

Anytime-Valid Tests of Group Invariance through Conformal Prediction

Tyron Lardy¹ and Muriel Felipe Pérez-Ortiz²

¹Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

²Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands

t.d.lardy@math.leidenuniv.nl, m.f.perez.ortiz@tue.nl

April 4, 2024

Abstract

Many standard statistical hypothesis tests, including those for normality and exchangeability, can be reformulated as tests of invariance under a group of transformations. We develop anytime-valid tests of invariance under the action of general compact groups and show their optimality—in a specific logarithmic-growth sense—against certain alternatives. This is achieved by using the invariant structure of the problem to construct conformal test martingales, a class of objects associated to conformal prediction. We apply our methods to extend recent anytime-valid tests of independence, which leverage exchangeability, to work under general group invariances. Additionally, we show applications to testing for invariance under subgroups of rotations, which corresponds to testing the Gaussian-error assumptions behind linear models.

Keywords— Anytime-Valid Testing, Hypothesis Testing, Group Invariance, Conformal Prediction

1. Introduction

Symmetry plays a crucial role in statistical modeling. Most models, either explicitly or implicitly, introduce assumptions of distributional symmetry about the data. For example, any model under which data are independent and identically distributed is symmetric under permutations of the data points, and any regression model with Gaussian errors is symmetric under certain rotations of the data. If these symmetries are actually present in the data, employing symmetric models yields advantages for various objectives. These objectives include max-min optimality in hypothesis tests (Lehmann et al., 2005; Pérez-Ortiz et al., 2022), admissibility of estimators (Brown, 1966), and increased predictive performance of neural networks (Cohen and Welling, 2016). On the other hand, if the symmetries are absent from the data, the use of a symmetric model may lead to poor performance in these same tasks.

The symmetries that we allude to are conventionally mathematized as a null hypothesis of distributional invariance under the action of a group. Perhaps the most prominent example is infinite exchangeability—the hypothesis that the distribution of any finite data sequence is invariant under permutations. The null hypothesis of exchangeability is at the heart of classic methods such as permutation tests (Fisher, 1936; Pitman, 1937) and rank tests (Sidak et al., 1999). Additionally, tests for more general symmetries have been studied; this includes tests for rotational symmetry (Baringhaus, 1991), symmetries for data taking values on groups (Diaconis, 1988), and more general symmetries (Lehmann and Stein, 1949; Chiu and Bloem-Reddy, 2023). Tests in this line of work are often designed for fixed-sample experiments—the amount of data to be collected is determined before the experiment. This work is about testing for the presence of these symmetries sequentially and under continuous monitoring.

In the applications that interest us, data are analyzed as they are collected and the decisions to either stop and reach a conclusion, or to continue data collection may depend on what has been observed so far. Tests with this quality have been called tests of power one (Robbins and Siegmund, 1974; Lai, 1977) and, more recently, anytime valid (Ramdas et al., 2023). The main insight in these works is that test martingales—nonnegative martingales with expected value equal to one—can be monitored continuously while maintaining tight type-I error control uniformly over time (Shafer, 2021; Ramdas et al., 2020). More generally, the minimum over a family of test martingales—an e-process—can be monitored. Constructions that use e-processes and test martingales have been shown to be necessary for anytime-valid testing (Ramdas et al., 2020). This work connects this line of research to testing for invariance.

Anytime-valid tests of infinite exchangeability have been studied classically. For example, Sen and Ghosh (1973a,b, 1974) study sequential rank tests. In particular, they develop asymptotic approximations and law-of-the-iterated-logarithm-type inequalities for linear rank statistics that hold uniformly over the duration of the experiment. More recently, Ramdas et al. (2022); Saha and Ramdas (2023) developed e-processes for the hypothesis of infinite exchangeability under specific assumptions (binary and paired data, respectively). However, an attempt to generalize these approaches may fail—only powerless tests are obtained—when the null hypothesis is “too big” (Vovk, 2023). Anytime-valid tests of exchangeability are also addressed in the work on conformal prediction by Vovk et al. (2003, 2005). Conformal prediction is perhaps best known as a framework for uncertainty quantification for point predictors under the minimal assumption of exchangeability. However, conformal prediction can also be used to produce test martingales, called conformal martingales, to test for exchangeability. Most crucially for our present purposes, Vovk et al. (2005) show that conformal martingales cannot only be used to test for infinite exchangeability, but also to test whether data are generated by a specific class of generating mechanisms. These data-generating mechanisms, called online compression models (see Section 3.2), and their relation to group-invariant models lie at the center of this article.

The main contributions of this article are (1) to show that a large class of group-invariant sequential probabilistic models are compression models (Proposition 2); (2) to build and assess the optimality of (conformal) test martingales to test for group invariance (Theorem 1 and Theorem 2); and (3) to connect conformal prediction to recent findings in anytime-valid testing. Regarding (2), we show that conformal martingales for distributional symmetry are likelihood ratios against implicit alternatives. Theorem 2 hinges on this likelihood-ratio point of view to prove that the resulting test martingales are optimal—in a sense that is specified in Section 2—against that particular alternative. Additionally, for (3), we show how to use conformal martingales to abstract and generalize existing tests independence under group invariance (Henzi and Law, 2023)—see Section 5.1. A number of examples and applications are also shown in Section 5. There, we apply the techniques that are developed to test invariance under subgroups of the orthogonal group, which includes testing the Gaussian-error assumptions behind linear models.

The rest of this document is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the problem of testing for distributional invariance sequentially. Section 3 shows our construction of test martingales against the hypothesis of distributional invariance. Section 4 discusses the optimality of the test martingales that are built in the previous section. Section 5 shows examples and applications of the constructions. In particular, it shows applications to independence testing and testing the assumptions of linear models. Finally, Section 6 discusses the relation of the constructions that are shown to other conformal tests.

2. Background and Sequential Group Invariance

In this section we define the sequential hypothesis testing problem of invariance under the action of a sequence of groups $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. In order to avoid trivial situations, additional structure must be imposed on how the groups act on the sequence of data. With this additional structure, we say that the sequence of groups acts on the data sequentially (see Definition 1). The assumptions on the spaces involved are topological in nature; if they are to be avoided, the data space \mathcal{X}^n can be thought of as \mathbb{R}^n , and each G_n can be safely assumed to be either a finite group or any classic compact matrix group acting on \mathbb{R}^n by multiplication. Examples are given after the definitions.

Suppose that we observe data X_1, X_2, \dots sequentially, and that they take values in some measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$. Note that the observations are not necessarily assumed to be independent nor identically

distributed; they will only assumed to be sampled from a distribution on infinite sequences. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we assume that G_n is a compact topological group that acts continuously on \mathcal{X}^n . Here, a topological group is a group equipped with a topology under which the group operation, seen as a function $G_n \times G_n \rightarrow G_n$, is a continuous map. A group action is a map $G_n \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$, which we will denote by $(g, x^n) \mapsto gx^n$. We are interested in testing the null hypothesis of invariance of the data under the action of the sequence of groups $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : gX^n \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} X^n \quad \text{for all } g \in G_n \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where $\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=}$ signifies equality in distribution. As anticipated, the hypothesis in (1) is only meaningful if the statements regarding group invariance for each n are consistent with each other; without any further restrictions, invariance of the data at one time may contradict the invariance of the data at a later time. We define what it means for $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to act on the data sequentially in the next subsection.

2.1 Sequential group actions

To avoid pathological situations and capture the settings that are of interest, we will assume that the groups act sequentially on the data. We explain the ramifications of this definition in the following paragraph.

Definition 1 (Sequential group action). The action of the sequence of groups $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $(\mathcal{X}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is sequential if the following three conditions hold.

- (i) The sequence of groups G_1, G_2, \dots , is ordered by inclusion: for each n , there is an inclusion map $\iota_{n+1} : G_n \rightarrow G_{n+1}$ such that ι_{n+1} is a continuous group isomorphism between G_n and its image, and the image of G_n under ι_{n+1} is closed in G_{n+1} .
- (ii) For all $g_n \in G_n$ and all $x^{n+1} \in \mathcal{X}^{n+1}$,

$$\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}^n}(\iota_{n+1}(g_n)x^{n+1}) = g_n(\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}^n}(x^{n+1})),$$

where $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}^n}$ is the canonical projection map $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}^n} : \mathcal{X}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$.

