

A New Representation of Uniform-Block Matrix and Applications

Yifan Yang* Hwiyoung Lee[†] Shuo Chen[‡]

Abstract

A covariance matrix with a special pattern (e.g., sparsity or block structure) is essential for conducting multivariate analysis on high-dimensional data. Recently, a block covariance or correlation pattern has been observed in various biological and biomedical studies, such as gene expression, proteomics, neuroimaging, exposome, and seed quality, among others. Specifically, this pattern partitions the population covariance matrix into uniform (i.e., equal variances and covariances) blocks. However, the unknown mathematical properties of matrices with this pattern limit the incorporation of this pre-determined covariance information into research. To address this gap, we propose a block Hadamard product representation that utilizes two lower-dimensional “coordinate” matrices and a pre-specific vector. This representation enables the explicit expressions of the square or power, determinant, inverse, eigendecomposition, canonical form, and the other matrix functions of the original larger-dimensional matrix on the basis of these “coordinate” matrices. By utilizing this representation, we construct null distributions of information test statistics for the population mean(s) in both single and multiple sample cases, which are extensions of Hotelling’s T^2 and T_0^2 , respectively.

Keywords. Block Hadamard product representation, dimensionality reduction, high-dimensional covariance matrix, uniform-block matrix, uniform-block structure

*Address: Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742 U.S.A., Email: yiorfun@umd.edu

[†]Address: School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland, 21201 U.S.A., Email: hwiyoung.lee@som.umaryland.edu

[‡]Address: School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland, 21201 U.S.A., Email: shuochen@som.umaryland.edu

1 INTRODUCTION

Covariance matrices with specific structures or patterns have been extensively studied for their crucial roles in theoretical and practical applications of multivariate analysis. Numerous examples of structured covariance matrices have been employed in multivariate analysis. [Mauchly \(1940\)](#) proposed a *spherical* covariance matrix with identical positive variance parameters along the diagonal and zero correlation parameters off the diagonal. [Wilks \(1946\)](#) extended the sphericity structure to have equal non-zero values for the off-diagonal correlation parameters, terming it the *uniform (intraclass or complete symmetry)* structure in the application to parallel forms of a test in educational studies. Furthermore, [Votaw \(1948\)](#) expanded Wilks' complete symmetry structure by incorporating the interchangeability of mutually exclusive subsets of variables, introducing two types of *compound symmetry* covariance structures, which were utilized in medical experiments ([Votaw et al., 1950](#)). In addition to the spherical and intraclass symmetric structures, [Olkin and Press \(1969\)](#) proposed another covariance structure known as *circular symmetry*, which was applied in physical studies and time series analysis.

A number of technological breakthroughs have led to significantly large-dimensional variables in real-world practice, necessitating the consideration of more complex covariance structures to reduce dimensionality. Customarily, various covariance structures have been developed, including the *bandability* ([Wu and Pourahmadi, 2003](#); [Bickel and Levina, 2008a](#)), the *sparsity* ([Karoui, 2008](#); [Bickel and Levina, 2008b](#); [Cai and Liu, 2011](#)), and the combination of sparsity and *low-rank* ([Fan et al., 2008, 2011](#)). Alternatively, to address the high dimensionality problem, covariance matrices can be assumed to have a block structure, where the number of unknown parameters is remarkably smaller than the original dimension. For instance, [Rogers and Young \(1974\)](#) generalized Wilks' intraclass structure to an arbitrary order in an educational study, such that all diagonal blocks have the same intraclass form, as do all off-diagonal blocks. [Szatrowski \(1976\)](#) studied covariance matrices with *block compound symmetry* structures, including type I and type II, and applied them to the analysis of educational testing data ([Szatrowski, 1982](#)). [Olkin \(1972\)](#) introduced circular symmetry structures in blocks and proposed a more general structure known as *block circular symmetry* for applications in physics. [Roy and Leiva \(2011\)](#), [Roy et al. \(2015\)](#), [Roy et al. \(2016\)](#), and [Žežula et al. \(2018\)](#) have extensively investigated a block structure referred to as *blocked compound symmetry* or

equicorrelation (partition) (Leiva, 2007; Roy and Leiva, 2008), and applied it in brain imaging and bone densitometry studies. In this paper, our focus is on a covariance or correlation matrix with a particular block structure that is commonly observed in empirical applications.

We concentrate on investigating a specific block pattern called *uniform-block* (UB) structure, motivated by its numerous real-world applications (Chen et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2023). Specifically, the UB structure is characterized by diagonal and off-diagonal elements within each diagonal submatrix being equal to two constants and all elements within each off-diagonal submatrix being equal to a constant. A partitioned matrix having a uniform-block structure is denoted as a *uniform-block* matrix. The concept of UB structures is not completely new and has been introduced by various researchers in different contexts. For instance, Geisser (1963) referred to it as the *uniform case of order m* and derived an information test statistic for the population mean vector, when the covariance matrix of a normal population has a UB structure of order $m = 1$ or 2 . Morrison (1972) extended Geisser's information test statistic to a more general order. Huang and Yang (2010) investigated the random sampling issues in the presence of a UB structure in the correlation matrix. Cadima et al. (2010) referred to it as a *k -group block structure* and studied the eigendecomposition of correlation matrices with a UB structure. Roustant and Deville (2017) named a correlation matrix with UB structure a *parametric block correlation matrix with p blocks*, and provided necessary and sufficient conditions for its positive definiteness. Roustant et al. (2020) investigated the Gaussian process regression problems using the name of *generalized compound symmetry block covariance matrices* for UB matrices. Recently, Archakov and Hansen (2022) examined this structured matrix, referring to it as a *block matrix with block partition*, and provided canonical forms for both symmetric and nonsymmetric cases.

However, to the best of our knowledge, there have been limited comprehensive studies on the algebraic properties of UB matrices, which restricts their applications in various fields, including statistics, biometrics, economics, finance, and others. For example, Geisser (1963) was the first to derive the null distributions of the information test statistics concerning the population mean vector(s) for both single and multiple samples, given a covariance matrix with a 2 by 2 UB structure. Specifically, Geisser (1963) derived an analogous version of Hotelling's (generalized) T^2 -statistic regarding the population mean vector based on a single normal sample, and an analogous version of Hotelling's (generalized) T_0^2 -statistic, known also as the Hotelling-

Lawley trace (Lawley, 1938; Hotelling, 1947, 1951), for testing the equality of population mean vectors based on multiple normal samples. Under the null hypotheses, both of Geisser’s information test statistics follow identical distributions as linear combinations of independent F -variates. Although Geisser (1963) and Morrison (1972) also extended these results to a general case with an arbitrary number of diagonal blocks, proofs were omitted.

In this study, we presented the algebraic properties of UB matrices through a novel block Hadamard product representation. In essence, given a vector consisting of the block sizes, a UB matrix can be uniquely determined by a diagonal matrix and a symmetric matrix of much smaller dimensions. Moreover, these two lower-dimensional matrices (and the block-size vector) can be viewed as the “coordinates” of a UB matrix since many important algebraic calculations on UB matrices only depend on their “coordinate” matrices. As a result, this representation greatly simplifies the algebraic operations, including the power computation, inverse calculation, eigenvalues determination, and determinant evaluation of a UB matrix, by leveraging its “coordinate” matrices. As an application in statistics, we revisited and rigorously established the exact null distributions of Geisser’s information test statistics for a general number of orders, including single and multiple sample cases.

We organize the remainder of this paper as follows. Section 2 presents the definitions and properties of UB matrices. Section 3 and Section 4 demonstrate the exact null distributions of Geisser’s information test statistics for one-sample and multiple-sample cases, respectively. Lastly, we summarize our findings and provide remarks and discussions in Section 5. Technical proofs are given in Appendix A. Throughout this paper, let \top denote the transpose of a vector or matrix. Let $\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{J}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the identity matrix and all-one matrix, respectively. Let $\mathbf{0}_{n \times m}, \mathbf{1}_{n \times m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denote the all-zero matrix and all-one matrix, respectively. Let $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Bdiag}(\cdot)$ denote the diagonal matrix and the block-diagonal matrix, respectively. Let $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ and $\text{det}(\cdot)$ denote the trace and determinant of a square matrix, respectively. Let $\text{sum}(\cdot)$ denote the sum of all elements of a matrix. Let $\text{corr}(\Sigma) = \text{diag}^{-1/2}(\sigma_{11}, \dots, \sigma_{pp}) \times \Sigma \times \text{diag}^{-1/2}(\sigma_{11}, \dots, \sigma_{pp})$ denote the correlation matrix of covariance matrix Σ with diagonal elements $\sigma_{11}, \dots, \sigma_{pp}$.

2 UNIFORM-BLOCK STRUCTURE AND UNIFORM-BLOCK MATRIX

In this section, we begin by defining a uniform-block structure and matrix. Next, we introduce a block Hadamard product representation for uniform-block matrices, which unveils their algebraic properties.

