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Abstract

Recently, Chatterjee (2020) introduced a new rank correlation that attracts many statisticians’ attention. This paper compares it to three already well-used rank correlations in literature, Hoeffding’s $D$, Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s $R$, and Bergsma–Dassios–Yanagimoto’s $\tau^*$. Three criteria are considered: (i) computational efficiency, (ii) consistency against fixed alternatives, and (iii) power against local alternatives. Our main results show the unfortunate rate sub-optimality of Chatterjee’s rank correlation against three popular local alternatives in independence testing literature. Along with some recent computational breakthroughs, they favor the other three in many settings.
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1 Introduction

Let $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}$ be two real-valued random variables defined on the same (otherwise unspecified) probability space. This paper is concerned with testing the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : X^{(1)} \text{ and } X^{(2)} \text{ are independent},$$

based on $n$ independent realizations $(X^{(1)}_1, X^{(2)}_1), \ldots, (X^{(1)}_n, X^{(2)}_n)$ of $(X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})$.

Testing $H_0$ is a classical statistical problem, and has generated an enormous literature. This paper is focused on rank correlations that are measures of ordinal association for bivariate population. Rank correlations are particularly attractive in the continuous univariate case as it then facilitates a distribution-free null distribution. Two most famous rank correlations are Spearman’s $\rho$ (Spearman, 1904) and Kendall’s $\tau$ (Kendall, 1938). Others include Spearman’s $\phi$ (Spearman, 1906), Gini’s $\gamma$ (Gini, 1914), and Blomqvist’s $\beta$ (Blomqvist, 1950), among many others.

Unfortunately, all the rank correlations mentioned above fail to facilitate a consistent test of independence, namely, there exist fixed alternatives such that $H_0$ cannot be rejected even with an infinite sample. To fix this, Hoeffding (1948) proposed the first test that is consistent against all dependent alternatives in the class of absolutely continuous bivariate distributions. Blum et al. (1961) developed Hoeffding’s idea and introduced an alternative rank correlation that is consistent

---

*Department of Statistics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA; e-mail: hongshi@uw.edu
†Department of Mathematics, Technical University of Munich, 85748 Garching b. München, Germany; e-mail: mathias.drton@tum.de
‡Department of Statistics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA; e-mail: fanghan@uw.edu
against all dependent bivariate alternatives; see also Hoeffding (1940). Much more recently, Bergsma and Dassios (2014) proposed a test of independence that is consistent in the class of bivariate distributions that are discrete, continuous, or a mixture of both. For this, they made use of a rank-based statistic that coincides with the one raised implicitly by Yanagimoto (1970) given continuity of distribution functions, as pointed out in Drton et al. (2020).

None of the three aforementioned rank correlations, however, has a normal limiting null distribution. Until very recently, it has been conjectured that consistency and normal limiting null distribution cannot coexist. In Chatterjee (2020), Chatterjee disproved it by constructing a new rank correlation coefficient $\xi_n$ that surprisingly achieves both simultaneously.

Since then, Chatterjee’s rank correlation has received much attention. This paper aims to compare Chatterjee’s rank correlation to its three obvious competitors, Hoeffding’s $D$, Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s $R$, and Bergsma–Dassios–Yanagimoto’s $\tau^*$, by adopting the following three criteria.

(i) **Computational efficiency.** Large-scale datasets and online computation favor fast, ideally of near-linear time complexity, algorithms. Accordingly, in this paper, we put preference on those rank correlation coefficients that can be computed in nearly linear, i.e., $O\{n(\log n)^{O(1)}\}$, time.

(ii) **Consistency.** Following the terminology in Weihs et al. (2018b), a correlation measure $\mu$ is consistent in a family of distributions $F$ if, within $F$, $\mu(X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}) = 0$ if and only if $X^{(1)}$ is independent of $X^{(2)}$. Consistent correlation measures (within a large nonparametric family) are able to detect non-linear, non-monotone relationship, and facilitate consistent tests of independence.

(iii) **Statistical efficiency.** For independence tests, while the most natural family of alternatives is lacking in the literature (Nikitin, 1995, Section 5.4), the local alternatives of Konijn (1956) and Farlie (1960, 1961), the latter of which was further developed in Dhar et al. (2016), are frequently used. In the following, we will call an independence test rate-optimal (or rate-suboptimal) against a family of local alternatives if within this family the test achieves the detection boundary up to constants in the minimax sense (or not).

From a theoretical standpoint, our main contribution lies in the third point. The original analysis of Chatterjee’s rank correlation uses the permutation theory and, in particular, is not based on the classical empirical process and U-statistic frameworks. This makes any subsequent local power analysis extremely difficult, as also observed in a parallel study of center-outward rank and sign–based tests performed in Shi et al. (2020a) and Shi et al. (2020b) (see, also, Deb and Sen (2019)). For this, we contribute a new proof of Theorem 2.1 of Chatterjee (2020) via a development of Hájek’s representation as done by Angus (1995). Integrating this new insight into Le Cam’s third lemma, we are then able to show the rate sub-optimality of the test based on Chatterjee’s $\xi$ against three considered local alternatives (Konijn, 1956; Farlie, 1960, 1961; Dhar et al., 2016). Coupled with the corresponding rate-optimality of the other three consistent independence tests, our theoretical analysis hence echos Chatterjee’s empirical observation, that is, his test suffers from low power sometimes.

To complete the story, this paper develops further a complementary comparison, illustrating advantages and disadvantages between the four rank correlations (Chatterjee’s $\xi$, Hoeffding’s $D$, Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s $R$, and Bergsma–Dassios–Yanagimoto’s $\tau^*$), regarding both continuous and discontinuous cases. In the continuous case, it is claimed that all the four correlations perform equally well regarding computational efficiency and consistency, except for Hoeffding’s $D$, which requires joint absolute continuity to achieve consistency. On the other hand, when ties exist with a
nonvanishing probability, Chatterjee’s ξ has its own advantages in terms of computational efficiency and consistency.

