

Homogeneity Test of Several High-Dimensional Covariance Matrices for Stationary Processes under Non-normality

ABDULLAH QAYED¹ and DONG HAN¹

Department of Statistics¹, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China.

February 25, 2022

Abstract

This article presents a homogeneity test for testing the equality of several high-dimensional covariance matrices for stationary processes with ignoring the assumption of normality. We give the asymptotic distribution of the proposed test. The simulation illustrates that the proposed test has perfect performance. Moreover, the power of the test can approach any high probability uniformly on a set of covariance matrices.

Keywords: Modified M test, equality of several covariance matrices, non-normal distribution, dependent stationary process, high-dimensional data.

1 Introduction

Many statistical methods in multivariate analysis require the assumption of homogeneous covariance matrices; for instance, multivariate analysis of variance, Hotelling T^2 -test, discriminant function analysis and Mahalanobis' generalized distance studies, in addition to the statistical models in repeated measures, longitudinal studies and multilevel regression analysis and so on. Moreover, the inference results of many applied sciences are depend on testing the covariance matrices, as in biometrics in the study of homogeneity of covariance matrices in infraspecific paleontologic and neontologic material and, if possible, by comparing with material known to be homochronous. On other hand, with the expansion of

¹ Supported by National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program, 2015CB856004) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11531001). *MSC 2010 subject classification.* Primary 62L10; Secondary 62L15

CONTACT: ABDULLAH QAYED, email: qayed@sjtu.edu.cn - Department of Statistics-Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Shanghai, Minhang District. Shanghai 200240,China.

exact procedures for measurement theory in many applied sciences such as biology, life and other sciences, data of many different research phenomena may not be distributed normally, as in the exponential distribution for growth, microorganisms, pandemics, cancer cells and compound interest in economic surveys,... etc. Other example, in genomics, Torrente et al (2019) investigated the prevalence of genes with expression distributions, they found that there are less than 50% of all genes were Normally-distributed, with other distributions including Gamma, Bimodal, Cauchy, and Log-normal were represented. In such a case, when studying a gene's distribution shape to test heterogeneity of data, the variety of non-normal data distributions is often overlooked when using homogeneity tests that assume all data groups follow the normal distribution.

In this paper, we consider homogeneity tests of covariance matrices with high dimensional data when p can be much larger than the sample size n_i . Recently, many homogeneity tests have been developed by many authors to address the deficiencies of classical tests caused by high-dimensional p and corresponding small sample sizes, and these tests are based on the trace of sample covariance matrices, as in sphericity hypothesis tests proposed by Jiang & Chen et al (2010), Qiu and Chen (2012), Ledoit and Wolf (2002), Srivastava (2005), Cai et al (2013), Cai and Ma (2013), Li and Chen (2014), Peng et al (2016), Ishii et al (2019) and Zhang et al (2020). Despite the classical homogeneity tests (as in Box (1949), Jiang et al (2012) and Jiang & Yang (2013)) are sensitive to departure the normal distribution, almost recently developed tests also assume the normal distribution of data. This raises questions about the accuracy of the various homogeneity tests with relatively small sample sizes of groups or when assumptions of normality and large samples are not met.

Moreover, for testing the equality of several covariance matrices under the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_k = \Sigma \text{ vs } H_1 : \Sigma_i \neq \Sigma_j, \text{ for at least one pair } (i, j), i \neq j, \quad (1)$$

where Σ_i denotes the the $p \times p$ covariance matrices of the i th population with p -dimensional multivariate distribution for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $k \geq 2$. Schott (2007) presented the J_k test based on the trace of sample covariance matrices and proved that the asymptotic distribution of J_k is normal $N(0, 1)$ under the null hypothesis H_0 in (1) with the setting of $p/n_i \rightarrow b_i \in (0, \infty)$ as $n_i, p \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where n_i is the number of samples for i th population. Srivastava and Yanagihara (2010) proposed two tests T_k^2 and Q_k^2 based on the trace of sample covariance matrices for testing H_0 and showed that the asymptotic null distributions of both testes are χ_{k-1}^2 in the setting of $n_i = O(p^\delta)$, $\delta > 1/2$ as $n_i, p \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. However, all tests J_k , T_k^2 and Q_k^2 assume the normal distribution of data. Based on the U -statistics, Ahmad (2016) and Zhong et al (2019) presented tests T_g and \hat{D}_{nt} respectively for high-dimensional data under non-normality and high-dimensional longitudinal data, where both tests have asymptotic null normal distribution and do not need a specific relationship between p and n_i as $p = p(n_i)$, $n_i \rightarrow \infty$. However, all five tests J_k , T_k^2 , Q_k^2 , T_g and \hat{D}_{nt} above need to assume that $0 < a_i = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \text{tr}(\Sigma^j)/p < \infty$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, or $0 < \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)/p^2 = \delta_1 < \infty$ for all p and $\inf_p \{ \text{tr}(\Sigma^4)/[\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)]^2 \} > 0$.

The research in this paper is motivated by the conventional likelihood ratio M test in Box (1949), which established the asymptotic χ^2 distribution of the test statistic for fixed-dimensional normally distributed random vectors, when $n_i > p$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. In this

paper, a modified M test, L_k , is proposed to test the null hypothesis in (1) without the normality assumption. We don't assume the conditions about the relationship between the traces of powers of covariance matrix and p listed above for testing the null hypothesis H_0 . However, we assume that the relationship between p and n_i satisfies $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(r-2)}$ for some positive constant c , where $n_{max} = \max\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\}$ and $r > 2$. Hence, the test L_k accommodates the large p , small n_{max} situations.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the basic data structure of the G-stationary process and its associated properties, and a modified M test. In section 3, we present the main results of this paper, we show that the asymptotic null distribution of L_k , as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$, is χ_{k-1}^2 under the null hypothesis H_0 in (1) followed by the procedures of L_k test. Reports of numerical simulation are given in section 4. An empirical study using time-series data to extract clinical information from speech signals is presented in section 5. The paper concludes in section 6. The proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, and the examples results are deferred to the Appendix.

