ON THE GOODNESS-OF-FIT TEST IN A FACTOR MODEL WITH HIGH-DIMENSIONAL DATA

Damien Passemier¹ & Jian-Feng Yao²

¹Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong eepassemier@ust.hk

²Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science The University of Hong Kong (HKU) Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong jeffyao@hku.hk

Abstract. Factor models appear in many areas, such as economics or signal processing. If the factors and errors are Gaussian, a likelihood-based theory is well-known since Lawley (1940). However, these results are obtained in the classical scheme where the data dimension p is kept fixed while the sample size n tends to infinity. This point of view is not valid anymore for large-dimensional data, and usual statistics have to be modified. In this talk, we consider the strict factor model with homoscedastic variance. First, we give the bias of the maximum likelihood estimator of the noise variance by giving a CLT. We then give a biascorrected estimator. Secondly, we present a corrected likelihood ratio test of the hypothesis that the factor model fits. Throughout the talk, simulation experiments are conducted to access the quality of our results.

Keywords. Covariance matrix, factor model random matrix theory, high-dimensional statistics, likelihood ratio test, maximum-likelihood estimation.

1 Introduction

In a factor model, variables are described as linear combinations of factors with added noise. This model, which first appears in psychology, is now widely used and appears in many scientific fields: in finance, the Arbitrage Pricing Theory (APT) of [15] heavily rely on factor analysis model. Similar models can be found in physics of mixture, see [9, 12], population genetics or wireless communications [6, 7, 16]. More recently, spiked population models have been introduced in [8] that encompass factor models.

A statistical theory for the maximum likelihood estimation is well-known since [11]. [2] also gives a likelihood ratio test for model fit which has an asymptotic χ^2 distribution under the null. However, these results are developed from a classical point of view where the data dimension p is kept fixed while the sample size n tends to infinity. This scheme is not valid anymore for large-dimensional data.

In the strict factor model case, [9] observed that the maximum likelihood estimator of the homoscedastic variance has a negative bias, and proposed an empirical correction. In Section 3, we give the bias and propose an unbiased estimator. Section 4 considers the goodness-of-fit test for the strict factor model: we propose a corrected likelihood ratio test to cope with the high-dimensional effects.

In the remaining Section 2, we introduce the definition of the strict factor model and the related maximum likelihood theory. Throughout the paper, simulation experiments are conducted to access the quality of the proposed estimation.

2 Problem formulation

2.1 The model

Let p denote the number of variables and n the sample size. In a general factor analysis model, the p-dimensional observation vectors $(x_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ are of the form

$$x_i = \sum_{k=1}^m f_{ki} \Lambda_k + e_i + \mu$$
 (1)

$$= \Lambda f_i + e_i + \mu, \qquad (2)$$

where

- $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ represents the general mean;
- $f_i = (f_{1i}, \dots, f_{mi})'$ are m random factors (m < p);
- $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \dots \Lambda_m)$ is the $p \times m$ full rank matrix of factor loadings;
- e_i is a *p*-dimensional centered vector of noise, independent from f_i and with covariance matrix $\Psi = \mathbb{E}(e_i e_i')$.

In order to remove indeterminacy and avoid identification problem in the model, commonly used restrictions are

- $\mathbb{E}(\mathsf{f}_i) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathsf{f}_i\mathsf{f}_i') = \mathsf{I}_p$;
- $\Psi = \text{cov}(e_i)$ is diagonal;
- $\Gamma = \Lambda' \Psi^{-1} \Lambda$ is diagonal.

Consequently, the population covariance matrix $\Sigma = \text{cov}(x_i)$ is $\Sigma = \Lambda \Lambda' + \Psi$. In a strict factor model with homoscedastic variance, we assume in addition that $\Psi = \sigma^2 I_p$, where $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ is the common variance of the noise e_i . In this case, $\Sigma = \Lambda \Lambda' + \sigma^2 I_p$ and has the spectral decomposition

$$W'\Sigma W = \sigma^2 I_p + diag(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where W is an unknown basis of \mathbb{R}^p and $\alpha_1 \ge \alpha_2 \ge \cdots \ge \alpha_m > 0$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ be the sample mean. The sample covariance matrix of the *n p*-dimensional i.i.d. vectors $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ is

$$S_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(x_i - \bar{x})'.$$

We denote by $\lambda_{n,1} \ge \lambda_{n,2} \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_{n,p}$ its eigenvalues.

