

1 that making multiple inferences calls for increased conservatism relative to making 1
2 a single inference. 2

3 The present study considers a more general setting for making multiple compar- 3
4 isons and introduces a new loss function that is more directly tied to the *FDR*. We 4
5 derive a Bayes rule for this loss function and show that it is very closely related 5
6 to a Bayesian version of the original multiple comparisons procedure proposed by 6
7 Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) to control the sampling theory *FDR*. We provide 7
8 the results of a Monte Carlo simulation that illustrates the very similar sampling 8
9 behavior of our Bayes rule and Benjamini and Hochberg's procedure when applied 9
10 to testing all pairwise comparisons for a one-way fixed effects analysis of variance 10
11 setup with 10 and with 20 means. 11

12 2. Setup 12

13 We start with a general likelihood $p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$, prior $p(\theta)$, and resulting posterior 13
14 $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$. Let $\psi = \mathbf{f}(\theta)$ be a vector of m "contrasts" among the elements of θ . 14
15 Suppose our goal is to identify the sign of each of the elements of ψ , given \mathbf{y} . In 15
16 the language of decision theory, for each ψ_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, we will take action a_i , 16
17 with $a_i = +1$ used to indicate that we declare ψ_i to be positive, $a_i = -1$ indicating 17
18 that we declare ψ_i to be negative, and $a_i = 0$ used to indicate that we are unable 18
19 to determine sign of ψ_i . Although directly inspired by Williams, Jones and Tukey 19
20 (1999), and Jones and Tukey (2000), this approach to (multiple) hypothesis testing 20
21 has its origins in the much earlier work of Lehmann (1950, 1957a, 1957b). 21

22 To continue, we introduce two component loss functions: $L_1(\psi_i, a_i) = 1$ if the 22
23 signs of ψ_i and a_i disagree, and $L_1 = 0$ otherwise (used to count the number of 23
24 incorrect sign declarations); $L_2(\psi_i, a_i) = 1$ if $a_i = 0$, and $L_2 = 0$ otherwise (used 24
25 to count the signs not declared). These actions and losses are very similar to those 25
26 given by Lehmann (1957b, p. 549). They differ from conventional treatments of hy- 26
27 pothesis testing in the sense that they focus on identifying the sign of each contrast 27
28 and do not formally consider the possibility that the value of the contrast could 28
29 be (exactly) 0. The reasonableness of this approach, compared with conventional 29
30 point hypothesis testing is emphasized by Jones and Tukey (2000), among others. 30
31

32 We now propose a loss function that combines L_1 and L_2 as follows: 32
33

$$34 \quad (1) \quad L_{DFDR}(\psi, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m L_1(\psi_i, a_i)}{\max\left\{1, m - \sum_{i=1}^m L_2(\psi_i, a_i)\right\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m L_2(\psi_i, a_i)}{m}, \quad 35$$

36 for a fixed choice of $0 < \alpha < 1$ (such as $\alpha = 0.05$). Here, *DFDR* (in notation 36
37 introduced by Shaffer, 2002) stands for Directional False Discovery Rate. The first 37
38 term in Equation 1 is the sample value of the *DFDR* for a given ψ and a vector of 38
39 actions \mathbf{a} , namely the number of incorrect sign declarations, divided by the total 39
40 number of signs declared (or divided by 1 if no signs are declared by \mathbf{a}). 40

41 The second term in Equation 1 is $\alpha/2$ times the sample proportion of signs 41
42 not declared. This term may be interpreted as a sample per-comparison Type II 42
43 error rate, weighted by a relative importance factor of $\alpha/2$. Using a per-comparison 43
44 formulation, as well as assigning this loss component a small weight, serves to 44
45 emphasize that failure to declare a sign is considered to be much less serious than 45
46 declaring that sign incorrectly. This emphasis is in keeping with the concern about 46
47 controlling Type I errors (at the expense of making Type II errors) in traditional 47
48 48
49 49
50 50
51 51

treatments of the multiple comparisons problem. The Bayes decision rule for the complete loss function in Equation 1 minimizes its posterior expected value, in this sense balancing the two types of losses against each other, with the major focus being on reducing the $DFDR$.

3. Bayes Decision Rule

To identify the actions that minimize the posterior expected value of the loss function given in Equation 1, we begin by introducing some notation.

