

Test for high-dimensional linear hypothesis of mean vectors via random integration

Jianghao Li¹, Shizhe Hong², Zhenzhen Niu^{3*}, Zhidong Bai¹

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northeast Normal University, 5268 Peoples Road, Changchun, 130024, China.

²School of Statistics and Management, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, No. 777, Guoding Road, Shanghai, 200433, China.

³School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University, No.1 University Road, Science Park, Changqing District, Jinan, 250358, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): niuZZ@sdu.edu.cn;

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate hypothesis testing for the linear combination of mean vectors across multiple populations through the method of random integration. We have established the asymptotic distributions of the test statistics under both null and alternative hypotheses. Additionally, we provide a theoretical explanation for the special use of our test statistics in situations when the nonzero signal in the linear combination of the true mean vectors is weakly dense. Moreover, Monte-Carlo simulations are presented to evaluate the suggested test against existing high-dimensional tests. The findings from these simulations reveal that our test not only aligns with the performance of other tests in terms of size but also exhibits superior power.

Keywords: High-dimensional data; Linear hypothesis; Mean vector tests; U-statistics

Mathematics Subject Classification: 62H15 , 62E20

1 Introduction

High-dimensional data has grown more commonplace due to the quick development of data gathering and technological advancements, which are now present in many scientific fields, including finance, medicine, genomics, and other fields. The common characteristic of these

high-dimensional datasets is that their dimensions are much greater than the number of samples, referred to as “large p , small n ”. In such cases, traditional statistical techniques are either entirely useless or inapplicable. This has prompted statisticians to explore novel approaches to dealing with high-dimensional data, e.g., the widely used random matrix method to tackle large-dimensional multivariate statistical issues.

In recent years, the test for mean vectors under high-dimensional setting have been a very hot topic in the literature because of its important applications. Many scholars, including [1]; [2]; [3]; [4]; [5]; [6]; [7] and among others, are interested in the two-sample high-dimensional mean test problem. Besides the above two-sample test problem, the multi-sample test problem is also concerned by many researchers, see, e.g., [8] [9]; [10]; [11] and the references therein.

However, if we only test the equality of several high-dimensional mean vectors, that is, $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \dots = \boldsymbol{\mu}_q$, we may not effectively infer the differences between several populations. When the heteroscedastic one-way MANOVA test is rejected, the relationship between the mean vectors may exhibit the following scenarios: e.g., $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_3$ or $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - 3\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_3 = \mathbf{0}$. In fact, these scenarios can be generalized as making inferences on a linear combination of q mean vectors.

Suppose that random samples $\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{in_i}\} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ follows from the i -th populations with mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$, possibly unknown and unequal covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ among populations, $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$. Our primary interest is to test the following linear hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \text{not } H_0, \quad (1)$$

where β_1, \dots, β_q are given scalars. For the hypothesis testing in (1), [12] transformed the q samples into one sample by borrowing the successful idea from the multivariate Scheffé’s transformation [13] (also known as Bennett’s transformation [14]), then proposed a Dempster trace test. By transforming the samples using methods akin to [12], [15] presented a test statistic similar to the F-matrix by employing the advanced tools from *Random Matrix Theory*. Although Bennett’s transformation, which converts multi-sample Behrens-Fisher problems into one-sample testing problems, offers an alternative approach to making the original problem (1) be solved in a different way, Bennett’s transformation is widely recognized as a very flawed solution to the Behrens-Fisher problem in classical multivariate theory, owing to its notable loss in power.[16] proposed a test for multiple linear combinations of mean vectors with unequal covariance matrices, which generalizes the test problem (1). A U-statistic-based test for a general linear hypothesis testing issue under heteroscedasticity was obtained by [17]. In actuality, for this test problem (1), the test statistics given by [16] and [17] are essentially equivalent. Without requiring the common covariance matrix assumption, [18] extended the well-known Welch-Satterthwaite chi-squared approximation technique to the general linear hypothesis testing problem. Nevertheless, the existing literature for the hypothesis test (1) does not provide a solution when nonzero signals in the linear combination of the true mean vectors are more dense or weakly dense nonzero signals. Therefore, it makes sense to develop a new test procedure for high-dimensional data.

In this paper, with the aid of random integration, we present a weighted L_2 -norm-based test for the hypothesis (1) under moderate conditions. With adjustable parameter settings,

some existing tests, such as [3, 16, 17, 19], become special instances in our proposed framework. The newly proposed high-dimensional test for the hypothesis (1), is non-parametric and purposefully avoids defining an explicit relationship between the dimension p and the total sample size n . Furthermore, when nonzero signals in the linear combination of the true mean vectors are more dense or weaker dense, we demonstrate theoretically that the power of our newly proposed high-dimensional test behaves distinctively from certain existing tests for the hypothesis (1), such as [16] or [17], [18]. In addition, we also fully utilize numerical results in a variety of settings to support our main results.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows: Our test procedure for the hypothesis (1) as well as the asymptotic distribution of our test statistic are presented in Section 2.1 and 2.2. In Section 2.3, We explore the asymptotic power of our test and briefly discuss its power performance when the covariance matrix of several populations is identical. Extensive simulation studies are presented in Section 3. Finally, technical proofs of the main theorems are outlined in Appendix A.

2 Methodology and main results

2.1 Construction of the test statistic

We initiate the development of the test statistic for the hypothesis problem (1) by defining $\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \triangleq \boldsymbol{\mu}$. This definition transforms (1) into the following equivalent form:

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0}. \quad (2)$$

Denote $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \mathbf{x}_i$, where \mathbf{x}_i represents the i -th populations with mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ and covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} &\Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbb{E}\mathbf{x} = 0, \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x}) = 0, \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \end{aligned}$$

A novel non-parametric technique called ‘‘random integration’’ suggested by [19] turns the original issue (1) into a one-dimension issue by introducing a random weight vector and integrating on its distribution. Therefore, to quantify the variations of a linear combination of mean vectors of several populations, one can employ the random integration approach described in [19]. Accordingly, testing problem (2) can be further translated to determine whether

$$RI_w(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \int \mathbb{E}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x}) w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $w(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ represents any positive weighting function.

We deduce that $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $RI_w(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, as indicated by Equation (3). An explicit expression for evaluating (3) with a proper weight function w is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. Given that $w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^p w_i(\theta_i)$ with each $w_i(\cdot)$ being a density function with a mean α_i and variance ω_i^2 for $i = 1, \dots, p$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RI}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) &\triangleq \text{RI}_w(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\mu} + (\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha})^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top (\boldsymbol{\Omega} + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_p)^\top$, and

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1^2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_2^2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \omega_p^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In addition, we have $\text{RI}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, achieving equality if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \triangleq \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$.

For notational convenience, denote $\mathbf{W} = \boldsymbol{\Omega} + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top$. Again, the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ and the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ correspond to the i -th population \mathbf{x}_i , which is represented by the i -th sample \mathbf{x}_{ij} , $i = 1, \dots, q$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$. To test the hypothesis problem (1), the following test statistic is taken into consideration as an unbiased estimator of the target function $(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)$:

$$T_n = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2}) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2}). \quad (4)$$

Remark 2.2. The exact form obtained with “random integration” is essentially a weighted L_2 -norm test. The two-sample mean test, or $q = 2$, $\beta_1 = 1$, $\beta_2 = -1$, is a specific example of hypothesis (1). Following that, [19]’s test statistic is a particular instance of our test statistic. Specifically, when $\omega_i = 1$, $\alpha_i = 0$, the expression for test statistic T_n is reduced to U -statistics proposed by [3]; Similarly, the test statistics proposed by [16] or [17] for the linear hypothesis (1) are also included. In summary, the fact that it offers a unified framework with adjustable settings that makes it possible to include some of the current testing procedures is undoubtedly a benefit. In this article, for the sake of argument, we will confine ourselves to the case that $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p$, $0 < \omega_1 \leq \dots \leq \omega_p$.

