

Simultaneous test of the mean vectors and covariance matrices for high-dimensional data using RMT

Zhenzhen Niu¹, Jianghao Li², Wenya Luo³, Zhidong Bai^{2*}

¹ School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University, No.1 University Road, Science Park, Changqing District, Jinan, 250358, China.

² School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northeast Normal University, 5268 Peoples Road, Changchun, 130024, China.

³ School of Data Sciences, Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics, Xueyuan Street, Xiasha Higher Education Park, Hangzhou, 310018, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): baizd@nenu.edu.cn;

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new modified likelihood ratio test (LRT) for simultaneously testing mean vectors and covariance matrices of two-sample populations in high-dimensional settings. By employing tools from Random Matrix Theory (RMT), we derive the limiting null distribution of the modified LRT for generally distributed populations. Furthermore, we compare the proposed test with existing tests using simulation results, demonstrating that the modified LRT exhibits favorable properties in terms of both size and power.

Keywords: High-dimensional data, Simultaneous test, Likelihood ratio test, Random matrix theory

1 Introduction

Large-dimensional data sets are becoming increasingly prevalent, involving many scientific fields such as biology, medicine, finance and so on, as modern data collecting and processing technology advances. Traditional hypothesis testing methods in multivariate statistical analysis are no longer effective or perform poorly. It is a challenging problem to develop effective methods for statistical inference of high-dimensional data sets. In recent years, the test for two sample mean vectors (see, e.g., [1]; [2]; [3]) or covariance matrices (see, e.g., [4]; [5];

[6]) under high-dimensional setting has been a very hot topic in the literature because of its important applications. We refer to [7] and [8] for recent comprehensive reviews on these topics. However, if we only test for mean vectors or covariance matrices, we may not effectively infer the differences between the two populations. Therefore, it makes sense to develop a new simultaneous test program for high-dimensional data.

Assume that there are two independent p -dimensional populations and let $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^p, t = 1, 2, i = 1, \dots, N_t\}$ be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random sample vectors from the t -th population with mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t = (\mu_{t1}, \dots, \mu_{tp})'$ and covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, $t = 1, 2$, respectively. The simultaneous testing of the mean vectors and covariance matrices among two populations can be formulated as follows:

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \text{ or } \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2. \quad (1)$$

For testing hypotheses (1), there exist some conventional methods whose asymptotic properties are established in the regime where the data dimension p is fixed, and n tends to infinity. See, e.g., when $p < \min\{N_1 - 1, N_2 - 1\}$, the likelihood ratio test for H_0 ,

$$\Lambda_N = \frac{\prod_{t=1}^2 |\mathbf{A}_t^{\mathbf{x}}|^{N_t/2} N^{pN/2}}{[(N_1 N_2) N^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(2)}) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(2)})' + \sum_{g=1}^2 \mathbf{A}_g^{\mathbf{x}}]^{n/2} \prod_{t=1}^2 N_t^{pN_t/2}},$$

in [9], where

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \quad \mathbf{A}_t^{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} (\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) (\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})', \quad t = 1, 2$$

and $N = N_1 + N_2$. However, the likelihood ratio is not well defined when $p > \min\{N_1 - 1, N_2 - 1\}$. In the sequel, in order to make up the deficiency of the traditional test and solve the large dimension problem, new methods have been proposed by researchers.

Some related works on the corrected likelihood ratio test from different perspectives can be found in [10] and [11]. When the population was the multivariate normal distribution, [10] and [11] studied LRT under the different assumption that the data dimension grew to infinity but was smaller than sample size, respectively. As a complement of [11], [12] obtained the asymptotic distribution of the log-likelihood ratio test statistic under alternative hypotheses that were not local ones. For more extensions and issues on this line, we refer the reader to [13]; [14].

However, a few works investigate simultaneous test of high-dimensional mean vectors and covariance matrices in different settings with general populations. The problem of one-sample simultaneous test procedure based on the quadratic loss for covariance matrix estimation is proposed by [15]. More recently, [16] further focused on the classical likelihood ratio test with high-dimensional non-Gaussian data. [17] and [18] considered a weighted sum of one test statistic related to the L^2 -norm-based test for mean vectors and another test statistic related to the L^2 -norm-based for covariance matrices in the context of the one-sample simultaneous test procedure and the two-sample simultaneous test procedure, respectively. However, their focus was limited to the structure or eigenvalues of the population covariance matrices. The test statistics of existing works are generally structured by weighting one proposed by the

high-dimensional mean vectors test and another proposed by the high-dimensional covariance matrices test; see, e.g., [15]; [17]; [18]. The weighting combination of such statistics may cause some loss of power; for more details, we may refer to the numerical simulations. In contrast, although the LRT statistic requires the dimensions to be smaller than the sample sizes, it makes no assumptions about the structure of the population covariance matrices. Inspired by the above discussions, we propose a novel modified likelihood ratio test for simultaneous testing of mean vectors and covariance matrices of two-sample populations. In order to solve the possible difficulties in the proof for non-Gaussian populations, we make full use of the advanced tools of RMT to accommodate the high-dimensional data.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the main results of the new modified LRT for simultaneous testing of equalities of mean vectors and covariance matrices. Section 3 shows some simulation results on the empirical sizes and the empirical powers of our test, including a comparison to other criteria under nonnormally distributed data. Section 4 contains some conclusions and discussions. The proof of the main result is provided in Appendix A.

