A nonparametric method to assess significance of events in search for gravitational waves with false discovery rate
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In this paper, we present a consistent procedure to assess the significance of gravitational wave events observed by laser interferometric gravitational wave detectors based on the background distribution of detection statistic. Based on the estimated p-values, we propose a procedure to assess the significance of a particular event with the false discovery rate. The false discovery rate can distinguish gravitational wave events from noise events and can provide reliable alerts to electromagnetic telescopes for follow-up observations. The proposed procedure is demonstrated by reanalyzing the results of the analysis of the first observing run (O1) data of advanced LIGO. As a result, we find that GW150914, GW151226, and GW151012 should be called significant, if the events whose false discovery rate is smaller than 0.05 are called significant. The result is consistent with the recent catalog of gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences. In addition, it is shown that the procedure presented in this paper is more powerful than the method controlling the $P_{\text{astro}}$, which is a conventional measure of the false discovery rate. The proposed procedure is applicable to other searches for gravitational waves whose background distribution of detection statistic is difficult to know.
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1. Introduction

The first gravitational wave event from binary black hole coalescence, GW150914, was observed by advanced LIGO detectors [7] in the first observing run (O1) [1]. After the first detection, tens of gravitational wave events were reported [2, 3]. During the second observing run (O2), the first gravitational waves from a binary neutron star coalescence, GW170817 [4], were observed by LIGO and Virgo[8]. The follow-up observations by electromagnetic telescopes identified the host galaxy in NGC4993. The event strongly suggests the existence of radioactive decay of rapid neutron-capture process [5]. The discovery of these events has opened the gravitational wave astronomy. In the coming years the network of gravitational wave detectors consisting of two LIGO detectors, Virgo and KAGRA[6] plans to perform coincident observation runs. As the detectors’ sensitivities improve and observation time becomes longer, we expect to observe more and more gravitational wave events.
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The electromagnetic follow-up observations are very important to investigate the astrophysical nature of compact binary coalescences. However, since large optical/infrared telescopes have limited time available for the follow-up observation, in order not to waste the observing time, it is important to provide a reliable evaluation of the significance of the gravitational wave candidates. As the number of gravitational wave events increases, this becomes more important.

Recently, the false discovery rate (FDR) is used for such a purpose (see Section 3 for the formal definition of the FDR). By the author’s knowledge, the first introduction of FDR to the gravitational wave community was given by Baggio and Prodi [9], but the paper did not discuss any actual problems. Controlling $P_{\text{astro}}$, which is extensively discussed in [2], is the first approach to assess the significance of each candidate in the search for gravitational waves from compact binary coalescence in terms of FDR. In the recent catalog of gravitational waves from compact binary mergers [2, 3], a candidate event is considered to have gravitational wave origin, if the false alarm rate is less than one per 30 days and the $P_{\text{astro}}$, a measure of true discovery (complement of false discovery) of a particular event, is larger than 0.5. The method used in [2] to obtain the $P_{\text{astro}}$ assumes that some of the candidate events have astrophysical origin in advance. Accordingly, it is impossible to assess the significance of these events. However, we are also interested in the significance of these events which are assumed as genuine gravitational waves.

In this paper, we will present a consistent procedure to assess the significance of all events in observed data based on the distribution of detection statistic of noise in simulated background data. In section 2, we discuss statistical hypothesis testing in the search for gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences. We propose a nonparametric estimation of the $p$-value by using the background distribution of the detection statistic. In section 3, we present a procedure to assess a significance of a particular event with a false discovery rate based on the method proposed by Storey and Tibshirani [10]. In section 4, the proposed procedure is applied to the results of the analysis of the O1 data. Section 5 is devoted to a summary and discussion.

2. Nonparametric estimation of $p$-value

In this section, we introduce the statistical terminology used in this paper. The definitions of statistical terminology can be found in a standard textbook, such as [11]. By analyzing the data from gravitational wave detectors, we obtain an event which has a larger signal-to-noise ratio than a threshold. Each event is classified as either signal or noise. If the event is originated from a gravitational wave, it is called a signal. Otherwise, it is called a noise. In the statistical literature, the noise model is called as the null hypothesis (in this paper, also called as background) and the signal model is called the alternative hypothesis.