- (iii) Let $n \geq 1$, $g_n \in G_n$, and $g_{n+1} \in G_{n+1}$. For $x^{n+1} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{X}^{n+1}$, denote $(x^{n+1})_{n+1} = x_{n+1}$. The following equivalence relation holds

$$g_{n+1} = \iota_{n+1}(g_n) \text{ if and only if, for all } x^{n+1} \in \mathcal{X}^{n+1}, (g_{n+1}x^{n+1})_{n+1} = x_{n+1}.$$

The items of Definition 1 introduce additional structure in the sequential testing problem. Item (i) gives an ordering of the sequence of groups by inclusion, (ii) ensures that this inclusion does not change the action of the groups on past data, and (iii) implies that the groups do not act on “future” data. As a result, invariance of X^{n-1} under G_{n-1} is implied by invariance of X^n under G_n and the individual statements of invariance in (1) for each n do not contradict each other. Some examples are in order.

Example 1 (Within-batch invariance). Perhaps the simplest example is when, for each n , G_n has a product structure and acts on \mathcal{X}^n componentwise. This is when

$$G_n = H_1 \times H_2 \times \dots \times H_n$$

for some sequence of topological groups $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, each H_n acting continuously on \mathcal{X} and $g_n X^n = (h_1 X_1, \dots, h_n X_n)$ for each $g_n = (h_1, \dots, h_n) \in G_n$. This covers the setting where batches of data are observed sequentially and the interest is in testing group invariance within each batch. For example, assume that $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^k$, each H_i is a fixed group H acting on \mathbb{R}^k , and data X_1^k, X_2^k, \dots are assumed to be i.i.d. copies of a random variable X^k . Then (1) becomes the problem of testing sequentially whether $X^k \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} hX^k$ for all $h \in H$, that is, whether the distribution of X^k is H -invariant. Koning (2023) treats this batch-by-batch setting for general compact groups.

However, more complicated situations where there is “cross-action” between the different data points are also amenable to this approach; for example when testing exchangeability and sphericity.

Example 2 (Exchangeability, rotational symmetry, and classic compact matrix groups). In the case of tests of exchangeability, the relevant sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of groups for is $G_n = n!$ —we refer with $n!$ to the group of permutations on n elements. This sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ acts sequentially on $\mathcal{X}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$ by permuting the entries of the vectors, that is, by $\pi X^n = (X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(n)})$ for each permutation $\pi \in n!$. In the case of sphericity, the relevant sequence of groups is that of orthogonal groups $G_n = O(n)$, the group of all $n \times n$ matrices O with orthonormal columns, that is, such that $O^T O = I$. The fact that this group action is sequential is readily checked (see Section 5 for details). The action of permutation and orthogonal groups are a special examples of the actions of classic compact matrix groups on \mathbb{R}^n (Meckes, 2019).

2.2 Anytime-valid testing

We construct sequential tests for \mathcal{H}_0 as in (1) that are anytime-valid at some prescribed level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We now define this objective and the main objects of study, test martingales. A sequential test is a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of rejection rules $\varphi_n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. We say that a sequential test is anytime valid for \mathcal{H}_0 at level α if

$$Q(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \varphi_n = 1) \leq \alpha \text{ for any } Q \in \mathcal{H}_0.$$

Notice that this is a type-I error guarantee that is valid uniformly over all sample sizes: the probability that the null hypothesis is ever rejected by $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is controlled by α . The main tools for constructing anytime-valid tests are test martingales (Ramdas et al., 2020; Shafer, 2021; Grünwald et al., 2024) and minima thereof, e-processes—see Ramdas et al. (2020) for a comprehensive overview. We now define them.

Let Q be a probability distribution on \mathcal{X} . A sequence of statistics $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where each $M_n = M_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, is a test martingale against Q with respect to a filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if $\mathbb{E}_Q[M_1] = 1$ and it is a nonnegative martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under Q . The main utility of test martingales is that, under Q , they take large values with small probability. This is quantified by the following well known fact.

Lemma 1. *Let $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a test martingale with respect to some filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under all elements of \mathcal{H}_0 , a set of probability distributions. Then*

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{H}_0} Q(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : M_n \geq 1/\alpha) \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. Fix $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Doob’s optional stopping theorem states that $\mathbb{E}_Q[M_\tau] \leq 1$ for any stopping time τ that is adapted to $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (Durrett, 2019, Theorem 5.7.6). Markov’s inequality implies that $Q(M_\tau > \frac{1}{C}) \leq C$ for any $C > 0$. Applying this to the stopping time $\tau^* = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : M_n \geq \frac{1}{\alpha}\}$ shows the result. \square

This shows that the sequential test given by $\varphi_n = \mathbf{1}\{M_n \geq 1/\alpha\}$ is anytime valid. Notable examples of test martingales include likelihood ratios for simple null hypotheses.

Test martingales that make use of external randomization will also prove useful; we will call them randomized test martingales. To this end, we append an external independent random number $\theta_n \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1])$ to each data point X_n .

Definition 2 (Randomized Test Martingale). Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a data sequence and let $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. $\text{Uniform}([0, 1])$ random variables independent of the data. A randomized martingale is any test martingale adapted to a filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sigma-algebras such that $\mathcal{G}_n \subseteq \sigma((X_i, \theta_i)_{i \leq n})$.

Sequential tests based on randomized test martingales have similar type-I error guarantees as those based on non-randomized test martingales; the probability of rejection simply includes the external randomization.

Test martingales are part of a broader class of processes, often referred to as e-processes (Ramdas et al., 2023). An e-process is any nonnegative stochastic process E such that $\mathbb{E}_Q[E_\tau] \leq 1$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and (a subset of) all stopping times τ . Any e-process can be turned into an anytime-valid test by thresholding it, i.e. rejecting the null when the stopped e-process exceeds $\frac{1}{\alpha}$. This property is often referred to as safety under optional stopping (Grünwald et al., 2024). Relatedly, the product of e-processes based on independent data is again an e-process. That is, suppose some e-processes E and E' are used for independent experiments, yielding stopped process E_{τ_1} and E'_{τ_2} . Then the product again has the property that $\mathbb{E}_Q[E_{\tau_1} E'_{\tau_2}] \leq 1$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$, which is referred to as safety under optional continuation.

This type of evidence aggregation by multiplication of e -processes motivates a natural optimality criterion. Indeed, suppose we were to repeatedly run a single experiment, using a fixed e -process E and stopping time τ . If we measure the total evidence by the cumulative product of the individual e -processes, then the asymptotic growth rate of our evidence under true distribution P will be $\mathbb{E}_P[\log E_\tau]$. It is therefore custom to look for e -processes that maximize this asymptotic growth rate, as can be traced back to Kelly betting (Kelly, 1956). Variants of this criterion have more recently been studied under numerous monikers (Shafer, 2021; Koolen and Grünwald, 2022; Grünwald et al., 2024), but here we shall simply refer to maximizers of this criterion as “log-optimal”. We discuss the log-optimality of the test martingales that we construct in Section 4.

3. Testing Group Invariance with Conformal Martingales

The goal of this section is the construction of test martingales for the null hypothesis of distributional symmetry in (1) any time that a sequence of groups $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ acts sequentially on the data $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (see Section 2). To this end, the invariant structure of the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 is used in tandem with conformal prediction to build a sequence of independent random variables $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with the following three properties:

1. The sequence $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is adapted to the data sequence with external randomization $(X_n, \theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, that is, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R_n = R_n(X_n, \theta_n)$.
2. Under any element of the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 from (1), $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed Uniform($[0, 1]$) random variables.
3. The distribution of $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ deviates from uniform when departures from symmetry are present in the data.

The construction of these random variables is the subject of Section 3.1—additional definitions are needed for their construction. In order to guide intuition, Example 3 shows a first example for testing exchangeability. Given their uniform distributions, the statistics R_1, R_2, \dots have previously been called p-values (e.g. Vovk et al., 2003; Fedorova et al., 2012). We opt against that terminology here, because typically only small p-values are interpreted evidence against the null hypothesis. However, in this context, it is any deviation from uniformity that we interpret as evidence against the null hypothesis. For reasons that will become apparent soon, we call R_1, R_2, \dots (smoothed) orbit ranks (see Example 3 and Definition 4).

Once the orbit ranks R_1, R_2, \dots are built, test martingales against distributional invariance can be constructed. Indeed, any time that $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of functions $f_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int f_i(u) du = 1$, the process $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$M_n := \prod_{i \leq n} f_i(R_i) \tag{2}$$

is a test martingale under any element of \mathcal{H}_0 . The functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are known as calibrators (Vovk and Wang, 2021). If the true distribution of the orbit ranks is not uniform, i.e. the null hypothesis is violated, then the functions f_i can be taken to be any predictable estimator of their actual distribution (Fedorova et al., 2012). These calibrators can be chosen depending on the application, and their optimality is discussed in Section 4.

