

Asymptotic Distribution-Free Tests for Ultra-high Dimensional Parametric Regressions via Projected Empirical Processes and p -value Combination *

Falong Tan¹, Shan Tang², and Lixing Zhu^{3*}

¹ *Department of Statistics and Data Science, Hunan University, Changsha, China*

² *School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan, China*

³ *Department of Statistics, Beijing Normal University at Zhuhai, Zhuhai, China*

Abstract

This paper develops a novel methodology for testing the goodness-of-fit of sparse parametric regression models based on projected empirical processes and p -value combination, where the covariate dimension may substantially exceed the sample size. In such ultra-high dimensional settings, traditional empirical process-based tests often fail due to the curse of dimensionality or their reliance on the asymptotic linearity and normality of parameter estimators—properties that may not hold under ultra-high dimensional scenarios. To overcome these challenges, we first extend the classic martingale transformation to ultra-high dimensional settings under mild conditions and construct a Cramér-von Mises type test based on a martingale-transformed, projected residual-marked empirical process for any projection on the unit sphere. The martingale transformation renders this projected test asymptotically distribution-free and enables us to derive its limiting distribution using only standard convergence rates of parameter estimators. While the projected test is consistent for almost all projections on the unit sphere under mild conditions, it may still suffer from power loss for specific projections. Therefore, we further employ powerful p -value combination procedures, such as the Cauchy combination, to aggregate p -values across multiple projections, thereby enhancing overall robustness. Furthermore, recognizing that empirical process-based tests excel at detecting low-frequency signals while local smoothing tests are generally superior for high-frequency alternatives, we propose a novel hybrid test that aggregates both approaches using Cauchy combination. The resulting hybrid test is powerful against both low-frequency and high-frequency alternatives. Detailed simulation studies and two real-data analyses are conducted to illustrate the effectiveness of our methodology in ultra-high dimensional settings.

Key words: Curse of dimensionality, generalized linear models, hybrid test, martingale transformation, projection.

*Corresponding author. Lixing Zhu's research was supported by the grants (NSFC12131006, NSFC12471276) from the National Natural Scientific Foundation of China and the grant (CI2023C063YLL) from the Scientific and Technological Innovation Project of China Academy of Chinese Medical Science.

1 Introduction

This research is motivated by the problem of testing the goodness-of-fit of ultra-high dimensional regression models, where the dimension of covariates may substantially exceed the sample size. Consider the regression model:

$$Y = m(X) + \varepsilon, \tag{1.1}$$

where $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ is the response, X is the p -dimensional covariate vector, $m(\cdot) = E(Y|X = \cdot)$ is the unknown regression function, and ε is the error term satisfying $E(\varepsilon|X) = 0$. Our objective is to test whether the mean function $m(\cdot)$ belongs to some parametric class of functions $\mathcal{M} = \{m(\cdot, \beta) : \beta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q\}$ in ultra-high dimensional settings.

There is an extensive literature on goodness-of-fit testing for regression models in low dimensional settings when the dimension p is considered to be fixed and smaller than the sample size n . One primary methodology for model checking, known as local smoothing tests, is based on nonparametric estimation of conditional moment restrictions $E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|X]$ for some $\beta_0 \in \Theta$, where $\varepsilon(\beta_0) = Y - m(X, \beta_0)$. Examples include Härdle and Mammen (1993), Zheng (1996), Dette (1999), Fan and Huang (2001), Horowitz and Spokoiny (2001), Koul and Ni (2004), Van Keilegom et al. (2008), Lavergne and Patilea (2008, 2012), Guo et al. (2016). These tests are usually asymptotically distribution-free and are particularly sensitive to high-frequency alternative models (Horowitz and Spokoiny, 2001). However, due to their reliance on nonparametric estimation, they usually suffer severely from the curse of dimensionality. The other main type of test for model checking constructs test statistics based on empirical processes, which circumvents the nonparametric estimation of conditional moment restriction $E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|X]$. See, for instance, Bierens (1982), Stute (1997), Bierens (1990), Stute, González Manteiga, and Presedo Quindimil (1998), Stute and Zhu (2002), Zhu (2003), Escanciano (2006b), Stute et al. (2008), Escanciano et al. (2018), Cuesta-Albertos et al. (2019), Lu and Zheng (2020), Escanciano (2024). These empirical process-based tests are usually powerful against low-frequency alternative models and can detect local alternatives at the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$, which is the optimal detection rate in hypothesis testing.

However, empirical process-based tests typically require the asymptotic linearity or normality of parameter estimators to derive their limiting null distributions. To illustrate this, we consider the seminal paper by Stute (1997). That paper showed that many goodness-of-fit tests for regressions are based on the empirical process $\hat{S}_n(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) I(X_i \leq t)$, where $\varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) = Y_i - m(X_i, \hat{\beta})$ with $\hat{\beta}$ being a consistent estimator of β and $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is an i.i.d. sample with the same distribution as (X, Y) . Under some regularity conditions and fixed dimensional settings, Stute (1997) showed that under the null hypothesis,

$$\hat{S}_n(t) = S_n^0(t) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top M(t) + o_p(1), \tag{1.2}$$

uniformly in t , where $M(t) = E[m'(X, \beta_0) I(X \leq t)]$ and $S_n^0(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\beta_0) I(X_i \leq t)$ with $\varepsilon_i(\beta_0) = Y_i - m(X_i, \beta_0)$. It is readily seen that the asymptotically linear expansion or normality of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)$ are required to derive the limiting null distribution of $\hat{S}_n(t)$. However, this asymptotic property for the estimated parameter $\hat{\beta}$ in high dimensional settings, such as Lasso, post-Lasso, or their variants, may no longer hold. Consequently, empirical process-based tests that incorporate these estimation methodologies, without further transformation for the corresponding empirical processes, typically cannot be directly extended to ultra-high dimensional settings where the covariate dimension

p significantly surpasses the sample size n . Another critical issue is that most existing empirical process-based tests suffer from the curse of dimensionality because of data sparsity in high dimensional spaces; see Escanciano (2006b) and Tan et al. (2025) for more details on this issue. More recently, Shah and Bühlmann (2018) and Janková et al. (2020) proposed two goodness-of-fit tests based on residual prediction and generalized residual prediction for high dimensional linear and generalized linear models, respectively, where the covariate dimension p can be much larger than the sample size n . However, Shah and Bühlmann (2018) considered a goodness-of-fit test for regression models with fixed design, which is different from the present paper. Janková et al. (2020) proposed a generalized residual prediction (GRP) test based on projected residuals $w^\top \hat{R}$, where \hat{R} and w are the estimated residual vector and projection on the unit sphere, respectively. Note that the GRP test only considers a specific aspect of the model misspecification; it may fail to capture all potential departures from the null hypothesis and loses power against certain alternatives in high dimensional settings.

The purpose of this paper is to develop a new goodness-of-fit test for regression models which can be applied in ultra-high dimensional scenarios and simultaneously mitigate the curse of dimensionality. Recall that empirical process-based tests typically require asymptotic linearity or normality of the parameter estimator $\hat{\beta}$ to derive their limiting distributions. Since this assumption for $\hat{\beta}$ in ultra-high dimensional settings may not hold, corresponding empirical process-based tests may not be applied to these settings either. Interestingly, we find that the classic martingale transformation (Stute et al., 1998) for model checking may be used to address this problem. This method can be traced back to Khmaladze (1981) for deriving a goodness-of-fit test of the cumulative distribution function; see also Koul and Stute (1999), Bai and Ng (2001), Koenker and Xiao (2002), Bai (2003), Khmaladze and Koul (2004, 2009), Delgado and Stute (2008), Tan and Zhu (2019), Lu and Zheng (2020), and Tan et al. (2025), among many others. A martingale transformation, say T for instance, is a linear operator such that the resulting test based on the martingale-transformed empirical process can be asymptotically distribution-free. More specifically, it eliminates the shift function, such as $M(t)$ in the decomposition of $\hat{S}_n(t)$, by setting $TM(t) \equiv 0$, and simultaneously ensures that the transformed process $TS_n^0(t)$ admits the same asymptotic properties as $S_n^0(t)$. This implies that $TS_n^0(t)$ and consequently $T\hat{S}_n(t)$ will be asymptotically distribution-free, with a limit of a Brownian motion in transformed time. Note that the martingale transformation eliminates the function $M(t)$, and thus the shift term $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top M(t)$ in $\hat{S}_n(t)$ would also vanish. Consequently, the martingale-transformed empirical process would not involve the estimated parameter $\hat{\beta}$ and then can be applicable for ultra-high dimensional model checking. However, the classic martingale transformation introduced by Stute et al. (1998) for model checking was designed for univariate covariates. Khmaladze and Koul (2004) and Delgado and Stute (2008) further extended the univariate martingale transformation to multivariate cases in fixed dimensional scenarios. Nevertheless, both of these methods involved multiple integrals with respect to p -dimensional covariates (Lu and Zheng, 2020), which makes them difficult to be extended to ultra-high dimensional scenarios. To our knowledge, whether the martingale transformation can be applied in the settings where the covariate dimension p may substantially exceed the sample size remains an open problem in the literature.

In this paper, inspired by the dimension-reduction test proposed by Stute and Zhu (2002), we successfully extended the classic martingale transformation to ultra-high dimensional settings under mild conditions. Building on this extension, we propose a novel methodology for testing the goodness-of-fit of sparse regression models, where the covariate dimension p may substantially exceed the sample size n . Our methodology includes two steps.

First, we use the martingale-transformed projected residual-marked empirical process to construct the test statistic for any given projection on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^p . We establish the limiting null distributions of the martingale-transformed process and its corresponding projected test statistic under mild conditions, even when the dimension p grows exponentially with the sample size n . Under the alternative hypothesis, this projected test is consistent for almost all projections on the unit sphere with asymptotic power 1. By projecting the high dimensional covariates X to a one-dimensional space, the projected test can detect local alternatives departing from the null at the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$ while significantly mitigating the curse of dimensionality. Moreover, the proposed martingale transformation involves only a univariate integral, making it easy to compute in practice, even when the dimension p is much larger than the sample size n . Theoretically, since the martingale transformation eliminates the shift term arising from parameter estimation, the projected test not only becomes asymptotically distribution-free but also requires only the standard convergence rate, rather than the asymptotic linearity or normality, of parameter estimators to derive the asymptotic properties under both the null and alternative hypotheses.

Second, we employ standard combination methods to combine the projected test statistics from different projections to form our final test. Note that although the projected tests can be consistent for almost all projections on the unit sphere, they may still lose power for some unsuitably chosen projections. Therefore, to avoid possible power loss for certain projections, we adopt the Cauchy combination method (Liu and Xie, 2020) to aggregate the corresponding p -values of the projected tests from different projections to enhance power. It is worth mentioning that empirical process-based tests are typically more sensitive than local smoothing tests for low-frequency alternative models, while local smoothing tests are generally more powerful for high-frequency or oscillating models (Fan and Li, 2000; Horowitz and Spokoiny, 2001). In practice, since the underlying forms of regression models are typically unknown, it is desirable to have a testing procedure that can be powerful for both high-frequency and low-frequency alternative models. To this end, we further propose a novel hybrid test that aggregates the combined empirical process-based test with the local smoothing test proposed by Tan et al. (2025) via the Cauchy combination method. Since the Cauchy combination is primarily influenced by the smallest p -values, the hybrid test inherits the advantages of empirical process-based tests and local smoothing tests. Simulation studies also show that the hybrid test is powerful for both high-frequency and low-frequency alternatives.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops the projected residual-marked empirical process and establishes its limiting null distribution. In Section 3, we extend the classic martingale transformation to ultra-high dimensional settings and construct the projected test based on the martingale-transformed projected residual-marked empirical process. The limiting null distributions of the martingale transformation and the corresponding test statistic are also established in this Section. Section 4 presents the power analysis for the martingale transformation and the projected test statistic. In Section 5, we construct the combined projected tests and discuss the choice of projections for practical use. Section 6 presents simulation studies and two real data analyses to assess the finite sample performance of our tests. Section 7 contains concluding remarks and topics for future study. All proofs for the theoretical results are deferred to the Supplementary Material.