Some straightforward calculations lead to

$$\mathbb{E}(T_n) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right),$$

and $\text{Var}(T_n) = \sigma_{n,q_1}^2 + \sigma_{n,q_2}^2$ with

$$\sigma_{n,q_1}^2 = 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)^2,$$

$$\sigma_{n,q_2}^2 = 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right) \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right).$$

The above results are postponed in the Appendix.

2.2 The asymptotic null distribution of T_n

To derive the asymptotic normality of our test statistic T_n , we impose a set of regular conditions. The key assumption is that the observations $\mathbf{x}_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, q, j = 1, \dots, n_i$ are generated from the following structure:

$$\mathbf{x}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{z}_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, q, j = 1, \dots, n_i, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i$ is a $p \times m$ matrix with $m \geq p$ such that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i^\top = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$, $\mathbf{z}_{ij} = (z_{ij1}, \dots, z_{ijm})^\top$ are $m \times 1$ independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors satisfying $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}_{ij}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{z}_{ij}) = \mathbf{I}_m$, where \mathbf{I}_m stands for the $m \times m$ identity matrix. This factor model structure is widely used in the literature, for instance [1]; [22] and the references therein. Additional assumptions are listed as follows:

Assumption A. The components of $\mathbf{z}_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, q, j = 1, \dots, n_i$ have uniformly bounded eighth moment, and satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell}) = 0, \mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell}^2) = 1, \mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell}^3) = \kappa_{3i} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell}^4) = \kappa_{4i} \quad (6)$$

for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Also, for positive integer v and ζ_ℓ such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^v \zeta_\ell \leq 8$,

$$\mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell_1}^{\zeta_1} \cdots z_{ij\ell_v}^{\zeta_v}) = \mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell_1}^{\zeta_1}) \cdots \mathbb{E}(z_{ij\ell_v}^{\zeta_v}), \quad (7)$$

whenever $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \neq \dots \neq \ell_v$.

Assumption B. The sample sizes $n_i, i = 1, \dots, q$ satisfy that $n_i/n \rightarrow k_i \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $n = \sum_{i=1}^q n_i$;

Assumption C.

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2} \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_3} \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_4}) = o \left[\text{tr}^2 \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right)^2 \right\} \right], \quad (8)$$

for $i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$;

Assumption D.

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right) \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) = o \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i_1, i_2}^q \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2}) \right). \quad (9)$$

The above assumptions can be viewed as extensions of those in [3] and [16]. Assumption A specifies the moment conditions and a pseudo-independence requirement for the components of \mathbf{z}_{ij} , which extends the case where $z_{ij\ell}$'s are i.i.d. with a bounded eighth moment.

Assumption B explains that each population has a certain proportion of sample sizes in the total. Assumption C can be seen as the multi-sample version of conditions (2.4) in [19], which is achievable through appropriate selection of \mathbf{W} . Theoretically, consider a simple case that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \cdots \leq \lambda_p$ and $\lambda_1^* \leq \lambda_2^* \cdots \leq \lambda_p^*$ are eigenvalues of \mathbf{W} and $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \cdots = \Sigma_q = \Sigma$, respectively, and assume that $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_p = \alpha$, $0 < \omega_1 \leq \cdots \leq \omega_p$. Then, (8) reduces to $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\Sigma)^4 = o[\text{tr}^2(\mathbf{W}\Sigma)^2]$, which holds when $\alpha^2 = O(p^{-3/4})$, $\text{tr}\Sigma^4 = o(\text{tr}^2\Sigma^2)$ and $p^{1/2}\lambda_p^{*2} = o(\text{tr}\Sigma^2)$. Assumption D is intended to establish the asymptotic normality of our suggested statistic under the local alternative hypothesis and evaluate the power performance of our proposed test, which will hold automatically when the null hypothesis is true. Furthermore, under Assumption D, it can be easily proved that $\text{Var}(T_n) = \sigma_{n,q_1}^2(1 + o(1))$, i.e., the variance of T_n is dominated by σ_{n,q_1}^2 . Therefore, we use $\sigma_{n,q}^2 \triangleq \sigma_{n,q_1}^2$ to denote the leading term of $\text{Var}(T_n)$.

The theorem presented below establishes the asymptotic normality of T_n .

Theorem 2.3. *Under Assumptions A-D, as $p, n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{T_n - \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i\right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i\right)}{\sigma_{n,q}} \xrightarrow{d} \text{N}(0, 1), \quad (10)$$

where \xrightarrow{d} means the convergence in distribution.

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is outlined in Appendix A.2. In particular, when the null hypothesis holds, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.4. *Under Assumptions A-D and $H_0 : \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i = \mathbf{0}$, as $p, n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{T_n}{\sigma_{n,q}} \xrightarrow{d} \text{N}(0, 1), \quad (11)$$

As the quantities $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\Sigma_{i_1}\mathbf{W}\Sigma_{i_2})$ and $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\Sigma_i)^2$ are unknown, it becomes necessary to employ their estimators that enjoy ratio consistency to formulate our test procedure based on T_n . The estimators proposed by [11] are utilized for this purpose, as they offer both consistency and computational efficiency, enabling an effective implementation of our testing approach. They are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{W}\Sigma_i})^2 \\ &= \frac{-1}{(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left((\mathbf{x}_{ij} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{ij} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \right)^2 + \frac{(n_i - 1)^2}{n_i(n_i - 3)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{S}_i)^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{(n_i - 1)}{n_i(n_i - 2)(n_i - 3)} \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{S}_i) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{W}\Sigma_{i_1}\mathbf{W}\Sigma_{i_2}}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{S}_{i_1}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{S}_{i_2}),$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ and \mathbf{S}_i stand for the sample mean vector and the sample covariance matrix of the i th group, respectively, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mathbf{x}_{ij}, \quad \mathbf{S}_i = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\mathbf{x}_{ij} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)(\mathbf{x}_{ij} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)^\top.$$

Hence, a ratio consistent estimator of $\sigma_{n,q}^2$ can be taken as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{n,q}^2 = 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \widehat{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \widehat{\Sigma}_{i_2}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \text{tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{W} \Sigma_i})^2.$$

Thus by Slutsky's theorem, we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 2.5. *Under Assumptions A-D, and $\mathbf{H}_0 : \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i = \mathbf{0}$ as $p, n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{T_n}{\hat{\sigma}_{n,q}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, 1), \quad (12)$$

According to Theorem 2.5, our proposed test rejects \mathbf{H}_0 if $T_n \geq \hat{\sigma}_{n,q} z_\vartheta$ for a given significance level ϑ , where z_ϑ is the upper- ϑ quantile of $\mathbf{N}(0, 1)$.