Example 3 (Sequential Ranks). Consider the case of testing exchangeability, that is, the case when $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ and each group G_n is $G_n = n!$, the group of permutations on n elements. A useful construction is the following. Consider, for each n , the random variables $\tilde{R}_n = \sum_{i \leq n} \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq X_n\}$ —the rank of X_n among X_1, \dots, X_n . It is a classic observation that each \tilde{R}_n is uniformly distributed on $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and that $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent random variables (Rényi, 1962). The random variables R_1, \tilde{R}_2, \dots are called sequential ranks (Malov, 1996). After rescaling and adding external randomization, a sequence of random variables $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be built from $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies items 1, 2 and 3 at the start of this section. Furthermore, if we denote the uniform measure on $n!$ by μ_n , then \tilde{R}_n can also be obtained from

$$\frac{1}{n} \tilde{R}_n = \mu_n \{g : (gX_n)_n \leq X_n\}.$$

While this rewriting may seem esoteric at this point, it turns out to be the correct point of view for generalization; there exists an analogue of the uniform probability distribution in every compact group—its Haar measure.

Example 3 shows a construction that outputs univariate sequential ranks for testing exchangeability. The next section generalizes this observation to general compact groups.

3.1 Conformal prediction under invariance

The orbit ranks $R_1, R_2 \dots$ will be designed to measure how strange the current observations X^n are compared to what would be expected under distributional invariance. To this end, the values of X^n are compared to those in the orbit of X^n under the action of G_n . The orbit $G_n X^n$ of X^n under the action of G_n is the set of all values that are reached by the action of G_n on X^n , i.e. $G_n X^n = \{gX^n : g \in G_n\}$. In order to identify each orbit, we pick a single element of \mathcal{X}^n in each orbit—an orbit representative—and consider the map $\gamma_n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ that takes each X^n to its orbit representative. We call γ_n an orbit selector, and we assume that it is measurable. Such measurable orbit selectors exist under weak regularity conditions on \mathcal{X}^n and G_n (see Bondar, 1976, Theorem 2) and hold in all the examples of this work.

Example 4 (Orbit selectors for permutations). Consider $G_n = n!$ and $\mathcal{X}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$. The orbit of X^n under the action of G_n consists of all vectors whose entries are permutations of those of X^n . An orbit selector γ_n for this action is the vector of order statistics, i.e. $\gamma_n(X^n) = X^{(n)} := (X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)})$, where, in the absence of ties, $X_{(1)} < X_{(2)} < \dots < X_{(n)}$.

Example 5 (Orbit selectors for rotations). If $G_n = O(n)$, the orthogonal group, and $\mathcal{X}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$, then the orbit of X^n under multiplication is $S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|)$, the $(n-1)$ -sphere of radius $\|X^n\|$. An orbit selector is $\gamma_n(X^n) = \|X^n\|e_1$, that is, the unit vector $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ scaled by the radius of said sphere.

In order to measure the “strangeness” of the observations in their orbit, we use an adaptation the conformity measures introduced by Vovk et al. (2003, 2005). This adaptation is necessary in our group-invariant setting. We call them conformity measures of invariance.

Definition 3 (Conformity measure of invariance). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let G_n be a group acting on \mathcal{X}^n , and let γ_n be an orbit selector for the action of G_n on \mathcal{X}^n . We say that $\alpha^n = \alpha^n(X^n)$ is a conformity measure of invariance at time n if the following two properties hold.

- (i) We have that $\alpha^n = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is a statistic, i.e. $\alpha^n = \alpha^n(X^n)$, and $\alpha_i = A(X_i, \gamma_n(X^n))$ for a fixed function $A : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) Let $X^n, X^m \in \mathcal{X}^n$. If $\alpha^n(X^n) = \alpha^n(X^m)$, then $\alpha^n(gX^n) = \alpha^n(gX^m)$ for all $g \in G_n$.

Example 3 about univariate sequential ranks is obtained from $\alpha^n(X^n) = X^n$, that is, the identity function; this special choice is always valid if $\mathcal{X}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Item (ii) in Definition 3 is an addition to that of Vovk et al. (2005). It ensures that, for each n , the action of G_n on \mathcal{X}^n induces an action on the conformity measures, that is, it implies that the action of G_n on α^n defined by $g\alpha^n := \alpha^n(gX^n)$ is well defined. We remark that the notation from (i) may suggest that, if $(\alpha^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of conformity measures, then α^n equals the first n entries of the vector of α^{n+1} . However, this need not be the case: the vectors α^n and α^{n+1} could be completely different.

The distribution of the conformity measures under the null hypothesis can be obtained by leveraging the distributional invariance. For instance, in examples 4 and 5, it is known that conditionally on γ_n , the distribution of X^n is uniform on its orbit. This fact is true in more generality. On every compact group G_n there exists a unique G_n -invariant probability distribution μ_n , called the Haar (probability) measure (see e.g. Bourbaki and Berberian, 2004, Chapter VII). The Haar measure plays the role of a uniform distribution on groups. The following result is well-known (see Eaton, 1989, Theorem 4.4), and it implies that, conditionally on the orbit selector $\gamma_n(X^n)$, the distribution of X^n is uniform over its orbit anytime that the distribution of X^n is G_n -invariant.

Proposition 1. *Let G act on the random variable X taking values in \mathcal{X} , let γ be an orbit selector for the action of G on \mathcal{X} , and let U be uniform (Haar-distributed) on G and independent of X . If $X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} gX$ for all $g \in G$, then $X \mid \gamma(X) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} U\gamma(X) \mid \gamma(X)$.*

Similarly to Example 3, this distribution can now be used to rank the observed value of the conformity score α_n among all its possible values on the orbit of the data. This idea gives rise to the orbit ranks $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the next definition.

Definition 4 (Smoothed Orbit Ranks). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let α^n be a conformity measure of invariance at time n . We call R_n , defined by

$$R_n = \mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n < \alpha_n\}) + \theta_n \mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n = \alpha_n\}), \quad (3)$$

a (smoothed) orbit rank, where μ_n denotes the Haar probability measure on G_n and the sequence $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ is independent of α^n .

If A in Item (i) of Definition 3 is chosen properly, a small orbit rank R_n indicates that the observed value of α_n is strange (not conform) compared to the values it would have attained on different elements in the orbit of the data. One can think of R_n as the CDF of the distribution of α_n conditional on $\gamma_n(X^n)$ evaluated in the data (with added randomization). It follows—and this is shown in Theorem 1—that each R_n is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Vovk et al. (2005, Theorem 11.2) show that, if the data is generated by an online compression model, then R_1, R_2, \dots are also independent. Online compression models are defined in the next section and, in particular, Proposition 2 shows that that a sequential group invariance structure gives rise to one. Therefore, the conditions to Theorem 11.2 of Vovk et al. hold and the smoothed orbit ranks from Definition 4 form an i.i.d. uniform sequence under the null hypothesis. This is stated in the next theorem, for which we provide a direct proof for completeness in Appendix A.

Theorem 1. *If X_1, X_2, \dots are generated by an element of \mathcal{H}_0 as in (1) and $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ have distribution U^∞ , then $R^n \perp \gamma_n(X^n)$ for each n and R_1, R_2, \dots are distributed according to U^∞ .*

3.2 Invariance as a Compression Model

An online compression model is a model for computing online summaries, or compressed representations, of the observed data using their statistical regularities. A compression model comprises three elements:

1. A sequence of statistics $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for each n , σ_n is a summary of X^n .
2. A sequence of functions $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for each n , $F_n(\sigma_{n-1}, X_n) = \sigma_n$.
3. A Markov kernel Q that gives the distribution of (σ_{n-1}, X_n) conditionally on σ_n .

The sequential group invariance structure considered here can be interpreted as an online compression model with summary function $\sigma_n = \gamma_n(X^n)$. The Markov kernel is characterized by Proposition 1—the conditional distribution of X^n given γ_n is uniform over its orbit—and the online character will be shown in the next proposition to follow from the fact that the action of the groups $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on the data is sequential (see Definition 1). The proof of the next proposition can be found in in Appendix A.

Proposition 2. *There exists a sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of measurable functions $F_n : \mathcal{X}^{n-1} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ such that:*

- (i) $F_n(\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1}), X_n) = \gamma_n(X^n)$,
- (ii) $F_n(\cdot, X_n)$ is a one-to-one function of $\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1})$.