2 Main Results

In this section, we present the asymptotic distribution of the modified LRT. For convenience of exposition, we first introduce some notations. In the following, the notation \xrightarrow{D} and \xrightarrow{P} denote convergence in distribution and convergence in probability, respectively. $\delta_{(\cdot)}$ and $\log(\cdot)$ represent the indicator function and logarithm function, respectively. Let

$$\begin{aligned} n &= n_1 + n_2, \quad r_n = \frac{p}{n}, \quad y_1 := y_{n_1} = \frac{p}{n_1}, \quad y_2 := y_{n_2} = \frac{p}{n_2}, \quad h := h_n = \sqrt{y_1 + y_2 - y_1 y_2}, \\ c_1 &:= \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{y_2}{y_1 + y_2}, \quad c_2 := \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{y_1}{y_1 + y_2}, \\ l(y_1, y_2) &= \log(h^{\frac{2c_1 h^2}{y_1^{y_2}}}) \delta_{y_1 > 1} - \log(y_1^{\frac{c_1(1+y_2)}{y_2}} y_2^{\frac{c_1(1-y_1)}{y_1}}) \delta_{y_1 > 1}, \\ u(y_1, y_2) &= \log\left(\frac{y_1^{c_1}}{h^{c_1}}\right) \delta_{y_1 > 1}, \quad v(y_1, y_2) = \log\left(\frac{y_1^{2c_1}}{h^{2c_1(c_1+2c_2)}}\right) \delta_{y_1 > 1}, \\ \Psi(y_1, y_2) &= c_2 y_1^2 [y_2^4 \delta_{y_2 < 1} + h^2(2y_2^2 - h^2) \delta_{y_2 > 1}] - c_1 y_2^2 [y_1^3 (y_1 + 2y_2) \delta_{y_1 < 1} + h^2(y_1 + y_2 + y_1 y_2) \delta_{y_1 > 1}]. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we start to consider the hypothesis (1). Suppose that the observations $\{\mathbf{x}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N_t}^{(t)}\}$ are p -dimensional i.i.d. random sample vectors from the t -th population for $t = 1, 2$, which have the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t = (\mu_{t1}, \dots, \mu_{tp})'$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$. Now we assume that the observation $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}$ follows the general multivariate model:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_t, \quad (2)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N_t$, $t = 1$ and 2 , where $\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} = (z_{i1}^{(t)}, \dots, z_{ip}^{(t)})'$ and $\{z_{ij}^{(t)}, i \leq N_t, j \leq p\}$ are i.i.d. real random variables. [9], see e.g., Section 10.3, suggested the use of a modified LRT statistic Λ_n^* , which uses $n_t = N_t - 1$ instead of sample size N_t , $t = 1, 2$ and N is replaced by $n = n_1 + n_2 = N - 2$ in Λ_N .

Then under the null hypothesis (1) and linear transformation model (2), we can easily rewrite the modified LRT statistic Λ_n^* as

$$\Lambda_n^* = \frac{|N_1^{-1}n_1\mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}}|^{\frac{n_1}{2}} \cdot |N_2^{-1}n_2\mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}}|^{\frac{n_2}{2}}}{|N^{-1}(n_1\mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}} + n_2\mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}})|^{\frac{N}{2}}} \cdot \left(\frac{|n_1\mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}} + n_2\mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}}|}{|(n_1\mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}} + n_2\mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}}) + N_1N_2N^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'|} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} = N_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{S}_t^{\mathbf{z}} = n_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})(\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})'$, $t = 1, 2$. In what follows, we remove the superscripts of $\mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}}$ and we denote $\mathbf{S}_1 := \mathbf{S}_1^{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 := \mathbf{S}_2^{\mathbf{z}}$ for brevity.

