

STABLE DISTILLATION AND HIGH-DIMENSIONAL HYPOTHESIS TESTING

BY RYAN CHRIST^{1,a} , IRA HALL^{1,b}  AND DAVID STEINSALTZ^{2,c} 

¹Department of Genetics, Yale School of Medicine, ^aryan.christ@yale.edu

²Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, ^bira.hall@yale.edu; ^csteinsal@stats.ox.ac.uk

While powerful methods have been developed for high-dimensional hypothesis testing assuming orthogonal parameters, current approaches struggle to generalize to the more common non-orthogonal case. We propose *Stable Distillation* (SD), a simple paradigm for iteratively extracting independent pieces of information from observed data, assuming a parametric model. When applied to hypothesis testing for large regression models, SD orthogonalizes the effect estimates of non-orthogonal predictors by judiciously introducing noise into the observed outcomes vector, yielding mutually independent p -values across predictors. Simulations and a real regression example using US campaign contributions show that SD yields a scalable approach for non-orthogonal designs that exceeds or matches the power of existing methods against sparse alternatives. While we only present explicit SD algorithms for hypothesis testing in ordinary least squares and logistic regression, we provide general guidance for deriving and improving the power of SD procedures.

1. Introduction.

1.1. *The problem of global null hypothesis testing.* Consider the problem of testing a null hypothesis $H_0 : \{\theta = \theta_0\}$ about a p -dimensional parameter θ given some observed data Y drawn from a known family of distributions F_θ . H_0 may be motivated by a scientific hypothesis, such whether any measured environmental toxins modulate disease risk [44], or arise during model selection, where we want to test whether we should add any more features to a given model [36].

In this paper we are particularly interested in procedures with power against sparse alternatives: in modern applications ranging from genetics and communications to signal detection and compressive sensing, p may be in the millions, while only very few elements of θ actually depart from θ_0 under the alternative hypothesis [1]. Throughout we consider the general context of non-orthogonal parameters: in most applications the likelihood implied by a given F_θ does not factorize according to θ . In the regression context, this refers to the fact that coefficient estimates are dependent unless there is orthogonality among their corresponding predictors. Throughout we will also allow for the presence of nuisance parameters: often F is indexed by additional parameters alongside θ that must also be estimated from Y .

In this general sparse-signal context, we propose an interactive, stochastic decoupling framework we call *Stable Distillation* (SD). Informally, SD provides a principled framework for repeatedly and interactively extracting information from Y , sometimes called “double dipping”. SD extracts some information U (relevant to H_0) from Y while injecting noise into Y in a way that maintains the distribution of Y under H_0 and forces the updated Y to be independent of U . Iterating this procedure enables the accumulation of independent pieces of information about H_0 across iterations, yielding powerful hypothesis tests. As we detail

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62F03; secondary 62J12.

Keywords and phrases: sparse, logistic, regression, ANOVA, Higher Criticism, F-test, global null.

in Section 4.6, this approach is intimately connected to but distinct from recent work on interactive hypothesis testing [14, 15, 29, 31], data fission [32], and stable algorithms [51].

We defer situating SD within that literature to Section 4.6, after we have explained the essential features of SD. There we also draw connections to leading stochastic inference approaches, such as knockoff methods [7] and stable algorithms [51]. In this paper we focus on using SD to untangle parameters when testing H_0 and leave applications of SD to more complex inference problems beyond hypothesis testing, such as variable selection, to future work.

The abstract definition of SD given in Section 2 does not immediately lead to useful procedures for particular classes of null and alternative hypotheses. We focus on providing explicit procedures for the common case of comparing nested regression models, where θ corresponds to some subset of coefficients. In Section 1.2 below, we motivate SD in the context of the sizeable literature on high-dimensional hypothesis testing for ordinary least squares regression. We present explicit SD procedures for ordinary least squares regression in Section 4 and logistic regression in Section 5. In the context of regression, applying SD yields an independent p-value U for each predictor, allowing direct application of an outlier test such as Tukey’s higher criticism to test H_0 with power against sparse alternatives [13, 46]. The simulations in Section 4.4 demonstrate that this approach yields considerable power gains in settings with sparse alternatives and high correlation among predictors. We provide general guidance for obtaining explicit and powerful SD procedures for testing H_0 under any F_θ throughout.

1.2. *Sparse-signal OLS models.* For an observed response $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a background covariate matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ where $q < n$, and a design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, the OLS model is

$$(1) \quad Y = A\alpha + X\beta + \sigma\epsilon$$

where $\epsilon \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and σ is an unknown scalar. In this regression context, we will consider the null hypothesis $H_0 : \{\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_p = 0\}$. Here, p may be very large: possibly greater than n and perhaps in the millions. Throughout, we will assume that $P_A^\perp X_{\cdot j} \neq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$, but make no further assumptions about the structure of the $X_{\cdot j}$ or the identifiability of each β_j . The predictors encoded in the columns of X may be strongly (even perfectly) correlated, making the resulting $\hat{\beta}_j$ dependent. Also note the presence of nuisance parameters, α and σ .

We are particularly interested in the “sparse-signal” setting, where the number of active predictors, $a = |\{X_{\cdot j} : \beta_j \neq 0\}|$, is very small compared to p . Note, our SD approach remains valid for any β . Hypothesis testing in this sparse-signal, high-dimensional context is common in modern applications. Sometimes predictors are collected with an eye toward a specific hypothesis: early pandemic detection, signal processing, and clinical trial rescue [13]. In many other scientific studies, predictors are collected without any known relevance: screening drug compounds for activity against some disease process [39]. Testing H_0 is also an essential tool in model selection [1]. For example, a financier may test whether there are any asset prices or economic variables from a large class that might be worth including in their forecast model. The association signals may be sparse and weak, and the asset prices may be strongly dependent, but they might be worth exploring in order to achieve a small increase in returns.

For the OLS model, the classic likelihood ratio test against H_0 (ANOVA) and related “sum-of-squares-type” statistics naturally account for non-orthogonality among parameters and the presence of nuisance parameters [8, 19, 20]. While these statistics are well powered against “dense” alternatives, where a is not so small compared to p , these statistics have little to no power against sparse alternatives [1, 22].

If X followed an orthogonal design, and there were no nuisance parameters, then the gold-standard method to test H_0 against the general alternative $\beta \neq 0$ would be to regress Y on each $X_{\cdot j}$ separately, obtain an independent p-value for each $X_{\cdot j}$. Then test H_0 with a goodness-of-fit test such as higher criticism that targets sparse signals [13]. Compared to more commonly used "minimum"-based approaches, such as testing the minimum p-value with Bonferroni correction or Holm's method, higher criticism and related tests in the General Goodness of Fit test family have more power when, roughly speaking, there are a handful of active predictors with modest effects [13, 49, 50].

Unfortunately, higher criticism and related outlier tests do not have known null distributions under non-orthogonality and the presence of nuisance parameters. Directly simulating the null distribution via Monte Carlo, as done in [1], is prohibitive when p is large and intractable in screening applications that test many H_0 . Such screening applications require precise estimates of the tail of the null distribution to account for multiple testing. For example, a standard challenge in genomics is to screen approximately 30,000 human genes to find those that might influence a disease of interest with a Bonferroni threshold of 10^{-6} . Here, association between the disease and the gene is typically tested by comparing nested regression models where the larger model includes all of the genetic variants within a given gene. Modern sequencing datasets may easily have tens of thousands of variants in a single gene, and the sample size n these datasets is now reaching into the millions [24].

As an alternative to higher criticism, impressive recent work on higher-order-norm U-statistics, [22] has sought to bridge the gap between statistics that are powerful against dense and sparse alternatives by considering the joint distribution of $\|\hat{\beta}\|_q$ across several positive integer q and $q = \infty$. Unfortunately, this work currently does not admit nuisance parameters and only an asymptotic null distribution is available under this approach, which makes calculating p-values at the scale 10^{-6} unreliable for applications like gene testing. Moreover, convergence to this null distribution requires difficult-to-verify limits on the strength of correlation among the predictors X_1, \dots, X_p that are violated in practice: in gene testing applications $\|\hat{\beta}\|_2$ is observed to converge to a generalized chi-square distribution rather than a Gaussian [38].

Various attempts have been made to extend higher criticism to non-orthogonal predictors while avoiding Monte Carlo simulation. The direct approach — rotating the Gaussian test statistics to produce new orthogonal test statistics, hence yielding independent p-values [21] — destroys any sparsity in the original design, causing the test to lose power rapidly as the correlations increase [4]. Generalised Higher Criticism [4] takes a different, in principle more powerful, approach, deploying ingenious computations to adjust the null distribution based on the correlation structure of dependent test statistics [4]. Unfortunately, this method scales like $\mathcal{O}(p^3)$, making its use in problems where p is much larger than 100 impractical.

There are several scalable off-the-shelf approaches to combining dependent p-values, such as the classic Simes procedure, the Cauchy Combination Test, and recent averaging-based p-value methods [23, 35, 43, 47]. The Cauchy Combination Test has proven to be relatively powerful and is widely used in genomics applications [35]. However, these procedures pay a substantial price in power to maintain type-1 error control in the presence of dependent p-values. Generalised Higher Criticism and related members of the General Goodness of Fit test family suffer the same problem. For intuition, consider the classic multiple testing problem of regressing some outcome vector onto each predictor, one-at-a-time to achieve some set of p-values. Assume two of these observed p-values are particularly small. If they correspond to nearly identical predictors, then the evidence against H_0 given by these each p-value is redundant: there really only one outlier, not two. However if these two small p-values correspond to orthogonal predictors, they provide independent evidence against H_0 and their signals may be combined to boost power. Off-the-shelf approaches allowing for

dependent p-values cannot distinguish between these two cases. In other words, they cannot distinguish observations where all of the outlying test statistics come from a single tightly correlated cluster of predictors from observations where the outlying test statistics correspond to orthogonal predictors. In contrast, our SD procedures make this distinction in the process of orthogonalizing the $\hat{\beta}_j$. It is this independence among p-values that ultimately allows higher criticism, or whatever outlier test is used after distillation, to out-perform generic methods that allow for dependent p-values. As we show in Section 4.4, this allows SD to achieve significantly more power than the Cauchy Combination Test in the presence of strongly correlated clusters of predictors.

1.3. *The Rényi Outlier Test.* As mentioned above, after we have used SD to decouple the parameters θ , we need an outlier test like higher criticism to test H_0 with power against sparse alternatives. Relatively recent work has made the null distribution of higher criticism analytically tractable for modest p problems ($p \sim 10^3$) [49, 50]. Unfortunately, these calculations do not scale to very large problems ($p \sim 10^6$) and cannot reliably estimate p-values at the lower ranges accessible to standard machine precision — on the order of 10^{-12} or less. The Rényi Outlier Test maintains comparable power against sparse alternatives but does not suffer from these constraints [10, 12], which is why we will be relying upon a modified version of it to test H_0 after we have used SD to orthogonalize the parameters θ rather than higher criticism.

The Rényi Outlier Test makes use of the *Rényi transformation* $\rho: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]^n$. For an ordered vector $u \in [0, 1]^n$, such that $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_n$, $\rho(u)_i = i \log(u_{i+1}/u_i)$ for all $i < n$ and $\rho(u)_n = -n \log(u_n)$. Alfréd Rényi pointed out that when ρ is applied to a vector U of ordered independent uniform random variables, the image $\rho(U)$ has entries that are independent exponential random variables [42]. In this paper, we will make use of a modified version of the Rényi Outlier Test, $\zeta_\tau: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$, to map independent p-values to a single p-value. Specifically,

$$(2) \quad \zeta_\tau: u \mapsto 1 - G_{|\{u < \tau\}|+1}^{-1} \left(\|\rho(\text{sort}(\{u/\tau: u < \tau\}))\|_1 - \log(1 - B_{n,\tau}(|\{u < \tau\}|)) \right),$$

where $B_{n,\theta}$ is the Binomial distribution cdf with parameters (n, θ) , and G_m is the cdf of the Gamma distribution with rate 1 and shape parameter m . If U is a vector of independent standard Uniform random variables, then $\zeta_\tau(U) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$. The term involving ρ captures information from the spacing of elements of U that fall below the threshold τ . The term involving the Binomial cdf feeds in information about the number of elements in U that appear below the threshold τ . This statistic may be generalized to apply unequal weights to elements of U , but we will not explore this possibility here.

1.4. *Notation.* Throughout the paper we will be defining distributions within a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . Unless otherwise indicated, the probability operator \mathbb{P} and the expectation operator \mathbb{E} will be assumed to refer to the null distribution defined by what we are calling, in the relevant context, the null hypothesis H_0 . $F_{a,b}(x)$ will be used to denote the cdf of the Beta distribution with parameters a, b (with mean $a/(a+b)$). For a full-rank matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ where $n \geq m$, P_M will denote the projection matrix onto the m -dimensional subspace spanned by the columns of M ; $P_M^\perp = I - P_M$, the projection matrix onto the orthogonal $n - m$ dimensional subspace. For a set of columns B we let $M_{.B}$ denote the matrix M subsetted down to the corresponding columns; for a set of rows B we let M_B denote, the corresponding rows. For a positive integer n we will abbreviate the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ as $[n]$, and use \mathcal{S}_n to denote the set of permutations on $[n]$.




Fig 1: **Bayesian network structure for an HMM.** Arrows represent independence of a node from all of its nondescendants, conditioned on its parents, as in Definition 3.1 of [26]. Each $Y^{(l)}$ denotes versions of the original data $Y^{(1)}$ that are “hidden” from the investigator or inference algorithm. Each $U^{(l)}$ denotes information extracted from $Y^{(l)}$ (typically a p-value or set of p-values) that is “observed” by the investigator or inference algorithm.

2. Stable Distillation. All of the random variables we describe in this section will be assumed to take values in a Polish space, with the Borel σ -algebra, but we will generally not need to specify these spaces further. Given observed data Y drawn from some family of distributions F_θ parameterized by θ , we present a stochastic decoupling framework we call *Stable Distillation* (SD) for orthogonalizing the parameters θ . A SD process is a stochastic process $(Y^{(l)}, U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$. In a regression context, the time steps l may correspond to predictors, which is to say, to columns of the design matrix X . The essential nature of the SD process is the conditional independence structure sketched in Figure 1, which is reminiscent of an abstract definition of a hidden Markov model (HMM), where the data play the role of “hidden states”, and test statistics on that data are the “observed states”. In line with Figure 1, here we define an HMM as a stochastic process $(Y^{(l)}, U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ such that $Y^{(l)}$ is independent of $((Y^{(l)})_{l=1}^{l-2}, (U^{(l)})_{l=1}^{l-1})$ given $Y^{(l-1)}$ and $U^{(l)}$ is independent of $((Y^{(l)})_{l=1}^{l-1}, (Y^{(l)})_{l=l+1}^L, (U^{(l)})_{l=1}^{l-1}, (U^{(l)})_{l=l+1}^L)$ given $Y^{(l)}$. In an SD process, the first “hidden state” of the HMM, $Y^{(1)}$ is initialized with the observed data Y .