4. Optimality

To investigate the optimality of martingales based on the smoothed orbit ranks as in (2), we discuss how such martingales can be thought of as likelihood ratio processes. It is known that likelihood ratio processes are optimal against the particular alternative for which they are built (Grünwald et al., 2024). Indeed, let P be a distribution such that, conditionally on R^{n-1} , R_n has density f_n under \tilde{P} for all n . Here, we use \tilde{P} to denote the distribution P with added external randomization, i.e. $\tilde{P} := P \times \mathcal{U}^\infty$, where \mathcal{U}^∞ is the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]^\infty$. Analogously, define $\tilde{Q} := Q \times \mathcal{U}^\infty$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Observe that $M_n = \prod_{i \leq n} f_i(R_i)$ as in (2) equals the likelihood ratio between \tilde{P}_{R^n} and the uniform distribution. Perhaps more surprisingly,

M_n can also be thought of as a likelihood ratio of the full data by taking P such that $R_n \perp \gamma_n(X^n)$. To this end, the following lemma will be useful. It is an extension of the fact that, for univariate observations sampled from a continuous distribution, the original observations can be recovered from the rank and order statistics.

Lemma 2. *Suppose, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that $\alpha_n(\cdot, \gamma_n(X^n))$ is a one-to-one function of X_n . Then there exists a map $D_n : [0, 1]^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n \times \mathcal{X}^n$ such that for any $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$,*

$$\tilde{Q}(D_n(R^n, \gamma_n(X^n)) = (\theta^n, X^n)) = 1.$$

With this lemma in hand, we can show that the conformal martingale M_n is a likelihood ratio process for the original data against a particular distribution. Indeed, let Q^* denote the distribution under which the marginal of $\gamma_n(X^n)$ coincides with that under P , and such that $X^n \mid \gamma_n(X^n) \stackrel{D}{=} U \gamma_n(X^n) \mid \gamma_n(X^n)$, where $U \sim \mu_n$ independently from $\gamma_n(X^n)$. Then, under the condition of Lemma 2, it holds that

$$\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(R_i) = \frac{dP_{\gamma_n(X^n)}}{dQ_{\gamma_n(X^n)}^*}(\gamma_n(X^n)) \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(R_i) = \frac{d\tilde{P}_{R^n, \gamma_n(X^n)}}{d\tilde{Q}_{R^n, \gamma_n(X^n)}^*}(R^n, \gamma_n(X^n)) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^n). \quad (4)$$

Distributions such as P are most easily constructed if the distribution of α_n given $\gamma_n(X^n)$ is continuous, because then the external randomization is not used and \tilde{P}_{R^n} equals P_{R^n} .

The next theorem uses the representation in (4) to show the log-optimality of the conformal martingale under certain alternative distributions. The proof, which can be found in Appendix A, is heavily inspired by Koolen and Grünwald (2022, Theorem 12).

Theorem 2. *Assume $\alpha_n(\cdot, \gamma_n(X^n))$ is one-to-one for all n and let P be any distribution such that $X^n \mid \gamma_n(X^n)$ has full support. Denote f_n for the density of $R_n \mid R^{n-1}$ under \tilde{P} . If τ is any stopping time and E any random process, both adapted to $(\sigma(R^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}}[E_\tau] \leq 1$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$, then it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln M_\tau] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}\left[\ln \prod_{i=1}^{\tau} f_i(R_i)\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln E_\tau]. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, if \tilde{P} is such that $R^n \perp \gamma_n(X^n)$ for all n , then for any process E' that is adapted to $(\sigma(X^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and such that $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}}[E_\tau] \leq 1$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$, it also holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln M_\tau] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln E'_\tau]. \quad (6)$$

The additional assumption of independence between R^n and $\gamma_n(X^n)$ is necessary for (6) to hold. This stems from the fact that, if \tilde{P} is a distribution under which $R_1, \dots, R_n \not\perp \gamma_n(x^n)$, then the conformal martingale is not in general a likelihood ratio as in (4). For the deterministic stopping time $\tau = n$, the optimal statistic is $S_n = \prod_{i=1}^n f_n(R_1, \dots, R_n \mid \gamma_n(X^n))$, as it can be written as a likelihood ratio, which is optimal (see also Grünwald et al., 2024; Koning, 2023). However, the sequence $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not necessarily an e-process and monitoring it does not necessarily give an anytime-valid test. Using tests based on the sequential ranks circumvents this issue for such alternatives.

The optimality of M_n in Theorem 2 is contingent on oracle knowledge of the true distributions f_1, f_2, \dots , which are unknown in practice. To counter this, past data can be used sequentially to estimate the true density. This idea has been applied for testing exchangeability (Fedorova et al., 2012; Vovk, 2021; Vovk et al., 2022). More precisely, for each n , let \hat{f}_n be an estimator of f_n based on R^{n-1} , and consider the martingale defined by $\prod_{i=1}^n \hat{f}_i(R_i)$. While this is suboptimal with respect to an oracle that knows the true density, there is limited loss asymptotically if \hat{f}_i is a good estimator of f_i . In order to judge if an estimator is good for the task at hand, consider the difference in expected growth per outcome for fixed n , i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\log f(R_i) - \log \hat{f}_i(R_i)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\text{KL}(f \parallel \hat{f}_i)], \quad (7)$$

where $\text{KL}(f\|\hat{g}) = \int_0^1 f(r) \log \frac{f(r)}{\hat{g}(r)} dr$ denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence whenever f is absolutely continuous with respect to g , and the expectation on the right-hand side of (7) is over past data (on which \hat{f}_i depends). Estimators under which (7) tends to zero are known to exist under weak conditions on the true density f (Haussler and Opper, 1997; Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2001; Grünwald and Mehta, 2019). Under more stringent assumptions—for example, if the density f belongs to an exponential family—sequential Bayesian-update-type algorithms are known to guarantee that (7) tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (Kotłowski and Grünwald, 2011).

5. Applications

In this section, we discuss applications and an extension of the theory developed above. In Section 5.1, we show a modification to test for independence in relation to the work of Henzi and Law (2023). In Section 5.2, we discuss testing for invariance under subgroups of the orthogonal groups. This includes testing the assumptions of linear regression models.

Throughout, we will use the most straightforward choice of conformity measure $\alpha_n(X^n) = X^n$ or some variation thereof. Shafer and Vovk (2008) and Fontana et al. (2023) show other possible choices. In most cases, we will discuss how R_n is computed, but will not go into detail about how its conditional density should be estimated for the test martingale, as that will highly depend on the specific alternative one has in mind.

5.1 Modification for Independence Testing

We now propose a minor modification of the conformal martingales from the previous section that can be used to test for independence under, or together with, group invariance. Formally, fix $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose that at each time point $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a K -dimensional vector $X_n = (X_{1,n}, \dots, X_{K,n}) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ is observed. We are interested in testing a null hypothesis consisting of the intersection of two hypotheses. First, that for each $k = 1, \dots, K$ and each n the vectors $(X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,n})$ are G_n -invariant; second, that $(X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,n}) \perp (X_{k',1}, \dots, X_{k',n})$ for all $k \neq k' \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. In words, this corresponds to testing simultaneously whether K streams of data are group invariant and independent from each other. A related problem that is amenable to the approach below is testing for independence while assuming group invariance. Either way, the data is invariant under the sequential action of $(\tilde{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$\tilde{G}_n = \underbrace{G_n \times G_n \times \dots \times G_n}_{K \text{ times}}$$

acting on $\mathcal{X}^{K \times n}$ rowwise, that is, the first copy of the group acts on $(X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,n})$, the second on $(X_{2,1}, \dots, X_{2,n})$, etc. This action is sequential anytime that the action of $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is sequential on each of the K data streams. If $G_n = n!$, this is equivalent to testing whether the data consists of i.i.d. copies of some vector (Y_1, \dots, Y_K) such that $Y_i \perp Y_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Based on the discussion above, a first idea to test for invariance under \tilde{G}_n is to create K test martingales and combine them through multiplication. More specifically, we can treat each of the sequences $(X_{k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ as a separate data stream and compute the corresponding statistics in (3), leading to K sequences of uniformly distributed random variables $(R_{k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. If, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, $f_{k,n}$ is a density on $[0, 1]$ then, by independence, the sequence $(M'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $M'_n = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{k=1}^K f_{k,i}(R_{k,i})$ is a martingale under the null hypothesis. However, this martingale would not be able to detect alternatives under which the marginals are group invariant. This stems from the fact that it only uses that the marginals are uniform under the null, while in fact a stronger claim is true: for each n , the joint distribution of $R_{k,n}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, is uniform on $[0, 1]^K$. As a result of this observation, one can choose any sequence of joint density (estimators) f_1, f_2, \dots on $[0, 1]^K$ and create a test martingale by considering $M_n = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(R_{1,i}, \dots, R_{K,i})$.