In the search for gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences, we evaluate the probability of observing one or more noise events as strong as a signal during the observation time. It is computed as

$$p_{\text{conv}} = 1 - e^{-\mu}, \quad \mu \equiv \mu(\rho) = \frac{n_{\text{bg}}(\rho)}{t_{\text{bg}}}t_{\text{obs}},$$

where $\rho$ is the detection statistic of the event [13, 15] (see Appendix A for discussion on the derivation). Here, $t_{\text{obs}}$ and $t_{\text{bg}}$ are the time length of the analyzed data and the time
length for the estimation of the background distribution, respectively. The estimation of
the background data is usually generated by time-shifting data of different detectors \[15\].
Moreover, \(n_{\text{bg}}(\rho)\) is the number of noise events in the simulated background data whose
detection statistics are the same or larger than \(\rho\). It is

\[
n_{\text{bg}}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bg}}(0)} 1\{r_i \geq \rho\},
\]

where \(r_i\) is the detection statistic of the \(i\)-th event in the simulated background data, \(1\{\cdot\} = 1\) if \(\cdot\) is true and 0 otherwise. From the definition, \(n_{\text{bg}}(0)\) is the total number of noise events
in the simulated background data. Therefore, \(\mu\) in Eq.(1) is the mean of number of events
whose detection statistics are more than or equal to \(\rho\). The ratio \(n_{\text{bg}}(\rho)/t_{\text{bg}}\) is usually called
the false alarm rate of the event whose detection statistic is \(\rho\). In the analysis of GW150914
in O1 \[13\], the detection statistic is \(\rho_{\text{gw}} = 23.7\), the false alarm rate of the event is less than
6.0 \times 10^{-7}\) per year, and the observation time length is \(t_{\text{obs}} = 46.1\) days. The probability (1)
is estimated as

\[
1 - e^{-6.0 \times 10^{-7}\times 46.1/365.25} = 7.6 \times 10^{-8}.
\]

Since this probability is very small, GW150914 has been considered to be a genuine gravitational wave signal \[1, 13\]. To be more precise, the probability of observing one or more noise events as strong as the signal of GW150914 during the observation time is \(7.6 \times 10^{-8}\) under the noise model.

In statistical hypothesis testing, the \(p\)-value of an event is a measure of the significance of
the event. It is the probability that the event or rarer events occur under the null hypothesis.
If the \(p\)-value of the event is significantly small, the null hypothesis is rejected. Let us consider statistical hypothesis testing of each event based on background distribution of detection statistic. If we know the probability density function of detection statistic under the null hypothesis, \(f(r)\), the \(p\)-value of an event whose detection statistic is \(\rho\) is given by

\[
p(\rho) = \int_{\rho}^{\infty} f(r)dr = 1 - F(\rho), \quad F(\rho) = \int_{0}^{\rho} f(r)dr.
\]

In reality the background distribution is unknown, nevertheless, it can be estimated non-parametrically (free from assumption of a parameterized distribution) by using simulated background data. An estimator of the null distribution \(F\) is given by

\[
\hat{F}(\rho) := \frac{1}{n_{\text{bg}}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bg}}(0)} 1\{r_i \leq \rho\}.
\]

It is important to distinguish \(F\) and \(\hat{F}\). The former is the (unknown) true background
distribution, while the latter is an estimator of the background distribution. By Glivenko-
Cantelli’s theorem, \(\hat{F}\) converges to \(F\) almost surely and uniformly in \(\rho\) \[11\]. Therefore, an estimator of the \(p\)-value of an event whose detection statistic is \(\rho\) is given by

\[
\hat{p}(\rho) = 1 - \hat{F}(\rho) := \frac{n_{\text{bg}}(\rho)}{n_{\text{bg}}(0)},
\]

where we used the fact that \(\rho \neq r_i\) where \(i = 1, ..., n_{\text{bg}}(0)\). Note that \(\hat{p}(\rho)\) has been called (an estimator of) false alarm probability in the gravitational wave community \[14\]. In addition, \(\hat{p}(\rho)\) is proportional to the mean \(\mu\) in (1). The estimator (5) is a consistent estimator of the
\( p \)-value (4), namely, \( \hat{p}(\rho) \) converges to \( p(\rho) \) almost surely for each \( \rho \) by the strong law of large numbers.

