

Order selection with confidence for finite mixture models

Hien D Nguyen^{1*}

Daniel Fryer²

Geoffrey J McLachlan²

November 25, 2021

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

²School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Australia.

*Corresponding author: h.nguyen5@latrobe.edu.au.

Abstract

The determination of the number of mixture components (the order) of a finite mixture model has been an enduring problem in statistical inference. We prove that the closed testing principle leads to a sequential testing procedure (STP) that allows for confidence statements to be made regarding the order of a finite mixture model. We construct finite sample tests, via data splitting and data swapping, for use in the STP, and we prove that such tests are consistent against fixed alternatives. Simulation studies are conducted to demonstrate the performance of the finite sample tests-based STP, yielding practical recommendations, and extensions to the STP are considered. In particular, we demonstrate that a modification of the STP yields a method that consistently selects the order of a finite mixture model, in the asymptotic sense. Our STP not only applicable for order selection of finite mixture models, but is also useful for making confidence statements regarding any sequence of nested models.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{X}$ be a random variable. Let $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X})$ be a class of probability density functions (PDFs), defined on the set \mathbb{X} , which we shall refer to as components. We say that \mathbf{X} arises from a g component mixture model of class \mathcal{K} if the PDF f_0 of \mathbf{X} belongs in the convex class

$$\mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{X}) = \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) : f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z f_z(\mathbf{x}) ; \pi_z \geq 0, \sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z = 1, f_z \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X}), z \in [g] \right\},$$

where $g \in \mathbb{N}$ and $[g] = \{1, \dots, g\}$.

Suppose that we observe an independent and identically distributed (IID) sample sequence of data $\mathbf{X}_n = (\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=1}^n$, where each \mathbf{X}_i has the same data generating process (DGP) as \mathbf{X} , which is unknown. Under the assumption that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{g_0}(\mathbb{X})$ for some $g_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we wish to use the data \mathbf{X}_n in order to determine the possible values of g_0 . This problem is generally referred to as order selection in the mixture modeling literature, and reviews regarding the problem can be found in McLachlan and Peel [2000, Ch. 6], McLachlan and Rathnayake [2014], and Celeux et al. [2019], for example.

Notice that the sequence $(\mathcal{M}_g)_{g=1}^\infty$ is nested, in the sense that $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_{g+1}$, for each g , and that $g_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ is equivalent to $f_0 \in \mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{g=1}^\infty \mathcal{M}_g$. We shall write the null hypothesis that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$ (or equivalently, $g_0 \leq g$) as H_g , and we assume that we have available a p -value for each hypothesis $P_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is available, and that $P_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$ correctly controls the size of the hypothesis test, in the sense that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} \Pr_f(P_g(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha, \quad (1)$$

for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Here, \Pr_f is the probability measure corresponding to the PDF f . In Wasserman et al. [2020], the following simple sequential testing procedure (STP) is proposed for determining the value of g_0 (for general nested models, not necessarily mixtures):

1. Choose some significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and initialize $\hat{g} = 0$;

2. Set $\hat{g} = \hat{g} + 1$;
3. Test the null hypothesis $H_{\hat{g}}$ using the p -value $P_{\hat{g}}(\mathbf{X}_n)$;
 - (a) If $P_{\hat{g}}(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha$, then go to Step 2.
 - (b) If $P_{\hat{g}}(\mathbf{X}_n) > \alpha$, then go to Step 4.
4. Output the estimated number of components $\hat{g}_n = \hat{g}$.

It was informally argued in Wasserman et al. [2020] that, although the procedure above involves a sequence of multiple tests, each with local size α , it still correctly controls the Type I error in the sense that

$$\Pr_{f_0}(f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n-1}) \leq \alpha \quad (2)$$

for any $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Here, we note that the complement of the event $\{f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n-1}\}$ is $\{f_0 \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n-1}\}$ or equivalently $\{g_0 \geq \hat{g}_n\}$. Thus, from (2), we can make the confidence statement that

$$\Pr_{f_0}(g_0 \geq \hat{g}_n) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (3)$$

for any $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}$.

In the present work, we shall provide a formal proof of the result (2) using the closed testing principle of Marcus et al. [1976] and Sonnemann [2008] (see also Dickhaus, 2014, Sec. 3.3). Using this result and the universal inference framework of Wasserman et al. [2020], we construct a sequence of tests for $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$ with p -values satisfying (1) and prove that each of the tests is consistent under some regularity conditions. We then demonstrate the performance of our testing procedure for the problem of order selection for finite mixtures of normal distributions, and verify the empirical manifestation of the confidence result (3). Extensions of the STP are also considered, whereupon we construct a method that consistently estimates the order g_0 , and consider the application of the STP to asymptotically valid tests.

We note that hypothesis testing for order selection in mixture models is a well-studied area of research. Difficulties in applying testing procedures to the order selection problem arise due to identifiability and boundary issues of the null hypothesis parameter spaces (see, e.g., Quinn et al., 1987, and references therein regarding parametric mixture models, and Andrews, 2001, more generally). Examples of testing methods proposed to overcome the problem include the parametric bootstrapping techniques of McLachlan [1987], Feng and McCulloch [1994], Feng and McCulloch [1996], and Polymenis and Titterton [1998], and the penalization techniques of Chen [1998], Chen and Li [2009], Li and Chen [2010], Chen et al. [2012], and Huang et al. [2017].

In fact, the sequential procedure described above was also considered for order selection in the mixture model context by Windham and Cutler [1992] and Polymenis and Titterton [1998], although no establishment of the properties of the approach was provided. The possibility of constructing intervals of form (3) via bounding of discrete functionals of the underlying probability measure is discussed in Donoho [1988], although no implementation is suggested. Citing observations made by Donoho [1988] and Cutler and Windham [1994], it is suggested in McLachlan and Peel [2000, Sec. 6.1] that intervals of form (3) are sensible in practice, because reasonable functionals that characterize properties of f_0 , such as for the number of components g_0 , can be lower bounded with high probability from data, but often cannot be upper bounded.

As previously mentioned, we plan to prove that (2) holds by demonstrating that the sequential test is a closed testing procedure. However, we note that the procedure may also be considered under the sequential rejection principle of Goeman and Solari [2010], and if $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{g=1}^G \mathcal{M}_g$ for some fixed $G \in \mathbb{N}$, then we may also consider the procedure as a fixed sequence procedure, as considered by Maurer et al. [1995]. Another perspective regarding the sequential test is via the general procedures of Bauer and Kieser [1996]. We also remark that the use of multiple testing procedures for model selection is well studied in the literature, as exemplified by the works of Finner and Giani [1996], Goeman and Solari [2011], and Hansen et al. [2011].