In the case that $K = 2$ and $G_n = n!$, this is the procedure that was recently employed by Henzi and Law (2023). They discuss a specific choice of histogram density estimator that is able to detect departures from independence consistently under the stronger assumption that data are i.i.d. One of the key insights of Henzi and Law is that independence of the data streams is equivalent to the joint uniformity of the

sequential ranks in their setting. This equivalence hinges crucially on the assumption that the data streams consist of i.i.d. observations, i.e. that $X_{k,1}, X_{k,2} \dots$ are i.i.d. for all k . This is not assumed here and it is possible to construct examples where the group-invariant structure of our problem is respected and the joint distribution of the ranks is uniform, but the streams are not independent. Indeed, let $K = 2$ and $G_n = n!$ and consider the case where $X_{1,1}$ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$, $X_{1,n} = X_{1,1}$ for all $n > 1$, $X_{2,1} = 1 - X_{1,1}$ and $X_{2,n} = X_{2,1}$ and $\alpha^n(X^n) = X^n$. Then the orbit ranks are equal to the external random variables. Consequently, their joint distribution is uniform, while $(X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,n})$ and $(X_{2,1}, \dots, X_{2,n})$ are dependent. Finding conditions under which the independence of the streams and the joint uniformity of the rank distributions are equivalent is future work.

5.2 The orthogonal group and linear models

We now discuss the application to testing for invariances under subgroups of the orthogonal group.

Spherical symmetry: full orthogonal group

Consider testing whether the data we observe are drawn from a spherically symmetric distribution, i.e. $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ and $G_n = O(n)$, where $O(n)$ is the orthogonal group in dimension n (see e.g. Fourdrinier et al., 2018, Chapter 4). Testing for spherical symmetry is equivalent to testing whether the data is generated by a zero-mean Gaussian distribution, one of the most common statistical assumptions. This follows from the fact that any distribution on \mathbb{R}^∞ for which the marginal of the first n coordinates is spherically symmetric for any n , can be written as a mixture of i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian distributions (Diaconis and Freedman, 1987; Bernardo and Smith, 2009, Proposition 4.4). It follows that any process that is a supermartingale under all zero-mean Gaussian distributions is also a supermartingale under spherical symmetry and vice-versa. This implies that, for the purpose of testing with supermartingales, the two hypotheses are equivalent.

We now check that testing spherical symmetry fits in our setting, i.e. that Definition 1 is fulfilled. Consider the inclusion of $O(n)$ in $O(n+1)$ given by

$$\iota_{n+1}(O_n) = \begin{pmatrix} O_n & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for each $O_n \in O(n)$. In other words, $O(n)$ can be identified with the isotropy group of the unit vector $e_{n+1} = (0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, a closed subgroup of $O(n+1)$. Using the canonical projections in \mathbb{R}^n , Definition 1 is readily checked. For simplicity, we further impose that the distribution of X^n has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure for each n . Since the data are real, α^n can be chosen to be the identity for all n , i.e. $\alpha^n(X^n) = X^n$. As stated in Example 5, an orbit selector is given by $\gamma_n(X^n) = \|X^n\|e_1$, where e_1 is the unit vector $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Since the data is assumed to be continuous, $R_n = \mu_n(\{O_n \in O(n) : (O_n X^n)_n < X_n\})$ —no external randomization is needed. Rather than thinking of μ_n as a measure on $O(n)$, one can think of it as the uniform measure on $S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|)$. This way, R_n can be recognized to be the relative surface area of the hyper-spherical cap with co-latitude angle $\varphi_n = \pi - \cos^{-1}(X_n/\|X^n\|)$. Li (2010) shows that an explicit expression for this area is given by

$$R_n = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{2} I_{\sin^2(\pi - \varphi_n)}\left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) & \text{if } \varphi_n > \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ \frac{1}{2} I_{\sin^2(\varphi_n)}\left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $I_x(a, b)$ denotes the regularized beta function, $I_x(a, b) = \frac{B(x, a, b)}{B(1, a, b)}$ for $B(x, a, b) = \int_0^x t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Note that $\varphi_n > \frac{\pi}{2}$ if and only if $X_n > 0$. Furthermore, we have that $\sin^2(\varphi_n) = 1 - \frac{X_n^2}{\|X^n\|^2}$, so that we recognize in (8) the CDF of the t-distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom evaluated in

$$t = \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}(\|X^n\|^2 - X_n^2)}} = \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}\|X^{n-1}\|}}. \quad (9)$$

If $X^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$, then the statistic t is the ratio of a normally distributed random variable and an independent chi-squared-distributed random variable. Therefore, t has a t distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom, so that our conformal machinery produces a type of sequential t-test.

Linear models: isotropy groups

The rotational symmetry described above is that of symmetry around the origin, which we argued is equivalent to testing whether $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Of course, there are many applications where it is not reasonable to assume that the data is zero-mean and it is more interesting to test whether the data is spherically symmetric around some point other than the origin. One particular instance of such non-centered sphericity is to test whether, for each n , the data can be written as $X_n = \mu + \epsilon_n$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and ϵ^n is spherically symmetric. If μ is known, we can test for spherical symmetry of $X^n - \mu$ under $O(n)$ and the problem reduces to that of the previous section. It is still possible to treat the more realistic case where μ is unknown because the null model is still symmetric under a family of rotations. Let $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vector of all ones. Notice the following: for any $O_n \in O(n)$ it holds that $O_n X^n = \mu O_n \mathbf{1}_n + O_n \epsilon^n$. Unless $\mu = 0$, it follows that $X^n \stackrel{D}{=} O_n X^n$ every time that $O_n \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$. That is, the distribution of X^n is invariant under the isotropy group of $\mathbf{1}_n$, i.e. $G_n = \{O_n \in O(n) : O_n \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n\}$. Invariance under the action of G_n has previously appeared in the literature as centered spherical symmetry (Smith, 1981). Through the lens of test martingales, sequentially testing for centered spherical symmetry is equivalent to testing whether the data was generated by any Gaussian. This holds because any probability distribution on \mathbb{R}^∞ for which the marginal of the first n coordinates is centered spherically symmetric for any n can be written as a mixture of Gaussians (Smith, 1981; Eaton, 1989, Theorem 8.13).

Note that we can write $X^n = X_{\mathbf{1}_n}^n + X_{\perp \mathbf{1}_n}^n$, where $X_{\mathbf{1}_n}^n = \frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n} \mathbf{1}_n$ is the projection of X^n onto the span of $\mathbf{1}_n$, and $X_{\perp \mathbf{1}_n}^n$ the projection onto its orthogonal complement. We have that $gX^n = X_{\mathbf{1}_n}^n + gX_{\perp \mathbf{1}_n}^n$ for any $g \in G_n$. Consequently, the orbit of X^n under G_n is given by the intersection of $S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|)$ and the hyperplane $H_n(X^n)$ defined by $H_n(X^n) = \{x^n \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle = \langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle\}$. There is a unique line that is perpendicular to $H_n(X^n)$ and passes through the origin $0_n = (0, \dots, 0)$; it intersects $H_n(X^n)$ in the point $0_{H_n} := \frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n} \mathbf{1}_n$. For any $x^n \in S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|) \cap H_n(X^n)$, Pythagoras' theorem gives that $\|x^n - 0_{H_n}\|^2 = \|X^n\|^2 - \|0_{H_n} - 0_n\|^2$. In other words, $S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|) \cap H_n(X^n)$ forms an $(n-2)$ -dimensional sphere of radius $(\|X^n\|^2 - \|0_{H_n} - 0_n\|^2)^{1/2}$ around 0_{H_n} . If one considers the projection of this sphere on the n -th coordinate, then the highest possible value is given by $\|X^n\|$, and the lowest value therefore by $\frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n} - \frac{1}{2}(\|X^n\| - \frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n})$. The relative value of X_n is therefore given by $\tilde{X}_n := X_n - \frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n} + \frac{1}{2}(\|X^n\| - \frac{\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{n})$. As a result, R_n is the relative surface area of the $(n-2)$ -dimensional hyper-spherical cap with co-latitude angle $\varphi = \pi - \cos^{-1}(\tilde{X}_n / (\|X^n\|^2 - \|0_{H_n} - 0_n\|^2)^{1/2})$, so that equation (8) can again be used to determine R_n . With this construction, we recover what Vovk (2023) refers to as the ‘‘full Gaussian model’’, which is an online compression model that is defined in terms of the summary statistic $\sigma_n = (\langle X^n, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle, \|X^n\|)$.

