


Provided for non-commercial research and education use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Statistics and Probability Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/stapro

On the false discovery proportion convergence under Gaussian equi-correlation

S. Delattre^a, E. Roquain^{b,*}^a University Paris Diderot, LPMA, France^b UPMC University of Paris 6, LPMA, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 3 July 2010

Accepted 30 September 2010

Available online 8 October 2010

MSC:

62G10

62J15

60F05

Keywords:

False discovery rate

Donsker theorem

Equi-correlation

Functional Delta method

p-value

ABSTRACT

We study the convergence of the false discovery proportion (FDP) of the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure in the Gaussian equi-correlated model, when the correlation ρ_m converges to zero as the hypothesis number m grows to infinity. In this model, the FDP converges to the false discovery rate (FDR) at rate $\{\min(m, 1/\rho_m)\}^{1/2}$, which is different from the standard convergence rate $m^{1/2}$ holding under independence.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

When simultaneously testing a large number m of null hypotheses, a popular global type I error, that can be traced back to Seeger (1968), is the false discovery proportion (FDP), defined as the ratio of the number of erroneous rejections to the number of rejections. The average of this random variable, called the false discovery rate (FDR, introduced by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995)), has been studied by a considerable number of works, see for instance Sarkar (2008) and Blanchard and Roquain (2009) for a review. However, studying the FDR is not sufficient to catch the full behavior of the FDP, for instance, a FDR control does not prevent the FDP from having large variations. Therefore, some other studies aim to directly control the upper-quantile of the FDP distribution, see e.g. Genovese and Wasserman (2006), Lehmann and Romano (2005), or to directly compute the distribution of the FDP, either non-asymptotically Chi and Tan (2008), Roquain and Villers (2010), or asymptotically Genovese and Wasserman (2004). Recently, Neuvial (2008, 2009) computed the asymptotic distribution of the FDP *actually* achieved by the Benjamini–Hochberg (BH) procedure (and some other adaptive procedures) under independence of the *p*-values. It is proved that the FDP converges to the FDR at the parametric rate $m^{1/2}$. Furthermore, Farcomeni (2007) showed that this convergence still holds under a specific short-range dependency between the *p*-values.

In this paper, we are interested in studying the convergence of the FDP of the BH procedure in the model where the test statistics have exchangeable Gaussian errors, with equi-correlation ρ (allowing in particular long-range dependencies). This model has become quite standard in multiple testing (see e.g. Benjamini et al., 2006; Finner et al., 2007), as it is among

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: etienne.roquain@upmc.fr (E. Roquain).

the simplest models that introduce some dependencies between the p -values. From an intuitive point of view, the test statistics can be seen as independent test statistics plus a disturbance variable whose importance depends on the value of ρ . When $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is fixed w.r.t. m (and in the “ideal” setting where the p -values under the alternative are all equal to zero), Finner et al. (2007) proved that the FDP of the BH procedure converges to a non-deterministic random variable that still depends on the disturbance variable. When $\rho_m \rightarrow 0$, we show here that this disturbance variable has no effect on the limit of the FDP anymore, which equals $\pi_0\alpha$ (where π_0 is the proportion of true nulls), but can still have an effect on the asymptotic variance of the FDP or even on the convergence rate. More precisely, when $\rho_m \rightarrow 0$ our main result states that $\{\min(m, 1/\rho_m)\}^{1/2}(\text{FDP}_m - \pi_0\alpha) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V)$ holds for a given $V > 0$; in comparison with the independent case, we may distinguish the two following cases, recovering all the possible convergence regimes of ρ_m to zero:

- when $\lim_m m\rho_m = \theta \in [-1, +\infty)$, the limit of the FDP and the convergence rate are the same as in the independent case. The asymptotic variance V is larger if $\theta > 0$, smaller if $\theta < 0$ and is the same whenever $\theta = 0$ (i.e. $m\rho_m \rightarrow 0$).
- when $\lim_m m\rho_m = +\infty$ and $\lim_m \rho_m = 0$ the convergence rate is $\rho_m^{-1/2}$ instead of $m^{1/2}$.