2.2 Maximum likelihood estimators

If the f_i and e_i are Gaussian, a likelihood-based theory has been developed by [11]. The maximum likelihood estimator of μ is \bar{x} and those of Λ and σ^2 are given by (see [3]):

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{p-m} \sum_{i=m+1}^p \lambda_i$$
 and $\widehat{\Lambda}_k = (\lambda_{n,k} - \widehat{\sigma}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n,k}, 1 \le k \le m$,

where $v_{n,k}$ is the normalized eigenvector of S_n corresponding to $\lambda_{n,k}$, for $1 \le k \le p$.

In the classical setting where p is kept fixed and small whereas the sample size $n \to \infty$, the almost sure convergence of these estimators is well-established. Nevertheless, this is no longer the case when p is large compared to n.

2.3 CLT for LSS of a high-dimensional covariance matrix

We recall a proposition which will be useful in the sequel. Let $F_n = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \delta_{\lambda_{n,i}}$ be the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of S_n and $F_{c,H}$ be the generalized Marčenko-Pastur distribution with indexes (c,H). We consider the following empirical process

$$G_n(f) = p \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) [F_n - F_{c_n, H_n}] (\mathrm{d}x), f \in \mathscr{A},$$

where \mathscr{A} is the set of analytic functions $f: \mathscr{U} \to \mathbb{C}$, with \mathscr{U} an open set of \mathbb{C} such that $[\mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(c)a(c),b(c)] \subset \mathscr{U}$. As $H_n = F^{\Sigma} \to \delta_{\sigma^2}$ and following [4], we have the following proposition which is a specialization of Theorem 9.10 of [5] (which covers more general matrices).

Proposition 1. Assume that $f_1, ..., f_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and the entries x_{ij} of the vectors $(x_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ are i.i.d. real random variables with mean 0, $\mathbb{E}(|x_{ij}|^4) = 3\sigma^4$ and $cov(x_i) = \Sigma = \Lambda\Lambda' + \sigma^2 I_p$. Then the random vector $(G_n(f_1), ..., G_n(f_k))$ converges to a k-dimensional Gaussian vector with given mean vector $m(f_i)$, j = 1, ..., k and covariance function $v(f_i, f_l)$, j, l = 1, ..., k.

3 Estimation of the homoscedastic variance

3.1 Central limit theorem for the estimator of the variance

As observed in [9, 10], in high-dimensional setting, the m.l.e. $\hat{\sigma}^2$ in (2.2) has a negative bias. The following theorem give this bias and show its asymptotic normality:

Theorem 1. We assume the same conditions of Proposition 1. Then, we have

$$\frac{(p-m)}{\sigma^2\sqrt{2c}}(\widehat{\sigma}^2-\sigma^2)+b(\sigma^2)\stackrel{\mathscr{L}}{\longrightarrow} \mathscr{N}(0,1),$$

where $b(\sigma^2) = \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \left(m + \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \right)$.

3.2 A bias-corrected estimator

The previous theory recommends to correct the negative bias of $\hat{\sigma}^2$. However, the bias $b(\sigma^2)$ depends on the number m and the values α_i of the spikes. These parameters could not be known in real-data applications and they need to be first estimated. In the literature, consistent estimators of m have been proposed, e.g. in [13, 14] and [9]. For the values of the spikes α_i , it can be done by inverting their almost sure limit at the corresponding eigenvalues λ_i .