2 Rank correlations

In the sequel, Greek and Latin letters are used to represent population quantities (correlation measures), and we use the corresponding ones with a subscript n to represent the sample analogues (correlation coefficients). Throughout the paper, let \((X_1^{(1)}, X_1^{(2)}), \ldots, (X_n^{(1)}, X_n^{(2)})\) be n independent realizations of \((X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})\) with joint distribution function \(F\) and marginal distribution functions \(F_1, F_2\) separately.

Definition 2.1 (Chatterjee’s ξ). Recently, Chatterjee (2020) proposed the following correlation coefficient between \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\):

\[
\xi_n \equiv 1 - \frac{n \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |r_{i+1} - r_i|}{2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell_i (n - \ell_i)}.
\]

Here \((X_{[1]}, X_{[1]}), \ldots, (X_{[n]}, X_{[n]})\) is a rearrangement of the data such that \(X_{[1]}^{(1)} \leq \cdots \leq X_{[n]}^{(1)}\), with ties, if exist, broken at random, \(r_i \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(X_{[j]}^{(2)} \leq X_{[i]}^{(2)})\) is the rank of \(X_{[i]}^{(2)}\) among \(X_{[1]}^{(2)}, \ldots, X_{[n]}^{(2)}\), with \(I(\cdot)\) representing the indicator function, and \(\ell_i \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(X_{[j]}^{(2)} \geq X_{[i]}^{(2)})\). If \(F_2\) is continuous, then there are almost surely no ties among \(X_1^{(2)}, \ldots, X_n^{(2)}\), and thus the definition of \(\xi_n\) reduces to

\[
\xi_n \equiv 1 - \frac{3 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |r_{i+1} - r_i|}{n^2 - 1}.
\]

The population analogue of Chatterjee’s ξ is defined as

\[
\xi \equiv \frac{\int \text{var}[E(I(X^{(2)} \geq x) | X^{(1)})]dF_2(x)}{\int \text{var}(I(X^{(2)} \geq x))dF_2(x)}.
\]

Definition 2.2 (Hoeffding’s \(D\)). Hoeffding’s (Hoeffding, 1948) correlation coefficient \(D_n\) is

\[
D_n \equiv \frac{1}{n(n-1) \cdots (n-4)} \sum_{i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_5} 1 \left[ \left\{ I(X_{i_1}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(1)}) - I(X_{i_2}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(1)}) \right\} - \left\{ I(X_{i_1}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(2)}) - I(X_{i_2}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(2)}) \right\} \right],
\]

which is a rank-based U-statistic of order 5. The Hoeffding’s correlation measure \(D\) of \(X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})\) is defined as

\[
D \equiv \left\{ \int \left[ F(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) - F_1(x^{(1)}) F_2(x^{(2)}) \right]^2 dF(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \right\}^{1/2}.
\]

Definition 2.3 (Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s \(R\)). Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s (Blum et al., 1961) cor-
relation coefficient $R_n$ is

$$R_n \equiv \frac{1}{n(n-1)\ldots(n-5)} \sum_{i_1 \neq \ldots \neq i_6} \frac{1}{4} \left[ \left\{ I\left(X_{i_1}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(1)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_2}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(1)}\right) \right\} \left\{ I\left(X_{i_3}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_4}^{(1)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_4}^{(1)} \leq X_{i_5}^{(1)}\right) \right\} 
+ \left\{ I\left(X_{i_1}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_6}^{(2)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_2}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_6}^{(2)}\right) \right\} \left\{ I\left(X_{i_3}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_4}^{(2)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_4}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_6}^{(2)}\right) \right\} \right],$$

which is a rank-based U-statistic of order 6. The Blum–Kiefer–Rosenblatt’s correlation measure $R$ is defined as

$$R \equiv \int \left\{ F\left(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}\right) - F_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) F_2\left(x^{(2)}\right) \right\}^2 dF_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) dF_2\left(x^{(2)}\right).$$

**Definition 2.4** (Bergsma–Dassios–Yanagimoto’s $\tau^*$). Bergsma and Dassios (2014) introduced the following rank correlation coefficient $\tau_n^*$ as a U-statistic of order 4:

$$\tau_n^* \equiv \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} \sum_{i_1 \neq \ldots \neq i_4} \left\{ I\left(X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)} < X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)}\right) + I\left(X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)} < X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)}\right) 
- I\left(X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)} < X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)} < X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)}\right) \right\} 
\left\{ I\left(X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_2}^{(2)} < X_{i_3}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)}\right) + I\left(X_{i_3}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)} < X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_2}^{(2)}\right) 
- I\left(X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_2}^{(2)} < X_{i_3}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)}\right) - I\left(X_{i_3}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)} < X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_2}^{(2)}\right) \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, $I(x_1, x_2 < x_3, x_4) \equiv I(\max\{x_1, x_2\} < \min\{x_3, x_4\})$. The corresponding correlation measure $\tau^*$ is defined as

$$\tau^* \equiv 4pr\left(X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)} < X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)}\right) + 4pr\left(X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_2}^{(2)} < X_{i_3}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)}\right) 
- 8pr\left(X_{i_1}^{(1)} X_{i_3}^{(1)} < X_{i_2}^{(1)} X_{i_4}^{(1)}\right) X_{i_1}^{(2)} X_{i_4}^{(2)} \leq X_{i_2}^{(2)} X_{i_3}^{(2)}\right),$$

which coincides with $12D + 24R$ given continuity (not necessarily absolute continuity) of $F$, via page 62 of Yanagimoto (1970), as conveyed in Drton et al. (2020).

**Remark 2.1** (A relation between $D_n$, $R_n$, and $\tau_n^*$). As long as $n \geq 6$ and there is no tie in the data, we have $12D_n + 24R_n = \tau_n^*$ (Drton et al., 2020, Equation (6.1)), and thus $12D + 24R = \tau^*$ given continuity of $F$.

### 2.1 Rank correlations without ties

In this section, the joint distribution function $F$ is assumed to be continuous, though not necessarily jointly absolutely continuous. Accordingly, both $X_1^{(1)}, \ldots, X_n^{(1)}$ and $X_1^{(2)}, \ldots, X_n^{(2)}$ are free of ties with probability one.