On the one hand, this shows that the FDP of the BH procedure is still well concentrated around $\pi_0\alpha$ under weak equi-correlation such that $\rho_m = O(1/m)$. On the other hand, this puts forward that the concentration of the FDP of the BH procedure around the FDR may be arbitrarily slow when $\rho_m \rightarrow 0$, which is a striking result that has not been reported before to the best of our knowledge. Therefore, our recommendation is that the BH procedure can be used under Gaussian equi-correlation when $\rho_m = O(1/m)$ (including the case of a negative equi-correlation) but should be used carefully as soon as $m\rho_m \rightarrow \infty$, as the actual convergence rate of the FDP to the FDR might be much slower.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the model, the notation and the main result. The latter is proved in Section 3, including a generalization to any “regular” thresholding procedure, recovering the so-called π_0 -adaptive procedures studied in Neuvial (2008). Finally, the case where $\rho_m = \rho \in [0, 1]$ does not converge to zero is discussed in Section 4.

2. Setting and main result

We observe $X_i = \tau_i + Y_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, where the parameter of interest is $(\tau_i)_i \in \{0, \mu\}^m$ (for a given $\mu > 0$) and the (unobservable) error vector (Y_1, \dots, Y_m) is an exchangeable Gaussian vector with $\mathbb{E}Y_1 = 0$ and $\text{Var}Y_1 = 1$. We let $\rho_m = \text{Cov}(Y_1, Y_2) \in [-(m-1)^{-1}, 1]$. We consider the problem of the one-sided testing of the null “ $\tau_i = 0$ ” against the alternative “ $\tau_i = \mu$ ”, simultaneously for any $1 \leq i \leq m$. To test each null, we define the p -value $p_i = \Phi(X_i)$, where $\Phi(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z \geq z)$ is the standard Gaussian upper-tail function. The c.d.f. of each p -value is denoted by $G_0(t) = t$ under the null and by $G_1(t) = \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu)$ under the alternative. The number of true nulls is denoted by $m_0(m) = |\{i \mid \tau_i = 0\}|$ and is assumed to be of the form $\lfloor m\pi_0 \rfloor$ for a given proportion of true null $\pi_0 \in (0, 1)$ independent of m . The “mixture” c.d.f. of the p -values is denoted by $G(t) = \pi_0 G_0(t) + (1 - \pi_0)G_1(t)$. Next, we define the e.c.d.f.’s $\widehat{G}_{0,m}(t) = (m_0(m))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\tau_i = 0\} \mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq t\}$, $\widehat{G}_{1,m}(t) = (m - m_0(m))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\tau_i > 0\} \mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq t\}$ and $\widehat{G}_m(t) = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq t\}$.

Given a pre-specified level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the procedure of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) can be defined as the procedure rejecting the nulls corresponding to $p_i \leq \mathcal{T}^{\text{BH}}(\widehat{G}_m)$ where the (data-driven) threshold $\mathcal{T}^{\text{BH}}(\widehat{G}_m)$ is $\max\{t \in [0, 1] \mid \widehat{G}_m(t) \geq t/\alpha\}$. Next, the false discovery proportion at a given threshold $t \in [0, 1]$ is defined as the proportion of true nulls among the hypotheses having a p -value smaller than or equal to t :

$$\text{FDP}_m(t) = \frac{|\{1 \leq i \leq m \mid \tau_i = 0, p_i \leq t\}|}{|\{1 \leq i \leq m \mid p_i \leq t\}| \vee 1} = \frac{m_0(m)}{m} \frac{\widehat{G}_{0,m}(t)}{\widehat{G}_m(t) \vee m^{-1}}.$$

We now state our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *There is a unique point $t^* \in (0, 1)$ such that $G(t^*) = t^*/\alpha$ and the following holds:*

- (i) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = \theta \in [-1, +\infty)$, then

$$\sqrt{m}(\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}^{\text{BH}}(\widehat{G}_m)) - \pi_0\alpha) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \pi_0\alpha^2 \frac{1-t^*}{t^*} + \theta \frac{\pi_0^2\alpha^2}{2\pi(t^*)^2} e^{-(\Phi^{-1}(t^*))^2}\right); \tag{1}$$

- (ii) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = +\infty$ and $\lim_m \rho_m = 0$, then

$$\rho_m^{-1/2}(\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}^{\text{BH}}(\widehat{G}_m)) - \pi_0\alpha) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\pi_0^2\alpha^2}{2\pi(t^*)^2} e^{-(\Phi^{-1}(t^*))^2}\right). \tag{2}$$

