Aggregated Tests Based on Supremal Divergence (or Dual φ -Divergence) Estimators for non-Regular Statistical Models

Jean-Patrick Baudry¹³, Michel Broniatowski¹, and Cyril Thommeret^{1,2}

¹ Sorbonne Université and Université Paris Cité, CNRS, Laboratoire de Probabilités, Statistique et Modélisation, F-75005 Paris, France
² Safran Group

³ Corresponding author, 4 place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, jean-patrick.baudry@sorbonne-universite.fr

Abstract. A methodology is proposed to build statistical test procedures pertaining to models with incomplete information; the lack of information corresponds to a nuisance parameter in the description of the model. The supremal approach based on the dual representation of CSAM divergences (or f-divergences) is fruitful; it leads to M-estimators with simple and standard limit distribution, and it is versatile with respect to the choice of the divergence. Duality approaches to divergence-based optimisation are widely considered in statistics, data analysis and machine learning: indeed, they avoid any smoothing or grouping technique which would be necessary for a more direct divergence minimisation approach for the same problem.

We are interested in a widely considered but still open problem which consists in testing the number of components in a parametric mixture. Although common, this is still a challenging problem since the corresponding model is non-regular particularly because of the true parameter lying on the boundary of the parameter space. This range of problems has been considered by many authors who tried to derive the asymptotic distribution of some statistic under boundary conditions. The present approach based on supremal divergence M-estimators makes the true parameter an interior point of the parameter space, providing a simple solution for a difficult question. To build a composite test, we aggregate simple tests.

Keywords: Non-regular models \cdot Dual form of f-divergences \cdot Statistical test aggregation \cdot Number of components in mixture models.

0.1 Dual Representation of the φ -Divergences and Tests

We consider CSAM divergences (see [13] for definitions and properties):

$$D_{\phi}(Q, P) = \begin{cases} \int \phi(\frac{dQ}{dP}) dP & \text{if } Q << P \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where Q and P are probability measures on the same probability space. Extensions to divergences between probability measures and signed measures can be found in [21]. Dual formulations of divergences can be found in [14] and [6]. They are widely considered in statistics, data analysis and machine learning (see e.g. [19, 3]).

Citing [18]: "Let \mathcal{F} be some class of \mathcal{B} -measurable real valued functions. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the subspace of the space of probability measures \mathcal{M} defined by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{P \in \mathcal{M} : \int |f| dP < \infty, \forall f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Assume that φ is differentiable and strictly convex. Then, for all $P \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $D_{\varphi}(P, P_T)$ is finite and $\varphi'(dP/dP_T)$ belongs to \mathcal{F} , the φ -divergence admits the dual representation (see Theorem 4.4 in [5]):

$$D_{\varphi}(P, P_T) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \int f dP - \int \varphi^*(f) dP_T, \tag{1}$$

where $\varphi^*(x) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} tx - \varphi(t)$ is the Fenchel-Legendre convex conjugate. Moreover, the supremum is [uniquely attained at $f = \varphi'(dP/dP_T)$]."

This result can be used in two directions. First, a statistical model, e.g. a parametrical model $\{P_{\theta}: \theta \in \Theta\}$ with P_{θ} is absolutely continuous with respect to some dominating measure μ for any θ , naturally induces a family $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi'(p_{\theta}/p_{\theta'}): \theta, \theta' \in \Theta\}$. This is the main framework of this paper.

Conversely, a class of functions \mathcal{F} defines the distribution pairs P and Q that can be compared, which are these such that $\varphi'(dP/dQ) \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore it induces a divergence D_{φ} on these pairs. A typical example is the logistic model.

The KLm divergence is defined by the generator $\varphi : x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto -logx + x - 1$ and leads to the maximum likelihood estimator for both forms of estimation for the supremal estimator (see Remark 3.2 in [6]).