DEFINITION 2.1. Given an initial $Y^{(1)} = Y \sim F_{\theta_0}$, a *stable distillation* (SD) process is a hidden Markov model $(Y^{(l)}, U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ where $Y^{(l)} \sim F_{\theta_0}$ for all $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ and $U^{(l)} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y^{(l+1)}$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$.

The HMM structure of SD may be understood intuitively: the observed data $Y^{(1)}$, and modified copies of that data, $Y^{(2)}, \dots, Y^{(L)}$, are “hidden” from the researcher. The researcher, and any downstream statistical procedures, only get to observe statistics $(U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ “emitted” by the algorithm for inference. This explicit masking of the data preserves information, so that later inference steps remain unbiased. Note, while Definition 2.1 requires that the marginal distribution of each $Y^{(l)}$ be stable, it does not assume that the Markov chain $(Y^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ is time-homogeneous.

Critically, Definition 2.1 guarantees independence among the $(U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$.

LEMMA 2.2. *If $(Y^{(l)}, U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ is an SD process, then $U^{(1)}, U^{(2)}, \dots, U^{(L)}$ are mutually independent.*

This makes it relatively straightforward to obtain a calibrated inference procedure that accumulates information across $(U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$. The challenge and focus of this paper lies in constructing explicit SD processes that meet the requirements of Definition 2.1 for a given likelihood F_θ and maintain power for inference. In short, our approach will involve judiciously injecting noise into $Y^{(l)}$ to obtain the next $Y^{(l+1)}$. This noise will ensure stability ($Y^{(l+1)} \sim F_{\theta_0}$) and serve as “payment” for observing $U^{(l)}$. We will describe some general strategies for reducing




Fig 2: **Independent EFR-SD.** Arrows show functional relationships. Red arrows represent splitting Y into U and V (the extraction step); green arrows, exchanging information between U and U' to obtain \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ (the filtration step); blue arrows, generating $Y^{(l+1)}$ from \tilde{U} by blending with the auxiliary information V (the reconstitution step). Dashed gray lines indicate the pairwise independence of variables.

the amount of noise injected into Y at each iteration, thereby improving the power of the procedure in Section 6 and Section 7. Injecting noise into and masking information within an inference procedure are common, albeit sometimes implicit, strategies for maintaining calibration in the post-selection inference literature. We defer properly situating SD within that literature to Section 4.6.

At the start of each iteration of distillation l , in principle one may use the statistics $U^{(k)}$ extracted in prior iterations ($k < l$) to help select which information to extract from $Y^{(l)}$. In the context of the OLS model, where each $U^{(l)}$ will roughly correspond to a vector of p-values for some subset of predictors, one may use the previous $U^{(k)}$ to select which predictor(s) to include in the next iteration of distillation. While this “human in the loop” feature provides a basis for interactive hypothesis testing, which has been a major recent focus in the literature [15, 30], the examples we present in this paper do not make use of this freedom.

3. Extraction-Filtration-Reconstitution (EFR) SD.

3.1. *The independent case.* Here we present a useful, albeit more constrained framework, Extraction-Filtration-Reconstitution Stable Distillation (EFR-SD), for obtaining valid SD procedures. Each iteration of $l = 1, \dots, L$ involves the following three steps, illustrated in Figure 2.

1. **Extraction:** We extract a statistic U with information relevant to H_0 from $Y^{(l)}$. Specifically, we apply a *bijective splitting* function $\psi(Y^{(l)}) = (V, U)$ (in arbitrary probability spaces). V can be interpreted as ancillary information that will be preserved for future SD iterations.
2. **Filtration:** We add noise to split U into new random variables $(\tilde{U}, U^{(l)})$ with an eye toward making \tilde{U} as close to U as possible, while moving information relevant for inference into $U^{(l)}$. More precisely, we start by sampling (U', ω) independent (of all other variables). U' will typically – but need not – have the same distribution as U , while ω is some random variable providing auxiliary randomization. Then, we apply a deterministic *selection-filtration* function (depending on ω), mapping the random variables (U, U') to $(\tilde{U}, U^{(l)})$. We elaborate on valid filters in Section 7.
3. **Reconstitution:** We obtain a new $Y^{(l+1)}$ based on \tilde{U} . Specifically, $Y^{(l+1)} := \psi^{-1}(V, \tilde{U})$.

THEOREM 3.1. *The EFR-SD procedure described above satisfies the conditions for generating a stable distillation if the following hold:*




Fig 3: **Independent EFR-SD Procedure with L Iterations.** As in Figure 2, red arrows represent the extraction step; green arrows, the filtration step; blue arrows, the reconstitution step. Here, orange arrows represent accumulating information across iterations into U^* , the final step after L iterations of SD.

- The two components $\psi(Y) = (V, U)$ are independent;
- U and \tilde{U} have the same distribution;
- The two components \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ are independent.

We complete the procedure by accumulating every $U^{(l)}$ into $U^* = (U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$. Figure 3 illustrates how this accumulation into U^* and multiple EFR rounds fit together to make up the full EFR-SD algorithm. As shown in Figure 3, after iterating EFR-SD L times, we can also obtain a final $Y^{(L+1)}$ that is independent of the collection $(U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$. The by-product $Y^{(L+1)}$ may be used for further inference, though we will not specifically make use of it in this paper.

Some knowledge of the null distribution of each $U^{(l)}$ is required in order to use it for inferences. For the remainder of the paper, we will choose EFR-SD procedures that make each $U^{(l)}$ a vector of independent uniform random variables under H_0 . To help us do this, we will define a ψ that makes each U a vector of independent uniform random variables when H_0 holds and randomly sample a vector U' at the start of each filtration step with the same distribution. As we will show in the next section, in the context of the OLS model, this construction will allow us to interpret each entry of U^* as an independent p-value associated with a given predictor.

3.2. *The general case.* The EFR framework proposes the decomposition of the data into two independent (under the null hypothesis) pieces (U, V) , where U will be used as a possible test statistic, while V will be held back, to be combined with an independently generated version of U to generate a slightly modified, but independent, version of the data. In the




Fig 4: **General EFR-SD.** Arrows show functional relationships. The red arrow represents the single mapping of Y to U (the extraction step); green arrows, the splitting of U into \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ (the filtration step); blue arrows, generating $Y^{(l+1)}$ from \tilde{U} and the residual information in $Y^{(l)}$ (the reconstitution step) through the coupling π . Dashed gray lines indicate the independence of variables.

following section, we show how such a factorization is easily obtained in the case of the OLS model using the peculiar property of the multivariate Gaussian that orthogonal linear projections are independent. However, it might be hard to imagine how such a factorization might be obtained for other models.

In principle, such a decomposition is generally available. We provide an explicit example for the case of logistic regression in Section 5. Suppose we have the general random variables $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $U = U(Y)$ where $U : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Following our general assumption that \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{U} are Polish spaces, these define countably generated σ -algebras \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{U} , and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P})$ is a regular conditional probability space [17, Theorem 5.1.9]. Hence, by [41] there exists an *independent complement* \mathcal{V} to \mathcal{U} ; that is, a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{Y} independent of \mathcal{U} , such that \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{U} jointly generate \mathcal{Y} modulo null sets. If \mathcal{V} is countably generated — for example, if Ω itself is countable — then we can use it to define a random variable V on some space \mathcal{V} that is independent to and “complementary” to U , in the sense that (V, U) can be used to reconstruct Y almost surely. Actually constructing this V is difficult, in general, and while the EFR construction does not require that V be calculated explicitly, these complications invite a more intuitive generalization based on coupled random variables.

If we have a single random variable U that has been split off from $Y^{(l)}$, the function of an independent complement is essentially to couple $Y^{(l)}$ to a new Y that will be generated from a newly generated value \tilde{U} . A more intuitively direct approach is then to make this coupling explicit: Let $\pi_u(dy)$ be a regular conditional distribution for Y conditioned on U , and define a coupling of $\pi_u(dy)$ and $\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y})$. The coupling may be represented as a joint distribution $\pi_{u,\tilde{u}}(dy, d\tilde{y})$ such that the marginal distributions are $\pi_u(dy)$ and $\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y})$, or as a regular conditional distribution, which is a kernel $\pi_{\tilde{u},y}(d\tilde{y})$. Similarly, we may think of the filtration step as being determined by a joint distribution $\mathfrak{f}(du, d\tilde{u}, du^{(l)})$ that couples $U = U(Y^{(l)})$ to the new independent pair $\tilde{U}, U^{(l)}$.

The general EFR construction is carried out as follows:

1. Starting from $Y^{(l)}$, we calculate U , from which we generate (using the joint distribution \mathfrak{f}) the independent pair $(\tilde{U}, U^{(l)})$. We write $q(du)$ for the distribution of U .
2. From the kernel $\pi_{\tilde{U}, Y^{(l)}}$ we generate a new $Y^{(l+1)}$, and then proceed from step 1.

THEOREM 3.2. *The general EFR-SD procedure described above satisfies the conditions for generating a stable distillation if the following hold:*

- The joint distribution $\pi_{u,\tilde{u}}(dy, d\tilde{y})$ has marginal distributions $\pi_u(dy)$ and $\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y})$ for every choice of u and \tilde{u} ;
- The joint distribution $\mathfrak{f}(du, d\tilde{u}, du^{(l)})$ has marginal distribution q in each component, and makes \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ independent.

Note that if we have an invertible splitting $\psi(Y) = (U, V)$, and a filtering function $\phi(u, u', \omega)$, we may define kernels

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{u,\tilde{u}}f(y)g(\tilde{y}) &:= \mathbb{E}[f(\psi^{-1}(u, V))g(\psi^{-1}(\tilde{u}, V))], \\ \mathfrak{f}_uf(\tilde{u}, u^{(l)}) &:= \mathbb{E}[f(\phi(u, U', \omega))]\end{aligned}$$

for bounded measurable test functions $f : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If the functions satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1 then the kernels satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.2; hence the independent EFR procedure is a special case of the general version. Theorem 3.1 could be a corollary of Theorem 3.2, but we present a separate proof for expository reasons.

While this coupling approach may appear unwieldy, it can produce relatively simple procedures: the SD procedure we provide for logistic regression in Section 5.

4. Distilling the OLS Model One Predictor At a Time. Here we will introduce a simple example of SD, where we sequentially estimate each β_j in the OLS model (1). In Section 6, we will consider the general case where our p predictors are grouped into $L < p$ “layers,” with each layer of predictors corresponding to one iteration of SD. However, throughout this section, we will assume that we have $L = p$ “atomic” layers: that each iteration of SD will involve only one predictor $X_{\cdot j}$. Without loss of generality, for ease of notation, in this section we assume that the columns of X are permuted so that $X_{\cdot j}$ is considered in the j^{th} SD iteration.

4.1. *Naïve SD.* The classic F -statistic for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ for a single β_j is

$$(3) \quad T_j^2 = \frac{W_j^2}{(\omega - W_j^2)/(n - q - 1)}$$

where $W_j = Y^\top \tilde{X}_j$, and $\tilde{X}_j = P_A^\perp X_{\cdot j} / \|P_A^\perp X_{\cdot j}\|_2$, and $\omega = \|P_A^\perp Y\|_2^2$. This statistic pivots out the unknown parameters α and σ . Under $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$, T_j^2 has an F -distribution with 1 and $n - q - 1$ degrees of freedom, so mapping T_j^2 through the corresponding complementary CDF yields a p-value U_j . The key to applying SD in this context is to notice that this extraction of U_j from $Y^{(j)}$ may be inverted while maintaining stability of distribution and the required independence assumptions. We can write the extraction of the statistic U_j from $Y^{(j)}$ as a component of an bijective factorization ψ_j of $Y^{(j)}$ into four independent pieces as follows. Recall that while EFR-SD requires the existence of such an explicit factorization, SD in general does not. To avoid the technical issues raised by the possibility that $P_{A, X_{\cdot j}}^\perp Y = 0$, we exclude the subspace of \mathbb{R}^n spanned by the columns of $(A, X_{\cdot j})$ from our proposed map ψ_j , a set of measure zero. Specifically, let $\mathfrak{N} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : P_{A, X_{\cdot j}}^\perp x \neq 0\}$ and $\mathfrak{S} = \{x \in \mathfrak{N} : \|x\| = 1\}$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *The map $\psi_j : \mathfrak{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q \times (0, 1] \times \{-1, 0, +1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathfrak{S}$ given by $\psi_j : Y \mapsto \left(P_A Y, U_j, \text{sgn}(T_j), \omega, P_{A, X_{\cdot j}}^\perp Y / \left\| P_{A, X_{\cdot j}}^\perp Y \right\|_2 \right)$ is invertible. If $Y \sim N(A\alpha, \sigma^2 I_n)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then the five components of $\psi_j(Y)$ are mutually independent.*

By Theorem 3.1, the family of maps ψ_j may be used to generate a stable distillation. Since we expect each p-value U_j obtained in this section to be $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ under H_0 , we will sample a new $U' \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ at each iteration in accordance with our filtration step outlined in Section 3.1.

Now we are ready to introduce an EFR-SD procedure for the OLS model that uses a trivial filter where the extracted U_j is always stored in $U^{(j)}$ and noise is injected into Y at every step; we call this the *naïve SD procedure*. We start with the extraction step, calculating $\psi_j(Y^{(j)})$. Then, in the filtration step, we simply set $U^{(j)} = U_j$ and $\tilde{U} = U' \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$. Finally, in the reconstitution step, we invert ψ_j to obtain $Y^{(j+1)} = \psi_j^{-1} \left(P_A Y, \tilde{U}, \text{sgn}(T_j), \omega, P_{A, X_j}^\perp Y / \left\| P_{A, X_j}^\perp Y \right\|_2 \right)$.

