

# The Chi-Square Test of Distance Correlation

Cencheng Shen\* and Joshua T. Vogelstein†

**Abstract.** Distance correlation has gained much recent attention in the data science community: the sample statistic is straightforward to compute and asymptotically equals zero if and only if independence, making it an ideal choice to test any type of dependency structure given sufficient sample size. One major bottleneck is the testing process: because the null distribution of distance correlation depends on the underlying random variables and metric choice, it typically requires a permutation test to estimate the null and compute the p-value, which is very costly for large amount of data. To overcome the difficulty, we propose a centered chi-square distribution, demonstrate it well-approximates the null distribution of unbiased distance correlation, and prove upper tail dominance and distribution bound between them. The resulting distance correlation chi-square test is a nonparametric test for independence, is valid and universally consistent using any strong negative type metric or characteristic kernel, enjoys a similar finite-sample testing power as the standard permutation test, and is provably the most powerful test of distance correlation among all valid tests with known distribution.

**Keywords:** unbiased distance correlation, centered chi-square distribution, nonparametric test, testing independence

**1 Introduction** Given pairs of observations  $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , assume they are independently identically distributed as  $F_{XY}$ . The testing independence problem is formulated as follows: the two random variables are independent if and only if  $F_{XY} = F_X F_Y$ , i.e., the joint distribution equals the product of the two marginal distributions. The statistical hypothesis is

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: F_{XY} = F_X F_Y, \\ H_A &: F_{XY} \neq F_X F_Y. \end{aligned}$$

Detecting the potential relationships underlying sample data has long been a fundamental question in theoretical and applied research. The traditional Pearson correlation [16] has been a valuable tool in quantifying the linear association and applied in many branches of statistics and machine learning. To detect all types of dependence structures, a number of universally consistent methods have been proposed recently, such as the distance correlation [25–28], the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion [4–6], the Heller-Heller-Gorfine statistics [7, 8], the multiscale graph correlation [29], among many others [10, 14, 15, 36]. There is a tight connection among these consistent methods. The Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion can be treated as a kernel version of distance correlation and vice versa [19, 23], and the multiscale graph correlation can be thought of as an optimal local version of distance correlation [22]. These universally consistent dependence measures have been widely used beyond independence testing, such as two-sample testing [17, 18, 21], conditional testing [4, 27, 31], feature screening [1, 11, 30, 34], clustering [17, 24], time-series [3, 13, 35], graph testing [22, 32], to name a few.

To populate these methods to big data analysis, a big hurdle is the time complexity. Computing the distance correlation typically requires  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ ; and to compute its p-value for testing, the standard approach is to estimate the null distribution of distance correlation via permutation, which requires  $\mathcal{O}(rn^2)$  where  $r$  is the number of random permutations and typically at least 1,000 or more. In comparison, for one-dimensional ( $p = q = 1$ ) data the Pearson correlation can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ , and a Pearson correlation t-test is readily available to compute the p-value in constant time complexity  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . The computational advantage makes Pearson extremely fast and attractive in practice. Recent works have successfully expedited the distance correlation computation into  $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n))$  under one-dimensional data and Euclidean distance [2, 9]. The testing part, however, remains difficult and less well-understood

\*Department of Applied Economics and Statistics, University of Delaware (shenc@udel.edu).

†Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University (jovo@jhu.edu).

despite some efforts to estimate the null distribution, most notably the distance correlation t-test [26] and the subsampling approach [33].

In this paper, we propose a centered chi-square distribution, demonstrate it well-approximates and may equal the null distribution of unbiased distance correlation, and prove the chi-square distribution upper tail dominates the null distribution at some tail probability level  $\alpha$ . Moreover, the upper tail of the null distribution is bounded between the centered chi-square distribution and a normal distribution, allowing us to discover a testing power inequality among the newly-proposed chi-square test, the previous distance correlation t-test, and the standard permutation test. The results are applicable to unbiased distance correlation using any strong negative type metric or characteristic kernel, not just the default Euclidean distance.

The resulting distance correlation chi-square test is likely the best nonparametric test of independence for big data, and shall make distance- and kernel-based testing methodology much more accessible to the data science community: It is simple and straightforward to use, has a constant time complexity without the need to permute nor subsampling nor parameter estimation, is universally consistent and valid at any type 1 error level no more than approximately 0.05 (see Section 5 for a detailed discussion on the empirical validity level), is guaranteed a similar testing power as the permutation test, and proved the most powerful test among all valid tests of distance correlation with known distribution. The results are demonstrated and supported by simulations. The appendix contains all theorem proofs, detailed simulation functions, and a fast algorithm for computing the unbiased distance correlation in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ , which renders the distance correlation chi-square test comparable in speed to the Pearson correlation t-test and scalable to billions of observations.

## 2 Background

**2.1 Biased and Unbiased Sample Distance Correlation** Let the paired sample data, which is assumed independently and identically distributed as  $F_{XY}$ , be denoted by

$$(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q}, i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Given a distance metric  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  (such as the Euclidean metric), let  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}$  denote the  $n \times n$  distance matrix of  $\mathbf{X}$  with  $\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{\mathbf{X}} = d(x_i, x_j)$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}$  denote the distance matrix of  $\mathbf{Y}$ , and  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{J}$  denote the  $n \times n$  centering matrix where  $\mathbf{I}$  is the identity matrix and  $\mathbf{J}$  is the matrix of ones. The biased sample distance correlation was proposed in Szekely et al. [28] with an elegant matrix formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}\mathbf{H}), \\ \text{Dcor}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{\text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X})\text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y})}} \in [-1, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Dcov}_n^b$  denotes the biased sample distance covariance and  $\text{Dcor}_n^b$  denotes the biased sample distance correlation. The unbiased version was later introduced via the following bias correction [27]: compute a modified matrix  $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}$  as

$$\mathbf{C}_{ij}^{\mathbf{X}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{\mathbf{X}} - \frac{1}{N-2} \sum_{t=1}^N \mathbf{D}_{it}^{\mathbf{X}} - \frac{1}{N-2} \sum_{s=1}^N \mathbf{D}_{sj}^{\mathbf{X}} + \frac{1}{(N-1)(N-2)} \sum_{s,t=1}^N \mathbf{D}_{st}^{\mathbf{X}}, & i \neq j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and similarly compute  $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{Y}}$  from  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ . The unbiased sample distance covariance and correlation are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{1}{n(n-3)} \text{trace}(\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X})\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y})}} \in [-1, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Namely,  $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{X}}$  always sets the diagonals to 0 and slightly modifies the off-diagonal entries from  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}$ . If  $n < 4$  or the denominator term is not a positive real number, the unbiased sample distance correlation is set to 0. Unless mentioned otherwise, in this paper distance correlation always means the unbiased sample version.

As long as the metric  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  is of strong negative type including the Euclidean metric [12], distance correlation satisfies the following:

$$\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \text{ if and only if independence,}$$

which guarantees a universally consistent statistic for testing independence. Moreover, it is unbiased in the following sense:

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})) = 0 \text{ when } X \text{ is independent of } Y,$$

which is not satisfied by the biased version.

