arXiv:math/0701003v1 [math.ST] 29 Dec 2006

TO HOW MANY SIMULTANEOUS HYPOTHESIS TESTS CAN NORMAL, STUDENT'S t OR BOOTSTRAP CALIBRATION BE APPLIED?

Jianqing Fan Peter Hall Qiwei Yao

ABSTRACT. In the analysis of microarray data, and in some other contemporary statistical problems, it is not uncommon to apply hypothesis tests in a highly simultaneous way. The number, N say, of tests used can be much larger than the sample sizes, n, to which the tests are applied, yet we wish to calibrate the tests so that the overall level of the simultaneous test is accurate. Often the sampling distribution is quite different for each test, so there may not be an opportunity for combining data across samples. In this setting, how large can N be, as a function of n, before level accuracy becomes poor? In the present paper we answer this question in cases where the statistic under test is of Student's t type. We show that if either Normal or Student's t distribution is used for calibration then the level of the simultaneous test is accurate provided $\log N$ increases at a strictly slower rate than $n^{1/3}$ as n diverges. On the other hand, if bootstrap methods are used for calibration then we may choose $\log N$ almost as large as $n^{1/2}$ and still achieve asymptotic level accuracy. The implications of these results are explored both theoretically and numerically.

KEYWORDS. Bonferroni's inequality, Edgeworth expansion, genetic data, large-deviation expansion, level accuracy, microarray data, quantile estimation, skewness, Student's t statistic.

Jianqing Fan is Frederick L. Moore '18 Professor of Finance (E-mail: jqfan@princeton.edu), Department of Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA. Peter Hall (E-mail: halpstat@maths.anu.edu.au) is professor, Centre for Mathematics and its Applications, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia. Qiwei Yao is professor (E-mail: q.yao@lse.ac.uk), Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom. Fan's work was sponsored in part by NSF grant DMS-0354223 and NIH grant R01-GM07261.

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern technology allows us to collect a large amount of data in one scan of images. This is exemplified in genomic studies using microarrays, tiling arrays and proteomic techniques. In the analysis of microarray data, and in some other contemporary statistical problems, we often wish to make statistical inference simultaneously for all important parameters. The number of parameters, N, is frequently much larger than sample size, n. Indeed, sample size is typically small; e.g. $n = 8$, 20 or 50 are considered to be typical, moderately large or large, respectively, for microarray data. The question arises naturally as to how large N can be before the accuracy of simultaneous statistical inference becomes poor.

Important results in this direction have been obtained by van der Laan and Bryan (2001), who showed that the population mean and variance parameters can be consistently estimated when $\log N = o(n)$ if observed data are bounded. Bickel and Levina (2004) gave similar results in a high-dimensional classification problem; Fan, Peng and Huang (2005) and Huang *et al.* (2005) studied semiparametric inference where $N \to \infty$; and Hu and He (2006) proposed an enhanced quantile normalization based on high-dimensional singular value decomposition to reduce information loss in gene expression profiles.

Korosok and Ma (2005) treated the problem of uniform, simultaneous estimation of a large number of marginal distributions, showing that if $\log N = o(n)$, and if certain other conditions hold, then $\max_{1 \le i \le N} \|\widehat{F}_i - F_i\|_\infty \to 0$, where $\widehat{F}_i$ is an estimator of the ith marginal distribution F_i. As a corollary they proved that a P-value $\hat{P}_i$ of $\widehat{F}_i$ converges uniformly in i to its counterpart

P_i for F_i, provided $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$:

$$\max_{1 \le i \le N} \|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_\infty \to 0\,. \tag{1.1}$$

These results are important advances in the literature of simultaneous testing, where P-values are popularly assumed to be known. For examples in the latter setting, see Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001), Dudoit, Shaffer and Boldrick (2003), Donoho and Jin (2004), Efron (2004), Genovese and Wasserman (2001), Storey, Taylor and Siegmund (2004), Lehmann and Romano (2005), Lehmann, Romano and Shaffer (2005) where many new ideas have been introduced to control different aspects of simultaneous hypothesis testing and false discovery rate (FDR).

In many practical settings the assumption that P-values are calculated without error is unrealistic, but it is unclear how good the approximation must be in order for simultaneous inference to be feasible. Simple consistency, as evidenced by (1.1), is not enough; the level of accuracy required must increase with N. More precisely, letting α_N be the significant level, which tends to zero as $N \to \infty$, the required accuracy is then

$$\max_{1 \le i \le N} \|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_\infty = o(\alpha_N). \tag{1.2}$$

In this paper we provide a concise solution to this problem.

For example, we show that in the case of simultaneous t-tests, calibrated by reference to Normal or Student's t distributions, a necessary and sufficient condition for overall level accuracy to be asymptotically correct is (a) $\log N = o(n^{1/3})$. This is true even if the sampling distribution is highly skewed or heavy tailed. On the other hand, if bootstrap methods are used for estimating P-values then the asymptotic level of the simultaneous test is

accurate as long as (b) $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$. These results make clear the advantages offered by bootstrap calibration. We shall explore them numerically as well as theoretically. Result (a) needs only bounded third moments of the sampling distribution, although our proof of (b) needs more restrictions.