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

3.1. A more general result

In what follows, we denote the space of functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} which are right-continuous and with left-hand limits (Skorokhod’s space) by $D(0, 1)$ and the space of continuous functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} by $C(0, 1)$. The method for proving

our result relies on the methodology let down by [Neuivial \(2008\)](#) which considers the case of a general threshold function $\mathcal{T} : D(0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ being Hadamard differentiable at G , tangentially to $C(0, 1)$ (see [van der Vaart, 1998](#) for a formal definition). The proof of [Theorem 2.1](#) is presented here as a consequence of a more general theorem, true for any such threshold. The derivative of the threshold \mathcal{T} at G , which is a continuous linear form on $C(0, 1)$, is denoted by $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$. According to the Riesz representation theorem, the continuous linear form $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$ can be written as $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G(F) = \int_0^1 F(t)\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G(dt)$, where we identify the linear form $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$ and the corresponding signed measure.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{T} : D(0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be Hadamard differentiable at G , tangentially to $C(0, 1)$, with derivative $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$. Let $q(t) = \pi_0 t/G(t)$ for $t > 0$, let $t^* = \mathcal{T}(G)$ and assume $t^* > 0$. We set $\zeta_0 = \frac{q(t^*)(1-q(t^*))}{t^*} \delta_{t^*} + \dot{q}(t^*)\pi_0 \dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$, $\zeta_1 = -\frac{q(t^*)(1-q(t^*))}{G_1(t^*)} \delta_{t^*} + \dot{q}(t^*)(1-\pi_0)\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$ and*

$$c(\mathcal{T}) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_0^1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Phi^{-1}(t))^2} \zeta_0(dt) + (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_0^1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Phi^{-1}(t)-\mu)^2} \zeta_1(dt);$$

$$\sigma^2(\mathcal{T}) = \pi_0^{-1} \int_{[0,1]^2} (s \vee t - st)\zeta_0(ds)\zeta_0(dt) + (1-\pi_0)^{-1} \int_{[0,1]^2} (G_1(s \vee t) - G_1(s)G_1(t))\zeta_1(ds)\zeta_1(dt).$$

Then the following holds:

(i) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = \theta \in [-1, +\infty)$,

$$\sqrt{m}(\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m)) - q(t^*)) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(\mathcal{T}) + \theta c(\mathcal{T})^2); \tag{3}$$

(ii) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = +\infty$ and $\lim_m \rho_m = 0$,

$$\rho_m^{-1/2}(\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m)) - q(t^*)) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c(\mathcal{T})^2). \tag{4}$$

Let us now check that [Theorem 2.1](#) follows from [Theorem 3.1](#). From [Neuivial \(2008\)](#) Corollary 7.12, $\mathcal{T}^{\text{BH}} : F \mapsto \max\{t \in [0, 1] \mid F(t) \geq t/\alpha\}$ is Hadamard differentiable at G , tangentially to $C(0, 1)$, with derivative $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G^{\text{BH}} = (1/\alpha - \dot{G}(t^*))^{-1} \delta_{t^*}$. Moreover, $t^* = \max\{t \in [0, 1] \mid G(t) \geq t/\alpha\}$ is positive, because $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t/G(t) = 0$. Also, since $G(t^*) = t^*/\alpha$ and $\dot{q}(t^*) = (1/\alpha - \dot{G}(t^*))\pi_0\alpha^2/t^*$, we may check that $\zeta_1 = 0$ and $\zeta_0 = (\pi_0\alpha/t^*)\delta_{t^*}$ in the above theorem, which leads to [Theorem 2.1](#).