We first summarize the properties of the correlation measures and coefficients, starting from Property (i), computational efficiency. Noting the assumption of no ties, the following proposition gives existence of algorithms to compute all four rank correlation coefficients in nearly linear time.
Proposition 2.1. Assuming $F$ to be continuous, one can compute

(i) $\xi_n$ in $O(n \log n)$ time (Chatterjee, 2020, page 2, Remark 4);
(ii) $D_n$ in $O(n \log n)$ time (Hoeffding, 1948, Section 5, Weih et al., 2018b, page 557);
(iii) $R_n$ in $O(n \log n)$ time (Drton et al., 2020, Equation (6.1), Weih et al., 2018b, page 557, Even-Zohar and Leng, 2019, Corollary 4, see also Remark 2.1);
(iv) $\tau^*_n$ in $O(n \log n)$ time (Even-Zohar and Leng, 2019, Corollary 4).

The second proposition shows the strong consistency of correlation coefficients $\xi_n, D_n, R_n$, and $\tau^*_n$ to the corresponding correlation measures.

Proposition 2.2 (Strong consistency). Assume $F$ to be continuous. As $n \to \infty$, $\mu_n$ converges almost surely to $\mu$ for $\mu \in \{\xi, D, R, \tau^*\}$ (Theorem 1.1 in Chatterjee, 2020, Proposition 1 in Weih et al., 2018b, Theorem 5.4.A in Serfling, 1980). It also holds that $E\mu_n = \mu$ for $\mu \in \{D, R, \tau^*\}$ and $n \geq 6$ (Proposition 1 in Weih et al., 2018b, Section 5.1.1 in Serfling, 1980).

The third proposition shows the consistency of correlation measures $\xi, D, R,$ and $\tau^*$ in view of the discussions in Property (ii). To clearly state this result, let us first define the following bivariate distribution families:

$$\mathcal{F}^c \equiv \{F : F \text{ is continuous (as a bivariate function)}\},$$
$$\mathcal{F}^D \equiv \{F : F \text{ is absolutely continuous (with regard to the Lebesgue measure)}\}.$$

Recall that $F$ is the joint distribution function of $X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})$, and see Proposition 2.8 ahead for further results as the continuity requirement is dropped.

Proposition 2.3 (Consistency of correlation measures). The following are true:

(i) for $F \in \mathcal{F}^c$, $\xi \geq 0$ with equality if and only if the pair is independent (Theorem 1.1 in Chatterjee, 2020);
(ii) for $F \in \mathcal{F}^c$, $D \geq 0$; for $F \in \mathcal{F}^D$, $D = 0$ if and only if the pair is independent (Theorem 3.1 in Hoeffding, 1948, Proposition 3 in Yanagimoto, 1970);
(iii) for $F \in \mathcal{F}^c$, $R \geq 0$ with equality if and only if the pair is independent (page 490 of Blum et al., 1961);
(iv) for $F \in \mathcal{F}^c$, $\tau^* \geq 0$ where equality holds if and only if the variables are independent (Theorem 1 in Bergsma and Dassios (2014), Theorem 6.1 in Drton et al., 2020).

Some elementary asymptotic results for the four correlation coefficients under $H_0$ are in line.

Proposition 2.4 (Theorem 2.1 in Chatterjee, 2020, Proposition 7 in Weih et al., 2018b, Proposition 3.1 in Drton et al., 2020). Assuming $F$ to be continuous and supposing that $X^{(1)}$ and $X^{(2)}$ are independent, then $n^{1/2} \xi_n \to \mathcal{N}(0, 2/5)$ in distribution, and for $\mu \in \{D, R, \tau^*\}$,

$$n\mu_n \to \sum_{v_1, v_2=1}^{\infty} \chi^\mu_{v_1, v_2} \left(\xi^{2}_{v_1, v_2} - 1\right) \text{ in distribution},$$

where

$$\chi^\mu_{v_1, v_2} = \begin{cases} 1/(\pi^4 v_1^2 v_2^2) & \text{when } \mu = D, R, \\ 36/(\pi^4 v_1^2 v_2^2) & \text{when } \mu = \tau^*, \end{cases}$$
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for \( v_1, v_2 = 1, 2, \ldots \), and \( \{\xi_{v_1,v_2}\} \) as independent standard normal random variables.

Given any pre-specified significance level \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), the test based on Chatterjee’s \( \xi_n \) is hence

\[
T_\alpha^\xi \equiv I\left\{ n^{1/2} \xi_n > (2/5)^{1/2} \cdot z_{1-\alpha} \right\},
\]

where \( z_{1-\alpha} \) is the \( (1-\alpha) \)-quantile of the standard normal distribution, and the test based on \( \mu_n \) with \( \mu \in \{D, R, \tau^*\} \) is

\[
T_\alpha^\mu \equiv I\left\{ n \mu_n > q_{1-\alpha}^\mu \right\}, \quad q_{1-\alpha}^\mu \equiv \inf\left\{ x : \Pr\left[ \sum_{v_1,v_2=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{v_1,v_2}^\mu \left( \xi_{v_1,v_2}^2 - 1 \right) \leq x \right] \geq 1 - \alpha \},
\]

where \( \lambda_{v_1,v_2}^\mu \) and \( \xi_{v_1,v_2} \), \( v_1, v_2 = 1, \ldots, n, \ldots \) are presented in Proposition 2.4.

A direct corollary of Propositions 2.2–2.4 regarding the uniform validity and consistency of tests \( T_\alpha^\xi, T_\alpha^D, T_\alpha^R \), and \( T_\alpha^{\tau^*} \) is summarized below.

**Proposition 2.5** (Uniform validity and consistency of tests). **Supposing** \( F \in F^c \), for \( \mu \in \{\xi, D, R, \tau^*\} \), we have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \Pr(T_\alpha^\mu = 1 \mid H_0) = \alpha.
\]

Moreover, it holds by distribution-freeness that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{F \in F^c} \Pr(T_\alpha^\mu = 1 \mid H_0) = \alpha.
\]

In addition, for any fixed \( F \in F^c \) that is not the product of \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) and any \( \mu \in \{\xi, R, \tau^*\} \),

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \Pr(T_\alpha^\mu = 1 \mid H_1) = 1.
\]

The same conclusion holds for \( \mu = D \) if assuming further that \( F \in F^D \).