2 The G-stationary process and a modified M test

We first introduce the G-stationary process and its associated properties, then present a modified M test.

A dependent stationary process is called as the G-stationary process if it has the following representation

$$X_j = G(\dots, \varepsilon_{j-1}, \varepsilon_j, \varepsilon_{j+1}, \dots), \quad j \in Z$$

and satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.1 in Berkes, Liu and Wu (2014), where $\varepsilon_i, i \in Z$, are i.i.d. random variables, $G: R^Z \rightarrow R$ is a measurable function, Z and R denote the set of integers and the set of real numbers, respectively. In fact, under some appropriate conditions, the G-stationary process can include a large class of linear and nonlinear processes, such as the functionals of linear processes, bilinear models, GARCH processes, generalized random coefficient autoregressive models, nonlinear AR models etc., see Liu and Lin (2009), Berkes, Liu and Wu (2014).

Assume that X_j has mean zero, $\mathbf{E}(|X_j|^r) < \infty$ for $r > 2$, with covariance function $\gamma(j) = \mathbf{E}(X_0 X_j), j \in Z$. It is clear that the covariance matrix $\Sigma_p = (\sigma_{ij})_{p \times p}$ of (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p) satisfies $\Sigma_p = (\sigma_{ij})_{p \times p} = \Sigma_p = (\gamma(j-i))_{p \times p}$. Let $\mathbb{S}_p = \sum_{j=1}^p X_j$. The most important result for the G-stationary process is that it satisfies the strong invariance principle, i.e., it can arrive the optimal KMT approximation (see Berkes, Liu and Wu 2014), that is, there exists a richer probability space such that

$$\mathbb{S}_p - \sigma \mathbb{B}(p) = o(p^{1/r}), \quad a.s. \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{B}(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion and $\sigma^2 = \sum_{j \in Z} \gamma(j)$. From (2) it follows that

$$\frac{\mathbb{S}_p}{\sigma \sqrt{p}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{S}_p^2)}{p}. \quad (3)$$

In this paper, our main purpose is to present a test for testing the equality of k covariance matrices $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k$ which correspond to k G-stationary processes, $X_j^{(i)}, 1 \leq j \leq p$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, respectively, where $\Sigma_i = (\sigma_{jj'}^{(i)})_{p \times p} = (\gamma^{(i)}(j - j'))_{p \times p}$ and $\gamma^{(i)}(j) = \mathbf{E}(X_0^{(i)} X_j^{(i)}), j \in Z$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. The k G-stationary processes can be considered as k p -dimensional random vectors, $X^{(i)} = (X_1^{(i)}, X_2^{(i)}, \dots, X_p^{(i)}), 1 \leq i \leq k$. For each i , we take n_i i.i.d. random samples (random vectors)

$$X_l^{(i)} = (X_{1l}^{(i)}, X_{2l}^{(i)}, \dots, X_{pl}^{(i)}), \quad 1 \leq l \leq n_i$$

to estimate Σ_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Sometimes, p is much bigger than n_i . For example, consider whether the fluctuation of hypertension in half a year (180 days) in patients with hypertension in k countries or regions is consistent. We may randomly select 100 patients with hypertension in every country and wear a smart health bracelet to every patient with hypertension, which can monitor the blood pressure profile of the patient every minute. Here, $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_k = 100$ and $p = 60 \times 24 \times 180 = 259200$.

Let \mathbf{S}_i be the sample covariance matrix for $\Sigma_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$. Note that \mathbf{S}_i can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}_i = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \begin{pmatrix} X_{1l}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_1^{(i)} \\ X_{2l}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_2^{(i)} \\ \dots \\ X_{pl}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_p^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_{1l}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_1^{(i)}, X_{2l}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_2^{(i)}, \dots, X_{pl}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_p^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p (X_{jl}^{(i)} - \bar{X}_j^{(i)}) \right)^2 \geq 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{X}_j^{(i)} = \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} X_{jl}^{(i)} / n_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ is p -dimensional vector with 1 as the component. How to guarantee $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T > 0, a.s. ?$ In fact, if $\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} := \sum_{j=1}^p X_{jl}^{(i)}$ is a continuous random variable for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq k$, then

$$\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_i}\right) \mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{l' \neq l} \mathbb{S}_{pl'}^{(i)} \neq 0, \quad a.s.$$

for $n_i > 1, 1 \leq i \leq k$, since $\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)}, 1 \leq l \leq n_i$, are i.i.d. continuous random variables for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq k$. This means that

$$(n_i - 1) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T = \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \left(\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} \right)^2 > 0, \quad a.s.$$

for $n_i > 1, 1 \leq i \leq k$. For general case, we can prove that $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T / p > 0, a.s.$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 3.1 in the next section.

The often used test for testing the equality of several covariance matrices is the Box's M (1949) test which can be written in the following

$$M = (n - k) \log |\mathbf{S}| - \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \log |\mathbf{S}_i|, \quad (6)$$

and $\mathbf{S} = \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \mathbf{S}_i / (n - k)$ and $n - k = \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1)$. When p is fixed and $\min_{1 < i < k} n_i \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic null distribution of φM test is chi-squared χ^2 with $df = (k - 1)p(p + 1)/2$ degrees of freedom, where

$$\varphi = 1 - \frac{2p^2 + 3p - 1}{6(p + 1)(k - 1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{n_i - 1} - \frac{1}{n - k} \right).$$

The Box's M test in (6) represents a ratio of the pooled determinant $|\mathbf{S}|$ to the geometric mean of the determinants $|\mathbf{S}_i|$, ($i = 1, \dots, k$), this test is extremely sensitive to departures from normality. On the other hand, the M test is valid only for $n_i > p$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ since the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_i is singular ($|\mathbf{S}_i| = 0$) with positive probability when $p \geq n_i$ (Dykstra, 1970). But $\mathbf{1S}_i\mathbf{1}^T$ can be positive almost surely when p is much bigger than n_i . Another disadvantage of the M test is that it is not easy to calculate the determinant $|\mathbf{S}|$ when p is large. In order to overcome these two shortcomings, we propose a modified M test, L_k , by replacing $|\mathbf{S}_i|$ in M test (6) with $\mathbf{1S}_i\mathbf{1}^T$, that is,

$$L_k := (n - k) \log \hat{\mathbf{V}}_p - \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \log \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \quad (7)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i = \mathbf{1S}_i\mathbf{1}^T, \quad \hat{\mathbf{V}}_p = \frac{1}{n - k} \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (8)$$

It can be seen that the modified M test, L_k , can not only be defined but also can be easily calculated when p is large.