For completeness, we note that apart from hypothesis testing, numerous solutions to the order selection problem for finite mixture models have been suggested. These related works include the use of information criteria [Leroux, 1992, Biernacki et al., 2000, Keribin, 2000, Naik et al., 2007, Hui et al., 2015] and parameter regularization [Chen and Khalili, 2009, Xu and Chen, 2015, Yin and Lin, 2016, Yin et al., 2019], among other techniques. Furthermore, outside of the multiple testing framework, the problem of model selection with confidence has also been addressed in the articles of Ferrari and Yang [2015], Li et al. [2019], Lei [2019], and Zheng et al. [2019].

The remainder of manuscript proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we recall the closed testing principle and use it to prove the inequality (2). In Section 3, we use the universal inference framework of Wasserman et al. [2020] to construct a class of likelihood ratio-based tests for the hypotheses $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$. In the context of normal mixture models, numerical simulations are used to assess the performance of the sequential procedure using the constructed tests in Section 4. Extensions to the STP are discussed in Section 5. Finally, conclusions are provided in Section 6.

2 Confidence via the closed testing principle

Let $\mathbb{H} = \{H_g : g \in \mathbb{G}\}$ be a set of hypotheses that are indexed by some (possibly infinite) set \mathbb{G} , where each hypothesis H_g corresponds to the statement $\{\theta \in \mathbb{T}_g\}$ regarding the parameter of interest $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, where $\mathbb{T}_g \subset \mathbb{T}$. We say that \mathbb{H} is a \cap -closed system if for each $\mathbb{I} \subseteq \mathbb{G}$, either $\bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{I}} \mathbb{T}_g = \emptyset$ or $\bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{I}} \mathbb{T}_g = \{\mathbb{T}_g : g \in \mathbb{G}\}$. That is, for every set \mathbb{I} of indices, there exists a hypothesis $H_g \in \mathbb{H}$ corresponding to the statement $\{\theta \in \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{I}} \mathbb{T}_g\}$.

Recalling the notation from Section 1, we say that H_g is rejected if $R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbf{1}\{P_g(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha\}$ is equal to 1, and we say that H_g is not rejected, otherwise. Here, $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function. We further say that the familywise error rate (FWER) of a set rejections $\{R_g(\mathbf{X}_n)\}_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ is strongly controlled at level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ if for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\Pr_{\theta} \left(\bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(\theta)} \{R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right) \leq \alpha,$$

where \Pr_{θ} denotes the probability measure corresponding to parameter value θ , and $\mathbb{G}_0(\theta) \subset \mathbb{G}$ is the set of indices with corresponding hypotheses that are true under \Pr_{θ} .

We note that the statement $\left\{ \bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(\theta)} \{R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right\}$ reads as at least one true hypothesis has been rejected. The complement of the statement is therefore that no true hypotheses have been rejected and hence the strong control of the FWER implies that the true parameter value lies in the complement of union of the rejected subsets with probability $1 - \alpha$, that is, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\Pr_{\theta} \left(\theta \in \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(\theta)} \mathbb{T}_g^c \right) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

where $(\cdot)^c$ is the set complement operation.

Define the set of closed tests corresponding to \mathbb{H} as the rejection rules: $(\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$, where for each $g \in \mathbb{G}$,

$$\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \min_{\{j: \mathbb{T}_j \subseteq \mathbb{T}_g\}} R_j(\mathbf{X}_n). \quad (4)$$

Then, we have the following result regarding the closed testing principle (cf. Dickhaus, 2014, Thm. 3.4).

Theorem 1. *For an \cap -closed system of hypotheses \mathbb{H} with corresponding α level local tests $(R_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$, the closed testing procedure defined by $(\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g \in \mathbb{G}}$ strongly controls the FWER at level α in the sense that*

$$\Pr_{\theta} \left(\bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(\theta)} \{\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right) \leq \alpha,$$

for each $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$.

We now demonstrate that the sequential procedure constitutes a set of closed tests of the form (4) and thus permits the conclusion of Theorem 1, which in turn implies (2) and thus (3).

Theorem 2. *The hypotheses $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$ and the STP from Section 1 constitute a \cap -closed system and a closed testing procedure, respectively, when testing using p -values $(P_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g=1}^{\infty}$, satisfying (1). The sequential test therefore permit conclusions (2) and (3).*

Proof. Firstly, since $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_{g+1}$, we have the fact that for any $g \in \mathbb{I} \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{I}} \mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_{\min_{g \in \mathbb{I}} g}$ and thus the sequence $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$ is \cap -closed. Next, the sequential procedure rejects H_g if and only if $R_j(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1$ for each $j \in [g]$, or more compactly, H_g is rejected if and only if $\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \min_{j \in [g]} R_j(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1$. Because $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_{g+1}$, we also have the fact that $\{j : \mathcal{M}_j \subseteq \mathcal{M}_g\} = [g]$, and thus $(\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g=1}^{\infty}$ is exactly the sequence of closed tests for $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$, of form (4).

By Theorem 1, for each $f \in \mathcal{M}$, we have the inequality

$$\Pr_f \left(\bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(f)} \{\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right) \leq \alpha, \quad (5)$$

where the event $\left\{ \bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{G}_0(f)} \{\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right\}$ can be written as $\left\{ f \in \bigcup_{j \in [\hat{g}_n - 1]} \mathcal{M}_j \right\}$, since the sequential procedure first fails to reject hypothesis $H_{\hat{g}_n}$. Again, since $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_{g+1}$, $\bigcup_{j \in [\hat{g}_n - 1]} \mathcal{M}_j = \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n - 1}$ and thus (5) can be written in form (2). This completes the proof. \square

3 Test of order via universal inference

Let \mathbf{X}_n be split into two subsequences of lengths n_1 and n_2 , where $\mathbf{X}_n^1 = (\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=1}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbf{X}_n^2 = (\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=n_1+1}^n$, and $n_1 + n_2 = n$. Assume that \mathbf{X} has DGP characterized by the PDF f_0 and for each $g \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\hat{f}_g^1 \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and $\hat{f}_g^2 \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$ be estimators of f_0 (not necessarily maximum likelihood estimators), based on \mathbf{X}_n^1 and \mathbf{X}_n^2 , respectively, where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