If $\Pr(\psi_i > 0 | \mathbf{y}) > 0.5$, define $a_i^* = +1$ and $p_i = \Pr(\psi_i < 0 | \mathbf{y})$; if $\Pr(\psi_i > 0 | \mathbf{y}) \leq 0.5$, define $a_i^* = -1$ and $p_i = \Pr(\psi_i > 0 | \mathbf{y})$. Note that a_i^* and p_i are related by the following result: $E_{\theta|\mathbf{y}} [L_1(\psi_i, a_i^*) | \mathbf{y}] = p_i$. Now order the p_i so that $p_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq p_{(m)}$. Define $\mathbf{a}^{(k)}$ for $k = 1, \dots, m$ as $a_{(i)}^{(k)} = a_{(i)}^*$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $a_{(i)}^{(k)} = 0$, for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$. For $k = 0$, take $a_{(i)}^{(0)} = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

The posterior expected loss for $\mathbf{a}^{(k)}$ is given by

$$(2) \quad E_{\theta|\mathbf{y}} [L_{DFDR}(\psi, \mathbf{a}^{(k)}) | \mathbf{y}] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k p_{(i)}}{\max\{1, k\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k}{m}\right).$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{a}^{(k)}$ minimizes the posterior expected loss among all action vectors \mathbf{a} that declare exactly k signs. Let k_{DFDR} be the value of k for which the posterior expected loss given in Equation 2 is minimized. (The value of k_{DFDR} in a given setting would normally be determined by an exhaustive search over all values of $k = 0, \dots, m$.) The Bayes decision rule for this problem is given by $\delta_{DFDR}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{a}^{(k_{DFDR})}$, and the corresponding Bayes risk is

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} r(\delta_{DFDR}) &= E_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} [L_{DFDR}(\psi, \delta_{DFDR}(\mathbf{y}))] \\ &= E_{\mathbf{y}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p_{(i)}}{\max\{1, k_{DFDR}\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR}}{m}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The latter expectation in Equation 3 is taken with respect to the predictive distribution of \mathbf{y} , and it should be noted that the $p_{(i)}$ and, consequently, k_{DFDR} all depend on \mathbf{y} .

Since $E_{\theta|\mathbf{y}} [L_{DFDR}(\psi, \mathbf{a}^{(0)}) | \mathbf{y}] = \alpha/2$ for all \mathbf{y} , it follows that $r(\delta_{DFDR}) \leq \alpha/2$. Consequently,

$$(4) \quad E_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m L_1(\psi_i, \delta_{DFDR, i}(\mathbf{y}))}{\max\left\{1, m - \sum_{i=1}^m L_2(\psi_i, \delta_{DFDR, i}(\mathbf{y}))\right\}} \right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Equation 4 says that a Bayesian version of the $DFDR$ is bounded by $\alpha/2$ when the Bayes rule δ_{DFDR} is used. It may be worth observing that these results apply to a very general class of multiple comparison problems. Essentially the only restriction is that the set of contrasts be finite. Indeed, these do not even have to be contrasts in the usual sense of that term. They could also, for example, be a set of independent parameters that formed a family of interest.

4. A Bayesian Version of Benjamini & Hochberg’s Procedure

Next, we consider the multiple comparisons procedure proposed by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) and modified for directional testing by Williams, Jones and Tukey (1999).

However, we will translate the procedure into our Bayesian framework. Define $k_{DB \& H}$ to be the largest value of $k = 1, \dots, m$, such that

$$p^{(k)} \leq \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m}\right),$$

with $k_{DB \& H} = 0$ if no such value of k exists. Define $\delta_{DB \& H}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{a}^{(k_{DB \& H})}$.

If $k_{DB \& H} = 0$, then the posterior expected loss for $\mathbf{a}^{(k_{DB \& H})}$ is equal to $\alpha/2$. If $k_{DB \& H} > 0$, the posterior expected loss for $\mathbf{a}^{(k_{DB \& H})}$ is given by Equation 2 as

$$(5) \quad E_{\theta|\mathbf{y}} \left[L_{DFDR} \left(\psi, \mathbf{a}^{(k_{DB \& H})} \right) | \mathbf{y} \right] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DB \& H}} p^{(i)}}{k_{DB \& H}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DB \& H}}{m}\right).$$

From the definition of $k_{DB \& H}$, it follows that

$$(6) \quad p^{(i)} \leq \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{k_{DB \& H}}{m}\right) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k_{DB \& H}.$$

Consequently, applying Inequality 6 to Equation 5, it follows that

$$E_{\theta|\mathbf{y}} \left[L_{DFDR} \left(\psi, \mathbf{a}^{(k_{DB \& H})} \right) | \mathbf{y} \right] \leq \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{k_{DB \& H}}{m}\right) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DB \& H}}{m}\right) = \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Since this inequality holds for all \mathbf{y} , it implies that $r(\delta_{DB \& H}) \leq \alpha/2$, and so, just as with δ_{DFDR} ,

$$(7) \quad E_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m L_1(\psi_i, \delta_{DB \& H, i}(\mathbf{y}))}{\max \left\{ 1, m - \sum_{i=1}^m L_2(\psi_i, \delta_{DB \& H, i}(\mathbf{y})) \right\}} \right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Equation 7 says that $\delta_{DB \& H}$ also controls our Bayesian $DFDR$.