Instead of using a strong negative type distance, one could use a characteristic kernel for  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}$  and  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}$  become two kernel matrices. Then all above results still hold [19, 23]. As the main results in this paper are applicable to any strong negative type metric or any characteristic kernel, we shall consistently use the distance correlation naming regardless of whether a metric or kernel is used for  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

**2.2 Null Distribution of Distance Correlation** Given a sample statistic, its null distribution is required to compute the p-value. The independence hypothesis is rejected when the p-value of distance correlation is smaller than a pre-specified critical level  $\alpha$ . When  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, the unbiased distance covariance distribution converges to

$$(2.1) \quad n\text{Dcov}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_j (\mathcal{N}_{ij}^2 - 1),$$

where  $\{\lambda_i\}$  are the limiting eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}/n$ ,  $\{\mu_j\}$  are the limiting eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}\mathbf{H}/n$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{ij}$  are identically and independently distributed standard normal random variables, and the summation index sums over  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . The limiting null distribution using sample eigenvalues is an accurate estimation of the actual finite-sample null distribution when  $n \geq 20$  (see Lyons [12] and Zhang et al. [33] for more details), so it suffices to approximate the limiting null distribution for testing.

The eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_i\}$  and  $\{\mu_j\}$  can vary significantly for different metric or kernel choices  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  and different marginal distributions  $F_X$  and  $F_Y$ . In a brute-force manner, these eigenvalues can be estimated via eigen-decomposition of the sample matrices, then the null distribution can be simulated by generating  $n^2$  independent normal distributions. This null distribution estimation has the best testing power (i.e., almost the same as permutation test) but requires  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  time complexity thus too costly. Alternatively, one could compute a subsampled distance correlation, then the central limit theorem yields a normal approximation for the averaged subsampled statistics. However, it is provable that the subsampled statistic yields an inferior testing power, because the estimated null distribution is a very conservative one with enlarged variance. These two approaches are summarized in Zhang et al. [33].

The standard permutation test works as follows: for each replicate, permute the observations in  $\mathbf{Y}$  (row indices of the matrix) by a random permutation  $\pi$ , denote the permuted sample data as  $\mathbf{Y}^\pi$ , and compute the permuted statistic  $\text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^\pi)$ . Repeat for  $r$  such random permutations, and compute a set of permuted statistics  $\{\text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^\pi)\}$ . Then the p-value is the fraction of times the observed test statistic is more extreme than the permuted test statistics. The random permutation effectively breaks dependencies within the sample data and well-approximates the actual null distribution. The permutation test is the default approach in almost every independence testing methodology, and provably a valid and consistent test with any consistent dependence measure [22], not just distance correlation. Also note that distance correlation and distance covariance share the same p-value under permutation test, because the covariance to correlation transformation is invariant to permutation.

A popular distribution-based test is the unbiased distance correlation t-test proposed in Székely and Rizzo [26], which approximates the null distribution by a normal distribution of mean 0 and variance 2. When  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, assume each dimension of  $X$  and  $Y$  are independently and independently distributed (or exchangeable) with positive finite variance, then

$$(2.2) \quad \sqrt{n^2 - 3n - 2} \cdot \text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, 2)$$

as  $n, p, q \rightarrow \infty$ . The t-distribution transformation and the corresponding t-test follow from the normal distribution. The distance correlation t-test enjoys a similar testing power as the permutation test under required condition, but there is no guarantee on its testing performance out of the high-dimensional assumption.

Note that the null distributions in both Equation 2.1 and Equation 2.2 multiply the distance correlation by a factor proportional to the sample size  $n$ , which does not change the p-value in testing and facilitates the asymptotic expression. In this paper we always consider the null distribution of distance correlation multiplied by  $n$ .

### 3 Main Results

#### 3.1 The Null Distribution and the Centered Chi-Square Distribution

*Assumption.* Unless mentioned otherwise, throughout the paper we assume:

1.  $X$  and  $Y$  are two arbitrary random variables that are non-constant and of finite second moments.
2. Sample size  $n \geq 4$ .
3. The choice of  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  is either a strong negative metric or a characteristic kernel for  $X$  and  $Y$ . It could be two different metrics or two different kernels for each.

**Theorem 3.1.** When  $X$  is independent of  $Y$ , the limiting null distribution of unbiased distance correlation satisfies

$$n\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_j (\mathcal{N}_{ij}^2 - 1)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2}},$$

where  $\{\lambda_i\}$  are the limiting eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{HD}^X \mathbf{H}/n$ ,  $\{\mu_j\}$  are the limiting eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{HD}^Y \mathbf{H}/n$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{ij}$  are identically and independently distributed as standard normal, and the eigenvalue weights

$$w_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_i \mu_j}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2}}$$

satisfy  $w_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{ij}^2 = 1$ .

We denote the distribution of  $n\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$  by  $C \sim F_C$  from now on, and call the distribution  $U \sim \chi_1^2 - 1$  as the centered chi-square distribution, i.e., the chi-square distribution of degree 1 centered by its mean. When the underlying metric or marginal distributions change, the eigenvalue weights and thus  $F_C$  may vary. However, it always has fixed mean and variance, which equal the mean and variance of the centered chi-square distribution.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $C \sim F_C$  be the limiting null distribution of unbiased distance correlation, and  $U \sim F_U$  be the centered chi-square distribution. The moments of  $C$  and  $U$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U) &= \mathbb{E}(C) = 0, \\ \mathbb{E}(U^2) &= \mathbb{E}(C^2) = 2, \\ \mathbb{E}(U^3) &> \mathbb{E}(C^3) > 0, \mathbb{E}(U^4) > \mathbb{E}(C^4) > 0, \\ \mathbb{E}(U^k) &> 0, \mathbb{E}(C^k) > 0 \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $U \in (-1, \infty)$ , while  $C \in (-\frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_j}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2}}, \infty)$  always has a smaller lower bound in its domain. The larger skewness and kurtosis of  $U$  suggest it shall have a heavier and more extreme tail to the right and thus dominate  $C$  in the upper tail.

**3.2 Upper Tail Dominance** We aim to show that  $U$  dominates  $C$  at some upper tail probability  $\alpha \leq 0.05$ . We denote  $F_V(x)$  as the cumulative distribution function of random variable  $V$  at argument  $x$ ,  $F_V^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$  as the inverse cumulative distribution function of random variable  $V$  at probability  $1 - \alpha$ , and formally define upper tail stochastic dominance as follows:

**Definition 3.3.** *Given two random variables  $U$  and  $V$ , we say  $U$  dominates  $V$  in upper tail at probability level  $\alpha$  if and only if*

$$F_V(x) \geq F_U(x)$$

for all  $x \geq F_V^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$ . This is denoted by

$$V \preceq_{\alpha} U.$$

We first establish two important intermediate theorems:

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume  $U, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_m$  are independently and identically distributed as  $\chi_1^2 - 1$ , and  $\{w_i\}$  satisfies  $w_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i^2 = 1$ . Suppose the weights satisfy any of the following cases:*

*Case 1:  $m = 1$ ;*

*Case 2:  $w_1 = w_2 = \dots = w_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ ;*

*Case 3:  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and  $w_i = o(1) > 0$  for all  $i$ .*

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i \preceq_{0.05} U.$$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Assume  $U, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_m$  are independently and identically distributed as  $\chi_1^2 - 1$ , there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i \preceq_{\alpha} U$$

for any  $m$  and any weight  $\{w_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m \mid \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^2 = 1\}$ .