From Eq.(5), the \( p \)-value of the event GW150914 is computed as

\[
\hat{p}(\rho_{gw}) = (\text{false alarm rate}) \times (3.1688 \times 10^{-8}(\text{year}) = 1(\text{sec})) = 1.9 \times 10^{-14}, \tag{6}
\]

where the false alarm rate is \( 6.0 \times 10^{-7} \) (sec\(^{-1}\)). In the analysis of the O1 data, the total number of noise events in the background data is \( n_{bg}(0) = t_{bg}/1(\text{sec}) \), since the detection statistics are computed for each 1(sec) window [15]. This \( p \)-value is extremely smaller than the probability (3). However, the difference between these two probabilities is not at all surprising, because these two probabilities give the significance of tests of quite different null hypotheses (See Appendix A).

For later discussion, let us recall a basic property of a \( p \)-value. A \( p \)-value of a statistic \( \rho \) following any null distribution \( F(\rho) \) follows the uniform distribution, because

\[
P(p(\rho) < u) = P(\rho > F^{-1}(1 - u)) = 1 - P(\rho < F^{-1}(1 - u))
= 1 - F(F^{-1}(1 - u)) = u,
\]

is the distribution function of the uniform distribution where \( 0 \leq u \leq 1 \) and \( P(x) \) is the probability of \( x \). It is worthwhile to mention that we cannot expect that the \( p \)-value given by (1) with \( \rho \) following \( F(\rho) \), follows the uniform distribution.

### 3. Assessment of significance with false discovery rate

In this section, we describe a statistical hypothesis testing by using all detection statistics and how to assess a significance with the false discovery rate. When we perform the statistical test, each detection statistic can be categorized in four possible outcomes, which are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Outcomes and counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Called significant</td>
<td>Called not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>( F )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>( T )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>( S )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two kinds of sources of the statistics (noise or signal) and two kinds of results of the test (called significant or called not significant). \( F \) and \( T \) are the number of noise and signal events called significant, respectively. \( S \) is the total number of the called significant statistic. \( n_0 \) and \( n_1 \) are the number of noise and signal statistics, respectively. \( n_{\text{obs}} \) is the total number of events in the observed data.

In statistical hypothesis testing, a \( p \)-value threshold is selected to keep the number of false positives \( F \) small. When we select the threshold \( \alpha \), the expected number of false positive is \( \alpha n_{\text{obs}} \). If \( n_{\text{obs}} \) is very large, \( \alpha \) should be selected to be very small. In fact, for the PyCBC
analysis of the O1 data,

\[ n_{\text{obs}} = \frac{t_{\text{obs}}}{1(\text{sec})} = 4,155,840, \]

since the detection statistics are computed for each 1(\text{sec}) window [15]. In addition, here and in the following we set \( t_{\text{obs}} = 48.1 \) days as the analysis by Nitz et al. [2], \(^1\) since we will compare our results with those by Nitz et al. in the next section.

Here, the probability \( \mathbb{P}(F \geq 1) \) is called a familywise error rate. \(^2\) The familywise error rate is simply called false alarm probability in the gravitational wave community, but we call the familywise false alarm probability in this paper to avoid a confusion. The “family” means that we test a hypothesis by using \( n_{\text{obs}} \) tests. To control the familywise error rate such that \( \mathbb{P}(F \geq 1) \leq \alpha \), that is, the rate that a noise event is classified as called significant is less than \( \alpha \), one of the solutions is to change the threshold \( \alpha \) to \( \alpha / n_{\text{obs}} \). This method is called Bonferroni’s procedure (see Chapter 9 of [11]).

Unfortunately, controlling the familywise error rate is practical only when extremely few events are expected to be signal. Otherwise, controlling the familywise error rate will be too conservative and statistical power of the test procedure will be too poor. Benjamini and Hochberg [17] introduce the false discovery rate, \(^3\) which is defined as the expected value of \( F/S \), \( \mathbb{E}(F/S, S > 0) \), where \( F \) and \( S \) are introduced in Table 1, and give a test procedure to keep the FDR less than a threshold. A fairly recent survey of an FDR is [18]. Note that the false positive rate and the FDR are quite different measures. A false positive rate of 5% means that 5% of noise events are called significant. On the other hand, an FDR of 5% means that 5% of events called significant are noise events. Controlling FDR should be more powerful than controlling familywise error rate, since FDR is less than or equals to the familywise error rate [17].