We consider in this paper the problem of testing the number of components in a mixture model. This question has been considered by various authors. [10, 8, 1, 12, 15] have considered likelihood ratio tests and showed some difficulties with those due to the fact that the likelihood ratio statistic is unbounded with respect to n. [15] prove that its distribution is driven by a $\log \log n$ term in a specific simple Gaussian mixture model. The test statistic needs to be calibrated in accordance with this result. But first, as stated by [15], the convergence to the limit distribution is extremely slow, making this result unpractical. And second, it seems very difficult to derive the corresponding term for a different model, and even more so for a general situation.

Our approach to this problem is suggested by the dual representation of the divergence. For the KLm divergence, it amounts to considering the maximum likelihood estimator itself as a test statistic instead of the usual maximum value of the likelihood function. This leads to a well-defined limiting distribution for the test statistic under the null. This holds for a class of estimators obtained by substituting KLm by any regular divergence. This approach also eliminates the curse of irregularity encountered by many authors for the problem of testing the number of components in a mixture.

Since we are interested in composite hypotheses, there is no justification in this context that the likelihood ratio test would be the best (in terms of uniform power) as is usually considered (e.g. [16, 7]) and [11] showed what difficulties likelihood ratio tests can encounter in this context.

[7] considered tests based on an estimation of the minimum divergence between the true distribution and the null model. In this paper we make use of the unicity of the optimiser of the dual representation of the divergence in (1).

Our procedure for composite hypotheses consists in the aggregation of simple tests in the spirit of [9]. [4] used a similar aggregation procedure for testing between two distributions under noisy data and obtained some control of the resulting test power.

1 Notation and Hypotheses

Let $\{f_1(.;\theta_1): \theta_1 \in \Theta_1\}$, $\Theta_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, and $\{f_2(.;\theta_2): \theta_2 \in \Theta_2\}$, $\Theta_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, be probability density families with respect to a σ -finite measure λ on $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{B})$. Let $\Theta \subset]a,b[\times\Theta_1\times\Theta_2]$, and

$$g_{\pi,\theta} = (1-\pi)f_1(.;\theta_1) + \pi f_2(.;\theta_2)$$

for any $(\pi, \theta) \in \Theta$ with $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$.

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} g_{\pi^*, \theta^*} \lambda$ with $(\pi^*, \theta^*) \in \Theta$ and assume that $g_{\pi, \theta} = g_{\pi^*, \theta^*} \Rightarrow \pi = \pi^*, \theta_1 = \theta_1^*$ and $\theta_2 = \theta_2^*$ if $\pi^* \neq 0$

Let g be a probability density with respect to λ such that $Supp(g) \subset Supp(g_{\pi,\theta})$ for any $(\pi,\theta) \in \Theta$ such that

$$\forall (\pi, \theta) \in \Theta, \int \left| \varphi'(\frac{g}{q_{\pi, \theta}}) \right| g d\lambda < \infty.$$

Let us define for any $(\pi, \theta) \in \Theta$,

$$m_{\pi,\theta}: x \in \mathcal{X} \mapsto \int \varphi'\left(\frac{g}{g_{\pi,\theta}}\right) g d\lambda - \varphi^{\#}\left(\frac{g}{g_{\pi,\theta}}\right)(x)$$

and assume that $(\pi, \theta) \mapsto m_{\pi, \theta}(x)$ is continuous for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Let us also assume that

$$\forall (\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\theta}) \in \Theta, \exists r_0 > 0 / \forall r \leq r_0, \ \mathbb{P}^* \left| \sup_{d((\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\theta}), (\pi, \theta)) < r} m_{\pi, \theta} \right| < \infty.$$

Theorem 1. For any $(\pi^*, \theta^*) \in \Theta$

$$D_{\varphi}(g, g_{\pi^*, \theta^*}) = \sup_{(\pi, \theta) \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}^* m_{\pi, \theta},$$

which we call the <u>supremal form</u> of the divergence. Moreover attainment holds uniquely at $(\pi, \theta) = (\pi^*, \theta^*)$.

