

Joint Mirror Procedure: Controlling False Discovery Rate for Identifying Simultaneous Signals

Linsui Deng¹, Kejun He^{1*}, Xianyang Zhang^{2*}

¹The Center for Applied Statistics, Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China

²Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

Abstract

In many applications, identifying a single feature of interest requires testing the statistical significance of several hypotheses. Examples include mediation analysis which simultaneously examines the existence of the exposure-mediator and the mediator-outcome effects, and replicability analysis aiming to identify simultaneous signals that exhibit statistical significance across multiple independent experiments. In this work, we develop a novel procedure, named joint mirror (JM), to detect such features while controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) in finite samples. The JM procedure iteratively shrinks the rejection region based on partially revealed information until a conservative false discovery proportion (FDP) estimate is below the target FDR level. We propose an efficient algorithm to implement the method. Extensive simulations demonstrate that our procedure can control the modified FDR, a more stringent error measure than the conventional FDR, and provide power improvement in several settings. Our method is further illustrated through real-world applications in mediation and replicability analyses.

Keywords: Composite null, Mediation analysis, Multiple hypothesis testing, Partial order, Replicability analysis.

*Correspondence: kejunhe@ruc.edu.cn and zhangxiany@stat.tamu.edu.

1 Introduction

Consider a set of features to be tested through statistical inference. For each feature, one can compute multiple p-values (associated with multiple hypotheses) to examine the significance of the feature. Identifying a single feature of interest requires the simultaneous significance of all hypotheses concerning the feature. Two notable examples of such a setup are testing high-dimensional mediation hypotheses and detecting replicable signals across multiple studies. Below we provide a brief introduction to these two problems that motivate our research.

Mediation analysis entails dissecting a mechanistic relationship between an exposure (denoted by X , e.g., smoking), a set of candidate mediators (denoted by M_i for $1 \leq i \leq m$, e.g., DNA methylation), and an outcome (denoted by Y , e.g., lung cancer progression). Under the assumption of no unmeasured confounding, if M_i mediates the effect of X on Y , then the exposure X should have a causal effect on the mediator M_i , and meanwhile, the mediator M_i has a causal effect on the outcome Y . Suppose the causal effect $X \rightarrow M_i$ is parameterized by α_i , and the causal effect $M_i \rightarrow Y$ is summarized by β_i . Then identifying the M_i 's that have a mediation effect consists of conducting m joint significance tests to test the composite null hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_{0i} : \alpha_i = 0$ or $\beta_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. This problem has been extensively studied in the literature. For example, [Sobel \(1982\)](#) proposed a Wald-type test to study the product of two normally distributed statistics for testing indirect effects, which includes testing exposure-mediator and mediator-outcome effects as a special case. [MacKinnon et al. \(2002\)](#) and [Huang \(2018\)](#) recommended the conventional joint significance (JS) test that delivers power improvement over Sobel's test in [Sobel \(1982\)](#). Observing that the composite null hypothesis consists of three null types, the two conventional methods are conservative because of ignoring the composite nature of the hypothesis. To alleviate the conservatism, [Huang \(2019\)](#) proposed to adjust the variances of the test statistics without directly estimating the proportions of different null hypothesis types. Another approach is to estimate the null proportions and incorporate them into large-scale inference. For example,

Dai et al. (2020) enhanced the conventional JS test by accounting for the mixture null distribution. Liu et al. (2021) constructed a composite p-value by aggregating the p-values weighted by the relative proportions. However, these methods depend on the estimation accuracy of the variances or null proportions and hence are not guaranteed to control the FDR in finite samples.

Another application that falls into our framework is the replicability analysis which has become a cornerstone of modern scientific research (Moonesinghe et al., 2007). Consistent results obtained from different studies with different data provide stronger scientific evidence and are a crucial component of reproducible research. For example, in genomics, replication can significantly improve the credibility of identified genotype-phenotype associations (Kraft et al., 2009). The partial conjunction hypothesis (PCH) test, introduced by Friston et al. (2005), provides a framework for evaluating the consistency of scientific discoveries across multiple studies. Benjamini and Heller (2008) further investigated the problem of the PCH test in large-scale inference, facing challenges of composition and multiplicity, and suggested combining p-values from different single tests. Wang et al. (2022) proposed to filter the features unlikely to be significant to alleviate the multiplicity burden and improve power, where the combined p-values are still “valid” conditioning on filtering because of the composite structure. Adopting the idea of filtering, Dickhaus et al. (2021) constructed new p-values by re-scaling the combined p-values that survive after filtering. Other related works that concern the PCH framework or its variants include Heller and Yekutieli (2014); Zhao and Nguyen (2020); Liang et al. (2022). However, these methods either fail to provide FDR control in finite samples or are too conservative when the number of studies that need to be reproducible is large.

Motivated by the applications in mediation analysis and replicability analysis, we formulate the following multiple joint significance testing problem. Consider a set of m features, where for the i th feature, we observe a sequence of K p-values, denoted by $\{p_{ki}\}_{k=1}^K$ for test-

ing the K hypotheses $\{H_{ki}\}_{k=1}^K$ concerning the feature i , $i = 1, \dots, m$. A feature is declared to be statistically significant if all the hypotheses H_{ki} for $1 \leq k \leq K$ associated with that feature are found to be significant simultaneously. In mediation analysis, we have $K = 2$ tests for each feature corresponding to testing the exposure-marker and marker-outcome effects. For replicability analysis, we are given $K \geq 2$ p-values for each feature, resulting from K independent experiments.

1.1 Main contributions

In this work, we propose a novel FDR-controlling procedure, named the joint mirror (JM) procedure, to detect and identify signals whose corresponding hypothesis tests are all non-null. The main components of our procedure include a new FDP estimator based on the numbers of p-values located at a rejection region, a control region consisting of K mirror regions, and a sequential rule of shrinking the rejection region. The JM procedure sequentially updates the rejection region subject to the shrinkage and partial masking principles until the FDP estimator is below the target FDR level. The proposed approach is innovative in several aspects:

- *Generalization of mirror conservatism.* The methods of mirror conservatism, such as the knockoff filter, have been extensively studied in the scope of multiple testing (Barber and Candès, 2015; Lei and Fithian, 2016; Candès et al., 2018). Although attempts have been made to extend the knockoff filter to multiple joint significance testing problems, current efforts are still limited to constructing one-dimensional symmetric statistics for each feature (Li et al., 2021; Dai and Zheng, 2023). Towards the goal of directly working on K -dimensional hypotheses, we construct K mirror regions for the first time to our best knowledge, which serve as the control for estimating the number of false discoveries. Furthermore, this generalization provides a fresh set of insights:
 - *Different mirror regions correspond to different null hypotheses.* Rather than

treating the composite null as a whole, the k th mirror region aims to estimate the number of false discoveries corresponding to the k th hypothesis by exploiting the mirror conservatism; see (5) of Section 2. This correspondence can be further used to determine a powerful sequential unmasking rule; see Section 3.2.

- *Sharper estimator for the number of false discoveries.* Example 1 demonstrates that the expected number of false discoveries estimated by the JM procedure is much closer to the true value than the conventional JS test, which leads to a sharper estimation for the number of false discoveries.
- *Partial-order-assisted rejection region.* The natural ordering in the case of one dimension suggests the rejection region for traditional multiple testing is on the leftmost side, that is, $[0, t]$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$. We propose a partial-order-assisted framework so that the rejection region corresponds to a set of small numbers in terms of partial ordering. This generalization helps interpret the rejection set of mediation and replicability analyses. See Remark 1 for more details.
- *Finite sample FDR control under PCH and a new error measure.* In theory, we establish finite FDR control under the framework of PCH, including the composite null in the joint significance testing problem as a special case. Numerical results suggest that our procedure can control a modified FDR, a more stringent error measure than the conventional FDR, that weights each null hypothesis based on its number of null components. This new measure provides an explanation for the conservatism of the JM procedure, which is not easily quantified in other methods (Wang et al., 2022; Dickhaus et al., 2021).
- *Power improvement in mediation and replicability analyses.* The JM procedure is anticipated to enhance detection power due to the sharper FDP estimator compared to the conventional JS method. Numerically, the JM procedure was shown to outper-

form the state-of-the-art methods in mediation (Benjamini and Heller, 2008; Zhao and Nguyen, 2020; Dai et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021) and replicability analysis (Zhao and Nguyen, 2020; Wang et al., 2022; Dickhaus et al., 2021) with more reliable FDR control and higher power.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the JM procedure and prove that it theoretically controls FDR under the target level in finite samples. Section 3 offers practical guidelines to implement the proposed procedure. In Sections 4 and 5, the superior performance of the JM procedure in mediation and replicability analyses is illustrated with both simulated and real datasets. Section 6 concludes and provides several future research directions. The supplement includes more implementation details, proofs of the main theoretical results, two extensions of the procedure, and additional numerical results.

2 Methodology

2.1 Basic setups

Consider a sequence of p-values arising from K experiments $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{1i}, \dots, p_{Ki})$ for $i \in [m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$, where p_{ki} is the p-value for testing H_{ki} , the hypothesis associated with the k th experiment and the i th feature. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\theta_{1i}, \dots, \theta_{Ki}) \in \{0, 1\}^K$ be the indicator for the underlying truth of the hypotheses (H_{1i}, \dots, H_{Ki}) , where $\theta_{ki} = 0$ ($\theta_{ki} = 1$) if H_{ki} is under the null (the alternative). Consider a class of probability measures $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. We assume that the p-values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are independently generated from

$$\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{1i}, \dots, p_{Ki}) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i} \quad \text{for} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \in \{0, 1\}^K. \quad (1)$$

The null set for experiment k is defined as $\mathcal{H}_0^k = \{1 \leq i \leq m : \theta_{ki} = 0\}$ and the alternative set is given by $\mathcal{H}_1^k = \{1 \leq i \leq m : \theta_{ki} = 1\}$. We define the composite null set as $\mathcal{H}_0 = \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{H}_0^k$. Our goal is to select a set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq [m]$ with the largest cardinality such that the FDR, defined as

$$\text{FDR}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{H}_0|}{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| \vee 1} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

is controlled at a target FDR level $q \in (0, 1)$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of a set.

2.2 Conditional mirror conservatism

For $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$, let $\mathbf{p}_{-k} = (p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}, p_{k+1}, \dots, p_K)$. Denote the conditional distribution of p_k given \mathbf{p}_{-k} and the marginal distribution of \mathbf{p}_{-k} by $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k| -k}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, -k}$, respectively, for any $k = 1, \dots, K$. We introduce the following concept that generalizes the notion of mirror conservatism in [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#).

Definition 1 (Conditional mirror conservatism). *Let $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{1 \leq k \leq K : \theta_k = 0\}$. For $k \in \mathcal{S}_0$, p_k is said to be conditionally mirror conservative if*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k| -k}(p_k \in [a_1, a_2] \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{K-1}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k| -k}(p_k \in [1 - a_2, 1 - a_1] \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{K-1}) \quad (3)$$

for all $0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq 1/2$ and $\mathbf{t}_{K-1} = (t_1, \dots, t_{K-1}) \in [0, 1]^{K-1}$. We say that \mathbf{p} is conditionally mirror conservative if all its components in \mathcal{S}_0 are conditionally mirror conservative.

When the p-values are conditionally mirror conservative and for a given rejection region $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [0, 1/2)^K$, we propose to estimate the number of false discoveries using the number of p-values located at a control region that consists of K separate mirror regions of the form

$$\mathcal{A}^k = \mathcal{A}^k(\mathcal{R}) = \{(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, 1 - t_k, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_m) : \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}\} \quad (4)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. We now explain the intuition behind the construction of the control region.

If $i \in \mathcal{H}_0$, then at least one component of \mathbf{p}_i is conditionally mirror conservative, i.e., (3) stands for some $k = 1, \dots, K$. We note that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}) \approx \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k) \approx \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k), \quad (5)$$

where the approximation is due to the law of large numbers, and the inequality is because of mirror conservatism. By the definition of \mathcal{H}_0 and using (5), we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}) \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k), \quad (6)$$

where \lesssim means ‘‘asymptotically less or equal to’’. Subsequently, we obtain an approximate upper bound for the FDP using \mathcal{R} as the rejection region:

$$\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R})}{1 \vee \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R})} \lesssim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k) + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R})} := \widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}). \quad (7)$$

We add a constant one in the numerator, which is crucial for achieving the finite sample FDR control; see Theorem 1 in Section 2.3 and its proof in Section SIII of the supplement. The upper bound in (6) appears to be quite conservative as (i) each $i \in \mathcal{H}_0$ could belong to multiple \mathcal{H}_0^k and (ii) bounding $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R})$ by $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k)$ for each k may be substantially loose.

