

Admissibility in partial conjunction testing

Jingshu Wang
Stanford University

Art B. Owen
Stanford University

July 2015

Abstract

Admissibility of meta-analysis has been well understood since Allan Birnbaum's work in the 1950s. Any valid combined p-value obeying a monotonicity constraint is optimal at some alternative and hence admissible. In an exponential family context, the admissible tests reduce to those with a convex acceptance region. The partial conjunction null hypothesis is that at most $r - 1$ of n independent component hypotheses are non-null with $r = 1$ corresponding to a usual meta-analysis. Benjamini and Heller (2008) provide a valid test for this null by ignoring the $r - 1$ smallest p-values and applying a valid meta-analysis p-value to the remaining $n - r + 1$ p-values. We provide sufficient conditions for the admissibility of their test among monotone tests. A generalization of their test also provides admissible monotone tests and we show that admissible monotone tests are necessarily of that generalized form. If one does not require monotonicity then their test is no longer admissible, but the dominating tests are too unreasonable to be used in practice.

1 Introduction

When a null hypothesis is tested in n different settings, a meta-analysis can be used to obtain a combined p-value based on all of the test results. It is possible that the null is then rejected largely on the basis of just one extremely significant component hypothesis test. Such a rejection may be undesirable as it could arise from some irreproducible property of the setting in which that one component test was made.

Researchers in functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) have adopted conjunction (logical 'and') testing (Price and Friston, 1997) in which an hypothesis must

⁰This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation under grant DMS-1407397.

Case	$p_{(1)}$	$p_{(2)}$	$p_{(3)}$	$p_{(4)}$	$p_{(5)}$
A	10^{-200}	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
B	10^{-10}	10^{-9}	10^{-8}	10^{-7}	10^{-6}
C	10^{-100}	10^{-100}	10^{-100}	0.049	0.8
D	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.8

Table 1: Four hypothetical cases for five ordered p-values.

be rejected in all n settings where it is tested. The n settings may correspond to related tasks or they may correspond to independent subjects. For some problems there is greater power to reject a null using n independent fixed effect analyses than there is in combining them via a random effects model (Friston et al., 1999).

Referring to Table 1, cases A and B illustrate the benefit of using conjunction tests. Both a Fisher and a Stouffer meta-analysis would find case A more significant than case B, but case B shows more consistent replication.

Conjunction tests lose power for large n as they are based on the largest of n p-values. A compromise is to require evidence that at least r out of n null hypotheses are false, for some user specified r . Such tests of the ‘partial conjunction null hypothesis’ were used in Friston et al. (2005) and then studied by Benjamini and Heller (2008). The extremes $r = 1$ and $r = n$ correspond to the usual meta-analysis tests and conjunction testing respectively. Partial conjunction testing has also been used for microarray experiments (Sun and Wei, 2011) and gene set enrichment analysis (Wang et al., 2010).

A Benjamini-Heller partial conjunction (BHPC) test works as follows. One sorts the observed p-values yielding $p_{(1)} \leq p_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq p_{(n)}$, ignores the smallest $r - 1$ of them, and then applies a valid p-value combination rule to the remaining $n - r + 1$ p-values. Benjamini and Heller (2008) show that BHPC tests are valid for the partial conjunction null when the n hypotheses are independent. They also consider some dependent test conditions as well as the consequences of using PC tests in the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure.

Cases C and D illustrate an interesting property of the BHPC tests. Suppose that we need to reject at least four null hypotheses to have a meaningful finding. Then a BHPC test finds that case D is stronger evidence (smaller p-value) than case C, because BHPC is based only on $p_{(4)}$ and $p_{(5)}$. In case C we are extremely confident of three rejections and are banking on the fourth one to be correct. In case D by contrast, none of the four smallest p-values is much better than borderline. It appears to have about four times as many ways to disappointing us. Some simple

Bayesian analyses also give C the better posterior probability of a non-null result. This comparison between case C and D reveals a counter-intuitive property of the BHPC tests, that we study further.

Here we investigate the power properties of BHPC tests focussing on admissibility. We give a sufficient condition for BHPC procedures to be admissible among monotone tests for the partial conjunction hypotheses. We also find a converse which characterizes the complete class of tests for monotone admissibility. The only admissible PC tests among monotone tests are either of the BHPC type, or are a generalization of them, which use combined p-values constructed by taking the maximum of the meta-analysis p-value of each of the $\binom{n}{r-1}$ subsets of $n-r+1$ hypotheses. The generalized BHPC p-values are also called r-values in Shenhav et al. (2015).

The monotonicity condition, which means that the combined p-value is a non-decreasing function of the individual p-values, is necessary for us to discuss admissibility for partial conjunction hypotheses with $r > 1$. If we relax this condition, then BHPC tests become inadmissible. Because non-monotone tests are quite unreasonable scientifically, this is not a strong criticism of BHPC. We side with Perlman and Wu (1999) in rejecting the admissibility criterion not the test, when methods lacking face-value validity are included in comparisons.

For BHPC tests, ignoring the smallest p-values has consequences like those alluded to for cases C and D in Table 1 that go beyond admissibility. To better understand this puzzling behavior, we considered a Bayesian analysis approach and calculate Bayes factors for the two cases under different priors for Gaussian distributions. We find that whether treating case C or D as having stronger evidence against the partial conjunction null heavily depends on the prior distribution.