### 2.2 Rank correlations with possible ties

In this section, we drop the continuity assumption of \( F \) made in Section 2.1 and allow for ties to exist with a nonzero probability.

The following proposition shows that, at the presence of ties, while \( \xi_n \) and \( D_n \) can still be computed in near-linear time, more time is needed for computing \( R_n \) and \( \tau_n^* \).

**Proposition 2.6.** When ties occur with nonzero probability, one can compute

(i) \( \xi_n \) in \( O(n \log n) \) time (breaking ties randomly) (Chatterjee, 2020, page 2, Remark 4).

If one ignores the presence of ties, and still uses (2.1), (2.2), (2.3) to evaluate \( D_n, R_n \) and \( \tau_n^* \), respectively, then one can compute

(ii) \( D_n \) in \( O(n \log n) \) time (Hoeffding, 1948, Section 5, Weihs et al., 2018a, Sec. S4.1);

(iii) \( R_n \) in \( O(n^2) \) time (Weihs et al., 2018a, Sec. S4.2);

(iv) \( \tau_n^* \) in \( O(n^2 \log n) \) time with little memory use (Weihs et al., 2016, Sec. 3), or \( O(n^2) \) time with more memory use (Heller and Heller, 2016, Sec. 2.2).

The next proposition shows that the correlation coefficients \( \xi_n, D_n, R_n \) and \( \tau_n^* \) are still strongly consistent regardless of the continuity of the distribution.
Proposition 2.7. Proposition 2.2(i) still holds if \(X^{(2)}\) is not almost surely a constant (Theorem 1.1 in Chatterjee, 2020). Proposition 2.2(ii)–(iv) still hold for all bivariate distributions (Proposition 1 in Weihs et al., 2018b and Theorem 5.4.A in Serfling, 1980) and no continuity assumption is required at all.

We then move on to evaluate consistency property (ii) with continuity requirement dropped. Define the following bivariate distribution families to be

\[ \mathcal{F} ≡ \{ F : F \text{ is a bivariate distribution function} \}, \]
\[ \mathcal{F}^* ≡ \{ F : F_k(x) \neq I(x \geq x_0) \text{ for any real number } x_0 \text{ for } k = 1, 2 \}, \]
\[ \mathcal{F}^{\tau*} ≡ \{ F : F \text{ is discrete, continuous, or a mixture of discrete and jointly absolutely continuous distribution functions} \}. \]

Proposition 2.8. We have

(i) Proposition 2.3(i) still holds for \(F\) replaced by \(F^*\) (Theorem 1.1 in Chatterjee, 2020);
(ii) Proposition 2.3(ii)–(iii) still hold for \(F\) replaced by \(F\) (Theorem 3.1 in Hoeffding, 1948, Proposition 3 in Yanagimoto, 1970, page 490 of Blum et al., 1961);
(iii) Proposition 2.3(iv) still holds for \(F\) replaced by \(F^{\tau*}\) (Theorem 1 in Bergsma and Dassios (2014), Theorem 6.1 in Drton et al., 2020).

Lastly, regarding Proposition 2.4, as continuity requirement is dropped, although the central and non-central limit theorems therein still hold, the variance and the weights in the limiting null distributions now have more complicated forms, and in particular, this time they may depend on the marginal distributions.

Proposition 2.9 (Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 in Chatterjee, 2020). Suppose that \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\) are independent, and \(X^{(2)}\) is not almost surely a constant. Then \(n^{1/2}\xi_n \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2)\) in distribution, where

\[ \sigma^2 = \frac{E[F_{2}^{\min}(X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(2)}))^2] - 2E(F_{2}^{\min}(X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(2)})(F_{2}^{\min}(X_1^{(2)}, X_3^{(2)})) + [E(F_{2}^{\min}(X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(2)}))]^2}{(E[F_{2}^{-}(X^{(2)})(1 - F_{2}^{-}(X^{(2)}))])^2}, \]

and \(F_{2}^{\min}(x_1, x_2) = \min\{F_2(x_1), F_2(x_2)\}\), \(F_{2}^{-}(x) = \text{pr}(X^{(2)} < x)\). Here \(\sigma^2\) is strictly positive, and equals to 2/5 if \(X^{(2)}\) is continuous, though not necessarily absolutely continuous.

Proposition 2.10 (Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.1 in Nandy et al., 2016, Theorem 5.5.2 in Serfling, 1980). Suppose that \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\) are independent, and \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\) are not necessarily continuous (in terms of marginal distribution functions) with \(F \in \mathcal{F}^*\). When \(\mu \in \{D, R, \tau^*\}\), we have

\[ n\mu_n \rightarrow \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{\mu}_v (\xi_v^2 - 1) \text{ in distribution,} \]

where \(\lambda^{\mu}_v\) depends on \(\mu\) as well as the marginal distributions of \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\) if at least one of which is discontinuous, and \(\xi_v, v = 1, \ldots, n, \ldots\) are independent standard Gaussian random variables.
3 Local power analysis

This section investigates the local powers of the four rank correlation-based tests of \( H_0 \). To this end, we consider three classical bivariate families of alternatives to the independence hypothesis: Konijn alternatives (Konijn, 1956), Goodness-of-fit alternatives (Dhar et al., 2016), and Farlie alternatives (Farlie, 1960, 1961). Other families of bivariate alternatives can be found in Kössler and Rödel (2007); conclusions for them are identical to the considered three and proofs are similar.

We first introduce the following three families of local alternatives.

(A) Konijn alternatives. Let \( Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)} \) be two mean zero independent Lebesgue-absolutely continuous real-valued random variables with density functions \( f_{Y^{(1)}} \) and \( f_{Y^{(2)}} \), respectively. Consider

\[
X = \begin{pmatrix} X^{(1)} \\ X^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Delta \\ \Delta & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y^{(1)} \\ Y^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = A \Delta \begin{pmatrix} Y^{(1)} \\ Y^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = A \Delta Y,
\]

where \( \Delta \) is real. Here \( A \Delta \) is clearly full rank and invertible for all \( \Delta \in \Theta \equiv (-\Delta^*, \Delta^*) \) with some (sufficiently small) constant \( \Delta^* > 0 \). Let \( f_X(x; \Delta) \) denote the density of \( X \) with \( \Delta \).