Write $\mathbf{X}_n^k = (\mathbf{X}_i^k)_{i=1}^{n_k}$, for each $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and let

$$L_f(\mathbf{X}_n^k) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_k} f(\mathbf{X}_i^k),$$

be the likelihood function corresponding to subsample \mathbf{X}_n^k , evaluated under PDF f . We wish to test the null hypothesis $H_g: f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$ against the alternative $\bar{H}_g: f_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$ using the Split test statistics

$$V_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n) = \frac{L_{\hat{f}_g^{3-k}}(\mathbf{X}_n^k)}{L_{\hat{f}_g^k}(\mathbf{X}_n^k)},$$

for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and the Swapped test statistic

$$\bar{V}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \frac{1}{2} \{V_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n) + V_g^2(\mathbf{X}_n)\}.$$

Here \tilde{f}_g^k is the maximum likelihood estimator of f_0 , based on \mathbf{X}_n^k under the null hypothesis H_g , in the sense that

$$\tilde{f}_g^k \in \left\{ \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{M}_g : L_{\tilde{f}}(\mathbf{X}_n^k) = \max_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} L_f(\mathbf{X}_n^k) \right\}.$$

We define the p -values for the Split and Swapped test statistics as $P_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1/V_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n)$ and $\bar{P}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1/\bar{V}_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$, respectively. The adaptation of Wasserman et al. [2020, Thm. 3] demonstrates that the two tests have correct size for any sample size n (i.e., $P_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n)$ and $\bar{P}_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$ satisfy condition (1), for any n).

Theorem 3. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} \Pr_f(P_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha$$

and

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} \Pr_f(\bar{P}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha.$$

It is suggested by Windham and Cutler [1992], Polymenis and Titterton [1998], and Wasserman et al. [2020] that the alternative hypothesis for each H_g should be that $f_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_g = \mathcal{M}_{g+1}$. However, since we are only looking to reject H_g , rather than making conclusions regarding the alternative, we can take $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$ to be a richer class of PDFs that is still feasible to estimate. Thus, in the sequel, we shall consider the possibility that $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g = \mathcal{M}_{g+l_g}$ for some $l_g \in \mathbb{N}$, for each $g \in \mathbb{N}$. Typically, we can let $l_g = l$ for all g , but we anticipate that there may be circumstances where one may wish for l_g to vary.

3.1 Consistency of order tests

Although Theorem 3 guarantees the control of the Type I error for each local test of H_g , it makes no statement regarding the power of the tests. For tests against alternatives of the form: $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g = \mathcal{M}_{g+l_g}$, we shall consider the issue of power from an asymptotic perspective in the parametric context. That is, we suppose that

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X}) = \{f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}\},$$

where $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus

$$\mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{X}) = \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)}) : f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)}) = \sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_z); \pi_z \geq 0, \sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z = 1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_g \in \mathbb{T}, z \in [g] \right\}.$$

We put the pairs $((\pi_z, \boldsymbol{\theta}_z))_{z=1}^g$ in the vector $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)} \in ([0, 1] \times \mathbb{T})^g = \mathbb{T}_g$. Here, we further replace \hat{f}_g^{3-k} and \tilde{f}_g^k by $f(\cdot; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)})$ and $f(\cdot; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)})$, respectively, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)}$ is a function of \mathbf{X}_n^2 and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}$ is a function of \mathbf{X}_n^1 . Further, since $f(\cdot; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)})$ is the maximum likelihood estimator of $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$, we also write

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)} \in \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g)} \in \mathbb{T}_g : \prod_{i=1}^{n_1} f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g)}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)} \in \mathbb{T}_g} \prod_{i=1}^{n_1} f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)}) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Following DasGupta [2008, Def. 23.1], we say that a sequence of tests $(R_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{n=1}^\infty$ for H_g is consistent if under the true DGP, characterized by $f_0 \notin \mathcal{M}_g$, it is true that $\Pr_{f_0}(R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1) \rightarrow 1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm and define the Kullback–Leibler divergence between two PDFs on \mathbb{X} : f_1 and f_2 , as

$$D(f_1, f_2) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_1(\mathbf{x}) \log \frac{f_1(\mathbf{x})}{f_2(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x}.$$

Further, say that a class of parametric mixture models \mathcal{M}_g is identifiable if

$$\sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_z) = \sum_{z=1}^g \pi'_z f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}'_z)$$

if and only if $\sum_{z=1}^g \pi_z \mathbf{1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_z) = \sum_{z=1}^g \pi'_z \mathbf{1}(\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}'_z)$, where $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is the usual indicator function. For $R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbf{1}(P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n) < \alpha)$, where $P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is obtained from testing H_g against the alternative $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g = \mathcal{M}_{g+l_g}$, we obtain the following result. The equivalent result regarding $\bar{P}_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$ can be established analogously.

Theorem 4. *Make the following assumptions:*

- (A1) *for each $g \in \mathbb{N}$, the class \mathcal{M}_g is identifiable;*
- (A2) *the PDF $f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$ is everywhere positive and continuous for all $(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{T}$, where \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{T} are Euclidean spaces and \mathbb{T} is compact;*
- (A3) *for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$, $|\log f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1)| \leq M_1(\mathbf{x})$ and*

$$|\log f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - \log f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)| \leq M_2(\mathbf{x}) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\|,$$

where $E_{f_0} M_1(\mathbf{X}) < \infty$ and $E_{f_0} M_2(\mathbf{X}) < \infty$.

- (A4) *the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}$, in probability, as $n_2 \rightarrow \infty$, where*

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)} \in \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g+l_g)} \in \mathbb{T}_{g+l_g} : E_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g+l_g)}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)} \in \mathbb{T}_{g+l_g}} E_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)}) \right\}.$$

Under Assumptions (A1)–(A4), if $f_0 \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}_g$, and $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then $R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbf{1}(P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n) < \alpha)$ is a consistent test for H_g .

Proof. Write the event $\{P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n) < \alpha\}$ as

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n_1} f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)})}{\prod_{i=1}^{n_1} f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)})} < \alpha,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)}) - \frac{\log \alpha}{n_1} < 0. \quad (7)$$

Thus, it suffices to show that the left-hand side converges in probability to a constant that is bounded above by zero.

