*
[2]*National Institutes of Health*

Repeated observations have become increasingly common in biomedical research and longitudinal studies. For instance, wearable sensor devices are deployed to continuously track physiological and biological signals from each individual over multiple days. It remains of great interest to appropriately evaluate how the daily distribution of biosignals might differ across disease groups and demographics. Hence these data could be formulated as multivariate complex object data such as probability densities, histograms, and observations on a tree. Traditional statistical methods would often fail to apply as they are sampled from an arbitrary non-Euclidean metric space. In this paper, we propose novel non-parametric graph-based two-sample tests for object data with repeated measures. A set of test statistics are proposed to capture various possible alternatives. We derive their asymptotic null distributions under the permutation null. These tests exhibit substantial power improvements over the existing methods while controlling the type I errors under finite samples as shown through simulation studies. The proposed tests are demonstrated to provide additional insights on the location, inter- and intra-individual variability of the daily physical activity distributions in a sample of studies for mood disorders.

1. Introduction. b Repeated measures are frequently obtained to capture the within-individual variation and enhance the data reproducibility. For example, studies that examine physical activities (PA) using accelerometers often observe individuals' 24hr activity profiles repeatedly over several days or weeks (Burton et al., 2013; Krane-Gartiser et al., 2014; De Crescenzo et al., 2017). Within each day, the physical accelerations during movement are recorded with a high frequency and processed into a time series of activity intensity metrics such as activity counts, vector of magnitude (VM) or Euclidean norm minus one (ENMO) over certain epoch lengths (e.g. 5-,

[*]equal contribution

Keywords and phrases: Graph-based test, Nonparametric test, Non-Euclidean data, Repeated measures, Wearable device data

15- or 60-seconds). Commonly extracted markers from accelerometry data include the total amount of PA such as total log activity intensities and step counts (Varma et al., 2018), and time spent in different activity intensity levels. In particular, proportion of time spent in sedentary behavior (SB), light (LPA) and moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) have been reported to meaningfully correlated with physical and mental functioning and health (Faurholt-Jepsen et al., 2012; De Crescenzo et al., 2017; Murray et al., 2020). However, there remain several known limitations in these traditional PA endpoints. First, metric such as time spent in SB, LPA and MVPA reduces the continuous activity profiles into a composition of only three discrete categories, resulting in great loss of the rich information captured by the densely measured raw accelerometry data. In fact, MVPA might be relatively sparse in a largely sedentary population and are less sensitive to meaningful clinical differences within the population. Secondly, these variables are determined with a priori selected cutpoints. Yet there is a lack of consensus of cutpoints for data collected across study populations (e.g., children vs. adults, diseased vs. healthy individuals), type of devices, wearing positions (e.g., hip vs. wrist)(Schrack et al., 2016; Leeger-Aschmann et al., 2019). It has also been reported that the recording frequency, the choice of epoch length and wear time algorithms during processing steps could significantly vary the endpoints and potentially lead to inconsistent conclusions (Banda et al., 2016). Hence it remains challenging to compare findings across studies with these traditionally derived metrics.

Instead of relying upon a few discrete categories defined by relatively arbitrary cutpoints, recently increasing attentions have been paid to model the continuous distribution of the raw daily activity intensities (Keadle et al., 2014; Schrack et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2020). In this paper, we also take the daily activity histogram for each individual as the observed outcome and develop statistical methods that compare density objects between groups. As an illustration, we plotted the observed activity data from one individual over four days (two weekdays and two weekends) in Figure 1 from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Family Study of Spectrum Disorders (Merikangas et al., 2014, 2019). Their time-specific activity intensities at one-minute intervals are shown on the top row and the corresponding histograms of activity intensities in log-transformed scale are shown on the bottom. As Figure 1 shows, despite the overall similarity in the time-specific activity patterns across days, the evident shifts in schedules from weekdays to weekends might not be of biological interests. Hence a second advantage of directly modeling the daily activity distributions is that it avoids the need for registering time stamps across days (Wrobel et al., 2019).




FIG 1. *activity intensities for a randomly chosen individual over 4 days. Top: trends of activity intensities; bottom: histograms and densities of activity intensities.*

We consider the problem of testing whether the activity density functions or distributions are significantly different between individuals from various clinical groups. As previously noted, the conventional representations of time spent in different levels of PA are derived from discretized distributions using pre-determined cutpoints. To minimize the loss of information, we will be working with the entire probability densities of the continuous daily activity intensities. Our challenges are two folds. First, probability densities, as characterized by the empirical histogram of the daily physical activity intensities, are non-Euclidean and hence many traditional two-sample test statistics are no longer applicable. Second, physical activity tracking over multiple days result in repeated probability densities. As far as we know, there are few existing method that could handle within-individual dependency in the complex object data.

While two-sample testing for mutivariate objects in Euclidean space or even infinite dimensional space have been studied extensively in the statistics literature, fewer tools are available for two-sample testing when the data are samples of density or distributional functions. To deal with a wide range of data types, nonparametric tests are preferable. Friedman and Rafsky (1979) proposed the first practical test as an extension of the Wald-Wolfowitz runs test to multivariate data. This framework has been extended to other graph-based testing methods. For example, Rosenbaum (2005) used the minimum distance pairing (MDP); Schilling (1986) and Henze (1988) adopted the nearest neighbor graph (NNG); Chen and Friedman (2017) and Chen, Chen and Su (2018) proposed a generalized edge-count test and a weighted edge-count test to address the problems under scale alternatives and unequal sample sizes, respectively. Recently, an extension of analysis of variance for metric space valued data objects was proposed by Dubey and Müller (2019), where Fréchet mean and variance are used to construct the test statistic. Yang et al. (2020) proposed quantlets as basis functions to approximate the quantile function objects in a regression setting.

However, most of these existing tests for object data assume that the observations are independent, which cannot be directly applied to repeated measures of object data where within-individual observations are correlated. One simple way to deal with this issue is to apply these tests to the average of the within-individual measures and convert the problem into a standard two-sample test for independent object observations (Dawson and Lagakos, 1993). However, it is not trivial to define the average of non-Euclidean object data. In addition, taking averages oversimplifies the true complexity of data and ignores the within-individual variability that could also be clinically relevant when studying individuals' behaviors and mood (Murray et al.,

2020).

We propose a new nonparametric testing framework for density data with repeated measures. This framework builds upon graph-based two-sample testing methods that are flexible and require few assumptions (Chen and Friedman, 2017; Chen, Chen and Su, 2018). In particular, to take into account the repeated nature of the data, we consider the between-individual and within-individual similarity graphs defined via the Wasserstein distances between two density functions. Based on the constructed graph, we define several test statistics that are powerful for various possible alternatives, including difference in population Fréchet means, Fréchet variances and Fréchet covariance. A new permutation null distribution is considered using the between-individual and within-individual similarity graphs. We also derive the asymptotic null distributions of these statistics under the permutation null, facilitating their applications to large data sets.

We evaluate the proposed test statistics using simulations and compare the power with several competing tests developed for density data. Our approaches are used in an extensive analysis to evaluate the effects of age, body mass index and types of mood disorders on daily activities in the NIMH family study population.

2. Non-parametric tests for density functions with repeated measures based on a similarity graph.

2.1. *A permutation null distribution for density data with repeated measures.* To analyze the repeated measurements of activity data, we treat the observed activity densities over l days from each individual as a vector of outcome. We assume that individuals are divided into two groups with $\mathcal{X}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{X}_{n_1}$ representing density objects for n_1 individuals from group 1 and $\mathcal{Y}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{Y}_{n_2}$ representing densities for n_2 individuals from group 2. For a given individual u from group 1, we have $\mathcal{X}_u = (X_{u1}, \cdots, X_{ul})$ representing each of the l days' activity densities. Similarly, for individual v from group 2, $\mathcal{Y}_v = (Y_{v1}, \cdots, Y_{vl})$.

We assume that each individual density X_{ui} and Y_{vj} $(u = 1, 2, \cdots, n_1; v = 1, 2, \cdots, n_2; i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, l)$ belongs to space $\mathcal{D}$, where $\mathcal{D}$ represents a class of one-dimensional densities such that $\int_R u^2 f(u)\mathrm{d}u < \infty$ for $f \in \mathcal{D}$. For any two random densities $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}$, we define d_W to be the Wasserstein metric as

$$d_W^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \int_R \{T(u) - u\}^2 \mathbf{X}(u)\mathrm{d}u$$

where $T = F_{\mathbf{Y}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the optimal transport, and $F_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $F_{\mathbf{Y}}$ are the distribution functions of $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$, respectively.

We further assume that X_{ui} and X_{uj} have identical distribution function F_1, but might be correlated; similarly Y_{vi} and Y_{vj} have the same distribution F_2. The vector of l-day densities $\mathcal{X}_u$, $u = 1, \cdots, n_1$, however, are independently and identically distributed across individuals according to $\tilde{P}_1$. $\mathcal{Y}_v$, $v = 1, \cdots, n_2$ are i.i.d according to $\tilde{P}_2$.

For a random density $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{D}$ from group 1, we define the corresponding group-level Fréchet mean μ_{F1} and Fréchet variance V_{F1} as

$$\mu_{F1} = \arg\min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} E\{d_W^2(x, \mathbf{X})\}, \; V_{F1} = E\{d_W^2(\mu_{F1}, \mathbf{X})\}.$$

Similarly μ_{F2} and V_{F2} represent the Fréchet mean and Fréchet variance for a random density $\mathbf{Y}$ from group 2. Given a vector of random densities whose elements are dependent with each other, we define their Wasserstein covariance following the framework in Petersen and Müller (2019). Specifically, for two random densities $\mathbf{X}_i$ and $\mathbf{X}_j$ from group 1, the Wasserstein covariance is defined as

$$Cov_{F1,ij} = E[\int_R \{F_{X_i}^{-1}(u) - \mu_{F1}(u)\}\{F_{X_j}^{-1}(u) - \mu_{F1}(u)\}\mathrm{d}u],$$

where the expectation was taken over the joint distribution of $\mathbf{X}_i$ and $\mathbf{X}_j$. Similarly, $Cov_{F2,ij}$ denotes the Wasserstein covariance between $\mathbf{Y}_i$ and $\mathbf{Y}_j$ from group 2.

We are interested in testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \tilde{P}_1 = \tilde{P}_2$, which implies that the $N = n_1 + n_2$ samples are from the same distribution. Based on our motivating examples, group differences in physical activity distributions could occur in mean $\mu_{F1} \neq \mu_{F2}$, between-individual variability $V_{F1} \neq V_{F2}$ or within-individual variability among repeated observations $Cov_{F1,ij} \neq Cov_{F2,ij}$ for at least one $(i, j), i \neq j$ pair. For a given test, any of such alternatives should lead to rejection of the null when the sample sizes are large enough. Instead of imposing any parametric assumptions, we propose a set of non-parametric test statistics based on a similarity graph constructed using pairwise Wasserstein distance as detailed in Section 2.2 and a permutation procedure to capture these various possible alternatives. The permutation procedure treats the repeated measures from the same individual as the permutation unit. Specifically, the permutation is done by randomly assigning n_1 individuals out of the total N individuals to group 1 and the rest to group 2. If an individual is assigned to group 1, then the repeated measures of the individual are labeled as observations from group 1. Note that we do not require equal correlation or exchangeability within individual among repeated observations since our data are observed sequentially over time. However, to ensure the exchangeability across individuals

under the null H_0, we do require that the number of repeated observations is the same for all the individuals. In the following, when there is no further specification, we use **P**, **E**, **Var** and **Cov** to denote probability, expectation, variance and covariance, respectively under this permutation null distribution. An illustration of the data structure and distribution assumptions are presented in Figure 3.

2.2. *Graph-based statistics for data with repeated measures.* Our proposed test statistics are constructed from similarity graph (Chen and Friedman, 2017) that includes both a within-individual graph and a between-individual graph in order to take into account repeated measures. To construct the graph based on the Wasserstein distance d_W, we pool all repeated measures from a total of $N = n_1 + n_2$ individuals, and construct a similarity graph G as a minimum spanning tree (MST). MST is a spanning tree that connects all observations that minimizes the sum of the total distances of the edges in the tree. In particular, a m-MST is the union of the 1st MST, $\cdots$, mth MST, where the 1st MST is the MST and the jth ($j > 1$) MST is a spanning tree connecting all observations that minimizes the sum of distances across edges, but individual to the constraint that this spanning tree does not contain any edge from the previous 1st MST, $\cdots$, and $(j-1)$th MST. Since the graph-based statistics are usually more powerful under a slightly denser graph (Friedman and Rafsky, 1979), we choose 9-MST for our similarity graph G in our simulation studies and real application, following the recommendation by Chen, Chen and Su (2018). Based on the similarity graph G of all the observations, we further divide its edges into two parts. If an edge connects two observations from the same individual, it belongs to the within-individual similarity graph G_{in}, otherwise, it belongs to the between-individual similarity graph G_{out} (see Figure 2 for an illustration).

