

# Wilks' $\Lambda$ and Hotelling's $T^2$ .

Steffen Lauritzen, University of Oxford

BS2 Statistical Inference, Lecture 13, Hilary Term 2008

March 2, 2008

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent,  $X \sim \Gamma(\alpha_x, \gamma)$ , and  $Y \sim \Gamma(\alpha_y, \gamma)$ , then the ratio  $X/(X + Y)$  follows a Beta distribution:

$$B = \frac{X}{X + Y} \sim \mathcal{B}(\alpha_x, \alpha_y).$$

A multivariate analogue of this result involves the Wishart distribution and asserts.

*If  $W_1 \sim \mathcal{W}_d(f_1, \Sigma)$  and  $W_2 \sim \mathcal{W}_d(f_2, \Sigma)$  with  $f_1 \geq d$ , then the distribution of*

$$\Lambda = \frac{\det(W_1)}{\det(W_1 + W_2)}$$

*does not depend on  $\Sigma$  and is denoted by  $\Lambda(d, f_1, f_2)$ .* The distribution is known as *Wilks' distribution*.

To see that the distribution of  $\Lambda$  does not depend on  $\Sigma$ , we choose a matrix  $A$  such that  $A\Sigma A^\top = I_d$ . Then

$$\tilde{W}_i = AW_iA^\top \sim \mathcal{W}_d(f_i, I_d)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \frac{\det(\tilde{W}_1)}{\det(\tilde{W}_1 + \tilde{W}_2)} = \frac{\det(A) \det(W_1) \det(A^\top)}{\det(A) \det(W_1 + W_2) \det(A^\top)} = \Lambda.$$

Clearly, the distribution of  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  does not depend on  $\Sigma$  and as  $\tilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda$  this also holds for the latter.

Wilks' distribution is closely related to the Beta distribution. *It holds that*

$$\Lambda \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \prod_{i=1}^d B_i$$

where  $B_i$  are independent and follow Beta distributions with

$$B_i \sim \mathcal{B}\{(f_1 + 1 - i)/2, f_2/2\}.$$

Indeed the distribution of

$$(W_1 + W_2)^{-1} W_1$$

is also known as *the multivariate Beta distribution*.

We first need a useful result about determinants of block matrices. If  $A$  is a  $d \times d$  symmetric matrix partitioned into blocks of dimension  $r \times r$ ,  $r \times s$ , and  $s \times s$  as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

*it holds that*

$$\det A = \det(A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}) \det(A_{22}). \quad (1)$$

Here the entire expression should be considered equal to 0 if  $A_{22}$  is not invertible and  $\det(A_{22}) = 0$ .

This follows from a simple calculation

$$\begin{aligned}\det(A) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \det \begin{pmatrix} I_{r \times r} & 0_{r \times s} \\ -A_{22}^{-1}A_{21} & I_{s \times s} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21} & A_{12} \\ 0_{s \times r} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det(A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}) \det(A_{22}).\end{aligned}$$

Consider a partitioning of  $W$  and  $\Sigma$  into blocks as

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ W_{21} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\Sigma_{11}$  is an  $r \times r$  matrix,  $\Sigma_{22}$  is  $s \times s$ , etc.

*If  $W \sim \mathcal{W}_d(f, \Sigma)$  and  $\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{21} = 0$  then*

$$\frac{\det(W)}{\det(W_{11}) \det(W_{22})} \sim \Lambda(r, f - s, s) = \Lambda(s, f - r, r).$$

To see this is true we first use the matrix identity (1) to write

$$\frac{\det(W)}{\det(W_{11}) \det(W_{22})} = \frac{\det(W_{1|2})}{\det(W_{11})} = \frac{\det(W_{1|2})}{\det(W_{1|2} + W_{12} W_{22}^{-1} W_{21})},$$

where  $W_{1|2} = W_{11} - W_{12} W_{22}^{-1} W_{21}$ .

Next we need to use that if  $\Sigma_{12} = 0$  and thus  $\Sigma_{1|2} = \Sigma_{11}$ , it further holds that  $W_{1|2}$  and  $W_{12} W_{22}^{-1} W_{21}$  are independent and both Wishart distributed as

$$W_{1|2} \sim \mathcal{W}_r(f - s, \Sigma_{11}), \quad W_{12} W_{22}^{-1} W_{21} \sim \mathcal{W}_r(s, \Sigma_{11}).$$

We abstain from giving further details.



Wilks' distribution occurs as the likelihood ratio test for independence. Consider  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}_d(0, \Sigma)$ . The likelihood function is

$$L(K) = (\det K)^{n/2} e^{-\text{tr}(KW)/2}.$$

As this is maximized by

$$\hat{K} = nW^{-1}$$

we have

$$L(\hat{K}) = (\det W)^{-n/2} e^{-nd/2}.$$

If  $\Sigma_{12} = 0$  we similarly have

$$L(\hat{K}_{11}, \hat{K}_{22}) = (\det W_{11})^{-n/2} e^{-nr/2} (\det W_{22})^{-n/2} e^{-ns/2}.$$

Hence the likelihood ratio statistic is

$$\frac{L(\hat{K}_{11}, \hat{K}_{22})}{L(\hat{K})} = \left\{ \frac{\det(W)}{\det(W_{11}) \det(W_{22})} \right\}^{n/2} = \Lambda^{n/2}.$$

Let  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mu, c\Sigma)$  and  $W \sim \mathcal{W}_d(f, \Sigma)$  with  $f \geq d$ , and  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp W$ .  
Then

$$T^2 = f(Y - \mu)^\top W^{-1}(Y - \mu)/c$$

is known as *Hotelling's  $T^2$* . This is the multivariate analogue of Student's  $t$  (or rather  $t^2$ ).

It is equivalent to the likelihood ratio statistic for testing  $\mu = 0$  from a sample  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  where then  $Y = \bar{X}$ ,  $W = \sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})^\top$ ,  $f = n - 1$ , and  $c = 1/n$ .

*It holds that*

$$\frac{1}{1 + T^2/f} \sim \Lambda(d, f, 1) = \Lambda(1, f - d + 1, d).$$

To see this we exploit the matrix identity (1) and calculate a determinant in two different ways. We may without loss of generality let  $\mu = 0$ . We have

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} W & -Y/\sqrt{c} \\ Y/\sqrt{c} & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \det(W + YY^T/c) \cdot 1,$$

But we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{pmatrix} W & -Y/\sqrt{c} \\ Y/\sqrt{c} & 1 \end{pmatrix} &= \det(1 + Y^T W^{-1} Y/c) \det W \\ &= (1 + Y^T W^{-1} Y/c) \det W \\ &= (1 + T^2/f) \det W. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{1 + T^2/f} = \frac{1}{1 + Y^T W^{-1} Y/c} = \frac{\det W}{\det(W + YY^T/c)}.$$

The result now follows by noting that  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}_d(0, c\Sigma)$  implies  $YY^T/c \sim \mathcal{W}_d(1, \Sigma)$ . Since

$$\Lambda(d, f, 1) = \Lambda(1, f - d + 1, d)$$

and the latter is a Beta distribution, *it also holds that*

$$\frac{f - d + 1}{fd} T^2 \sim F(d, f + 1 - d)$$

where  $F$  denotes Fisher's  $F$ -distribution.