3 Main results

The asymptotic properties of $\mathbf{1S}_i\mathbf{1}^T$ and L_k will be given in this section.

Theorem 3.1. *For each i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $\{X_{jl}^{(i)}, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$, $1 \leq l \leq n_i$, be n_i i.i.d. G -stationary processes with $E(X_{jl}^{(i)}) = 0$ and $E(|X_{jl}^{(i)}|^r) < \infty$ for $r > 2$, $1 \leq l \leq n_i$, $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\mathbf{1}\Sigma_i\mathbf{1}^T > 0$ and $\sigma_i^2 = \sum_{j \in Z} \gamma^{(i)}(j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $p \geq c(n_i)^{r/(r-2)}$ for some positive constant c , then*

$$\frac{(n_i - 1) \mathbf{1S}_i\mathbf{1}^T}{p\sigma_i^2} \rightarrow \chi_i, \text{ a.s.}, \quad \chi_i \sim \chi_{(n_i-1)}^2 \quad (9)$$

as $p \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Remark 3.1. From (3) it follows that $\mathbf{1}\Sigma_i\mathbf{1}^T/(p\sigma_i^2) \rightarrow 1$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, that is, $(n_i - 1)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{S}_i\mathbf{1}^T/\mathbf{1}\Sigma_i\mathbf{1}^T \rightarrow \chi_i$. Gupta and Nagar (2000, Theorem 3.3.11) has proved the similar result of Theorem 3.1 for $p < n_i$ by using the method of characteristic function assuming the normal distribution of the data. Here, we prove Theorem 3.1. without assuming the normality and permitting p larger than n_i , and therefore (9) holds for any data distribution satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3.1.

Let $n_{min} = \min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\}$ and $n_{max} = \max\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\}$. The following theorem shows that the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic L_k in (7) is χ_{k-1}^2 .

Theorem 3.2. *Let the conditions of Theorem 2.1 hold and $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(2-r)}$. Under the original hypothesis H_0 in (1) with $\Sigma > 0$, we have that the test statistic L_k in (7) converges in distribution to χ_{k-1}^2 as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$.*

Next we give an example to illustrate how to use Theorem 3.1. to test the null hypothesis in (1).

Example 1. Let $k = 3$ and $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 100$. Without loss of generality, we assume that p is even. Let $\alpha = 0.05$. Take two positive numbers χ_1 and χ_2 such that $\chi_1 < \chi_2$ and

$$\mathbf{P}(\chi_{k-1}^2 < \chi_1) = 0.025, \quad \mathbf{P}(\chi_{k-1}^2 > \chi_2) = 0.025.$$

This means that $\mathbf{P}(\chi_1 \leq \chi_{k-1}^2 \leq \chi_2) = 1 - 0.05$, that is, $\mathbf{R}_k = \{[0, \chi_1) \cup (\chi_2, \infty)\}$ is a domain of rejecting the null hypothesis H_0 , here, the procedures of L_k hold for any $\mathbf{1} = (1_1, \dots, 1_p)$, $\mathbf{1}$ is $(1 \times p)$ vector, .

For high dimensional observation vector $(X_1^{(i)}, \dots, X_p^{(i)})$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, researchers sometimes not only want to infer whether their covariance matrices, $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$, are equal, but also want to know whether sub covariance matrices of relative low dimensional observations vectors, $(X_1^{(i)}, \dots, X_{p_1}^{(i)})$, $(X_{p_1+1}^{(i)}, \dots, X_{p_1+p_2}^{(i)})$, \dots , $(X_{p_1+\dots+p_{l-1}+1}^{(i)}, \dots, X_p^{(i)})$, are equal, where $p = \sum_{i=1}^l p_i$, all $p_i \geq 2$ and $l \geq 2$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $p \geq n_{min} = \min\{n_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Let $p_j = j(n_{min} - 1) \wedge p$ for $j \geq 0$ and take $m \geq 2$ such that $p_{m-1} < p \leq p_m$. By the definition of p_j , we know that $p_m = p$. Now, we divide Σ_i and \mathbf{S}_i into the following two forms respectively

$$\Sigma_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{p_1 \times p_1}^{(i)} & \Sigma_{p_1 \times p_2}^{(i)} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \Sigma_{p_2 \times p_1}^{(i)} & \Sigma_{p_2 \times p_2}^{(i)} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \Sigma_{p_{m-1} \times p}^{(i)} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \Sigma_{p \times p_{m-1}}^{(i)} & \Sigma_{p \times p}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_i = \begin{pmatrix} S_{p_1 \times p_1}^{(i)} & S_{p_1 \times p_2}^{(i)} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ S_{p_2 \times p_1}^{(i)} & S_{p_2 \times p_2}^{(i)} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & S_{p_{m-1} \times p}^{(i)} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & S_{p \times p_{m-1}}^{(i)} & S_{p \times p}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix},$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $\Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)}$ and $S_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)}$ are all $(p_j - p_{j-1}) \times (p_j - p_{j-1})$ sub-matrices for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m-1$, and $\Sigma_{p \times p}^{(i)}$ and $S_{p \times p}^{(i)}$ are $(p - p_{m-1}) \times (p - p_{m-1})$ sub-matrices for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let $\mathbf{y}_{p_1} = (1_1, \dots, 1_{p_1})$, $\mathbf{y}_{p_2} = (1_{p_1+1}, \dots, 1_{p_2})$, \dots , $\mathbf{y}_{p_m} = (1_{p_{m-1}+1}, \dots, 1_p)$ and