2.3 The power analysis

In this subsection, we delve into the power of the proposed test and undertake a preliminary analysis of our suggested statistic under the local alternative hypothesis. From Theorem 2.3, we can readily deduce the power of our test as follows:

$$\lim_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(T_n \geq \hat{\sigma}_{n,q} z_\vartheta) = \lim_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} \Phi \left\{ -z_\vartheta + \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)}{\sigma_{n,q}} \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal random variable. In order to simplify our analysis and underscore the strengths of our method, we assume that the q population covariance matrices are equal. In this scenario, the asymptotic power (13) will be transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(T_n \geq \hat{\sigma}_{n,q_1} z_\vartheta) \\ &= \lim_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} \Phi \left\{ -z_\vartheta + \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)}{\sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_1)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i (n_i - 1)}}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

With an understanding of the weight matrix \mathbf{W} , our next step involves deriving the lower bound for the expression in (14) by considering the case where $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p = \alpha$ and $0 < \omega_1 \leq \dots \leq \omega_p$. Let $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_p$ and $\lambda_1^* \leq \lambda_2^* \leq \dots \leq \lambda_p^*$ be eigenvalues of \mathbf{W} and

$\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \dots = \Sigma_q$, respectively. Then by calculating the characteristic function of \mathbf{W} , it can be found that $\omega_1^2 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \omega_2^2, \dots, \omega_{p-1}^2 \leq \lambda_{p-1} \leq \omega_p^2$, and $|\lambda_p - \omega_p^2| \leq \|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{\Omega}\| = p\alpha^2$. For the true mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$, we consider a scenario with weakly dense, yet non-trivial signals across the linear combination of these vectors:

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \triangleq \boldsymbol{\mu} = (\underbrace{v, \dots, v}_{p^\delta}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p^{1-\delta}})^\top,$$

that is, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ had p^δ nonzero entries of equal value. By noting that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\Sigma_1)^2 \leq \lambda_p^{*2} \text{tr} \mathbf{W}^2$, we can establish a lower bound such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)}{\sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}\Sigma_1)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i(n_i-1)}}} \\ & \geq \frac{\alpha^2 p^{2\delta} v^2 + v^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p^\delta} \omega_i^2}{\sqrt{(\lambda_p^*)^2 (\sum_{i=2}^p \omega_i^4 + \omega_p^4 + 2p\omega_p^2 \alpha^2 + p^2 \alpha^4)} \sqrt{\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i(n_i-1)}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.6. Assume $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \dots = \Sigma_q$, $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p = \alpha$ and $0 < \omega_1 \leq \dots \leq \omega_p < \infty$,

$\alpha^2 = O(p^{-3/4})$, $\lambda_p^* \sqrt{\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i(n_i-1)}} = o(v^2 p^{2\delta-1})$ and Assumptions A-D hold.

Then under $H_1 : \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \neq 0$, as $p, n \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic power of our proposed test is given by

$$\lim_{n, p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(T_n \geq \hat{\sigma}_{n, q_1} z_{\hat{\theta}}) = 1.$$

Corollary 2.6 indicates that for the asymptotic power of T_n to reach 1, a sufficient condition is $\delta > 1/2$, provided that the eigenvalues of Σ_1 are restricted away from 0 and

$v^2 = O\left(\sqrt{\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i(n_i-1)}}\right)$. This theoretically demonstrates that our statistic performs well under weakly dense signal situations. From another perspective, the suggested new test, with the exception of the strong sparse non-zero signals, may be unable to offer significant benefits when $\delta < 1/2$.

3 Simulation Studies

In this section, we conduct a series of numerical studies to evaluate the performance of our proposed test, denoted by T_L . To provide a comprehensive evaluation, we compare it against various testing procedures for linear hypotheses of mean vectors, including those introduced by [17] and [20], which are subsequently referenced as T_U and T_C , respectively. Notably, these two referenced methods represent the U-statistic and chi-square approximation

techniques. For simplicity, we set $q = 3$ first and assume the samples are generated from

$$\mathbf{x}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{ij}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, the linear coefficients β_i are set to be $\beta_1 = 2, \beta_2 = -2$ and $\beta_3 = -1$. The additional settings for our model are detailed as follows:

- (1) The covariance structures $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ are considered as the following two cases, representing the common and different covariance matrices, respectively:

Case 1. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 = \left(2 \times 0.4^{|i-j|}\right)_{i,j}$.

Case 2. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \left(0.5^{|i-j|} I_{(|i-j|\leq 1)}\right)_{i,j}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = 1.5\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 = 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$.

- (2) The elements of \mathbf{z}_{ij} are assumed to be independent and identically distributed, sourced from the following distributions:
- The standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$.
 - The standardized *Gamma*(4, 1) distribution.
 - The standardized *t*(5) distribution.
- (3) Under the null hypothesis, the mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ are chosen to be $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_3 = \mathbf{0}$. Conversely, for the alternative hypothesis, the mean vectors are considered as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = (\kappa, \dots, \kappa)^\top, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \left(\overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^{[p^{1-\rho}]}, \kappa, \dots, \kappa\right)^\top, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_3 = \left(\overbrace{\kappa, \dots, \kappa}^{[p^{1-\rho}]}, 0, \dots, 0\right)^\top,$$

where $[a]$ denotes the integer part of a . Such designs yield that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i = \left(\overbrace{\kappa, \dots, \kappa}^{[p^{1-\rho}]}, 0, \dots, 0\right)^\top$. Here, κ is selected to be $\sqrt{3r \log p (n_1^{-1} + n_2^{-1} + n_3^{-1})}$, with $r = 0.04, 0.08, 0.12$ to delineate the signal from weak to strong, and ρ is chosen to be 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4 to modulate the signal's sparsity.

- (4) The dimensional settings are established as $n_1 = 0.5n^*$, $n_2 = n^*$, $n_3 = 1.5n^*$ for $n^* = 80, 120$, and $p = 200, 400, 600$.
- (5) For the tuning parameter of our test, we adopt $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p = \sqrt{5}p^{-3/8}$ and $\omega_k = \sqrt{2}\left(1 + \frac{2k}{3p}\right)$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$.

Empirical sizes and powers at 0.05 significance level from 5000 independent replications are reported in Table 1-2 and 3-8, respectively. Results in Table 1-2 reveal that the test sizes are well-controlled around the 0.05 significance level across all methods, with disparities decreasing as n and p increase. For empirical powers, as depicted in Table 3-8, larger dimensions p and signal strength r exhibit higher powers for all the test methods, while all powers decrease with an increasing sparsity ρ . These findings confirm Corollary 2.6. However, our proposed test T_L showcases superior powers than the other two competitors, especially for lower ρ values, affirming its exceptional performance in detecting weakly dense linear combination signals.

Table 1 Empirical sizes for Case 1.

p	n^*	$N(0, 1)$			$\text{Gamma}(4, 1)$			$t(5)$		
		T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.059	0.059	0.054	0.062	0.057	0.051	0.063	0.059	0.050
	120	0.063	0.057	0.053	0.060	0.058	0.051	0.059	0.054	0.048
400	80	0.053	0.056	0.053	0.063	0.055	0.050	0.062	0.063	0.056
	120	0.058	0.055	0.052	0.058	0.055	0.052	0.061	0.058	0.052
600	80	0.057	0.057	0.054	0.057	0.056	0.051	0.057	0.057	0.053
	120	0.057	0.055	0.054	0.056	0.053	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.046

Table 2 Empirical sizes for Case 2.

p	n^*	$N(0, 1)$			$\text{Gamma}(4, 1)$			$t(5)$		
		T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.059	0.056	0.052	0.063	0.054	0.050	0.064	0.053	0.047
	120	0.056	0.057	0.050	0.061	0.057	0.050	0.062	0.057	0.048
400	80	0.063	0.063	0.057	0.058	0.054	0.050	0.059	0.055	0.048
	120	0.058	0.058	0.052	0.058	0.056	0.052	0.059	0.056	0.051
600	80	0.056	0.055	0.052	0.055	0.055	0.052	0.058	0.056	0.049
	120	0.049	0.051	0.048	0.054	0.054	0.051	0.056	0.050	0.045

