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Abstract: Two-sample tests utilizing a similarity graph on observations are useful for high-dimensional data and non-Euclidean data due to their flexibility and good performance under a wide range of alternatives. Existing works mainly focused on sparse graphs, such as graphs with the number of edges in the order of the number of observations. However, the tests have better performance with denser graphs under many settings. In this work, we establish the theoretical ground for graph-based tests with graphs that are much denser than those in existing works.
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1. Introduction

Given two random samples: $X_1, \ldots, X_m \overset{iid}{\sim} F_X, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \overset{iid}{\sim} F_Y$, we concern the hypothesis testing $H_0 : F_X = F_Y$ against $H_a : F_X \neq F_Y$. This two-sample testing problem is a fundamental problem in statistics and has been extensively studied for univariate and low-dimensional data. Nowadays, it’s common that observations are in high dimension (Network et al., 2012; Feigenson et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2020), or non-Euclidean, such as network data (Bullmore and Sporns, 2009; Biswal et al., 2010; Beckmann et al., 2021). In many of these applications, one has little knowledge on $F_X$ or $F_Y$, making parametric tests unapproachable.

In the nonparametric domain, the first practical test that can be applied to data in an arbitrary dimension or non-Euclidean data was proposed by Friedman and Rafsky (1979). They construct the minimum spanning tree (MST) on all observations from the two samples. It is a tree connecting all the observations such that the sum of edge lengths that are measured by the distance between two endpoints is minimized. They then count the number of edges that connect observations from different samples and reject $H_0$ when this count is significantly small. The rationale is that, when two samples are from the same distribution, they are well mixed and this count shall be relatively large, so a small count suggests separation of the two samples and rejection of $H_0$. We refer this test to be the original edge-count test (OET) in the following. This test is not limited for the MST. Friedman and Rafsky (1979) also applied it to the $K$-MST*. Later,
Schilling (1986) and Henze (1988) applied it to the $K$-nearest neighbor graphs, and Rosenbaum (2005) applied it to the cross-match graph. Recently, Chen and Friedman (2017) noticed an issue of the original edge-count test caused by the curse of dimensionality. They made use of a common pattern under moderate to high dimensions and proposed the 
 generalized edge-count test (GET), which exhibits substantial power gain over OET under a wide range of alternatives. Later, two more edge-count tests were proposed, the 
 weighted edge-count test (WET) (Chen, Chen and Su, 2018) and the 
 max-type edge-count test (MET) (Chu and Chen, 2019). WET addresses another issue of OET, but it focuses on the locational alternatives. MET performs similarly to GET while it has some advantages under the change-point settings. Since all these edge-count tests rely on a similarity graph constructed on observations, we refer to them as the graph-based tests.

1.1. The merits of denser graphs in improving power for graph-based tests

Friedman and Rafsky (1979) found that the original edge-count test in general has a higher power under the 3-MST than that under the 1-MST. Similarly, Chen and Friedman (2017) found that the generalized edge-count test in general has a higher power under the 5-MST than that under the 1-MST. We here check the performance of these tests under even denser graphs. In particular, for $m = n = 100$, we consider the generalized edge-count tests on the 5-MST (GET$_5$) and on the 50-MST (GET$_{50}$), the original edge-count tests on the 5-MST (OET$_5$) and on the 50-MST (OET$_{50}$). We also consider two other tests as baselines: the kernel two-sample test in Gretton et al. (2012) with the $p$-value approximated by 10,000 bootstrap samples (Kernel) and the Adaptable Regularized Hotelling’s $T^2$ test (Li et al., 2020) (ARHT). All $K$-MSTs in the procedure of graph-based tests are constructed under the Euclidean distance.

We consider different distributions in the comparison. Explicitly,

$$X_i = \Sigma \frac{1}{2} U_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, 100,$$
$$Y_j = (1 + ad^{-\frac{1}{2}})\Sigma \frac{1}{2} V_j - bd^{-\frac{1}{2}} 1_d, \ j = 1, \cdots, 100,$$

with $\Sigma = (0.5^{i-j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$, where $d$ is the dimension of the data, $1_d$ is a $d$-length vector of all ones. Let $0_d$ be a $d$-length vector of all zeros and $I_d$ be a $d$-dimensional identity matrix. We consider four different settings:

(i) $U_1, \cdots, U_m, V_1, \cdots, V_n \sim N(0_d, I_d)$, $a = b = 0.17$,
(ii) $U_1, \cdots, U_m, V_1, \cdots, V_n \sim N(0_d, I_d)$, $a = 0.1, b = 0.6$,
(iii) $U_1, \cdots, U_m, V_1, \cdots, V_n \sim t_5(0_d, I_d)$, $a = b = 0.25$,
(iv) $U_1, \cdots, U_m, V_1, \cdots, V_n \sim \text{Uniform}[-0.5, 0.5]^d$, $a = 0.12, b = 0.1$.

Here, $a$ and $b$ are chosen so that the tests have moderate power in low dimensions. The dimension $d$ ranges from 25 to 1000 with an increment of 25. The
Fig 1: Estimated power of the generalized edge-count tests on the 5-MST (GET$_5$) and on the 50-MST (GET$_{50}$), the original edge-count tests on the 5-MST (OET$_5$) and on the 50-MST (OET$_{50}$), the kernel test (Kernel), and the Adaptable Regularized Hotelling’s $T^2$ test (ARHT) under different simulation settings (i) - (iv).
power of tests are estimated through 1,000 simulation runs (Figure 1). We see that GET\textsubscript{50} works well in these settings, either having the best power or on par with the test of the best power. While GET\textsubscript{5} in general has a lower power than GET\textsubscript{50}. For OET, it is only powerful under setting (ii). The in general worse performance of OET compared to GET is expected as OET covers less alternatives than GET for high-dimensional data (Chen and Friedman, 2017). Under setting (ii) where OET is powerful, OET\textsubscript{50} has a higher power than OET\textsubscript{5}.

In the above simulation studies, even though GET\textsubscript{50} has a higher power than GET\textsubscript{5}, the performance of GET\textsubscript{5} is acceptable under settings (i), (iii) and (iv) where it is more powerful than other tests except for GET\textsubscript{50}. However, under some settings, it could be that GET\textsubscript{5} has a very low power while GET\textsubscript{50} is powerful. Consider a toy example that \(X_1, \ldots, X_{100}\) are iid from \(N_{50}(0, I_{50})\) and \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{100}\) are iid from a mixture distribution \(0.2N_{50}(0, 0.7I_{50}) + 0.8N_{50}(0, 1.3I_{50})\). The estimated power of the generalized edge-count test on the \(K\)-MST for different \(K\)’s is in Figure 2. The generalized edge-count test with a small \(K\) like \(K = 5\) has very low power while GET\textsubscript{50} has power almost 0.9.

![Figure 2: Estimated power of GET under the \(K\)-MST with different \(K\) values.](image)

1.2. Existing theorems on graph-based test statistics

We first define some essential notations before stating the existing results. Given two samples \(X_1, \ldots, X_m\) and \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\), we pool all observations together and index them by \(1, \ldots, N (N = m + n)\). We use \(G\) to denote the set of all edges in the similarity graph, such as the \(K\)-MST, and \(|\cdot|\) to denote the cardinality of a set. For each node \(i \in N \equiv \{1, \ldots, N\}\), \(G_i\) is the set of edges with one endpoint node \(i\), \(node_{G_i}\) is the set of nodes connected by \(G_i\), and \(G_{i,2}\) is the set of edges with at least one endpoint in \(node_{G_i}\). For each edge \(e = (e^+, e^-) \in G\),
\[ A_e := G_e^+ \cup G_e^-, \quad B_e := \bigcup_{l \in \text{node}_{A_e}G_l} G_l \quad \text{and} \quad C_e := \bigcup_{l \in \text{node}_{B_e}G_l} G_l. \]  Figure 3 and 4 plots the quantities related to a node \( i \) and an edge \( e \), respectively.

**Fig 3:** Notations related to a node \( i \): \( G_i = \) \{blue edges\}, \( G_{i,2} = \) \{sky blue edges\} \( \cup \) \{blue edges\}; \( j \in \text{node}_{G_i}, \quad k \in \text{node}_{G_{i,2}} \setminus \text{node}_{G_i}, \quad l \notin \text{node}_{G_{i,2}}. \)

**Fig 4:** Notations related to an edge \( e \): \( A_e = \) \{dark blue edges\}, \( B_e \setminus A_e = \) \{sky blue edges\}, \( C_e \setminus B_e = \) \{light steel blue edges\}; \( f_1 \in A_e, \quad f_2 \in B_e \setminus A_e, \quad f_3 \in C_e \setminus B_e, \quad f_4 \notin C_e. \)
We also define $V_G := \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (|G_i| - \frac{2|G|}{N})^2$ that measures the variability of $|G_i|$s. Besides, $a_n = o(b_n)$ means that $a_n$ is dominated by $b_n$ asymptotically, i.e. $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 0$, and $a_n = O(b_n)$ or $a_n \asymp b_n$ means that $a_n$ is bounded both above and below by $b_n$ asymptotically. We use $a \wedge b$ for $\min\{a, b\}$. For two sets $S_1$ and $S_2$, $S_1 \backslash S_2$ is used for the set that contains elements in $S_1$ but not in $S_2$.