Section 2 presents our notation and some background on partial conjunction tests and admissibility. Section 3 presents the main theorems on monotone admissible partial conjunction p-values. Section 4 gives counter-examples to show that BHPC tests are inadmissible if we relax the monotonicity condition. Section 5 presents a Bayesian analysis on case C and D in Table 1, and compares it to BHPC to show that BHPC tests in fact give less counter-intuitive decisions than they first appear. Section 6 has our conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

The problem begins with n null hypotheses to test, H_{0i} for $i = 1, \dots, n$. The corresponding alternative hypotheses are H_{1i} . The i 'th hypothesis refers to a parameter θ_i . If H_{0i} holds then $\theta_i \in \Theta_{0i}$, while H_{1i} specifies that $\theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}$. The parameter space for the i 'th hypothesis is $\Theta_i = \Theta_{0i} \cup \Theta_{1i}$ and of course $\Theta_{0i} \cap \Theta_{1i} = \emptyset$.

To each hypothesis, there corresponds a p-value, p_i . There may be a loss of information in reducing a data set to one p-value. Yet often that loss is small and very commonly the researchers who gathered the original data share only their p-values for reasons that may include privacy of their subjects.

We use p_i to denote the numerical value of the p-value for the i 'th hypothesis. It is the observed value of a corresponding random variable P_i . The sorted p-values are $p_{(1)} \leq p_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq p_{(n)}$ and $P_{(1)} \leq P_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq P_{(n)}$ are the sorted random variables. Probability and expectation for functions of P_i are given by \mathbb{P}_{θ_i} and \mathbb{E}_{θ_i} respectively. We let $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ and $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$. Probability and expectation for functions of P are given by \mathbb{P}_θ and \mathbb{E}_θ . Apart from a few exceptions discussed below we assume that P_1, \dots, P_n are independent p-values, that are valid according to the definition below.

Definition 1 (Validity). A valid component p-value satisfies $\sup_{\theta_i \in \Theta_{0i}} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(P_i \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

Let $\omega_i = 1$ if $\theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}$ and $\omega_i = 0$ if $\theta_i \in \Theta_{i0}$. At the meta-level, our parameter is $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$. The parameter space for a PC test is $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^n$. The PC null hypothesis and alternative hypotheses are

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{r/n} : \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_0^{r/n} &\equiv \{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \leq r - 1\}, \quad \text{and} \\ H_1^{r/n} : \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_1^{r/n} &\equiv \{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also use $\Theta_0^{r/n} = \{\theta \mid \boldsymbol{\omega}(\theta) \in \Omega_0^{r/n}\}$.

We use $1:r$ to denote $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and similarly $(r+1):n = \{r+1, r+2, \dots, n\}$. The index set $u \subset 1:n$ has cardinality $|u|$ and complement $-u = 1:n \setminus u$. Under the null hypothesis H_{0u} we have $\theta_j \in \Theta_{0j}$ for all $j \in u$.

Sometimes we combine points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ into a point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $z_j = x_j$ for $j \in u$ and $z_j = y_j$ for $j \notin u$. Such a hybrid point is denoted $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}_u : \mathbf{y}_{-u}$.

We can extend the definition of validity to meta-analysis p-values. The combination of k independent p-values (k may differ from n later) produces the combined p-value $P_{1/k} = f_{M,k}(P_1, \dots, P_k)$ which is a valid p-value for testing $H_0^{1/k}$ if

$$\sup_{\theta_j \in \Theta_{0j}, j=1, \dots, k} \mathbb{P}_\theta(P_{1/k} \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha, \quad \forall 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1.$$

Definition 2 (Sensitivity). A sensitive meta-analysis p-value $P_{1/k} = f_{M,k}(P_1, \dots, P_k)$ satisfies $\liminf_{P_i \rightarrow 0} P_{1/k} = 0$ for $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Sensitivity requires that the meta-analysis p-value drops to 0 when we are certain to reject any of the individual hypothesis, which we think is a reasonable requirement for a p-value for testing $H_0^{1/n}$. Of course, partial conjunction p-values for $H_0^{r/n}$ with $r > 1$ are not sensitive. They are instead designed to allow $r - 1$ of the component p-values to approach zero without yielding a combined p-value of zero.

Here are some examples of valid and sensitive meta-analysis p-values given valid p-values p_1, \dots, p_k . The combination for a method M is defined in terms of a function $f_{M,k}$ which may incorporate sorting of its arguments.

Example 1. Simes' method:

$$p_{S,k} = f_{S,k}(p_1, \dots, p_k) \equiv \min_{i=1, \dots, k} \left\{ \frac{kp(i)}{i} \right\}.$$

Example 2. Fisher's method:

$$p_{F,k} = f_{F,k}(p_1, \dots, p_k) \equiv \mathbb{P} \left(\chi_{(2k)}^2 \geq -2 \sum_{i=1}^k \log p_i \right).$$

Example 3. Gaussian Likelihood Ratio Test: If $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, I_k)$ and the component tests are $H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0$ versus $H_{1i} : \mu_i \neq 0$ with (two-sided) p-values $p_i = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{(1)}^2 \geq x_i^2)$ then a valid test based on LRT is

$$p_{\text{LRT},k} = f_{\text{LRT},k}(p_1, \dots, p_k) \equiv \mathbb{P} \left(\chi_{(k)}^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{p_i}{2} \right) \right)^2 \right)$$

where Φ is the $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ cumulative distribution function.