Storey and Tibshirani [10] introduced the \( q \)-value for a particular event, which is the expected proportion of false positives incurred if calling the event significant. Let us define FDR(\( t \)), which is the FDR when calling all events significant whose \( p \)-value is less than or equals to a threshold \( t \) where \( 0 < t \leq 1 \), namely,

\[
FDR(t) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F(t)}{S(t)} \right]_{S(t) > 0}, \tag{7}
\]

where \( \mathbb{E}(x, y > 0) \) is the expectation of \( x \) given \( y > 0 \). Here, \( F(t) \) is the number of the noise events which \( p \)-value is smaller than or equals to the threshold \( t \), and \( S(t) \) is the number of both noise and signal events which \( p \)-value is smaller than or equals to the threshold \( t \). The definition of the \( q \)-value is the minimum FDR that can be attained when calling the event significant, namely,

\[
q_i := \min_{t \geq p_i} \text{FDR}(t), \tag{8}
\]

---

\(^1\) Such a data is called high-dimensional or wide data, and frequently appears in various fields. Issues around high-dimensional data have been actively discussed in modern statistics and machine learning literature (see Chapter 18 of [16] for a survey).

\(^2\) Following the convention of statistics, familywise error rate and false discovery rate represent “probability” in this paper. However, this should not be confused with false alarm rate in Section 2 which represents the number of events in a unit time.
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where $i = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{obs}}$ and the $p$-value given by (4) of the $i$-th event are denoted by $p_i$. Note that $\text{FDR}(t)$ is not always monotonically increasing in the threshold $t$. Taking minimum guarantees that the estimated $q$-values are increasing in the same order as the $p$-values.

Let us recall the procedure to estimate $q$-values proposed by Storey and Tibshirani [10]. Their estimator of the $\text{FDR}(t)$ is

$$
\widehat{\text{FDR}}(t) = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} t}{S(t)},
$$

where $\hat{\pi}_0$ is an estimator of $\pi_0 = n_0/n_{\text{obs}}$. Roughly speaking, (9) is a sample mean whose population mean is (7). Since a $p$-value of a statistic follows the uniform distribution under the null hypothesis (see Section 2), the numerator of (9) is an estimator of $F(t)$. Benjamini and Hochberg’s proposal [17] is setting $\hat{\pi}_0 = 1$. It is reasonable when very few events are expected to be signal, such as in gravitational wave search. On the other hands, for data in which some portion of events are expected to be signal, such as in genomewide studies, Storey and Tibshirani [10] proposed $\hat{\pi}_0 = \hat{f}(1)$, where $\hat{f}(\lambda)$ is the natural cubic spline curve with three degrees of freedom fitted to

$$
f(\lambda) = \frac{\#\{p_i > \lambda\}}{n_{\text{obs}} (1 - \lambda)},
$$

where $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{obs}}$. Here, $\#\{p_i > \lambda\}$ is the the number of both noise and signal events which $p$-value is larger than or equals to $\lambda$. The estimator $\hat{f}(\lambda)$ stands on the fact that a histogram density of $p$-values beyond some point should be fairly flat, since there are mostly noise $p$-values in this region, and the height of this flat portion is estimated by $\hat{f}(1)$ (See Section 4 for the demonstration and [10] for general discussion with several examples). A possible estimator of $q$-values is plugging (9) into (8). The estimation procedure yields a conservative estimate under some reasonable technical condition for $p$-values (see Remark D of Appendix of [10] for the details).

In the search for gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences, the $p$-values (4) are unavailable. Nevertheless, we can construct an estimator of the $q$-values by plugging the estimator of the $p$-values (5) and the estimator of the FDR (9) into the expression (8). The result is

$$
\hat{q}(i) = \min_{t \geq \hat{p}(i)} \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} t}{\#\{\hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, n_{\text{obs}}\}}
$$

The estimation procedure of $q$-values is summarized as the following algorithm, which is a slight modification of the procedure given in Remark B of Appendix of [10]. The input is the list of detection statistics obtained from the observed data and detection statistics in simulated background data. Appendix B explains why Algorithm 1 yields estimates of the $q$-values defined in (10).

**Algorithm 1.** Compute estimates of $q$-values defined in (10).

1. Compute estimated $p$-values

$$
\hat{p}_i \equiv \hat{p}(\rho_i) = \frac{n_{\text{bg}}(\rho_i)}{n_{\text{bg}}(0)},
$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{bg}}(0)$, $\rho_i$ is the detection statistic of the $i$-th event and $n_{\text{bg}}(\rho)$ is given in (2).