Definition 1. Let \mathbb{P}_n denote the empirical measure pertaining to the sample X_1, \ldots, X_n . Define

$$(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}) := \arg \max_{(\pi, \theta)} \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta}$$

the <u>supremal estimator</u> of (π^*, θ^*) .

The existence of $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta})$ can be guaranteed by assuming that Θ is compact. When uniqueness does not hold, consider any maximizer. This class of estimators has been introduced in [6], under the name dual φ -divergence estimators.

2 Consistency of the Supremal Divergence Estimator

Let us first state the consistency of the supremal divergence estimator of the proportion and the parameters of the existing component, when the non-existing component parameters are fixed, uniformly over the latter.

Here and below, by abuse of notation, we let $\varphi'(\frac{g}{g_{\pi,\theta}})$ stand for $x \mapsto \varphi'(\frac{g(x)}{g_{\pi,\theta}(x)})$, and so on.

Remark that, for $\pi^* = 0$ and any $\theta_1^* \in \Theta_1$ and $\theta_2 \in \Theta_2$, we can unambiguously write m_{π^*, θ_1^*} for $m_{\pi^*, \theta_1^*, \theta_2}$ since the parameter θ_2 is not involved in the expression of $m_{0, \theta_1^*, \theta_2}$.

Theorem 2. Assume that $\pi^* = 0$ and let for any $\theta_2 \in \Theta_2$, $(\hat{\pi}(\theta_2), \hat{\theta}_1(\theta_2)) \in]a, b[\times \Theta_1 \text{ such that}]$

$$\inf_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} \mathbb{P}_n m_{\hat{\pi}(\theta_2), \hat{\theta}_1(\theta_2), \theta_2} \ge \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi^*, \theta_1^*} - o_{\mathbb{P}^*}(1). \tag{2}$$

Then

$$\sup_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} d((\hat{\pi}(\theta_2), \hat{\theta}_1(\theta_2)), (0, \theta_1^*)) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{\mathbb{P}^*} 0.$$

The convergence holds a.s. in the particular case of (2) when, a.s.,

$$\forall \theta_2 \in \Theta_2, (\hat{\pi}(\theta_2), \hat{\theta}_1(\theta_2)) \in \underset{(\pi, \theta_1) \in]a, b[\times \Theta_1}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}. \tag{3}$$

3 Asymptotic Distribution of the Supremal Divergence Estimator

Under H_0 ($\pi^* = 0$), the joint asymptotic distribution of $(\hat{\pi}(\theta_2), \hat{\pi}(\theta_2'))$ is provided by the following theorem.

Theorem 3. Let $\theta_2 \in \Theta_2$ and $\theta_2' \in \Theta_2$ such that $(\pi^*, \theta_1^*, \theta_2) \in \mathring{\Theta}$ and $(\pi^*, \theta_1^*, \theta_2') \in \mathring{\Theta}$. Write

$$\Theta(\theta_2) = \{ (\pi, \theta_1) \in] - \infty, 1[\times \Theta_1 : (\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta \}$$

$$\Theta(\theta_2') = \{ (\pi, \theta_1) \in] - \infty, 1[\times \Theta_1 : (\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2') \in \Theta \},$$

and let $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1)$ and $(\hat{\pi}', \hat{\theta}'_1)$ be such that

$$(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1) \in \underset{(\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2)}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}$$
$$(\hat{\pi}', \hat{\theta}_1') \in \underset{(\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2')}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2'}.$$