We make the following assumptions on \( Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)} \).

**Assumption 3.1.** It is assumed that

(i) the distributions of \( X \) have a common support for all \( \Delta \in \Theta \), so that without loss of generality \( X = \{ x : f_X(x; \Delta) > 0 \} \) is independent of \( \Delta \);

(ii) \( f_{Y^{(k)}} \) is absolutely continuous with \( E\{f'_{Y^{(k)}}(Y^{(k)})/f_{Y^{(k)}}(Y^{(k)})\} = 0 \) for \( k = 1, 2 \);

(iii) \( 0 < I_X(0) < \infty \), where \( I_X(0) \) is the Fisher information of \( X \) relative to \( \Delta \) at the point 0.

**Example 3.1.**

(a) Let \( f_{Y^{(k)}}(y) > 0, k = 1, 2 \) for all real \( y \). If the following moment condition

\[
E\left( Y^{(k)} \right) = 0, \quad E\left( \left( Y^{(k)} \right)^2 \right) < \infty, \quad E\left[ \left( \rho_{Y^{(k)}}(Y^{(k)}) \right)^2 \right] < \infty, \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, 2,
\]

is satisfied, where \( \rho_{Y^{(k)}}(z) \equiv f'_{Y^{(k)}}(z)/f_{Y^{(k)}}(z) \), then Assumption 3.1 holds.

(b) In particular, if \( Y^{(1)} \) and \( Y^{(2)} \) are centered normal or follow centered \( t \)-distributions with degrees of freedom (not necessarily integer-valued) greater than two, then Assumption 3.1 holds.

(B) Goodness-of-fit alternatives. Consider the following alternative family used in Dhar et al. (2016, Sec. 3). Let \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \), the marginal distribution functions of \( X^{(1)} \) and \( X^{(2)} \), be Lebesgue-absolutely continuous with density functions \( f_1, f_2 \), respectively, let \( F_0 = F_1 F_2 \), let \( G \equiv G_{X^{(1)},X^{(2)}} \neq F_0 \) be a fixed joint distribution function, and let \( f_0 \) and \( g \) denote density functions of \( F_0 \) and \( G \), respectively. Consider the following alternative model of \( X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}) \):

\[
F_X \equiv (1 - \Delta) F_0 + \Delta G,
\]

where \( 0 \leq \Delta \leq 1 \).

We make the following assumptions on \( F_0 \) and \( G \).

**Assumption 3.2.** It is assumed that...
(i) \( G \) is absolutely continuous with respect to \( F_0 \);
(ii) \( g(x)/f_0(x) \) is not an additive function of \( x^{(1)} \) and \( x^{(2)} \), i.e., there do not exist functions \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) such that \( g(x)/f_0(x) = h_1(x^{(1)}) + h_2(x^{(2)}) \) and \( h_k \) does not depend on \( x^{(3-k)} \) for \( k = 1, 2 \);
(iii) \( 0 < \mathcal{I}_X(0) < \infty \).

**Example 3.2.** (Example 3 in Dhar et al., 2016, Sec. 3) Let \( F_0 \) and \( G \) be the distribution functions of two bivariate normal distributions with mean 0 and \( \mu \) respectively, i.e., \( f_0(x) = (2\pi)^{-1} \exp[-\{(x^{(1)})^2 + (x^{(2)})^2\}/2] \) and \( g(x) = (2\pi)^{-1} \exp[-\{(x^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})^2 + (x^{(2)} - \mu^{(2)})^2\}/2] \). Then, as long as \( \mu \) is finite and nonzero, Assumption 3.2 holds.

More examples can be found in Dhar et al. (2016, Sec. 3); see also Example 3.3 ahead.

(C) **Farlie alternatives.** Consider Farlie alternatives used in Farlie (1960, 1961). Let \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) be Lebesgue-absolutely continuous with density functions \( f_1, f_2 \), respectively, and let \( \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \) be real bounded differentiable functions satisfy conditions to be laid out soon. Consider the following alternative model of \( X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}) \):

\[
F\left(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}\right) = F_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) F_2\left(x^{(2)}\right) \left\{1 + \Delta \Omega_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) \Omega_2\left(x^{(2)}\right)\right\},
\]

where \( \Delta \) is small enough such that \( F \) is a bonafide joint distribution function.

Notice that Farlie alternatives can be identified as special cases of Goodness-of-fit alternatives by letting \( G(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) = F_1(x^{(1)}) F_2(x^{(2)}) \{1 + \Delta^* \Omega_1(x^{(1)}) \Omega_2(x^{(2)})\} \), where \( \Delta^* \) is the largest constant such that \( G \) is a bonafide joint distribution function.

We make further assumptions on the generating scheme.

**Assumption 3.3.** It is assumed that

(i) \( \lim_{z \to \infty} \Omega_1(z) = \lim_{z \to \infty} \Omega_2(z) = 0 \);
(ii) \( F_k \Omega_k \neq 0 \) and \( \Psi_k \equiv \frac{d(F_k \Omega_k)}{dF_k} \) is bounded with \( E\{\Psi_k(X^{(k)})\} = 0 \) for \( k = 1, 2 \).

**Example 3.3.**

(a) (Farlie–Gumbel–Morgenstern family) Let \( \Omega_k(x) = 1 - F_k(x) \), then Assumption 3.3 holds for all absolutely continuous \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) (Farlie, 1960; Gumbel, 1958; Morgenstern, 1956).

(b) Let \( \Omega_k(z) = f_k(z)/F_k(z) \). If \( f_k \) is absolutely continuous and \( \rho_k(z) \equiv f'_k(z)/f_k(z) \) is bounded, then Assumption 3.3 holds.

(c) In particular, if \( \Omega_k(z) = f_k(z)/F_k(z) \) and \( X^{(k)} \) is a \( t \)-distributed with strictly positive degrees of freedom, a Laplace distribution, or a logistic distribution, then Assumption 3.3 holds.

