

Bootstrap Tests on High Dimensional Covariance Matrices with Applications to Understanding Gene Clustering

Jinyuan Chang*, Wen Zhou[†], Wen-Xin Zhou[‡]

First version: Dec 26th 2014

Latest version: Feb 18th 2015

Abstract

Recent advancements in genomic study and clinical research have drawn growing attention to understanding how relationships among genes, such as dependencies or co-regulations, vary between different biological states. Complex and unknown dependency among genes, along with the large number of measurements, imposes a methodological challenge in studying gene relationships between different states. Starting from an interrelated problem, we propose a bootstrap procedure for testing the equality of two unspecified covariance matrices in high dimensions, which turns out to be an important tool in understanding the change of gene relationships between states. The two-sample bootstrap test takes maximum advantage of the dependence structures given the data, and gives rise to powerful tests with desirable size in finite samples. Theoretical and numerical studies show that the bootstrap test is powerful against sparse alternatives and more importantly, it is robust against highly correlated and nonparametric sampling distributions. Encouraged by the wide applicability of the proposed bootstrap test, we design a gene clustering algorithm to understand gene clustering structures. We apply the bootstrap test and gene clustering algorithm to the analysis of a human asthma dataset, for which some interesting biological implications are discussed.

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia. Email: jinyuan.chang@unimelb.edu.au.

[†]Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA. Email: riczw@stat.colostate.edu.

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia. Email: wenxin.zhou@unimelb.edu.au.

Keywords: Covariance matrix; Hypothesis testing; Two-sample test; Multiplier bootstrap; Clustering analysis; Gene clustering.

1 Introduction

Due to rapid advances of high throughput technologies, simultaneous measurement and storage of thousands to millions of potentially interesting features, such as mRNA expression levels, have become more feasible now than ever. Studies based on such technologies have fundamentally transformed biomedical research, and have since been widely applied to understand and to aid in developing treatments against a variety of diseases including cancer, Alzheimer’s disease, and asthma. Complex dependence structure among measurements as well as relatively small sample size in studies using high throughput technologies impose significant methodological challenges in statistical inference. While the mean-based inference procedures (Chen and Qin, 2010; Chang, Zhou, and Zhou, 2014) have led to successful selections of important genes associated with diseases in terms of mean expression levels, developments in genomic research demand for new methodologies to study the change of relationships among genes in different biological states which provides critical information on disease-associated genetic signatures (Ho et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2009; de la Fuente, 2010).

From a statistical point of view, detecting changes in the overall gene relationships between two biological states (typically health and disease) is equivalent to testing the equality of two population covariance matrices which reflect dependence structures among genes. Let \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} be two p -dimensional random variables with means $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$, and covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$, respectively. Assume that $\mathcal{X}_n = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_m = \{\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_m\}$ are two independent random samples drawn respectively from the underlying distributions of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} . We are interested in testing the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2. \quad (1.1)$$

In the traditional multivariate setting where the dimension p is fixed, the problem (1.1) has been extensively studied, see for example Anderson (2003) and references therein.

To accommodate high dimensionality which is often the case in contemporary scientific applications, particularly genome-wide association studies and biomedical research, tests other than the likelihood ratio ones have been developed in the literature when the dimension p is greater than $\max(n, m)$. Tailored for multivariate Gaussian models and when p is regarded a fixed constant or $p/\min(n, m) \rightarrow c \in [0, \infty)$, Schott (2007) and Srivastava and

Yanagihara (2010) constructed tests using different trace based measures of distance between matrices. Based on a more general multivariate model, Li and Chen (2012) developed a test based on linear combinations of U -statistics. Under the dense alternative where the two population covariance matrices differ in a large number of entries, the aforementioned L_2 -type tests are powerful and thus preferred.

Modern scientific studies that involve high throughput technologies, such as the controlled trials in biomedical research and abnormality detection in image study, routinely encounter sparsity alternatives. The case where $\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$ is sparse has therefore gained ever-increasing attentions. As pointed out by Cai, Liu, and Xia (2013), L_2 -type testing procedures usually suffer from low power in detecting sparse alternatives, while the L_∞ -type ones tend to have higher power. Tests that are based on the latter, also known as extreme-value tests, maintain certain optimality against a large class of sparse alternatives.

For given test statistic \hat{T} and nominal level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it is a common practice to compute the critical value c_α based on the limiting distribution of \hat{T} so that the resulting test is of the form $\Psi_\alpha = I\{\hat{T} > c_\alpha\}$. However, this limiting distribution based approach has two potential limitations for extreme-value-type statistics. First, the existence of a pivotal asymptotic distribution relies heavily on the unknown covariance/correlation structures as well as parametric shape constraints which may involve skewness and kurtosis parameters. Assumptions of this kind are difficult to be verified and usually not true in practical applications. For example, it is very common that gene expressions are highly correlated for those genes that are regulated by the same pathway (Wolen and Miles, 2012) or associated with the same functionality (Katsani, et al., 2014). The above empirical evidences indicate that the strong structural assumptions on the underlying covariance matrices in Cai, Liu, and Xia (2013) may sometimes be unrealistic in real-world applications. Second, the convergence rate of extreme-value statistics is notoriously slow. For example, as shown by Liu, Lin, and Shao (2008), the convergence rate to the extreme distribution of type I is of order $O\{\log(\log n)/\log n\}$. Therefore, taking the critical value as the upper α -quantile of the limiting distribution may be too conservative as it ignores correlation between the coordinates.

Motivated by the foregoing concerns, we propose in this paper a two-sample bootstrap test for $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ in high dimensions that is powerful against sparse alternatives. Importantly, the bootstrap testing procedure is robust against high correlations and parametric uncertainties in the underlying data distributions. Designed for sparse alternatives, we consider the same type of extreme-value test statistic as in Cai, Liu, and Xia (2013) which is a natural extension of the two-sample t statistic. To conduct inference for the test, we consider the use of a Monte Carlo method, now known as the multiplier (wild)

bootstrap method (Wu, 1986; Mammen, 1993) and more generally the weighted bootstrap (Ma and Kosorok, 2005). The proposed procedure takes maximum advantage of the dependence structures given the data, and gives rise to tests with good powers and desirable size in finite samples.

Validity of the multiplier bootstrap methods is guaranteed by the multiplier central limit theorems in the traditional fixed- and low-dimensional (compared to the sample size) settings. See, for example, Ledoux and Talagrand (1988), Giné and Zinn (1990) and van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), among others. We refer to Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2013) for recent advances of multiplier central limit theorem in high dimensions. Under mild moment and regularity conditions, we show that our proposed test maintains predetermined significance level asymptotically. The power of the test is also studied. Moreover, the proposed bootstrap test also enjoys optimality from a minimax point of view (Cai, Liu, and Xia, 2013). Extensive numerical studies demonstrate that the proposed test has superior power against sparse alternatives, and outperforms the existing methods particularly for those data sets under strong dependency. The wide applicability in practice of the proposed method is thus highlighted.

Encouraged by the flexibility of the bootstrap method, we further propose a variable clustering algorithm to study gene clustering. In order to extract the enormous biological information from the genome, thousands or tens of thousands of genes measured in microarray or transcriptomic experiments are usually grouped together given their similar expression patterns (Hastie et al., 2000; Sharan, Elkon, and Shamir, 2002). Gene clustering is an important tool for detecting co-expression gene sets in genomic study and biomedical research (D’haeseleer, 2005; Yvert et al., 2003), identifying functionally related genes (Yi, Sze, and Thon, 2007), and discovering large groups of genes suggestive of co-regulation by common factors (Hubner et al., 2005). Gene clustering and functional analysis of genes within clusters have provided advancement in understanding regulatory pathways that underlie phenotypes. For example, the absence of co-expression of certain genes has been identified to be associated with high-level prototypes (e.g. disease state), and the corresponding genomic clusters are usually identified as critical signatures for disease progressions (Overbeek et al., 1999). For more examples on applications of gene clustering in scientific studies, see D’haeseleer, Liang, and Somogyi (2000); Dhillon, Marcotte, and Roshan (2003) and Nützmänn and Osbourn (2014). In this paper, we first partition the sample covariance matrix of p genes into blocks of moderate size, and then define a dissimilarity measure of genes based on testing multiple local hypotheses on blocks using the proposed test. We fulfill the gene clustering by applying clustering algorithms such as the hierarchical clustering or the local linear embedding. Together, we apply the bootstrap

testing procedure and the gene clustering algorithm to a human asthma dataset recently reported by [Voraphani et al. \(2014\)](#) in effort to systemically understand regulatory pathways in severe asthma progression. Some biologically interesting observations are made based on the proposed methods.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, a bootstrap method is proposed for testing the equality of two unknown covariance matrices in high dimensions. Theoretical properties of the bootstrap test are established in Section 3. Section 4 contains extensive numerical studies of the proposed testing procedure and comparisons with a variety of existing methods. In Section 5, we develop a gene clustering algorithm using the bootstrap test, and consider its application to the human asthma dataset. We conclude with some discussions in Section 6. Proofs of the theoretical results and additional numerical results are provided in the supplementary material.