Take the case of family-wise error rate as an example. If the overall error rate is controlled at p, then k_n hypotheses with the smallest P-values are rejected, where

$$k_n = \max\{i : P_i \le p/N, i = 1, \ldots, N\} \tag{1.3}$$

and P_i denotes the significance level of the ith test. The Benjamini and Hochberg's (1995) approach to control false discovery rate (FDR) at p is to select

$$k_n = \max\{i : P_{(i)} \le ip/N, i = 1, \ldots, N\}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\{P_{(i)}\}$ are the ordered values of $\{P_i\}$. If the distributions from which the P_i's are computed need to be estimated then, in view of (1.3) or (1.4), the error of the estimators $\hat{P}_i$ should equal $o(N^{-1})$ in order to sort correctly $\{P_i\}$, and the approximation (1.1) requires significant refinement. Indeed, it corresponds to (1.2) with $\alpha_N = p/N$. This is a very stringent requirement ($\alpha_N = 10^{-5}$, if $p = 0.1$ and $N = 10^4$) and the accuracy is hard to achieve for many practical situations.

Sometimes, the classical approach provides an attractive alternative to select significant hypotheses (genes). For example, in their analysis of gene expression data, Fan *et al.* (2004) take $\alpha_N = 0.001$ and find the significant set of genes,

$$\mathcal{S} = \{i : P_i \le \alpha_N, i = 1, \ldots, N\}, \tag{1.5}$$

for $N = 15{,}000$ simultaneous tests. Here α_N is an order of magnitude larger than N^{-1}, and the approximation errors when estimating P-values need only be $o(\alpha_N)$ when computing (1.5), rather than $o(N^{-1})$ in the family-wise error rate problem. In this case, the requirement is much less stringent and the number of simultaneous tests N for (1.2) to hold should be an order of magnitude larger than the case with $\alpha_N = N^{-1}$. However, even if we take $\alpha_N = C\,N^{-a}$, where $C > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1]$ are constants, from some points of view the problem does not become appreciably simpler. For instance, in the case of calibration by the Normal or Student's t distributions, condition (a) two paragraphs above is still necessary and sufficient.

In this example the number of elements of $\mathcal{S}$, denoted by k'_n, equals the number of genes discovered at the significance level α_N; and $N\alpha_N$, an upper bound to the expected number of falsely discovered genes, is approximately the same as the expected number of falsely discovered genes when most null hypotheses are true. Hence, the FDR in this example is estimated as $\hat{p} = N\alpha_N/k'_n$. Surprisingly, this classical approach is approximately the same as the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Using $\hat{p}$ as the FDR to be controlled, the Benjamini-Hochberg method picks up $\hat{k}_n = \max\{i : P_{(i)} \le i\hat{p}/N, i = 1, \ldots, N\}$ most significant P-values, whereas the classical approach (1.5) selects k'_n most significant P-values. The classical approach is more conserve since it is shown by Fan *et al.* (2005) that $k'_n \le \hat{k}_n$. However, in our simulation experiments (reported in a previous version), $\hat{k}_n \approx k_n$. In other words, the classical approach selects nearly the same set of significant hypotheses as that by the Benjamini-Hochberg method.

The results stated above are for the case of independent tests, but they also apply, in the sense of sufficiency for asymptotically conservative tests,

under the assumption of positive regression dependency; see Benjamini and Yekuteli (2001, p. 1170) for discussion. We discuss too the case where the errors in the data come from a linear process. There, theoretical formulae for significance levels can be based on Poisson cluster-process arguments. To treat simultaneous hypothesis testing under completely general types of dependence we use a Bonferroni argument. This permits our results on the accuracy of bootstrap and Student's t approximations to be extended to a wide range of settings. In particular they apply in the context of generalized family-wise error rate.

Practical implications of our work include the following. (i) When calibrating multiple hypothesis tests using Student's t statistic, for example with a view to controlling family-wise error rate, impressive level-accuracy can be obtained via Student's t approximation. Only a mild moment condition is needed. (ii) Nevertheless, accuracy is noticeably improved through using the bootstrap. (iii) These results also apply in the case of generalized family-wise error rate. (iv) Owing to the limitation of on the number of simultaneous hypotheses that can be accurately tested for a given n and α_N, other methods of pre-screening are needed when there are excessively many hypotheses to be tested.

In a sequence of papers, Finner and Roters (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002) developed theoretical properties of n simultaneous hypothesis tests as n increases. However, their work differs from ours in a major respect, through their assumption that the exact significance level can be tuned to a known value in the continuum. In such cases there is no theoretical limit to how large nN can be. By way of comparison, in the setting of the genetic problems that motivates our work, level inaccuracies limit the effective size

of N; we shall delineate this limitation using both theoretical and numerical arguments.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we formulate the accuracy problem for simultaneous tests. There, we also outline statistical models and testing procedures. Our main results are presented in section 3, where we answer the question of how many hypotheses can be tested simultaneously without the overall significance level being seriously in error. The theoretical definition of the latter property is that the overall significance level should converge to the nominal one as the number of tests increases, if the samples on which the tests are based are independent; and that the limiting level should not exceed the nominal one if the independence condition is violated and a Bonferroni bound is used.

Section 4 outlines the idea of marginal aggregation when the number of hypotheses is ultra-large. Numerical investigations among various calibration methods are presented in section 5. Technical proofs of results in section 3 are relegated to section 6.

2. MODEL AND METHODS FOR TESTING

2.1. Basic model and methodology. The simplest model is that where we observe random variables

$$Y_{ij} = \mu_i + \epsilon_{ij}\,, \quad 1 \le i < \infty\,, \quad 1 \le j \le n\,, \tag{2.1}$$

with the index i denoting the ith gene, j indicating the jth array, and the constant μ_i representing the mean effect for the ith gene. We shall assume that:

for each i, $\epsilon_{i1}, \ldots, \epsilon_{in}$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with zero expected value. (2.2)

The results given below are readily extended to the case where $n = n_i$ depends on i, but taking n fixed simplifies our discussion.