$$\mathbf{y}_1 = (\mathbf{y}_{p_1}, 0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{y}_2 = (0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{y}_{p_2}, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, \mathbf{y}_m = (0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{y}_{p_m}), \quad (10)$$

be m p -dimensional vectors. It follows that

$$\mathbf{y}_j \Sigma_i \mathbf{y}_j^T = \mathbf{y}_{p_j} \Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} \mathbf{y}_{p_j}^T, \quad \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{y}_j^T = \mathbf{y}_{p_j} S_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} \mathbf{y}_{p_j}^T$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Note that $p_j - p_{j-1} = n_{min} - 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $p - p_{m-1} \leq n_{min} - 1$, that is, \mathbf{y}_{p_j} , $1 \leq j \leq m-1$, are $(n_{min} - 1)$ -dimensional vectors and \mathbf{y}_{p_m} is a $(p - p_{m-1})$ -dimensional vector. If $\mathbf{y}_j \neq 0$, or equivalently, $\mathbf{y}_{p_j} \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{y}_j^T = \mathbf{y}_{p_j} S_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} \mathbf{y}_{p_j}^T > 0$ when $\Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Now we present m test statistics as follows:

$$L_{kj} := (n - k) \log \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{pj} - \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \log \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \quad (11)$$

for $1 \leq j \leq m$, where

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} = \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{y}_j^T = \mathbf{y}_{p_j} S_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} \mathbf{y}_{p_j}^T, \quad \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{pj} = \frac{1}{n - k} \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{ij}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$.

Hence, by extending Theorem 3.2 we can get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/r-2}$. Under the original hypothesis H_0 in (1) with $\Sigma > 0$, for any p -dimensional vector $\mathbf{y}_j \neq 0$ defined in (10), we have that for every j ($1 \leq j \leq m$), the test statistic L_{kj} in (11) converges in distribution to χ_{k-1}^2 as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark 3.2. Here, we divide the original hypothesis H_0 and the alternative hypothesis H_1 into m original hypotheses and m alternative hypotheses in the following

$$H_{0j} : \Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(1)} = \dots = \Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(k)} \text{ vs } H_{1j} : \Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)} \neq \Sigma_{p_j \times p_j}^{(l)} \text{ at least one pair } (i, l), i \neq l$$

for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Thus, we can use the test statistic L_{kj} to do the original hypothesis H_{0j} and the alternative hypothesis H_{1j} for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Moreover, though the above division may lose some information, for example, $\Sigma_{p_j \times p_l}^{(k)}$, $j \neq l$, one of its advantages is that it can help us to test which part (H_{0j}) of the original hypothesis $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \dots = \Sigma_k = \Sigma$ is inconsistent.

Remark 3.3. If necessary, one can divide the original hypothesis H_0 and the alternative hypothesis H_1 into more or less sub hypotheses, H_{0j} and H_{1j} , $1 \leq j \leq l$.

The following example will discuss on how to use Corollary 3.1. for testing the null hypothesis.

Example 2. Let $k = 3$, $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 101$ and $p = 350$. Let $\mathbf{1}_a = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{0}_a = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ be two 100-dimensional vectors and $\mathbf{1}_b = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{0}_b = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ denote two 50-dimensional vectors. Take four 350-dimensional vectors \mathbf{y}_j , $1 \leq j \leq 5$, defined in the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_1 &= (\mathbf{1}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_b), & \mathbf{y}_2 &= (\mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{1}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_b) \\ \mathbf{y}_3 &= (\mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{1}_a, \mathbf{0}_b), & \mathbf{y}_4 &= (\mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{0}_a, \mathbf{1}_b). \end{aligned}$$

Divide \mathbf{S}_i into four sub sample covariance matrices: $S_{p_j \times p_j}^{(i)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $p_1 = 100, p_2 = 200, p_3 = 300$ and $p_4 = 350$. By (7) we can get four test statistics L_{kj} , $1 \leq j \leq 4$. Thus, we will reject the null hypothesis H_0 if at least one of L_{kj} , $1 \leq j \leq 4$ belong to the rejecting region \mathbf{R}_k . If $L_{k4} \in \mathbf{R}_k$ and $L_{kj} \notin \mathbf{R}_k$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3$, this means that the three covariances, $\Sigma_{p_4 \times p_4}^{(1)}$, $\Sigma_{p_4 \times p_4}^{(2)}$ and $\Sigma_{p_4 \times p_4}^{(3)}$, corresponding to $(\mathbf{X}_{301}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{350}^{(1)})$, $(\mathbf{X}_{301}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{350}^{(2)})$ and $(\mathbf{X}_{301}^{(3)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{350}^{(3)})$, are not equal.

Remark 3.4. In practice, ρL_k converges to χ_{k-1}^2 , where $\rho = \rho_n$ is the scale factor given in Bartlett (1937) as follows:

$$\rho = \rho_n = \frac{1}{C}, \quad \text{where } C = 1 + \frac{1}{3(k-1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{n_i - 1} - \frac{1}{n - k} \right) \quad (12)$$

and $\rho \rightarrow 1$ for fixed k as $n_{\min} \rightarrow \infty$. Here, the use of ρ tends to over-correct the exaggerated significance levels in small samples. The scale factor ρ also greatly increases the approximation of significance level and uses as a gauge of its convergence. The empirical sizes of ρL_k in Table 1 are corresponding to the correct significance levels of χ_{k-1}^2 for several cases of n_i , p and k with the nominal level 0.05.