However, [19] has proved that this is the likelihood ratio test itself, not the modified test, which is unbiased to test (1). Thus, in this paper we reconsider the statistic Λ_n^* ,

$$\Lambda_n^* = \frac{|\mathbf{S}_1|^{\frac{n_1}{2}} \cdot |\mathbf{S}_2|^{\frac{n_2}{2}}}{|n^{-1}(n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2)|^{\frac{n}{2}}} \cdot \left(\frac{|n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2|}{|(n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2) + n_1n_2n^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'|} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Then after a simple calculation, we can obtain

$$L = \frac{2}{n} \log \Lambda_n^* = c_1 \cdot \log |c_1^{-1}\mathbf{B}_n| + c_2 \cdot \log |c_2^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{B}_n)| - \log(1 + T_n),$$

where $\mathbf{B}_n = n_1\mathbf{S}_1(n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2)^{-1}$, $T_n = n_1n_2n^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'(n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2)^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})$ and \mathbf{I}_p is the $p \times p$ identity matrix.

Note that when $p > n_1$ or $p > n_2$, L is undefined. Moreover, we know from previous works (see [20]) that if the fourth moment of $z_{ij}^{(t)}$ exists, matrix \mathbf{B}_n almost certainly contains $p - n_1$ zero eigenvalues and $p - n_2$ one eigenvalues for the conditions $p > \min\{N_1 - 1, N_2 - 1\}$. Therefore, we redefine L by restricting the eigenvalues of \mathbf{B}_n between zero and one, that is

$$L = \sum_{\lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} \in (0,1)} [c_1 \log \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} + c_2 \log(1 - \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n})] - \log(1 + T_n). \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n}$ denotes the i -th smallest eigenvalues of \mathbf{B}_n .

Next, we impose the following two assumptions, which are frequently utilized in random matrix theory, to analyze the asymptotic behaviors of the considered statistics throughout the paper.

- **Assumption A:** The random vectors $\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} = (z_{i1}^{(t)}, \dots, z_{ip}^{(t)})'$ satisfy the model (1) with common moments $\mathbb{E}z_{11}^{(1)} = \mathbb{E}z_{11}^{(2)} = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(z_{11}^{(1)})^2 = \mathbb{E}(z_{11}^{(2)})^2 = 1$, and $\mathbb{E}(z_{11}^{(1)})^4 = \beta_1 + 3 < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(z_{11}^{(2)})^4 = \beta_2 + 3 < \infty$;
- **Assumption B:** $y_1 \neq 1$, $y_2 \neq 1$ and $r_n < 1$, $\lim y_1 \notin \{0, 1\}$, $\lim y_2 \notin \{0, 1\}$ and $r = \lim r_n \in (0, 1)$ as $\min\{p, n_1, n_2\} \rightarrow \infty$;

Remark 1. In Assumption B, we require the data dimension p to be less than $n_1 + n_2$ so that the matrix $n_1\mathbf{S}_1 + n_2\mathbf{S}_2$ is invertible, but allow that the data dimension p to be greater or less than the sample size n_t , $t = 1, 2$.

Subsequently, the following theorem establishes the joint limiting null distribution of L defined in (3).

Theorem 2.1. Under the assumptions A and B, and the null hypothesis H_0 in (1), we have

$$\frac{L - p \cdot l_n - \mu_n - \log(1 - r_n)}{v_n} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &= \log\left(\frac{y_1^{c_2} y_2^{c_1} h^{\frac{2h^2}{y_1 y_2}}}{(y_1 + y_2)^{\frac{(y_1 + y_2)}{y_1 y_2}} |1 - y_1|^{\frac{c_1 |1 - y_1|}{y_1}} |1 - y_2|^{\frac{c_2 |1 - y_2|}{y_2}}}\right) - l(y_1, y_2) - l(y_2, y_1), \\ \mu_n &= \log\left[\frac{(y_1 + y_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} |1 - y_1|^{\frac{c_1}{2}} |1 - y_2|^{\frac{c_2}{2}}}{h}\right] - u(y_1, y_2) - u(y_2, y_1) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_1 \Psi(y_1, y_2)}{2y_1 y_2^2 (y_1 + y_2)^2} + \frac{\beta_2 \Psi(y_2, y_1)}{2y_2 y_1^2 (y_1 + y_2)^2}, \\ v_n^2 &= \log \frac{h^4}{|1 - y_1|^{2c_1^2} |1 - y_2|^{2c_2^2} (y_1 + y_2)^2} \\ &\quad + 2[v(y_1, y_2) + v(y_2, y_1) + \log(h^{4c_1 c_2}) \delta_{y_1 > 1} \delta_{y_2 > 1}] \\ &\quad + \frac{(y_1 \beta_1 + y_2 \beta_2)}{y_1^2 y_2^2 (y_1 + y_2)^2} [(y_1 - 1) y_2^2 \delta_{y_1 > 1} - (y_2 - 1) y_1^2 \delta_{y_2 > 1}]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2. Note that if y_1 or y_2 is close to 1, the variance v_n will increase rapidly and the LRT will become unstable.