Let $T_i = n^{1/2}\,\bar{Y}_i/S_i$, where

$$\bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_{ij}\,, \quad S_i^2 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_{ij}-\bar{Y}_i)^2\,.$$

For a given value of i we wish to test the null hypothesis H_{0i} that $\mu_i = 0$, against the alternative hypothesis H_{1i} that $\mu_i \neq 0$, for $1 \leq i \leq N$ say. We first study this classical testing problem of controlling the probability of making at least one false discovery, which requires calculating P-values with accuracy $o(N^{-1})$, the same as that needed in (1.3). We then extend our results to control the relaxed FDR in (1.5), which is less stringent.

A standard test is to reject H_{0i} if $|T_i| > t_\alpha$. Here, t_α denotes the solution of either of equations

$$P(|Z| > t_\alpha) = 1-(1-\alpha)^{1/N}\,, \quad P\{|T(n-1)| > t_\alpha\} = 1-(1-\alpha)^{1/N}\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where N and $T(k)$ have respectively the standard Normal distribution and Student's t distribution with k degrees of freedom. Note that (2.3) serves only to give a definition of t_α that is commonly used in practice; it does not amount to an assumption about the sampling distribution of the data. Indeed, $\alpha_N = 1-(1-\alpha)^{1/N}$ and α is a one-to-one map. The core of the argument in this paper is that the accuracy of the distributional approximations implicit in (2.3) are based on a delicate relationship between n and N, which is central to the question of how many simultaneous tests are possible.

2.2. Significance levels for simultaneous tests. If H_{0i} is true then the significance level of the test restricted to gene i, is given by

$$p_i = P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_\alpha)\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where P_{0i} denotes probability calculated under H_{0i}. For the classical approach (1.3), which is nearly the same as the Benjamini-Hochberg method, we ask how large N can be so that

$$\max_{1\le i\le N} |p_i - \alpha_N| = o(\alpha_N)? \tag{2.5}$$

The answer depends on the rate at which α_N approaches to zero. In particular, if $\alpha_N = \beta/N$, (2.5) entails that

$$\max_{1\le i\le N} p_i = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = \beta + o(1)\,, \tag{2.6}$$

for some $0 < \beta < \infty$? Result (2.6) implies that the significance level of the simultaneous test, described in section 2.1, is

$$\alpha(N) \equiv P\Big(H_{0i} \text{ rejected for at least one } i \text{ in the range } 1 \le i \le N\Big) \tag{2.7}$$

$$\le \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = \beta + o(1)\,. \tag{2.8}$$

If, in addition to (2.2), we assume that

$$\text{the sets of variables } \{\epsilon_{ij},\ 1 \le j \le n\} \text{ are independent for different } i, \tag{2.9}$$

then

$$\alpha(N) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{N} (1 - p_i) = 1 - \exp\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i\Big) + O\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^2\Big). \tag{2.10}$$

Consequently, (2.6) and (2.10) imply the following property:

$$\text{if (2.9) holds then} \quad \alpha(N) = 1 - e^{-\beta} + o(1)\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\alpha(N)$ is as defined at (2.7). The "$o(1)$" terms in (2.8) and (2.11) are quantities which converge to zero as $N \to \infty$. Result (2.11) also holds, with

the identity $\alpha(N) = 1 - e^{-\beta} + o(1)$ replaced by $\alpha(N) \leq 1 - e^{-\beta} + o(1)$, if (2.9) is replaced by the positive regression dependency assumption (Benjamini and Yekuteli, 2001 p. 1170).

In practice we would take $\beta = -\log(1-\alpha)$, if we were prepared to assume (2.9) (or positive regression dependency of the test statistics) and wished to construct a simultaneous test with level close to α [or, respectively, asymptotically not exceeding α]; and take $\beta = \alpha$, if we were using Bonferroni's bound to construct a conservative simultaneous test with the same approximate level. Further discussion of the dependent-data case is given in section 2.3.

2.3. Generalized family-wise error rate. The results above can be generalized by extending the definition at (2.7) to,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k(N) &\equiv P\Big(H_{0i} \text{ rejected for at least } k \text{ values of } i \text{ in the range } 1 \leq i \leq N\Big) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = k^{-1}\beta + o(1)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where (2.12) follows from (2.6). We also have the following analogue of (2.11): Assuming (2.6):

$$\text{if (2.9) holds then} \quad \alpha_k(N) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\beta^j}{j!}\, e^{-\beta} + o(1)\,. \tag{2.13}$$

Under the positive regression dependency assumption, the equality in (2.13) would be replaced by $\leq$.

Insight into properties of generalized family-wise error-rate in cases of dependency can be gained by considering settings where the processes $\mathcal{P}_j = \{\epsilon_{ij}, i \geq 1\}$, for $j \geq 1$, are independent and identically distributed moving averages, each with the distribution of $\mathcal{P} = \{\epsilon_i, i \geq 1\}$, where

$\epsilon_i = \sum_k \theta_k \delta_{i+k}$, the variables δ_i are independent and identically distributed with zero mean, and the weights θ_k may depend on n but satisfy $\sum_k \theta_k^2 \le C$ for a fixed constant C. Here, under conditions on the distribution of δ, it can be shown that if (2.6) holds then the limiting distribution of N, defined to equal the number of indices i for which $|T_i| > t_\alpha$, is that of $\sum_{1 \le \ell \le M} K_\ell$, where M has a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda = \beta/E(K)$, $K_1, K_2, \ldots$ are identically distributed as the nonnegative, integer-valued random variable K, and $M, K_1, K_2, \ldots$ are independent. Thus, the distribution of the number of counts is based on a Poisson cluster process, with K denoting cluster size.