2 Bootstrap test for equality of covariance matrices

Consider two independent p -variate random samples $\mathcal{X}_n = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_m = \{\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_m\}$ with mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = (\mu_{11}, \dots, \mu_{1p})'$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = (\mu_{21}, \dots, \mu_{2p})'$, and covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = (\sigma_{1,k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = (\sigma_{2,k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$, respectively. Write $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})'$ and $\mathbf{Y}_j = (Y_{j1}, \dots, Y_{jp})'$. Denote by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 = (\widehat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 = (\widehat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ the sample covariance matrices given by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})', \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m (\mathbf{Y}_j - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})(\mathbf{Y}_j - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})',$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = (\bar{X}_1, \dots, \bar{X}_p)' = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = (\bar{Y}_1, \dots, \bar{Y}_p)' = m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_j$.

Observe that the null hypothesis in (1.1) is equivalent to $H_0 : \sigma_{1,k\ell} = \sigma_{2,k\ell}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p$. For each (k, ℓ) , we consider a natural extension of the two-sample Studentized t -statistic

$$\hat{t}_{k\ell} = \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell} - \widehat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}}{(\widehat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}/n + \widehat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}/m)^{1/2}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{(X_{ik} - \bar{X}_k)(X_{i\ell} - \bar{X}_\ell) - \widehat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}\}^2 \\ \widehat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \{(Y_{jk} - \bar{Y}_k)(Y_{j\ell} - \bar{Y}_\ell) - \widehat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}\}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

are the estimates of $s_{1,k\ell} = \text{Var}\{(X_{ik} - \mu_{1k})(X_{i\ell} - \mu_{1\ell})\}$ and $s_{2,k\ell} = \text{Var}\{(Y_{jk} - \mu_{2k})(Y_{j\ell} - \mu_{2\ell})\}$, respectively. Statistic $\hat{t}_{k\ell}$ is *de facto* a test statistic for the marginal hypothesis testing problem $H_{0,k\ell} : \sigma_{1,k\ell} = \sigma_{2,k\ell}$ v.s. $H_{1,k\ell} : \sigma_{1,k\ell} \neq \sigma_{2,k\ell}$. Tailored for sparse alternatives in (1.1), we focus on the L_∞ -type statistic

$$\hat{T}_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} |\hat{t}_{k\ell}|.$$

Then the proposed test is $\Psi_\alpha = I\{\hat{T}_{\max} > c_\alpha\}$, where c_α is some critical value to be specified so that Ψ_α is, at least approximately, an α -level test. To determine c_α , we propose the following bootstrap procedure.

Algorithm 1. *Multiplier Bootstrap Test*

- (i) *Independent of observations \mathcal{X}_n and \mathcal{Y}_m , generate a new sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables $\{g_1, \dots, g_n, g_{n+1}, \dots, g_N\}$ with $N = n + m$.*
- (ii) *Construct the multiplier bootstrap statistic*

$$\hat{T}_{\max}^\dagger = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} |\hat{t}_{k\ell}^\dagger|, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\hat{t}_{k\ell}^\dagger = (\hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}^\dagger - \hat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}^\dagger) / (\hat{s}_{1,k\ell}/n + \hat{s}_{2,k\ell}/m)^{1/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}^\dagger &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \{(X_{ik} - \bar{X}_k)(X_{i\ell} - \bar{X}_\ell) - \hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}\}, \\ \hat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}^\dagger &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m g_{n+j} \{(Y_{jk} - \bar{Y}_k)(Y_{j\ell} - \bar{Y}_\ell) - \hat{\sigma}_{2,k\ell}\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) *Conditional on \mathcal{X}_n and \mathcal{Y}_m , the computed critical value \hat{c}_α is defined as the conditional upper α -quantile of \hat{T}_{\max}^\dagger ; that is,*

$$\hat{c}_\alpha = \inf \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}_g(\hat{T}_{\max}^\dagger > t) \leq \alpha \right\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where \mathbb{P}_g denotes the probability measure induced by the multiplier Gaussian random variables $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^N$ with \mathcal{X}_n and \mathcal{Y}_m fixed.

- (iv) *Finally, the proposed bootstrap test is defined as*

$$\Psi_\alpha = I\{\hat{T}_{\max}^\dagger > \hat{c}_\alpha\}. \quad (2.5)$$

In Algorithm 1, we employ artificial random numbers to simulate random variables that are asymptotically identical to but independent of \widehat{T}_{\max} so that our procedure possesses similar structures of many other bootstrap methods, such as the weighted and wild bootstrap procedures proposed by Wu (1986) and Mammen (1993) which were developed to conduct inference for linear models. To implement the method, we compute the critical value \hat{c}_α via Monte Carlo simulations by

$$\hat{c}_{B,\alpha} = \inf \{t \in \mathbb{R} : 1 - \widehat{F}_B(t) \leq \alpha\},$$

where $\widehat{F}_B(t) = B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B I(\widehat{T}_b^\dagger \leq t)$ and $\widehat{T}_1^\dagger, \dots, \widehat{T}_B^\dagger$ are B independent realizations of $\widehat{T}_{\max}^\dagger$ in (2.3) by repeating steps (i) and (ii) in Algorithm 1. For a prescribed significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the null hypothesis $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ is rejected whenever $\Psi_{B,\alpha} = 1$, where $\Psi_{B,\alpha} = I\{\widehat{T}_{\max}^\dagger > \hat{c}_{B,\alpha}\}$.

3 Theoretical properties for the bootstrap test

In this section, we study the asymptotic properties of the bootstrap test Ψ_α . The asymptotic size of the proposed test is obtained under the H_0 in (1.1). We also show the consistency of Ψ_α under local alternatives. We do not impose any structural assumptions on the covariance or correlation of entries in \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , nor do we specify any a priori parametric shape constraints of the data distributions, such as Condition A3 in Li and Chen (2012) and Conditions (C1) and (C3) in Cai, Liu, and Xia (2013). In contrast, we only require the following mild moment and regularity conditions. Let $K > 0$ be a finite constant independent of n, m and p .

(P). There exists a constant $r \geq 4$ such that, for every $k = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\{\mathbb{E}(|X_{ik}|^{2r})\}^{1/r} \leq K\sigma_{1,kk} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\mathbb{E}(|Y_{jk}|^{2r})\}^{1/r} \leq K\sigma_{2,kk}.$$

(E). There exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \mathbb{E}\{\exp(\kappa X_{ik}^2/\sigma_{1,kk})\} \leq K \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p} \mathbb{E}\{\exp(\kappa Y_{j\ell}^2/\sigma_{2,\ell\ell})\} \leq K.$$

(M). There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} \frac{s_{1,k\ell}}{\sigma_{1,kk}\sigma_{1,\ell\ell}} \geq c_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} \frac{s_{2,k\ell}}{\sigma_{2,kk}\sigma_{2,\ell\ell}} \geq c_2.$$

(S). The sample sizes n and m are comparable, i.e. $\frac{n}{m}$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity.