By (A2) and (A3), we have the facts that (i): $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}$, in probability as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)} \in \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g+l_g)} \in \mathbb{T}_{g+l_g} : \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}^{(g+l_g)}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)} \in \mathbb{T}_{g+l_g}} \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)}) \right\},$$

and (ii):

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}),$$

in probability, as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$, by application of Atienza et al. [2007, Lem. 1], which states that

$$\left| \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g)}) \right| \leq \sum_{z=1}^g |\log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_z)|, \quad (8)$$

and using the classic uniform weak law of large numbers of Jennrich [1969, Thm. 2]. That is, (A2) permits the use of Potscher and Prucha [1997, Lem. 4.2] to prove result (i), by verifying the conditions for the uniform law, which can be done via the bound (8) and the existence of moments from (A3). Next, using (i), we show (ii) by considering the decomposition:

$$\left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) \right|,$$

where the first term on the right-hand side converges to zero in probability, by the uniform law, and using (A3), the second term is bounded from above by

$$\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \left| \log f(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}) - \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) \right| \leq 2g \mathbb{E}_{f_0} M_1(\mathbf{X}) < \infty. \quad (9)$$

The continuity from (A2) and bound (9) then implies that the second term is continuous with respect to the argument $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)}$ (cf. Makarov and Podkorytov, 2013, Thm. 7.1.3). The continuous mapping theorem then implies that the second term converges in probability to zero, as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, we write

$$\left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)}) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) \right|.$$

Using (A3), the first term on the right-hand side can be bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left| \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)}) - \log f(\mathbf{X}_i^1; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) \right| \leq \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} M_2(\mathbf{X}_i^1) \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)} \right\|.$$

Thus, the first term converges to zero in probability, as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$, by the law of large numbers (since $\mathbb{E}_{f_0} M_2(\mathbf{X}) < \infty$), and since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}$, in probability, as $n_2 \rightarrow \infty$. The second term converges to zero, in probability, as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$, by the law of large numbers, since

$$\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \left| \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) \right| \leq 2(g+l_g) \mathbb{E} M_1(\mathbf{X}) < \infty,$$

by application of bound (8).

We have thus established that the left-hand side of (7) converges in probability to

$$\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) - \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) = D(f_0, f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)})) - D(f_0, f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})), \quad (10)$$

as $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose, for contradiction, that (10) is equal to zero. Then, for all $f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)}) \in \mathcal{M}_{g+l_g}$,

$$D\left(f_0, f\left(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(g+l_g)}\right)\right) - D\left(f_0, f\left(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}\right)\right) \geq 0.$$

In particular, for some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\varpi \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \log \left\{ \frac{(1-\varpi)f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) + \varpi f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} \right\} d\mathbf{x} \leq 0.$$

By Fatou's Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \liminf_{\varpi \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varpi} \log \left\{ \frac{(1-\varpi)f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) + \varpi f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} \right\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \left\{ \frac{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} - 1 \right\} d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \frac{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} d\mathbf{x} \leq 1. \quad (11)$$

Since $f_0 \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}_g$, we have $f_0 = f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g_0)}) \in \mathcal{M}_{g_0}$, where $g_0 > g$ and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{g_0}$ contains the pairs $(\pi_{0,z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,z})_{z=1}^{g_0}$. By taking the expectation of both sides of (11) with respect to the probability measure on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, defined by

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}') = \sum_{z=1}^{g_0} \pi_{0,z} \mathbf{1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}' = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,z}),$$

we have

$$\sum_{z=1}^{g_0} \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\pi_{0,z} f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,z})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \frac{f_0^2(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} d\mathbf{x} \leq 1.$$

Finally, by the fact that $\log a \leq a - 1$, for all $a > 0$, we have

$$D\left(f_0, f\left(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}\right)\right) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \log \left\{ \frac{f_0(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} \right\} d\mathbf{x} \leq \int_{\mathbb{X}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \left\{ \frac{f_0(\mathbf{x})}{f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)})} - 1 \right\} d\mathbf{x} \leq 0,$$

which implies that $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) = f_0$, by (A1) and the definition of the Kullback–Leibler divergence (cf. Leroux, 1992, Lem. 1). Thus, we have the contradiction that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$, and hence

$$E_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g)}) - E_{f_0} \log f(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_0^{(g+l_g)}) < 0,$$

as required. □

4 Normal mixture models

We apply the STP with the Split and Swapped tests from Section 3 to the classic problem of order selection for normal mixture models, whereby $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) : \phi(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = |\mathbf{2}\pi\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-1/2} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right] \right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is symmetric positive definite.




Figure 1: Example data sets of $n_1 = 1000$ random observations from a $d = 2$ dimensional g_0 component normal mixture model, with parameters determined via parameter $\bar{\omega}$. Here, the pairs $(g_0, \bar{\omega})$ visualized in subplots a, b, c, and d are $(5, 0.01)$, $(5, 0.05)$, $(5, 0.1)$, and $(10, 0.01)$, respectively.

To assess the performance of the STP, we conduct a thorough simulation study, within the R programming environment [R Core Team, 2020]. For each $d \in \{2, 4\}$, we generate data sets \mathbf{X}_n , with $n_1 = n_2 \in \{1000, 2000, 5000, 10000\}$ observations (recall that $n = n_1 + n_2$), where each $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, from a multivariate normal mixture model in $\mathcal{M}_{g_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $g_0 \in \{5, 10\}$, with parameter elements $(\pi_z, \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z)_{z=1}^{g_0}$ of $\mathcal{M}_{g_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ generated using the MixSim package [Melnykov et al., 2012], using the setting $\bar{\omega} \in \{0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$ and $\min_{z \in [g_0]} \pi_z \geq (2g_0)^{-1}$. Here, the $\bar{\omega}$ parameter is described in Maitra and Melnykov [2010] and Melnykov et al. [2012], and controls the level of overlap between the normal components of the mixture model. Four examples of data sets generated using various combinations of simulation parameters $(g_0, \bar{\omega})$, with $d = 2$ and $n_1 = 1000$, are provided in Figure 1.