As the bias depends on σ^2 which we want to estimate, a natural correction is to use the plug-in estimator

$$\hat{\sigma}_*^2 = \hat{\sigma}^2 + \frac{b(\hat{\sigma}^2)}{p-m}\hat{\sigma}^2\sqrt{2c}.$$

Using Theorem 1 and the delta-method, we obtain the following CLT

Theorem 2. We assume the same conditions of Proposition 1. Then, we have

$$\tilde{v}(c)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_*^2 - \sigma^2 + \tilde{b}(\sigma^2)) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{L}} \mathcal{N}(0,1),$$

where

$$\bullet \ \ \tilde{b}(\sigma^2) = \tfrac{c\sqrt{2c}\sigma^2}{(p-m)^2} \left(mb(\sigma^2) + 2\sigma^2b(\sigma^2) \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{-1} \right) - \tfrac{2c^2\sigma^4b(\sigma^2)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{-1}}{(p-m)^3} = O\left(\tfrac{1}{p^2}\right);$$

•
$$\tilde{v}(c) = \frac{2c\sigma^4}{(p-m)^2} \left(1 + \frac{cm}{p-m} + \frac{4c^2\sigma^4}{(p_m)^3} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{-1} \right)^2 = v(c) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) \right).$$

 σ_*^2 is still a biased estimator, but with a bias of order $O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)$ instead of $O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$ for $\hat{\sigma}^2$.

3.3 Simulation experiments

We conduct some simulation experiments in three different settings and compare with two existing estimators of the common variance. Our estimator performs well.

4 Corrected likelihood ratio test of the hypothesis that the factor model fits

In this section we consider the following goodness-of-fit test for the strict factor model. The null hypothesis is then

$$\mathcal{H}_0: \Sigma = \Lambda \Lambda' + \sigma^2 I_p,$$

where the number of factors m is specified.

Following [3], the likelihood ratio test (LRT) statistic is

$$T_n = -nL^*$$
, where $L^* = \sum_{i=m+1}^p \log \frac{\lambda_{n,j}}{\widehat{\sigma}^2}$,

and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is the variance estimator (2.2). Keeping p fixed while letting $n \to \infty$, then the classical theory states that T_n converges to χ_q^2 , where q = p(p+1)/2 + m(m-1)/2 - pm - 1, see [3]. However, this classical approximation is no more valid in the large-dimensional setting. Indeed, we will prove that this criterion leads to a high rate of false-alarm. In particular, the test becomes biased since the size will be much higher than the nominal level (see Table 1).

In a way similar to Section 3, we will construct a corrected version of T_n using Proposition 1 and calculus done in [4] and [17]. As we consider the logarithm of the eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix, we will assume in the sequel that c < 1 to avoid null eigenvalues. We have the following theorem

Theorem 3. We assume the same conditions of Proposition 1, with c < 1, i.e. the entries x_{ij} of the vectors $(x_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ are i.i.d. real random variables with mean 0, $\mathbb{E}(|x_{ij}|^4) = 3\sigma^4$ and $cov(x_i) = \Sigma = \Lambda\Lambda' + \sigma^2 I_p$. Then, we have

$$v(c)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(L^*-m(c)-ph(c_n)-\eta+(p-m)\log(\beta)) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{L}} \mathscr{N}(0,1),$$

where
$$m(c) = \frac{\log(1-c)}{2}$$
, $h(c_n) = \frac{c_n-1}{c_n}\log(1-c_n) - 1$, $\eta = \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1+c\sigma^2\alpha_i^{-1})$, $\beta = 1 - \frac{c}{p-m}(m+\sigma^2\sum_{i=1}^m\alpha_i^{-1})$ and $v(c) = -2\log(1-c) + \frac{2c}{\beta}\left(\frac{1}{\beta}-2\right)$.

To test \mathcal{H}_0 , we then can use the statistic

$$v(c_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(L^*-m(c)-ph(c_n)-\eta+(p-m)\log(\beta)),$$

This test is asymptotically normal and will be hereafter referred as the corrected likelihood ratio test (CLRT in short).

4.1 Simulation experiments

We consider the following models:

- Model 1: $\operatorname{spec}(\Sigma) = (25, 16, 9, 0, \dots, 0) + \sigma^2(1, \dots, 1), \ \sigma^2 = 4, \ c = 0.9;$
- Model 2: spec(Σ) = (4,3,0,...,0) + σ^2 (1,...,1), σ^2 = 2, c = 0.2;
- Model 4: spec(Σ) = (8,7,0,...,0) + σ^2 (1,...,1), σ^2 = 1, varying c.

