

Distribution-Free Detection of Structured Anomalies: Permutation and Rank-Based Scans

Ery Arias-Castro¹, Rui M. Castro², Ervin Tánčozs², and Meng Wang¹

¹University of California, San Diego

²Technische Universiteit Eindhoven

Abstract

The scan statistic is by far the most popular method for anomaly detection, being popular in syndromic surveillance, signal and image processing, and target detection based on sensor networks, among other applications. The use of the scan statistics in such settings yields an hypothesis testing procedure, where the null hypothesis corresponds to the absence of anomalous behavior. If the null distribution is known, then calibration of a scan-based test is relatively easy, as it can be done by Monte-Carlo simulation. When the null distribution is unknown, it is less straightforward. We investigate two procedures. The first one is a calibration by permutation and the other is a rank-based scan test, which is distribution-free and less sensitive to outliers. Furthermore, the rank-scan test requires only a one-time calibration for a given data size making it computationally much more appealing. In both cases, we quantify the performance loss with respect to an oracle scan test that knows the null distribution. We show that using one of these calibration procedures results in only a very small loss of power in the context of a natural exponential family. This includes the classical normal location model, popular in signal processing, and the Poisson model, popular in syndromic surveillance. We perform numerical experiments on simulated data further supporting our theory and also on a real dataset from genomics.

1 Introduction

Signal detection (and localization) is important in a large variety of applications, encompassing any situation where the goal is to discover patterns or detect/locate anomalies. Our focus is on the detection of anomalous behavior which is endowed with some structure. For instance, one might have data consisting of the physical location of a sensor and the corresponding measurement, and would like to determine if there is a spatial region where measurements are unusually high (Balakrishnan and Koutras, 2002). For instance in (Cheung et al., 2013) the scan statistics was used to detect small geographic areas with large suicide rates. Guerriero et al. (2009) used the scan-statistics for target detection using distributed sensors in a two dimensional region.

A standard way to tackle this problem is the use of a scan statistic which essentially inspects all possible anomalous patterns. It usually corresponds to a form of generalized likelihood ratio test (Kulldorff, 1997). Although computationally this might present a challenge, there are a number of situations where this is possible in nearly linear time (Arias-Castro et al., 2005; Neill, 2012; Neill and Moore, 2004; Walther, 2010).

We are interested in ways to calibrate the scan statistic when the null distribution is unknown. For the purpose of illustration, consider the following prototypical example¹: suppose we have event

¹In fact, this setting might have been the original motivation for the work on the scan statistic (Wallenstein, 2009).

data over a certain time period and want to detect if there is a time interval with an unusually high concentration of events. To make things more concrete and move towards the setting we consider in this paper, assume one can model this event data as a realization of a Poisson process and bin the data, so that we observe a sequence of Poisson random variables. The scan statistic in this particular case combines sums of these values over (discrete) intervals of different sizes and location, together with some normalization — see (2) further down. In this scenario we want to perform a hypotheses test, where the null hypothesis is that no anomaly is present (a homogenous Poisson process) versus the alternative where some time intervals have an elevated rate of events (an inhomogenous process). If the (constant) rate is known under the null, then the null distribution is completely specified and the test can be calibrated either analytically or by Monte-Carlo simulation. But what if the null event rate is unknown?

One can regard the scan statistic as a comparison between observations in one interval to those outside the interval. This point of view leads naturally to a two-sample problem for each interval, which is then followed by some form of multiple testing since we scan many intervals. Thus drawing from the classical literature on the two-sample problem, two approaches can be considered:

- *Calibration by permutation.* This amounts to using the permutation distribution of the scan statistic for inference (detection/estimation).
- *Scanning the ranks.* This amounts to replacing each observation with its rank before scanning. As any rank-based method, calibration can be done by Monte-Carlo simulation before the observation of data.

The perspective offered by the two-sample testing framework makes these two procedures very natural. The permutation scan has been suggested in a number of papers and applied in a number of ways in different context. For example, it is suggested in (Huang et al., 2007; Kulldorff et al., 2005, 2009) in the context of syndromic surveillance; in (Walther, 2010) in the context of a sensor network with binary output; and in (Flenner and Hewer, 2011) in the context of detecting a change in a sequence of images.

Surprisingly enough, the method based on ranks appears to be new in the present context.² Although less popular, as in two-sample testing, a procedure based on ranks offers some advantages over a pure calibration by permutation: it is more robust to outliers and its calibration only needs to be done once for a given sample size.³ The latter is rather advantageous if one desires to apply the test repeatedly on several datasets of same size. Compare with a calibration by permutation: typically, several hundred permutations are sampled at random and, for each one of them, the scan statistic is computed — and this is done each time the test is applied.

In this paper we study the performance of both methods and provide strong asymptotic theoretical guarantees as well as insights on their finite-sample performance in some numerical experiments. In the context of a natural exponential family — which includes the classical normal location model and the Poisson example above — we find that the permutation scan test and the rank scan test come very close to performing as well as the oracle scan test, which we define as the scan test calibrated by Monte Carlo with (clairvoyant) knowledge of the null distribution. We perform numerical experiments on simulated data, confirming our theory, and also some experiments using a real dataset from genomics.

²We were recently made aware of a publication (Jung and Cho, 2015) where a rank-based approach is proposed. This article was made public after our paper was posted on the arxiv.org. To the best of our knowledge, this other publication became publicly available on October 20, 2015 (doi:10.1186/s12942-015-0024-6), a couple of months after ours appeared online on August 12, 2015.

³The latter explains why, in two-sample testing, methods based on ranks were feasible decades before methods based on permutations, which typically require access to a computer.

As specified below, we focus on a “static” setting, where the length of the signal being monitored is fixed a priori. Adding time is typically done by adding one ‘dimension’ to the framework, as done for example in (Kulldorff et al., 2005).

1.1 General setting

A typical framework for static anomaly detection — which includes detection in digital signals and images, sensor networks, biological data, and more — may be described in general terms as follows. We observe a set of random variables, denoted $(X_v : v \in \mathcal{V})$, where \mathcal{V} is a finite index set of size N . This is a snapshot of the state of the environment, where each element of \mathcal{V} corresponds to an element of the environment (e.g., these correspond to nodes of a network, pixels in an image, genes, etc.). In this work we take a hypothesis testing point of view. Under the null hypothesis, corresponding to the nominal state when no anomalies are present, these random variables are Independent and Identically Distributed (IID) with some null distribution F_0 . Under the alternative, some of these random variables will have a different distribution. Let $\mathbb{S} \subset 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ denote a class of possibly anomalous subsets, corresponding to the anomalous patterns we expect to encounter. (This would be a class of intervals in the example that we used earlier.) Under the alternative hypothesis there is a subset $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that, for each $v \in \mathcal{S}$, $X_v \sim F_v$, for some distribution $F_v \neq F_0$, and independent of $(X_v : v \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{S})$, which are still IID with distribution F_0 . In a number of important applications, the variables are real-valued and the anomalous variables take larger-than-usual values, which can be formalized by assuming that each F_v stochastically dominates⁴ F_0 . We take this to be the case throughout the paper.

1.2 Exponential models

An important special case of the general framework just described is that of a one-parameter exponential model in natural form. In detail, consider a probability measure ν on the real line with finite second moment. We assume that either ν is continuous (i.e., diffuse) or discrete (i.e., with discrete support). For $\theta \in (0, \theta_*)$, define $f_\theta(x) = \exp(\theta x - \log \varphi_0(\theta))$, where $\varphi_0(\theta) = \int e^{\theta x} \nu(dx)$ and $\theta_* = \sup\{\theta > 0 : \varphi_0(\theta) < \infty\}$, assumed to be strictly positive (and possibly infinite). Note that in this model F_0 coincides with ν (and in particular $f_0 \equiv 1$). In this setting, we replace F_v with F_{θ_v} , where $\theta_v > 0$. Since a natural exponential family has the monotone likelihood ratio property⁵, it follows that (F_θ) is stochastically increasing in θ (Lehmann and Romano, 2005, Lem 3.4.2). In particular, we do have $F_\theta \geq F_0$ for all $\theta > 0$. Important special cases of such an exponential model includes the normal location model — with F_θ corresponding to $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$ — standard in many signal and image processing applications; the Poisson model — with F_θ corresponding to $\text{Pois}(\theta)$ — popular in syndromic surveillance (Kulldorff et al., 2005); and the Bernoulli model (Walther, 2010) with F_θ corresponding to $\text{Ber}(\theta)$.

Note that in the formulation above the alternative hypothesis is composite. Tackling this problem using a generalized likelihood ratio approach is popular in practice (Kulldorff, 1997) and often referred to as the scan test, as it works by scanning over the possible anomalous sets to determine if there is such a set that is able to “explain” the observed data. Assuming the nonzero θ_v ’s are all equal to θ under the alternative, and that all subsets in the class \mathbb{S} have same size, some

⁴For two distribution (functions) on the real line, F and G , we say that G stochastically dominates F if $G(t) \leq F(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote this by $G \geq F$.

⁵A family of densities $(f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta)$, where $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$, has the monotone likelihood ratio property if $f_{\theta'}(x)/f_\theta(x)$ is increasing in x when $\theta' > \theta$.

simplifications lead to considering the test that rejects for large values of the scan statistic

$$\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} X_v . \quad (1)$$

When the subsets in the class \mathbb{S} may have different sizes, a more reasonable approach includes a normalization of the partial sums above, leading to the following variant of the scan statistic

$$\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} (X_v - \mathbb{E}_0(X_v)) . \quad (2)$$

(\mathbb{E}_θ denotes the expectation with respect to F_θ , and for a discrete set \mathcal{S} , $|\mathcal{S}|$ denotes its cardinality.) As argued in (Arias-Castro and Grimmett, 2013), this test is in a certain sense asymptotically equivalent to the generalized likelihood ratio test, but slightly simpler.

1.3 Structured anomalies

Naturally, the intrinsic difficulty of the detection task depends not only on the data distribution, but also on the complexity of the class of anomalous sets. In several cases one can make some structural assumptions on such classes. For instance, grid-like networks are an important special case, arising in applications such as signal and image processing (where the signals are typically regularly sampled) and sensor networks deployed for the monitoring of some geographical area, for example. This situation is considered in great generality and from different perspectives in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011, 2005; Cai and Yuan, 2014; Desolneux et al., 2003; Hall and Jin, 2010; Perone Pacifico et al., 2004; Walther, 2010). Also, the distribution of the corresponding scan statistic (2) and variants has been studied in a number of places (Boutsikas and Koutras, 2006; Jiang, 2002; Kabluchko, 2011; Sharpnack and Arias-Castro, 2014; Siegmund and Venkatraman, 1995). Since the main motivation of our work is to develop methods and theory for the scenario when the null distribution is unknown/unspecified, we focus on the simplest and most emblematic setting, that of detecting an interval in a one-dimensional regularly sampled signal. Generalizations of our results to more complex settings (e.g., rectangles in two or more dimensions, or even blob-like subsets) are possible, and we later explain how this can be done.