2. Let $\hat{p}(1) \leq \hat{p}(2) \leq \cdots \leq \hat{p}(n_{\text{obs}})$ be the ordered $p$-values.
(3) Set $\hat{\pi}_0 = 1$ or $\hat{\pi}_0 = \hat{f}(1)$.

(4) Set $\hat{q}_{(n_{\text{obs}})} = \hat{\pi}_0 \hat{p}_{(n_{\text{obs}})}$.

(5) For $i = n_{\text{obs}} - 1, n_{\text{obs}} - 2, \ldots, 1$, calculate

$$\hat{q}(i) = \min \left( \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(i)}{i}, \hat{q}(i+1) \right).$$

(6) The estimated $q$-value for the $i$-th most significant event is $\hat{q}(i)$ defined in (10).

4. Demonstration by analyzing O1 data

In this section, we demonstrate the estimation of $q$-values presented in the previous section by the re-analysis of the O1 data. We use the list of false alarm rates of the observed events analyzed by Nitz et al. [2], which can be downloaded from https://github.com/gwastro/1-ogc. The total number of observed events is expected as $n_{\text{obs}} = 4,155,840$ (see Section 2). But, in the analysis, the threshold of the signal-to-noise ratio is selected as 5.5. The $\chi^2$ statistic [19] and the modified signal-to-noise ratio are calculated, only when the events pass the threshold. As a result, the number of available data is reduced as 146,214. Analysis using a subset of events is usual in search for gravitational waves from the compact binary coalescence [3, 12, 13], mainly because analyzing all events is prohibitive because of the computational burden. Therefore, we use the subset of the list consisting of false alarm rates less than some value, such that the subset is free from the irregularity.

The following procedure for estimating $q$-values is a modified version of Algorithm 1 with accounting the effect of taking the subset of $p$-values. Appendix B explains why Algorithm 2 yields estimates of the $q$-values defined in (10).

**Algorithm 2.** Compute estimates of $q$-values defined in (10). Let $m$ to be the number of false alarm rates which are less than some value. Assume a histogram density of $p$-values in the region around and larger than $\hat{p}(m)$ is flat.

1. Compute estimated $p$-values defined as (5). This can be done by evaluating the following quantities.

$$\hat{p}_i = (\text{false alarm rate of } i\text{-th event}) \times 1(\text{sec}),$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

2. Let $\hat{p}(1) \leq \hat{p}(2) \leq \cdots \leq \hat{p}(m)$ be the ordered $p$-values.

3. Set $\hat{\pi}_0 = 1$ or $\hat{\pi}_0 = \hat{f}(\hat{p}(m))$, where $\hat{f}(\lambda)$ is the natural cubic spline curve with three degree of freedom fitted to

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{n_{\text{obs}} - \#\{\hat{p}_i < \lambda\}}{n_{\text{obs}} (\hat{p}(m) - \lambda)},$$

where $0 < \lambda < \hat{p}(m)$.

4. Set $\hat{q}(m) = \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(m)/m$.

5. For $i = m - 1, m - 2, \ldots, 1$, calculate

$$\hat{q}(i) = \min \left( \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(i)}{i}, \hat{q}(i+1) \right).$$