For each set of simulation parameters $(g_0, \bar{\omega}, d, n_1)$, we simulate $r = 100$ replicate data sets, whereupon we apply the STP at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, using the Split and Swapped test p -values of the forms P_g^1 and \bar{P}_g , for each of the r data sets. To compute the maximum likelihood estimators $\tilde{f}_g^k = f(\cdot; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g)})$, under the null hypotheses that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$, we use the `gmm_full` function from the Armadillo C++ library, implemented in R using the `RcppArmadillo` package [Eddelbuettel and Sanderson, 2014]. We also use the maximum likelihood estimator as $\hat{f}_g^{3-k} = f(\cdot; \hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_n^{(g+l_g)})$, under the alternative hypotheses $f_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_g = \mathcal{M}_{g+l_g}$, where we set $l_g = l \in \{1, 2\}$, for all $g \in \mathbb{N}$. From each of the r STP

results, we compute the coverage proportion (CovProp; proportion of r for which $g_0 \geq \hat{g}_n$), the mean estimated number of components (MeanComp; the average of \hat{g}_n over the r repetitions), and the proportion of times that the estimated number of components corresponded with the g_0 (CorrProp; the proportion of times the event $\hat{g}_n = g_0$ occurs out of the r repetitions). All of our R codes are made available at <https://github.com/ex2o/oscfmm>.

4.1 Simulation results

For all scenario combinations $(g_0, \bar{\omega}, d, n_1, l)$, the CovProp was 100% over the r repetitions. This confirms the conclusions of Theorems 2 and 3. This also implies that the tests are underpowered, which is conforming to the observations from the simulations of Wasserman et al. [2020]. This result is unsurprising since the tests are constructed via a Markov inequality argument, which makes no use of the topological features of the sets \mathcal{M}_g and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$ that can be used to derive more specific results.

We report the MeanComp and CorrProp results for all of the combinations $(g_0, \bar{\omega}, d, n_1, l)$, partitioned by $(g_0, \bar{\omega})$ in Tables 1–6. Here, Tables 1–6 contain results for pairs $(5, 0.01)$, $(5, 0.05)$, $(5, 0.1)$, $(10, 0.01)$, $(10, 0.05)$, and $(10, 0.1)$, respectively. In the $(5, 0.01)$ case, we observe that both the Split and Swapped test-based STPs were able to identify the generative value of g in over 90% of the cases, except when $(d, n_1, l) = (4, 1000, 2)$. There is some evidence that the Swapped test is more powerful than Split test in all cases, as indicated by the higher values of MeanComp and CorrProp. Furthermore, the $l = 2$ alternative appears to be more powerful than the $l = 1$ alternative in all cases except when $(d, n_1) = (4, 1000)$.

Table 1: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (5, 0.01)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp		
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped	
2	1000	1	4.88	4.95	0.95	0.98	
		2	4.92	4.96	0.92	0.96	
	2000	1	4.89	4.94	0.96	0.98	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	
	5000	1	4.94	4.98	0.97	0.99	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	
	10000	1	4.93	4.96	0.97	0.98	
		2	4.99	4.99	0.99	0.99	
	4	1000	1	4.87	4.97	0.92	0.97
			2	4.85	4.86	0.85	0.86
2000		1	4.94	4.98	0.97	0.99	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	
5000		1	4.98	5.00	0.99	1.00	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	
10000		1	4.98	4.98	0.99	0.99	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	

For the other pairs of $(g_0, \bar{\omega})$, we observe the same relationships between the values of l and the Split and Swapped tests. That is, $l = 2$ tends to be more powerful than $l = 1$ (except when n_1 is relatively small, i.e. $n_1 \in \{1000, 2000\}$), and the Swapped test tends to be more powerful than the Split test. In addition, we also observe that the STP becomes more powerful as n_1 increases, which supports the conclusions of Theorem 4, which applies to the normal mixture model that is under study.

For small sample sizes, we observe that the STP tended to be more powerful when $d = 2$ in almost all cases, and for larger sample sizes, the opposite appears to be true. This is likely due to a combination of the variability of the maximum likelihood estimator and the increase in separability of higher dimensional spaces. Finally, we notice that the STP was more powerful when the data were more separability (i.e., for larger values of $\bar{\omega}$). Here, we can see that for $n_1 = 10000$, the STP can identify the generative value of g in the $g_0 = 5$ scenarios, in a large proportion of cases. However, when $g_0 = 10$, the STP becomes less powerful. It is particularly remarkable that even when $n_1 = 10000$, the highest detection proportion was 7% in the $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (10, 0.1)$ scenarios. This again implies that the STP lacks power, when applied with the Split or Swapped tests, especially when component densities of the generative mixture model are not well separated.

Overall, we observe that the conclusions of Theorems 2–4 appear to hold over the assessed simulation scenarios. From a practical perspective we can make the following recommendations. Firstly, the STP based on the Swapped

Table 2: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (5, 0.05)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp		
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped	
2	1000	1	4.41	4.52	0.57	0.62	
		2	4.51	4.60	0.53	0.60	
	2000	1	4.82	4.92	0.88	0.94	
		2	4.85	4.88	0.85	0.88	
	5000	1	4.96	4.96	0.98	0.98	
		2	4.90	4.93	0.90	0.93	
	10000	1	4.92	4.92	0.96	0.96	
		2	4.95	4.98	0.97	0.98	
	4	1000	1	3.98	4.25	0.22	0.37
			2	4.20	4.27	0.21	0.27
2000		1	4.71	4.85	0.77	0.87	
		2	4.73	4.79	0.73	0.79	
5000		1	4.96	5.00	0.98	1.00	
		2	4.96	4.98	0.96	0.98	
10000		1	4.98	4.98	0.99	0.99	
		2	4.99	5.00	0.99	1.00	

test is preferred over the Split test. Secondly, the alternative based on $l = 2$ is preferred over $l = 1$. Thirdly, larger sample sizes are necessary when data arise from mixture models with larger numbers of mixture components and when the mixture components are not well separated.

5 Extensions

5.1 A consistent sequential testing procedure

Important criteria regarding the validity of an order selection method are the large sample properties of conservativeness and consistency. These properties are defined by Leeb and Pötscher [2009], in the context of this work, as

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_{f_0} (g_0 \geq \hat{g}_n) = 1$$

and

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_{f_0} (g_0 = \hat{g}_n) = 1,$$

for all $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, respectively (see also Dickhaus, 2014, Sec. 7.1).

By Theorem 2, we have the fact that (3) holds for all n , and thus the STP, as stated in Section 1, cannot be conservative, nor consistent. However, if we replace α by a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then we can conclude that the modified procedure is conservative by taking the limits on both sides of inequality (3).