In this case, without the independence assumption (2.9),

$$\alpha_k(N) \to \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!}\, e^{-\lambda}\, P\biggl(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} K_\ell \ge k \biggr) \le k^{-1}\, \beta\,,$$

which property generalizes both (2.12) and (2.13). This result is not necessarily beneficial in practice, however, owing to the difficulty of estimating the distribution of K.

2.4. Methods for calibration. For calibration against Normal or Student's t distributions we take the critical point t_α to be the solution of the respective equations (2.3). Below we consider bootstrap calibration; Edgeworth correction (see e.g. Hall, 1990) could also be used.

Let $Y_{i1}^\dagger, \ldots, Y_{in}^\dagger$ denote a bootstrap resample drawn by sampling randomly, with replacement, from $\mathcal{Y}_i = \{Y_{i1}, \ldots, Y_{in}\}$. Put $Y_{ij}^* = Y_{ij}^\dagger - \bar{Y}_i$ and $T_i^* = n^{1/2} \bar{Y}_i^* / S_i^*$, where $\bar{Y}_i^* = n^{-1} \sum_j Y_{ij}^*$ and $(S_i^*)^2 = n^{-1} \sum_j (Y_{ij}^* - \bar{Y}_i^*)^2$. Write z_α for the conventional Normal critical point for N simultaneous tests. That is, z_α solves the equation $P(|Z| > z_\alpha) = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/N}$. (We could also use the Student's t point.) Define $\xi = \hat{f}_i(\alpha)$ to be the solution of the

equation

$$P(|T_i^*| > z_\xi \mid \mathcal{Y}_i) = 1 - (1-\alpha)^{1/N}\,.$$

Our bootstrap critical point is $\hat{t}_{i\alpha} = z_{\hat{f}_i(\alpha)}$; we reject H_{0i} if and only if $|T_i| > \hat{t}_{i\alpha}$. The definition of p_i at (2.4) should here be replaced by,

$$p_i = P_{0i}(|T_i| > \hat{t}_{i\alpha})\,. \tag{2.14}$$

With this new definition, (2.11), (2.12) and (2.13) continue to be a consequences of (2.6).

3. THEORETICAL RESULTS

3.1. Asymptotic results. Define κ_{i3} to be the third cumulant, or equivalently the skewness, of the distribution of $\epsilon_i' = \epsilon_{i1}/(E\epsilon_{i1}^2)^{1/2}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that*

$$\max_{1\le i\le N} E|\epsilon_i'|^3 = O(1) \tag{3.1}$$

as $N \to \infty$, and suppose too that $N = N(n) \to \infty$ in such a manner that $(\log N)/n^{1/3} \to \gamma$, where $0 \le \gamma < \infty$. Define t_α by either of the formulae at (2.3)*, and p_i by* (2.4)*. Then* (2.6) *holds with*

$$\beta = \beta(N) \equiv -\frac{\log(1-\alpha)}{N}\,\sum_{i=1}^{N} \cosh\left(\tfrac{1}{3}\,\gamma^3\kappa_{i3}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\cosh(x) = (e^x + e^{-x})/2$.

The value of $\beta(N)$, defined at (3.2), is bounded by $|\log(1-\alpha)|\,\cosh(\gamma^3\,B)$, uniformly in N, where $B = \sup_i |\kappa_{i3}|$.

Corollary 3.2. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.1. If $\gamma = 0$, i.e. if $\log N = o(n^{1/3})$, then* (2.6) *holds with $\beta = -\log(1-\alpha)$; and if $\gamma > 0$ then*

(2.6) *holds with* $\beta = -\log(1-\alpha)$ *if and only if* $N^{-1}\sum_{i\le N}|\kappa_{i3}| \to 0$, *i.e. if and only if the limit of the average absolute values of the skewnesses of the distributions of* $\epsilon_{11},\ldots,\epsilon_{N1}$ *equals zero.*

Since Corollary 3.2 implies (2.6) then it also entails (2.8) and (2.11)–(2.13).

Theorem 3.3. *Strengthen* (3.1) *to the assumption that for a constant* $C > 0$, $P(|\epsilon_i'| \le C) = 1$, *and suppose too that* $N = N(n) \to \infty$ *in such a manner that* $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$. *Define* $\hat{t}_{i\alpha} = z_{\hat{f}_i(\alpha)}$, *as in section 2.4, and define* p_i *by* (2.14). *Then* (2.6) *holds with* $\beta = -\log(1-\alpha)$.

3.2. Applications to controlling error rate. Define t_α and $\hat{t}_{i\alpha}$ by (2.3) and as in section 2.4, respectively. In the proof of Theorem 3.1 it is shown that, with $\beta = -\log(1-\alpha)$ and using conventional calibration, $P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_\alpha) = \beta\, N^{-1} + o(N^{-1})$, uniformly in i under the null hypotheses, provided $\log N = o(n^{1/3})$; and that, when employing bootstrap calibration, $P_{0i}(|T_i| > \hat{t}_{i\alpha}) = \beta\, N^{-1} + o(N^{-1})$, again uniformly in i, if $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$. These results substantially improve a uniform convergence property of Kosorok and Ma (2005), at the expense of more restrictions on N.