This model can be extended to the case in which there are covariates, i.e. $X_n = (Y_n, Z_n^d)$ for some $Y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z_n^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Denote Z_n for the matrix with row-vectors Z_n^d and, as is a standard assumption in regression, assume that Z_n is full rank for every n . The model of interest is $Y^n = Z_n \beta^d + \epsilon^n$ where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and ϵ^n is spherically symmetric for each n . Similar to the reasoning above, this model is invariant under the intersection of the isotropy groups of the column vectors of Z_n , i.e. $G_n = \{O_n \in O(n) : O_n Z_n = Z_n\}$. The orbit of X^n under G_n is given by the intersection of $S^{n-1}(\|X^n\|)$ with the intersection of the d hyperplanes defined by the columns of Z_n , so that for $\alpha^n(Y^n, Z_n) = Y^n$, computing R_n is analogous. Interestingly, however, it does not always hold that testing for invariance under G_n is equivalent to testing for normality with mean $Z_n \beta^d$. A sufficient condition for the equivalence to hold is that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (Z_n' Z_n)^{-1} = 0$, which is essentially the condition that the parameter vector β can be consistently estimated by means of least squares (Eaton, 1989, Section 9.3).

6. Discussion

We have discussed how the theory of conformal prediction can be applied to test for symmetry of infinite sequences of data. This was done by showing that any distribution on an infinite sequence that is invariant under a compact group can be thought of as an online compression model. Here we discuss three topics. First, the relationship to noninvariant conformal martingales. Second, the choice of sigma-algebra for the test martingales. Third, whether smoothing is necessary when defining orbit ranks.

6.1 Noninvariant conformal martingales

Not all online compression models correspond to a compact-group invariant null hypothesis. An interesting example of this phenomenon is when the data are i.i.d. and exponentially distributed. This distribution is invariant under reflection in any 45° line¹ (not necessarily through the origin), but these reflections do not define a compact group and therefore do not fit the setting discussed in this article. Nevertheless, the sum of data points is a sufficient statistic for the data, so this model can still be seen as an online compression model with the sum being the summary.

In the same way, many exponential families can be seen as online compression models, though most of them do not seem to be relatable to group invariance. Therefore, conformal martingales can also be used to test whether the assumptions of such exponential families are correct. More work is needed to find out whether conformal martingales are log-optimal against certain alternatives in this setting.

6.2 Choice of sigma-algebra

The conformal test martingale $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that was built in Section 3 does not constitute a test martingale with respect to the filtration induced by the entirety of the data. This means that for arbitrary stopping times τ that are not adapted to the reduced filtration, it might hold that $\mathbb{E}_Q[M_\tau] > 1$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{H}_0$. However, it is still true that $\mathbb{P}(M_\tau > C) \leq \frac{1}{C}$, as discussed in a different setting by Pérez-Ortiz et al. (2022, Appendix C). Practically, this means that one does not lose type-I error guarantees under optional stopping, but one is not allowed to engage in optional continuation with stopping times that are not adapted to $(\sigma(R^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

For testing exchangeability, this phenomenon is in fact unavoidable when one restricts to testing with martingales: the only martingales that exist with respect to the original filtration are trivial (Vovk et al., 2005, Section 8.6.1). However, coarsening the filtration to the one induced by the sequential ranks is not the only way to avoid this. For example, Saha and Ramdas (2023) show that it is also possible to construct martingales with respect to the filtration that considers data to be paired. This only allows stopping at even times, but at those times all of the previous data can be taken into account. Another way to circumvent this is by considering e -processes instead of test martingales, which gives safety under optional stopping even for stopping rules that depend on all of the data (Ramdas et al., 2022). However, it is shown by Vovk (2023) that there are settings in which the latter cannot cover results attainable by conformal martingales. Vovk therefore argues that it is more fruitful to embrace the slight loss of flexibility incurred by coarsening the filtration. Our Theorem 2 then shows that, under certain alternatives, the conformal martingale leads to the best testing strategy among all processes that are safe under optional continuation with respect to stopping times that are adapted to $(\sigma(R^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

6.3 The need for smoothing

In situations when, conditionally on the orbit selector $\gamma_n(X^n)$, the conformity measure $\alpha^n(X^n)$ has a continuous distribution, the smoothing plays no role in (4). This is the case for the rotations discussed in Section 5.2. In certain other scenarios, smoothing can be avoided as well. Indeed, one can always define nonsmoothed orbit ranks, in opposition to the smoothed ranks R_n from Definition 4, by

$$\tilde{R}_n := \mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n \leq \alpha_n\}).$$

Notice that this nonsmooth version satisfies $\tilde{R}_n \leq R_n$. Then, for a particular choice of increasing densities f_1, f_2, \dots , on $[0, 1]$ —in the sense that $u \mapsto f_i(u)$ is increasing—, we have that the process $\tilde{M}_n := \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tilde{R}_i)$ is bounded from above by the conformal martingale $M_n = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(R_i)$. Such a choice of increasing f_i is natural when high values of R_i (or \tilde{R}_i) are associated with departures from the null hypothesis. Then, any test based on an upper threshold on \tilde{M}_n inherits the anytime-valid type-I error guarantees of M_n —exactly because $\tilde{M}_n \leq M_n$. This was previously noted by Vovk et al. (2003). In general, the process \tilde{M}_n may not be a martingale itself, but sometimes a test martingale can be associated to \tilde{R}_n . For instance, in the setting of Example 3, the distribution of \tilde{R}_n under the null hypothesis is known—it is uniformly distributed on

¹Any distribution that is invariant under such reflections can be written as a mixture of i.i.d. exponentially distributed random variables (Bernardo and Smith, 2009, Chapter 4.4.3)

$\{1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore, we can construct likelihood ratio processes for the sequence of nonsmoothed ranks. Even more, there are parametric alternatives under which the exact distributions of the nonsmoothed ranks can be computed. This is the case for Lehmann alternatives where, for data, X_1, X_2, \dots , each X_i is assumed to be sampled from some continuous distribution with c.d.f. $F_i(x) = F_0(x)$ for some fixed F_0 ; under the alternative, $F_i(x) = 1 - (1 - F_0(x))^{\theta_i}$ for some θ_i . From Theorem 7.a.1 of Savage (1956) the distribution of \tilde{R}_i can be derived. This fact is also discussed by Kalbfleisch and Prentice (1973) in the context of survival analysis, and by Woodroffe (1984) in the context of sequential rank tests.

Acknowledgements

We thank the attendants of the Seminar on Anytime-Valid Inference “E-readers” at *Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica* in Amsterdam for their input and valuable insights. In particular, we are grateful to Peter Grünwald for feedback on a first version of this article, and Nick Koning for fruitful discussions.

References

- Baringhaus, L. (1991). Testing for spherical symmetry of a multivariate distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 899–917.
- Bernardo, J. M. and Smith, A. F. (2009). *Bayesian theory*, volume 405. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bondar, J. V. (1976). Borel cross-sections and maximal invariants. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 866–877.
- Bourbaki, N. and Berberian, S. (2004). *Integration II: Chapters 7–9*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Brown, L. D. (1966). On the admissibility of invariant estimators of one or more location parameters. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37(5):1087–1136.
- Cesa-Bianchi, N. and Lugosi, G. (2001). Worst-case bounds for the logarithmic loss of predictors. *Machine Learning*, 43:247–264.
- Chiu, K. and Bloem-Reddy, B. (2023). Non-parametric hypothesis tests for distributional group symmetry. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15834.
- Cohen, T. and Welling, M. (2016). Group equivariant convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2990–2999. PMLR.
- Diaconis, P. (1988). Group representations in probability and statistics. *Lecture notes-monograph series*, 11:i–192.
- Diaconis, P. and Freedman, D. (1987). A dozen de finetti-style results in search of a theory. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 23, pages 397–423.
- Durrett, R. (2019). *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press.
- Eaton, M. L. (1989). Group invariance applications in statistics. *Regional Conference Series in Probability and Statistics*, 1:i–133.
- Fedorova, V., Gammernan, A., Nouretdinov, I., and Vovk, V. (2012). Plug-in martingales for testing exchangeability on-line. In Langford, J. and Pineau, J., editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-12)*, ICML ’12, pages 1639–1646, New York, NY, USA. Omnipress.
- Fisher, R. A. (1936). Design of experiments. *British Medical Journal*, 1(3923):554.
- Fontana, M., Zeni, G., and Vantini, S. (2023). Conformal prediction: a unified review of theory and new challenges. *Bernoulli*, 29(1):1–23.