2 Projected residual-marked empirical process

In this paper, we focus on testing the goodness-of-fit of generalized linear models (GLMs), when the covariate dimension p may significantly exceed the sample size n . Our method can also be extended to test the adequacy of more generalized models, such as quasi-GLMs, parametric multiple index models, etc. Recall that under the GLM settings, we have $E(Y|X = x) = \mu(\beta_0^\top X)$ and $\text{var}(Y|X = x) = V(\mu(\beta_0^\top x))$ for some unknown parameter $\beta_0 = (\beta_0^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_0^{(p)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and some inverse link function $\mu(\cdot)$. To illustrate our method, we restrict ourselves to testing the misspecification of the conditional mean function $m(x) = E(Y|X = x)$. Consequently, the null and alternative hypotheses become

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \mathbb{P}\{m(X) = \mu(\beta_0^\top X)\} = 1, \quad \text{for some } \beta_0 \in \Theta, \\ H_1 &: \mathbb{P}\{m(X) \neq \mu(\beta^\top X)\} > 0, \quad \text{for any } \beta \in \Theta, \end{aligned}$$

where Θ is a compact set in \mathbb{R}^p . In high dimensional settings with $p \geq n$, as shown by Janková et al. (2020), if the design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$ is of full rank, there always exists a solution $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ of the system of linear equations $m(X_i) = \mu(\beta_0^\top X_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. This implies that GLMs can never be misspecified in practice without any model structural assumption when $p \geq n$. A commonly used assumption in high dimensional scenarios is the sparsity of regression models. It is readily seen that the problem of model checking for sparse GLMs is reasonable when $p \geq n$. Therefore, we consider sparse regression models under both the null and alternative hypotheses throughout this paper.

We introduce some notations that will be used below. For a vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, let $\beta^{(j)}$ denote the j -th entry of β and let $\|\beta\|_q = (\sum_{j=1}^p |\beta^{(j)}|^q)^{1/q}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\|\beta\|_0$ be the number of non-zero entries of β . Let $I \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and let β_I denote the vector containing only the entries of β whose indices are in I . For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, let M_I be the matrix only with the columns of M whose indices are in I and let M_{I^c} be the columns of M with the indices in the complement of I . Let $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ be the active set that contains the indices of the covariates $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)})^\top$ truly related to the response Y . Under the null H_0 , the true regression parameter β_0 is sparse, and the active set becomes $S = \{j : \beta_0^{(j)} \neq 0\}$.

Our methodology for testing the goodness-of-fit of ultra-high dimensional regression models depends on the following result.

Proposition 2.1. (i) *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be random variables. It follows that*

$$\begin{aligned} E[W|X] = 0 \text{ a.s.} &\iff E[W|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s. for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}, \\ E[W|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s.} &\iff E[WI(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] \equiv 0 \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}^{p-1} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\alpha\|_2 = 1\}$.

(ii) *Suppose that $E|W|^2 < \infty$, $E\|X\|_2^k < \infty$, and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (E\|X\|_2^k)^{-1/k} = \infty$. If we write $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p : E[W|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\{E[W|X] = 0\} = 1 \iff \mathcal{A} \text{ has positive Lebesgue measure.}$$

Moreover, if we write $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1} : E[W|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{E[W|X] = 0\} = 1 \iff \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1) = 1,$$

$$\mathbb{P}\{E[W|X] \neq 0\} > 0 \iff \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1) = 0,$$

where \mathcal{L} denotes the uniform probability measure on the unit sphere \mathcal{S}^{p-1} .

Proposition 2.1 (i) has been established in Lemma 2.1 of Zhu and Li (1998), Lemma 1 of Escanciano (2006a), or Lemma 2.1 of Lavergne and Patilea (2008). Patilea et al. (2016) and Cuesta-Albertos et al. (2019) derived similar results to the first part of Proposition 2.1(ii) in the setting of functional data. The condition $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (E\|X\|_2^k)^{-1/k} = \infty$ in Proposition 2.1(ii) is called the Carleman's condition, which can be satisfied if the random vector X has a finite moment generating function around the neighborhood of zero; see Cuesta-Albertos et al. (2007) for more details. A detailed proof of Proposition 2.1 is provided in the Supplementary Material.

We write $\varepsilon(\beta) = Y - \mu(\beta^\top X)$. Since the null hypothesis H_0 is tantamount to $\mathbb{P}\{E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|X] = 0\} = 1$ for some $\beta_0 \in \Theta$, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that H_0 holds if and only if $\mathcal{L}\{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1} : E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = 1$ for some $\beta_0 \in \Theta$. Therefore, to test the null hypothesis H_0 , we may first choose a projection $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ and then test the projected null hypothesis

$$H_0^\alpha : \mathbb{P}\{E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|\alpha^\top X] = 0\} = 1, \quad \text{for some } \beta_0 \in \Theta.$$

The principle behind this testing methodology is as follows. Under the null H_0 , the projected null H_0^α also holds. Under the alternative H_1 , we have $\mathbb{P}\{E[\varepsilon(\beta)|X] \neq 0\} > 0$ for all $\beta \in \Theta$ and then $\mathcal{L}\{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1} : E[\varepsilon(\beta)|\alpha^\top X] = 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = 0$. This implies that, under the alternative H_1 , the projected null hypothesis H_0^α fails for \mathcal{L} -a.s. projections on \mathcal{S}^{p-1} . Consequently, the null H_0 is \mathcal{L} -a.s. equivalent to $H_0^\alpha : \mathbb{P}\{E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)|\alpha^\top X] = 0\} = 1$ for some $\beta_0 \in \Theta$. We then construct the test statistics according to the projected null hypothesis H_0^α .

For any given projection $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$, it follows from Proposition 2.1 (i) that H_0^α is equivalent to

$$E[\varepsilon(\beta_0)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] \equiv 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{for some } \beta_0 \in \Theta. \quad (2.1)$$

Let $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be an i.i.d. sample with the same distribution as (X, Y) and let $\hat{\beta}$ be an estimator of β_0 under the GLM setting, such as a penalized estimator or its variants. Motivated by (2.1), we propose a projected residual-marked empirical process as

$$\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) = Y_i - \mu(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)$.

The projected residual-marked empirical process $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ depends on the chosen projection α . However, selecting appropriate projections is a non-trivial task. An unsuitably chosen projection can lead to a significant loss of power under alternative hypotheses, especially in ultra-high dimensional settings. Section 5 provides a detailed discussion on the selection of projections to ensure that our proposed tests can achieve good power.

2.1 Limiting null distribution of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$

To derive the asymptotic properties of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ under H_0 in ultra-high dimensional settings, we introduce some notions and regularity conditions. A random variable $W \in \mathbb{R}$ is called sub-Weibull of

order $\tau > 0$, if

$$\|W\|_{\psi_\tau} := \inf\{\eta > 0 : E\psi_\tau(|W|/\eta) \leq 1\} < \infty,$$

where $\psi_\tau(x) = \exp(x^\tau) - 1$ for $x \geq 0$. Since $\|W\|_{\psi_\tau} = \inf\{\eta > 0 : E \exp(|W|^\tau/\eta^\tau) \leq 2\}$, it follows from the Markov inequality that if W is sub-Weibull of order τ , then $\mathbb{P}(|W| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^\tau/\|W\|_{\psi_\tau}^\tau)$ for all $t \geq 0$. It is readily seen that sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential random variables are special cases of sub-Weibull distributions of $\tau = 2$ and $\tau = 1$, respectively. Note that the mean of a sub-Weibull random variable is not required to be zero. More detailed results on sub-Weibull distributions are elaborated in Vladimirova et al. (2020) and Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty (2022). We further define $\hat{S} = \{j : \hat{\beta}^{(j)} \neq 0\}$, $\hat{s} = |\hat{S}|$, and $s = |S|$. The notation C in the following denotes a constant independent of n , which may be different for each appearance.

(A1) Under H_0 , the estimator $\hat{\beta}$ satisfies $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{n}})$ and $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0\|_1 = O_p(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 \log p}{n}})$.

(A2) The random variables $\varepsilon(\beta_0)$, $\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)$, and $\mu''(\beta_0^\top X)$ are sub-Weibull of order $\tau = 2$ with $\max\{\|\varepsilon(\beta_0)\|_{\psi_2}, \|\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)\|_{\psi_2}, \|\mu''(\beta_0^\top X)\|_{\psi_2}\} \leq C < \infty$. The covariates $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are centered and $\alpha^\top X$ is sub-Weibull of order $\tau = 2$ with $\|\alpha^\top X\|_{\psi_2} \leq C < \infty$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$.

(A3) The link function $\mu(\cdot)$ admits third derivatives, and $\max\{|\mu''(\beta^\top x)|, |\mu'''(\beta^\top x)|\} \leq F(x)$ for all $\beta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ with $F(X)$ being sub-weibull of order $\tau \geq 1/3$ and $\|F(X)\|_{\psi_\tau} \leq C < \infty$.

Condition (A1) is satisfied by many commonly used penalized estimators under mild conditions, such as the GLM Lasso estimator, the GLM SCAD estimator, or their variants, when the underlying GLMs are correctly specified (the null hypothesis), see Bühlmann and Van De Geer (2011) for instance. The sub-weibull assumption of order 2 (sub-Gaussian) in (A2) is typically imposed in the literature of high dimensional data analysis (Wainwright, 2019). It is used to bound the tail probability of the remainder process in the decomposition of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$, when the dimension p may exceed the sample size n . Condition (A3) is satisfied by many GLMs that are used in practice, such as Gaussian linear models, logistic regression models, and probit regression models. It is also used to control the convergence rate of the remainder of the process $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$. The sub-Weibull order $\tau \geq 1/3$ of $F(X)$ is a technical condition which can be weakened if we impose a more restrictive condition on the divergence rate of p in Theorem 2.1 below.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Conditions (A1)-(A3) hold. If $s^2 \log^3(p \vee n) = o(n)$, then under H_0 , uniformly in $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\beta_0) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t) - \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top M(t) + o_p(1) \\ &=: R_{n1}^\alpha(t) + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where $p \vee n = \max\{p, n\}$, $\varepsilon_i(\beta_0) = Y_i - \mu(\beta_0^\top X_i)$, and $M(t) = E[X \mu'(\beta_0^\top X) I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$.

Note that the asymptotic linearity or normality may not hold for some penalized estimators $\hat{\beta}$, such as Lasso, post-Lasso, and their variants, making it challenging to establish the limiting null distribution of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ for these estimators in high dimensional scenarios. Consequently, the conventional Cramér-von Mises functional or the Kolmogorov-Smirnov functional of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ cannot be directly applied to construct goodness-of-fit tests for regression models. To overcome this difficulty, we extend

the classic method of martingale transformation to ultra-high dimensional settings under mild conditions. Since the martingale transformation would make the shift term $M(t)$ in (2.3) to vanish, we can derive the limiting null distribution of the resulting martingale-transformed process, even in the absence of the asymptotic linear expansion of $\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0$. It is also worth noting that Cuesta-Albertos et al. (2019) used projected empirical processes to test the goodness of fit of functional linear models. However, their test statistic is based on the projected residual-marked empirical process without martingale transformation, and consequently it still requires the asymptotic linear expansion of parameter estimators to derive its limiting distribution.

3 Martingale transformation in ultra-high dimensional settings

In this section, we construct the martingale transformation for the projected residual-marked empirical process $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$, which can be applied in settings where the covariate dimension p may significantly exceed the sample size n . It follows from Theorem 2.1 that under H_0 ,

$$\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) = R_{n0}^\alpha(t) - \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top M(t) + o_p(1),$$

where $R_{n0}^\alpha(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\beta_0) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t)$ and $M(t) = E[X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$. Straightforward calculations show that under H_0 ,

$$\text{cov}(R_{n0}^\alpha(s), R_{n0}^\alpha(t)) = \psi_n^\alpha(s \wedge t), \quad (3.1)$$

where $\psi_n^\alpha(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = \int_{-\infty}^t \sigma_\alpha^2(u) dF_\alpha(u)$ and $\sigma_\alpha^2(u) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0)|\alpha^\top X = u]$. Note that for any given projection α , the function class $\{I(\alpha^\top x \leq t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a VC class with a VC-index 2. It is readily seen that the empirical process $R_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ is asymptotically tight and the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions of $R_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ can be proved by standard arguments. This yields

$$R_{n0}^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow B(\psi(t)), \quad \text{in distribution}$$

in the Skorohod space $D[-\infty, \infty]$, where $\psi(t)$ is the pointwise limit of $\psi_n^\alpha(t)$ and $B(t)$ is the standard Brownian motion.