Conditions (P) and (E) correspond to the polynomial-type and exponential-type tails of the underlying distributions, respectively. Condition (M) ensures that the random variables $\{(X_{ik} - \mu_{1k})(X_{i\ell} - \mu_{1\ell})\}_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ and $\{(Y_{jk} - \mu_{2k})(Y_{j\ell} - \mu_{2\ell})\}_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ are non-degenerate. Condition (S) is a standard condition in two-sample hypothesis testing problems. Theorem 1 below shows that, under mild moment and regularity conditions, the bootstrap test Ψ_α defined in (2.5) is an asymptotically level α test.

Theorem 1. *Let Conditions (M) and (S) hold. Assume that $p = O(n^{r/2-1-\delta})$ for some constant $\delta > 0$ with Condition (P) held or $\log p = o(n^{1/7})$ with Condition (E) held. Then as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\Psi_\alpha = 1) \rightarrow \alpha$$

uniformly over $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Next, we investigate the asymptotic power of the bootstrap test Ψ_α . Now it is known (Cai, Liu, and Xia, 2013) that the L_∞ -type test statistics are preferred to the sums-of-squares-type statistics, including those proposed by Schott (2007), Srivastava and Yanagihara (2010) and Li and Chen (2012), when sparse alternatives are under consideration. As discussed in Section 1, this is of great interest in scientific studies whenever the differences between Σ_1 and Σ_2 are rare. Therefore, we focus on the local sparse alternatives which can be characterized by the following class of matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\gamma) &= \mathcal{M}_{n,m}(\gamma) \\ &= \left\{ (\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) : \Sigma_1 \text{ and } \Sigma_2 \text{ are positive semi-definite matrices} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{satisfying Condition (M) and } \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} \frac{|\sigma_{1,k\ell} - \sigma_{2,k\ell}|}{\sqrt{s_{1,k\ell}/n + s_{2,k\ell}/m}} \geq \gamma \sqrt{\log p} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next theorem shows that the proposed bootstrap test Ψ_α is able to distinguish H_0 from the alternative H_1 whenever $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim (\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ with probability tending to 1, provided that $\gamma > 2$.

Theorem 2. *Let Conditions (M) and (S) hold. Assume that $p = O(n^{r/2-1-\delta})$ for some constant $\delta > 0$ with Condition (P) held or $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$ with Condition (E) held. If $\gamma > 2$, then as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim (\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma)} \mathbb{P}_{H_1}(\Psi_\alpha = 1) \rightarrow 1.$$

In particular, above result with $\gamma = 4$ is proved in [Cai, Liu, and Xia \(2013\)](#). Moreover, they showed that the rate $\sqrt{(\log p)/n}$ for the lower bound of the maximum magnitude of the entries of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$ is minimax optimal in the sense that, for any $\alpha, \beta > 0$ satisfying $\alpha + \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_0)} \sup_{T_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha} \mathbb{P}_{H_1}(T_\alpha = 1) \leq 1 - \beta$$

for all sufficiently large n and p , where \mathcal{T}_α is the set of α -level tests over the collection of distributions satisfying Conditions (P) or (E).

In summary, the bootstrap test Ψ_α enjoys minimax optimality and is powerful against sparse alternatives in the sense that it rejects the null hypothesis H_0 correctly with high probability whenever at least one of the entries of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$ is greater in magnitude than $C\sqrt{(\log p)/n}$. Despite of the fact that the bootstrap test is computationally heavier than the limiting distribution based procedure, it takes into correlation between p marginal statistics into account and therefore is less conservative in practice. Importantly, the validity of the test requires no assumption on the unknown dependence structures and parametric shape constraints of the populations.

4 Numerical studies

In this section, we investigate the finite sample performance of the proposed bootstrap test Ψ_α by comparing it with the existing testing procedures in the literature via Monte Carlo simulation studies. Specifically, we compare our method with that of [Schott \(2007\)](#) (Sc hereafter), [Li and Chen \(2012\)](#) (LC hereafter) and [Cai, Liu, and Xia \(2013\)](#) (CLX hereafter). Both the Sc and LC tests are of sum-of-square type, and the extreme-value-type test of [Cai, Liu, and Xia \(2013\)](#) is based on the limiting distribution calibration approach.

We generate two independent random samples $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_j\}_{j=1}^m$ from multivariate models $\mathbf{X}_i = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_1 \mathbf{Z}_i^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_j = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_2 \mathbf{Z}_j^{(2)}$ with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'_\ell = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. To compare the empirical sizes of the candidate tests, we consider four models on the covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*$ and let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*$ under the null hypothesis in (1.1).

- M1 (Block diagonals): Let $\mathbf{D} = (d_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ be a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $d_{kk} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(0.5, 2.5)$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Let $\mathbf{A} = (a_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$, where $a_{kk} = 1$, $a_{k\ell} = 0.55$ for $10(q-1) + 1 \leq k \neq \ell \leq 10q$ for $q = 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{p}{10} \rfloor$, and $a_{k\ell} = 0$ otherwise. Then, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^* = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{1/2}$. This model was used by [Cai, Liu, and Xia \(2013\)](#).

- M2 (Slow exponential decay): Take $\Sigma^* = (\sigma_{k\ell}^*)_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ with $\sigma_{k\ell}^* = \theta^{|k-\ell|^\rho}$ with $\theta = 0.99$ and $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$.
- M3 (Long range dependence): Let $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_p)'$ be a $p \times 1$ vector with i.i.d. components $d_k \sim \text{Unif}(1, 2)$. Let $\Sigma^* = (\sigma_{k\ell}^*)_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ with $\sigma_{kk}^* = d_k$ and $\sigma_{k\ell}^* = \rho_\alpha(|k-\ell|)$ for $k \neq \ell$, where $\rho_\alpha(d) = \frac{1}{2}\{(d+1)^{2H} + (d-1)^{2H} - 2d^{2H}\}$ with $H = 0.85$. This model is used to take long range dependence into account.
- M4 (Non-sparse): Define matrices $\mathbf{F} = (f_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ with $f_{kk} = 1, f_{k,k+1} = f_{\ell+1,\ell} = 0.5$, $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V}_{p,k_0})$, the uniform distribution on the Stiefel manifold (i.e. $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k_0}$ and $\mathbf{U}'\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_{k_0}$), and diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} = (d_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ with i.i.d. diagonal entries $d_{kk} \sim \text{Unif}(1, 6)$. We take $k_0 = 10$ and $\Sigma^* = \mathbf{D}^{1/2}(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}')\mathbf{D}^{1/2}$.

For high throughput data, non-Gaussian measurements are more common than normal data and are ubiquitous in a wide range of applications, such as data of count type with heavy tails in transcriptomic analysis, real data with heavy tails in microarray analysis and data of count type with zero-inflation in image processing, among others. To reflect these practical scenarios, we consider the following three different data generation mechanisms. Denote $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(\ell)} = (Z_{i1}^{(\ell)}, \dots, Z_{ip}^{(\ell)})'$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

- D1 (Data of count type with heavy tails). Let the components of $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(\ell)}$ ($\ell = 1, 2$) be i.i.d. negative binomial distributed random variables, i.e. $Z_{ik}^{(\ell)} \sim \text{NB}(100, 0.2)$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $\ell = 1, 2$.
- D2 (Zero-inflated data of count type). Let the components of $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(\ell)}$ ($\ell = 1, 2$) be i.i.d. zero-inflated Poisson random variables in the sense that for each $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $\ell = 1, 2$, $Z_{ik}^{(\ell)}$ is Poisson random variable with parameter $\lambda = 1000$ with probability 0.15 and zero with probability 0.85.
- D3 (Real data with heavy tailed distributions). Let $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(2)}$ follow multivariate t -distributions with 5 degrees of freedom and covariance matrices Σ_1 and Σ_2 , respectively.

To assess the power of the four tests, define the perturbation matrix $\mathbf{Q} = (q_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ which has $\lfloor 0.05p \rfloor$ random non-zero entries. Half of the non-zero entries of \mathbf{Q} are randomly located in its upper triangle part and the others are in its lower triangle by symmetry. The magnitudes of non-zero entries are randomly generated from $\tau \cdot \text{Unif}(0.5, 1.5)$ with $\tau = 8 \max\{\max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \sigma_{kk}^*, \sqrt{\log p}\}$, where σ_{kk}^* are the diagonal entries of Σ^* in the models

Table 1: Comparison of empirical sizes for Model 1 based on 1000 replications when $\alpha = 0.05$, $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.