Assume that $\pi^* = 0$. Assume that:

$$- (\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2) \mapsto m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}(x) \text{ (resp. } (\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2') \mapsto m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2'}(x)) \text{ is dif-}$$

$$ferentiable \ \lambda\text{-a.e. with derivative } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1} = \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_1, \theta_2}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}}\right)_{|(\pi, \theta_1)} \text{ (resp. } \psi_{\pi, \theta_1}' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi} m_{\pi,\theta_1,\theta_2'} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} m_{\pi,\theta_1,\theta_2'} \end{pmatrix}_{|(\pi,\theta_1)|}) \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}^* \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*} = 0 \text{ (resp. } \mathbb{P}^* \psi'_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*} = 0).$$

$$- (\pi,\theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2) \mapsto \mathbb{P}^* \psi_{\pi,\theta_1} \text{ (resp. } (\pi,\theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2') \mapsto \mathbb{P}^* \psi'_{\pi,\theta_1} \text{) is differentiable}$$

- at π^*, θ_1^* with invertible derivative matrix $H = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi)_{|{\pi^* \choose a^*}}^{(\tau^*)}$ (resp. H' =
- $D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|}$). $- \{\psi_{\pi,\theta_1} : (\pi,\theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2)\} \text{ and } \{\psi'_{\pi,\theta_1} : (\pi,\theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta'_2)\} \text{ are } \mathbb{P}^*\text{-}Donsker.$
- $\ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x))^2 d\mathbb{P}^*(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^*} 0 \ and \ \int (\psi_{\hat{\pi},\hat{\theta}_1}'(x) \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x) + \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x) + \psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}'(x)$

 $Assume \ that \ H = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi)_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} = \mathbb{P}^*D^2(h)_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} \ (resp. \ H' = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} = \mathbb{P}^*D^2(h')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} \ (resp. \ H' = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} \ (resp. \ H' = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} = \mathbb{P}^*D^2(h')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} \ (resp. \ H' = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}{\theta_1^*}\right|} \ (resp. \ H' = D(\mathbb{P}^*\psi')_{\left|\binom{\pi^*}$

 $h: (\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta_2) \mapsto m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2}(x) \text{ (resp. } h': (\pi, \theta_1) \in \Theta(\theta'_2) \mapsto m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta'_2}(x)).$ $Then with a_n \text{ (resp. } a'_n) \text{ the } (1, 1) \text{ entry of } H_n^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1} \psi_{\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1}^T H_n^{-1} \text{ (resp. } H_n'^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1}^T \psi_{\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1}^T H_n^{-1})$ $where \ H_n \text{ (resp. } H'_n) \text{ is the Hessian matrix of } (\pi, \theta_1) \mapsto \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta_2} \text{ (resp. } H_n'^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1}^T H_n^{-1})$ $(\pi, \theta_1) \mapsto \mathbb{P}_n m_{\pi, \theta_1, \theta'_2})$ at $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\theta}_1)$, which is supposed to be invertible, which should hold with high probability,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_n}}(\hat{\pi} - \pi^*) \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{a'_n}}(\hat{\pi}' - \pi^*) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, U)$$

with

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{b}{\sqrt{aa'}} \\ \frac{b}{\sqrt{aa'}} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where b is the (1,1) entry of $H^{-1}\mathbb{P}\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}^{\prime T}H^{\prime-1}$, a (resp. a^\prime) the (1,1) entry of $H^{-1}\mathbb{P}\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}^TH^{-1}$ (resp. $H'^{-1}\mathbb{P}\psi'_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}\psi'_{\pi^*,\theta_1^*}^TH'^{-1}$).

This result naturally generalises to k-uples... The marginal result for θ actually holds when $\pi^* > 0$ and $\theta_2 = \theta_2^*$, which is useful to control the power of the test procedure to be defined.

Let us consider as a test statistic $T_n = \sup_{\theta_2} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_n}} \hat{\pi}$ and let us reject H_0 when T_n takes large values. It seems sensible to reduce $\hat{\pi}$ for each value of θ_2 so that, under H_0 , it is asymptotically distributed as a $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and that the (reduced) values of $\hat{\pi}$ for different θ_2 can be compared. In practice, the asymptotic variance has to be estimated hence the substitution of $\hat{\pi}$, $\hat{\theta}_1$, and \mathbb{P}_n for π^* , θ_1^* , and \mathbb{P}^* in $H^{-1}\mathbb{P}^*\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_*^*}\psi_{\pi^*,\theta_*^*}^TH^{-1}$. This choice is justified in [17].