Definition 1 (partition-size vector and partitioned matrix by a partition-size vector). *Given a p by p matrix $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and a positive integer $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $K < p$, we define:*

(1) *a column vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top \in \mathbb{Z}_+^K$ is a partition-size vector, if $p_k > 1$ for every k and $p = p_1 + \dots + p_K$;*

(2) *the K by K partitioned matrix $(\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ of \mathbf{N} is the partitioned matrix of \mathbf{N} by \mathbf{p} , if the (k, k') -th block $\mathbf{N}_{kk'}$ has dimensions p_k by $p_{k'}$ for $k, k' = 1, \dots, K$.*

Definition 2 (uniform-block structure and matrix). *Given a partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$ and the K by K partitioned matrix $(\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ of a symmetric matrix \mathbf{N} by \mathbf{p} , we define:*

(1) *the structure of $(\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ is a uniform-block structure, if there exist real numbers a_{kk} and $b_{kk'}$ satisfying that the diagonal block $\mathbf{N}_{kk} = a_{kk}\mathbf{I}_{p_k} + b_{kk}\mathbf{J}_{p_k}$ for every $k = k'$ and the off-diagonal block $\mathbf{N}_{kk'} = b_{kk'}\mathbf{I}_{p_k \times p_{k'}}$ with $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$;*

(2) *the partitioned matrix $(\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ is a uniform-block matrix, if it has the structure of uniform-block. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] = (\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ denote this uniform-block matrix, where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$ is a K by K diagonal matrix and $\mathbf{B} = (b_{kk'})$ is a K by K symmetric matrix with $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$.*

Remark (non-symmetric uniform-block structure and matrix). We impose the condition of symmetry on a uniform-block structure or matrix, as defined in Definition 2, because we will be considering covariance or correlation matrices with this structure. However, it is worth noting that a non-symmetric uniform-block structure and matrix can also be defined by removing the condition $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$, i.e., allowing \mathbf{B} to be an arbitrary K by K matrix. Nonetheless, throughout this paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we refer to a uniform-block structure or matrix as symmetric.

Following Definition 2, we introduce two important instances of UB matrices: the partitioned matrices of an identity matrix \mathbf{I}_p and an all-one matrix \mathbf{J}_p are UB matrices, by a predetermined partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$. For simplicity, we will use $\mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$

instead of $\mathbf{I}[\mathbf{I}_K, \mathbf{0}_{K \times K}, \mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{0}_{K \times K}, \mathbf{J}_K, \mathbf{p}]$ throughout the paper.

$$\mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{I}_K, \mathbf{0}_{K \times K}, \mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{I}_p = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{p_1} & \mathbf{0}_{p_1 \times p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{p_1 \times p_K} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p_2 \times p_1} & \mathbf{I}_{p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{p_2 \times p_K} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{p_K \times p_1} & \mathbf{0}_{p_K \times p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_{p_K} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{0}_{K \times K}, \mathbf{J}_K, \mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{J}_p = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_{p_1} & \mathbf{1}_{p_1 \times p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{p_1 \times p_K} \\ \mathbf{1}_{p_2 \times p_1} & \mathbf{J}_{p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{p_2 \times p_K} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{1}_{p_K \times p_1} & \mathbf{1}_{p_K \times p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{J}_{p_K} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the notations $\mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$, we propose the following novel block Hadamard product representation of a UB matrix, which extremely simplifies the algebraic calculations involving UB matrices.

Lemma 1 (block Hadamard product representation of a UB matrix). *Given a pre-determined a partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$, suppose the K by K partitioned matrix $(\mathbf{N}_{kk'})$ of a p by p symmetric matrix \mathbf{N} by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$ is a diagonal matrix and $\mathbf{B} = (b_{kk'})$ is a symmetric matrix with $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}],$$

holds uniquely for \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , where \circ denotes the block Hadamard product satisfying that $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]$ is the block-diagonal matrix $\text{Bdiag}(a_{11}\mathbf{I}_{p_1}, \dots, a_{KK}\mathbf{I}_{p_K})$ and $\mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$ is the symmetric block matrix $(b_{kk'}\mathbf{I}_{p_k \times p_{k'}})$.

Remark (block Hadamard product representation). The matrix operator \circ can be regarded as a specialized form of block Hadamard product that is specifically tailored for block matrices, as discussed in works (Horn et al., 1991; Günther and Klotz, 2012). We provide an illustration of Lemma 1 in Fig. 1. A proof of Lemma 1 is available in Appendix A.1. From the proof, it is evident that the block Hadamard product representation holds (except for uniqueness) when $p_k = 1$ for some k . Furthermore, the representation also holds for non-symmetric uniform-block matrices.




Figure 1: Illustration of the block Hadamard product representation of a UB matrix $\Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{p} = (2, 3)^\top$, $K = 2$, $p = 5$, each square represents an element of $\Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, different colors represent different values.

By Lemma 1, the block Hadamard product representation is crucial for a UB matrix, as it provides an explicit expression involving the diagonal matrix \mathbf{A} , the symmetric matrix \mathbf{B} , and the partitioned-size vector \mathbf{p} . Therefore, we suggest utilizing the notation $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ (instead using the usual notation $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p})$) in Definition 2 to emphasize the importance of this representation. As demonstrated below, \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , and \mathbf{p} are sufficient and necessary for determining the expressions for the power, inverse (if it exists), and eigenvalues of a UB matrix $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$.

Corollary 1 (algebraic properties of UB matrices). *Given a common partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$, suppose $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, $\mathbf{N}_1 = \mathbf{N}_1[\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{N}_2 = \mathbf{N}_2[\mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{p}]$ are UB matrices with K by K diagonal matrices $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$, $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2$, K by K symmetric matrices $\mathbf{B} = (b_{kk'})$, $\mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2$. Let $\Delta = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ with $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$.*

(1) (Addition/Subtraction) *suppose $\mathbf{N}^* = \mathbf{N}_1 \pm \mathbf{N}_2$, then the partitioned matrix of \mathbf{N}^* by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A}_1 \pm \mathbf{A}_2$ and $\mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{B}_1 \pm \mathbf{B}_2$;*

(2) (Product) *suppose $\mathbf{N}^* = \mathbf{N}_1 \times \mathbf{N}_2$, in general, \mathbf{N}^* is not a UB matrix. But, if \mathbf{N}_1 and \mathbf{N}_2 are commute, i.e., $\mathbf{N}_1 \times \mathbf{N}_2 = \mathbf{N}_2 \times \mathbf{N}_1$, then \mathbf{N}^* is a UB matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{A}_2 = \mathbf{A}^{*,\top}$ and $\mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{B}_2 + \mathbf{B}_1 \times \mathbf{A}_2 + \mathbf{B}_1 \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}_2 = \mathbf{B}^{*,\top}$; in particular,*

(2-1) (Square) *suppose $\mathbf{N}^* = \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N}$, then the partitioned matrix of \mathbf{N}^* by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$;*

(2-2) (Power) *suppose $\mathbf{N}^* = \mathbf{N} \times \dots \times \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}^m$ with integer $m \geq 2$, then the partitioned matrix of \mathbf{N}^* by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^{(m)}, \mathbf{B}^{(m)}, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A}^{(1)} = \mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}^{(1)} = \mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{A}^{(m')} = \mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)} \times \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{(m')} = \mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)} \times \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}^{(m'-1)} \times \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}^{(m'-1)} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ for $m' = 2, \dots, m$;*

(3) (Eigenvalues) $N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ has p real eigenvalues in total, those are a_{kk} with multiplicity $(p_k - 1)$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and the rest K eigenvalues are identical with those of Δ ;

(4) (Determinant) $N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ has the determinant $\left(\prod_{k=1}^K a_{kk}^{p_k-1}\right) \times \det(\Delta)$;

(5) (Inverse) suppose N is invertible and $N^* = N^{-1}$, then the partitioned matrix of N^* by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $N^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{B}^* = -\Delta^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1}$.

(6) (Canonical Form) let $\bar{p}_0 = 0$, $\bar{p}_k = \sum_{k'=1}^k p_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ (then $\bar{p}_K = p$), and λ_j denote the j -th eigenvalue of $N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_{\bar{p}_1-1} = a_{11}$, $\lambda_{\bar{p}_1+1} = \dots = \lambda_{\bar{p}_2-1} = a_{22}$, \dots , $\lambda_{\bar{p}_{K-1}+1} = \dots = \lambda_{\bar{p}_K-1} = a_{KK}$ and the rest $\lambda_{\bar{p}_1}, \lambda_{\bar{p}_2}, \dots, \lambda_{\bar{p}_K}$ are identical with the eigenvalues of Δ (in the decreasing order). Thus, there exists an p by p orthogonal matrix Γ satisfying that $\Gamma \times N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \Gamma^\top = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$ and Γ can be constructed by K Helmert submatrices and K row vectors as follows:

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{(p_1-1) \times p_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{(p_1-1) \times p_K} \\ \xi_{1,1} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_1} & \xi_{1,2} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_2} & \cdots & \xi_{1,K} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_K} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{(p_K-1) \times p_1} & \mathbf{0}_{(p_K-1) \times p_2} & \cdots & \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_K \\ \xi_{K,1} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_1} & \xi_{K,2} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_2} & \cdots & \xi_{K,K} \mathbf{I}_{1 \times p_K} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(p_k-1) \times p_k}$ is the submatrix of a standard Helmert matrix of order p_k without the first row (Lancaster, 1965) and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k = (\xi_{k,1}, \xi_{k,2}, \dots, \xi_{k,K})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 1}$ is the eigenvector (normalized to the unit length) of Δ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{\bar{p}_k}$ for every k .