Let α be the significance level. According to Theorem 2.1, the rejection region of the test problem (1) is denoted by

$$\{(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) : L < -v_n z_{\alpha/2} + p \cdot l_n + \mu_n + \log(1 - r_n) \text{ or } L > v_n z_{\alpha/2} + p \cdot l_n + \mu_n + \log(1 - r_n)\},$$

where z_α is the upper α quantile of the standard normal distribution, v_n , μ_n and l_n are defined in Theorem 2.1.

Remark 3. Note that the fourth moments are unknown in practical applications, and therefore, the estimates of the fourth moments are necessary. [21] obtained their consistent estimators by using the method of moments and RMT, more details may be found in the Theorem 2.7 in [21]

The proof of the Theorem 2.1 will be postponed in Appendix A.

3 Simulation study

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to illustrate the performance of the proposed modified LRT (referred to as the ML test in the following context), compared to the tests proposed by [18] (referred to as the HN test).

Assume that the random samples are generated from the following model:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} = \Sigma_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_t, \quad i = 1, \dots, N_t, \quad t = 1 \text{ and } 2,$$

where $\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} = (z_{i1}^{(t)}, \dots, z_{ip}^{(t)})'$ and $\{z_{ij}^{(t)}, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are i.i.d. real random variables from Gamma distribution $Gamma(4, 2) - 2$. Note that in the following simulations, we did not utilize the estimators $\hat{\beta}_i, i = 1, 2$, and we always assume that the fourth moments of the $\{z_{ij}^{(t)}\}_{j=1}^p$ are known. [21] has provided explanations and demonstrated that the performance of the estimators is remarkable based on the numerical results. For further details, we direct readers to [21].

For the mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ and the covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$, we consider two scenarios with respect to the random samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1}^{N_1}$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(2)}\}_{i=1}^{N_2}$:

- Model I: $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \mathbf{0}_p, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \text{diag}(p^2, 1, \dots, 1), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = (1 + a/n_1)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$, where the number of p^2 is equal to 1 and a is a constant, and $\mathbf{0}_p$ denotes the p -dimensional zero vector.
- Model II: $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = (1, p, \dots, p)'$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = (1, p + 1, \dots, p + 1)'$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \text{diag}(p^2, 1, \dots, 1)$, where the number of p and $p + 1$ is equal to $(p - 1)$, respectively.

In each case, we perform 10,000 independent replications to estimate the empirical sizes and the empirical powers of the proposed ML test and the HN test based on different values of (n_1, n_2, p) , respectively, and the nominal significance level of the tests was $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 1 displays the empirical sizes of the proposed ML test and the HN test under Model I with $a = 0$. In addition, Table 2 and Table 3 present the empirical powers of the HN test and the proposed ML test for the two alternative settings, respectively. We observe from Table 1 that under model I of Gamma distribution, the empirical sizes of the proposed ML test are closed to the significance level 0.05 when n_1, n_2, p increase. In contrast, the empirical sizes of the HN test are slightly higher than ours did. This reflects that the null distribution of the test statistic of the HN test can not be approximated its asymptotic distribution well in this case. The power results in table 2 showed the proposed ML test and the HN test had similar empirical power and were less affected by the increased dimensionality when $y_1 < 1, y_2 > 1$ or $y_1 > 1, y_2 < 1$, but the proposed ML test had quite good power compared with the HN test when $y_1 > 1, y_2 > 1$ or $y_1 < 1, y_2 < 1$. The powers under the second model reported in Table 3 increased much faster than those under the first model reported in Table 2 as the sample size and the dimension increased, which indicated that the proposed ML test is more sensitive than the HN test in our setting.

Fig.1-4 illustrate that the probability density curve of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$ is consistent with the histogram of the proposed ML test as p becomes larger. The red curve represents the standard normal distribution density curve. Figures 5-8 show the divergence of powers between the two test statistics, with the parameter a increasing, showing the trend from the empirical sizes to the empirical powers under Model I.




Fig. 1 The pictures show that for different n_1, n_2, p , that is when $y_1 > 1, y_2 > 1$, the probability density curve of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$ is consistent with the histogram of the proposed ML test as p becomes larger.

Table 1 Empirical sizes of the tests the proposed ML test and the HN test, based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma data under Model I with $a = 0$.

$y_1 > 1, y_2 > 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 40)	(50, 70, 80)	(100, 140, 160)	(200, 280, 320)
ML	0.0639	0.0566	0.0559	0.0496
HN	0.1335	0.1431	0.1384	0.1474
$y_1 > 1, y_2 < 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 30)	(50, 70, 60)	(100, 140, 120)	(200, 280, 240)
ML	0.0572	0.0573	0.0533	0.0526
HN	0.1375	0.146	0.1384	0.1461
$y_1 < 1, y_2 > 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(35, 25, 30)	(70, 50, 60)	(140, 100, 120)	(280, 200, 240)
ML	0.0694	0.063	0.0582	0.0498
HN	0.14	0.1383	0.1407	0.1399
$y_1 < 1, y_2 < 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 20)	(50, 70, 40)	(100, 140, 80)	(200, 280, 160)
ML	0.062	0.0549	0.0539	0.0543
HN	0.1313	0.138	0.1509	0.1501




Fig. 2 The pictures show that for different n_1, n_2, p , that is when $y_1 > 1, y_2 < 1$, the probability density curve of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$ is consistent with the histogram of the proposed ML test as p becomes larger.