4 Numerical simulations

In this section, we use ρL_k to test the hypothesis (1). Here, ρ was chosen as in (12) so that the convergence of the significance levels by the empirical distributions of ρL_k test are close to χ_{k-1}^2 . All simulation results in this paper are obtained using 10^3 repetitions with the nominal level (0.05). To demonstrate how ρL_k performs, we conducted the test proposed by Ahmad (2017) (T_g test) in non-normal high dimensional data. We compare the power and empirical size of the ρL_k with that of the T_g , where $T_g = (g-1) \sum_{i=1}^g T_i - 2 \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^g T_{ij}$, see Ahmed (2017).

The empirical sizes and attained power

Based on different distributions structures under the null hypothesis, our simulations are designed in Two scenarios: (i) In dependent stationary process of Gaussian AR(1) model,

to evaluate the empirical sizes and power of the ρL_k tests, we present the results of the equality test between three covariance matrices ($k = 3$). For this purpose, we generated three multivariate normal random vectors $\mathbf{X}_{jG}^{(i)}$, $1 \leq j \leq p, 1 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq l \leq n_i$, with $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{jG}^{(i)} = \mu_p^{(i)} = 0_p$ and $cov(\mathbf{X}_{jG}^{(i)}) = \Sigma_i = \Sigma_p^{(i)} = (\sigma_{i,j})_{p \times p} = (-1)^{(i+j)}(0.2 \times (J+2))^{|i-j|} = \Omega_J, J = 0, 1, 2$. We considered the following hypothesis testing setup:

$$H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_3 = \Sigma = \Omega_0, H_1 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma, \Sigma_2 = \Omega_1 \text{ and } \Sigma_3 = \Omega_2.$$

(ii) Here, the dependent stationary processes of multivariate uniform distribution $\mathbf{X}_{jU}^{(i)}$ and multivariate exponential distribution $\mathbf{X}_{jE}^{(i)}$ were generated by AR(1) model. For testing the null hypotheses we adapted the foregoing setting of $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_3 = \Sigma = \Omega_0$ in (i) above for both the uniform and exponential processes $\mathbf{X}_{jU}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{jE}^{(i)}$, respectively. Moreover, for power, the alternative hypotheses were constructed at least one of the three distributions that follows a different covariance structure than the others. The first two structures of covariance matrices are defined as Compound Symmetry (CS): $\Sigma_1 = K\mathbf{I} + \phi\mathbf{J}$ and Autoregressive of order 1 (AR(1)): $\Sigma_2 = (-1)^{(i+j)}(0.4)^{|i-j|}$, respectively, with \mathbf{I} as identity matrix, \mathbf{J} as the matrix of ones and $K = 1, \phi = 0.70$ as constants, However, the third covariance matrix Σ_3 was simulated with data being drawn from the p -dimensional centralized $\Gamma(1, 1)$.

We computed the empirical size under H_0 and the attained power under H_1 , Tables 1 and 2 show the results of ρL_k and T_g , respectively. From Table 1 we find that the ρL_k test has good performance for the three distributions. The empirical sizes of ρL_k are uniformly close to the nominal level 0.05. We observe that the power of ρL_k test uniformly approaches to 1 for small, moderate and large sample sizes n_i . According to Table 2, we observe that the performance of ρL_k test is better than that of T_g test in all cases. The reason why the performance of the proposed test is better should be that the test statistic ρL_k is based on the k estimators $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T, 1 \leq i \leq k$.

Table 1: The empirical size and power of ρL_k test in the normal, exponential and uniform distributions

p	$n_1 = n_2 = n_3$	Empirical size			Pwoer		
		Normal	Exp	Uniform	Normal	Exp	Uniform
20	10	0.049	0.054	0.057	0.981	0.988	0.984
	20	0.049	0.056	0.056	0.989	0.999	0.993
	50	0.051	0.047	0.061	1.000	1.000	1.000
	100	0.050	0.054	0.067	1.000	1.000	1.000
50	10	0.054	0.052	0.052	0.992	0.999	0.990
	20	0.046	0.050	0.049	0.991	1.000	1.000
	50	0.045	0.047	0.056	1.000	1.000	1.000
	100	0.053	0.050	0.051	1.000	1.000	1.000
100	10	0.050	0.050	0.051	0.989	1.000	1.000
	20	0.048	0.042	0.052	1.000	1.000	1.000
	50	0.053	0.054	0.046	1.000	1.000	1.000
	100	0.052	0.050	0.052	1.000	1.000	1.000
200	10	0.047	0.046	0.041	0.987	1.000	1.000
	20	0.046	0.050	0.055	1.000	1.000	1.000
	50	0.050	0.047	0.053	1.000	1.000	1.000
	100	0.051	0.052	0.050	1.000	1.000	1.000
300	10	0.053	0.051	0.054	0.995	1.000	1.000
	20	0.046	0.050	0.048	1.000	1.000	1.000
	50	0.050	0.047	0.051	1.000	1.000	1.000
	100	0.051	0.051	0.053	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 2: The empirical size and power of T_g test in the normal, exponential and uniform distributions

p	$n_1 = n_2 = n_3$	Empirical size			Pwoer		
		Normal	Exp	Uniform	Normal	Exp	Uniform
20	10	0.001	0.005	0.010	0.482	0.201	0.320
	20	0.019	0.006	0.012	0.518	0.190	0.300
	50	0.021	0.011	0.015	0.540	0.234	0.341
	100	0.023	0.014	0.017	0.618	0.261	0.365
50	10	0.014	0.010	0.012	0.452	0.251	0.380
	20	0.024	0.015	0.016	0.672	0.351	0.480
	50	0.023	0.020	0.019	0.751	0.391	0.590
	100	0.025	0.022	0.023	0.800	0.421	0.680
100	10	0.016	0.013	0.015	0.513	0.301	0.490
	20	0.024	0.014	0.019	0.712	0.362	0.602
	50	0.026	0.017	0.021	0.821	0.401	0.680
	100	0.029	0.020	0.022	0.850	0.510	0.750
200	10	0.017	0.014	0.019	0.590	0.452	0.522
	20	0.016	0.017	0.020	0.763	0.562	0.682
	50	0.028	0.020	0.023	0.862	0.572	0.702
	100	0.030	0.022	0.025	0.923	0.662	0.792
300	10	0.021	0.019	0.022	0.640	0.500	0.541
	20	0.027	0.021	0.024	0.792	0.782	0.727
	50	0.027	0.020	0.025	0.831	0.702	0.771
	100	0.030	0.024	0.029	0.913	0.762	0.802

5 Experimental study

To demonstrate the performance of the proposed ρL_k test we use the time-series of LSVT Voice rehabilitation dataset, provided by <https://archive.ics.uci.edu>. This dataset is used to study the extracting of clinical information from speech signals provided by LSVT Global, a company specializing in voice rehabilitation (see Tsanas, M.A. et al. 2014). The original study used 309 Attributes (variables) to characterize 126 speech signals (Instances).

