

Sample-and-Forward: Communication-Efficient Control of the False Discovery Rate in Networks

Mehrdad Pournaderi, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Yu Xiang, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This work concerns controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) in networks under communication constraints. We present sample-and-forward, a flexible and communication-efficient version of the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure for multihop networks with general topologies. Our method evidences that the nodes in a network do not need to communicate p-values to each other to achieve a decent statistical power under the global FDR control constraint. Consider a network with a total of m p-values, our method consists of first sampling the (empirical) CDF of the p-values at each node and then forwarding $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ bits to its neighbors. Under the same assumptions as for the original BH procedure, our method has both the provable finite-sample FDR control as well as competitive empirical detection power, even with a few samples at each node. We provide an asymptotic analysis of power under a mixture model assumption on the p-values.

Index Terms—Distributed setting, FDR control, Benjamini-Hochberg procedure, communication-efficient methods.

I. INTRODUCTION

FOR large-scale networks where each node performs multiple hypothesis tests, it is of theoretical and practical interest to understand the amount of communication needed among the nodes to achieve a satisfactory testing performance. We follow the false discovery rate control criterion and aim to adapt the celebrated Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure [1] (also see [2]–[9] for extensions and applications) to the network settings *with a limited communication budget in mind*. It should be pointed out that our focus on FDR control using the BH procedure is fundamentally different from the existing literature on distributed detection and hypothesis testing formulations [10]–[13].

Our study is motivated by a recent distributed FDR control method called the Query-Test-Exchange (QuTE) algorithm [14], which requires each node to transmit its p-values to all of its neighbors. This method can handle *multihop networks with general topologies*, however, the amount of communication needed to implement this algorithm can be a bottleneck for practical problems as the size of the network or the number of p-values per node grows. On the other hand, the authors in [15]–[18] have studied a distributed sensor network setting by assuming a *broadcast model*, where each sensor is allowed to broadcast its decision to the entire network. Under this model, they have proposed several (iterative) distributed BH procedures where each sensor broadcasts at most 1-bit information. Despite the low communication cost, this broadcast model is mainly suitable for small-scale sensor networks

(e.g., see [17, Section VIII] for discussions), and the proposed iterative methods are not applicable for multihop network with general topologies, which is the main focus of this work. Furthermore, we follow [14] by considering multiple p-values at each node, while it was assumed that each sensor has only one p-value in [15], [16], [18]; a transformation was proposed in [17] to combine multiple (dependent) p-values to a single scalar. In [19], the authors took an *asymptotic* perspective and proposed a communication-efficient aggregation method to match the global performance by achieving the global BH threshold asymptotically. However, the finite-sample performance can only be shown empirically without theoretical guarantees. A related attempt to reduce the communication cost of the QuTE algorithm has been made in [20], but it still requires transmitting the quantized version of all the p-values in a network.

In this short letter, we focus on multihop networks with general topologies, and propose *sample-and-forward*, a sampling-based version of the BH procedure for networks, with *finite-sample* provable FDR control. In our method, each node samples the (empirical) CDF (see (1)) and only needs to send $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ bits to its neighboring nodes. This is in contrast with sending $\mathcal{O}(m)$ *real-valued* p-values required in the QuTE method. Our method is flexible in the sense that (a) it can be coupled with the QuTE algorithm to deal with arbitrary network topologies, and (b) the FDR control holds independent of the number of samples taken at each node. Our method shows robust and competitive statistical powers in a variety of simulation settings.

II. MULTIPLE TESTING AND FDR CONTROL

Consider testing the null hypotheses $H_{0,k}, 1 \leq k \leq m$ according to the test statistics $X_k, 1 \leq k \leq m$. Let $P_k = \Psi_{H_{0,k}}(X_k), 1 \leq k \leq m$, denote the p-values computed for the test statistics, where $\Psi_{H_{0,k}} = 1 - F_{H_{0,k}}$ and $F_{H_{0,k}}$ is the (hypothetical) CDF of X_k under $H_{0,k}$. Let m_0 denote the number of statistics generated according to their corresponding null hypotheses, i.e., m_0 of the null hypotheses are true. The p-values computed for these m_0 statistics are called *null p-values* and we refer to the rest of them as *non-nulls*. If the statistics are generated according to a continuous distribution functions, by the probability integral transform, the null p-values will have a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$.