This procedure can be implemented algorithmically in a somewhat more simplified form as follows. In the extraction step, we calculate U_j via T_j^2 . In the reconstitution step, we map \tilde{U} through the inverse complementary CDF of the appropriate F -distribution to obtain \tilde{T}_j^2 . We then obtain $\tilde{W}_j = \text{sgn}(T_j) \sqrt{\frac{\omega \tilde{T}_j^2}{(n-q-1) + \tilde{T}_j^2}}$. Finally we set

$$(4) \quad Y^{(j+1)} = P_A Y^{(j)} + \gamma \left(P_A^\perp Y^{(j)} - W_j \tilde{X}_j \right) + \tilde{W}_j \tilde{X}_j \quad \text{where} \quad \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{\omega - \tilde{W}_j^2}{\omega - W_j^2}}.$$

Under H_0 , Proposition 4.1 guarantees stability — $Y^{(j+1)} \sim N(A\alpha, \sigma I_n)$ — and that $Y^{(j+1)}$ is independent of $U^{(j)}$. From (4), the change in Y induced by this procedure can be written as

$$(5) \quad \left\| Y^{(j+1)} - Y^{(j)} \right\|_2^2 = \underbrace{\left(\tilde{W}_j - \gamma W_j \right)^2}_{\text{shifting}} + \underbrace{\omega(\gamma - 1)^2}_{\text{rescaling}},$$

which neatly shows the noise coming from shifting $Y^{(j)}$ along \tilde{X}_j and the noise coming from rescaling $Y^{(j)}$. While this yields a valid SD procedure that can be iterated, it is not powerful because of the relatively large amount of noise injected into $Y^{(j)}$ at each iteration. This motivates the use of a non-trivial filter, such as the simple quantile filter described below, during the filtration step.

4.2. The simple quantile filter. Here we consider equipping our SD procedure for the OLS model with a simple quantile filter for some fixed quantile $t \in (0, 1)$. In this section, we will refer to this as the *filtered SD procedure*.

In Algorithm 1, if $U_j > t$ and $U'_j > t$, which is highly likely under H_0 for small t , then U_j is not modified and the filter simply returns $\tilde{U}_j = U_j$, guaranteeing that $\tilde{W}_j = W_j$ and $Y^{(j+1)} = Y^{(j)}$. More explicitly, under H_0 , this filter guarantees that $\mathbb{P}(Y^{(j+1)} = Y^{(j)}) \geq (1-t)^2$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| Y^{(j+1)} - Y^{(j)} \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq C \cdot t$ for some $C > 0$. Setting t lower not only reduces the expected noise introduced in each iteration, but also reduces the risk that proxy predictors (predictors that are correlated with the active predictors) will truncate the signal driven by the active predictors.

On the other hand, if the filtering threshold t is set too low, small outlying U_j corresponding to important active predictors may simply be missed (omitted in the final U^*). Ideally, t would be chosen to maximize power given a required size of the test α and knowledge of the number of active predictors a . We leave optimization of thresholds t for filtering to later work.

4.3. *Power recovered by using filtered SD instead of naïve SD.* In order to more easily discuss the power gains made possible by filtering, in this sub-section, we consider the special case of the OLS model when σ is known to be 1. In this special case, we have a simplified version of Proposition 4.1 where $U_j = 1 - F_{\chi_1^2}(Z_j^2)$ for $Z_j = \tilde{X}_j^\top Y^{(j)}$.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *The map $\psi_j^\dagger : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q \times [0, 1] \times \{-1, 0, +1\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-q-1}$ given by $\psi_j^\dagger : Y \mapsto (PAY, U_j, \text{sgn}(Z_j), P_{\tilde{A}X_j}^\perp Y)$ is invertible. If $Y \sim N(A\alpha, I_n)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^q$, then the four components of $\psi_j^\dagger(Y)$ are mutually independent.*

Under H_0 the $Z_j = \tilde{X}_j^\top Y^{(j)}$ are standard normal for each $j \in [p]$. Under the alternative where $Y \sim N(\mu, I_n)$ the Z_j are still normal with variance 1, but with changing mean $\tilde{\mu}_j := \tilde{X}_j^\top \mu_j$, where $\mu_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of residual means, after j rounds of distillation, starting from $\mu_1 = \mu$.

Suppose we are performing naïve SD (without filtering). Then with each round of distillation, we extract the signal in the direction of \tilde{X}_j and replace it with a newly simulated standard normal random variable. The new $Y^{(j+1)}$ will still have variance I_n , but mean

$$(6) \quad \mu_{j+1} = P_{\tilde{X}_j}^\perp \mu_j = \left(I_n - \tilde{X}_j \tilde{X}_j^\top \right) \mu_j.$$

Note that these mean vectors will certainly be shrinking in L^2 norm, but the composition is not the same as the projection onto the subspace orthogonal to the span of the first j columns. The strength of the signal that may be extracted in the j -th SD iteration will be determined by μ_j . In general, we expect this new mean to be smaller than it would have been without these successive projections, though this is not guaranteed. If there is a single \tilde{X}_j that has a large concordance with μ , it is likely that most of this signal will have been lost by the time we get around to testing that column, unless p is much smaller than n . Hence, power will be very substantially reduced. The exact behaviour of the power in the setting of a random ordering of predictors is an interesting question in probability theory that we hope to address in future work.

If we instead apply the basic quantile filter with threshold $t = \alpha/p$ to this problem, the result is very different. If U_j passes the filter ($U_j < t$) in a given round, we still extract the

Algorithm 1 Simple Quantile Filter

Input: t, U, U'

Output: $U^{(l)}, \tilde{U}$

Require: $t, U, U' \in (0, 1)$

if $U < t$ **then**

$\tilde{U} \leftarrow U'$
 $U^{(l)} \leftarrow U$

else

if $U' > t$ **then**

$\tilde{U} \leftarrow U$
 $U^{(l)} \leftarrow U'$

else

$\tilde{U} \leftarrow t \cdot g_t(U)$
 $U^{(l)} \leftarrow g_t^{-1}(U'/t)$

▷ where $g_t(x) = (x - t)/(1 - t)$

end if

end if

return $U^{(l)}, \tilde{U}$

signal in the direction of \tilde{X}_j and replace it with a newly simulated standard normal random variable. However, if U_j does not pass the filter ($U_j \geq t$), then any signal in U_j is effectively ignored, but in return we get to deliver Y unchanged into the next round of testing.

It is difficult to analyze the power consequences of this when the Rényi Outlier Test or Tukey's higher criticism (see Section 1) is used as the final global test on U^* . However, we can immediately address the much simpler global test statistic $\min(U^{(j)})$. As a point of comparison, consider the standard Bonferroni procedure, taking $p \min(\ddot{U}_j)$ as our p-value where $\ddot{U}_j = 1 - F_{\chi_1^2} \left(\left(\tilde{X}_j^\top Y \right)^2 \right)$ is the standard marginal p-value for X_j .

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Consider distilling an OLS model where $\sigma = 1$. Let $p_f(\alpha)$ denote the power of a filtered SD procedure with threshold $t = \alpha/p$ for a desired test size α with global test statistic $\min(U^{(j)})$. Let $p_b(\alpha)$ denote the power of the Bonferroni method applied directly to the marginal test statistics $\ddot{U}_j = 1 - F_{\chi_1^2} \left(\left(\tilde{X}_j^\top Y \right)^2 \right)$ for the same OLS model. Then, $p_f(\alpha) \geq (1 - \alpha)p_b(\alpha)$.*

What is the advantage of applying this complicated procedure only to recover (approximately) the Bonferroni correction? The Bonferroni procedure provides very near optimal power against alternatives with only a single active predictor. The fact that we effectively recover Bonferroni power after using distillation to decouple our p-values suggests that distillation with filtering effectively controls the noise injected during the distillation process. This control will be less optimal when there are more active predictors — precisely because the choice of filtering threshold depends on balancing the number of active predictors against the signal contributed by each one — but it suggests how a well-adapted filtering procedure will protect the power against excessive distillation noise. As described in Section 1.2, a wide range of statistics can be applied to combine independent $U^{(j)}$ that have no easy adaptation to more general designs. SD bridges this gap by making the statistics $U^{(j)}$ independent, and filtering can help prevent power from draining away in the process.

4.4. Power Simulations. To see the true power of SD, we apply it to data simulated under the OLS model 1, setting $p = 10,000$, with ζ_τ , as defined in (2), used to provide the final summary of the 10,000 independent test statistics aggregated into U^* . Let U_τ^* denote the U^* returned by our filtered SD procedure where τ is the quantile filtering threshold. For a desired type-1 error rate α and hypothesized number of active predictors \hat{a} , we will use threshold

$$(7) \quad t_{\hat{a}} = F_{\hat{a}, p - \hat{a} + 1}^{-1}(2\alpha).$$

To hedge against a bad choice, we will perform an omnibus test over geometrically spaced thresholds, assuming that at most 1% of predictors are active: $\hat{a} \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128\}$. For each \hat{a} we test the resulting $U_{t_{\hat{a}}}^*$ with $\zeta_{t_{\hat{a}}}$, so that the SD filter and the final outlier test both use the same threshold $t_{\hat{a}}$. In order to cover the $a = 1$ case, we also incorporate the Bonferroni corrected p-value U^\dagger calculated among the marginal test statistics for each predictor. Taking the minimum and the corresponding Bonferroni correction, we arrive at

$$(8) \quad 8 \min \left(U^\dagger, \zeta_{t_2}(U_{t_2}^*), \zeta_{t_4}(U_{t_4}^*), \zeta_{t_8}(U_{t_8}^*), \dots, \zeta_{t_{128}}(U_{t_{128}}^*) \right)$$

as our p-value based on filtered SD. For comparison, we take $\zeta_1(U_1^*)$ as our p-value for naïve (non-filtered) SD. For each replicate of the filtered SD procedure and the naïve SD procedure, we sampled a permutation from \mathcal{S}_p uniformly at random to dictate the order in which to distill the simulated predictors.

First we consider the $n > p$ case, setting $n = 100,000$. We fix each column of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 3}$ by simulating three vectors: an intercept, a vector of standard Gaussians, and a vector of Rademacher random variables, all independent. We simulate X so that the columns follow a block covariance structure based on clusters of size 10. More explicitly, the entries of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are drawn from centered Gaussians so that the covariance structure follows $\mathbb{E}(X^\top X) =$

$$I_{\frac{p}{10} \times \frac{p}{10}} \otimes B \text{ where } B \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 10}, B_{ij} = \begin{cases} r & i \neq j \\ 1 & i = j \end{cases} \text{ for some positive } r. \text{ In our simulations, we}$$

specify three levels of dependence within the blocks of predictors in terms of the proportion of variance shared, $r^2 \in \{0.2, 0.5, 0.8\}$. We set the nuisance parameters from (1) $\sigma = 2$ and $\alpha = \mathbf{1}$. In each simulation, we select a desired number of active predictors $a \in \{4, 16\}$ uniformly at random from $[p]$. Given this active set \mathcal{A} we select β , while aiming to distribute the observed effects across active predictors as evenly as possible. To accomplish this, consider the QR -decomposition $QR = \tilde{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$, which we define as $P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp X_{\mathcal{A}}$ with length-normalized columns. Given σ , the sufficient statistic for the oracle model is $\|Q^\top Y\|_2^2$ with expected value $\|R\beta\|_2^2$. For a desired underlying ‘‘signal strength’’ s , we solve $R\beta = \sqrt{F_{\chi_a^2}^{-1}(1 - 10^{-s})} \mathbf{1}$ to make the magnitude of each entry of β as similar as possible. Then, we simulate $Y = A\alpha + \sigma \left(\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{A}}\beta + P_{\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{A}}}^\perp \epsilon \right)$ where $\epsilon \sim N(0, I_n)$. This ensures that the observed $\hat{\beta} = R^{-1}Q^\top Y = \sigma\beta$ is stable across simulations and that the $-\log_{10}$ p-value that one would obtain by testing the resulting Y with an oracle ANOVA model that ‘‘knows’’ the active predictors will be approximately s in every simulation.

For each combination of $a \in \{4, 16\}$, $r^2 \in \{0.2, 0.5, 0.8\}$, and $s \in \{0, 2, 4, 6, \dots, 200\}$, we simulate 2,000 independent pairs (Y, X) , each with a different \mathcal{A} . We compare our filtered SD and naïve SD approaches with the Cauchy Combination Test [35] (CAUCHY), the Bonferroni-adjusted minimum marginal p-value (MINP), and ANOVA. This yields the power curves shown in Section 2 of the Supplementary Material [9], where each plotted point is based on 2,000 replicates. We summarize the resulting power curves in Figure 5, where we plot the estimated signal strength s required to achieve 80% power.

Figure 5 shows that filtered SD dominates standard methods in all settings and significantly improves on the non-filtered, naïve SD method. When there are 4 active predictors and the size of the test is 10^{-2} the power gain is minimal; when there are 16 active predictors, considerable. When the size of the test is 10^{-8} , the power gain available through filtered SD is particularly notable, requiring less than half the signal of the Cauchy method in the case of 16 active predictors. We also observe that the power gain available through filtered SD is typically higher when r^2 is lower.

We replicated the experiments displayed in Figure 5 while setting $n = 1,000$. The results in this $n < p$ case are shown in Figure 6. Here ANOVA is omitted since it is undefined for the $n < p$ case. In Figure 6 we see a dramatic deterioration in the power of naïve SD, and that filtering rescues the SD procedure. Given the low dimensionality of each n -vector relative to p , it makes sense that modifying the projection of Y onto predictors early in the distillation procedure would have a relatively large impact on the projection of Y onto predictors encountered later in the distillation procedure. We see that filtered SD continues to dominate standard methods in these $n < p$ simulations. When the size of the test is 10^{-8} and there are 16 active predictors only filtered SD attains significant power anywhere near the range of oracle signal strength.