4 Conclusions and discussions

This paper is concerned with the new modified LRT for simultaneous testing of equalities of mean vectors and covariance matrices in high-dimensional settings. We prove that the modified LRT converges in distribution to the normal distribution under the null hypothesis. Simulation results show that the performance of the modified LRT is remarkable under applicable conditions, especially in Model I (we may refer to as the unbounded spectral norm of the population covariance matrix).

In this paper, we consider the unstructured covariance matrix. However, various models with specific covariance structures naturally appear in the context of repeated measurements with high-dimensional data, such as first-order autoregressive (AR), moving average (MA),

Table 2 Empirical powers of the tests the proposed ML test and the HN test, based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma data under Model I

(n_1, n_2, p)		$a = 5$		$a = 10$		$a = 15$		$a = 20$	
		ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN
$y_1 > 1$	(25,35,40)	0.2271	0.1405	0.4884	0.1769	0.752	0.2478	0.9061	0.3066
$y_2 > 1$	(50,70,80)	0.2153	0.145	0.5129	0.1707	0.7863	0.2147	0.9416	0.2623
	(100,140,160)	0.2202	0.1423	0.5168	0.161	0.7954	0.1822	0.9514	0.2065
	(200,280,320)	0.2139	0.1491	0.5232	0.1586	0.8096	0.1759	0.9548	0.1916
(n_1, n_2, p)		$a = 5$		$a = 10$		$a = 15$		$a = 20$	
		ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN
$y_1 > 1$	(25,35,30)	0.1307	0.1407	0.2615	0.1845	0.4316	0.2358	0.6376	0.3104
$y_2 < 1$	(50,70,60)	0.1266	0.1454	0.2607	0.1742	0.4455	0.2102	0.6425	0.2619
	(100,140,120)	0.1229	0.14	0.2454	0.1559	0.4358	0.1859	0.6292	0.2173
	(200,280,240)	0.1255	0.1447	0.2467	0.1555	0.4287	0.1709	0.6146	0.1804
(n_1, n_2, p)		$a = 5$		$a = 10$		$a = 15$		$a = 20$	
		ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN
$y_1 < 1$	(35,25,30)	0.1124	0.1538	0.1463	0.2044	0.1843	0.2531	0.2121	0.3028
$y_2 > 1$	(70,50,60)	0.1018	0.1478	0.1557	0.1856	0.2116	0.2113	0.274	0.2437
	(140,100,120)	0.1017	0.1554	0.1575	0.1645	0.2372	0.1841	0.3074	0.1999
	(280,200,240)	0.102	0.1518	0.1587	0.1605	0.2419	0.1679	0.3519	0.1695
(n_1, n_2, p)		$a = 20$		$a = 40$		$a = 60$		$a = 80$	
		ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN	ML	HN
$y_1 < 1$	(25,35,20)	0.2594	0.3225	0.7719	0.6086	0.9825	0.8227	0.9998	0.9198
$y_2 < 1$	(50,70,40)	0.1628	0.2562	0.6072	0.5245	0.956	0.7605	0.9986	0.8929
	(100,140,80)	0.1115	0.221	0.3607	0.4123	0.7895	0.6354	0.9862	0.8
	(200,280,160)	0.0795	0.1867	0.1903	0.3043	0.4757	0.476	0.8164	0.652

compound symmetry (CS), and so on. It remains to be a theoretical interest to study simultaneous testing of mean vectors and covariance matrices under such structured covariance models. In addition, due to the lack of progress in RMT, we do not consider the asymptotic distribution of modified LRT under the alternative hypothesis in our current work. These will be continued for our future research.

Funding. Niu's research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (No. ZR2021QA077); Luo's research was supported by Statistical Research Project of Zhejiang Province (No. 22TJJD05); Bai's research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12271536), National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171198), and Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (No. 20210101147JC).