1.3.1 Detection of intervals

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ represent a one-dimensional lattice and \mathbb{S} be the class of all discrete intervals of \mathcal{V} , meaning $\mathbb{S} = \{[a, \dots, b] : 1 \leq a \leq b \leq N\}$. If one assumes a normal location model the scan test corresponding to (2) rejects the null for large values of

$$\max_{1 \leq a \leq b \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{b-a+1}} \sum_{v=a}^b X_v . \quad (3)$$

Following the parameterization in (Arias-Castro et al., 2005) one assumes

$$\min_{v \in \mathcal{S}} \theta_v \geq \tau \sqrt{2 \log(N)/|\mathcal{S}|}, \quad \text{with } \tau > 0 \text{ fixed,} \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{S} denotes the anomalous set (this ensures that all intervals are roughly equally difficult to detect). In a minimax setting, it can be shown that the detection boundary is at $\tau = 1$, meaning that, when $\tau < 1$, no test can simultaneously attain arbitrarily small type I and type II error probabilities in the large sample limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, while there is such a test when $\tau > 1$ (meaning such a test has risk tending to 0). In fact, the scan test (3) is one of them. We remark that in this model the short intervals (the most numerous in \mathbb{S}) drive the difficulty of the problem and a refinement is possible. See (Arias-Castro et al., 2011; Walther, 2010) for details.

1.3.2 Detection of other objects

The principles underlying the detection of intervals can be used for the detection of much more general anomaly classes. As shown in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011), similar results apply to a general (nonparametric) class \mathbb{S} of blob-like (‘thick’) sets \mathcal{S} when \mathcal{V} is a grid-like set of arbitrary finite dimension, although the scanning is done over an appropriate approximating net for \mathbb{S} (instead of the entire class \mathbb{S}). Furthermore, these results generalize to one-parameter exponential models, beyond the commonly assumed normal location model, as long as the sets $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ are sufficiently large (poly-logarithmic in N). Other papers that develop theory for different environments include (Addario-Berry et al., 2010; Arias-Castro et al., 2008; Sharpnack and Singh, 2010; Sharpnack et al., 2013; Zhao and Saligrama, 2009). Variants of this detection problem have been suggested, and the applied literature is quite extensive. We refer the reader to (Arias-Castro et al., 2011) and references therein.

In this paper we focus exclusively on the detection of intervals, for the sake of clarity and simplicity, but our techniques and results apply naturally to more general anomaly classes. We also study a scan test restricted to an approximating net, because of the following advantages: the analysis is simpler as it does not require the use of chaining to achieve tight constants; it is applicable in more general settings, in particular, when the class \mathbb{S} is nonparametric; and it is computationally advantageous, giving rise to fast implementations.

1.4 Calibration by permutation

Suppose we are considering a test that rejects the null for large values of a test statistic $T(\mathbf{X})$ where $\mathbf{X} = (X_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$ the observed value of \mathbf{X} . If we were to know the null distribution F_0 , we would return the P-value as $\mathbb{P}_0(T(\mathbf{X}) \geq T(\mathbf{x}))$. In practice, more than knowing the null distribution, what really matters is that we can (efficiently) simulate from it, so that we can estimate this P-value by Monte-Carlo simulation.

Ignoring computational constraints for the moment, a calibration by permutation amounts to computing $T(\mathbf{x}_\pi)$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{V}!$, where $\mathcal{V}!$ denotes the set of all permutations of \mathcal{V} and $\mathbf{x}_\pi = (x_{\pi(v)}, v \in \mathcal{V})$ is the permuted data. We then return the P-value

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|!} |\{\pi \in \mathcal{V}! : T(\mathbf{x}_\pi) \geq T(\mathbf{x})\}|$$

and the rejection decision is based on this value. Let $M = |\{T(\mathbf{x}_\pi) : \pi \in \mathcal{V}!\}|$. If there are no multiplicities, meaning $M = \mathcal{V}!$, it can be shown such tests are exact and that under the null the P-value has a (discrete) uniform distribution on $\{1/M, 2/M, \dots, 1\}$. Otherwise the test will be conservative (Lehmann and Romano, 2005). In practice, the number of permutations is very large (as $|\mathcal{V}!| = |\mathcal{V}|!$) and the P-value is estimated by simulation (by uniform sampling of permutations).

In our setting, T above will be a form of a scan statistic. Assuming T has been chosen, we define the oracle scan test as the scan test calibrated with full knowledge of the null distribution by Monte Carlo simulations. We also define the permutation scan test as the scan test calibrated by permutation as explained above.

Contribution 1: *We characterize the performance of the permutation scan test, concluding that it has as much asymptotic power as the oracle scan test (Theorem 1).*

We note that permutation tests are known to perform this well in classical two-sample testing (Lehmann and Romano, 2005). However, in the context of the scan test, we are only aware of one other paper, that of Walther (2010), that develops theory for the permutation scan test. This is

done in the context of binary data (a Bernoulli model). Our analysis extends the theory to any natural exponential model as described in Section 1.2 (which also includes the binary case). This requires a different set of tools.

1.5 Scanning the ranks

As we explained earlier, when calibrating by permutation, the scan is performed on each permutation of the original dataset. Even though this is done for only a relatively small number of permutations, that number is often chosen in the hundreds, if not thousands, meaning that the procedure requires the computation of that many scans. Even if the computation (in fact, approximation) of the scan statistic is done in linear time, this can be rather time consuming. Furthermore, for a new instantiation of the data the whole procedure must be undertaken anew. The computational burden of doing so may be prohibitive in some practical situations, for instance, when monitoring a sensor network in real-time.

We propose instead a rank-based approach, which avoids the expensive calibration by permutation. The procedure amounts to simply replacing the observations with their ranks⁶ before scanning, so that we end up scanning the ranks instead of the original values. As any other rank-based method, the resulting procedure is distribution-free and therefore only needs to be calibrated once for each data size (which is $N \equiv |\mathcal{V}|$ in our context) even though it is a permutation procedure. Such a procedure is very natural given the classical literature on nonparametric tests (Hettmansperger, 1984), and from the two-sample perspective offered earlier, it is directly inspired by the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Wilcoxon, 1945).

In detail, let R_v denote the rank (in increasing order) of X_v among \mathbf{X} . If there are ties, they can be dealt with in any of the classical ways, for instance, given the average rank. For technical reasons our results are proven under the assumption that ties are broken randomly. If $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a form of scan statistic, we then consider the rank scan, defined as $T(\mathbf{R})$, where $\mathbf{R} = (R_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$. For example, the rank variant of (2) is

$$\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} (R_v - \frac{N+1}{2}),$$

since $\mathbb{E}_0(R_v) = \frac{N+1}{2}$. Assuming T has been chosen, we define the rank scan test as the scan test based on the ranks. Again, the test is calibrated by permutation, since this corresponds to the null distribution once the observations are replaced by their ranks.

Contribution 2: *We establish the performance of the rank scan test, concluding that it has nearly as much asymptotic power as the oracle scan test (Theorem 2 and Proposition 2).*

This result is remarkable in the sense that the scan test can be completely calibrated before any data has been observed, and yet attain essentially the same power as the optimal test with full knowledge of the statistical model. That said, rank tests such as Wilcoxon’s are known to perform this well in classical two-sample testing (Hettmansperger, 1984; Lehmann and Romano, 2005).

Our results allow us to precisely quantify how much (asymptotic) power is lost when using the rank scan test versus the oracle scan test. For example, in the normal means model the rank-scan test requires a signal magnitude 1.023 times larger than the regular scan test to be asymptotically powerful against anomalous sets that are not too small. In fact, in our empirical analysis of the finite sample properties of the rank-scan we actually found it is slightly more powerful than the oracle scan test.

⁶Throughout, the observations are ranked in increasing order of magnitude.

1.6 Content and notation

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we consider the case when the null distribution is known. This section is expository, introducing the reader to the basic proof techniques that are used, for example in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011), to establish the performance of the scan statistic when calibrated with full knowledge of the null distribution — the oracle scan test, as we called it here. To keep the exposition simple, and to avoid repeating the substantially more complex arguments detailed in that paper and others, we focus on the problem of detecting an interval in a one-dimensional lattice. This allows us to set the foundation and discover what the performance bounds for the scan test in this case rely on. In Section 3 we consider the same setting and instead calibrate the scan statistic by permutation. In Section 4 we consider the same setting and instead scan the ranks. In both cases, our analysis relies on concentration inequalities for sums of random variables obtained from sampling without replacement from a finite set of reals, already established in the seminal paper of Hoeffding (1963). In Section 5 we perform some simulations to numerically quantify how much is lost in finite samples when calibrating by permutation or when using ranks. We also compare our methodology with the method of Cai et al. (2012), on simulated data, and also on a real dataset from genomics. Section 6 is a brief discussion. Except for the expository derivations in Section 2, the technical arguments are gathered in Section 7.

2 When the null distribution is known

This section is meant to introduce the reader to the techniques underlying the performance bounds developed in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011, 2005) for the scan statistic (and variants) when the null distribution is known. These provide a stepping stone for our results in regards to permutation and rank scan tests. We detail the setting of detecting an interval of unknown length in a one-dimensional lattice. Therefore, as in Section 1.3, consider the setting where

$$\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ and } \mathbb{S} = \{\{a, \dots, b\} : 1 \leq a \leq b \leq N\} .$$

We begin by considering the normal model — $X_v \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_v, 1)$ are independent — and explain later on how to generalize the arguments to an arbitrary exponential model as described in Section 1.2. We are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \theta_v = 0, \forall v \in \mathcal{V} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \exists \mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{S} \text{ such that (4) holds.} \quad (5)$$

We consider this problem from a minimax perspective. It is shown in (Arias-Castro et al., 2005) that, if $\tau < 1$, then any test with level α has power at most $\beta(\alpha, N)$, with $\beta(\alpha, N) \rightarrow \alpha$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, in the large-sample limit, no test can do better than random guessing, meaning, than the test that rejects with probability α regardless of the data. On the other hand, if $\tau > 1$, then for any level $\alpha > 0$ there exists a test with level α and power $\beta(\alpha, N) \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, such a test can be constructed using a form of scanning.