The Bonferoni aggregation rule is not sensible here since the tests for different values of θ_2 are obviously not independent. Hence the need in Theorem 3 for the joint asymptotic distribution to take the dependence between $\hat{\pi}$ for different values of θ_2 . This leads to the study of the asymptotic distribution of T_n which should be the distribution of $\sup W$ where W is a Gaussian process which covariance structure is given by Theorem 3. This will be proved in the forthcoming section.

4 Asymptotic Distribution of the Supremum of Supremal Divergence Estimators

 H_0 is assumed to hold in this section.

It is stated that the asymptotic distribution of T_n is that of the supremum of a Gaussian process with the covariance $\frac{b}{\sqrt{aa'}}$, as in (4).

Then it is stated that the distribution of the latter can be approximated by maximising the Gaussian process with the covariance $\frac{b_n}{\sqrt{a_n a'_n}}$, where a_n , a'_n , and b_n are estimations of the corresponding quantities, on a finite grid of values for θ_2 .

Let X be the centred Gaussian process over Θ_2 with

$$\forall \theta_2, \theta_2' \in \Theta_2, r(\theta_2, \theta_2') = \operatorname{Cov}(X_{\theta_2}, X_{\theta_2'}) = \frac{b}{\sqrt{aa'}}$$

where a and b are defined in Theorem 3.

Theorem 4. Under general regularity conditions pertaining to the class of derivatives of m (Glivenko-Cantelli classes),

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{a_n}}(\hat{\pi}_n - \pi^*) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X.$$

This results from [20] when $dim(\Theta_2) = 1$ and [22] when $dim(\Theta_2) > 1$.

Theorem 5. Under the same general regularity conditions as above,

$$T_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} X(\theta_2).$$

The proof of the last result when $dim(\Theta_2) = 1$ makes use of the fact that $\theta_2 \mapsto \hat{\pi}(\theta_2)$ is cadlag ([20]). This is a reasonable assumption, which holds in the examples which we considered. We are eager for counter-examples! When $dim(\Theta_2) > 1$, the result holds also by [2].

Let now X^n be the centred Gaussian process over Θ_2 with

$$\forall \theta_2, \theta_2' \in \Theta_2, \operatorname{Cov}(X_{\theta_2}^n, X_{\theta_2'}^n) = \frac{b_n}{\sqrt{a_n a_n'}}$$

where a_n , a'_n are defined in Theorem 3 and b_n is defined analogously.

Theorem 6. Let, for any $\delta > 0$, Θ_2^{δ} be a finite set such that $\forall \theta_2 \in \Theta_2, \exists \tilde{\theta}_2 \in \Theta_2^{\delta}/\|\theta_2 - \tilde{\theta}_2\| \leq \delta$. Then

$$M_n^{\delta} = \sup_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2^{\delta}} X_{\theta_2}^n \xrightarrow[\delta \to 0]{\mathcal{L}} M = \sup_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} X_{\theta_2}.$$

5 Algorithm

Algorithm 1: Test of H_0 : one component vs H_1 : two components

Parameters :
$$\varphi$$
, $\{f_1(.;\theta_1): \theta_1 \in \Theta_1\}$, θ_1^* , $\{f_2(.;\theta_2): \theta_2 \in \Theta_2\}$, n , K , Θ_2^{δ} , $p \in [0,1]$

- 1. let $t = \sup_{\theta_2 \in \Theta_2} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_n(\theta_2)}} \hat{\pi}(\theta_2)$ 2. for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ (a) sample $(X_t)_{t \in \Theta_2^{\delta}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \left(\frac{b_n(t, t')}{\sqrt{a_n(t)a_n(t')}}\right)_{t, t' \in \Theta_2^{\delta}}\right)$
- (b) let $\tilde{t}_k = \max_{t \in \Theta_2^{\delta}} x_t$ 3. if $t \ge \text{empirical_quantile}((\tilde{t}_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}}, 1-p)$ reject H_0 else don't reject H_0 vs H_1 .