Interestingly, we argue that the FDP estimate can be quite tight and improves over the FDR controlling procedure with a conventional JS test (MacKinnon et al., 2002; Huang, 2018) when the rejection region is a small square around the origin. Letting $\mathcal{S}_{0i} = \{1 \leq k \leq K : \theta_{ki} = 0\}$, we define $\mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)} = \{i : |\mathcal{S}_{0i}| = \kappa\}$ for $\kappa = 1, \dots, K$. In replicability analysis, for example, $\mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$ represents the set of features that are under the null in κ out of the K experiments. Obviously, $\mathcal{H}_0 = \cup_{\kappa=1}^K \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ (so $[m] = \cup_{\kappa=0}^K \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$). In the following, Example 1 compares the number of false discoveries estimated by (7) and the

conventional JS test in a general setting. Example 2 further provides a specific numerical example.

Example 1. *In this example, we assume that $\{p_{ki} : \theta_{ki} = 0, 1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ are uniformly distributed and mutually independent. Fixing $\mathcal{R} = [0, t]^K$ as the rejection region, the expectation of the number of false discoveries can be calculated as*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}\} \right) = \sum_{\kappa=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}} \left\{ t^\kappa \prod_{k \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i}} F_{ki}(t) \right\} \quad (8)$$

where $F_{ki} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the distribution function of p_{ki} . The FDR controlling procedure with the conventional JS test would bound (8) by $(m - m_0)t$, where m_κ denotes the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$. As a comparison, the expectation of the RHS of (6) is

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k\} \right) = \sum_{\kappa=0}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}} \left[\kappa t^\kappa \prod_{l \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i}} F_{li}(t) + \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i}} t^\kappa \{1 - F_{ki}(1 - t)\} \prod_{l \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i} \cup \{k\}} F_{li}(t) \right], \quad (9)$$

which bounds (8). Let us examine each summand in the RHS of (9) when t is small. Since the p -values under the alternative concentrate around zero, $F_{ki}(1 - t)$ is expected to be close to one, and thus, the summand is dominated by its first term $\kappa t^\kappa \prod_{l \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i}} F_{li}(t)$. We further note that

$$\sum_{\kappa=0}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}} \kappa t^\kappa \prod_{l \notin \mathcal{S}_{0i}} F_{li}(t) \leq \sum_{\kappa=0}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}} \kappa t^\kappa = m_1 t + 2m_2 t^2 + \dots + Km_K t^K,$$

which can be much tighter than $(m - m_0)t = (m_1 + \dots + m_K)t$ provided that $\kappa m_\kappa t^\kappa \ll m_\kappa t$ for $\kappa \geq 2$, i.e., $t \ll \min_{\kappa=2}^K \kappa^{1/(1-\kappa)} = 1/2$ and $m_\kappa > 0$ for some $\kappa \geq 2$. In this way, our proposed estimator for the number of false discoveries, though improvable, reduces the gap to the true expected number of false discoveries from $\sum_{\kappa=2}^K m_\kappa (t - t^\kappa)$ to $\sum_{\kappa=2}^K (\kappa - 1)m_\kappa t^\kappa$. This improvement can be quite significant for small t as our estimate captures the correct

power of t at the expense of a larger coefficient.

Example 2. Consider the case of $K = 2$. Generate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\theta_{1i}, \theta_{2i})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ from a mixture distribution of point masses:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_i \sim \pi_{(0,0)}\delta_{(0,0)} + \pi_{(0,1)}\delta_{(0,1)} + \pi_{(1,0)}\delta_{(1,0)} + \pi_{(1,1)}\delta_{(1,1)},$$

where $\delta_{(a,b)}$ denotes a point mass at (a, b) , $\pi_{(0,0)} = 0.4$ and $\pi_{(1,0)} = \pi_{(0,1)} = \pi_{(1,1)} = 0.2$. Given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ we generate two test statistics $X_{1i} \sim N(\mu_{i1}, \sigma_1^2)$ and $X_{2i} \sim N(\mu_{i2}, \sigma_2^2)$ independently. Specifically, we take $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$, $(\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) = (0, 0)$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (0, 0)$, $(\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) = (0, 2.5)$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (0, 1)$, $(\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) = (1.5, 0)$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (1, 0)$, and $(\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) = (2, 3)$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (1, 1)$. Figure 1 presents the corresponding p -values and the rejection and control regions determined by JM procedure with two unmasking rules (see Section 3.3) with various target FDR levels when the sample size $m = 2000$. With the rejection region being $\mathcal{R} = [0, t]^2$ and sample size $m = 10,000$, Panel A of Figure 2 shows the number of controls, compared to the number of false discoveries estimated by the conventional JS test, serving as a better estimator of the number of false rejections, especially when $t < 0.1$. It can also be seen that the empirical numbers of controls and false discoveries (red and blue points, respectively) are quite close to their theoretical values (dotted and dashed lines, respectively).

2.3 Joint mirror procedure

In this section, we propose an FDR-controlling procedure named the joint mirror (JM) procedure for testing the composite null. It is a sequential procedure that starts with an initial rejection region $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq [0, 1/2)^K$. At each step $t = 0, 1, \dots$, we calculate the FDP estimate $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_t)$ according to (7). If $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_t) \leq q$, the procedure terminates and returns the set of rejections $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \{1 \leq i \leq m : \mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_t\}$. If $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_t) > q$, we propose a new rejection region \mathcal{R}_{t+1} that satisfies (i) the shrinkage principle and (ii) the partial masking




Figure 1: Illustration of different rejection regions. Panel A corresponds to the square rejection region, and Panel B corresponds to the rejection region associated with the product order.




Figure 2: Panel A presents (i) the theoretical numbers of false discoveries and controls, the theoretical numbers of false discoveries estimated by the conventional joint significant test, and (ii) the empirical numbers of false discoveries and controls, using the rejection region $\mathcal{R} = [0, t]^2$. Panel B compares the corresponding empirical numbers of controls and weighted false discoveries when the empirical number of weighted false discoveries increases.

principle. The shrinkage principle requires that $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \subset \mathcal{R}_t$. The partial masking principle loosely refers to that only part of the information is available for determining the next rejection region (see a formal definition below). Specifically, the information available at step t include the number of controls, $A_t = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}_t^k\}$, and the number of

discoveries, $R_t = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_t\}$ with $\mathcal{A}_t^k = \mathcal{A}^k(\mathcal{R}_t)$, and the masked p-values $\{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m$, defined as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i} = \begin{cases} \text{Proj}(\mathbf{p}_i), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M}_t \\ \mathbf{p}_i, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{U}_t \end{cases}$$

with function $\text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = (\min\{1 - t_1, t_1\}, \dots, \min\{1 - t_K, t_K\})$ for $\mathbf{t} \in [0, 1]^K$. In the above, we let $\mathcal{M}_t = \{1 \leq i \leq m : \mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_t^k \cup \mathcal{R}_t\}$ be the masked set and $\mathcal{U}_t = [m] \setminus \mathcal{M}_t$ be the unmasked (or name revealed) set. When $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$, the value of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i}$ is not informative about the region to which \mathbf{p}_i belongs and hence $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i}$ is called the masked p-value. Mathematically, the information available at step t is summarized by the sigma field $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i})_{i=1}^m, A_t, R_t, \mathcal{M}_t, \mathcal{U}_t\}$. The partial masking principle can be formally stated as that

$$\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \text{ is measurable with respect to } \mathcal{F}_t, \text{ i.e., } \mathcal{R}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

For the ease of presentation, we let $\mathcal{R}_{-1} = [0, 1/2)^K$ and generate the corresponding \mathcal{F}_{-1} so that the pre-specified rejection region satisfies that $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{-1}$. To distinguish $(\mathcal{R}_{-1}, \{\mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}_{k=1}^K)$ with the rejection/control regions of $(\mathcal{R}_t, \{\mathcal{A}_t^k\}_{k=1}^K)$, $t \geq 0$, we simply call \mathcal{R}_{-1} the rejection side and $\{\mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}_{k=1}^K$ the control side (consisting of K mirror sides). Obviously, the two principles ensure that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=-1,0,1,\dots}$ is a filtration as the information of masked p-values at each step increases with t , and the trajectory of updating A_t , R_t , \mathcal{M}_t and \mathcal{U}_t can be inferred from the initial state. Note that at the initial state, \mathbf{p}_i with two of its components greater than $1/2$ are in the unmasked set, i.e., $|\{1 \leq k \leq K : p_{ki} \geq 1/2\}| \geq 2$, which is excluded from estimating FDP. Equivalently, only the p-values located at the ‘‘L’’-Shape region in Panel A of Figure 1 are used in estimating FDP.

In a related work, Wang et al. (2022) developed an FDP estimator that is tighter than conventional methods. The core idea behind their approach is to estimate the number of

falsely rejected null hypotheses using the expected number of null hypotheses located in a similar “L”-shaped region (called the filtering region). The latter value is approximated by counting the p-values (including both the null and alternative p-values) in the “L”-shaped region. In contrast, our proposed FDP estimator improves detection power by partitioning the “L”-shaped region into three sections: a rejection side (the bottom-left corner) and two mirror sides (the top-left and bottom-right corners). By only using the p-values in the mirror sides to estimate the number of false discoveries, our method is less affected by the p-values under the alternative hypothesis, which are more likely to be on the rejection side than the mirror sides.

Algorithm 1 Joint Mirror Procedure.

Input: P-values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^m$, target fdr level $q \in (0, 1)$;

Initialization:

- 1: Set $\mathcal{R}_{-1} = [0, 1/2)^K$ and initialize \mathcal{F}_{-1} ;
- 2: Set $t = 0$ and \mathcal{R}_0 such that $\mathcal{R}_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathcal{R}_{-1}$;
- 3: Update \mathcal{F}_0 and calculate A_0 , R_0 and $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_0) = (1 + A_0)/(R_0 \vee 1)$;

Search Step:

- 1: **while** $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_t) > q$ and $R_t > 0$ **do**
- 2: Choose the next rejection region satisfying $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \subset \mathcal{R}_t$;
- 3: Update \mathcal{F}_{t+1} and calculate A_{t+1} , R_{t+1} and $\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}) = (1 + A_{t+1})/(R_{t+1} \vee 1)$;
- 4: Update $t = t + 1$;
- 5: **end while**

Output: Selected hypothesis $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \{i : \mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_t\}$.

We summarize the JM procedure in Algorithm 1. Similar to Barber and Candès (2015) and Lei and Fithian (2016), the core idea for proving the finite sample FDR control is to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\text{FDP}(\mathcal{R}_\tau)\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_\tau) \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}_\tau^k) + 1}\right\} \\ &\leq q \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_\tau)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}_\tau^k) + 1}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau := \inf\{t : \widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_t) \leq q\}$ is a stopping time for a backwards super-martingale. We

expect the expectation of the ratio at the RHS to be less or equal to one because of (6). In fact, we are able to obtain a more sophisticated inequality by considering the problem of testing the PCH. The PCH concerns about whether or not at least κ out of the K experiments are under the alternative, i.e., the set of null hypotheses is $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}} = \cup_{k=\kappa}^K \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$ for $\kappa = 1, \dots, K$. Fixing $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$, we obtain that

$$\kappa \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{0i}} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k) = \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{0i}} \mathcal{A}^k) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}^k), \quad (10)$$

where the first inequality is because of the mirror conservatism and $|\mathcal{S}_{0i}| \geq \kappa$, and the equality holds as $\{\mathcal{A}^k\}_{k=1}^K$ are mutually disjoint. Using the optional stopping time theorem, we show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_\tau)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}_\tau^k) + 1} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa},$$

which implies the finite sample FDR control for the JM procedure. The detailed arguments are given in the supplement.

Theorem 1 (Finite sample FDR control). *Consider the problem of testing $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$ for any $\kappa = 1, \dots, K$, where the corresponding FDR is defined in (2) with \mathcal{H}_0 being replaced by $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. Suppose that the null p -values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ are independent of each other and of the non-null p -values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$. Suppose \mathbf{p}_i is conditionally mirror conservative for all $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. Then the JM procedure controls the FDR at level q/κ , or equivalently controls κ FDR at level q . As a consequence, when $\kappa = 1$ (i.e., under the composite null \mathcal{H}_0), the JM procedure controls the FDR at level q .*

Theorem 1 shows that the JM procedure controls the FDR in finite samples for testing the PCH. Researchers have the freedom to choose an appropriate method that adheres to the two principles outlined. In terms of practical implementation, Section 3 offers a method that is both computationally convenient and readily interpretable.