Given a constructed graph G, we let $D = (D_{uv})_{N\times N}$ be a symmetric matrix, where D_{uv} denotes the number of edges between individuals u and v in G, and let $D_u = \sum_{v\neq u} D_{uv}$ be the total number of edges connecting individual u and others. The total number of edges in G is denoted by $|G|$. Furthermore, let g_i be an indicator function that takes value 1 when node i belongs to an individual from group 1, and 2 otherwise. We denote an edge in G by the indices of the nodes that are connected by the edge such as $e = (u, v)$. Define

$$R_{\text{out},k} = \sum_{(i,j)\in G_{\text{out}}} I(g_i = g_j = k), \qquad R_{\text{in},1} = \sum_{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}}} I(g_i = g_j = 1).$$




FIG 2. *An example of similarity graph G, within-individual gragh G_{in} and between-individual graph G_{out} for three individuals with repeated measures.*

Here $R_{\text{out},k}$ is the number of between-individual edges in G_{out} that connect observations belonging to the same group k, $k = 1, 2$. $R_{\text{in},1}$ is the number of within-individual edges in G_{in} from group 1.

To accommodate various alternatives to the null hypothesis, we consider

six different test statistics presented in Table 1. The six test statistics are defined based on different functions of $R_{\text{out},1}$, $R_{\text{out},2}$ and $R_{\text{in},1}$ and their expectations and variances calculated under the permutation null. These different test statistics are developed for testing the same null $H_0 : \tilde{P}_1 = \tilde{P}_2$, but their statistical power depends on specific alternatives, as summarized in Figure 3. For each of the test statistics, under H_0 and a fixed graph G, one could randomly shuffle the group assignments for all individuals to estimate their corresponding null distributions.




FIG 3. *An overview of the repeated data structure, the null hypothesis and various alternatives that each of the proposed test statistics are most suitable for.*

Specifically, T_{in} builds upon the contrast of within-individual edge counts between group 1 and group 2, holding the total number of edge counts to be constant. Hence it captures the covariance among the repeatedly observed densities. Rejecting H_0 based on T_{in} implies that $Cov_{F1} \neq Cov_{F2}$, suggesting that the group difference occurs in the amount of day-to-day variability in daily activity distributions.

The next three test statistics $Z_{\text{out},w}$, $T_{\text{out},d}$ and $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$ are developed to capture the group difference in the marginal distribution of individual activity densities F_1 and F_2. In particular, $Z_{\text{out},w}$ evaluates the mean difference between the two groups, and rejecting H_0 implies that $\mu_{F1} \neq \mu_{F2}$. Similarly, $T_{\text{out},d}$ examines the group difference in between-individual variances and rejects H_0 when $V_{F1} \neq V_{F2}$. Finally, $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$ combines the comparison in both mean and variance by taking the maximum of the two. Note that

these statistics are adapted from the existing formulations from Zhang and Chen (2020). However this is not a direct application from the previous work due to the existence of repeated observations per individual. Our novelty lies in expanding the similarity graph to include both G_{out} and G_{in} that allow more than one edges connecting between any pair of nodes. As a consequence, we construct the statistics based on the weighted edge counts and new derivations are needed to obtain the asymptomatic distributions. The two final statistics S_R and $M(\alpha, \kappa)$ combine the previously defined statistics in a weighted fashion and flexibly capture differences occurred in both the between-individual distributions F_1 and F_2 as well as the within-individual covariance.

TABLE 1

Proposed test statistics for the difference of two population distributions of the density functions.

Within-individual test
Wasserstein covariance difference
$T_{\text{in}} = \lvert Z_{\text{in}}\rvert, Z_{\text{in}} = \frac{R_{\text{in},1} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1})}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{in},1})}}.$
Between-individual test
Mean difference
$Z_{\text{out},w} = \frac{(n_2-1)R_{\text{out},1} + (n_1-1)R_{\text{out},2} - \mathbf{E}((n_2-1)R_{\text{out},1} + (n_1-1)R_{\text{out},2})}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}((n_2-1)R_{\text{out},1} + (n_1-1)R_{\text{out},2})}}.$
Variance difference
$T_{\text{out},d} = \lvert Z_{\text{out},d}\rvert, Z_{\text{out},d} = \frac{R_{\text{out},1} - R_{\text{out},2} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1} - R_{\text{out},2})}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1} - R_{\text{out},2})}}.$
Overall difference
$M_{\text{out}}(\kappa) = \max\{T_{\text{out},d}, \kappa Z_{\text{out},w}\}.$
Joint between and within-individual test
Sum-type test
$S_R = \begin{pmatrix} R_{\text{out},1} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}) \\ R_{\text{out},2} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2}) \\ R_{\text{in},1} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}) \end{pmatrix}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} R_{\text{out},1} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}) \\ R_{\text{out},2} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2}) \\ R_{\text{in},1} - \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}) \end{pmatrix},$
where $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{Var}((R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})^T)$.
Max-type test
$M(\alpha, \kappa) = \max\{T_{\text{in}}, \alpha M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)\}.$

2.3. *Analytic expressions of the new statistics.* In the following, we first derive the exact analytic expressions for the expectation and variance of $(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})$, so that the proposed test statistics in Section 2.2 can be computed efficiently. The analytic expressions are provided in the following theorem. The detailed proof could be found in the Supplementary Material.

THEOREM 2.1. *Under the permutation null, the analytic expressions of*

the expectation of $(R_{out,k}, R_{in,1})^T, k = 1, 2$ *are*

$$\mathbf{E}(R_{out,k}) = |G_{out}|\frac{n_k(n_k-1)}{N(N-1)}, \mathbf{E}(R_{in,1}) = |G_{in}|\frac{n_1}{N},$$

the analytic expressions of the variances

$$\mathbf{Var}(R_{out,k}) = \frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1-1)(n_2-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 + \frac{n_k - 2}{N - n_k - 1}\left(\sum_u D_u^2 - \frac{4|G_{out}|^2}{N}\right) - \frac{2}{N(N-1)}|G_{out}|^2 \right\},$$

$$\mathbf{Var}(R_{in,1}) = \frac{n_1 n_2}{N(N-1)}\left(\sum_u D_{uu}^2 - \frac{|G_{in}|^2}{N}\right),$$

and the analytic expressions of covariance

$$\mathbf{Cov}(R_{out,1}R_{out,2}) = \frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1-1)(n_2-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 - \left(\sum_u D_u^2 - \frac{4}{N}|G_{out}|^2\right) - \frac{2}{N(N-1)}|G_{out}|^2 \right\},$$

$$\mathbf{Cov}(R_{out,k}R_{in,1}) = (-1)^{k+1}\frac{n_1 n_2 (n_k - 1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)}\left(\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}D_u - \frac{2}{N}|G_{in}||G_{out}|\right).$$

Using the results of Theorem 2.1, we can check that under the permutation null, $\mathbf{E}(Z_{\text{out},w}) = \mathbf{E}(Z_{\text{out},d}) = \mathbf{E}(Z_{\text{in}}) = 0$, $\mathbf{Var}(Z_{\text{out},w}) = \mathbf{Var}(Z_{\text{out},d}) = \mathbf{Var}(Z_{\text{in}}) = 1$, and $\mathbf{Cov}(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}) = 0$, $\mathbf{Cov}(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{in}}) = 0$. In addition,

$$\mathbf{Cov}(Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}}) = \frac{\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}D_u - \frac{2}{N}|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|}{\sqrt{(\sum_{u=1}^N D_u^2 - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N})(\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}^2 - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N})}}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that the statistic S_R can be rewritten in the following form

$$S_R = (Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})\mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})^T,$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{Var}\{(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})^T\}$. The detailed proof is provided in the Supplementary Material.

3. Asymptotic distribution under the permutation null. The critical values of the test statistics can be determined by performing permutations of individual nodes as stated in Section 2.1. However, such a permutation procedure is often time consuming. To make the tests computationally more efficient, we have derived the asymptotic null distributions of the test statistics. In Section 4, we examine how the critical values obtained from asymptotic results agree with those obtained through permutation directly in finite sample settings.

Before stating the theorem, we need to define a few additional notations for the similarity graph G. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_u$ the set of repeated measures belonging to individual u. For an edge $e = (i, j) \in G_{\text{out}},\ i \in \mathcal{C}_u,\ j \in \mathcal{C}_v\ (u \neq v)$, let $A_{\text{out},e}$ be the subset of edges that share nodes with e as

$$A_{\text{out},e} = \{e\} \cup \{e' = (k, l) \in G_{\text{out}} : k \in \mathcal{C}_u \cup \mathcal{C}_v \text{ or } l \in \mathcal{C}_u \cup \mathcal{C}_v\} \cup \{e'' \in G_{\text{in}} : e'' \text{ in individuals } u \text{ or } v\}.$$

For an edge $e = (i, j) \in G_{\text{in}},\ i, j \in \mathcal{C}_u$, let

$$A_{\text{in},e} = \{e' \in G_{\text{out}} :\ \text{one endpoint of } e' \in \mathcal{C}_u\} \cup \{e'' \in G_{\text{in}} : e'' \text{ in individual } u\}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} A_e &= A_{\text{out},e} I(e \in G_{\text{out}}) + A_{\text{in},e} I(e \in G_{\text{in}}), \\ B_{\text{out},e} &= \cup_{\tilde{e} \in A_{\text{out},e}} A_{\tilde{e}},\ B_{\text{in},e} = \cup_{\tilde{e} \in A_{\text{in},e}} A_{\tilde{e}}, \\ B_e &= B_{\text{out},e} I(e \in G_{\text{out}}) + B_{\text{in},e} I(e \in G_{\text{in}}). \end{aligned}$$

To derive the asymptotic null distribution of the proposed test statistics, we assume $n_1 = O(N)$, $n_2 = O(N)$ and $l = O(1)$. In addition, the following conditions are needed:

Condition 1 (C1): $|G_{\text{out}}|,\ |G_{\text{in}}| = O(N)$.

Condition 2 (C2): $\sum_u D_u^2 - 4|G_{\text{out}}|^2/N,\ \sum_u D_{uu}^2 - |G_{\text{in}}|^2/N = O(N)$

Condition 3 (C3): $\sum_{e \in G_{\text{out}}} |A_{\text{out},e}||B_{\text{out},e}| = o(N^{1.5})$.

Here, we use $a = O(b)$ to denote that a and b are of the same order and $a = o(b)$ to denote that a is of a smaller order than b.

Condition C1 requires that the number of the edges in G_{out} and G_{in} is in the same order as N. Condition C2 guarantees that $(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})^T$ does not degenerate asymptotically. Since

$$\sum_u D_u^2 - 4|G_{\text{out}}|^2/N = \sum_u \left(D_u - \frac{2|G_{\text{out}}|}{N} \right)^2,$$

$$\sum_u D_{uu}^2 - |G_{\text{in}}|^2/N = \sum_u \left(D_{uu} - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|}{N} \right)^2,$$

if $D_u - 2|G_{\text{out}}|/N = O(1)$ and $D_{uu} - |G_{\text{in}}|/N = O(1)$, then Condition C2 is satisfied. Condition C3 requires the number of edges from an individual in the graph G such being not too large. A similar condition was needed for graph-based statistics for independent observations (Chen and Friedman, 2017; Chen, Chen and Su, 2018). Conditions C1 and C2 imply that $\sum_u D_u^2$, $\sum_u D_{uu}^2 = O(N)$. In addition, we note that $2|G_{\text{out}}| = \sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv} \leq \sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 \leq \sum_u D_u^2$ and $|G_{\text{in}}| = \sum_u D_{uu} \leq \sum_u D_{uu}D_u \leq \sqrt{\sum_u D_{uu}^2}\sqrt{\sum_u D_u^2}$, which leads to

$$\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 = O(N) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_u D_{uu}D_u = O(N).$$

We assume the following limits exist,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|G_{\text{out}}|}{N} = b_1, \quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_u D_u^2}{N} - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N^2} = b_2, \quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2}{N} = b_3,$$

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|}{N} = b_4, \quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_u D_{uu}^2}{N} - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N^2} = b_5, \quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_u D_{uu}D_u}{N} = b_6.$$

The following theorem presents the asymptotic distribution of $(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{in})^T$ under the permutation null when $N \to \infty$.

THEOREM 3.1. *Under Conditions 1-3 and under the new permutation null distribution, as $N \to \infty$, $(Z_{out,w}, Z_{out,d}, Z_{in})^T$ converges to a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean* $\mathbf{0}$ *and covariance matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \rho_Z \\ 0 & \rho_Z & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\rho_Z = \frac{b_6 - 2b_1b_4}{\sqrt{b_2b_5}}.$$

Based on Theorem 3.1, it is easy to obtain the asymptotic cumulative distribution functions (CDF) of T_{in}, $Z_{\text{out},w}$, $T_{\text{out},d}$, $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$, S_R and $M(\alpha,\kappa)$ under the permutation null. They are given in the following Corollary 3.2.

COROLLARY 3.2. *Under Conditions C1-C3, and under the permutation null distribution, as $N \to \infty$ the asymptotic CDFs for each of the test statistic are*

1. $P(T_{in} \leq x) \longrightarrow 2\Phi(x) - 1$.