The purpose of multiple testing is to test the m hypotheses while controlling a simultaneous measure of type I error. A rejection procedure controls a measure of error at some (prefixed) level α if it guarantees to keep the error less than

or equal to α . The two major approaches to a simultaneous measure of error are the family-wise error rate (FWER) control and the false discovery rate (FDR) control. FWER concerns with controlling the probability of making at least one false rejection, while FDR is a less stringent measure of error that aims to control the average *proportion* of false rejections among all rejections. Let R and V denote the number of rejections and false rejections by some procedure, respectively. Then, FWER is defined as $\mathbb{P}(V > 0)$ and it can be controlled at some target level α by rejecting $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Bonf}} = \{k : P_k \leq \alpha/m\}$. The threshold α/m is so-called Bonferroni-corrected test size. On the other hand, FDR is defined as $\text{FDR} = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V}{R \vee 1}\right)$ and the celebrated Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure [1] controls the FDR at level α under the *Positive Regression Dependence on a Subset* (PRDS) assumption [2]. The vector of p-values $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m)$ is said to satisfy the PRDS condition if $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{D} | P_i \leq t)$ is non-decreasing over $(0, 1]$ for all non-decreasing $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [0, 1]^m$ and $i \in \mathcal{H}_0 := \{k : H_{0,k} \text{ is true}\}$ [21].

Assumption 1. \mathbf{P} satisfies the PRDS condition. The PRDS condition holds trivially if the p-values are independent [2].

Let $(P_{(1)}, P_{(2)}, \dots, P_{(m)})$ denote the ascending-ordered p-values. Using this notation, BH procedure rejects \hat{k} smallest p-values ($\mathcal{R}_{\text{BH}} = \{k : P_k \leq P_{(\hat{k})}\}$), where $\hat{k} = \max\{1 \leq k \leq m : P_{(k)} \leq \tau_k\}$ with $\tau_k = \alpha k/m$ and $\hat{k} = 0$ if $P_{(k)} > \tau_k$ for all k . We adopt the notation $R_{\text{BH}} := \hat{k}$ and $\tau_{\text{BH}} := \tau_{\hat{k}} = \alpha R_{\text{BH}}/m$ for the rejecting index and rejecting threshold, respectively. The power of detection is defined as $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{E} \text{TPP}$ where $\text{TPP} = \frac{R-V}{m_1 \vee 1}$ is the true positive proportion.

Define the function

$$\mathcal{F}(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{P_i \leq t\}. \quad (1)$$

In the rest of this work, we refer to $\mathcal{F}(t)$ as the *pseudo-CDF* since the p-values are not assumed to be i.i.d.. Observe that $\mathcal{F}(P_{(k)}) = k/m$. Therefore $R_{\text{BH}} = \max\{0 \leq k \leq m : \mathcal{F}(P_{(k)}) \geq P_{(k)}/\alpha\}$, with the convention $P_{(0)} = 0$. An alternative representation for the BH threshold is known [22], which can be adapted to our setting straightforwardly as $\tau_{\text{BH}} = \sup\{t \geq 0 : \mathcal{F}(t) = t/\alpha\}$.

III. SAMPLE-AND-FORWARD FOR STAR NETWORKS

To set the stage for the general multihop network settings in the next section, we start with describing our method for the star networks. Consider a network consisting of one center node and N other nodes, where the center node collects (or broadcasts) information from (or to) all the other N nodes. Each node $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, owns $m^{(i)}$ p-values $\mathbf{P}^{(i)} = (P_1^{(i)}, \dots, P_{m^{(i)}}^{(i)})$, where $m_0^{(i)}$ (or $m_1^{(i)}$) of them correspond to the true null (or alternative) hypotheses with $m_0^{(i)} + m_1^{(i)} = m^{(i)}$.

There are two obvious ways to attain the global FDR control over the network. Baseline I: performing the global BH procedure, i.e., pooling all the p-values in the network at the center node and perform the BH procedure; Baseline II: performing local BH procedures with (node-wise) Bonferroni

corrected test size $\alpha^{(i)} = \frac{m^{(i)}}{m} \alpha$. For Baseline I, it is straightforward to observe that the same performance can be achieved by only communicating the p-values less than the test size α along with the number of p-values each node possesses. However, this is not communication-efficient as it still requires communicating $\mathcal{O}(m^{(i)})$ (real-valued) p-values. Regarding the second baseline, even though no communication is needed, the method suffers from a significant power loss in comparison to the pooled inference, especially as the number of nodes in the network grows. Our proposed algorithm achieves a detection power close to Baseline I but with $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ bits communication cost for each node as we shall see in the section on numerical results.