Bibliography

- [1] Bickel, P.J., Chernoff, H.: Asymptotic distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic in a prototypical non regular problem. Statistics and Probability: A Raghu Raj Bahadur Festschrift pp. pp. 83–96 (1993)
- [2] Bickel, P.J., Wichura, M.J.: Convergence criteria for multiparameter stochastic processes and some applications. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics 42(5), 1656–1670 (1971)
- [3] Birrell, J., Dupuis, P., Katsoulakis, M., Pantazis, Y., Rey-Bellet, L.: (f, γ) -divergences: Interpolating between f-divergences and integral probability metrics. Journal of machine learning research (2022)
- [4] Broniatowski, M., Jurečková, J., Moses, A.K., Miranda, E.: Composite tests under corrupted data. Entropy **21**(1), 63 (2019)
- [5] Broniatowski, M., Keziou, A.: Minimization of φ -divergences on sets of signed measures. Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica **43**(4), 403–442 (2006)
- [6] Broniatowski, M., Keziou, A.: Parametric estimation and tests through divergences and the duality technique. Journal of Multivariate Analysis **100**(1), 16–36 (2009)
- [7] Broniatowski, M., Miranda, E., Stummer, W.: Testing the number and the nature of the components in a mixture distribution. In: Geometric Science of Information: 4th International Conference, GSI 2019, Toulouse, France, August 27–29, 2019, Proceedings 4. pp. 309–318. Springer (2019)
- [8] Feng, Z., McCulloch, C.E.: Statistical inference using maximum likelihood estimation and the generalized likelihood ratio when the true parameter is on the boundary of the parameter space. Statistics & Probability Letters 13(4), 325–332 (1992)
- [9] Garel, B.: Asymptotic theory of the likelihood ratio test for the identification of a mixture. Journal of statistical planning and inference **131**(2), 271–296 (2005)
- [10] Ghosh, J.K., Sen, P.K.: On the asymptotic performance of the log likelihood ratio statistic for the mixture model and related results. Tech. rep., North Carolina State University. Dept. of Statistics (1984)
- [11] Hall, P., Stewart, M.: Theoretical analysis of power in a two-component normal mixture model. Journal of statistical planning and inference **134**(1), 158–179 (2005)
- [12] Hartigan, J.A.: Statistical theory in clustering. Journal of classification **2**(1), 63–76 (1985)
- [13] Liese, F., Vajda, I.: Convex statistical distances, vol. 95. Teubner (1987)
- [14] Liese, F., Vajda, I.: On divergences and informations in statistics and information theory. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 52(10), 4394–4412 (2006)

- [15] Liu, X., Shao, Y.: Asymptotics for the likelihood ratio test in a two-component normal mixture model. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference **123**(1), 61–81 (2004)
- [16] Lo, Y., Mendell, N.R., Rubin, D.B.: Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. Biometrika 88(3), 767–778 (2001)
- [17] McLachlan, G., Peel, D.: Finite Mixture Models. New York: Wiley (2000)
- [18] Mohamad, D.A.: Towards a better understanding of the dual representation of phi divergences. Statistical Papers $\bf 59(3)$, 1205-1253 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00362-016-0812-5, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00362-016-0812-5
- [19] Nguyen, X., Wainwright, M.J., Jordan, M.I.: Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **56**(11), 5847–5861 (2010)
- [20] Pollard, D.: Convergence of stochastic processes. Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
- [21] Rüschendorf, L.: On the minimum discrimination information theorem. Statistical Decisions pp. 263–283 (1984)
- [22] van der Vaart, A., Wellner, J.A.: Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes. Springer (1996)