For a local power analysis, concerning any one of the three considered alternative families, we consider the corresponding sequence of alternatives as \( H_1 : \Delta = \Delta_n \), where \( \Delta_n \equiv n^{-1/2} \Delta_0 \) with constant \( \Delta_0 \neq 0 \). Testing the null hypothesis then reduces to testing

\[ H_0 : \Delta_0 = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \Delta_0 \neq 0. \]

We obtain the following results on the powers of the discussed tests.
Theorem 3.1 (Power analysis). Concerning any one of the three local alternative families, as long as the corresponding assumption (Assumption 3.1, 3.2, or 3.3) holds, we have, for any fixed constant $C_0 > 0$,

$$
\inf_{|\Delta_0| \geq C_0} \text{pr}(T^k_\alpha = 1) = \alpha + o(1),
$$

(3.2)

where the infimum is taken over all distributions $X$ with $\Delta_n$ such that $|\Delta_0| \geq C_0$. In comparison, for any number $\beta > 0$, there exists some sufficiently large constant $C_\beta > 0$ only depending on $\beta$ such that for all $n$ large enough,

$$
\inf_{|\Delta_0| \geq C_\beta} \text{pr}(T^\mu_\alpha = 1) \geq 1 - \beta,
$$

(3.3)

where $\mu \in \{D, R, \tau^*\}$, and the infimum is taken over all distributions $X$ with $\Delta_n$ such that $|\Delta_0| \geq C_\beta$.

Combined with the following result, Theorems 3.1 yields rate sub-optimality of the test based on Chatterjee’s $\xi_n$ and rate optimality of the three competing tests, respectively, against the considered local alternatives.

Theorem 3.2 (Rate-optimality). Concerning any one of the three local alternative families, as long as the corresponding assumption (Assumption 3.1, 3.2, or 3.3) holds, we have, for any number $\beta > 0$ satisfying $\alpha + \beta < 1$, there exists an absolute constant $c_\beta > 0$ depending on $\beta$ such that for all sufficiently large $n$, it holds that

$$
\inf_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_n} \sup_{|\Delta_0| \geq c_\beta} \text{pr}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha = 0) \geq 1 - \alpha - \beta.
$$

Here the infimum is taken over all size-$\alpha$ tests, and the supremum is taken over all distributions $X$ with $\Delta_n$ such that $|\Delta_0| \geq c_\beta$.

4 Proof

4.1 Proof of Example 3.1

Proof of Example 3.1. Denote

$$
L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)} \text{ and } L'(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta),
$$

then we can write $\mathcal{I}_X(0) = E[\{L'(Y; 0)\}^2]$. Notice $Y$ is distributed as $X$ with $\Delta = 0$. Since $Y = A_\Delta^{-1}X$ is an invertible linear transformation, the density of $X$ can be expressed as

$$
f_X(x; \Delta) = |\text{det}(A_\Delta)|^{-1} f_Y(A_\Delta^{-1}x),
$$

where $f_Y(y) = f_Y(y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}) = f_{Y^{(1)}}(y^{(1)}) f_{Y^{(2)}}(y^{(2)})$. Direct computation yields

$$
L(x; \Delta) = |\text{det}(A_\Delta)|^{-1} f_Y(A_\Delta^{-1}x)/f_Y(x),
$$

$$
L'(x; 0) = -x^{(1)} \left\{ f'_{Y^{(2)}}(x^{(2)})/f_{Y^{(2)}}(x^{(2)}) \right\} - x^{(2)} \left\{ f'_{Y^{(1)}}(x^{(1)})/f_{Y^{(1)}}(x^{(1)}) \right\}.
$$

(4.1)

(a) Assumption 3.1(i) is obvious. Assumption 3.1(iii) holds in view of (4.1). Assumption 3.1(ii) is implied by Assumption 3.1(iii) using Lemma A.1 in Johnson and Barron (2004) and Lemma I.2.4.a in Hájek and Šidák (1967).
(b) Without loss of generality, we can assume $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ are standard normal or standard $t$-distributed. For the standard normal, we have $\rho_{Y(k)}(z) = -t$ and thus (3.1) is satisfied. For the standard $t$-distribution with $\nu_k$ degrees of freedom, we have $\rho_{Y(k)}(z) = -z(1 + 1/\nu_k)/(1 + z^2/\nu_k)$. It is easy to check (3.1) is satisfied when $\nu_k > 2$.

The proof is thus completed.  

\[ \square \]

4.2 Proof of Example 3.2

Proof of Example 3.2. Denote
\[ L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)} \quad \text{and} \quad L'(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta), \]
then we can write $\mathcal{I}_X(0) = E[\{L'(Y; 0)\}^2]$, where $Y$ is distributed as $X$ with $\Delta = 0$. Direct computation yields
\[ L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{(1 - \Delta)f_0(x) + \Delta g(x)}{f_0(x)}, \quad L'(x; 0) = \frac{g(x) - f_0(x)}{f_0(x)}, \]
and thus
\[ \mathcal{I}_X(0) = E[\{L'(Y; 0)\}^2] = E[\{(g(Y)/f_0(Y) - 1)^2\} = \chi^2(G, F_0) = \int (dG/dF_0 - 1)^2 dF_0. \]
In Example 3.2,
\[ g(x)/f_0(x) - 1 = \exp \left[ \mu_1 x_1 + \mu_2 x_2 - \left\{ \left( \mu_1 \right)^2 + \left( \mu_2 \right)^2 \right\}/2 \right] - 1, \]
and thus $\mathcal{I}_X(0) = \exp\{(\mu_1)^2 + (\mu_2)^2\} - 1$. It is clear that Assumption 3.2 holds.  

\[ \square \]

4.3 Proof of Example 3.3

Proof of Example 3.3. Denote
\[ L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)} \quad \text{and} \quad L'(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta), \]
then we can write $\mathcal{I}_X(0) = E[\{L'(Y; 0)\}^2]$, where $Y$ is distributed as $X$ with $\Delta = 0$. Direct computation yields
\[ L(x; \Delta) \equiv 1 + \Delta \Psi_1(x_1) \Psi_2(x_2), \quad L'(x; 0) = \Psi_1(x_1) \Psi_2(x_2), \]
Then as long as Assumption 3.3(ii) holds, we have $0 < \mathcal{I}_X(0) < \infty$.