When the P-values in (1.3) need to be estimated, the estimation errors should be of order $o(N^{-1})$, where N diverges with n. On the other hand, when P-values in (1.5) are estimated, the precision can be of order $o(\alpha_N)$, where for definiteness we shall take $\alpha_N = C\, N^{-a}$ with $C > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1]$. In the latter case the results in Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 continue to apply; there is no relaxation, despite the potential simplicity of the problem.

To appreciate why, note that the tail probability of the standard Normal distribution satisfies $P(|Z| \ge x) \sim \exp(-x^2/2)/(\sqrt{2\pi}\, x)$. Suppose that the large deviation result holds up to the point $x = x_n$, which should be of order

$o(n^{1/6})$ for Student's t calibration, and $o(n^{1/4})$ for bootstrap calibration. Setting $P(|Z| \geq x)$ equal to α_N yields $\log(1/\alpha_N) = \frac{1}{2}\, x_n^2 + \log x_n + \ldots$, that is,

$$a \, \log N = \tfrac{1}{2}\, x_n^2 + \log x_n + \log(\sqrt{2\pi}\, C) + \text{smaller order terms}\,.$$

Regardless of the values of $C > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1]$, this relation implies that the condition $x_n = o(n^{1/6})$ is equivalent to $\log N = o(n^{1/3})$ and $x_n = o(n^{1/4})$ entails $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$, although taking a close to 0 will numerically improve approximations, in both theory and practice.

4. MARGINAL AGGREGATION

We have shown that with bootstrap calibration, Student's t-statistics can test simultaneously a number of hypotheses of order $\exp\{o(n^{1/2})\}$. Although this value may be conservative, it may still not be large enough for some applications to microarray and tiling arrays where the number of simultaneous tests can be even larger. Similarly, whether we consult a t-table or a Normal table depends very much on mathematical assumptions. For example, suppose an observed value of a t statistic is 6.7. Its corresponding two-tail P-value, for $n = 6$ arrays, is 0.112% when looking up t-tables with five degrees of freedom, and 2.084×10^{-11} when consulting Normal tables. Yet, both distributions can be regarded as the approximate ones.

To overcome these problems, Reiner *et al.* (2003) and Fan *et al.* (2004) introduce marginal aggregation methods. The basic assumption is that the null distributions of test statistics T_i are the same, denoted by F. With this assumption (which also implicitly assumed when the same distribution table is looked up), we can use the empirical distribution of $\{T_i, i = 1, \ldots, N\}$, i.e.

$$\widehat{F}_N(x) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(T_i \leq x)\,, \tag{4.1}$$

as an estimator of F. This turns the "curse-of-dimensionality" into a "blessing-of-dimensionality". In this case, even if n is fixed, the distribution of F can still be consistently estimated when $N \to \infty$ and only a small fraction of alternative hypotheses are true.

Reiner *et al.* (2003) and Fan *et al.* (2004) carry this idea one step further. They aggregate the estimated distributions for each T_i, based on a resampling technique (more precisely, a permutation method). For example we can use, as an estimator of $F(x)$, the average of bootstrap estimators,

$$\widehat{F}_N^*(x) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(T_i^* \le x \mid \mathcal{Y}_i)\,. \tag{4.2}$$

The theorem below describes properties of $\widehat{F}_N$ and $\widehat{F}_N^*$, defined at (4.1) and (4.2), respectively. Interpret x_n, below, as a left-tail critical value; similar results also hold in the upper tail.

Theorem 4.1. *Let N_1 be the number of nonzero μ_i, i.e. the number of elements of the set $\{i : H_{1i}$ is true$\}$, and put $F_n(x) = E\{P(T_i^* < x)\}$. Then,*

$$\widehat{F}_N(x_n) = F(x_n) + O_p\left[(N_1/N) + \sqrt{F(x_n)/N}\,\left\{1 + a_n\,N + a_n\,N_1\,F(x_n)^{-1/2}\right\}^{1/2}\right]\,,$$
$$\widehat{F}_N^*(x_n) = F_n(x_n) + O_p\left\{\sqrt{F(x_n)/N}\right\}\,,$$

provided that $|r_{ij}| \le a_n$, with r_{ij} denoting the correlation coefficient between $I(T_i \le x_n)$ and $I(T_j \le x_n)$.

The term $O(N_1/N)$ in (4.3) reflects the bias of the estimate. It can be reduced by using the sieve idea of Fan *et al.* (2005).

5. NUMERICAL PROPERTIES

In our simulation study we construct models that reflect aspects of gene expression data. To this end, we divide genes into three groups. Within

each group, genes share one unobserved common factor with different factor loadings. In addition, there is an unobserved common factor among all the genes across the three groups. For simplicity of presentation, we assume that N is a multiple of three. We denote by Z_{ij} a sequence of independent $\mathrm{N}(0,1)$ random variables, and χ_{ij} a sequence of independent random variables of the same distribution as that of $(\chi^2_m - m)/\sqrt{2m}$. Note that χ_{ij} has mean 0, variance 1 and skewness $\sqrt{8/m}$. In our simulation study we set $m = 6$.