2. $P(Z_{out,w} \leq x) \longrightarrow \Phi(x)$.
3. $P(T_{out,d} \leq x) \longrightarrow 2\Phi(x) - 1$.
4. $P(M_{out}(\kappa) \leq x) \longrightarrow (1 - 2\Phi(-x))\Phi(x/\kappa)$
5. $P(S_R \leq x) \longrightarrow \chi^2(3)$
6. $P(M(\alpha, \kappa) \leq x) \longrightarrow \Phi(x/(\alpha\kappa))\mathbf{P}(-x/\alpha \leq Z_{out,d} \leq x/\alpha, -x \leq Z_{in} \leq x)$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ *denotes the CDF of a standard normal distribution.*

The term $P(-x/\alpha \leq Z_{\text{out},d} \leq x/\alpha, -x \leq Z_{\text{in}} \leq x)$ can be calculated from function `pmvnorm()` in the `R` package `mvtnorm`, where the correlation between $Z_{\text{out},d}$ and Z_{in} can be estimated using finite sample estimate,

$$\rho_{Z,N} = \frac{\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}D_u - \frac{2}{N}|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|}{\sqrt{(\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_u^2 - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N})(\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}^2 - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N})}}.$$

It is easy to see that $\lim_{N\to\infty} \rho_{Z,N} = \rho_Z$.

4. Simulation studies. We evaluate the performance of the proposed test statistics T_{in}, $Z_{\text{out},w}$, $T_{\text{out},d}$, $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$, S_R and $M(\alpha, \kappa)$ under various simulation settings. Under each setting, we compare the results with the generalized edge-count test (S) of Chen and Friedman (2017) and the Fréchet test (Fretest) of Dubey and Müller (2019). As far as we know, neither method allows for data with repeated measures and would rely on between-individual distance metrics from a single observation. Simply applying those tests on the individual observations without accounting for within-subject correlation leads to an inflated type 1 error (results omitted). To ensure a fair comparison, we apply these two tests on the subject-level graph constructed based on two definitions of distance metrics that respect the hierarchical structure among the repeated observations. The first distance is chosen to be the Wasserstein distance calculated from each subject's barycenter (average distance). Alternatively, we use the integrated distance by taking the square root of the total sum square distances across all the l observations for any pair of individuals. We denote the generalized edge-count test and the Fréchet test calculated under the first distance metric by $S1$ and Fretest1, and those calculated under the second definition as $S2$ and Fretest2, respectively. More specifically, let $Z_u = (Z_{u1}, \cdots, Z_{ul})$ and $Z_v = (Z_{v1}, \cdots, Z_{vl})$, where Z_{uj}, Z_{vj} $(j = 1, \cdots, l)$ represent the repeated measures for individuals u and v, the two distances are defined as:

1. Average distance: $d(Z_u, Z_v) = d_W(\tilde{Z}_u, \tilde{Z}_v)$, where $\tilde{Z}_u$ and $\tilde{Z}_v$ are the barycenters of Z_u and Z_v, respectively, i.e.,

$$\tilde{Z}_u = \arg\min_{x\in\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_W(x, Z_{ui}), \quad \tilde{Z}_v = \arg\min_{x\in\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_W(x, Z_{vi}).$$

2. Integrated distance: $d(Z_u, Z_v) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{l} d_W^2(Z_{ui}, Z_{vi})}$.

Following the recommendations from Zhang and Chen (2020), when there is no prior knowledge about the type of between-individual difference (i.e., location difference or scale difference), we choose $\kappa = 1.14$ for the statistic $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$ and denote it by M_{out} for simplicity. For the statistic $M(\alpha, \kappa)$, the parameter α weights the between-individual difference. Here, we let $\kappa = 1.14$ and $\alpha = 1$, and denote the statistic by M for simplicity.

The general setup for the simulation settings is as following. We generate the observed physical activity density for individual u on day j to be equal to the density function of a p-dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean θ_{uj} and variance $\omega_u^2 I_p$. That is, $X_{uj} = \psi_p(\theta_{uj}, \omega_u^2 I_p), j = 1, \cdots, l$. We further assume that ω_u is independent and identically distributed from a uniform distribution $U(\nu_{k1}, \nu_{k2})$, with $k = 1, 2$ corresponding to group label. θ_{uj} $(j = 1, \cdots, l)$ are sampled from another multivariate normal distribution $N_p(a_{ku}, \sigma^2 I_p)$ with individual-specific mean a_{ku}. We further assume an exchangeable correlation between $\theta'_{uj}s$, which leads to

$$(\theta_{u1}^T, \cdots, \theta_{ul}^T)^T | \mu_{ku} \sim N_{pl}(\mu_{ku}, \sigma^2 \varrho_k \otimes I_p),$$

where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product, $\mu_{ku} = (a_{ku}^T, \cdots, a_{ku}^T)^T$ and $\varrho_k = \rho_k \mathbf{1}_l \mathbf{1}_l^T + (1 - \rho_k) I_l$. Here, a_{ku} $(u = 1, \cdots, n) \overset{i.i.d}{\sim} N_p(\beta_k, \epsilon_k^2 I_p)$. We also consider an exponentially decayed correlation between $\theta'_{uj}s$ with the (s, t)-element of ϱ_k being $\rho_k^{|s-t|}$, $s, t = 1, \cdots, l$. The results are similar and are given in the Supplementary Material.

We simulate unbalanced data with $n_1 = 50$, $n_2 = 80$ individuals for each group and $l = 5$ days for each individual. When applying the proposed statistics, we use the Wasserstein distance to measure the dissimilarity between any two density functions, which can be explicitly calculated. The similarity graph G is constructed by the procedure outlined in Section 2.2 with 9-MST.

4.1. *Simulations for one-dimensional density, $p = 1$.* We consider five different parameter settings as listed on the top rows of Table 2. All the

test statistics are compared in terms of type 1 error and power. Here, Model (A1) is the null model when there is no difference between the two groups, Models (A2)-(A4) represent the cases where the two groups differ in within-individual covariance, between-individual mean and between-individual variability, respectively. Model (A5) represents the case that differences exist in mean, variance and also in the within-individual covariance.

TABLE 2

Parameter values for 5 different simulation settings for comparisons. (A) one-dimensional density functions; (B) 30-dimensional density functions.

(A) - one-dimensional density functions
A1: null model.
$\rho_1 = 0.6,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.6,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 2;\ \sigma = 1.$
A2: within-individual variability difference in ρ.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.8,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.2;\ \sigma = 1.$
A3: between-individual mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.2;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0.7,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.96,\ \nu_{22} = 1.16;\ \sigma = 1.$
A4: between-individual variability difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.97,\ \nu_{22} = 1.33;\ \sigma = 1.$
A5: within-individual variability difference in ρ, between-individual mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$, variance difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.35,\ \beta_2 = 0.5,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.97,\ \nu_{22} = 1.36;\ \sigma = 1.$
(B) - 30-dimensional density functions
B1: null model.
$\rho_1 = 0.3,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.3,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 2;\ \sigma = 1.$
B2: within-individual variability difference in ρ.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.1,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.3;\ \sigma = 1.$
B3: between-individual mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0.1\mathbf{1}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1.2,\ \nu_{22} = 1.5;\ \sigma = 1.$
B4: between-individual variability difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.8,\ \nu_{22} = 1.5;\ \sigma = 1.$
B5: within-individual variability difference in ρ, between-individual mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$, variance difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.09,\ \beta_2 = 0.1\mathbf{1}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.03,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.5;\ \sigma = 1.$

Table 3 shows the empirical power of the proposed statistics at $\alpha = 0.05$ level based on 1,000 replications. Under the null model (A1), all the statistics

TABLE 3

Empirical power of the proposed test statistics in the first 6 columns, generalized edge-count test ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet test (Fretest1, Fretest2) at 0.05 significance level under the five scenarios denoted by A1–A5. The bold fonts indicate for test with the best power and those with power is over 95% of the best power for each of the models.

	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
(A) One-dimensional density										
Null model										
A1	0.044	0.061	0.047	0.057	0.051	0.052	0.051	0.053	0.057	0.057
Alternative model										
A2	**0.911**	0.038	0.100	0.066	0.719	0.786	0.133	**0.950**	0.423	0.048
A3	0.048	**0.973**	0.064	**0.962**	**0.939**	**0.954**	0.645	0.575	0.287	0.276
A4	0.038	0.190	**0.911**	**0.867**	0.802	0.830	0.142	0.104	0.321	0.324
A5	0.245	0.664	**0.994**	**0.995**	**0.992**	**0.994**	0.422	0.616	0.583	0.298
(B) 30-dimensional density										
Null model										
B1	0.048	0.045	0.049	0.041	0.042	0.045	0.035	0.039	0.078	0.088
Alternative model										
B2	**0.926**	0.055	0.046	0.054	0.840	0.865	0.164	0.051	0.371	0.087
B3	0.054	**0.969**	0.058	**0.939**	0.836	0.916	0.766	0.713	0.136	0.201
B4	0.143	0.273	**0.893**	0.847	0.787	0.809	0.757	0.827	**0.864**	**0.883**
B5	**0.865**	0.387	0.192	0.355	**0.853**	**0.897**	0.513	0.223	0.754	0.425

are able to control the type 1 errors at the nominal level.

As for detecting the group differences in the alternative Models (A2-A5), the power of S and Fréchet test is uniformly lower than our proposed statistics except for $S2$ under Model (A2). As expected, the power of different test statistics depends on the alternative hypothesis. In Model (A2), when ρ_1 is different from ρ_2, T_{in} shows its superior performance of detecting group differences in covariance among repetaed measures within individuals. For Model (A3), since the difference only happens in the group mean parameters, all the proposed test statistics except T_{in} and $T_{\text{out},d}$ yield high power. Model (A4) is designed to examine the power of the tests when the between-individual variability is different between the two groups. We observe that indeed all the proposed tests except T_{in} and $Z_{\text{out},w}$ have high power. The results for Model (A5) suggest that $T_{\text{out},d}$ works well for detecting group difference in between-individual variability and $Z_{\text{out},w}$ is suitable for detecting differences in the between-individual mean. Since there is a smaller difference in ρ's than that under Model (A2), T_{in} did not yield high power in this scenario.

4.2. *Simulations for moderate-dimensional density, $p = 30$.* Although we have mostly been concerned with two-sample testing for one-dimensional probability densities based on a single morality of measurements such as

physical activity intensity, it is worth noting that our proposed tests are directly applicable to density objects from multimodal measurements as long as there is a well defined distance metrics. In fact, many wearable devices simultaneously collect multiple markers such as heart rate, respiratory rate in addition to the physical movement, and there is need to compare the joint density distributions of multivariate measures in mobile health research. To illustrate their utility for multivariable density objects with repeated measures, we conduct another set of simulation studies for $p = 30$. Our simulation setups are similar to $p = 1$ case, where we simulate an unbalanced sample with $n_1 = 50,\ n_2 = 80$ individuals in each group and $l = 5$ repeated measures per individual. All of the statistics are assessed and compared under five different scenarios as listed in Table 2. These 5 models parallel the Models (A1)-(A5), except that we consider density measures for 30-dimensional variables.

Table 3 shows the estimated empirical powers of the proposed statistics at 0.05 significance level based on 1000 simulations. Again we observe that all the statistics control the type 1 errors at the approximate level. However, the type 1 errors of the Fréchet tests are slightly inflated.

For Models (B2)-(B4), the power of the proposed tests remain similar to those under the one-dimensional setting in Section 4.1. As a comparison, although tests $S1$ and $S2$ can detect the between-individual mean and variance differences (B3, B4), they are not effective for detecting the within-individual variability difference (B2). Fretest1 and Fretest2, on the other hand, work well when only between-individual variance differ as in Model (B4). The results for Model (B5) indicate that the proposed tests S_R and M perform well for the overall difference and is much better than the competing tests $S1$, $S2$, Fretest1 and Fretest2.

Finally, we also perform simulations to examine whether the asymptotic p-values could approximate the p-values obtained from 10,000 permutations. The results show that the two p-values are very close and the power obtained by the asymptotic p-value is similar to that based on the permutation p-value for all the proposed test statistics. As sample size increases, the results are almost identical as expected. We omit the details here and present the results in the Supplementary Material, Section C.