2.1 Scanning over an approximating net

Instead of considering a test that scans over all elements in \mathbb{S} , as in (3), we describe a variant that consists of scanning an approximating net for the class \mathbb{S} . This brings both computational and analytical advantages over scanning all sets in \mathbb{S} as discussed in Section 1.3. We use the approximating net of (Arias-Castro et al., 2005); see (Sharpnack and Arias-Castro, 2014) for an alternative construction. The underlying metric on \mathbb{S} is given by

$$\delta(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_0(Y_{\mathcal{S}} - Y_{\mathcal{S}'})^2} = \sqrt{2 - 2\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}')} ,$$

where

$$Y_{\mathcal{S}} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} X_v \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') := \frac{|\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}'|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{S}'|}} .$$

Step 1: Construction of an approximating net. Instead of scanning over \mathbb{S} we will scan over a subclass of intervals \mathbb{S}_b , where $0 \leq b \leq N$ is an integer to be specified later on. Such a subclass must satisfy two important properties, namely have cardinality significantly smaller than \mathbb{S} , and be such that any element $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ can be well approximated by an element of \mathbb{S}_b , in terms of the metric δ defined above. To simplify the presentation assume N is a power of 2 (namely $N = 2^q$ for some integer q). We describe the construction given in (Arias-Castro et al., 2005). Let \mathbb{D}_j denote the class of dyadic intervals at scale j , meaning of the form $\mathcal{S} = [1 + k2^j, (k+1)2^j] \subset \mathcal{V}$ with j and k nonnegative integers. Let $\mathbb{D}_{j,0}$ denote the class of intervals of the form $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{D}_j$ or $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \notin \mathbb{D}_{j+1}$ with $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \mathbb{D}_j$. Note that $\mathbb{D}_j \subset \mathbb{D}_{j,0}$. Then for $b \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{D}_{j,b}$ be the class of intervals of \mathcal{V} of the form $\mathcal{S}_{\text{left}} \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\text{right}}$, where $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{D}_{j,b-1}$ while $\mathcal{S}_{\text{left}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_{\text{right}}$) is adjacent to \mathcal{S} on the left (resp. right) and is either empty or in \mathbb{D}_{j-b} . Note that $\mathbb{D}_{j,b-1} \subset \mathbb{D}_{j,b}$ by construction. Finally, define $\mathbb{S}_b = \bigcup_j \mathbb{D}_{j,b}$.

Lemma 1. (Arias-Castro et al., 2005, Lem 2.6) *The subclass $\mathbb{S}_b \subset \mathbb{S}$ has cardinality at most $N4^{b+1}$ and is such that for any element $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ there is an element $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ satisfying $\mathcal{S}^* \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2}$.*

Remark 1. It is easy to see that the subclass \mathbb{S}_b can be scanned in $O(Nb4^b)$ operations — this is implicit in (Arias-Castro et al., 2005). Indeed, we start by observing that scanning all dyadic intervals can be done in $O(N)$ operations by recursion, starting from the smallest intervals and moving up (in scale) to larger intervals. We then conclude by realizing that each interval in \mathbb{S}_b is the union of at most $2b + 2$ dyadic intervals.

Step 2: Definition of the scan test. We consider a test based on scanning only the intervals in \mathbb{S}_b . This test rejects the null if

$$\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}_b} Y_{\mathcal{S}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \log N} , \quad (6)$$

where $\eta > 0$ satisfies $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta \log(N) \rightarrow \infty$. (The reason for these conditions will become clear shortly.)

Step 3: Under the null hypothesis. By the union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_0 \left(\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}_b} Y_{\mathcal{S}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \log N} \right) &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}_b} \mathbb{P}_0 \left(Y_{\mathcal{S}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \log N} \right) \\ &\leq |\mathbb{S}_b| \bar{\Phi} \left(\sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \log N} \right) , \end{aligned}$$

where Φ denotes the standard normal distribution function and $\bar{\Phi} = 1 - \Phi$ denotes the corresponding survival function. We have the well-known bound on Mill's ratio:

$$\bar{\Phi}(x) \leq e^{-x^2/2}, \quad \forall x \geq 0 . \quad (7)$$

Therefore we get

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \left(\max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}_b} Y_{\mathcal{S}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \log N} \right) \leq N4^{b+1} N^{-(1+\eta)} = N^{-\eta} 4^{b+1} .$$

We choose $b = \frac{1}{2} \eta \log(N) / \log(4)$. With our assumption that $\eta \log N \rightarrow \infty$, this makes the last expression tend to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. (It also implies that $b \rightarrow \infty$, which we use later on.) We conclude the test in (6) has level tending to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 4: Under the alternative. We now show that the power of this test tends to 1 when $\tau > 1$. Let \mathcal{S} denote the anomalous interval. Referring to Lemma 1, there is a set $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ such that $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2}$, so that $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) = 1 + o(1)$ since $b \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore $Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}$ is normal with mean $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*)\tau\sqrt{2\log N}$ and variance 1. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{\mathcal{S}^*} \geq \sqrt{2(1+\eta)\log N}\right) = \bar{\Phi}(\xi) ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &:= \sqrt{2(1+\eta)\log N} - \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*)\tau\sqrt{2\log N} \\ &= \sqrt{2(1+\eta)\log N}(1 - (1+o(1))\tau/\sqrt{1+\eta}) \\ &\sim -(\tau-1)\sqrt{2\log N} \rightarrow -\infty , \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\tau > 1$ is fixed and $\eta \rightarrow 0$. We conclude that the test in (6) has power tending to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In conclusion, we have shown the following result.

Proposition 1 (Arias-Castro et al. (2005)). *The test defined in (6), with $\eta = \eta_N \rightarrow 0$, $\eta_N \log N \rightarrow \infty$ and $b = b_N = \frac{1}{2}\eta_N \log N$, has level converging of 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if (4) holds with $\tau > 1$, then it has power converging to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

We remark that, in principle, we may choose any $b = b_N \rightarrow \infty$ such that $b_N/\log N \rightarrow 0$. From Remark 1 the computational complexity of the resulting scan test is of order $O(Nb_N 4^{b_N})$. For example, $b_N \sim \log \log N$ is a valid choice and the resulting scan test runs in $O(N \text{polylog}(N))$ time.

2.2 Generalizations

The arguments just given for the setting of detecting an anomalous interval under a normal location model can be generalized to the problem of detecting other classes of subsets under other kinds of distributional models. We briefly explain how this is done. (Note that these generalizations can be combined.)

Other classes of anomalous subsets For a given detection problem, specified by a set of nodes \mathcal{V} and a class of subsets $\mathbb{S} \subset 2^{\mathcal{V}}$, the arguments above continue to apply if one is able to construct an appropriate approximating net as in Lemma 1. This is done, for example, in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011, 2005) for a wide range of settings. We note that the construction of a net is purely geometrical.

Other exponential models To extend the result to an arbitrary (one-parameter, natural) exponential model, we require the equivalent of the tail-bound (7). While such a bound may not apply to a particular exponential model, it does apply asymptotically to large sums of IID variables from that model by Chernoff's bound and a Taylor development of the rate function.

Indeed, recalling the notation introduced in Section 1.2, let $\psi_0(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} (\lambda t - \log \varphi_0(\lambda))$, which is the rate function of F_0 . By Chernoff's bound, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_0(Y_{\mathcal{S}} \geq y) \leq \exp\left(-|\mathcal{S}|\psi_0(y/|\mathcal{S}|^{-1/2})\right) . \quad (8)$$

Assuming without loss of generality that F_0 has zero mean and unit variance, we have

$$\psi_0(t) \geq \frac{1}{2}t^2 + O(t^3) , \quad t \rightarrow 0 . \quad (9)$$

To see this, note that $\varphi_0(\lambda)$ is infinitely many times differentiable when $\lambda \geq 0$, with $\varphi_0'(0) = \mathbb{E}_0(X) = 0$ and $\varphi_0''(0) = \mathbb{E}_0(X^2) = 1$, by assumption. Therefore, there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, when $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\varphi_0(\lambda) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 - c\lambda^3$. For $t \in [0, 1]$, we then have

$$\psi_0(t) \geq \sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \left[\lambda t - \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 - c\lambda^3\right) \right] \geq t^2 - \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}t^2 - ct^3\right),$$

which yields (9). From this we see that our derivations for the normal model apply essentially verbatim if, for some constant $c > 0$, $|\mathcal{S}| \geq c(\log N)^3$ for all $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$. Furthermore, it can be seen the test in (6) is essentially optimal for exponential models, as its performance matches the lower bounds in (Arias-Castro et al., 2011).

3 Calibration by permutation

Having described in detail how a performance bound is established for the scan test variant (6) for the problem of detecting an interval of unknown length, and its extensions to other detection problems, we now clearly see that the key to adapting this analysis to a calibration by permutation is a concentration of measure bound to replace (7) and (8). Since this is the same in any detection setting, we consider as in Section 2 the problem of detecting an interval of unknown length. This time, we impose a minimum and maximum length on the intervals

$$\mathbb{S} = \left\{ \{a, \dots, b\} : 1 \leq a < b \leq N, 2^{q_l} \leq b - a \leq 2^{q_u} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Indeed, when calibrating the scan test by permutation, we necessarily have to assume nontrivial upper and lower bounds on the size of an anomalous interval. To see this consider intervals of length one. Then the value of the scan for any permutation of the data is the same. By symmetry the same reasoning applies for intervals of length $N - 1$.

We consider essentially the same scan statistic (6) as before, except for the following. We restrict the approximating net to match the class of intervals defined in (10) (but still call it \mathbb{S}_b). Specifically we only keep an element $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ if there is $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2}$. This ensures that the statements in Lemma 1 still hold, and also that $|\mathcal{S}^*| \geq 2^{q_l}/(1 + 2^{-b+1})$ for all $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$. We also do a ‘‘centering’’ of the statistic prior to the scan. In detail, with $\mathbf{x} = (x_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$ denoting the observed data, we define

$$\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}_b} \left(Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}| \bar{x}} \right), \quad Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} x_v, \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} x_v$ is the overall average. The test rejects the null when

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|!} \left| \left\{ \pi \in \mathcal{V}! : \text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x}_\pi) \geq \text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x}) \right\} \right| \leq \alpha, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x})$ is the permutation P-value, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is the desired level.

Recall the definition of θ_* in Section 1.2.

Theorem 1. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and consider the test that rejects the null if $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{X}) \leq \alpha$, where \mathfrak{P} is defined in (12), with $b = b_N \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_N/\log N \rightarrow 0$. Assume that the anomalous set \mathcal{S} belongs to \mathbb{S} defined in (10) with $q_l - 3 \log_2 \log N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $q_u - \log_2 N \rightarrow -\infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then the test has level at most α . Moreover, it has power converging to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ when (4) holds with $\tau > 1$ provided that either ν has compact support or $\max_v \theta_v \leq \bar{\theta} < \theta_*$ for some fixed $\bar{\theta} > 0$.*

The headline here is that a calibration by permutation has as much asymptotic power as a calibration by Monte-Carlo with full knowledge of the null distribution (to first-order accuracy). This is (qualitatively) in line with what is known in classical settings [Lehmann and Romano \(2005\)](#).

The conditions required here allow \mathbb{S} to be any class of intervals of lengths between $(\log N)^{3+a}$ and $o(N)$, for any $a > 0$ fixed. This includes the most interesting cases of intervals not too short and also not too long. In fact, for certain families of distributions removing from consideration very small intervals is essential and cannot be avoided. For instance consider the Bernoulli model, where $X_v \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1/2)$, for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ under the null and $X_v \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1)$, for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$ when \mathcal{S} is anomalous. Even under the null we will encounter a run of ones of length $\sim \log_2 N$ (the famous Erdős–Rényi Law) with positive probability. Therefore in this case the scan test, calibrated by Monte-Carlo or permutation, is powerless for detection of intervals of length $\frac{1}{2} \log_2 N$. In fact, it can be shown that no test has any power in that case.

We place an upper bound on the nonzero θ_v 's to streamline the proof arguments and also avoid special cases we were not able to rule out. For example, an open question is whether the power of this permutation test is monotone increasing in each of the θ_v when $v \in \mathcal{S}$ and \mathcal{S} is the anomalous set. If this is true, then obviously the upper bound (by $\bar{\theta}$) can be removed. We note that when ν does not have compact support, this can be enforced by applying a censoring. See Section 6.