A. Sample-and-Forward: Star Networks

For an overall targeted FDR level α , our *sample-and-forward BH method* consists of four main steps. Note that $\tau_{\text{BH}} \leq \alpha$, thus it suffices to sample in $[0, \alpha]$.

- (1) **Sample the pseudo-CDF:** Each node i computes $\mathcal{F}_i(t) = \frac{1}{m^{(i)}} \sum_{j=1}^{m^{(i)}} \mathbf{1}\{P_j^{(i)} \leq t\}$ and then take $M \geq 2$ samples from it on the $[0, \alpha]$ interval, at locations $t_j := \frac{j-1}{M-1} \alpha$, $1 \leq j \leq M$. Then each node i sends (I) the samples (i.e., $\mathcal{F}_i(t_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq M$) and (II) the number of p-values $m^{(i)}$, to the center node.
- (2) **Approximate the pooled pseudo-CDF:** The center node computes $S_j = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N m^{(i)} \mathcal{F}_i(t_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq M$ where $m = \sum_{i=1}^N m^{(i)}$.
- (3) **Compute the global threshold:** The center node computes $\hat{\tau} = t_I + \alpha(S_I - t_I/\alpha)$ where $I = \max\{j : S_j \geq t_j/\alpha\}$ and broadcasts it to the other nodes.
- (4) **Reject according to $\hat{\tau}$:** Upon receiving $\hat{\tau}$, each node i rejects $\{1 \leq j \leq m^{(i)} : P_j \leq \hat{\tau}\}$.

In the statement of the algorithm, we take a fixed number of samples M at fixed locations t_j , $1 \leq j \leq M$ for each node to simplify the presentation. Nevertheless, the proof does not rely on this structure. In fact, each node (i) can take an arbitrary number of samples $M^{(i)}$ at any set of locations $\{Z_1^{(i)}, Z_2^{(i)}, \dots, Z_{M^{(i)}}^{(i)}\}$. However, these locations need to be communicated to the center node in step (1). To avoid this communication cost, one can restrict the sampling positions to be equispaced. In this case the center node can compute the positions based on the number of samples it receives from the local nodes. For the general framework, in step (2), the pooled pseudo-CDF is approximated as follows,

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N m^{(i)} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(t), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(t) = 0$ for $t < Z_1^{(i)}$, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 1$, and

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(t) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_i(Z_j^{(i)}), & Z_j^{(i)} \leq t < Z_{j+1}^{(i)} \\ \mathcal{F}_i(Z_{M^{(i)}}^{(i)}), & Z_{M^{(i)}}^{(i)} \leq t < 1 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

and $1 \leq j < M^{(i)}$. The general version of the formula given in step (3) (for $\hat{\tau}$) can be defined as

$$\hat{\tau} = \sup\left\{t \geq 0 : \hat{\mathcal{F}}(t) = t/\alpha\right\}. \quad (4)$$

To implement this formula, one can use the following procedure. Let $\{J_1, \dots, J_M\}$ denote the set of jump locations of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(t)$. Define $\tau' = \max\{J_i : \hat{\mathcal{F}}(J_i) \geq J_i/\alpha\}$. The threshold $\hat{\tau}$ can be computed via $\hat{\tau} = \tau' + \alpha(\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau') - \tau'/\alpha)$ which is compatible with the formula given in step (3).

B. FDR Control

Let $\mathcal{F}(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N m^{(i)} \mathcal{F}_i(t)$ denote the (pooled) pseudo-CDF of the p-values in the network.

Proposition 1. *Our sample-and-forward algorithm controls the FDR globally.*

Proof. Let \hat{R} denote the total number of rejections in the network made according to $\hat{\tau}$. We note that $\hat{R} = m\mathcal{F}(\hat{\tau}) \geq m\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{\tau}) = m\hat{\tau}/\alpha$ by $\hat{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathcal{F}$ and (4). Therefore,

$$\text{FDR} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j \leq \hat{\tau}\}}{\hat{R} \vee 1} \right] \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j \leq \hat{\tau}\}}{(m/\alpha)\hat{\tau} \vee 1} \right],$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{1 \leq k \leq m : H_{0,k} \text{ is true}\}$. We note that $\hat{\tau}$ is a non-increasing function of any p-value in the network since decreasing a p-value will result in a stochastically smaller sampled pooled pseudo-CDF $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ and thus larger $\hat{\tau}$. Therefore, according to [21], [23], we get $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j \leq \hat{\tau}\}}{\hat{\tau} \vee 1} \right] \leq 1$. Hence,