5. Comparisons of physical activity distributions in mood disorder samples. We apply each of the six test statistics to the continuous physical activity measures collected from a subset of the participants from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Family Study of Spectrum Disorders (Merikangas et al., 2014; Shou et al., 2017; Merikangas et al.,

2019). In this study, 384 individuals were instructed to wear the Philips Actiwatch devices for about two weeks. The daily activity data were processed into 1440 minute-level intensity values each day. Meanwhile, the 384 individuals were interviewed and assessed into four clinical groups based on DSM-IV criteria as: healthy control (HC), major depressive disorders (MDD), type-I bipolar disorders (BPI) and type-II bipolar disorders (BPII). Previous research studies have consistently reported a lower average daytime motor activities among bipolar patients based on summary statistics from physical activity measures (Scott et al., 2017; Murray et al., 2020). Age and body mass index (BMI) are among the other factors are known to be associated with the mean activity levels (Schott, 2007; Varma et al., 2017). However, although there were a few papers that suggested potential links between bipolar disorder and interindividual and intraindividual variability in activity patterns, the evidence was much less robust and the extracted markers for quantifying variability was quite heterogeneous(Indic et al., 2011; Pagani et al., 2016; Robillard et al., 2015), making it even more challenging to understand the complex disease manifestations. Hence we focus on comparing the continuous physical activity profiles and testing whether mean and variability of the daily physical activity differ across disease groups or by demographic characteristics. To apply our proposed methods, we first estimate the empirical daily probability densities using the observed minute-by-minute activity intensities. Let $Z_{uj} = (z_{uj}^{(1)}, \cdots, z_{uj}^{(1440)})^T$ be the vector of ordered 1440 activity intensities for individual u on day j. Here $z_{uj}^{(q)}$ represents the empirical qth quantile of the probability distribution of activity intensities per day. The Wasserstein distance metric is calculated to quantify the distance between two empirical distributions based on any pairs of Z_{ui} and Z_{vj}. Since densities are empirically estimated from the ordered values, the Wasserstein distance between densities is equivalent to the Euclidean distance between the two empirical quantiles, i.e.,

$$d(Z_{ui}, Z_{vj}) = \left(\sum_{q=1}^{1440} \left(z_{ui}^{(q)} - z_{vj}^{(q)} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

We further construct the similarity graph G following the procedure that is introduced in Section 2.2 with 9-MST. As a sensitivity analysis, we also apply the tests using 5-MST, 15-MST and under the maximum mean discrepancy (Gretton et al., 2012). The results are similar and are provided in the Supplementary Material, Section E.

Considering the potential difference in daily routines and movement between weekdays and weekends, we apply the test statistics separately to

observations collected on weekdays and weekends with $l = 7$ and $l = 3$ days, respectively. For each analysis, the individuals with fewer than the given number of days l are excluded from the analysis. For those with more than l days of observations, a random subset of l days are included in generating the test statistics. Sensitivity analysis was conducted by repeating the random subsetting 1000 times in order to assess the variability in the test results due to choice of days. To summarize the results, we take the p-value $p_j, j = 1, 2, \cdots, 1000$ from each of the 1000 trials, and estimate an overall p-value as

$$\hat{p} = 1 - \frac{2}{1 + e^{2\theta}},$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{1}{1000} \sum_{j=1}^{1000} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + p_j}{1 - p_j} \right).$$

5.1. *Comparison of activity densities between healthy individuals and those with mood disorders.* We first compare the activity densities among healthy individuals and those with histories of mood disorders in the free-living conditions during the weekdays and weekends. Figure 8 shows the p-values of the pairwise comparisons using the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) (detailed p-values and the sample sizes for different groups are given in Table 5 of the Supplementary Material). We first observe that the differences between diagnostic groups are mostly driven by activity patterns on weekends and no significant difference is observed during the weekdays. In particular, we observe that the healthy individuals have significantly different activity distributions from those with BPI. Among the proposed statistics, $Z_{\text{out},w}$ achieves the most significant results when comparing healthy with BPI and BPII vs BPI. While T_{in} and $T_{\text{out},d}$ result in nonsignificant large p-values and cannot reject the null hypothesis. These results suggest that there exist significant differences in the population-level mean activity density between healthy and BPI or between BPI and BPII. This is consistent with findings from the existing literature where BPI patients were found to have lower average activity levels especially in the later of the day (Scott et al., 2017; Shou et al., 2017) and less time spent in MVPA (Chapman et al., 2017). But no significant difference is observed in the variance of activity densities or in day-to-day variability of the activity density. Since all of $M_{\text{out}}(\kappa)$, S_R and $M(\alpha, \kappa)$ include a $Z_{\text{out},w}$ in their definitions, they are also effective to capture the mean difference of activity densities when $Z_{\text{out},w}$ yields a small p-value.




FIG 4. *Comparisons of activity distributions among the healthy controls (HC), MDD, BPI and BPII individuals for activities over weekdays and on weekends. For each individual, 7 weekdays and 3 weekends of data are used. The* $-\log(p\text{-values})$ *are plotted for each of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests (*$S1$*,* $S2$*) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2). The corresponding sample sizes for each group is presented on the upper right corner.*

5.2. *Comparison of activity distributions among different age groups.* It is well known that age is associated with the amount of physical activity. For example, Schrack et al. (2014) found 'a 1.3% decrease per year' in cumulative physical activity counts from mid-to-late life among a elderly population. Similar results have been reported in several other large cohort studies and age groups including NHANES and UK Biobank (Varma et al., 2017; Viciana, Mayorga-Vega and Martínez-Baena, 2016; Doherty et al., 2017). However, few studies has examined how inter- and intra-individual variability in physical activity differ by age. We ask whether the proposed test statistics are able to detect differences in the daily activity densities over different age categories and inform us where the difference lies. To ensure a proper power with an adequate sample size, we take the two diagnostic groups with the largest sample sizes, the HC and major depressive disorder (MDD), and stratify them into three age groups, young (age$\leq$30), middle age (30$<$age$\leq$60) and older age (age$>$ 60) groups. We also separately test activity densities from weekdays and weekends.

The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count test ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet test (Fretest1, Fretest2) are shown in Figure 9 with detailed p-values given in Table 6 of the Supplementary Material. Overall, among the healthy individuals, the proposed statistical tests find large differences in the distributions of activity intensities among the three age groups for both weekdays and weekends. Such differences are especially prominent when comparing the young age group or middle age group with the older




FIG 5. *Comparisons of activity distributions in different age groups for young (≤30), middle (30<age≤60) and older age (> 60) groups. The* $-\log$*(p-values) of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests (*$S1$*,* $S2$*) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons. The corresponding sample sizes for each group is presented on the upper right corner.*

group during the weekdays. In contrast, Fréchet test fails to detect such differences in most of the comparisons and is only able to capture marginally significant results when comparing the young and older individuals among MDD patients. The tests $S1$ and $S2$ also show fewer significant results than our proposed tests.

To further demonstrate the possible gain of power, we note that among the patients with MDD, only the proposed $Z_{\text{out},w}$ test shows statistically significant difference between young and older groups for both weekend and weekday activities. Fréchet test shows some difference in activity distributions between young and older groups but only for the weekdays. To confirm the detected differences in the original data, we visualize the density data in Figure 6 by projecting them onto a lower-dimensional plots using multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) based on the Wasserstein distances. The figure

clearly shows difference in activity densities between young and older groups for both weekdays and weekends among MDD patients.




FIG 6. *Multidimensional scaling (MDS) plots based on the Wasserstain distances to visualize the distribution of activity densities among MDD patients, across three pairwise comparisons by age groups (left, middle, right) and on weekdays (top) and weekends (bottom).*

Finally, it is also interesting that T_{in} detects significant difference in day-to-day variability between the healthy young group and older groups. In fact, we obtained a negative value for Z_{in} which implies that the younger subjects have larger day-to-day variability than the two groups with older ages. Lastly, $T_{\text{out},d}$ does not yield any significant results, indicating that there is large subject heterogeneity within each age group, yet their scales are comparable.

5.3. *Comparison of activity distributions among different BMI groups.* A third factor that could potentially affect differential physical activity patterns is the body mass index (BMI). We apply our proposed tests to examine difference in daily activity density among individuals who are lean with BMI$\leq$25 and obese with BMI$>$25 among healthy individuals and those with mood disorders (OTHER). To control for the age effects, we only consider those individuals with age of 30 years or older.




FIG 7. *Comparisons of activity distributions by BMI (lean and obese groups). The* $-\log$*(p-values) of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests (*$S1$*,* $S2$*) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons. The corresponding sample sizes for each group is presented on the upper right corner.*

The results are provided in Figure 10. Among the healthy individuals, little difference is observed in their activity distribution patterns between lean and obese individuals during the weekdays and weekends. When assessing among patients in the OTHER group, we observe some differences in the mean of the activity distributions both during weekdays and weekends. We do not see group differences in the within-individual or between-individual variability. The generalized edge-count test and Fréchet test achieve non-significant large p-values and fail to reject the null hypothesis for all the comparisons. This further demonstrates that our proposed test statistics can detect difference in activities that could be missed by other methods.

6. Discussion. In this paper, we have extended the graph-based two-sample tests for density data and proposed several test statistics to account for repeated measure data by considering both the within-individual similarity graph G_{in} and between-individual similarity graph G_{out}. The graph allows for more than one edge between any two individuals, which extends the existing graph-based testing methods where only one edge between any two individuals is allowed. We have proposed a list of six test statistics that capture different alternatives that are associated with distributions of density functions, including differences in mean, inter- and intra-individual variances. These statistics are constructed based on the similarity graph G, which is the union of G_{in} and G_{out}. Furthermore, we have developed the asymptotic null distributions that can be used to obtain p-values under the permutation null. The test statistics are easy to calculate and the testing procedures are computationally efficient. Our simulation studies have shown

that the proposed test statistics control the desired type 1 errors and are more powerful than existing distance-based tests that ignore the repeated observations.

In our analysis of the physical activity measures with repeated observations, we have observed a substantial differences in the day-to-day variability within subject across disease groups and age categories. Such findings have rarely been reported previously. Our proposed tests are able to take into account such within-individual dependency and variability. Compared to the two versions of Fréchet tests, we observed increased power in detecting the differences in activity densities. In addition, by comparing results utilizing various proposed test statistics, we are able to further understand the complex data structures and decompose the source of differences between various groups.

Our proposed permutation procedure treats the entire vector of repeated observations from an individual as the independent unit, which requires that we have the same number of observations for each individual. Otherwise, the within-individual Wasserstein covariance is not well defined. In our analysis of the NIMH physical activity data, we noticed that the results are robust to different subsets of the observations used in our analysis and reported an average through Fisher's transformation. An interesting future research topic is to develop statistical tests that allow for different numbers of repeated observations.

References.

Banda, J. A., Haydel, K. F., Davila, T., Desai, M., Bryson, S., Haskell, W. L., Matheson, D. and Robinson, T. N. (2016). Effects of Varying Epoch Lengths, Wear Time Algorithms, and Activity Cut-Points on Estimates of Child Sedentary Behavior and Physical Activity from Accelerometer Data. *PLoS One* **11** e0150534.

Burton, C., McKinstry, B., Tătar, A. S., Serrano-Blanco, A., Pagliari, C. and Wolters, M. (2013). Activity monitoring in patients with depression: a systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **145** 21–28.

Chapman, J. J., Roberts, J. A., Nguyen, V. T. and Breakspear, M. (2017). Quantification of free-living activity patterns using accelerometry in adults with mental illness. *Sci Rep* **7** 43174.

Chen, H., Chen, X. and Su, Y. (2018). A weighted edge-count two-sample test for multivariate and object data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113** 1146–1155.

Chen, H. and Friedman, J. H. (2017). A new graph-based two-sample test for multivariate and object data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** 397–409.

Chen, L. H. and Shao, Q.-M. (2005). Stein's method for normal approximation. *An introduction to Stein's method* **4** 1–59.

Dawson, J. D. and Lagakos, S. W. (1993). Size and power of two-sample tests of repeated measures data. *Biometrics* 1022–1032.

De Crescenzo, F., Economou, A., Sharpley, A. L., Gormez, A. and Quested, D. J. (2017). Actigraphic features of bipolar disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Medicine Reviews* **33** 58–69.

Doherty, A., Jackson, D., Hammerla, N., Plötz, T., Olivier, P., Granat, M. H., White, T., van Hees, V. T., Trenell, M. I., Owen, C. G., Preece, S. J., Gillions, R., Sheard, S., Peakman, T., Brage, S. and Wareham, N. J. (2017). Large Scale Population Assessment of Physical Activity Using Wrist Worn Accelerometers: The UK Biobank Study. *PLoS One* **12** e0169649.

Dubey, P. and Müller, H.-G. (2019). Fréchet analysis of variance for random objects. *Biometrika* **106** 803–821.

Faurholt-Jepsen, M., Brage, S., Vinberg, M., Christensen, E. M., Knorr, U., Jensen, H. M. and Kessing, L. V. (2012). Differences in psychomotor activity in patients suffering from unipolar and bipolar affective disorder in the remitted or mild/moderate depressive state. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **141** 457–463.

Friedman, J. H. and Rafsky, L. C. (1979). Multivariate generalizations of the Wald-Wolfowitz and Smirnov two-sample tests. *The Annals of Statistics* 697–717.

Gretton, A., Borgwardt, K. M., Rasch, M. J., Schölkopf, B. and Smola, A. (2012). A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **13** 723–773.

Henze, N. (1988). A multivariate two-sample test based on the number of nearest neighbor type coincidences. *The Annals of Statistics* 772–783.

Indic, P., Salvatore, P., Maggini, C., Ghidini, S., Ferraro, G., Baldessarini, R. J. and Murray, G. (2011). Scaling behavior of human locomotor activity amplitude: association with bipolar disorder. *PLoS One* **6** e20650.

Keadle, S. K., Shiroma, E. J., Freedson, P. S. and Lee, I. M. (2014). Impact of accelerometer data processing decisions on the sample size, wear time and physical activity level of a large cohort study. *BMC Public Health* **14** 1210.

Krane-Gartiser, K., Henriksen, T. E. G., Morken, G., Vaaler, A. and Fasmer, O. B. (2014). Actigraphic assessment of motor activity in acutely admitted inpatients with bipolar disorder. *PloS One* **9** e89574.