3.2. Proof of [Theorem 3.1](#)

Let us now prove [Theorem 3.1](#). First write $\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m)) = (m_0(m)/m)\pi_0^{-1}\Psi(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{0,m}, \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{1,m})$, where for any F_0, F_1 in $D(0, 1)$ with $F(\mathcal{T}(F)) > 0$ (letting $F = \pi_0 F_0 + (1-\pi_0)F_1$), we put $\Psi(F_0, F_1) = \pi_0 \frac{F_0(\mathcal{T}(F))}{F(\mathcal{T}(F))}$. From standard computations, Ψ is Hadamard differentiable at (G_0, G_1) , tangentially to $C(0, 1)^2$ and the derivative takes the form, for $(H_0, H_1) \in C(0, 1)^2$, $\dot{\Psi}_{G_0, G_1}(H_0, H_1) = q(t^*)(1-q(t^*)) \left(\frac{H_0(t^*)}{t^*} - \frac{H_1(t^*)}{G_1(t^*)} \right) + \dot{q}(t^*)\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G(H)$, where $H = \pi_0 H_0 + (1-\pi_0)H_1$. Applying the functional Delta method, this leads to the following useful result, which was essentially stated in [Neuivial \(2008\)](#).

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{T} : D(0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be Hadamard differentiable at G , tangentially to $C(0, 1)$, with derivative $\dot{\mathcal{T}}_G$. Let $q(t) = \pi_0 t/G(t)$ for $t > 0$, let $t^* = \mathcal{T}(G)$ and assume $t^* > 0$. If for a given sequence $a_m \rightarrow \infty$ with $a_m = o(m)$,*

$$a_m \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{0,m} - G_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{1,m} - G_1 \end{pmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{W}_0 \\ \mathbb{W}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

where the convergence in distribution is relative to the Skorokhod topology and where \mathbb{W}_0 and \mathbb{W}_1 are processes with continuous paths, then we have

$$a_m(\text{FDP}_m(\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m)) - q(t^*)) \rightsquigarrow X, \tag{6}$$

where $X = \zeta_0(\mathbb{W}_0) + \zeta_1(\mathbb{W}_1)$ and ζ_0, ζ_1 are defined as in [Theorem 3.1](#).

A convergence of the type (5) in the particular Gaussian equi-correlated model is stated in [Lemma 3.3](#). Using [Proposition 3.2](#), this proves that (6) holds both in the cases (i) and (ii) with $a_m = \sqrt{m}$ and $a_m = \rho_m^{-1/2}$, which respectively leads to (3) and (4) (the variance computations are straightforward).

3.3. Convergence of the e.c.d.f.s in the Gaussian equi-correlated model

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, Z)$ be a random variable such that $\mathbb{Z}_0 \stackrel{(d)}{=} \pi_0^{-1/2}\mathbb{B}$, $\mathbb{Z}_1 \stackrel{(d)}{=} (1-\pi_0)^{-1/2}\mathbb{B} \circ G_1$, \mathbb{B} being a standard Brownian bridge on $[0, 1]$, \mathbb{Z}_0 is independent from \mathbb{Z}_1 , $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, $\text{Cov}(Z, \mathbb{Z}_0(t)) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-\{\Phi^{-1}(t)\}^2/2)$*

and $\text{Cov}(Z, \mathbb{Z}_1(t)) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-\{\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu\}^2/2)$. Let also $U \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ be independent of the vector $(\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, Z)$. Then we have the following convergences in law for the Skorokhod topology:

(i) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = \theta \in [-1, +\infty)$,

$$\sqrt{m} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{0,m} - G_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{1,m} - G_1 \end{pmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_0 + (Z - \sqrt{1+\theta}U)\dot{\Phi} \circ \Phi^{-1} \\ \mathbb{Z}_1 + (Z - \sqrt{1+\theta}U)\dot{\Phi} \circ (\Phi^{-1} - \mu) \end{pmatrix}; \tag{7}$$

(ii) if $\lim_m m\rho_m = +\infty$ and $\lim_m \rho_m = 0$,

$$\rho_m^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{0,m} - G_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{1,m} - G_1 \end{pmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{pmatrix} U\dot{\Phi} \circ \Phi^{-1} \\ U\dot{\Phi} \circ (\Phi^{-1} - \mu) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

To prove Lemma 3.3, first remark that the distribution of the X_i s may be realized as $X_i = \sqrt{1 - \rho_m}(\xi_i - \bar{\xi}) + \sqrt{(1 + (m-1)\rho_m)/m}U + \mu \mathbf{1}\{\tau_i > 0\}$, where (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m, U) are all i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ variables and $\bar{\xi}$ denotes the empirical mean of the ξ_i s. Let $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{0,m}(t) = (m_0(m))^{-1} \sum_{i:\tau_i=0} \mathbf{1}\{\Phi(\xi_i) \leq t\}$, $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{1,m}(t) = (m - m_0(m))^{-1} \sum_{i:\tau_i>0} \mathbf{1}\{\Phi(\xi_i + \mu) \leq t\}$ and

$$f_m(t, U, \rho_m) = (1 - \rho_m)^{-1/2} \left(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \sqrt{(1 + (m-1)\rho_m)/m}U \right).$$