$\text{FDR} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{m_0}{m} \alpha$, where m_0 denotes the total number of null p-values in the network. ■

C. Power Analysis

It is of interest to understand the approximation quality of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(t)$ in (2) (under the fixed sampling location scheme with $t_j = \frac{j-1}{M-1}\alpha$). Observe that if $\tau_{\text{BH}} = 0$, then $\hat{\tau} = 0$ since $\hat{\tau} \leq \tau_{\text{BH}}$ by definition. On the other hand, if $\tau_{\text{BH}} > 0$ and the p-values are generated according to a continuous distribution function, with probability 1, one can take the sample size M large enough such that $p_{(i)} < t_j < \tau_{\text{BH}} < p_{(i+1)}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq M$. In this case, we get $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_{\text{BH}}) = \mathcal{F}(\tau_{\text{BH}})$, which implies $\hat{\tau} = \tau_{\text{BH}}$, immediately. To shed light on the approximation quality in terms of M , suppose the p-values are generated i.i.d. according to the CDF $F = \pi_0 U + \pi_1 G$, $\pi_1 > 0$, where $U(t) = t$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$ is the distribution function for true nulls and $G(t)$ denotes the common CDF of the p-values under true alternatives. Note that G can be a mixture of various alternative distributions. Define $\tau^* := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : F(t) = t/\alpha\}$.

Assumption 2. $F(t) > t/\alpha$, $t \in (\tau^* - \delta, \tau^*)$ for some $\delta > 0$, $F(t)$ is differentiable at τ^* , and $F'(\tau^*) \neq 1/\alpha$.

If Assumption 2 holds, from [6] we know $\tau_{\text{BH}} \xrightarrow{P} \tau^*$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. The following lemma (see Appendix A for the proof) is a corollary of this result and it is proved in [24] under a slightly different set of assumptions.

Lemma 1. *If Assumption 2 holds, then $\tau_{\text{BH}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tau^*$.*

Assumption 3. $t_{j^*} < \tau^* < t_{j^*+1}$ for some $1 \leq j^* \leq M$, meaning, τ^* is not located exactly at some sampling point t_j .

The following theorem (see Appendix B for the proof) concerns the limiting value of the sample-and-forward threshold.

Theorem 1. *If Assumptions 2 (with $\delta = \delta^*$) and 3 hold, then $\hat{\tau} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \alpha F(t_{j^*}) =: \bar{\tau}$ for all $M > (\alpha/\delta^*)\mathbf{1}\{\tau^* > 2\delta^*\} + 1$.*

Corollary 1. *If Assumptions 2 (with $\delta = \delta^*$) and 3 hold, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\tau} \in (t_{j^*}, t_{j^*+1})$, a.s. and therefore, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_{\text{BH}} - \hat{\tau}) \leq \alpha/(M-1)$, a.s. for all $M > (\alpha/\delta^*)\mathbf{1}\{\tau^* > 2\delta^*\} + 1$.*

Proof. According to the proof of Theorem 1 ((8) and (9)), we have $t_{j^*} < \alpha F(t_{j^*}) = \bar{\tau} < t_{j^*+1}$ for $M > (\alpha/\delta^*)\mathbf{1}\{\tau^* > 2\delta^*\} + 1$. We note that $\hat{\tau} \leq \tau_{\text{BH}}$ (because $\hat{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathcal{F}$). Therefore, $t_{j^*} < \bar{\tau} \leq \tau^* < t_{j^*+1}$. ■

Assumption 4. G is C -Lipschitz on (t_{j^*}, t_{j^*+1}) .