4.5. Computational Scalability. Here we briefly compare the scalability of our SD procedure to the Cauchy Combination Test. The run time of the Cauchy method is effectively equal to the time required to compute the marginal p-values for each predictor; combining them with




Fig 5: **Power in the $n > p$ case.** Dotplot of signal strength ($s \approx \text{oracle} - \log_{10} \text{p-value}$) required to achieve 80% power under various simulation conditions. Here, $p = 10,000$ and $n = 100,000$. The columns of the key on the left list the size of the test (10^{-2} or 10^{-8}), the number of active predictors (a), and the squared correlation between predictors within each block/cluster r^2 respectively. The light blue tick marks on each line indicate the effect size at which the oracle model achieves 80% power. The absence of a diamond on any line indicates that it is beyond the range of the plot (signal strength > 200).

the Cauchy CDF is nearly instantaneous. Here we benchmark our R-based implementations of both approaches. In these benchmarking simulations we fix $p = 10^4$ and $q = 3$, simulating A as above. We consider three problem sizes: $n \in \{10^3, 10^4, 10^5\}$. All benchmarks were performed on a machine with 32 Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6242 CPUs, each at 2.8GHz. R was compiled against OpenBLAS, which was configured to use all available cores. The median run times, each based on 50 independent replicates, are shown in a log-log plot in Figure 7. We see that our R-implementation of the Cauchy method scales linearly in n (the slope is 1), as expected since most of the compute is handled by the highly optimized BLAS. While there is significant overhead in our R-implementation of the filtered SD procedure, as can be seen from the relatively long run time when $n = 10^3$, we see that the relative cost of this overhead diminish as n increases and the BLAS operations begin to dominate the run time. For large n , we expect both the Cauchy method (based on p BLAS-parallelized projections) and our filtered SD implementation to scale as $\mathcal{O}(np)$. For large n , we not only see similar scaling for the two algorithms in n , but also that the run time of SD is very close to that of the Cauchy method. For $n = 10^5$, we observe a Cauchy median run time of 48.1s and an SD median run time of 60.3s.

4.6. *SD in the Context of Leading Multiple Testing Approaches.* Now that we have delineated a simple filtered SD procedure for the OLS model, we pause to situate our SD




Fig 6: **Power in the $n < p$ case.** Dotplot of signal strength ($s \approx \text{oracle} - \log_{10} \text{p-value}$) required to achieve 80% power under various simulation conditions. Here, $p = 10,000$ and $n = 1,000$. The columns of the key on the left list the size of the test (10^{-2} or 10^{-8}), the number of active predictors (a), and the squared correlation between predictors within each block/cluster r^2 respectively. The light blue tick marks on each line indicate the effect size at which the oracle model achieves 80% power. The absence of a diamond on any line indicates that it is beyond the range of the plot (signal strength > 200).

within the post-selection inference literature. Many of the approaches in multiple testing literature we discuss below target the much more challenging task of variable selection, with FDR or FWER control. We do not take on variable selection in this paper – the primary aim in post-selection inference – so it would be unfair for us to draw any direct comparisons to our present work. We provide the following a high level discussion to give some intuition for the strengths and weaknesses of SD as a foundation for inference within and beyond the context of testing H_0 .

The idea of injecting noise into Y to break the dependence between predictors may seem unorthodox, or even ill-advised, but is far from new. Inferences from Monte Carlo methods, and particularly Bayesian inferences based on MCMC, are obviously stochastic, as is cross-validation. But the same applies to data splitting, a foundational method for generating valid post-selection inference, and already in the 1970s Cox [11] discussed the interpretation of algorithmically random p -values. There is significant analogy here to the recent work on stable algorithms [51] and data fission [32]. These approaches all effectively perform a one-shot partitioning of the information in the data into two parts, typically using one part to perform model selection across all parameters while reserving the other part for estimating parameters within that model.

That work is fundamentally different from SD in both method and aims. The methods differ in that rather than considering all parameters in parallel, SD iterates sequentially, extracting




Fig 7: **Benchmarking.** Median run time, in terms of $\log_{10}(\text{seconds})$, as a function of sample size, in terms of $\log_{10}(n)$. The green notch on the y-axis marks one minute.

all of the information relevant to selecting and estimating each parameter in the model at once. Independence is then maintained by injecting (a minimal amount of) noise in just the component of the data relevant to that single parameter before moving on to the next one. And the aims differ, as SD is most naturally suited to global testing, whereas stable algorithms and data fission are, at least in their current conception, developed as variable selection methods. As SD is developed for variable selection (or data fission for global testing), ideas around available data factorizations and information masking/filtering from these varying approaches may converge. We expect that some of the lessons from stable algorithms and data fission will prove useful in the future development of SD.

Knockoff procedures such as the fixed-X knockoff filter [2] have become popular tools in variable selection, particularly in genomics. [33] described how the fixed-X knockoff filter can be rewritten as a whitening procedure that adds noise to effect size estimators $\hat{\beta}_j$ to make them independent. The greater the dependence between predictors, the more noise is required. This whitening representation makes explicit a key challenge for the fixed-X knockoff approach: noise must be introduced to decouple the $\hat{\beta}_j$ *a priori* – without any information about Y . Although model-X knockoffs inject noise into the variable selection procedure by simulating knockoff predictors rather than knockoff outcomes [7], the noise is still introduced *a priori*.

In contrast, SD introduces noise *a posteriori*, after observing relevant information from Y . Since we are assuming that the number of non-null hypotheses is small, during the filtration step we can substantially limit the information exchanged between U and U' to the most extreme observations. While this makes use of partial information from Y , to prioritise where to inject noise, the filter substantially reduces the amount of noise injected back into Y at the end of each round of distillation via \tilde{U} . As we saw in Section 4, sometimes an iteration of distillation can even return Y completely unaltered. It is this *a posteriori* approach that ultimately conserves power across iterations and the overall power of SD against sparse alternatives.

While a key downside of SD’s iterative approach is that it does not treat all hypotheses exchangeably – in regression models, predictors included in early layers will be tested against an outcome vector that is closer to the initial vector Y – the consequences of this are mitigated by the filtration step. This sequential nature of SD has another key side-effect: when there is a strong effect harboured by a cluster of tightly correlated predictors, SD will “extract” the signal from whichever predictor is in the earliest layer as a representative and use it against H_0 . In contrast, due to their mandate to control FDR, methods with FDR guarantees

tend to entirely ignore these clusters [7, 48]. This makes SD similar in spirit to sequential “data-carving” methods for variable selection, built around the LASSO, which also tend to select one representative predictor from each cluster [18, 28].

However, the two-stage nature of these data-carving methods – where part of the information in the data is used to select variables and the remaining information is used for inference – has made it difficult for them to achieve sufficient power to be useful in practice [34, 45]. Since, under this framework, the underlying distribution of Y is ever changing as more variables are selected and those selection events are conditioned on, data-carving methods may be loosely thought of as “non-stable distillation” processes. Although SD also involves two stages – distillation to obtain U^* and then inference on U^* – there is no conditioning required. As is clear in our OLS model examples above, the cost of testing multiple hypotheses is not incurred until after U^* is formed. In this sense, SD is a unified testing approach, similar to knockoffs and even the humble Bonferroni method. As first noted by [11], unified rather than two-stage inference approaches tend to enjoy more success.

While SD is also an interactive procedure, it is fundamentally different from recently-proposed iterative multiple-testing methods based on masking [15, 29, 31]. These approaches iterate at the level of p-values rather than the data Y itself. SD iteratively updates the data Y itself, requiring a factorization ψ , or more generally, a coupling based on the assumed model F_θ . See Section 5 below for an example. As described above, the intended benefit of working “closer to the data” likelihood is more parsimonious noise injection. We do not compare to the very creative masking-and-martingale-based global null testing procedure developed by Duan et al. [14] because that procedure requires p-values to be independent under the null hypothesis. However, p-values in U^* returned by SD could be used as input to that procedure.

In the next section, we take our inspiration from HDFX and consider testing multiple predictors with each iteration of SD by uniquely assigning samples to each predictor within a layer. This will lead us to partitioning predictors into layers with a view toward making the predictors within each layer follow nearly orthogonal designs. In the subsequent section, we present more general filtering techniques that can generalize to the multiple-predictors-per-layer case. Before we proceed, we note that it is possible to actively allocate samples to predictors within a layer that appear “interesting” based on putative test statistics within our SD framework, as is done in HDFX. We leave development of procedures using such an allocation scheme to a future paper.

We also defer addressing the application of SD to variable selection, identifying which $\beta_j \neq 0$, to a future paper. There are problems raised by trying to apply a standard false discovery rate (FDR) controlled procedure, such as the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure [5], to the independent vector of p-values U^* returned by SD. While we expect the set of predictors identified by this procedure to be somewhat interesting, because of the noise injected into Y throughout the SD procedure, it is not obvious how one might interpret this set. It seems clear that no straightforward claim of FDR control may be made for this procedure. This stems from the fact that, during SD, any predictor X_k that is strongly correlated with a true active predictor X_j may act as a proxy if X_k appears in an earlier layer than X_j . The more relaxed FDR framework defended in [3] for settings like genomics, where a proxy predictor may be deemed acceptable in lieu of identifying the true active predictor, may provide a way forward.

5. Distilling the logistic regression model one predictor at a time. While many inference problems can be coaxed into the form of testing a Gaussian model, this is often not possible for categorical outcomes. To illustrate the flexibility of the general EFR framework from Section 3.2, here we present an SD procedure for logistic regression. For some binary data $Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, consider testing $H_0 : \beta \equiv 0$ under the logistic regression model $Y_i \sim \text{Bern}(\text{logistic}(A_i \cdot \alpha + X_i \cdot \beta))$.

We begin by fitting the background model $Y_i \sim \text{Bern}(\text{logistic}(A_i \cdot \alpha))$, to obtain background estimates \hat{p}_i for $\mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1)$. When considering predictor j , we may consider the score test statistic

$$(9) \quad \frac{((Y - \hat{p})^\top X_{\cdot j})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_i(1 - \hat{p}_i)X_{ij}^2}.$$

After shifting and scaling, this score statistic is equivalent to $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_{ij}$, which has a Poisson binomial distribution with parameters $\hat{p} := (\hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_n)$. This is a discrete distribution, with corresponding cdf $G_{\hat{p}}$, so we cannot directly apply it to S_n to obtain a uniformly distributed p-value. We can add auxiliary randomization to fill in the gaps. Define ω to be uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and independent of all other random variables. If the possible values of S_n are $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_m$, and setting $s_0 := -\infty$, we define

$$W := \omega G_{\hat{p}}(s_i) + (1 - \omega)G_{\hat{p}}(s_{i-1}) \text{ when } S_n = s_i.$$

This is analogous to the use of randomized residuals [16]. This W has uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ when Y is a sample from the Poisson binomial distribution with parameters \hat{p} . Decomposing W to obtain a ‘‘two-sided p-value,’’ as we did for the OLS model, we have $\mathbf{1}\{W \leq 0.5\}$ and $U := 2 \min(W, 1 - W)$. After filtering we have two random variables \tilde{U} and $U^{(j)}$ that have the same uniform distribution. We set $\tilde{W} = \left(\tilde{U}/2\right)^{\mathbf{1}\{W \leq 0.5\}} \left(1 - \tilde{U}/2\right)^{1 - \mathbf{1}\{W \leq 0.5\}}$.

To complete the EFR procedure we need a coupling between the distribution π_w of (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) conditioned on $Y^\top X_{\cdot j} = r := G_{\hat{p}}^{-1}(W)$, and the distribution $\pi_{\tilde{w}}$ of (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) conditioned on $\tilde{Y}^\top X_{\cdot j} = \tilde{r} := G_{\hat{p}}^{-1}(\tilde{W})$. One way to do this is to view the partial sums $S_k := \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i X_{ij}$ as a random walk. For simplicity, here we consider a random walk starting from $i = 1$ and progressing to $i = n$. We are free to randomly order the samples along the walk; preliminary experiments suggest that starting the random walk with samples where \hat{p}_i is close to 0 or 1 improves efficiency. Define

$$(10) \quad q_k(s) := \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=k+1}^n Y_i X_{ij} = s\right).$$

Then, having observed a partial sum $S_{i-1} = s$, we may compute probabilities for the next step $Y_i = 0$ or 1 by

$$(11) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1 \mid S_{i-1} = s, S_n = r) = \frac{\hat{p}_i q_i(r - s - X_{ij})}{q_{i-1}(r - s)}.$$

For brevity, let $\kappa(s, r)$ be a function that maps to (11). Given two different values W, \tilde{W} , we then have a maximal coupling of the steps of two random walks (Y_i) and (\tilde{Y}_i) conditioned to have $(Y^\top X)_j = r$ and $(\tilde{Y}^\top X)_j = \tilde{r}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = \tilde{Y}_i = 1 \mid S_{i-1} = s, S_n = r, \tilde{S}_{i-1} = \tilde{s}, \tilde{S}_n = \tilde{r}) &= \kappa(s, r) \wedge \kappa(\tilde{s}, \tilde{r}), \\ \mathbb{P}(Y_i = \tilde{Y}_i = 0 \mid S_{i-1} = s, S_n = r, \tilde{S}_{i-1} = \tilde{s}, \tilde{S}_n = \tilde{r}) &= 1 - \kappa(s, r) \vee \kappa(\tilde{s}, \tilde{r}), \\ \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1, \tilde{Y}_i = 0 \mid S_{i-1} = s, S_n = r, \tilde{S}_{i-1} = \tilde{s}, \tilde{S}_n = \tilde{r}) &= (\kappa(s, r) - \kappa(\tilde{s}, \tilde{r}))_+, \\ \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 0, \tilde{Y}_i = 1 \mid S_{i-1} = s, S_n = r, \tilde{S}_{i-1} = \tilde{s}, \tilde{S}_n = \tilde{r}) &= (\kappa(\tilde{s}, \tilde{r}) - \kappa(s, r))_+. \end{aligned}$$

The coupling is ‘‘maximal’’ in the sense that it maximizes the probability of the same direction for each step i . It also has the convenient property that it will automatically return $Y^{(j+1)} = Y^{(j)}$, so introducing no additional noise into the data, when $r = \tilde{r}$. This happens

whenever $\tilde{U} = U$, which should be a frequent occurrence since we expect the large majority of predictors to fail the filter. Another major advantage of this approach is its computational efficiency. The probabilities at each step depend on the quantities $q_k(s)$. While these probabilities seem to require sums over exponentially many (in n) terms, in fact they may be computed rapidly by means of the Fast Fourier Transform, as explained in [6].

A weakness of this approach is that increased diversity among the entries of each $X_{\cdot j}$ can reduce statistical efficiency. While our coupling procedure is valid for any $X_{\cdot j}$, the more various the entries of $X_{\cdot j}$ become, the more $Y^\top X_{\cdot j}$ will constrain the entire sequence Y , and so, the more noise the procedure will inject into $Y^{(j+1)}$ when $\tilde{U} \neq U$. In the extreme case, where $X_{\cdot j}$ contains distinct real entries (at arbitrary precision), each possible sum will be obtainable in exactly one way, and the ‘‘coupling’’ will be singular. In other words, the ‘‘outcome data’’ $Y^{(j)}$ will rapidly degenerate to mere noise, and power will be essentially zero. This does not reflect a flaw in the coupling approach, but rather a requirement born out of the discreteness of Y and the independence properties required to produce a valid SD process.