The major existing works that studied the asymptotic null distribution of the graph-based test statistics are listed in Table 1. So far, the best results are in Chen, Chen and Su (2018) and Chu and Chen (2019) where the maximum size of possible graphs is of order $N^\alpha$, $1 \leq \alpha < 1.25$. In the numerical studies in Section 1.2 where $N = 200$, we see that GET$_{50}$ has superb performance. The number of edges in the 50-MST is 9950 ($\approx N^{1.74}$). Existing conditions can not work for such a dense graph. Therefore, it is important to figure out the limiting distributions for denser graphs.

Table 1: Major existing works on graph-based tests and their conditions on the graph in deriving for the asymptotic distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Graph conditions</th>
<th>max size of possible graphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friedman and Rafsky (1979)</td>
<td>MST with $\sum_{i=1}^{N}</td>
<td>G_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilling (1986)</td>
<td>K-NN, $K = O(1)$ for low-dimensional data</td>
<td>$O(N)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze (1988)</td>
<td>K-NN, $K = O(1)$ with bounded maximal indegrees</td>
<td>$O(N)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum (2005)</td>
<td>cross-match</td>
<td>$N/2$ or $(N + 1)/2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Zhang (2015)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Friedman (2017)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Chen and Su (2018)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu and Chen (2019)</td>
<td>Generalized Weighted Max-type</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the conditions in Chen, Chen and Su (2018) and Chu and Chen (2019), the size of the graph is bounded by the condition on $|A_e|^2$: $\sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2 = o(N^{\alpha + 0.5})$ requires that $\alpha < 1.25$.

Our main contribution of this paper is to relax the conditions on the graphs. Under new conditions, the max size of possible graphs can be as large as
$M^{1-\epsilon}$ with an arbitrarily small $\epsilon$, such as $M^{0.99}$, where $M = \binom{N}{2}$ is the size of complete graph. The main theorems are listed in Section 2. We also show by simulations that the limiting distributions kick in under pretty small sample sizes, such as when $m = n = 100$. Proofs of these theorems are in Sections 3 and 4 with the proof of some technical inequalities in the Supplement Materials.

2. Asymptotic distribution under denser graphs

We first provide mathematical forms of the four graph-based tests in Section 2.1. The theorems on the asymptotic distributions are in the Section 2.2, and some numerical results on checking the empirical size are provided in Section 2.3.

2.1. Graph-based test statistics

For the pooled the observations, let $g_i$ be the group label of $i$-th observation,

$$g_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if observation } i \text{ is from sample } X \\ 2 & \text{if observation } i \text{ is from sample } Y \end{cases}.$$ 

We use $R_1, R_2$ to denote the numbers of within-sample edges for sample X and sample Y respectively, formally defined as

$$R_j = \sum_{e \in G} 1_{\{J_e = j\}}, \quad j = 1, 2$$

where $1_{\{A\}}$ is the indicator function taking value 1 if the event $A$ occurs, otherwise taking 0 and

$$J_e = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_{e^+} \neq g_{e^-} \\ 1 & \text{if } g_{e^+} = g_{e^-} = 1. \\ 2 & \text{if } g_{e^+} = g_{e^-} = 2 \end{cases}$$

Since no distributional assumption was made for $F_X$ and $F_Y$, the permutation null distribution is used. It places probability $1/\binom{N}{m}$ on each selection of $m$ observations among pooled observations as sample $X$. Let $E_P, \text{Var}_P, \text{Cov}_P$ be expectation, variance and covariance under the permutation null distribution.

The four edge-count tests are listed below.

1. Original edge-count test statistic:

$$Z^P_o = \frac{R_1 + R_2 - E_P(R_1 + R_2)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(R_1 + R_2)}}$$

2. Generalized edge-count test statistic:

$$S = (R_1 - E_P(R_1) \quad R_2 - E_P(R_2)) \Sigma_R^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} R_1 - E_P(R_1) \\ R_2 - E_P(R_2) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Sigma_R = \text{Var}_P(R_1, R_2)^T$. 

3. Weighted edge-count test statistic:
\[ Z_w^P = \frac{R_w - \mathbb{E}_P(R_w)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(R_w)}}, \]
where
\[ R_w = \frac{n-1}{N-2} R_1 + \frac{m-1}{N-2} R_2, \]
4. Max-type edge-count test statistic:
\[ \max\{Z_w^P, Z_{\text{diff}}^P\} \]
where
\[ Z_{\text{diff}}^P = \frac{R_{\text{diff}} - \mathbb{E}_P(R_{\text{diff}})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(R_{\text{diff}})}} \]
with
\[ R_{\text{diff}} = R_1 - R_2. \]

The analytic formulas for the expectations and variances of \( R_1 + R_2, (R_1, R_2)^T, R_w, R_{\text{diff}} \) were provided in Friedman and Rafsky (1979); Chen and Friedman (2017); Chen, Chen and Su (2018); Chu and Chen (2019). It was shown in Chu and Chen (2019) that the statistic \( S \) can be decomposed as
\[ S = (Z_w^P)^2 + (Z_{\text{diff}}^P)^2 \] (1)
and
\[ \text{Cov}_P(Z_w^P, Z_{\text{diff}}^P) = 0. \]

2.2. Main Results

We use \( D \to \) to denote for convergence in distribution, and define \( a_n \lesssim b_n \) as \( a_n \) bounded above by \( b_n \) (up to constant factor) asymptotically. We use ‘the usual limit regime’ to refer \( N \to \infty \) and \( \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{N}{r} = r \in (0, 1). \)

**Theorem 2.1.** For \( |G| = O(N^\alpha) \), \( 1 \leq \alpha < 2 \), under conditions
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o\left(|G|^2\right), \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o\left(|G|^2 \sqrt{V_G V_G}\right), \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G|V_G) \]
in the usual limit regime, we have, under the permutation null distribution, that
\[ S \to \chi^2_2. \]

**Remark 1.** For the validity of asymptotic distribution of the generalized edge-count test statistic, Chu and Chen (2019) had the best result so far. The conditions in Theorem 2.1 are direct relaxations of that in Chu and Chen (2019). This can be seen from two facts
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \lesssim \sum_{e \in G} |A_e||B_e|, \] (2)
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \lesssim \sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2. \] (3)
The inequality (2) can be seen by
\[
8 \sum_{e \in G} |A_e| |B_e| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} (|G_i| + |G_j|)(|G_{i,2}| + |G_{j,2}|) \geq \sum_{e \in G} |A_e| |B_e|,
\]
and
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} (|G_i| + |G_j|)(|G_{i,2}| + |G_{j,2}|)
\]
\[
= 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} |G_i||G_{i,2}| + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} |G_j||G_{i,2}|
\]
\[
\approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 |G_{i,2}| + \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2.
\]

For (3), we have
\[
2 \sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} (|G_i| + |G_j| - 1)^2
\]
\[
\approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i} \setminus \{i\}} (|G_i|^2 + |G_j|^2) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3.
\]

Hence, the relaxed version of the condition in Chu and Chen (2019) is \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G|^{1.5}) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(|G|\sqrt{N}) \), and \( V_G = O(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2) \). It is clear that the first condition in Theorem 2.1 is much more relaxed than \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(|G|\sqrt{N}) \) as \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \) and \( |G|\sqrt{N} \lesssim |G|^{1.5} \). For the other two conditions, under the scenario \( V_G = O(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2) \) in Chu and Chen (2019), and \( |G| = O(N^\alpha) \), \( 1 \leq \alpha < 2 \), since \( |G| \lesssim \frac{4|G|^2}{N} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \), it is also clear that they are much more relaxed than those in Chu and Chen (2019).

The above comparisons are done in asymptotics that \( N \rightarrow \infty \). We also check the conditions under finite \( N \)'s. We generate multivariate Gaussian data for three settings: (1) \( d = 100, K = 5 \), (2) \( d = 100, K = \sqrt{N} \), (3) \( d = N, K = \sqrt{N} \). Figure 5 plots \( \sum_{|G|^{1.5}} |G_{i,2}|^2 \) and \( \sum_{|G|V_G} |G_{i,2}|^2 \) for \( N \) ranging from 50 to 2000. We see that \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G|^{1.5}) \) (the relaxed version of the existing condition) hardly holds for finite \( N \)'s, even for \( K = 5 \). While the new condition holds better: \( \sum_{|G|V_G} |G_{i,2}|^2 \) becomes less than 1 for \( N > 500 \) under all three settings, and the decreasing trend of \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 |G_i|^2 \) as \( N \) increases is also clear. A comparison of the conditions on \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \) is in the Supplement Materials and the results are similar.