We now specialize our focus, again, to the parametric setting. To construct a procedure that is consistent requires further modification to the STP. Namely, we require additionally that the individual tests of H_g are consistent (i.e., that Theorem 4 holds for the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, replacing α in each test). Thus, to make (7) hold with probability approaching one, we require that the third term on the left-hand side converges to zero. Thus, the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ must simultaneously satisfy the conditions that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n_1^{-1} \log \alpha_n \rightarrow 0$, as $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$. For instance, we may choose to set $\alpha_n = n_1^{-\kappa}$, with $\kappa > 0$. We thus have the following result regarding the STP when applied using the sequence of p -values $(P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g=1}^{\infty}$.

Corollary 1. *Assume (A1)–(A4) from Theorem 4, and that $g_0 < \infty$. If $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n_1^{-1} \log \alpha_n \rightarrow 0$, as $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then the STP for testing the sequence $(H_g)_{g=1}^{\infty}$ is consistent, when applied using the rules $(R_g(\mathbf{X}_n))_{g=1}^{\infty}$, where $R_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbf{1}(P_g^1(\mathbf{X}_n) < \alpha_n)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $N(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n_1, n_2 \geq N(\epsilon)$, we have for any $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}$:

$$\Pr_{f_0} (g_0 = \hat{g}_n) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Table 3: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (5, 0.1)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp		
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped	
2	1000	1	3.86	3.98	0.18	0.22	
		2	4.13	4.22	0.20	0.26	
	2000	1	4.41	4.60	0.57	0.67	
		2	4.51	4.58	0.51	0.58	
	5000	1	4.71	4.75	0.77	0.80	
		2	4.83	4.84	0.83	0.84	
	10000	1	4.87	4.88	0.90	0.91	
		2	4.88	4.90	0.88	0.90	
	4	1000	1	3.44	3.70	0.03	0.09
			2	3.82	3.94	0.01	0.03
2000		1	4.05	4.35	0.32	0.44	
		2	4.35	4.48	0.35	0.48	
5000		1	4.96	4.97	0.96	0.97	
		2	4.87	4.91	0.87	0.91	
10000		1	4.98	5.00	0.99	1.00	
		2	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	

Firstly, using the form of the sequential testing procedure, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr_{f_0}(g_0 = \hat{g}_n) &= \Pr_{f_0} \left(\left(\bigcap_{g=1}^{g_0-1} \{R_g^n = 1\} \right) \cap \{R_{g_0}^n = 0\} \right) \\
 &= 1 - \Pr_{f_0} \left(\left(\bigcup_{g=1}^{g_0-1} \{R_g^n = 0\} \right) \cup \{R_{g_0}^n = 1\} \right) \\
 &\geq 1 - \sum_{g=1}^{g_0-1} \Pr_{f_0}(R_g^n = 0) - \Pr_{f_0}(R_{g_0}^n = 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

By $n_1^{-1} \log \alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and Theorem 4, and by $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and Theorem 3, we have for any $\delta > 0$, there exist $N_{g_0}(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\Pr_{f_0}(R_g^n = 0) \leq \delta,$$

and

$$\Pr_{f_0}(R_{g_0}^n = 1) \leq \delta,$$

for all $n_1, n_2 \geq N_{g_0}(\delta)$ and $g \in [g_0 - 1]$. Thus, setting $\epsilon = g_0 \delta$ and $N(\epsilon) = \max_{g \in [g_0]} N_g(\delta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr_{f_0}(g_0 = \hat{g}_n) &\geq 1 - (g_0 - 1) \delta - \delta \\
 &= 1 - g_0 \delta = 1 - \epsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

We note that the modified STP resembles the time series order selection procedure of Potscher [1983]. In fact, the conditions placed on the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are the same as those imposed in Potscher [1983, Thm. 5.7]. Furthermore, we note that the conditions placed on $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ also closely resembles the conditions that are required for the consistent application of information criteria methods; see Sin and White [1996], Keribin [2000], and Baudry [2015], for example.

5.2 Asymptotic tests

Throughout the manuscript, we have assumed that the p -values from which tests are constructed satisfy (1) for all n . This assumption is compatible with our application of the STP using the local tests proposed in Section 3. We note that the STP still provides guarantees for p -values that only satisfy (1) asymptotically, in the sense that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_f(P_g(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha \quad (12)$$

Table 4: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (10, 0.01)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp		
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped	
2	1000	1	6.46	7.50	0.04	0.13	
		2	8.69	9.05	0.25	0.29	
	2000	1	7.59	8.42	0.29	0.40	
		2	9.31	9.52	0.47	0.58	
	5000	1	8.76	9.14	0.69	0.78	
		2	9.50	9.79	0.76	0.84	
	10000	1	8.81	9.19	0.75	0.82	
		2	9.60	9.81	0.82	0.90	
	4	1000	1	5.83	6.50	0.00	0.00
			2	7.17	7.77	0.00	0.00
2000		1	7.04	7.82	0.07	0.12	
		2	8.81	9.14	0.16	0.26	
5000		1	8.54	9.25	0.47	0.60	
		2	9.65	9.73	0.73	0.76	
10000		1	9.37	9.68	0.84	0.91	
		2	9.87	9.93	0.90	0.93	

for all $f \in \mathcal{M}_g$. In such a case, we have the limiting version of the confidence statement (3):

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_{f_0} (g_0 \geq \hat{g}_n) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (13)$$

To obtain (13), suppose that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{g_0}$, for some finite $g_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. In the notation of Section 2, we can write $\mathbb{G}_0(f_0) = \mathbb{N} \setminus [g_0 - 1]$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{f_0} (f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n - 1}) &= \Pr_{f_0} \left(\bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{N} \setminus [g_0 - 1]} \{\bar{R}_g(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1\} \right) = \Pr_{f_0} (\bar{R}_{g_0}(\mathbf{X}_n) = 1) \\ &= \Pr_{f_0} \left(\bigcap_{g \in [g_0]} \{P_g(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha\} \right) \leq \Pr_{f_0} (P_{g_0}(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Then, since (14) holds for all n , we can apply Rudin [1976, Thm. 3.19] to obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_{f_0} (f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{g}_n - 1}) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_{f_0} (P_{g_0}(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha,$$

as required. Via (13), we can justify the use of the STP with asymptotically valid tests, such as the procedure of Li and Chen [2010].