This seems like an appropriate place to note that what has just been established (namely the fact that $\delta_{DB \& H}$ controls the $DFDR$ for an arbitrary set of contrasts) is a Bayesian, rather than a sampling theory result. Indeed, Benjamini and Hochberg’s (1995) sampling theory procedure has only been shown to control the sampling theory FDR in special circumstances, such as the case of independent tests. In particular, it has not been shown to provide sampling theory control of the FDR when making all pairwise comparisons among a set of means in a one-way, fixed effects analysis of variance setup.

Since δ_{DFDR} is a Bayes decision rule, it must be the case that $r(\delta_{DFDR}) \leq r(\delta_{DB \& H})$. Moreover, it is also possible to show that $k_{DFDR} \geq k_{DB \& H}$ for all \mathbf{y} . To see this, suppose the contrary: $k_{DB \& H} = k_{DFDR} + d$ with $d > 0$. By the definition of k_{DFDR} , we must have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p^{(i)}}{\max \{1, k_{DFDR}\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR}}{m}\right) < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DB \& H}} p^{(i)}}{k_{DB \& H}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DB \& H}}{m}\right)$$

1 or

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i)}{\max\{1, k_{DFDR}\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR}}{m}\right) < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i) + \sum_{i=k_{DFDR}+1}^{k_{DFDR}+d} p(i)}{k_{DFDR} + d} \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR} + d}{m}\right).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{8}$$

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Note that a strict inequality has been used here, implying that, in case of ties, k_{DFDR} would be chosen to be the largest value of k that minimizes the posterior expected loss. To continue, using the definition of $k_{DB \& H}$,

$$\sum_{i=k_{DFDR}+1}^{k_{DFDR}+d} p(i) \leq d \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{k_{DFDR} + d}{m}\right).
 \tag{9}$$

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Combining Inequalities 8 and 9 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i)}{\max\{1, k_{DFDR}\}} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR}}{m}\right) < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i)}{k_{DFDR} + d} \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{d}{m}\right) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{DFDR} + d}{m}\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 or

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i)}{\max\{1, k_{DFDR}\}} < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_{DFDR}} p(i)}{k_{DFDR} + d},
 \tag{10}$$

25
26
27
28
29 If $k_{DFDR} > 0$, Inequality 10 implies that $d = 0$, contrary to our initial assumption. If $k_{DFDR} = 0$, both sides of Inequality 10 would be 0, contradicting the strict inequality. Thus, we have demonstrated that $k_{DFDR} \geq k_{DB \& H}$ for all \mathbf{y} . In other words, the Bayes rule δ_{DFDR} will always declare at least as many signs as $\delta_{DB \& H}$.

34 35 5. Simulation Results

36
37 It is important to recall that the procedure actually proposed by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) uses sampling theory p -values (one-tailed values in Williams, Jones and Tukey's 1999 version), rather than posterior tail probabilities and controls the sampling theory version of the FDR (or $DFDR$ in Willams et al.'s version). Now consider a standard multiple comparisons problem: the one-way, fixed effects analysis of variance setup, with the ψ_i chosen to be all pair-wise differences among the group means. In this case, the relevant sampling theory and Bayesian (based on a vague prior for all parameters) p -values are identical tail probabilities from the appropriate Student's t -distribution (see, for instance, Box & Tiao, 1973, p. 140).

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Tables 1 and 2 give the results of sampling theory simulations (based on 25,000 replications for each condition) of one-way, fixed effects ANOVA setups, considering all pair-wise differences for 10 evenly spaced means, and for 25 evenly spaced means. In these simulations, the within-group variance was set at 3.0 with $n = 3$ sample observations per group (so the sampling variances of the sample means are all equal to 1.0 and the within-group degrees of freedom equals 20 in the first case and 50 in

the second case). In addition, we chose $\alpha = 0.05$, with the intention of controlling the sampling theory $DFDR$ at $\alpha/2 = 0.025$, although we emphasize again that there is no theory to support that control for pair-wise comparisons.

The $DFDR$ values in Table 1 are sampling theory averages of the sample $DFDR$ used as the first term of our loss function for the two rules with two numbers of means, and a range of spacings among the means. To make the results comparable across the two setups, we used the population standard deviation (denoted here by τ) to index the spread of the means. The Average Power values in Table 2 are sampling theory averages of the sample per-comparison correct sign declaration rate. All four quantities for a given number of means are computed from the same 25,000 replications at each spread of the means. Note that the spread is effectively given in units equal to the standard errors of the sample means. For the spread labeled “0.00+” all population mean values were set equal, and an arbitrary ordering was chosen to evaluate the “wrong sign” errors. Both procedures conservatively control the $DFDR$ for all conditions considered. The Bayes rule procedure provides slightly greater per-comparison power than that of Benjamini and Hochberg in these conditions, but the actual differences are trivial.