Theorem 3.4 shows the dominance for some special weight cases where the summation density is well-known. The dominance level can be derived exactly in these cases (see the proof of Theorem 3.4), which is at least  $\alpha = 0.05$  and increases to 0.0875 as  $m$  increases to infinity. Theorem 3.5 shows the upper tail dominance for any eigenvalue weights, for which the actual  $\alpha$  is not analytically determined because the summation density has no general closed-form. The actual level is empirically supported at  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  and further discussed in Section 5. From the above theorems, we are able to bound the upper tail distribution of unbiased distance correlation as follows:

**Theorem 3.6.** *For sufficiently large  $n$ , there always exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(0, 2) \preceq_{\alpha} nDcor_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \preceq_{\alpha} U$$

regardless of the metric choice or marginal distributions.

This theorem immediately leads to the validity and consistency of the distance correlation chi-square test in the next subsection.

### 3.3 The Distance Correlation Chi-Square Test

**Theorem 3.7.** *The distance correlation chi-square test that rejects independence if and only if*

$$nDcor_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \geq F_{\chi^2_{1-1}}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

*is a valid and universally consistent test for sufficiently large  $n$  and sufficiently small type 1 error level  $\alpha$ .*

Note that the assumption for sufficiently large sample size is merely a regularity condition when working with the limiting distribution [26, 33]. In practice,  $n \geq 20$  generally suffices, and the validity level is empirically supported at any  $\alpha \leq 0.05$ . Often, the distance correlation chi-square test is better applied via the equivalent p-value approach: given any sample data  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ , compute

$$p = 1 - F_{\chi^2_{1-1}}(nDcor_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})),$$

and reject the independence hypothesis if and only if  $p < \alpha$ .

**3.4 Some Examples Demonstrating the Null Distribution** Assuming using the Euclidean distance in this subsection, here we give some random variable examples where the centered chi-square distribution equals, well-approximates, and dominates the actual null at  $\alpha \geq 0.05$ . We first state the following theorem regarding the eigenvalue weights:

**Theorem 3.8.** *Suppose the sample data  $\mathbf{X}$  has at most  $m$  distinct values. Then the sample matrix  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}$  has at most  $m - 1$  non-zero eigenvalues regardless of  $n$ .*

Therefore, when the random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are discrete, the number of eigenvalue weights is bounded, leading to the next corollary where  $C$  distributes the same as  $U$ :

**Corollary 3.9.** *When both  $X$  and  $Y$  are binary random variables, the eigenvalue weights satisfy Theorem 3.4 case (1) and  $F_C = F_U$ .*

For two continuous random variables, the limiting null distribution is generally an infinite weighted summation of  $U_i$ . Given  $(X, Y)$  with  $p = q = 1$ , the largest eigenvalue weight always dominates the remaining weights (empirically  $w_1 > 0.9$ , see the left panels of Figure 1), so the weighted summation almost equals the leading term and  $F_C(x) \approx F_U(x)$ . Empirically, when each dimension of  $X$  and  $Y$  has equal variance, the number of significant eigenvalue weights always equals  $pq$  and the null distribution approximates cases (2) with  $m = pq$ . For example, given two continuous random variables with  $p = 2$  and  $q = 1$  and Euclidean distance, the null distribution has two significant eigenvalue weights while all remaining ones are negligible, which approximates Theorem 3.4 case (2) with  $m = 2$ . When either dimension increases to infinity, all eigenvalue weights provably become the same asymptotically, which falls into Theorem 3.4 case (3) and thus the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.10.** *Assume  $X$  is independent of  $Y$ ,  $X$  is continuous, and each dimension of  $X$  is exchangeable with positive finite variance. As  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ , the eigenvalue weights satisfy Theorem 3.4 case (3) such that*

$$nDcor_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, 2) \preceq_{0.0875} U.$$

The above theorem establishes the same normal distribution as Equation 2.2 with a simplified proof, and is also applicable when the same assumption is placed on  $Y$  and  $q$  instead of  $X$  and  $p$ .

**3.5 Testing Power Comparison** It is not a coincidence that the same normal distribution appeared in both Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.10. As the distance correlation t-test [26] essentially uses a t-transformation of  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2)$ , we can view the t-test and the chi-square test as two-sides of the permutation test. In particular, the distance correlation t-test is an invalid test that slightly inflates the type 1 error level, while the chi-square test is always valid and slightly conservative in power:



**Corollary 3.11.** *At any type 1 error level  $\alpha \leq 0.05$ , denote the testing power of distance correlation chi-square test, distance correlation t-test, and the permutation test as  $\beta_\alpha^X, \beta_\alpha^t, \beta_\alpha$  respectively. Suppose the level  $\alpha$  satisfies Theorem 3.6, then there exists  $\alpha_1 \in (0, \alpha]$  and  $\alpha_2 \in (\alpha, 0.0875]$  such that*

$$\beta_\alpha^X = \beta_{\alpha_1} \leq \beta_\alpha < \beta_{\alpha_2} = \beta_\alpha^t.$$

*The actual  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  depend on the metric choice and marginal distributions.*

Therefore, both tests always offer good approximation of the permutation test, and at most slightly shift the error level to the right or left side respectively. We can numerically determine how aggressive and conservative the t-test and the chi-square tests are from the distribution bound (for visualization see top row of Figure 1): at the type 1 error level 0.05 where Theorem 3.6 is empirically satisfied, the permutation test shall correctly control 0.05, the t-test actually controls the error within  $(0.05, 0.07]$  and thus power inflation, while the chi-square test controls the error within  $[0.02, 0.05]$  and thus valid. Viewed in another way, the t-test at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is equivalent in power to a permutation test at  $\alpha \in (0.05, 0.07]$ , while the chi-square test at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is equivalent in power to a permutation test at  $\alpha \in [0.02, 0.05]$ .

From the examples in Section 3.4, the chi-square test is expected to have a very similar power as the permutation test in general and especially any low-dimensional data, except being slightly conservative for high-dimensional random variable of exchangeable dimensions. The t-test is expected to always inflate the testing power, with a minimal inflation for high-dimensional random variable of exchangeable dimensions. In fact, there is no other valid test of distance correlation that is as fast and as powerful as the chi-square test:

**Theorem 3.12.** *At any type 1 error level  $\alpha$  satisfying Theorem 3.6, the chi-square test is the most powerful test among all valid tests of distance correlation with known distribution. Namely, for any valid test  $z$  of distance correlation using a known distribution, it always holds that  $\beta_\alpha^X \geq \beta_\alpha^z$ .*

## 4 Numerical Experiments

**4.1 Null Distribution Approximation** The top row of Figure 1 visualizes the centered chi-square distribution  $U$ , the normal distribution  $N(0, 2)$ , and the null distribution  $C$  in varying dimensions. The centered chi-square distribution and the normal distribution are plotted by a blue solid line and an orange dashed line, respectively. We set sample size at  $n = 100$ , generate independent  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  from uniform distribution in  $[0, 1]^{p \times q}$  for  $r = 10,000$  replicates and different  $p, q$ , and plot the null distribution in red dotted line. The left panel shows the distributions at  $p = q = 1$ , the center panel is for  $p = q = 10$ , and the right panel is for  $p = q = 100$ . As expected from the theorems, the upper tail of the null distribution for  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  (equivalently y-axis greater than 0.95) always lies between and gradually shifts from  $U$  to  $N(0, 2)$  as dimension increases.