	D1				D2				D3			
tests / p	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000
$(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$												
Ψ_α	0.078	0.078	0.093	0.090	0.072	0.072	0.094	0.077	0.032	0.028	0.029	0.032
LC	0.073	0.061	0.055	0.052	0.089	0.084	0.073	0.059	0.326	0.325	0.300	0.309
Sc	0.066	0.054	0.046	0.047	0.611	0.566	0.616	0.608	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.071	0.053	0.065	0.062	0.069	0.062	0.047	0.064	0.015	0.009	0.009	0.007
$(n_1, n_2) = (60, 80)$												
Ψ_α	0.066	0.064	0.067	0.075	0.035	0.045	0.050	0.052	0.017	0.029	0.015	0.027
LC	0.060	0.064	0.058	0.056	0.104	0.069	0.055	0.059	0.345	0.369	0.361	0.371
Sc	0.055	0.057	0.054	0.050	0.622	0.641	0.613	0.651	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.051	0.056	0.055	0.059	0.031	0.034	0.046	0.028	0.010	0.013	0.003	0.004

Table 2: Comparison of empirical sizes for Model 2 based on 1000 replications when $\alpha = 0.05$, $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.

	D1				D2				D3			
tests / p	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000
$(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$												
Ψ_α	0.076	0.071	0.090	0.094	0.051	0.064	0.090	0.090	0.035	0.027	0.032	0.038
LC	0.080	0.073	0.08	0.082	0.096	0.091	0.077	0.088	0.336	0.328	0.348	0.310
Sc	0.063	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.348	0.325	0.166	0.115	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.064	0.054	0.069	0.060	0.041	0.056	0.049	0.070	0.014	0.007	0.009	0.010
$(n_1, n_2) = (60, 80)$												
Ψ_α	0.069	0.070	0.071	0.072	0.037	0.033	0.043	0.053	0.020	0.013	0.022	0.028
LC	0.059	0.099	0.071	0.087	0.086	0.079	0.059	0.091	0.325	0.344	0.338	0.374
Sc	0.057	0.092	0.072	0.068	0.454	0.137	0.342	0.142	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.054	0.062	0.054	0.057	0.032	0.023	0.034	0.042	0.012	0.005	0.008	0.004

M1–M4. In each model, we take $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma^* + \lambda_0 \mathbf{I}$ and $\Sigma_2 = \Sigma^* + \mathbf{Q} + \lambda_0 \mathbf{I}$ where $\lambda_0 = |\min\{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^* + \mathbf{Q}), \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^*)\}| + 0.05$.

In all the results reported here, the sample sizes $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45), (60, 80)$, the dimension p takes value in $\{80, 280, 500, 1000\}$ and the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$. The empirical sizes and powers are computed via 1000 replications and the number of bootstrap iterations B is taken to be 1500. The empirical sizes are reported in Tables 1–4 and the powers are depicted in Figures 1–4.

It can be seen from Tables 1–4 that, the empirical sizes of the bootstrap test Ψ_α are fairly close to the nominal level 0.05 over all the models and data sets. This justifies the theoretical property of Ψ_α under the null hypothesis. As n_1 and n_2 increase, the empirical size of Ψ_α is approaching the nominal level. The LC and Sc tests maintain the nominal size for the data set D1 over all the models, while the LC test suffers from size distortion

Table 3: Comparisons of empirical sizes for Model 3 based on 1000 replications when $\alpha = 0.05$, $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.

	D1				D2				D3			
tests / p	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000
$(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$												
Ψ_α	0.077	0.065	0.084	0.091	0.065	0.072	0.075	0.081	0.029	0.028	0.033	0.037
LC	0.081	0.065	0.057	0.051	0.101	0.065	0.055	0.054	0.321	0.302	0.311	0.323
Sc	0.061	0.051	0.047	0.035	0.580	0.611	0.626	0.595	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.065	0.040	0.071	0.048	0.059	0.065	0.042	0.071	0.016	0.01	0.012	0.006
$(n_1, n_2) = (60, 80)$												
Ψ_α	0.064	0.067	0.092	0.065	0.038	0.043	0.043	0.053	0.018	0.023	0.024	0.025
LC	0.057	0.053	0.060	0.057	0.086	0.053	0.072	0.068	0.337	0.335	0.343	0.342
Sc	0.054	0.051	0.054	0.048	0.651	0.674	0.644	0.662	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.053	0.059	0.075	0.043	0.028	0.035	0.035	0.025	0.006	0.011	0.006	0.005

for the data set D3 and the Sc test has severely distorted size for data sets D2 and D3. The CLX test maintains the nominal size for data sets D1 and D2 over all the models. It is interesting to note that the CLX test usually has an empirical size much smaller than the nominal level for the data set D3. This phenomenon may be caused by the slow rate of convergence to the extreme distribution, based on which the critical value is computed.

Table 4: Comparison of empirical sizes for Model 4 based on 1000 replications when $\alpha = 0.05$, $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.

	D1				D2				D3			
tests / p	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000	80	280	500	1000
$(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$												
Ψ_α	0.065	0.078	0.084	0.084	0.052	0.079	0.086	0.086	0.021	0.031	0.031	0.027
LC	0.063	0.057	0.060	0.063	0.105	0.070	0.070	0.053	0.323	0.311	0.343	0.318
Sc	0.059	0.049	0.046	0.052	0.595	0.606	0.632	0.621	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.050	0.059	0.061	0.079	0.045	0.066	0.040	0.076	0.009	0.011	0.004	0.004
$(n_1, n_2) = (60, 80)$												
Ψ_α	0.052	0.082	0.061	0.081	0.047	0.042	0.047	0.055	0.029	0.013	0.022	0.024
LC	0.050	0.060	0.065	0.046	0.104	0.049	0.070	0.051	0.340	0.334	0.335	0.341
Sc	0.044	0.051	0.058	0.037	0.618	0.650	0.641	0.682	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
CLX	0.044	0.070	0.051	0.064	0.036	0.037	0.039	0.025	0.016	0.004	0.006	0.004

We compare the empirical powers of the tests with the nominal size maintained. Figures 1–4 show that the bootstrap test has higher power than the LC and Sc tests for data sets D1 and D2 over all the models. As the number of non-zero off-diagonal entries of $\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$ grows slowly with p , both the bootstrap test Ψ_α and CLX test gain powers when p increases, while powers of the LC and Sc tests are much lower due to the sparsity. For data sets D1 and D2, the bootstrap test Ψ_α is slightly more powerful than the CLX test for small sample sizes, and the two tests are comparable as n_1, n_2 and p increase. For the

data set D3, it is not surprising that the bootstrap test Ψ_α is more powerful than the CLX test and it gains more power than the CLX test when n_1, n_2 and p increase. In summary, the proposed bootstrap test outperforms the other three over all the sparse models of interest. More simulation results for data sets from Gamma distributions are reported in the supplementary material with similar phenomena as above observed.




Figure 1: (Model 1) Comparison of empirical powers based on 1000 replications when $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.




Figure 2: (Model 2) Comparison of empirical powers based on 1000 replications when $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.




Figure 3: (Model 3) Comparison of empirical powers based on 1000 replications when $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.




Figure 4: (Model 4) Comparison of empirical powers based on 1000 replications when $(n_1, n_2) = (45, 45)$ and $(60, 80)$.

5 Applications in understanding gene clustering: A Ψ_α -based gene clustering procedure

The wide applicability of the bootstrap procedure, on which our proposed bootstrap test is based, makes studying the structure of unspecified covariance matrix in high dimension possible. We therefore employ the bootstrap procedure in Section 2 to design a gene clustering algorithm, using which we are able to discover biologically intuitive grouping structures among genes of interest based on their dependence structures. The gene clustering analy-

sis will complement the traditional differential expression analysis to provide information regarding the genetic mechanisms on a different dimension. In this section, we will, firstly, describe this gene clustering algorithm in more details. Then we illustrate the proposed bootstrap test and gene clustering algorithm by applying them to an analysis on the human asthma data from microarray experiments reported by [Voraphani et al. \(2014\)](#). Biologically interesting observations are summarized in this section. For example, while not detectable by other tests, the gene-set for integral of plasma membrane (GO:0005887) is identified to be disease associated by the proposed bootstrap test successfully; also, the gene clustering analysis reveals how do genes from the gene-set for INF- γ mediated signaling pathway (GO:0060333) tend to function in large groups in the health group but not in the asthma group.