4 Scanning the ranks

Having observed $\mathbf{x} = (x_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$, scanning the ranks amounts to replacing every observation with its rank among all the observations, and computing the scan (11). We call this the *rank scan*. As for all rank-based methods, the null distribution is the permutation distribution when there are no ties.

- When there are no ties with probability one we calibrate the test by permutation, and this can be done before data is observed.
- When there are ties the rank scan test is also calibrated by permutation. If one breaks ties using the average rank then the calibration must be done every time as for the permutation test. A much better alternative is to break ties randomly, so that the test can be calibrated by permutation only once (before seeing the data). The latter option is computationally superior and is the one we analyze.

See Section 5 for implementation issues and a computational complexity analysis.

Formally, let $\mathbf{x} = (x_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$ denote the observations as before, and for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$, let r_v be the rank (in increasing order) of x_v in \mathbf{x} , where ties are broken randomly, and let $\mathbf{r} = (r_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$ be the vector of ranks. The rank scan test returns the P-value $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{r})$ defined in (12).

As we mentioned in the Introduction, an important advantage of the rank scan over the permutation scan is the fact that the former only requires calibration once, while the latter requires a new calibration with each dataset. This assumes that the size $|\mathcal{V}|$ of the node set remains the same. An additional advantage of the rank scan is its robustness to outliers — although the permutation scan after censoring (discussed in Section 6) is also robust to outliers.

Because the rank scan test is a special case of the permutation scan test, we assume similarly upper and lower bounds on the size of the anomalous set as in Section 3. Define

$$\Upsilon_0 = \mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X > Y\}}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X = Y\}}], \quad (13)$$

where $X, Y \sim F_0$ and independent.

Theorem 2. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and consider the test that rejects the null if $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \alpha$, where \mathfrak{P} is defined in (12), with $b = b_N \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_N/\log N \rightarrow 0$. Assume that the anomalous set \mathcal{S} belongs to \mathbb{S} defined in (10) with $q_l - \log_2 \log N \rightarrow +\infty$ and that $q_u - \log_2 N \rightarrow -\infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then the test has level at most α . Moreover, it has power converging to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ when when (4) holds with $\tau > \tau_0 := 1/(2\sqrt{3}\Upsilon_0)$.*

The headline here is that rank scan requires a signal amplitude which is τ_0 larger than what is required of the regular scan test calibrated by Monte-Carlo with full knowledge of the null distribution. This is (qualitatively) in line with similar results in more classical settings (Hettmansperger, 1984). For the normal location model, we find that $\tau_0 \leq \sqrt{\pi/3} \approx 1.023$, so the detection threshold of rank scan is almost the same as that of the regular scan test. See the Appendix 7.4.2 for details.

Smaller intervals

The conditions of Theorem 2 allow for dealing with intervals of length of order (strictly) larger than $\log N$. We give here results that encompass the scenario where the interval might be of smaller length. To keep the discussion simple we consider the class of intervals of a fixed size $|\mathcal{S}| = k$ under the alternative. In this situation there is no need to consider an approximating net and we simply scan over the entire class, denoted by \mathbb{S} . Define

$$p_\theta = \mathbb{P}(Y > X) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(Y = X), \quad \text{where } X \sim F_0 \text{ and } Y \sim F_\theta \text{ are independent.} \quad (14)$$

Recall the definition of the P-value of the permutation test (12). We can state the following result.

Proposition 2. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and consider the test that rejects the null if $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \alpha$. Then, in the present context, the test has level at most α and power converging to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ provided $p_{\theta_v} \geq p_{\theta_\dagger}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$ with*

- (i) $p_{\theta_\dagger} = 1 - o(N^{-2/k})$ when $2 < k = o(\log N)$; or
- (ii) $p_{\theta_\dagger} > 1 - \exp(-\frac{c+1}{c})/2$ when $k = c \log N$ for some $c > 0$ fixed.

Theorem 2 and Proposition 2 together cover essentially all interval sizes which are $o(N)$. Theorem 2 covers the case of larger intervals, in which case p_{θ_\dagger} can go to $1/2$ provided it does not converge too fast, and the test is still powerful asymptotically. In Proposition 2, a sufficient condition for an asymptotically powerful test is that p_{θ_\dagger} goes to 1 at a certain rate when the size of the anomalous interval is $o(\log N)$. If the interval size is $c \log N$ with $c > 0$ arbitrary the rank test is asymptotically powerful when p_{θ_\dagger} is greater than a constant (strictly larger than $1/2$) depending on c .

Unlike in Theorem 2, the statement of Proposition 2 is in terms of p_θ , and not θ itself. This is due to the fact that, for small intervals, the signal magnitude must necessarily be large, implying that θ is bounded away from zero. In such situations, one can only relate p_θ and θ with further knowledge about the family of distributions.

As an example, consider the normal means model when $k = o(\log N)$. In this case, we have

$$p_\theta = \Phi(-\theta/\sqrt{2}) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\theta^2/4},$$

where $\Phi(x)$ is the CDF of the standard normal distribution. Hence, whenever $\frac{1}{2} e^{-\theta_\dagger^2/4} = o(N^{-2/k})$, the condition in the proposition is met. This is satisfied when

$$\theta_\dagger = \tau \sqrt{2 \log(N)/k}, \quad \text{with } \tau > 2 \text{ fixed.} \quad (15)$$

This means that in this case the rank scan requires an amplitude at most two times larger than the regular scan test calibrated with full knowledge of the null distribution.

Finally note that the condition $p_{\theta_v} \rightarrow 1$ or $p_{\theta_v} > 1 - p_c$ might not be possible to meet for certain distributions of the exponential family. Recall the example of Bernoulli random variables discussed Section 3. In this setup $p_{\theta_v} = 3/4$, a case not covered by Proposition 2 when the interval size is smaller than $c \log N$ and c is small enough. But this is expected since no test has any power if c is sufficiently small.

Remark 2. We considered the case when the size of the anomalous interval is known. However, we could consider the class of intervals of length greater than 2 and at most \bar{k} for some given $\bar{k} = O(\log N)$. In this case we would simply scan the ranks for every fixed interval size up to \bar{k} and apply a Bonferroni correction to the P-values. Following through the steps, one can see that the rank scan test would be asymptotically powerful when

$$(i') \quad p_{\theta_{\bar{k}}} = 1 - o(N \log N)^{-2/\bar{k}} \text{ when } 2 < \bar{k} = o(\log N);$$

or when (ii) above holds. (This time k is the size of the anomalous set under the alternative.) For the normal location model and considering $\bar{k} = o(\log N)$, we can see that this is satisfied when (15) holds.

5 Numerical experiments

5.1 Computational complexity

We already cited some works where fast (typically approximate) algorithms for scanning various classes of subsets are proposed (Arias-Castro et al., 2005; Neill, 2012; Neill and Moore, 2004; Walther, 2010). For example, as we saw in Lemma 1, Arias-Castro et al. (2005) design an approximating net \mathbb{S}_b for the class of all intervals \mathbb{S} that can be scanned in $O(Nb4^b)$ operations and provides an approximation in δ -metric of order $O(2^{-b/2})$. Furthermore, we saw in Proposition 1 that this procedure achieves the optimal asymptotic power as long as $b = b_N \rightarrow \infty$. For example, if $b_N \asymp \log \log N$, then the computational complexity is of order $(N \text{polylog}(N))$.

In any case, suppose that a scanning algorithm has been chosen and let \mathcal{C}_N denote its computational complexity. The oracle scan test and the rank scan test are then comparable, in that they estimate the null distribution of their respective test statistic by simulation, and this is done only once for each data size N . With this preprocessing already done, the computational complexity of these two procedures is \mathcal{C}_N , the cost of a single scan when applied to data of size N . In contrast, the permutation scan test is much more demanding, in that it requires scanning each of the permuted datasets, and this is done every time the test is applied. Assuming B permutations are sampled at random for calibration purposes, the computational complexity is $B\mathcal{C}_N$, that is, B times that of the oracle or rank variants (not accounting for preprocessing). B is typically chosen in the hundreds ($B = 200$ in our experiments), if not thousands, so the computational burden can be much higher for the permutation test.

5.2 Simulations

We present the results of some basic numerical experiments that we performed to corroborate our theoretical findings in finite samples. We generated the data from the normal location model — where $F_\theta = \mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$ — which is arguably the most emblematic one-parameter exponential family and a popular model in signal and image processing. We used the regular scan test, calibrated with full knowledge of the null distribution, as a benchmark. The permutation scan test and rank scan test were calibrated by permutation.

The test statistic that we use in our experiments is the scan over all intervals of dyadic length. This subclass of intervals is morally similar to \mathbb{S}_0 (corresponding to $b = 0$) but somewhat richer. This choice allows us to both streamline the implementation and make the computations very fast via one application of the Fast Fourier Transform per dyadic length. In detail, letting \mathbb{S} denote the class of all discrete intervals in \mathcal{V} , this amounts to taking as approximating set

$$\mathbb{S}_{\text{dyad}} = \left\{ \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S} : |\mathcal{S}| = 2^j \text{ for some } j \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

As explained earlier, the calibration by permutation and the rank-based approach are valid no matter what subclass of intervals is chosen, and in fact, the same mathematical results apply as long as the subclass is an appropriate approximating net. We encourage the reader to experiment with his/her favorite scanning implementation.

It is easy to see that, for each $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}$, there is $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_{\text{dyad}}$ with $\mathcal{S}^* \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $|\mathcal{S}^*| > |\mathcal{S}|/2$. Hence,

$$\min_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}} \max_{\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_{\text{dyad}}} \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq 1/\sqrt{2}.$$

A priori, this implies that scanning over \mathbb{S}_{dyad} requires an amplitude $\sqrt{2}$ larger to achieve the same (asymptotic) performance as scanning over \mathbb{S} or a finer approximating set as considered previously. To simplify things, however, in our simulations we took an anomalous interval of dyadic length, so that the detection threshold is in fact the same as before.

We set $N = 2^{15}$ and tried two different lengths for the anomalous interval $|\mathcal{S}| \in \{2^7, 2^{10}\}$. All the nonzero θ'_v s were taken to be equal to

$$\theta_{\mathcal{S}} = t\sqrt{2\log N}/\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|} \tag{16}$$

with t varying. The critical values and power are based on 1000 repeats in each case. A level of significance of 0.05 was used. Also, 200 permutations were used for the permutation scan test. The results are presented in Figure 5.2. At least in these small numerical experiments, the three tests behave comparably, with the rank scan slightly dominating the others. Although the last finding is somewhat surprising, this is a finite-sample effect and is localized in the intermediate power range (around a power of 0.5) and so does not contradict the theory developed earlier. In fact, the three tests achieve power 1 at roughly the same signal amplitude, confirming the theory.