Indeed, the FDR control becomes more stringent as the number of null components κ gets larger. To understand this finding, let us assume that the null p-values are all symmetric about 0.5. Recall that the JM procedure estimates the number of false discoveries by $\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k)$ which is lower bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}^k) \approx \sum_{\kappa=1}^K \kappa \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}),$$

where the RHS weights the number of false discoveries by the corresponding number of null components. In other words, the JM procedure automatically takes into account the heterogeneity among the null hypotheses by weighting them by their number of null components in the FDP estimate. This property is particularly desirable in a situation where falsely rejecting a null hypothesis with more null components is more harmful than rejecting one with fewer null components. This observation motivates us to define the following error measure which can be viewed as a variant of the weighted FDR (wFDR, [Benjamini and Hochberg 1997](#)) adapted to the current context.

Definition 2 (Modified FDR, mFDR). The modified FDR is defined as

$$\text{mFDR}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \text{mFDP}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}) \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{\kappa=1}^K \kappa |\hat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}|}{|\hat{\mathcal{S}}| \vee 1} \right\},$$

where the numerator is a weighted sum of the number of false discoveries (also called the number of weighted false discoveries).

The mFDR differs from both the traditional FDR and the wFDR in several ways. Specifically, the mFDR is a more stringent error measure than the conventional FDR because it satisfies the inequality $\text{mFDR}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}) \geq \text{FDR}(\hat{\mathcal{S}})$. In spatial signal detection, the wFDR calculates the numerator and denominator as weighted sums of the number of false and total discoveries, respectively. The weights w_i in the wFDR are related to the cluster sizes, re-

flecting the fact that discovering a cluster with a larger size would account for either a larger error if it is under the null or more meaningful discoveries if it is indeed a signal (Benjamini and Heller, 2007; Basu et al., 2018). In contrast, the weights in the mFDR are based on the numbers of null components and only affect the false discoveries. Falsely rejecting a hypothesis with a larger number of null components would account for a larger error in mFDR. The mFDR approach offers a fresh viewpoint on joint significance testing, as it penalizes more for rejecting a hypothesis that contains more null components. In Example 2, Panel B of Figure 2 demonstrates that the empirical number of controls is similar to the empirical number of weighted false discoveries. Furthermore, our numerical simulation in Section 4 demonstrates that the JM procedure can effectively control the mFDR at the desired FDR level.

2.4 JM procedure with unmasking rule

We note that the method used for updating the rejection region does not affect the FDR control as long as $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{F}_t$. Here we provide a new perspective on updating the rejection region, which is useful for implementing the JM procedure in practice. At each step, we aim to construct a new rejection region \mathcal{R}_{t+1} using the information in \mathcal{F}_t . As $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \subset \mathcal{R}_t$, the control region is also shrinking over time, i.e., $\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{t+1}^k \subset \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_t^k$. Our idea is to select one hypothesis which is in the masked set using a sequential unmasking rule (to be described in the next section). The p-value of this particular hypothesis is then revealed. It belongs to either the current rejection region \mathcal{R}_t or one of the \mathcal{A}_t^k 's. We remove this p-value from the corresponding rejection or control region and update A_t (the conservative estimate of the number of false rejections) and R_t (the number of rejections) accordingly. The search step in Algorithm 1 can then be described as follows:

1. Choose $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$ using the information of \mathcal{F}_t , and set $\mathcal{M}_{t+1} = \mathcal{M}_t \setminus \{i\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{t+1} = \mathcal{U}_t \cup \{i\}$;

2. Update \mathcal{F}_{t+1} . Set $A_{t+1} = A_t$ and $R_{t+1} = R_t - 1$ if $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}$, and set $A_{t+1} = A_t - 1$ and $R_{t+1} = R_t$ otherwise;
3. Calculate $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_{t+1} = (1 + A_{t+1}) / (R_{t+1} \vee 1)$.

In this way, updating the rejection region amounts to finding an appropriate unmasking rule, i.e., determining the next p-value to be revealed from the masked set. We will also provide a careful discussion about the connection between the partial order-assisted unmasking rule and its corresponding rejection region in Section 3.3.

3 Sequential Unmasking Rule

In this section, we develop a sequential unmasking rule by adopting a Bayesian viewpoint.

3.1 Oracle procedure

Consider a mixture model with 2^K components for the p-values:

$$f(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0,1\}^K} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \quad (11)$$

with $\sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0,1\}^K} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = 1$ and $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \geq 0$, where $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is the probability of the underlying state being $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is the density of \mathbf{p} given the state $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. We shall first consider $\mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ and denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \text{Proj}(\mathbf{p})$ the corresponding masked p-value. The density of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ is given by

$$g(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \propto \sum_{\mathbf{t}: \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}} f(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}\}. \quad (12)$$

At step t , the sequential unmasking rule selects the hypothesis i_t^* satisfying that

$$i_t^* = \arg \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} q_i, \quad \text{where} \quad q_i = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) = f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) / g(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) \quad (13)$$

represents the conditional probability of a p-value falling into the rejection region given its masked p-value.

Roughly speaking, we prefer to reveal the hypothesis whose p-value is more likely to be in the control side. Subsequently, the FDP estimate calculated by (7) would get smaller, and the procedure may stop earlier. Consequently, the final number of rejections would be larger, leading to a higher power. Such an idea has been implemented by [Ren and Candès \(2020\)](#); [Chao and Fithian \(2021\)](#) to determine the next p-value to be revealed from the masked set using side information. We show that the unmasking rule defined in (12) is optimal in the sense of delivering the most discoveries among all possible unmasking procedures. Analogous to [Chao and Fithian \(2021\)](#), although this rule is updated stepwise and appears to be only stepwise optimal, it is indeed globally optimal once the initial state has been determined.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are independently generated from model (11). The sequence of the masked sets induced by (13) is the most powerful among all possible sequences in the sense of maximizing $\mathbb{P}(R_\tau \geq r)$ for every $r = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{M}_0|$.*

Another interesting observation is that the conditional probability in (13) is closely related to a generalized version of the local false discovery rate (lfdr, [Efron et al., 2001](#)) under some conditions.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are independently generated from model (11) that additionally satisfies: For $\mathbf{p} \sim f_\theta$, (a) $p_k < 1/2$ if $\theta_k = 1$; (b) the distribution of p_k is symmetric about $1/2$ if $\theta_k = 0$ conditional on \mathbf{p}_{-k} . Setting $\kappa_\theta = \sum_{k=1}^K (1 - \theta_k)$, we have*

$$f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})/g(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \propto \left\{ 1 + \frac{\sum_{\theta \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_\theta \pi_\theta f_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})}{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})} \right\}^{-1} \quad \text{for } \tilde{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}.$$

When $K = 1$, $\sum_{\theta \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_\theta \pi_\theta f_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})/f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ becomes $\pi_0 f_0(\tilde{t})/f(\tilde{t})$, the usual lfdr, where π_0 is the null probability, $f_0(\cdot)$ is the probability density of the p-value under the null, and $f(\cdot)$ is the marginal density of the p-value. When $K > 1$, it can be viewed as a “modified

local false discovery rate" (mlfdr) because $\pi_{\theta}f_{\theta}(\mathbf{t})/f(\mathbf{t})$ is $\mathbb{P}(\Theta = \theta \mid \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{t})$, the posterior probability of $\Theta = \theta$ given $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{t}$, and κ_{θ} plays the same role as κ in the mFDR. Theorem 3 suggests that the hypothesis i_t^* in (13) is also the one with the maximum mlfdr value in \mathcal{M}_t . This indicates that the oracle procedure tends to rule out null hypotheses with more null components first, which is the main factor causing conservatism.

3.2 Feasible sequential unmasking rule

In practice, the conditional probability $\{q_i\}$ in (13) is unknown and we need to estimate it from the data. As long as the estimation procedure uses only the information contained in \mathcal{F}_t at step t , our procedure controls the FDR regardless of the estimation accuracy. However, the estimation method affects the sequence of the masked sets and hence has a critical impact on the power. In this work, we consider a kernel-based estimator for q_i at step t defined as

$$\hat{q}_{t,i} = \frac{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{U}_t \cap \mathcal{M}_{-1}} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_{i'} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{i'})}{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{U}_t \cap \mathcal{M}_{-1}} v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{i'})} := \frac{\hat{q}_{t,i}^n}{\hat{q}_{t,i}^d}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i = \text{Proj}(\mathbf{p}_i)$, $v_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{K}_H(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')/\mathcal{K}_H(\mathbf{0})$, $\mathcal{K}_H(\mathbf{t}) = \det(H)^{-1/2} \mathcal{K}(H^{-1/2}\mathbf{t})$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a positive definite bandwidth matrix, and $\mathcal{K} : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a positive, bounded and symmetric kernel function. In (14), $\hat{q}_{t,i}^n$ and $\hat{q}_{t,i}^d$ can be viewed as the kernel density estimators for $f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)$ and $g(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)$ up to a constant, respectively, based on the information in \mathcal{F}_t . An interesting fact is that the numerator and the denominator of (14) can be updated separately, which allows us to speed up the computation using the result from the previous step. Specifically, given \hat{i}_{t+1}^* the index of the next p-value to be unmasked, we only need to add $\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_{\hat{i}_{t+1}^*} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\hat{i}_{t+1}^*})$ and $v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\hat{i}_{t+1}^*})$ to the numerator and the denominator of (14) respectively to get the value of $\hat{q}_{t+1,i}$. As for the choice of bandwidth matrix H , we adopt the rule of thumb bandwidth matrix $\{4/m(K+2)\}^{2/(K+4)} \widehat{\text{var}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})$ proposed in Silverman (1986). In our numerical experiments, we found that this rule works reasonably well. There

are other ways to select the bandwidth matrix, including the plug-in method (Duong and Hazelton, 2003; Chacón and Duong, 2010) and the cross-validation selection method (Duong and Hazelton, 2005).

3.3 Sequential unmasking rule using partial order

The feasible sequential unmasking rule can be further improved from the following two aspects. First, the estimation accuracy of (14) depends on the information in the unmasked set, which raises concern when revealing a hypothesis whose masked p-value is far from the masked p-values of those hypotheses in the unmasked set. For the data example in Section 5.1 below, the SNP with the strongest mediation effect (pink solid triangle) between smoking and lung disease failed to be rejected by JM.EmptyPoset in Figure 6, possibly because its masked p-values were too far from those of the unmasked hypotheses (gray circles).

The second concern can be illustrated by considering the case of $K = 1$. Suppose the p-values $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are independently generated from a two-group mixture model $f(x) = \pi_0 f_0(x) + (1 - \pi_0) f_1(x)$, where $\pi_0 = 0.9$ is the probability of a hypothesis under the null, $f_0(x) = 2x$ and $f_1(x) = 2(1 - x)$ are the densities of the p-values under the null and alternative, respectively. In this case, $\mathbb{P}(p = x \mid \tilde{p} = x) = f(x)/g(x) = 0.1 + 0.8x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 0.5$. According to the sequential unmasking rule defined in (13), hypotheses with smaller masked p-values \tilde{p} are being revealed earlier, which will reveal a large proportion of alternative p-values too early and thus damages the detection power.

To address these two concerns, we suggest imposing some additional requirements on unmasking/revealing orders. We introduce a general framework based on the notion of partially ordered sets that generalizes the intuitive concept of an ordering, sequencing, or arrangement of the elements of a set.

Definition 3 (Partially Ordered Set, Wallis, 2011). *A strict partial order on a set \mathcal{P} is a relation \prec on \mathcal{P} that is irreflexive, asymmetric, and transitive; that is,*

- (a) *Irreflexivity:* for any $a \in \mathcal{P}$, $a \prec a$ is not true;
- (b) *Asymmetry:* for any $a, b \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $a \prec b$, $b \prec a$ is not true;
- (c) *Transitivity:* for any $a, b, c \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $a \prec b$ and $b \prec c$, then $a \prec c$ is always true.

We call the pair (\mathcal{P}, \prec) as a partially ordered set (or a poset for short). If $a \prec b$, we say a is less than b or b is larger than a .

Definition 4 (Maximal Set, Wallis, 2011). Consider a poset (\mathcal{P}, \prec) . We call $a \in P$ a maximal element of (\mathcal{P}, \prec) if there is no other element $b \in P$ such that $a \prec b$. The maximal set $\mathcal{P}^{maximal}$ is the collection of all maximal elements of (\mathcal{P}, \prec) .