The bottom row of Figure 1 shows the respective ordered eigenvalue list  $\{\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, 10\}$ , normalized by  $-(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2)^{0.5}$  to reflect the weights used in the limiting null distribution. When  $p = 1$ , the leading eigenvalue plays a dominating role, thus explaining why  $U \stackrel{D}{\approx} C$  in low-dimension. As dimension increases, all eigenvalues becoming similar, explaining why  $C$  converges to  $N(0, 2)$ . Note that the other eigenvalue list  $\{\mu_j\}$  has the same pattern thus not shown.

**4.2 Testing Power Comparison for 1-Dimensional Random Variables** Here we compare the testing power of distance correlation chi-square test, permutation test, distance correlation t-test, and the subsampling method for linear, quadratic, spiral, and independent simulations. The simulation function details are in the appendix, which were part of the 20 dependency types in Vogelstein et al. [29] and Shen et al. [22]. We have ran all 20 simulations and decided to illustrate four representative simulations only, as the phenomenon is qualitatively similar throughout all 20 dependency types. All simulations are one-dimensional, that is,  $p = q = 1$ . In each simulation, we sample  $n = 20, 40, \dots, 200$  points, generate sample data 1,000 times, run each test and reject at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level, and compute how often the test is correctly rejected (the testing power), which is then plotted against the sample size.




Figure 1: The top row compares the centered chi-square distribution, the normal distribution, and the actual null distribution of distance correlation in case of varying dimensions. The bottom row shows the weighted eigenvalues in each case.

The top row of Figure 2 shows the power of distance correlation under Euclidean distance, while the bottom row shows the power of distance correlation under Gaussian kernel (namely the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion). The performance supports Section 3.5 with the same pattern throughout all dependency types and sample size and metric choice: the distance correlation chi-square test has virtually the same testing power as the benchmark permutation test; the distance correlation t-test consistently inflates the power in most simulations, e.g., it has a power of 0.07 for independence vs about 0.05 of the permutation test; and the subsampling method always has degraded power.

**4.3 Testing Power Comparison for Increasing-Dimensional Random Variables** Here we show how the testing power behaves as dimension increases, as the distance correlation chi-square test can be slightly conservative for certain high-dimension scenarios. We consider four settings: equal variance (each dimension is exchangeable with same variance), minimal variance (first few dimensions has same variance while remaining dimensions have very small variance), dependent coordinates (consecutive dimensions are dependent), and varying marginals (the marginal distribution of each dimension is different). The function details are in the appendix. We fix the sample size and  $q = 1$ , increase  $p$  accordingly in each simulation, and compute the testing power at  $\alpha = 0.05$  based on 1000 Monte-Carlo replicates.

The testing power is plotted against dimension in Figure 3, which again supports Section 3.5 and






Figure 2: The testing powers of distance correlation using different tests for linear, quadratic, spiral, and independent simulations. The top row chooses the Euclidean distance for  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  while the bottom row chooses the Gaussian kernel.




Figure 3: The testing powers of distance correlation using different tests for four increasing-dimensional simulations using Euclidean distance.

offers almost the same interpretation as Figure 2. In particular, the equal variance simulation is the only setting here satisfying the assumption of Theorem 3.10 while others do not, in which case the t-test only minimally inflate the testing power and the chi-square test exhibits a slightly more conservative testing power vs the permutation test. In the other three high-dimensional settings, the dimensions are no longer exchangeable, and the chi-square test has almost the same power as the permutation test. Therefore, without any prior knowledge on the dimension structure, the chi-square test is the best choice for general use including high-dimensional testing. As a side note, for high-dimensional testing, the marginal distance correlation method often performs better than distance correlation using all dimensions [20].

**5 Discussion** In this paper, we propose the distance correlation chi-square test. It is a nonparametric test of independence, is extremely fast for big data, has a similar testing power as the permutation test, is valid and universally consistent, and is the most powerful among all valid tests of distance correlation with known distribution. We consider it the best possible test of distance correlation and expect it to be widely used in the future.

A theoretical point of interest is the exact tail dominance probability level (e.g., in Theorem 3.7), which may not be analytically determinable due to the intractable density form for arbitrary eigenvalue weights. Nevertheless, both the theoretical and numerical results in this paper strongly support  $\alpha \approx 0.05$  as the dominance level in general. From the proof of Theorem 3.4 case (2), in case of equal weights  $\alpha \geq 0.05$  and increases to 0.0875 as  $m$  increases. As the number of significant eigenvalue weights equals  $pq$  empirically, the actual null distribution  $F_C$  always approximates Theorem 3.4 case (2) for some  $m$ , so  $\alpha = 0.05$  shall be true approximately. Numerically, Figure 1 shows the actual null distribution shifts from  $U$  to  $N(0, 2)$  as dimension increases, and Figure 2 and Figure 3 confirm that the chi-square test never inflates the testing power at  $\alpha = 0.05$  regardless of the dependency type or dimensions. We also numerically verified the cumulative distribution function  $F_C$  for a vast variety of  $m$  and weight combination, and there is no exception to the dominance level at any  $\alpha \leq 0.05$ . These evidences suggest that  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  shall be a valid choice in practice, and we hope future investigations into the eigenvalue weights and the density may help narrowing down  $\alpha$  further.

Furthermore, one may wonder whether the chi-square test can be similarly adapted to the biased distance correlation. The short answer is no. Based on the covariance distribution from [33] and the proof of Theorem 3.1, one can show the limiting null distribution of biased distance correlation equals

$$n\text{Dcor}^b(\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{Y}_n) \sim \sum_{i=1}^{n^2} w_i \chi_1^2$$

This limiting null distribution has a positive and unknown mean  $\sum_{i=1}^{n^2} w_i \in [1, n]$  that can significantly change depending on the metric choice and marginal distributions. So the chi-square test cannot be readily applied unless one estimates or has prior knowledge on the unknown mean, which is in fact better achieved by bias correction into the unbiased version of zero mean. As a side effect, using biased distance correlation for feature screening can be inaccurate: comparing two biased distance correlations without actual testing is more likely to yield a wrong conclusion, as a larger correlation does not imply a more significant p-value due to potential mean shifting for the null distribution. The biased version is sometimes handy for asymptotic properties and related theoretical derivations, while for practical usage we always recommend the unbiased distance correlation.

**Acknowledgment** This work was supported by the National Science Foundation award DMS-1921310 and DARPA L2M program FA8650-18-2-7834. The authors thank Dr. Austin Brockmeier, Mr. Ronak Mehta, Dr. Yuexiao Dong, Dr. Carey Priebe for helpful discussions and suggestions, and anonymous feedback that motivated better expositions and additional simulations.