Let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{BH}}(m)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(m)$ denote the detection power of BH and our sample-and-forward procedures. See Appendix C for the proof of the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *If Assumptions 2 (with $\delta = \delta^*$), 3 and 4 (with $C = C^*$) hold, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{P}_{\text{BH}}(m) - \hat{\mathcal{P}}(m)) \leq C^* \alpha/M$ for $M > (\alpha/\delta^*)\mathbf{1}\{\tau^* > 2\delta^*\} + 1$.*

Remark 1. *Note that for Gaussian statistics, Assumption 2 holds for $\delta = \tau^*$ and Assumption 4 holds with $C = G'(t_{j^*})$, if $M \geq 3$. Therefore, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, hold for all $M \geq 2$ and Corollary 2 holds for all $M \geq 3$.*

IV. MULTIHOP NETWORK WITH GENERAL TOPOLOGIES

In this section, we present a communication-efficient algorithm for the general multihop networks, adapting our method to an existing algorithm for decentralized inference known as the QuTE [14], which controls the FDR over networks with arbitrary topology by allowing communication between adjacent nodes. The QuTE algorithm consists of three steps: query, test, and exchange. At the query step, each node needs to communicate all of its p-values to the neighboring nodes. We now present our communication-efficient version of this algorithm where nodes communicate sampled pseudo-CDFs (instead of p-values) while maintaining the FDR control.

- (1) **Query:** Each node queries its neighbors for the sampled pseudo-CDFs and the number of p-values they possess.
- (2) **Test:** Let $n^{(a)}$ denote the number of p-values at node a and all of its neighbors. In this step, each node x pools the sampled pseudo-CDFs using (2) and computes the threshold $\hat{\tau}_0^{(x)}$ via (4) with the test size $\alpha^{(x)} = (n^{(x)}/m)\alpha$.
- (3) **Exchange:** Each node x communicates $\hat{\tau}_0^{(x)}$ to its neighbors. Let $\{\hat{\tau}_1^{(a)}, \dots, \hat{\tau}_{N_a}^{(a)}\}$ denote the set of thresholds node a receives from its neighbors where N_a denote the number of the nodes neighboring node a . Each node x decides about the p-values that originally belong to it based on $\hat{\tau}^{(x)} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq N_x} \hat{\tau}_i^{(x)}$, i.e., it rejects $R_{(x)} = \{1 \leq j \leq m^{(x)} : P_j^{(x)} \leq \hat{\tau}^{(x)}\}$. Note that if $i \neq 0$, then $\hat{\tau}_i^{(x)} = \hat{\tau}_0^{(y)}$ for some y that neighbors x .

Proposition 2. *Our sample-and-forward version of the QuTE algorithm controls the FDR globally.*

Proof. We follow the approach in [14] closely. Let \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{H}_0^{(a)}$ denote the set of nodes and the set of null p-values at node




Fig. 1: From left to right, the four sets of plots correspond to Experiments 1 to 4. M denotes the number of samples taken from the pseudo-CDFs, λ the mean of the Poisson distribution, N the number of nodes, and ρ the correlation coefficient.

a , respectively. For node a , define $\check{R}_0^{(a)} = n^{(a)} \frac{\hat{\tau}_0^{(a)}}{\alpha}$ and let $\{\check{R}_1^{(a)}, \dots, \check{R}_{N_a}^{(a)}\}$ denote the same quantity for its neighbors. Now define $\check{R}^{(a)} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq N_a} \check{R}_i^{(a)}$ and observe $\check{R}^{(a)} = m \frac{\hat{\tau}^{(a)}}{\alpha}$.

Let \hat{R} denote the total number of rejections in the network using the communication-efficient QuTE algorithm. We have

$$\text{FDR} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0^{(x)}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j^{(x)} \leq \hat{\tau}^{(x)}\}}{\hat{R} \vee 1} \right] =: \sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0^{(x)}} A_{x,j},$$

where $A_{x,j}$ can be upper bounded as follows.

$$A_{x,j} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j^{(x)} \leq \hat{\tau}^{(x)}\}}{\hat{R}^{(x)} \vee 1} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j^{(x)} \leq \hat{\tau}^{(x)}\}}{(m/\alpha) \hat{\tau}^{(x)} \vee 1} \right],$$

because $\hat{R} \geq \hat{R}^{(y)} \geq \check{R}_0^{(y)} = \check{R}^{(x)}$ for some $y \in x \cup \text{neighbors}(x)$, where $\hat{R}^{(y)}$ denotes the number of p-values at node y and its neighbors that are smaller than $\hat{\tau}^{(y)}$. By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 1 we get that $\hat{\tau}^{(x)}$ is a non-increasing function of any p-value at node x or at its neighbors. Thus, according to [21], [23], we get $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{P_j^{(x)} \leq \hat{\tau}^{(x)}\}}{\hat{\tau}^{(x)} \vee 1} \right] \leq 1$. Hence, $\text{FDR} \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0^{(x)}} \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{m_0}{m} \alpha$, where m_0 denotes the total number of null p-values in the network. ■