5.3 Aggregated tests

Under the null hypothesis that $f_0 \in \mathcal{M}_g$, both the Split and Swapped statistics, $V_g^k(\mathbf{X}_n)$ and $\bar{V}_g(\mathbf{X}_n)$, are examples of e -values (which we shall write generically as E_g), as defined in Vovk and Wang [2021] (note that these values also appear as s -values in Grunwald et al., 2020, and as betting scores in Shafer, 2021), based on the defining feature that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} \mathbb{E}_f (E_g) \leq 1. \quad (15)$$

By Markov's inequality, (15) implies

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_g} \Pr_f (E_g \geq 1/\alpha) \leq \alpha,$$

for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, from which we can derive the p -value $P_g = 1/E_g$, which satisfies (1).

As discussed in Wasserman et al. [2020] and Vovk and Wang [2021], any set of possibly dependent e -values E_g^1, \dots, E_g^m ($m \in \mathbb{N}$) can be combined by simple averaging to generate a new e -value $\bar{E}_g = m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m E_g^j$, which

Table 5: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (10, 0.05)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp	
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped
2	1000	1	4.78	5.44	0.01	0.01
		2	6.11	6.68	0.00	0.00
	2000	1	5.74	6.56	0.01	0.01
		2	6.96	7.85	0.02	0.11
	5000	1	7.21	7.82	0.06	0.11
		2	8.59	8.91	0.14	0.19
10000	1	7.62	8.38	0.17	0.26	
	2	8.86	9.04	0.24	0.33	
4	1000	1	3.89	4.32	0.00	0.00
		2	4.98	5.30	0.00	0.00
	2000	1	5.07	5.63	0.00	0.00
		2	6.30	6.63	0.00	0.00
	5000	1	6.63	7.45	0.00	0.04
		2	8.35	8.71	0.01	0.05
	10000	1	8.25	8.57	0.13	0.18
		2	9.23	9.36	0.32	0.42

we shall call the aggregated e -value. As such, one may consider generating m different e -values based on either the Split or Swapped statistics, using different partitions of the data into subsequences \mathbf{X}_n^1 and \mathbf{X}_n^2 . For any fixed n_1 and n_2 , there are only a finite number of such partitions and thus one may imagine an aggregated e -value that averages over all such partitions. This hypothetical process was referred to as derandomization in Wasserman et al. [2020], since the resulting p -value is no longer dependent on any particular random partitioning of \mathbf{X}_n .

We further note that one can also aggregate the results from multiple instances of the Split and Swapped statistics via methods for aggregating over p -values. These methods are discussed at length in the works of DiCiccio et al. [2020] and Vovk and Wang [2020].

6 Conclusions

In this work, we proved that the closed testing principle could be used to construct a sequence of null hypothesis tests that generates a confidence statement regarding the true number of mixture components of a finite mixture model. Further, we derive tests for each of the null hypotheses in the STP, using the universal inference framework of Wasserman et al. [2020], and proved that in the parametric case, under regularity conditions, such tests are consistent against fixed alternative hypotheses.

The performance of the STP for order selection of normal mixture models was considered via a comprehensive simulation study. We observe from the study that the constructed confidence statements were conservative, as predicted by the theory, and we were also able to make recommendations regarding the different variants of the tests, for practical application.

Extensions of the STP were also discussed, including the possibility of aggregating over multiple tests, and performing the STP with asymptotic tests. Of particular interest is a proof that the testing procedure could be modified to generate a order selection procedure that is consistent determination of the true number of mixture components, in the asymptotic sense. Our proof shows that such a procedure was essentially equivalent to other asymptotic model selection methods such as the Bayesian information criterion and its variants.

We note that our general order selection confidence result of Theorem 2 applies not only to finite mixture models, but also to any nested sequences of models. For example, we may consider the same STP to generate confidence statements regarding the number of factors in a factor analysis model or the degree of a polynomial fit. We leave the application of the STP to such problems for future work, along with the applications of our discussed variants on the testing procedures.

Table 6: MeanComp and CorrProp results for different values of (d, n_1, l) , when $(g_0, \bar{\omega}) = (10, 0.1)$.

d	n_1	l	MeanComp		CorrProp		
			Split	Swapped	Split	Swapped	
2	1000	1	4.14	4.74	0.00	0.00	
		2	5.02	5.28	0.00	0.00	
	2000	1	4.99	5.55	0.00	0.00	
		2	5.87	6.30	0.00	0.00	
	5000	1	6.02	6.51	0.00	0.00	
		2	7.16	7.60	0.00	0.01	
	10000	1	6.75	7.45	0.02	0.07	
		2	7.75	8.06	0.04	0.06	
	4	1000	1	3.07	3.37	0.00	0.00
			2	3.61	3.82	0.00	0.00
2000		1	4.12	4.52	0.00	0.00	
		2	4.99	5.22	0.00	0.00	
5000		1	5.40	6.09	0.00	0.00	
		2	6.95	7.32	0.00	0.00	
10000		1	6.90	7.60	0.01	0.03	
		2	8.38	8.54	0.02	0.02	

References

- D W K Andrews. Testing when a parameter is on the boundary of the maintained hypothesis. *Econometrica*, 69: 683–734, 2001.
- N Atienza, J Garcia-Heras, J M Munoz-Pichardo, and R Villa. On the consistency of MLE in finite mixture models of exponential families. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 137:496–505, 2007.
- J-P Baudry. Estimation and model selection for model-based clustering with the conditional classification likelihood. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9:1041–1077, 2015.
- P Bauer and M Kieser. A unified approach for confidence intervals and testing of equivalence and difference. *Biometrika*, 83:934–937, 1996.
- C Biernacki, G Celeux, and G Govaert. Assessing a mixture model for clustering with the integrated completed likelihood. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 22:719–725, 2000.
- G Celeux, S Fruwirth-Schatter, and C P Robert. Model selection for mixture models – perspectives and strategies. In S Fruwirth-Schatter, G Celeux, and C P Robert, editors, *Handbook of Mixture Analysis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2019.
- J Chen. Penalized likelihood-ratio test for finite mixture models with multinomial observations. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 26:583–599, 1998.
- J Chen and A Khalili. Order selection in finite mixture models with a nonsmooth penalty. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104:187–196, 2009.
- J Chen and P Li. Hypothesis test for normal mixture models: the EM approach. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:2523–2542, 2009.
- J Chen, P Li, and Y Fu. Inference on the order of a normal mixture. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107:1096–1105, 2012.
- A Cutler and M P Windham. Information-based validity functionals for mixture analysis. In *Proceedings of the First US/Japan Conference on the Frontiers of Statistical Modeling in Informational Approach*, Amsterdam, 1994. Kluwer.
- A DasGupta. *Asymptotic Theory Of Statistics And Probability*. Springer, New York, 2008.