Example 4. Weighted Stouffer test: Consider test statistics $T_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{n_i}\theta_i/\sigma_i, 1)$, with sample sizes n_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and known $\sigma_i > 0$. The p-value for the null that $\theta_i = 0$ versus the alternative that $\theta_i > 0$ is $P_i = 1 - \Phi(T_i) = \Phi(-T_i)$. A weighted Stouffer p-value for $H_0^{1/k}$ takes the form

$$p_{\text{WS},k} = p_{\text{WS},k}(p_1, \dots, p_k) \equiv 1 - \Phi \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{n_i} \Phi^{-1}(p_i) / \sigma_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k n_i / \sigma_i}} \right).$$

There are two-sided versions of the weighted Stouffer test as well as weighted versions of Fisher tests. Note that each of the functions f in the previous examples is monotone according to this definition:

Definition 3. The p-value $f(p_1, \dots, p_k)$ is monotone if the function f is non-decreasing in each argument. The set of such monotone p-value functions is denoted \mathcal{F}_{mon} . A monotone test is one that rejects its null hypothesis for small values of a monotone p-value.

A non-monotone test would reject its null hypothesis at some input (p_1, \dots, p_k) but fail to reject at some (p'_1, \dots, p'_k) with all $p'_i \leq p_i$. Such a test is clearly unreasonable.

A valid PC p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$ satisfies

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0^{r/n}} \mathbb{P}_\theta(P_{r/n} \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

Now we restate Theorem 1 of Benjamini and Heller (2008).

Theorem 2.1. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent valid p-values, and for $k = n - r + 1$ let $f_{M,k}(P_1, \dots, P_k)$ be a valid and symmetric meta-analysis p-value where $f_{M,k} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{mon}}$. Then $P_{r/n} = f_{M,k}(P_{(r)}, P_{(r+1)}, \dots, P_{(n)})$ is a valid p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$.*

As mentioned, we call the combined p-value $P_{r/n}$ described in 2.1 a BHPC p-value for short. In practice it makes sense to require that the p-value combination function $f_{M,k}(\cdot)$, for $k = n - r + 1$, be a sensitive one for $H_0^{1/k}$. If instead, $f_{M,k}$ were a conjunction test, then $P_{r/n}$ would also be a conjunction p-value. More generally if $f_{M,k}$ were a partial conjunction test of $H_0^{s/k}$ for $s > 1$, then $P_{r/n}$ in Theorem 2.1 would be better thought of as a test of $H_0^{(r+s-1)/n}$, although it would still be a valid but less efficient test of $H_0^{r/n}$.

3 Admissibility

A hypothesis test of H_0 versus H_1 is described by a function $\varphi(X) \in \{0, 1\}$ of the data X . If $\varphi(X) = 1$ then H_0 is rejected and $\varphi(X) = 0$ otherwise. The test φ is valid at level α if $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathbb{E}_\theta(\varphi(X)) \leq \alpha$. In our context, the data are a vector $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ of p-values and $\varphi(P_1, \dots, P_n) = 1_{f(P_1, \dots, P_n) \leq \alpha}$ where f is a multiple testing p-value function.

The quality of a valid test depends on its performance under H_1 . We use the definition of admissible tests from Lehmann and Romano (2006, Chapter 6.7).

Definition 4 (Ψ, α -admissibility). The level- α test $\varphi \in \Psi$ is α -admissible for testing $H_0 : \theta \in \Theta_0$ against $H_1 : \theta \in \Theta_1$ if for any other level- α test $\varphi' \in \Psi$

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(\varphi') \geq \mathbb{E}_\theta(\varphi), \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta_1$$

implies $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\varphi') = \mathbb{E}_\theta(\varphi)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_1$.

The definition of admissibility depends on the alternatives in Θ_1 as well as the space Ψ of test functions. The constraints on Θ_1 are important. For the ordinary meta-analysis, Birnbaum (1954) shows that every monotone p-value is admissible when the P_i are independent and the null hypothesis is simple, because there is then some alternative at which that p-value gives optimal power. However, those optimizing alternatives may not all be reasonable. Birnbaum (1955) and Stein (1956) (generalized later by Matthes and Truax (1967) to include nuisance parameters) also showed that for the ordinary meta-analysis, when the test statistic distribution is an exponential family with θ as canonical parameter, a necessary and sufficient condition for admissibility is to have a closed convex acceptance region of underlying test statistics (with some other conditions).

For the space of test functions Ψ , traditionally it contains all possible functions when considering admissibility. However, for the partial conjunction null hypothesis, we restrict Ψ to only include tests using monotone p-values to avoid unreasonable more powerful tests (see Section 4 for details).

3.1 Definitions and assumptions

Motivated from the BHPC p-value, we try to find a more general class of combined p-values with good power properties. Each of our results uses some combination of these mild assumptions on p-values.

Assumption 1 (Valid components). P_i is valid by 1 for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Assumption 2 (Strong alternatives). $\forall \alpha > 0$, $\sup_{\theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(P_i \leq \alpha) = 1$.

Assumption 3 (Continuity). For $\forall \theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}$, $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(P_i = 0) = 0$.