The process $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{0,m} - G_0, \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_{1,m} - G_1)$ is then equal to $V_m + W_m$ where

$$V_m(t) = \begin{pmatrix} (\widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{0,m} - G_0)(\Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi})) \\ (\widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{1,m} - G_1)(\Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi} - \mu(1 - \rho_m)^{-1/2} + \mu)) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W_m(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi}) - t \\ \Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi} - \mu(1 - \rho_m)^{-1/2}) - \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, applying Donsker's theorem, we derive $\sqrt{m}(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{0,m} - G_0, \widehat{\mathbb{G}}'_{1,m} - G_1, \bar{\xi}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, Z)$, where $(\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, Z)$ is defined as in Lemma 3.3. Since $\rho_m \rightarrow 0$, the inverse functions of $t \mapsto \Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi})$ and $t \mapsto \Phi(f_m(t, U, \rho_m) + \bar{\xi} - \mu(1 - \rho_m)^{-1/2} + \mu)$ converge uniformly on $[0, 1]$ to the identity a.s. Therefore, applying Skorokhod's representation theorem, we get

$$\sqrt{m}(V_m, \bar{\xi}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, Z). \tag{9}$$

Let us now consider the case (i), in which $\lim_m m\rho_m = \theta \in [-1, +\infty)$. In that case, a standard reasoning involving Taylor expansions of Φ and $y \mapsto \Phi(y\Phi^{-1}(t))$ leads to

$$\sqrt{m}W_m(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Phi}(\Phi^{-1}(t))(\sqrt{m}\bar{\xi} - \sqrt{1+\theta}U) \\ \dot{\Phi}(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu)(\sqrt{m}\bar{\xi} - \sqrt{1+\theta}U) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} R_{0,m}(t) \\ R_{1,m}(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

with remainder terms satisfying $\|R_{0,m}\|_\infty \vee \|R_{1,m}\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ in probability. Since U is independent of all the other variables, we derive from (9) that $\sqrt{m}(V_m, W_m) \rightsquigarrow (\mathbb{Z}_0, \mathbb{Z}_1, (Z - \sqrt{1+\theta}U)\dot{\Phi} \circ \Phi^{-1}, (Z - \sqrt{1+\theta}U)\dot{\Phi} \circ (\Phi^{-1} - \mu))$. This implies (7). Consider now the case (ii), in which $\lim_m m\rho_m = +\infty$ and $\lim_m \rho_m = 0$. In that situation, we deduce from (9) that $\rho_m^{-1/2}V_m$ converges in probability to 0. Furthermore, using that $\rho_m^{-1/2}\bar{\xi}$ tends to zero in probability, we obtain that

$$\rho_m^{-1/2}W_m(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Phi}(\Phi^{-1}(t))(-U) \\ \dot{\Phi}(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu)(-U) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} T_{0,m}(t) \\ T_{1,m}(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

with remainder terms satisfying $\|T_{0,m}\|_\infty \vee \|T_{1,m}\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ in probability. This implies (8).

4. Discussion: FDP convergence in the case $\rho_m = \rho \in (0, 1)$

When $\rho_m = \rho \in (0, 1)$, we cannot expect that the FDP concentrates around the FDR as in Theorem 2.1 (see e.g. Finner et al., 2007, Theorem 2.1). As a consequence, even if the FDP has a mean below $\pi_0\alpha$ (because the false discovery rate of the BH procedure is below $\pi_0\alpha$ for each m for PRDS statistics, see Theorem 1.2 in Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001)), the FDP can exceed $\pi_0\alpha + \varepsilon$ ($\varepsilon > 0$) with a probability that does not vanish when m grows to infinity.