Table 3 Empirical powers for Case 1 with $N(0, 1)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.348	0.137	0.128	0.166	0.097	0.090	0.104	0.088	0.080	0.081	0.078	0.071
		0.08	0.603	0.251	0.239	0.277	0.149	0.140	0.131	0.110	0.103	0.090	0.088	0.082
400	80	0.12	0.786	0.377	0.358	0.384	0.221	0.210	0.180	0.144	0.137	0.096	0.101	0.092
		0.04	0.554	0.184	0.173	0.220	0.114	0.108	0.109	0.092	0.087	0.070	0.068	0.065
600	80	0.08	0.877	0.399	0.391	0.395	0.208	0.202	0.156	0.127	0.119	0.091	0.082	0.077
		0.12	0.966	0.605	0.595	0.569	0.302	0.292	0.229	0.167	0.160	0.115	0.110	0.106
200	120	0.04	0.727	0.231	0.227	0.270	0.131	0.126	0.121	0.088	0.084	0.075	0.070	0.066
		0.08	0.957	0.522	0.512	0.500	0.255	0.246	0.184	0.130	0.125	0.093	0.089	0.085
400	120	0.12	0.997	0.770	0.763	0.696	0.388	0.379	0.260	0.184	0.179	0.118	0.113	0.108
		0.04	0.355	0.148	0.134	0.154	0.098	0.091	0.092	0.083	0.075	0.074	0.066	0.061
600	120	0.08	0.614	0.255	0.239	0.267	0.162	0.149	0.132	0.102	0.095	0.085	0.087	0.081
		0.12	0.791	0.396	0.379	0.376	0.219	0.207	0.177	0.149	0.141	0.100	0.106	0.098
200	120	0.04	0.560	0.190	0.183	0.217	0.114	0.107	0.110	0.091	0.086	0.075	0.069	0.064
		0.08	0.868	0.392	0.381	0.394	0.203	0.196	0.160	0.120	0.113	0.093	0.086	0.081
400	120	0.12	0.974	0.611	0.600	0.567	0.313	0.301	0.210	0.169	0.161	0.114	0.107	0.100
		0.04	0.719	0.225	0.214	0.264	0.133	0.127	0.113	0.088	0.085	0.078	0.073	0.070
600	120	0.08	0.961	0.495	0.484	0.484	0.247	0.237	0.179	0.139	0.133	0.092	0.092	0.089
		0.12	0.997	0.768	0.763	0.695	0.398	0.389	0.264	0.188	0.181	0.123	0.113	0.108

4 Conclusions and discussions

In this article, we propose a novel testing procedure for a linear combination of the mean vectors of several populations. Some of the existing tests are already included in our suggested framework, such as [3, 16, 17, 19]. According to our theoretical analysis and numerical results, the suggested test can have substantial power improvements in the presence of the weakly dense nonzero signal in the linear combination of the true mean vectors. Throughout this paper, we shall limit the case study in this article to the following: $0 < \omega_1 \leq \dots \leq \omega_p$, and

Table 4 Empirical powers for Case 1 with $\text{Gamma}(4, 1)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.342	0.140	0.130	0.165	0.097	0.086	0.089	0.075	0.067	0.080	0.069	0.063
		0.08	0.615	0.255	0.239	0.271	0.160	0.147	0.127	0.108	0.098	0.086	0.085	0.074
		0.12	0.783	0.386	0.370	0.388	0.227	0.216	0.171	0.139	0.128	0.102	0.104	0.096
400	80	0.04	0.575	0.190	0.177	0.219	0.121	0.113	0.107	0.086	0.080	0.070	0.071	0.067
		0.08	0.876	0.396	0.380	0.398	0.210	0.199	0.162	0.123	0.114	0.103	0.089	0.084
		0.12	0.972	0.601	0.586	0.563	0.306	0.293	0.230	0.174	0.163	0.103	0.106	0.100
600	80	0.04	0.709	0.224	0.213	0.277	0.138	0.130	0.121	0.095	0.089	0.076	0.070	0.065
		0.08	0.955	0.493	0.483	0.505	0.246	0.235	0.193	0.131	0.124	0.095	0.090	0.084
		0.12	0.996	0.761	0.752	0.701	0.393	0.380	0.262	0.194	0.185	0.113	0.119	0.113
200	120	0.04	0.346	0.134	0.123	0.167	0.097	0.088	0.096	0.078	0.071	0.070	0.068	0.061
		0.08	0.620	0.247	0.231	0.280	0.155	0.141	0.136	0.110	0.101	0.086	0.082	0.074
		0.12	0.788	0.382	0.364	0.385	0.226	0.211	0.177	0.145	0.133	0.100	0.102	0.092
400	120	0.04	0.562	0.187	0.176	0.226	0.121	0.114	0.104	0.086	0.080	0.072	0.071	0.065
		0.08	0.857	0.387	0.372	0.400	0.200	0.188	0.156	0.119	0.110	0.092	0.092	0.085
		0.12	0.977	0.616	0.600	0.559	0.307	0.295	0.237	0.173	0.165	0.116	0.105	0.098
600	120	0.04	0.715	0.231	0.220	0.267	0.123	0.118	0.115	0.095	0.088	0.082	0.078	0.072
		0.08	0.959	0.518	0.503	0.504	0.255	0.247	0.192	0.129	0.121	0.096	0.089	0.081
		0.12	0.996	0.770	0.758	0.689	0.387	0.376	0.262	0.194	0.184	0.125	0.117	0.112

Table 5 Empirical powers for Case 1 with $t(5)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.349	0.138	0.125	0.165	0.108	0.093	0.101	0.079	0.070	0.081	0.070	0.059
		0.08	0.615	0.255	0.234	0.261	0.159	0.143	0.138	0.106	0.096	0.091	0.088	0.078
		0.12	0.789	0.390	0.364	0.387	0.222	0.204	0.175	0.135	0.122	0.109	0.110	0.097
400	80	0.04	0.569	0.190	0.172	0.217	0.114	0.101	0.106	0.087	0.077	0.070	0.073	0.065
		0.08	0.864	0.395	0.372	0.398	0.203	0.186	0.166	0.123	0.109	0.088	0.090	0.080
		0.12	0.968	0.612	0.586	0.565	0.309	0.289	0.231	0.173	0.158	0.118	0.114	0.102
600	80	0.04	0.719	0.239	0.223	0.266	0.133	0.123	0.115	0.089	0.081	0.076	0.074	0.066
		0.08	0.956	0.517	0.494	0.489	0.239	0.221	0.194	0.143	0.132	0.098	0.094	0.086
		0.12	0.997	0.760	0.742	0.695	0.385	0.367	0.263	0.202	0.186	0.115	0.107	0.098
200	120	0.04	0.341	0.141	0.127	0.163	0.098	0.086	0.099	0.087	0.076	0.074	0.068	0.059
		0.08	0.613	0.254	0.233	0.261	0.150	0.137	0.133	0.104	0.093	0.089	0.091	0.081
		0.12	0.791	0.396	0.368	0.386	0.227	0.208	0.168	0.135	0.124	0.100	0.106	0.094
400	120	0.04	0.549	0.179	0.167	0.214	0.121	0.109	0.107	0.078	0.071	0.070	0.066	0.059
		0.08	0.872	0.385	0.364	0.403	0.204	0.189	0.158	0.123	0.113	0.090	0.087	0.079
		0.12	0.967	0.614	0.594	0.568	0.317	0.296	0.234	0.181	0.167	0.112	0.111	0.104
600	120	0.04	0.723	0.232	0.218	0.267	0.128	0.119	0.123	0.091	0.083	0.081	0.074	0.067
		0.08	0.959	0.508	0.489	0.487	0.239	0.223	0.184	0.139	0.130	0.100	0.089	0.081
		0.12	0.996	0.760	0.747	0.682	0.383	0.364	0.266	0.200	0.186	0.122	0.116	0.106

$\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p$. Certainly, it would be interesting to explore other weighting function alternatives. To conclude the article, an intriguing potential future expansion is described below: First, in the case when the sample sizes is fixed but the data dimension is divergent, we might reconsider the original problem (1), see, e.g., [21]. Second, it is also interesting to consider the more general linear hypothesis testing problem: $H_0 : \mathbf{GM} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{M} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_q)^\top$ is a $q \times p$ matrix consisting of the q mean vectors, and \mathbf{M} is a $r \times q$ known coefficient matrix. More endeavors in this regard are required.