With given factor loading coefficients a_i and b_i, the error ϵ_{ij} in (2.1) is defined as

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{Z_{ij} + a_{i1}\,\chi_{j1} + \alpha_{i2}\,\chi_{j2} + a_{i3}\,\chi_{j3} + b_i\,\chi_{j4}}{(1 + a_{i1}^2 + a_{i2}^2 + a_{i3}^2 + b_i^2)^{1/2}}\,, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N\,, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n\,,$$

where $a_{ij} = 0$ except that $a_{i1} = a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \frac{1}{3}\,N$, $a_{i2} = a_i$ for $i = \frac{1}{3}\,N + 1, \ldots, \frac{2}{3}\,N$, and $a_{i3} = a_i$ with $i = \frac{2}{3}\,N + 1, \ldots, N$. Note that $E\epsilon_{ij} = 0$ and $\mathrm{var}(\epsilon_{ij}) = 1$, and that the within-group correlation is in general stronger than the between-group correlation, since the former shares one extra common factor. We consider two specific choices of factor loadings: Case I, where the factor loadings are taken to be $a_j = 0.25$ and $b_j = 0.1$ for all j (thus, the ϵ_{ij}'s have the same marginal distribution, although they are correlated); and Case II, for which the factor loadings a_i and b_i are generated independently from, respectively, $U(0, 0.4)$ and $U(0, 0.2)$.

The "true gene expression" levels μ_i are taken from a realization of the mixture of a point mass at 0 and a double-exponential distribution: $c\,\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\,(1 - c)\,\exp(-|x|)$, where $c \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. With the noise and the expression level given above, Y_{ij} generated from (2.1) represents, for each fixed j, the observed log-ratios between the two-channel outputs of a c-DNA microarray. Note that $|\mu_j| \geq \log 2$ means that the true expression

ratio exceeds 2. The probability, or the empirical fraction, of this event equals $\frac{1}{2}(1-c)$.

For each α_N we compute the P-value according to the Normal approximation, t-approximation, the bootstrap method and the aggregated bootstrap (4.2). This results in N estimated P-values $\hat{P}_j$ for each method and each simulation. Let N_1 denote the number of P-values that are no larger than α_N; see (1.5). Then, N_1/N is the empirical fraction of null hypotheses that are rejected. When $c = 1$, $N_1/(N\alpha_N) - 1$ reflects the accuracy with which we approximate P-values. Its root mean square error (RMSE), $\{E(N_1/(N\alpha_N) - 1)^2\}^{1/2}$, will be reported, where the expectations are approximated by averages across simulations. We exclude the marginal aggregation method (4.1), since in our simulations it always gave $N_1/N = \alpha_N$.

We take $N = 600$ (small), $N = 1,800$ (moderate) and $N = 6,000$ (typical) for microarray applications (after preprocessing, which filters out many low quality measurements on certain genes) and $\alpha_N = 1.5N^{-2/3}$, resulting in $\alpha_N = 0.02$, 0.01 and 0.005, respectively. The sample size n is taken to be 6 (typical number of microarrays), 20 (moderate) and 50 (large). The number of replications in simulations is 600,000/N. For the bootstrap calibration method and the aggregated method (4.2), we replicate bootstrap samples 2,000, 4,000 and 9,000 times, respectively, for $\alpha_N = 0.02, 0.01$ and 0.005.

Tables 1 and 2 report the accuracy of estimated P-values when $c = 1$. It can be seen that the Normal approximations are too inaccurate to be useful. Therefore we shall exclude the Normal method in the discussion below. For $n = 20$ and 50, the bootstrap method provides better approximations than Student's t-method. This indicates that the bootstrap can test more hypotheses simultaneously, which is in accord with our asymptotic theory.

Overall the bootstrap method is also slightly better then the aggregated bootstrap (4.2), although the two methods are effectively comparable. However, with the small sample size $n = 6$, Student's t-method is relatively the best, although the approximations are poor in general. This is understandable, as the noise distribution is not Normal. With such a small sample size, the two bootstrap-based methods, in particular the aggregated bootstrap method (4.2), suffer more from random fluctuation in the original samples.

We now illustrate the four methods by using a microarray data set. The data were analyzed by Fan *et al.* (2004), where the biological aim was to examine the impact of the stimulation by MIF, a growth factor, on the expressions of genes in neuroblastoma cells. Six arrays of cDNA microarray data were collected, consisting of relative expression profiles of 19,968 genes in the MIF stimulated neuroblastoma cells (treatment) and those without stimulation (control). After preprocessing that filtered low quality expression profiles, 15,266 genes remained. Within-array normalization, discussed by Fan *et al.* (2004), was applied to remove the intensity effect and block effect. Among 15,266 gene expression profiles, for simplicity of illustration we focussed only on 7,583 genes that do not have any missing values. In our notation, $N = 7{,}583$ and $n = 6$. Table 3 summarizes the results at different levels of significance.

Different methods for estimating P-values yield very different results. In particular, the distribution of P-values computed by looking up the normal table is stochastically much larger than that based on the t-table, which in turn is stochastically much larger than that based on the bootstrap method. The results are very different. As noted before, the normal approximation is usually very poor and grossly inflates the number of significant genes.

The same remark applies to the t-approximation with moderate or large numbers of degrees of freedom. The most accurate approximation is given by bootstrap methods.

6. PROOFS OF RESULTS IN SECTION 3

For the sake of brevity we shall derive only Theorems 3.1 and 3.3. Let $C_1 > 0$. Given a random variable X with $E(X) = 0$, consider the condition:

$$E(X) = 0\,, \quad E\big(X^2\big) = 1\,, \quad E\big(X^4\big) \le C_1\,. \tag{6.1}$$

The following result follows from Theorem 1.2 of Wang (2005), after transforming the distribution of T to that of $(\sum_i X_i)/(\sum_i X_i^2)$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $X, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ denote independent and identically distributed random variables such that* (6.1) *holds. Write $T = T(n)$ for Student's t statistic computed from the sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, with (for the sake of definiteness) divisor n rather than $n-1$ used for the variance. Put $\pi_3 = -\frac{1}{3}\,\kappa_3$, where κ_3 denotes the skewness of the distribution of $X/(\mathrm{var}X)^{1/2}$. Then,*

$$\frac{P(T > x)}{1 - \Phi(x)} = \exp\left(\pi_3\, x^3\, n^{-1/2}\right) \left\{1 + \theta\, \frac{(1+x)^2}{n^{1/2}}\right\}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\theta = \theta(x, n)$ satisfies $|\theta(n, x)| \le C_2$ uniformly in $0 \le x \le C_3\, n^{-1/4}$ and $n \ge 1$, and $C_2, C_3 > 0$ depend only on C_1.