Results and discussion

We show the results of the LSVT voice rehabilitation data set in Table 3. We chose three sample sizes $n_i = 10$, $n_i = 20$ and $n_i = 40$, each sample size was chosen by randomly selecting instances. Table 5 show the statistics measure and P_{value} of T_g and ρL_k tests. We observe in Table 3 that the ρL_k test rejects the null hypothesis H_0 , that is, $P_{value} < 0.05$. The results of ρL_k may consistent with the results of T_g , however, for $n_i = 10$ the P_{value} of ρL_k test equals 0.0391, that is, ρL_k appears more conservative than the T_g to reject H_0 when H_0 is correct.

Table 3: The statistic measure and P_{value} of T_g and ρL_k tests, of LSVT voice rehabilitation dataset

$n_1 = n_2 = n_3$	T_g		ρL_k	
	$(z)_T$	P_{value}	$(\chi^2)_{\rho L}$	P_{value}
10	4.2005	0.0000	3.0833	0.0391
20	9.4051	0.0000	15.1066	0.0005
40	13.0521	0.0000	39.7810	0.0000

6 Concluding remarks

This article presents a modified test, L_k , to test the null hypothesis in (1) for high-dimensional settings with ignoring the assumption of normality. We prove that the L_k converges in distribution to χ^2_{k-1} . Here, we don't assume the usual conditions about the relationship between the traces of powers of covariance matrix and p , but we assume that the relationship between p and n_{max} satisfies $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(r-2)}$ for a positive constant c . Hence, the L_k test accommodates the large p , small n_{max} situations. The most significant two advantages of the modified test, L_k , are that (1) it is easy to calculate; (2) it can effectively test the equality of several high-dimensional covariance matrices when p is much bigger than n_{max} . The simulation results in Tables 1-2 demonstrate that the ρL_k test has perfect performance and its power tends to 1.

7 Appendix

A.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^p X_{jl}^{(i)}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_p^{(i)} = \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)}/n_i$. By the strong invariance principle in (2), $\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)}$ can be written as

$$\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} = \sigma_i \mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) + \epsilon_{pl}^{(i)}, \quad a.s., \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for $1 \leq l \leq n_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$, and therefore,

$$\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\mathbb{S}}_p^{(i)} = \sigma_i \left(\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p) \right) + \epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p, \quad a.s., \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p) = \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p)/n_i$, for each i , $\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(t), 1 \leq l \leq n_i$, are mutually independent n_i standard Brownian motions, and the random variables $\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)}$ satisfies that $\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)}/p^{1/r} \rightarrow 0, a.s.$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ for all $1 \leq l \leq n_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$. Note that

$$\chi_i := \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{n_i} (\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p))^2}{p} \sim \chi_{(n_i-1)}^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

It means that χ_i does not depend on p for all $1 \leq l \leq n_i, n_i > 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$. From (5), (A.1) and (A.2), it follows that

$$\frac{(n_i - 1) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T}{p \sigma_i^2} = \frac{1}{p \sigma_i^2} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} (\mathbb{S}_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\mathbb{S}}_p^{(i)})^2 = \chi_i + \xi_i(p) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for large $p, 1 \leq l \leq n_i, n_i > 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i(p) &= 2 \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{n_i} (\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p)) (\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p)}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{1}{p \sigma_i^2} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} (\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p)^2 \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n_i} p^{1/r}}{\sqrt{p}} \left(\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{n_i} (\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p)) (\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p)}{\sqrt{n_i} p} + \frac{\sqrt{n_i} p^{1/r}}{\sqrt{p}} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \frac{(\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p)^2}{p^{2/r}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Since $(\mathbb{B}_l^{(i)}(p) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}^{(i)}(p))/\sqrt{n_i p} \sim N(0, (n_i - 1)/n_i^2)$, $(\epsilon_{pl}^{(i)} - \overline{\epsilon}^{(i)}_p)/p^{1/r} \rightarrow 0, a.s.$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sqrt{n_i} p^{1/r}/\sqrt{p}$ is bounded, or $p \geq c(n_i)^{r/(r-2)}$ for some positive constant c , it follows that $\xi_i(p) \rightarrow 0, a.s.$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, by (A.4) and (A.5) we have

$$\frac{(n_i - 1) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{1}^T}{p \sigma_i^2} \rightarrow \chi_i, \quad a.s. \quad \chi_i \sim \chi_{n_i-1}^2$$