Assumption 4 (Completeness). The family $\{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_i} : \theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}\}$ is complete.

Examples of tests satisfying Assumption 2 include testing the parameters of exponential families or location families. Lehmann and Romano (2006, Theorem 4.3.1) show that Assumption 4 is satisfied for testing the natural parameter of a k -dimensional exponential family if the alternative space Θ_{1i} contains a k -dimensional rectangle. Thus, we believe that Assumptions 1 to 4 can cover a large class of problems.

3.2 Monotone α -admissible partial conjunction p-values

The two main theorems of this section show that a slight generalization of the BHPC p-value provides both necessary and sufficient conditions for α -admissibility within monotone tests.

Definition 5 (GBHPC p-value). For each $u \subset 1:n$ with $|u| = k = n - r + 1$ let g_u be a function from $[0, 1]^k$ to $[0, 1]$ such that g_u is non-decreasing and is a valid meta-analysis p-value for H_{0u} . Then

$$f^*(\mathbf{p}) = f^*(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \max_{\substack{u \subset 1:n \\ |u|=n-r+1}} g_u(\mathbf{p}_u) \quad (2)$$

is a generalized BHPC (GBHPC) p-value.

Some meta-analysis methods, such as the weighted Stouffer test in Example 4, treat their component p-values differently depending on the relative sample sizes on which they are based. The GBHPC framework includes such methods.

Theorem 3.1 shows that GBHPC p-values form a complete class of monotone α -admissible p-values for $H_0^{r/n}$. Theorem 3.2 gives conditions under which the GBHPC form is sufficient to make a p-value monotone α -admissible.

Theorem 3.1. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent p-values satisfying Assumptions 1 to 3. Let $P_{r/n}$ be a valid monotone p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$ where $1 \leq r \leq n$. Then there exists a valid GBHPC p-value $P_{r/n}^* \equiv f^*(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ for f^* of the form (2) that is uniformly at least as powerful as $P_{r/n}$.*

Theorem 3.2. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent p-values satisfying Assumptions 1 to 4. For a GBHPC p-value $P_{r/n}^* = f^*(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ of the form (2) if each g_u is sensitive and provides a monotone α -admissible meta-analysis test for H_{0u} , then $P_{r/n}^*$ is a monotone α -admissible p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$.*

We introduce two lemmas before proving 3.1 and 3.2. The first lemma is a generalization of Theorem 1 of Benjamini and Heller (2008).

Lemma 3.3. *Under Assumption 1, any GBHPC p-value is a valid p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$.*

Proof. Consider a GBHPC p-value of the form (2). From the definition of $H_0^{r/n}$, for all $\theta \in \Theta_0^{r/n}$, there exists u with $|u| = n - r + 1$ such that $\theta_j \in \Theta_{0j}$ for all $j \in u$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta(f^*(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) \leq \mathbb{P}_\theta(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) = \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha.$$

Thus $f^*(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ is valid for $H_0^{r/n}$. □

The next lemma shows that given a valid monotone p-value that is not of the GBHPC form, we can expand its rejection region while retaining its validity. This is the critical fact underlying 3.1.

Lemma 3.4. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent p-values satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. Let $f(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ be a valid monotone p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$ and for $u \subset 1:n$ with $|u| = n - r + 1$, define*

$$g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) = \inf_{\mathbf{P}_{-u} \in (0,1]^{r-1}} f(P_1, \dots, P_n) \quad (3)$$

Then g_u is a valid monotone meta-analysis p-value for H_{0u} .

Proof. Monotonicity of f implies monotonicity and measurability of g_u . Next, suppose that g_u is not valid for H_{0u} . Then there is an $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and a θ with $\theta_j \in \Theta_{0j}$ for all $j \in u$ such that $\mathbb{P}_\theta(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) = \mathbb{P}_\theta(\inf_{\mathbf{P}_{-u} \in (0,1]^{r-1}} f(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) > \alpha + \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. From the monotonicity of f , there is some fixed $\tilde{p} \in (0, 1]$ with $\mathbb{P}_\theta(f(\mathbf{P}_u; \mathbf{p}_{-u}) \leq \alpha) > \alpha + \epsilon$ for any $\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in [0, \tilde{p}]^{r-1}$. Using Assumption 2, there also exists θ^* with $\theta_j^* \in \Theta_{1j}$ for $j \in -u$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_j^*}(P_j \leq \tilde{p}) \geq ((\alpha + \epsilon/2)/(\alpha + \epsilon))^{1/(r-1)}$ for $j \in -u$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{(\theta_u; \theta_{-u}^*)}(f(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) \geq \mathbb{P}_{(\theta_u; \theta_{-u}^*)}(f(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha, P_j \leq \tilde{p}, \forall j \in -u) > \alpha + \epsilon/2$$

contradicting the validity of $f(\mathbf{P})$. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Proof of 3.1. Let $g_u(\mathbf{P}_u)$ be defined in (3). Then $P_{r/n} \geq P_{r/n}^*$ when $\mathbf{P} \in (0, 1]^n$. Using Assumption 3, $P_{r/n}^*$ is then uniformly at least as powerful as $P_{r/n}$. It then follows directly from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 that $P_{r/n}^*$ is a valid GBHPC p-value. \square

Using Lemma 3.3, to prove 3.2, we only need to prove the monotone α -admissibility of $P_{r/n}^*$.