5.3 Comparison with RSI

Next, we compare our rank scan with the robust segment identifier (RSI) of [Cai et al. \(2012\)](#). This is a recent method based taking the median over bins of a certain size (a tuning parameter of the method) and then scanning over intervals. Because the median is asymptotically normal, it allows for a calibration that only requires the value of the null density at 0. In turn, one can try to estimate this parameter. Although the method is not distribution-free proper, it appears to be the main contender in the literature. We first compare the two methods on simulated data, for in the context of detection (the problem we considered so far) and in the context of identification (a problem considered in that paper).

Detection In the problem of detection, we compare the performance of the rank scan test and RSI with bin size $m \in \{10, 20\}$ in normal data. To turn RSI into a test, we reject if it detects any anomalous interval. In the simulation, we set sample size $N = 50,000$ and considered the case where there is only one signal interval with known length $|\mathcal{S}| \in \{100, 1000\}$. The amplitude satisfy (16) as before. We report the empirical power curves (based on 100 repeats) in Figure 2.




Figure 1: Power curves (with 95% margin of error) for the three tests (all set at level 0.05) as a function of the parameter t in (16): the scan test calibrated with knowledge of the null distribution (black); the permutation scan test (blue); and the rank scan test (red). On the left are the results for $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^7$ and on the right for $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^{10}$. $N = 2^{15}$ in both cases. Each situation was repeated 1,000 times and each time 200 permutations were drawn for calibration. The vertical black dashed line is the minimax boundary for t . The horizontal black dashed line is the significance level 0.05.




Figure 2: Power curves (with 95% margin of error) for the three tests as a function of the parameter t in (16): the rank scan test (red); RSI with bin size 10 (solid green); and RSI with bin size 20 (dashed green). The rank scan test is set at level 0.05 and its critical value is from 1000 repeats. On the left are the results for $|\mathcal{S}| = 100$ and on the right for $|\mathcal{S}| = 1000$. $N = 50,000$ in both cases. Each situation was repeated 100 times. The vertical black dashed line is the minimax threshold for t . The horizontal black dashed line is the significance level 0.05.

To be fair, both methods only scan candidate signal intervals of length $|\mathcal{S}|$. The rank scan is calibrated as before. For RSI, we set the threshold to $\sqrt{2 \log N}$ for the normalized data after

localization to better control the family-wise type I error as explained in (Cai et al., 2012). From Figure 2, we can see that RSI is a bit more conservative. In fact, a drawback of RSI is the difficulty to calibrate it correctly.⁷ In any case, the rank scan test outperforms RSI in these simulations.

Identification In the problem of identification, we compare the rank scan and RSI. Although we focused on the problem of detection so far, a scan can be as easily used for testing as for estimation (i.e., identification). Indeed, one sets an identification threshold and extract all the intervals that exceed that threshold. Some post-processing — such as merging significant intervals that intersect or keeping the most significant among significant intervals that intersect — is often applied.

Here, in an effort to be fair, we simply took the procedure of (Cai et al., 2012) — which is essentially the procedure of (Jeng et al., 2010) — but scanning ranks and calibrating as we did for testing. Note that this implies a very stringent false identification rate. (At the 0.05 testing level, this means that the chances that one or more intervals are identified by mistake is 0.05.)

Following (Cai et al., 2012), in the simulation, we set the sample size to $N = 10^4$. We consider a range of null distributions: the standard normal distribution, the t -distribution with 15 degrees of freedom and that with one degree of freedom. In each case, we set the signal mean to $\theta_S \in \{1, 1.5, 2\}$. There are three signal intervals, $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$, starting at positions 1000, 2000, 3000, and having lengths $2^4, 2^5, 2^6$, respectively. We set the threshold for the rank scan test by simulation at a significance level of 0.05. For RSI, we tried several bin sizes, $m \in \{2^3, 2^5\}$. To simplify the computation, both methods only scan dyadic intervals of length at most 2^6 . As in (Cai et al., 2012), we compare their performance in terms of the following dissimilarities

$$D_j = \min_{\hat{\mathcal{S}} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}} \{1 - \rho(S_j, \hat{\mathcal{S}})\},$$

and the number of false positives, namely

$$O = \{\hat{\mathcal{S}} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}} : \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset, \forall \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}\},$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ are the estimated signal intervals.

We report the average and standard deviation (in the parenthesis in the tables below) based on 200 repeats in Tables 1, 2, and 3. We can see that the rank scan method performs better than RSI in when the null distribution is normal and $t(15)$, and it performs similarly to RSI with bin size $m = 2^3$ in $t(1)$. However, when the bin size of RSI is not properly chosen, RSI can perform poorly.

5.4 Application to the real data

In this section, we apply the methods to the problem of detecting the copy number variant (CNV) in the context of next generation sequencing data. We compare the rank scan method and RSI on the task of identifying short reads on chromosome 19 of a HapMap Yoruban female sample (NA19240) from the 1000 genomes project (<http://www.1000genomes.org>), which is the same data set used in (Cai et al., 2012). Following standard protocols (Ernst et al., 2011), we extend all the reads to 100 base pairs (BPs). We take 10^6 reads from the whole data set for comparison purposes resulting in 1,281,502 genomic locations.

We tune RSI as done in (Cai et al., 2012), setting the bin size to $m = 400$ and the maximum BPs in a possible CNV to $L = 2^{16}$. Note that (Cai et al., 2012) took $L = 60,000$, which is a bit

⁷Of course, it could be calibrated by permutation, but this would make the procedure much more like the permutation scan test (with the same high-computational burden), somewhat far from the intentions of (Cai et al., 2012).

Table 1: Dissimilarity and number of over-selected intervals in $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$

$\theta_{\mathcal{S}}$	Method	$D_1(\mathcal{S}_1 = 2^4)$	$D_2(\mathcal{S}_2 = 2^5)$	$D_3(\mathcal{S}_3 = 2^6)$	$\#O$
1	Rank Scan	0.734 (0.421)	0.148 (0.284)	0.031 (0.049)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.916 (0.235)	0.420 (0.406)	0.095 (0.091)	0.065 (0.267)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.998 (0.029)	0.959 (0.144)	0.326 (0.278)	0.130 (0.337)
1.5	Rank Scan	0.167 (0.326)	0.019 (0.044)	0.008 (0.012)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.593 (0.391)	0.132 (0.033)	0.069 (0.029)	0.080 (0.272)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.980 (0.087)	0.729 (0.284)	0.204 (0.044)	0.025 (0.157)
2	Rank Scan	0.018 (0.051)	0.006 (0.024)	0.004 (0.008)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.277 (0.226)	0.128 (0.021)	0.064 (0.013)	0.065 (0.247)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.960 (0.122)	0.476 (0.162)	0.193 (0.032)	0.010 (0.100)

Table 2: Dissimilarity and number of over-selected intervals in $t(15)$

$\theta_{\mathcal{S}}$	Method	$D_1(\mathcal{S}_1 = 2^4)$	$D_2(\mathcal{S}_2 = 2^5)$	$D_3(\mathcal{S}_3 = 2^6)$	$\#O$
1	Rank Scan	0.806 (0.369)	0.223 (0.354)	0.029 (0.048)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.926 (0.223)	0.436 (0.406)	0.106 (0.099)	0.050 (0.218)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.996 (0.041)	0.944 (0.168)	0.336 (0.278)	0.125 (0.332)
1.5	Rank Scan	0.232 (0.378)	0.026 (0.079)	0.010 (0.017)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.554 (0.391)	0.143 (0.112)	0.069 (0.031)	0.075 (0.282)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.992 (0.057)	0.732 (0.286)	0.199 (0.042)	0.020 (0.140)
2	Rank Scan	0.034 (0.097)	0.009 (0.019)	0.005 (0.014)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.277 (0.220)	0.128 (0.022)	0.063 (0.013)	0.060 (0.238)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.968 (0.107)	0.521 (0.214)	0.192 (0.030)	0.010 (0.100)

smaller than 2^{16} . (We chose the latter because we only scan intervals of dyadic length.) To save computational time, in the implementation of the rank scan we group read depths in every 200 positions and take the summation of the read depths for each bin and use that as input (meaning, we rank the sums and scan the ranks). We get the critical value for the rank scan method under the significance level 0.05 from 1000 repeats. In the experiment, we let RSI and the rank scan method only scan dyadic intervals of lengths from 2^1 to 2^{16} .

After merging the contiguous selected segments, RSI found 30 possible CNVs and the rank scan method selected 34. Figure 3 shows the histograms of the read depths of the selected CNVs. We can see the read depth in the rank scan method is generally larger than that in RSI.

Table 3: Dissimilarity and number of over-selected intervals in $t(1)$

θ_S	Method	$D_1(\mathcal{S}_1 = 2^4)$	$D_2(\mathcal{S}_2 = 2^5)$	$D_3(\mathcal{S}_3 = 2^6)$	$\#O$
1	Rank Scan	0.989 (0.082)	0.878 (0.305)	0.461 (0.448)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.950 (0.186)	0.764 (0.370)	0.332 (0.358)	4.305 (5.653)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.998 (0.022)	0.982 (0.098)	0.609 (0.392)	0.520 (0.501)
1.5	Rank Scan	0.922 (0.251)	0.542 (0.455)	0.067 (0.132)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.843 (0.307)	0.342 (0.354)	0.104 (0.080)	3.920 (2.082)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.983 (0.079)	0.877 (0.236)	0.225 (0.111)	0.055 (0.229)
2	Rank Scan	0.763 (0.410)	0.206 (0.333)	0.043 (0.093)	0.000 (0.000)
	RSI($m = 2^3$)	0.619 (0.382)	0.154 (0.121)	0.089 (0.063)	3.945 (2.385)
	RSI($m = 2^5$)	0.978 (0.090)	0.667 (0.280)	0.208 (0.05)	0.060 (0.238)




Figure 3: Histogram of the read depths of the selected CNVs in log scale (base 10). Both methods only scan dyadic intervals of lengths from 2^1 to 2^{16} . The RSI used a bin size $m = 400$, while the rank scan was calibrated as for testing.

6 Discussion

In this paper we consider a prototypical structured detection setting with the particularity that the null distribution is unknown. When the null distribution is known, various works have shown that a form of scan test achieves the best possible asymptotic power. When the null distribution is unknown, one can alternatively calibrate the scan test by permutation. This has been suggested a number of times in the detection literature. Theorem 1 implies doing this results in no loss of asymptotic power compared to a calibration by Monte Carlo with full knowledge of the null distribution. To circumvent the expense of calibrating by permutation, we propose to scan the ranks. Theorem 2 implies that this results in very little loss in asymptotic power. In our empirical experiments all three methods perform comparably.

Censoring before permutation. When ν is not of compact support, we can enforce it by applying a censoring of the form $\tilde{X}_v = X_v \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_v| \leq t\}} + t \text{sign}(X_v) \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_v| > t\}}$. With a choice of threshold $t = t_N \rightarrow \infty$ slowly (e.g., $t_N = \log \log N$), Theorem 1 applies unchanged and without an upper bound on the θ'_v s, and the proof is identical except for very minor modifications. This censoring has the added advantage of making the method more robust to possible outliers.