Remark (sufficient and necessary condition for positive definiteness). Let $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$. We observe that the term $\Delta = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ plays a critical role in determining the eigenvalues, determinant, and inverse of an invertible UB matrix $N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$. Although Δ is not symmetric in general, it has K real eigenvalues because $\Delta = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1} + \mathbf{B})\mathbf{P}$ is similar to a real symmetric matrix $\mathbf{P}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1} + \mathbf{B})\mathbf{P}^{1/2}$, which has K real eigenvalues. Therefore, $N[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ is positive definite or invertible, if and only if \mathbf{A} is positive definite (i.e., $a_{kk} > 0$ for every k) and Δ has K positive eigenvalues.

Remark (subspace). Consider the trace as an inner product, and let \mathcal{A} denote the finite-dimensional Hilbert space of p by p real symmetric matrices. A subspace \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} is said to be a *quadratic subspace* of \mathcal{A} , if $B \in \mathcal{B}$ implies that $B^2 \in \mathcal{B}$ (Seely, 1971). By the square

property in Corollary 1, the collection of all UB matrices having a common partition-size vector forms a quadratic subspace. Quadratic subspaces are useful in studying the completeness of minimal sufficient statistics in a family of multivariate normal distributions (Seely, 1971, 1977; Zmyślony, 1980). For example, Szatrowski (1980) explored the relationship between the quadratic subspace and the explicit representation of maximum likelihood estimators for covariance matrices in a normal model. Roy et al. (2016) proved the optimal properties of the unbiased estimator that they derived for estimating a blocked compound symmetry covariance matrix.

Remark (algebraic properties for non-symmetric UB matrices). Most results in Corollary 1 also hold for non-symmetric uniform-block matrices. Specifically, the sum, difference, and product of two non-symmetric UB matrices are still a non-symmetric UB matrix with the same expressions of \mathbf{A}^* and \mathbf{B}^* as in Corollary 1. The determinant and inverse (if it exists) of a non-symmetric UB matrix are also a non-symmetric UB matrix with the same expressions of \mathbf{A}^* and \mathbf{B}^* . However, it is worth noting that although a non-symmetric UB matrix $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ still has p eigenvalues, i.e., a_{kk} with multiplicity $(p_k - 1)$ for every k and K eigenvalues of Δ , some of the K eigenvalues of Δ may be complex. Subsequently, we may rearrange the K Helmert submatrices in Γ below the remaining K row vectors, resulting in a block-diagonal canonical form for a non-symmetric UB matrix (please see Theorem 1 in Archakov and Hansen (2022)). If Δ is diagonalizable, the canonical form will have a diagonal structure, and Γ remains the same as in Corollary 1, where $\lambda_{\bar{p}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\bar{p}_K}$ may be ordered in decreasing real parts.

The results in Corollary 1 highlight the advantages of using the block Hadamard product representations of UB matrices. First, calculations on K by K matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} can replace calculations on a larger p by p matrix \mathbf{N} , where K is typically much smaller than p , e.g., a proteomics study has $K = 7$ and $p = 107$ and a brain imaging study has $K = 5$ and $p = 227$ (Yang et al., 2023). This reduction in matrix size can significantly improve computational efficiency. Second, the results involving addition or subtraction of UB matrices with a common partition-size vector, as well as operations such as taking the square (or power), computing eigenvalues, determinant, and inverse (if it exists) of a UB matrix can be expressed in terms of the “coordinates” \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , and \mathbf{p} . These results greatly facilitate the use of UB matrices in various fields of applications. For example, Yang et al. (2023) proposed best unbiased covariance-

and precision-matrix estimators when the number of diagonal blocks K is fixed, as well as a modified hard-thresholding covariance matrix estimator when K grows with the sample size, respectively.

Before proceeding to hypothesis testing problems in the next sections, we specify the relationships between a covariance matrix and its precision and correlation matrix.

Corollary 2 (covariance matrix with a UB structure). *Given a partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$, suppose $\Sigma = \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ is a p by p positive definite covariance matrix with a uniform-block structure, where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$ and $\mathbf{B} = (b_{kk'})$ with $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$. Then, the partitioned matrix of $\Theta = \Sigma^{-1}$ by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $\Theta[\mathbf{A}_\Theta, \mathbf{B}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}]$; the partitioned matrix of $\Xi = \text{corr}(\Sigma)$ by \mathbf{p} is a UB matrix, denoted by $\Xi[\mathbf{A}_\Xi, \mathbf{B}_\Xi, \mathbf{p}]$, where*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_\Theta = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{B}_\Theta = -\Delta^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1} \end{cases}, \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_\Xi = \mathbf{C}^{-1/2} \times \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{C}^{-1/2} \\ \mathbf{B}_\Xi = \mathbf{C}^{-1/2} \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{C}^{-1/2} \end{cases},$$

with $\Delta = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$, $\mathbf{C} = \text{diag}(c_{11}, \dots, c_{KK})$, and $c_{kk} = a_{kk} + b_{kk}$ for every k .

3 TESTING A SPECIFIC MEAN FOR ONE-SAMPLE

In the case where the number of diagonal blocks $K = 1$ or $K = 2$, Geisser (1963) proposed an information test statistic for testing a specific mean vector based on a multivariate normal sample, and derived its exact null distribution in closed form. The distribution of Geisser's information test statistic under null hypothesis is identical to the distribution of a sum of several independent F -variates. However, for the general case $K > 2$, Geisser (1963) provided an algorithm for calculating the information test statistic and explicitly formulated the exact null distribution, but omitted the proofs. In this section, we present the exact null distribution of the one-sample Geisser's information test statistic using the notations of UB matrices: this exact null distribution is equivalent to the distribution of a linear combination of mutually independent F -variates, where the last variate is exactly the Hotelling's T^2 statistic.

Specifically, given p -dimensional normal vectors $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}])$, the

null and alternative hypotheses are given by

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \quad (3.1)$$

where the covariance matrix is known to have a UB structure, $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$ is an unknown diagonal matrix, $\mathbf{B} = (b_{kk'})$ is an unknown symmetric matrix with $b_{k'k} = b_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$, $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$ is a known partition-size vector, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a pre-determined vector. To guarantee positive definiteness of $\Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, we assume \mathbf{A} is positive definite and $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ has positive eigenvalues only, with $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$.

Before deriving Geisser's information test statistic for a specific mean vector, we introduce the maximum likelihood estimator of $\Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ based on a multivariate normal sample. Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = n^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{X}_n)$, $\mathbf{S} = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top$, and $(\mathbf{S}_{kk'})$ denote the sample mean, the (unbiased) sample covariance matrix, and the partitioned matrix of \mathbf{S} by \mathbf{p} , respectively. If the sample size is larger than the total number of unknown covariance parameters, i.e., $n > K + (K+1)K/2$, then we can obtain the best unbiased estimators of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \text{diag}(\hat{a}_{11}, \dots, \hat{a}_{KK})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = (\hat{b}_{kk'})$ with $\hat{b}_{k'k} = \hat{b}_{kk'}$ for every $k \neq k'$, respectively, where \hat{a}_{kk} and $\hat{b}_{kk'}$ are given by

$$\hat{a}_{kk} = \frac{p_k \times \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{kk}) - \text{sum}(\mathbf{S}_{kk})}{p_k \times (p_k - 1)}, \quad \hat{b}_{kk'} = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{S}_{kk'})}{p_k \times p_{k'}}, & k \neq k' \\ \frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{S}_{kk'}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{kk'})}{p_k \times (p_{k'} - 1)}, & k = k' \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

for every k and every k, k' respectively (see the details in [Yang et al. \(2023\)](#)). It is clear that the maximum likelihood estimator \hat{a}_{kk} is exactly the average of the off-diagonal elements within the (k, k) -th diagonal block of $(\mathbf{S}_{kk'})$; \hat{b}_{kk} is exactly the average of diagonal elements within the (k, k) -th diagonal block minus \hat{a}_{kk} ; and $\hat{b}_{kk'}$ is the average of all elements within the (k, k') -th off-diagonal block. By Corollary 2, the plug-in estimators of $\Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ and $\Theta[\mathbf{A}_\Theta, \mathbf{B}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}]$ are $\hat{\Sigma}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{p}]$ and $\hat{\Theta}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} = \hat{\mathbf{A}} + \hat{\mathbf{B}} \times \mathbf{P}$ are assumed to be positive definite and have positive eigenvalues only, respectively, and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta$ are given by $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta = \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \hat{\mathbf{B}} \times \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1}$.