Remark 2. The QuTE algorithm has been extended to the setting where each node can query for the p-values from the neighbors that are c edges away, which requires c rounds of communication between immediate neighbors [14]. Our arguments regarding the communication efficiency and FDR control via sampling the pseudo-CDFs can be carried over to $c \geq 2$ as well.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We evaluate the empirical performance of our algorithm for the star networks with $\alpha = 0.2$. The estimated FDR and power are computed by averaging over 10000 trials. The number of p-values at each local node is drawn from $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$ and the probability of generating a non-null p-value at node i is $\pi_1^{(i)} = 0.5 - 0.4(i/N)$, where N denotes the number of local nodes in the network. The statistics are distributed

according to $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ under H_0 and we compute two-sided p-values. Under H_1 , we consider composite alternatives, i.e., we generate samples according to $\mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$ at node i where $\mu^{(i)} \sim \text{Unif}\{\mu_{\text{base}}^{(i)} - 0.5, \mu_{\text{base}}^{(i)} + 0.5\}$ and $\mu_{\text{base}}^{(i)} = 2 + 4(i/N)$. The pseudo-CDFs at local nodes are sampled at $\frac{j}{M+1}$, $1 \leq j \leq M$. The sample locations in section III-A are chosen slightly different than this just to simplify the presentation of our power analysis. We compare our method sample-and-forward, with the two baselines discussed in Section III: the Bonferroni method and the global (referred to as *pooled-BH*) multiple testing by carrying out the BH procedure over all the p-values from all nodes, i.e., $\{\mathbf{P}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{P}^{(N)}\}$. Under this setting, we consider the following four experiments.

Experiment 1 (vary M). We examine the effect of varying M on the power and FDR. We fix $N = 100$ and $\lambda = 3$.

Experiment 2 (vary n). We fix $M = 3$, $N = 100$ and vary λ from 1 to 10. We observe that for a fixed number of samples taken from the pseudo-CDFs, increasing the number of p-values improves the power of the sample-and-forward while it impacts the Bonferroni method in the negative way.

Experiment 3 (vary N). We fix $M = 3$ and $\lambda = 3$, and vary the number of nodes in the network from $N = 5$ to 205. It can be observed that increasing the number of nodes improves the power of the sample-and-forward while it impacts the Bonferroni method in the negative way.