Leeger-Aschmann, C. S., Schmutz, E. A., Zysset, A. E., Kakebeeke, T. H., Messerli-Bürgy, N., Stülb, K., Arhab, A., Meyer, A. H., Munsch, S., Jenni, O. G., Puder, J. J. and Kriemler, S. (2019). Accelerometer-derived physical activity estimation in preschoolers - comparison of cut-point sets incorporating the vector magnitude vs the vertical axis. *BMC Public Health* **19** 513.

Merikangas, K. R., Cui, L., Heaton, L., Nakamura, E., Roca, C., Ding, J., Qin, H., Guo, W., Shugart, Y. Y., Zarate, C. and Angst, J. (2014). Independence of familial transmission of mania and depression: results of the NIMH family study of affective spectrum disorders. *Mol Psychiatry* **19** 214–9.

Merikangas, K. R., Swendsen, J., Hickie, I. B., Cui, L., Shou, H., Merikangas, A. K., Zhang, J., Lamers, F., Crainiceanu, C., Volkow, N. D. and Zipunnikov, V. (2019). Real-time mobile monitoring of the dynamic associations among motor activity, energy, mood, and sleep in adults with bipolar disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry* **76** 190–198.

Murray, G., Gottlieb, J., Hidalgo, M. P., Etain, B., Ritter, P., Skene, D. J., Garbazza, C., Bullock, B., Merikangas, K., Zipunnikov, V., Shou, H., Gonzalez, R., Scott, J., Geoffroy, P. A. and Frey, B. N. (2020). Measuring circadian function in bipolar disorders: Empirical and conceptual review of physiological, actigraphic, and self-report approaches. *Bipolar Disorders*.

Pagani, L., St Clair, P. A., Teshiba, T. M., Service, S. K., Fears, S. C.,

Araya, C., Araya, X., Bejarano, J., Ramirez, M., Castrillón, G., Gomez-Makhinson, J., Lopez, M. C., Montoya, G., Montoya, C. P., Aldana, I., Navarro, L., Freimer, D. G., Safaie, B., Keung, L. W., Greenspan, K., Chou, K., Escobar, J. I., Ospina-Duque, J., Kremeyer, B., Ruiz-Linares, A., Cantor, R. M., Lopez-Jaramillo, C., Macaya, G., Molina, J., Reus, V. I., Sabatti, C., Bearden, C. E., Takahashi, J. S. and Freimer, N. B. (2016). Genetic contributions to circadian activity rhythm and sleep pattern phenotypes in pedigrees segregating for severe bipolar disorder. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113** E754–761.

Petersen, A. and Müller, H.-G. (2019). Wasserstein covariance for multiple random densities. *Biometrika* **106** 339–351.

Robillard, R., Hermens, D. F., Naismith, S. L., White, D., Rogers, N. L., Ip, T. K., Mullin, S. J., Alvares, G. A., Guastella, A. J., Smith, K. L., Rong, Y., Whitwell, B., Southan, J., Glozier, N., Scott, E. M. and Hickie, I. B. (2015). Ambulatory sleep-wake patterns and variability in young people with emerging mental disorders. *J Psychiatry Neurosci* **40** 28–37.

Rosenbaum, P. R. (2005). An exact distribution-free test comparing two multivariate distributions based on adjacency. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **67** 515–530.

Schilling, M. F. (1986). Multivariate two-sample tests based on nearest neighbors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **81** 799–806.

Schott, J. R. (2007). A test for the equality of covariance matrices when the dimension is large relative to the sample sizes. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **51** 6535–6542.

Schrack, J. A., Zipunnikov, V., Goldsmith, J., Bai, J., Simonsick, E. M., Crainiceanu, C. and Ferrucci, L. (2014). Assessing the "physical cliff": detailed quantification of age-related differences in daily patterns of physical activity. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* **69** 973–9.

Schrack, J. A., Cooper, R., Koster, A., Shiroma, E. J., Murabito, J. M., Rejeski, W. J., Ferrucci, L. and Harris, T. B. (2016). Assessing Daily Physical Activity in Older Adults: Unraveling the Complexity of Monitors, Measures, and Methods. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences* **71** 1039–1048.

Scott, J., Murray, G., Henry, C., Morken, G., Scott, E., Angst, J., Merikangas, K. R. and Hickie, I. B. (2017). Activation in Bipolar Disorders: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Psychiatry* **74** 189–196.

Shou, H., Cui, L., Hickie, I., Lameira, D., Lamers, F., Zhang, J., Crainiceanu, C., Zipunnikov, V. and Merikangas, K. R. (2017). Dysregulation of objectively assessed 24-hour motor activity patterns as a potential marker for bipolar I disorder: results of a community-based family study. *Translational Psychiatry* **7** e1211.

Varma, V. R., Dey, D., Leroux, A., Di, J., Urbanek, J., Xiao, L. and Zipunnikov, V. (2017). Re-evaluating the effect of age on physical activity over the lifespan. *Prev Med* **101** 102–108.

Varma, V. R., Dey, D., Leroux, A., Di, J., Urbanek, J., Xiao, L. and Zipunnikov, V. (2018). Total volume of physical activity: TAC, TLAC or TAC(λ). *Preventive Medicine* **106** 233–235.

Viciana, J., Mayorga-Vega, D. and Martínez-Baena, A. (2016). Moderate-to-Vigorous Physical Activity Levels in Physical Education, School Recess, and After-School Time: Influence of Gender, Age, and Weight Status. *J Phys Act Health* **13** 1117–1123.

Wrobel, J., Zipunnikov, V., Schrack, J. and Goldsmith, J. (2019). Registration for

exponential family functional data. *Biometrics* **75** 48–57.

Yang, H., Baladandayuthapani, V., Rao, A. U. K. and Morris, J. S. (2020). Quantile function on scalar regression analysis for distributional data. *J Am Stat Assoc* **115** 90–106.

Zhang, J. and Chen, H. (2020). Graph-based two-sample tests for data with repeated observations. *Statistica Sinica*.

SUPPLEMENT A: PROOFS OF THEOREMS

A.1. Proof of Theorem 2.1.

PROOF. According to the following definitions

$$R_{\text{out},1} = \sum_{(u,v)\in G_{\text{out}}} I(g_u = g_v = 1),$$
$$R_{\text{out},2} = \sum_{(u,v)\in G_{\text{out}}} I(g_u = g_v = 2),$$
$$R_{\text{in},1} = \sum_{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}}} I(g_i = g_j = 1),$$

we have

$$\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}) = \sum_{(u,v)\in G_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{P}(g_u = g_v = 1) = |G_{\text{out}}|\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)},$$
$$\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2}) = \sum_{(u,v)\in G_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{P}(g_u = g_v = 2) = |G_{\text{out}}|\frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{N(N-1)},$$
$$\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}) = \sum_{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{P}(g_i = g_j = 1) = |G_{\text{in}}|\frac{n_1}{N}.$$

For $\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1})$, we only need to figure out $\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}^2)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}^2)\\
=&\sum_{(u,v)\in G_{\text{out}}} P(g_u=g_v=1)+\sum_{\substack{(u,v),(u,s)\in G_{\text{out}}\\ v\neq s}} P(g_u=g_v=g_s=1)\\
&+\sum_{\substack{(u,v),(s,t)\in G_{\text{out}}\\ u,v,s,t \text{ are all different}}} P(g_u=g_v=g_s=g_t=1)\\
=&|G_{\text{out}}|\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)}+\sum_{u\neq v}\frac{D_{uv}(D_{uv}-1)}{2}\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)}\\
&+\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}(D_u-D_{uv})\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)}{N(N-1)(N-2)}\\
&+\left(|G_{\text{out}}|^2+\sum_{u\neq v}\frac{D_{uv}^2}{2}-\sum_u D_u^2\right)\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)(n_1-3)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)}\\
=&\sum_{u\neq v}\frac{D_{uv}^2}{2}\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)}+\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}(D_u-D_{uv})\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)}{N(N-1)(N-2)}\\
&+\left(|G_{\text{out}}|^2+\sum_{u\neq v}\frac{D_{uv}^2}{2}-\sum_u D_u^2\right)\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)(n_1-3)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The analytic expression of $\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},2})$ can be derived in a similar way as that of $\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1})$.

For $\mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},1},R_{\text{out},2})$, we only need to figure out $\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1},R_{\text{out},2})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}R_{\text{out},2})=&\sum_{(u,v)(s,t)\in G_{\text{out}}} P(g_u=g_v=1,g_s=g_t=2)\\
=&\left(|G_{\text{out}}|^2+\sum_{u\neq v}\frac{D_{uv}^2}{2}-\sum_u D_u^2\right)\frac{n_1(n_1-1)n_2(n_2-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we compute $\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}^2)$, $\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1},R_{\text{in},1})$ and $\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2},R_{\text{in},1})$ so that the analytic expressions of $\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{in},1})$, $\mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},1},R_{\text{in},1})$ and $\mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},2},R_{\text{in},1})$

can be derived immediately. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}^2)\\
=&\sum_{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}}} P(g_i=g_j=1)+\sum_{\substack{(i,j),(i,k)\in G_{\text{in}}\\ j\neq k}} P(g_i=g_j=g_k=1)\\
&+\sum_{\substack{(i,j),(k,l)\in G_{\text{in}}\\ i,j,k,l \text{ are all different}}} P(g_i=g_j=g_k=g_l=1)\\
=&\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}^2\frac{n_1n_2}{N(N-1)}+|G_{\text{in}}|^2\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)},\\
&\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}R_{\text{out},1})\\
=&\sum_{\substack{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}},i\in\mathcal{C}_s\\ (s,t)\in G_{\text{out}}}} P(g_i=g_j=g_t=1)+\sum_{\substack{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}},i\notin\mathcal{C}_s,j\notin\mathcal{C}_t\\ (s,t)\in G_{\text{out}}}} P(g_i=g_j=g_s=g_t=1)\\
=&\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}D_u\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{N(N-1)}+\left(|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|-\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}D_u\right)\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)}{N(N-1)(N-2)},\\
&\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}R_{\text{out},2})\\
=&\sum_{\substack{(i,j)\in G_{\text{in}},i\notin\mathcal{C}_s,j\notin\mathcal{C}_t\\ (s,t)\in G_{\text{out}}}} P(g_i=g_j=1,\ g_s=g_t=2)\\
=&\left(|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|-\sum_{u=1}^{N} D_{uu}D_u\right)\frac{n_1n_2(n_2-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

A.2. Rewrite S_R.

LEMMA A.1. *The statistic S_R can be rewritten in the following form*

$$S_R=(Z_{out,w},Z_{out,d},Z_{in})\mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}(Z_{out,w},Z_{out,d},Z_{in})^T,$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}=\mathbf{Var}((Z_{out,w},Z_{out,d},Z_{in})^T)$.

PROOF. Let

$$\mathbf{R}=\begin{pmatrix} R_{\text{out},1}-\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1})\\ R_{\text{out},2}-\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2})\\ R_{\text{in},1}-\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1})\end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} Z_{\text{out},m} \\ Z_{\text{out},d} \\ Z_{\text{in}} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n_2-1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}((n_2-1)R_{\text{out},1}+(n_1-1)R_{\text{out},2})}} & \frac{n_1-1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}((n_2-1)R_{\text{out},1}+(n_1-1)R_{\text{out},2})}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1}-R_{\text{out},2})}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1}-R_{\text{out},2})}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{in},1})}} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}$$
$$\triangleq \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{B}$ is invertible. From the definition of S, it can be written as

$$S = \mathbf{R}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{Z}^T(\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}.$$

Here, $\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T$ is the variance of $(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})^T$. □

A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Applying Stein's method, we prove $(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})^T$ converges in distribution to a trivariate Gaussian distribution as $N \to \infty$ first. Consider sums of the form $W = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} \xi_i$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is an index set and ξ_i are random variables with $\mathbf{E}(\xi_i) = 0$, and $\mathbf{E}(W^2) = 1$. The following assumption restricts the dependence between $\{\xi_i : i \in \mathcal{J}\}$.

ASSUMPTION A.1. *[Chen and Shao (2005), p. 17] For each $i \in \mathcal{J}$ there exists $S_i \subset T_i \subset \mathcal{J}$ such that ξ_i is independent of $\xi_{S_i^c}$ and ξ_{S_i} is independent of $\xi_{T_i^c}$.*

We will use the following theorem.

THEOREM A.2. *[Chen and Shao (2005), Theorem 3.4] Under Assumption A.1, we have*

$$\sup_{h\in Lip(1)} |\mathbf{E}h(W) - \mathbf{E}h(Z)| \le \delta$$

where $Lip(1) = \{h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \ \| h' \| \le 1\}$, Z has $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ distribution and

$$\delta = 2\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{E}|\xi_i\eta_i\theta_i| + |\mathbf{E}(\xi_i\eta_i)|\mathbf{E}|\theta_i|) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\mathbf{E}|\xi_i\eta_i^2|$$

with $\eta_i = \sum_{j\in S_i}\xi_j$ and $\theta_i = \sum_{j\in T_i}\xi_j$, where S_i and T_i are defined in Assumption A.1.