Theorem 1 (exact null distribution of Geisser's one-sample information test statistic). *Geisser's*

one-sample test statistic for the hypotheses in (3.1) is given by

$$U = n \times (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \times \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \left[\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}, \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}, \mathbf{p} \right] \times (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0).$$

Under H_0 , it follows a distribution \mathcal{U} that is identical with the distribution of

$$\sum_{k=1}^K (p_k - 1) F_{(p_k-1), (p_k-1)(n-1)}^{(k)} + T^2,$$

where $T^2 = K(n-1)(n-K)^{-1} F_{K, n-K}^{(K+1)}$ is the Hotelling's T^2 -statistic and $F_{df_1, df_2}^{(k)}$ are $(K+1)$ mutually independent F -variates with degrees of freedom df_1 and df_2 for $k = 1, \dots, K+1$.

Remark (information test statistic U). Geisser's information criterion was proposed by Geisser (1963) to test the hypotheses in (3.1) using analysis of variance tables. In the distribution \mathcal{U} , the last variate is precisely the Hotelling's (generalized) T^2 -statistic, which is most likely used in multivariate inference (Anderson, 1992).

Remark (related distributions under H_0). (1) As $n \rightarrow \infty$, U asymptotically follows a chi-square distribution χ_p^2 where $p = p_1 + \dots + p_K$ (Geisser, 1963);

(2) Given a significance level α and an arbitrary vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ simultaneous confidence interval for a measurable function $\mathbf{a}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ has the form

$$\mathbf{a}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} + \pm \sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\alpha) \times \mathbf{a}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left[\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \widehat{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{p} \right] \mathbf{a}/n},$$

where $\mathcal{U}(\alpha)$ denotes the upper α -th percentile of the distribution \mathcal{U} (Morrison, 1972);

(3) An approximate distribution of U is suggested as $C_1 F_{(p, C_2)}$ by Morrison (1971), where the scale coefficient C_1 and the second degree of freedom C_2 are determined by equating the first two cumulants of $C_1 F_{(p, C_2)}$ to those of \mathcal{U} . The specific values of C_1 and C_2 for $K = 2$ can be found in Spjøtvoll (1972) and Young (1976). Furthermore, Dyer (1982) considered the distribution of the sum of generalized F variates and Lee and Hu (1996) extended above result to independent F -variates with arbitrary coefficients and degrees of freedom.

Remark (related distributions under H_1). (1) The non-null distribution was analogous to the null distribution \mathcal{U} , except that one or more F -variates are non-central (Geisser, 1963);

(2) An approximate non-null distribution of U can be represented as $D_1 F_{(p, D_2)}(\delta)$, where the noncentrality parameter $\delta = n(\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \boldsymbol{\Theta} [\mathbf{A}_\Theta, \mathbf{B}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}] (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)$, and the scale coefficient D_1 and the second degree of freedom D_2 are determined by equating the first two cumulants of $D_1 F_{(p, D_2)}(\delta)$ to the non-null distribution of U .

4 TESTING THE EQUALITY OF MEANS FOR MULTIPLE-SAMPLE

We consider a general M -sample mean test ($M > 1$), where the samples are drawn from M normal distributions with means $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, for $m = 1, \dots, M$, and an equal covariance matrix with a UB structure $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$.

Specifically, suppose the m -th sample $\mathbf{X}_1^{(m)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_m}^{(m)}$ has a size of n_m , for $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$. Thus, the grand sample size is denoted by $n = n_1 + \dots + n_M$ and we assume $n > \max\{M, K + (K+1)K/2\}$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} = n_m^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_1^{(m)} + \dots + \mathbf{X}_{n_m}^{(m)})$, $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = n^{-1} (n_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)} + \dots + n_M \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(M)})$, and $\mathbf{S} = (n - M)^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{n_m} (\mathbf{X}_j^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)}) (\mathbf{X}_j^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)})^\top$ denote the m -th sample mean, the grand sample mean, and the (pooled) unbiased estimator of the common covariance matrix, respectively. The maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}$ can be obtained similarly to those in (3.2), yielding the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}]$, respectively. Therefore, the null and alternative hypotheses can be written as

$$H_0^{(M)} : \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(1)} = \dots = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(M)} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1^{(M)} : \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m')} \neq \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)} \text{ for some } m'. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 2 (exact null distribution of Geisser's multiple-sample information test statistic). *Geisser's multiple-sample information test statistic for the hypotheses in (4.1) is given by*

$$U_M = \sum_{m=1}^M n_m (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta, \mathbf{p}] (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}).$$

Under $H_0^{(M)}$, it follows a distribution \mathcal{U}_M that is identical with the distribution of

$$\sum_{k=1}^K (M-1)(p_k-1) F_{(M-1)(p_k-1), (n-M)(p_k-1)}^{(k)} + T_0^2$$

where T_0^2 is the Hotelling's T_0^2 -statistic, $F_{df_1, df_2}^{(k)}$ are K mutually independent F -variates (and

independent from T_0^2) with degrees of freedom df_1 and df_2 for $k = 1, \dots, K$.

Remark (information test statistic U_M). The Hotelling's (generalized) T_0^2 -statistic, also known as the Hotelling-Lawley trace, is commonly used to test the equality of multiple population means, assuming these multiple normal populations have the same (arbitrary) population covariance matrices (Lawley, 1938; Hotelling, 1947, 1951). However, it is intractable to obtain the exact null or non-null distribution of the Hotelling's T_0^2 -statistic, and various approximations have been proposed in the literature (Ito, 1956, 1960; Pillai and Young, 1971; Siotani, 1971; McKeon, 1974).

5 DISCUSSION

In this paper, we concentrate on the algebraic properties of a specific type of block matrices, where each block is uniform. We chose to parameterize the matrices in this way for two key reasons. First, the uniform-block pattern has been popularly discovered in plenty of large-scale biological data. Second, from a biological perspective, the variables that are clustered into the same community may exhibit stochastic equivalence or comparable patterns, while variables from different communities may have coherent connections at the community level. Compared to the conventional diagonal or block-diagonal structure, the proposed uniform-block structure offers more flexibility and is better suited for real data analysis, since the information contained in the non-zero off-diagonal blocks can potentially provide valuable insights into the scientific mechanisms.

In addition to defining a uniform-block structure, we have discovered a unique block Hadamard product representation for a uniform-block matrix. This representation plays an important role because it allows for the transformation of a large-scale uniform-block matrix into two lower-dimensional matrices and an integer-valued vector. The block Hadamard product representation simplifies the computations related to uniform-block matrices. With these algebraic properties, the uniform-block matrices are applicable to various statistical problems. For example, covariance estimation with the uniform-block structure (Yang et al., 2023), hypothesis testing for the information test statistics, and the multivariate linear regression models (Yang et al., 2023).

In conclusion, a uniform-block matrix (or structure), its associated algebraic properties, and the block Hadamard product representation have broad applications in a range of fields,

including linear algebra, statistics, economics, and many others.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Proofs in Section 2

Proof of Lemma 1. The proof of the block Hadamard product representation is straightforward. To show the uniqueness, consider two equal UB matrices $\mathbf{N}_1[\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{p}] = (\mathbf{N}_{1,kk'})$ and $\mathbf{N}_2[\mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{p}] = (\mathbf{N}_{2,kk'})$ with a common pre-determined partition-size vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)^\top$ satisfying that $p_k > 1$ for every k and $p = p_1 + \dots + p_K$, where $\mathbf{A}_i = \text{diag}(a_{i,11}, \dots, a_{i,KK})$ is a diagonal matrix and $\mathbf{B}_i = (b_{i,kk'})$ is a symmetric matrix with $b_{i,k'k} = b_{i,kk'}$ for $i = 1, 2$. By the equality, $\mathbf{N}_{1,kk'} = \mathbf{N}_{2,kk'}$ for every k and k' . If $k \neq k'$, then $b_{1,kk'} \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times p_{k'}} = b_{2,kk'} \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times p_{k'}}$ and therefore $b_{1,kk'} = b_{2,kk'}$. If $k = k'$, then $a_{1,kk} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} + b_{1,kk} \mathbf{J}_{p_k} = a_{2,kk} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} + b_{2,kk} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}$, equivalently, $[(a_{1,kk} - a_{2,kk}) + (b_{1,kk} - b_{2,kk})] \mathbf{I}_{p_k} + (b_{1,kk} - b_{2,kk}) \mathbf{J}_{p_k} = \mathbf{0}_{p_k \times p_k}$. Due to $p_k > 1$, off-diagonally, $b_{1,kk} = b_{2,kk}$; diagonally, $a_{1,kk} = a_{2,kk}$. Eventually, $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A}_2$ and $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$. ■

Proof of Corollary 1. (1) holds and the proof is straightforward. (2), (2-1), and (2-2) hold because of the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A}_1 \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A}_2 \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]) &= (\mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{A}_2) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}], & (\mathbf{B}_1 \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{B}_2 \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) &= (\mathbf{B}_1 \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}_2) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}], \\ (\mathbf{B}_1 \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A}_2 \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]) &= (\mathbf{B}_1 \times \mathbf{A}_2) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}], & (\mathbf{A}_1 \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{B}_2 \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) &= (\mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{B}_2) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}], \end{aligned}$$

which are easy to verify since \mathbf{A}_i and \mathbf{P} are diagonal matrices for $i = 1, 2$ and \mathbf{B}_i is a symmetric matrix for $i = 1, 2$.