Funding. Bai's research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12271536, No. 12171198), and Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (No. 20210101147JC).

Table 6 Empirical powers for Case 2 with $N(0, 1)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.547	0.197	0.183	0.248	0.126	0.118	0.119	0.095	0.086	0.075	0.075	0.070
		0.08	0.858	0.420	0.405	0.435	0.236	0.222	0.198	0.147	0.135	0.123	0.105	0.098
		0.12	0.962	0.631	0.616	0.624	0.363	0.345	0.271	0.207	0.197	0.135	0.138	0.127
400	80	0.04	0.814	0.303	0.292	0.346	0.163	0.155	0.146	0.107	0.102	0.087	0.080	0.074
		0.08	0.987	0.647	0.635	0.636	0.337	0.327	0.258	0.186	0.178	0.116	0.105	0.099
		0.12	1.000	0.889	0.882	0.844	0.541	0.528	0.365	0.259	0.249	0.146	0.138	0.130
600	80	0.04	0.931	0.388	0.377	0.422	0.181	0.175	0.159	0.119	0.112	0.093	0.085	0.081
		0.08	0.999	0.813	0.805	0.759	0.419	0.408	0.293	0.204	0.200	0.118	0.114	0.108
		0.12	1.000	0.970	0.969	0.926	0.653	0.644	0.432	0.316	0.306	0.166	0.152	0.146
200	120	0.04	0.557	0.198	0.183	0.244	0.133	0.123	0.118	0.093	0.085	0.089	0.076	0.069
		0.08	0.862	0.427	0.407	0.438	0.232	0.219	0.197	0.146	0.133	0.110	0.103	0.094
		0.12	0.965	0.640	0.622	0.614	0.352	0.336	0.275	0.205	0.192	0.141	0.136	0.124
400	120	0.04	0.824	0.301	0.291	0.332	0.162	0.153	0.144	0.111	0.104	0.090	0.083	0.078
		0.08	0.988	0.657	0.643	0.638	0.335	0.318	0.245	0.172	0.162	0.116	0.107	0.101
		0.12	0.999	0.886	0.879	0.834	0.532	0.520	0.357	0.262	0.249	0.157	0.154	0.146
600	120	0.04	0.929	0.386	0.374	0.439	0.196	0.187	0.166	0.118	0.111	0.087	0.078	0.074
		0.08	0.999	0.821	0.811	0.763	0.413	0.400	0.297	0.209	0.202	0.113	0.109	0.103
		0.12	1.000	0.969	0.966	0.921	0.662	0.650	0.422	0.313	0.303	0.164	0.155	0.148

Table 7 Empirical powers for Case 2 with $\text{Gamma}(4, 1)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.538	0.200	0.184	0.237	0.131	0.119	0.124	0.089	0.079	0.083	0.076	0.067
		0.08	0.859	0.425	0.403	0.443	0.234	0.217	0.196	0.145	0.131	0.105	0.107	0.098
		0.12	0.969	0.648	0.626	0.625	0.371	0.348	0.276	0.212	0.195	0.140	0.135	0.123
400	80	0.04	0.815	0.299	0.285	0.355	0.170	0.160	0.143	0.109	0.100	0.082	0.084	0.075
		0.08	0.986	0.648	0.634	0.641	0.346	0.331	0.242	0.173	0.162	0.113	0.110	0.101
		0.12	1.000	0.890	0.883	0.833	0.534	0.515	0.361	0.259	0.246	0.151	0.147	0.139
600	80	0.04	0.930	0.375	0.361	0.431	0.187	0.180	0.165	0.121	0.115	0.089	0.084	0.079
		0.08	0.999	0.814	0.803	0.755	0.399	0.384	0.287	0.203	0.194	0.117	0.115	0.108
		0.12	1.000	0.976	0.974	0.921	0.655	0.643	0.429	0.311	0.299	0.159	0.155	0.147
200	120	0.04	0.559	0.205	0.189	0.227	0.122	0.107	0.117	0.089	0.079	0.087	0.077	0.070
		0.08	0.851	0.416	0.392	0.440	0.238	0.222	0.183	0.146	0.133	0.102	0.110	0.100
		0.12	0.964	0.647	0.627	0.627	0.361	0.339	0.264	0.204	0.186	0.140	0.130	0.120
400	120	0.04	0.820	0.296	0.286	0.350	0.162	0.154	0.144	0.105	0.095	0.082	0.086	0.076
		0.08	0.988	0.661	0.647	0.639	0.339	0.322	0.253	0.171	0.160	0.123	0.107	0.099
		0.12	1.000	0.890	0.882	0.829	0.528	0.512	0.346	0.256	0.242	0.152	0.144	0.135
600	120	0.04	0.930	0.392	0.379	0.430	0.189	0.181	0.165	0.116	0.111	0.087	0.084	0.077
		0.08	0.998	0.813	0.802	0.770	0.432	0.419	0.291	0.206	0.197	0.119	0.114	0.107
		0.12	1.000	0.969	0.965	0.923	0.659	0.649	0.424	0.317	0.305	0.163	0.160	0.151

Declarations

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

Table 8 Empirical powers for Case 2 with $t(5)$ distributed \mathbf{z}_{ij} .

p	n^*	r	$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$			$\rho = 0.3$			$\rho = 0.4$		
			T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C	T_L	T_U	T_C
200	80	0.04	0.569	0.201	0.181	0.241	0.129	0.115	0.125	0.096	0.085	0.075	0.071	0.063
		0.08	0.858	0.421	0.395	0.434	0.223	0.203	0.200	0.145	0.130	0.105	0.104	0.092
		0.12	0.970	0.638	0.613	0.620	0.367	0.343	0.261	0.203	0.182	0.135	0.129	0.116
400	80	0.04	0.819	0.292	0.270	0.350	0.163	0.149	0.150	0.109	0.099	0.096	0.082	0.073
		0.08	0.986	0.666	0.644	0.640	0.330	0.310	0.250	0.173	0.159	0.115	0.108	0.098
		0.12	1.000	0.888	0.876	0.830	0.532	0.508	0.361	0.258	0.239	0.162	0.154	0.138
600	80	0.04	0.931	0.392	0.371	0.429	0.188	0.175	0.167	0.118	0.108	0.087	0.076	0.068
		0.08	1.000	0.813	0.801	0.755	0.417	0.403	0.290	0.196	0.183	0.120	0.110	0.100
		0.12	1.000	0.977	0.975	0.922	0.658	0.640	0.435	0.323	0.302	0.167	0.168	0.153
200	120	0.04	0.564	0.206	0.185	0.230	0.125	0.112	0.121	0.094	0.084	0.082	0.073	0.065
		0.08	0.865	0.423	0.396	0.450	0.238	0.220	0.197	0.145	0.129	0.108	0.099	0.091
		0.12	0.968	0.644	0.622	0.626	0.370	0.347	0.267	0.207	0.189	0.143	0.134	0.118
400	120	0.04	0.816	0.306	0.287	0.348	0.160	0.147	0.148	0.107	0.095	0.074	0.077	0.069
		0.08	0.985	0.662	0.645	0.633	0.337	0.320	0.241	0.174	0.163	0.119	0.112	0.101
		0.12	0.999	0.889	0.881	0.831	0.535	0.516	0.354	0.270	0.251	0.155	0.148	0.138
600	120	0.04	0.930	0.387	0.369	0.430	0.189	0.176	0.150	0.103	0.096	0.086	0.081	0.072
		0.08	0.999	0.804	0.794	0.756	0.414	0.396	0.294	0.209	0.194	0.129	0.115	0.107
		0.12	1.000	0.976	0.973	0.916	0.655	0.640	0.432	0.318	0.301	0.166	0.163	0.153