Remark 2. The relaxation of conditions in Theorem 2.1 compared to previous works is mainly due to three improvements.
Fig 5: Quantities $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{|G_{i,2}|^2}{|G|^4}$ (simplified from the existing condition, left panels) versus $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{|G_{i,2}|^2}{|G||V_G|}$ (new condition, right panels) under different choices of $d$’s and $K$’s for a range of $N$. 
1. In Friedman and Rafsky (1979), the asymptotic normality of the original edge-count test statistic on the 1-MST was proved through the arguments in Daniels (1944) by directly analyzing the limiting property of each moment. This limits the generalizing of the arguments when the structure of the graph fails the conditions in Daniels (1944). Since there are dependencies caused by the graph, starting from Chen and Zhang (2015), the Stein’s method was used to deal with those dependencies, which results in a jump of the density of the graph from $O(N)$ to $O(N^{1-\alpha})$, $1 \leq \alpha < 1.25$. However, these works rely on a version of Stein’s method that uses the second neighbor of dependency to weaken the conditions on the graph. In this paper, we work under the version of the Stein’s method that only uses the first neighbor of dependency to weaken the conditions on the graph.

2. Instead of analysing the limiting joint distribution of $(Z^B_{w}, Z^B_{diff}, Z_X)$ that was done in Chu and Chen (2019) (the quantities with a superscript or a subscript B are defined under the bootstrap null distribution, which is formally specified in Section 3), we focus on a modified object (5). The former requires order of $O_{\alpha}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2$ to be the same, while the modified version (5) allows the removal of this restriction.

3. Earlier works, such as Chen and Friedman (2017), define $\xi_e = a_1 \frac{I_{j=1} - m^2}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_1)}} + a_2 \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}_N(R_2)}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_N(R_2)}}$ and $\xi_i = a_3 \frac{I_{\text{diff}} - m}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_N(R_i)}}$, for $e \in G$ and $i \in N$, respectively, and the asymptotic distribution of $(Z^B_{w}, Z^B_{diff})$ was studied through the linear combination $a_1 \frac{R_1 - E_B(R_1)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_1)}} + a_2 \frac{R_2 - E_B(R_2)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_2)}} + a_3 Z_X$. Easy upper bounds were used for $\xi_e$ and $\xi_i$ to make the calculation tractable under the second neighbor dependency: $|\xi_e| \leq 2a/\sigma, |\xi_i| \leq a/\sigma$ with $a = \max\{|a_1|, |a_2|, |a_3|\}$ and $\sigma = \min\{\sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_1)}, \sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_1)}, N \frac{m^2}{N^2}\}$. In this work, we treat $\xi_e$’s and $\xi_i$’s much more carefully by decomposing them as (see detail in Section 3)

\[
\xi_e = \frac{a_1}{\sigma^w_{B}} h\left(e^+\right) h\left(e^-\right) + \frac{a_2}{\sigma^B_{\text{diff}}} \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - \frac{a_1(m - \overline{m})}{\sigma^w_{B}(N - 2)} \left(h\left(e^+\right) + h\left(e^-\right)\right),
\]
\[
\xi_i = \left(a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1\right) \frac{1}{\sigma^B_{\text{diff}}} h(i),
\]

where $h(i) = I_{(g=1)} - \frac{m}{N}, i \in N$. The $h(i)$’s are mutually independent under the bootstrap null distribution. As we will show later that $\sigma^B_{w} \gtrsim \sigma^B_{\text{diff}}$, the leading term in $\xi_e$ becomes $\frac{a_1}{\sigma^w_{B}} h\left(e^+\right) h\left(e^-\right)$. Such decomposition makes the calculation much more tractable compared to their original forms without introducing any relaxation.

In the following, we also provide better results on the limiting distributions for the weighted edge-count test and the original edge-count test as they might be preferred under some settings. We define $N_{\text{sq}}$ as the number of squares in the graph.
Theorem 2.2. Under the conditions \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^2) \) and \( N_{sq} = o(|G|^2) \), in the usual limiting regime, we have, under the permutation null distribution, that

\[ Z^P_w \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1). \]

Theorem 2.3. Under the condition \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(V_G^2) \), in the usual limit regime, we have, under the permutation null distribution, that

\[ Z^P_{diff} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1). \]

Remark 3. From the decomposition (1) of \( S \), it is not surprising that conditions in Theorem 2.1 can be split into two parts to serve for \( Z^P_w \) and \( Z^P_{diff} \) separately. The condition \( N_{sq} = o(|G|^2) \) in Theorem 2.2 can be implied by conditions in Theorem 2.1, which can be seen from that, \( N_{sq} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2} \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G|^2) \) from (31) - (33) (See Section 3.1). Each part is further relaxed when serving \( Z^P_w \) or \( Z^P_{diff} \) alone. This relaxation is reasonable as theorem 2.1 needs the asymptotic normality of the joint distribution of \( (Z^P_w, Z^P_{diff}) \) while theorem 2.2 and 2.3 only needs that for the marginal distributions. On the other hand, the limiting distribution of the max-type edge-count test still requires the conditions in theorem 2.1 as this test relies on the statistic \( \max\{Z^P_w, Z^P_{diff}\} \).

The asymptotic normality of the joint distribution of \( (Z^P_w, Z^P_{diff}) \) can imply that

\[ \max\{Z^P_w, Z^P_{diff}\} \xrightarrow{D} \max\{Z_1, Z_2\} \]

where \( Z_1, Z_2 \) are independent standard normal variables.

For the original edge-count test, when \( m = n \), its test statistic is equivalent to the weighted edge-count test statistic, and Theorem 2.2 directly applies. When \( m \neq n \), the results are presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4. Assume \( |m - n| = O(N^\beta) \) with \( 0 \leq \beta \leq 1 \), under conditions,

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 &= o\left( (|G| + \frac{V_G}{N^{2-2\beta}})^2 N^{2-2\beta}, (|G| + \frac{V_G}{N^{2-2\beta}})^2 N^{1-\beta} \right) \\
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 &= o\left( (|G| + \frac{V_G}{N^{2-2\beta}})^2 N^{2-2\beta} \right) \\
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 &= o\left( (|G| + \frac{V_G}{N^{2-2\beta}})^2 N^{2-2\beta} \right) \\
N_{sq} &= o\left( (|G| + \frac{V_G}{N^{2-2\beta}})^2 \right)
\end{align*}
\]

in the usual limit regime, we have, under the permutation null distribution, that

\[ Z^P_o \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1). \]
Corollary 2.5. In the usual limit regime, under the permutation null distribution, when \(|m-n| = O(N)|, Z_0^p\) is asymptotically normally distributed under conditions \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(|G| + V_G)\), and \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G| + V_G)\), and when \(|m-n| = O(1)|, Z_0^p\) is asymptotically normally distributed under conditions \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^2)\) and \(N_{sq} = o(|G|^2)\).

Remark 4. Corollary 2.5 can be obtained from theorem 2.4 by setting \(\beta\) to be 1 and 0, respectively. When \(\beta = 1\), the conditions in Theorem 2.4 become \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(|G| + V_G)^{3/2}\), \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = O(|G| + V_G)^{3/2}\), \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G| + V_G)^2\) and \(N_{sq} = o(|G| + V_G)^2\). Since \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3\), and from inequalities (31) and (32) (see Section 3.1), \(N_{sq} \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_{i,2}|^2}\), we only need conditions \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(|G| + V_G)^{3/2}\) and \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G| + V_G)^2\). When \(\beta = 0\), we have \(\frac{V_n}{N^3} = \frac{V_n}{N^2} \lesssim |G|\). Thus, the conditions in Theorem 2.4 become \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(\min\{|G|^2 N^2, |G|^2 N\}), \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^{3/2})\), \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G|^{3/2} N^2)\) and \(N_{sq} = o(|G|^2)\). The condition on \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3\) can be implied by the condition \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^{1/2})\) as \(\max |G_i| \lesssim N\). The condition on \(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_{i,2}|^2\) always holds as \(\max |G_{i,2}| \lesssim |G|\).

2.3. Empirical size

Theorems 2.1 - 2.4 provide theoretical guarantees asymptotically. Here, we check empirical sizes for finite samples under a few distributions. Let

\[ X_i = \sum_{j=1}^d U_{ij}, i = 1, \ldots, m \]
\[ Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^d V_{ij}, j = 1, \ldots, n \]

with \(\Sigma = (0.5^{(|i-j|)})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}\). Four distributions for \(U_i\)'s and \(V_j\)'s are considered:

(i) \(U_1, \ldots, U_m, V_1, \ldots, V_n \sim N(0_d, I_d)\),
(ii) \(U_1, \ldots, U_m, V_1, \ldots, V_n \sim t_d(0_d, I_d)\),
(iii) \(U_1, \ldots, U_m, V_1, \ldots, V_n \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]^d\),
(iv) \(U_1, \ldots, U_m, V_1, \ldots, V_n \sim \text{iid with coordinates of } U_i, V_j \sim \text{Exp}(1)\).