The purpose of martingale transformation is to eliminate $M(t)$ in the shift term of $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ and simultaneously transform $R_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ to an innovation process that admits the same limiting null distribution as $R_{n0}^\alpha(t)$. The principle of martingale transformation is as follows. Let $A^\alpha(t) = \frac{\partial M(t)}{\partial \psi_n^\alpha(t)}$ be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $M(t)$ with respect to $\psi_n^\alpha(t)$. Recall that $M(t) = E[X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = \int_{-\infty}^t r_\alpha(u) F_\alpha(du)$, where $r_\alpha(u) = E[X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)|\alpha^\top X = u]$. It follows that $A^\alpha(t) = r_\alpha(t)/\sigma_\alpha^2(t)$. We then define a matrix as

$$\Gamma^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty A^\alpha(u) A^\alpha(u)^\top d\psi_n^\alpha(u) = \int_t^\infty \frac{r_\alpha(u) r_\alpha(u)^\top}{\sigma_\alpha^4(u)} d\psi_n^\alpha(u).$$

Assuming $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is nonsingular for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the martingale transformation is defined as

$$Tf(t) = f(t) - \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha(u)^\top \Gamma^\alpha(u)^{-1} \int_u^\infty A^\alpha(v) df(v) d\psi_n^\alpha(u), \quad (3.2)$$

where $f(t)$ is either a bounded variation function or a stochastic process such that the integral in (3.2) is well defined. It may also be a vector of functions sometimes. Note that $\Gamma^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty A^\alpha(u) dM(u)^\top$ and $M(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t A(u) d\psi_n^\alpha(u)$, it is readily seen that

$$TM(t)^\top = M(t)^\top - \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha(u)^\top \Gamma^\alpha(u)^{-1} \int_u^\infty A^\alpha(v) dM(v)^\top d\psi_n^\alpha(u) \equiv 0.$$

This implies that the martingale transformation T eliminates the shift term $M(t)$ in the decomposition of $\hat{R}_n(t)$. Also note that T is a linear operator, it follows that $TR_{n1}^\alpha(t) = TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)$.

We further investigate the asymptotic properties of $TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ under the null hypothesis. Recalling that $R_{n0}^\alpha(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\beta_0) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t)$, it follows that

$$TR_{n0}^\alpha(t) = R_{n0}^\alpha(t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\beta_0) \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha(u)^\top \Gamma^\alpha(u)^{-1} A^\alpha(\alpha^\top X_i) I(\alpha^\top X_i \geq u) d\psi_n^\alpha(u).$$

This implies that $TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ is a centered cusum process with the covariance function

$$\text{cov}(TR_{n0}^\alpha(s), TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)) = \text{cov}(R_{n0}^\alpha(s), R_{n0}^\alpha(t)) = \psi_n^\alpha(s \wedge t). \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, the transformed process $TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ has the same covariance structure as $R_{n0}^\alpha(t)$ under H_0 . The assertion (3.3) is justified in the Supplementary Material. Similar to the arguments for proving Theorem 1.2 of Stute et al. (1998), we can derive the asymptotic tightness and the finite-dimensional convergence of $TR_{n0}^\alpha(t)$. Consequently,

$$TR_{n1}^\alpha(t) = TR_{n0}^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow B(\psi(t)), \quad \text{in distribution}$$

in the Skorohod space $D[-\infty, \infty)$. Furthermore, under mild conditions, we can show that $T\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) - TR_{n1}^\alpha(t) = o_p(1)$ uniformly in t . Altogether we obtain that the martingale-transformed process $T\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$, after the time transformation $z = \psi(t)$, converges in distribution to the standard Brownian motion $B(t)$.

For practical application, the martingale transformation T needs to be estimated by its empirical analog. For this, recall that

$$A^\alpha(t) = \frac{r_\alpha(t)}{\sigma_\alpha^2(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^\alpha(t) = E \left(\frac{r_\alpha(\alpha^\top X) r_\alpha(\alpha^\top X)^\top}{\sigma_\alpha^2(\alpha^\top X)} I(\alpha^\top X \geq t) \right),$$

where $r_\alpha(t) = E[X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X) | \alpha^\top X = t]$ and $\sigma_\alpha^2(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0) | \alpha^\top X = t]$. Since we do not make any assumption for the quantities $r_\alpha(t)$ and $\sigma_\alpha^2(t)$ other than smoothness, they should be estimated in a nonparametric way. In low dimensional settings, standard nonparametric estimators such as the Nadaraya–Watson estimator may be suitable for this purpose. However, we note that $r_\alpha(t) = E[X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X) | \alpha^\top X = t] \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a p -dimensional function. When the dimension p significantly exceeds the sample size n , nonparametric estimations for $r_\alpha(t)$ would bring enormous theoretical difficulties in deriving the asymptotic properties of the corresponding estimated martingale transformation. To address this difficulty, inspired by Stute and Zhu (2002), we proposed a novel variant of martingale transformation under mild conditions.

(A4) The covariates X satisfy the linear conditional mean assumption, i.e., $E[X|B^\top X] = DB^\top X$ for a non-random matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times 2}$, where $B = (\alpha, \beta_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times 2}$. Furthermore, the (i, j) -entry D_{ij} of D satisfies $|D_{ij}| \leq C < \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

The linear conditional mean assumption (A4) is satisfied if the distribution of the covariates X is elliptically symmetric, such as normal distributions. In high dimensional settings, as Hall and Li (1993) demonstrated, if the original covariate dimension p is large, then $E[X|B^\top X]$ is approximately linear in X .

Under Condition (A4), we have

$$M(t) = E\{E[X|B^\top X]\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)\} = DE[B^\top X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)].$$

We write $M_0(t) = E[B^\top X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$, it follows that

$$M(t) = DM_0(t) = D \left(\int_{-\infty}^t ug_{1\alpha}(u)dF_\alpha(u), \int_{-\infty}^t g_{2\alpha}(u)dF_\alpha(u) \right)^\top,$$

where $g_{1\alpha}(u) = E[\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)|\alpha^\top X = u]$ and $g_{2\alpha}(u) = E[\beta_0^\top X\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)|\alpha^\top X = u]$. Consequently, the residual marked empirical process $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ in (2.3) can be restated as

$$\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) = R_{n0}^\alpha(t) - \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top DM_0(t) + o_p(1).$$

To eliminate the shift term $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)^\top DM_0(t)$, we respectively define the new $A^\alpha(t)$ and $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ as

$$A^\alpha(t) = \frac{\partial M_0(t)}{\partial \psi_n^\alpha(t)} = \left(\frac{tg_{1\alpha}(t)}{\sigma_\alpha^2(t)}, \frac{g_{2\alpha}(t)}{\sigma_\alpha^2(t)} \right)^\top$$

and

$$\Gamma^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty A^\alpha(u)A^\alpha(u)^\top d\psi_n^\alpha(u) = \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{\sigma_\alpha^4(u)} \begin{pmatrix} u^2g_{1\alpha}(u)^2, & ug_{1\alpha}(u)g_{2\alpha}(u) \\ ug_{1\alpha}(u)g_{2\alpha}(u), & g_{2\alpha}(u)^2 \end{pmatrix} d\psi_n^\alpha(u).$$

It is important to note that these new $A^\alpha(t)$ and $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ only involve univariate function $g_{1\alpha}(t)$, $g_{2\alpha}(t)$, and $\sigma_\alpha^2(t)$. We then estimate these quantities by one-dimensional Nadaraya–Watson estimators:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2(\hat{\beta})K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}, \\ \hat{g}_{1\alpha}(t) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mu'(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}, \\ \hat{g}_{2\alpha}(t) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}^\top X_i \mu'(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_h(t - \alpha^\top X_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) = Y_i - \mu(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)$ and $K_h(\cdot) = h^{-1}K(\cdot/h)$ with univariate kernel function $K(\cdot)$ and bandwidth h . The estimators $\hat{A}_n^\alpha(t)$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_n^\alpha(t)$ for $A^\alpha(t)$ and $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ respectively are

$$\hat{A}_n^\alpha(t) = \left(\frac{t\hat{g}_{1\alpha}(t)}{\hat{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t)}, \frac{\hat{g}_{2\alpha}(t)}{\hat{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t)} \right)^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}_n^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty \hat{A}_n^\alpha(u)\hat{A}_n^\alpha(u)^\top d\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(u), \quad (3.4)$$

where $\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(u) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2(\hat{\beta}) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq u)$. Consequently, we obtain the empirical analogue \hat{T}_n of the martingale transformation T :

$$\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) = \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) - \int_{-\infty}^t \hat{A}_n^\alpha(u)^\top \hat{\Gamma}_n^\alpha(u)^{-1} \int_u^\infty \hat{A}_n^\alpha(v) d\hat{R}_n^\alpha(v) d\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(u), \quad (3.5)$$

where $\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t)$ is given by (2.2).

3.1 Limiting null distribution of $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$

To derive the asymptotic properties of the martingale-transformed process $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ in ultra-high dimensional settings, we impose some additional regularity conditions.

(A5) The kernel function $K(\cdot)$ satisfies (i) $K(\cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R} and has a continuous derivative on its support $[-1, 1]$; (ii) $K(x) = K(-x)$ and $K(\cdot)$ is of bounded variation; (iii) $\int_{-1}^1 K(u) du = 1$ and $\int_{-1}^1 u^i K(u) du = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$.

(A6) We write $\sigma_{1\alpha}^2(t) = \sigma_\alpha^2(t) f_\alpha(t)$, $w_{1\alpha}(t) = g_{1\alpha}(t) f_\alpha(t)$, and $w_{2\alpha}(t) = g_{2\alpha}(t) f_\alpha(t)$. The functions $\sigma_{1\alpha}^2(t)$, $w_{1\alpha}(t)$, and $w_{2\alpha}(t)$ admit derivatives up to the $k-1$ order in t . Let $w_{1\alpha}^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i w_{1\alpha}(t)}{dt^i}$, $w_{2\alpha}^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i w_{2\alpha}(t)}{dt^i}$, and $(\sigma_{1\alpha}^2)^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i \sigma_{1\alpha}^2(t)}{dt^i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. The functions $w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)$, $w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)$, and $(\sigma_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t)$ satisfy the Lipschitz condition:

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t+u) - w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u|, \quad \forall u \in U, \\ |w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t+u) - w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u|, \quad \forall u \in U, \\ |(\sigma_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t+u) - (\sigma_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u|, \quad \forall u \in U, \end{aligned}$$

for some neighborhood U of zero. Moreover, we assume that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |f_\alpha(t)| \leq C < \infty$ and $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sigma_{1\alpha}^2(t) \geq C > 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$.

(A7) The bandwidth h satisfies $\sqrt{nh}^{2k} = o(1)$ and $\log^4 n = o(nh^4)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(A8) The matrix $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ satisfies $\inf_{t \leq t_0} |\det(\Gamma^\alpha(t))| > 0$ for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$, where $\det(\Gamma^\alpha(t))$ denotes the determinant of the matrix $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$.

Conditions (A5)-(A7) are usually used in the literature of high-order nonparametric estimation; see, for instance, Chapters 2 and 4 of Rao (1983) and Zhu and Fang (1996). Condition (A8) is necessary for the uniform boundedness of $\|\Gamma^\alpha(t)^{-1}\|_2$ from infinity.

The next result establishes the asymptotic property of the martingale transformed process $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ under H_0 . Its proof is provided in the Supplementary Material.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Conditions (A1)-(A8) hold and the matrix $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is nonsingular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If $s^4 \log^4(p \vee n) = o(n)$ and $\log^5 p = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then under H_0 ,*

$$\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow B(\psi(t)), \quad \text{in distribution}$$

in the Skorohod space $D[-\infty, \infty)$.

It is worth mentioning that the martingale transformation can have a more appealing structure when the null hypothesis is a Gaussian linear model. We also require the linear conditional mean assumption of the covariates X .

(A4') The covariates X satisfy the linear conditional mean assumption, i.e., $E[X|\alpha^\top X] = \alpha^\top X D_0$ for some non-random vector $D_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $|D_0^{(j)}| \leq C < \infty$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$.

Recalling that $\mu'(t) \equiv 1$ under Gaussian linear models, it follows from (A4') and (2.3) that

$$M(t) = E[XI(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = E\{E[X|\alpha^\top X]I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)\} = E[\alpha^\top XI(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]D_0.$$

We write $M_0(t) = E[\alpha^\top XI(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = \int_{-\infty}^t u dF_\alpha(u)$. Since $\sigma_\alpha^2(t) \equiv \sigma^2$ is a constant under Gaussian linear models, it follows that the quantities $A^\alpha(t)$ and $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ can be restated as

$$A^\alpha(t) = \frac{\partial M_0(t)}{\partial \psi_n^\alpha(t)} = \frac{t}{\sigma^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty A^\alpha(u)^2 d\psi_n^\alpha(u) = \frac{1}{\sigma^4} \int_t^\infty u^2 d\psi_n^\alpha(u),$$

where $\psi_n^\alpha(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \sigma_\alpha^2(u) dF_\alpha(u) = \sigma^2 F_\alpha(t)$. Consequently, the martingale transformation T can also be applied in this much simplified scenario. Note that under Gaussian linear models, we avoid the nonparametric estimations for $\sigma_\alpha^2(u) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0)|\alpha^\top X = u]$, $g_{1\alpha}(u) = E[\mu'(\beta_0^\top X)|\alpha^\top X = u]$ and $g_{2\alpha}(u) = E[\beta_0^\top X \mu'(\beta_0^\top X)|\alpha^\top X = u]$ when constructing the estimated martingale transformation. Therefore, the resulting martingale transformation can have a much simpler structure when testing ultra-high dimensional Gaussian linear models.