Proof of 3.2. To prove the monotone α -admissibility of $f^*(P_1, \dots, P_n)$, suppose that there is a valid monotone test f^{**} satisfying $\mathbb{P}_\theta(f^{**}(P) \leq \alpha) \geq \mathbb{P}_\theta(f^*(P) \leq \alpha)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_1^{r/n}$. By 3.1 we can assume that f^{**} is a GBHPC p-value:

$$f^{**}(\mathbf{P}) = \max_{\substack{u \subset 1:n \\ |u|=n-r+1}} g'_u(\mathbf{P}_u),$$

where g'_u is a valid monotone meta-analysis p-value. We now show that for each $u \subset 1:n$ with $|u| = n - r + 1$, and any $\theta_u \notin \Theta_{0u}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u} \left(\inf_{\mathbf{P}_{-u} \in (0,1]^{r-1}} f^*(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g'_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) \equiv \beta' \quad (4)$$

using a similar strategy as in the proof of 3.4. If (4) does not hold for some set u and a corresponding θ_u , then there exist some $\epsilon > 0$ and $\tilde{p} \in (0, 1]$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(f^*(\mathbf{P}_u; \mathbf{p}_{-u}) \leq \alpha) > \beta' + \epsilon$ for any $\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in (0, \tilde{p}]^{r-1}$. Using Assumption 2, there exists θ^* with $\theta_j^* \in \Theta_{1j}$ for $j \in -u$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_j^*}(P_j \leq \tilde{p}) \geq ((\beta' + \epsilon/2)/(\beta' + \epsilon))^{1/(r-1)}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(\theta_u; \theta_{-u}^*)}(f^*(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{(\theta_u; \theta_{-u}^*)}(f^*(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha, P_j \leq \tilde{p}, \forall j \in -u) > \beta' + \epsilon/2 \\ &> \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g'_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) \geq \mathbb{P}_{(\theta_u; \theta_{-u}^*)}(f^{**}(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

which violates the assumption that f^{**} is uniformly at least as powerful as f^* . Thus, (4) holds. Notice that by definition of f^* and the sensitivity condition, $\inf_{\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in (0, 1]^{r-1}} f^*(\mathbf{P}) = g_u(\mathbf{P}_u)$, thus (4) implies that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g'_u \leq \alpha) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha)$ for any $\theta_u \notin \Theta_{0u}$ and any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. As $g_u(\mathbf{P}_u)$ is α -admissible for H_{0u} , we have $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g'_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) = \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha)$. Further, using Assumption 4 and the independence of P_i , it's easy to show that the P-value distribution family on the alternative of H_{0u} is also complete, thus $g'_u(\mathbf{P}_u) = g_u(\mathbf{P}_u)$ a.e.. Thus, for all $\theta \in \Theta_1^{r/n}$, $\mathbb{P}_\theta(f^{**}(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha) = \mathbb{P}_\theta(f^*(\mathbf{P}) \leq \alpha)$ which shows that f^* is monotone α -admissible for $H_0^{r/n}$. \square

The BHPC p-values are special cases of GBHPC p-values in which g_u is symmetric in the subsets u and by monotonicity only depends on the order statistics of the p-values. We can also show that the BHPC p-values characterize the form of symmetric monotone admissible combined p-values.

Corollary 3.5. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent p-values satisfying Assumptions 1 to 3. Let $P_{r/n}$ be a valid symmetric monotone p-value for $H_0^{r/n}$. Then there exists a BHPC p-value $P_{r/n}^*$ for $H_0^{r/n}$ that is uniformly at least as powerful as $P_{r/n}$.*

Proof. Since $P_{r/n}$ is a valid monotone p-value, using 3.1 we only need to show that the GBHPC p-value $P_{r/n}^*$ constructed in 3.4 is actually a BHPC p-value. As $P_{r/n}$ is symmetric, $g_u \equiv g$ is also symmetric and monotone. Thus, $g(P_{(r)}, \dots, P_{(n)}) = \max_{u \subset [1:n], |u|=n-r+1} g(\mathbf{P}_u) = f^*(\mathbf{P})$ and thus $P_{r/n}^*$ is a BHPC p-value. \square

Combining 3.2 with results of Birnbaum (1955) and Stein (1956) who characterized admissible tests for the global null in exponential families, we can give more specific conditions of monotone admissible GBHPC P-values for exponential families. To simplify the statement, the next corollary illustrates a sufficient condition for admissibility of a partial conjunction test of the means of Gaussian distributions with known covariance. For other distributions in the exponential families, the result will be similar.