Here, \(M = \binom{m+n}{m}\) is the size of the complete graph and we use \(|s|\) to denote the largest integer that is not larger than \(s\). Table 2 presents the proportion of trials (out of 1000) that the generalized edge-count test statistic is greater than \(\chi^2_{2}(0.95)\) the 95% quantile of \(\chi^2_{2}\). We see that the empirical size is quite close to the nominal level for all simulation settings. The results for the original edge-count test, the weighted edge-count test and the max-type edge-count test are similar, and are presented in the Supplement Materials.
Table 2: Empirical size of the generalized edge-count test

(a) m=50, n=150, N=200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>$[M^{0.5}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.6}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.7}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.8}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.9}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.95}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.99}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) normal</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) $t_5$</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) exp(1)</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) uniform</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) m=100, n=100, N=200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>$[M^{0.5}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.6}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.7}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.8}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.9}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.95}]$</th>
<th>$[M^{0.99}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) normal</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) $t_5$</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) exp(1)</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) uniform</td>
<td>0.5N</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5N</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

To study the limiting distributions of $Z_w^p$ and $Z_{4gr}^p$, we essentially need to deal with the linear combinations of $\sum_{e \in G} 1_{\{J_e=1\}}$ and $\sum_{e \in G} 1_{\{J_e=2\}}$. It is clear that the items in these summations are dependent. The dependency comes from two sources. One is due to the permutation null distribution. Given one node from sample X, the probability of another node coming from sample X is no longer $\frac{m}{N}$. The other is due to the nature of the graph-based methods that different edges could share one common node. To conquer these two issues, we work under the bootstrap null distribution to remove the dependency caused by the
permutation null distribution, and then link statistics under the bootstrap null distribution and the permutation null distribution together. For the dependency caused by the nature of the graph-based method, we use the Stein’s method (Chen, Goldstein and Shao, 2010). In particular, the following theorem is used.

**Theorem 3.1.** (Chen, Goldstein and Shao (2010) Theorem 4.13) Let \( \{\xi_i, i \in J\} \) be a random field with mean zero, \( W = \sum_{i \in J} \xi_i \) and \( \text{Var}(W) = 1 \), for each \( i \in J \) there exits \( K_i \subset J \) such that \( \xi_i \) and \( \xi_{K^C_i} \) are independent, then

\[
\sup_{f \in L_{1}(1)} |Ef(W) - Ef(Z)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i \in J} \{\xi_i \eta_i - E(\xi_i \eta_i)\} \right| + \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_i \eta_i^2 \right|
\]

where \( \eta_i = \sum_{j \in K_i} \xi_j \), \( Z \) is the standard normal.

The Stein’s theorem we rely on is different from that used in Chen and Friedman (2017) and Chu and Chen (2019). The main difference is that the theorem used in these earlier works considers a second neighbor of the dependency that, for each \( i \in J \), there exits \( K_i \subset L_i \subset J \) such that \( \xi_i \) is independent of \( \xi_{K^C_i} \) and \( \xi_{K_i} \) is independent of \( \xi_{L^C_i} \). Then the upper bound involves \( \sum_{j \in L_i} \xi_j \) that could easily expand under the graph structure. We thus turn to the Stein’s theorem that only considers the first neighbor of dependency and the quantities can be strategically handled to not expand too much.

The bootstrap null distribution places probability \( \frac{1}{2^N} \) on each of the \( 2^N \) assignments of \( N \) observations to either of the two samples, i.e., each observation is assigned to sample \( X \) with probability \( \frac{m}{N} \) and to sample \( Y \) with probability \( \frac{n}{N} \), independently from any other observations. Let \( \mathbb{E}_B, \text{Var}_B, \text{Cov}_B \) be expectation, variance and covariance under the bootstrap null distribution. It’s not hard to see that the number of observations assigned to sample \( X \) may not be \( m \). Let \( n_X \) be this number and \( Z_X = n_X - \frac{m}{\sigma_B^w} \) where \( \sigma_B^w \) is the standard deviation of \( n_X \) under the bootstrap null distribution. Notice that the bootstrap null distribution becomes the permutation null distribution conditioning on \( n_X = m \). We express \((Z^P_w, Z^P_{\text{diff}})\) in the following way:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
Z^P_w \\
Z^P_{\text{diff}}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_B^w & 0 \\
0 & \sigma_{\text{diff}}^w
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
Z^B_w \\
Z^B_{\text{diff}}
\end{pmatrix}
+ \begin{pmatrix}
\mu_B^w - \mu^P \\
\mu_B - \mu^P \\
\mu_{\text{diff}}^w - \mu_{\text{diff}}^P \\
\mu_{\text{diff}} - \mu_{\text{diff}}^P \\
\sigma_{\text{diff}}^w \\
\sigma_{\text{diff}}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\phi_N \\
\frac{Z^B_w}{\sqrt{\Gamma_C}} \\
\frac{Z^B_{\text{diff}}}{\sqrt{\Gamma_D}}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(4)
where \( Z^B_w = \frac{R_w - \mu_B}{\sigma_B} \), \( Z^B \) \( \phi_N = \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N}}, T_G = \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \) and
\[
\mu_B = E_B(R_w) = \frac{mnN - m^2 - n^2}{N^2(N-2)} |G|, \quad \mu^B = E_B(R_{\text{diff}}) = \frac{m-n}{N} |G|,
\]
\[
\sigma^B_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_{\text{diff}})} = \sqrt{\frac{mnn}{N^2} \sum |G_i|^2},
\]
\[
\sigma^B_w = \sqrt{\text{Var}_B(R_w)} = \sqrt{\frac{m^2n^2}{N^2} |G| + \frac{mn(m-n)^2}{N^2(N-2)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2},
\]
\[
\mu^P_w = E_P(R_w) = \frac{(n-1)(m-1)}{(N-1)(N-2)} |G|, \quad \mu^P = E_P(R_{\text{diff}}) = \frac{m-n}{N} |G|,
\]
\[
\sigma^P_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(R_{\text{diff}})} = \sqrt{\frac{m(m-1)n(n-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)} \frac{(m-2)(n-2)}{(m-1)(n-1)} \left( \sum |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N} \right)},
\]
\[
\sigma^P_w = \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(R_w)} = \sqrt{\frac{m(m-1)n(n-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)} \left( |G| - \frac{2}{N(N-1)} |G|^2 - \frac{1}{N-2} \sum |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N} \right)}.
\]

Here we deal with \( Z^B_w \) and \( \sqrt{T_G} Z^B \) \( \phi_N \) instead of \( Z^B_w \) and \( Z^B_{\text{diff}} \) directly to get rid of the condition \( V_G = O(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2) \) appeared in Chen and Friedman (2017), Chu and Chen (2019). Since the distribution of \( (Z^B_w, \sqrt{T_G} Z^B_{\text{diff}}) \) under the permutation null distribution is equivalent to the distribution of \( (Z^B_w, \sqrt{T_G} Z^B_{\text{diff}}) \) \( Z_X = 0 \) under the bootstrap null distribution, we only need to show the following two statements for proving Theorem 2.1:

(i) \( \left( Z^B_w, \sqrt{T_G} \left( Z^B_{\text{diff}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^P}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B}} Z_X \right) \right), Z_X \) is asymptotically multivariate Gaussian distribution under the bootstrap null distribution and the covariance matrix of the limiting distribution is of full rank.

(ii) \( \frac{\sigma^P_{\text{diff}}}{\sigma^P_{\text{diff}}} \rightarrow c_w; \frac{\sigma^P_w}{\sigma^P_{\text{diff}}} \rightarrow 0; \frac{\mu_B}{\mu_{\text{diff}}} \rightarrow 0 \) where \( c_w \) is a positive constant.

From statement (i), the asymptotic distribution of \( \left( Z^B_w, \sqrt{T_G} \left( Z^B_{\text{diff}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^P}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B}} Z_X \right) \right) \) conditioning on \( Z_X = 0 \) is a bivariate Gaussian distribution under the bootstrap null distribution, which further can imply that the asymptotic distribution of \( (Z^B_w, \sqrt{T_G} Z^B) \) under the permutation null distribution is a bivariate Gaussian distribution. Then, with statement (ii), \( \phi_N \rightarrow 1 \) and equation (4), we have \( (Z^B_w, Z^B_{\text{diff}}) \) asymptotically bivariate Gaussian distributed under the permutation null distribution. Finally, plus the fact that \( \text{Var}_P(Z^P_w) = \text{Var}_P(Z^P_{\text{diff}}) = 1 \) and \( \text{Cov}_P(Z^P_w, Z^P_{\text{diff}}) = 0 \), we have that \( S \xrightarrow{P} \chi^2_2 \).