6. The estimated $q$-values for the $i$-th most significant event is $\hat{q}(i)$.
To calculate $q$-value from the full data set, we use $m = 126,384$ false alarm rates, whose estimated $p$-values are smaller than 0.03. Figure 1 is a plot of $f(\lambda)$ defined in (11). As seen in Figure 1, we can see that (11) is almost unity for $0 < \lambda < 0.03$. In fact, we obtain $0.99998 < f(\lambda) < 1.00005$ for $\lambda = 0.001, 0.002, ..., 0.029$. This result means that the histogram density of $p$-values is almost flat in $(0, 1)$ and most of the $p$-values are noise except for a few $p$-values around zero. Therefore, we set $f(\lambda) = 1$ for $0 < \lambda < 0.03$, or $\hat{\pi}_0 = 1$ in Step 3 of Algorithm 2.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the estimated $q$-values of the events from the full search for compact binary mergers in the O1 data, which are labeled “complete” in the dataset. Since the top two events are limited only by the background time length, the $p$-values should be regarded as conservative estimates. If we call the events whose $q$-value is smaller than 0.05 significant, the top three events are significant. The expected proportion of false discoveries incurred in the three events is less than 0.05. In the recent catalog of gravitational-waves from compact binary mergers during O1 and O2, a necessary condition that an event is considered to be a gravitational wave signal is that the false alarm rate of the event is less than one per 30 days [3], which corresponds to the $p$-value of $1(\text{sec})/30(\text{days}) = 3.9 \times 10^{-7}$. The condition coincidentally gives the same conclusion as the $q$-value threshold of 0.05.
Table 2  Estimated $p$-values and $q$-values of the events from the full search for compact binary mergers in the O1 data. Events are sorted by false alarm rate and the top 10 events are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>1/(false alarm rate) (year)</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>$q$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150914+09:50:45UTC</td>
<td>$&gt; 6.55 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$&gt; 4.84 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.11 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151226+03:38:53UTC</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.91 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.37 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.11 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151012+09:54:43UTC</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>$1.30 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$1.80 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151019+00:23:16UTC</td>
<td>0.0596</td>
<td>$5.32 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150928+10:49:00UTC</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>$7.48 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151218+18:30:58UTC</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>$1.08 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160103+05:48:36UTC</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td>$1.21 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151202+01:18:13UTC</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
<td>$1.25 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160104+03:51:51UTC</td>
<td>0.0212</td>
<td>$1.50 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151213+00:12:20UTC</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
<td>$1.65 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 summarizes the results of estimated $q$-values of the events consistent with the selected population of binary black holes in the O1 data, which are labeled “bbh” in the dataset. In Table 3, a measure of true discovery of a particular event $P_{\text{astro}}$ computed by Nitz et al. [2] is also displayed. Although the list of events consistent with the selected population of binary black holes contains 12,741 events, we use $m = 10,434$ false alarm rates, whose $p$-values are smaller than 0.0025. We set $n_{\text{obs}} = 4,155,840$, because the total number of events is not available. This setting leads a conservative estimate of $q$-values. Once again, if we call the events whose $q$-value is smaller than 0.05 significant, the top three events are significant. This coincides with the results in Ref. [3]. However, note that $1 - P_{\text{astro}}$ values are always larger than the corresponding $q$-values. This trend implies that

Table 3  Estimated $p$-values, $q$-values, and $P_{\text{astro}}$ of the events consistent with the selected population of binary black holes in the O1 data. Events are sorted by false alarm rate and the top 10 events are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>1/(false alarm rate) (year)</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>$q$-value</th>
<th>$1 - P_{\text{astro}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150914+09:50:45UTC</td>
<td>$&gt; 6.55 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$&gt; 4.84 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.11 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151226+03:38:53UTC</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.91 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.36 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.11 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151012+09:54:43UTC</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>$7.10 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>9.83 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160103+05:48:36UTC</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>$8.00 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>0.0831</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151213+00:12:20UTC</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>$1.03 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151216+18:49:30UTC</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>$2.98 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151222+05:28:26UTC</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
<td>$4.22 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151217+03:47:49UTC</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>$8.82 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151009+05:06:12UTC</td>
<td>0.0351</td>
<td>$9.02 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151220+07:45:36UTC</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>$1.53 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controlling \( q \)-value should be more powerful than controlling \( P_{\text{astro}} \). Moreover, \( P_{\text{astro}} \) is not available for the top two events, because these two events are assumed to be gravitational wave signal in the computation of \( P_{\text{astro}} \) in advance [2].

5. Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we presented a consistent procedure to assess the significance of each event. We proposed an estimator of the \( p \)-values (5) using the background distribution of detection statistic without assuming any functional forms of the background distribution. We believe that the \( p \)-value (5) is more useful to assess the significance of each event than the conventional \( p \)-value (1). Based on the estimated \( p \)-values, we proposed a procedure to assess the significance of a particular event with FDR. The proposed procedure is demonstrated by the re-analysis of the O1 data. The results are shown in Table 2 and 3. We showed that the top three events should be called significant, if we call events with \( q \)-value smaller than 0.05 significant. The result is consistent with the result obtained by the criterion used in the recent catalog of gravitational waves [3]. The obtained \( q \)-values of GW150914 and GW151226 (the first and second events in Table 3, respectively) are about \( 10^{-6} \), while the \( q \)-value of GW151012 (the third event in Table 3) is about 0.0001. This means that if we call these three events significant, 0.01% of events are expected to be noise.