3.2 Projected test statistics based on $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$

According to Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 3.1, we can construct the test for H_0 based on any functional of $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ such that the resulting test is asymptotically distribution-free. Specifically, we employ the Cramér-von Mises functional of the martingale-transformed process $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ to construct the test statistic. We define the (informal) test statistic as:

$$CvM_{n,\alpha}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} |\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)|^2 d\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(t),$$

where $\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(t) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2(\hat{\beta}) I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t)$. By Theorem 3.1 and the Extended Continuous Mapping Theorem (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Theorem 1.11.1), we have under H_0 ,

$$CvM_{n,\alpha}^2 \longrightarrow \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} B^2(\psi(t)) d\psi(t) \quad \text{in distribution,}$$

where $B(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion. Since $B(t\psi(t_0))/\sqrt{\psi(t_0)} = B(t)$ in distribution, it follows that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t_0} B^2(\psi(t)) d\psi(t) = \psi^2(t_0) \int_0^1 B^2(t) dt, \quad \text{in distribution.}$$

Therefore, our final test statistic based on a given projection α is

$$TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 = \frac{1}{\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(t_0)^2} \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} |\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)|^2 d\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(t), \quad (3.6)$$

where $\hat{\psi}_n^\alpha(t_0) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - \mu(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)]^2 I(\alpha^\top X_i \leq t_0)$ is an empirical analog of $\psi(t_0)$. Applying Theorem 3.1 and the Extended Continuous Mapping Theorem again, we readily obtain the limiting null distribution of $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ in ultra-high dimensional settings.

Corollary 3.1. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.1. Then, under H_0 ,*

$$TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 \longrightarrow \int_0^1 B^2(t) dt \quad \text{in distribution.} \quad (3.7)$$

Corollary 3.1 implies that the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ based on the martingale-transformed process $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ is asymptotically distribution-free, and consequently its critical values can be tabulated.

In homoscedastic cases, such as Gaussian linear models, we have $\sigma_\alpha^2(t) \equiv \sigma^2$, which is independent of t . Recall that $\sigma_\alpha^2(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0) | \alpha^\top X = t]$ and $\psi_n^\alpha(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\beta_0) I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = \sigma^2 F_\alpha(t)$. Therefore, $\psi_n^\alpha(t)$ can be estimated by $\hat{\sigma}^2 \hat{F}_\alpha(t)$, where $\hat{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - \mu(\hat{\beta}^\top X_i)]^2$ and $\hat{F}_\alpha(t)$ is the empirical distribution of $\{\alpha^\top X_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Consequently, the test statistic $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ becomes

$$TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 = \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}^2 \hat{F}_\alpha(t_0)^2} \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} |\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)|^2 d\hat{F}_\alpha(t).$$

For t_0 , we adopt the 99% quantile of \hat{F}_α for practical applications, as suggested by Stute et al. (1998) and Stute and Zhu (2002).

4 Power analysis

In this section, we investigate the asymptotic properties of the martingale-transformed process $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ and the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ under various alternative hypotheses. Consider the following alternative hypotheses converging to the null hypothesis H_0 at the rate $\gamma_n = n^{-c}$:

$$H_{1n} : m(x) = E(Y|X = x) = \mu(\beta_0^\top x) + \gamma_n L(x),$$

where $c \in [0, 1/2]$, and $L(\cdot)$ is a non-constant function with $\mathbb{P}\{L(X) = 0\} < 1$. Here, $c = 0$ corresponds to the global alternative hypothesis and $c > 0$ corresponds to local alternative hypotheses. We also assume the sparsity for the regression function $m(\cdot)$.

To derive the asymptotic properties of $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ under various alternative hypotheses in ultra-high dimensional settings, we impose some additional conditions. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\tilde{\beta}_0) | \alpha^\top X = t]$, $\tilde{g}_{1\alpha}(t) = E[\mu'(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X) | \alpha^\top X = t]$, $\tilde{g}_{2\alpha}(t) = E[\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X \mu'(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X) | \alpha^\top X = t]$, and $l_{2\alpha}(t) = E[L(X)^2 | \alpha^\top X = t]$.

(A9) (i) Under the global alternative H_{1n} , there exists a parameter $\tilde{\beta}_0 = (\tilde{\beta}_0^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_0^{(p)})^\top \in \Theta$ such that

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_0\|_1 = O_p(\tilde{s} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{s} \log p}{n}}),$$

where $\tilde{s} = |\tilde{S}|$ and $\tilde{S} = \{j : \tilde{\beta}_0^{(j)} \neq 0\}$. (ii) Under the local alternative H_{1n} with $c \in (0, 1/2]$, we have $\tilde{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 = r_n M^L + o_p(r_n)$ with $M_{\tilde{S}^c}^L = 0$ and $\|M^L\|_2 = O(1)$, and

$$\|\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0\|_1 = O_p(\tilde{s} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\tilde{s}_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0\|_2 = O_p(\tilde{s} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} + \gamma_n),$$

where $\tilde{s}_1 = |\tilde{S}_1|$, $\tilde{s} = |\tilde{S}|$, and $\tilde{S}_1 = S \cup \tilde{S}$ with $S = \{j : \beta_0^{(j)} \neq 0\}$.

(A10) The random variables $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$, $\mu'(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X)$, and $\mu''(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X)$ are sub-Weibull of order $\tau = 2$ with $\max\{\|\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)\|_{\psi_2}, \|\mu'(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X)\|_{\psi_2}, \|\mu''(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X)\|_{\psi_2}\} \leq C < \infty$. The random variable $L(X)$ is sub-Weibull of order $\tau \geq 2/3$ with $\|L(X)\|_{\psi_\tau} \leq C < \infty$.

(A11) We write $\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2(t) = \tilde{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t)f_\alpha(t)$, $\tilde{w}_{1\alpha}(t) = \tilde{g}_{1\alpha}(t)f_\alpha(t)$, and $\tilde{w}_{2\alpha}(t) = \tilde{g}_{2\alpha}(t)f_\alpha(t)$. The functions $\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2(t)$, $\tilde{w}_{1\alpha}(t)$, and $\tilde{w}_{2\alpha}(t)$ admit $k - 1$ order derivative in t and let $(\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2)^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i \tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2(t)}{dt^i}$, $\tilde{w}_{1\alpha}^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i \tilde{w}_{1\alpha}(t)}{dt^i}$, and $\tilde{w}_{2\alpha}^{(i)}(t) = \frac{d^i \tilde{w}_{2\alpha}(t)}{dt^i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. The functions $(\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t)$, $w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)$, $w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)$, and $l_{2\alpha}(t)$ satisfy the Lipschitz condition

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t+u) - w_{1\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u| \quad \forall u \in U, \\ |w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t+u) - w_{2\alpha}^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u| \quad \forall u \in U, \\ |(\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t+u) - (\tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2)^{(k-1)}(t)| &\leq L|u| \quad \forall u \in U, \\ |l_{2\alpha}(t+u)f_\alpha(t+u) - l_{2\alpha}(t)f_\alpha(t)| &\leq L|u| \quad \forall u \in U, \end{aligned}$$

for some neighborhood U of zero. Moreover, we assume that $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{\sigma}_{1\alpha}^2(t) \geq C > 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$.

(A12) Let $\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t) = \int_t^\infty \tilde{A}^\alpha(u) \tilde{A}^\alpha(u)^\top d\tilde{\psi}_n^\alpha(u)$, where $\tilde{\psi}_n^\alpha(v) = E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)^2 I(\alpha^\top X \leq v)]$ and $\tilde{A}^\alpha(t) = \left(\frac{t\tilde{g}_{1\alpha}(t)}{\tilde{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t)}, \frac{\tilde{g}_{2\alpha}(t)}{\tilde{\sigma}_\alpha^2(t)} \right)^\top$. The matrix $\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t)$ satisfies $\inf_{t \leq t_0} |\det(\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t))| \geq C > 0$ for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\det(\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t))$ denotes the determinant of the matrix $\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t)$.

We show in the Supplementary Material that the GLM lasso estimator satisfies Condition (A9) under both the local and global alternative hypotheses (the misspecified models). It is also worth noting that Bühlmann and van de Geer (2015) showed that under misspecified linear models, the support \tilde{S} of $\tilde{\beta}_0$ satisfies $\tilde{S} \subset S$ if the covariates X follow a Gaussian distribution with positive definite covariance matrix. Under the misspecified generalized linear model with fixed dimension p , Lu et al. (2012) proved that $\tilde{S} = S$ if the true underlying model is also a generalized linear model with a misspecified link function and the linear conditional mean assumption is satisfied for X , that is, $E(\beta^\top X | \beta_0^\top X) = b\beta_0^\top X + a$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Both of these results provide evidence for Condition (A9). Conditions (A10) and (A11) are similar to (A2) and (A3) in Section 3, which are used to control the convergence rate of the remainders of $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ under the alternative hypotheses. Condition (A12) is needed to ensure the uniform boundedness of $\|\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t)^{-1}\|_2$ away from infinity.

The next theorem establishes the asymptotic properties of $\hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t)$ under various alternative hypotheses. Its proof is provided in the Supplementary Material. We write $\tilde{G}^\alpha(t) = E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0) I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$, $S_L^\alpha(t) = E[L(X) I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$, $\tilde{T}\tilde{G}^\alpha(t) = \tilde{G}^\alpha(t) - \int_{-\infty}^t \tilde{A}^\alpha(u)^\top \tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(u)^{-1} \int_u^\infty \tilde{A}^\alpha(v) d\tilde{G}^\alpha(v) d\tilde{\psi}_n^\alpha(u)$, and $TS_L^\alpha(t) = S_L^\alpha(t) - \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha(u)^\top \Gamma^\alpha(u)^{-1} \int_u^\infty A^\alpha(v) dS_L^\alpha(v) d\psi_n^\alpha(u)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Conditions (A2)-(A12) holds.*

(1) *Under H_1 , if $\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tilde{s}^2 \log^4(p \vee n) = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$n^{-1/2} \hat{T}_n \hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow L_1(t), \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where $L_1(t)$ is the pointwise limit of $\tilde{T}\tilde{G}^\alpha(t)$.

(2) *Under H_{1n} with $r_n = n^{-a}$ and $a \in (0, 1/2)$, if $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_n \tilde{s}_1^2 \log^2(p \vee n) =$*

$o(1)$, $\log^5 p = o(n)$, and $\sqrt{n}\gamma_n^2 = o(h)$, then

$$(nr_n^2)^{-1/2}\hat{T}_n\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow L_2(t), \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where $L_2(t)$ is the pointwise limit of $TS_L^\alpha(t)$.

(3) Under H_{1n} with $r_n = n^{-1/2}$, if $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{s}_1^2 \log^2(p \vee n) = o(\sqrt{n})$, and $\log^5 p = o(n)$, then

$$\hat{T}_n\hat{R}_n^\alpha(t) \longrightarrow B(\psi(t)) + L_2(t), \quad \text{in distribution,}$$

in the Skorohod space $D[-\infty, \infty)$, where $B(\psi(t))$ is given in Theorem 3.1.

The following asymptotic result for the projected test statistic $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ is a consequence of Theorem 4.1 and the Extended Continuous Mapping Theorem (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Theorem 1.11.1). We write $\tilde{\psi}_n^\alpha(t) = E[\varepsilon^2(\tilde{\beta}_0)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] = E[\tilde{\sigma}^2(\alpha^\top X)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)]$.

Corollary 4.1. *Suppose that Conditions (A2)-(A12) holds.*

(1) Under H_1 , if $\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tilde{s}^2 \log^4(p \vee n) = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\frac{1}{n}TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\tilde{\psi}(t_0)} \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} |L_1(t)|^2 d\tilde{\psi}(t) \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(t)$ and $L_1(t)$ are the pointwise limits of $\tilde{\psi}_n^\alpha(t)$ and $\tilde{T}\tilde{G}^\alpha(t)$, respectively.

(2) Under H_{1n} with $r_n = n^{-c}$ and $c \in (0, 1/2)$, if $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_n \tilde{s}_1^2 \log^2(p \vee n) = o(1)$, $\log^5 p = o(n)$, and $\sqrt{n}\gamma_n^2 = o(h)$, then

$$\frac{1}{nr_n^2}TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\psi(t_0)} \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} |L_2(t)|^2 d\psi(t) \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where $\psi(t)$ and $L_2(t)$ are the pointwise limits of ψ_n^α and $TS_L^\alpha(t)$, respectively.

(3) Under H_{1n} with $r_n = n^{-1/2}$, if $\Gamma^\alpha(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{s}_1^2 \log^2(p \vee n) = o(\sqrt{n})$, and $\log^5 p = o(n)$, then

$$TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2 \longrightarrow \int_0^1 |B(t) + L_2(\psi^{-1}(t\psi(t_0))) / \sqrt{\psi(t_0)}|^2 dt, \quad \text{in distribution,}$$

where $B(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion..