To prove Theorem 3.1, we take one step back to study the statistic under the bootstrap null distribution, which is defined as follows: For each subject,

we assign it to be from sample 1 with probability n_1/N, and from sample 2 with probability n_2/N, independently of other subjects. Let n_1^B be the number of subjects that are assigned to be from sample 1. Then, conditioning on $n_1^B = n_1$, the bootstrap null distribution becomes the permutation null distribution. We use $\mathbf{P}_B, \mathbf{E}_B, \mathbf{Var}_B$ to denote the probability, expectation, and variance under the bootstrap null distribution, respectively.

Let

$$\mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},1}) \triangleq \mu_1, \quad \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{out},2}) \triangleq \mu_2, \quad \mathbf{E}(R_{\text{in},1}) \triangleq \mu_3,$$
$$\mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},1}) \triangleq (\sigma_1)^2, \quad \mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{out},2}) \triangleq (\sigma_2)^2, \quad \mathbf{Var}(R_{\text{in},1}) \triangleq (\sigma_3)^2,$$
$$\mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}) \triangleq \sigma_{12}, \quad \mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{in},1}) \triangleq \sigma_{13}, \quad \mathbf{Cov}(R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1}) \triangleq \sigma_{23}.$$

Let $p_n = n_1/N, q_n = n_2/N$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n = p, \lim_{n\to\infty} q_n = q$. Using the similar steps as in the Proof A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}_B(R_{\text{out},1}) = |G_{\text{out}}|p_n^2 \triangleq \mu_1^B,\\
&\mathbf{E}_B(R_{\text{out},2}) = |G_{\text{out}}|q_n^2 \triangleq \mu_2^B,\\
&\mathbf{E}_B(R_{\text{in},1}) = |G_{\text{in}}|p_n \triangleq \mu_3^B,\\
&\mathbf{Var}_B(R_{\text{out},1}) = p_n^2 q_n^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 + \frac{p_n}{q_n}\sum_u D_u^2 \right\} \triangleq (\sigma_1^B)^2,\\
&\mathbf{Var}_B(R_{\text{out},1}) = p_n^2 q_n^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u\neq v} D_{uv}^2 + \frac{q_n}{p_n}\sum_u D_u^2 \right\} \triangleq (\sigma_2^B)^2,\\
&\mathbf{Var}_B(R_{\text{in},1}) = p_n q_n \sum_u D_{uu}^2 \triangleq (\sigma_3^B)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1^B &= \frac{R_{\text{out},1} - \mu_1^B}{\sigma_1^B}, \quad W_1 = \frac{R_{\text{out},1} - \mu_1}{\sigma_1},\\
W_2^B &= \frac{R_{\text{out},2} - \mu_2^B}{\sigma_2^B}, \quad W_2 = \frac{R_{\text{out},2} - \mu_2}{\sigma_2},\\
W_3^B &= \frac{R_{\text{in},1} - \mu_3^B}{\sigma_3^B}, \quad W_3 = \frac{R_{\text{in},1} - \mu_3}{\sigma_3},\\
W_4^B &= \frac{n_1^B - Np_n}{\sigma_0}, \text{ where } \sigma_0^2 = Np_n(1-p_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, as $N \to \infty$, we can prove the following results:

(1) $(W_1^B, W_2^B, W_3^B, W_4^B)$ becomes multivariate Gaussian distributed under the bootstrap null.

(2)

$$\frac{\sigma_1^B}{\sigma_1} \to c_1, \quad \frac{\mu_1^B - \mu_1}{\sigma_1^B} \to 0; \quad \frac{\sigma_2^B}{\sigma_2} \to c_2, \quad \frac{\mu_2^B - \mu_2}{\sigma_2^B} \to 0;$$
$$\frac{\sigma_3^B}{\sigma_3} \to c_3, \quad \frac{\mu_3^B - \mu_3}{\sigma_3^B} \to 0,$$

where c_1, c_2 and c_3 are constants.

(3)

$$|\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_2)| < 1, \quad |\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_3)| < 1,$$
$$|\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_2, W_3)| < 1.$$

From (1) and given that $\mathbf{Var}_B(W_4^B) = 1$, the conditional distribution of $(W_1^B, W_2^B, W_3^B)^T$ given W_4^B is a trivariate Gaussian distribution under the bootstrap null distribution as $N \to \infty$. Since the permutation null distribution is equivalent to the bootstrap null distribution given $W_4^B = 0$, $(W_1^B, W_2^B, W_3^B)^T$ follows a trivariate Gaussian distribution under the permutation null distribution as $N \to \infty$. Since

$$W_1 = \frac{\sigma_1^B}{\sigma_1}\left(W_1^B + \frac{\mu_1^B - \mu_1}{\sigma_1^B}\right), \quad W_2 = \frac{\sigma_2^B}{\sigma_2}\left(W_2^B + \frac{\mu_2^B - \mu_2}{\sigma_2^B}\right),$$
$$W_3 = \frac{\sigma_3^B}{\sigma_3}\left(W_3^B + \frac{\mu_3^B - \mu_3}{\sigma_3^B}\right),$$

given (2), we have $(W_1, W_2, W_3)^T$ follows a trivariate Gaussian distribution under the permutation null distribution as $N \to \infty$. Together with (3), we can conclude that $(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})^T$ converges in distribution to a trivariate Gaussian distribution as $N \to \infty$. In the following, we prove the results (1)—(3).

To prove (1), by Cramér-Wold device, we only need to show that $W = a_1W_1^B + a_2W_2^B + a_3W_3^B + a_4W_4^B$ is asymptotically Gaussian distributed for any combination of a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 such that $\mathbf{Var}_B(W) > 0$.

We first define more notations. For an edge (u, v) of G_{out}, i.e., $uv \in \mathcal{J}_1 = \{uv : u < v, (u, v) \in G_{\text{out}}\}$, let

$$\xi_{uv} = a_1\frac{I(g_u = g_v = 1) - p_n^2}{\sigma_1^B} + a_2\frac{I(g_u = g_v = 2) - q_n^2}{\sigma_2^B}.$$

For an edge (k,l) of G_{in}, i.e., $kl \in \mathcal{J}_2 = \{kl : k < l, (k,l) \in G_{\text{in}}\}$, let

$$\xi_{kl} = a_3 \frac{I(g_k = g_l = 1) - p_n}{\sigma_3^B}.$$

And for a subject $s \in \mathcal{J}_3 = \{1, \ldots, N\}$, let

$$\xi_s = a_4 \frac{I(g_s = 1) - p_n}{\sigma_0}.$$

Thus,

$$W = a_1 W_1^B + a_2 W_2^B + a_3 W_3^B + a_4 W_4^B = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_i,$$

where $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_1 \cup \mathcal{J}_2 \cup \mathcal{J}_3$.

For an edge $e = (u,v) \in G_{\text{out}}$, let

$$C_{\text{out},e} = \{u,v\} \cup \{s \in \{1, \ldots, N\} : s \text{ is connected to } u \text{ or } v \text{ in } G_{\text{out}}\}.$$

For an edge $e = (i,j) \in G_{\text{in}},\ i,j \in \mathcal{C}_u$, let

$$C_{\text{in},e} = \{u\} \cup \{s \in \{1, \ldots, N\} : s \text{ is connected to } u \text{ in } G_{\text{out}}\}.$$

We define

$$C_e = C_{\text{out},e} I(e \in G_{\text{out}}) + C_{\text{in},e} I(e \in G_{\text{in}})$$

and introduce following index sets to satisfy Assumption A.1. For $i \in \mathcal{J}_1$ (i.e., i is an edge $(u,v) \in G_{\text{out}}$), let

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &= A_i \cup \{u,v\}, \\ T_i &= B_i \cup C_i. \end{aligned}$$

For $i \in \mathcal{J}_2 \cup \mathcal{J}_3$ (i.e., i is an edge $(k,l) \in G_{\text{in}},\ k,l \in \mathcal{C}_s$ or i is a subject $s \in \mathcal{J}_3$),

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &= A_i \cup \{s\}, \\ T_i &= B_i \cup C_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then S_i and T_i satisfy Assumption A.1.

Let $a = \max\{|a_1|, |a_2|, |a_3|, |a_4|\}$ and $\sigma = \min\{\sigma_1^B, \sigma_2^B, \sigma_3^B, \sigma_0\}$. Since

$$|\xi_i| \le \begin{cases} 2a/\sigma & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_1, \\ a/\sigma & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_2 \cup \mathcal{J}_3 \end{cases},$$

we have

$$\sum_{j\in S_i}|\xi_j|\le(|A_i|+2)2a/\sigma,\quad \sum_{j\in T_i}|\xi_j|\le(|B_i|+|C_i|)2a/\sigma,\quad i\in\mathcal{J},$$

and the terms $\mathbf{E}|\xi_i\eta_i\theta_i|$, $|\mathbf{E}(\xi_i\eta_i)|\mathbf{E}|\theta_i|$ and $\mathbf{E}|\xi_i\eta_i^2|$ are all bounded by

$$\frac{32a^3}{\sigma^3}|A_i||B_i|.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta=&\frac{1}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{Var}_B(W))^3}}\left\{2\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{E}_B|\xi_i\eta_i\theta_i|+|\mathbf{E}_B(\xi_i\eta_i)|\mathbf{E}_B|\theta_i|)+\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\mathbf{E}_B|\xi_i\eta_i^2|\right\}\\ \le&\frac{1}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{Var}_B(W))^3}}\frac{160a^3}{\sigma^3}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}|A_i||B_i|\\ \le&\frac{480a^3}{\sigma^3\sqrt{(\mathbf{Var}_B(W))^3}}\sum_{e\in G_{\text{out}}}|A_{\text{out},e}||B_{\text{out},e}|\end{aligned}$$

Since $480a^3/\sqrt{(\mathbf{Var}_B(W))^3}$ is of constant order and $\sigma=O(N^{0.5})$, we have $\delta\to 0$ when $\sum_{e\in G_{\text{out}}}|A_{\text{out},e}||B_{\text{out},e}|=o(N^{1.5})$.

Next we prove result (2). Since $|G_{\text{out}}|=O(N)$ and $\sum_u D_u^2-4|G_{\text{out}}|^2/N=O(N)$, let $\lim_{N\to\infty}|G_{\text{out}}|/N=b_1$ and $\lim_{N\to\infty}\sum_u D_u^2/N-4|G_{\text{out}}|^2/N^2=b_2$, $b_1,b_2\in(0,\infty)$. Then $\lim_{N\to\infty}\sum_u D_u^2/N=4b_1^2+b_2$, i.e., $\sum_u D_u^2=O(N)$. Since

$$2|G_{\text{out}}|=\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}\le\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}^2\le\sum_u D_u^2,$$

we have $\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}^2=O(N)$ and let $\lim_{N\to\infty}\sum_{u\neq v}D_{uv}^2/N=b_3\in(0,\infty)$. Hence, as $N\to\infty$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{(\sigma_1^B)^2}{N}\longrightarrow p^2q^2\left\{\frac{1}{2}b_3+\frac{p}{q}(4b_1^2+b_2)\right\},\\ &\frac{(\sigma_1)^2}{N}\longrightarrow p^2q^2\left\{\frac{1}{2}b_3+\frac{p}{q}b_2\right\},\\ &\frac{\sigma_1^B}{\sigma_1}\longrightarrow\sqrt{1+\frac{8pb_1^2}{qb_3+2pb_2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\frac{\sigma_2^B}{\sigma_2}\longrightarrow\sqrt{1+\frac{8qb_1^2}{pb_3+2qb_2}}.$$

Since $|G_{\text{in}}| = O(N)$ and $\sum_u D_{uu}^2 - |G_{\text{in}}|^2/N = O(N)$, let $\lim_{N\to\infty} |G_{\text{in}}|/N = b_4$ and $\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_u D_{uu}^2/N - |G_{\text{in}}|^2/N^2 = b_5$, $b_4, b_5 \in (0,\infty)$. Then $\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_u D_{uu}^2/N = b_4^2 + b_5$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(\sigma_3^B)^2}{N} &\longrightarrow pq(b_4^2 + b_5),\\
\frac{(\sigma_3)^2}{N} &\longrightarrow pqb_5,\\
\frac{\sigma_3^B}{\sigma_3} &\longrightarrow \sqrt{1 + \frac{b_4^2}{b_5}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\mu_1^B - \mu_1 = |G_{\text{out}}| \frac{n_1 n_2}{N^2(N-1)},$$

so

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_1^B - \mu_1}{\sigma_1^B} = 0.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_2^B - \mu_2}{\sigma_2^B} = 0.$$

Since $\mu_3^B - \mu_3 = 0$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_3^B - \mu_3}{\sigma_3^B} = 0.$$

Last, we prove result (3). As $N \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\sigma_{12}}{N} \longrightarrow p^2q^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} b_3 - b_2 \right\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_2) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sqrt{(\sigma_1)^2(\sigma_2)^2}}\\
&= \frac{b_3 - 2b_2}{\sqrt{(b_3 - 2b_2)^2 + 2b_2 b_3/pq}},
\end{aligned}$$

Strictly positive $2b_2b_3/pq$ implies $|\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_2)| < 1$. Note that

$$|G_{\text{in}}| = \sum_u D_{uu} \le \sum_u D_{uu} D_u \le \sqrt{\sum_u D_{uu}^2} \sqrt{\sum_u D_u^2},$$

$|G_{\text{in}}| = O(N)$, $\sum_u D_{uu}^2 = O(N)$ and $\sum_u D_u^2 = O(N)$. We have $\sum_u D_{uu}D_u = O(N)$ and let $\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_u D_{uu}D_u/N = b_6 \in (0,\infty)$. Thus,

$$\frac{\sigma_{13}}{N} \longrightarrow p^2q(b_6 - 2b_1b_4),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_3) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sigma_{13}}{\sqrt{(\sigma_1)^2(\sigma_3)^2}} \\ &= \frac{p^2q(b_6 - 2b_1b_4)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}p^3q^3b_3b_5 + p^4q^2b_2b_5}},\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}D_u - \frac{2}{N}|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|}{\sqrt{(\sum_{u=1}^N D_u^2 - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N})(\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}^2 - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N})}} \right| = |\mathbf{Cor}(Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})| \le 1,$$

so

$$\left| \frac{b_6 - 2b_1b_4}{\sqrt{b_2b_5}} \right| = \left| \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\frac{\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}D_u}{N} - \frac{2}{N^2}|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|}{\sqrt{(\sum_{u=1}^N \frac{D_u^2}{N} - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N^2})(\sum_{u=1}^N \frac{D_{uu}^2}{N} - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N^2})}} \right| \le 1.$$

We have $|\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_1, W_3)| < 1$, since $p^3q^3b_3b_5/2$ is strictly positive. Similarly, we obtain $|\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{Cor}(W_2, W_3)| < 1$.