Experiment 4 (dependent p-values). We fix $M = 3$, $\lambda = 3$ and $N = 100$, and evaluate the performance of our method when the p-values are dependent. In particular, we adopt the tapering covariance structure $\Sigma_{i,j} = \rho^{|i-j|}$ where ρ varies from 0 to 0.9. Although these p-values are not known to satisfy Assumption 1, it can be observed that the sample-and-forward has stable power and controls the FDR in this setting.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have developed a simple yet effective algorithm for communication-efficient multiple testing problem in networks. The method has finite-sample provable FDR control and only requires transmitting $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ bits, compared to $\mathcal{O}(m)$ real-valued numbers needed by the existing method. The detection power is analyzed under a mixture model, showing that a moderate number of samples guarantees good power, which is supported by our empirical results.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Benjamini and Y. Hochberg, "Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing," *Journal of the royal statistical society. Series B (Methodological)*, pp. 289–300, 1995.
- [2] Y. Benjamini and D. Yekutieli, "The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency," *Annals of Statistics*, pp. 1165–1188, 2001.
- [3] B. Efron, R. Tibshirani, J. D. Storey, and V. Tusher, "Empirical bayes analysis of a microarray experiment," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 96, no. 456, pp. 1151–1160, 2001.
- [4] J. D. Storey, "A direct approach to false discovery rates," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 479–498, 2002.
- [5] S. K. Sarkar, "Some results on false discovery rate in stepwise multiple testing procedures," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 239–257, 2002.
- [6] C. Genovese and L. Wasserman, "Operating characteristics and extensions of the false discovery rate procedure," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 499–517, 2002.
- [7] B. Efron, *Large-scale inference: empirical Bayes methods for estimation, testing, and prediction*. Cambridge University Press, 2012, vol. 1.
- [8] C. R. Genovese, N. A. Lazar, and T. Nichols, "Thresholding of statistical maps in functional neuroimaging using the false discovery rate," *Neuroimage*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 870–878, 2002.
- [9] F. Abramovich, Y. Benjamini, D. L. Donoho, and I. M. Johnstone, "Adapting to unknown sparsity by controlling the false discovery rate," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 584–653, 2006.
- [10] R. R. Tenney and N. R. Sandell, "Detection with distributed sensors," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, no. 4, pp. 501–510, 1981.
- [11] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Problems in decentralized decision making and computation." DTIC Document, Tech. Rep., 1984.
- [12] R. Viswanathan and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection with multiple sensors Part I. Fundamentals," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 54–63, 1997.
- [13] R. S. Blum, S. A. Kassam, and H. V. Poor, "Distributed detection with multiple sensors II. Advanced topics," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 64–79, 1997.
- [14] A. Ramdas, J. Chen, M. Wainwright, and M. Jordan, "QuTE: Decentralized multiple testing on sensor networks with false discovery rate control," in *IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, 2017, pp. 6415–6421.
- [15] E. B. Ermis and V. Saligrama, "Adaptive statistical sampling methods for decentralized estimation and detection of localized phenomena," in *IPSN 2005. Fourth International Symposium on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, 2005*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 143–150.
- [16] P. Ray, P. K. Varshney, and R. Niu, "A novel framework for the network-wide distributed detection problem," in *2007 10th International Conference on Information Fusion*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [17] E. B. Ermis and V. Saligrama, "Distributed detection in sensor networks with limited range multimodal sensors," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 843–858, 2009.
- [18] P. Ray and P. K. Varshney, "False discovery rate based sensor decision rules for the network-wide distributed detection problem," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1785–1799, 2011.
- [19] M. Pournaderi and Y. Xiang, "Communication-efficient distributed multiple testing for large-scale inference," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2022, pp. 1477–1482.
- [20] Y. Xiang, "Distributed false discovery rate control with quantization," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2019, pp. 246–249.
- [21] A. K. Ramdas, R. F. Barber, M. J. Wainwright, and M. I. Jordan, "A unified treatment of multiple testing with prior knowledge using the p-filter," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 2790–2821, 2019.
- [22] C. Genovese and L. Wasserman, "A stochastic process approach to false discovery control," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 1035–1061, 2004.
- [23] G. Blanchard and E. Roquain, "Two simple sufficient conditions for fdr control," *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, vol. 2, pp. 963–992, 2008.
- [24] J. D. Storey, J. E. Taylor, and D. Siegmund, "Strong control, conservative point estimation and simultaneous conservative consistency of false discovery rates: a unified approach," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 187–205, 2004.
- [25] A. W. Van der Vaart, *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, vol. 3.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof. Define the sequences $a_m = \frac{m\tau^*}{\alpha}(1 - 1/\log m)$ and $b_m = \frac{m\tau^*}{\alpha}(1 + 1/\log m)$. In the proof of Theorem 1 from [6], it is shown that ¹

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{\text{BH}} > b_m) \leq m e^{-c_1 m / (\log m)^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{\text{BH}} < a_m) \leq e^{-c_2 m / (\log m)^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

for some constants $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 > 0$. But the RHS of the both inequalities is summable in m . Therefore, according to the Borel-Cantelli lemma $a_m \leq R_{\text{BH}} \leq b_m$, *a.s.* for $m > \check{m}(\omega)$, completing the proof. ■

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Define the sequences a_m and b_m as in Appendix A. Pick some $\tau^* - \delta^* < \zeta < \tau^*$ and define,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\max}(m) &:= \frac{m}{\alpha} \sup \{t : \mathcal{F}(t) \geq t/\alpha\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \{0\} \cup \left\{ 1 \leq k \leq m : P_{(k)} \leq \frac{\alpha k}{m} \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\min}(m; \zeta) &:= \frac{m}{\alpha} \inf \{t > \zeta : \mathcal{F}(t) \leq t/\alpha\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \{m\} \cup \left\{ \zeta_m < k < m : P_{(k+1)} > \frac{\alpha k}{m} \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_m = m\zeta/\alpha$. We note that