5.1 Variable clustering based on a Ψ_α -driven dissimilarity

To discover latent clustering structure, a dissimilarity or proximity measure of the p variables is computed based on independent observations $\mathcal{X}_n = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$ drawn from the underlying distribution of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ with covariance matrix $\Sigma_1 = (\sigma_{1,k\ell})$. Clustering algorithms, such as the hierarchical, partition or nonlinear manifold learning methods, will be applied to the dissimilarity measure of clustering variables. As pointed by [Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman \(2009\)](#), to obtain successful clustering, specifying a proper dissimilarity measure is far more important than the choice of clustering algorithm as a noisy empirical dissimilarity tends to obscure the true grouping structure. To discover the clustering structure of variables, it is common to use the covariance or correlation to specify the dissimilarity in the sense that variables X_k and X_ℓ are clustered in the same group if $|\sigma_{1,k\ell}|$ is large and separated otherwise ([Hastie et al., 2000](#); [Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman, 2009](#); [Wagaman and Levina, 2009](#)).

Variable clustering can be described via the covariance matrix Σ_1 in the sense that if there is certain clustering structure among variables, then upon permutations, there exists a partition of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, denoted by $\{B_t\}_{t=1}^m$ for some $1 \leq m \leq p$, such that $\min_{k,\ell \in B_t} |\sigma_{1,k\ell}| > c_1$, and for any $1 \leq t \neq t' \leq m$, $\max_{k \in B_t, \ell \in B_{t'}} |\sigma_{1,k\ell}| < c_2$, where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are positive constants. This formulation is closely related to testing one-sample local hypothesis, i.e. for a given $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{I}_p = \{(1, 1), \dots, (1, p), (2, 1), \dots, (2, p), \dots, (p, p)\}$,

$$H_0^\Lambda : \sigma_{1,k\ell} = 0 \text{ for any } (k, \ell) \in \Lambda \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1^\Lambda : \sigma_{1,k\ell} \neq 0 \text{ for some } (k, \ell) \in \Lambda. \quad (5.1)$$

Testing the hypothesis (5.1), in fact, facilitates recovering the dissimilarity patterns among variables, that is, failing to reject H_0^Λ indicates that it is preferable to segregate variables

X_k and X_ℓ whenever $(k, \ell) \in \Lambda$.

The choice of Λ , however, is nontrivial. For variable clustering, the cardinality of $\{(k, \ell) : \sigma_{1,k\ell} \neq 0\}$ is not necessarily small and thus it may be unnatural to assume sparsity. The similarity among variables may easily be underestimated when Λ is chosen too large. On the other hand, reducing Λ to a singleton will lead to a multiple testing problem with a large number of hypotheses. One may therefore overestimate the similarity among variables. Motivated by the block-wise estimation method for spatial data proposed by [Caragea and Smith \(2007\)](#), we place the covariance matrix Σ_1 on a $p \times p$ grid indexed by \mathcal{I}_p and partition it with blocks of moderate size. Due to symmetry, we only focus on the upper triangle part. First, we construct blocks of size $s_0 \times s_0$ along the diagonal and note that the last block may be of a smaller size if s_0 is not a divisor of p (in fact, only the upper half of these blocks will be used and we have $\lceil p/s_0 \rceil$ triangles). Next, we create new blocks of size $s_0 \times s_0$ successively toward the top right corner. Similarly as before, blocks to the most right may be of smaller size. The grid, or equivalently, the index set \mathcal{I}_p , is partitioned into $S = \lceil p/s_0 \rceil (\lceil p/s_0 \rceil + 1)/2$ sub-regions and we denote by $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_S$ the partition of the upper triangle indices $\{(k, \ell) : 1 \leq k < \ell \leq p\}$.

The idea for the proposed method Ψ_α can be also used to test [\(5.1\)](#). On each of the sub-regions we modify Ψ_α to test local hypotheses $H_0^{\Lambda_s} : \sigma_{1,k\ell} = 0$ for any $(k, \ell) \in \Lambda_s$ v.s. $H_1^{\Lambda_s} : \sigma_{1,k\ell} \neq 0$ for some $(k, \ell) \in \Lambda_s$ for $s = 1, \dots, S$. We then apply the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure ([Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995](#)) to control the false discovery rate (FDR) for simultaneously testing these S hypotheses. For each s , failing to reject the null hypothesis $H_0^{\Lambda_s}$ indicates that it is preferable to segregate variables X_k and X_ℓ for $(k, \ell) \in \Lambda_s$. It is thus natural to assign zero to the similarity between X_k and X_ℓ for variable clustering. Further, to accommodate false discoveries when $\sigma_{1,k\ell} = 0$ while $H_0^{\Lambda_s}$ was rejected, we consider the one-sample version of the test statistic in [\(2.1\)](#) and assign its relative value to the maximum over Λ_s the variable similarity so that the small similarity suggests us to segregate the corresponding variables. We summarize the above procedure in [Algorithm 2](#) below.

Algorithm 2 (Computation of the Ψ_α -driven dissimilarity).

- (i) From the observations \mathcal{X}_n , compute the sample covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = (\hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{T}} = (\tilde{t}_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$, where $\tilde{t}_{k\ell} = \sqrt{n} \hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell} / \sqrt{\hat{s}_{1,k\ell}}$ for $\hat{s}_{1,k\ell}$ defined in [\(2.2\)](#).
- (ii) Independent of \mathcal{X}_n , generate a bootstrap sample of size B , where for each $b = 1, \dots, B$

and $1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p$, compute

$$\tilde{t}_{b,k\ell}^\dagger = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n g_{b,i} \{(X_{ik} - \bar{X}_k)(X_{i\ell} - \bar{X}_\ell) - \hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell}\}}{\sqrt{n\hat{S}_{1,k\ell}}},$$

where $\{g_{b,1}, \dots, g_{b,n}\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables.

- (iii) Partition the $p \times p$ grid as discussed before by S blocks. For each block with entries indexed by $\Lambda_s \subset \mathcal{I}_p$, compute the bootstrap-based approximated p -value as follows:

$$\hat{p}_s = 1 - \hat{F}_B \left(\max_{(k,\ell) \in \Lambda_s} \tilde{t}_{k\ell} \right),$$

where \hat{F}_B denotes the empirical (conditional) distribution function of $\max_{(k,\ell) \in \Lambda_s} \tilde{t}_{k\ell}$ given \mathcal{X}_n using the bootstrap samples $\{\max_{(k,\ell) \in \Lambda_s} \tilde{t}_{b,k\ell}^\dagger\}_{b=1}^B$.

- (iv) Estimate the q -values for $\{\hat{p}_s\}_{s=1}^S$ using the BH procedure, denoted by $\{\hat{q}_s\}$. For a prespecified cut-off π , define the Ψ_α -driven dissimilarity measure by

$$d_{k\ell} = 1 - \frac{\tilde{t}_{k\ell} I\{\hat{q}_s < \pi\}}{\max\{\max_{(k,\ell) \in \Lambda_s} \tilde{t}_{k\ell}, 1\}} \quad \text{for any } (k, \ell) \in \Lambda_s. \quad (5.2)$$

Based on the Ψ_α -driven similarity/dissimilarity defined in (5.2), we further apply clustering algorithms such as the hierarchical clustering, the self-organizing map or the local linear embedding for variable clustering. To specify the blocks needed in Algorithm 2, we propose the following data-driven selection of s_0 . The S local hypotheses to be tested simultaneously admit unknown complex dependencies so that the FDR, controlled by the BH procedure, satisfies the general upper bound

$$\text{FDR} \leq \frac{S_0}{S} \pi \log S$$

where S_0 denotes the number of true null local hypotheses (Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2001). To control the FDR at the nominal level π , we need $S \geq S_0 \log S$ which is automatically satisfied when $S = 1$ or s_0 is large. Therefore, we define a data-driven s_0 as

$$s_0 = \max \left\{ \log p, \min \left\{ s : \hat{S}_0(s) \leq \frac{S(s)}{\log\{S(s)\}} \right\} \right\} \quad (5.3)$$

where $S(s) = \frac{1}{2}[p/s]([p/s] + 1)$ and \hat{S}_0 is an estimate for the number of true null local hypotheses (Nettleton et al., 2006; Markitsis and Lai, 2010). To efficiently employ Algorithm 2 in practice, we also apply the Isoband algorithm by Wagaman and Levina

(2009) to reorder the variables which makes the covariance matrix as close as possible to a block-diagonal or bandable one. A demonstration of Algorithm 2 is displayed in Figure 5.