Since $(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})^T$ is the linear transformation of $(R_{\text{out},1}, R_{\text{out},2}, R_{\text{in},1})^T$, the proof above implies $(Z_{\text{out},w}, Z_{\text{out},d}, Z_{\text{in}})^T$ converges in distribution to a trivariate Gaussian distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Γ. As shown in Proof A.2, the linear transformation is nondegenerate. Thus Γ is invertible and $\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \rho_Z \\ 0 & \rho_Z & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where

$$\rho_Z = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}D_u - \frac{2}{N}|G_{\text{in}}||G_{\text{out}}|}{\sqrt{(\sum_{u=1}^N D_u^2 - \frac{4|G_{\text{out}}|^2}{N})(\sum_{u=1}^N D_{uu}^2 - \frac{|G_{\text{in}}|^2}{N})}} = \frac{b_6 - 2b_1b_4}{\sqrt{b_2b_5}}$$

and $|\rho_Z| < 1$.

SUPPLEMENT B: ADDITIONAL SIMULATION RESULTS FOR DATA WITH AN EXPONENTIALLY DECAYED WITHIN-SUBJECT CORRELATION

(1) Simulations for one-dimensional density, $p = 1$.

TABLE 4

Parameter values for 5 different simulation settings for comparison one-dimensional density functions.

A1': null model.
$\rho_1 = 0.6,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.6,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 2;\ \sigma = 1.$
A2': within-subject variability difference in ρ.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.9,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.2;\ \sigma = 1.$
A3': between-subject mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.2;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0.7,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.96,\ \nu_{22} = 1.16;\ \sigma = 1.$
A4': between-subject variability difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.97,\ \nu_{22} = 1.33;\ \sigma = 1.$
A5': within-subject variability difference in ρ, between-subject mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$, variance difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = 0,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.35,\ \beta_2 = 0.5,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.97,\ \nu_{22} = 1.36;\ \sigma = 1.$

TABLE 5

Empirical power of the proposed test statistics in the first 6 columns, generalized edge-count test (S1, S2) and Fréchet test (Fretest1, Fretest2) at 0.05 significance level under the five scenarios denoted by A1'–A5'. Those above 95 percentage of the best power under A2'–A5' are in bold.

	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
					Null model					
A1'	0.057	0.055	0.046	0.061	0.055	0.063	0.056	0.047	0.048	0.054
					Alternative model					
A2'	**0.966**	0.050	0.149	0.111	0.851	0.901	0.153	**1.000**	0.463	0.056
A3'	0.036	**0.970**	0.071	**0.960**	0.914	**0.949**	0.640	0.555	0.293	0.288
A4'	0.053	0.186	**0.908**	0.859	0.790	0.814	0.140	0.062	0.304	0.277
A5'	0.067	0.697	**0.993**	**0.995**	**0.986**	**0.991**	0.398	0.391	0.467	0.333

(2) Simuations for moderate-dimensional density, $p = 30$.

TABLE 6

Parameter values for 5 different simulation settings for comparison 30-dimensional density functions.

B1': null model.
$\rho_1 = 0.3,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 2;$
$\rho_2 = 0.3,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 2;\ \sigma = 1.$
B2': within-subject variability difference in ρ.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.25,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.3;\ \sigma = 1.$
B3': between-subject mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = 0.1\mathbf{1}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1,\ \nu_{21} = 1.2,\ \nu_{22} = 1.5;\ \sigma = 1.$
B4': between-subject variability difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0,\ \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.1,\ \nu_{21} = 0.8,\ \nu_{22} = 1.5;\ \sigma = 1.$
B5': within-subject variability difference in ρ, between-subject mean difference in β and $\nu_{\cdot 1} + \nu_{\cdot 2}$, variance difference in ϵ and $\nu_{\cdot 2} - \nu_{\cdot 1}$.
$\rho_1 = 0,\ \beta_1 = \mathbf{0}_p,\ \epsilon_1 = 1,\ \nu_{11} = 1,\ \nu_{12} = 1.3;$
$\rho_2 = 0.22,\ \beta_2 = 0.2\mathbf{1}_p,\ \epsilon_2 = 1.03,\ \nu_{21} = 1,\ \nu_{22} = 1.4;\ \sigma = 1.$

TABLE 7

Empirical power of the proposed test statistics in the first 6 columns, generalized edge-count test ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet test (Fretest1, Fretest2) at 0.05 significance level under the five scenarios denoted by B1'–B5'. Those above 95 percentage of the best power under B2'–B5' are in bold.

	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
					Null model					
B1'	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.045	0.049	0.051	0.047	0.050	0.050	0.066
					Alternative model					
B2'	**0.934**	0.054	0.046	0.043	0.838	0.852	0.212	0.054	0.485	0.079
B3'	0.057	**0.945**	0.049	**0.916**	0.812	0.893	0.772	0.717	0.118	0.181
B4'	0.144	0.241	**0.882**	0.835	0.774	0.806	0.720	0.800	**0.859**	**0.883**
B5'	**0.892**	0.668	0.131	0.596	**0.911**	**0.906**	0.756	0.483	0.853	0.461

SUPPLEMENT C: ADDITIONAL RESULTS ON COMPARISON OF ASYMPTOTIC *P*-VALUES AND PERMUTATION *P*-VALUES

We next examine whether the asymptotic p-values are close to the p-values obtained based on 10,000 permutations. We consider the data generating procedure in Section 4.1 with the parameters set as those in model (A5). In particular, under the chosen sample sizes n_1=n_2=25, 50, 75 and 100, data were generated over 100 simulation runs. For each run, we estimate the asymptotic p-values and permutation p-values over 10,000 permutations.

Figure 8 shows the empirical powers of each test estimated by the asymptotic and permutation p-values over the 100 runs for n_1=n_2=25, 50, 75, 100. The results show that the power obtained by the asymptotic p-value is very close to that based on the permutation p-value for all the proposed test statistics. As sample size increases, the results are almost identical as expected. We also provide the comparison of asymptotic p-value and permutation p-value over 100 simulation runs in the Supplementary Material.




FIG 8. *Comparison of the empirical power estimated by the asymptotic p-value and by the p-value calculated from 10,000 permutations for different proposed test statistics.*

Figures 9 and 10 show the comparison of asymptotic p-value and permuta-




FIG 9. *Compare the asymptotic p-value with the p-value calculated from 10,000 permutations with 100 simulations for test statistics* T_{in}, $Z_{out,w}$ *and* $T_{out,d}$.

tion p-value over 100 simulation runs. The results show that the asymptotic p-values are very similar to that based on the permutation p-value for all the proposed test statistics. As sample size increases, the results are almost identical as expected.




FIG 10. *Compare the asymptotic p-value with the p-value calculated from 10,000 permutations with 100 simulations for test statistics* $M_{out}(1.14)$, S_R *and* $M(1, 1.14)$.

SUPPLEMENT D: DETAILED P-VALUES IN REAL DATA ANALYSIS

TABLE 8

Comparisons of activity distributions among the controls, MDD, BPI and BPII patients. The p-values are presented for the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays, $n_1 = 117,\ n_2 = 106,\ n_3 = 26,\ n_4 = 32$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.729	0.625	0.307	0.428	0.567	0.566	0.472	0.171	0.381	0.305
HC vs BPII	0.777	0.442	0.238	0.345	0.550	0.488	0.305	0.053	0.661	0.231
HC vs BPI	0.770	0.061	0.867	0.140	0.405	0.205	0.734	0.734	0.262	0.105
MDD vs BPII	0.708	0.464	0.067	0.116	0.155	0.169	0.243	0.133	0.708	0.769
MDD vs BPI	0.746	0.119	0.617	0.272	0.539	0.377	0.693	0.680	0.703	0.491
BPII vs BPI	0.718	0.055	0.119	0.107	0.088	0.156	0.286	0.151	0.123	0.127
	weekends, $n_1 = 116,\ n_2 = 98,\ n_3 = 30,\ n_4 = 33$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.404	0.623	0.700	0.780	0.695	0.632	0.471	0.710	0.061	0.060
HC vs BPII	0.652	0.618	0.658	0.747	0.817	0.781	0.498	0.404	0.539	0.515
HC vs BPI	0.287	**0.003**	0.068	**0.005**	**0.005**	**0.006**	0.063	**0.018**	**0.014**	**0.002**
MDD vs BPII	0.714	0.451	0.848	0.813	0.885	0.828	0.482	0.728	0.274	0.317
MDD vs BPI	0.744	0.085	0.317	0.161	0.297	0.237	0.154	0.133	0.480	0.288
BPII vs BPI	0.699	**0.002**	0.250	**0.004**	**0.017**	**0.005**	**0.005**	0.054	**0.007**	**0.005**

TABLE 9

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different age groups, where C1, C2 and C3 denoting young, middle-aged and older age groups. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 55, 25										
C1 vs C2	**0.020**	0.139	0.513	0.314	**0.028**	0.054	0.812	0.060	0.718	0.547
C1 vs C3	**0.004**	**<1e-3**	0.867	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	0.078	0.116
C2 vs C3	0.201	**0.001**	0.781	**0.002**	**0.007**	**0.003**	0.332	**0.008**	0.272	0.369
MDD 21, 62, 20										
C1 vs C2	0.383	0.295	0.879	0.680	0.639	0.596	0.543	0.617	0.053	0.060
C1 vs C3	0.160	**0.012**	0.841	**0.024**	**0.044**	**0.033**	**0.048**	0.144	**0.011**	**0.033**
C2 vs C3	0.546	0.464	0.725	0.769	0.850	0.746	0.745	0.819	0.862	0.674
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 53, 26										
C1 vs C2	0.722	0.069	0.349	0.147	0.261	0.215	0.120	0.241	0.655	0.159
C1 vs C3	0.317	**0.001**	**0.013**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**0.001**	**0.047**	**0.004**	0.558	0.083
C2 vs C3	0.478	**0.027**	**0.042**	**0.035**	**0.017**	**0.050**	0.671	0.090	0.770	0.483
MDD 18, 55, 22										
C1 vs C2	0.408	0.468	0.276	0.375	0.394	0.408	0.426	0.210	0.358	0.604
C1 vs C3	0.533	**0.025**	0.155	**0.047**	0.065	0.070	0.145	0.110	0.073	0.097
C2 vs C3	0.633	0.526	0.684	0.726	0.767	0.726	0.868	0.691	0.543	0.355

TABLE 10

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different BMI groups, where D1 and D2 denoting lean and obese people, respectively. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 32, 48										
D1 vs D2	0.815	0.837	0.487	0.621	0.645	0.776	0.809	0.788	0.529	0.390
OTHER 43, 75										
D1 vs D2	0.756	**0.009**	0.163	**0.017**	**0.040**	**0.022**	0.384	0.614	0.826	0.858
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 30, 49										
D1 vs D2	0.579	0.718	0.366	0.493	0.490	0.566	0.636	0.375	0.262	0.168
OTHER 40, 74										
D1 vs D2	0.715	**0.030**	0.223	0.063	0.133	0.094	0.372	0.803	0.533	0.673

SUPPLEMENT E: RESULTS OF REAL APPLICATION WHEN USING 5-MST AND 15-MST AS THE SIMILARITY GRAPH

TABLE 11

Comparisons of activity distributions among the controls, MDD, BPI and BPII patients. The p-values are presented for the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays, $n_1 = 117,\ n_2 = 106,\ n_3 = 26,\ n_4 = 32$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.701	0.803	0.658	0.769	0.674	0.807	0.426	0.212	0.384	0.307
HC vs BPII	0.728	0.380	0.392	0.485	0.751	0.643	0.164	0.056	0.661	0.230
HC vs BPI	0.592	0.192	0.730	0.433	0.657	0.523	0.611	0.754	0.262	0.104
MDD vs BPII	0.834	0.390	0.134	0.210	0.354	0.303	0.176	0.181	0.711	0.767
MDD vs BPI	0.773	0.263	0.544	0.496	0.734	0.636	0.620	0.577	0.705	0.485
BPII vs BPI	0.712	0.137	0.260	0.250	0.265	0.348	0.508	0.116	0.124	0.127
	weekends, $n_1 = 116,\ n_2 = 98,\ n_3 = 30,\ n_4 = 33$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.541	0.655	0.838	0.877	0.788	0.779	0.640	0.676	0.052	0.060
HC vs BPII	0.405	0.491	0.725	0.723	0.691	0.592	0.596	0.403	0.542	0.515
HC vs BPI	0.206	**0.021**	0.092	**0.031**	**0.023**	**0.036**	0.275	0.077	**0.014**	**0.002**
MDD vs BPII	0.759	0.431	0.830	0.782	0.905	0.845	0.530	0.718	0.279	0.322
MDD vs BPI	0.654	0.176	0.276	0.237	0.378	0.334	0.354	0.196	0.477	0.288
BPII vs BPI	0.720	**0.030**	0.670	0.065	0.209	0.095	**0.026**	0.090	**0.007**	**0.005**

E.1. 5-MST with the 2-Wasserstein distance as the similarity graph.