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose that independent test statistics $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are available on hypotheses $H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0$, where Σ_i is known. For a GBHPC p-value $f^*(\mathbf{p})$ in the form of (2), suppose that for every subset u , g_u is sensitive, monotone and $\mathbb{P}_0(g_u(\mathbf{P}_u) \leq \alpha) = \alpha$. Also, for $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$ the set of test statistics \mathbf{Y}_u for which $g_u(\mathbf{p}_u) > \alpha$ (the acceptance region) is a closed and convex set, except for a subset of measure 0. Then $f^*(\mathbf{p})$ is monotone α -admissible for $H_0^{r/n}$.*

Proof. First, Assumptions 1 to 4 are satisfied for hypothesis testing of the Gaussian mean. Thus, using 3.2, we just need to prove the α -admissibility of $g_u(P_u)$ under each condition. This is true by directly applying Lehmann and Romano (2006, Theorem 6.7.1) on sufficient conditions of admissibility in exponential families. The original proof of the convexity condition can be found in Stein (1956). \square

Related work on convexity and admissibility appears in Matthes and Truax (1967) for testing parameters of exponential families with presence of nuisance parameters, Marden et al. (1982) and Brown and Marden (1989) for generalization to distribution families beyond exponential families, and Owen (2009) for tests powerful against alternatives with concordant signs. Notice that the n -dimensional set of test statistics \mathbf{Y} itself for which $f^*(\mathbf{p}) > \alpha$ is not convex. For partial conjunctions, the null hypothesis for the parameter usually includes all of the coordinate axes and the smallest convex set containing the axes is all of Euclidean space. As a result convexity of the acceptance region is not appropriate to partial conjunction testing.

4 Inadmissibility

In Section 3.2 we constructed monotone α -admissible p-values for $H_0^{r/n}$. They fail to be admissible if we allow non-monotone tests. For the case $n = r = 2$, the construction of such counter-examples dates back to Lehmann (1952) and Iwasa (1991).

Here we demonstrate that if we don't require monotone tests then a BPHC test can be inadmissible. Let $n = r = 2$. If both P_1 and P_2 are α -admissible, then using 3.1 and 3.2, the constructed combined p-value is just $P_{(2)}$, which is monotone admissible. At a given α , the critical function is $\varphi = \mathbb{1}_{p_{(2)} \leq \alpha}(p_1, p_2)$.

Now we can easily construct a more powerful α -level test, by adding to the original rejection region a square around the top-right corner in the p-value space. Define the set

$$S = \begin{cases} \{(p_1, p_2) \mid p_{(1)} \geq 1 - \alpha\}, & \text{if } \alpha < \frac{1}{2} \\ \{(p_1, p_2) \mid p_{(1)} \geq \alpha\}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$




Figure 1: Rejection regions in the p-value space and the test statistic space for the counter-example of this section, using $\alpha = 0.2$.

Then the test φ' with critical function $\varphi'(\mathbf{P}) = \varphi(\mathbf{P}) + \mathbb{1}_{(P_1, P_2) \in S}$ is uniformly and strictly more powerful than φ . To prove that φ' is an α -level test, we note that $S \cap \{p_{(2)} \leq \alpha\} = \emptyset$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}(\varphi'(\mathbf{P}) \mid P_1 = p_0) \leq \alpha$ holds for any $p_0 \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}(\varphi'(\mathbf{P}) \mid P_2 = p_0) \leq \alpha$. Since p_0 is arbitrary we conclude that φ' is an α -level test.

If the test statistics are $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, 1)$ and $X_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, 1)$, and H_1 and H_2 are two-sided tests for the mean μ_1 and μ_2 respectively, then Figure 1 shows the rejection region of φ' in the p-value space and in the test statistic space. In the test statistics space, the added rejection region is a small square around the origin.

The more powerful test φ' increases power by strangely rejecting $H_0^{2/2}$ when both input p-values are large enough. We now use this same approach to construct counter-examples of admissibility for any n and any $r \in 2:n$. The idea is to show that for any GBHPC test, it's always possible to add a “box”-shaped rejection region like the square around the origin in the right panel of Figure 1 while still keeping the test valid. The point is not to advocate for such tests, but rather to reinforce the idea that admissibility is only a useful concept within a well chosen class of functions.

We need the following mild technical constraint to guarantee that the “box” we have chosen can really increase power at least in one alternative hypothesis.

Assumption 5. For each $i \in 1:n$, there exists $\theta_i^0 \in \Theta_{0i}$ that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_i^0}(P_i \leq \alpha) =$

$\sup_{\theta_i \in \Theta_{\theta_i}} (P_i \leq \alpha)$ for $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$. Let $\theta^0 = (\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \dots, \theta_n^0)$. Then for any set A , if $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(A) > 0$, then there exists $\theta^1 \in \Theta_1^{r/n}$ that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(A) > 0$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let P_1, \dots, P_n be independent p-values satisfying Assumptions 1 to 3 and 5. Let $1 < r \leq n$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then any monotone α -admissible combined p-value for testing $H^{r/n}$ is not α -admissible without the monotonicity constraint.*

Proof. Using 3.1, we only need to consider a GBHPC p-value f^* which is defined in 5. Let $\theta^0 = (\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \dots, \theta_n^0)$ be the parameter in Assumption 5. Define

$$R = \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n : f^*(\mathbf{p}) \leq \alpha\} = \bigcap_{\substack{u \subset 1:n \\ |u|=n-r+1}} R_u$$

where $R_u = \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n : g_u(\mathbf{p}_u) \leq \alpha\}$ and g_u is the same as in (2).

First, as $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(f^* \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha < 1$ and f^* is non-decreasing, there exists some $p_0 < 1$ such that if $p_j \geq p_0$ for all $j \in 1:n$ then $f^*(\mathbf{p}) > \alpha$.