We can avoid degeneracy and maintain statistical power in practice if most of the possible values of $Y^\top X_{\cdot j}$ are achievable via many random walk paths. We will have this redundancy among the paths when X consists of small integers. A common example includes applications where $X \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times p}$; each predictor may correspond to a different (potentially overlapping) treatment condition. Another example includes genomics applications where predictors correspond to variants, with X_{ij} representing the genotype — 0, 1, or 2 copies — for individual i at variant j . These examples suggest a more general, approximate approach: scaling and shifting each $X_{\cdot j}$ so that it may be approximated with a new predictor that takes values among small integers. This may be achieved computationally by casting each $X_{\cdot j}$ to a low-precision (eg: single-byte) representation. An alternative approach is to treat the entries X_{ij} as being themselves subject to random noise, an idea that we briefly outline in Section 3 of the Supplementary Material [9].

6. Consolidating SD iterations.

6.1. Introduction to consolidation. Extracting more information relevant to H_0 with each move of the SD Markov chain, and thereby consolidating the number of SD iterations, can improve the power of SD by reducing the amount of noise introduced over the course of the distillation process. Increasing the dimensionality of each $U^{(l)}$ has an intuitive motivation in the context of the OLS model. If X followed an orthogonal design and there were no background covariates A , then all of the $\hat{\beta}$ would be independent, all of the predictors could be tested in parallel with a single iteration of SD, and no noise from U' would be injected into the estimated $\hat{\beta}$. Here, we revisit the OLS model where we have grouped the predictors into $L \leq p$ layers. We start by showing how the bijective splitting function ψ for the OLS model we presented in Proposition 4.1 can be generalized to handle multiple predictors in parallel. We then provide a formal description of and heuristics for partitioning predictors into layers.

6.2. Distilling the OLS model with multiple predictors per layer. To distill multiple predictors per layer under the OLS model (1), we use the orthogonal design case as inspiration. By ‘‘orthogonal design,’’ we do not mean simply that the columns of X are orthogonal, but additionally that no row of X has more than one non-zero entry. The analyst can group (partition) the predictors arbitrarily, but to maximise power the predictors should be partitioned with a view toward minimising the shared variance among predictors in the same layer.

Consider first a version of the OLS model (1) with three simplifying restrictions: $\alpha = 0$, $\sigma = 1$, and the columns of X can be partitioned into layers such that the predictors within each layer follow an orthogonal design. In this special case, it would be simple to generalize

from distilling one predictor per layer to multiple predictors per layer since the estimators $\hat{\beta}_j$ within each layer would be independent. We could then “assign” each sample i to the unique predictor j such that $X_{ij} \neq 0$.

Relaxing these assumptions requires that we now formalize this notion of assigning samples to predictors using assignment vectors ξ . In the definition below we account for the general case with background covariates A by performing a separate projection for each predictor in a layer. The processes of partitioning predictors, assigning samples to predictors, and projecting predictors to account for A interact jointly with the goal of maximizing power. For this reason, we present these projections and assignment vectors conjointly with our definition of a partitioning below.

A *partitioning* $\pi_A(X)$ is a collection, one for each layer $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, of $\xi^{(l)} : [n] \rightarrow [p]$, understood as assignments of each subject to a single predictor:

$$\pi_A(X) = \left(\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)}, \dots, \xi^{(L)} \right).$$

We say that predictor j is in (or *belongs to*) layer l if j is in the image $\xi^{(l)}([n])$. We use $S_l := \{j \in [p] : j \in \xi^{(l)}([n])\}$ to denote the set of predictors in layer l and call $p_l := |S_l|$ the *size* of layer l . The set of samples assigned to predictor j (in the unique layer that predictor j belongs to) will be called G_j :

$$G_j := \left\{ i \in [n] : \xi_i^{\{\{l:j \in S_l\}\}} = j \right\}.$$

DEFINITION 6.1. $\pi_A(X)$ is a *partitioning* of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with respect to $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ under the OLS model with L layers if

1. the images $\xi^{(l)}([n])$ comprise a partition of $\{1, \dots, p\}$; that is, $\bigcup_l \xi^{(l)}([n]) = \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $\xi^{(l)}([n]) \cap \xi^{(k)}([n]) = \emptyset \forall l \neq k$;
2. $q < |G_j| \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$;
3. $\tilde{X}_j \neq 0 \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

where

$$\tilde{X}_j = \ddot{X}_{\cdot,j} / \|\ddot{X}_{\cdot,j}\| \quad \text{and} \quad \ddot{X}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \left[P_{A_{G_j}}^\perp X_{G_j,j} \right]_i & i \in G_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

This construction ensures that the implied $W_j = Y^\top \tilde{X}_j$ are non-degenerate. The more general definition of \tilde{X}_j introduced here is consistent with our prior definition of \tilde{X}_j for the case of one predictor per layer. Since samples can only be assigned to at most one predictor, \tilde{X}_{\cdot,S_l} follows an orthogonal design while ensuring $\tilde{X}_{\cdot,S_l}^\top A = 0$ for each l . This “generalized orthogonal design” guarantees the independence of the implied W_j within a layer despite the presence of background covariates.

The assumption that $P_A^\perp X_{\cdot,j} \neq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$ that we introduced with the OLS model (1) guarantees that we can always find a valid $\pi_A(X)$; for example, we could simply place one predictor in each layer and, for each layer, trivially assign every sample to the sole predictor in that layer. The tradeoff in terms of power going from this one predictor per layer partitioning to a more consolidated partitioning depends on the balance between the noise removed in the SD procedure by the consolidation and the power lost by shoeorning predictors into an orthogonal design within each layer. While it is difficult to quantify the former, the latter can be expressed in terms of the proportion of projected variance assigned to each predictor. We calculate this below in Section 6.3, and provide further practical guidance on partitioning

predictors, and demonstrate that the trade-off can strongly favour consolidation in the case where X follows an orthogonal design.

While our partitioning definition above guarantees independence among the implied W_j in the presence of background covariates, defining a valid SD procedure requires that we also account for the unknown scale σ of the W_j . A naive approach would be to studentize each W_j separately, using only the subset of samples assigned to predictor j . This would be equivalent to performing separate t tests for each predictor in the layer. It is clear, though, that this procedure would lose substantial power when a predictor is sparse, with only a handful of samples assigned to it, hence leaving very few degrees of freedom to estimate σ . We would like to share degrees of freedom for estimating σ as far as possible across predictors within a layer, while maintaining independence. To do this, we adapt the following representation of the standard i.i.d. Gaussian vector, taking our inspiration from the stick-breaking representation of the Dirichlet Process. Here we let $\mathcal{G}_n = [0, 1]^{n-1} \times \{-1, 0, 1\}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

LEMMA 6.2. *For an n -dimensional random vector W let $\omega := \|W\|_2^2$ and $B_j := W_j^2 / \sum_{i=j}^n W_i^2$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let $\mu_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_n$ be the bijective map*

$$(12) \quad \mu_n(W) = (B_1, \dots, B_{n-1}, \text{sgn}(W_1), \dots, \text{sgn}(W_n), \omega) = (B, \text{sgn}(W), \omega).$$

If $W \sim N(0, I)$, then all elements of $\mu_n(W)$ are mutually independent where $\text{sgn}(W_j) \sim$ Rademacher, $B_j \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-j}{2}\right)$, and $\omega \sim \chi_n^2$.

From this lemma, we quickly arrive at a bijective factorization that we can use for distillation under the OLS model, once we have specified a permutation that prioritizes predictors within the layer $\lambda_l : \mathcal{S}_{p_l} \rightarrow [p]^{p_l}$.¹ Recall that $F_{a,b}$ is the CDF of the Beta distribution with shape parameters (a, b) and mean $\frac{a}{a+b}$. Note $1 - F_{a,b} = F_{b,a}$.

PROPOSITION 6.3. *Let $\lambda_l : \mathcal{S}_{p_l} \rightarrow [p]^{p_l}$. Let orthonormal matrices $\tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_l}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-p_l-q)}$ form an orthonormal basis $[\tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}, V]$ for $H = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n : A^\top v = 0\}$. Let $\eta : \mathcal{G}_{n-q} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{n-q}$ where $[\eta(x)]_j = F_{\frac{n-j}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}(x)$ for $j < n$ and x_j otherwise. Define $\psi^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathcal{G}_{n-q}$ by*

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi^*(Y) &= \left(P_A Y, \eta \circ \mu_{n-q} \left(\left[\tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}, V \right]^\top Y \right) \right) \\ &= (P_A Y, \eta \circ \mu_{n-q}(W)) \\ &= (P_A Y, U_1, \dots, U_{n-1}, \text{sgn}(W_1), \dots, \text{sgn}(W_n), \omega) \\ &= (P_A Y, U, \text{sgn}(W), \omega). \end{aligned}$$

If $Y \sim N(A\alpha, \sigma I_n)$, then all elements of $\psi^(Y)$ are mutually independent where $U_j \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$, $\text{sgn}(W_j) \sim \text{Rademacher}$, and $\omega/\sigma \sim \chi_n^2$.*

¹To connect these beta statistics to the more classic T statistic from (3), note that B_1 is a simple monotonic transformation of T_1^2 : $B_1 = \frac{(n-q-1)T_{\lambda_l(1)}^2}{1+(n-q-1)T_{\lambda_l(1)}^2}$. Effectively $n-q-1$ degrees of freedom are used to estimate the unknown σ when estimating $\beta_{\lambda_l(1)}$. However, only $n-q-p_l$ degrees of freedom are used to estimate σ when estimating $\beta_{\lambda_l(p_l)}$. While this inhomogeneity may appear problematic at first, note that only $n-q-p_l$ degrees of freedom are used to estimate σ in standard ANOVA. The difference in power across predictors within a layer is negligible as long as no layer has too many predictors. For this reason and general power considerations, as a general rule of thumb, we recommend selecting a partitioning $\rho_A(X)$ where $n-q-\max_l p_l \geq 50$.

Applying this factorization ψ^* in practice does not require explicit construction of V . Let $\nu = \omega - \sum_{k=1}^{p_l} W_{\lambda_l(k)}^2$. Under H_g , $\nu/\sigma \sim \chi_{n-q-p_l}^2$ and is independent of the W_j for $j = 1, \dots, p_l$. It is sufficient to calculate these W_j and summarize ω and the remaining W_{p_l+1}, \dots, W_n via ν .

To invert this procedure given \tilde{U} , we simply use the corresponding beta quantile functions to obtain $\tilde{B}_1, \dots, \tilde{B}_j$ and set $\tilde{W}_j^2 = \omega \tilde{B}_j \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 - \tilde{B}_i)$. From here, we calculate $\tilde{\nu} = \omega - \sum_{j=1}^{p_l} \tilde{W}_j^2$. Then we update Y with what is only a slight extension of (4):

$$(14) \quad \tilde{Y} = P_A Y + \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\nu}}{\nu}} \left(P_A^\perp Y - \tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}^\top W \right) + \tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}^\top \tilde{W}.$$

As above, this procedure maintains $\tilde{Y}^\top \tilde{Y} = \omega$.

While $\tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_l}$, it has at most n non-zero elements. Hence, after partitioning and performing the p_l QR decompositions (each scaling as $\mathcal{O}(|G_j|q^2)$ where G_j is the set of samples assigned to predictor j) to obtain $\tilde{X}_{\cdot, \lambda_l}^\top$, the storage requirements for this procedure scale at worst as $\mathcal{O}(n)$ and the number of FLOPs required scales as $\mathcal{O}(np_l)$. After partitioning, that gives us a combined worst-case of $\mathcal{O}(npq^2)$ FLOPs required.

6.3. Partitioning. While our distillation procedure is valid for any partitioning $\pi_A(X)$, we aim to select a $\pi_A(X)$ that maximizes power to reject H_g when distillation is iterated over the layers. This involves a trade-off in minimizing the influence of two opposing sources of noise.

On one side, we have the familiar noise that the statistician cannot control: the noise inherent to the data generating process that is endogenous to the observed data. Minimizing the impact of this noise involves extracting as much information relevant to H_0 in each layer as possible. In the notation of Definition 6.1, for the OLS model, this means assigning as many samples as possible to each predictor so that $\|\ddot{X}_{ij}\|_2$ is not much smaller than $\|P_A^\perp X_j\|_2$. In other words, we maximize the effective sample size for performing inference about each β_j . If we were concerned only to reduce this source of noise, we would run SD with the trivial partitioning of one predictor per layer.

On the other side we have the exogenous noise that we inject into our inference during the SD process. Minimizing the impact of this noise involves extracting the information most relevant to H_0 in early layers and minimizing the total number of layers, L . For the OLS model, this translates to a) prioritising predictors that are suspected of having non-negligible effects in one of the early layers and b) packing the predictors into as few layers as possible. Overall, this helps to ensure that each β_j is estimated with a $Y^{(l)}$ that is as similar to the initially observed $Y^{(0)}$ as possible. Were we concerned only to reduce this source of noise, we would pack all of the predictors into a single layer, assigning relatively few, or sometimes even no, samples to some predictors.

We can calibrate the trade-off between minimizing endogenous and exogenous noise in our choice of $\pi_A(X)$. Whenever possible, a practitioner should start by examining the structure of X to see if there are any sets of orthogonal columns or other patterns that could make it straightforward to construct layers such that the predictors within each layer are nearly orthogonal. However, in the absence of any obvious patterns, we need an automated procedure for selecting $\pi_A(X)$ for the OLS model, assuming the use of a quantile filter at each iteration. Our overall strategy may be applied to other models, and aims simply to minimize exogenous noise subject to an upper bound on increasing the endogenous noise.