The statement (ii) is easy to prove. It is clear that \( \mu_{\text{diff}} - \mu^P_{\text{diff}} = 0 \). It is also not hard to see that, under condition \( \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^2) \), in the usual limit regime, \( \sigma^B_w, \sigma^P_w \) are of the same order of \( \sqrt{|G|} \) and \( \frac{\sigma^P_{\text{diff}}}{\sigma^P_{\text{diff}}} \) goes to zero.
Next we prove statements (i). Let

\[ W = a_1 Z^B_w + a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} \left( Z^B_{\text{diff}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{V_G}{T_G} Z_X} \right) + a_3 Z_X \]

\[ = a_1 Z^B_w + a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} Z^B_{\text{diff}} + \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G} - 1} \right) Z_X. \quad (5) \]

Firstly we show that, in the usual limit regime,

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \text{Var}_B(W) > 0 \text{ when at least one of } a_1, a_2, a_3 \text{ is not zero}. \quad (6) \]

Since \( g_i \)'s are independent under the bootstrap null distribution, it’s not hard to derive that

\[ \text{Cov}_B(R_1, n_X) = 2|G|pq^2 \]

\[ \text{Cov}_B(R_2, n_X) = -2|G|pq^2 \]

so

\[ \text{Cov}_B(Z^B_{w}, Z^B_{\text{diff}}) = pq \frac{(n-m)}{(N-2)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{N \sigma_{wB}^2 \sigma_{\text{diff}}} , \]

\[ \text{Cov}_B(Z^B_{w}, Z_X) = pq \frac{2(n-m)}{(N-2)} \frac{|G|}{N \sigma_{wB}^2 \sigma_{B}}, \]

\[ \text{Cov}_B(Z^B_{\text{diff}}, Z_X) = \frac{2pq|G|}{\sigma_{\text{diff}} \sigma_{B}}, \]

\[ (\sigma_B^2)^2 = Npq, \]

where \( p = \frac{m}{N}, q = \frac{n}{N}. \)

Then the variance of \( W \) under the bootstrap null distribution can be computed as

\[ \text{Var}_B(W) = a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + 2a_1 a_2 pq \frac{n-m}{N-2} \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{N \sigma_{wB}^2 \sigma_{\text{diff}}} \]

\[ + 4pq a_1 \frac{n-m}{N-2} \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G} - 1} \right) \frac{|G|}{N \sigma_{wB}^2 \sigma_{B}}. \quad (7) \]

Under conditions \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o \left( |G| \right)^2 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o \left( \sqrt{|G| \land V_G V_G} \right), \)

\[ \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{\sqrt{V_G} |G| N} \sim \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{\sqrt{V_G} |G| N} = \frac{|G|}{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^\frac{2}{3} N \sqrt{V_G}} \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^\frac{1}{3} N \sqrt{V_G}}{|G|^2} \sim N \to \infty 0, \]

\[ \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1 \frac{|G|}{N \sigma_{wB}^2 \sigma_{B}} \sim \frac{|G|^2}{N^2 \sqrt{V_G}} \sim \frac{|G|^2}{N^2 (\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{V_G}} \sim N \to \infty \sim 0. \]
Thus, we have
\[
\frac{|G|}{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^{1/3}N} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|}{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^{1/3}N} \leq \frac{1}{N^{1/3}},
\]
and
\[
\frac{|G|^{3/2}}{N^2(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|)^{3/2}}{N^2(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{1}{N}.
\]
Thus, we have
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \text{Var}_B(W) = a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 > 0.
\]
This implies that the covariance matrix of the joint limiting distribution is of full rank. Then by Cramér–Wold device, statement (i) holds if \( W \) is asymptotically Gaussian distributed under the bootstrap null distribution for any combinations of \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) such that at least one of them is nonzero.

We reorganized \( W \) in the following way
\[
W = \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w^B} \left( \frac{n-1}{N-2} (R_1 - |G|p^2 + \frac{m-1}{N-2} (R_2 - |G|q^2) \right) + a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} \left( \frac{R_1 - R_2 - |G|p^2 + |G|q^2}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B} \right) + (a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1) \left( \frac{nX - m}{\sigma_B} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{e \in G} \left( \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w^B} \frac{N}{N-2} (I_{(g_e = 1)} - p)(I_{(g_e = 1)} - p) - \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w^B} I_{(J_e = 1)} + I_{(J_e = 2)} - p^2 - q^2 \right)
\]
\[
+ \sum_{e \in G} \frac{T_G}{V_G} \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B} (I_{(g_e = 1)} + I_{(g_e = 1)} - 2p) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1 \right) \frac{I_{(J_e = 1)} - p}{\sigma_B}.\]

Define a function \( h : \mathcal{N} \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( h(i) = I_{(g_e = 1)} - p, i \in \mathcal{N} \). Then,
\[
I_{(J_e = 1)} + I_{(J_e = 2)} - p^2 - q^2 = 2h(e^+)(h(e^-)) + (p - q)(h(e^+) + h(e^-)),
\]
\[
I_{(J_e = 1)} + I_{(J_e = 1)} - 2p = h(e^+) + h(e^-).
\]
Thus, \( W \) can be expressed as
\[
W = \sum_{e \in G} \left( \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w^B} h(e^+)h(e^-) + \left( a_2 \frac{T_G}{V_G} - \frac{a_1(p - q)}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B(N-2)} \right) \left( h(e^+) + h(e^-) \right) \right) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1 \right) \frac{h(i)}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B}.
\]

Let \( b_1 = \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w^B}, b_2 = \frac{a_2}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B} \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - \frac{a_1(p - q)}{\sigma_{\text{diff}}^B(N-2)}, b_3 = \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\sigma_B} \) and
\[
\xi_e = b_1 h(e^+)h(e^-) + b_2 (h(e^+) + h(e^-)),
\]
\[
\xi_i = b_3 h(i).
\]
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Then
\[ W = \sum_{e \in G} \xi_e + \sum_{i \in N} \xi_i. \]  
(8)

Plug in the expressions of \( \sigma_{Bw}^2, \sigma_{B\text{diff}}^2, \sigma_{B}^2 \), it’s not hard to see that
\[ b_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}}, b_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_G}}, b_3 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_GN}}. \]

Next, we apply Stein’s method 3.1 to \( \tilde{W} = \frac{W}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_B(W)}} \). Let \( \mathcal{J} = G \cup \mathcal{N} \), \( K_e = A_e \cup \{ e^+, e^- \} \) for each edge \( e = (e^+, e^-) \in G \) and \( K_i = G_i \cup \{ i \} \) for each node \( i \in \mathcal{N} \). These \( K_e \)'s and \( K_i \)'s satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 under the bootstrap null distribution. Then, we define \( \eta_e \)'s, \( \eta_i \)'s as follows,
\[ \eta_e = \xi_e^+ + \xi_e^- + \sum_{e \in A_e} \xi_e, \text{ for each edge } e \in G \]
\[ \eta_i = \xi_i + \sum_{e \in G_i} \xi_e, \text{ for each node } i \in \mathcal{N}. \]

By theorem 3.1, we have
\[ \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |E_B h(\tilde{W}) - E_B h(Z)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{\text{Var}_B(W)}} \left| E_B \left( \sum_{i \in N} \{ \xi_i \eta_i - E_B(\xi_i \eta_i) \} + \sum_{e \in G} \{ \xi_e \eta_e - E_B(\xi_e \eta_e) \} \right) \right| \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\text{Var}_B^2(W)} \left( \sum_{i \in N} E_B |\xi_i \eta_i|^2 + \sum_{e \in G} E_B |\xi_e \eta_e|^2 \right). \]  
(9)

Our next goal is to find some conditions under which the RHS\(^*\) of inequality (9) can go to zero. Since the limit of \( \text{Var}_B(W) \) is bounded above zero when \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) are not all zeros, the RHS of inequality (9) goes to zero if the following three terms go to zero:
\[ (A1) \ E_B \left| \sum_{i \in N} \{ \xi_i \eta_i - E_B(\xi_i \eta_i) \} + \sum_{e \in G} \{ \xi_e \eta_e - E_B(\xi_e \eta_e) \} \right|. \]
\[ (A2) \sum_{i \in N} E_B |\xi_i \eta_i|^2. \]
\[ (A3) \sum_{e \in G} E_B |\xi_e \eta_e|^2. \]
\[ ^*\text{RHS: right-hand side; LHS: left-hand side.} \]
For (A1), we have

\[ E_B \left| \sum_{i \in N} \{ \xi_i \eta_i - E_B(\xi_i \eta_i) \} + \sum_{e \in G} \{ \xi_e \eta_e - E_B(\xi_e \eta_e) \} \right| \leq E_B \left| \sum_{i \in N} \{ \xi_i \eta_i - E_B(\xi_i \eta_i) \} \right| + E_B \left| \sum_{e \in G} \{ \xi_e \eta_e - E_B(\xi_e \eta_e) \} \right| \]

\[ \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i \in N} \text{Var}_B(\xi_i \eta_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} n_{i,j} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_i \eta_i, \xi_j \eta_j)} + \sqrt{\sum_{e \in G} \text{Var}_B(\xi_e \eta_e) + \sum_{e \neq f} n_{e,f} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f)} \]

\[ = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in N} \text{Var}_B(\xi_i \eta_i) + \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{j \in \text{node}(G \setminus \{i\})} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_i \eta_i, \xi_j \eta_j)} + \sqrt{\sum_{e \in C} \text{Var}_B(\xi_e \eta_e) + \sum_{e \in C \setminus \{e\}} \sum_{f \in C \setminus \{e\}} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f)} \]