- Fourdrinier, D., Strawderman, W. E., and Wells, M. T. (2018). *Shrinkage Estimation*. Springer International Publishing.
- Grünwald, P. D. and Mehta, N. A. (2019). A tight excess risk bound via a unified pac-bayesian–rademacher–shtarkov–mdl complexity. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 433–465. PMLR.
- Grünwald, P., de Heide, R., and Koolen, W. (2024). Safe Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, page qkae011.
- Haussler, D. and Opper, M. (1997). Mutual information, metric entropy and cumulative relative entropy risk. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(6):2451–2492.
- Henzi, A. and Law, M. (2023). A rank-based sequential test of independence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13818.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (1973). Marginal Likelihoods Based on Cox’s Regression and Life Model. *Biometrika*, 60(2):267–278.
- Kelly, J. L. (1956). A new interpretation of information rate. *the bell system technical journal*, 35(4):917–926.
- Koning, N. W. (2023). Online permutation tests: e -values and likelihood ratios for testing group invariance. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01153.
- Koolen, W. M. and Grünwald, P. (2022). Log-optimal anytime-valid e -values. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 141:69–82.
- Kotłowski, W. and Grünwald, P. (2011). Maximum likelihood vs. sequential normalized maximum likelihood in on-line density estimation. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 457–476. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- Lai, T. L. (1977). Power-one tests based on sample sums. *The Annals of Statistics*, 5(5):866–880.
- Lehmann, E. L., Romano, J. P., and Casella, G. (2005). *Testing statistical hypotheses*, volume 3. Springer.
- Lehmann, E. L. and Stein, C. (1949). On the theory of some non-parametric hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 20(1):28–45.
- Li, S. (2010). Concise formulas for the area and volume of a hyperspherical cap. *Asian Journal of Mathematics & Statistics*, 4(1):66–70.
- Malov, S. (1996). Sequential ranks and order statistics. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 81:2434–2441.
- Meckes, E. S. (2019). *The random matrix theory of the classical compact groups*, volume 218. Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez-Ortiz, M. F., Lardy, T., de Heide, R., and Grünwald, P. (2022). E -statistics, group invariance and anytime valid testing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07610.
- Pitman, E. J. (1937). Significance tests which may be applied to samples from any populations. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 4(1):119–130.
- Ramdas, A., Grünwald, P., Vovk, V., and Shafer, G. (2023). Game-theoretic statistics and safe anytime-valid inference. *Statistical Science*, 38(4):576–601.
- Ramdas, A., Ruf, J., Larsson, M., and Koolen, W. (2020). Admissible anytime-valid sequential inference must rely on nonnegative martingales. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03167.
- Ramdas, A., Ruf, J., Larsson, M., and Koolen, W. M. (2022). Testing exchangeability: Fork-convexity, supermartingales and e -processes. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 141:83–109.

- Rényi, A. (1962). On the extreme elements of observations. *MTA III. Oszt. Közl*, 12:105–121.
- Robbins, H. and Siegmund, D. (1974). The expected sample size of some tests of power one. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2(3):415–436.
- Saha, A. and Ramdas, A. (2023). Testing exchangeability by pairwise betting. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14293.
- Savage, I. R. (1956). Contributions to the Theory of Rank Order Statistics-the Two-Sample Case. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):590–615. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Sen, P. K. and Ghosh, M. (1973a). A Chernoff-Savage Representation of Rank Order Statistics for Stationary φ -Mixing Processes. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (1961-2002)*, 35(2):153–172. Publisher: Springer.
- Sen, P. K. and Ghosh, M. (1973b). A Law of Iterated Logarithm for One-Sample Rank Order Statistics and an Application. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(3):568–576. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Sen, P. K. and Ghosh, M. (1974). Sequential Rank Tests for Location. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2(3):540–552. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Shafer, G. (2021). Testing by betting: A strategy for statistical and scientific communication. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 184(2):407–431.
- Shafer, G. and Vovk, V. (2008). A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(3).
- Shiryayev, A. N. (2016). *Probability-1*, volume 95. Springer.
- Sidak, Z., Sen, P. K., and Hajek, J. (1999). *Theory of Rank Tests*. Elsevier.
- Smith, A. F. (1981). On random sequences with centred spherical symmetry. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 43(2):208–209.
- Vovk, V. (2002). On-line confidence machines are well-calibrated. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 187–196. IEEE.
- Vovk, V. (2004). A universal well-calibrated algorithm for on-line classification. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:575–604.
- Vovk, V. (2021). Conformal testing in a binary model situation. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction and Applications*, pages 131–150. PMLR.
- Vovk, V. (2023). The power of forgetting in statistical hypothesis testing. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction with Applications*, pages 347–366. PMLR.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer.
- Vovk, V., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2003). Testing exchangeability on-line. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, pages 768–775.
- Vovk, V., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2022). Conformal testing: binary case with markov alternatives. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction with Applications*, pages 207–218. PMLR.
- Vovk, V. and Wang, R. (2021). E-values: Calibration, combination and applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1736–1754.
- Woodroffe, M. (1984). Likelihood ratio tests with ranks. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (1961-2002)*, 46(2):233–252.

A. Proofs

This appendix contains the proofs that were omitted from the main text.

A.1 Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof can be divided in two main steps: (1) to show that, conditionally on $\gamma_n(X^n)$, R_n is uniformly distributed for each n and (2) to show that R_1, R_2, \dots are also independent. The second step is completely analogous to the proof of Theorem 3 by Vovk (2002). For each n , define the σ -algebra $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(\gamma_n(X^n), X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}, \dots)$. Notice that \mathcal{G}_n contains—among others—all G_n -invariant functions of X^n because γ_n is a maximally invariant function of X^n —any other G_n -invariant function of X^n is a function of $\gamma_n(X^n)$. Let $g' \in G_n$ such that $\gamma_n(X^n) = g'X^n$, then we have that $\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n < \alpha_n\} = \{g \in G_n : (\alpha^n(g\gamma_n(X^n)))_n < \alpha_n\}g'$. By the invariance of μ_n —it is the Haar probability measure—, it follows that

$$\mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n < \alpha_n\}) = \mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (\alpha^n(g\gamma_n(X^n)))_n < \alpha_n\}).$$

An analogous identity can be derived for the second term in (3). By Proposition 1, we have $\alpha_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (\alpha^n(U\gamma_n(X^n)))_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n$.

We will denote $F(b) := \mu(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n < b\})$ and define $G(\delta) = \sup\{b \in \mathbb{R} : F(b) \leq \delta\}$. If $\alpha_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n$ is continuous, then F is the CDF of that distribution, otherwise it is the CDF minus the probability of equality. In any case, F is nonincreasing and left-continuous. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have that $F(G(\delta)) = \delta'$ for some $\delta' \leq \delta$, with equality if F is continuous in $G(\delta)$. Then we can write

$$\mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta' \mid \mathcal{G}_n) + \mathbb{P}(\delta' < R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n). \quad (10)$$

For any $\theta \in (0, 1]$, we have that $R_n = F(\alpha_n) + \theta(F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n)) \leq \delta'$ if and only if either $F(\alpha_n) < \delta'$ or $F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n) = 0$, which happens precisely when $\alpha_n < G(\delta)$. We therefore see

$$\mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta' \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha_n < G(\delta') \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = F(G(\delta')) = \delta'.$$

If F is continuous in $G(\delta)$, then this shows that $\mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \delta$, since $\delta' = \delta$ in that case. If F is not continuous in $G(\delta)$, then we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\delta' < R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \mathbb{P}(\delta' < F(\alpha_n) + \theta(F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n)) \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n).$$

Notice that $\delta' < F(\alpha_n) + \theta(F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n)) \leq \delta$ if and only if $\alpha_n = G(\delta)$ and $\theta < (\delta - \delta') / (F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n))$, so that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\delta' < R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n) &= \mathbb{P}(\alpha_n = G(\delta) \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \mathbb{P}\left(\theta \leq \frac{\delta - \delta'}{F(G(\delta')^+) - F(G(\delta'))} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\right) \\ &= (F(G(\delta')^+) - F(G(\delta')))) \frac{\delta - \delta'}{(F(G(\delta')^+) - F(G(\delta')))} \\ &= \delta - \delta'. \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we see that $\mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \delta$. This shows the first part, that R_n has a conditional uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$.