Then, we show that there must exist a set u^* with $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(R_{u^*} \cap R^c) > 0$, where R^c is the complement set of R . If this doesn't hold, then it means that for any $u \subset 1:n$ with $|u| = n - r + 1$, the equation $\mathbb{1}_{f^*(\mathbf{p}) \leq \alpha}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbb{1}_{g_u(\mathbf{p}_u) \leq \alpha}(\mathbf{p})$ a.e. \mathbb{P}_{θ^0} holds. This implies that $\mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha}$ doesn't depend on \mathbf{p}_{-u} except for a zero probability set under \mathbb{P}_{θ^0} . As $\bigcup_{\substack{u \subset 1:n \\ |u|=n-r+1}} -u = 1:n$, we get that $\mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha}$ doesn't depend on any p_j except for a zero probability set under \mathbb{P}_{θ^0} , which implies that $\mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha} \equiv 1$ or 0 a.e. \mathbb{P}_{θ^0} . It's obvious that such a test is either invalid or trivially not admissible, which contradicts our assumptions.

As a consequence, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(f^* \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha - \epsilon$. Notice that $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(f^* \leq \alpha) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta_{-u}^0}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u^0}[f^* \leq \alpha \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u}])$ for any u . Using the fact that f^* is non-decreasing, $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u^0}[f^* \leq \alpha \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u} = \mathbf{p}_{-u}]$ is non-increasing in \mathbf{p}_{-u} . Thus there exists $\tilde{p} < 1$, such that for any u , if $\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in [\tilde{p}, 1]^{r-1}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta_u^0}[f^* \leq \alpha \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u} = \mathbf{p}_{-u}] \leq \alpha - \epsilon.$$

Let $p^* = \max(p_0, \tilde{p}, 1 - \epsilon^{1/(n-r+1)})$ and $S = \bigcap_i \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n : p_i \geq p^*\}$. Then we construct a new test with critical function φ : $\varphi = \mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha} + \mathbb{1}_S$.

As $\{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n : f^*(\mathbf{p}) \leq \alpha\} \cap S = \emptyset$, we know that φ is at least as powerful as $\mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha}$. Using Assumption 5, as $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^0}(S) \geq (1 - p^*)^n > 0$, there exists $\theta^1 \in \Theta_1^{r/n}$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(S) > 0$. Thus, φ strictly dominates $\mathbb{1}_{f^* \leq \alpha}$ at θ^1 . Finally, for $\forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $\forall u \subset 1:n$ with $|u| = n - r + 1$, if $\theta_u \in H^{1/n-r+1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_u}[\varphi \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u} = \mathbf{p}_{-u}] &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u}[f^* \leq \alpha \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u} = \mathbf{p}_{-u}] + \epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in [p^*, 1]^{r-1}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta_u^0}[f^* \leq \alpha \mid \mathbf{P}_{-u} = \mathbf{p}_{-u}] + \epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{p}_{-u} \in [p^*, 1]^{r-1}} \leq \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above follows from Assumption 5, independence of the individual p-values and monotonicity of f^* . Thus φ is still an α -level test for $H^{r/n}$. This shows that f^* is not α -admissible. \square

5 Bayesian analysis

Here we revisit cases C and D in Table 1 and consider a Bayesian alternative to the traditional hypothesis testing. The purpose of this section is to understand the puzzling behavior of BHPC tests we discussed in Section 1.

For Bayesian analysis, we consider $H_0^{r/n}$ and $H_1^{r/n}$ to be two alternative models for $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^n$. We then define prior distributions for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given that $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_j^{r/n}$ for $j = 0, 1$ and calculate the Bayes factor

$$K = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p} \mid \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_1^{r/n})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p} \mid \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_0^{r/n})} = \frac{\int \mathbb{P}_\theta(\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}) \mathbb{P}(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_1^{r/n}) d\theta}{\int \mathbb{P}_\theta(\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}) \mathbb{P}(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega_0^{r/n}) d\theta} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbb{P} refers to the density for a continuous variable. A larger K indicates a stronger evidence for the alternative hypothesis.

Example 5. Assume $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, I_n)$ and that the component tests in Table 1 are $H_{0i} : \theta_i \leq 0$ versus $H_{1i} : \theta_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, 5$. If the p-values are from a likelihood ratio test, then the observed values $\mathbf{X}_C = (21, 21, 21, 1.65, -0.84)$ and $\mathbf{X}_D = (1.66, 1.66, 1.66, 1.66, -0.84)$ correspond to cases C and D in Section 1 respectively.

We have shown that a BHPC p-value would give case D a smaller combined p-value. On the other hand, the Bayes factor's preference depends on prior of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Here we consider two different reasonable priors on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that give opposite preferences

1. Suppose that the prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is $\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_5)$. Then after some calculation, the Bayes factors are

$$K_C = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_C \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \geq 4)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_C \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 < 4)} = 44.87, \quad \text{and} \quad K_D = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_D \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \geq 4)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_D \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 < 4)} = 9.62$$

which shows that case C has much stronger evidence for $H_1^{r/n}$ than case D, matching our intuitive argument in Section 1.