Both of \( P_{\text{astro}} \) and \( q \)-value are designed to give the significance of a particular event with the false discovery rate. Therefore, \( q \)-value can be regarded as an alternative to \( P_{\text{astro}} \). However, if we compare controlling \( q \)-values with controlling \( P_{\text{astro}} \), the latter has several difficulties. Firstly, in the calculation of \( P_{\text{astro}} \), we need a priori knowledge about what candidate events truly have gravitational wave origin. Since we do not have such knowledge, we have to assume some of the candidate events have gravitational wave origin in advance. In addition, it is impossible to assess the significance of these events. Secondly, computing \( P_{\text{astro}} \) demands a signal model. The definition of \( P_{\text{astro}}(\rho) \) (equation (6) in [2]) involves the signal number density \( \Lambda_S P_s(\rho) \), where \( \Lambda_S \) is the rate of signal events and \( P_s(\rho) \) is the probability of an event having the detection statistic \( \rho \). Then, the constancy of \( \Lambda_S \) and \( P_s(\rho) \propto \rho^{-4} \) are assumed, where the latter assumption comes from a modeling by Schutz [20]. However, it is difficult to guarantee that these assumptions really hold. In terms of this difficulty, \( q \)-value has an advantage, because the definition of \( q \)-value is free from any assumptions on the signal model. Lastly, controlling \( P_{\text{astro}} \) will be less powerful than controlling \( q \)-value. As shown in Table 3, the \( 1 - P_{\text{astro}} \) of GW151012 is 0.024, while \( q \)-value of the event is 0.0001. This contrasting result indicates poor power of controlling \( P_{\text{astro}} \). In fact, in Table 3 we have seen that \( 1 - P_{\text{astro}} \) values are uniformly larger than the \( q \)-values for each event.

The first difficulty and the third difficulty are closely related. In [2], the \( P_{\text{astro}} \) was defined as

\[
P_{\text{astro}} = \frac{\Lambda_S P_s(\rho)}{\Lambda_N P_N(\rho) + \Lambda_S P_S(\rho)},
\]

where \( \Lambda_S P_S(\rho) = n_c \rho_c^2 \rho^{-4} \) and \( \Lambda_N P_N(\rho) = A e^{-B\rho} \), respectively. Here, \( n_c \) is the expected number of events which have gravitational wave origin under the Poisson distribution whose the mean is determined by the number of events which are assumed to have gravitational wave origin, \( \rho_c \) is the threshold of the detection statistics \( \rho \), and \( A \) and \( B \) are the constants obtained by fitting to the background distribution of the detection statistic. The evaluated
\( P_{\text{astro}} \) strongly depends on our choice of \( n_c \) and \( \rho_c \), and the arbitrariness causes bias of evaluation of \( P_{\text{astro}} \).

Because of these difficulties in controlling \( P_{\text{astro}} \) we have seen so far, the authors consider that controlling \( q \)-values is a reasonable method to estimate FDR of a particular event. In this paper, we demonstrated the \( q \)-value estimation in the search for gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences. However, it can be applicable to other searches for gravitational waves, because our procedure to estimate \( q \)-value is not restricted to the specific search for the gravitational wave whose true background distribution of detection statistic is difficult to know.
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**A. Appendix : Derivation and meaning of \( p_{\text{conv}} \)**

In this appendix, we discuss derivation and meaning of the probability (1), which is the probability of observing one or more noise events as strong as a signal whose detection statistic is \( \rho \) under the noise model. In the analysis paper of the event GW150914 [13], Abbott et al. called this probability a \( p \)-value. However, in the text we have not called it \( p \)-value to avoid a possible confusion with the \( p \)-value of (4). In fact, as we have seen in Section 2, the probability (3) is far larger than the estimated \( p \)-value (6).