## References

- [1] Balasubramanian, K., B. Sriperumbudur, and G. Lebanon (2013). Ultrahigh dimensional feature screening via rkhs embeddings. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 126–134.
- [2] Chaudhuri, A. and W. Hu (2018). A fast algorithm for computing distance correlation. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11332>.
- [3] Fokianos, K. and M. Pitsillou (2018). Testing independence for multivariate time series via the auto-distance correlation matrix. *Biometrika* 105(2), 337–352.
- [4] Fukumizu, K., A. Gretton, X. Sun, and B. Schölkopf (2007). Kernel measures of conditional dependence. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- [5] Gretton, A. and L. Györfi (2010). Consistent nonparametric tests of independence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11, 1391–1423.
- [6] Gretton, A., R. Herbrich, A. Smola, O. Bousquet, and B. Schölkopf (2005). Kernel methods for measuring independence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 6, 2075–2129.
- [7] Heller, R., Y. Heller, and M. Gorfine (2013). A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances. *Biometrika* 100(2), 503–510.
- [8] Heller, R., Y. Heller, S. Kaufman, B. Brill, and M. Gorfine (2016). Consistent distribution-free  $k$ -

- sample and independence tests for univariate random variables. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17(29), 1–54.
- [9] Huo, X. and G. Szekely (2016). Fast computing for distance covariance. *Technometrics* 58(4), 435–447.
- [10] Kim, I., S. Balakrishnan, and L. Wasserman (2018). Robust multivariate nonparametric tests via projection-pursuit. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.00715>.
- [11] Li, R., W. Zhong, and L. Zhu (2012). Feature screening via distance correlation learning. *Journal of American Statistical Association* 107, 1129–1139.
- [12] Lyons, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *Annals of Probability* 41(5), 3284–3305.
- [13] Mehta, R., C. Shen, X. Ting, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019). Consistent and powerful independence testing for time series. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.06486>.
- [14] Pan, W., X. Wang, W. Xiao, and H. Zhu (2018). A generic sure independence screening procedure. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- [15] Pan, W., X. Wang, H. Zhang, H. Zhu, and J. Zhu (2019). Ball covariance: A generic measure of dependence in banach space. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- [16] Pearson, K. (1895). Notes on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* 58, 240–242.
- [17] Rizzo, M. and G. Szekely (2010). DISCO analysis: A nonparametric extension of analysis of variance. *Annals of Applied Statistics* 4(2), 1034–1055.
- [18] Rizzo, M. and G. Szekely (2016). Energy distance. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* 8(1), 27–38.
- [19] Sejdinovic, D., B. Sriperumbudur, A. Gretton, and K. Fukumizu (2013). Equivalence of distance-based and rkhs-based statistics in hypothesis testing. *Annals of Statistics* 41(5), 2263–2291.
- [20] Shen, C. (2020). High-dimensional independence testing and maximum marginal correlation. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.01095>.
- [21] Shen, C., C. E. Priebe, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019a). The exact equivalence of independence testing and two-sample testing. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.08883>.
- [22] Shen, C., C. E. Priebe, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019b). From distance correlation to multiscale graph correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- [23] Shen, C. and J. T. Vogelstein (2019). The exact equivalence of distance and kernel methods in hypothesis testing. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.05514>.
- [24] Szekely, G. and M. Rizzo (2005). Hierarchical clustering via joint between-within distances: Extending ward’s minimum variance method. *Journal of Classification* 22, 151–183.
- [25] Szekely, G. and M. Rizzo (2009). Brownian distance covariance. *Annals of Applied Statistics* 3(4), 1233–1303.
- [26] Szekely, G. and M. Rizzo (2013). The distance correlation t-test of independence in high dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 117, 193–213.
- [27] Szekely, G. and M. Rizzo (2014). Partial distance correlation with methods for dissimilarities. *Annals of Statistics* 42(6), 2382–2412.
- [28] Szekely, G., M. Rizzo, and N. Bakirov (2007). Measuring and testing independence by correlation of distances. *Annals of Statistics* 35(6), 2769–2794.
- [29] Vogelstein, J. T., Q. Wang, E. Bridgeford, C. E. Priebe, M. Maggioni, and C. Shen (2019). Discovering and deciphering relationships across disparate data modalities. *eLife* 8, e41690.
- [30] Wang, S., C. Shen, A. Badea, C. E. Priebe, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019). Signal subgraph estimation via iterative vertex screening. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.07683>.
- [31] Wang, X., W. Pan, W. Hu, Y. Tian, and H. Zhang (2015). Conditional Distance Correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 110(512), 1726–1734.
- [32] Xiong, J., C. Shen, J. Arroyo, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019). Graph independence testing. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.03661>.
- [33] Zhang, Q., S. Filippi, A. Gretton, and D. Sejdinovic (2018). Large-scale kernel methods for inde-

- pendence testing. *Statistics and Computing* 28(1), 113–130.
- [34] Zhong, W. and L. Zhu (2015). An iterative approach to distance correlation-based sure independence screening. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* 85(11), 2331–2345.
- [35] Zhou, Z. (2012). Measuring nonlinear dependence in time series, a distance correlation approach. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 33(3), 438–457.
- [36] Zhu, L., K. Xu, R. Li, and W. Zhong (2017). Projection correlation between two random vectors. *Biometrika* 104(4), 829–843.

## APPENDIX

### Appendix A. Proofs.

#### A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

*Proof.* Recall from Equation 2.1 that the limiting null distribution of distance covariance is

$$n\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_j (\mathcal{N}_{ij}^2 - 1).$$

The denominator terms of distance correlation satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0 \\ \text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{\lambda_i\}$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}/n$  and  $\{\mu_j\}$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}\mathbf{H}/n$ .

Therefore the limiting null distribution of distance correlation is

$$n\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \sim \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_j (\mathcal{N}_{ij}^2 - 1)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2}}.$$

A strong negative type metric is always of negative type, and a characteristic kernel is always a positive definite kernel. When the distance metric is of negative type, the two matrices are negative definite and all eigenvalues are all non-positive. When positive definite kernels are used, then these eigenvalues are all non-negative. In either case, the product  $\{\lambda_i \mu_j\}$  is always non-negative, such that

$$w_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_i \mu_j}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^2}} \in [0, 1].$$

One can easily verify that  $\sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{ij}^2 = 1$ .

Note that in the special case that either  $X$  or  $Y$  is constant, all eigenvalues are 0 so the correlation equals 0 instead. This corresponds to a trivial independence case, and all dominance / validity / consistency results hold trivially. ■

#### A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

*Proof.* The  $k$ th moment of  $U$  equals:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U^k) &= \mathbb{E}((\chi_1^2 - 1)^k) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\chi_1^{2k} + k\chi_1^{2k-2} \cdot (-1) + \binom{k}{2}\chi_1^{2k-4} \cdot (-1)^2 + \dots + k\chi_1^2 \cdot (-1)^{k-1} + (-1)^k) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k (2i - 1) - k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (2i - 1) + \binom{k}{2} \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} (2i - 1) + \dots + k(-1)^{k-1} + (-1)^k \\ &= (k - 1) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (2i - 1) + \binom{k}{2} (2k - 5) - \binom{k}{3} \prod_{i=1}^{k-3} (2i - 1) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by combining the consecutive positive and negative entries together to form a positive term. When  $k$  is even, the moment is a summation of positive terms and always greater than

0; when  $k$  is odd, only the last term is a negative which equals  $-1$ , and the positive sums exceeds  $-1$  unless  $k = 1$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{E}(U) = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(U^2) = 2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(U^3) = 8$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(U^4) = 60$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(U^k) > 0$  for all  $k > 1$  and monotonically increasing.