In order to measure the impact of endogenous noise, note that the power of SD to accumulate evidence against H_0 when using a quantile filter with threshold t is dependent on $\mathbb{P}(U_j < t)$

for all $j : \beta_j \neq 0$. For the OLS model, this probability varies as a function of the true underlying β_j and the $\pi_A(X)$. To more easily demonstrate the influence of $\pi_A(X)$ on $\mathbb{P}(U_j < t)$, let us momentarily suppose that we have placed all of our predictors in a single layer and that there is only one active predictor j ; that is, one predictor such that $\beta_j \neq 0$. This allows us to drop the subscript j and write Y in terms of a single column X corresponding to the active predictor. In this simplified case, applying the projection P_A^\perp to both sides of **1**, we have

$$(15) \quad P_A^\perp Y = \beta \|P_A^\perp X\| \frac{P_A^\perp X}{\|P_A^\perp X\|} + P_A^\perp \epsilon.$$

Now consider setting a $\pi_A(X)$ that assigns all samples to the active predictor and ignores all of the other predictors. This would maximize the effective sample size for and minimize the endogenous noise involved in estimating β . After renormalizing the predictor $P_A^\perp X$ as above, we would be targeting an implied effect size $\beta_{[n]} := \beta \|P_A^\perp X\|$. Define the function f_t by

$$(16) \quad f_t(\beta) := \mathbb{P}\left((Z + \beta)^2 > F_{\chi_1^2}^{-1}(1 - t)\right) \quad \text{where } Z \sim N(0, 1)$$

so that $\mathbb{P}(U < t) = f_t(\beta_{[n]})$. If under $\pi_A(X)$, only the subset ξ of samples are assigned to predictor X , we have

$$(17) \quad P_{A_\xi}^\perp Y_\xi = \beta \|P_{A_\xi}^\perp X_\xi\| \frac{P_{A_\xi}^\perp X_\xi}{\|P_{A_\xi}^\perp X_\xi\|} + P_{A_\xi}^\perp \epsilon_\xi$$

with an implied effect size $\beta_\xi = \beta \|P_{A_\xi}^\perp X_\xi\|$. So if we have a true effect β that yields some initial detection probability $p_0 = f_t(\beta_{[n]})$, we can guarantee a lower bound on the detection probability, p_1 , after assigning a subset of samples $\xi \subseteq [n]$ to a given predictor by requiring

$$(18) \quad \frac{\|P_{A_\xi}^\perp X_\xi\|}{\|P_A^\perp X\|} \geq \frac{f_t^{-1}(p_1)}{f_t^{-1}(p_0)}.$$

Returning to the general context where we have a partitioning with multiple predictors and multiple predictors may have non-zero effects, in the notation of Definition 6.1, this amounts to enforcing a lower bound on $\|\ddot{X}_{ij}\|/\|P_A^\perp X_j\|$ while building $\rho_A(X)$. Such constraints can be enforced via various greedy or integer programming procedures while seeking to minimize the total number of layers. We leave further development of these procedures to future work.

7. Filtering. In this section, we provide a more general treatment of filtration that will allow us to devise filters beyond the simple quantile filter presented in Algorithm 1 in Section 3. For example, we will show how this quantile filter can be generalized to cases where we have multiple predictors in each distillation layer, as proposed in Section 6.

At a high level, during filtration, we exchange information between some U and some simulated U' . The choice of which information to exchange will be structured so as to maximise the power to detect sparse signals, while minimising the distortion of Y . Here we will assume that we have selected an SD procedure such that both U and U' are p -vectors of independent uniform random variables. Let $r : \{1, \dots, p\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, p\}$ be the ordering permutation of U , so that $U_{r(1)} \leq U_{r(2)} \leq \dots \leq U_{r(p)}$. Let $T = (U_{r(1)}, U_{r(2)}, \dots, U_{r(p)})$ be the order statistic of U , and let T' be the order statistic of p simulated independent standard uniform random variables, U' .

Let $\varphi : [0, 1]^p \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Q} \times \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}_i$ be an invertible *filtration function* where \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{Q} , and $\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_m$ are arbitrary state spaces. We require that φ be chosen such that $(P, Q, R_1, \dots, R_m) = \varphi(Z)$ are mutually independent when Z is the order statistic of p independent standard uniform random variables. Let $(P, Q, R_1, \dots, R_m) = \varphi(T)$ and $(P', Q', R'_1, \dots, R'_m) = \varphi(T')$. Filtration proceeds according to these simple rules: P and P' are never exchanged; Q and Q' are always exchanged; whether components R_i and R'_i are exchanged is determined by Q . That is, we create two new versions of the data \tilde{T} and T , mixing $\varphi(T)$ and $\varphi(T')$:

$$(19) \quad \tilde{T} = \varphi^{-1} \left(P, Q', \tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_m \right),$$

$$(20) \quad T = \varphi^{-1} \left(P', Q, R_1^*, \dots, R_m^* \right),$$

where

$$(21) \quad (R_i^*, \tilde{R}_i) := \begin{cases} (R_i, R'_i) & \text{if } \mathcal{S}(Q)_i = 1 \\ (R'_i, R_i) & \text{if } \mathcal{S}(Q)_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

for an arbitrary *selection function* $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$.

We set $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{T}_{r^{-1}(1)}, \tilde{T}_{r^{-1}(2)}, \dots, \tilde{T}_{r^{-1}(p)})$ and $U^{(l)} = (T_{r^{-1}(1)}, T_{r^{-1}(2)}, \dots, T_{r^{-1}(p)})$. Given mutual independence among the components (P, Q, R_1, \dots, R_m) guaranteed by φ , this swapping procedure ensures that $\tilde{U} \perp\!\!\!\perp U^{(l)}$. From here $U^{(l)}$ is either tested directly or combined across distillation iterations. Note that φ and \mathcal{S} can vary between SD iterations.

A simple example of φ involves exchanging all components of U below a specified quantile cutoff t . For the l^{th} layer with p_l predictors, let T be the order statistic of $U^{(l)}$ so that $T_1 \leq T_2 \leq \dots \leq T_{p_l}$. As above in Algorithm 1, let $g_t(x) = (x - t)/(1 - t)$. Recall our definition of ρ from Section 1.

DEFINITION 7.1. Quantile Filter

Given target quantile cutoff $t \in (0, 1)$, a quantile filter uses filtration function $\varphi_t(T) = (Q, R)$ where

$$(22) \quad Q = \#\{j \in [p_l] : T_j \leq t\}$$

$$(23) \quad R = (\rho(T_1/t, \dots, T_Q/t), \rho(g_t(T_{Q+1}), \dots, g_t(T_{p_l})))$$

and selection function $\mathcal{S}(Q)_i = \mathbf{1}\{i \leq Q\}$.

This quantile filter is a generalization of Algorithm 1 and allows us to apply quantile filtering to distillation procedures where there are multiple predictors included in each layer. Using our more general filtering framework, we introduce another class of filters based on exchanging the smallest k order statistics in Section 4 of the Supplementary Material [9].

8. Application to US election fundraising data. In every US election the personality and campaign style of each candidate (and the opposing candidate) may influence enthusiasm for that candidate among base party supporters. Here, we use SD to test whether the occupation of a voter predicts the relative enthusiasm for a particular Senate candidate among base party supporters, as measured by changes in the amount of money they contribute to the candidate's campaign.

Five key swing states held US Senate races in 2018 and 2022: Arizona (AZ), Nevada (NV), Ohio (OH), Pennsylvania (PA), and Wisconsin (WI). Both major political parties, the

State	Party	n	p	2018 Candidate	2018 Avg \$	2022 Candidate	2022 Avg \$
AZ	DEM	1385	54	SINEMA (W)	1083	KELLY (W)	1349
AZ	REP	360	38	MCSALLY (L)	1374	MASTERS (L)	1452
NV	DEM	641	53	ROSEN (W)	1229	CORTEZ MASTO (W)	1402
NV	REP	285	44	HELLER (L)	2024	LAXALT (L)	2066
OH	DEM	3104	80	BROWN (W)	1599	RYAN (L)	955
OH	REP	291	37	RENACCI (L)	1193	VANCE (W)	1481
PA	DEM	1947	73	CASEY (W)	1841	FETTERMAN (W)	924
PA	REP	358	50	BARLETTA (L)	1418	OZ (L)	1667
WI	DEM	1963	68	BALDWIN (W)	1314	BARNES (L)	894
WI	REP	937	62	VUKMIR (L)	1282	JOHNSON (W)	1915

TABLE 1

Base Donors in 2018 & 2022 Swing Senate Races.

n = # of base donors in a given party and state p = # of unique occupations found among those donors. Candidates are listed by their last name. A (W) indicates that the candidate won; a (L), lost. The average donation given to each candidate (Avg \$) is also listed.

Democrats and Republicans, fielded candidates in these races (see Table 1). In accordance with US federal law, individual donations made to campaign committees affiliated with a particular candidate are recorded by the Federal Election Commission (FEC). The FEC records the donation amount, the name of the donor, the donor’s home address, and the donor’s occupation. Using the FEC API (api.open.fec.gov), we retrieved the records of donations made to each of the Senate candidates in Table 1 during the relevant election cycle (2018 or 2022). Using their names and addresses, we matched donors who made donations to the same party in both election cycles (2018 and 2022) to the Senate race in their home state. See Section 5 of the Supplementary Material for details [9]. We refer to these repeat Senate race donors as “base” donors.

In these data, the number of Democratic Party base donors is consistently larger than the number of Republican Party base donors in a given state. In Table 1 n denotes the number of base donors for each state-party pairing. As an example, we display a heat map of the number of base donors per postal code in Pennsylvania for each party in Section 5 of the Supplementary Material [9].

For each base donor, we divided the sum of donations they made to their party’s candidate in 2022 by the sum of donations they made to their party’s candidate in 2018. Taking the logarithm of that ratio and rank normalizing the result, we obtained a standard Gaussian-distributed measure of enthusiasm for 2022 candidates relative to enthusiasm for 2018 candidates among base donors. We used the postal code of each base donor to estimate their local population density (2020 US Census) and socioeconomic status (using the Neighborhood Atlas Area Deprivation Index)[25, 40]. Using the natural language processing tools available in the R package `labourR`, we mapped the occupation listed for each donation to a Level 3 ISCO occupation category [27]. Since the occupation listed by a donor may change between or during election cycles, we assigned a weighted vector of occupations to each donor proportional to the number of times they listed each occupation. Averaging these vectors across election cycles, we obtained a right stochastic matrix, with each row representing a weighted assignment of a given donor to the occupations (columns). Any columns/occupations not represented in a given state-party pairing were dropped, yielding a final design matrix X for each state-party pairing. p in Table 1 indicates the number of unique occupations found among donors for each state-party pairing (the number of columns in the corresponding X).

Using the above data, for each state-party pairing, we constructed an OLS model of change in enthusiasm (log-ratio of total donations) among base donors. Intercept, population density, and ADI were included in A as background covariates. For each state-party model, we tested

State	Party	ANOVA	CAUCHY	MINP	SD
AZ	DEM	0.0697	0.0003	0.0003	0.0011
AZ	REP	0.7409	0.5836	1.0000	1.0000
NV	DEM	0.0977	0.9273	0.4408	1.0000
NV	REP	0.6221	0.3614	0.3902	1.0000
OH	DEM	0.0011	0.0044	0.0051	0.0016
OH	REP	0.2526	0.0672	0.1119	0.4478
PA	DEM	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
PA	REP	0.7282	0.2881	0.7259	1.0000
WI	DEM	0.1478	0.4801	0.2014	0.8055
WI	REP	0.0643	0.1601	0.1935	0.7739

TABLE 2

P-values against the null hypothesis: that occupation does not affect changes in base donor support (adjusting for population density and ADI). All p-values < 0.01 are reported in bold.

whether occupation, encoded in the corresponding matrix X , was associated with the change in donation amount from 2018 to 2022. As in our simulations in Section 4.4, we compare ANOVA, CAUCHY, MINP, and filtered SD to test $H_g: \beta = 0$. Since we expect a relatively small number of occupations to have a non-negligible impact in this application, for the version of filtered SD applied here, we modify (8) and take

$$(24) \quad 4 \min \left(U^\dagger, \zeta_{t_2} (U_{t_2}^*), \zeta_{t_4} (U_{t_4}^*), \zeta_{t_8} (U_{t_8}^*) \right)$$

as our global test statistic. As in Section 4.4, we distill one predictor at a time in the filtered SD implementation used here. The p-values obtained are reported in Table 2.

Overall, we see broad agreement among the CAUCHY, MINP, and SD methods, with all three reporting a significant impact of occupation on relative enthusiasm among Democratic base donors in the Arizona, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. While these signals are sufficiently strong in Ohio and Pennsylvania so that they are captured even by ANOVA, ANOVA does not detect the strong signal for Arizona Democrats seen with the other methods. In Section 5 of the Supplementary Material, we provide a table that lists the three marginally most significant occupations that appear to be driving these results [9]. In Arizona and Pennsylvania, we see a significant boost in enthusiasm among retired/unemployed base donors and a significant reduction in enthusiasm among legal professionals for 2022 Democratic candidates compared to 2018 Democratic candidates.

Funding. This first and second authors were supported in part by NIH Grant UM1 HG008853/HG/NHGRI NIH HHS/United States. The third author was supported in part by BBSRC grant number BB/S001824/1.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Proofs, Figures & Text

The Appendix below contains four sections. Section 1 provides proofs for all of the results stated in the paper. Section 2 provides the power curves underlying Figure 5 and Figure 6. Section 3 provides a description of smallest-k filters. Section 4 provides additional figures and tables related to the real data (FEC) analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] ARIAS-CASTRO, E., CANDÈS, E. J. and PLAN, Y. (2011). Global testing under sparse alternatives: ANOVA, multiple comparisons and the higher criticism. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 2533–2556.