Declarations

Conflict of interest. On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Table 3 Empirical powers of the tests the proposed ML test and the HN test, based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma data under Model II

$y_1 > 1, y_2 > 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 40)	(50, 70, 80)	(100, 140, 160)	(200, 280, 320)
ML	0.8896	0.984	0.9985	0.9999
HN	0.1542	0.1525	0.1509	0.1558
$y_1 > 1, y_2 < 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 30)	(50, 70, 60)	(100, 140, 120)	(200, 280, 240)
ML	0.7217	0.9197	0.9868	0.9987
HN	0.165	0.1692	0.1605	0.1626
$y_1 < 1, y_2 > 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(35, 25, 30)	(70, 50, 60)	(140, 100, 120)	(280, 200, 240)
ML	0.7168	0.9146	0.985	0.999
HN	0.1545	0.1588	0.1687	0.1634
$y_1 < 1, y_2 < 1$ (n_1, n_2, p)	(25, 35, 20)	(50, 70, 40)	(100, 140, 80)	(200, 280, 160)
ML	0.8778	0.9897	0.9998	1
HN	0.1757	0.1736	0.1716	0.1684




Fig. 3 The pictures show that for different n_1, n_2, p , that is when $y_1 < 1, y_2 > 1$, the probability density curve of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$ is consistent with the histogram of the proposed ML test as p becomes larger.

Appendix A Proofs of the main results

In this section, we provide the proof of Theorem 2.1. We begin by enumerating key results from RMT, which will be useful for our proof.

Lemma 1. For any positive defined matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}'$ are invertible, we have

$$(\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}')^{-1} = \mathbf{W}^{-1} - \frac{\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}}{1 + \mathbf{q}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{q}},$$

$$\mathbf{q}'(\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}')^{-1} = \frac{\mathbf{q}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}}{1 + \mathbf{q}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{q}}.$$




Fig. 4 The pictures show that for different n_1, n_2, p , that is when $y_1 < 1, y_2 < 1$, the probability density curve of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$ is consistent with the histogram of the proposed ML test as p becomes larger .




Fig. 5 The empirical powers are estimated based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma variables and these results are based on the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ under Model I (note that our proposed test is abbreviated to L in the picture).

Lemma 2 (Theorem 2.1 in [21]). *To test the hypothesis $H_{0a} : \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ v.s. $H_{1a} : \Sigma_1 \neq \Sigma_2$, assuming that the conditions of Theorem 2.1 hold. Then under the null hypothesis H_{0a} ,*

$$\frac{ZH - p \cdot l_n - \mu_n}{\nu_n} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$




Fig. 6 The empirical powers are estimated based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma variables and these results are based on the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ under Model I (note that our proposed test is abbreviated to L in the picture).

where

$$ZH = \sum_{\lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} \in (0,1)} [c_1 \log \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} + c_2 \log(1 - \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n})],$$

l_n , μ_n and ν_n are defined in Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 3 (Lemma 5.3 in [22]). For $t = 1, 2$, let

$$\Delta^{(t)} = \frac{1}{n_t N_t} \sum_{j \neq k \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{z}_j^{(t)} (\mathbf{z}_k^{(t)})', \quad \mathbf{B}_t^{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{N_t} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{z}_j^{(t)} (\mathbf{z}_j^{(t)})', \quad \mathbf{A}_t(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{B}_t^{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z} \mathbf{I}_p.$$

After truncation and normalization, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_t^{-1}(\mathbf{z}) \Delta^{(t)})|^2 = \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{n_t N_t} \sum_{j \neq k \in \mathcal{U}} (\mathbf{z}_j^{(t)})' \mathbf{A}_t^{-1}(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{z}_k^{(t)} \right|^2 \leq KN_t^{-1}$$




Fig. 7 The empirical powers are estimated based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma variables and these results are based on the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ under Model I (note that our proposed test is abbreviated to L in the picture).

for every $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Especially for every $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_t^{-2}(z)\Delta^{(t)})|^2 = \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{1}{n_t N_t} \sum_{j \neq k \in \mathcal{U}} (\mathbf{z}_j^{(t)})' \mathbf{A}_t^{-2}(z) \mathbf{z}_k^{(t)}\right|^2 = O(N_t^{-1}), \quad \mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \dots, N_t\}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Recall the modified LRT statistic

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \sum_{\lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} \in (0,1)} [c_1 \log \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n} + c_2 \log(1 - \lambda_i^{\mathbf{B}_n})] - \log(1 + T_n) \\ &= ZH - \log(1 + T_n). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that the proof of Theorem 2.1 can be divided into two steps, one is to prove that ZH converges in distribution to a normal distribution, and the other is to prove that T_n converges in probability to a constant. Applying Lemma 2, we can obtain that

$$\frac{ZH - p \cdot l_n - \mu_n}{\nu_n} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$




Fig. 8 The empirical powers are estimated based on 10,000 replications with real Gamma variables and these results are based on the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ under Model I (note that our proposed test is abbreviated to L in the picture).