Consider a partial order \prec on $\{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ satisfying that a small value favors the alternative hypothesis. For example, \prec is defined as the usual “less than sign $<$ ” when $K = 1$. The candidates for the next masked p-value to be revealed are in the maximal set of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t := \{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t}$, denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t^{maximal}$. For convenience, we define a partial order \prec on \mathcal{M}_t satisfying that $i \prec j$ in \mathcal{M}_t iff $\mathbf{p}_i \prec \mathbf{p}_j$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t$, and write $\mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}$ as the corresponding maximal set. Algorithm 2 combines the kernel method in (14) with the sequential unmasking rule using partial order. If more than one hypotheses attain the minimum value of $\hat{q}_{t,i}$ in Line 2 of the search steps of Algorithm 2, we randomly select one of them to ensure that only one hypothesis is revealed at each step. During the JM procedure, we dynamically update the maximal set $\mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}$ by removing the revealed hypothesis and adding new elements to $\mathcal{M}_t^{add,maximal}$ at each step. The implementation details are deferred to Section SI of the supplement.

The JM procedure has different variants depending on the choice of partial orders. Below we introduce three partial orders exhibiting different impacts on determining the next hypothesis to be revealed.

1. JM.Max procedure orders K dimensional vectors through their infinity norm: $\mathbf{t} \prec \mathbf{t}'$ iff $\|\mathbf{t}\|_\infty < \|\mathbf{t}'\|_\infty$ for $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' \in \mathbb{R}^K$, where $\|\mathbf{t}\|_\infty = \max_k t_k$. In this case, JM.Max is equivalent

Algorithm 2 JM Procedure with the Sequential Unmasking Rule using Partial Order.

Input: P-values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^m$, partial order \prec , target FDR level $q \in (0, 1)$;

Initialization:

- 1: Set $\mathcal{R}_{-1} = [0, 1/2)^K$ and initialize \mathcal{F}_{-1} ;
- 2: Set $t = 0$ and \mathcal{R}_0 such that $\mathcal{R}_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathcal{R}_{-1}$;
- 3: Update \mathcal{F}_0 and calculate A_0 , R_0 and $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_0 := \widehat{\text{FDP}}(\mathcal{R}_0) = (1 + A_0)/(R_0 \vee 1)$;
- 4: Obtain \mathcal{M}_0 , \mathcal{U}_0 , $\mathcal{M}_0^{maximal}$, and calculate $\hat{q}_{t,i}^n$ and \hat{q}_{it}^d according to (14) for $i \in \mathcal{M}_0^{maximal}$;

Search Step:

- 1: **while** $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_t > q$ **do**
- 2: Calculate $\hat{q}_{t,i} = \hat{q}_{t,i}^n / \hat{q}_{t,i}^d$ for $i \in \mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}$ and find $\hat{i}_t^* = \arg \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}} \hat{q}_{t,i}$;
- 3: Update the mask and unmask sets $\mathcal{M}_{t+1} = \mathcal{M}_t \setminus \{\hat{i}_t^*\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{t+1} = \mathcal{U}_t \cup \{\hat{i}_t^*\}$;
- 4: Find new hypotheses to be added to the maximal set, denoted as $\mathcal{M}_t^{add,maximal}$;
- 5: Update $\mathcal{M}_{t+1}^{maximal} = \mathcal{M}_t^{maximal} \cup \mathcal{M}_{t+1}^{add,maximal} \setminus \{\hat{i}_t^*\}$;
- 6: For $i \in \mathcal{M}_t^{add,maximal}$, calculate $\hat{q}_{t+1,i}^n$ and $\hat{q}_{t+1,i}^d$ according to (14);
- 7: For $i \in \mathcal{M}_t^{maximal} \setminus \{\hat{i}_t^*\}$, update $\hat{q}_{t+1,i}^d = \hat{q}_{t+1,i}^d + v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\hat{i}_t^*})$;
- 8: **if** $\mathbf{p}_{\hat{i}_t^*} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ **then**
- 9: $\hat{R}_{t+1} = R_t - 1$;
- 10: For $i \in \mathcal{M}_t^{maximal} \setminus \{\hat{i}_t^*\}$, update $\hat{q}_{t+1,i}^n = \hat{q}_{t+1,i}^n + v_H(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\hat{i}_t^*})$;
- 11: **else**
- 12: $A_{t+1} = A_t - 1$;
- 13: **end if**
- 14: Update $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_{t+1} = (1 + A_{t+1})/(R_{t+1} \vee 1)$;
- 15: Update $t = t + 1$;
- 16: **end while**

Output: Selected hypothesis $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{i : \mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_t$.

to requiring the rejection region to be a cube, i.e., in the form of $\{[0, s]^K : s \in [0, 1]\}$.

When $\{\|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\|_\infty\}_{i=1}^m$ has no ties, the partial order has a dominant effect because the maximal set $\mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}$ contains only one element at each step.

2. JM.Product procedure employees the product order: $\mathbf{t} \prec \mathbf{t}'$ iff $t_k \leq t'_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $\mathbf{t} \neq \mathbf{t}' \in \mathbb{R}^K$. In this case, both the partial order and kernel method play important roles in deciding the next hypothesis to be revealed.
3. JM.EmptyPoset procedure assumes that the set of partial order relation \prec is empty, and equivalently, any two vectors are non-comparable. It reduces to the JM procedure purely with the feasible sequential unmasking rule.

The different performances of the three JM procedures reflect the impact of the choice

of partial ordering. Given a partial order and setting the target FDR level to zero, the full unmasking order can be determined. The later a hypothesis is revealed, the more likely it is under the alternative. Algorithm 2 induces a topological order \prec_t of $(\{i : \mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_0\}, \prec)$ such that $a \prec b$ implies $a \prec_t b$, where \prec_t is a strict total order that is irreflexive, asymmetric, transitive, and additionally connected:

- (d) Connectivity: for any $a \neq b \in \mathcal{P}$, either $a \prec_t b$ or $b \prec_t a$.

The induced order can be used as the prior information in subsequent research by ranking i before j if $i \prec_t j$ (G'Sell et al., 2016; Li and Barber, 2017, 2019). The real data example about Crohn's disease in Section 5.2 shows that the ordering induced by JM.Product is empirically superior to the other procedures; see Figure 7(b). Finally, the utilization of partial order enables us to explicitly specify the rejection region that corresponds to the JM procedure with the sequential unmasking rule.

Remark 1 (The partial-order-assisted rejection region). Algorithm 2 can be viewed as a specific implementation of Algorithm 1 that chooses the rejection region $\mathcal{R}_t = \{\mathbf{t} \in [0, 1]^K : \mathbf{t} \prec \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \text{ for some } i \in \mathcal{M}_t\} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t$ at step t . In other words, the rejection region consists of masked p-values in the masked set, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t$, and all the points in $[0, 1]^K$ that are "less than" at least one element of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t$ according to the partial ordering. This observation allows us to specify the partial-order-assisted rejection region. The bottom-left corners in Figure 1 correspond to the rejection regions induced by JM.Max and JM.Product with nominal FDR levels chosen as $\{0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$.

4 Simulation Studies

We evaluate the performance of the JM procedure in the mediation analysis and the reproducible study. As described in Section 3.3, three variants of the JM procedure, namely JM.Max, JM.Product and JM.EmptyPoset, are implemented in the simulation studies below.

Throughout, we consider the following three criteria, i.e.,

$$\text{FDP} = \frac{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{H}_0|}{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| \vee 1}, \quad \text{mFDP} = \frac{\sum_{\kappa=1}^K \kappa |\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}|}{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| \vee 1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{power} = \frac{|\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathcal{H}_1|}{|\mathcal{H}_1| \vee 1},$$

to evaluate the performance of different procedures.

4.1 Mediation analysis

In this section, we consider four popular competitors for mediation analysis: the divide-aggregate composite-null test (DACT, Liu et al., 2021), the joint significant test with the asymptotic mixture null distribution (JS.Mix.Asy, Dai et al., 2020) and with the finite mixture null distribution (JS.Mix.Finite, Dai et al., 2020), and the mediation test with the composite null hypothesis (MT.Comp, Huang, 2019). We follow the settings in Dai et al. (2020) and compare the abilities of the aforementioned tests in assessing the mediation effect of an exposure on quantitative outcomes by independent molecular markers. Specifically, we simulate $n = 250$ subjects from the following model:

$$X \sim \text{Ber}(0.2), \quad M_i = \alpha_i X + \epsilon_i, \quad Y_i = \beta_i M_i + \beta_0 X + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 5000,$$

where for each i , both ϵ_i and e_i are independently drawn from a standard normal distribution, β_0 is the common effect of the exposure on the outcomes, α_i is the effect of the exposure on the i th molecular marker, and β_i corresponds to the effect of the i th marker on the i th outcome. Our goal is to identify the markers possessing exposure-marker and marker-outcome effects simultaneously. Equivalently, we are interested in testing $\mathcal{H}_{i0} : \alpha_i = 0$ or $\beta_i = 0$. For each marker, there are four different cases \mathcal{H}_{00} , \mathcal{H}_{10} , \mathcal{H}_{01} , and \mathcal{H}_{11} : Under \mathcal{H}_{00} , $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0$; under \mathcal{H}_{10} , $\alpha_i = 0.25$ and $\beta_i = 0$; under \mathcal{H}_{01} , $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0.375$; under \mathcal{H}_{11} , $\alpha_i = 0.25$ and $\beta_i = 0.375$. For the common effect, we take $\beta_0 = 0.3$. Let $(\pi_{00}, \pi_{10}, \pi_{01}, \pi_{11})$ be the proportions for each case. We consider two different values for π_{00} ,

namely $\pi_{00} = 0.4$ or 0.88 . Fixing π_{00} , we set $\pi_{11} = \tilde{\pi}_1(1 - \pi_{00})$ with $\tilde{\pi}_1$ varying from zero to one, and $\pi_{01} = \pi_{10} = (1 - \pi_{00} - \pi_{11})/2$. We obtain 5,000 pairs of p-values for testing $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0$ (by regressing M_i on X , and Y_i on (M_i, X)) separately, and compare the JM procedure with the other multiple testing procedures designed for mediation analysis based on the calculated p-values.

Figure 3 reports the FDPs, mFDPs, and powers when the target FDR levels q are 0.05 and 0.2, respectively. Overall, JM.EmptyPoset and JM.Product deliver the highest power while controlling the empirical FDR, as well as the empirical mFDR, under the target FDR level. MT.Comp has severe FDR inflation when $\tilde{\pi}_1$ is small. The FDPs of DACT and JS.Mix.Finite are slightly inflated when $\tilde{\pi}_1$ is close to zero and $\pi_{00} = 0.4$. The core idea of JS.Mix.Finite and JS.Mix.Asy is to approximate the mixture null distribution. JS.Mix.Finite realizes a better approximation by performing a finite-sample adjustment and hence delivers higher power. The power of JS.Mix.Finite is comparable to that of JM.Max when $q = 0.05$ and $\tilde{\pi}_1$ is large. The power improvement of JM.EmptyPoset and JM.Product, compared to JM.Max owns to the better revealing ordering induced by the sequential unmasking rule: hypotheses likely to be under the null are revealed and excluded from the mask set earlier. Additional simulation studies are provided in Section SIV of the supplement.

4.2 Replicability analysis

We examine the performance of different methods in detecting simultaneous signals, i.e., hypothesis i is under the alternative if and only if it is under the alternative in all the K experiments. Besides the proposed JM procedure with three partial-ordered unmasking rules (i.e., JM.Max, JM.EmptyPoset, and JM.Product), we shall also consider the BH procedure using the Bonferroni adjusted p-values (BonferroniBH, Benjamini and Heller, 2008), the adaptive filtering multiple testing procedure (AdaFilter, Wang et al., 2022), the conditional partial conjunction test based on the BH procedure (cPC, Dickhaus et al., 2021), and the




Figure 3: The FDPs, mFDPs, and powers of various methods in mediation analysis. The results are based on 100 independent replications.

simultaneous signal analysis (ssa, [Zhao and Nguyen, 2020](#)) in this numerical study.

Our data-generating process is similar to that in [Wang et al. \(2022\)](#) with slight modification. We set $m = 10,000$ and consider the number of experiments $K \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$. Denote by π_0^{global} and π_1 the probabilities of being global null (all K experiments are under the null) and alternative, respectively. Other null combinations (excluding the global null, i.e., $\{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0, 1\}^K : 1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_k < K\}$) have equal probabilities adding up to $1 - \pi_0^{\text{global}} - \pi_1$. We mimic the typical signal sparsity situation in genetic studies by considering two values for π_1 : 0.01 and 0.03, and two values for π_0^{global} : 0.8 and 0.95.