We claim here that in the ideal situation where the parameters of the model π_0, μ, ρ are perfectly known, it is possible to modify the p -values so that the FDP convergence to the FDR keeps the parametric convergence rate \sqrt{m} . For this, we replace each test statistic X_i by $\tilde{X}_i = \sqrt{m/((m-1)(1-\rho))}(X_i - \bar{X} + (1 - \pi_0)\mu)$, so that $(\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_m)$ is a Gaussian vector with variances equal to 1, equi-correlation $\tilde{\rho}_m = -(m-1)^{-1}$ and means $\mathbb{E}\tilde{X}_i = \sqrt{m/((m-1)(1-\rho))}\tau_i$. We build the corresponding p -values by letting $\tilde{p}_i = \Phi(\tilde{X}_i)$, which are uniform under the null and have the c.d.f. $\tilde{G}_{1,m}(t) = \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \tilde{\mu}_m)$ for $\tilde{\mu}_m = (m/(m-1))^{1/2}\mu(1-\rho)^{-1/2}$ under the alternative. Although the latter depends (slightly) on m ,

we easily check that our methodology applies using $\tilde{G}_1(t) = \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \tilde{\mu})$ for $\tilde{\mu} = \mu(1 - \rho)^{-1/2}$ and that the following convergence holds:

$$\sqrt{m}(\widetilde{\text{FDP}}_m - \pi_0\alpha) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \pi_0\alpha^2 \frac{1 - t_\rho^*}{t_\rho^*} - \frac{\pi_0^2\alpha^2}{2\pi(t_\rho^*)^2} e^{-(\Phi^{-1}(t_\rho^*))^2}\right),$$

where $\widetilde{\text{FDP}}_m$ denotes the FDP of the BH threshold \mathcal{T}^{BH} used with the p -values \tilde{p}_i 's and where $t_\rho^* \in (0, 1)$ is the unique point $t \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\pi_0 t + (1 - \pi_0)\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(t) - \mu(1 - \rho)^{-1/2}) = t/\alpha$ (which depends on ρ). Of course, while this p -value modification greatly improves the convergence rate of the FDP to $\pi_0\alpha$, this approach requires to know perfectly the parameters π_0 , μ and ρ . A correct estimation of the model parameters within such a procedure stays an open issue.

References

- Benjamini, Y., Hochberg, Y., 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* 57, 289–300.
- Benjamini, Y., Krieger, A.M., Yekutieli, D., 2006. Adaptive linear step-up procedures that control the false discovery rate. *Biometrika* 93, 491–507.
- Benjamini, Y., Yekutieli, D., 2001. The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Ann. Statist.* 29, 1165–1188.
- Blanchard, G., Roquain, E., 2009. Adaptive FDR control under independence and dependence. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 10, 2837–2871.
- Chi, Z., Tan, Z., 2008. Positive false discovery proportions: intrinsic bounds and adaptive control. *Statist. Sinica* 18, 837–860.
- Farcomeni, A., 2007. Some results on the control of the false discovery rate under dependence. *Scandinavian J. Statist.* 34, 275–297.
- Finner, H., Dickhaus, T., Roters, M., 2007. Dependency and false discovery rate: asymptotics. *Ann. Statist.* 35, 1432–1455.
- Genovese, C., Wasserman, L., 2004. A stochastic process approach to false discovery control. *Ann. Statist.* 32, 1035–1061.
- Genovese, C.R., Wasserman, L., 2006. Exceedance control of the false discovery proportion. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 101, 1408–1417.
- Lehmann, E.L., Romano, J.P., 2005. Generalizations of the familywise error rate. *Ann. Statist.* 33, 1138–1154.
- Neuval, P., 2008. Asymptotic properties of false discovery rate controlling procedures under independence. *Electron. J. Stat.* 2, 1065–1110.
- Neuval, P., 2009. Corrigendum to “asymptotic properties of false discovery rate controlling procedures under independence”. *Electron. J. Stat.* 3, 1083. [mr2460858].
- Roquain, E., Villers, F., 2010. Exact calculations for false discovery proportion with application to least favorable configurations. [ArXiv.org:1002.2845](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.2845).
- Sarkar, S.K., 2008. On methods controlling the false discovery rate. *Sankhya Ser. A* 70, 135–168.
- Seeger, P., 1968. A note on a method for the analysis of significances en masse. *Technometrics* 10, 586–593.
- van der Vaart, A.W., 1998. Asymptotic statistics. In: *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*, vol. 3. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.