as $p \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

A.2. Proof of Theorem 3.2. Under the original hypothesis H_0 in (1) with $\Sigma > 0$, we have $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \dots = \sigma_k^2 = \sigma^2$. Let $a_i = (n_i - 1)/(n - k)$ and $N = (n - k)/2$. By (A.4) L_k can be written as $L_k = -2N \log J_{n,k} = -2 \log J_{n,k}^N$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n,k} &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^k [\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i]^{\frac{n_i-1}{n-k}}}{\hat{\mathbf{V}}_p} = \frac{(n-k) \prod_{i=1}^k [\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i]^{a_i} \frac{1}{p\sigma^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^k (n_i-1) \frac{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i}{p\sigma^2}} = \frac{(n-k) \prod_{i=1}^k [\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i]^{a_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^k (n_i-1) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^k [a_i]^{-a_i} \prod_{i=1}^k [(n_i-1) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i]^{a_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^k (n_i-1) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i} = C_{n,k}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k \left[\frac{\chi_i Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^k \chi_i} \right]^{a_i} = C_{n,k}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (Z_i Y_i)^{a_i} \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i := \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i / p\sigma^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{n,k} &= \prod_{i=1}^k \left[\frac{n_i-1}{n-k} \right]^{\frac{n_i-1}{n-k}}, \quad Y_i = \frac{1 + \xi_i(p)/\chi_i}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i(p)/\sum_{i=1}^k \chi_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ Z_i &= \frac{\chi_i}{\chi_1 + \dots + \chi_k}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-1, \quad Z_k = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} Z_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi_i \sim \chi_{(n_i-1)}^2$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, it follows that (Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}) is subject to the Dirichlet distribution with density function $f(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1})$ in the following

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}) = \frac{\Gamma(N)}{\prod_{i=1}^k \Gamma(N a_i)} \prod_{i=1}^k z_i^{N a_i - 1}.$$

As in the lemma 2 in Chao and Glaser (1978), we can get that

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\left[C_{nk}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (Z_i)^{a_i} \right]^{N\gamma} \right) = \left(C_{nk}^{-1} \right)^{N\gamma} \frac{\Gamma(N)}{\Gamma(N(1+\gamma))} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(N a_i (1+\gamma))}{\Gamma(N a_i)}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

for any constant γ satisfying $\gamma > -1$. By using Stirling approximation to the gamma function in (A.6), it follows that

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\left[C_{nk}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (Z_i)^{a_i} \right]^{N\gamma} \right) \rightarrow \left(1 + \gamma \right)^{\frac{-(k-1)}{2}} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

as $n_{\min} \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, if $Y_i > 1$, then

$$(Z_i Y_i)^{n_i-1} = [Z_i(Y_i - 1) + Z_i]^{n_i-1} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$= (Z_i)^{n_i-1} + (n_i - 1) Z_i (Y_i - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i-1} C_{n_i-2}^{j-1} \frac{1}{j} [Z_i(Y_i - 1)]^{j-1} (Z_i)^{n_i-2-(j-1)}$$

$$\leq (Z_i)^{n_i-1} + (n_i - 1) Z_i (Y_i - 1) [Z_i(Y_i - 1) + Z_i]^{n_i-2}$$

$$= (Z_i)^{n_i-1} + (n_i - 1) Z_i (Y_i - 1) (Z_i Y_i)^{n_i-2}, \quad n_i \geq 2$$

$$(Z_i Y_i)^{-\alpha} \leq (Z_i)^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Similarly, if $Y_i \leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(Z_i Y_i)^{n_i-1} &= [Z_i - Z_i(1 - Y_i)]^{n_i-1} \\
&= (Z_i)^{n_i-1} - (n_i - 1)Z_i(1 - Y_i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i-1} C_{n_i-2}^{j-1} \frac{1}{j} [-Z_i(1 - Y_i)]^j (Z_i)^{n_i-2-(j-1)} \\
&\geq (Z_i)^{n_i-1} - (n_i - 1)Z_i(1 - Y_i)[Z_i - Z_i(1 - Y_i)]^{n_i-2} \\
&\geq (Z_i)^{n_i-1} - (n_i - 1)Z_i(1 - Y_i)(Z_i)^{n_i-2}, \quad n_i \geq 2 \\
(Z_i Y_i)^{-\alpha} &\geq (Z_i)^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Note that $0 \leq Z_i Y_i \leq 1$, $0 < Z_i < 1$, and therefore, $|Z_i(1 - Y_i)| = |Z_i(Y_i - 1)| \leq 1$. By (A.5) we know that

$$n_i |Y_i - 1| = \frac{n_i |\xi_i(p)/\chi_i - \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i(p)/\sum_{i=1}^k \chi_i|}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i(p)/\sum_{i=1}^k \chi_i} \rightarrow 0, \quad a.s.$$

as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ when $n_{max} \sqrt{n_{max} p^{1/r}} / \sqrt{p}$ is bounded, or $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(r-2)}$ for some positive constant c . Thus, by (A.7), (A.8), (A.9) and the control convergence theorem, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\lim}_{n_{min} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(J_{n,k}^{N\gamma} \right) &= \overline{\lim}_{n_{min} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(\left[C_{nk}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (Z_i Y_i)^{a_i} \right]^{N\gamma} \right) \leq \left(1 + \gamma \right)^{\frac{-(k-1)}{2}} \\
\underline{\lim}_{n_{min} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(J_{n,k}^{N\gamma} \right) &= \underline{\lim}_{n_{min} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(\left[C_{nk}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (Z_i Y_i)^{a_i} \right]^{N\gamma} \right) \geq \left(1 + \gamma \right)^{\frac{-(k-1)}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

for $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(r-2)}$. This means that

$$\mathbf{E} \left(J_{n,k}^{N\gamma} \right) \rightarrow \left(1 + \gamma \right)^{\frac{-(k-1)}{2}} \tag{A.10}$$

as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$ for $p \geq c(n_{max})^{3r/(r-2)}$. Note that the random variable $-2 \log X$ is subject to $\chi_{(k-1)}^2$ distribution if and only if the γ -th order moment of the positive random variable X is equal to $\left(1 + \gamma \right)^{\frac{-(k-1)}{2}}$. Thus, let $X = J_{n,k}^N$, by (A.10) we have

$$L_k = -2N \log J_{n,k} = -2 \log J_{n,k}^N \rightarrow \chi_{(k-1)}^2, \quad \text{as } n_{min} \rightarrow \infty.$$

It is clear that for positive number $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$ we have $\rho_n L_k \rightarrow \chi_{k-1}^2$ as $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $k \geq 2$.