Given the latent state $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$, we then generate the z-values from which we calculate the corresponding p-values. The z-values are independently sampled for the K experiments. For the i th feature and the k th experiment, we generate μ_{ki}^0 uniformly from $\{\pm 3, \pm 4, \pm 5\}$ if $\theta_{ki} = 1$ and let $\mu_{ki}^0 = 0$ otherwise. To allow the signal strength to vary across different experiments, we set the mean of the z-value μ_{ki} to be $\mu_k^0 \{2 - w_0 - 2k(1 - w_0)/K\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq K$, where $w_0 \in \{0.5, 1\}$. Finally, the correlation structure of the m z-values within the same experiment is set as $I_{b \times b} \otimes \Sigma_\rho$, where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product, b is the number of blocks, and $\Sigma_\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{m/b \times m/b}$ is compound symmetry with the diagonal elements being 1 and the other elements being $\rho = 0.5$. We consider two levels of dependency, i.e., $b = 100$ for weak dependence and $b = 10$ for strong dependence.

Figures 4 and 5 present the FDPs, mFDPs, and powers with the target FDR levels q being 0.05 and 0.2. All methods successfully control the empirical FDR as well as the empirical mFDR, under the target FDR level. The empirical mFDR of the three JM procedures is close to the target FDR level when $w_0 = 1$ and $K \leq 6$. As for the power, JM.EmptyPoset and JM.Product perform the highest power when $\pi_1 = 0.03$. JM.Max discovers more signals than adaFilter when $K \geq 6$, which indicates that the FDP estimator in (7) is less conservative when the number of experiments is large. JM.EmptyPoset and JM.Product are generally more powerful than JM.Max when $w_0 = 0.5$, which shows the usefulness of the sequential

unmasking rule. Since the JM procedure is impossible to make fewer than $1/q$ rejections due to the form of our FDP estimator, `adaFilter` can outperform the three JM procedures when $q = 0.05$ and $\pi_1 = 0.01$ (i.e., when alternative hypotheses are very sparse).

5 Applications

5.1 Cigarette Smoking, DNA methylation, and Lung Diseases

Recent research has identified several CpG sites whose DNA methylation mediates the negative effects of cigarette smoking on lung functions (Zhang et al., 2016; Barfield et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2021). We demonstrate the effectiveness of the JM procedure in detecting DNA methylation CpG sites being the mediators of smoking on lung diseases using the dataset studied in Liu et al. (2021). The original dataset came from the Normative Aging Study, including the questionnaires, follow-up visits, and diagnostic data (Bell et al., 1972), as well as the DNA methylation on $m = 484,613$ CpG sites measured using the Illumina Infinium HumanMethylation450 Beadchip on blood samples (Bibikova et al., 2011). The processed data include the estimated coefficients for the association between smoking and DNA methylation (denoted by γ), the association between the DNA methylation and lung function (denoted by β), and their standard errors and the corresponding p-values (denoted by p_γ and p_β respectively).

We applied DACT and the proposed JM procedures (i.e., JM.Max, JM.Product, and JM.EmptyPoset) on this dataset with the target FDR level as 0.2, and the discoveries of various methods were illustrated in Figure 6. In particular, DACT, JM.Max, JM.Product, and JM.EmptyPoset identified 21, 27, 32, and 37 CpG sites that mediate the effect of smoking on lung diseases, respectively. This result shows that the three JM procedures discovered more significant CpG sites compared to DACT. Furthermore, in Panel A, though finding the most sites, JM.EmptyPoset ignores the most significant CpG site (the pink solid triangle), which




Figure 4: The FDPs, mFDPs, and powers of various methods in replicability analysis when $\pi_1 = 0.01$. The results are based on 100 independent replications.




Figure 5: The FDPs, mFDPs, and powers of different methods in replicability analysis when $\pi_1 = 0.03$. The results are based on 100 independent replications.

emphasizes the importance of including a partial order structure. Compared to JM.Max, JM.Product prefers the sites with the weaker association between DNA methylation and lung function but with a stronger association between smoking and DNA methylation. In fact, most points are below the 45-degree line, indicating a stronger association between smoking and DNA methylation. The rejection region of JM.Product also prefers a stronger smoking-methylation effect. Panel B shows that JM.Product and JM.EmptyPoset identify several CpG sites with large mediation effects and small p-values that were not discovered by the other methods.




Figure 6: Panel A presents the pairs of p-values (p_γ, p_β) with $p_\gamma \leq 0.002$ and $p_\beta \leq 0.1$ on the $-\log_{10}$ scale. The red and blue regions represent the rejection regions of JM.Product and JM.Max, respectively. Panel B depicts the volcano plot for the Sobel test, where the horizontal axis is the mediation effect size, and the vertical axis is the p-value calculated using the Sobel test. Points with different colors and shapes are the discoveries identified by different (combinations of) methods.

5.2 Genome-wide association study for Crohn’s Disease

In this section, we study a data set¹ previously analyzed in [Franke et al. \(2010\)](#) by applying the JM procedure to identify SNPs exhibiting replicable associations with the Crohn’s disease. In each experiment, the data comprises z-values for testing the association between SNPs and Crohn’s disease. After retaining the SNPs that possess observations in all eight experiments, we have a $953,154 \times 8$ data matrix corresponding to 953,154 SNPs from 8 experiments. For each SNP, we test the null hypothesis that the SNP has no association with Crohn’s disease in at least one experiment.

Figure 7(a) presents the testing results for different methods when the target FDR level is 0.05. Both JM.Product and JM.EmptyPoset discovered 124 Crohn’s disease-related SNPs. In contrast, JM.Max found 57 SNPs, adaFilter identified 15 SNPs, while cPC only found eight SNPs. Note that JM.Product and JM.EmptyPoset additionally identified 68 significant SNPs that were not found by the other methods.

To validate the findings by the JM procedure, we leave one of the eight studies out and implement JM.Product using the p-values from the remaining seven studies. We rank the SNPs based on their rejection orders in the JM procedure: a more significant SNP requires a lower target FDR level to be rejected and has a lower rank. As a comparison, we also rank the SNPs according to the maximum p-values of the remaining seven studies. Ranking using the maximum p-values is consistent with those using the Boferrorni test ([Benjamini and Heller, 2008](#)), the adaFilter procedure ([Wang et al., 2022](#)), and the conditional partial conjunction test ([Dickhaus et al., 2021](#)). Motivated by the ordered hypotheses testing problem ([G’Sell et al., 2016](#); [Li and Barber, 2017, 2019](#)), we plot the cumulative sum of the p-values for the leave-one-out study based on these two different rankings in Figure 7(b). We observe that the cumulative sum of the p-values based on the ranking produced by JM.Product is generally lower than that by the maximum p-values. This finding suggests that the SNPs

¹The data are available at [International Inflammatory Bowel Disease Genetics Consortium](#).

ranked higher by JM.Product are more likely to be associated with Crohn’s disease in a separate leave-one-out study, and hence corroborates the validity of the findings by the JM procedure to some extent.


6 Discussion

In this paper, we have proposed the JM procedure, a robust and powerful multiple testing method for identifying simultaneous signals. The JM procedure is based on a new FDP estimator built upon the mirror conservatism, and it involves the following key ingredients:


- a rejection region and a set of mirror regions for estimating the number of false rejections;
- a sequential unmasking rule that uses partially masked p-values to determine the next p-value to unmask;
- a partial order that provides additional guidance on the unmasking orders;
- a sequential procedure that updates the FDP estimate, the rejection region, and the control region dynamically until the FDP estimate is below the target FDR level.

Using various simulation experiments and real data examples, we show that the JM procedure controls the FDR in finite samples and can provide power improvements over current state-of-the-art methods.

We briefly mention a few directions that are worth future investigation. First, one can consider a more general masking scheme (or equivalently, a control region) that improves the JM procedure when the set of discoveries is small, or the null p-values concentrate around one (Chao and Fithian, 2021). Second, the JM procedure takes p-values as inputs which ignore the sign information. It is of interest to extend the JM procedure to handle test statistics directly and to control the directional FDR, an error measure accounting for signs. We briefly



(a) UpSet plot



(b) Cumulative p-values.

Figure 7: Illustrations of Crohn's disease GWAS.

summarize the first two ideas in Section [SIII](#) of the supplement with more discussions. Third, incorporating side information (e.g., spatial information in genetic studies) may lead to a more powerful multiple testing procedure and needs further investigation. Finally, the JM procedure can provide quite stringent error control for testing PCH. It is thus interesting to design a less conservative procedure that is tailored to such hypotheses with finite sample FDR control.

References

- Barber, R. F. and Candès, E. J. (2015), “Controlling the false discovery rate via knockoffs,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 43, 2055–2085.
- Barfield, R., Shen, J., Just, A. C., Vokonas, P. S., Schwartz, J., Baccarelli, A. A., VanderWeele, T. J., and Lin, X. (2017), “Testing for the indirect effect under the null for genome-wide mediation analyses,” *Genetic epidemiology*, 41, 824–833.
- Basu, P., Cai, T. T., Das, K., and Sun, W. (2018), “Weighted false discovery rate control in large-scale multiple testing,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113, 1172–1183.
- Bell, B., Rose, C. L., and Damon, A. (1972), “The normative aging study: An interdisciplinary and longitudinal study of health and aging,” *Aging and Human Development*, 3, 5–17.
- Benjamini, Y. and Heller, R. (2007), “False discovery rates for spatial signals,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 1272–1281.
- (2008), “Screening for partial conjunction hypotheses,” *Biometrics*, 64, 1215–1222.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1997), “Multiple hypotheses testing with weights,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 24, 407–418.
- Bibikova, M., Barnes, B., Tsan, C., Ho, V., Klotzle, B., Le, J. M., Delano, D., Zhang, L., Schroth, G. P., Gunderson, K. L., et al. (2011), “High density DNA methylation array with single CpG site resolution,” *Genomics*, 98, 288–295.
- Candès, E., Fan, Y., Janson, L., and Lv, J. (2018), “Panning for gold: ‘model-X’ knockoffs for high dimensional controlled variable selection,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80, 551–577.
- Chacón, J. E. and Duong, T. (2010), “Multivariate plug-in bandwidth selection with unconstrained pilot bandwidth matrices,” *TEST*, 19, 375–398.
- Chao, P. and Fithian, W. (2021), “AdaPT-GMM: Powerful and robust covariate-assisted multiple testing,” *arXiv preprint*, abs/2106.15812.
- Dai, J. Y., Stanford, J. L., and LeBlanc, M. (2020), “A multiple-testing procedure for high-dimensional mediation hypotheses,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–16.
- Dai, R. and Zheng, C. (2023), “False discovery rate-controlled multiple testing for union null hypotheses: a knockoff-based approach,” *Biometrics*, 0, 1–13.

- Dickhaus, T., Heller, R., and Hoang, A.-T. (2021), “Multiple testing of partial conjunction null hypotheses with conditional p-values based on combination test statistics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06692*.
- Duong, T. and Hazelton, M. (2003), “Plug-in bandwidth matrices for bivariate kernel density estimation,” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 15, 17–30.
- Duong, T. and Hazelton, M. L. (2005), “Cross-validation bandwidth matrices for multivariate kernel density estimation,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 32, 485–506.
- Efron, B., Tibshirani, R., Storey, J. D., and Tusher, V. (2001), “Empirical Bayes analysis of a microarray experiment,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1151–1160.
- Franke, A., McGovern, D. P., Barrett, J. C., Wang, K., Radford-Smith, G. L., Ahmad, T., Lees, C. W., Balschun, T., Lee, J., and Roberts, R. (2010), “Genome-wide meta-analysis increases to 71 the number of confirmed Crohn’s disease susceptibility loci,” *Nature genetics*, 42, 1118–1125.
- Friston, K. J., Penny, W. D., and Glaser, D. E. (2005), “Conjunction revisited,” *Neuroimage*, 25, 661–667.
- G’Sell, M. G., Wager, S., Chouldechova, A., and Tibshirani, R. (2016), “Sequential selection procedures and false discovery rate control,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 78, 423–444.
- Heller, R. and Yekutieli, D. (2014), “Replicability analysis for genome-wide association studies,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 8, 481–498.
- Huang, Y.-T. (2018), “Joint significance tests for mediation effects of socioeconomic adversity on adiposity via epigenetics,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 12, 1535–1557, 23.
- (2019), “Genome-wide analyses of sparse mediation effects under composite null hypotheses,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13, 60–84.
- Kraft, P., Zeggini, E., and Ioannidis, J. P. (2009), “Replication in genome-wide association studies,” *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 24, 561.
- Lei, L. and Fithian, W. (2016), “AdaPT: An interactive procedure for multiple testing with side information,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80.
- Li, A. and Barber, R. F. (2017), “Accumulation tests for FDR control in ordered hypothesis testing,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112, 837–849.
- (2019), “Multiple testing with the structure-adaptive Benjamini-Hochberg algorithm,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 81, 45–74.
- Li, S., Sesia, M., Romano, Y., Cand, egrave, s, E., and Sabatti, C. (2021), “Searching for robust associations with a multi-environment knockoff filter,” *Biometrika*, 109, 611–629.
- Liang, B., Zhang, L., and Janson, L. (2022), “Powerful partial conjunction hypothesis testing via conditioning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11304*.
- Liu, Z., Shen, J., Barfield, R., Schwartz, J., Baccarelli, A. A., and Lin, X. (2021), “Large-scale hypothesis testing for causal mediation effects with applications in genome-wide epigenetic studies,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–15.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., and Sheets, V. (2002), “A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects,” *Psy-*

chological methods, 7, 83.