Other scoring functions. Although rank-sums are intuitive and classically used, any scan based on $h(r_v)$, where h is increasing, is valid. (Recall that r_v is the rank of x_v in the sample.) In two-sample testing, it is known that there is no uniformly better choice of function h . See (Lehmann and Romano, 2005, Sec 6.9) where it is shown that choosing $h(r) = \mathbb{E}(Z_{(r)})$ — where $Z_{(1)} < \dots < Z_{(N)}$ are the order statistics of a standard normal sample — is (in some sense) optimal in the normal location model. Our method of proof applies to a general h .

Unstructured subsets. No permutation approach (including a rank-based approach) has any power for detecting unstructured anomalies. A prototypical example is when \mathbb{S} is the class of all subsets, or all subsets of given size, the latter including the class of singletons.

7 Proofs

7.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Suppose we are under the null hypothesis. Note that $\mathbf{X} = (X_v, v \in \mathcal{V})$ are IID under the null, and therefore exchangeable. This means that, for any permutation π the marginal distributions of $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X}_\pi)$ are the same. This implies that $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X})$ is uniformly distributed on the set $\{\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X}_\pi), \pi \in \mathcal{V}!\}$ (with multiplicities). With this we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\{\pi \in \mathcal{V}! : \text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X}_\pi) \geq \text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X})\}| \geq \alpha \mathcal{V}!) \leq \frac{\lfloor \alpha |\mathcal{V}! \rfloor}{|\mathcal{V}!|} \leq \alpha,$$

where $\lfloor z \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of z . If there were no ties, the first inequality above would be an equality, but with ties present the test becomes more conservative. For more details on permutation tests the reader is referred to (Lehmann and Romano, 2005).

All that remains to be done is to study the permutation test under the alternative hypothesis. This requires two main steps. First we need to control the randomness in the permutation, conditionally on the observations \mathbf{x} . Once this is done we remove the conditioning on the observed data.

The key to the first step is the following Bernstein's inequality for sums of variables sampled without replacement from a finite population.

Lemma 2 (Bernstein's inequality for sampling without replacement). *Let (Z_1, \dots, Z_m) be obtained by sampling without replacement from a given a set of real numbers $\{z_1, \dots, z_J\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Define $z_{\max} = \max_j z_j$, $\bar{z} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_j z_j$, and $\sigma_z^2 = \frac{1}{J} \sum_j (z_j - \bar{z})^2$. Then the sample mean $\bar{Z} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i Z_i$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{Z} \geq \bar{z} + t) \leq \exp \left[- \frac{mt^2}{2\sigma_z^2 + \frac{2}{3}(z_{\max} - \bar{z})t} \right], \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

This result is a consequence of (Hoeffding, 1963, Th. 4) and Chernoff's bound, from which Bernstein's inequality is derived, as in⁸ (Shorack and Wellner, 1986, p 851). See (Bardenet and

⁸There is a typo in the statement of the result in (Shorack and Wellner, 1986, p 851), but following the proof one can find the correct result. Where the statement of the result reads $-\frac{\lambda}{2\sigma^2}$ we should have $-\frac{\lambda^2}{2\sigma^2}$ instead

Maillard, 2013; Boucheron et al., 2013; Dembo and Zeitouni, 2010) for a discussion of the literature on concentration inequalities for sums of random variables sampled without replacement from a finite set.

Applying this result for a fixed (but arbitrary) set $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ when π is uniformly drawn from \mathcal{V} ! and \mathbf{x} is given, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{x}_\pi) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|}\bar{x} \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left[-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_x^2 + \frac{2}{3}(x_{\max} - \bar{x})t/\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|}}\right], \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

using the same notation as in Lemma 2. Plugging in $t = \text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x})$, noting that $|\mathcal{S}^*| \geq 2^{q_l}/(1+2^{-b+1}) \geq 2^{q_l}/2$ eventually (because $b \rightarrow \infty$), and using this together with a union bound, we get

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) \leq |\mathbb{S}_b| \exp\left[-\frac{\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x})^2}{2\sigma_x^2 + (x_{\max} - \bar{x})2^{-q_l/2}\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{x})}\right]. \quad (17)$$

(The $\frac{2}{3}$ in the denominator, when multiplied by $\sqrt{2}$, from $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2^{q_l}/2$, is still less than 1.)

Now we proceed by upper bounding the right-hand side of the above inequality by assuming we are under the alternative, which yields an upper bound for the P-value $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{X})$. This amounts to controlling the terms $X_{\max} - \bar{X}$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^2$ and $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X})$ under the alternative (upper-case X relates to the random quantities.)

Assume that, without loss of generality, f_0 has zero mean and unit variance. Let \mathcal{S} denote the anomalous interval under the alternative and assume that $\theta_{\dagger} \leq \theta_v \leq \bar{\theta}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$ with

$$\theta_{\dagger} := \tau\sqrt{2\log(N)/|\mathcal{S}|}. \quad (18)$$

Note that, by the assumption on q_l , we have $\theta_{\dagger} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To simplify the presentation let $\varepsilon = (\tau - 1)^2$, so that $\tau = \sqrt{1 + \varepsilon}$.

We begin by controlling $X_{\max} - \bar{X}$. For notational convenience define $\zeta_\theta = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X)$ and $\sigma_\theta^2 = \text{Var}_\theta(X)$ for all $\theta \geq 0$. Note that ζ_θ is increasing in θ and σ_θ is continuous in θ , and in particular bounded on $[0, \bar{\theta}]$. Let $\bar{X}_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} X_v$ denote the sample mean over \mathcal{S} . We have

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_v \zeta_{\theta_v} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_v (X_v - \mathbb{E}(X_v)) = O(|\mathcal{S}|/N) + o_P(1) = o_P(1),$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, since $|\mathcal{S}| = o(N)$, using Chebyshev's inequality in the second equality. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{X}_{\max, \mathcal{S}} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{S}} X_v$ be the maximum over \mathcal{S} . We have $X_{\max} = \mathbf{X}_{\max, \mathcal{S}} \vee \mathbf{X}_{\max, \mathcal{S}^c}$, which by the union bound implies

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{\max} > x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{\max, \mathcal{S}} > x) + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{\max, \mathcal{S}^c} > x) \leq |\mathcal{S}| \bar{F}_{\bar{\theta}}(x) + |\mathcal{S}^c| \bar{F}_0(x),$$

where $\bar{F}_\theta(x) = \mathbb{P}_\theta(X > x)$ and we used the fact that $\bar{F}_\theta(x)$ is monotone increasing in θ — see Section 1.2. For $c \in (0, \theta_* - \bar{\theta})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_{\bar{\theta}}(x) &= \int_x^\infty e^{\bar{\theta}u - \log \varphi_0(\bar{\theta})} f_0(u) \nu(du) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi_0(\bar{\theta})} \int_x^\infty e^{-cu} e^{(\bar{\theta}+c)u} f_0(u) \nu(du) \leq \frac{\varphi_0(\bar{\theta}+c)}{\varphi_0(\bar{\theta})} e^{-cx}. \end{aligned}$$

This exponential tail bound and the union bound that precedes it imply $\mathbb{P}(X_{\max} > (2/c) \log N) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This and the bound on \bar{X} imply that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{\max} - \bar{X} > (3/c) \log N) \rightarrow 0.$$

We now consider $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^2$. Similarly as before, we have

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (X_v - \bar{X})^2 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} X_v^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{E}(X_v^2) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (X_v^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_v^2)) .$$

On the one hand,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{E}(X_v^2) = \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{N}\right) \sigma_0^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}} (\sigma_{\theta_v}^2 + \zeta_{\theta_v}^2) = 1 - \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{N} + O\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{N}\right) = 1 + o(1) ,$$

using the fact that $\sigma_0 = 1$, $\max_{\theta \in [0, \bar{\theta}]} \sigma_{\theta}^2 < \infty$, and $\max_{\theta \in [0, \bar{\theta}]} \zeta_{\theta} < \infty$, as well as our assumption that $|\mathcal{S}| = o(N)$. On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (X_v^2 - \mathbb{E}(X_v^2)) = O_P(1/\sqrt{N}) ,$$

using the fact that $\max_{\theta \in [0, \bar{\theta}]} \mathbb{E}_{\theta}(X^4) < \infty$ combined with Chebyshev's inequality. We may therefore conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \leq 1 + \varepsilon/4) \rightarrow 1 .$$

From Lemma 1 (which does apply to the newly defined \mathbb{S}_b) there is a set $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ such that $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2}$. Note that $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) = 1 - o(1)$ by the fact that $b \rightarrow \infty$. We then have

$$\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X}) \geq Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{X}) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} \bar{X} = \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}^*} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2} \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}^*} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) .$$

By Chebyshev's inequality again,

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}^*} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}^*|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}^*} \zeta_{\theta_v} + o_P(1) \geq \zeta_{\theta_{\dagger}} + o_P(1) .$$

Furthermore, as seen in Section 2.2, $\zeta_{\theta} \geq \theta$ for $\theta \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{X}) \geq (\theta_{\dagger} + o_P(1)) \sqrt{(1 - o(1)) |\mathcal{S}^*|} \geq \sqrt{2(1 + \varepsilon/2) \log N} ,$$

with probability tending to one as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We are now ready to evaluate the upper bound on the P-value given by (17). We have

$$\log |\mathbb{S}_b| \leq \log \left[N 4^{b+1} \right] = \log N + (b+1) \log 4 = (1 + o(1)) \log N , \quad (19)$$

by our assumption on b , while the exponent in (17) is bounded from below by

$$\frac{2(1 + \varepsilon/2) \log N}{2(1 + \varepsilon/4) + (3/c)(\log N) 2^{-q_l/2} \sqrt{2(1 + \varepsilon/2) \log N}}$$

with probability tending to one. Assuming $q_l - 3 \log_2 \log N \rightarrow +\infty$ guarantees that the second term in the denominator is a $o(1)$. Thus, eventually, this exponent is bounded from above by $-[(1 + \varepsilon/2)/(1 + \varepsilon/3)] \log N$. Combining this and the upper bound (19) allows us to conclude that $\log \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow -\infty$ (meaning $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow 0$) with probability tending to one, implying that the test has power tending to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

7.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The arguments used for the general permutation test apply verbatim under the null hypothesis, so all that remains to be done is to study the performance of the rank scan test under the alternative.

We may directly apply (17), to obtain

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{r}) \leq |\mathbb{S}_b| \exp\left(-\frac{\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{r})^2}{\frac{N^2}{6} + \frac{N}{2}2^{-q/2}\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{r})}\right),$$

where we used $\sigma_r^2 = (N^2 - 1)/12 < N^2/12$, $r_{\max} = N$ and $\bar{r} = (N + 1)/2$, so that $r_{\max} - \bar{r} < N/2$. The previous bounds can be directly computed when there are no ties in the ranks, and it is easy to verify that they also hold if ties are dealt with in any of the classical ways (assigning the average rank, randomly breaking ties, etc). As before, this is a result conditional on the observations $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ and hence the ranks $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}$. The next step is to remove this conditioning, which now amounts to controlling the term $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R})$.