Figure 5: A demonstration of Algorithm 2. The true $p \times p$ covariance matrix Σ_1 with $p = 550$, as displayed in panel (a), is in block-diagonal with 10 blocks in different sizes. Entries within each blocks are generated by $\sigma_{1,k\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(1.2\sqrt{\log(p)/n}, 1)$ for $k \neq \ell$ and $\sigma_{1,kk} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(0.5, 2.5)$ where $n = 30$. Entries across blocks are equal to zero. Using data generation model D1 in Section 4 in conjunction with Σ_1 , 30 independent samples are obtained whose sample correlation matrix is displayed in panel (b). The dissimilarity matrix $\mathbf{D} = (d_{k\ell})$ in (5.2) is computed based on the 30 independent samples and displayed in panel (c) that the lighter the closer $d_{k\ell}$ to one. The clustering results of p variables based on dissimilarity \mathbf{D} , Algorithm 2 and the hierarchical clustering method with average linkage is shown in panel (d).

5.2 Case study: Analysis of differential gene expression and clustering in human asthma

As a common chronic inflammatory disease of the airways, asthma affects more than 200 million people worldwide as of 2013 and approximately 300,000 die per year (World Health

Organization, 2013). Global rates of asthma have increased significantly since 1970s and has been recognized as a major public health issue. Asthma is caused by a combination of complex genetic and environmental interactions whose mechanism and regulatory pathways remain unclear, which influences the effectiveness of clinical treatments (Choudhry, Seibold, and Borrell, 2007). Lately, to understand the regulatory pathway and mechanism for high nitrative stress, a major characteristic of human severe asthma, microarray experiments were conducted to compare 3-nitrotyrosines (3NTs), widely recognized proteins with altered functions in the disease, with two major CD4+ T cell immunity, the Th1 and Th2 pathways (Voraphani et al., 2014). Voraphani et al. (2014) identified several novel metabolic pathways that expand the understanding on genetic mechanism of the asthma. In particular, they found that the Th1 cytokine, IFN- γ , along or with Th2 regulations, is a critical immune agent for the disease development by amplifying epithelial NAD/NADPH thyroid oxidase expression and aiding the production of nitrite. They also identified the thyroid peroxidase (TPO) as a critical catalyst in 3NT generation that may contribute to the pathobiology of the disease.

The original microarray gene expression data is available at the NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus database <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/GDSbrowser> with the Gene Expression Omnibus Series accession number GSE43696. The data consists of 108 samples, including 20 health samples, 50 moderate asthma patients and 38 severe asthma patients with similar demographic characteristics. We compare the asthma cases with health samples. The health sample consists of $n_1 = 20$ observations and the asthma group consists of $n_2 = 88$ patients. Biologically, the so called gene-sets group genes with the same biological functions are technically defined in gene ontology (GO) system which provides structured vocabularies producing the names of the sets of genes, known as GO terms (see Ashburner et al. (2000) for more details). After preliminary screening for gene-filtering using the approach in Gentleman et al. (2005) and removing genes without GO terms annotated, there remains 24,520 genes from the original data. We exclude GO terms with missing information and those with the number of genes less than 10 to accommodate high dimensionality. There retains 3,290 GO terms from the original dataset whose sizes vary from 11 to 8,070. For $g = 1, \dots, G$ with $G = 3,290$, denote by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,g}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{a,g}$ the mean gene expression levels, and let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h,g}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a,g}$ be the covariance matrices of the g^{th} GO term in the health and disease groups.

5.2.1 Differential expression analysis

A commonly used method in microarray analysis is the mean-based test that selects interesting GO terms by testing the null hypothesis that overall gene expressions within a GO term are similar between the disease and normal populations (Chen and Qin, 2010; Chang, Zhou, and Zhou, 2014). Though the mean-based procedure has been successful in detecting differentially expressed genes or GO terms based on the changes in the mean expression level, recent developments in genomic analysis have revealed the importance to detect genes with changing relationships with other genes in different biological states, and particularly GO terms that change the clustering structures across populations (de la Fuente, 2010; Ho et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2009). The discovery of those GO terms with altered clustering structures provides information on critical gene regulation pathways. Taking all the GO terms into consideration, we apply the procedure proposed by Chang, Zhou, and Zhou (2014) to test the hypotheses

$$H_{0g}^m : \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,g} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{a,g} \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1g}^m : \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,g} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_{a,g} \quad (5.4)$$

and then apply the bootstrap procedure Ψ_α to test the hypotheses

$$H_{0g}^c : \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h,g} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a,g} \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1g}^c : \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h,g} \neq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a,g}. \quad (5.5)$$

In the second step, we also applied the LC and CLX tests for comparisons. Here, the bootstrap test Ψ_α is obtained based on 5,000 bootstrap replications. By controlling the FDR at 2.5%, the mean test of Chang, Zhou, and Zhou (2014) declared 2,122 GO terms significant. For (5.5), the bootstrap test Ψ_α declared 969 GO terms significant, and the CLX and LC tests declared 524 and 290 GO terms significant, respectively. The bootstrap test has found more significant GO terms than the others. Histograms of p -values for the three tests are reported in the supplementary material. Table 5 displays the top 15 most significant GO terms declared by Ψ_α and also highlights those GO terms that were not detected by the CLX and LC tests. For example, the GO term 0005887, the integral to plasma membrane, is functionally relevant to the dual oxidases (DUOX2)-thyroid peroxidase interaction and is important to the mechanism of asthma development (Fortunato et al., 2010; Voraphani et al., 2014). It is worth noticing that the bootstrap test is able to discover this biologically interesting GO term while the other methods fail. This further highlights the empirical performance of the proposed method.

In addition, besides the 701 GO terms that were declared significant via testing (5.4) and (5.5), the bootstrap test discovered 268 significant GO terms that were not identified by

the mean test. This reflects the recent demanding on analyzing gene dependence structures separately for analyzing the mean gene expressions. Table S2 in the supplementary material displays the top 15 most significant GO terms declared by Ψ_α while undetected via testing (5.4).

Table 5: Top 15 most significant GO terms detected by Ψ_α with FDR controlled at 2.5%. \flat and \dagger refer to the GO terms not being declared significant by the CLX test and the LC test, respectively.

GO ID	GO term name
GO:0006886	intracellular protein transport \dagger
GO:0008565	protein transporter activity \dagger
GO:0030117	membrane coat \dagger
GO:0005515	protein binding $^{\flat,\dagger}$
GO:0016032	viral reproduction $^{\flat,\dagger}$
GO:0005829	cytosol \dagger
GO:0000278	mitotic cell cycle \dagger
GO:0006334	nucleosome assembly \dagger
GO:0034080	CenH3-containing nucleosome assembly at centromere
GO:0006974	response to DNA damage stimulus \dagger
GO:0016874	ligase activity \dagger
GO:0032007	negative regulation of TOR signaling cascade \dagger
GO:0005887	integral to plasma membrane $^{\flat,\dagger}$
GO:0006997	nucleus organization \dagger
GO:0030154	cell differentiation \dagger

5.2.2 Gene clustering study on the differentially expressed GO terms

Voraphani et al. (2014) revealed a novel pathway involving epithelial iNOS, dual oxidases, TPO and CD4+ T cell cytokines such as INF- γ to understand the mechanism of human asthma. Multiple transcripts, together with their variants, are related to these pathways, while their co-regulation mechanisms are less clear. The Ψ_α -based cluster discovery procedure (Algorithm 2) provides a way to study gene interactions. For illustration, we focus on the GO terms that were declared significant via testing (5.5) and are related to Th1 cytokine IFN- γ or TPO, and apply our cluster discovery procedure to the sample from health and disease groups separately to study how the gene clustering alters between the two groups. For IFN- γ , we consider the GO terms 0032689 (negative regulation of IFN- γ production), 0060333 (IFN- γ -mediated signaling pathway) and 0071346 (cellular response to IFN- γ). For TPO, the GO terms have been considered include 0004601 (peroxidase activity), 0042446 (hormone biosynthetic process), 0035162 (embryonic hemopoiesis), 0006979

(response to oxidative stress), 0009986 (cell surface), 0016491 (oxidoreductase activity), 0005886 (integral to plasma membrane) and 0005886 (plasma membrane). Their sizes vary from 17 to 1436.