- Moonesinghe, R., Khoury, M. J., and Janssens, A. C. J. W. (2007), “Most published research findings are false—But a little replication goes a long way,” *PLOS Medicine*, 4, 1–4.
- Ren, Z. and Candès, E. (2020), “Knockoffs with side information,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*.
- Silverman, B. W. (1986), *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*, CRC Press.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982), “Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models,” *Sociological Methodology*, 13, 290–312.
- Sun, Y.-Q., Richmond, R. C., Suderman, M., Min, J. L., Battram, T., Flatberg, A., Beisvag, V., Nøst, T. H., Guida, F., Jiang, L., Wahl, S. G. F., Langhammer, A., Skorpen, F., Walker, R. M., Bretherick, A. D., Zeng, Y., Chen, Y., Johansson, M., Sandanger, T. M., Relton, C. L., and Mai, X.-M. (2021), “Assessing the role of genome-wide DNA methylation between smoking and risk of lung cancer using repeated measurements: the HUNT study,” *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 50, 1482–1497.
- Wallis, W. D. (2011), *A beginner’s guide to discrete mathematics*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Wang, J., Gui, L., Su, W. J., Sabatti, C., and Owen, A. B. (2022), “Detecting multiple replicating signals using adaptive filtering procedures,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 50, 1890–1909.
- Zhang, H., Zheng, Y., Zhang, Z., Gao, T., Joyce, B., Yoon, G., Zhang, W., Schwartz, J., Just, A., Colicino, E., Vokonas, P., Zhao, L., Lv, J., Baccarelli, A., Hou, L., and Liu, L. (2016), “Estimating and testing high-dimensional mediation effects in epigenetic studies,” *Bioinformatics*, 32, 3150–3154.
- Zhao, S. D. and Nguyen, Y. T. (2020), “Nonparametric false discovery rate control for identifying simultaneous signals,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14, 110–142, 33.

Supplementary Material for “Joint Mirror Procedure: Controlling False Discovery Rate for Identifying Simultaneous Signals”

Linsui Deng¹, Kejun He^{1*}, Xianyang Zhang^{2*}

¹The Center for Applied Statistics, Institute of Statistics and Big Data,
Renmin University of China, Beijing, China

²Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

The supplement is organized as follows. Section [SI](#) discusses the detailed implementation of Algorithm [2](#). Section [SII](#) presents the proofs of Theorems [1–3](#) and Remark [1](#) of the main paper. In Section [SIII](#), we discuss two possible extensions of the proposed JM procedure. The first one develops the JM procedure with a general masking scheme, and we prove that it controls the FDR in finite samples. The other extension demonstrates the JM procedure with z-values. Section [SIV](#) provides some additional numerical results.

SI Discussions on Algorithm [2](#)

In this section, we describe how to update the maximal set $\mathcal{M}_t^{maximal}$ in Algorithm [2](#). We consider a partial order set (poset) consisting of seven masked bivariate p-values equipped with the product order \prec . Figure [S1](#) illustrates the poset $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \prec)$ with a directed acyclic graph $G = (V, E)$, where $V = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $(b, a) \in E$ iff $a \prec b$. Panel A describes the partial order relationship completely, but the edges could include redundant information, e.g., with edges (b, a) and (a, c) , edge (b, c) can be inferred by the transitivity and hence can be removed. In other words, to store information efficiently, we adopt the idea of transitive reduction to remove redundant edges, which can recover the original directed acyclic graph (DAG) with the fewest edges.

Definition S1 (Transitive Reduction, [Aho et al., 1972](#)). *A graph G_t is a transitive reduction of a directed graph G if it satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. *there is a directed path from a to b in G iff there is a directed path from a to b in G_t ;*
2. *there is no graph with fewer edges than G_t satisfying the first condition.*

The computational cost of finding the transitive reduction is no more than $O(|V|^{\log_2 7})$; see [Aho et al. \(1972\)](#) for more details. Recall that our goal is to find the maximal set of the poset in each step, which is equivalent to finding the root set of the corresponding DAG. The process of updating the root set is described by Algorithm [S1](#), a well-known

*Correspondence: kejunhe@ruc.edu.cn and zhangxiany@stat.tamu.edu.




Figure S1: Panel A depicts the complete partial order set (poset). Panel B is the transitive reduction of Panel A. Colorful points and their edges in Panel C represent the transitive reduction of poset at Step 4. The color represents the conditional probability of a p-value locating at the rejection side defined in (13) of the main paper. The labels in Panels B and C are the unmasking orders, e.g., vertex a is the first one being revealed.

algorithm for searching a topological sorting (Kahn, 1962). Removing one root from the root set corresponds to revealing a hypothesis in the maximal set (line 5 of the Search Step in Algorithm 2 of the main paper). Updating the root set corresponds to finding the new hypotheses to be added to the maximal set (line 4 of the Search Step in Algorithm 2 of the main paper). The computational cost of updating the root set is approximately $O(|V| + |E|)$. Therefore, replacing the DAG with its transitive reduction can save much time.

Finally, we exemplify the sequential unmasking rule using partial order with Figure S1. At Step 1, the maximal set is $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{a, c\}$. Since $q_a < q_c$, a is more likely to locate at the control side, and therefore we remove it first. After removing a , we add b into the maximal set because the in-degree of b becomes zero. Then, the maximal set at Step 2 is $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{b, c\}$. We compare q_b with q_c to decide which one to be removed. Panel C describes the poset at Step 4, where the hypotheses $\{a, b, c\}$ have been unmasked at the previous steps. The maximal set of the remaining set is $\mathcal{M}_4 = \{d, e\}$. Since $q_d < q_e$, d is revealed in Step 4. Similarly, Steps 5 to 7 reveal hypotheses g , e , and f in order.

Algorithm S1 Kahn’s Algorithm (Kahn, 1962).

Input: An directed acyclic graph $G = (V, E)$;

Initialization:

- 1: Calculate the in-degrees $\{d_v\}_{v \in V}$ of all vertexes (i.e., the number of edges whose endpoint is v);
- 2: Set the initial root set $V_r = \{v \in V : d_v = 0\}$;

Iterative Step:

- 1: **while** $V_r \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 2: Remove one root $v_r \in V_r$ from the root set;
 - 3: Update the in-degrees: For v such that $(v_r, v) \in E$, $d_v = d_v - 1$;
 - 4: Update the root set: For v such that $(v_r, v) \in E$, add v to V_r if $d_v = 0$.
 - 5: **end while**
-

SII Proofs of the theoretical results

SII.1 FDR control

Throughout the proof, we fix $\kappa \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and consider testing the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}} = \cup_{k=\kappa}^K \mathcal{H}^{(\kappa)}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} b_i &= \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\}, \\ U_t &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} (1 - b_i), \\ V_t &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} b_i. \end{aligned} \tag{S1}$$

Obviously, $U_t + V_t = |\mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|$. Recall that the filtration for determining the next hypothesis to be revealed is $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=-1,0,\dots}$, where $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t,i})_{i=1}^m, A_t, R_t, \mathcal{M}_t, \mathcal{U}_t\}$. We further define a filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t=-1,0,\dots}$ with

$$\mathcal{G}_t = \begin{cases} \sigma\left(\{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}, \{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{U}_{-1} \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}, \mathcal{M}_{-1}, \mathcal{U}_{-1}, V_{-1}, U_{-1}\right), & t = -1, \\ \sigma\left(\mathcal{G}_{t-1}, \{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{U}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}, \mathcal{M}_t, \mathcal{U}_t\right), & t \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i = \text{Proj}(\mathbf{p}_i)$. We have that $\tau = \inf\{t : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_t \leq q\}$ is a stopping time of $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$ because τ is a stopping time of $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ and $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_t$ is determined by A_t and R_t whose σ -field is included in \mathcal{F}_t and $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}_t$. We prove Theorem 1 of the main paper using the following two lemmas.

Lemma S1. *Fix $\kappa \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Suppose that the null p -values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ are mutually independent and are conditionally mirror conservative. Then $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ defined in (S1) are independent Bernoulli random variables conditioned on \mathcal{G}_{-1} with*

$$\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq 1/(\kappa + 1)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$.

Lemma S2. *Suppose b_1, \dots, b_m are independent Bernoulli random variable conditioned on \mathcal{G}_{-1} with $\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_{-1}) = \rho_i \leq \rho < 1$ almost surely. Consider a sequence of masked sets $\mathcal{M}_{-1} \supseteq \mathcal{M}_0 \supseteq \dots$. If \mathcal{M}_t is measurable with respect to \mathcal{G}_t and τ is an almost surely finite stopping time with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t=0,1,\dots}$, then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{U_\tau + 1} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{-1}\right) \leq 1/(1 - \rho). \tag{S2}$$

We now present the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Similar to the derivations in Section 2.3 of the main paper, we have

$$\text{FDP}_\tau = \frac{V_\tau}{R_\tau \vee 1} = \frac{A_\tau + 1}{R_\tau \vee 1} \frac{V_\tau}{A_\tau + 1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \widehat{\text{FDP}}_\tau \frac{V_\tau}{U_\tau + 1} \\
&\leq q \frac{V_\tau}{U_\tau + 1} = q \left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{U_\tau + 1} - 1 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the two inequalities in the second and third lines hold because of $A_\tau \geq U_\tau$ and the stopping time definition of τ . Using the above inequalities, Theorem 1 immediately stands by applying Lemmas S1 and S2. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{FDR} &= \mathbb{E}(\text{FDP}_\tau) \\
&\leq q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{V_\tau}{U_\tau + 1} \right) \\
&= q \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{U_\tau + 1} - 1 \middle| \mathcal{G}_{-1} \right) \right\} \\
&\leq q \left(\frac{\kappa + 1}{\kappa} - 1 \right) = q/\kappa,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Next, we prove Lemmas S1 and S2.

Proof of Lemma S1. Since $\mathcal{R}_{-1} = [0, 1/2)^K$ is non-random, $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0}$ are independent Bernoulli random variables due to the definition in (S1). To prove the bound for the conditional probability, we first note that $b_i = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}} \cap \mathcal{U}_{-1}$ by the definition of \mathcal{U}_{-1} . Therefore, we only need to prove $\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq 1/(\kappa + 1)$ for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}} \cap \mathcal{M}_{-1}$. Since $i \in \mathcal{M}_{-1}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}$, it is sufficient to show

$$\mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \leq 1/(\kappa + 1) \quad (\text{S3})$$

for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$, where \mathbb{P}_i is the probability measure of \mathbf{p}_i . Fixing $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$ and for any $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}$, it is can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) = 1,
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

because \mathcal{R}_{-1} and $\{\mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}_{k=1}^K$ are mutually exclusive and their union covers the whole space. Since the null p-values are conditionally mirror conservative, we have

$$\kappa \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{0i}} \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}^k) = \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{0i}} \mathcal{A}^k) \leq \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}^k), \quad (\text{S5})$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{0i} = \{1 \leq k \leq K : \theta_{ki} = 0\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{R}_\Delta = \{\mathbf{t} : \|\mathbf{t} - \tilde{\mathbf{t}}\|_2 \leq \Delta\} \cap \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ with $\|\cdot\|_2$ being Euclidean norm and $\mathcal{A}_\Delta^k := \mathcal{A}^k(\mathcal{R}_\Delta)$. Taking $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_\Delta$ and $\mathcal{A}^k = \mathcal{A}_\Delta^k$, then (S5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

because $\{\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}$ are equivalent to $\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta\}$ and $\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}$, respectively. If $\mathbb{P}_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \kappa \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\|\Delta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and taking $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \kappa \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can obtain (S3) by combining the above formula to (S4). \square

Proof of Lemma S2. This lemma holds by slightly modifying the proof of Lemma 2 in [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#). We highlight the key difference here and omit the detailed proof. Conditioned on \mathcal{G}_{-1} , we can construct conditionally independent random variables $\{\tilde{b}_i\}$ and $\{\bar{b}_i\}$ such that $\tilde{b}_i \sim \text{Ber}(\rho)$, $\bar{b}_i \sim \text{Ber}(\rho_i)$ and $\tilde{b}_i \leq \bar{b}_i$ almost surely. By construction, the conditional distribution of $(\tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m)$ is identical to that of (b_1, \dots, b_m) . Then, LHS of (S2) can be bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} (1 - \tilde{b}_i) + 1} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{-1} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}} (1 - \bar{b}_i) + 1} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{-1} \right).$$

In this way, we can work with \bar{b}_i whose conditional distributions are identical. Interested readers are referred to the proof of Lemma 2 in [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#) for more details about the construction.