Corollary 4.1 implies that if $L_1(t)$ and $L_2(t)$ are non-zero functions, then the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ is consistent under the global alternative hypothesis and can detect the local alternatives distinct from the null at the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$, even when the covariate dimension p grows exponentially with the sample size n .

5 The test statistics for practical use

5.1 Combined projected test statistics

Note that a sequence of test statistics can be constructed based on various projections. According to Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 4.1, if the limit function $L_1(t)$ is non-zero, then the projected test

$TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ is consistent under H_1 for almost all projections $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ with respect to the uniform measure \mathcal{L} . However, the test may still suffer from a substantial power loss for some inappropriate choice of projection, particularly in ultra-high dimensional settings. Another potential problem is that the value of the projected test statistic $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ may vary across distinct projections, potentially leading to unstable power performance when relying on a single projection. To address these limitations, we propose to combine various projected test statistics $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ to form a final test statistic, thereby enhancing the overall statistical power.

A variety of methods are available in the literature for combining test statistics or their corresponding p -values, such as the classic Fisher's combination method (Fisher, 1925) and the more recent Cauchy combination method (Liu and Xie, 2020). For a set of chosen projections $\{\alpha_i \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}, i = 1, \dots, k_1\}$, the asymptotic p -value of the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha_i}^2$ is given by $\hat{p}_{1\alpha_i} = 1 - \Psi(TCvM_{n,\alpha_i}^2)$, where $\Psi(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the random variable $\int_0^1 B^2(t)dt$. Similar to the arguments for Theorem 3.1 and by applying the Continuous Mapping Theorem, we have, under H_0 ,

$$(\hat{p}_{1\alpha_1}, \dots, \hat{p}_{1\alpha_{k_1}}) \longrightarrow (p_1, \dots, p_{k_1}), \quad \text{in distribution,} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\{p_i : i = 1, \dots, k_1\}$ are uniform random variables on $(0, 1)$. Note that these p -values p_1, \dots, p_{k_1} may be mutually dependent. Consequently, the classic Fisher's combination method cannot be applied here as it requires the independence between the p -values. In contrast, the Cauchy combination method is robust to dependence of the p -values; see Liu and Xie (2020) for more details on this issue. We therefore employ it to combine the p -values to form our final test statistic. The Cauchy combination-based test statistic is given by

$$TCvM_C^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\alpha_i}\right)\pi\right\} = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i \tan\left\{\left[\Psi(TCvM_{n,\alpha_i}^2) - \frac{1}{2}\right]\pi\right\}, \quad (5.2)$$

where w_i are non-negative weights satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i = 1$. In this paper, we simply use the equal weights, i.e., $w_i = 1/k_1$ for $i = 1, \dots, k_1$, which performs very well in our simulation studies. By (5.1) and applying the Continuous Mapping Theorem again, we have, under H_0 ,

$$TCvM_C^2 \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - p_i\right)\pi\right\}, \quad \text{in distribution.}$$

Let $P_w = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - p_i\right)\pi\right\}$. If p_1, \dots, p_{k_1} are i.i.d. uniform random variables on $(0, 1)$, then it is readily seen that P_w follows a standard Cauchy distribution, $Cauchy(0, 1)$. Furthermore, even when the p -values p_1, \dots, p_{k_1} are mutually dependent, Liu and Xie (2020) demonstrated that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(P_w > t) / \mathbb{P}(P_0 > t) = 1$ under the null hypothesis, where P_0 denotes a standard Cauchy random variable. This implies that even when there exist dependencies between the p -values, the tail probability of P_w can be approximated by that of the standard Cauchy distribution. Consequently, the asymptotic critical values of the Cauchy combination-based test $TCvM_C^2$ can also be approximated by quantiles of the standard Cauchy distribution.

In model checking, it is well known that empirical process-based tests, such as $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$, are more sensitive to low-frequency alternative models, while local smoothing tests are usually more sensitive and powerful against high-frequency alternative models. In practice, however, researchers usually do not know in advance which kind of models the underlying regression model comes from if no prior

information is available. Therefore, it is important to propose a test statistic that can be sensitive to both low-frequency and high-frequency alternatives. Note that the Cauchy combination is most determined by the smallest p -values (Liu and Xie, 2020); thus, a natural idea is to employ this combination method to combine empirical process-based tests and local smoothing tests to achieve this goal. Recently, Tan et al. (2025) proposed a new local smoothing test for ultra-high dimensional regression models via projections, which also performs very well against high-frequency alternative models. Their test statistic based on a given projection α is

$$PLS_{n,\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \varepsilon_i(\hat{\beta}) \varepsilon_j(\hat{\beta}) K\left(\frac{\alpha^\top X_i - \alpha^\top X_j}{h}\right)}{\left(2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \varepsilon_i^2(\hat{\beta}) \varepsilon_j^2(\hat{\beta}) K^2\left(\frac{\alpha^\top X_i - \alpha^\top X_j}{h}\right)\right)^{1/2}}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $K(\cdot)$ is a univariate kernel function and h is the bandwidth. According to Corollary 3.1 of Tan et al. (2025), for any given projection α , $PLS_{n,\alpha}$ converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution under H_0 . Let $\hat{p}_{2\alpha_i} = 1 - \Phi(PLS_{n,\alpha_i})$ be the asymptotic p -value of PLS_{n,α_i} for $i = 1, \dots, k_2$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. We then propose a hybrid test statistic based on the Cauchy combination method as

$$Hybrid_C = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\alpha_i}\right)\pi\right\} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} v_j \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{2\alpha_j}\right)\pi\right\}, \quad (5.4)$$

where the weights w_i and v_j satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} w_i + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} v_j = 1$. The asymptotic critical values of $Hybrid_C$ can also be determined by the quantiles of the standard Cauchy distribution.

Remark 1. *The combined tests $TCvM_C^2$ and $Hybrid_C$ are both asymptotically distribution-free, and thus we do not need to resort to the resampling methods such as the wild bootstrap to approximate the limiting null distribution. Therefore, these tests are easy to implement in practice, particularly in ultra-high dimensional settings. Under the global alternative H_1 and mild conditions, it follows from Corollary 4.1 and Theorem 3.3 of Tan et al. (2025) that the asymptotic p -values $\hat{p}_{1\alpha_i}$ and $\hat{p}_{2\alpha_i}$ converge to zero for almost all projections $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$. Consequently, the combined test statistics $TCvM_C^2$ and $Hybrid_C$ diverge to infinity for almost all projections as the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$. Liu and Xie (2020) theoretically demonstrated that the Cauchy combination of p -values is robust to dependent p -values and is most influenced by the smallest p -values. Therefore, even if the test statistics $TCvM_{n,\alpha_i}^2$ or PLS_{n,α_i} based on a single projection α_i may not be consistent, the combined test statistics $TCvM_C^2$ and $Hybrid_C$ can still exhibit robust power performance under the alternative hypothesis. We also note that our empirical process-based test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ is more sensitive to low-frequency alternatives and the local smoothing test $PLS_{n,\alpha}$ is more powerful against high-frequency models. Since the Cauchy combination of p -values is primarily determined by the smallest p -values, the hybrid test $Hybrid_C$ is expected to be powerful for both low-frequency and high-frequency alternative models. Simulation studies in Section 6 validate these theoretical assertions.*

5.2 The choice of projections

In practice, the power of the combined tests $TCvM_C^2$ and $Hybrid_C$ would be heavily influenced by the choice of projections in ultra-high dimensional scenarios. To illustrate this, we consider the problem

of testing the goodness-of-fit of Gaussian linear models. Assume without loss of generality that the data are standardized, so we have $E(X) = 0$ and $E(Y) = 0$. According to Corollary 4.1, the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ can have power under the alternative hypothesis for a given projection $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ only if $E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] \neq 0$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0) = Y - \tilde{\beta}_0^\top X$. Consider an extreme case where $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$ is mean independent of $\alpha^\top X$ for a certain projection $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$, i.e., $E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)|\alpha^\top X] = E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)]$. This can be achieved if $X \sim N(0, I_p)$, ε is independent of X , and $\alpha_S = 0$, where S is the true active set. Indeed, if $X \sim N(0, I_p)$, it follows from Bühlmann and van de Geer (2015) that the support \tilde{S} of $\tilde{\beta}_0$ satisfies $\tilde{S} \subset S$. Note that $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0) = m(X) + \varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_0^\top X = m(X_S) + \varepsilon - \tilde{\beta}_{0S}^\top X_S$ and $\alpha^\top X = \alpha_{S^c}^\top X_{S^c}$, where S^c denotes the complement of S . This implies that $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$ is independent of $\alpha^\top X$ and consequently $E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)|\alpha^\top X] = E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)]$. Recalling that $E(X) = 0$ and $E(Y) = 0$, it follows that $E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)|\alpha^\top X] = 0$, and thus $E[\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)I(\alpha^\top X \leq t)] \equiv 0$. This means that the projected test $TCvM_{n,\alpha}^2$ may have no power under the alternative hypothesis in such scenarios. Therefore, to ensure good power, we should choose projections such that $\alpha^\top X$ has high correlation with the error term $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$. To this end, we propose a data-driven procedure to select the projections to ensure the proposed tests $TCvM_C^2$ and $Hybrid_C$ have good power under the alternatives.

Recall that $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0) = m(X) - \mu(\tilde{\beta}_0^\top X) + \varepsilon$, and we assume sparsity for the regression models under both the null and alternative hypotheses. Motivated by this, we assume without loss of generality that the error term $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$ admits a multiple-index model structure, that is, $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0) = g(\tilde{\vartheta}, \tilde{\theta}_1^\top X, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d^\top X, \varepsilon)$, where $\tilde{\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}$, and the projections $\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ are latent parameters. If there were no dimension reduction structure in this model, then we would have $d = p$ and $\tilde{\theta}_i = e_i$, where $e_i \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ with 1 in the i -th component and 0 otherwise. However, this case is unlikely to occur given the sparsity assumed under both the null and alternative hypotheses. It is evident that the projected variables $\tilde{\theta}_1^\top X, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d^\top X$ are highly correlated with the error $\varepsilon(\tilde{\beta}_0)$. Furthermore, the projected predictor $\tilde{\theta}_0^\top X$ with $\tilde{\theta}_0 = \beta_0/\|\tilde{\beta}_0\|$ may also exhibit high correlation with the error (Stute and Zhu, 2002). Consequently, a natural idea is to construct the Cauchy combination-based test statistics based on these latent projections $\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d$.

However, all these latent projections are unknown and must be estimated in practice. If the full sample were used to estimate the latent projections, dependencies would be introduced between the estimated projections and the test statistics, thereby complicating the derivation of the asymptotic distribution. To address this issue, we randomly split the data into two parts, \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , of equal size. Here, we assume without loss of generality that the sample size n is even. We use the first part of the data, \mathcal{D}_1 , to estimate the projections $\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d$, and subsequently construct the test statistic based on the second part, \mathcal{D}_2 . Let $\hat{\theta}_0^{(1)}, \hat{\theta}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_d^{(1)}$ be the estimators of $\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d$ using \mathcal{D}_1 , respectively. The resulting Cauchy combination test statistic is defined as:

$$TCvM_C^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)}\right)\pi\right\}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i = 1$, and $\hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)} = 1 - \Psi(TCvM_{n,\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{2(2)})$ is computed using \mathcal{D}_2 and the estimated projection $\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}$.

The test $TCvM_C^2$ in (5.5) uses only half of the data to construct the test statistic, which may lead to power loss under the alternative hypothesis. To address this problem, we adopt the cross-fitting strategy to enhance power. Specifically, we swap the roles of the two subsamples, \mathcal{D}_2 is used

to estimate the latent projections, while \mathcal{D}_1 is employed to construct the test statistic. The resulting cross-fitting test statistic is given by

$$TCvM_{CF}^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)}\right)\pi\right\} + \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} w_j \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)}\right)\pi\right\}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i + \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} w_j = 1$, $\{\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}\}_{j=0}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}}$ are estimated using \mathcal{D}_2 , and $\hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)} = 1 - \Psi(TCvM_{n,\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{2(1)})$ is computed using \mathcal{D}_1 and the projection $\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}$. Similarly, the resulting cross-fitting hybrid test statistic is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Hybrid_{CF} = & \sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)}\right)\pi\right\} + \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} w_j \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{1\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)}\right)\pi\right\} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} v_i \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{2\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)}\right)\pi\right\} + \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} v_j \tan\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{p}_{2\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)}\right)\pi\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where the weights w_i, w_j, v_i, v_j satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} w_i + \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} w_j + \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{d}^{(1)}} v_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{d}^{(2)}} v_j = 1$, $\hat{p}_{2\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)} = 1 - \Phi(PLS_{n,\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}}^{(2)})$ is computed using \mathcal{D}_2 and the projection $\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}$ from \mathcal{D}_1 , and $\hat{p}_{2\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)} = 1 - \Phi(PLS_{n,\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}}^{(1)})$ is computed using \mathcal{D}_1 and the projection $\hat{\theta}_j^{(2)}$ from \mathcal{D}_2 .