Figure 6: Comparison of clustering structures of GO:0071346, cellular response to $\text{INF-}\gamma$, between the health and disease groups using the Ψ_α -based cluster discovery procedure (Algorithm 2).

As discussed in Section 5.1, we first apply the ISOband algorithm by Wagaman and Levina (2009) to reorder genes within each group, to which our cluster discovery procedure is applied. We take the bootstrap sample size $B = 5,000$, $\pi = 0.05$ and use hierarchical clustering algorithm (Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman, 2009) with average linkage. The block size s_0 is selected by (5.3), where \hat{S}_0 is estimated using the censored Beta-Uniform mixture model by Markitsis and Lai (2010). The number of clusters is determined by the variance ratio criterion (also known as the Calinski-Harabasz criterion) (Calinski and Harabasz, 1974). Figures 6–9 display comparisons of gene clustering between the health and disease groups (more comparisons are included in the supplementary material). Each vertex represents a gene or its variant and is labelled by the corresponding gene symbol. Vertices connected by edges in gray are clustered into one group, and vertices in red and yellow belong respectively to the maximum clique in the health and disease groups. Vertices in both red and yellow belongs to the maximum cliques for both groups.

From Figure 6 we see that, regarding the cellular response to $\text{INF-}\gamma$, genes tend to function in clusters in the asthma group more than that in the health group. Gene TLR3 actively appears in the largest gene clusters for both the health and asthma groups, while gene IL18 is isolated in the asthma group. On the other hand, gene NOS2 involves into the disease through the establishment of ARG2-NOS2 link in the asthma group. These observations suggests these four genes might be important genetic signature for understanding




Figure 7: Comparison of clustering structures of GO:0060333, INF- γ -mediated signaling pathway, between the health and disease groups using the Ψ_α -based cluster discovery procedure (Algorithm 2).

the effect of INF- γ on the asthma progression. Regarding the INF- γ -mediated signaling pathway, Figure 7 shows that compared to the health group, genes seem to preferentially function separately in the asthma group. The original dominating gene clusters are broken into small groups in the presence of the disease. The different configurations in primary gene clusters in the health and asthma groups for GO term 0060333 provide further information on how does INF- γ influence the iNOS pathway. For the critical enzyme TPO, Figure 8 shows that genes also tend to function in clusters in the disease group compared to in the health group. In the presence of asthma, the gene cluster HBB-HBA2.1-HBA2 is preserved and the gene IPCEF1 is isolated from the original largest gene cluster. It is interesting to notice that the DUOX2 genes are isolated in the health group but do interact with many genes, particularly with TPO, in the presence of asthma as documented in Voraphani et al. (2014). The identified DUOX2 gene cluster provides a candidate pathway to understand how TPO catalyzes the iNOS-DUOX2-thyroid peroxidase pathway discovered by Voraphani et al. (2014). Last but not least, it can be seen from Figure 9 that the overall co-regulation patterns remain similar between the health and disease groups, while the clustering pattern of TPO alters significantly that it interacts with more genes in the presence of asthma. In summary, based on the proposed procedure, not only we can test the difference in gene dependences, we can also discover the disparity in gene clustering that reflects the difference in gene clustering patterns between the health and disease groups.




Figure 8: Comparison of clustering structures of GO:0004601, peroxidase activity, between the health and disease groups using the Ψ_α -based cluster discovery procedure (Algorithm 2).




Figure 9: Comparison of clustering structures of GO:0035162, embryonic hemopoiesis, between the health and disease groups using the Ψ_α -based cluster discovery procedure in Algorithm 2.

6 Discussion

In this paper, we proposed a bootstrap testing procedure to test the equality of two covariance matrices in high dimensions. To accommodate the practical challenge of sparsity, the

same type of extreme-value test statistic as in [Cai, Liu, and Xia \(2013\)](#) is employed for the proposed procedure so that the bootstrap test enjoys minimax optimality and possesses good powers in practice. Moreover, the proposed test maintains the nominal significance level asymptotically under mild conditions. Remarkably, our testing procedure is valid without imposing any structural assumptions on the unknown covariance matrices, which makes it applicable to a vast scope of scientific applications. Our procedure enjoys similar flexibility as the weighted or wild bootstrap methods, encouraged by which we developed a gene clustering algorithm to study the latent grouping structures among genes of interest. Applications of the proposed bootstrap test and gene clustering algorithm on differential expression analysis for human asthma data from microarray experiments provided some interesting biological findings.

In fact, as noticed for developing the gene clustering algorithm, our proposed bootstrap testing procedure can be easily adjusted for testing a variety of one-sample hypotheses via specifying the index set. For example, our bootstrap testing procedure can be implemented to test the one-sample problem $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \mathbf{I}_p$ v.s. $H_1 : \Sigma_1 \neq \mathbf{I}_p$ in high dimensional settings, where \mathbf{I}_p is the p -dimensional identity matrix. Similarly to (2.1), we may consider $\hat{t}_{k\ell}^\# = \{\hat{\sigma}_{1,k\ell} - I(k = \ell)\} / (\hat{s}_{1,k\ell}/n)^{1/2}$ with $\hat{s}_{1,k\ell}$ defined in (2.2) and define $\hat{T}_{\max}^\# = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq p} |\hat{t}_{k\ell}^\#|$. Hence, with step (ii) in [Algorithm 1](#) slightly modified, we can determine a critical value $c_\alpha^\#$ such that $H_0 : \Sigma_1 = \mathbf{I}_p$ is rejected whenever $\hat{T}_{\max}^\# > c_\alpha^\#$. Inheriting the theoretical properties of Ψ_α , the above bootstrap identity test is also valid under mild moment and regularity conditions without extra structural assumptions on Σ_1 , and it is expected to be powerful against sparse alternatives. In addition, the proposed bootstrap test can be generalized to test the mutual independence of the p -variate population, i.e. $H_0 : X_1, \dots, X_p$ are mutually independent, where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Specifically, we reject the null hypothesis of mutual independence whenever $\hat{T}_{\max}^\ddagger = \max_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq p} \hat{t}_{k\ell}^\ddagger > c_\alpha^\ddagger$, where c_α^\ddagger is determined by [Algorithm 1](#) with step (ii) slightly modified. The resulting independence test will enjoy all the properties of test Ψ_α as discussed before.

In the genomic and biomedical research, weak and dense signals bring challenges to statistical inference from a different perspective other than the sparsity assumption discussed in this paper. It is well known that the sum-of-square type test statistics, with aid of certain thresholding procedures, provide powerful test against weak and dense alternatives. It is interesting to investigate whether the bootstrap method can be incorporated with the sum-of-square-type test statistics. We leave this to future work.