Appendix A Proofs of main results

A.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1

Assume that $\check{\mathbf{x}}$ is independent copies of \mathbf{x} , we have by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{RI}_w(\mathbf{x}) &= \int \mathbb{E}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x}) w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
 &= \int \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \check{\mathbf{x}}) w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
 &= \int \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \check{\mathbf{x}}) w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int (\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{x} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \check{\mathbf{x}}) w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \right\} \\
 &= \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\mu} + (\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha})^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Write

$$T_n = T_{n1} + T_{n2} \tag{A1}$$

where

$$T_{n1} = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2})$$

and

$$T_{n2} = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{ij_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_{ij_2}).$$

It is very easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(T_n) &= \mathbb{E}(T_{n1}) + \mathbb{E}(T_{n2}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{ij_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{ij_2}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the variance of T_n , we decompose it into

$$\text{Var}(T_n) = \text{Var}(T_{n1}) + \text{Var}(T_{n2}) + 2 \text{Cov}(T_{n1}, T_{n2}),$$

and calculate each term. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var}(T_{n1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \sum_{i_3 \neq i_4} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_4}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2} n_{i_3} n_{i_4}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \sum_{j_3, j_4} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_3 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_4 j_4} \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3 \neq i_4} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_4} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_4} + 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}^2 n_{i_3}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \sum_{j_3, j_4} \mathbb{E} \left((\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_3 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4} \left. \right) + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1}^2 n_{i_2}^2} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \sum_{j_3, j_4} \mathbb{E} \left((\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4} \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3 \neq i_4} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_4} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_4} + 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}^2 n_{i_3}} \sum_{j_1, j_3} \left(\sum_{j_2 \neq j_4} + \sum_{j_2 = j_4} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left((\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} (\mathbf{x}_{i_3 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4} \right) + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1}^2 n_{i_2}^2} \sum_{j_2, j_4} \sum_{j_1, j_3} \mathbb{E} \left((\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_3} \right) \\
& - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3 \neq i_4} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_4} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3}^\top \mu_{i_4} + 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2} \left(\mu_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_1} \mu_{i_3}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3} \right) + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}) + \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} + \right. \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_1} + \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \mu_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right) - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3 \neq i_4} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_4} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3}^\top \mu_{i_4} + 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2} \mu_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_1} \mu_{i_3}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} + 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2} \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3} \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_1} + \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \mu_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right) + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}) \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right)^2 \\
& = 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \beta_{i_2} \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3} + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_1} + \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \mu_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_2} \right) \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}) \\
& = 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \sum_{i_3 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3} \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \mu_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \mu_{i_3} + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}). \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}(T_{n2}) \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^q \sum_{i_2=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1) n_{i_2} (n_{i_2} - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4} \right) \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_i^\top \mathbf{W} \mu_i \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1) n_{i_2} (n_{i_2} - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4} \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1}^4}{n_{i_1}^2 (n_{i_1} - 1)^2} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_4} \\
& - \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2}^q \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1}^4}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1)} (2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + \\
& \quad (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^2 + \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1})^2) + 4 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1}^4 (n_{i_1} - 2)}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1)} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^2) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1}^4 (n_{i_1} - 2)(n_{i_1} - 3)}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1)} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{i_2=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + 4 \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^4 \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^4 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1})^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^2 \\
& = 4 \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^4 \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^4 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} (n_{i_1} - 1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1})^2, \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov}(T_{n_1}, T_{n_2}) \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2}^q \sum_{i_3=1}^q \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \beta_{i_3}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2} n_{i_3} (n_{i_3} - 1)} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_3 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_3 j_4} \right) \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 = i_3} \frac{\beta_{i_2}^3 \beta_{i_1}}{n_{i_2}^2 (n_{i_2} - 1) n_{i_1}} \sum_{j_1} \left(\sum_{j_2 = j_3 \neq j_4} + \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4 = j_2} + \sum_{j_2 \neq j_3 \neq j_4} \right) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_4} \\
& \quad + \sum_{i_3 = i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^3 \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1}^2 (n_{i_1} - 1) n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_2} \left(\sum_{j_1 = j_3 \neq j_4} + \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4 = j_1} + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_3 \neq j_4} \right) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_3})^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_4} \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_2}^3 \beta_{i_1} \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + \frac{2}{n_{i_2}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^3 \beta_{i_2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + \frac{2}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) - \left(\sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_2}^3 \beta_{i_1} \left(\frac{2}{n_{i_2}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^3 \beta_{i_2} \left(\frac{2}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right) \\
& = 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^3 \beta_{i_2} \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}, \tag{A4}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from (A2)-(A4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(T_n) & = 4 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \sum_{i_3 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}^2 \beta_{i_3} \frac{1}{n_{i_2}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_3} + 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2 \frac{1}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2}) \\
& \quad + 4 \sum_{i_1=1}^q \beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_1}^2 \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i^4 \frac{1}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)^2 \\
& \quad + 8 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1}^3 \beta_{i_2} \frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \\
& \triangleq \sigma_{n, q_1}^2 + \sigma_{n, q_2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sigma_{n, q_1}^2 = 2 \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1}^2 \beta_{i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i_2}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)^2$$

and

$$\sigma_{n, q_2}^2 = 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right) \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n & = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2}) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2}) \\
& = \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}) + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \\
&\quad + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \left[(\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \\
&\quad \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \left[(\mathbf{x}_{i j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i) \right] \\
&= \tilde{T}_n + \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{T}_n &= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \left[(\mathbf{x}_{i_1 j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1})^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i_2 j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}) \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \left[(\mathbf{x}_{i j_1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i + \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}_{i j_2} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2} \mathbf{z}_{i_2 j_2}) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i (n_i - 1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{z}_{i j_1})^\top \mathbf{W} (\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{z}_{i j_2}) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^q \beta_{i_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^q \frac{2\beta_{i_1}}{n_{i_1}} \sum_{j_1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{\tilde{T}_n}{\sigma_{n, q_1}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, 1).$$

For convenience, define $\mathbf{y}_{t+\sum_{i=1}^l n_i} = \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{z}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$, with $\sum_{i=1}^0 n_i = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{st} &= \begin{cases} \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t & s, t \in \Lambda_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, q \\ \frac{\beta_i \beta_l}{n_i n_l} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t, & (s, t) \in \Lambda_i \times \Lambda_l, 1 \leq i < l \leq q \end{cases} \\
\psi_t &= \frac{1}{n_i} \beta_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t,
\end{aligned}$$

where $t \in \Lambda_i = \{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j + 1, \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j + 2, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^i n_j\}$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$. In addition, we denote c_{st} as the coefficient of φ_{st} , and if $t \in \Lambda_i$, $\tilde{\Sigma}_t = \Sigma_i$.