$$D_{\max} = R_{\text{BH}} = \frac{m}{\alpha} \sup \{t : \mathcal{F}(t) = t/\alpha\}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 1 we have $a_m \leq D_{\max} \leq b_m$ for large m almost surely. This implies $\{t > \zeta : \mathcal{F}(t) = t/\alpha\} \neq \emptyset$ *a.s.* for large m . Thus, for large enough m we have $D_{\min} \leq D_{\max}$ almost surely. Now we wish to prove $a_m \leq D_{\min} \leq b_m$ for large m almost surely. First we note that, $D_{\max} \leq b_m$ *a.s.* implies $D_{\min} \leq b_m$ *a.s.* since $D_{\min} \leq D_{\max}$ *a.s.* for large m . So we only need to show $D_{\min} \geq a_m$ *a.s.*. We note,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(D_{\min} < a_m) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} \{P_{(k+1)} > \alpha k/m\} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{P_i \leq \alpha k/m\} \leq k \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} \mathbb{P} \left[\mu(k) - \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{P_i \leq \alpha k/m\} \geq \mu(k) - k \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(k) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{P_i \leq \alpha k/m\} \right) = mF(\alpha k/m)$. We observe that

$$\mu(k) - k = m \left(F(\alpha k/m) - \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha k/m) \right) =: h(k). \quad (5)$$

According to the Taylor's theorem we have,

$$h(a_m) = m \left(\frac{\tau^*}{\log m} (1/\alpha - F'(\tau^*)) + o\left(\frac{1}{\log m}\right) \right).$$

¹The result is derived under the strict concavity assumption on $G(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. However, this assumption can be weakened as pointed out in [6].

We note,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} h(k)/m &= \inf_{\frac{\alpha \zeta_m}{m} < \frac{\alpha k}{m} < \frac{\alpha a_m}{m}} \left(F(\alpha k/m) - \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha k/m) \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\zeta < t < \tau^* (1 - \frac{1}{\log m})} \left(F(t) - \frac{t}{\alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to Assumption 2, we have $F(t) - t/\alpha > 0$ for all $\zeta < t < \tau^*$. But we note that,

$$F\left(\tau^* (1 - 1/\log m)\right) - \frac{\tau^* (1 - 1/\log m)}{\alpha} = \frac{h(a_m)}{m} = o(1).$$

Hence, for large enough m we get

$$\inf_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} h(k)/m \geq h(a_m)/m$$

and therefore $h(k) \geq h(a_m)$ for all $\zeta_m < k < a_m$. Now by Hoeffding's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(D_{\min} < a_m) &\leq \sum_{\zeta_m < k < a_m} e^{-2h(k)^2/m} \\ &\leq m e^{-2h(a_m)^2/m} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the RHS is summable in m , we get $D_{\min} \geq a_m$ *a.s.* for large m . Therefore, for any $\tau^* - \delta^* < \zeta < \tau^*$ we have

$$\inf \{t > \zeta : \mathcal{F}(t) \leq t/\alpha\} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \tau^*. \quad (6)$$

Also from Lemma 1 we have

$$\sup \{t : \mathcal{F}(t) \geq t/\alpha\} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \tau^*. \quad (7)$$

We note that if $M > (\alpha/\delta^*)\mathbf{1}\{\tau^* > 2\delta^*\}$ and $t_{j^*} < \tau^* < t_{j^*+1}$, then $\tau^* - \delta^* < t_{j^*} < \tau^* < t_{j^*+1}$. In this case, according to (6) and (7) we get

$$t_{j^*}/\alpha < \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*}) < t_{j^*+1}/\alpha, \quad \text{a.s. all } m > m'(\omega),$$

which implies

$$t_{j^*} < \alpha \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*}) < t_{j^*+1}, \quad \text{a.s. all } m > m'(\omega). \quad (8)$$

According to (3), we get

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*})) = \hat{\mathcal{F}}(t_{j^*}) = \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*}) = \frac{\alpha \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*})}{\alpha}.$$

We note that $\hat{\tau} \leq \tau_{\text{BH}}$ (since $\hat{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathcal{F}$) and therefore, $\hat{\tau} = \alpha \mathcal{F}(t_{j^*})$. By the strong law of large numbers, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(t_{j^*}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} F(t_{j^*}) \quad (9)$$

which implies $\hat{\tau} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \alpha F(t_{j^*})$, completing the proof.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

Proof. According to the Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem [25] and $\tau_{\text{BH}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \tau^*$, we get $\text{TPP}(\tau_{\text{BH}}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} G(\tau^*)$. Dominated convergence theorem implies,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{P}_{\text{BH}} - \hat{\mathcal{P}}) = G(\tau^*) - G(\bar{\tau}) \leq C^* (\tau^* - \bar{\tau}) \leq \frac{C^* \alpha}{M - 1},$$

where the inequalities hold according to Corollary 1 and Assumption 4. ■