TABLE 12

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different age groups, where C1, C2 and C3 denoting young, middle-aged and older age groups. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 55, 25										
C1 vs C2	0.109	0.074	0.663	0.169	**<1e-3**	0.142	0.473	**0.044**	0.709	0.559
C1 vs C3	**0.005**	**<1e-3**	0.723	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**0.005**	**<1e-3**	0.076	0.116
C2 vs C3	0.143	**<1e-3**	0.725	**0.002**	**0.004**	**0.002**	0.395	**0.044**	0.272	0.369
MDD 21, 62, 20										
C1 vs C2	0.418	0.320	0.868	0.710	0.674	0.623	0.649	0.527	0.053	0.060
C1 vs C3	0.182	**0.029**	0.800	0.062	0.100	0.079	0.126	0.182	**0.011**	**0.033**
C2 vs C3	0.611	0.368	0.746	0.697	0.842	0.730	0.746	0.778	0.861	0.675
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 53, 26										
C1 vs C2	0.656	0.093	0.587	0.201	0.356	0.278	0.317	0.215	0.661	0.157
C1 vs C3	0.597	**<1e-3**	**0.027**	**<1e-3**	**<1e-3**	**0.002**	**0.024**	**0.003**	0.553	0.082
C2 vs C3	0.688	0.109	**0.048**	0.068	0.078	0.100	0.471	0.106	0.767	0.480
MDD 18, 55, 22										
C1 vs C2	0.558	0.542	0.308	0.416	0.471	0.484	0.340	0.197	0.348	0.603
C1 vs C3	0.490	0.069	0.424	0.143	0.197	0.186	0.200	0.087	0.075	0.099
C2 vs C3	0.716	0.580	0.447	0.553	0.656	0.640	0.801	0.588	0.553	0.359

TABLE 13

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different BMI groups, where D1 and D2 denoting lean and obese people, respectively. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 32, 48										
D1 vs D2	0.803	0.920	0.242	0.354	0.258	0.485	0.796	0.726	0.533	0.395
OTHER 43, 75										
D1 vs D2	0.793	**0.011**	0.128	**0.020**	**0.034**	**0.029**	0.439	0.451	0.826	0.857
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 30, 49										
D1 vs D2	0.631	0.332	0.401	0.444	0.542	0.544	0.595	0.424	0.257	0.163
OTHER 40, 74										
D1 vs D2	0.692	0.105	0.121	0.142	0.204	0.208	0.464	0.680	0.504	0.657

TABLE 14

Comparisons of activity distributions among the controls, MDD, BPI and BPII patients. The p-values are presented for the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays, $n_1 = 117,\ n_2 = 106,\ n_3 = 26,\ n_4 = 32$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.801	0.596	0.231	0.341	0.597	0.482	0.644	0.158	0.388	0.309
HC vs BPII	0.773	0.248	0.089	0.148	0.237	0.219	0.706	0.057	0.657	0.226
HC vs BPI	0.759	0.056	0.886	0.055	0.222	0.081	0.781	0.623	0.257	0.103
MDD vs BPII	0.540	0.451	0.055	0.064	0.059	0.094	0.574	0.089	0.717	0.762
MDD vs BPI	0.787	0.058	0.755	0.107	0.333	0.154	0.746	0.778	0.696	0.482
BPII vs BPI	0.354	0.051	0.147	0.051	0.058	0.059	0.113	0.189	0.122	0.126
	weekends, $n_1 = 116,\ n_2 = 98,\ n_3 = 30,\ n_4 = 33$.									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.329	0.390	0.392	0.468	0.513	0.443	0.459	0.699	0.051	0.059
HC vs BPII	0.754	0.442	0.414	0.502	0.718	0.650	0.481	0.393	0.538	0.509
HC vs BPI	0.508	**0.001**	**0.031**	**0.001**	**0.001**	**0.002**	**0.007**	**0.005**	**0.013**	**0.002**
MDD vs BPII	0.319	0.348	0.848	0.711	0.609	0.499	0.545	0.748	0.276	0.317
MDD vs BPI	0.620	**0.038**	0.218	0.073	0.122	0.107	0.072	0.078	0.482	0.288
BPII vs BPI	0.768	< 1**e-3**	0.168	**0.001**	**0.003**	**0.001**	**0.003**	**0.006**	**0.007**	**0.005**

TABLE 15

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different age groups, where C1, C2 and C3 denoting young, middle-aged and older age groups. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 55, 25										
C1 vs C2	**0.023**	0.073	0.368	0.165	**0.020**	0.055	0.859	0.083	0.717	0.551
C1 vs C3	**0.001**	< 1**e-3**	0.577	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	0.076	0.115
C2 vs C3	0.074	< 1**e-3**	0.726	**0.001**	**0.001**	**0.001**	**0.011**	**0.003**	0.268	0.366
MDD 21, 62, 20										
C1 vs C2	0.250	0.259	0.885	0.613	0.467	0.456	0.470	0.755	0.053	0.061
C1 vs C3	0.059	**0.006**	0.885	**0.010**	**0.006**	**0.013**	**0.005**	**0.020**	**0.011**	**0.033**
C2 vs C3	0.399	0.401	0.815	0.781	0.772	0.644	0.705	0.863	0.858	0.677
	weekends									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 53, 26										
C1 vs C2	0.455	0.059	0.145	0.091	0.089	0.129	0.189	0.307	0.670	0.158
C1 vs C3	**0.050**	**0.002**	**0.005**	**0.002**	< 1**e-3**	**0.003**	0.187	**0.021**	0.556	0.083
C2 vs C3	0.311	**0.042**	0.058	0.056	**0.026**	0.076	0.722	0.096	0.769	0.481
MDD 18, 55, 22										
C1 vs C2	0.181	0.395	0.295	0.395	0.285	0.289	0.837	0.452	0.350	0.607
C1 vs C3	0.370	**0.039**	0.116	0.068	0.057	0.096	**0.005**	**0.021**	0.071	0.095
C2 vs C3	0.624	0.369	0.865	0.762	0.856	0.776	0.906	0.699	0.545	0.359

TABLE 16

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different BMI groups, where D1 and D2 denoting lean and obese people, respectively. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 32, 48										
D1 vs D2	0.843	0.717	0.649	0.767	0.874	0.891	0.886	0.826	0.531	0.394
OTHER 43, 75										
D1 vs D2	0.793	**0.006**	0.263	**0.011**	**0.043**	**0.016**	0.496	0.833	0.825	0.856
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 30, 49										
D1 vs D2	0.609	0.861	0.496	0.628	0.480	0.689	0.672	0.340	0.256	0.167
OTHER 40, 74										
D1 vs D2	0.763	**0.031**	0.422	0.065	0.195	0.098	0.690	0.673	0.482	0.643

E.2. 15-MST with the 2-Wasserstein distance as the similarity graph.

TABLE 17

Comparisons of activity distributions among the controls, MDD, BPI and BPII patients. The p-values are presented for the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays, $n_1 = 117,\ n_2 = 106,\ n_3 = 26,\ n_4 = 32.$									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.730	0.810	0.603	0.714	0.629	0.774	0.718	0.504	0.382	0.307
HC vs BPII	0.735	0.062	0.744	0.133	0.302	0.182	0.466	0.322	0.656	0.230
HC vs BPI	0.644	0.205	0.774	0.435	0.634	0.507	0.768	0.758	0.259	0.103
MDD vs BPII	0.801	0.115	0.616	0.221	0.426	0.310	0.549	0.321	0.712	0.768
MDD vs BPI	0.706	0.343	0.738	0.608	0.782	0.684	0.761	0.759	0.700	0.483
BPII vs BPI	0.708	0.053	0.672	0.071	0.177	0.101	0.600	0.306	0.121	0.124
	weekends, $n_1 = 116,\ n_2 = 98,\ n_3 = 30,\ n_4 = 33.$									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC vs MDD	0.511	0.912	0.733	0.824	0.447	0.696	0.614	0.743	0.062	0.060
HC vs BPII	0.593	0.593	0.716	0.755	0.745	0.726	0.636	0.316	0.553	0.523
HC vs BPI	0.456	0.066	0.190	0.087	0.119	0.112	0.144	0.093	**0.014**	**0.002**
MDD vs BPII	0.391	0.600	0.753	0.778	0.585	0.561	0.728	0.439	0.267	0.310
MDD vs BPI	0.689	0.243	0.257	0.236	0.378	0.329	0.296	0.143	0.485	0.284
BPII vs BPI	0.409	**0.021**	0.359	**0.041**	0.078	0.055	0.127	0.340	**0.007**	**0.005**

TABLE 18

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different age groups, where C1, C2 and C3 denoting young, middle-aged and older age groups. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

	weekdays									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 55, 25										
C1 vs C2	0.409	**0.036**	0.725	0.082	0.156	0.106	0.708	0.495	0.713	0.550
C1 vs C3	**0.029**	< 1**e-3**	0.270	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	< 1**e-3**	**0.002**	< 1**e-3**	0.076	0.115
C2 vs C3	0.206	**0.002**	0.669	**0.005**	**0.010**	**0.006**	0.154	0.062	0.272	0.369
MDD 21, 62, 20										
C1 vs C2	0.396	0.121	0.801	0.281	0.313	0.278	0.425	0.332	0.053	0.060
C1 vs C3	0.206	**0.002**	0.742	**0.005**	**0.012**	**0.006**	0.191	0.230	**0.011**	**0.032**
C2 vs C3	0.744	0.183	0.624	0.380	0.602	0.482	0.779	0.793	0.863	0.681
	weekends									
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 36, 53, 26										
C1 vs C2	0.696	**0.012**	0.721	**0.027**	0.079	**0.037**	0.291	0.353	0.657	0.157
C1 vs C3	0.612	**0.002**	0.538	**0.004**	**0.011**	**0.005**	**0.014**	**0.009**	0.554	0.081
C2 vs C3	0.664	0.091	0.492	0.162	0.278	0.223	0.259	0.154	0.771	0.482
MDD 18, 55, 22										
C1 vs C2	0.480	0.270	0.413	0.344	0.481	0.406	0.468	0.237	0.358	0.604
C1 vs C3	0.646	**0.041**	0.721	0.091	0.220	0.126	0.094	0.104	0.073	0.096
C2 vs C3	0.715	0.379	0.236	0.281	0.418	0.377	0.754	0.700	0.546	0.353

TABLE 19

Comparisons of activity distrbutions in different BMI groups, where D1 and D2 denoting lean and obese people, respectively. The p-values of the proposed test statistics, the generalized edge-count tests ($S1$, $S2$) and Fréchet tests (Fretest1, Fretest2) are presented for different comparisons (bold for those <0.05).

					weekdays					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 32, 48										
D1 vs D2	0.770	0.798	0.501	0.614	0.624	0.716	0.774	0.713	0.533	0.400
D1 vs D2	0.794	**0.008**	0.284	**0.015**	**0.038**	**0.021**	0.319	0.235	0.826	0.861
					weekends					
	T_{in}	$Z_{\text{out},w}$	$T_{\text{out},d}$	M_{out}	S_R	M	$S1$	$S2$	Fretest1	Fretest2
HC 30, 49										
D1 vs D2	0.630	0.467	0.559	0.584	0.658	0.635	0.697	0.681	0.258	0.168
D1 vs D2	0.697	0.134	0.592	0.293	0.490	0.404	0.551	0.455	0.531	0.697

E.3. 5-MST with the maximum mean discrepancy as the similarity graph.

DIVISION OF BIOSTATISTICS
DEPARTMENT OF BIOSTATISTICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY AND INFORMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PERELMAN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19104
USA
EMAIL: JINGRU.ZHANG@PENNMEDICINE.UPENN.EDU
EMAIL: HONGZHE@PENNMEDICINE.UPENN.EDU
EMAIL: HSHOU@PENNMEDICINE.UPENN.EDU

GENETIC EPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH BRANCH
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
BETHESDA, MD 20892
USA
EMAIL: MERIKANK@MAIL.NIH.GOV