- C J DiCiccio, T J DiCiccio, and J P Romano. Exact tests via multiple data splitting. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 166:108865, 2020.
- T Dickhaus. *Simultaneous Statistical Inference: With Applications in the Life Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2014.
- D L Donoho. One-sided inference about functionals of a density. *Annals of Statistics*, 16:1390–1420, 1988.
- D Eddelbuettel and C Sanderson. RcppArmadillo: accelerating R with high-performance C++ linear algebra. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 71:1054–1063, 2014.
- Z D Feng and C E McCulloch. On the likelihood ratio test statistic for the number of components in a normal mixture with unequal variances. *Biometrics*, 50:1158–1162, 1994.
- Z D Feng and C E McCulloch. Using bootstrap likelihood ratios in finite mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 58:609–617, 1996.
- D Ferrari and Y Yang. Confidence sets for model selection by F-testing. *Statistica Sinica*, 25:1637–1658, 2015.
- H Finner and G Giani. Duality between multiple testing and selecting. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 54:201–227, 1996.
- J J Goeman and A Solari. The sequential rejection principle of familywise error control. *Annals of Statistics*, 38: 3782–3810, 2010.
- J J Goeman and A Solari. Multiple testing for exploratory research. *Statistical Science*, 26:5840597, 2011.
- P Grunwald, R de Heide, and W M Koolen. Safe testing. In *IEEE Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*, 2020.
- P R Hansen, A Lunde, and J M Nason. The model confidence set. *Econometrica*, 79:453–497, 2011.
- T Huang, H Peng, and K Zhang. Model selection for Gaussian mixture models. *Statistica Sinica*, 27:147–169, 2017.
- F K C Hui, D I Warton, and S D Foster. Order selection in finite mixture models: complete or observed likelihood information criteria. *Biometrika*, 102:724–730, 2015.
- R I Jennrich. Asymptotic properties of non-linear least squares estimators. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 40: 633–643, 1969.
- C Keribin. Consistent estimation of the order of mixture models. *Sankhya A*, 62:49–65, 2000.
- H Leeb and B M Potscher. Model selection. In T G Andersen, R A Davis, J-P Kreiss, and T Mikosch, editors, *Handbook of Financial Time Series*, pages 889–925. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- J Lei. Cross-validation with confidence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115:1978–1997, 2019.
- B G Leroux. Consistent estimation of a mixing distribution. *Annals of Statistics*, 20:1350–1360, 1992.
- P Li and J Chen. Testing the order of a finite mixture. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105: 1084–1092, 2010.
- Y Li, Y Luo, D Ferrari, X Hu, and Y Qin. Model confidence bounds for variable selection. *Biometrics*, 75:392–403, 2019.
- R Maitra and V Melnykov. Simulating data to study performance of finite mixture modeling and clustering algorithms. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 19:354–376, 2010.
- B Makarov and A Podkorytov. *Real Analysis: Measures, Integrals and Applications*. Springer, New York, 2013.
- R Marcus, E Peritz, and K R Gabriel. On closed testing procedures with special reference to ordered analysis of variance. *Biometrika*, 63:655–660, 1976.
- W Maurer, L A Hothorn, and W Lehmacher. Multiple comparisons in drug clinical trials and preclinical assays: a priori ordered hypotheses. In J Vollman, editor, *Biometrie in der Chemisch-in-Pharmazeutischen Industrie*. Fischer-Verlag, Stuttgart, 1995.

- G J McLachlan. On bootstrapping the likelihood ratio test statistic for the number of components in a normal mixture. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C*, 36:318–324, 1987.
- G J McLachlan and D Peel. *Finite Mixture Models*. Wiley, New York, 2000.
- G J McLachlan and S Rathnayake. On the number of components in a Gaussian mixture model. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 4:341–355, 2014.
- V Melnykov, W-C Chen, and R Maitra. MixSim: an R package for simulating data to study performance of clustering algorithms. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 51:1–25, 2012.
- P A Naik, P Shi, and C-L Tsai. Extending the Akaike information criterion to mixture regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102:244–254, 2007.
- A Polymenis and D M Titterton. On the determination of the number of components in a mixture. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 38:295–298, 1998.
- B M Potscher. Order estimation in ARMA-models by Lagrangian multiplier tests. *B M Potscher*, 11:872–885, 1983.
- B M Potscher and I R Prucha. *Dynamic Nonlinear Econometric Models: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- B G Quinn, G J McLachlan, and N L Hjort. A note on the Aitkin-Rubin approach to hypothesis testing in mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 49:311–314, 1987.
- R Core Team. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2020.
- W Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw Hill, Singapore, 1976.
- G Shafer. Testing by betting: a strategy for statistical and scientific communication. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, To appear, 2021.
- C-Y Sin and H White. Information criteria for selecting possibly misspecified parametric models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 71:207–225, 1996.
- E Sonnemann. General solutions to multiple testing problems. *Biometrical Journal*, 5:641–656, 2008.
- V Vovk and R Wang. Combining p-values via averaging. *Biometrika*, 107:791–808, 2020.
- V Vovk and R Wang. E-values: calibration, combination, and application. *Annals of Statistics*, To appear, 2021.
- L Wasserman, A Ramdas, and S Balakrishnan. Universal inference. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117:16880–16890, 2020.
- M P Windham and A Cutler. Information ratios for validating mixture analyses. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87:1188–1197, 1992.
- C Xu and J Chen. A thresholding algorithm for order selection in finite mixture models. *Communications in Statistics—Simulation and Computation*, 44:433–453, 2015.
- C Yin and X S Lin. Efficient estimation of erlang mixtures using iSCAD penalty with insurance application. *ASTIN Bulletin*, 46:779–799, 2016.
- C Yin, X S Lin, R Huang, and H Yuan. On the consistency of penalized MLEs for Erlang mixtures. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 145:12–20, 2019.
- C Zheng, D Ferrari, and Y Yang. Model selection confidence sets by likelihood ratio testing. *Statistica Sinica*, 29: 827–851, 2019.