(3) and (4) are proved by using induction with respect to the number of diagonal blocks K . Specifically, we assume that both (3) and (4) hold for the case of K and check whether they hold for the case of $K + 1$. Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q > 1$. Denote $\mathbf{A}^* = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{A}, a) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+1) \times (K+1)}$, $\mathbf{P}^* = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{P}, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+1) \times (K+1)}$, and $\mathbf{B}^* = (\mathbf{B}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top, b) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+1) \times (K+1)}$. We would like to obtain the eigenvalues of the $(p+q)$ by $(p+q)$ UB matrix $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*]$ with $(K+1)$ diagonal blocks, where $\mathbf{p}^* = (\mathbf{p}^\top, q)^\top$. By definition, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*]$ are the solutions to the characteristic equation $\det(\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*] - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{p+q}) = 0$. Equivalently,

$$0 = \det(\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*] - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{p+q}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] & (\eta_k \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times q}) \\ (\eta_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times p_k}) & (a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q \end{pmatrix},$$

where $(\eta_k \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ and $(b_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times p_k}) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$.

Without loss the generality, assume that $((a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q)$ is invertible, or we can consider $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying that $((a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q) + \epsilon \mathbf{I}_q$ is positive definite and let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Then, the characteristic equation can be written as

$$0 = \det [(a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q] \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\times \det \left\{ [(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]] - (\eta_k \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times q}) [(a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q]^{-1} (\eta_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times p_k}) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In other words, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*]$ consist of some eigenvalues of $(a \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q)$ and some roots of the rational equation (A.2) = 0 (not a polynomial equation, i.e., not a characteristic equation).

First, it is easy to observe that the eigenvalues of $(a \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q)$ are exactly a with multiplicity $(q - 1)$ and $(a + bq)$. We will discard $(a + bq)$ because it is not the eigenvalue of $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*]$. Second, using the fact $[(a - \lambda) \mathbf{I}_q + b \mathbf{J}_q]^{-1} = (a - \lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{I}_q - b (a - \lambda)^{-1} (a - \lambda + bq)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_q$, we simplify (A.2) to (A.3) as below,

$$\det \left\{ (\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \left(\mathbf{B} - \frac{q}{a - \lambda + bq} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \right) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right\}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

which is the determinant of a UB matrix with K diagonal blocks. Thus, use the induction assumption and $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{KK})$, this determinant equals to the product of $\prod_{k=1}^K (a_{kk} - \lambda)^{p_k - 1}$ and (A.4), which is

$$\det \left\{ (\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) + \left(\mathbf{B} - \frac{q}{a - \lambda + bq} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \right) \mathbf{P} \right\} = \det \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\Delta} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) - \frac{q}{a + bq - \lambda} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \mathbf{P} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Thus, (A.2) = 0 yields the solutions consist of a_{kk} with multiplicity $(p_k - 1)$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and the roots of (A.4) = 0, which are the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^* = \mathbf{A}^* + \mathbf{B}^* \times \mathbf{P}^*$. It is because,

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_{K \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times K} & a \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B} & \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top & b \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{0}_{K \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times K} & q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Delta} & q \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \mathbf{P} & a + bq \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assuming that $(a + bq - \lambda)$ is invertible, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \det(\Delta^* - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{K+1}) \\
&= \det(a + bq - \lambda) \det\left\{(\Delta - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) - (q\boldsymbol{\eta})(a + bq - \lambda)^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \mathbf{P})\right\} \\
&= \det(a + bq - \lambda) \det\left\{(\Delta - \lambda \mathbf{I}_K) - \frac{q}{a + bq - \lambda} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \mathbf{P}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(a + bq)$ cannot be the eigenvalue of Δ^* , all eigenvalues of Δ^* are the roots of the rational equation (A.4) = 0. In summary, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{N}^*[\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{p}^*]$ consist of a with multiplicity $(q - 1)$, a_{kk} with multiplicity $(p_k - 1)$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$, and all eigenvalues of $\Delta^* = \mathbf{A}^* + \mathbf{B}^* \times \mathbf{P}^*$.

(5) Let $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{B}^* = -\Delta^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1}$, where the inverses exist by the assumption. Thus, \mathbf{A}^* is a diagonal matrix and \mathbf{B}^* is a symmetric matrix. It is because both \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{P} are diagonal matrices, so they are commute, and the following equalities are equivalent

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}, \\
(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}) \times \mathbf{A}^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}), \\
-\mathbf{A}^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} \times (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B})^{-1} &= -(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P})^{-1} \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^{-1}, \\
\mathbf{B}^{*,\top} &= \mathbf{B}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, follow the analogous lines of arguments for the square formula,

$$\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{I}_K, \quad \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}^* + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{A}^* + \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{0}_{K \times K},$$

thus, $(\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A}^* \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B}^* \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) = \mathbf{I}_K \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{0}_{K \times K} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{I}_p$.

Finally, the proof of (6) is straightforward, noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_k^\top = \mathbf{I}_{p_k-1}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_k \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_k}^\top = \mathbf{0}_{(p_k-1) \times 1}$ for every k , and suppose λ is the common eigenvalue of Δ and $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, if $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K)^\top$ is the corresponding eigenvector of Δ , then the corresponding eigenvector of $\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ is $(\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_1}, \dots, \xi_K \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_K})^\top$. \blacksquare

A.2 Proofs in Section 3 and Section 4

Before proving the main theorems, we present two lemmas below.

Lemma A.1 (Craig’s Theorem). *Suppose $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a normal vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and positive definite covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be two real symmetric matrices. Then, $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}_2 \mathbf{X}$ are independently distributed if and only if $\mathbf{Y}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}$.*

Proof of Lemma A.1. This result was originally proposed by [Craig \(1943\)](#). Please refer the corrected proof and discussion in [Ravishanker and Dey \(2002, page 175, proof of Result 5.4.4\)](#), [Mathai and Provost \(1992, page 209, proof of Theorem 5.2.1\)](#), [Driscoll and Gundberg \(1986\)](#) and [Ogawa and Olkin \(2008\)](#). ■

Lemma A.2. *Suppose $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a normal vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and positive definite covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be a real symmetric matrix. Then, $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{X}$ follows a non-central chi-squared distribution with degree of freedom m and noncentrality parameter $\delta = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ if and only if $\mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is idempotent with rank m .*

Proof of Lemma A.2. Please refer the proof and discussion in [Muirhead \(2005, page 31, proof of Theorem 1.4.5\)](#), [Mathai and Provost \(1992, page 199, proof of Theorem 5.1.3\)](#) and [Zhang \(2018\)](#). ■

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof can be divided into three steps. First, we need to decompose U into a sum of several components. Second, we need to examine the independence of these components. Third, we need to determine the distribution of each component.

Step 1: decomposition of U . The following equality demonstrates an elegant way to decompose U :

$$\left(\widehat{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{P}\right)^{-1} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{B}} \times \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} = \left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}\right)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Equality (A.5) holds if and only if $\mathbf{P}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{B}} \times \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \mathbf{P}^{-1}$. First, right-multiply $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ on both sides of (A.5) and switch \mathbf{P}^{-1} and $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ on the right hand side since both $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{P} are diagonal matrices, yielding that (A.5) holds if and only if $\mathbf{P}^{-1} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{B}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{P}^{-1}$. Then, right-multiply \mathbf{P} on the both sides, (A.5) holds if and only if $\mathbf{I}_K - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{B}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \times \widehat{\mathbf{A}}$. Next, left-multiply $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}$ on the both sides, yielding that (A.5) holds if and only if $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}} \times \mathbf{P} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}$, which holds by the definition of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}$.

Using (A.5) and substituting $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\Theta}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\Theta}$, we have

$$\widehat{\Theta} \left[\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{\Theta}, \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{\Theta}, \mathbf{p} \right] = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] - \left(\widehat{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{P} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] + \left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}].$$

Since both $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{P} are diagonal matrices, $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] - \left(\widehat{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{P} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$ is a block diagonal matrix $\text{Bdiag} \left(\widehat{a}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_1} - \widehat{a}_{11}^{-1} p_1^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_1}, \dots, \widehat{a}_{KK}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_K} - \widehat{a}_{KK}^{-1} p_K^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_K} \right)$.