For the second part of the proof, we show that the sequence R_1, R_2, \dots is also an independent sequence. We have that R_n is \mathcal{G}_{n-1} -measurable because it is invariant under transformations of the form $X^n \mapsto (gX^{n-1}, X_n)$ for $g \in G_{n-1}$ (see also Vovk, 2004, Lemma 2). We proceed (implicitly) by induction:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta_n, \dots, R_1 \leq \delta_1 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{R_n \leq \delta_n, \dots, R_1 \leq \delta_1\} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{R_n \leq \delta_n, \dots, R_1 \leq \delta_1\} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{R_n \leq \delta_n\} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{p_{n-1} \leq \delta_{n-1}, \dots, R_1 \leq \delta_1\} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{R_n \leq \delta_n\}] \delta_{n-1} \cdots \delta_1 \\ &= \delta_n \cdots \delta_1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows by the law of total expectation that

$$\mathbb{P}(R_n \leq \delta_n, \dots, R_1 \leq \delta_1) = \delta_n \cdots \delta_1,$$

which shows that R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n are independent and uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that the distribution of R_1, R_2, \dots coincides with U^∞ by Kolmogorov's extension theorem (see e.g. Shiryaev, 2016, Theorem II.3.3). This shows the claim of the theorem. \square

A.2 Proposition 2

Proof of Proposition 2. For $X^{n-1} \in \mathcal{X}^{n-1}$ and $X_n \in \mathcal{X}$, let $F_n(X^{n-1}, X_n) = \gamma_n((X^{n-1}, X_n))$, where, by a slight abuse of notation, we refer by (X^{n-1}, X_n) to the concatenation of X^{n-1} and X_n . We will show that F_n has the claimed properties. First, we will show that the vectors $(\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1}), X_n)$ and X^n are in the same orbit, so that also $\gamma_n((\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1}), X_n)) = \gamma_n(X^n)$. To this end, let $g' \in G_{n-1}$ denote the group element such that $g'X^{n-1} = \gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1})$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \{g(\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1}), X_n) : g \in G_n\} &= \{g(g'X^{n-1}, X_n) : g \in G_n\} \\ &= \{g^n(g')X^n : g \in G_n\} \\ &= \{gX^n : g \in G_n\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we called X^n the concatenation of X^{n-1} and X_n . This shows the first claim. For the second claim, that $F_n(\cdot, X_n)$ is one-to-one for each fixed X_n , we show that we can reconstruct $\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1})$ from X_n and $\gamma_n(X^n)$.

Pick any $g_{X_n} \in G_n$ such that $(g_{X_n}\gamma_n(X^n))_n = X_n$. We furthermore know that there exists some $g \in G_n$ such that $gX^n = \gamma_n(X^n)$. Note that $g_{X_n}g$ does nothing to the final coordinate of X^n , so by Assumption 1 there is a $g_{n-1}^* \in G_{n-1}$ such that $g_{X_n}gX^n = \iota(g_{n-1}^*)X^n$. Then we see

$$\begin{aligned} \{\iota(g_{n-1})g_{X_n}\gamma_n(X^n) : g_{n-1} \in G_{n-1}\} &= \{\iota(g_{n-1})g_{X_n}gX^n : g_{n-1} \in G_{n-1}\} \\ &= \{\iota(g_{n-1})\iota(g_{n-1}^*)X^n : g_{n-1} \in G_{n-1}\} \\ &= \{\iota(g_{n-1})X^n : g_{n-1} \in G_{n-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We find that $G_{n-1}\text{proj}_{n-1}(g_{X_n}\gamma_n(X^n)) = G_{n-1}X^{n-1}$ and therefore $\gamma_{n-1}(\text{proj}_{n-1}(g_{X_n}\gamma_n(X^n))) = \gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1})$. \square

A.3 Lemma 2

Proof of Lemma 2. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we will denote $F(b) = \mu_n(\{g \in G_n : (g\alpha^n)_n < b\})$ and define $G(\delta) = \sup\{b \in \mathbb{R} : F(b) \leq \delta\}$. Furthermore, we will write $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}$ for the distribution of α_n given $\gamma_n(X^n)$ and denote its support by

$$\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \text{for all } I \text{ open, if } x \in I \text{ then } \mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}(I) > 0\},$$

If $b \in \text{int}(\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}))$, then there exists an open interval B with $b \in B$ and $B \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)})$. For all $c \in B$ with $c > b$, we have that $F(c) - F(b) = \mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}([b, c]) > 0$, since $[b, c)$ contains an open neighborhood of an interior point of the support. It follows that $F(c) > F(b)$. In words, there are no points c to the right of b such that $F(c) > F(b)$. Consequently, we have

$$G(F(b)) = \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} : F(a) \leq F(b)\} = b.$$

In a similar fashion, we can conclude that the same identity holds if $b \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}) \setminus \text{int}(\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}))$. Notice furthermore that $G(R_n) = G(F(\alpha_n) + \theta_n(F(\alpha_n^+) - F(\alpha_n))) = G(F(\alpha_n))$ whenever $\theta_n < 1$, which happens with probability one. Together with the fact that $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}(\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)})) = 1$, this gives $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_n|\gamma_n(X^n)}(G(R_n) = \alpha_n) = 1$, so also $\mathbb{P}(G(R_n) = \alpha_n) = 1$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}(\theta_n = (R_n - F(G(R_n)))/(F(G(R_n)^+) - F(G(R_n)))) = 1$. Since $\alpha_n(\cdot, \gamma_n(X^n))$ is one-to-one by assumption, there exists some map that maps α_n to X_n . By Proposition 2, there also exists a map from X_n and $\gamma_n(X^n)$ to $\gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1})$. At this point, we can repeat the procedure above to recover X_{n-1} from $(R_{n-1}, \gamma_{n-1}(X^{n-1}))$, from which we can then recover $\gamma_{n-2}(X^{n-2})$, etc. Together, all of the maps involved give the function as in the statement of the proposition. \square

A.4 Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. We first show (6). Assume that \tilde{P} is such that $R^n \perp \gamma_n(X^n)$ for all n . Let Q^* denote the distribution under which the marginal of $\gamma_n(X^n)$ coincides with that under P , and such that $X^n | \gamma_n(X^n) \stackrel{D}{=} U \gamma_n(X^n) | \gamma_n(X^n)$, where $U \sim \mu_n$ is uniform on G_n and independent from $\gamma_n(X^n)$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}^* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\tau} f_i(R_i) = \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^\tau) \right) &\geq \tilde{Q}^* \left(\forall t : \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(R_i) = \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^t) \right) \\ &= 1 - \tilde{Q}^* \left(\exists t : \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(R_i) \neq \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^t) \right) \\ &= 1 - \tilde{Q}^* \left(\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(R_i) \neq \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^t) \right\} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}^* \left(\left\{ \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(R_i) \neq \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^t) \right\} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we used Lemma 2. Since the distribution of $X | \gamma_n(X^n)$ has full support under P , we have that $\tilde{P} \ll \tilde{Q}^*$, so it also holds that $\tilde{P} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\tau} f_i(R_i) = \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^\tau) \right) = 1$. We have shown that M_τ is a modification of the likelihood ratio evaluated at X^τ . We now show that the latter is optimal.

Denote $\ell_n = \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(X^n)$ and let $f(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln((1-\alpha)\ell_\tau + \alpha E'_\tau)]$; a concave function. We will show that the derivative of f in 0 is negative, which implies that f attains its maximum in $\alpha = 0$. This in turn implies our claim. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(0) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}} \left[\frac{E'_\tau - \ell_\tau}{\ell_\tau} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}} \left[\frac{E'_i}{\ell_i} \mathbb{1}\{\tau = i\} \right] - 1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^*} [E'_i \mathbb{1}\{\tau = i\}] - 1 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^*} [E'_\tau] - 1 \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use that differentiation and integration can be interchanged, because

$$|f'(\alpha)| = \left| \frac{E'_\tau - \ell_\tau}{(1-\alpha)\ell_\tau + \alpha E'_\tau} \right| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\},$$

so that the dominated convergence theorem is applicable. Finally, this gives that $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln \prod_{i=1}^{\tau} f(R_i)] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln E'_\tau] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}}[\ln E'_\tau]$. The proof of (5) follows from the same argument, but using $\ell'_n = \frac{dP}{dQ^*}(R^n)$. \square