- [2] BARBER, R. F. and CANDÈS, E. J. (2015). Controlling the false discovery rate via knockoffs. *The Annals of Statistics* **43** 2055–2085.
- [3] BARBER, R. F. and CANDÈS, E. J. (2019). A knockoff filter for high-dimensional selective inference. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 2504–2537.
- [4] BARNETT, I., MUKHERJEE, R. and LIN, X. (2017). The generalized higher criticism for testing SNP-set effects in genetic association studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** 64–76.
- [5] BENJAMINI, Y. and HOCHBERG, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: series B (Methodological)* **57** 289–300.
- [6] BISCARRI, W., ZHAO, S. D. and BRUNNER, R. J. (2018). A simple and fast method for computing the Poisson binomial distribution function. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **122** 92–100.
- [7] CANDÈS, E., FAN, Y., JANSON, L. and LV, J. (2018). Panning for gold: ‘model-X’ knockoffs for high dimensional controlled variable selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **80** 551–577.
- [8] CHEN, S. X., LI, J. and ZHONG, P.-S. (2019). Two-sample and ANOVA tests for high dimensional means. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 1443–1474.
- [9] CHRIST, R., HALL, I. and STEINSALTZ, D. Supplement to “Stable Distillation and High-Dimensional Hypothesis Testing.”.
- [10] CHRIST, R., HALL, I. and STEINSALTZ, D. (2022). Rényi Distillation for Global Testing in Sparse Regression Problems (arxiv.org/abs/2212.12539v1).
- [11] COX, D. R. (1975). A note on data-splitting for the evaluation of significance levels. *Biometrika* **62** 441–444. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/62.2.441>
- [12] COX, D. R. and KARTSONAKI, C. (2019). On the Analysis of Large Numbers of p-values. *International Statistical Review* **87** 505–513.
- [13] DONOHO, D. and JIN, J. (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 962–994.
- [14] DUAN, B., RAMDAS, A., BALAKRISHNAN, S. and WASSERMAN, L. (2020). Interactive martingale tests for the global null. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **14**.
- [15] DUAN, B., RAMDAS, A. and WASSERMAN, L. (2020). Familywise error rate control by interactive unmasking. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 2720–2729. PMLR.
- [16] DUNN, P. K. and SMYTH, G. K. (1996). Randomized quantile residuals. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **5** 236–244.
- [17] DURRETT, R. (2010). *Probability: Theory and examples*, fourth ed. *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. [MR2722836 \(2011e:60001\)](https://doi.org/10.1017/C9780521866223)
- [18] FITHIAN, W., SUN, D. and TAYLOR, J. (2014). Optimal inference after model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.2597*.
- [19] GOEMAN, J. J., VAN DE GEER, S. A. and VAN HOUWELINGEN, H. C. (2006). Testing against a high dimensional alternative. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **68** 477–493.
- [20] GUO, B. and CHEN, S. X. (2016). Tests for high dimensional generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **78** 1079–1102.
- [21] HALL, P. and JIN, J. (2010). Innovated higher criticism for detecting sparse signals in correlated noise. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 1686–1732.
- [22] HE, Y., XU, G., WU, C. and PAN, W. (2021). Asymptotically independent U-statistics in high-dimensional testing. *Annals of statistics* **49** 154.
- [23] HOCHBERG, Y. (1988). A sharper Bonferroni procedure for multiple tests of significance. *Biometrika* **75** 800–802.
- [24] KATHIRESAN, N., CHO, S. M. J., BHATTACHARYA, R., TRUONG, B., HORNSBY, W. and NATARAJAN, P. (2022). Representation of Race and Ethnicity in a Contemporary US Health Cohort: The All of Us Research Program. *medRxiv*.
- [25] KIND, A. J. H. and BUCKINGHAM, W. R. (2018). Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible — The Neighborhood Atlas. *New England Journal of Medicine* **378** 2456–2458. PMID: 29949490. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1802313>
- [26] KOLLER, D. and FRIEDMAN, N. (2009). *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press.
- [27] KOURETSIS, A., BAMPOURIS, A., MORFIRIS, P. and PAPAGEORGIOU, K. (2020). labourR: Classify Multilingual Labour Market Free-Text to Standardized Hierarchical Occupations R package version 1.0.0.
- [28] LEE, J. D., SUN, D. L., SUN, Y. and TAYLOR, J. E. (2016). Exact post-selection inference, with application to the LASSO. *The Annals of Statistics* **44** 907–927.

- [29] LEI, L. and FITHIAN, W. (2018). AdaPT: an interactive procedure for multiple testing with side information. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **80** 649–679.
- [30] LEI, L., RAMDAS, A. and FITHIAN, W. (2017). STAR: A general interactive framework for FDR control under structural constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.02776*.
- [31] LEI, L., RAMDAS, A. and FITHIAN, W. (2020). A general interactive framework for false discovery rate control under structural constraints. *Biometrika* **108** 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asaa064>
- [32] LEINER, J., DUAN, B., WASSERMAN, L. and RAMDAS, A. (2023). Data fission: splitting a single data point. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1–12.
- [33] LI, X. and FITHIAN, W. (2021). Whiteout: when do fixed-X knockoffs fail? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06388*.
- [34] LIU, K., MARKOVIC, J. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2018). More powerful post-selection inference, with application to the LASSO. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09037*.
- [35] LIU, Y. and XIE, J. (2020). Cauchy combination test: a powerful test with analytic p-value calculation under arbitrary dependency structures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115** 393–402.
- [36] LOCKHART, R., TAYLOR, J., TIBSHIRANI, R. J. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2014). A significance test for the LASSO. *Annals of statistics* **42** 413.
- [37] LUKACS, E. (1955). A Characterization of the Gamma Distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **26** 319 – 324. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728549>
- [38] LUMLEY, T., BRODY, J., PELOSO, G., MORRISON, A. and RICE, K. (2018). FastSKAT: Sequence kernel association tests for very large sets of markers. *Genetic epidemiology* **42** 516–527.
- [39] MICHELINI, E., CEVENINI, L., MEZZANOTTE, L., COPPA, A. and RODA, A. (2010). Cell-based assays: fuelling drug discovery. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry* **398** 227–238.
- [40] OF WISCONSIN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, U. and HEALTH, P. (2022). Area Deprivation Index, 2020 Version.
- [41] RAMACHANDRAN, D. (1979). Existence of independent complements in regular conditional probability spaces. *The Annals of Probability* **7** 433–443.
- [42] RÉNYI, A. (1953). On the theory of order statistics. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung* **4**.
- [43] SIMES, R. J. (1986). An improved Bonferroni procedure for multiple tests of significance. *Biometrika* **73** 751–754.
- [44] SU, F.-C., GOUTMAN, S. A., CHERNYAK, S., MUKHERJEE, B., CALLAGHAN, B. C., BATTERMAN, S. and FELDMAN, E. L. (2016). Association of environmental toxins with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *JAMA neurology* **73** 803–811.
- [45] TIAN, X., LOFTUS, J. R. and TAYLOR, J. E. (2018). Selective inference with unknown variance via the square-root LASSO. *Biometrika* **105** 755–768.
- [46] TUKEY, J. W. (1976). T13 N: The higher criticism. *Course Notes, Statistics* 411.
- [47] VOVK, V. and WANG, R. (2020). Combining p-values via averaging. *Biometrika* **107** 791–808.
- [48] WANG, G., SARKAR, A., CARBONETTO, P. and STEPHENS, M. (2020). A simple new approach to variable selection in regression, with application to genetic fine-mapping. *BioRxiv* 501114.
- [49] ZHANG, H., JIN, J. and WU, Z. (2020). Distributions and power of optimal signal-detection statistics in finite case. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **68** 1021–1033.
- [50] ZHANG, H. and WU, Z. (2022). The general goodness-of-fit tests for correlated data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **167** 107379.
- [51] ZRNIC, T. and JORDAN, M. I. (2023). Post-selection inference via algorithmic stability. *The Annals of Statistics* **51** 1666–1691.

APPENDIX A: PROOFS

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.2.

Statement of Lemma: If $(Y^{(l)}, U^{(l)})_{l=1}^L$ is a SD process, then $U^{(1)}, U^{(2)}, \dots, U^{(L)}$ are mutually independent.

Proof: We show by induction that the collection of random variables $(U^{(l)})_{l=k}^L$ are mutually independent for each $k \in [L]$. The statement is trivial for our base case $k = L$. Assume it is true for a given $k > 1$ (Fact A). Consider the $k - 1$ case. Since a SD process is a HMM by definition, the family $(U^{(l)})_{l=k}^L$ is d-separated from $U^{(k-1)}$ by $Y^{(k)}$, hence the family $(U^{(l)})_{l=k}^L$ is independent of $U^{(k-1)}$ conditioned on $Y^{(k)}$ (Fact B) by Theorem 3.3 of [26]. Also by the definition of a SD process, $U^{(k-1)} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y^{(k)}$ (Fact C). Let $f_{k-1}, f_k, f_{k+1}, \dots, f_L : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable bounded functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=k-1}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \prod_{j=k}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \middle| Y^{(k)} \right] \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \middle| Y^{(k)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=k}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \middle| Y^{(k)} \right] \right] \quad \text{by Fact B} \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=k}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \middle| Y^{(k)} \right] \right] \quad \text{by Fact C} \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=k}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \middle| Y^{(k)} \right] \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=k}^L f_j(U^{(j)}) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_{k-1}(U^{(k-1)}) \right] \prod_{j=k}^L \mathbb{E} \left[f_j(U^{(j)}) \right] \quad \text{by Fact A.}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\{U^{(k-1)}, \dots, U^{(L)}\}$ are mutually independent, completing the induction. \square

A.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Statement of Theorem: The EFR-SD procedure satisfies the conditions for generating a stable distillation if the following hold:

- The two components $\psi(Y) = (V, U)$ are independent;
- U and \tilde{U} have the same distribution;
- The two components \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ are independent.

Proof: The assumption of independent noise implies the necessary conditional independence for $Y^{(l)} \mapsto (U^{(l)}, Y^{(l+1)})$ to continue the HMM.

\tilde{U} is a deterministic function of U , U' , and ω , which are jointly independent of V , hence \tilde{U} is independent of V . By the first two conditions of the lemma then $(V, \tilde{U}) \stackrel{d}{=} (V, U)$, hence $Y^{(l+1)} = \psi^{-1}(V, \tilde{U}) \stackrel{d}{=} \psi^{-1}(V, U) = Y^{(l)}$.

Finally, V is independent of the pair $(\tilde{U}, U^{(l)})$, implying by the last condition that all three variables are mutually independent, so that $U^{(l)}$ is independent of (V, \tilde{U}) . Hence $U^{(l)} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y^{(l+1)}$. \square

A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.2.

Statement of Theorem: The general EFR-SD procedure satisfies the conditions for generating a stable distillation if the following hold:

- The joint distribution $\pi_{u, \tilde{u}}(dy, d\tilde{y})$ has marginal distributions $\pi_u(dy)$ and $\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y})$ for every choice of u and \tilde{u} ;
- The joint distribution $\mathfrak{f}(du, d\tilde{u}, du^{(l)})$ has marginal distribution q in each component, and makes \tilde{U} and $U^{(l)}$ independent.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{F}_l^<$ be the σ -algebra generated by $(Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(l)})$, \mathcal{F}_l the σ -algebra generated by $Y^{(l)}$, and let U be the random variable $U(Y^{(l)})$. Then by construction $U^{(l)}$ has distribution conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l^<$ given by \mathfrak{f}'_U , which is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_l , hence $U^{(l)} \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(l-1)})$ conditioned on $Y^{(l)}$. Similarly, $Y^{(l+1)}$ has distribution conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l^<$ given by $\mathfrak{f}_U(d\tilde{u})\pi_{\tilde{u}, Y^{(l)}}(dy^{(l+1)})$, which is also measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_l , hence also $Y^{(l+1)} \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(l-1)})$ conditioned on $Y^{(l)}$. This proves by induction the HMM property.

Now let $f : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded measurable test functions. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(U^{(l)})g(Y^{(l+1)})] &= \int f(u^{(l)})g(\tilde{y})\mathfrak{f}(du, d\tilde{u}, du^{(l)})\pi_{u, \tilde{u}}(dy, d\tilde{y}) \\ &= \int f(u^{(l)})g(\tilde{y})\mathfrak{f}(du, d\tilde{u}, du^{(l)})\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y}), \end{aligned}$$

after carrying out the integration in y , as the coupling $\pi_{u, \tilde{u}}(dy, d\tilde{y})$ has the same marginal $\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y})$ for each u . As u now no longer appears in the integrand we may integrate over u , reducing the joint distribution to the paired marginal of $(\tilde{u}, u^{(l)})$, which is $q(d\tilde{u})q(du^{(l)})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(U^{(l)})g(Y^{(l+1)})] &= \int f(u^{(l)})g(\tilde{y})q(d\tilde{u})q(du^{(l)})\pi_{\tilde{u}}(d\tilde{y}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(U^{(l)})] \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(Y^{(l+1)})], \end{aligned}$$

showing that $U^{(l)}$ and $Y^{(l+1)}$ are independent. \square

A.4. Proof of Proposition 4.1.

Statement of Lemma: The map $\psi_j : \mathfrak{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q \times (0, 1] \times \{-1, 0, +1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathfrak{S}$ given by $\psi_j : Y \mapsto \left(P_A Y, U_j, \text{sgn}(T_j), \omega, P_{AX_j}^\perp Y / \left\| P_{AX_j}^\perp Y \right\|_2 \right)$ is invertible. When $Y \sim N(A\alpha, \sigma I_n)$, the five components of $\psi_j(Y)$ are mutually independent.

Proof: It is sufficient to show that ψ_j is the composition of bijective functions. The mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-q-1}$ given by $y \mapsto (P_A y, P_{\tilde{X}_j} y, P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top y)$ is bijective by the Rank-Nullity theorem, since it projects \mathbb{R}^n onto disjoint subsets whose total dimension is n . Restricted to \mathfrak{N} , f is a bijective map onto $\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R} \times \{\mathbb{R}^{n-q-1} \setminus \{0\}\}$.

The map $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-q-1} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathfrak{S}$ given by $x \mapsto \left(\|x\|_2^2, \frac{x}{\|x\|_2} \right)$ is bijective. Composing g and f , where we apply g to the last component of $f(Y)$, we have a map $Y \mapsto (P_A Y, P_{\tilde{X}_j} Y, \nu, P_{A\tilde{X}_j}^\perp Y / \|P_{A\tilde{X}_j}^\perp Y\|_2)$. Note, in our notation introduced in the main text, $W_j = P_{\tilde{X}_j} Y$ and $\omega = \nu + W_j^2$.

We now define the bijective map $h : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow (0, 1] \times \{-1, 0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$h(x_1, x_2) = \left(\frac{x_1^2}{x_1^2 + x_2}, \text{sgn}(x_1), x_1 + x_2 \right).$$

This gives us $h(W_j, \nu) = (B, \text{sgn}(W_j), \omega)$ where $B = W_j^2 / \omega$. Note that $\text{sgn}(W_j) = \text{sgn}(T_j)$. Observing that $T_j^2 = (n - q - 1) \frac{B}{1 - B}$ is invertible and U_j is an invertible function of T_j^2 proves that ψ_j is invertible.