Let $\mathbf{W}_k = \text{Bdiag} \left(\mathbf{0}_{p_1 \times p_1}, \dots, \widehat{a}_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \widehat{a}_{kk}^{-1} p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{p_K \times p_K} \right)$ for every k , which is a UB matrix, expressed by $\mathbf{W}_k = \mathbf{W}_k [\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{B}_k, \mathbf{p}]$ for every k , where both $\mathbf{A}_k = \text{diag} \left(0, \dots, \widehat{a}_{kk}^{-1}, \dots, 0 \right)$ and $\mathbf{B}_k = \text{diag} \left(0, \dots, -\widehat{a}_{kk} p_k^{-1}, \dots, 0 \right)$ have the non-zero values on the (k, k) -th elements. Herein, U can be written as a sum of $(K + 1)$ components:

$$\begin{aligned} U &= n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{W}_k \right) \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right) + n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \left[\left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \mathbf{W}_k \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right) + n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \left[\left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right) \\ &\equiv F_1 + F_2 + \dots + F_K + F_{K+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where F_k denotes $n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \mathbf{W}_k \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)$, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, and F_{K+1} denotes the last term $n \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)^{\top} \left[\left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \left(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \right)$. Next we will show these F_k are mutually independent in Step 2 and each follows a F -distribution in Step 3.

Step 2: independence. Recall $\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ follows $N \left(\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \right)$. To show F_1, \dots, F_{K+1} are mutually independent, by Lemma A.1, we need to check $\mathbf{W}_k \times (n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) \times \mathbf{W}_{k'} = \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}$ for every $k \neq k'$ and $\mathbf{W}_k \times (n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) \times \left[\left(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] = \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}$ for ev-

ery k . It is easy to check the former holds by using the representation of $\mathbf{W}_k = \mathbf{W}_k [\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{B}_k, \mathbf{p}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{W}_k \times \Sigma [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \mathbf{W}_{k'} \\
&= (\mathbf{A}_k \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B}_k \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A}_{k'} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B}_{k'} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \\
&= [(\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + (\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]] \times (\mathbf{A}_{k'} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B}_{k'} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \\
&= (\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}_{k'}) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&+ [(\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{A}_{k'} + \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}_{k'} + (\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_{k'}] \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&= \mathbf{0}_{K \times K} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{0}_{K \times K} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&= \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}.
\end{aligned}$$

To check the latter one holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{W}_k \times \Sigma [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \left[(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \\
&= (\mathbf{A}_k \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B}_k \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times (\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]) \times \left[(\mathbf{P} \times \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \\
&= [(\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}) \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] + (\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]] \times \left[(\mathbf{P} \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] \\
&= \left[\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} + (\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \right] \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&= \left[((\mathbf{A}_k + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P}) \mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{A}_k + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{P}) (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \right] \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&= \mathbf{0}_{K \times K} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \\
&= \mathbf{0}_{p \times p},
\end{aligned}$$

using $\mathbf{A}_k + \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{0}_{K \times K}$.

Step 3: distribution. Now, we specify the distributions for F_1, \dots, F_{K+1} respectively. Furthermore, let $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(1), \top}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(K), \top})^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(1), \top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(K), \top})^\top$, where $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k}$ for every k . Focus on the first K component, i.e., F_k for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Substituting the block diagonal matrix \mathbf{W}_k , we have

$$F_k = n (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \mathbf{W}_k (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0) = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)})^\top \left(\frac{n}{\widehat{a}_{kk}} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \frac{n}{\widehat{a}_{kk} p_k} \mathbf{J}_{p_k} \right) (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)}).$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_k = n (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)})^\top [(1/a_{kk}) \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - 1/(a_{kk} p_k) \mathbf{J}_{p_k}] (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)})$ and $\mathbf{V}_k = (p_k -$

$1)(n-1)(\widehat{a}_{kk}/a_{kk})$ for every k . Thus, $\mathbf{U}_k/\mathbf{V}_k = F_k/((p_k-1)(n-1))$ for every k . Let $\mathbf{M}_k = \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \mathbf{J}_{p_k}/p_k$ for every k . It is clear that $\mathbf{M}_k^2 = (\mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \mathbf{J}_{p_k}/p_k)^2 = \mathbf{I}_{p_k} + \mathbf{J}_{p_k}/p_k - 2\mathbf{J}_{p_k}/p_k = \mathbf{M}_k$ therefore \mathbf{M}_k is idempotent. We can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{S}_{kk} \mathbf{M}_k) &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{S}_{kk}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{kk} - \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times 1} \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times 1}^\top \mathbf{S}_{kk} / p_k) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{kk}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{1}_{p_k \times 1}^\top \mathbf{S}_{kk} \mathbf{1}_{p_k \times 1}) / p_k \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{kk}) - \text{sum}(\mathbf{S}_{kk}) / p_k = (p_k - 1) \widehat{a}_{kk}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the fact that $(n-1)\mathbf{S}_{kk} \sim \text{Wishart}(n-1, \Sigma_{kk})$, where Σ_{kk} is positive definite for every k because $(\mathbf{0}_{1 \times p_1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p_K}) \Sigma (\mathbf{0}_{1 \times p_1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p_K})^\top = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \Sigma_{kk} \boldsymbol{\alpha} > 0$ for any $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k}$. So, $(n-1)\mathbf{S}_{kk}$ can be expressed as $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)} \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)\top}$ where $\mathbf{Z}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^{(k)}$ are mutually independently distributed as $N(\mathbf{0}_{p_k \times 1}, \Sigma_{kk})$ for every k . We then observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{kk} \mathbf{V}_k &= (n-1)(p_k-1) \widehat{a}_{kk} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_k [(n-1)\mathbf{S}_{kk}] \mathbf{M}_k) = \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{M}_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)} \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)\top} \right) \mathbf{M}_k \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)\top} \mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{Z}_j^{(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ and \mathbf{S} are independent, so \mathbf{U}_k and \mathbf{V}_k for every k are mutually independent. On the other hand, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)}) \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)}, \Sigma_{kk})$. By Lemma A.2 and

$$\left(\frac{1}{a_{kk}} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \frac{1}{a_{kk} p_k} \mathbf{J}_{p_k} \right) \Sigma_{kk} = \left(\frac{1}{a_{kk}} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - \frac{1}{a_{kk} p_k} \mathbf{J}_{p_k} \right) (a_{kk} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} + b_{kk} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}) = \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k},$$

which is idempotent with rank (p_k-1) . Therefore, \mathbf{U}_k follows a $\chi^2(\lambda_k)$ distribution with degree of freedom (p_k-1) , and the noncentrality parameter is given by

$$\delta_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)} \right)^\top \left(a_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - a_{kk}^{-1} p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(k)} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Since $\mathbf{M}_k = \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}$ is also idempotent with rank (p_k-1) . Therefore, $a_{kk} \mathbf{V}_k$ follows a central χ^2 -distribution with degree of freedom $(n-1)(p_k-1)$. Furthermore,

$$F_k = (p_k-1) \frac{\mathbf{U}_k / (p_k-1)}{\mathbf{V}_k / ((p_k-1)(n-1))} \sim (p_k-1) F_{(p_k-1), (n-1)(p_k-1)}^{(k)}(\delta_k), \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

For $F_{K+1} = n (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \left[(\mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)$, consider a transformation $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{X}$, where $\mathbf{C} = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_1}/p_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_K}/p_K) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times p}$. As $\mathbf{X} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}])$, $\mathbf{Y} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_y, \Sigma_y)$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_y = \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_1} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(1)}/p_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_K} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(K)}/p_K \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_y = \mathbf{C} \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \mathbf{C}^\top = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{P}^{-1} + \mathbf{B}.$$

Furthermore, let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_0 = \mathbf{C} \times \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = \left(\mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(1)}/p_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_K} \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{(K)}/p_K \right)^\top$. By noting that $(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C})^\top \times \Gamma \times (\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}) = \Gamma \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$ for any $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, then,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{K+1} &= n (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \left[(\mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] \right] (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0) \\ &= n (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \left[(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C})^\top (\mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}})^{-1} (\mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}) \right] (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0) \\ &= n (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^\top \left[\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} \mathbf{P}\mathbf{C} \right] (\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0) \\ &= n (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0)^\top (\mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1}) (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0) \\ &= n (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0)^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_y^{-1}) (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{-1} = \mathbf{P} (\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{P} + \hat{\mathbf{B}}\mathbf{P})^{-1} = \mathbf{P} \left[(\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}^{-1} + \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \mathbf{P} \right]^{-1} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}^{-1} + \hat{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} = \hat{\Sigma}_y^{-1}$. By the definition of the Hotelling's T^2 -statistic, $F_{K+1} \sim T^2 = \frac{K(n-1)}{n-K} F_{K, n-K}^{(K+1)}(\delta_{K+1})$, where $\delta_{K+1} = \frac{1}{2} n (\boldsymbol{\mu}_y - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0)^\top \Sigma_y^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_y - \boldsymbol{\nu}_0)$.

Finally, by the mutual independence of F_1, \dots, F_K, F_{K+1} , U is decomposed as a linear combination of mutually independent F -variates, distributed as $\sum_{k=1}^K (p_k - 1) F_{(p_k - 1), (n-1)(p_k - 1)}^{(k)}(\delta_k) + \frac{K(n-1)}{n-K} F_{K, n-K}^{(K+1)}(\delta_{K+1})$. Under H_0 , $\delta_k = 0$ for $K = 1, \dots, K + 1$. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 2. We also divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1: decomposition of U_M . Let $\mathbf{Z} = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(1), \top}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(M), \top})^\top$ denote a (pM) -dimensional normal vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}_Z = (\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(1), \top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(M), \top})^\top$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma_Z = \mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$, where $\mathbf{N} = \text{diag}(n_1, \dots, n_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ and \otimes denotes the Kronecker product.