2. Here we consider a prior for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that incorporates an expectation that the effects should be reproducible across experiments. It is a hierarchical prior. At the

first level, $\omega_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(1, 0.5)$. Next, if $\omega_i = 0$ then $\theta_i = -|\theta^0|$ while if $\omega_i = 1$ then $\theta_i = |\theta^1|$, where $\theta^0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\theta^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are independent. This hierarchical structure assumes that the true nulls share a common reproducible mean as do the true alternatives. Under such a prior, the marginal prior of each θ_i is still $\theta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ which is the same as in the previous situation, but now they are dependent. After some calculation we now find that the Bayes factors are

$$K_C = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_C \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \geq 4)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_C \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 < 4)} \approx 10^{-33}, \quad \text{and} \quad K_D = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_D \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 \geq 4)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_D \mid \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_0 < 4)} = 8.35.$$

For this prior, case D has stronger evidence of $H_1^{r/n}$ than case C. This prior is for illustration and is not the only reasonable way to build in an expectation of reproducibility.

The above example shows that the BHPC p-value preferring case D to case C is not without reason. It may arise from a prior belief in reproducibility. Relatedly, the likelihood ratio test statistic for $H_0^{r/n}$ in Example 5 is

$$L = \frac{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Omega_1^{r/n}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Omega_0^{r/n}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_1^{r/n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(x_i \mid \theta_i)}{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0^{r/n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(x_i \mid \theta_i)} \quad (6)$$

will result in a BHPC p-value only based on the two smallest x_i values (the largest two P-values correspondingly). Comparing (6) and (5), the only difference is that a Bayes factor averages over a prior on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ while the likelihood ratio looks at extreme $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ values.

A fuller decision theoretic analysis would additionally specify differing values for rejecting a null depending on the true vector $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Then one could in principal optimize the expected value of the discoveries subject to a constraint on some measure of false discoveries. For example we might well consider reproducible discoveries with many nonzero ω_i to be more valuable than discoveries with just one nonzero component ω_i . Specifying that prior and the differential value function would often be infeasible in applications. The partial conjunction approach is a simple and tractable way to build in a preference for reproducible findings.

6 Conclusion

This paper characterizes the admissible p-values for a partial conjunction test of independent hypotheses, within the class of non-decreasing p-values. Any monotone

admissible p-value for $H^{r/n}$ is the maximum of the non-decreasing p-values for the global null in each combination of $n-r+1$ hypotheses. We have shown that as long as each meta-analysis p-value of the $n-r+1$ hypotheses is sensitive and admissible, the combined p-value is monotone admissible. A consequence is that among combined p-values that only depend on the order statistics of individual p-values, the original BHPC p-values are the only monotone admissible ones. Because the partial conjunction null hypothesis is a special composite hypothesis, we can always construct counter-intuitive p-values which are not non-decreasing but uniformly more powerful than monotone admissible p-values. Those counter-examples of admissibility reject when all p-values are large, and so they are not reasonable choices.

We have emphasized independent p-values. For dependent p-values one can follow (Benjamini and Heller, 2008) and use $p_{r/n} = (n-r+1)p_{(r)}$ in the component tests of a BHPC test. Similarly if the dependence structure is well known, as it could be for Gaussian test statistics with known covariance, then valid combined p-values can be used as the components.

References

- Benjamini, Y. and R. Heller (2008). Screening for partial conjunction hypotheses. *Biometrics* 64(4), 1215–1222.
- Birnbaum, A. (1954). Combining independent tests of significance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 49(267), 559–574.
- Birnbaum, A. (1955). Characterizations of complete classes of tests of some multi-parametric hypotheses, with applications to likelihood ratio tests. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 26(1), 21–36.
- Brown, L. D. and J. I. Marden (1989). Complete class results for hypothesis testing problems with simple null hypotheses. *The Annals of Statistics*, 209–235.
- Friston, K. J., A. P. Holmes, C. J. Price, C. Büchel, and K. J. Worsley (1999). Multisubject fMRI studies and conjunction analyses. *Neuroimage* 10(4), 385–396.
- Friston, K. J., W. D. Penny, and D. E. Glaser (2005). Conjunction revisited. *NeuroImage* 25(3), 661–667.
- Iwasa, M. (1991). Admissibility of unbiased tests for a composite hypothesis with a restricted alternative. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 43(4), 657–665.

- Lehmann, E. L. (1952). Testing multiparameter hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 23(4), 541–552.
- Lehmann, E. L. and J. P. Romano (2006). *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Marden, J. I. et al. (1982). Combining independent noncentral chi squared or f tests. *The Annals of Statistics* 10(1), 266–277.
- Matthes, T. K. and D. R. Truax (1967). Tests of composite hypotheses for the multivariate exponential family. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 38(3), 681–697.
- Owen, A. B. (2009). Karl Pearson’s meta-analysis revisited. *The annals of statistics* 37(6B), 3867–3892.
- Perlman, M. D. and L. Wu (1999). The emperor’s new tests. *Statistical Science* 14(4), 355–369.
- Price, C. J. and K. J. Friston (1997). Cognitive conjunction: A new approach to brain activation experiments. *NeuroImage* 5(4), 261–270.
- Shenhav, L., R. Heller, and Y. Benjamini (2015). Quantifying replicability in systematic reviews: the r-value. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.00088*.
- Stein, C. (1956). The admissibility of Hotelling’s T^2 -test. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 27(3), 616–623.
- Sun, W. and Z. Wei (2011). Multiple testing for pattern identification, with applications to microarray time-course experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(493), 73–88.
- Wang, W., Z. Wei, and W. Sun (2010). Simultaneous set-wise testing under dependence, with applications to genome-wide association studies. *Stat. Interface* 3, 501–511.