In what follows, we begin to construct square integrable martingale sequence. Denote $V_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} + \psi_t$, and $G_m = \sum_{t=1}^m V_t$, and $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t\}$ which is the σ -field generated by $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t\}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{T}_n &= \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\Gamma_i \mathbf{z}_{ij_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\Gamma_i \mathbf{z}_{ij_2}) + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\Gamma_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\Gamma_{i_2} \mathbf{z}_{i_2 j_2}) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i_1 i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1}} \sum_{j_1}^{n_{i_1}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{W}(\Gamma_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i(n_i-1)} 2 \sum_{j_1 < j_2} (\Gamma_i \mathbf{z}_{ij_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\Gamma_i \mathbf{z}_{ij_2}) + 2 \sum_{i_1 < i_2} \frac{\beta_{i_1} \beta_{i_2}}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\Gamma_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1})^\top \mathbf{W}(\Gamma_{i_2} \mathbf{z}_{i_2 j_2}) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i_1} \beta_{i_1} \sum_{j_1} \left(\sum_{i_2} \beta_{i_2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i_2} \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n_{i_1}} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \Gamma_{i_1} \mathbf{z}_{i_1 j_1} \right) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t=1+\sum_{m=1}^{i-1} n_m}^{\sum_{m=1}^i n_m} \sum_{s=1+\sum_{m=1}^{i-1} n_m}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \sum_{l=i+1}^q \sum_{s=1+\sum_{m=1}^{i-1} n_m}^{\sum_{m=1}^i n_m} \sum_{t=1+\sum_{m=1}^{l-1} n_m}^{\sum_{m=1}^l n_m} \phi_{st} + 2 \sum_i \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \psi_t \\
&= 2 \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} \right) + 2 \sum_{t=1}^n \psi_t \\
&= 2 \sum_{t=1}^n V_t.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to prove our main results, the following two lemmas are given.

Lemma A.1. For each n , $\{G_m, \mathcal{F}_m\}_{m=1}^n$ is the sequence of zero mean and a square integrable martingale.

Proof. By the definition of the martingale, it is obvious that $\mathcal{F}_{m-1} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_m$, for any $1 \leq m \leq n$ and G_m is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_m . In addition, note that

$$\mathbb{E}(V_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}) = 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}G_m^2 \leq \text{Var}(\tilde{T}_n)$$

Next, we only need to show that $\{G_m\}$ is a martingale, that is, $\mathbb{E}(G_r | \mathcal{F}_m) = G_m$ for any $r \geq m$. Note that $\mathbb{E}(V_\ell | \mathcal{F}_m) = 0, \forall \ell > m$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}(G_r | \mathcal{F}_m) = G_m + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^r \mathbb{E}(V_\ell | \mathcal{F}_m) = G_m.$$

□

Lemma A.2. Under Assumption A-D, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$, it gets

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(V_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})}{\text{Var}(T_n)} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{4} \quad (\text{A5})$$

and

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(V_t^2 I(|V_t| > \varepsilon \sqrt{\text{Var}(T_n)}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})}{\text{Var}(T_n)} \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where \xrightarrow{p} means convergence in probability.

Proof. Denote

$$\zeta_n = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(V_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \mathbb{E}(V_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}).$$

To begin with, for $t \in \Lambda_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(V_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} \right)^2 + (\psi_t)^2 + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} \psi_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{s_1 t} \varphi_{s_2 t} + \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &= \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \mathbf{y}_{s_2} + \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top) \mathbf{y}_{s_2} + \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_t \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} + \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)$$

Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\zeta_n) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} + \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left(c_{s_1 t}^2 \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i < l} \frac{\beta_i^2 \beta_l^2}{n_i n_l} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l) + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^4}{2n_i(n_i-1)} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \right) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \text{Var } T_n. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we split the term $\mathbb{E}(\zeta_n^2)$ into six term, and analyze them one by one.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\zeta_n^2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} + \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right]^2 \\ &=: K_1 + K_2 + 4K_3 + 2K_4 + 4K_5 + 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

After tedious calculations, we can get the following results:

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \sum_{t_1, t_2}^n \sum_{s_1, s_2}^{t_1-1} \sum_{s_3, s_4}^{t_2-1} c_{s_1 t_1} c_{s_2 t_1} c_{s_3 t_2} c_{s_4 t_2} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_2} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_4} \\ &= \sum_{t_1 \neq t_2}^n \sum_{s_1=s_2}^{t_1-1} \sum_{s_3=s_4}^{t_2-1} c_{s_1 t_1}^2 c_{s_3 t_2}^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_2} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t_1=t_2}^n \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4}^{t_1-1} c_{s_1 t_1} c_{s_2 t_1} c_{s_3 t_1} c_{s_4 t_1} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_4} \\ &= \sum_{i \neq l}^q \left(\sum_{t_1 \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_1}^{t_1-1} c_{s_1 t_1}^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \right) \left(\sum_{t_2 \in \Lambda_l} \sum_{s_3}^{t_2-1} c_{s_3 t_2}^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_2} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_2=s_1 \neq s_3=s_4}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t}^2 c_{s_3 t}^2 \left(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \right) \left(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_3=s_1 \neq s_2=s_4}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t_1}^2 c_{s_2 t_1}^2 \left(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \right) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{s t}^4 \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_s \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_s \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{16} \sigma_{n,q_1}^4 (1 + o(1)) + O(n^{-4}) \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3}^q \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_3} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_3}) \\
& + O(n^{-5}) \left(\sum_{i_1, i_2}^q \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}) + \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4}^q \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_1} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_2}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_3} \mathbf{W} \Sigma_{i_4}) \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{16} \sigma_{n,q_1}^4 (1 + o(1)) + o(\text{Var}^2(T_n)), \tag{A8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$K_2 = \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i} \Sigma_i \right) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right]^2 = \frac{1}{16} \sigma_{n,q_2}^4, \tag{A9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3 & = \sum_{i_1, i_2}^n \sum_{s_1}^{t_1-1} \sum_{s_2}^{t_2-1} c_{s_1 t_1} c_{s_2 t_2} \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \right) \\
& = O(n^{-6}) \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_s^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_s \right) \\
& = O(n^{-4}) \sum_{l \leq i}^q \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& = O(n^{-4}) \sum_{l \leq i}^q \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} (\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W}^{1/2}) (\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W}^{1/2}) (\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W}^{1/2}) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& \leq O(n^{-4}) \sum_{l \leq i}^q \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l) \\
& \leq O(n^{-4}) \sum_{l \leq i}^q \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_l \mathbf{W} \Sigma_l) \\
& = o(\text{Var}^2(T_n)). \tag{A10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_4 & = \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left(c_{s_1 t} c_{s_2 t} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \right) \right) \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i} \Sigma_i \right) \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{16} \sigma_{n,q_1}^2 \sigma_{n,q_2}^2. \tag{A11}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_5 &= \sum_{t_1, t_2}^n \sum_{s_1, s_2}^{t_1-1} \sum_{s_3}^{t_2-1} c_{s_1 t_1} c_{s_2 t_1} c_{s_3 t_2} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_2} \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{t_1=t_2}^n \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3}^{t_1-1} c_{s_1 t_1} c_{s_2 t_1} c_{s_3 t_1} \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_3}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{t_1=t_2}^n \sum_{s_1}^{t_1-1} c_{s_1 t_1}^3 \frac{\beta_i}{n_i} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right) \\
&= O(n^{-7}) \sum_{t_1}^n \sum_{s_1}^{t_1-1} \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{t_1} \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right)^2 \\
&= O(n^{-5}) \mathbf{1}^\top \text{diag} \left(\Gamma_1^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \Gamma_1 \right) \Gamma_1^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \\
&\leq O(n^{-5}) \left(\mathbf{1}^\top \text{diag}^2 \left(\Gamma_1^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \Gamma_1 \right) \mathbf{1} \right)^{1/2} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \Sigma_1 \mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq O(n^{-5}) \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \Sigma_1 \right) \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \Sigma_1 \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{W} \Sigma_2 \mathbf{W} \Sigma_1 \right) \right)^{1/2} \\
&= o \left(\text{Var}^2 (T_n) \right) \tag{A12}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the identity $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} u_1^3 a_{ii} c_{ii} r_i + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E} u_1^3 a_{ij} u_{ij} r_j = \mathbb{E} u_1^3 \cdot \mathbf{1}^\top \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}) \mathbf{C} \mathbf{r}$, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)^\top$ is a random vector with i.i.d. entries satisfying $\mathbb{E} x_1 = 0, \mathbb{E} x_1^2 = 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_p)^\top$ is a non-random vector, and $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij}), \mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})$ be complex $p \times p$ nonrandom matrices.