Thus, there exists $\mathbf{C}_Z = [\mathbf{N}^{1/2} \times (\mathbf{I}_M - n^{-1}\mathbf{J}_M \times \mathbf{N})] \otimes \mathbf{I}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{(pM) \times (pM)}$ such that

$$\left(\sqrt{n_1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top, \dots, \sqrt{n_M} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(M)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top \right)^\top = \mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}.$$

Therefore, U_M can be rewritten as

$$U_M = (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z})^\top \left\{ \mathbf{I}_M \otimes \hat{\Theta} \left[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta, \mathbf{p} \right] \right\} (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}).$$

Using the same decomposition, $\hat{\Theta} \left[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\Theta, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_\Theta, \mathbf{p} \right] = \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{p}] - (\hat{\mathbf{A}} \times \mathbf{P})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}] + (\mathbf{P} \times \hat{\Delta})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$, U_M can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} U_M &= (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z})^\top \left[\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{W}_k \right) \right] (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}) + (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z})^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{K+1}) (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z})^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}) + (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z})^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{K+1}) (\mathbf{C}_Z \times \mathbf{Z}) \\ &\equiv F_1 + \dots + F_K + F_{K+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{W}_k = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{0}_{p_1 \times p_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{kk}^{-1} - \hat{a}_{kk}^{-1} p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{p_K \times p_K}) = \mathbf{W}_k [\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{B}_k, \mathbf{p}]$ with $\mathbf{A}_k = \text{diag}(0, \dots, \hat{a}_{kk}^{-1}, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ and $\mathbf{B}_k = \text{diag}(0, \dots, -\hat{a}_{kk}^{-1} p_k^{-1}, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ having the non-zero values on the (k, k) -th elements, and $\mathbf{W}_{K+1} = (\mathbf{P} \times \hat{\Delta})^{-1} \circ \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{p}]$. Next, we need to prove the mutual independence between F_1, \dots, F_{K+1} and specific the distribution for each of them.

Step 2: independence. By Lemma A.1, we need to check

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] (\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{k'}) \mathbf{C}_Z] &= \mathbf{0}_{(pM) \times (pM)}, \quad k \neq k', k, k' = 1, \dots, K \\ [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] (\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{K+1}) \mathbf{C}_Z] &= \mathbf{0}_{(pM) \times (pM)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{N}^{1/2} \times (\mathbf{I}_M - n^{-1}\mathbf{J}_M \times \mathbf{N})$. Given $k \neq k'$ and $\mathbf{C}_Z = \mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{I}_p$ and the fact $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z &= (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{I}_M \mathbf{M}) \otimes (\mathbf{I}_p \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{I}_p) = (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \mathbf{W}_k, \\ \mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{k'}) \mathbf{C}_Z &= (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \mathbf{W}_{k'}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we can calculate the following result:

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] (\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{k'}) \mathbf{C}_Z] \\ &= [(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \mathbf{N}^{-1} (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M})] \otimes [\mathbf{W}_k \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \mathbf{W}_{k'}]. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\mathbf{W}_k = \mathbf{W}_k [\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{B}_k, \mathbf{p}]$ and $\mathbf{W}_{k'} = \mathbf{W}_{k'} [\mathbf{A}_{k'}, \mathbf{B}_{k'}, \mathbf{p}]$, we have the result $\mathbf{W}_k \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \mathbf{W}_{k'} = \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}$. Therefore, $[\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] (\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{k'}) \mathbf{C}_Z] = \mathbf{0}_{(pM) \times (pM)}$. On the other hand, we can calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] (\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]) [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_{K+1}) \mathbf{C}_Z] \\ &= [(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \mathbf{N}^{-1} (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M})] \otimes [\mathbf{W}_k \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \mathbf{W}_{K+1}] \\ &= \mathbf{0}_{(pM) \times (pM)} \end{aligned}$$

using the result $\mathbf{W}_k \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \mathbf{W}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}$.

Step 3: distribution. By definition, for $k = 1, \dots, K$

$$F_k = \mathbf{Z}^\top \times [\mathbf{C}_Z^\top (\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{W}_k) \mathbf{C}_Z] \times \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}^\top [(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \mathbf{W}_k] \mathbf{Z},$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{0}_{p_1 \times p_1}, a_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_k} - a_{kk}^{-1} p_k^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{p_k}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{p_K \times p_K})$ have non-zero values on the (k, k) -th element for every k . Let $\mathbf{U}_k = \mathbf{Z}^\top \left((\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \right) \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{V}_k = (n - M)(p_k - 1) \hat{a}_{kk} / a_{kk}$, and therefore, $\mathbf{U}_k / \mathbf{V}_k = F_k / [(n - M)(p_k - 1)]$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$.

Since \mathbf{S} is independent from $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(M)}$, then \mathbf{S} is independent from \mathbf{Z} , and therefore \mathbf{U}_k and \mathbf{V}_k are independent for every k . By Lemma A.2 and $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_Z, \mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}])$, we obtain that

$$\left[(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \right] [\mathbf{N}^{-1} \otimes \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]] = (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{N}^{-1}) \otimes \left(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \right),$$

whose square equals $(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{N}^{-1})^2 \otimes \left(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \right)^2 = (\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{N}^{-1}) \otimes \left(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \right)$

since

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{N}^{-1} &= \left(\mathbf{N}^{1/2} \left(\mathbf{I}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \right) \right)^\top \times \left(\mathbf{N}^{1/2} \left(\mathbf{I}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \right) \right) \times \mathbf{N}^{-1} \\
&= \left(\mathbf{I}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M \right) \times \mathbf{N}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \mathbf{N}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \left(\mathbf{I}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \right) \times \mathbf{N}^{-1} \\
&= \left(\mathbf{N} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \right) \times \left(\mathbf{N}^{-1} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_M \right) \\
&= \mathbf{I}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M + \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M \\
&= \mathbf{I}_M - n^{-1} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M,
\end{aligned}$$

and using $\mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M = n \mathbf{J}_M$. It is clear that $\mathbf{I}_M - n^{-1} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M$ is an idempotent matrix since its square equals $\mathbf{I}_M + n^{-2} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M - 2n^{-1} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M = \mathbf{I}_M - n^{-1} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{J}_M$. Also, the result shows that $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}]$ is an idempotent matrix.

Therefore, \mathbf{U}_k follows a noncentral χ^2 -distribution with the noncentrality parameter $\delta_k = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}_Z^\top \left[(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \right] \boldsymbol{\mu}_Z$ and a degree of freedom $\text{rank} \left((\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \right) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M}) \times \text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k) = (M-1)(p_k-1)$ by using the fact that $\text{rank}(A \otimes B) = \text{rank}(A) \text{rank}(B)$.

Given $a_{kk} \mathbf{V}_k = (n-M)(p_k-1) \hat{a}_{kk}$, the result that $(p_k-1) \hat{a}_{kk} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{S}_{kk} \mathbf{M}_{kk})$, and the fact that $(n-M) \mathbf{S}_{kk} \sim \text{Wishart}(n-M, \Sigma_{kk})$, we obtain that $a_{kk} \mathbf{V}_k$ follows a central χ^2 -distribution with a degree of freedom $(n-M)(p_k-1)$. Therefore, for $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_k &= (n-M)(p_k-1) \frac{\mathbf{U}_k}{\mathbf{V}_k} \\
&= (n-M)(p_k-1) \frac{\chi_{(M-1)(p_k-1)}^2(\delta_k)}{\chi_{(n-M)(p_k-1)}^2} \\
&= \frac{\chi_{(M-1)(p_k-1)}^2(\delta_k) / [(M-1)(p_k-1)]}{\chi_{(n-M)(p_k-1)}^2 / [(n-M)(p_k-1)]} (n-M)(p_k-1) \times \frac{(M-1)(p_k-1)}{(n-M)(p_k-1)} \\
&= (M-1)(p_k-1) F_{(M-1)(p_k-1), (n-M)(p_k-1)}^{(k)}(\delta_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{C}_Y = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_1}/p_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{1 \times p_K}/p_K)$, let $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{(m)} = \mathbf{C}_Y \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)}$, and let $\mathbf{Y}_j^{(m)} = \mathbf{C}_Y \mathbf{X}_j^{(m)}$ for every j and m with mean $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{(m)} = \mathbf{C}_Y \times \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)}$ and $\Sigma_Y = \mathbf{C}_Y \times \Sigma[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}] \times \mathbf{C}_Y^\top = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}^{-1} + \mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{P}) \mathbf{P}^{-1} = \Delta \mathbf{P}^{-1} = (\mathbf{P} \Delta^{-1})^{-1}$. Thus, $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{(m)} = \mathbf{C}_Y \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)}$ for every m and $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{C}_Y \bar{\mathbf{X}}$.