A key difference compared to [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#) is that \mathcal{G}_t includes the information of $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{U}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ in our case. Knowing b_i and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i$ is sufficient to recover \mathbf{p}_i in [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#). However, we need to additionally know at which mirror region the p-value \mathbf{p}_i locates to recover \mathbf{p}_i . The proof in [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#) is still valid with this modification because $\{\mathcal{G}_k\}_{k=-1,0,\dots}$ is a filtration and $\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_t) = V_t / (U_t + V_t)$ for $i \in \mathcal{U}_t \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. \square

SII.2 Optimality

In this section, we prove Theorems 2 and 3.

Proof of Theorem 2. As those p-values in \mathcal{U}_0 do not play a role in our procedure, we proceed with the proof under the condition $i \in \mathcal{M}_0$. Recall that our stopping condition is $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_t \leq q$. The sequential unmasking rule defined in (13) of the main paper reveals the p-value of one hypothesis at one time. Thus, at step t , we have $A_t + R_t = |\mathcal{M}_0| - t$. Simple derivation shows that the stopping condition is equivalent to $A_t \leq (q|\mathcal{M}_0| - qt - 1)/(1 + q)$.

Define $B_i = \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}$, then it is straightforward to see that B_i independently follows $\text{Ber}(1 - q_i)$ for $i \in \mathcal{M}_0$ since

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \mid \mathcal{G}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) = 1 - q_i.$$

By Theorem A.2 in [Chao and Fithian \(2021\)](#) with $S_t = A_t = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} B_i$ and $s_t = (q|\mathcal{M}_0| - qt - 1)/(1 + q)$, the most powerful procedure, minimizing τ so that maximizing

$$R_\tau = |\mathcal{M}_0| - \tau - A_\tau = |\mathcal{M}_0| - \tau - \frac{q|\mathcal{M}_0| - q\tau - 1}{1 + q} = |\mathcal{M}_0| - \frac{\tau}{1 + q} - \frac{q|\mathcal{M}_0| - 1}{1 + q},$$

is to reveal the masked hypotheses in the decreasing order of $1 - q_i$, i.e., the increasing order of q_i . \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Under the assumptions (a) and (b) of the distribution of \mathbf{p} , we claim that the density of \mathbf{p} given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) = f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\text{Proj}(\mathbf{t})) \times \left(1 - \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 1, t_k > 1/2\} \right). \quad (\text{S6})$$

Given the signal indicator $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the density of \mathbf{p} conditional on the event $\mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \\ &\propto f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} \\ &= f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} + \sum_{k=1}^K f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\} \\ &= f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} + f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\text{Proj}(\mathbf{t})) \times \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 0, \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S7})$$

To see why the last equality in (S7) holds, we notice that $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k$ implies $t_l < 1/2$ for all $l \neq k$ and hence $\mathbf{1}\{\theta_l = 1, t_l > 1/2\} = 0$ for $l \neq k$. Moreover, we have $t_k > 1/2$. Then, for $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k$, we obtain

$$\left(1 - \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \mathbf{1}\{\theta_l = 1, t_l > 1/2\} \right) = 1 - \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 1, t_k > 1/2\} = \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 0\}.$$

The last equality immediately holds according to (S6).

We now examine the denominator of (13). Recalling $g(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ defined in (12) and rearranging the RHS of (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) &\propto \sum_{\mathbf{t}: \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}} f(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{t}: \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}} \left\{ \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0, 1\}^K} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) \right\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0, 1\}^K} \sum_{\mathbf{t}: \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\text{Proj}(\mathbf{t})) \times \left(\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}\} + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 0, \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S8})$$

where the first equality is due to (11) and the second equality follows by changing the order of the summations. Noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t})$, (S8) becomes

$$f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0, 1\}^K} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_{\mathbf{t}: \text{Proj}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathbf{t} \neq \tilde{\mathbf{t}}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 0, \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \{0,1\}^K} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 0\} \\
&= f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line uses the technique for deriving (S7), the second line stands because each \mathbf{t} can only locate at exactly one mirror side, and the last equality is because of the definition $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \sum_{k=1}^K (1 - \theta_k)$. Therefore, $f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})/g(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ is proportional to

$$\frac{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})}{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})},$$

the reciprocal of which is equal to

$$\frac{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})}{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})} = 1 + \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq (1, \dots, 1)} \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})}{f(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})}.$$

We now prove the claim in (S6). Our argument consists of two steps. First, we examine the coordinates of the p-value under the alternative. If $\theta_k = 1$, then p_k has to be below $1/2$ by (a) and hence $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) = 0$ for $t_k > 1/2$. In other words, $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) = 0$ if and only if $\theta_k = 1$ and $t_k > 1/2$ is true for at least one $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Therefore, we can multiply the density by $1 - \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \mathbf{1}\{\theta_k = 1, t_k > 1/2\}$. Next, we examine the coordinates under the null. If $\theta_k = 0$, then p_k is symmetric about $1/2$ conditional on the rest of the p-values by (b), and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{t}) &= f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k|k} (t_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k}) f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, -k}(\mathbf{t}_{-k}) \\
&= f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k|k} (1 - t_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k}) f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, -k}(\mathbf{t}_{-k}) = f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, 1 - t_k, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_K),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{t}_{-k} = (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_K)$, $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, -k}(\cdot)$ is the density of \mathbf{p}_{-k} conditional on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, k|k}$ is the density of p_k conditional on \mathbf{p}_{-k} and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Hence the density remains unchanged if we replace t_k by $1 - t_k$. Combining the arguments, we conclude that claim (S6) is true. \square

SII.3 The partial-order-assisted rejection region

In this section, we present a brief proof for Remark 1 of the main paper.

First, note that Algorithm 1 implies two basic principles for the rejection regions: (i) \mathcal{R}_t shrinks as t increases because $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t$ in Algorithm 1 shrinks as well; (ii) \hat{i}_t^* is determined by \mathcal{F}_t so that $\mathcal{R}_t \in \mathcal{F}_t$.

Second, employing these \mathcal{R}_t in Algorithm 1, in turn, results in the same unmask set \mathcal{M}_t as in Algorithm 2, i.e., $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$ iff $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \in \mathcal{R}_t$ (which is also equivalent to $\mathbf{p}_i \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_t^k \cup \mathcal{R}_t$ with \mathcal{R}_t defined in Remark 1). Thus, we have the following two arguments.

- For any $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \subseteq \mathcal{R}_t$ according to the definition of \mathcal{R}_t .
- For any $i \notin \mathcal{M}_t$, hypotheses i is revealed at step s for some $s < t$. If $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \in \mathcal{R}_t$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \prec \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_j$ for some $j \in \mathcal{M}_t$. However, $j \in \mathcal{M}_t$ implies $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s$ for all $s < t$. Thus, $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i$ would not be a maximal element of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s$ for any $s < t$, which contradicts the assumption that hypothesis i is revealed at step s . Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i \notin \mathcal{R}_t$.

Overall, the proof is completed by combining the above arguments. It is worth mentioning that the presented argument is also applicable to the JM procedure with an unmasking rule using partial order, i.e., one can use a preferred method to choose \hat{i}_t^* based solely on the information in \mathcal{F}_t .

SIII Generalized JM procedure: Two extensions

SIII.1 JM procedure with a general masking scheme

Similar to [Lei and Fithian \(2016\)](#), JM procedure may lose power when (i) the discovery set is small or (ii) the null p-values concentrate around one. Motivated by [Chao and Fithian \(2021\)](#), we generalize the masking scheme to resolve these two issues. To be precise, we define $\text{Proj}^h(\mathbf{t}) = (h(t_1), \dots, h(t_K))$, where

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} (\nu - t)/\zeta, & t \in (\lambda, \nu] \\ t, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$, and $\zeta = (\nu - \lambda)/\alpha_m$, $0 < \alpha_m < \lambda < \nu$, the ratio of probabilities located at the rejection and control sides. The corresponding rejection and control sides are $\mathcal{R}_{-1} = [0, \alpha_m)^K$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_{-1}^k = \{\mathbf{t} : t_k \in (\lambda, \nu] \text{ and } t_l \in [0, \alpha_m) \text{ for } l \neq k\}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Then we can generalize the JM procedure using this masking scheme by replacing Proj with Proj^h and the FDP bound with

$$\widehat{\text{FDP}}_t^M = \frac{1 + A_t}{\zeta(R_t \vee 1)},$$

where R_t and A_t are the numbers of discoveries and controls, respectively. When we take $\nu = 1$ and $\alpha_m = \lambda = 1/2$, the procedure reduces to the original JM procedure. To see why the generalized procedure may avoid power loss, we take $\kappa = 1$ as an example. For (i), JM procedure requires at least $1/q$ rejections, while the generalized JM procedure can make as small as $1/(q\zeta)$ rejections. For (ii), the generalized JM procedure can choose $\nu < 1$ to exclude the hypotheses whose p-values are close to one from constructing the controls.

We now show that the generalized JM procedure also controls FDR in finite samples. We require a condition about the distribution of the null p-values, which is more stringent than conditional mirror conservatism.

Definition S2 (Conditional non-decreasing density). *Let $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{1 \leq k \leq K : \theta_k = 0\}$. We say that \mathbf{p} has a conditional non-decreasing density if the conditional density of p_k given $\mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k} = (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_K)$, denoted by $f_{k|-k}(t_k | \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k})$, is non-decreasing w.r.t. t_k for any \mathbf{t}_{-k} and $k \in \mathcal{S}_0$.*

With this definition, we can derive a result similar to [Lemma S1](#).

Lemma S3. *Fix $\kappa \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Suppose that the null p-values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ are independent of each other and have conditional non-decreasing densities. Furthermore, $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ are independent Bernoulli random variables conditioned on \mathcal{G}_{-1} with*

$$\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 | \mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq 1/(\kappa\zeta + 1)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$.

Proof of Lemma S3. Following the proof of Lemma S1, we only need to show a variant of (S3),

$$\mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1}) \leq 1/(\kappa\zeta + 1) \quad (\text{S9})$$

for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}} \cap \mathcal{M}_{-1}$. Define \mathbb{P}_i and $f_{k|-k,i}$ as the probability measure of \mathbf{p}_i and conditional density of its k th coordinate given the remaining coordinates for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. Setting $h_k = (\nu - p_k)/\zeta$, the conditional density of $h_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k}$ is

$$f_{k|-k,i}^h(h \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k}) = \zeta f_{k|-k,i}(t \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \mathbf{t}_{-k}),$$

where $t = \nu - \zeta h$. For $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ and $k \in \mathcal{S}_{0i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1})}{\mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1})} &= \frac{f_{k|-k,i}(\tilde{t}_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_{-k})}{f_{k|-k,i}^h(\tilde{t}_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_{-k})} \\ &= \frac{f_{k|-k,i}(\tilde{t}_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_{-k})}{\zeta f_{k|-k,i}(\nu - \zeta \tilde{t}_k \mid \mathbf{p}_{-k} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_{-k})} \leq 1/\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because \mathbf{p}_i has conditional non-decreasing density and $\tilde{t}_k \leq \nu - \zeta \tilde{t}_k$ for $0 < \tilde{t}_k < \alpha_m$. Similar to Lemma S1, we obtain

$$\frac{\kappa\zeta \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1})}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{P}_i(\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k, \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{A}_{-1}^k \cup \mathcal{R}_{-1})} \leq 1$$

and (S9) stands. \square

Theorem S1 (Finite sample FDR control). *Consider the problem of testing $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$ for any $\kappa = 1, \dots, K$, where the corresponding FDR is defined in (2) with \mathcal{H}_0 being replaced by $\mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. Suppose that the null p -values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$ are independent of each other and of the non-null p -values $\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\kappa, \text{partial}}}$. Suppose \mathbf{p}_i has a conditional non-decreasing density for all $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}$. Then, the JM procedure with a general masking scheme controls the FDR at level q/κ , or equivalently controls the κ FDR at level q .*

Proof of Theorem S1. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\text{FDP}_\tau = \frac{V_\tau}{R_\tau \vee 1} = \zeta \frac{A_\tau + 1}{\zeta(R_\tau \vee 1)} \frac{V_\tau}{A_\tau + 1} \leq \zeta q \frac{V_\tau}{U_\tau + 1} = \zeta q \left(\frac{1 + |\mathcal{M}_\tau \cap \mathcal{H}_0^{\kappa, \text{partial}}|}{U_\tau + 1} - 1 \right).$$

Applying Lemmas S2 and S3, we get

$$\text{FDR} = \mathbb{E}(\text{FDP}_\tau) \leq \zeta q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{V_\tau}{U_\tau + 1} \right) \leq \zeta q \left(\frac{\zeta\kappa + 1}{\zeta\kappa} - 1 \right) = q/\kappa,$$

which completes the proof. \square

SIII.2 JM procedure with z-values

In some replicability studies, researchers require both the signals and their signs to be repetitive. When making inferences with two-sided p -values, the sign information is lost. A remedy is to use the one-sided p -values for testing the two one-sided hypotheses

separately and combine the results (Wang et al., 2022). Here we introduce a z-value-based approach to control the directional false discovery rate (dFDR), which has been considered in the literature with a single experiment (Leung and Sun, 2021; Leung, 2022).