References

- Ashburner, M., Ball, C., Blake, J., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J., Davis, A., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S., Eppig, J., Harris, M., Hill, D., Issel-Tarver, L., Kasarskis, A., Lewis, S., Matese, J., Richardson, J., Ringwald, M., Rubin, G., and Sherlock, G. (2000). Gene Ontology: Tool for the Unification of Biology. *Nature Genetics*, **25**, 25–29.
- Anderson, T.W. (2003). *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. 3rd edition. Wiley-Interscience, New York.
- Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **57**, 289–300.
- Benjamini, Y., and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The Control of the False Discovery Rate in Multiple Testing Under Dependency. *The Annals of Statistics*, **29**, 1165–1188.
- Cai, T.T., Liu, W., and Xia, Y. (2013). Two-Sample Covariance Matrix Testing and Support Recovery in High-Dimensional and Sparse Settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **108**, 265–277.
- Calinski, T., and Harabasz, J. (1974). A Dendrite Method for Cluster Analysis. *Communications in Statistics*, **3**, 1–27.
- Caragea, P., and Smith, R. (2007). Asymptotic Properties of Computationally Efficient Alternative Estimators for A Class of Multivariate Normal Models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **98**, 1417–1440.
- Chang, J., Zhou, W., and Zhou, W.-X. (2014). Simulation-Based Hypothesis Testing of High Dimensional Means Under Covariance Heterogeneity. Available at *arXiv:1406.1939*.
- Chen, S.X., and Qin, Y. (2010). A Two-Sample Test for High-Dimensional Data With Applications to Gene-Set Testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 808–835.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian Approximations and Multiplier Bootstrap for Maxima of Sums of High-Dimensional Random Vectors. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2786–2819.
- Choudhry, S., Seibold, M.A., and Borrell, L.N. (2007). Dissecting Complex Diseases in Complex Populations: Asthma in Latino Americans. *Proceedings of the American Thoracic Society*, **4**, 226–233.
- de la Fuente, A. (2010). From Differential Expression to Differential Networking – Identification of Dysfunctional Regulatory Networks in Diseases. *Trends in genetic*, **26**, 326–333
- D’haeseleer, P. (2005). How Does Gene Expression Clustering Work? *Nature Biotechnol-*

- ogy, **23**, 1499–1501.
- D’haeseleer, P, Liang, S., and Somogyi, R. (2000). Genetic Network Inference: From Co-expression Clustering to Reverse Engineering. *Bioinformatics*, **16**, 707–726.
- Dhillon, I., Marcotte, E., and Roshan, U. (2003). Diametrical Clustering for Identifying Anti-Correlated Gene Clusters. *Bioinformatics*, **19**, 1612–1619.
- Fortunato, R.S., Lima de Souza, E.C., Ameziane-el Hassani, R., Boufrajech, M., Weyemi, U., Talbot, M., Lagente-Chevallier, O., de Carvalho, D.P., Bidart, J.M., Schlumberger, M., and Dupuy, C. (2010). Functional Consequences of Dual Oxidase-Thyroperoxidase Interaction at the Plasma Membrane. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, **95**, 5403–5411.
- Gentleman, R., Irizarry, R.A., Carey, V.J., Dudoit, S., and Huber, W. (2005). *Bioinformtics and Computational Biology Solutions Using R and Bioconductor*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Ginní, E., and Zinn, J. (1990). Bootstrapping General Empirical Functions. *The Annals of Probability*, **18**, 851–869.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Eisen, M.B., Alizadeh, A., Levy, R., Staudt, L., Chan, W.C., Botstein, D., and Brown, P. (2000). ‘Gene Shaving’ as A Method for Identifying Distinct Sets of Genes With Similar Expression Patterns. *Genome Biology*, **1**, research0003-research0003.21
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Ho, J.W., Stehani, M., dos Remedios, C.G., and Charleston, M.A. (2008). Differential Variability Analysis of Gene Expression and Its Application to Human Diseases. *Bioinformatics*, **24**, 390–398.
- Hu, R., Qiu, X., Glazko, G., Klevanov, L., and Yakovlev, A. (2009). Detecting Intergene Correlation Changes in Microarray Analysis: A New Approach to Gene Selections. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **10**, 20.
- Hubner, N., Wallace, C.A., Zimdahl, H., Petretto, E., Schulz, H., Maciver, F., Mueller, M., Hummel, O., Monti, J., Zidek, V., Musilova, A., Kren, V., Causton, H., Game, L., Born, G., Schmidt, S., Müller, A., Cook, S.A., Kurtz, T.W., Whittaker, J., Pravenec, M., and Aitman, T.J.. (2005). Integrated Transcriptional Profiling and Linkage Analysis for Identification of Genes Underlying Disease. *Nature Genetics*, **37**, 244–253.
- Katsani, K.R., Irimia, M., Karapiperis, C., Scouras, Z.G., Blencowe, B.J., Promponas, V.J., and Ouzounis, C.A. (2014). New Moonlighting Roles of Outer Ring Coat Nucleoporins.

Scientific Reports, **4**:4655.

- Ledoux, M., and Talagrand, M. (1988). Un Critère sur les Petites Boules dans le Théorème Limite Central. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **77**, 29–47.
- Li, J., and Chen, S.X. (2012). Two-Sample Tests for High-Dimensional Covariance Matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 908–940.
- Liu, W., Lin, Z.Y., and Shao, Q.-M. (2008). The Asymptotic Distribution and Berry-Esseen Bound of a New Test for Independence in High Dimension With An Application to Stochastic Optimization. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **18**, 2337–2366.
- Ma, S., and Kosorok, M.R. (2005). Robust Semiparametric M-Estimation and the Weighted Bootstrap. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **96**, 190–217.
- Mammen, E. (1993). Bootstrap and Wild Bootstrap for High Dimensional Linear Models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **21**, 255–285.
- Markitsis, A., and Lai, Y. (2010). A Censored Beta Mixture Model for the Estimation of the Proportion of Non-Differentially Expressed Genes. *Bioinformatics*, **26**, 640–646.
- Nettleton, D., Hwang, J.T.G., Caldo, R.A., and Wise, R.P. (2006). Estimating the Number of True Null Hypotheses From a Histogram of p Values. *Journal of Agriculture, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, **11**, 337–356.
- Nützmann, H.-W., and Osbourn, A. (2014). Gene Clustering in Plant Specialized Metabolism. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, **26**, 91–99.
- Overbeek, R., Fonstein, M., D’Souza, M., Pusch, G., and Maitsev, D. (1999). The Use of Gene Clusters to Infer Functional Coupling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, **96**, 2896–2901.
- Schott, J.R. (2007). A Test for the Equality of Covariance Matrices When the Dimension is Large Relative to the Sample Size. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **51**, 6535–6542.
- Sharan, R., Elkon, R., and Shamir, R. (2012). Cluster Analysis and Its Applications to Gene Expression. *Ernst Schering Research Foundation Workshop*, **38**, 83–108.
- Srivastava, M.S., and Yanagihara, H. (2010). Testing the Equality of Several Covariance Matrices With Fewer Observations Than the Dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **101**, 1319–1329.
- van der Vaart, A.W., and Wellner, J.A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer, New York.
- Voraphani, N., Gladwin, M.T., Contreras, A.U., Kaminski, N., Tedrow, J.R., Milosevic, J.,

- Bleecker, E.R., Meyers, D.A., Ray, A., Ray, P., Erzurum, S.C., Busse, W.W., Zhao, J., Trudeau, J.B., and Wenzel, S.E. (2014). An Airway Epithelial iNOS-DUOX2-Thyroid Peroxidase Metabolome Drives Th1/Th2 Nitrative Stress in Human Severe Asthma. *Mucosal Immunology*, **7**, 1175–1185.
- Wagaman, A.S., and Levina, E. (2009). Discovering Sparse Covariance Structures With the Isomap. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **18**, 551–572.
- Wolen, A.R., and Miles, M.F. (2012). Identifying Gene Networks Underlying the Neurobiology of Ethanol and Alcoholism. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, **34**, 306–317
- World Health Organization. (2013). *World Health Organization Fact Sheet No 307: Asthma*. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs307/en/>
- Wu, C.F.J. (1986). Jackknife, Bootstrap and Other Resampling Methods in Regression Analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, **14**, 1261–1295.
- Yi, G., Sze, S.-H., and Thon, M. (2007). Identifying Clusters in Functionally Related Genes in Genomes. *Bioinformatics*, **23**, 1053–1060.
- Yvert, G., Brem, R.B., Whittle, J., Akey, J.M., Foss, E., Smith, E.N., Mackelprang, R., and Kruglyak, L. (2003). Trans-Acting Regulatory Variation in *Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* and the Role of Transcription Factors. *Nature Genetics*, **35**, 57–64.