Let \mathcal{S} denote the anomalous interval under the alternative and first assume that $\theta_v = \theta_{\ddagger}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$ with θ_{\ddagger} as in (18). Note that since F_0 is assumed to have zero mean we have $\mathbb{E}(X\mathbb{1}_{\{X>y\}}) \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(X\mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq y\}}) \geq 0$ for all y . Hence one can easily check that $\Upsilon_0 \geq 0$. By our assumptions on the size of the anomalous set we have $\theta_{\ddagger} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 2. From Lemma 1 there is a set $\mathcal{S}^* \in \mathbb{S}_b$ such that $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \geq (1 + 2^{-b+1})^{-1/2}$. Note that $\rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) = 1 - o(1)$ by the fact that $b \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R}) \geq Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R}) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*| \frac{N+1}{2}},$$

we focus on obtaining a lower bound on $Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R})$ that applies with high probability.

Take any $v, w \in \mathcal{S}^*$ distinct and define

$$\zeta_\theta = \mathbb{E}_\theta(R_v), \quad \sigma_\theta^2 = \text{Var}_\theta(R_v), \quad \xi_\theta = \text{Cov}_\theta(R_v, R_w).$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta[Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R})] = \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|}\zeta_{\theta_{\ddagger}}, \quad \text{Var}_\theta[Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R})] = \sigma_{\theta_{\ddagger}}^2 + (|\mathcal{S}^*| - 1)\xi_{\theta_{\ddagger}},$$

and so, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R}) = \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|}\zeta_{\theta_{\ddagger}} + O_P(\sqrt{\sigma_{\theta_{\ddagger}}^2 + |\mathcal{S}^*|\xi_{\theta_{\ddagger}}}). \quad (20)$$

In an analogous fashion to that in (Hettmansperger, 1984) we can derive the first two moments of the ranks.

Lemma 3. *Suppose A_1, \dots, A_m are IID and independent of B_1, \dots, B_n which are IID, all being real-valued random variables. Let R_i denote the rank (in increasing order) of A_i in the combined sample, and suppose ties are broken randomly. Then, for any $i \neq i'$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(R_i) &= \frac{m+n+1}{2} + n(\lambda_1 - 1/2), \\ \text{Var}(R_i) &= \frac{m-1}{4} + n\lambda_1(1 - \lambda_1) + \frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{12} + n(n-1)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1^2) + 2n(m-1)(\lambda_4 - \lambda_1/2), \\ \text{Cov}(R_i, R_{i'}) &= -\frac{1}{4} - \frac{m-2}{12} + n(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_5 - \lambda_1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &:= \mathbb{P}(A_1 > B_1) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(A_1 = B_1), \\ \lambda_2 &:= \mathbb{P}(\{A_1 > B_1\} \cap \{A_2 > B_1\}) + \mathbb{P}(A_1 > A_2 = B_1) + \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{P}(A_1 = A_2 = B_1), \\ \lambda_3 &:= \mathbb{P}(\{A_1 > B_1\} \cap \{A_1 > B_2\}) + \mathbb{P}(A_1 = B_1 > B_2) + \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{P}(A_1 = B_1 = B_2), \\ \lambda_4 &:= \mathbb{P}(\{A_1 > A_2\} \cap \{A_1 > B_1\}) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{P}(A_1 > A_2 = B_1) + \mathbb{P}(A_1 = A_2 > B_1)) + \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{P}(A_1 = A_2 = B_1) \\ \lambda_5 &:= \mathbb{P}(\{A_2 > A_1\} \cap \{A_1 > B_1\}) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{P}(A_2 > A_1 = B_1) + \mathbb{P}(A_1 = A_2 > B_1)) + \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{P}(A_1 = A_2 = B_1). \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of completeness we sketch a proof of Lemma 3 in Appendix 7.4.1. What we directly use from the result above is the formula for the expectation and the order of magnitude the variance and covariance terms. Recall the definition (14). Using Lemma 3, we have

$$\zeta_\theta = \frac{N+1}{2} + (N - |\mathcal{S}|)(p_\theta - \frac{1}{2}), \quad \sigma_\theta^2 \leq 4N^2, \quad \xi_\theta \leq 2N.$$

Hence, together with (20), we obtain

$$Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R}) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} \frac{N+1}{2} = \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} (N - |\mathcal{S}|) (p_{\theta_{\ddagger}} - \frac{1}{2}) + O_P(N). \quad (21)$$

We continue by bounding p_θ by using a Taylor expansion. When ν is discrete, we have

$$p_\theta = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\bar{F}_\theta(x) + \frac{1}{2} f_\theta(x)) \nu(dx).$$

We expand the integrand seen as a function of θ , around $\theta = 0$. We have

$$\partial_{\theta=0} f_\theta(x) = x f_0(x), \quad \partial_{\theta=0} \bar{F}_\theta(x) = \int_{(x, \infty)} u f_0(u) \nu(du),$$

where the second one comes from differentiating inside the integral defining \bar{F}_θ , justified by dominated convergence. Similarly, we have

$$c'_0 := \sup_x |\partial_{\theta=0}^2 f_\theta(x)| < \infty, \quad c_0 := \sup_x |\partial_{\theta=0}^2 \bar{F}_\theta(x)| < \infty.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} p_\theta &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\bar{F}_0(x) + \frac{1}{2} f_0(x) + \theta \left(\int_{(x, \infty)} u f_0(u) \nu(du) + \frac{1}{2} x f_0(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} (c_0 + c'_0/2) \theta^2 \right] f_0(x) \nu(dx) \\ &= p_0 + \theta \left(\mathbb{E}_0[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X>Y\}}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_0[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X=Y\}}] \right) - \frac{1}{2} (c_0 + c'_0/2) \theta^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \theta \Upsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2} (c_0 + c'_0/2) \theta^2. \end{aligned}$$

When ν is continuous, we have

$$p_\theta = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{F}_\theta(x) \nu(dx),$$

and the same calculations lead to

$$p_\theta \geq \frac{1}{2} + \theta \Upsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2} c_0 \theta^2.$$

In any case, $p_\theta \geq \frac{1}{2} + \theta \Upsilon_0 - O(\theta^2)$.

This lower bound, combined with (21), the fact that $|\mathcal{S}| = o(N)$, and the definition Υ_0 and τ_0 , yields

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathcal{S}^*}(\mathbf{R}) - \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}^*|} \frac{N+1}{2} &= \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*) \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|} (N - |\mathcal{S}|) (\theta_{\ddagger} \Upsilon_0 - O(\theta_{\ddagger}^2)) + O_P(N) \\ &= (1 + o_P(1)) N (\tau/\tau_0) \sqrt{\frac{1}{6} \log N}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\kappa = (\tau/\tau_0 - 1)^2$, we may conclude that

$$\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R}) \geq N \sqrt{\frac{1}{6} (1 + \kappa) \log N}$$

with probability going to one as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The remaining arguments are exactly parallel to those at the end of Section 3. When the previous inequality holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{R}) &\leq \log(N4^{b+1}) - \frac{N^2(1+\kappa)^{\frac{1}{6}} \log N}{\frac{N^2}{6} + \frac{N^2}{2} 2^{-q/2} \sqrt{(1+\kappa)^{\frac{1}{6}} \log N}} \\ &\leq (1+o(1)) \log N - \frac{(1+\kappa) \log N}{1+o(1)} \\ &\leq -(1+o(1)) \kappa \log N \rightarrow -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the rank scan test has power going to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ when $\theta_v = \theta_{\ddagger}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$ (the anomalous set).

Finally, to arrive at the same conclusion when $\theta_v \geq \theta_{\ddagger}$ for $v \in \mathcal{S}$ (as we assume in the statement of the theorem), note that p_{θ} is increasing in θ by virtue of the fact that $(F_{\theta} : \theta \geq 0)$ has monotone likelihood ratio.

7.3 Proof of Proposition 2

We treat each case separately.

Condition (i). The same arguments hold as before under the null, so again we are left with studying the alternative. To deal with smaller intervals, we need a slightly different concentration inequality than before.

Lemma 4 (Chernoff's inequality for ranks). *In the context of Lemma 2, assume that $z_j = j$ for all j . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{Z} \geq \bar{z} + t) \leq \exp\left[-m \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \psi(t, \lambda)\right], \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \psi(t, \lambda) := \lambda t - \log\left(\frac{\sinh(\lambda N/2)}{N \sinh(\lambda/2)}\right).$$

Similarly to Lemma 2 this result is also a consequence of (Hoeffding, 1963, Th. 4) and Chernoff's bound. However, with the assumption on z_j in the lemma above we can directly compute the moment generating function of Z_j after using Chernoff's bound instead of upper bounding it as is classically done to obtain Bernstein's inequality.

In the present context, this yields

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{r}) \leq |\mathcal{S}| \exp\left[-k\psi(\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{r})/\sqrt{k}, \lambda)\right] \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

As before, the next step is to bound $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R})$. Recall $\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R}) = \max_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{S}} Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) - \sqrt{k} \frac{N+1}{2}$ as now k is the common interval size. Note that we keep the centering to stay consistent with the previous definitions. Let \mathcal{S} denote the anomalous interval. As in the proof of Theorem 2, by monotonicity, we may assume that $\theta_v = \theta_{\ddagger}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$, with θ_{\ddagger} satisfying

$$p_{\theta_{\ddagger}} = 1 - N^{-2/k} / \omega_N. \quad (22)$$

For the sake of simplicity we present the proof when $\omega_N \rightarrow \infty$ not too fast. In particular assume $\omega_N = O(\log N)$. The proof can be carried out regardless of the choice of $\omega_N \rightarrow \infty$. Note that $Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})$ takes values in the interval $[0, \sqrt{k}N/2]$ because of the centering and the fact that we are considering only intervals of length k . For convenience we use the parametrization $Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{k}N(1 - \gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}))$ and control the term $\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})$. Thus

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) = 1 + \frac{N+1}{N} - \frac{2Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})}{\sqrt{k}N}.$$

By Lemma 3,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta_{\dagger}}[Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})] = \sqrt{k}(N+1)/2 + \sqrt{k}(N-k)(p_{\theta_{\dagger}} - 1/2)$$

and

$$\text{Var}_{\theta_{\dagger}}[Y_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})] \leq p_{\theta_{\dagger}}(1-p_{\theta_{\dagger}})N^2 + O(kN),$$

where for the variance we used the fact that $\lambda_3 \leq \lambda_1$ in Lemma 3. We thus have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta_{\dagger}}[\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})] \leq 2(1-p_{\theta_{\dagger}}) + O(k/N) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}_{\theta_{\dagger}}[\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})] \leq (1-p_{\theta_{\dagger}})/k + O(1/N).$$

Therefore, using (22) and Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) \geq \omega_N^{-1/4}N^{-1/k}) &= \mathbb{P}(\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) - \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})) \geq \omega_N^{-1/4}N^{-1/k} - 2(1-p_{\theta_{\dagger}}) - O(k/N)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) - \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}))| \geq 2\omega_N^{-1/4}N^{-1/k}) \\ &\leq \frac{N^{-2/k}/(k\omega_N) + O(1/N)}{4N^{-2/k}/\omega_N^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds for N large enough when $k = O(\log N)$. We conclude that when $k > 2$ we have $\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \tilde{\gamma} := \omega_N^{-1/4}N^{-1/k}$ with probability tending to 1. When this is the case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R})/\sqrt{k}, \lambda) &\geq \psi(\tfrac{1}{2}N(1-\gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{R})), \lambda) \\ &\geq \lambda \tfrac{1}{2}N(1-\tilde{\gamma}) - \log \left(\frac{\sinh(\lambda N/2)}{N \sinh(\lambda/2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\lambda = 1/(N\tilde{\gamma})$ and using the fact that $x \leq \sinh(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}e^x$ for all $x \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\text{SCAN}(\mathbf{R})/\sqrt{k}, \lambda) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}} - \log \left(\frac{\sinh(1/(2\tilde{\gamma}))}{N \sinh(1/(2N\tilde{\gamma}))} \right) \\ &= -\log \tilde{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the fact that $|\mathbb{S}| \leq N$, with probability tending to 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{R}) &\leq \log N + k \log \tilde{\gamma} + k/2 \\ &= \log N + k \log(\omega_N^{-1/4}N^{-1/k}) + k/2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}k \log \omega_N + k/2 \rightarrow -\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

so that $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow 0$ in probability, which is what we needed to prove.