Consider a sequence of z-values arising from K experiments $\mathbf{Z}_i = (Z_{1i}, \dots, Z_{Ki})$ for $i \in [m]$, where Z_{ki} are independently generated from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{ki}, \sigma^2)$. We define the alternative set with positive and negative signs as $\mathcal{H}_1^+ = \{i : \mu_{ki} > 0, \text{ for all } k\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1^- = \{i : \mu_{ki} < 0, \text{ for all } k\}$, respectively. The rest belongs to the null set, $\mathcal{H}_0 = [m] \setminus (\mathcal{H}_1^+ \cup \mathcal{H}_1^-)$. Let $s_i = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{H}_1^+$, $s_i = -1$ for $i \in \mathcal{H}_1^-$, and $s_i = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Our goal is to decide the sign of each hypothesis, say by $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^d = \{\hat{s}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with $\hat{s}_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, while controlling the directed FDR given by

$$\text{dFDR}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^d) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i \neq 0, \hat{s}_i \neq s_i\}}{(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i \neq 0\}) \vee 1} \right]$$

at a target dFDR level $q \in (0, 1)$. The main idea of the z-value-based approach is to construct two rejection regions for the repeated positive (negative) signs \mathcal{R}^+ (\mathcal{R}^-) and define the sign estimate as

$$\hat{s}_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{R}^+, \\ -1, & \mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{R}^-, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, we let $\mathcal{R}^+ \subset (0, \infty)^K$ and $\mathcal{R}^- = \{(-t_1, \dots, -t_K) : \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}^+\}$. Rearranging the number of false sign assignments, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i \neq 0, \hat{s}_i \neq s_i\} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i \neq 0\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1^+} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i = -1\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1^-} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i = 1\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^-} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i = 1\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^+} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{s}_i = -1\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^-} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{R}^+\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^+} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{R}^-\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, we define $2K$ mirror regions as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{k,+} &= \{(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, -t_k, t_{k+1}, t_K) : \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}^+\} \\ \mathcal{A}^{k,-} &= \{(-t_1, \dots, -t_{k-1}, t_k, -t_{k+1}, -t_K) : \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{R}^+\} \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. For any $i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^-$, we have at least one element in $\{\mu_{ki}\}_{k=1}^K$, say $\mu_{k_0 i}$, less or equal than zero, which indicates that the corresponding z-value is more likely to locate at $\mathcal{A}^{k_0,+}$ than at \mathcal{R}^+ . Therefore, the number of false sign assignments can be approximately upper bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^-} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{A}^{k,+}\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_1^+} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{A}^{k,-}\}.$$

Subsequently, we propose a conservative estimate of the directed FDR given by

$$\widehat{\text{dFDP}}(\mathcal{R}^+, \mathcal{R}^-) = \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{A}^{k,+} \cup \mathcal{A}^{k,-}\}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathcal{R}^+ \cup \mathcal{R}^-\} \vee 1}.$$

Finally, the dFDR controlling procedure for repetitive signals can be established in the same way as in the main paper. If one has the prior knowledge that more signals are of the positive sign, then it makes sense to enlarge \mathcal{R}^+ . More generally, when there is potentially useful side information, it is interesting to design adaptive rejection regions to incorporate the information.

SIV Additional Numerical Results

In this section, we further investigate the performance of the JM procedure in mediation analysis and compare it with some existing alternatives as discussed in Section 4.1 of the main paper. We follow the settings in Section 4.1 with some modifications: Under \mathcal{H}_{00} , $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0$; under \mathcal{H}_{10} , $\alpha_i = 0.5$ and $\beta_i = 0$; under \mathcal{H}_{01} , $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0.75$; under \mathcal{H}_{11} , $\alpha_i = 0.5$ and $\beta_i = 0.75$. Motivated by Dai et al. (2020), we consider five hypothesis configurations: Global Null (GNull), Sparse Null (SNull), Dense Null (DNull), Sparse Alternative (SAlter), Dense Alternative (DAlter). Table S1 presents the proportions of the four different types of null hypotheses in different configurations.

Tables S2–S4 respectively summarize the FDPs, mFDPs, and powers when the target FDR levels q are 0.05 and 0.2. The FDPs and mFDPs of the three JM procedures are either below or around the target FDR levels. They are extremely conservative under the three null configurations (i.e., GNull, SNull, and DNull). We notice that their mFDPs are around the target FDR levels under the two types of alternatives (i.e., SAlter and DAlter), while their FDPs are below the target FDR levels under SAlter. The other methods all suffer from FDR inflation to some extent. For example, we observe FDR inflation for JS.Mix.Asy under GNull, DACT under all configurations except for GNull, and JS.Mix.Finite and MT.Comp under all the configurations. As the mFDP counts the number of false discoveries for the null hypotheses in \mathcal{H}_{00} twice, it is not surprising that the mFDPs of JS.Mix.Asy and JS.Mix.Finite are around $2q = 0.4$ under GNull when $q = 0.2$. We exclude MT.Comp in the power comparison due to its severe FDR inflation. DACT has the most discoveries except for the case of DAlter and $q = 0.05$. JM.Product has competitive performance and achieves the highest power under DAlter.

Hypothesis Configuration	π_{00}	π_{01}	π_{10}	π_{11}
GNull	1	0	0	0
SNull	0.90	0.05	0.05	0
DNull	0.60	0.20	0.20	0
SAlter	0.88	0.05	0.05	0.02
DAlter	0.40	0.20	0.20	0.20

Table S1: The null proportions under different configurations.

Target FDR Level	Method	Hypothesis Configuration				
		GNull	SNull	DNull	SAlter	DAlter
$q = 0.05$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.070(0.162)	0.030(0.108)	0.030(0.108)	0.042(0.018)	0.045(0.006)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.070(0.162)	0.060(0.151)	0.060(0.151)	0.057(0.018)	0.058(0.006)
	DACT	0.020(0.089)	0.060(0.151)	0.080(0.172)	0.061(0.017)	0.064(0.006)
	MT.Comp	0.090(0.182)	1.000(0.000)	0.240(0.271)	0.274(0.023)	0.074(0.005)
	JM.Max	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.043(0.022)	0.052(0.007)
	JM.Product	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.046(0.024)	0.052(0.007)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.043(0.023)	0.051(0.007)
$q = 0.2$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.200(0.254)	0.170(0.239)	0.150(0.227)	0.167(0.038)	0.185(0.014)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.210(0.259)	0.290(0.288)	0.260(0.279)	0.211(0.033)	0.224(0.010)
	DACT	0.060(0.151)	0.300(0.291)	0.380(0.309)	0.226(0.030)	0.245(0.008)
	MT.Comp	0.230(0.267)	1.000(0.000)	0.850(0.227)	0.425(0.022)	0.221(0.008)
	JM.Max	0.000(0.000)	0.060(0.151)	0.030(0.108)	0.167(0.035)	0.185(0.010)
	JM.Product	0.000(0.000)	0.040(0.125)	0.040(0.125)	0.191(0.042)	0.202(0.012)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.000(0.000)	0.040(0.125)	0.010(0.063)	0.187(0.042)	0.199(0.011)

Table S2: Mean and the corresponding standard deviation (in the round bracket) of FDPs for various methods. The results are based on 100 independent replications.

Target FDR Level	Method	Hypothesis Configuration				
		GNull	SNull	DNull	SAlter	DAlter
$q = 0.05$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.140(0.324)	0.030(0.108)	0.030(0.108)	0.047(0.021)	0.046(0.006)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.140(0.324)	0.060(0.151)	0.060(0.151)	0.063(0.021)	0.059(0.006)
	DACT	0.040(0.178)	0.060(0.151)	0.080(0.172)	0.066(0.018)	0.065(0.006)
	MT.Comp	0.180(0.364)	1.000(0.000)	0.240(0.271)	0.274(0.023)	0.074(0.005)
	JM.Max	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.048(0.025)	0.054(0.007)
	JM.Product	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.048(0.025)	0.052(0.007)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.000(0.000)	0.045(0.025)	0.051(0.007)
$q = 0.2$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.400(0.509)	0.171(0.241)	0.150(0.227)	0.204(0.053)	0.203(0.017)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.420(0.518)	0.291(0.290)	0.260(0.279)	0.266(0.047)	0.249(0.012)
	DACT	0.120(0.302)	0.300(0.291)	0.380(0.309)	0.276(0.040)	0.265(0.009)
	MT.Comp	0.460(0.535)	1.000(0.001)	0.850(0.227)	0.426(0.022)	0.221(0.008)
	JM.Max	0.000(0.000)	0.063(0.160)	0.030(0.110)	0.204(0.046)	0.202(0.011)
	JM.Product	0.000(0.000)	0.040(0.125)	0.040(0.125)	0.197(0.043)	0.202(0.012)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.000(0.000)	0.042(0.130)	0.010(0.063)	0.205(0.047)	0.202(0.012)

Table S3: Mean and the corresponding standard deviation (in the round bracket) of mFDPs for various methods. The results are based on 100 independent replications.

Target FDR Level	Method	Hypothesis Configuration	
		SAlter	DAlter
$q = 0.05$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.772(0.061)	0.875(0.032)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.812(0.053)	0.895(0.028)
	DACT	0.825(0.051)	0.906(0.026)
	JM.Max	0.763(0.078)	0.887(0.030)
	JM.Product	0.807(0.067)	0.928(0.020)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.765(0.078)	0.913(0.025)
$q = 0.2$	JS.Mix.Asy	0.901(0.036)	0.965(0.012)
	JS.Mix.Finite	0.921(0.031)	0.973(0.010)
	DACT	0.929(0.028)	0.977(0.009)
	JM.Max	0.902(0.035)	0.965(0.012)
	JM.Product	0.928(0.038)	0.977(0.009)
	JM.EmptyPoset	0.890(0.042)	0.969(0.009)

Table S4: Mean and the corresponding standard deviation (in the round bracket) of powers for various methods. The results are based on 100 independent replications.

References

- Aho, A. V., Garey, M. R., and Ullman, J. D. (1972), “The transitive reduction of a directed graph,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1, 131–137.
- Chao, P. and Fithian, W. (2021), “AdaPT-GMM: Powerful and robust covariate-assisted multiple testing,” *arXiv preprint*, abs/2106.15812.
- Dai, J. Y., Stanford, J. L., and LeBlanc, M. (2020), “A multiple-testing procedure for high-dimensional mediation hypotheses,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–16.
- Kahn, A. B. (1962), “Topological sorting of large networks,” *Commun. ACM*, 5, 558–562.
- Lei, L. and Fithian, W. (2016), “AdaPT: An interactive procedure for multiple testing with side information,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80.
- Leung, D. (2022), “Z-value directional false discovery rate control with data masking,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05828*.
- Leung, D. and Sun, W. (2021), “ZAP: Z-value adaptive procedures for false discovery rate control with side information,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12623*.
- Wang, J., Gui, L., Su, W. J., Sabatti, C., and Owen, A. B. (2022), “Detecting multiple replicating signals using adaptive filtering procedures,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 50, 1890–1909.