Let us see more details of the probability (1) which is proposed by Usman et al. in Appendix of [15]. The total number of noise events in the observed data, \( N \), is modeled parametrically with the Poisson process of mean \( \mu \):

\[
P(N = n) = \frac{\mu^n}{n!} e^{-\mu}, \quad n \in \{0, 1, 2, ...\}.
\]

(A1)

The slight difference between the expression of \( \mu \) in (1) and the expression \( (1 + n_{bg}(\rho) t_{\text{obs}})/t_{bg} \) in Eq. 17 of [15] (the unity in the numerator) comes from the fact that the model used by Usman et al. [15] involves observed events. In contrast, (1) is based only on the noise events in simulated background data, because the authors of the present paper believe that the noise model is better to be constructed by noise events only. In addition, Usman et al. [15] considered a randomness in the number of candidate events and then marginalized them out. However, these steps have no influence on the final expression if \( n_{bg}(\rho) \ll n_{bg}(0) \) (compare Equations A.4 and A.12 in [15]). Then, the probability of observing one or more noise events as strong as a signal whose detection statistic is \( \rho \) under the noise model, \( P(N \geq 1) \), is given by (1).

**B. Appendix : Derivation of Algorithm 1 and 2 to estimate \( q \)-values**

In this section we show how Algorithms 1 and 2 give estimates of the \( q \)-value (10). Since in the case of \( m = n_{\text{obs}} \) Algorithm 2 reduces to Algorithm 1, we concentrate on Algorithm 2.
Since a histogram density of p-values in the region around and larger than \( \hat{p}(m) \) is flat, it is reasonable to assume that all of the p-values in the region are noise. Then, if we take the threshold \( t \) in \([\hat{p}(m), 1]\), we obtain \( S(t) = n_1 + n_{\text{obs}}t \) where \( n_1 \) is defined in Table 1. Accordingly, (9) is

\[
\hat{\text{FDR}}(t) = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{n_1 + n_{\text{obs}}t},
\]

which is monotonically increasing. Therefore, we have \( \hat{q}(m) = \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(m)/m \), in Step 4. How Step 5

\[
\hat{q}(i) = \min \left( \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(i)}{i}, \hat{q}(i+1) \right)
\]

(B1)
gives (10) for \( i = m - 1, m - 2, \ldots, 1 \) can be seen by induction. Assume (B1) gives (10) for \( i = m - 1, m - 2, \ldots, k + 1 \). Note that

\[
\hat{q}(m) \geq \hat{q}(m-1) \geq \cdots \geq \hat{q}(k+1) \geq \hat{q}(k).
\]

(B2)
Let us show that (B1) gives (10) for \( i = k \), namely,

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} \geq \hat{q}(k), \quad \forall t \geq \hat{p}(k).
\]

(B3)
and the equality holds for some \( t \geq \hat{p}(k) \).

- If \( \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k) \leq \hat{q}(k+1) \), then \( \hat{q}(k) = \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k)/k \). Note that the equality of (B3) holds if \( t = \hat{p}(k) \). For \( t \in (\hat{p}(k), \hat{p}(k+1)) \),

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k+1)}{k + 1} \geq \hat{q}(k+1) = \hat{q}(k).
\]

where the second last inequality holds from (B1) and the last inequality holds from (B2). Using the similar argument iteratively proves the assertion.

- If \( \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k)/k > \hat{q}(k+1) \), then \( \hat{q}(k) = \hat{q}(k+1) \). For \( t \in (\hat{p}(k), \hat{p}(k+1)) \),

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k+1)}{k + 1} \geq \hat{q}(k+1) = \hat{q}(k).
\]

For \( t = \hat{p}(k+1) \),

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k+1)}{k + 1} \geq \hat{q}(k+1) = \hat{q}(k).
\]

(B4)
Suppose the second last equality holds, namely, the equality of (B3) holds at \( t = \hat{p}(k+1) \). Then, for \( t \in (\hat{p}(k+1), \hat{p}(k+2)) \),

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k+2)}{k + 2} \geq \hat{q}(k+2) = \hat{q}(k).
\]

For \( t = \hat{p}(k+2) \),

\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}}t}{\# \{ \hat{p}(j) \leq t; j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \}} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(k+2)}{k + 2} \geq \hat{q}(k+2) \geq \hat{q}(k) = \hat{q}(k).
\]
Using the similar argument iteratively proves the assertion. If the second last equality of (B4) does not hold, there exists some \( l \) such that \( k + 2 \leq l \leq m \) and
\[
\frac{\hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(l)}{l} = \hat{q}(l) = \hat{q}(l-1) = \cdots = \hat{q}(k),
\]
because \( \hat{q}(m) = \hat{\pi}_0 n_{\text{obs}} \hat{p}(m)/m \). The assertion can be shown in the similar manner.
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