The limiting null distribution  $F_C$  satisfies

$$C \sim \sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i,$$

where  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_m$  are independently and identically distributed as  $U$ , and the weights satisfy  $w_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i^2 = 1$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{E}(C) = 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(C^2) = \sum w_i^2 \mathbb{E}(U^2) = \mathbb{E}(U^2) = 2,$$

and all the higher moments of  $C$  are always positive as the weights  $\{w_i\}$  are non-negative.

To show  $U$  dominate  $C$  in third moment, it suffices to prove that given any random variable  $V$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}(V) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(V^2) = 2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(V^3) \leq \mathbb{E}(U^3)$ , it leads to  $\mathbb{E}\{(\sqrt{1-w^2}U + wV)^3\} \leq \mathbb{E}(U^3)$  for any weight  $w \in [0, 1]$ . This is true because

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{(\sqrt{1-w^2}U + wV)^3\} \\ &= (1-w^2)^{1.5}\mathbb{E}(U^3) + 3(1-w^2)w\mathbb{E}(U^2)\mathbb{E}(V) + 3w^2\sqrt{1-w^2}\mathbb{E}(U)\mathbb{E}(V^2) + w^3\mathbb{E}(V^3) \\ &= (1-w^2)^{1.5}\mathbb{E}(U^3) + w^3\mathbb{E}(V^3) \\ &= (1-w^2)^{1.5}\mathbb{E}(U^3) + w^3\mathbb{E}(V^3) \\ &\leq ((1-w^2)^{1.5} + w^3)\mathbb{E}(V^3) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(U^3). \end{aligned}$$

Then the general case follows by mathematical induction.

The fourth moment dominance can be similarly proved by assuming  $\mathbb{E}(V^4) \leq \mathbb{E}(U^4)$  and observing that for any  $w \in [0, 1]$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{(\sqrt{1-w^2}U + wV)^4\} \\ &= (1-w^2)^2\mathbb{E}(U^4) + 6(1-w^2)w^2\mathbb{E}(U^2)\mathbb{E}(V^2) + w^4\mathbb{E}(V^4) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(U^4)((1-w^2)^2 + w^4 + (1-w^2)w^2) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(U^4)(1-w^2 + w^4) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(U^4). \end{aligned}$$

The general case follows by mathematical induction. ■

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.4

*Proof.* Case (1): When  $m = 1$ , apparently  $w_1 = 1$  and  $V = U$  in distribution, so dominance trivially holds at any  $\alpha$  including 0.05.

Case (2): First, the density of  $U$  is

$$f_U(x) = c(x+1)^{-0.5}e^{-(x+1)/2}$$

where  $c = 2^{-0.5}\Gamma(0.5)^{-1} \approx 0.4$  is the constant from standard chi-square distribution of degree 1. The domain of  $U$  is  $(-1, +\infty)$ , and the density equals 0 otherwise.

When  $w_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ ,

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i = \sum_{i=1}^m U_i / \sqrt{m} \sim \frac{\chi_m^2 - m}{\sqrt{m}},$$



whose density equals

$$\frac{\sqrt{m}}{2^{\frac{m}{2}} \Gamma(m/2)} (\sqrt{m}x + m)^{\frac{m}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{m}x+m}{2}}.$$

At fixed  $m$ , the density of  $V$  decays exponentially at the rate  $O(e^{-\sqrt{m}x/2})$  as  $x$  increases. In comparison, the density of  $U$  decays at  $O(e^{-x/2})$  as  $x$  increases. As  $V$  decays faster than  $U$ , there must exist  $x$  such that  $f_U(x') \geq f_V(x')$  for all  $x' \geq x$ .

Note that the density of  $V$  decays at a faster rate as  $m$  increases, so the threshold  $x$  becomes smaller as  $m$  increases. For example, we can compute the density dominance threshold:  $x = 4.5$  when  $m = 2$ ,  $x = 4.3$  when  $m = 3$ ,  $x = 3.7$  when  $m = 10$ , and  $x = 3.1$  when  $m = 1000$ , etc. The corresponding constant  $x$  for  $F_V(x) \geq F_U(x)$  is smaller, which can be exactly computed as:  $x = 2.7 < F_U^{-1}(0.95)$  when  $m = 2$ ,  $x = 2.5$  when  $m = 3$ ,  $x = 2.3$  when  $m = 10$ , and  $x = 2$  when  $m = 1000$ . Therefore  $\alpha$  is at least 0.05 regardless of  $m$ , and  $V \leq_{0.05} U$  always holds in the equal weight case.

Case (3): As  $w_i = o(1) > 0$  for all  $i$ , by Lyapunov Central Limit Theorem:

$$\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(0, 2),$$

which is also the asymptotic distribution of case (2) as  $m$  increases to infinity. Therefore  $f_U(x)$  is larger than the normal distribution density for sufficiently large  $x$ . Evaluating the cumulative distribution of standard normal, it follows that  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2) \leq_{\alpha} U$  at  $\alpha = 0.0875$ . ■

#### A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.5

*Proof.* This theorem is proved by induction: at  $m = 2$  where both  $U$  and  $V$  are independently distributed as  $F_U$ , Lemma A.1 states that the summation density of  $wU + \sqrt{1-w^2}V$  decays faster than  $U$ ; then at any  $m > 2$  where  $U \sim F_U$  and  $V$  is an  $m-1$  weighted summation of  $U_i$ , Lemma A.2 states that the summation density of  $wU + \sqrt{1-w^2}V$  decays at a faster rate than both  $U$  and  $V$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i$  always decays faster than  $U$  such that

$$f_{\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i}(x) \leq f_U(x)$$

for sufficiently large  $x$ . Thus, for any weight it holds that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m w_i U_i \leq_{\alpha} U$$

for some  $\alpha > 0$ .

The initial case is proved in Lemma A.1 by restricting the weight to  $w \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$  instead of  $w \in [0, 1]$ : when  $w = 0$  or 1, it is the trivial case; when  $w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ , it reduces to Theorem 3.4 case (2); otherwise there must exist one nonzero weight  $w < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ . The induction step is then proved in Lemma A.2 by restricting the weight to  $w \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$ : when  $w = 0$  or 1 it reduces to the base case; when  $w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ , it reduces to Theorem 3.4 case (2); otherwise there must exist one nonzero weight  $w_i < \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ . ■

**Lemma A.1.** *Suppose both  $U$  and  $V$  are independently and identically distributed as the centered chi-square distribution. For any  $w \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$ , the density of  $wU + \sqrt{1-w^2}V$  decays exponential at the rate  $O(e^{-x/(2\sqrt{1-w^2})})$  as  $x$  increases.*

**Proof.** The summation density equals

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{wU+\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(x) &= \int_{-w}^{+\infty} f_{\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(x-z)f_{wU}(z)dz \\
&= \frac{c^2}{w\sqrt{1-w^2}} \int_{-w}^{x+\sqrt{1-w^2}} \left(\left(\frac{x-z}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}+1\right)\left(\frac{z}{w}+1\right)\right)^{-0.5} e^{-\left(\frac{x-z}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}+\frac{z}{w}+2\right)/2} dz \\
&= e^{-\frac{x}{2\sqrt{1-w^2}}} \cdot \frac{c^2 e^{-0.5}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \cdot \int_{-1}^{\frac{x+\sqrt{1-w^2}}{w}} \left(\left(\frac{x-wz}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}+1\right)(z+1)\right)^{-0.5} e^{-\left(\left(1-\frac{w}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}\right)z+1\right)/2} dz \\
&= e^{-\frac{x}{2\sqrt{1-w^2}}} \cdot g(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last equality involves a change of variable from  $z$  to  $\frac{z}{w}$ , and the last equality combines every other term into  $g(x)$ .