By combining (A7), (A8), (A9), (A10), (A11), and (A12), we obtain

$$\text{Var}(\zeta_n) = \mathbb{E}(\zeta_n^2) - \mathbb{E}^2(\zeta_n) = o \left(\text{Var}^2 (T_n) \right).$$

which completes the proof of (A5).

Note that

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(V_t^2 I(|V_t| > \varepsilon \sqrt{\text{Var}(T_n)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right)}{\text{Var}(T_n)} \leq \varepsilon^{-2} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(V_t^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right)}{\text{Var}^2 (T_n)}. \tag{A13}$$

Hence, to prove (A6), it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} (V_t^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \right) = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} (V_t^4) = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} + \psi_t \right)^4 = o \left(\text{Var}^2 (T_n) \right). \tag{A14}$$

By C_r 's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}(V_t^4) &\leq 8 \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{st} \right)^4 + \psi_t^4 \right] \\
&= 8 \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4=1}^{t-1} \varphi_{s_1 t} \varphi_{s_2 t} \varphi_{s_3 t} \varphi_{s_4 t} + \psi_t^4 \right] \\
&= 8 \sum_{t=1}^n \left[3 \sum_{s_1 \neq s_2}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t}^2 c_{s_2 t}^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2}^\top \mathbf{y}_t + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st}^4 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_s \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_s \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right)^2 \right] \\
&=: 24R_1 + 8R_2 + 8R_3, \tag{A15}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we turn to analyze the following three terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq s_2}^{t-1} c_{s_1 t}^2 c_{s_2 t}^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2}^\top \mathbf{y}_t \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_i} \sum_{s_1 \neq s_2}^{t-1} O(n^{-8}) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_1} \mathbf{y}_{s_1}^\top \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_{s_2} \mathbf{y}_{s_2}^\top \mathbf{y}_t \quad (\text{by } c_{st} = O(n^{-2})) \\
&\leq O(n^{-5}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^q \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)^2 + \sum_{i < l} \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l) \right] \\
&= o(\sigma_{n, q_1}^4), \tag{A16}
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from Proposition A.1. in [22]. By the same argument, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2 &= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{st}^4 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_s \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{y}_s \mathbf{y}_s^\top \mathbf{y}_t \\
&= o(\sigma_{n, q_1}^4). \tag{A17}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_3 &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right]^2 \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{t \in \Lambda_l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\beta_i^2}{n_i^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right]^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= O(n^{-4}) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right)^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \right) \right]^2 \\
&= o\left(\sigma_{n,q_2}^4\right), \tag{A18}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line we used $\sigma_{n,q_2}^2 = o\left(\sigma_{n,q_1}^2\right) = o\left(\text{Var}(T_n)\right)$. By combining (A15)-(A18), the proof of (A6) is complete. \square

Putting together the above results, by the martingale central limit theorem (see Corollary 3.1 of [23]), Theorem 2.3 can be obtained.

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] 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>
- [3] 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>
- [4] Lopes, M., Jacob, L., Wainwright, M.J.: A more powerful two-sample test in high dimensions using random projection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **24** (2011)
- [5] Cai, T.T., Liu, W.D., Xia, Y.: Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* **76**(2), 349–372 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12034>
- [6] Xu, G.J., Lin, L.F., Wei, P., Pan, W.: An adaptive two-sample test for high-dimensional means. *Biometrika* **103**(3), 609–624 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asw029>
- [7] Zhang, J.T., Guo, J., Zhou, B., Cheng, M.Y.: A simple two-sample test in high dimensions based on L2-norm. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **115**(530), 1011–1027 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2019.1604366>
- [8] Schott, J.R.: A test for the equality of covariance matrices when the dimension is large relative to the sample sizes. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **51**(12), 6535–6542 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2007.03.004>
- [9] Cai, T.T., Xia, Y.: High-dimensional sparse MANOVA. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **131**, 174–196 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2014.07.002>

- [10] Hu, J., Bai, Z.D., Wang, C., Wang, W.: On testing the equality of high dimensional mean vectors with unequal covariance matrices. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **69**(2), 365–387 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10463-015-0543-8>
- [11] Li, J., Niu, Z., Hong, S., Bai, Z.: Test for high-dimensional mean vectors via the weighted l_2 -norm. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17143 (2024)
- [12] Nishiyama, T., Hyodo, M., Seo, T., Pavlenko, T.: Testing linear hypotheses of mean vectors for high-dimension data with unequal covariance matrices. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **143**(11), 1898–1911 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2013.07.008>
- [13] Scheffé, H.: On solutions of the Behrens-Fisher problem, based on the t-distribution. *Ann. Math. Statistics* **14**, 35–44 (1943) <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177731490>
- [14] Bennett, B.M.: Note on a solution of the generalized Behrens-Fisher problem. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **2**, 87–90 (1951) <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02919505>
- [15] Jiang, D.D.: Likelihood-based tests on moderate-high-dimensional mean vectors with unequal covariance matrices. *J. Korean Statist. Soc.* **46**(3), 451–461 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jkss.2017.01.005>
- [16] Li, H.Q., Hu, J., Bai, Z.D., Yin, Y.Q., Zou, K.X.: Test on the linear combinations of mean vectors in high-dimensional data. *TEST* **26**(1), 188–208 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11749-016-0505-3>
- [17] Zhou, B., Guo, J., Zhang, J.T.: High-dimensional general linear hypothesis testing under heteroscedasticity. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **188**, 36–54 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2017.03.005>
- [18] Zhang, J.T., Zhou, B., Guo, J.: Linear hypothesis testing in high-dimensional heteroscedastic one-way MANOVA: a normal reference L_2 -norm based test. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **187**, 104816–19 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2021.104816>
- [19] Jiang, Y.L., Wang, X.Q., Wen, C.H., Jiang, Y.K., Zhang, H.P.: Nonparametric two-sample tests of high dimensional mean vectors via random integration. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **0**(0), 1–14 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2022.2141636>
- [20] Zhang, J.T., Guo, J., Zhou, B.: Linear hypothesis testing in high-dimensional one-way MANOVA. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **155**, 200–216 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2017.01.002>
- [21] Li, J.: Finite sample t-tests for high-dimensional means. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **196**, 105183–15 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2023.105183>
- [22] Chen, S.X., Zhang, L.X., Zhong, P.S.: Tests for high-dimensional covariance matrices. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **105**(490), 810–819 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2010.tm09560>

- [23] Hall, P., Heyde, C.C.: Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application. Probability and mathematical statistics. New York-London, New York-London (1980)