6 Numerical studies

6.1 Simulations

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$ when the covariate dimension p may substantially exceed the sample size n . Since our tests rely on the parameter estimation, an inaccurate estimate of the parameters may affect the finite sample performance of the tests. We therefore employ the post-Lasso estimator of β_0 to construct the test statistics. The post-Lasso method applies least squares to the model selected by the Lasso estimator. According to Belloni and Chernozhukov (2013), the post-Lasso estimator performs at least as well as Lasso in terms of the rate of convergence and has the additional advantage of a smaller bias. This implies that the post-Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}_0$ satisfies Condition (A1) and the resulting tests are asymptotically distribution-free. We also conduct simulation studies for our tests using the Lasso estimator. These unreported results show that although our proposed tests control the empirical size in the setting of testing Gaussian linear models, they fail to maintain the significant level for testing logistic regression models. This may suggest that, in high dimensional scenarios, the finite sample performance of goodness-of-fit tests for regression models is also affected by the parameter estimation methodology.

To compute the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$, we randomly split the data into two parts, \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , and then construct the test statistics according to (5.5), (5.6), and (5.7). To

accurately estimate the latent projections $\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_d$, we utilize the Distance Correlation Sure Independence Screening (Li et al., 2012) to select the first $\frac{n/2}{\log(n/2)}$ top-ranked variables, and then apply the sparse sufficient dimension reduction technique LassoSIR (Lin et al., 2019) to construct the estimated projections $\hat{\theta}_i^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\theta}_i^{(2)}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, d$. Furthermore, since the proposed tests involve nonparametric estimation, we compute them using the Epanechnikov kernel $K(x) = (3/4)(1 - x^2)I(|x| \leq 1)$ and choose the bandwidth by cross validation automatically.

We compare our tests with the RP_n test of Shah and Bühlmann (2018), the GRP_n test of Janková et al. (2020), and the local smoothing test $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ proposed by Tan et al. (2025). The latter is based on combining the projected tests $PLS_{n,\alpha}$ from different projections. For the specific forms of these tests, we refer the reader to the respective papers for details. In the following simulations, the parameter $a = 0$ corresponds to the null hypothesis, and $a \neq 0$ corresponds to the alternative hypothesis. The simulation results are based on the average of 1000 replications with a nominal level of $\tau = 0.05$. The simulation results of the RP_n test are computed using the R package `RPtests`, and those for GRP_n are computed by running the code available on the website <https://github.com/jankova/GRPtests>, provided by Janková et al. (2020). We compute the test $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ using the Epanechnikov kernel $K(x) = (3/4)(1 - x^2)I(|x| \leq 1)$ and the bandwidth $h = n^{-2/9}$ as suggested in Tan et al. (2025). Furthermore, despite all the following null models having zero intercepts, we estimate them as unknown parameters in the simulation studies.

In the first simulation study, we consider the case of testing Gaussian linear models, where the covariate dimension p may be much larger than the sample size n .

Study 1. Generate data from the following models:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{11} : Y &= \beta_0^\top X + 0.1a(\beta_0^\top X)^2 + \varepsilon; \\ H_{12} : Y &= \beta_0^\top X + a \cos(0.6\pi\beta_0^\top X) + \varepsilon; \\ H_{13} : Y &= \beta_0^\top X + a \exp(0.25\beta_1^\top X) + \varepsilon; \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_0 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and $\beta_1 = \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)}_{p_1}$ with $p_1 = 10$. The covariates $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$

is $N(0, \Sigma)$ independent of the standard Gaussian error ε , where $\Sigma = I_p$ or $\Sigma = (\rho^{|i-j|})_{p \times p}$ with $\rho = 0.4$ and $\rho = 0.8$. Here, H_{11} and H_{13} are low-frequency models and H_{12} is a high-frequency model under the alternative hypothesis. We consider the sample size $n = 300$ with the covariate dimension $p \in \{50, 100, 300, 600, 900, 1200\}$.

The simulation results are presented in Tables 1-3. We observe that all tests control the significant level very well in all cases of sample sizes and dimensions. The GRP_n test of Janková et al. (2020) is slightly conservative with smaller empirical sizes. For low-frequency models H_{11} and H_{13} , our tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$ generally exhibit higher power than the other three competing tests across all settings. For the high-frequency model H_{12} , the tests RP_n , GRP_n , $TCvM_C^2$, and $TCvM_{CF}^2$ exhibit almost no power, even in the low dimensional setting ($p = 50$). In contrast, the local smoothing test $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ and our test $Hybrid_{CF}$ have substantially higher power than the other four. This result is inline with the traditional findings in low dimensional model checking that local smoothing tests typically are more sensitive to high-frequency models and empirical process-based tests are more powerful for low-frequency models. Interestingly, our hybrid test $Hybrid_{CF}$ inherits the merits of both local smoothing tests and empirical process-based tests, as it maintains high power

for both low-frequency and high-frequency alternatives.

Table 1: Empirical sizes and powers of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, \hat{T}_{Fisher}^C , $Hybrid_{CF}$, RP_n , and GRP_n for H_{11} in Study 1.

	a	n=300 p=50	n=300 p=100	n=300 p=300	n=300 p=600	n=300 p=900	n=300 p=1200
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.052	0.040	0.042	0.051	0.046	0.047
	0.5	0.664	0.581	0.401	0.357	0.334	0.279
	1.0	0.991	0.953	0.831	0.716	0.628	0.608
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.047	0.035	0.035	0.056	0.048	0.049
	0.5	0.847	0.731	0.547	0.474	0.432	0.396
	1.0	1.000	0.995	0.929	0.875	0.791	0.773
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.021	0.034	0.026	0.036	0.026	0.034
	0.5	0.195	0.143	0.111	0.104	0.084	0.073
	1.0	0.917	0.791	0.534	0.419	0.343	0.300
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.057	0.050	0.058	0.065	0.054	0.063
	0.5	0.772	0.679	0.478	0.405	0.362	0.336
	1.0	0.999	0.993	0.917	0.828	0.744	0.730
$RP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.038	0.039	0.034	0.024	0.028	0.041
	0.5	0.094	0.086	0.058	0.054	0.064	0.057
	1.0	0.176	0.149	0.144	0.127	0.110	0.114
$GRP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.034	0.020	0.018	0.017	0.014	0.012
	0.5	0.085	0.049	0.025	0.019	0.018	0.025
	1.0	0.291	0.182	0.079	0.054	0.040	0.055
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.039	0.051	0.045	0.044	0.030	0.037
	0.5	0.994	0.984	0.903	0.857	0.821	0.808
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.982	0.951	0.924	0.904
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.043	0.048	0.046	0.046	0.037	0.037
	0.5	0.999	1.000	0.981	0.959	0.947	0.937
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.990	0.982	0.981
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.025	0.029	0.031	0.026	0.033	0.034
	0.5	0.896	0.779	0.627	0.574	0.529	0.487
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.985	0.918	0.887	0.874
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.055	0.058	0.057	0.053	0.047	0.050
	0.5	0.999	1.000	0.975	0.950	0.929	0.908
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.996	0.983	0.980	0.978
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.029	0.037	0.035	0.037	0.039	0.042
	0.5	0.470	0.391	0.340	0.314	0.327	0.318
	1.0	0.601	0.534	0.481	0.436	0.445	0.485
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.026	0.031	0.030	0.025	0.019	0.019
	0.5	0.785	0.604	0.280	0.162	0.139	0.121
	1.0	0.998	0.981	0.700	0.582	0.542	0.475
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.047	0.050	0.039	0.030	0.048	0.047
	0.5	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.997	0.988	0.977
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.994	0.990	0.976
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.040	0.046	0.037	0.035	0.056	0.049
	0.5	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.999	0.997
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.028	0.028	0.025	0.032	0.041	0.038
	0.5	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.989	0.970	0.968
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.992	0.984
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.050	0.055	0.040	0.055	0.068	0.069
	0.5	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.998
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.999	0.998
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.039	0.029	0.039	0.032	0.035	0.034
	0.5	0.746	0.654	0.578	0.574	0.582	0.541
	1.0	0.741	0.653	0.603	0.561	0.547	0.552
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.043	0.041	0.027	0.024	0.025	0.037
	0.5	1.000	1.000	0.987	0.969	0.961	0.950
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.995	0.999

Next, we investigate the finite sample performance of our proposed tests for the goodness-of-fit of logistic regression models.

Table 2: Empirical sizes and powers of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, \hat{T}_{Fisher}^C , $Hybrid_{CF}$, RP_n and GRP_n for H_{12} in Study 1.

	a	n=300 p=50	n=300 p=100	n=300 p=300	n=300 p=600	n=300 p=900	n=300 p=1200
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.033	0.045	0.052	0.042	0.048	0.031
	0.5	0.055	0.052	0.039	0.033	0.046	0.061
	1.0	0.046	0.059	0.035	0.044	0.043	0.035
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.048	0.049	0.042	0.045	0.046	0.038
	0.5	0.054	0.055	0.043	0.048	0.032	0.051
	1.0	0.052	0.052	0.037	0.051	0.048	0.043
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.020	0.017	0.031	0.036	0.037	0.037
	0.5	0.320	0.216	0.085	0.074	0.053	0.053
	1.0	0.838	0.650	0.227	0.124	0.091	0.095
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.050	0.055	0.050	0.059	0.059	0.050
	0.5	0.274	0.182	0.096	0.075	0.052	0.059
	1.0	0.689	0.413	0.178	0.116	0.083	0.085
$RP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.036	0.030	0.039	0.040	0.038	0.032
	0.5	0.045	0.037	0.032	0.042	0.029	0.040
	1.0	0.033	0.058	0.032	0.049	0.042	0.036
$GRP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.037	0.033	0.018	0.010	0.016	0.012
	0.5	0.040	0.034	0.027	0.019	0.014	0.015
	1.0	0.069	0.066	0.045	0.027	0.032	0.027
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.048	0.052	0.041	0.037	0.041	0.058
	0.5	0.042	0.043	0.039	0.038	0.049	0.057
	1.0	0.052	0.046	0.037	0.037	0.039	0.043
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.044	0.053	0.047	0.038	0.044	0.040
	0.5	0.037	0.043	0.043	0.042	0.037	0.057
	1.0	0.052	0.055	0.044	0.042	0.035	0.043
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.031	0.027	0.030	0.031	0.037	0.037
	0.5	0.350	0.279	0.155	0.142	0.114	0.106
	1.0	0.924	0.837	0.567	0.404	0.308	0.258
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.054	0.060	0.058	0.059	0.058	0.068
	0.5	0.289	0.197	0.123	0.121	0.094	0.094
	1.0	0.753	0.563	0.315	0.210	0.160	0.153
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.036	0.039	0.033	0.041	0.042	0.041
	0.5	0.040	0.051	0.019	0.039	0.041	0.045
	1.0	0.035	0.037	0.037	0.041	0.048	0.041
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.033	0.034	0.021	0.030	0.022	0.016
	0.5	0.043	0.053	0.032	0.018	0.025	0.021
	1.0	0.075	0.056	0.062	0.036	0.027	0.038
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.032	0.047	0.049	0.038	0.043	0.045
	0.5	0.042	0.053	0.042	0.048	0.059	0.052
	1.0	0.051	0.048	0.039	0.040	0.045	0.034
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.036	0.046	0.040	0.041	0.054	0.045
	0.5	0.037	0.046	0.046	0.049	0.042	0.041
	1.0	0.047	0.044	0.031	0.052	0.049	0.032
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.024	0.033	0.032	0.034	0.028	0.040
	0.5	0.307	0.247	0.246	0.178	0.150	0.169
	1.0	0.911	0.872	0.773	0.693	0.633	0.581
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.054	0.056	0.066	0.057	0.051	0.069
	0.5	0.332	0.267	0.216	0.153	0.135	0.123
	1.0	0.881	0.767	0.536	0.399	0.403	0.306
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.035	0.052	0.051	0.049	0.046	0.035
	0.5	0.050	0.029	0.038	0.042	0.037	0.032
	1.0	0.055	0.034	0.036	0.044	0.040	0.033
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.038	0.032	0.032	0.034	0.027	0.035
	0.5	0.065	0.039	0.047	0.038	0.037	0.043
	1.0	0.074	0.068	0.061	0.064	0.059	0.057

Study 2. The data are generated from the logistic regression model according to

$$Y|X \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\mu(\beta_0^\top X + ag(X))\},$$