(a) Assumption 3.3(i) is obvious. Assumption 3.3(ii) holds since $\Psi_k = 1 - F_k$ is bounded and $E\{\Psi_k(X(k))\} = E\{1 - F_k(X(k))\} = 0$.
(b) Using Lemma A.1 in Johnson and Barron (2004) and Lemma I.2.4.a in Hájek and Šidák (1967) yields $\lim_{x \to \infty} f_k(x) = 0$ and $E\{\rho_k(X(k))\} = 0$. It is clear that Assumption 3.3 holds.
(c) Without loss of generality, we can assume $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ are centered and standard. For the standard $t$-distribution with $\nu_k$ degrees of freedom, we have
\[ |\rho_k(z)| = \frac{|z|(1 + 1/\nu_k)}{1 + z^2/\nu_k} \leq \frac{1 + 1/\nu_k}{2(1/\nu_k)^{1/2}}. \]
For the standard Laplace distribution, we have $\rho_k(z) = -\text{sign}(z)$, which is bounded by 1. For the standard logistic distribution, we have

$$-1 \leq \rho_k(z) = \frac{1 - e^{-z}}{1 + e^{-z}} \leq 1.$$ 

The proof is completed. \hfill \Box

## 4.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

### 4.4.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1, Claim (3.2)

**Proof of Theorem 3.1, Claim (3.2).** (A) Konijn alternatives. Let $Y_i = (Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ be independent copies of $Y$. Denote

$$L(x; \Delta) = \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)}, \quad L'(x; \Delta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta),$$

and define $\Lambda_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log L(Y_i; \Delta_n)$ and $T_n = \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{n} L'(Y_i; 0)$.

We wish to derive the limiting null distribution of $(-n^{1/2} \xi_n/3, \Lambda_n)$. Under the null hypothesis, it holds that $Y^{(2)}_1, \ldots, Y^{(2)}_n$ are still independent and identically distributed, where $[i]$ is such that $Y^{(1)}_1 < \cdots < Y^{(1)}_n$. We hence assume hereafter, without loss of generality, that $Y^{(1)}_1 < \cdots < Y^{(1)}_n$.

Angus (1995, Equation (9)) shows that under the null,

$$-n^{1/2} \xi_n/3 \rightarrow n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Xi_i \quad \text{in probability},$$

where

$$\Xi_i = \left| F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i) \right| + 2F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i) \left\{ 1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\} - \frac{2}{3},$$

and $F_{Y^{(2)}}$ is the cumulative distribution function for $Y^{(2)}$.

To find the limiting null distribution of $(n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Xi_i, \Lambda_n)$, using the idea from Hájek and Šidák (1967, p. 210–214), we first find the limiting null distribution of

$$(n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Xi_i, T_n) = \left( n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Xi_i, n^{1/2} \Delta_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n} L'(Y_i; 0) \right).$$

We claim that

$$\text{cov}\left\{ n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Xi_i, n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\} = 0,$$

for any measurable function $h$ satisfying $E[|h(Y^{(2)})|] < \infty$. By taking conditional expectation,

$$\text{cov}\left\{ F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i), h(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \text{cov}\left\{ F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i)^2 + \left\{ 1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\}^2, h(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) \right\},$$

$$\text{cov}\left\{ F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i), h(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \text{cov}\left\{ F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i)^2 + \left\{ 1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\}^2, h(Y^{(2)}_i) \right\},$$

$$\text{cov}\left\{ F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_{i+1}) - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)}_i), h(Y^{(2)}_j) \right\} = 0,$$

for all $j \neq i$ or $i + 1$. 
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Then
\[
\text{cov}\left\{n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i, n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(Y_i^{(2)})\right\}
\]
\[
= n^{-1} \left(2(n-1) \times \frac{1}{2} \text{cov}\left[\left\{F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}^2 + \left\{1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}^2, h(Y^{(2)})\right]\right)
+ (n-1) \times \text{cov}\left[2F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\left\{1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}, h(Y^{(2)})\right]
\]
\[
= \frac{n-1}{n} \text{cov}\left[\left\{F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}^2 + \left\{1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}^2 + 2F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\left\{1 - F_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right\}, h(Y^{(2)})\right]
\]
\[
= \frac{n-1}{n} \text{cov}\left\{1, h(Y^{(2)})\right\} = 0.
\]
Furthermore, recall that
\[
T_n = \Delta_n \left[-Y^{(1)} \left(f'_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})/f_{Y^{(2)}}(Y^{(2)})\right) - Y^{(2)} \left(f'_{Y^{(1)}}(Y^{(1)})/f_{Y^{(1)}}(Y^{(1)})\right)\right].
\]
We thus have, under the null,
\[
\text{cov}\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i, T_n\right) = 0.
\]
Applying central limit theorem for 1-dependent random variables (see, e.g., Corollary in Orey, 1958, p. 546), we deduce for any real numbers \(a\) and \(b\),
\[
an^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i + bn^{-1/2}\Delta_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n} L'(Y_i; 0) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left\{a\xi_i + b\Delta_0 L'(Y_i; 0)\right\} + n^{-1/2} b\Delta_0 L'(Y_n; 0)
\]
is asymptotically normally distributed with mean 0 and variance \(2a^2/45 + b^2\Delta_0^2 L_X(0)\) under the null, and using Cramér–Wold device yields that under the null,
\[
\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i, T_n\right) \rightarrow N_2\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2/45 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta_0^2 L_X(0) \end{pmatrix}\right)
\]
in distribution.
Furthermore, using idea from Hájek and Šidák (1967, p. 210–214) (see also Gieser, 1993, Appx. B), we have under the null,
\[
\Lambda_n - T_n + \Delta_0^2 L_X(0)/2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability},
\]
and thus under the null,
\[
\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i, \Lambda_n\right) \rightarrow N_2\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\Delta_0^2 L_X(0)/2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2/45 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta_0^2 L_X(0) \end{pmatrix}\right)
\]
in distribution,
and \((-n^{1/2}\xi_n/3, \Lambda_n)\) has the same limiting null distribution by (4.2). Then we employ a corollary to Le Cam’s third lemma (van der Vaart, 1998, Example 6.7) to obtain that under the consider local alternative,
\[
-n^{1/2}\xi_n \rightarrow N(0, 2/5) \quad \text{in distribution}.
\]
This completes the proof.