The leading exponential term dominates the decay rate of the density, while  $g(x)$  is a bounded constant: the term  $\frac{c^2 e^{-0.5}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \leq \sqrt{2}c < 1$  is a fixed constant; the upper bound of the integral increases at  $O(x)$ , while the only exponential term in the function  $g(x)$  satisfies

$$e^{-\left(\left(1-\frac{w}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}\right)z+1\right)/2} \leq 1$$

for any fixed  $w \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$  and converges to 0 as  $z$  increases. Therefore, both the integral within  $g(x)$  and  $g(x)$  itself are bounded constants.

Therefore, the density of  $wU + \sqrt{1-w^2}V$  decays at the exponential rate  $O(e^{-x/(2\sqrt{1-w^2})})$ , which is always faster than the decay rate  $O(e^{-x/2})$  of  $U$ . ■

**Lemma A.2.** Suppose  $U$  is the centered chi-square distribution, and  $V$  is an  $m-1$  weighted summation of  $U_i$  with the density satisfying

$$f_V(x) = O(e^{-xc_{m-1}/2})$$

where  $m > 2$  and  $c_{m-1} \in (1, \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1}})$  is a fixed constant based on given weights. Then for any  $w \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$ , the density  $f_{wU+\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(b)$  satisfies

$$f_{wU+\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(x) = O(e^{-xc_m/2})$$

where  $c_m \in (c_{m-1}, \sqrt{\frac{m+1}{m}})$ .

**Proof.** The initial case corresponds to Lemma A.1 with  $c_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \in (1, \sqrt{2})$ . Given  $f_V(x) = O(e^{-xc_{m-1}/2})$  for  $m > 1$ , the distribution must be of the form

$$f_V(x) = e^{-xc_{m-1}/2} g(x)$$

where  $g(x)$  is a function that grows at most  $o(e^{xc_{m-1}/2})$ . Then the summation density is

$$\begin{aligned}
&f_{wU+\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(x) \\
&= \int_{-w}^{+\infty} f_{\sqrt{1-w^2}V}(x-z)f_{wU}(z)dz \\
&= \frac{c}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \int_{-1}^{\frac{b+\sqrt{m(1-w^2)}}{w}} (z+1)^{-0.5} e^{-\left(\frac{c_{m-1}(x-wz)}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}+z+1\right)/2} g\left(\frac{x-wz}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}\right) dz \\
&= e^{-\frac{xc_{m-1}}{2\sqrt{1-w^2}}} \cdot \frac{c}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \cdot \int_{-1}^{\frac{b+\sqrt{m(1-w^2)}}{w}} (z+1)^{-0.5} e^{-\left(\left(1-\frac{wc_{m-1}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}\right)z+1\right)/2} g\left(\frac{x-wz}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}\right) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

The only exponential term within the integral satisfies

$$e^{-((1-\frac{wc_{m-1}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}})z+1)/2} \leq 1.$$

This is because

$$\frac{wc_{m-1}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} < \frac{c_{m-1}}{\sqrt{m-1}} < \frac{\sqrt{m}}{m-1} < 1$$

for all  $m \geq 3$ , so that  $(1 - \frac{wc_{m-1}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}})z + 1 \geq 0$  when  $z > -1$ . Analyzing every other term in the same manner as the base case in the proof of Lemma A.1, we conclude that the density is dominated by the leading exponential decay term, while the remaining term is a bounded constant. Therefore the density decays at  $O(e^{-\frac{xc_{m-1}}{2\sqrt{1-w^2}}})$  where  $c_m = \frac{c_{m-1}}{\sqrt{1-w^2}} \in (c_{m-1}, \sqrt{\frac{m+1}{m}})$ . ■

### A.5 Proof of Theorem 3.6

*Proof.* From Theorem 3.1 and proof of Theorem 3.5, it immediately follows that  $n\text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n) \preceq_\alpha U$ . The tail decay rates of  $n\text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$  and  $N(0, 2)$  are  $O(e^{-xc_m/2})$  for  $c_m \geq 1$  and  $O(e^{-x^2/8})$  respectively, so the latter always decays faster. Therefore  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2) \preceq_\alpha n\text{Dcor}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n) \preceq_\alpha U$ . ■

### A.6 Proof of Theorem 3.7

*Proof.* Because  $U$  dominates  $C$  in upper tail and the actual null converges to  $F_C$ , there exists  $n'$  and  $\alpha'$  such that the test correctly controls the type 1 error level for any  $\alpha \leq \alpha'$  and sample size  $n \geq n'$ . For example, since  $\alpha' = 0.05$  from Theorem 3.4, the test is valid at any type 1 error level no more than 0.05 and moderate sample size.

For consistency: at any  $\alpha < 2\Phi(1) - 1$ ,  $F_U^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$  is a positive and fixed constant. When  $X$  is dependent of  $Y$ ,  $\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$  converges to a non-zero positive constant, such that  $n\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \rightarrow +\infty > F_U^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$  and the test is always correctly rejected asymptotically. Therefore the distance correlation chi-square test is valid and universally consistent. ■

### A.7 Proof of Theorem 3.8

*Proof.* This theorem can be proved via the sample matrix as follows: First, as  $\mathbf{H}$  is the centering matrix, the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}$  always equal the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}$ . Next, observe that  $\det(\mathbf{H}) = 0$  and thus  $\det(\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}) = 0$ , so there exists at least one zero eigenvalue and at most  $n - 1$  non-zero eigenvalues. The geometric multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue equals  $n - \text{rank}(\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H})$ , so the total number of non-zero eigenvalues is  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}) - 1$ . When  $X$  has  $m$  distinct values, the distance matrix only has  $m$  distinct rows and  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}) = m$ . Therefore the centered matrix has  $m - 1$  non-zero eigenvalues. ■

### A.8 Proof of Theorem 3.10

*Proof.* As  $p \rightarrow \infty$  and  $X$  is continuous, the Euclidean distance matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}$  converges to  $a(J - I)$ , so the centered matrix converges to  $a(-I) + aJ/n$ , where  $a$  is a constant depending on the metric choice and marginal distribution  $F_X$ . Using Theorem 3.8,  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{H}/n$  has 1 zero eigenvalue and  $n - 1$  non-zero eigenvalues that are asymptotically the same, so the eigenvalue weights satisfy Theorem 3.4 case (3). Similarly for  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{Y}}\mathbf{H}/n$  when  $q \rightarrow \infty$  and  $Y$  is continuous. Therefore, when either  $p$  or  $q$  increases to infinity and  $n$  also increases to infinity, the limiting null distribution becomes a normal distribution and satisfies  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2) \preceq_{0.0875} U$  following the proof of Theorem 3.4. ■