Table 3: Empirical sizes and powers of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, \hat{T}_{Fisher}^C , $Hybrid_{CF}$, RP_n and GRP_n for H_{13} in Study 1.

	a	n=300 p=50	n=300 p=100	n=300 p=300	n=300 p=600	n=300 p=900	n=300 p=1200
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.047	0.043	0.046	0.043	0.038	0.040
	0.5	0.312	0.211	0.135	0.150	0.115	0.104
	1.0	0.776	0.668	0.401	0.310	0.267	0.243
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.061	0.037	0.045	0.039	0.037	0.045
	0.5	0.397	0.294	0.189	0.177	0.132	0.120
	1.0	0.920	0.834	0.545	0.417	0.387	0.310
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.025	0.021	0.025	0.022	0.025	0.031
	0.5	0.056	0.038	0.037	0.038	0.026	0.029
	1.0	0.189	0.095	0.061	0.063	0.051	0.050
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.055	0.051	0.061	0.044	0.044	0.052
	0.5	0.334	0.226	0.164	0.136	0.111	0.110
	1.0	0.892	0.778	0.483	0.365	0.332	0.258
$RP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.043	0.044	0.033	0.044	0.034	0.048
	0.5	0.054	0.045	0.061	0.046	0.042	0.050
	1.0	0.072	0.061	0.069	0.058	0.065	0.053
$GRP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.026	0.048	0.019	0.010	0.008	0.014
	0.5	0.065	0.056	0.022	0.024	0.016	0.018
	1.0	0.108	0.097	0.040	0.040	0.028	0.029
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.037	0.043	0.052	0.045	0.043	0.042
	0.5	0.943	0.866	0.741	0.647	0.613	0.574
	1.0	0.998	0.996	0.943	0.869	0.798	0.803
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.038	0.040	0.045	0.038	0.041	0.047
	0.5	0.990	0.976	0.895	0.820	0.790	0.758
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.992	0.974	0.946	0.945
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.031	0.026	0.028	0.033	0.030	0.037
	0.5	0.437	0.306	0.187	0.143	0.129	0.138
	1.0	0.954	0.831	0.586	0.409	0.350	0.305
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.044	0.060	0.061	0.057	0.056	0.056
	0.5	0.981	0.959	0.855	0.781	0.735	0.716
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.986	0.960	0.924	0.918
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.037	0.039	0.037	0.042	0.041	0.033
	0.5	0.226	0.214	0.160	0.166	0.159	0.179
	1.0	0.284	0.237	0.214	0.203	0.236	0.228
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.030	0.030	0.015	0.021	0.020	0.021
	0.5	0.642	0.462	0.211	0.155	0.134	0.129
	1.0	0.933	0.800	0.430	0.312	0.320	0.269
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.041	0.035	0.042	0.039	0.040	0.037
	0.5	1.000	0.999	0.989	0.964	0.954	0.941
	1.0	1.000	0.999	0.987	0.954	0.934	0.921
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.048	0.048	0.044	0.044	0.040	0.034
	0.5	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.991	0.996
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.997	0.990	0.986
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.036	0.024	0.034	0.032	0.034	0.042
	0.5	1.000	1.000	0.991	0.969	0.928	0.887
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.983	0.962	0.935
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.053	0.052	0.047	0.053	0.066	0.057
	0.5	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.990	0.990
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.998	0.988	0.978
$RP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.043	0.042	0.048	0.032	0.038	0.036
	0.5	0.663	0.622	0.513	0.506	0.521	0.482
	1.0	0.687	0.603	0.557	0.523	0.525	0.531
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.053	0.037	0.032	0.024	0.029	0.032
	0.5	1.000	1.000	0.993	0.985	0.974	0.975
	1.0	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.996	0.989

where $\mu(z) = 1/(1 + \exp(-z))$. We consider two different cases for the misspecified $g(X)$:

$$H_{21} : g(X) = 0.2(\beta_0^\top X)^2,$$

$$H_{22} : g(X) = X^{(1)}X^{(2)} + X^{(2)}X^{(3)} + X^{(3)}X^{(4)} + X^{(4)}X^{(5)},$$

where the parameter $\beta_0 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and the covariates X are the same as in study 1, and the sample size $n = 600$ with the covariate dimension $p \in \{50, 100, 300, 600, 900, 1200\}$.

Since the RP_n test proposed by Shah and Bühlmann (2018) cannot be applied in testing GLMs, we only compare our tests with the tests GRP_n and $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ developed by Tan et al. (2025) and Janková et al. (2020), respectively. The simulation results are provided in Tables 4-5. It can be seen that our tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, $Hybrid_{CF}$, and the local smoothing test $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ control the empirical size in most cases. The tests $TCvM_C^2$ and $TCvM_{CF}^2$ are generally conservative, exhibiting smaller empirical sizes in large dimensional settings. The test $\hat{T}_{\text{Fisher}}^C$ becomes liberal with large empirical sizes in settings with high correlation ($\rho = 0.8$) and large dimension ($p = 1200$). However, the empirical size of GRP_n is far from the significant level when the covariate correlation $\rho = 0.4$ or $\rho = 0.8$. For the empirical power, our tests $TCvM_{CF}^2$ and $Hybrid_{CF}$ typically have higher power than the other competitors. Moreover, the empirical powers of all tests increase as the correlation of the covariates X grows.

6.2 Real data examples

In this subsection, we evaluate the proposed tests using two real datasets: the Communities and Crime data and the Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML) data (Bottomly et al., 2022). The Communities and Crime dataset, available from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/183/communities+and+crime>), contains 1994 observations with one response variable, the per capita violent crime rate, and 99 predictors describing demographic and law-enforcement characteristics. Let Y denote the per capita violent crime rate and $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(99)})^\top$ represent the predictor vector. We first evaluate the adequacy of a sparse linear regression model, $Y = a_0 + \beta_0^\top X + \varepsilon$, for this dataset using our tests. The choices for the kernel function and bandwidth are the same as those in the simulation studies. The p -values of $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$ are approximately 0.0037, 0.0053, and 0.0001, respectively. These results strongly reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the linear relationship between Y and X is not adequate for fitting this dataset. Figure 1 presents a scatter plot of the response variable Y versus $\hat{\beta}_0^\top X$, where $\hat{\beta}_0$ is a post-Lasso estimator from the linear model. This plot also suggests that a linear relationship between Y and X may not be plausible. Furthermore, it suggests the potential existence of a quadratic relationship between Y and $\hat{\beta}_0^\top X$.

To identify a more appropriate relationship between Y and X , we expand the model by incorporating the quadratic and interaction terms of covariates, leading to the following quadratic polynomial model

$$Y = a_0 + \beta_0^\top X + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \beta_1^{(ij)} X^{(i)} X^{(j)} + \varepsilon. \quad (6.1)$$

When applying our tests to this quadratic polynomial model, the resulting p -values of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$ are 0.4759, 0.6510, and 0.5989, respectively. These results fail to reject the null hypothesis, implying that the polynomial regression model (6.1) may be plausible to fit this dataset. To further visualize this fit, we present a scatter plot of the residuals from the

Table 4: Empirical sizes and powers of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, \hat{T}_{Fisher}^C , $Hybrid_{CF}$, and GRP_n for H_{21} in Study 2.

	a	n=600 p=50	n=600 p=100	n=600 p=300	n=600 p=600	n=600 p=900	n=600 p=1200
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.068	0.065	0.033	0.013	0.029	0.027
	0.5	0.296	0.209	0.084	0.043	0.038	0.036
	1.0	0.800	0.630	0.338	0.226	0.156	0.155
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.087	0.065	0.016	0.011	0.009	0.011
	0.5	0.348	0.264	0.085	0.045	0.024	0.019
	1.0	0.944	0.816	0.493	0.266	0.165	0.153
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.028	0.028	0.026	0.032	0.040	0.049
	0.5	0.084	0.077	0.032	0.034	0.034	0.045
	1.0	0.681	0.489	0.203	0.101	0.068	0.058
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.080	0.053	0.041	0.024	0.028	0.028
	0.5	0.278	0.236	0.088	0.066	0.041	0.033
	1.0	0.924	0.787	0.445	0.257	0.169	0.144
$GRP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.084	0.065	0.030	0.030	0.018	0.020
	0.5	0.068	0.048	0.034	0.027	0.027	0.023
	1.0	0.077	0.042	0.029	0.025	0.024	0.024
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.093	0.076	0.042	0.023	0.011	0.011
	0.5	0.566	0.444	0.259	0.161	0.102	0.085
	1.0	0.960	0.902	0.711	0.537	0.449	0.408
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.088	0.050	0.033	0.006	0.008	0.005
	0.5	0.673	0.562	0.313	0.174	0.102	0.075
	1.0	1.000	0.992	0.950	0.776	0.677	0.581
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.027	0.023	0.033	0.030	0.056	0.076
	0.5	0.215	0.224	0.146	0.090	0.076	0.090
	1.0	0.996	0.961	0.810	0.682	0.588	0.519
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.087	0.054	0.049	0.038	0.037	0.034
	0.5	0.620	0.503	0.298	0.187	0.112	0.101
	1.0	0.999	0.991	0.948	0.809	0.714	0.630
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.225	0.168	0.114	0.105	0.095	0.078
	0.5	0.151	0.103	0.057	0.036	0.036	0.038
	1.0	0.776	0.478	0.167	0.104	0.077	0.072
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.088	0.073	0.051	0.037	0.031	0.028
	0.5	0.924	0.923	0.833	0.757	0.644	0.591
	1.0	0.980	0.965	0.860	0.771	0.724	0.664
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.088	0.055	0.031	0.018	0.012	0.008
	0.5	0.991	0.981	0.950	0.877	0.776	0.702
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.988	0.971	0.946	0.914
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.034	0.031	0.026	0.058	0.079	0.130
	0.5	0.935	0.921	0.874	0.872	0.823	0.757
	1.0	1.000	0.998	0.954	0.910	0.879	0.854
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.081	0.058	0.035	0.048	0.049	0.063
	0.5	0.991	0.983	0.958	0.912	0.858	0.801
	1.0	1.000	0.999	0.988	0.971	0.957	0.933
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.410	0.393	0.357	0.322	0.310	0.305
	0.5	0.830	0.769	0.606	0.461	0.366	0.305
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.964	0.970	0.938	0.893

quadratic polynomial model versus the fitted values \hat{Y} in Figure 2. The absence of an obvious trend between the residuals and the fitted values further supports the adequacy of this model.

Next, we apply our proposed tests to the AML dataset, which was obtained from cBioPortal (https://www.cbioportal.org/study/summary?id=aml_ohsu_2022). This dataset consists of RNA-Seq expression profiles on 444 patients, who are classified by the ELN2017 criteria into high-risk (319) and non-high-risk (125) groups. The expression data contains 22834 genes, yielding a ultra-high dimensional setting for evaluation. We then evaluate the adequacy of a sparse linear logistic regression model for the AML classification task and apply our tests to check whether the functional form of




Figure 1: The scatter plot of Y versus $\hat{\beta}^T X$.




Figure 2: The scatter plot of the residuals from the quadratic polynomial model versus the fitted values \hat{Y} .