where l_n , μ_n and ν_n are defined in Theorem 2.1. Thus, it remains to prove that

$$T_n - \frac{r_n}{1 - r_n} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Write

$$T_n = \frac{n_1 n_2}{n} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})' (n_1 \mathbf{S}_1 + n_2 \mathbf{S}_2)^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{n_1 n_2}{n^2} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}) \\
&= \frac{n_1 n_2}{n^2} [(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - 2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} + (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_n = \frac{1}{n} (n_1 \mathbf{S}_1 + n_2 \mathbf{S}_2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)}) (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})'.$$

A.1 The limit of $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)}$

In this section, our aim is to prove that

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} - \frac{n}{N_t} \frac{r_n}{1 - r_n} \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad t = 1, 2. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Let

$$\mathbf{S}_{nt} = \mathbf{S}_n + \frac{N_t}{n} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})', \quad \mathbf{S}_{it} = \mathbf{S}_{nt} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})',$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N_t$, $t = 1, 2$. Therefore, from Lemma 1, we have

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} = \frac{(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)}}{1 - \frac{N_t}{n} (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)}}.$$

To prove (A2), we only need to prove that

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} - \frac{n}{N_t} r_n \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Applying $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} = N_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)} &= \left(\frac{1}{N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} \right)' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N_t} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{z}_j^{(t)} \right) \\
&= d_{n1} + d_{n2},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$d_{n1} = \frac{1}{N_t^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}, \quad d_{n2} = \frac{1}{N_t^2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_t} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_j^{(t)}.$$

Subsequently, it becomes necessary to evaluate the limits of d_{n1} and d_{n2} . As for d_{n1} , from Lemma 1, we conclude that

$$(\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} = \frac{(\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{it}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}}{1 + \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{it}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}}.$$

In addition, using the fact that by Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 in [23], for fixed $\kappa > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' (\mathbf{S}_{it} + \kappa \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \frac{p}{n} \cdot \Theta(r, \kappa) \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

where

$$\Theta(r, \kappa) = \frac{1 - \kappa m_F(-\kappa)}{1 - r(1 - \kappa m_F(-\kappa))},$$

$m_F(-\kappa)$ is a substitute for $m_F(z)$ by replacing parameter z with $-\kappa$, and $m_F(z)$ is the Stieltjes transform of the limiting spectral distribution (LSD) of \mathbf{S}_{it} . [24] have used $\hat{\Theta}_n(\kappa)$ to estimate $\Theta(r, \kappa)$ under normal distribution, where $\hat{\Theta}_n(\kappa)$ is substituted for $\Theta(r, \kappa)$ with the parameters r and $m_F(-\kappa)$ replaced by r_n and $m_{F_n}(-\kappa)$ respectively, and $m_{F_n}(-\kappa) = p^{-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{it} + \kappa \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}$. Finally, using Vitali's Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{it}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)} - \frac{r_n}{1 - r_n} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Note that because of $(\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' \mathbf{S}_{nt}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(t)}$ has the same distribution for every $i = 1, \dots, N_t$, thus

$$d_{n1} - \frac{n}{N_t} r_n \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Now we consider the second term d_{n2} . According to Lemma 3, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N_t^2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_t} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(t)})' (\mathbf{S}_{nt} + \kappa \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{z}_j^{(t)} \right|^2 \leq K N_t^{-1},$$

and using Vitali's Convergence Theorem again, we obtain

$$d_{n2} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Thus, the proof of (A2) is complete.

A.2 The limit of $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}$

In this section, our goal is to show that

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})' \mathbf{S}_n^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \tag{A3}$$

Let $\mathbf{S}_{n21} = \mathbf{S}_{n2} + n^{-1}N_1\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'$ and recalling the definition of $\mathbf{S}_{n2} = \mathbf{S}_n + n^{-1}N_2\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'$, using Lemma 1 again, we obtain

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_n^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} = \frac{(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_{n21}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}}{(1 - \frac{N_2}{n}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'\mathbf{S}_{n2}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})(1 - \frac{N_1}{n}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_{n21}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})}.$$

In the previous section, we have obtained the limit of $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})'\mathbf{S}_{n2}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}$. Similarly, the limit of $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_{n21}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)}$ can also be obtained, thus we need only consider the limit of $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_{n21}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}$. As in section A.1, we then write

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'(\mathbf{S}_{n21} + \kappa\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \mathbf{z}_i^{(1)}\right)'(\mathbf{S}_{n21} + \kappa\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \mathbf{z}_j^{(2)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)})'(\mathbf{S}_{n21} + \kappa\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}\mathbf{z}_j^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with Lemma 3, shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N_1} \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)})'(\mathbf{S}_{n21} + \kappa\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}\mathbf{z}_j^{(2)} \right|^2 \leq K(\sqrt{N_1N_2})^{-1}.$$

Then using Vitali's Convergence Theorem, it is easily seen that

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)})'\mathbf{S}_{n21}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

we have completed the proof of (A3).