A.3. Results of Examples 1 and 2

In Examples 1 and 2, we test the null hypothesis $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_3 = \Sigma$, where Σ is a $p \times p$ matrix whose (a, b) th element are defined by $(-1)^{(a+b)}(0.40)^{|a-b|}$. We considered the null hypothesis test for two cases of dependent stationary process, the Gaussian and exponential AR(1) models, respectively, with the dimension $p = 350$. For both distributions, P-values in table 4 indicate that the ρL_k accepts H_0 when H_0 is correct. We observe in Table 4 that the ρL_k test does not reject the null hypothesis H_0 , that is, each P_{value} of the ρL_k test does not fall into the rejection region R_k . The results of ρL_k in Table 4 are completely consistent with the results in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 4: The statistic measure and P_{value} of ρL_k test for testing a stationary processes AR(1), in Examples 1 and 2.

	Example 1.				Example 2.			
	Exponential		Gaussian		Exponential		Gaussian	
	χ^2	P_{value}	χ^2	P_{value}	χ^2	P_{value}	χ^2	P_{value}
$\rho L_{k(\mathbf{y}_1)}$	—	—	—	—	1.2006	0.7815	4.4730	0.7094
$\rho L_{k(\mathbf{y}_2)}$	—	—	—	—	1.0615	0.5915	1.3009	0.6444
$\rho L_{k(\mathbf{y}_3)}$	—	—	—	—	0.8418	0.5267	2.2446	0.8654
$\rho L_{k(\mathbf{y}_4)}$	—	—	—	—	1.2540	0.4301	2.1401	0.8004
$\rho L_{k(1)}$	1.0593	0.6528	1.6076	0.7230	—	—	—	—

References

- [1] Ahmad, M. R. Testing homogeneity of several covariance matrices and multi-sample sphericity for high-dimensional data under non-normality. *Comm. in Stat.- Theorey and Methods*, **46** (2017), 3738-3753.
- [2] Bartlett, M. S. Properties of sufficiency and statistical tests. *Proc. Royal Soc. Lond. Series A* . **160** (1937), 268282.
- [3] Berkes, I., Liu, W. and Wu, W. B. Komlos,- Major- Tusnady approximation under dependence. *The Annals of Probability*,**42** (**2**) (2014), 794817.
- [4] Box, G. E. P. A general distribution theory for a class of likelihood criteria. *Biometrika*, **36** (1949), 317346.
- [5] Cai, T. and Ma, Z. M. Optimal hypothesis testing for high dimensional convariance matrices. *Bernoulli*, **19** (2013), 2359-2388
- [6] Cai. T , Liu, W and Xia, Y. Two-sample covariance matrix testing and support recovery in high-dimensional and sparse settings. *J. of the American Statistical Association*,**108** (2013), (265-277)
- [7] Chao. M and Glaser. R. The exact distribution of Bartlett’s test statistic for homogeneity of variances with unequal sample sizes. *J. of the American Statistical Association*, **73** (1978), 422-426.
- [8] Chen, S. X. Zhang, L. X. and Zhang, P. S. Tests for High-Dimensional Covariance Matrices. *J. of the American Statistical Association*, **105** (2010), 810-819.

- [9] Dykstra, R. L. Establishing the positive definiteness of the sample covariance matrix. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **41** (1970), 2153-2154
- [10] Friendly, M., Sigal, M. Visualizing tests for equality of covariance matrices. York University, Toronto (2017). www.datavis.ca/papers/EqCov-rev2.
- [11] Gupta, A. K. and Nagar, D. K. Matrix variate distribution, *Chapman and Hall/CRC*, New York, (2000).
- [12] Ishll, A, Yata, K. and Aoshima, M. Equality tests of high-dimensional covariance matrices under the strongly spiked eigenvalue model. *J. Stat. Plan. Inference*, **202** (2019), 99-111.
- [13] Jiang, D., Jiang, T. and Yang, F. Likelihood ratio tests for covariance matrices of high-dimensional normal distributions. *J. Stat. Plan. Inference*, **142** (2012), 22412256.
- [14] Jiang, T. and Yang, F. Central limit theorems for classical likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *Ann. Stat*, **41** (2013), 20292074.
- [15] Ledoit, O., and Wolf, M. Some hypothesis tests for the covariance matrix when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *The Annals of Statistics*, **30** (2002), 1081-1102.
- [16] Liu, W. and Lin, Z. Strong approximation for a class of stationary processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl*, **119** (2009), 249280.
- [17] Peng, L. H., Chen, S. X. and Zhou, W. More powerful for tests sparse high-dimensional covariance matrices. *J. Mutlyivariate Anal*, **149** (2016), 124-143.
- [18] Qiu, Y. and Chen, S. X. Test for bandedness of high-dimensional covariance matrices and bandwidth estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40** (2012), 12851314.
- [19] Schott, J. R. A Test for the equality of covariance matrices when the dimension is large relative to the sample sizes. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **51** (2007), 65356542.
- [20] Srivastava, M.S., Yanagihara, H. Testing the equality of several covariance matrices with fewer observations than the dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **101** (2010), 1319-1329.
- [21] Srivastava, M. S. Some tests concerning the covariance matrix in high dimensional data. *J. Japan Statist. Soc*, **35**(2005), 251-272.
- [22] Torrente. l, Zimmerman.S, Suzuki.M, Christopheit.M, Greally .M.J, Mar.C.J. The shape of gene expression distributions matter: how incorporating distribution shape improves the interpretation of cancer transcriptomic data , (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/572693>
- [23] Tsanas, M.A. Little, C. Fox, L.O. Objective automatic assessment of rehabilitative speech treatment in parkinsons disease. *IEEE Transaction on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, **22**, (2014).
- [24] Zhang, Q. Y., Hu, J. and Bai, Z. D. Modified Pillais trace statistics for two high-dimensional sample covariance matrices, arXiv:2001.00397v1 [math.ST] (2020)
- [25] Zhong, P., Li, R. and Shanto, S., Homogeneity tests of covariance matrices with high-dimensional longitudinal data. *Biometrika*, **106** (2019), 619-634.