The last equality holds as \(\xi_i \eta_i\) and \(\{\xi_j \eta_j\}_{j \in \text{node}(G \setminus \{i\})}\) are uncorrelated under the bootstrap null distribution, and \(\xi_e \eta_e\) and \(\{\xi_f \eta_f\}_{f \in C}\) are uncorrelated under the bootstrap null distribution. The covariance part of edges is a bit complicated to handle directly, so we decompose it into three parts based on the relationship of \(e\) and \(f\):

\[ \sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in C \setminus \{e\}} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f) = \sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in A \setminus \{e\}} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f) + \sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in B \setminus A} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f) + \sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in C \setminus B} \text{Cov}_B(\xi_e \eta_e, \xi_f \eta_f) \]

With carefully examining these quantities, we can show the following inequalities (10) - (17). Here, we only need to consider the worst case, i.e. \(b_1, b_2, b_3\) take the largest possible orders, denoted by \(c_1, c_2, c_3\), i.e. \(c_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}}, c_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_G}}, c_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{|G|}{V_G N}\), then \(c_1 \preceq c_3\) and \(c_2 \preceq c_3\). The details of obtaining (10) - (17) are provided in the Supplement Materials. For a pair of nodes \(i, j\), \(N_{i,j}\) is defined as the number of other nodes connecting to \(i\) and \(j\) simultaneously.
\[
\sum_{i \in N} \Var B(\xi, \eta_i) \preceq Nc_3^4 + |G| (c_2^2c_3^2 + c_1^2c_3^2) + c_2^2c_3^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2,
\]

(10)

\[
\sum_{e \in G} \Var B(\xi, \eta_e) \preceq (c_1^4 + c_1^2c_2c_3 + c_2^2c_3) \sum_{e \in G} |A_e| + |G| (c_1^2c_3^2 + c_2^2c_3^2)
\]

(11)

\[
+ c_1^4 \sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2 + c_2^4 \sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \text{node}_{G_i \backslash \{i\}}} \Cov B(\xi, \eta_i, \xi, \eta_j) \preceq |G| (c_1^2c_3^2 + c_2^2c_3^2) + (c_1c_2c_3 + c_1^2c_3^2) \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2
\]

(12)

\[
\sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in A_e \backslash \{e\}} \Cov B(\xi, \eta_e, \xi, \eta_f) \preceq (c_1^2c_2 + c_1^2c_3 + c_2^2c_3) \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3
\]

(13)

\[
+ (c_1^2c_2c_3 + c_1^2c_3^2 + c_2^2c_3) \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^4 |G_{i,2}|
\]

\[
+ c_1^4 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 + c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 |G_{i,2}|
\]

\[
\sum_{e \in G} \sum_{f \in A_e \backslash \{e\}} \Cov B(\xi, \eta_e, \xi, \eta_f) \preceq c_1^4 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq k, j, k \in \text{node}_{G_i \backslash \{i\}}} N_{j,k}
\]

(14)

Based on facts that \(\sum_{e \in G} |A_e| \asymp \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2\), \(\sum_{e \in G} |A_e|^2 \asymp \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3\) and \(\sum_{e \in G} |B_e| \leq \sum_{e \in G} (|G_{e,+}| + |G_{e,-}|) \asymp \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i||G_{i,2}|\), (A1), (A2) and (A3)
going to zero as long as the following conditions hold.

\[ (c_1^2 c_3^2 + c_1^3 + c_1 c_2 c_3 + c_2^2 c_3) \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \rightarrow 0, \tag{18} \]

\[ (c_1^3 c_2 + c_1 c_2^2 + c_2^3) \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \rightarrow 0, \tag{19} \]

\[ (c_2^2 c_2 c_3 + c_2^3 c_3) \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \rightarrow 0, \tag{20} \]

\[ c_1 c_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 |G_{i,2}| \rightarrow 0, \tag{21} \]

\[ c_1^2 c_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \rightarrow 0, \tag{22} \]

\[ c_2^4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4 \rightarrow 0, \tag{23} \]

\[ c_4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k}^{j \in \text{node } G_{i} \setminus \{i\}} N_{j,k} \rightarrow 0, \tag{24} \]

\[ |G| (c_1 c_2^2 + c_2 c_3^2) \rightarrow 0, \tag{25} \]

\[ N c_3^3 \rightarrow 0. \tag{26} \]

Next, we show that the conditions in Theorem 2.1 can ensure (18)-(26). The conditions in Theorem 2.1 are listed below for easy reference.

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^2), \tag{27} \]

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(\sqrt{|G|} V_G), \tag{28} \]

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(V_G^3), \tag{29} \]

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(|G| V_G). \tag{30} \]

First of all, (22) directly follows from (30). For (26), \( N c_3^3 \) is of the same order
of \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{|G|^3}{V_G^2 N^2} \). Obviously, \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \) goes to zero as \( N \to \infty \), and
\[
\frac{|G|^3}{V_G^2 N^2} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G^2} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G^2}
\]
by Jensen’s inequality. Thus, \( Nc_3^3 \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} 0 \) under (29).

For (25), \( |G|c_1c_3^2 \) is of order \( \frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G N}} + \frac{|G|^3}{V_G^2 N^2} \), which would go to zero under (27) and (28), because
\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{|G|^3} \leq \frac{4\sqrt{|G|}}{N}
\]
and
\[
\frac{|G|^4}{V_G^2 N^2} = \frac{|G|^3}{V_G^2 N^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{\sqrt{|G^3 V_G}}} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G^2}.
\]
The second part \( |G|c_2c_3^3 \) is of order \( \frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G N}} + \frac{|G|^3}{V_G^2 N^2} \), which goes to zero as \( Nc_3^3 \) goes to zero.

For (19), it is enough to show \( c_1c_2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 \) going to zero, as the remaining parts can be directly implied by (28) and (29). The first part \( c_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 \) is of order \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{|G|^3} \), which goes to zero under (27) and (29) as
\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{|G|^3} \leq \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3)^3}{\sqrt{V_G}} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G^2} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G^2}.
\]
For (18), we have \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{|G|^3} \frac{\sqrt{|G|}}{N} \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} 0 \) under conditions (27) and (28), so \( c_1^3 c_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} 0 \). The second part \( c_1^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \) directly follows from (27). The third part \( c_1^2 c_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \) can be deal as
\[
c_1^2 c_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \leq \frac{c_1^2 c_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{c_1 c_3^3 |G|}
\]
and we’ve proved that \( c_1^2 c_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 \) and \( c_1^3 c_3^3 |G| \) go to 0 under (28) an (29). The last part \( c_2^3 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \) can be deal as
\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{V_G \sqrt{N}} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{\sqrt{|G^3 V_G}}} \leq \frac{1}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{V_G}.
\]
\[
\frac{|G| \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{N^2 V_G^2} \leq \frac{|G| \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{V_G}} \leq \frac{|G|}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{V_G}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{V_G}} \leq \frac{N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{V_G}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} V_G.
\]
where \( \frac{|G|}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{V_G}} \) goes to zero under (29) and

\[
\frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{N^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq 1,
\]

so \( c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \) goes to zero under (29).