Table 1. Sampling Theory $DFDR$ for All Pair-wise Comparisons Made Using Our Bayes Rule and Benjamini & Hochberg’s Procedures.

τ : Spread of Means	10 Means		25 Means	
	δ_{DFDR}	$\delta_{DB \& H}$	δ_{DFDR}	$\delta_{DB \& H}$
0.00+	0.0204	0.0171	0.0206	0.0176
0.721	0.0062	0.0044	0.0067	0.0046
3.606	0.0005	0.0005	0.0013	0.0012
5.408	0.0001	0.0001	0.0006	0.0006
7.211	0.0000	0.0000	0.0003	0.0003
14.422	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 2. Sampling Theory Average Power for All Pair-wise Comparisons Made Using Our Bayes Rule and Benjamini & Hochberg’s Procedure.

τ : Spread of Means	10 Means		25 Means	
	δ_{DFDR}	$\delta_{DB \& H}$	δ_{DFDR}	$\delta_{DB \& H}$
0.00+	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.000
0.721	0.022	0.016	0.012	0.007
3.606	0.634	0.621	0.604	0.594
5.408	0.783	0.778	0.741	0.737
7.211	0.860	0.857	0.813	0.811
14.422	0.984	0.984	0.924	0.924

Note: 25,000 replications for each condition, $n = 3$ observations per group, within degrees of freedom $\nu = 20$ for 10 means and $\nu = 50$ for 25 means, within variance $\sigma^2 = 3.0$, $\alpha/2 = .025$.

6. Conclusions

The decision rule δ_{DFDR} has been shown to be optimal (from a Bayesian perspective) relative to the loss function L_{DFDR} for a wide class of multiple comparison problems involving sign declarations. It has also been shown to control a Bayesian version of the directional false discovery rate ($DFDR$), as has a Bayesian version of

1 the procedure proposed by Benjamini and Hochberg ($\delta_{DB \& H}$). There is no guar- 1
 2 antee that δ_{DFDR} or $\delta_{DB \& H}$ will control a sampling theory $DFDR$ for the case 2
 3 of pair-wise comparisons, although that appears to occur in the ANOVA examples 3
 4 given, where the two rules behave very similarly. 4

5 6 References 6

- 7
8
9 [1] BENJAMINI, Y., & HOCHBERG, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful 9
 10 approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **57**, 289–300. 10
 11 [2] BOX, G. E. P., & TIAO, G. C. (1973). *Bayesian inference in statistical analysis*. Reading, MA: 11
 Addison-Wesley. 12
 12 [3] DUNCAN, D. B. (1965). A Bayesian approach to multiple comparisons. *Technometrics*, **7**, 171–222. 12
 13 [4] JONES, L. V., & TUKEY, J. W. (2000). A sensible formulation of the significance test. *Psychological 13
 Methods*, **5**, 411–414. 14
 14 [5] LEHMANN, E. L. (1950). Some principles of the theory of testing hypotheses. *The Annals of Math- 14
 ematical Statistics*, **21**, 1–26. 15
 15 [6] LEHMANN, E. L. (1957a). A theory of some multiple decision problems. I. *The Annals of Mathemat- 15
 ical Statistics*, **28**, 1–25. 16
 16 [7] LEHMANN, E. L. (1957b). A theory of some multiple decision problems. II. *The Annals of Mathe- 16
 matical Statistics*, **28**, 547–572. 17
 17 [8] LEWIS, C., & THAYER, D. T. (2004). A loss function related to the FDR for random effects multiple 17
 18 comparisons. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **125**, 49–58. 18
 19 [9] SAKAR, S. K., & ZHOU, T. (2008). Controlling Bayes directional false discovery rate in random effects 19
 20 model. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **138**, 682–693. 20
 21 [10] SHAFFER, J. P. (1999). A semi-Bayesian study of Duncan’s Bayesian multiple comparison procedure. 21
 22 *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **82**, 197–213. 22
 23 [11] SHAFFER, J. P. (2002). Multiplicity, directional (Type III) errors and the null hypothesis. *Psycho- 23
 logical Methods*, **7**, 356–369. 24
 24 [12] WALLER, R. A., & DUNCAN, D. B. (1969). A Bayes rule for symmetric multiple comparisons problems. 24
 25 *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **64**, 1484–1503. 25
 26 [13] WILLIAMS, V. S. L., JONES, L. V., & TUKEY, J. W. (1999). Controlling error in multiple comparisons, 26
 27 with examples from state-to-state differences in educational achievement. *Journal of Educational 27
 and Behavioral Statistics*, **24**, 42–69. 28
 28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51