Condition (ii). We can mimic the arguments above. Suppose $k = c \log N$ with arbitrary $c > 0$ and $p_{\theta_{\dagger}} = 1 - \exp(-\frac{c+1}{c})/(2(1+\delta))$ with some $\delta > 0$. We can show that

$$\gamma(\mathbf{R}) \leq \tilde{\gamma} := \frac{1+\delta/2}{1+\delta} \exp(-\frac{c+1}{c})$$

with probability going to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Plugging this new $\tilde{\gamma}$ and k into (23) we see that the log of the P-value goes to $-\infty$, which is what we wanted to show.

7.4 Additional results

7.4.1 Sketch proof of Lemma 3

First, assume that there are no ties in the ranks, with probability one. Note that we can write

$$R_i = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i > A_j\}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i > B_j\}}.$$

Taking expectation yields

$$\mathbb{E}(R_i) = \frac{m+1}{2} + n\mathbb{P}(A_1 > B_1) = \frac{m+n+1}{2} + n(p_1 - 1/2),$$

since when there are no ties $\mathbb{P}(A_1 = B_1) = 0$. The variance and covariance terms can be worked out using the same representation of the ranks as above, but we omit these straightforward computations so that the presentation does not become cluttered.

In case of ties, to keep the presentation simple, assume that the distributions of A_1 and B_1 are supported on \mathbb{Z} . Then randomly breaking ties in the ranks amounts to using the following procedure. Let $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ and $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ be independent and uniformly distributed on $(-c, c)$ with $c \leq 1/2$, also independent from $A_1, \dots, A_m, B_1, \dots, B_n$. Consider $A'_i = A_i + \epsilon_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $B'_i = B_i + \delta_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let R'_i be the rank of A'_i in the combined sample $A'_1, \dots, A'_m, B'_1, \dots, B'_n$. Then the joint distribution of $(R'_i, i = 1, \dots, m)$ is the same as that of $(R_i, i = 1, \dots, m)$ when ties are broken randomly. However, for the ranks of the modified random variables, we have that there are no ties with probability one, hence we can apply the previous part of the proof. Hence we have

$$\mathbb{E}(R'_i) = \frac{m+n+1}{2} + n(\mathbb{P}(A'_1 > B'_1) - 1/2),$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}(A'_1 > B'_1) = \mathbb{P}(A_1 > B_1) + \mathbb{P}(\{A_1 = B_1\} \cap \{\epsilon_1 > \delta_1\}) = \mathbb{P}(A_1 > B_1) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(A_1 = B_1) = p_1.$$

The variance and covariance can be dealt with in the same way.

Finally, when A_1, B_1 have arbitrary distributions a similar method can be applied, although it requires a bit more care and one needs to take c approaching zero.

7.4.2 Derivation of Υ_0 in the normal location model

Assume the normal model where $F_\theta = \mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$. For this case we can derive a very good bound for Υ_0 (confirmed by numerical integration). Since there are no ties with probability 1, we have

$$\Upsilon_0 = \mathbb{E}(X \mathbb{1}_{\{X > Y\}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_x^{\infty} u f_0(u) du f_0(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u f_0(u) F_0(u) du.$$

Here F_0 is the standard normal distribution, which can be expressed as the following infinite sum

$$F_0(u) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-u^2/2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{u^{2j+1}}{(2j+1)!!} = \frac{1}{2} + f_0(u) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{u^{2j+1}}{(2j+1)!!}.$$

The expression above can be upper-bounded by $1/2 + u f_0(u)$ when $u < 0$ and lower-bounded by the same expression when $u \geq 0$. Hence we have

$$\Upsilon_0 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u f_0(u) (1/2 + u f_0(u)) du = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 f_0^2(u) du = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}},$$

where the last step follows from integration by parts. (This exact lower bound is in fact very good as direct numerical integration yields the same value down to 7 digits.) We conclude that, in the normal location model, $\tau_0 \leq \sqrt{\pi/3}$ as claimed earlier.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Daniel Neill for references on fast scans; Martin Kulldorff for references on permutation scans, for bringing the reference (Jung and Cho, 2015) to our attention, and for helpful comments; and Bing Zhou for help with the real data application of Section 5.4. The basic concept of this paper arose out of conversations between some of the authors at the 2013 Mathematical Statistics conference in Luminy, France. This work was partially supported by a grant from the US National Science Foundation (DMS 1223137) and a grant from the *Nederlandse organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (NWO 613.001.114).

References

- Addario-Berry, L., N. Broutin, L. Devroye, G. Lugosi, et al. (2010). On combinatorial testing problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(5), 3063–3092.
- Arias-Castro, E., E. J. Candès, and A. Durand (2011). Detection of an anomalous cluster in a network. *The Annals of Statistics* 39(1), 278–304.
- Arias-Castro, E., E. J. Candès, H. Helgason, and O. Zeitouni (2008). Searching for a trail of evidence in a maze. *Ann. Statist.* 36(4), 1726–1757.
- Arias-Castro, E., D. Donoho, and X. Huo (2005). Near-optimal detection of geometric objects by fast multiscale methods. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 51(7), 2402–2425.
- Arias-Castro, E. and G. R. Grimmett (2013). Cluster detection in networks using percolation. *Bernoulli* 19(2), 676–719.
- Balakrishnan, N. and M. V. Koutras (2002). *Runs and Scans with Applications*. Wiley.
- Bardenet, R. and O.-A. Maillard (2013). Concentration inequalities for sampling without replacement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.4029*.
- Boucheron, S., G. Lugosi, and P. Massart (2013). *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press.
- Boutsikas, M. V. and M. V. Koutras (2006). On the asymptotic distribution of the discrete scan statistic. *J. Appl. Probab.* 43(4), 1137–1154.
- Cai, T. T., J. X. Jeng, and H. Li (2012). Robust detection and identification of sparse segments in ultrahigh dimensional data analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 74(5), 773–797.
- Cai, T. T. and M. Yuan (2014). Rate-optimal detection of very short signal segments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.2812*.
- Cheung, Y. T. D., M. J. Spittal, M. K. Williamson, S. J. Tung, and J. Pirkis (2013, 01). Application of scan statistics to detect suicide clusters in australia. *PLoS ONE* 8(1), e54168.
- Dembo, A. and O. Zeitouni (2010). *Large deviations techniques and applications*, Volume 38 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. Corrected reprint of the second (1998) edition.
- Desolneux, A., L. Moisan, and J.-M. Morel (2003). Maximal meaningful events and applications to image analysis. *Ann. Statist.* 31(6), 1822–1851.
- Ernst, J., P. Kheradpour, T. S. Mikkelsen, N. Shores, L. D. Ward, C. B. Epstein, X. Zhang, L. Wang, R. Issner, M. Coyne, et al. (2011). Mapping and analysis of chromatin state dynamics in nine human cell types. *Nature* 473(7345), 43–49.
- Flenner, A. and G. Hewer (2011). A Helmholtz principle approach to parameter-free change detection and coherent motion using exchangeable random variables. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* 4(1), 243–276.

- Guerriero, M., P. Willett, and J. Glaz (2009, July). Distributed target detection in sensor networks using scan statistics. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on* 57(7), 2629–2639.
- Hall, P. and J. Jin (2010). Innovated higher criticism for detecting sparse signals in correlated noise. *Ann. Statist.* 38(3), 1686–1732.
- Hettmansperger, T. P. (1984). *Statistical inference based on ranks*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 58, 13–30.
- Huang, L., M. Kulldorff, and D. Gregorio (2007). A spatial scan statistic for survival data. *Biometrics* 63(1), 109–118.
- Jeng, X. J., T. T. Cai, and H. Li (2010). Optimal sparse segment identification with application in copy number variation analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105(491), 1156–1166.
- Jiang, T. (2002). Maxima of partial sums indexed by geometrical structures. *Ann. Probab.* 30(4), 1854–1892.
- Jung, I. and H. Cho (2015). A nonparametric spatial scan statistic for continuous data. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 14(1), 30.
- Kabluchko, Z. (2011). Extremes of the standardized gaussian noise. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 121(3), 515–533.
- Kulldorff, M. (1997). A spatial scan statistic. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods* 26(6), 1481–1496.
- Kulldorff, M., R. Heffernan, J. Hartman, R. Assuncao, and F. Mostashari (2005). A space-time permutation scan statistic for disease outbreak detection. *PLOS Medicine* 2(3), 216.
- Kulldorff, M., L. Huang, and K. Konty (2009). A scan statistic for continuous data based on the normal probability model. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 8(1), 58.
- Lehmann, E. L. and J. P. Romano (2005). *Testing statistical hypotheses* (Third ed.). Springer Texts in Statistics. New York: Springer.
- Neill, D. B. (2012). Fast subset scan for spatial pattern detection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 74(2), 337–360.
- Neill, D. B. and A. W. Moore (2004). Rapid detection of significant spatial clusters. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 256–265. ACM.
- Perone Pacifico, M., C. Genovese, I. Verdinelli, and L. Wasserman (2004). False discovery control for random fields. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 99(468), 1002–1014.
- Sharpnack, J. and E. Arias-Castro (2014). Exact asymptotics for the scan statistic and fast alternatives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.7127*.
- Sharpnack, J. and A. Singh (2010). Identifying graph-structured activation patterns in networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2137–2145.
- Sharpnack, J. L., A. Krishnamurthy, and A. Singh (2013). Near-optimal anomaly detection in graphs using lovász extended scan statistic. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1959–1967.
- Shorack, G. R. and J. A. Wellner (1986). *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Siegmund, D. and E. S. Venkatraman (1995). Using the generalized likelihood ratio statistic for sequential detection of a change-point. *Ann. Statist.* 23(1), 255–271.
- Wallenstein, S. (2009). Joseph naus: Father of the scan statistic. In *Scan Statistics*, pp. 1–25. Springer.

- Walther, G. (2010). Optimal and fast detection of spatial clusters with scan statistics. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(2), 1010–1033.
- Wilcoxon, F. (1945). Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bulletin* 1(6), 80–83.
- Zhao, M. and V. Saligrama (2009). Anomaly detection with score functions based on nearest neighbor graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2250–2258.