### A.9 Proof of Theorem 3.12

*Proof.* Given a test  $z$  with a known distribution  $Z$ , it being always valid for testing independence at level  $\alpha$  means

$$U \preceq_\alpha Z$$

because  $U$  is the actual null distribution when testing independence between two binary random variables by Corollary 3.9. Thus,

$$n\text{Dcor}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \preceq_\alpha U \preceq_\alpha Z$$

when testing independence between arbitrary random variables, and

$$\beta_\alpha^z < \beta_\alpha^x \leq \beta_\alpha$$

always holds. Therefore, the chi-square test is the most powerful test among all valid tests of distance correlation with known distribution. ■

**Appendix B. Simulation Details.** Letting  $\epsilon$  be sampled from an independent standard normal distribution, the 1-dimensional sample data in each simulation of Section 4.2 are generated via the following:

- Linear  $(X, Y)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1), \\ Y &= X + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

- Quadratic  $(X, Y)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1), \\ Y &= X^2 + 0.5\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

- Spiral  $(X, Y)$ : let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 5)$ ,  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} X &= Z \cos(\pi Z), \\ Y &= Z \sin(\pi Z) + 0.4\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

- Independent  $(X, Y)$ : let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $Z' \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ ,  $W' \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ , ■

$$\begin{aligned} X &= Z/3 + 2Z' - 1, \\ Y &= W/3 + 2W' - 1. \end{aligned}$$

The increasing-dimensional sample data in Section 4.3 are generated via an equal variance simulation:

$$\begin{aligned} X[d] &\sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1) \text{ for each } d = 1, \dots, p \\ Y &= X[1]; \end{aligned}$$

a minimal variance simulation:

$$\begin{aligned} X[d] &\sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1), \text{ for } d = 1, \dots, 20, \\ X[d] &\sim \frac{1}{p} \cdot \text{Uniform}(-1, 1), \text{ for } d = 21, \dots, p, \\ Y &= X[1]; \end{aligned}$$

a dependent coordinate simulation:

$$\begin{aligned} X[1] &\sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1), \\ X[d] &= 0.5X[d-1] + \text{Uniform}(-0.5, 0.5), \text{ for } d = 2, \dots, p, \\ Y &= \sum_{d=1}^p X^2[d]; \end{aligned}$$

and a varying marginal simulation:

$$\begin{aligned} X[d] &\sim \mathcal{N}(d, d), \text{ for } d = 1, \dots, p, \\ Y &= X[1]. \end{aligned}$$

The sample size were fixed at 20, 100, 50, 100 respectively, while the dimension increases from 100 to 1000 in the first two cases and 2 to 20 in the latter two cases.

**Appendix C. Fast Statistic Computation.** In the special case of  $p = q = 1$  and Euclidean distance, the biased distance covariance can be efficiently computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$  as shown in Huo and Szekely [9] and Chaudhuri and Hu [2]. Because the distance correlation chi-square test requires the unbiased distance correlation, here we show how to compute the unbiased distance correlation in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$  time.

Denote the distances and centered distances as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \|x_i - x_j\|_2, & B_{ij} &= \|y_i - y_j\|_2 \\ A_{i\cdot} &= \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij}, & B_{i\cdot} &= \sum_{j=1}^n B_{ij} \\ A_{\cdot\cdot} &= \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i\cdot}, & B_{\cdot\cdot} &= \sum_{i=1}^n B_{i\cdot}. \end{aligned}$$

and define

$$T_1 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}B_{ij}, \quad T_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i\cdot}B_{i\cdot}, \quad T_3 = A_{\cdot\cdot}B_{\cdot\cdot}.$$

It was shown in Chaudhuri and Hu [2] that  $T_1, T_2, T_3$  can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$  for one-dimensional data using Euclidean metric, so is

$$\text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{T_1}{n^2} - \frac{2T_2}{n^3} + \frac{T_3}{n^4}.$$

The unbiased fast implementation follows as:

**Theorem C.1.** *The unbiased distance covariance can be expressed into*

$$\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{T_1}{n(n-3)} - \frac{2T_2}{n(n-2)(n-3)} + \frac{T_3}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)}.$$

*Therefore, unbiased distance covariance and correlation can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ .*

This makes the distance correlation chi-square test for one-dimensional data comparable to the Pearson correlation t-test. For example, on a standard Windows 10 machine using MATLAB, distance correlation can now test independence between a million pairs of observations ( $p = q = 1$ ) within 10 seconds using minimal space requirement of  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ . Previously, the statistic computation and the permutation test need a space complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  and a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(rn^2)$ , which would have required external disk storage and days of computation to finish testing on the same amount of data.

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{ij} &= \|x_i - x_j\|_2, & B_{ij} &= \|y_i - y_j\|_2 \\
A_{i\cdot} &= \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij}, & B_{\cdot j} &= \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ij} \\
A_{\cdot\cdot} &= \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i\cdot}, & B_{\cdot\cdot} &= \sum_{i=1}^n B_{\cdot i} \\
T_1 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij} B_{ij} \\
T_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i\cdot} B_{\cdot i} \\
T_3 &= A_{\cdot\cdot} B_{\cdot\cdot}
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Chaudhuri and Hu [2], Szekely et al. [28], the biased sample distance covariance can be decomposed into these terms as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Dcov}_n^b(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \frac{A_{i\cdot}}{n})(B_{ij} - \frac{B_{\cdot j}}{n}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij} B_{ij} - \frac{2}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i\cdot} B_{\cdot i} + \frac{1}{n^4} A_{\cdot\cdot} B_{\cdot\cdot} \\
&= \frac{T_1}{n^2} - \frac{2T_2}{n^3} + \frac{T_3}{n^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the unbiased distance covariance can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{1}{n(n-3)} \sum_{i \neq j}^n (A_{ij} - \frac{1}{n-2} A_{i\cdot} - \frac{1}{n-2} A_{\cdot j} + \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} A_{\cdot\cdot}) \\
&\quad \cdot (B_{ij} - \frac{1}{n-2} B_{\cdot i} - \frac{1}{n-2} B_{\cdot j} + \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} B_{\cdot\cdot}) \\
&= \frac{T_1}{n(n-3)} - \frac{2T_2}{n(n-2)(n-3)} + \frac{T_3}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} \\
&\quad - \frac{T_2}{n(n-2)(n-3)} + \frac{(n-1)T_2}{n(n-2)^2(n-3)} + \frac{T_3 - T_2 - T_3}{n(n-2)^2(n-3)} \\
&\quad - \frac{T_2}{n(n-2)(n-3)} + \frac{(n-1)T_2}{n(n-2)^2(n-3)} + \frac{T_3 - T_2 - T_3}{n(n-2)^2(n-3)} \\
&\quad + \frac{T_3}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} - \frac{2T_3}{n(n-2)^2(n-3)} + \frac{T_3}{(n-1)(n-2)^2(n-3)} \\
&= \frac{T_1}{n(n-3)} - \frac{2T_2}{n(n-2)(n-3)} + \frac{T_3}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

To compute the unbiased distance correlation, one needs to compute  $\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ ,  $\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X})$ , and  $\text{Dcov}_n(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y})$ , all of which take  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ . Therefore, the unbiased distance correlation can also be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ . ■