

Modified Tests of Linear Hypotheses Under Heteroscedasticity for Multivariate Functional Data with Finite Sample Sizes

Tianming Zhu¹

¹National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Abstract

As big data continues to grow, statistical inference for multivariate functional data (MFD) has become crucial. Although recent advancements have been made in testing the equality of mean functions, research on testing linear hypotheses for mean functions remains limited. Current methods primarily consist of permutation-based tests or asymptotic tests. However, permutation-based tests are known to be time-consuming, while asymptotic tests typically require larger sample sizes to maintain an accurate Type I error rate. This paper introduces three finite-sample tests that modify traditional MANOVA methods to tackle the general linear hypothesis testing problem for MFD. The test statistics rely on two symmetric, nonnegative-definite matrices, approximated by Wishart distributions, with degrees of freedom estimated via a U-statistics-based method. The proposed tests are affine-invariant, computationally more efficient than permutation-based tests, and better at controlling significance levels in small samples compared to asymptotic tests. A real-data example further showcases their practical utility.

KEY WORDS: Multivariate functional data; Heteroscedasticity; Wishart mixtures; Wishart-approximation; Affine-invariance; U-statistics; Finite sample.

1 Introduction

Over the past few decades, functional data have garnered significant attention due to their widespread collection across various scientific fields. In the early literature on functional data analysis (FDA), each functional observation was typically represented by a single curve, a framework referred to as the univariate case. This approach was sufficient when only one type of functional information was available for each individual. However, with rapid advancements in data recording and storage technology, researchers can now collect multiple streams of functional information for the same individual, such as measurements taken across different modalities or time points. As a result, interest in multivariate functional data (MFD) has grown significantly, where each observation is represented by multiple interrelated curves or functions.

Despite the growing interest in MFD, extending it from univariate data remains an emerging and underdeveloped field. The complexity increases as researchers must account for interactions between

different functional components, such as dependencies across various measurement dimensions or functional processes. Consequently, new statistical models and techniques are required to adequately analyze and interpret MFD. This emerging framework holds significant promise for advancing our understanding of complex phenomena across disciplines; however, considerable work remains to develop a comprehensive theory and practical methods for MFD.

This study was partially inspired by the work of Soh et al. (2023), which aimed to differentiate the geographical origins of extra virgin olive oil (EVOO) using attenuated total reflectance-Fourier-transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectra. In their study, 43 bottles of organic EVOO, spanning seven different brands from Greece, Spain, or Italy, were obtained from local suppliers. For each bottle, a portion of oil was extracted, stirred, and four drops were taken using a dropper. Each drop was scanned twice, resulting in a total of 344 spectra. The ATR-FTIR spectra were obtained using a Perkin-Elmer Spectrum 100 model with an ATR accessory, with spectral readings taken in the mid-infrared region, covering wavenumbers from 4000 cm^{-1} to 500 cm^{-1} , at intervals of 1 cm^{-1} (see Soh et al. 2023 for details). The authors proposed the sparse fused group lasso logistic regression (SFGL-LR) model to distinguish between Greek and non-Greek EVOOs. However, Soh et al. (2023) noted that the spectral observations were not entirely independent, as each drop was scanned twice. Despite this, the model demonstrated good prediction accuracy and improved interpretability, especially with a large number of observations. In this context, introducing the concept of MFD is reasonable, where two scans of each drop represent a single functional observation for each origin. Given that geographical origin can influence consumer purchasing decisions, it is worth examining whether the mean spectral observations from these three regions differ.

The problem of comparing the mean vectors of k multivariate populations based on k independent samples is considered multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). In the context of functional data, when observations encompass more than one feature, the objective is to test the equality of the vector of mean functions across k independent functional populations. This is referred to as one-way functional MANOVA (FMANOVA). Górecki and Smaga (2017) was the first to define the “between” and “within” matrices for MFD and used them to construct various test statistics. Building on this, Qiu et al. (2021) proposed two global tests for the two-sample problem in MFD, based on the integration and supremum of the pointwise Hotelling’s T^2 -test statistic. More recently, Qiu et al. (2024) extended this work to the multi-sample problem. Zhu et al. (2022) explored the Lawley–Hotelling trace test for the FMANOVA problem under the assumption of equal covariance function matrices across the k samples, while Zhu et al. (2024) introduced a global test statistic tailored for the heteroscedastic FMANOVA problem. Additionally, Zhu (2024) addressed the general linear hypothesis testing (GLHT) problem for MFD. However, the simulation results in Tables 1, 5, and 6 reveal that the aforementioned asymptotic tests perform poorly in terms of accuracy when the sample size is small, as they fail to maintain the desired significance level. Consequently, this study focuses on developing new tests for linear hypotheses under heteroscedasticity in MFD, particularly for cases involving finite sample sizes.

Throughout this paper, we write $\mathbf{y}(t) \sim \text{SP}_p(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma})$ for a p -dimensional stochastic process $\mathbf{y}(t)$ over a compact space \mathcal{T} with mean function $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, covariance function $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} : \mathcal{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. At each time point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{y}(t)$ is a p -dimensional vector. Hence, it is appropriate to employ transitional methods from MANOVA in the context of MFD. Traditional one-way MANOVA tests for multivariate normal distributions rely on two independent Wishart matrices that share the same variance structure. Examples include the Wilks’ likelihood ratio test Wilks (1932), the Lawley—Hotelling trace test Lawley (1938); Hotelling et al. (1951), the Bartlett—Nanda—Pillai trace test

Bartlett (1939); Nanda (1950); Pillai et al. (1955), and Roy’s largest root test Roy et al. (1953). These tests are commonly used to test the equality of mean vectors across groups under the assumption of homogeneous covariance matrices. However, when this assumption is violated, the problem becomes more complex and is referred to as the k -sample Behrens–Fisher (BF) problem Behrens (1929); Fisher (1935), or heteroscedastic one-way MANOVA. In such cases, classical MANOVA tests may exhibit substantial bias, particularly when sample sizes are unbalanced across groups. One approach to addressing the multivariate BF problem is the Wishart-approximation method, first introduced by Nel and Van der Merwe (1986). This approach is conceptually similar to the χ^2 -approximation method developed by Satterthwaite (1946), where parameters are computed by matching the first two moments. Harrar and Bathke (2012) was among the first to propose using a Wishart distribution to approximate these two Wishart matrices, building on the results of Bathke and Harrar (2008). Later, Xiao and Zhang (2016) noted that the modified tests by Harrar and Bathke (2012) lacked affine invariance and extended their work, along with Zhang (2012), to address the GLHT problem in heteroscedastic two-way MANOVA. More recently, Zeng and Harrar (2024) developed a robust test for multivariate repeated measures data. However, to the best of our knowledge, the application of the Wishart-approximation method to functional data has not yet been explored in the literature.

In this paper, we propose three modified tests for linear hypotheses under heteroscedasticity in MFD with finite sample sizes, using the Wishart-approximation method. The key contributions of this work are as follows. First, we define the global variation matrices associated with the hypothesis and error for the GLHT problem and develop modified tests based on these matrices, with approximate degrees of freedom estimated from the data. Second, we demonstrate that the proposed tests are affine-invariant and consistent, regardless of the contrast matrix used to define the hypothesis. Third, we derive the approximate degrees of freedom using a U-statistics-based approach, which provides bias-reduced estimators. Simulation results in Section 3 show that the proposed tests achieve similar size control as the permutation-based tests introduced by Górecki and Smaga (2017), while outperforming these methods in terms of computational efficiency. Additionally, the proposed tests demonstrate better performance than those from Qiu et al. (2021); Zhu et al. (2022, 2024); Zhu (2024); Qiu et al. (2024) in maintaining the desired significance levels.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The main results are presented in Section 2. Simulation studies and real data applications are given in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 5. Technical proofs of the main results are included in Appendix.

2 Main Results

2.1 Models and Hypotheses

Suppose we have k independent multivariate functional samples given by p -dimensional stochastic processes:

$$\mathbf{y}_{i1}(t), \dots, \mathbf{y}_{in_i}(t) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{SP}_p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ are the unknown vector of group mean functions of the k samples and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i : \mathcal{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ are the unknown matrix of group covariance functions for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. In this paper, we study the following GLHT problem for MFD:

$$H_0 : \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}(t) = \mathbf{C}_0(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \text{ vs } H_1 : \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}(t) \neq \mathbf{C}_0(t), \text{ for some } t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{C} : q \times k$ is a known full-rank coefficient matrix with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = q \leq k$, and at time point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{M}(t) = [\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t), \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k(t)]^\top$ is a $k \times p$ matrix whose rows are the k mean functions and $\mathbf{C}_0(t)$ is some known constant matrix. It is worth noting that the GLHT problem (2) provides a broad and general framework that includes various specific hypotheses. To provide further clarity on the GLHT problem (2), we present the following examples of null hypotheses, all of which can be addressed within the framework of (2).

Example 1 (Linear hypothesis testing with univariate functional data) *For univariate functional data where $p = 1$, the k independent functional samples in (1) can be represented as $y_{i1}(t), \dots, y_{in_i}(t) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{SP}(\eta_i, \gamma_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. In this scenario, we have $\mathbf{M}(t) = [\eta_1(t), \dots, \eta_k(t)]^\top$ and the GLHT problem in (2) simplifies to the scenario studied in Smaga and Zhang (2019). In particular, using the contrast matrix $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{I}_{k-1}, -\mathbf{1}_{k-1})$, where \mathbf{I}_k and $\mathbf{1}_k$ denote the identity matrix of size $k \times k$ and a k -dimensional vector of ones, respectively, and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the GLHT problem (2) becomes equivalent to a one-way functional ANOVA (FANOVA).*

Example 2 (Two-sample test for MFD) *For the special case where $k = 2$, the objective is to test whether the mean functions from two populations are equal, as $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$ vs $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) \neq \boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t)$, for some $t \in \mathcal{T}$. By using the configuration $\mathbf{C} = (1, -1)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the GLHT problem (2) simplifies to a two-sample problem, which has been addressed by Qiu et al. (2021).*

Example 3 (One-way FMANOVA) *In a broader context than the previous example, this involves testing the equality of mean functions across k populations:*

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) = \dots = \boldsymbol{\eta}_k(t), t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (3)$$

against the usual alternative that at least two of the mean functions are not equal. By using a contrast matrix $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{I}_{k-1}, -\mathbf{1}_{k-1})$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the problem becomes a one-way FMANOVA, as studied in Górecki and Smaga (2017); Zhu et al. (2022, 2024); Qiu et al. (2024).

Example 4 (Testing linear combinations of mean functions) *The GLHT problem (2) can also encompass the testing of linear combinations of functional means as a special case, which can be described as $H_0 : \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t) = \mathbf{0}$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$ vs H_1 : not H_0 . The above problem can be equivalently tested by setting $\mathbf{C} = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and is primarily discussed in Zhu (2024).*

2.2 Test Statistics

Based on the k functional samples (1), the unbiased estimators of vector of mean functions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ and matrix of group covariance functions $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i(t) &= \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) = n_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mathbf{y}_{ij}(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(s, t) &= (n_i - 1)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} [\mathbf{y}_{ij}(s) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(s)][\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t)]^\top, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

respectively. We begin by setting up the notation.

Let $\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k(t)]^\top$ and $\mathbf{D}_n = \text{diag}(1/n_1, \dots, 1/n_k)$. To test hypothesis (2), we construct the pointwise variation matrix due to hypothesis for the heteroscedastic GLHT problem

(2), denoted as $\mathbf{B}_n(t) = [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. It follows that the global variation matrix due to hypothesis can be defined as

$$\mathbf{B}_n = \int_{\mathcal{T}} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)] dt. \quad (5)$$

Under the null hypothesis in (2), we can express \mathbf{B}_n in (5) as

$$\mathbf{B}_{n,0} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}(t)]^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}(t)] dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{X}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{X}(t) dt,$$

where $\mathbf{X}(t) = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k(t)]^\top$ and $\mathbf{H}_n = \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} = (h_{ij}) : k \times k$, with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$.

This expression for $\mathbf{B}_{n,0}$ can further be written as $\mathbf{B}_{n,0} = \sum_{i_1=1}^k \sum_{i_2=1}^k h_{i_1 i_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i_1}(t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i_2}(t)^\top dt$. It is then straightforward to compute the expectation of $\mathbf{B}_{n,0}$ as $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B}_{n,0}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} [\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(t, t)/n_i] dt = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i/n_i$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(t, t) dt$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(t, t) dt$. It is evident that the unbiased estimator of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n$ is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i/n_i$, where the matrix of sample covariance functions $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(t, t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ is given in (4). Let $\mathbf{E}_n = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n$, then we can treat \mathbf{E}_n as the global variation matrix due to error.

Remark 1 When $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{I}_{k-1}, -\mathbf{1}_{k-1})$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the entries of \mathbf{H}_n are given by $h_{ii} = n_i(n - n_i)/n$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $h_{i_1 i_2} = -n_{i_1} n_{i_2}/n$ for $i_1 \neq i_2$ where $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$. Consequently, $\mathbf{B}_n = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)] [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)]^\top dt$, where $\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t)$ represents the vector of sample grand mean function. This formulation matches the matrix \mathbf{H} defined in Górecki and Smaga (2017) and the matrix \mathbf{B}_n defined in Zhu et al. (2022). However, the resulting $\mathbf{E}_n = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^k [n(n_i - 1)]^{-1} (n - n_i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} [\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t)] [\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t)]^\top dt$ can be interpreted as an adjusted version of the within-group variation matrix defined in Górecki and Smaga (2017) and Zhu et al. (2022). This adjustment is used to ensure that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B}_n) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{E}_n)$ under H_0 .

Since both \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n are symmetric and nonnegative-definite, following the ideas in Harrar and Bathke (2012); Xiao and Zhang (2016); Zeng and Harrar (2024), it is reasonable to approximate their distributions by two matrices with Wishart distributed. Let $W_p(m, \mathbf{V})$ denote a Wishart distribution of m degrees of freedom and with covariance matrix $\mathbf{V} : p \times p$. We expect to approximate the distributions of \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n by the distributions of the following Wishart random matrices: $\mathbf{B} \sim W_p(d_B, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n/d_B)$ and $\mathbf{E} \sim W_p(d_E, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n/d_E)$, where d_B and d_E are the approximate degrees of freedom for \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n , respectively. The approximate degrees of freedom d_B and d_E can be determined via matching the total variations of \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{B} and those of \mathbf{E}_n and \mathbf{E} . Note that the total variation of a random matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij}) : m \times m$ is the sum of the variances of all the entries of \mathbf{X} , that is, $V(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{X})^2] = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \text{Var}(x_{ij})$, where and throughout $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the trace of a matrix \mathbf{A} . However, the resulting d_B and d_E are not affine-invariant so that the modified tests based on \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n will not be affine-invariant. To address this issue, if $\mathbf{B} \sim W_p(d_B, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n/d_B)$ and $\mathbf{E} \sim W_p(d_E, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n/d_E)$ hold, then we have $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \sim W_p(d_B, \mathbf{I}_p/d_B)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \sim W_p(d_E, \mathbf{I}_p/d_E)$. This implies that the approximate degrees of freedom d_B and d_E for \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n are also the approximate degrees of freedom of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{B}_n \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{E}_n \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$. Therefore, d_B and d_E can be determined via matching the total variations

of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, and those of $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$, respectively. That is, we need to solve the following two equations for d_B and d_E :

$$V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}) = V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n), \quad \text{and} \quad V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}) = V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n). \quad (6)$$

Let $\gamma_{i,h\ell}(s,t)$ be the (h,ℓ) -th entry of $\mathbf{F}_i(s,t)$, $s,t \in \mathcal{T}$. For simplicity of notation, throughout this paper, for any matrix of covariance functions $\mathbf{F}_i(s,t)$, $s,t \in \mathcal{T}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, we write $\text{tr}(\mathbf{F}_i) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_i(t,t)] dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{h=1}^p \gamma_{i,hh}(t,t) dt$; for any two covariance function matrices $\mathbf{F}_{i_1}(s,t)$ and $\mathbf{F}_{i_2}(s,t)$, $s,t \in \mathcal{T}$, $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$, we write $I_{i_1 i_2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_{i_1}(s,t)] \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_{i_2}(s,t)] ds dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \gamma_{i_1,hh}(s,t) \gamma_{i_2,\ell\ell}(s,t) ds dt$, and $T_{i_1 i_2} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{F}_{i_1} \mathbf{F}_{i_2}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_{i_1}(s,t) \mathbf{F}_{i_2}(s,t)] ds dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \gamma_{i_1,h\ell}(s,t) \gamma_{i_2,h\ell}(s,t) ds dt$. The following theorem provides the solution of (6) and its proof is presented in Appendix.

Theorem 1 *For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, we assume that the vector of subject-effect functions $\mathbf{x}_{ij}(t) = \mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$ are identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.). Let $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^*(t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{ij}(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$; $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $\mathbf{F}_i^*(s,t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{F}_i(s,t) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, then the solution of (6) is given by*

$$d_B = \frac{p(p+1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*)/n_i^3 + \sum_{i_1=1}^k \sum_{i_2=1}^k h_{i_1 i_2}^2 (I_{i_1 i_2}^* + T_{i_1 i_2}^*)/n_{i_1} n_{i_2}}, \quad (7)$$

and

$$d_E = \frac{p(p+1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*)/n_i^3 + \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 (I_{ii}^* + T_{ii}^*)/[n_i^2(n_i - 1)]}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t) \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t)] ds dt - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2}) - I_{ii}^* - T_{ii}^*$, with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{F}_i^*(t,t) dt$, $I_{i_1 i_2}^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_{i_1}^*(s,t)] \text{tr}[\mathbf{F}_{i_2}^*(s,t)] ds dt$, and $T_{i_1 i_2}^* = \text{tr}(\mathbf{F}_{i_1}^* \mathbf{F}_{i_2}^*)$, $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$.

Now we have $d_B \mathbf{B}_n \sim W_p(d_B, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n)$ and $d_E \mathbf{E}_n \sim W_p(d_E, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n)$, approximately. Let $\mathbf{M}_1 = d_B \mathbf{B}_n$ and $\mathbf{M}_2 = d_E \mathbf{E}_n$. Then we can propose the following three test statistics for MFD, namely the modified functional Wilks (MFW) test statistic, the modified functional Lawley–Hotelling (MFLH) test statistic, and the modified functional Pillai (MFP) test statistic:

$$T_{\text{MFW}} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{M}_2)}{\det(\mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2)}, \quad T_{\text{MFLH}} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{M}_2^{-1}), \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\text{MFP}} = \text{tr}[\mathbf{M}_1(\mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2)^{-1}], \quad (9)$$

where $\det(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the determinant of a square matrix \mathbf{A} .

Remark 2 *When $p = 1$, the three test statistics coincide. Moreover, $\mathbf{B}_n(t)$ in (5) matches the value of $\text{SSH}_n(t)$ in Smaga and Zhang (2019), while \mathbf{E}_n resembles the denominator of F_n in Equation (3) of Smaga and Zhang (2019), though it is not identical. Consequently, the three proposed test statistics are comparable to the F -type test introduced by Zhang (2013), whose null distribution can be approximated by an F -distribution.*

Remark 3 *Unlike the multivariate data scenario, even when the k functional samples follow Gaussian processes, under the homogeneity assumption and the null hypothesis in (2), the exact distributions of \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{E}_n cannot be determined. However, at each time point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, setting $\mathbf{B}_n(t) = \mathbf{X}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{X}(t)$ and $\mathbf{E}_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}(t,t)/n_i$, it can be shown that, under the homogeneity assumption and the null hypothesis in (2), the pointwise variation matrices $\mathbf{B}_n(t)$ and $\mathbf{E}_n(t)$ follow Wishart distributions. Nevertheless, simulation results indicate that our modified tests continue to perform well even when the functional samples are non-Gaussian.*

2.3 Properties of the Proposed Tests

The proposed tests possess several desirable invariance properties. This subsection introduces two key invariance properties of the tests. First, the proposed tests $T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}},$ and T_{MFP} (9) are affine invariant, meaning that the results of the statistical inference remain unaffected by affine transformations of the data. This property is particularly useful in practice since the functional observations $\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t)$ are often recentered or rescaled before conducting an inference. These transformations are special cases of the affine transformation defined in (10).

Proposition 1 *The proposed tests, $T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}},$ and T_{MFP} (9) are invariant under the following affine-transformation:*

$$\mathbf{y}_{ij}^0(t) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) + \mathbf{b}(t), j = 1, \dots, n_i; i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{A} is any nonsingular matrix and $\mathbf{b}(t)$ is any given function.

Besides, the proposed tests $T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}},$ and T_{MFP} possess another invariance property. Note that for the hypotheses in (2), it is evident that the contrast matrix \mathbf{C} is not unique for the same hypothesis test. For instance, in Example 3, one valid choice for the one-way FMANOVA problem is $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{I}_{k-1}, -\mathbf{1}_{k-1})$, while another equally valid choice is $\mathbf{C} = (-\mathbf{1}_{k-1}, \mathbf{I}_{k-1})$. Therefore, it is important to construct a test that remains invariant under non-singular transformations of the coefficient matrix \mathbf{C} and the constant matrix $\mathbf{C}_0(t)$.

Proposition 2 *The proposed tests, $T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}},$ and T_{MFP} (9) are invariant when the coefficient matrix \mathbf{C} and the constant matrix $\mathbf{C}_0(t)$ are transformed as follows:*

$$\mathbf{C} : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}_0(t) : \mathbf{C}_0(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}_0(t), \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{P} is any nonsingular matrix of size $q \times q$.

The proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 are provided in Appendix.

2.4 Implementation

The exact distributions of the three proposed test statistics (9) take quite complicated forms. Fortunately, they can be approximated by the F -approximation (Rao 1951), the chi-squared asymptotic expansion (Harrar and Bathke 2012) or the normal-based asymptotic expansion (Fujikoshi 1975). Zeng and Harrar (2024) noted that the F -approximation provides a more accurate estimation compared to the other two approximation methods. Additionally, as mentioned in Remark 2, the F -distribution is used to approximate the test statistics in Zhang (2013), which is comparable to our proposed test statistics in the special case where $p = 1$. Therefore, it is reasonable to utilize the F -approximation in our approach.

Denote $\nu_1 = (|d_B - p| - 1)/2$ and $\nu_2 = (d_E - p - 1)/2$. Set $s = \min(p, d_B)$. Let α denote the significance level and $F_{d_1, d_2}(\alpha)$ denote the upper 100α percentile of the F -distribution with d_1 and d_2 degrees of freedom. The three tests can be conducted using F -approximation as follows:

- The F -approximation of T_{MFW} is given by

$$F_{\text{MFW}} = \frac{\theta_1\theta_2 - \theta_3}{pd_B} \frac{1 - T_{\text{MFW}}^{1/\theta_1}}{T_{\text{MFW}}^{1/\theta_1}},$$

where $\theta_1^2 = (p^2 d_B^2 - 4)/(p^2 + d_B^2 - 5)$ if $p^2 + d_B^2 - 5 > 0$ and $\theta_1 = 1$ otherwise, $\theta_2 = d_E - (p - d_B + 1)/2$, and $\theta_3 = pd_B/2 - 1$. The MFW test will reject the null hypothesis if F_{MFW} is greater than $F_{pd_B, \theta_1 \theta_2 - \theta_3}(\alpha)$.

- When $\nu_2 \leq 0$, the F -approximation of T_{MFLH} is

$$F_{\text{MFLH}} = 2(s\nu_2 + 1)[s^2(2\nu_1 + s + 1)]^{-1} T_{\text{MFLH}},$$

and the MFLH test will reject the null hypothesis if F_{MFLH} is greater than $F_{s(2\nu_1 + s + 1), 2(s\nu_2 + 1)}(\alpha)$. When $\nu_2 > 0$, the F -approximation of T_{MFLH} is

$$F_{\text{MFLH}} = \left(4 + \frac{pd_B + 2}{\phi_2 - 1}\right) \frac{T_{\text{MFLH}}}{pd_B \phi_1},$$

where $\phi_1 = [2 + (pd_B + 2)/(\phi_2 - 1)]/(2\nu_2)$ and $\phi_2 = (p + 2\nu_2)(d_B + 2\nu_2)/[2(2\nu_2 + 1)(\nu_2 - 1)]$. The MFLH test will reject the null hypothesis if F_{MFLH} is greater than $F_{pd_B, 4 + (pd_B + 2)/(\phi_2 - 1)}(\alpha)$.

- The F -approximation of T_{MFP} is

$$F_{\text{MFP}} = \frac{2\nu_2 + s + 1}{2\nu_1 + s + 1} \frac{T_{\text{MFP}}}{s - T_{\text{MFP}}},$$

and the MFP test will reject the null hypothesis if F_{MFP} is greater than $F_{s(2\nu_1 + s + 1), s(2\nu_2 + s + 1)}(\alpha)$.

To implement the three proposed tests, we shall estimate the approximate degrees of freedom d_B and d_E as provided in Theorem 1. Specifically, this involves estimating $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i_1}^*)$, $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, $I_{i_1 i_2}^*$ and $T_{i_1 i_2}^*$, $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$ properly. These terms can be directly approximated by replacing $\mathbf{I}_i^*(s, t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ with its natural estimator, $\hat{\mathbf{I}}_i^*(s, t) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{I}}_i(s, t) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1/2}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. However, it is well known that $\text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{I}}^2)$ and $\text{tr}^2(\hat{\mathbf{I}})$ are poor estimators of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{I}^2)$ and $\text{tr}^2(\mathbf{I})$, respectively, where $\hat{\mathbf{I}}(s, t)$, $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$ denotes the usual matrix of sample covariance functions, which serves as an unbiased estimator of the matrix of covariance functions $\mathbf{I}(s, t)$, $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, based on simulation results in Zhu et al. (2022, 2024) and additional pre-simulation studies, bias introduced by these natural estimators becomes significant, particularly when the MFD exhibit weak correlations. To address this issue, in this study, we adopt the U-statistics-based estimation approach utilized in Li and Chen (2012), which traces back to earlier works by Glasser (1961, 1962). Throughout this paper, we use \sum^* to denote summation over mutually distinct indices. For example, \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3}^* means summation over $\{(i_1, i_2, i_3) : i_1 \neq i_2, i_2 \neq i_3, i_3 \neq i_1\}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{ij}(t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{y}_{ij}(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$; $i = 1, \dots, k$. Consequently, we have $\text{Cov}[\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{i1}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{i1}(t)] = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{I}_i(s, t) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} = \mathbf{I}_i^*(s, t)$. By applying Lemma 2 in Appendix, the unbiased estimators for $I_{i_1 i_2}^*$, $T_{i_1 i_2}^*$, $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$ and $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ can be obtained by substituting $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{ij}(t)$. Unfortunately, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n$ is unknown but can be replaced with its unbiased estimator, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n$. Therefore, we propose the following bias-reduced estimators of I_{ii}^* , T_{ii}^* , and $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ by substituting

$\mathbf{y}_{ij}^*(t) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{y}_{ij}(t)$ for $\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t), j = 1, \dots, n_i; i = 1, \dots, k$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_{ii}^* &= [n_i(n_i - 1)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_1}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_2 j_2}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad - 2[n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_1}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_2 j_3}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad + [n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)(n_i - 3)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_3 j_4}(t, s) ds dt, \\
\hat{T}_{ii}^* &= [n_i(n_i - 1)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_2 j_1}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad - 2[n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_3 j_1}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad + [n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)(n_i - 3)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_2 j_3}(t, s) \delta_{i,j_4 j_1}(t, s) ds dt, \\
\widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})} &= [n_i(n_i - 1)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(s, t) \delta_{i,j_2 j_1}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad - 2[n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(s, t) \delta_{i,j_3 j_1}(t, s) ds dt \\
&\quad + [n_i(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)(n_i - 3)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \delta_{i,j_2 j_3}(s, t) \delta_{i,j_4 j_1}(t, s) ds dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\delta_{i,j_1 j_2}(s, t) = \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)$, $s, t \in \mathcal{T}, j_1, j_2 = 1, \dots, n_i$.

To estimate $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*), i = 1, \dots, k$ properly, we adopt the approach used by Himeno and Yamada (2014) and Zhu et al. (2024), and propose the following estimator:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) = (n_i - 1)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \{[\mathbf{y}_{ij}(s) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(s)]^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} [\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t)]\}^2 ds dt - \widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})} - \hat{I}_{ii}^* - \hat{T}_{ii}^*, \tag{13}$$

where $\widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})}, \hat{I}_{ii}^*$, and $\hat{T}_{ii}^*, i = 1, \dots, k$, are given in (12). Similarly, the bias-reduced estimators of $I_{i_1 i_2}^*$ and $T_{i_1 i_2}^*, i_1 \neq i_2$ also can be obtained by applying Lemma 2 in Appendix, as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_{i_1 i_2}^* &= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_1}^*(s, t)] \text{tr}[\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_2}^*(s, t)] ds dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt, \text{ and} \\
\hat{T}_{i_1 i_2}^* &= \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_1}^* \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_2}^*) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_1}(s, t) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Therefore, the bias-reduced estimators of d_B (7) and d_E (8) are given by

$$\hat{d}_B = \frac{p(p+1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 [\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*)/n_i^3 + (\hat{I}_{ii}^* + \hat{T}_{ii}^*)/n_i^2] + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} h_{i_1 i_2}^2 (\hat{I}_{i_1 i_2}^* + \hat{T}_{i_1 i_2}^*)/(n_{i_1} n_{i_2})}, \tag{15}$$

and

$$\hat{d}_E = \frac{p(p+1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 \{ \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*)/n_i^3 + (\hat{I}_{ii}^* + \hat{T}_{ii}^*)/[n_i^2(n_i - 1)] \}}, \tag{16}$$

respectively, where $\hat{I}_{i_1 i_2}^*, \hat{T}_{i_1 i_2}^*, i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*), i = 1, \dots, k$ are provided in (12), (13), and (14). Let \hat{d}_B and \hat{d}_E be the estimated degrees of freedom obtained from (15) and (16), respectively, and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_1 = \hat{d}_B \mathbf{B}_n$ and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_2 = \hat{d}_E \mathbf{E}_n$. Then the proposed tests can be conducted by employing the F -approximation introduced above.

3 Simulation Studies

In this section, we perform simulation studies to assess the finite-sample performance of the three proposed tests: $T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}}$, and T_{MFP} . We consider a fixed number of samples with $k = 4$ and examine

three cases for $\mathbf{n} = [n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4]$: $\mathbf{n}_1 = [10, 10, 10, 10]$, $\mathbf{n}_2 = [10, 12, 12, 15]$, and $\mathbf{n}_3 = [15, 15, 25, 25]$. For computational efficiency, the generated functions are observed at $M = 80$ equidistant points in the closed interval $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$, as Zhang and Liang (2014) suggests that $M = 50 \sim 1000$ is often sufficient for various functional data purposes. Although larger values of M could be used, they often increase computational cost without significantly improving test performance. The effect of M is discussed in (Zhang, 2013, Sec.4.5.6).

Following simulation studies of Smaga and Zhang (2019), Qiu et al. (2021), and Munko et al. (2024), the k multivariate functional samples are generated using the model: $\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t) + \sum_{r=1}^q \sqrt{\lambda_{ir}} \varepsilon_{ijr} \boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$; $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Here, ε_{ijr} are i.i.d. random variables, and the orthonormal basis functions $\boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t)$ along with the variance components λ_{ir} , in descending order, are used to define the covariance matrix functions $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t) = \sum_{r=1}^q \lambda_{ir} \boldsymbol{\phi}_r(s) \boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t)^\top$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$. The goal is to compare the finite-sample performance of T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} with other tests when the dimension p of the generated MFD is reasonably large, and we set $p = 6$. The vector of mean functions for the first group, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) = [\eta_{11}(t), \dots, \eta_{16}(t)]^\top$, is defined as $\eta_{11}(t) = [\sin(2\pi t^2)]^5$, $\eta_{12}(t) = [\cos(2\pi t^2)]^5$, $\eta_{13}(t) = t^{1/3}(1-t) - 5$, $\eta_{14}(t) = \sqrt{5}t^{2/3} \exp(-7t)$, $\eta_{15}(t) = \sqrt{13}t \exp(-13t/2)$, and $\eta_{16}(t) = 1 + 2.3t + 3.4t^2 + 1.5t^3$. To define the mean functions for the other three groups, we set $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_3(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_4(t)$. Specifically, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{3\ell}(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1\ell}(t)$, $\ell = 1, \dots, 5$ and $\eta_{36}(t) = (1 + \delta/\sqrt{30}) + (2.3 + 2\delta/\sqrt{30})t + (3.4 + 3\delta/\sqrt{30})t^2 + (1.5 + 4\delta/\sqrt{30})t^3$, where δ controls the difference in the mean functions.

To define the matrices of covariance functions $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)$, we set $\lambda_{ir} = \nu_i \rho^r$, $r = 1, \dots, q$, with $\rho = 0.1, 0.5, 0.9$, representing high, moderate, and low correlations among the components of the simulated functional data. When ρ is large, the eigenvalues λ_{ir} decay more slowly, making the functional samples noisier. We consider two scenarios: S1: $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu_3 = \nu_4 = 1.5$; S2: $\nu_1 = 1.5, \nu_2 = 2, \nu_3 = 2.5, \nu_4 = 3$ for homoscedastic and heteroscedastic cases, respectively. For $\boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t) = [c_1 \psi_r(t), \dots, c_p \psi_r(t)]^\top$, the basis functions are taken as $\psi_1(t) = 1$, $\psi_{2r}(t) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi r t)$, $\psi_{2r+1}(t) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi r t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $r = 1, \dots, (q-1)/2$, and we let $c_\ell = \ell / (1^2 + \dots + p^2)^{1/2}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, so that $\sum_{\ell=1}^p c_\ell^2 = 1$ and $\int_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}_r(t) dt = 1$ holds for $r = 1, \dots, q$. We take $q = 7$. To generate Gaussian functional data we set $\varepsilon_{ijr} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ (Model 1), and we specify $\varepsilon_{ijr} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} t_8 / \sqrt{4/3}$ (Model 2) and $\varepsilon_{ijr} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} (\chi_4^2 - 4) / (2\sqrt{2})$ (Model 3) to generate non-Gaussian functional data.

Throughout this section, we set the nominal size α to 5% and conduct a total of $N = 1000$ simulation runs under each configuration. To evaluate a test's overall ability to maintain the nominal size, we employ the average relative error (ARE) metric, as proposed by Zhang (2011). The ARE value for a test is computed as follows: $\text{ARE} = 100J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J |\hat{\alpha}_j - \alpha| / \alpha$, where $\hat{\alpha}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, J$ denote the empirical sizes under J simulation settings. A lower ARE value reflects superior performance of the test in controlling size.

3.1 Simulation 1: One-way FMANOVA

We first focus on Example 3 in Section 2.1, which involves testing homogeneity of several mean functions. The three proposed tests were compared to several competing tests introduced by Górecki and Smaga (2017), Zhu et al. (2022), Zhu et al. (2024), Qiu et al. (2024), and Zhu (2024). Specifically, the permutation tests proposed by Górecki and Smaga (2017), which are based on a basis function representation of functional data, use the Wilks', Lowley–Hotelling's, Pillay's and Roy's test statistics are denoted as W, LH, P, and R, respectively. The functional Lowley–Hotelling trace (FLH) tests

proposed by Zhu et al. (2022), with the naive and bias-reduced methods are denoted as $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$, respectively. The global tests proposed by Zhu et al. (2024) for the heteroscedastic one-way MANOVA problem with MFD, using the naive and bias-reduced methods are denoted as $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$, respectively. The two novel global testing statistics, derived by integrating or maximizing the pointwise Lawley–Hotelling trace test statistic proposed by Qiu et al. (2024), are denoted as T_{QFZ} and $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$, respectively. Additionally, the test proposed by Zhu (2024) for the GLHT problem under heteroscedasticity is referred to as T_{Z} . We can employ $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{I}_3, -\mathbf{1}_3)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ in (2) to implement the three new tests.

Table 1 shows the empirical sizes (in %) of all the considered tests under the one-way FMANOVA problem (S1). The last row of each sub-table summarizes the ARE values corresponding to the three different ρ values. Several key conclusions can be drawn from the results. First, the proposed new tests, T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} , consistently demonstrate strong performance in terms of ARE values, regardless of the correlations among the components of the simulated functional data. Specifically, when $\rho = 0.1$, the ARE values are 17.56, 22.00, and 14.67 for T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} , respectively; for $\rho = 0.5$, the corresponding ARE values are 16.00, 17.56, and 14.00 for T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} , respectively. When $\rho = 0.9$, the ARE values are 15.78 for T_{MFW} , 14.00 for T_{MFLH} and 13.78 for T_{MFP} . Among these three proposed tests, in terms of overall ability to maintain the nominal size (ARE values), T_{MFP} performs slightly better than T_{MFW} and T_{MFLH} when the functional data are highly correlated ($\rho = 0.1$), but it is slightly conservative under Model 3. The performances of the three tests are comparable under moderate ($\rho = 0.5$) and low correlations ($\rho = 0.9$). Both T_{MFW} and T_{MFLH} perform well for non-Gaussian data (Model 2 and Model 3), especially when the sample sizes are not too small ($\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_2$ and \mathbf{n}_3). Second, the four permutation-based tests proposed by Górecki and Smaga (2017) (W, LH, P, and R) perform consistently well, regardless of whether the functional data exhibit high correlation ($\rho = 0.1$), moderate correlation ($\rho = 0.5$), or low correlation ($\rho = 0.9$). Their performance remains robust regardless of whether the generated data are Gaussian or non-Gaussian. Third, the FLH tests proposed by Zhu et al. (2022) ($T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$) and the global tests from Zhu et al. (2024) ($T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$) do not perform as well as Górecki and Smaga (2017)’s tests. Specifically, the tests with the naive method ($T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$) become increasingly conservative as correlation decreases, while the tests with the bias-reduced method ($T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$ and $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$) tend to be overly liberal, especially when the data are highly or moderately correlated. These findings align with the simulation results from Zhu et al. (2022) and Zhu et al. (2024), but the smaller sample sizes in this study lead to even poorer performance for these tests. Fourth, T_{QFZ} performs similarly to $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$ as their test statistics are equivalent and are implemented in a similar manner. $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ generally performs well, particularly when $\rho = 0.1$, outpacing the three new tests. Finally, the test developed by Zhu (2024) is highly conservative in this simulation. This is attributed to the indiscriminate use of their adjustment coefficient c_n . The large value of c_n , which deviates significantly from 1, causes the test to behave conservatively.

For the power comparison, it is inappropriate to compare the powers of tests if they are either too conservative or too liberal. Therefore, we focus solely on scenarios with large sample sizes to ensure that the tests under consideration are neither overly conservative nor overly liberal. The empirical powers (in %) of all considered tests under homoscedastic case (S1) when $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_3$ are given in Table 2. Since when ρ is large, the eigenvalues λ_{ir} decay more slowly, making the functional samples noisier, we anticipate that the empirical power of a test decreases as ρ increases for a fixed value of δ . To investigate this, we consider the following values of δ : $\delta = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4$ when $\rho = 0.1$; $\delta = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ when $\rho = 0.5$; and $\delta = 0.4, 0.8, 1.2, 1.6$ when $\rho = 0.9$. As shown in Table 2, the

Table 1: Empirical sizes (in %) in Simulation 1 under homoscedastic case (S1).

$\rho = 0.1$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	5.6	5.3	5.5	5.6	19.1	23.1	13.5	22.8	23.6	5.7	2.9	7.2	7.8	6.0
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.8	5.0	5.2	4.3	14.1	16.7	9.7	16.0	16.7	5.6	3.4	5.4	5.9	5.2
	\mathbf{n}_3	5.8	5.6	5.9	4.1	9.8	11.1	7.2	11.3	11.6	5.7	5.6	6.4	6.4	6.0
2	\mathbf{n}_1	5.6	5.3	6.0	4.4	18.2	23.7	11.4	23.8	24.4	3.9	2.2	6.3	6.5	5.1
	\mathbf{n}_2	5.1	5.0	5.5	5.1	15.7	18.8	9.8	18.7	18.7	5.6	3.0	6.2	6.6	5.0
	\mathbf{n}_3	4.5	4.3	4.9	4.5	9.0	10.7	6.3	10.3	10.4	5.4	3.6	4.8	4.7	4.3
3	\mathbf{n}_1	5.1	5.2	4.9	4.8	17.6	23.3	11.5	24.1	24.2	5.3	1.9	5.3	5.5	4.2
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.8	13.0	15.7	7.9	15.0	15.7	4.4	2.5	4.6	4.6	3.3
	\mathbf{n}_3	5.0	5.2	4.9	5.1	9.0	11.4	6.0	10.9	11.2	5.2	3.8	4.5	4.5	3.9
ARE		7.33	6.44	8.22	8.67	178.89	243.33	85.11	239.78	247.78	11.56	38.44	17.56	22.00	14.67
$\rho = 0.5$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	5.4	5.6	5.4	5.7	8.6	15.8	11.4	34.9	32.9	6.1	2.2	6.9	7.3	5.4
	\mathbf{n}_2	5.5	5.1	5.6	4.0	7.3	11.5	7.8	23.8	21.6	4.3	2.9	6.2	6.3	5.8
	\mathbf{n}_3	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.0	6.4	8.3	6.1	15.7	14.6	5.1	4.4	6.0	5.9	5.7
2	\mathbf{n}_1	5.6	5.8	5.5	4.4	7.8	15.1	9.1	35.7	32.6	4.9	1.3	5.8	6.0	5.2
	\mathbf{n}_2	6.5	5.9	6.2	5.3	8.3	13.0	8.1	23.3	21.9	6.1	3.0	6.1	6.6	5.7
	\mathbf{n}_3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.7	5.4	8.7	5.1	12.7	12.0	5.0	4.0	4.7	5.2	4.4
3	\mathbf{n}_1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.7	6.9	15.4	8.9	34.7	31.9	4.6	1.3	4.6	5.2	3.9
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.4	6.4	10.8	5.4	21.9	19.4	3.5	2.0	4.9	5.1	4.0
	\mathbf{n}_3	4.7	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.7	9.1	5.1	14.1	12.6	6.0	3.7	4.6	4.7	4.2
ARE		11.78	10.67	10.89	8.44	39.56	139.33	48.89	381.78	343.33	13.33	44.89	16.00	17.56	14.00
$\rho = 0.9$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	5.8	5.7	5.9	5.6	2.5	10.7	6.6	51.9	40.2	5.6	0.2	6.8	6.6	6.3
	\mathbf{n}_2	5.1	5.2	5.1	4.6	2.0	8.4	4.3	35.2	25.6	5.7	1.3	5.6	5.3	5.5
	\mathbf{n}_3	5.0	5.1	4.9	4.9	3.1	7.4	3.0	17.4	14.7	4.7	1.8	5.3	5.7	5.1
2	\mathbf{n}_1	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.3	2.2	10.8	5.6	50.9	38.9	5.3	0.4	6.4	6.1	5.8
	\mathbf{n}_2	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.9	3.1	9.4	3.9	32.8	24.3	6.6	1.4	5.9	5.7	5.8
	\mathbf{n}_3	4.6	4.7	4.6	5.6	3.0	6.6	2.5	17.0	13.5	6.7	2.1	4.7	4.8	4.7
3	\mathbf{n}_1	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.6	1.3	8.6	4.0	48.7	36.9	5.2	0.2	3.9	4.2	3.6
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.5	2.8	9.3	3.6	31.4	22.9	4.6	1.2	4.5	4.2	4.1
	\mathbf{n}_3	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.7	3.0	7.4	2.9	17.5	12.6	6.8	2.1	5.2	5.1	4.9
ARE		8.00	8.00	8.89	10.00	48.89	74.67	28.89	572.89	410.22	16.89	76.22	15.78	14.00	13.78

empirical powers of the tests increase as the values of δ increase, and they also increase as the sample sizes grow. Notably, when $\rho = 0.1$, T_{FLH}^N , T_{FLH}^B , T_{ZZC}^N , T_{ZZC}^B , T_{QFZ} and T_{QFZ}^{\max} demonstrate significantly higher powers compared to the other eight tests. A clear pattern emerges when analyzing the empirical powers of the tests in relation to their empirical sizes, as T_{FLH}^N , T_{FLH}^B , T_{ZZC}^N , T_{ZZC}^B , and T_{QFZ} exhibit higher empirical sizes, as seen in Table 1. As ρ increases, the empirical sizes of T_{FLH}^N and T_{ZZC}^N decrease,

Table 2: Empirical powers (in %) in Simulation 1 under homoscedastic case (S1) when $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_3$.

$\rho = 0.1$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.1	10.5	10.1	10.8	7.9	18.5	20.8	14.7	20.1	20.0	27.4	8.7	11.9	11.6	10.8
	0.2	38.0	38.9	37.3	34.4	51.4	53.6	45.8	53.3	53.0	96.7	35.7	38.9	39.9	36.5
	0.3	82.5	83.4	80.9	83.3	90.5	91.4	87.8	91.8	91.7	100.0	80.3	83.1	84.3	80.2
	0.4	98.9	99.2	98.7	99.6	99.7	99.7	99.6	99.8	99.7	100.0	98.7	99.0	99.3	98.2
2	0.1	9.8	9.9	10.2	8.1	16.9	19.0	12.3	18.0	18.3	25.9	7.9	10.3	10.3	9.8
	0.2	36.8	36.6	36.0	35.6	49.8	53.1	41.5	52.9	52.4	95.3	31.9	35.7	36.6	33.5
	0.3	81.0	81.6	79.8	81.2	89.0	90.8	85.0	90.7	90.7	100.0	77.6	79.8	80.7	76.8
	0.4	98.6	98.7	98.3	99.2	99.6	99.6	99.1	99.6	99.6	100.0	97.8	98.2	98.3	97.8
3	0.1	9.6	9.5	9.2	8.1	17.4	20.0	12.3	19.8	19.6	29.0	7.5	9.3	9.6	8.1
	0.2	38.6	38.7	39.5	36.5	51.3	55.0	43.7	54.6	54.0	94.7	35.0	37.1	37.2	35.1
	0.3	82.1	82.7	80.9	82.7	89.7	90.8	85.0	91.0	91.0	100.0	76.6	78.5	80.2	74.1
	0.4	98.5	98.8	98.1	99.3	99.3	99.4	99.0	99.3	99.5	100.0	97.3	97.4	97.9	95.2
$\rho = 0.5$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.2	9.4	9.1	9.5	8.4	11.0	15.6	10.8	20.7	19.6	10.2	8.3	10.2	10.6	9.4
	0.4	25.7	26.5	25.2	27.9	30.2	36.8	27.4	46.8	45.3	49.5	22.6	26.7	27.4	25.2
	0.6	65.4	66.0	63.1	70.1	70.6	76.1	68.3	82.2	81.8	94.3	61.3	66.6	67.9	63.3
	0.8	92.0	93.3	91.0	96.2	94.6	96.2	94.3	97.9	97.6	100.0	91.7	93.1	93.9	91.1
2	0.2	8.4	8.4	8.3	7.5	10.3	13.9	7.9	18.7	17.4	10.3	6.0	8.3	8.8	7.6
	0.4	26.2	26.7	26.3	24.7	30.4	36.3	27.3	43.7	42.5	51.5	21.1	27.0	27.7	25.3
	0.6	62.8	64.0	61.1	68.5	66.8	73.7	65.2	81.8	81.0	94.9	58.2	62.0	64.2	59.5
	0.8	92.7	93.7	91.5	95.4	94.2	96.0	93.7	97.4	97.2	100.0	91.6	91.7	93.3	89.8
3	0.2	9.1	9.1	9.2	7.2	10.3	14.3	8.8	21.3	19.5	10.7	6.5	8.6	8.7	8.1
	0.4	27.5	28.2	26.9	26.1	31.1	37.7	29.0	47.4	45.1	51.9	22.7	27.0	28.2	24.7
	0.6	64.2	65.6	62.2	71.0	69.4	74.8	66.1	82.7	81.5	93.9	59.7	62.2	65.6	58.9
	0.8	93.1	93.4	91.7	96.5	94.3	95.9	93.0	97.7	97.3	100.0	90.2	91.2	92.5	89.4
$\rho = 0.9$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.4	9.9	10.4	9.8	10.1	7.8	13.6	6.3	28.3	22.9	7.5	5.1	10.5	10.8	10.0
	0.8	38.0	38.4	36.9	45.7	31.1	44.4	26.8	63.3	57.6	33.0	21.8	38.3	39.0	36.6
	1.2	83.8	85.2	82.2	94.4	81.2	88.7	76.6	94.4	92.5	85.4	73.2	84.4	86.3	82.7
	1.6	99.1	99.1	98.8	99.9	98.9	99.3	98.8	100.0	99.9	99.7	97.7	99.1	99.2	99.0
2	0.4	9.3	9.3	9.2	8.9	6.4	12.7	5.3	28.3	22.5	9.5	4.0	9.5	9.1	9.2
	0.8	38.2	38.4	37.6	45.2	31.2	43.4	25.2	61.0	55.1	35.6	22.3	37.5	38.0	36.3
	1.2	82.0	83.2	80.7	94.1	78.6	86.9	74.0	94.6	93.1	86.3	69.6	81.6	82.5	79.6
	1.6	99.1	99.2	98.8	100.0	98.9	99.6	98.2	99.9	99.9	99.6	97.6	99.3	99.3	98.8
3	0.4	9.9	9.9	9.7	8.9	7.0	13.0	4.9	30.4	23.8	9.6	4.6	9.5	9.5	9.6
	0.8	37.9	38.5	37.2	47.0	31.5	44.8	27.7	64.8	57.8	37.6	23.5	35.8	36.3	34.9
	1.2	83.2	84.4	82.2	94.1	79.7	87.0	75.6	93.7	92.0	85.2	71.5	81.8	82.5	79.4
	1.6	98.8	99.2	98.6	100.0	98.6	99.4	97.8	99.8	99.6	99.7	96.7	98.5	99.0	97.8

causing their powers to no longer significantly outperform the previous eight tests when $\rho = 0.5$ and 0.9 . In contrast, $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$, and T_{QFZ} remain liberal, as indicated in Table 1, and thus maintain higher empirical powers than the aforementioned eight tests. Moreover, T_{Z} consistently demonstrates the least power due to its conservative behavior, as shown in Table 1. This trend indicates that these competing tests may struggle to maintain effective size control, even with a larger sample size. This highlights the critical importance of size control in evaluating test performance and underscores the need for an optimal method that can reliably manage size to avoid potentially misleading results. Interestingly, $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ is the most powerful test when $\rho = 0.1$ and 0.5 , but becomes comparable to the three new tests when the functional data are less correlated ($\rho = 0.9$). The empirical powers of T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} are generally similar to those of the tests from Górecki and Smaga (2017) since their empirical sizes in Table 1 are generally comparable.

Next, we evaluate the finite-sample performance of the tests under consideration in the context of the heteroscedastic one-way FMANOVA problem. The empirical sizes of the tests considered under this scenario (S2) are detailed in Table 3. Several important conclusions can be drawn from this table. Firstly, when $\rho = 0.1$, $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$, and T_{QFZ} remain relatively liberal, while T_{Z} continues to exhibit conservative behavior. $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ performs well with smaller sample sizes but becomes increasingly conservative as the sample size grows. The tests proposed by Górecki and Smaga (2017), developed under the assumption of homoscedasticity, become conservative and perform less effectively compared to their results in Table 1. In contrast, the three newly proposed tests generally exhibit strong performance. As the value of ρ increases, the differences between the covariance matrix functions also grow larger. When $\rho = 0.9$, the performance of Górecki and Smaga (2017)'s tests further deteriorates due to the increasing variance differences between groups, becoming notably more conservative, especially with larger sample sizes. The other six competing tests are either overly conservative or excessively liberal. In contrast, the three modified tests maintain strong performance, demonstrating their robustness under these challenging conditions.

Table 4 presents the empirical powers (in %) of all considered tests under the heteroscedastic case (S2) when $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_3$. The findings are consistent with those observed in Table 2. Notably, $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ remains the most powerful test when $\rho = 0.1$, but its empirical powers declines as ρ increases, consistent with its empirical sizes shown in Table 3. $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$, and T_{QFZ} exhibit higher powers in the second batch due to their empirical sizes from Table 3 being significantly greater than 5% when $\rho = 0.1$. Additionally, the empirical powers of the three newly proposed tests, i.e., T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} , are either larger than or comparable to those of the tests from Górecki and Smaga (2017) and Zhu (2024), which are notably conservative in Table 3. Overall, these results highlight the efficacy of the proposed tests, especially in maintaining robust power levels in the face of heteroscedasticity.

3.2 Simulation 2: Two-sample problem

When the one-way FMANOVA (3) is rejected, it is reasonable to proceed with pairwise comparisons. For example, we can compare $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_4(t)$, specifically testing $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_4(t)$ by setting $\mathbf{C} = (1, 0, 0, -1)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. This results in a two-sample problem previously explored by Qiu et al. (2021). Consequently, we can assess the finite-sample performance of T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} in comparison to Qiu et al. (2021)'s two-sample tests based on the integration and supremum of the pointwise Hotelling's T^2 -test statistics, denoted as T_{QCZ} and $T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$, respectively. Given that $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$, $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$, and T_{Z} do not perform well in the aforementioned one-way FMANOVA context for small sample sizes, and T_{QFZ} and $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ behave similarly to T_{QCZ} and $T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$ for the two-sample

Table 3: Empirical sizes (in %) in Simulation 1 under heteroscedastic case (S2).

$\rho = 0.1$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	4.8	5.2	4.8	5.9	16.3	20.7	13.1	22.6	21.1	5.6	3.1	8.1	8.6	6.3
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.3	4.6	3.9	4.5	11.6	13.7	10.4	16.8	14.7	5.3	4.3	6.9	7.1	5.5
	\mathbf{n}_3	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.9	7.0	8.2	8.2	11.6	8.0	3.0	5.5	6.5	6.6	5.7
2	\mathbf{n}_1	4.2	4.7	4.4	5.1	16.5	22.0	12.3	24.7	21.7	3.8	1.8	6.4	6.7	4.6
	\mathbf{n}_2	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.5	12.9	15.7	10.6	17.6	15.4	5.0	3.6	5.7	5.7	5.0
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.1	2.2	2.2	3.1	6.2	7.4	6.9	10.0	7.1	3.6	3.7	4.9	4.7	4.4
3	\mathbf{n}_1	4.2	4.5	4.3	5.2	16.9	21.1	12.4	24.7	22.5	4.8	2.7	5.2	5.3	4.4
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.5	3.7	3.7	4.0	10.2	13.3	8.3	16.0	13.1	4.2	2.3	4.5	4.5	3.2
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.9	2.6	2.8	4.2	6.0	6.9	6.2	10.3	6.7	3.6	3.5	4.0	4.3	3.7
ARE		24.44	21.56	25.56	15.56	130.22	186.67	96.44	242.89	189.56	17.56	34.44	23.11	25.56	16.00
$\rho = 0.5$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	4.3	4.4	4.0	5.6	7.2	13.6	11.8	36.6	29.5	5.9	2.3	7.2	7.6	5.7
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.6	5.6	8.4	9.4	23.2	16.9	4.3	3.7	6.6	6.9	6.0
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.8	1.9	1.8	3.6	2.9	4.7	6.8	15.3	7.4	2.6	4.1	6.2	5.9	5.6
2	\mathbf{n}_1	4.6	4.4	4.3	5.3	6.6	13.4	10.6	36.5	27.8	5.1	1.1	6.3	6.5	5.4
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.3	3.2	3.1	5.1	5.4	9.1	9.5	22.8	17.1	4.6	2.7	6.1	6.6	5.5
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.3	2.1	2.0	3.1	3.0	4.3	5.3	12.4	6.9	2.8	3.8	5.1	5.1	4.6
3	\mathbf{n}_1	3.0	2.9	3.0	4.1	5.5	12.6	9.8	35.3	26.8	4.9	1.6	4.3	4.9	3.5
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	4.3	7.1	6.2	22.3	14.4	4.1	2.1	4.5	4.9	3.9
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.2	2.2	2.2	3.6	2.8	4.6	5.4	14.0	6.9	3.9	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.3
ARE		36.22	37.33	39.56	20.67	27.33	79.11	66.22	385.33	241.56	19.56	43.56	20.44	19.56	15.33
$\rho = 0.9$															
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	3.3	3.5	3.3	5.4	1.4	7.4	7.4	53.2	34.3	6.2	0.5	6.6	6.9	6.4
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.2	2.2	2.2	3.3	1.2	4.2	4.6	35.6	17.7	5.1	1.6	5.1	5.1	4.7
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.1	1.0	1.0	2.3	0.6	1.7	3.3	17.1	5.5	3.6	2.3	5.3	5.5	5.3
2	\mathbf{n}_1	3.6	3.7	3.5	4.1	1.6	7.5	6.3	52.6	32.8	5.2	0.4	5.6	5.8	5.3
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.6	2.8	2.5	4.0	1.0	4.2	4.3	32.2	17.8	6.1	1.5	4.8	4.8	4.7
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.4	1.3	1.3	3.1	1.1	2.1	3.6	17.4	5.6	3.6	2.8	5.0	5.4	4.9
3	\mathbf{n}_1	2.1	2.1	2.2	3.5	0.8	6.0	4.5	49.5	29.7	5.1	0.1	3.6	3.6	3.2
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.3	1.5	5.5	4.7	31.4	15.9	4.5	1.3	5.3	5.2	5.3
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.1	1.1	1.1	2.5	0.3	1.9	2.9	17.3	5.9	4.4	1.6	4.9	5.1	4.9
ARE		55.11	54.22	56.00	31.78	78.89	38.44	24.00	580.67	267.11	14.67	73.11	10.22	12.44	10.89

problem, we will focus on comparing T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} with W, LH, P, R, T_{QCZ} and T_{QCZ}^{\max} for this two-sample scenario.

Table 5 summarizes the empirical sizes of all considered tests in Simulation 2 under the heteroscedastic case (S2) with $\mathbf{C} = (1, 0, 0, -1)$. We can conclude that, among the three proposed tests, T_{MFP} demonstrates the best performance regarding ARE values, achieving the smallest ARE values of

Table 4: Empirical powers (in %) in Simulation 1 under heteroscedastic case (S2) when $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_3$.

$\rho = 0.1$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.1	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.9	10.4	12.8	12.9	17.4	12.6	12.1	7.7	9.4	9.3	8.6
	0.2	18.5	18.0	18.2	17.1	28.1	30.2	30.7	39.0	30.6	75.5	22.5	25.2	26.1	24.6
	0.3	49.6	50.3	48.4	51.8	63.5	67.3	65.9	74.2	66.0	100.0	54.0	58.7	59.2	55.9
	0.4	85.9	86.6	84.0	89.2	92.8	94.3	93.8	95.9	93.9	100.0	90.2	90.7	91.1	89.1
2	0.1	5.5	5.0	5.6	4.5	9.9	10.9	10.5	15.0	10.6	10.8	6.4	7.8	7.6	7.6
	0.2	16.1	16.1	16.2	14.1	25.9	28.6	27.2	35.2	28	74.6	19.0	22.1	22.6	20.6
	0.3	48.6	49.6	47.4	50.3	61.8	66.1	64.4	73.4	65.9	99.3	53.2	57.1	57.5	54.2
	0.4	83.5	84.5	82.0	87.3	91.2	92.9	92.2	95.5	92.3	100	87.4	88.2	89.5	86.3
3	0.1	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.2	8.6	10.3	9.3	14.8	10.0	10.8	5.3	6.5	7.0	6.1
	0.2	15.6	15.7	15.7	16.1	27.4	31.9	29.5	38.9	30.6	76.4	19.9	22.4	22.5	21.3
	0.3	49.7	50.6	48.4	52.8	64.6	68.4	66.2	76.0	67.5	99.6	54.6	56.1	57.4	53.4
	0.4	85.9	87.6	84.8	89.1	92.2	93.5	93.1	96.1	93.4	100	88.0	88.0	89.1	86.4
$\rho = 0.5$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.2	3.9	3.7	3.9	5.2	5.0	7.5	9.5	18.6	10.7	5.1	7.1	8.9	9.1	8.4
	0.4	9.8	10.3	9.6	12.2	12.6	16.5	20.0	33.7	22.5	21.1	15.8	19.6	19.8	18.2
	0.6	28.6	30.0	27.9	38.1	32.6	39.7	46.2	63.7	49.9	70.7	39.7	43.8	45.6	42.2
	0.8	64.1	66.4	61.4	75.9	69.5	75.1	79.4	88.1	81.1	97.0	74.2	78.0	79.4	74.7
2	0.2	3.6	3.7	3.7	4.9	4.1	6.0	7.6	16.7	9.2	5.7	5.5	7.5	7.6	6.6
	0.4	9.1	9.6	8.8	10.4	11.1	14.2	18.0	33.0	20.6	20.2	13.4	16.1	16.6	15.0
	0.6	29.6	30.9	28.0	35.6	33.3	39.7	41.9	61.0	46.8	69.1	35.7	40.7	42.0	39.2
	0.8	60.1	62.7	58.9	72.8	66.7	71.9	77.0	87.8	80.2	97.3	71.9	74.0	75.0	71.0
3	0.2	3.3	3.4	3.1	4.2	4.1	6.2	7.8	16.9	10.0	5.9	5.4	7.2	7.6	6.6
	0.4	9.8	9.8	9.9	10.3	11.5	16.5	17.0	34.9	21.5	23.4	13.4	17.2	17.9	16.2
	0.6	29.1	30.2	28.3	37.2	34.2	40.8	45.6	65.0	49.9	70.7	38.3	41.5	42.7	39.0
	0.8	62.8	65.2	60.1	76.3	68.5	74.4	78.3	89.4	81.2	97.8	72.0	74.1	75.7	70.6
$\rho = 0.9$															
Model	δ	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	0.4	2.8	2.6	2.7	4.9	1.2	3.7	5.6	23.9	8.5	4.7	4.3	8.9	8.8	8.4
	0.8	9.6	9.9	9.5	17.3	7.5	13.1	16.4	48.1	23.3	12.7	13.0	23.2	23.7	22.9
	1.2	36.9	39.0	34.9	64.7	31.3	45.7	50.8	81.5	59.6	48.7	45.6	58.4	59.8	57.0
	1.6	81.1	82.4	78.2	96.6	77.8	86.2	87.7	97.7	91.2	90.8	85.0	91.8	92.4	90.6
2	0.4	3.3	3.2	3.2	4.1	1.7	3.9	5.8	23.1	8.8	5.6	4.4	7.5	7.6	7.3
	0.8	10.3	10.7	9.9	17.3	7.2	13.0	16.8	45.1	22.3	13.7	14.6	21.9	22.3	21.3
	1.2	37.1	38.3	36.1	62.8	30.8	44.9	48.1	78.8	56.3	50.9	43.7	57.7	58.7	55.6
	1.6	78.3	81.3	76.4	96.5	74.4	84.7	86.6	97.4	91.1	89.9	82.7	89.4	90.4	88.5
3	0.4	2.3	2.5	2.3	3.7	1.0	3.9	5.2	25.0	8.6	5.9	3.5	8.4	8.5	8.3
	0.8	9.8	10.2	9.6	18.7	6.2	14.1	17.3	49.0	25.3	15.5	13.5	23.3	23.2	22.4
	1.2	38.1	39.4	36.8	65.1	32.2	47.0	50.1	82.7	60.6	52.5	45.0	57.9	59.3	55.8
	1.6	80.4	81.7	77.9	97.0	76.3	85.3	87.0	96.9	89.6	89.6	83.3	89.3	91.1	88.5

Table 5: Empirical sizes (in %) in Simulation 2 under heteroscedastic case (S2) when $\mathbf{C} = (1, 0, 0, -1)$.

$\rho = 0.1$										
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{QCZ}	$T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7	29.2	4.4	6.3	7.5	4.4
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.7	3.9	3.8	4.2	14.6	4.8	7.4	7.9	6.4
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	7.3	2.7	4.9	5.0	4.1
2	\mathbf{n}_1	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	29.2	4.8	6.6	7.0	5.2
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	15.7	4.2	6.1	6.9	4.9
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.3	2.6	2.1	3.0	8.2	3.3	5.5	5.8	4.9
3	\mathbf{n}_1	5.9	5.4	5.6	5.4	29.3	5.8	7.5	8.5	5.5
	\mathbf{n}_2	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.9	15.3	3.8	4.8	5.2	3.9
	\mathbf{n}_3	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.6	6.8	2.4	4.0	4.4	3.6
ARE		35.56	32.00	36.00	29.11	245.78	23.11	23.78	32.00	14.00
$\rho = 0.5$										
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{QCZ}	$T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.8	39.2	4.7	6.6	7.6	5.0
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.8	15.3	5.2	6.2	6.7	5.4
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.5	5.1	2.8	3.7	4.2	3.3
2	\mathbf{n}_1	3.9	3.9	4.7	3.2	37.1	6.1	7.1	7.1	5.7
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.9	16.8	3.8	5.3	6.0	5.2
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.6	1.4	1.5	2.3	7.0	3.8	6.2	6.8	5.4
3	\mathbf{n}_1	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.8	36.2	6.3	5.2	6.1	4.3
	\mathbf{n}_2	2.0	2.0	2.2	3.0	18.4	4.0	4.8	5.2	4.7
	\mathbf{n}_3	1.8	1.8	1.7	2.3	5.9	2.8	5.3	5.5	4.8
ARE		52.89	52.44	52.00	45.33	302.22	23.78	18.67	26.22	10.22
$\rho = 0.9$										
Model	\mathbf{n}	W	LH	P	R	T_{QCZ}	$T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	2.4	2.8	2.4	3.6	43.5	4.4	6.8	6.9	6.1
	\mathbf{n}_2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.9	15.4	4.6	6.2	6.5	5.6
	\mathbf{n}_3	0.3	0.2	0.4	1.1	2.5	2.8	3.7	3.7	3.6
2	\mathbf{n}_1	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.6	46.4	6.3	6.3	6.2	6.0
	\mathbf{n}_2	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.1	16.3	3.7	5.2	5.4	4.9
	\mathbf{n}_3	0.5	0.6	0.5	1.5	4.0	2.5	4.9	5.2	4.9
3	\mathbf{n}_1	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.7	41.2	5.7	5.1	5.1	4.5
	\mathbf{n}_2	1.0	1.1	0.9	2.0	16.5	4.7	6.1	6.1	5.5
	\mathbf{n}_3	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.8	4.8	3.0	6.0	6.0	5.8
ARE		72.44	71.33	72.22	54.89	340.00	25.11	18.00	19.33	13.56

14.00, 10.22, and 13.56 for $\rho = 0.1, 0.5$, and 0.9 , respectively. T_{MFW} and T_{MFLH} also perform well, with empirical sizes of T_{MFW} ranging from 4.0% to 7.5% for $\rho = 0.1$, 3.7% to 7.1% for $\rho = 0.5$, and 3.7% to 6.8% for $\rho = 0.9$. In contrast, the empirical sizes of T_{MFLH} range from 4.4% to 8.5% for $\rho = 0.1$, 4.2% to 7.6% for $\rho = 0.5$, and 3.7% to 6.9% for $\rho = 0.9$, respectively. While T_{QCZ} exhibits a liberal behavior and only achieves acceptable size control when $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_3$. $T_{\text{QCZ}}^{\text{max}}$ becomes conservative with

larger sample sizes. Additionally, the four permutation-based tests proposed by Górecki and Smaga (2017) show conservative performance consistent with the results in Table 3. To save space, we do not present the empirical powers of these tests in two-sample problem since the conclusions drawn from them are similar to those drawn from Table 2 and Table 4.

3.3 Simulation 3: Testing linear combinations of mean functions

It is important to note that, under this simulation setting, the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_4(t)$ is equivalent to the specific linear hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) - 3\boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t) + 2\boldsymbol{\eta}_4(t) = \mathbf{0}$. Consequently, it is reasonable to further assess the finite-sample performance of T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} in comparison to the test proposed by Zhu (2024) by setting $\mathbf{C} = (1, -3, 0, 2)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The empirical sizes (in %) of T_Z , T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} under heteroscedastic case (S2) when $\mathbf{C} = (1, -3, 0, 2)$ are displayed in Table 6. It is observed that the empirical sizes of T_Z are not as small as those in Table 1, indicating the test to become somewhat liberal. This raises questions about the effectiveness of the adjustment coefficient proposed in Zhu (2024). T_{MFP} demonstrates superior performance over T_{MFW} and T_{MFLH} when $\rho = 0.1$ and 0.5 , as T_{MFW} and T_{MFLH} exhibit slight liberal behavior with small sample sizes. All three tests perform well when the functional data are nearly uncorrelated.

Table 6: Empirical sizes (in %) under heteroscedastic case (S2) when $\mathbf{C} = (1, -3, 0, 2)$.

		$\rho = 0.1$				$\rho = 0.5$				$\rho = 0.9$			
Model	\mathbf{n}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
1	\mathbf{n}_1	9.9	9.3	10.3	7.4	10.1	7.5	8.6	5.8	7.3	6.0	6.1	5.3
	\mathbf{n}_2	8.0	7.4	7.9	6.4	8.9	6.3	6.5	5.6	7.6	6.4	6.5	6.0
	\mathbf{n}_3	9.4	6.7	7.2	6.6	9.8	6.5	6.6	5.5	7.7	5.3	5.5	5.0
2	\mathbf{n}_1	7.2	7.1	7.7	6.0	8.7	6.7	7.1	5.8	7.0	5.4	5.6	4.7
	\mathbf{n}_2	7.8	6.3	6.8	5.2	9.1	6.1	6.9	4.6	7.3	4.1	4.2	3.8
	\mathbf{n}_3	8.2	6.2	6.8	5.9	9.5	5.5	5.7	5.0	7.5	4.6	4.6	4.2
3	\mathbf{n}_1	8.4	7.7	8.2	6.3	9.5	7.1	7.7	6.0	5.1	5.2	4.9	4.7
	\mathbf{n}_2	6.2	4.4	5.1	3.9	8.2	4.9	5.2	4.4	8.2	4.9	4.7	4.3
	\mathbf{n}_3	7.3	5.3	5.6	5.1	7.8	4.7	5.0	4.7	6.3	4.6	4.7	4.2
ARE		60.89	36.89	45.78	22.22	81.33	24.67	31.78	11.11	42.22	11.33	12.44	12.00

In conclusion, we conducted a series of hypothesis tests in this section by varying the coefficient matrix \mathbf{C} . The results demonstrate that the three proposed tests, T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} and T_{MFP} , generally perform reasonably well in both homoscedastic and heteroscedastic cases in terms of controlling the Type I error rate, with clear advantages over existing competitors in the heteroscedastic case. Among these three tests, T_{MFP} performs the best overall, though it tends to be slightly conservative for heavy-tailed distributions (Model 3). Therefore, we recommend using T_{MFP} for light-tailed distributions and T_{MFW} or T_{MFLH} for heavy-tailed distributions.

4 Real Data Applications

As outlined in Section 1, it is appropriate to apply the concept of MFD to the dataset from Soh et al. (2023)’s study. This dataset comprises 344 spectra from 43 bottles across seven brands, labeled Brand I through Brand VII. In this section, we assume that the spectra obtained from drops of the same brand are i.i.d. Accordingly, we consider the spectra from 5 bottles of Brand I to represent spectral observations from Italy, those from 8 bottles of Brand II to represent observations from Spain, and those from 8 bottles of Brand III to represent observations from Greece. For each bottle, four drops were sampled using a dropper, resulting in $n_1 = 20$ observations for Italy, $n_2 = 32$ for Spain, and $n_3 = 32$ for Greece, with each observation consisting of $p = 2$ curves corresponding to two scans of each drop. The primary objective is to assess whether the mean spectral observations differ among these three regions, which constitutes a one-way FMANOVA problem. In this section, we apply T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} , and T_{MFP} , along with their competitors considered in Simulation 1, to the aforementioned dataset. The p -values obtained from these tests are exceptionally low, essentially 0, and much smaller than the selected significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$. As a result, we firmly reject the null hypothesis.

Besides the testing results, we also compare the computational costs for this one-way FMANOVA problem, which was executed on a 16-inch MacBook Pro with 12 cores, 32GB of RAM, Apple M2 Max (version 4.3.1). Note that the implementations of the newly introduced tests are based on the C++ implementations of the most computationally intensive parts, and the test results are obtained simultaneously. Therefore, we report the total execution time for T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} , and T_{MFP} together in Table 7. The total execution time (in seconds) for the remaining tests considered is also shown in Table 7. Specifically, we use the function `fmanova.ptbfr` from the R package `fdANOVA` to compute the results for W, LH, P, and R, which are returned simultaneously. As a result, we report the computational time for all four tests together. Similarly, since $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$ share the same test statistic but use different approximation methods, their results are also obtained simultaneously. Consequently, we report the computational time for both $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$ together, as shown in Table 7. The same approach is applied to $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}$ and $T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$. It is seen from Table 7, the permutation-based tests, namely, W, LH, P, and R are indeed time-consuming. In contrast, our proposed tests are significantly faster than both the permutation-based tests (W, LH, P, R) and the bootstrap-based test ($T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$).

Table 7: Computational costs (in seconds) for one-way FMANOVA.

W, LH, P, R	$T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{N}}, T_{\text{FLH}}^{\text{B}}$	$T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{N}}, T_{\text{ZZC}}^{\text{B}}$	T_{QFZ}	$T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$	T_{Z}	$T_{\text{MFW}}, T_{\text{MFLH}}, T_{\text{MFP}}$
1753.91	50.02	0.15	42.68	26.99	0.24	29.15

Since the heteroscedastic one-way FMANOVA is highly significant, we further apply the tests under consideration to some contrast tests to determine whether any two of the three regions share the same underlying group mean spectra. The results of these contrast tests are presented in Table 8. All the tests produced consistent results for the contrast tests ‘‘Greece vs. Italy’’ and ‘‘Greece vs. Spain’’, indicating that the mean spectra from Greece differ significantly from those of Italy and Spain. However, the tests under consideration provided conflicting results regarding whether the mean spectra from Italy and Spain are significantly different. Most of the tests concluded that the mean spectra are not significantly different at the 5% significance level, with only T_{QFZ} and $T_{\text{QFZ}}^{\text{max}}$ reported opposite results. Notably, the p -value of T_{QFZ} was only slightly below the 5% threshold.

Moreover, in Soh et al. (2023)’s study, Italy and Spain were grouped together under the category “non-Greece”, supporting the hypothesis that their mean spectra are not significantly different.

Table 8: P -values for some contrast tests for the real dataset.

	W	LH	P	R	T_{FLH}^N	T_{FLH}^B	T_{ZZC}^N
Greece vs. Italy	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Greece vs. Spain	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Italy vs. Spain	0.134	0.136	0.133	0.273	0.152	0.139	0.080
	T_{ZZC}^B	T_{QFZ}	T_{QFZ}^{\max}	T_Z	T_{MFW}	T_{MFLH}	T_{MFP}
Greece vs. Italy	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Greece vs. Spain	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Italy vs. Spain	0.050	0.044	< 0.001	0.068	0.214	0.233	0.195

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we introduced three tests, MFW, MFLH, and MFP for addressing the general linear hypothesis testing problem for multivariate functional data. These tests are highly adaptable and can be applied to a variety of scenarios by specifying appropriate contrast matrices. To illustrate their versatility, we considered applications such as the two-sample problem, one-way FMANOVA, and specific linear hypotheses. The methodology is based on two symmetric, nonnegative-definite matrices that capture the variation due to the hypothesis and error, with their distributions approximated by Wishart distributions. By aligning the mean and total variances of these matrices with their Wishart-approximations, we derived the approximate degrees of freedom that are estimated using a U-statistics-based approach. The resulting tests are affine-invariant and robust to deviations from Gaussianity and heteroscedasticity, showing strong performance even with small sample sizes.

Simulation studies revealed that, under equal covariance functions across groups, the proposed tests achieve comparable size control to the permutation-based tests of Górecki and Smaga (2017) and the bootstrap-based test of Qiu et al. (2024). Importantly, under heteroscedasticity, the proposed tests demonstrated superior performance, underscoring their robustness and utility in diverse testing scenarios. Furthermore, as shown in the real data analysis, the proposed tests are significantly faster computationally compared to the permutation-based and bootstrap-based alternatives. However, as indicated in Table 2, the proposed tests are less powerful than T_{QFZ}^{\max} in Qiu et al. (2024) when the functional data exhibit high or moderate correlations. Future work to enhance the power of the proposed tests is warranted and represents an interesting avenue for further research. In addition, although the use of the Wishart-approximation is not grounded in a formal theoretical foundation, the simulation results clearly indicate its appropriateness. Further investigation into this theoretical aspect is planned.

Acknowledgements

The author is thankful to Dr. Zhu Ying and Dr. Soh Chin Gi for providing their dataset, which is used in Section 4, and to Dr. Zhiping Qiu for providing the code from Qiu et al. (2021, 2024).

A Technical Proofs

Lemma 1 Suppose that at each time point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{X}(t) = [\mathbf{x}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{x}_m(t)]^\top$ is an $m \times p$ random matrix whose columns $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \sim \text{SP}_p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Gamma}_i)$ and are independent for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$ be an $m \times m$ symmetric matrix, and define $\mathbf{Q} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{X}(t)^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}(t) dt$. The mean and total variation of \mathbf{Q} are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \text{ and } V(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_i) + \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2}^2 (I_{i_1 i_2} + T_{i_1 i_2}),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_i) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t) \mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t)] ds dt - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_i^2) - I_{ii} - T_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{\Gamma}_i(t, t) dt$, $I_{i_1 i_2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt$ and $T_{i_1 i_2} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2})$, $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof of Lemma 1. We can further write $\mathbf{Q} = \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}_{i_1}(t) \mathbf{x}_{i_2}(t)^\top dt$. Since $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ are independently distributed, it is easy to find

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}_i(t) \mathbf{x}_i(t)^\top dt \right] = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{\Gamma}_i(t, t) dt = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \mathbf{\Sigma}_i.$$

Next, to find $V(\mathbf{Q})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{Q}) &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \text{Var} \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2} x_{i_1 h}(t) x_{i_2 \ell}(t) dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2} x_{i_1 h}(t) x_{i_2 \ell}(t) dt \right]^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \mathbb{E}^2 \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2} x_{i_1 h}(t) x_{i_2 \ell}(t) dt \right] \\ &= V_1 - V_2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m \sum_{i_3=1}^m \sum_{i_4=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_3 i_4} x_{i_1 h}(s) x_{i_2 \ell}(s) x_{i_3 h}(t) x_{i_4 \ell}(t) ds dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t) \mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t)] ds dt + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} a_{i_1 i_1} a_{i_2 i_2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, s) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(t, t)] ds dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} a_{i_1 i_2}^2 \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt + \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} a_{i_1 i_2}^2 \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t) \mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t)] ds dt + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} a_{i_1 i_1} a_{i_2 i_2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i_2}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} a_{i_1 i_2}^2 I_{i_1 i_2} + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} a_{i_1 i_2}^2 T_{i_1 i_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \mathbb{E}^2 \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} x_{ih}(t) x_{i\ell}(t) dt \right] = \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \gamma_{i, h\ell}(t, t) dt \right]^2 \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^p \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_1} a_{i_2 i_2} \gamma_{i_1, h\ell}(s, s) \gamma_{i_2, h\ell}(t, t) ds dt \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_1} a_{i_2 i_2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, s) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(t, t)] ds dt \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_1} a_{i_2 i_2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{i_1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$V(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_i) + \sum_{i_1=1}^m \sum_{i_2=1}^m a_{i_1 i_2}^2 (I_{i_1 i_2} + T_{i_1 i_2}),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_i) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t) \mathbf{x}_i(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t)] ds dt - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_i^2) - I_{ii} - T_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Lemma 2 Given the k functional samples (1), let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(t, t) dt, i = 1, \dots, k$, $I_{i_1 i_2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt$, and $T_{i_1 i_2} = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t) \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt, i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, k$. When $i_1 \neq i_2$, the unbiased estimators of $I_{i_1 i_2}$ and $T_{i_1 i_2}$ are given by

$$\hat{I}_{i_1 i_2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt, \text{ and } \hat{T}_{i_1 i_2} = \text{tr}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_2}), i_1 \neq i_2, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

respectively, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(s, t), i = 1, \dots, k$ is the sample matrix of group covariance functions given in (4). In addition, the unbiased estimators of I_{ii}, T_{ii} and $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^2), i = 1, \dots, k$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_{ii} &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(s) ds dt, \\ \hat{T}_{ii} &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(s) \mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt, \text{ and} \\ \widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^2)} &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t) \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t) \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t) \mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s) ds dt, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

respectively.

Proof of Lemma 2. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(s, t)$ (4) is the unbiased estimator of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t), i = 1, \dots, k$, it is straightforward to show that $\text{E}\{\text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i(s, t)]\} = \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)], i = 1, \dots, k$. When $i_1 \neq i_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{E}(\hat{I}_{i_1 i_2}) &= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{E}\{\text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_1}(s, t)]\} \text{E}\{\text{tr}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_2}(s, t)]\} ds dt = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] ds dt = I_{i_1 i_2}, \text{ and} \\ \text{E}(\hat{T}_{i_1 i_2}) &= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{\text{E}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_1}(s, t)] \text{E}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{i_2}(s, t)]\} ds dt = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}) = T_{i_1 i_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, equation (A.1) is obtained. Next, we focus on demonstrating the unbiasedness of the estimators in (A.2). The main ideas of constructing the unbiased estimators in (A.2) follow U-statistics-based estimate approach in Li and Chen (2012). Besides considering U-statistics of the form $[n_i(n_i-1)]^{-1} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t) \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t) ds dt$, to address the case where $\text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij}(t)] \neq \mathbf{0}$, we subtract two additional U-statistics of orders three and four, respectively. This approach dates back to Glasser (1961, 1962) and follows the method outlined in equation (2.1) of Li and Chen (2012). Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{E}(\hat{I}_{ii}) &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)] ds dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top \mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(s)] ds dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top] \text{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(s)] ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)] + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\} \{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)] + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\} ds dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)] + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s) ds dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s) \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s) ds dt \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}^2[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t)] ds dt = I_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\hat{T}_{ii}) &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&- \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(t)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&+ \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(s)] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(t)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)] dsdt \\
&= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top][\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&- \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top]\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top\} dsdt \\
&+ \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s) dsdt \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t)\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t)] dsdt = T_{ii}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the expectation of $\widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^2)}$ can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^2)}] &= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&- \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(t)] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&+ \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_2}(s)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_3}(t)] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_4}(t)^\top] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{ij_1}(s)] dsdt \\
&= \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, s) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)^\top][\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(t, t) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top]\} dsdt \\
&- \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}\{[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, s) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)^\top]\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top\} dsdt \\
&+ \frac{1}{n_i(n_i-1)(n_i-2)(n_i-3)} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^* \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i(s) dsdt \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, s)\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(t, t)] dsdt = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.

Proof of Proposition 1. Under the affine-transformation (10), the associated vector of mean functions and matrix of covariance functions transform as $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^0(t) = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(t) + \mathbf{b}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_i^0(s, t) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t)\mathbf{A}^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, respectively. Consequently, the GLHT problem (2) associated with the transformed data becomes $H_0^0 : \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}^0(t) = \mathbf{C}_0^0(t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$ vs $H_1^0 : \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}^0(t) \neq \mathbf{C}_0^0(t)$, for some $t \in \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathbf{M}^0(t) = [\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^0(t), \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^0(t)]^\top$, and $\mathbf{C}_0^0(t) = \mathbf{C}_0(t)\mathbf{A}^\top + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{1}_k\mathbf{b}(t)^\top$. Since $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^0(t) = \mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) + \mathbf{b}(t)$, we have $\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}^0(t) - \mathbf{C}_0^0(t) = [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]\mathbf{A}^\top$, where $\hat{\mathbf{M}}^0(t) = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1^0(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k^0(t)]^\top$ which is an unbiased estimator of $\mathbf{M}^0(t)$. It follows that $\mathbf{B}_n^0 = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{A}[\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]\mathbf{A}^\top dt = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_n\mathbf{A}^\top$. Similarly, we have $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^0 = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n\mathbf{A}^\top$ and $\mathbf{E}_n^0 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{A}^\top$. Additionally, $\text{tr}[\mathbf{\Gamma}_i^*(s, t)] = \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}_i(s, t)]$ and $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}^*\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}^*) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_1}(s, t)\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i_2}(s, t)] dsdt$ are invariant under the affine-transformation (10). Furthermore, it is easy to find that \mathbf{H}_n is unaffected by the affine-transformation (10). These results imply that the proposed test statistics T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} , and T_{MFP} (9) are affine-invariant. Moreover, the approximate degrees of freedom d_B and d_E in (7) and (8), along with their estimators in (15) and (16), are also invariant. The proof is complete.

Proof of Proposition 2. To demonstrate that the proposed tests T_{MFW} , T_{MFLH} , and T_{MFP} (9) are invariant under the transformation specified in (11), it is sufficient to establish that \mathbf{B}_n , \mathbf{E}_n , d_B , and d_E remain invariant under the same transformation. Specifically, we have $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{P}[\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]$, and $(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top\mathbf{P}^\top)^{-1} = (\mathbf{P}^{-1})^\top(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{B}_n \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{T}} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)]^\top \mathbf{P}^\top (\mathbf{P}^{-1})^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P} [\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \mathbf{C}_0(t)] dt = \mathbf{B}_n,$$

and $\mathbf{H}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{P}^\top (\mathbf{P}^{-1})^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{H}_n$, both of which remain invariant under the transformation in (11). Then the invariance of \mathbf{E}_n , d_B , and d_E follows immediately.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first find d_B so that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n \sim W_p(d_B, \mathbf{I}_p/d_B)$ approximately via matching the total variations of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \sim W_p(d_B, \mathbf{I}_p/d_B)$. It can be shown that the total variation of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is given by $V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}) = d_B(p/d_B^2 + p^2/d_B^2) = p(p+1)/d_B$. Then we aim to find the total variation of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{X}(t) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} dt$. Let $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^*(t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{ij}(t)$, so that $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^*(t) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{SP}_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i^*)$, $j = 1, \dots, n_i$; $i = 1, \dots, k$, where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i^*(s, t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i(s, t) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^*(t) = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1^*(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^*(t)]^\top$. As a result, we can express $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^*(t)^\top \mathbf{H}_n \bar{\mathbf{X}}^*(t) dt$. Since $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t)] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{Cov}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(s), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t)] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i^*(s, t)/n_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, applying Lemma 1 yields

$$V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*) + \sum_{i_1=1}^k \sum_{i_2=1}^k \frac{h_{i_1 i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} (I_{i_1 i_2}^* + T_{i_1 i_2}^*),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_4(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(s)^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(s) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t) ds dt] - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2})/n_i^2 - I_{ii}^*/n_i^2 - T_{ii}^*/n_i^2$, with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_i^*(t, t) dt$, $I_{i_1 i_2}^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1}^*(s, t) \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}^*(s, t)] ds dt$, and $T_{i_1 i_2}^* = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_1}^* \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{i_2}^*)$.

Further, since $\int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(s)^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(s)^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t) ds dt] = n_i^{-3} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t) \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t)] ds dt + n_i^{-3} (n_i - 1) [\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2}) + I_{ii}^* + T_{ii}^*]$, it follows that $\mathcal{K}_4(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*) = \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*)/n_i^3$. Therefore,

$$V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{h_{ii}^2}{n_i^3} \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) + \sum_{i_1=1}^k \sum_{i_2=1}^k \frac{h_{i_1 i_2}^2}{n_{i_1} n_{i_2}} (I_{i_1 i_2}^* + T_{i_1 i_2}^*),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t) \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(s)^\top \mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t)] ds dt - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{*2}) - I_{ii}^* - T_{ii}^*$, $i = 1, \dots, k$.

By matching $V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n)$ and $V(\tilde{\mathbf{B}})$, equation (7) is derived.

Next, we proceed to find d_E by matching $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n)$ and $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}})$. Similarly, it is straightforward to determine $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}) = p(p+1)/d_E$. Thus, our task reduces to determining $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n)$. We can further express $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n$ as $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*/n_i$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i^*(t, t) dt$ with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_i^*(t, t) = (n_i - 1)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} [\mathbf{x}_{ij}^*(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t)][\mathbf{x}_{ij}^*(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^*(t)]^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \mathbb{E}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*)/n_i, \quad \text{and} \quad V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii}^2 V(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*)/n_i^2.$$

As a result, we aim to study $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ first. We can write $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^* = (n_i - 1)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{X}_i^*(t)^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X}_i^*(t) dt$, where $\mathbf{X}_i^*(t) = [\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*(t), \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_i}^*(t)]^\top$ and $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_{n_i} - \mathbf{J}_{n_i}/n_i$ with \mathbf{I}_n denoting the usual $n \times n$ identity matrix and \mathbf{J}_n denoting the usual $n \times n$ matrix of ones. Then by Lemma 1, we have $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*) = (n_i - 1)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} p_{jj} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^* = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^*$, provided by $p_{jj} = 1 - 1/n_i$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n_i$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k h_{ii} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^*/n_i$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i^*) &= (n_i - 1)^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} p_{jj}^2 \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) + (n_i - 1)^{-2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n_i} \sum_{j_2=1}^{n_i} p_{j_1 j_2}^2 (I_{ii}^* + T_{ii}^*) \\ &= n_i^{-1} \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) + (n_i - 1)^{-1} (I_{ii}^* + T_{ii}^*). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{h_{ii}^2}{n_i^3} \mathcal{K}_4(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{h_{ii}^2}{n_i^2 (n_i - 1)} (I_{ii}^* + T_{ii}^*).$$

By matching $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_n)$ and $V(\tilde{\mathbf{E}})$, equation (8) is derived.

References

- Bartlett, M. S. (1939). A note on tests of significance in multivariate analysis. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 35, pages 180–185. Cambridge University Press.
- Bathke, A. C. and Harrar, S. W. (2008). Nonparametric methods in multivariate factorial designs for large number of factor levels. *Journal of Statistical planning and Inference*, 138(3):588–610.
- Behrens, W. U. (1929). Ein beitrag zur fehlerberechnung bei wenigen beobachtungen (A contribution to error estimation with few observations). *Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbucher (Berlin: Wiegandt and Hempel)*, 68:807–837.
- Fisher, R. A. (1935). The fiducial argument in statistical inference. *Annals of Eugenics*, 6(4):391–398.
- Fujikoshi, Y. (1975). Asymptotic formulas for the non-null distributions of three statistics for multivariate linear hypothesis. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 27:99–108.
- Glasser, G. J. (1961). An unbiased estimator for powers of the arithmetic mean. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 23(1):154–159.
- Glasser, G. J. (1962). Estimators for the product of arithmetic means. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 24(1):180–184.
- Górecki, T. and Smaga, L. (2017). Multivariate analysis of variance for functional data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 44(12):2172–2189.
- Harrar, S. W. and Bathke, A. C. (2012). A modified two-factor multivariate analysis of variance: asymptotics and small sample approximations. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 64:135–165.
- Himeno, T. and Yamada, T. (2014). Estimations for some functions of covariance matrix in high dimension under non-normality and its applications. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 130:27–44.
- Hotelling, H. et al. (1951). A generalized t test and measure of multivariate dispersion. In *Proceedings of the second Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 1, pages 23–41. University of California Press Berkeley.
- Lawley, D. (1938). A generalization of Fisher’s z test. *Biometrika*, 30(1/2):180–187.
- Li, J. and Chen, S. X. (2012). Two sample tests for high-dimensional covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):908 – 940.
- Munko, M., Ditzhaus, M., Pauly, M., and Smaga, L. (2024). Multiple comparison procedures for simultaneous inference in functional MANOVA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01242*.

- Nanda, D. (1950). Distribution of the sum of roots of a determinantal equation under a certain condition. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 432–439.
- Nel, D. and Van der Merwe, C. (1986). A solution to the multivariate Behrens-Fisher problem. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 15(12):3719–3735.
- Pillai, K. et al. (1955). Some new test criteria in multivariate analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 26(1):117–121.
- Qiu, Z., Chen, J., and Zhang, J.-T. (2021). Two-sample tests for multivariate functional data with applications. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 157:107160.
- Qiu, Z., Fan, J., and Zhang, J.-T. (2024). Tests for equality of several mean vector functions for multivariate functional data with applications. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, pages 1–21.
- Rao, C. R. (1951). An asymptotic expansion of the distribution of wilk’s criterion. *Bulletin of the international statistical institute*, 33(2):177–180.
- Roy, S. N. et al. (1953). On a heuristic method of test construction and its use in multivariate analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(2):220–238.
- Satterthwaite, F. E. (1946). An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components. *Biometrics bulletin*, 2(6):110–114.
- Smaga, L. and Zhang, J.-T. (2019). Linear hypothesis testing with functional data. *Technometrics*, 61(1):99–110.
- Soh, C. G., Zhu, Y., and Toh, T. L. (2023). A regularised logistic regression model with structured features for classification of geographical origin in olive oils. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 237:104819.
- Wilks, S. S. (1932). Certain generalizations in the analysis of variance. *Biometrika*, pages 471–494.
- Xiao, S. and Zhang, J.-T. (2016). Modified tests for heteroscedastic two-way MANOVA. *Journal of Advanced Statistics*, 1(1):1.
- Zeng, T. and Harrar, S. W. (2024). Robust tests for multivariate repeated measures with small samples. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 51(3):555–580.
- Zhang, J.-T. (2011). Two-way MANOVA with unequal cell sizes and unequal cell covariance matrices. *Technometrics*, 53(4):426–439.
- Zhang, J.-T. (2012). An approximate Hotelling T^2 -test for heteroscedastic one-way MANOVA. *Open Journal of Statistics*, 2(01):1.
- Zhang, J.-T. (2013). *Analysis of Variance for Functional Data*. CRC Press, New York.
- Zhang, J.-T. and Liang, X. (2014). One-way ANOVA for functional data via globalizing the pointwise F-test. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 41(1):51–71.

- Zhu, T. (2024). The general linear hypothesis testing problem for multivariate functional data with applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02518*.
- Zhu, T., Zhang, J.-T., and Cheng, M.-Y. (2022). One-way MANOVA for functional data via Lawley–Hotelling trace test. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 192:105095.
- Zhu, T., Zhang, J.-T., and Cheng, M.-Y. (2024). A global test for heteroscedastic one-way FMANOVA with applications. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 231:106133.