Theorem 3.1 in the case of Normal calibration follows directly from Theorem 6.1. The case of Student's t calibration can be treated similarly.

To derive Theorem 3.3, note that each $\mathrm{var}(\epsilon_i') = 1$. To check that, with probability at least $p_n \equiv 1 - \exp(-d_1\, n^{1/2})$ for a constant $d_1 > 0$, the conditions of Theorem 6.1 hold for the bootstrap distribution of the

statistic T_i^*, for each $1 \le i \le N$, it suffices to show that there exist constants $0 < C_4 < C_5^{1/2}$ such that, with probability at least p_n, the following condition holds for $1 \le i \le N$:

$$C_4 \le \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2 \,, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^4 \le C_5 \,. \tag{6.3}$$

This can be done using Bernstein's inequality and the assumption that, for each i, $P(|\epsilon_i'| \le C) = 1$, and can also be shown by the uniform convergence result of the empirical process of Korosok and Ma (2005).

Let $\mathcal{E}_n$ denote the event that (6.3) holds for each $1 \le i \le N$. When $\mathcal{E}_n$ prevails, we may apply Theorem 6.1 to the distribution of T_i^* conditional on $\mathcal{Y}_i$, obtaining:

$$P\big(T_i^* > x \;\big|\; \mathcal{Y}_i\big) = \{1 - \Phi(x)\} \, \exp\big(- \tfrac{1}{3} \, \hat{\kappa}_{i3} \, n^{-1/2} \, x^3\big) \left\{ 1 + \hat{\theta}_i \, \frac{(1+x)^2}{n^{1/2}} \right\}, \tag{6.4}$$

where $\hat{\kappa}_{i3}$ is the empirical version of κ_{i3}, computed from $\mathcal{Y}_i$, and, on an event of which the probability equals $1 - O\{\exp(-d_2 \, n^{1/2})\}$, $|\hat{\theta}_i| \le D_1$ uniformly in i and in $0 \le x \le x_n$. (Here and below, x_n will denote any sequence diverging to infinity but satisfying $x_n = o(n^{1/4})$, and $D_1, D_2, \ldots$ and $d_1, d_2, \ldots$ will denote constants.) It follows directly from Theorem 6.1 that

$$P_{0i}(T_i > x) = \{1 - \Phi(x)\} \, \exp\big(- \tfrac{1}{3} \, \kappa_{i3} \, n^{-1/2} \, x^3\big) \left\{ 1 + \theta \, \frac{(1+x)^2}{n^{1/2}} \right\}, \tag{6.5}$$

where $|\theta_i| \le D_1$ uniformly in i and in $0 \le x \le x_n$.

Result (6.5), and its analogue for the left-hand tail of the distribution of T_i, allow us to express $t_{i\alpha}$, the solution of the equation $P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha}) = 1 - (1-\alpha)^{1/N}$, as a Taylor expansion:

$$\big| t_{i\alpha} - z_\alpha - c \, \kappa_{i3} \, n^{-1/2} \, z_\alpha^2 \big| \le D_2 \left(n^{-1} \, z_\alpha^4 + n^{-1/2} \, z_\alpha \right),$$

uniformly in i, where c is a constant and z_α is the solution of $P(|Z| > z_\alpha) = 1 - (1-\alpha)^{1/N}$. Note that if z_α solves this equation then $z_\alpha \sim (2 \log N)^{1/2}$, and so, since $\log N = o(n^{1/2})$, then $z_\alpha = o(n^{1/4})$. Therefore, without loss of generality, $0 \le z_\alpha \le x_n$. Likewise we may assume below that $0 \le t_{i\alpha} \le x_n$, and $0 \le \hat{t}_{i\alpha} \le x_n$ with probability $1 - O\{\exp(-d_2\, n^{1/2})\}$.

Also, from (6.4) we can see that on an event of which the probability equals $1 - O\{\exp(-d_2\, n^{1/2})\}$,

$$\left|\hat{t}_{i\alpha} - z_\alpha - c\,\hat{\kappa}_{i3}\, n^{-1/2}\, z_\alpha^2\right| \le D_3 \left(n^{-1}\, z_\alpha^4 + n^{-1/2}\, z_\alpha\right).$$

However, on an event with probability $1 - O\{\exp(-d_3\, n^{1/2})\}$, $|\hat{\kappa}_{i3} - \kappa_{i3}| \le D_4\, n^{-1/4}$, and therefore, on an event with probability $1 - O\{\exp(-d_4\, n^{1/2})\}$,

$$\left|\hat{t}_{i\alpha} - z_\alpha - c\,\kappa_{i3}\, n^{-1/2}\, z_\alpha^2\right| \le D_5 \left(n^{-1}\, z_\alpha^4 + n^{-1/2}\, z_\alpha + n^{-3/4}\, z_\alpha^2\right).$$