For conditions (20) and (24), since

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} |V_G|^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3,
\]

we deal them together. By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2}.
\]

Thus, \( c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \) goes to zero obviously as \( c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \) and \( c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \) go to zero. Further \( c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \) going to zero follows from \( \frac{c_1}{c_4^3} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \) going to zero, which can be showed as

\[
\frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G} N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \leq \frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G} N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \leq \frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G} N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3.
\]

The last part \( c_4^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \) going to zero follows from \( c_4^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \) going to zero and \( c_4^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \) going to zero, which can be showed by

\[
\frac{c_4^3}{c_4^2 c_2} = \frac{V_G}{|G|^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \rightarrow 0.
\]

For (23), we have

\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4}{V_G} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4}{(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3)^{\frac{4}{3}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \frac{4}{3} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4}{V_G^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \frac{4}{3} \rightarrow 0.
\]

For (21), by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

\[
c_1 c_2^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 |G_{i,2}| \leq \sqrt{c_1 c_1^4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4 c_2^2 c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2},
\]

and the RHS goes to zero under (22) and (23).
4. Proofs of Theorems 2.2-2.4

4.1. Proof of Theorem 2.2

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1. The difference is that, now coefficient $a_2$ in (5) is zero, i.e., $W = a_1 Z^B_w + a_3 Z_X$ without the term $Z^B_{\text{diff}}$. With slightly abuse of notations, we can still represent $W$ by

$$W = \sum_{e \in G} \xi_e + \sum_{i \in N} \xi_i$$

with

$$\xi_e = \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w} b_1 \frac{h(e^+) h(e^-) + a_1 (p-q)}{\sigma(N-2)} (h(e^+) + h(e^-))$$

$$\xi_i = \frac{a_3 h(i)}{\sigma_B}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

Let $b_1 = \frac{a_1}{\sigma_w}$, $b_2 = -\frac{a_1 (p-q)}{\sigma(N-2)}$, $b_3 = \frac{a_3}{\sigma_B}$ and suppose that $p - q = m - n = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$, with $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, then we have $b_1 \preceq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} c_1$, $b_2 \preceq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|N^{2-\beta}}}$ : $c_2$, and $b_3 \preceq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ : $c_3$. Then $c_1 \preceq c_3$ and $c_2 \preceq c_3$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.1, conditions (18)-(26) are sufficient conditions with new $c_1, c_2, c_3$ for (A1), (A2) and (A3) going to zero. Here, we further have $c_2 \preceq c_1 \preceq c_3$, so (18)-(26) can be simplified to the following conditions:

$$c_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \to 0,$$

$$c_1^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \to 0,$$

$$c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_{i,2}| \to 0,$$

$$c_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 |G_{i,2}| \to 0,$$

$$c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_{i,2}|^2 \to 0,$$

$$c_4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4 \to 0,$$

$$c_1^4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k} N_{j,k} \to 0,$$

$$|G| c_1^2 \to 0.$$
above eight conditions.

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^\frac{3}{2}) \quad (35) \]

\[ N_{eq} = o(|G|^2) \quad (36) \]

First of all, \( c_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \rightarrow 0 \) directly follows from (36). For \( c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \), which is of order \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{\alpha-\beta}} \), since \( 0 \leq \beta \leq 1 \) and \( \max \{|G_i|\} \leq N \), we have \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \). For \( c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^4| \), which is of order \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \), it goes to zero as \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^4|}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \frac{|G||G_i|}{|G|^2 N^{1.5}} = \frac{2\sqrt{|G|}}{N^{1.5}} \). For \( c_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^2| \), which is of order \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{\alpha-\beta}} \), it goes to zero as \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^2|}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \frac{|G_i|^2 N}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \). For \( c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^2| \), which is of order \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{\alpha-\beta}} \), it goes to zero as \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i||G_i^2|}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \frac{N|G|^2}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} = \frac{1}{N} \). For \( c_1^4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4 \), which is of order \( \sum_{|G_i|^2 N^{\alpha-\beta}} \), it goes to zero as \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \frac{|G|^2 N^3}{|G|^2 N^{2\alpha-\beta}} = \frac{1}{N} \). For \( c_1^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k} N_{j,k} \) node \( c_i \), it goes to zero under (36), as \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k} N_{j,k} \) node \( c_i \). For \( |G|c_1^{-3} \), which is of order \( \frac{\sqrt{|G|}}{N} \), it goes to zero under (35) as \( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{|G|^2} \geq \frac{4\sqrt{|G|}}{N} \).

By setting \( a_2 \) to be zero in (7), the variance of \( W \) under the bootstrap null distribution is still asymptotically positive when at least one of \( a_1, a_3 \) is not zero. Thus, under conditions (35) and (36), the joint distribution of \((Z_w^B, Z_X)\) under the bootstrap null distribution converges in distribution to a bivariate normal distribution with a full rank covariance matrix, which further implies that the distribution of \( Z_w^B \) conditioning on \( Z_X = 0 \) converges to a normal distribution. Thus, \( Z_w^B \) under the permutation null distribution is asymptotically normally distributed. By (4), we can rewritten \( Z_w^P \) as follows,

\[ Z_w^P = \frac{\sigma_w^B}{\sigma_w^P} Z_w^B + \frac{\mu_w^B - \mu_w^P}{\sigma_w^P} \]

and we’ve proved that \( \sigma_w^B, \sigma_w^P \) are of the same order and \( \frac{\mu_w^B - \mu_w^P}{\sigma_w^P} \rightarrow 0 \) under condition \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 = o(|G|^\frac{3}{2}) \) in Section 3.2. Hence, \( Z_w^B \) is asymptotically normally distributed under the permutation null distribution under conditions (35) and (36).

### 4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.3

Now, let the coefficient \( a_1 \) in (5) to be zero so

\[ W = a_2 \sqrt{T_G \frac{Z_{diff}^B}{V_G}} + \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{T_G \frac{V_{diff} - 1}{V_G}} \right) Z_X. \]
We can still express $W$ as the summation of $\xi_e$ and $\xi_i$, i.e. $W = \sum_{e \in G} \xi_e + \sum_{i \in N} \xi_i$, with

$$
\xi_e = \frac{a_2 \sqrt{T_G \sigma^2_{B \text{diff}}}}{V_G \sigma^{2}_{B}} \left( h(e^+) + h(e^-) \right),
$$

$$
\xi_i = \left( a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\sigma_B} h(i).
$$

Thus $b_1 = 0$ \( \triangleq c_1 \), $b_2 = \frac{a_2 \sqrt{T_G}}{\sqrt{V_G \sigma^2_{B \text{diff}}}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \triangleq c_2$, $b_3 = (a_3 - a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} - 1) \frac{1}{\sigma_B} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{|G|}{\sqrt{V_G N}} \triangleq c_3$. Since we still have $c_1 \lesssim$ and $c_2 \lesssim c_3$, conditions (18)-(26) are sufficient with new $c_1, c_2, c_3$. Here $c_1 = 0$, (18)-(26) can be simplified to the following conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
c_2^2 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 & \rightarrow 0, \\
c_2^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 & \rightarrow 0, \\
c_2^3 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i| |G_{i,2}| & \rightarrow 0, \\
c_2^4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^4 & \rightarrow 0, \\
c_2 c_3^2 |G| & \rightarrow 0, \\
Nc_3^2 & \rightarrow 0.
\end{align*}
\]

By following similar procedures in Section 3.1, $c_2^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \rightarrow 0$ could ensure the above six conditions, i.e. we only need

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(V_G^\frac{3}{2}).
$$

From (7), the variance of $W$ under the bootstrap null distribution is $a_2^2 + a_3^2$, which is positive when at least one of $a_2, a_3$ is not zero. Thus, under condition $\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 = o(V_G^\frac{3}{2})$, the joint distribution of $(\sqrt{V_G} \left( Z_{\text{diff}}^B - \sqrt{1 - \frac{V_G}{T_G}} Z_X \right), Z_X)$ under the bootstrap null distribution converges to a bivariate normal distribution and the covariance matrix is of full rank, which further implies that $\sqrt{V_G} Z_{\text{diff}}^B$ conditioning on $Z_X = 0$ converges to a normal distribution. Thus $\sqrt{V_G} Z_{\text{diff}}^B$ converges to a normal distribution under the permutation null distribution.

By (4), $Z_{\text{diff}}^B$ can be rewritten as

$$
Z_{\text{diff}}^B = \phi_N \sqrt{\frac{T_G}{V_G}} Z_{\text{diff}}^B + \frac{\mu_{B \text{diff}} - \mu_{P \text{diff}}}{\sigma_{B \text{diff}}}.
$$
Thus, $Z_{\text{diff}}^P$ converges to a normal distribution under the permutation null distribution.

### 4.3. Proof of Theorem 2.4

Assume $|m - n| = O(N^{\beta})$ with $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, we have $\frac{m-n}{N} = O(\frac{1}{N^{1-\beta}})$. We first write $Z_o^P$ as

$$Z_o^P = \frac{\sigma_o^B Z_o^B}{\sigma_o^P} + \frac{\mu_o^B - \mu_o^P}{\sigma_o^P},$$

where $\mu_o^P = E_P(R_1 + R_2)$, $\mu_o^B = E_B(R_1 + R_2)$, $(\sigma_o^P)^2 = \text{Var}_P(R_1 + R_2)$, $(\sigma_o^B)^2 = \text{Var}_B(R_1 + R_2)$ and $Z_o^B = \frac{R_1 + R_2 - m \bar{y}}{\sigma_o^B}$. These quantities are listed as follows

$$\mu_o^P = |G| \frac{m^2 + n^2 - N}{N(N-1)}, \quad (37)$$

$$\mu_o^B = |G| \frac{m^2 + n^2}{N}, \quad (38)$$

$$(\sigma_o^P)^2 = \frac{m(m-1)n(n-1)}{N(N-1)(N-2)(N-3)} \left(4|G| - \frac{8}{N(N-1)} |G|^2 + \frac{(m-n)^2 - N + 2}{(m-1)(n-1)} \sum |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N}(39)\right)$$

$$(\sigma_o^B)^2 = \frac{m^2 + n^2}{N} 4|G| + \frac{mn(m-n)}{N} N \sum |G_i|^2. \quad (40)$$

Let

$$T_1 = 4|G| + \frac{(m-n)^2}{mn} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N}\right) \asymp |G| + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^2}{N}}{N^{2(1-\beta)}},$$

$$T_2 = 4|G| + \frac{(m-n)^2}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \asymp |G| + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2}{N^{2(1-\beta)}},$$

and it is not hard to see that $(\sigma_o^P)^2$ has the same order as $T_1$ and $(\sigma_o^B)^2$ has the same order as $T_2$. Thus, $Z_o^P$ can be rewritten as

$$Z_o^P = \frac{\sigma_o^B}{\sigma_o^P} \sqrt{T_1} \sqrt{T_2} \sqrt{Z_o^B} + \frac{\mu_o^B - \mu_o^P}{\sigma_o^P}.$$

Next, we show that the joint distribution of $\left(\sqrt{T_1} (Z_o^B - \sqrt{1 - \frac{T_1}{T}} Z_Y), Z_Y\right)$ under the bootstrap null distribution converges a bivariate normal distribution. Here, without generality, we can assume $m > n$, otherwise we can replace $Z_X$ by $Z_Y$ which is the standardized version of the number of observations assigned to sample $Y$. By Cramér-Wold device, it is enough to show that $a_1 \sqrt{T_1} (Z_o^B - \sqrt{1 - \frac{T_1}{T}} Z_Y) + a_2 Z_X$ converges a normal distribution for any $a_1, a_2$ not both
equal to zero. The variance of this linear combination can be computed as
\[
\text{Var}_B(W) = a_1^2 \frac{T_2}{T_1} + a_2^2 + a_1^2 \left( \frac{T_2}{T_1} - 1 \right) - 2a_1a_2 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} - 1 \\
+ 2a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} \left( a_2 - a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} - 1 \right) \text{Cov}_B(Z^0_B, Z_X) \\
= a_1^2 + a_2^2.
\]

Here the second equality is due to \( \text{Cov}_B(Z^0_B, Z_X) = \frac{2|G|(|p-q|)}{\sqrt{T_2 \sqrt{pqN}}} \) where \( p = \frac{m}{N} \) and \( q = \frac{n}{N} \). When \( m < n \), we can replace \( Z_X \) by \( Z_Y \) and \( \text{Cov}_B(Z^0_B, Z_Y) = \frac{2|G|(|q-p|)}{\sqrt{T_2 \sqrt{pqN}}} \).

Then, analogy to the proof of theorem 2.1, we can rewritten \( W \) as
\[
W = a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} \sigma^B + \left( a_2 - a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} - 1 \right) Z_X \\
= \sum_{e \in G} \left[ b_1 h(e^+) h(e^-) + b_2 (h(e^+) + h(e^-)) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N b_3 h(i),
\]
where
\[
b_1 = 2a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} \frac{1}{\sigma^B} = \frac{2a_1}{pq \sqrt{T_1}},
\]
\[
b_2 = a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} \frac{m-n}{N \sigma^B} = \frac{a_1 (m-n)}{pq N \sqrt{T_1}},
\]
\[
b_3 = (a_2 - a_1 \sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} - 1) \frac{1}{\sigma^B}.
\]

Thus, \( b_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \), \( b_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N \sqrt{T_1}} \), \( b_3 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \) and \( b_3 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{|G|}{N^2 \sqrt{T_1}} \). Since we still have \( c_1 \lesssim c_3 \) and \( c_2 \lesssim c_3 \), conditions (18)-(26) are sufficient with new \( c_1, c_2 \) and \( c_3 \). Here, we further have \( c_2 \lesssim c_1 \lesssim c_3 \), so (18)-(26) can be ensured by the following conditions:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(T_1^2 N^{2(1-\beta)}), \tag{41}
\]
\[
\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3 = o(T_1^2 N^{1-\beta}), \tag{42}
\]
\[
\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 = o(T_1^2), \tag{43}
\]
\[
\sum_{i=1}^N |G_{i,2}|^2 = o(T_1^2 N^{2(1-\beta)}), \tag{44}
\]
\[
N_{sq} = o(T_1^2). \tag{45}
\]
Firstly, for (19), since $c_2 \lesssim c_1$, we only need to show $c_1^3c_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \to 0$ and $c_1c_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \to 0$, which directly follows from (42) and (41).

For (26), $Nc_1^3$ is of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta}T_1^2}$. The first term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ goes to zero obviously as $N \to \infty$. The second term $\frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta}T_1^2}$ also goes to zero under (41), because

$$\frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta}T_1^2} \lesssim \frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3} \lesssim \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3}{T_1^2 N^{2(1-\beta)}},$$

where the second inequality is due to

$$\frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3} = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \right)^3}{8N^{-\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3}{8N^{1-\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3} \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

For (25), it is enough to show $c_1c_2^2|G| \to 0$ as $c_2 \lesssim c_1$. $c_1c_2^3|G|$ has the order of $\frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta}T_1^2}$. The first term $\frac{|G|^3}{\sqrt{T_1 N}}$ goes to zero under the condition (43), because

$$\frac{|G|}{\sqrt{T_1 N}} = \frac{\sqrt{|G|}}{N} \frac{\sqrt{|G|}}{\sqrt{T_1}},$$

when $|G| = o(T_1)$, the above term would go to zero obviously, and when $|G| \asymp T_1$, from (43), we have $|G| = o(N^2)$. The second term $\frac{|G|^3}{N^{3-3\beta}T_1^2}$ goes to zero under the condition (41) as

$$\frac{|G|^3}{N^{4-3\beta}T_1^2} = \frac{|G|^3}{N^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3}{N^{2-2\beta}T_1^2} \lesssim \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3}{N^{2-2\beta}T_1^2}.$$

For (18), it is enough to look at $c_1^2c_3^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2$, $c_1^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2$ and $c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2$ as $c_2 \lesssim c_1$. The condition $c_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \to 0$ directly follows from (43). The condition $c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \to 0$ can be proved by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as $c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \leq \sqrt{c_1c_2c_3} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|$ and $c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^3 \to 0$ from (41) and $c_1c_2c_3|G| \to 0$ from (25). In order to show $c_1^2c_3^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \to 0$, it is enough to compare the orders of $c_1^2c_3^2$, $c_1c_2c_3$ and $c_1$. When $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, under the condition $|G| = o(\sqrt{T_1 N})$ (Note this condition has been proved when we deal with (25)), we have

$$c_1c_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1 \sqrt{N}}} + \frac{|G|}{N^{2-\beta}T_1} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1 N^{1-\beta}}},$$

so $c_1c_3 \lesssim c_2$, which further implies $c_1^2c_3^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \lesssim c_1c_2c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2$. When $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, then $T_1$ must be of order $|G|$ as $\sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 - \frac{4|G|^3}{N} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} |G_i|^2 \lesssim N|G|$. 
Since
\[
\frac{1}{N} + \frac{|G|}{N^{4-2\beta}} \lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \frac{|G|}{N^3} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}}
\]
we have \(c_2^2 \lesssim c_1\), which further implies that \(c_2^2 c_3^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2 \lesssim c_1 \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^2\).

The condition (22) directly follows from (44), and the condition (24) follows from (45) as \(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq k \in \text{node } c_i \setminus \{i\}} N_{j,k}\) has the same order as \(N_{sq}\).

The condition (23) can be ensured by (41) as
\[
\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^4 = \sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^4 \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N |G_i|^3\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \left(\frac{T_1^2 N^{3-3\beta}}{2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\]

The conditions (20) and (21) can be proved by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality from conditions (18), (22) and (22), (23) respectively.

Hence, under sufficient conditions (41)-(45), the joint distribution of
\[
\left(\sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} \left(\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1} Z_B - \sqrt{1 - \frac{T_1}{T_2}} Z_X\right), Z_X\right)
\]
under the bootstrap null distribution converges a bivariate normal distribution. This implies that \(\sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} Z_B|Z_X = 0\) under the bootstrap null distribution converges to a normal distribution and further yields that \(\sqrt{\frac{T_2}{T_1}} Z_B\) under the permutation distribution converges to a normal distribution. Hence, it remains to show that
\[
\frac{\sigma_B^B}{\sigma_B^P} / \sqrt{T_1} \rightarrow c \neq 0, \quad \frac{\mu_B^B - \mu_P^B}{\sigma_P^B} \rightarrow 0.
\]
The first one is trivial, because \((\sigma_B^B)^2 \approx T_2\) and \((\sigma_B^P)^2 \approx T_1\). Notice that \(\frac{\mu_B^B - \mu_P^B}{\sigma_P^B} = \frac{2pq|G|}{N - T_1}\), so the second one is equivalent to \(\frac{|G|}{N \sqrt{T_1}} \rightarrow 0\) which has been proved when we deal (25).
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