Table 1 gives the realized sizes (i.e. the empirical probability of rejecting the null hypothesis) of the classical likelihood ratio test (LRT) and the corrected likelihood ratio test (CLRT) proposed above. The computations are done under 10000 independent replications and the nominal test level is 0.05.

Table 1: Comparison of the realized size of the classical likelihood ratio test (LRT) and the corrected likelihood ratio test (CLRT) in various settings.

ziti) iii various settings.				
	Settings		Realized size of CLRT	Realized size of LRT
Model 1	p = 90	n = 100	0.0497	0.9995
	p = 180	n = 200	0.0491	1
	p = 720	n = 800	0.0496	1
Model 2	p = 20	n = 100	0.0324	0.0294
	p = 80	n = 400	0.0507	0.0390
	p = 200	n = 1000	0.0541	0.0552
Model 4	p=5	n = 500	0.0108	0.0483
	p = 10	n = 500	0.0190	0.0465
	p = 50	n = 500	0.0424	0.0445
	p = 100	n = 500	0.0459	0.0461
	p = 200	n = 500	0.0491	0.2212
	p = 250	n = 500	0.0492	0.7395
	p = 300	n = 500	0.0509	0.9994

The sizes of our new CLRT are close to the theoretical one, except when the ratio c = p/n is small (less than 0.1). On the contrary, the sizes produced by the classical LRT are much higher than the nominal level when c is going close to one, and the test will always be rejected when p is large.

References

- [1] Bai, Z. D. and Silverstein, J. W. (2004), *CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices*, Annals of Probability, 32(1A), 553–605.
- [2] Amemiya, Y. and Anderson, T. W. (1990), *Asymptotic chi-square tests for a large class of factor analysis models*, The Annals of Statistics, 18(3), 1453–1463.

- [3] Anderson, T. W. and Rubin, H. (1956), *Statistical inference in factor analysis*, Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. V, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 111–150.
- [4] Bai, Z., Jiang, D., Yao, J.-F. and Zheng, S. (2009), Corrections to LRT on large-dimensional covariance matrix by RMT, The Annals of Statistics, 37(6B), 3822–3840.
- [5] Bai, Z. and Silverstein, J. (2010), *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York.
- [6] Bianchi, P., Debbah, M., Maida, M. and Najim, J. (2011), *Performance of statistical tests for single source detection using random matrix theory*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 57(4), 2400–2419.
- [7] Hachem, W., Loubaton, P., Mestre X., Najim, J. and Vallet, P. (2012), Large information plus noise matrix models and consistent subspace estimation in large sensor networks, Random Matrices: Theory and Applications, 1(2), 1150006.
- [8] Johnstone, I. (2001), On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis, The Annals of Statistics, 29(2), 295–327.
- [9] Kritchman, S. and Nadler, B. (2008), *Determining the number of components in a factor model from limited noisy data*, Chem. Int. Lab. Syst, 94, 19–32.
- [10] Kritchman, S. and Nadler, B. (2009), *Non-parametric detection of the number of signals: Hypothesis testing and random matrix theory*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 57(10), 3930–3941.
- [11] Lawley, D. (1940), The estimation of factor loadings by the method of maximum likelihood, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh, 60, 64–82.
- [12] Naes, T., Isaksson, T., Fearn, T. and Davies, T. (2002), *User-friendly guide to multi-variate calibration and classification*, NIR Publications, Chichester.
- [13] Passemier, D. and Yao, J.-F. (2012), On determining the number of spikes in a high-dimensional spiked population model, Random Matrices: Theory and Applications, 1(1), 1150002.
- [14] Passemier, D. and Yao, J.-F. (2012), Estimation of the number of factors, possibly equal, in the high-dimensional case, Preprint.
- [15] Ross, S. (1976), *The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing*, Journal of Economic Theory, 13(3), 341–360.
- [16] Vallet, P., Loubaton, P. and Mestre, X. (2012), *Improved subspace estimation for multivariate observations of high dimension: the deterministic signals case*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 58(2), 1043–1068.
- [17] Zheng, S. (2012), Central limit theorems for linear spectral statistics of large dimensional F-matrices, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré Probabilités et Statistiques, 48(2), 444–476.