Finally summarizing the above, the proof of (A1) is complete. □

References

- [1] Bai, Z.D., Saranadasa, H.: Effect of high dimension: by an example of a two sample problem. *Statist. Sinica* **6**(2), 311–329 (1996)
- [2] Chen, S.X., Qin, Y.L.: A two-sample test for high-dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *Ann. Statist.* **38**(2), 808–835 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS716>
- [3] Srivastava, M.S., Du, M.: A test for the mean vector with fewer observations than the dimension. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **99**(3), 386–402 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2006.11.002>

- [4] Bai, Z.D., Jiang, D.D., Yao, J.F., Zheng, S.R.: Corrections to LRT on large-dimensional covariance matrix by RMT. *Ann. Statist.* **37**(6B), 3822–3840 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS694>
- [5] Li, J., Chen, S.X.: Two sample tests for high-dimensional covariance matrices. *Ann. Statist.* **40**(2), 908–940 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS993>
- [6] Cai, T.T., Liu, W.D., Xia, Y.: Two-sample covariance matrix testing and support recovery in high-dimensional and sparse settings. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **108**(501), 265–277 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2012.758041>
- [7] Hu, J., Bai, Z.D.: A review of 20 years of naive tests of significance for high-dimensional mean vectors and covariance matrices. *Sci. China Math.* **59**(12), 2281–2300 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11425-016-0131-0>
- [8] Huang, Y., Li, C.C., Li, R.Z., Yang, S.S.: An overview of tests on high-dimensional means. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **188**, 104813–14 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2021.104813>
- [9] Anderson, T.W.: *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, 3rd edn. Wiley series in probability and statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, ??? (2003)
- [10] Jiang, T.F., Yang, F.: Central limit theorems for classical likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **41**(4), 2029–2074 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOS1134>
- [11] Jiang, T.F., Qi, Y.C.: Likelihood ratio tests for high-dimensional normal distributions. *Scand. J. Stat.* **42**(4), 988–1009 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjos.12147>
- [12] Chen, H., Jiang, T.: A study of two high-dimensional likelihood ratio tests under alternative hypotheses. *Random Matrices Theory Appl.* **7**(1), 1750016–23 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010326317500162>
- [13] Lim, J., Li, E.N., Lee, S.: Likelihood ratio tests of correlated multivariate samples. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **101**(3), 541–554 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2009.10.011>
- [14] Bai, Y.S., Zhang, Y.: The moderate deviation principles of likelihood ratio tests under alternative hypothesis. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 2350003 (2023)
- [15] Liu, Z.Y., Liu, B.S., Zheng, S.R., Shi, N.Z.: Simultaneous testing of mean vector and covariance matrix for high-dimensional data. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **188**, 82–93 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2017.03.009>
- [16] Niu, Z.Z., Hu, J., Bai, Z.D., Gao, W.: On LR simultaneous test of high-dimensional mean vector and covariance matrix under non-normality. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **145**, 338–344 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2018.10.008>
- [17] Cao, M.X., Sun, P., Park, J.: A simultaneous test of mean vector and covariance matrix

- in high-dimensional settings. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **212**, 141–152 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2020.09.003>
- [18] Hyodo, M., Nishiyama, T.: A simultaneous testing of the mean vector and the covariance matrix among two populations for high-dimensional data. *TEST* **27**(3), 680–699 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11749-017-0567-x>
- [19] Perlman, M.D.: Unbiasedness of the likelihood ratio tests for equality of several covariance matrices and equality of several multivariate normal populations. *Ann. Statist.* **8**(2), 247–263 (1980)
- [20] Bai, Z.D., Hu, J., Pan, G.M., Zhou, W.: Convergence of the empirical spectral distribution function of Beta matrices. *Bernoulli* **21**(3), 1538–1574 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.3150/14-BEJ613>
- [21] Zhang, Q.Y., Hu, J., Bai, Z.D.: Invariant test based on the modified correction to LRT for the equality of two high-dimensional covariance matrices. *Electron. J. Stat.* **13**(1), 850–881 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-ejs1542>
- [22] Zheng, S.R., Bai, Z.D., Yao, J.F.: Substitution principle for CLT of linear spectral statistics of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices with applications to hypothesis testing. *Ann. Statist.* **43**(2), 546–591 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1292>
- [23] Ha, G.-F., Zhang, Q., Bai, Z., Wang, Y.-G.: Ridgelized Hotelling’s T^2 test on mean vectors of large dimension. *Random Matrices Theory Appl.* **11**(1), 2250011–29 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010326322500113>
- [24] Chen, L.S., Paul, D., Prentice, R.L., Wang, P.: A regularized Hotelling’s T^2 test for pathway analysis in proteomic studies. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **106**(496), 1345–1360 (2011) <https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2011.ap10599>