We now consider the distribution of $\psi_j(Y)$ when $Y \sim A\alpha + \sigma Z$, where $Z \sim N(0, I_n)$. Since orthogonal projections of Z are independent and

$$\left(P_A Y, P_{\tilde{X}_j} Y, P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y \right) \sim \left(A\alpha + P_A Z, P_{\tilde{X}_j} Z, P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Z \right)$$

we have that $(P_A Y, P_{\tilde{X}_j} Y, P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y)$ are mutually independent. Since $P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y$ is a standard multivariate normal in the null space of (A, \tilde{X}_j) , it is spherically symmetric. Hence, we have independence between length, $\nu = \|P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y\|_2^2$, and direction, $P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y / \|P_{A, \tilde{X}_j}^\top Y\|_2$. It follows that the components of $g \circ f$ are independent. We now apply the function h , to the second component, which we denote by W_j . Since $W_j \sim N(0, 1)$, $\text{sgn}(W_j)$ is independent of W_j^2 , so $\text{sgn}(W_j)$ is independent of B and ω . Since $B \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-q-1}{2}\right)$, we have $B \perp\!\!\!\perp \omega$ from Lukacs's Proportion-Sum Independence Theorem [37].

This establishes that the map from Y to

$$(P_A Y, B, \text{sgn}(T_j), \omega, P_{A\tilde{X}_j}^\perp Y / \|P_{A\tilde{X}_j}^\perp Y\|_2)$$

has independent components. The final mapping acts only on the component B , thus preserves independence. \square

A.5. Proof of Proposition 4.3.

Statement of Proposition: Consider distilling an OLS model where $\sigma = 1$. Let $p_f(\alpha)$ denote the power of a filtered SD procedure with threshold $t = \alpha/p$ for a desired test size α with global test statistic $\min(U^{(j)})$. Let $p_b(\alpha)$ denote the power of the Bonferroni method applied directly to the marginal test statistics $\check{U}_j = 1 - F_{\chi_1^2} \left(\left(\tilde{X}_j^\top Y \right)^2 \right)$ for the same OLS model. Then, $p_f(\alpha) \geq (1 - \alpha)p_b(\alpha)$.

Proof: Assume that the Bonferroni method has rejected H_0 . Then at least one $\check{U}_j < \alpha/p$. Let $k = \min \{j : \check{U}_j < \alpha/p\}$. Given α/p is also the filtering threshold, and that $p \min(U^{(j)})$ is our global test statistic, we know that the filtered SD procedure will also reject H_0 upon the k^{th} round as long as $Y^{(k)} = Y^{(1)}$. By our definition of k as the first significant index, the only way that $Y^{(k)} \neq Y^{(1)}$ is if noise is introduced into Y by the filter. Thus, $\mathbb{P}(Y^{(k)} = Y^{(1)}) = (1 - \alpha/p)^{k-1} \geq (1 - \alpha)$. \square

A.6. Proof of Lemma 6.2.

Statement of Lemma: For an n -dimensional random vector W let $\omega := \|W\|_2^2$ and $B_j := W_j^2 / \sum_{i=j}^n W_i^2$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let $\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ be the bijective map

$$(25) \quad \mu(W) = (B_1, \dots, B_{n-1}, \text{sgn}(W_1), \dots, \text{sgn}(W_n), \omega) = (B, \text{sgn}(W), \omega).$$

If $W \sim N(0, I)$, then all elements of $\mu(W)$ are mutually independent where $\text{sgn}(W_j) \sim \text{Rademacher}$, $B_j \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-j}{2}\right)$, and $\omega \sim \chi_n^2$.

Proof: Let $S_j = \sum_{i=j}^n W_i^2$, so $B_j = W_j^2/S_j$ and $S_1 = \omega$. By the symmetry of the Gaussian distribution, the collections of random variables $\{|W_j| : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{\text{sgn}(W_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ are independent of each other. Hence we need only show that $\{B_1, \dots, B_{n-1}, \omega\}$ are mutually independent.

We begin by noting the following facts:

1. Lukacs's proportion-sum Independence Theorem: B_j is independent of S_j , and $B_j \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-j}{2}\right)$.
2. For each $j \geq 2$, $B_j \perp\!\!\!\perp (B_1, \dots, B_{j-1}, S_1, \dots, S_{j-1})$ conditioned on S_j . This follows from the fact that the W_i 's are mutually independent and $S_1, \dots, S_{j-1}, B_1, \dots, B_{j-1}$ are all measurable with respect to $(S_j, W_1, \dots, W_{j-1})$.

We now prove by induction on j that for any $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ the random variables ω, B_1, \dots, B_j are mutually independent. For $j = 0$ the statement is trivial. Assume now that ω, B_1, \dots, B_j are mutually independent. Consider any bounded measurable functions f_0, f_1, \dots, f_j . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[f_0(\omega) \prod_{i=1}^j f_i(B_i) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_0(S_1) \prod_{i=1}^j f_i(B_i) \mid S_j \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_0(S_1) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} f_i(B_i) \mid S_j \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} [f_j(B_j) \mid S_j] \right] \text{ by fact 2} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f_0(S_1) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} f_i(B_i) \mid S_j \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} [f_j(B_j)] \right] \text{ by fact 1} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_0(S_1) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} f_i(B_i) \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} [f_j(B_j)] \text{ by the law of total expectation} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [f_0(S_1)] \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} [f_i(B_i)] \cdot \mathbb{E} [f_j(B_j)] \text{ by the induction hypothesis. } \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B: POWER CURVES




Fig 8: **Power in the dense X , $n > p$ case where $r^2 = 0.2$.** Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^5$ and $p = 10^4$. (a) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (b) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (c) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . (d) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .




Fig 9: **Power in the dense X , $n > p$ case where $r^2 = 0.5$.** Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^5$ and $p = 10^4$. **(a)** 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . **(b)** 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . **(c)** 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . **(d)** 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .




Fig 10: Power in the dense X , $n > p$ case where $r^2 = 0.8$. Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^5$ and $p = 10^4$. (a) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (b) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (c) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . (d) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .




Fig 11: Power in the dense X , $n < p$ case where $r^2 = 0.2$. Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^3$ and $p = 10^4$. (a) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (b) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (c) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . (d) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .




Fig 12: Power in the dense X , $n < p$ case where $r^2 = 0.5$. Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^3$ and $p = 10^4$. (a) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (b) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (c) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . (d) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .




Fig 13: Power in the dense X , $n < p$ case where $r^2 = 0.8$. Power plotted as a function of target signal strength s . $n = 10^3$ and $p = 10^4$. (a) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (b) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-2} . (c) 4 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} . (d) 16 active predictors with type-1 error rate 10^{-8} .

APPENDIX C: FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL

As discussed in section 6 of the main text, our treatment of SD for logistic regression rapidly loses power if the design matrix entries are too various. There need to be multiple alternative random paths leading to the same weighted sum, so that we can select one that is biased to be similar to the original data. In the extreme case, where X contains arbitrary real entries, each possible sum will be obtainable in exactly one way, and the “coupling” will be singular. The resampled outcome data will be completely decoupled from the original data, and power will be essentially 0.

If the X entries are not all integers, but are all similarly sized, one possible solution would be to treat the entries X_{ij} as being themselves subject to random noise. That is, instead of testing the statistic $W_j = \sum X_{ij}Y_i$, we test $\widetilde{W}_j := \sum X_{ij}(1 + \sigma\xi_{ij})Y_i$, where (ξ_{ij}) are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. This will have variance $(1 + \sigma^2)$ times the usual variance of the score test statistic. The residual sum $S_k = \sum_{i=k}^n X_{ij}(1 + \sigma\xi_{ij})Y_i$ has a continuous distribution supported on all of \mathbb{R} , so we may compute conditional probabilities of $Y_k = 1$ conditioned on $\{S_k = U - s\}$, and so define a coupling as above. The power to identify effective predictors will presumably depend on a favourable choice of σ : If σ is too small, the information in the data Y will be rapidly subsumed in noise; if too large, the information in the design matrix X will evaporate.

It is not clear whether this Gaussianized coupling can be computed efficiently. Certainly there does not seem to be an obvious way of adapting the FFT algorithm from the Poisson-binomial case.

APPENDIX D: SMALLEST- k FILTERING

This appendix builds up increasingly complex filtering procedures that target exchanging the smallest- k order statistics between U and U' . We start with “exchanging the smallest- k ratios”. For the l^{th} layer with p_l predictors, as above, let T be the order statistic of U so that $T_1 \leq T_2 \leq \dots \leq T_{p_l}$. Say in a given layer, we can safely assume that the number of non-null hypotheses is less than some k . Then, we can set $\varphi(T) = (P, Q)$ where

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} P_j &= T_j && \text{for } j = k + 1, \dots, p, \\ Q_j &= T_j/T_{k+1} && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

and the R_1, \dots, R_m are null. Since R_1, \dots, R_m are null, \mathcal{S} is not needed or defined in this example. Note that Q here is distributed as the order statistics of $k - 1$ independent standard uniform random variables. This definition of φ ensures the required independence between P and Q ; however, since it always exchanges the tail of T with the tail of T' , it can introduce a fair amount of noise into the Rényi Distillation process over many iterations. It also can lose substantial power if k is chosen too small.

We can make the procedure more robust against mis-specification of k by moving T_k from P to Q so that it is always exchanged during filtration. This means, in effect, that the smallest- k uniform random variables rather than the smallest k ratios are exchanged. Let $g(x, c) = (x - c)/(1 - c)$ where $c \in [0, 1]$. We set $\varphi(T) = (P, Q)$ where

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} P_j &= g(T_j, T_k) && \text{for } j = k + 1, \dots, p_l, \\ Q_j &= T_j && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

and the R_1, \dots, R_m are null. Again, this definition of φ ensures the required independence between P and Q . When we invert φ in this case, we see that all of the original order statistics T_{k+1}, \dots, T_{p_l} are shifted and rescaled according to the simulated k^{th} order statistic. In the OLS context, this makes $\widetilde{W}_j \neq W_j$ for all predictors j in layer l . This additional noise allows us to extract the absolute values of the k smallest U' , which would all still be outliers in U even if we under-specified k , giving us the desired robustness to k . However, if we do not under-specify k and p_i is large, $\text{Var}(T_k - \widetilde{T}_k)$ will be small. This makes the difference between \widetilde{W}_j and W_j small with high probability, so the noise we need to inject in order to exchange T_k during filtration can actually be smaller than it might be supposed. Like (26), since (27) essentially always exchanges the tail of T with the tail of T' , it can introduce a fair amount of noise into the distillation process over many iterations.

By introducing non-trivial R_1, \dots, R_m , (26) and (27) can be generalised to reduce the information exchanged during filtration. We start by generalizing (26). Let $G_j = (T_j/T_{j+1})^j$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and fix some $c_1 \in [0, 1]$. As a consequence of the Rényi transformation [42], under H_0 , $G_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(0, 1)$. See Definition 1.3 for more details. We can set $\varphi(T) = (P, Q, R_1, \dots, R_m)$ where

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} P_j &= T_j && \text{for } j = k + 1, \dots, p_i, \\ Q_j &= \mathbf{1}\{G_j \leq c_1\} && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \\ R_j &= (G_j/c_1)^{Q_j} g(G_j, c_1)^{1-Q_j} && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

Here, R has $m = k$ components. With this definition of φ we can simply set our selection function to be $\mathcal{S}(Q) = Q$. With this selection function, if $Q_j = 0$, then, upon inversion of φ , G_j is returned unchanged. In other words, this choice of φ and \mathcal{S} ensures that ratios between consecutive T_j are only exchanged if they are more extreme than some quantile c_1 .

The underlying motivation for introducing this c_1 : if a given gap is not mildly significant, it does not provide evidence against H_g , so exchanging it would only introduce unnecessary noise into Y . Note that (28) reduces to (26) when $c_1 = 1$. If c_1 is set to 0.1, then under the

null, on average, only outlying 10% of ratios are exchanged between T and T' . We can reduce this exchange further by lowering c_1 to 0.01 so that, under the null, only the most outlying 1% of ratios are exchanged. However, if c is set too small then the exchange of information between T and T' can be so limited that we lose power. In all of our simulations, we will set $c_1 = 0.05$ as a default. If $c_1 = 0.05$ and $k = 8$, then under H_g , the probability that inverting (28) returns $\tilde{Y} = Y$ is $(1 - 0.05)^8 \approx 0.66$. Even if $k = 16$, the probability only drops to $(1 - 0.05)^{16} \approx 0.44$. In other words, with this smallest- k filter, SD can often screen a large number of predictors p_l for “free” – without introducing any noise into Y . Here, even when noise is introduced, it only modifies the most extreme (smallest) U . Recall, we see a similar result from filtering with a quantile filter (see Section 4.3).

By adding one additional parameter, c_2 , we can further generalise (28) so that it includes (27) as a special case. Let $G'_j = F_{j,p-j+1}(T_j)$ (recall $F_{a,b}$ is the CDF of the beta distribution). For our general “top- k ” filter we have

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} P_j &= g(T_j, T_k) && \text{for } j = k + 1, \dots, p_i, \\ Q_j &= \mathbf{1}\{G_j \leq c_1\} && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k - 1, \\ Q_k &= \mathbf{1}\{G'_k \leq c_2\} \\ R_j &= (G_j/c_1)^{Q_j} g(G_j, c_1)^{1-Q_j} && \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k - 1, \\ R_k &= (G'_k/c_2)^{Q_k} g(G'_k, c_2)^{1-Q_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, we set $\mathcal{S}(Q) = Q$ and note that (29) reduces to (27) when $c_1 = 1$ and $c_2 = 1$. There are many more sophisticated examples of φ and \mathcal{S} available: the tails of U and U' can be exchanged in blocks rather than element-by-element as in (28) and (29) by making use of Lukacs’s proportion-sum independence theorem [37]. The development of different pairs of filtration and selection functions is left for future work.

APPENDIX E: FEC EXAMPLE APPENDIX




Fig 14: # of base donors by postal code.

State	Occupation (ISCO Level 3 classification)	Direction	p-value
AZ	Retired/Unemployed	Increase	5.30e-06
	Legal professionals	Decrease	6.91e-04
	Legal, social and religious associate professionals	Decrease	2.02e-02
OH	Managing directors and chief executives	Decrease	6.36e-05
	Artistic, cultural and culinary associate professionals	Decrease	6.61e-04
	Shop salespersons	Decrease	2.19e-03
PA	Retired/Unemployed	Increase	5.63e-12
	Legal professionals	Decrease	2.60e-09
	Managing directors and chief executives	Decrease	8.22e-04

TABLE 3

Driving occupations among DEM base donors.

For each state-party pair, we tested each occupation for its marginal association with relative financial support (adjusting for an intercept, population density, and ADI). The three most significant occupations, their inferred direction of effect on relative enthusiasm, and marginal p-value are reported here.