Finally, F_{K+1} can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{K+1} &= \sum_{m=1}^M n_m (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mathbf{W}_{K+1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^M n_m (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top \left[\mathbf{C}_Y^\top \mathbf{P} \hat{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{C}_Y \right] (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^M n_m (\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^\top \left(\mathbf{P} \hat{\Delta}^{-1} \right) (\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}) \\
&= \text{tr} \left[\left(\hat{\Sigma}_Y \right)^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M n_m (\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}) (\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})^\top \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which is the Hotelling's T_0^2 -statistic. ■

References

- Anderson, T. (1992). Introduction to hotelling (1931) the generalization of student's ratio. In *Breakthroughs in Statistics*, pages 45–53. Springer.
- Archakov, I. and Hansen, P. R. (2022). A Canonical Representation of Block Matrices with Applications to Covariance and Correlation Matrices. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* pages 1–39.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008a). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *Annals of Statistics* **36**, 199–227.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008b). Covariance regularization by thresholding. *Annals of Statistics* **36**, 2577–2604.
- Cadima, J., Calheiros, F. L., and Preto, I. P. (2010). The eigenstructure of block-structured correlation matrices and its implications for principal component analysis. *Journal of Applied Statistics* **37**, 577–589.
- Cai, T. and Liu, W. (2011). Adaptive thresholding for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**, 672–684.
- Chen, S., Kang, J., Xing, Y., Zhao, Y., and Milton, D. K. (2018). Estimating large covariance matrix with network topology for high-dimensional biomedical data. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **127**, 82 – 95.
- Craig, A. T. (1943). Note on the independence of certain quadratic forms. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **14**, 195–197.
- Driscoll, M. F. and Gundberg, W. R. (1986). A history of the development of craig's theorem. *The American Statistician* **40**, 65–70.
- Dyer, D. (1982). The convolution of generalized f distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **77**, 184–189.
- Fan, J., Fan, Y., and Lv, J. (2008). High dimensional covariance matrix estimation using a factor model. *Journal of Econometrics* **147**, 186–197.

- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Mincheva, M. (2011). High-dimensional covariance matrix estimation in approximate factor models. *The Annals of Statistics* **39**, 3320 – 3356.
- Geisser, S. (1963). Multivariate analysis of variance for a special covariance case. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **58**, 660–669.
- Günther, M. and Klotz, L. (2012). Schur’s theorem for a block hadamard product. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **437**, 948–956.
- Horn, R. A., Mathias, R., and Nakamura, Y. (1991). Inequalities for unitarily invariant norms and bilinear matrix products. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **30**, 303–314.
- Hotelling, H. (1947). Multivariate quality control, illustrated by the air testing of sample bomb-sights.
- Hotelling, H. (1951). A generalized t test and measure of multivariate dispersion. In *Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1951*. University of California Press.
- Huang, J. and Yang, L. (2010). Correlation matrix with block structure and efficient sampling methods. *Journal of Computational Finance* **14**, 81.
- Ito, K. (1956). Asymptotic Formulae for the Distribution of Hotelling’s Generalized T_0^2 Statistic. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **27**, 1091 – 1105.
- Ito, K. (1960). Asymptotic Formulae for the Distribution of Hotelling’s Generalized T_0^2 Statistic. II. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **31**, 1148 – 1153.
- Karoui, N. E. (2008). Operator norm consistent estimation of large-dimensional sparse covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics* **36**, 2717–2756.
- Lancaster, H. O. (1965). The helmert matrices. *The American Mathematical Monthly* **72**, 4–12.
- Lawley, D. N. (1938). A generalization of fisher’s z test. *Biometrika* **30**, 180–187.
- Lee, J. C. and Hu, L. (1996). On the distribution of linear functions of independent f and u variates. *Statistics & probability letters* **26**, 339–346.

- Leiva, R. (2007). Linear discrimination with equicorrelated training vectors. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **98**, 384–409.
- Mathai, A. M. and Provost, S. B. (1992). *Quadratic forms in random variables: theory and applications*. Dekker.
- Mauchly, J. W. (1940). Significance test for sphericity of a normal n -variate distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **11**, 204–209.
- McKeon, J. J. (1974). F approximations to the distribution of hotelling's t^2 . *Biometrika* **61**, 381–383.
- Morrison, D. F. (1971). The distribution of linear functions of independent f variates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **66**, 383–385.
- Morrison, D. F. (1972). The analysis of a single sample of repeated measurements. *Biometrics* **28**, 55–71.
- Muirhead, R. J. (2005). *Aspects of multivariate statistical theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ogawa, J. and Olkin, I. (2008). A tale of two countries: The craig–sakamoto–matusita theorem. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **138**, 3419–3428. Special Issue in Honor of Junjiro Ogawa (1915 - 2000): Design of Experiments, Multivariate Analysis and Statistical Inference.
- Olkin, I. (1972). Testing and estimation for structures which are circularly symmetric in blocks. *ETS Research Bulletin Series* **1972**, i–20.
- Olkin, I. and Press, S. J. (1969). Testing and estimation for a circular stationary model. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **40**, 1358–1373.
- Pillai, K. and Young, D. (1971). On the exact distribution of hotelling's generalized t^2 . *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **1**, 90–107.
- Ravishanker, N. and Dey, D. K. (2002). *A first course in linear model theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Rogers, G. and Young, D. (1974). Testing and estimation when a normal covariance matrix has intraclass structure of arbitrary order. *Communications in Statistics* **3**, 343–359.
- Roustant, O. and Deville, Y. (2017). On the validity of parametric block correlation matrices with constant within and between group correlations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.09793* .
- Roustant, O., Padonou, E., Deville, Y., Clément, A., Perrin, G., Giorla, J., and Wynn, H. (2020). Group kernels for gaussian process metamodels with categorical inputs. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* **8**, 775–806.
- Roy, A. and Leiva, R. (2008). Likelihood ratio tests for triply multivariate data with structured correlation on spatial repeated measurements. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **78**, 1971–1980.
- Roy, A. and Leiva, R. (2011). Estimating and testing a structured covariance matrix for three-level multivariate data. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* **40**, 1945–1963.
- Roy, A., Leiva, R., Žežula, I., and Klein, D. (2015). Testing the equality of mean vectors for paired doubly multivariate observations in blocked compound symmetric covariance matrix setup. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **137**, 50–60.
- Roy, A., Zmysłony, R., Fonseca, M., and Leiva, R. (2016). Optimal estimation for doubly multivariate data in blocked compound symmetric covariance structure. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **144**, 81–90.
- Seely, J. (1971). Quadratic Subspaces and Completeness. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **42**, 710 – 721.
- Seely, J. (1977). Minimal sufficient statistics and completeness for multivariate normal families. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (1961-2002)* **39**, 170–185.
- Siotani, M. (1971). An Asymptotic Expansion of the Non-Null Distribution of Hotelling’s Generalized T_0^2 -Statistic. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **42**, 560 – 571.
- Spjøtvoll, E. (1972). Joint confidence intervals for all linear functions of means in the one-way layout with unknown group variances. *Biometrika* **59**, 683–685.

- Szatrowski, T. H. (1976). Estimation and testing for block compound symmetry and other patterned covariance matrices with linear and nonlinear structure. Technical Report 107, Stanford University.
- Szatrowski, T. H. (1980). Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Explicit Solutions in the Multivariate Normal Estimation Problem for Patterned Means and Covariances. *The Annals of Statistics* **8**, 802 – 810.
- Szatrowski, T. H. (1982). Testing and estimation in the block compound symmetry problem. *Journal of Educational Statistics* **7**, 3–18.
- Votaw, D. F. (1948). Testing compound symmetry in a normal multivariate distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **19**, 447–473.
- Votaw, D. F., Kimball, A. W., and Rafferty, J. A. (1950). Compound symmetry tests in the multivariate analysis of medical experiments. *Biometrics* **6**, 259–281.
- Wilks, S. S. (1946). Sample criteria for testing equality of means, equality of variances, and equality of covariances in a normal multivariate distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **17**, 257–281.
- Wu, W. B. and Pourahmadi, M. (2003). Nonparametric estimation of large covariance matrices of longitudinal data. *Biometrika* **90**, 831–844.
- Yang, Y., Chen, C., and Chen, S. (2023). Covariance estimation with uniform blocks.
- Yang, Y., Lee, H., and Chen, S. (2023). Modeling dependence for multi-region multi-metabolite mrs data. submitted.
- Young, D. L. (1976). Inference concerning the mean vector when the covariance matrix is totally reducible. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **71**, 696–699.
- Žežula, I., Klein, D., and Roy, A. (2018). Testing of multivariate repeated measures data with block exchangeable covariance structure. *TEST* **27**, 360–378.
- Zhang, J. (2018). On the distribution of a quadratic form in normal variates. *REVSTAT-Statistical Journal* **16**, 315–322.

Zmyślony, R. (1980). Completeness for a family of normal distributions. *Banach Center Publications* **6**, 355–357.