Table 5: Empirical sizes and powers of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, \hat{T}_{Fisher}^C , $Hybrid_{CF}$, and GRP_n for H_{22} in Study 2.

	a	n=600 p=50	n=600 p=100	n=600 p=300	n=600 p=600	n=600 p=900	n=600 p=1200
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.090	0.073	0.026	0.023	0.019	0.016
	0.5	0.169	0.129	0.064	0.045	0.031	0.025
	1.0	0.433	0.357	0.141	0.087	0.079	0.070
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.093	0.066	0.011	0.017	0.005	0.007
	0.5	0.182	0.121	0.048	0.031	0.021	0.011
	1.0	0.536	0.425	0.155	0.094	0.074	0.063
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.022	0.027	0.033	0.046	0.033	0.043
	0.5	0.039	0.046	0.031	0.043	0.045	0.042
	1.0	0.241	0.195	0.064	0.046	0.043	0.041
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.082	0.054	0.033	0.043	0.026	0.028
	0.5	0.162	0.121	0.057	0.037	0.049	0.023
	1.0	0.489	0.367	0.153	0.103	0.095	0.066
$GRP_n, \Sigma = I_p$	0.0	0.076	0.065	0.035	0.029	0.025	0.020
	0.5	0.130	0.078	0.033	0.036	0.020	0.022
	1.0	0.235	0.094	0.037	0.031	0.027	0.019
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.092	0.076	0.038	0.019	0.019	0.015
	0.5	0.451	0.351	0.185	0.100	0.081	0.082
	1.0	0.902	0.810	0.570	0.439	0.334	0.334
$TCvM_{CF}^{2D}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.088	0.046	0.020	0.009	0.010	0.003
	0.5	0.506	0.416	0.193	0.102	0.072	0.055
	1.0	0.989	0.965	0.858	0.705	0.574	0.488
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.023	0.027	0.034	0.049	0.061	0.090
	0.5	0.154	0.136	0.090	0.067	0.079	0.063
	1.0	0.906	0.835	0.627	0.487	0.384	0.327
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.071	0.051	0.036	0.041	0.038	0.028
	0.5	0.491	0.376	0.183	0.114	0.098	0.069
	1.0	0.985	0.953	0.866	0.710	0.585	0.531
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.4^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.195	0.173	0.110	0.072	0.098	0.078
	0.5	0.280	0.181	0.107	0.075	0.065	0.048
	1.0	0.944	0.790	0.336	0.191	0.152	0.109
$TCvM_C^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.115	0.098	0.054	0.056	0.029	0.022
	0.5	0.778	0.699	0.582	0.475	0.386	0.344
	1.0	0.985	0.969	0.908	0.791	0.720	0.694
$TCvM_{CF}^2, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.089	0.077	0.028	0.024	0.012	0.007
	0.5	0.906	0.833	0.703	0.581	0.455	0.398
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.996	0.982	0.935	0.912
$\hat{T}_{Fisher}^C, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.020	0.029	0.035	0.047	0.093	0.119
	0.5	0.525	0.519	0.479	0.505	0.423	0.391
	1.0	1.000	0.999	0.975	0.937	0.906	0.886
$Hybrid_{CF}, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.082	0.068	0.034	0.037	0.061	0.063
	0.5	0.891	0.824	0.699	0.632	0.521	0.479
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.994	0.983	0.958	0.946
$GRP_n, \Sigma = (0.8^{ i-j })_{p \times p}$	0.0	0.409	0.392	0.368	0.357	0.345	0.323
	0.5	0.566	0.499	0.341	0.282	0.228	0.195
	1.0	1.000	1.000	0.962	0.996	0.981	0.944

the conditional expectation, $E[Y|X] = \frac{\exp(\beta^\top X)}{1 + \exp(\beta^\top X)}$, is plausible. The p -values of the tests $TCvM_C^2$, $TCvM_{CF}^2$, and $Hybrid_{CF}$ are approximately 0.9877, 0.9961, and 0.9921, respectively. The universally high p -values lead us to fail to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that the sparse linear logistic regression model is adequate for this dataset. We further calculate the model predictive accuracy of the linear logistic regression model using 20 repetitions of 5-fold cross-validation. The resulting average predictive accuracy and Area Under the ROC Curve (AUROC) are 0.8514 and 0.9292, respectively. These metrics provide additional confirmation of the adequacy of the linear logistic regression model for this dataset.

7 Discussion

In this paper, we propose a two-step methodology for testing the goodness-of-fit of sparse parametric regression models, when the covariate dimension p may significantly exceed the sample size n . In the first step, we construct the Cramér-von Mises type test based on the martingale transformation of projected residual marked empirical processes. Under the null hypothesis, our projected tests are asymptotically distribution-free. Under the alternative hypothesis and mild conditions, the projected tests are consistent with asymptotic power 1 for almost all projections on the unit sphere and can detect local alternatives departing from the null at the parametric rate of $O(n^{-1/2})$. In the second step, we employ the Cauchy combination method and data splitting to combine the projected tests to form our final tests, thereby enhancing power. Moreover, since empirical process-based tests are generally more sensitive to low-frequency alternatives and local smoothing tests are more powerful for high-frequency alternatives, we further propose a hybrid test that combines our empirical process-based tests and the local smoothing test proposed by Tan et al. (2025). Simulation results show that the hybrid test performs very well for both low-frequency and high-frequency alternative models. It is important to note that our methodology requires data splitting for the construction of the test statistics, which introduces variability in the values of the test statistics. An interesting question is whether the data splitting strategy can be completely avoided. Such alternative methods, without data splitting, would be particularly useful for model checking where there exist dependency between observations. We also note that model checking for the conditional mean function is a special case of testing conditional moment restrictions. It is of interest to extend our method to test general conditional moment restrictions in ultra-high dimensional settings.

References

- Bai, J. (2003). Testing parametric conditional distributions of dynamic models. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 85(3), 531–549. 1
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2001). A consistent test for conditional symmetry in time series models. *Journal of Econometrics* 103(1), 225–258. Studies in estimation and testing. 1
- Belloni, A. and V. Chernozhukov (2013). Least squares after model selection in high-dimensional sparse models. *Bernoulli* 19(2), 521 – 547. 6.1
- Bierens, H. J. (1982). Consistent model specification tests. *J. Economet.* 20, 105–134. 1
- Bierens, H. J. (1990). A consistent conditional moment test of functional form. *Econometrica* 58, 1443–1458. 1
- Bottomly, D., N. Long, A. R. Schultz, S. E. Kurtz, C. E. Tognon, K. Johnson, M. Abel, A. Agarwal, S. Avaylon, E. Benton, et al. (2022). Integrative analysis of drug response and clinical outcome in acute myeloid leukemia. *Cancer cell* 40(8), 850–864. 6.2
- Bühlmann, P. and S. Van De Geer (2011). *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media. 2.1

- Bühlmann, P. and S. van de Geer (2015). High-dimensional inference in misspecified linear models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 9(1), 1449 – 1473. 4, 5.2
- Cuesta-Albertos, J. A., R. Fraiman, and T. Ransford (2007). A sharp form of the cramér–wold theorem. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* 20(2), 201–209. 2
- Cuesta-Albertos, J. A., E. García-Portugués, M. Febrero-Bande, and W. González-Manteiga (2019). Goodness-of-fit tests for the functional linear model based on randomly projected empirical processes. *The Annals of Statistics* 47(1), 439 – 467. 1, 2, 2.1
- Delgado, M. A. and W. Stute (2008). Distribution-free specification tests of conditional models. *Journal of Econometrics* 143(1), 37–55. 1
- Dette, H. (1999). A consistent test for the functional form of a regression based on a difference of variance estimators. *Ann. Statist.* 27(3), 1012–1040. 1
- Escanciano, J. C. (2006a). A consistent diagnostic test for regression models using projections. *Econome. Theo.* 22(06), 1030–1051. 2
- Escanciano, J. C. (2006b). Goodness-of-fit tests for linear and nonlinear time series models. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* 101(474), 531–541. 1, 1
- Escanciano, J. C. (2024). A gaussian process approach to model checks. *The Annals of Statistics* 52(5), 2456–2481. 1
- Escanciano, J. C., J. C. Pardo-Fernández, and I. Van Keilegom (2018). Asymptotic distribution-free tests for semiparametric regressions with dependent data. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(3), 1167–1196. 1
- Fan, J. and L. Huang (2001). Goodness-of-fit tests for parametric regression models. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* 96(454), 640–652. 1
- Fan, Y. and Q. Li (2000). Consistent model specification tests: Kernel-based tests versus bierens’ icm tests. *Econometric Theory* 16(6), 1016–1041. 1
- Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical methods for research workers*. Springer. 5.1
- Guo, X., T. Wang, and L. Zhu (2016). Model checking for generalized linear models: a dimension-reduction model-adaptive approach. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B.* 78, 1013–1035. 1
- Hall, P. and K.-C. Li (1993). On almost linearity of low dimensional projections from high dimensional data. *The annals of Statistics*, 867–889. 3
- Härdle, W. K. and E. Mammen (1993). Comparing nonparametric versus parametric regression fits. *Ann. Statist.* 21(4), 1926–1947. 1
- Horowitz, J. L. and V. Spokoiny (2001). An adaptive, rate-optimal test of a parametric mean-regression model against a nonparametric alternative. *Econometrica* 69(3), 599–631. 1, 1
- Janková, J., R. D. Shah, P. Bühlmann, and R. J. Samworth (2020). Goodness-of-fit testing in high dimensional generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 82(3), 773–795. 1, 2, 6.1, 6.1

- Khmaladze, E. V. (1981). Martingale approach in the theory of goodness-of-fit tests. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 26, 240–257. 1
- Khmaladze, E. V. and H. L. Koul (2004). Martingale transforms goodness-of-fit tests in regression models. *Ann. Statist.* 32(3), 995–1034. 1
- Khmaladze, E. V. and H. L. Koul (2009). Goodness-of-fit problem for errors in nonparametric regression: Distribution free approach. *The Annals of Statistics* 37(6A), 3165–3185. 1
- Koenker, R. and Z. Xiao (2002). Inference on the quantile regression process. *Econometrica* 70(4), 1583–1612. 1
- Koul, H. L. and P. Ni (2004). Minimum distance regression model checking. *J. Statist. Plan. Inference.* 119(1), 109–141. 1
- Koul, H. L. and W. Stute (1999). Nonparametric model checks for time series. *The Annals of Statistics* 27(1), 204–236. 1
- Kuchibhotla, A. K. and A. Chakraborty (2022, 06). Moving beyond sub-Gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* 11(4), 1389–1456. 2.1
- Lavergne, P. and V. Patilea (2008). Breaking the curse of dimensionality in non-parametric testing. *J. Economet.* 143, 103–122. 1, 2
- Lavergne, P. and V. Patilea (2012). One for all and all for one: regression checks with many regressors. *J. Busi. Econom. Statist.* 30(1), 41–52. 1
- Li, R., W. Zhong, and L. Z. and (2012). Feature screening via distance correlation learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(499), 1129–1139. 6.1
- Lin, Q., Z. Zhao, and J. S. Liu (2019). Sparse sliced inverse regression via lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 114(528), 1726–1739. 6.1
- Liu, Y. and J. Xie (2020). Cauchy combination test: A powerful test with analytic p-value calculation under arbitrary dependency structures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115(529), 393–402. 1, 5.1, 5.1, 5.1, 1
- Lu, W., Y. Goldberg, and J. P. Fine (2012). On the robustness of the adaptive lasso to model misspecification. *Biometrika* 99(3), 717–731. 4
- Lu, X. and X. Zheng (2020). A goodness-of-fit test for copulas based on martingale transformation. *Journal of Econometrics* 215(1), 84–117. 1, 1
- Patilea, V., C. Sánchez-Sellero, and M. Saumard (2016). Testing the predictor effect on a functional response. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 111(516), 1684–1695. 2
- Rao, B. P. (1983). *Nonparametric functional estimation*. Academic press. 3.1
- Shah, R. D. and P. Bühlmann (2018). Goodness-of-fit tests for high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 80(1), 113–135. 1, 6.1, 6.1

- Stute, W. (1997). Nonparametric model checks for regression. *Ann. Statist.* 25(2), 613–641. 1
- Stute, W., W. González Manteiga, and M. Presedo Quindimil (1998). Bootstrap approximations in model checks for regression. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* 93(441), 141–149. 1
- Stute, W., S. Thies, and L. Zhu (1998). Model checks for regression: an innovation process approach. *Ann. Statist.* 26(5), 1916–1934. 1, 3, 3.2
- Stute, W., W. L. Xu, and L. Zhu (2008). Model diagnosis for parametric regression in high-dimensional spaces. *Biometrika* 95(2), 451–467. 1
- Stute, W. and L. Zhu (2002). Model checks for generalized linear models. *Scand. J. Statist.* 29(3), 535–545. 1, 1, 3, 3.2, 5.2
- Tan, F., X. Guo, and L. Zhu (2025). Weighted residual empirical processes, martingale transformations, and model specification tests for regressions with diverging number of parameters. *Journal of Econometrics* 252, 106113. 1
- Tan, F., J. Liu, H. Peng, and L. Zhu (2025). A two-step projection-based goodness-of-fit test for ultra-high dimensional sparse regressions. 1, 5.1, 5.1, 1, 6.1, 6.1, 7
- Tan, F. and L. Zhu (2019). Adaptive-to-model checking for regressions with diverging number of predictors. *Ann. Statist.* 47(4), 1960–1994. 1
- van der Vaart, A. W. and J. Wellner (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media. 3.2, 4
- Van Keilegom, I., W. González Manteiga, and C. s. Sánchez Sellero (2008). Goodness-of-fit tests in parametric regression based on the estimation of the error distribution. *Test* 17, 401–415. 1
- Vladimirova, M., S. Girard, H. Nguyen, and J. Arbel (2020). Sub-weibull distributions: Generalizing sub-gaussian and sub-exponential properties to heavier tailed distributions. *Stat* 9(1), e318. 2.1
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press. 2.1
- Zheng, J. X. (1996). A consistent test of functional form via nonparametric estimation techniques. *J. Economet.* 75(2), 263–289. 1
- Zhu, L. (2003). Model checking of dimension-reduction type for regression. *Statist. Sinica* 13, 283–296. 1
- Zhu, L. and K. Fang (1996). Asymptotics for kernel estimate of sliced inverse regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 24(3), 1053–1068. 3.1
- Zhu, L. and R. Li (1998). Dimension-reduction type test for linearity of a stochastic regression model. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica* 14(2), 165–175. 2