It follows from the above results that $P_{0i}(|T_i| > \hat{t}_{i\alpha})$ lies between the respective values of

$$P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha} \pm \delta) \mp D_6\, \exp\left(-d_4\, n^{1/2}\right), \tag{6.6}$$

where

$$\delta = D_5 \left(n^{-1}\, z_\alpha^4 + n^{-1/2}\, z_\alpha + n^{-3/4}\, z_\alpha^2\right).$$

Using (6.5), and its analogue for the left-hand tail, to expand the probability in (6.6), we deduce that

$$P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha} \pm \delta) = P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha})\,\{1 + o(1)\},$$

uniformly in i. More simply, $\exp(-d_4\, n^{1/2}) = o\{P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha})\}$, using the fact that $z_\alpha = o(n^{1/4})$ and $\exp(-D_7\, z_\alpha^2) = o\{P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha})\}$ for sufficiently large $D_7 > 0$. Hence,

$$P_{0i}(|T_i| > \hat{t}_{i\alpha}) = P_{0i}(|T_i| > t_{i\alpha})\,\{1 + o(1)\},$$

uniformly in i. Theorem 3.3 follows from this property.

REFERENCES

BENJAMINI, Y. AND HOCHBERG, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* Ser. B **57**, 289–300.

BENJAMINI, Y. AND YEKUTIELI, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Ann. Statist.* **29**, 1165–1188.

BENTKUS, V. AND GÖTZE, F. (1996). The Berry-Esseen bound for Student's statistic. *Ann. Statist.* **24**, 491–503.

BICKEL, P.J. and LEVINA, E. (2004). Some theory for Fisher's linear discriminant, 'naive Bayes', and some alternatives when there are many more variables than observations. *Bernoulli*, **10**, 989-1010.

DUDOIT, S., SHAFFER, J.P. AND BOLDRICK, J.C. (2003). Multiple hypothesis testing in microarray experiments. *Statist. Sci.* **18**, 71–103.

EFRON, B. (2004). Large-scale simultaneous hypothesis testing: the choice of a null hypothesis. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **99**, 96–104.

FAN, J., CHEN, Y., CHAN, H.M., TAM, P., AND REN, Y. (2005). Removing intensity effects and identifying significant genes for Affymetrix arrays in MIF-suppressed neuroblastoma cells. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **102**, 17751-17756.

FAN, J. AND LI, R. (2006). Statistical Challenges with High Dimensionality: Feature Selection in Knowledge Discovery. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (M. Sanz-Sole, J. Soria, J.L. Varona, J. Verdera, eds.) , Vol. III, 595-622.

FAN, J., PENG, H., AND HUANG, T. (2005). Semilinear high-dimensional model for normalization of microarray data: a theoretical analysis and partial consistency (With discussion). *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **100**, 781–813.

FAN, J., TAM, P., VANDE WOUDE, G. AND REN, Y. (2004). Normalization and analysis of cDNA micro-arrays using within-array replications applied to neuroblastoma cell response to a cytokine. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **101**, 1135–1140.

FINNER, H. AND ROTERS, M. (1998). Asymptotic comparison of step-down and step-up multiple test procedures based on exchangeable test statistics. *Ann. Statist.* **26**, 505–524.

FINNER, H. AND ROTERS, M. (1999). Asymptotic comparison of the critical values of step-down and step-up multiple comparison procedures. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **79**, 11–30.

FINNER, H. AND ROTERS, M. (2000). On the critical value behaviour of multiple decision procedures. *Scand. J. Statist.* **27**, 563–573.

FINNER, H. AND ROTERS, M. (2001). On the false discovery rate and expected type I errors. *Biom. J.* **43**, 985–1005.

FINNER, H. AND ROTERS, M. (2002). Multiple hypotheses testing and expected number of type I errors. *Ann. Statist.* **30**, 220–238.

GENOVESE, C. AND WASSERMAN, L. (2004). A stochastic process approach to false discovery control. *Ann. Statist.* **32**, 1035–1061.

HU, J. AND HE, X. (2006). Enhanced quantile normalization of microarray data to reduce loss of information in the gene expression profile. *Biometrics*, to appear.

HUANG, J., WANG, D., AND ZHANG, C. (2005). A two-way semi-linear model for normalization and significant analysis of cDNA microarray data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **100**, 814–829.

KOROSOK, M.R. AND MA, S. (2005). Marginal asymptotics for the "large p, small n" paradigm: With applications to micorarray data. *Manuscript.*

LEHMANN, E.L., ROMANO, J.P. AND SHAFFER, J.P. (2005). On optimality of stepdown and stepup multiple test procedures. *Ann. Statist.* **33**, 1084–1108.

LEHMANN, E.L. AND ROMANO, J.P. (2005). Generalizations of the familywise error rate. *Ann. Statist.* **33**, 1138–1154.

PETROV, V.V. (1975). *Sums of Independent Random Variables*. Springer, Berlin.

REINER, A., YEKUTIELI, D. AND BENJAMINI, Y. (2003). Identifying differentially expressed genes using false discovery rate controlling procedures. *Bioinformatics*, **19**, 368-375.

STOREY, J.D., TAYLOR, J.E., AND SIEGMUND, D. (2004). Strong control, conservative point estimation, and simultaneous conservative consistency of false discovery rates: A unified approach. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc.* Ser. B **66**, 187–205

VAN DER LAAN, M.J. AND BRYAN, J. (2001). Gene expression analysis with the parametric bootstrap. *Biostatistics* **2**, 445–461.

WANG, Q. (2005). Limit theorems for self-normalized large deviations. *Elect. J. Probab.* **10**, 1260–1285.