(B) Goodness-of-fit alternatives. Let \(Y_i = (Y_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(2)}), i = 1, \ldots, n\) be independent copies
of $Y$ (distributed as $X$ with $\Delta = 0$). Denote

$$L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)}, \quad L'(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta),$$

and define $\Lambda_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L(Y_i; \Delta_n)$ and $T_n \equiv \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^n L'(Y_i; 0)$. Direct computation yields

$$L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{(1 - \Delta) f_0(x) + \Delta g(x)}{f_0(x)}, \quad L'(x; 0) = \frac{g(x) - f_0(x)}{f_0(x)},$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{I}_X(0) = E[\{L'(Y; 0)\}^2] = E[\{(g(Y)/f_0(Y) - 1)^2\} = \chi^2(G, F_0) \equiv \int (dG/dF_0 - 1)^2 dF_0.$$  

It holds by central limit theorem that $\Delta_n$ is asymptotically normal with mean 0 and variance $\Delta_n^2 \chi^2(G, F_0)$. In the proof of Theorem 2 in Dhar et al. (2016), they showed that under the null,

$$\Lambda_n - T_n + \Delta_n^2 \chi^2(G, F_0)/2 \to 0 \quad \text{in probability.}$$

The rest of the proof is the same as that for family (A).

(C) Farlie alternatives. This can be proved in view of the proof for family (B) by defining joint distribution function $G(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})$ as

$$G\left(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}\right) = F_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) F_2\left(x^{(2)}\right) \left\{1 + \Delta^* \Omega_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) \Omega_2\left(x^{(2)}\right)\right\}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\Delta^*$ is the largest constant such that $G$ is a bonafide joint distribution function. We can assume without loss of generality that $\Delta^* = 1$. Then we can write $F = (1 - \Delta) F_1 F_2 + \Delta G$. Notice the density of $G(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})$ (with $\Delta^* = 1$) is

$$g\left(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}\right) = f_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) f_2\left(x^{(2)}\right) \left\{1 + \Psi_1\left(x^{(1)}\right) \Psi_2\left(x^{(2)}\right)\right\}.$$  

We thus complete the proof.  

\[ \square \]

4.4.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1, Claim (3.3)

Proof of Theorem 3.1, Claim (3.3). (A) Konijn alternatives. Let $Y_i = (Y_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(2)})$ and $X_i = (X_i^{(1)}, X_i^{(2)})$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ be independent copies of $Y$ and $X$, respectively. Here $X$ depends on $n$ with $\Delta = \Delta_n = n^{-1/2} \Delta_0$. Let $F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(a)}$ be the (joint) distribution functions of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ and $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$, respectively. Denote

$$L(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{f_X(x; \Delta)}{f_X(x; 0)}, \quad L'(x; \Delta) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} L(x; \Delta),$$

and define $\Lambda_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L(Y_i; \Delta_n)$ and $T_n \equiv \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^n L'(Y_i; 0)$.

In this proof we will consider the Hoeffding decomposition of $\mu_n$ under the null:

$$\mu_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \left( \frac{n}{\ell} \right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_\ell \leq n} \left( \frac{m}{\ell} \right) \tilde{H}_\ell^{\mu} \left\{\left(Y_{i_1}^{(1)}, Y_{i_1}^{(2)}\right), \ldots, \left(Y_{i_\ell}^{(1)}, Y_{i_\ell}^{(2)}\right)\right\},$$

(4.4)
where

\[
\tilde{h}_\ell^\mu(y_1, \ldots, y_\ell) = h_\ell^\mu(y_1, \ldots, y_\ell) - E h_\ell^\mu - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq \ell} \tilde{h}_k^\mu(y_{i_1}, \ldots, y_{i_k}),
\]

\[
h_\ell^\mu(y_1, \ldots, y_\ell) = E h_\ell^\mu(y_1, \ldots, y_\ell, Y_{\ell+1}, \ldots, Y_m),
\]

independent copies of \( (Y_1, \ldots, Y_m) \). Here \( \tilde{h}^\mu \) is the "symmetrized" kernel for \( \mu \in \{ D, R, \tau^* \} \) related to (2.1), (2.2), or (2.3):

\[
h^D(y_1, \ldots, y_5) = \frac{1}{5!} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_5 \leq 5} \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_5^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_5^{(2)}) \\
I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_5^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_5^{(2)})
\end{array} \right\},
\]

\[
h^R(y_1, \ldots, y_6) = \frac{1}{6!} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_6 \leq 6} \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_6^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_6^{(2)}) \\
I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_6^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_6^{(2)})
\end{array} \right\},
\]

and

\[
h^{**}(y_1, \ldots, y_4) = \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_4 \leq 4} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_4^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_4^{(2)}) \\
I(y_1^{(2)} \leq y_4^{(1)}) - I(y_1^{(1)} \leq y_4^{(2)})
\end{array} \right\},
\]

We will omit the superscript \( \mu \) in \( h^\mu \), \( \tilde{h}_\ell^\mu \) and \( H^\mu_{n, \ell} \) hereafter if there is no possibility of confusion.

The proof is separated into three steps. First, we prove that \( F^{(a)} \) is contiguous to \( F^{(0)} \) in order to employ Le Cam’s third lemma (van der Vaart, 1998, Theorem 6.6). Next, we find the limiting null distribution of \((n\mu_n, A_n)\) Lastly, we employ Le Cam’s third lemma to deduce the alternative distribution of \((n\mu_n, A_n)\).

**Step I.** In view of Gieser (1993, Sec. 3.2.1), Assumption 3.1 is sufficient for the contiguity: we have \( F^{(a)} \) is contiguous to \( F^{(0)} \).

**Step II.** Next we need to derive the limiting distribution of \((n\mu_n, A_n)\) under null hypothesis. To this end, we first derive the limiting null distribution of \((nH_{n,2}, A_n)\), where \( H_{n,2} \) is defined in (4.4). We write by the Fredholm theory of integral equations (Dunford and Schwartz, 1963, pages 1009, 1083, 1087) that

\[
H_{n,2} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \psi_v(Y_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(2)}) \psi_v(Y_j^{(1)}, Y_j^{(2)}),
\]
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where \( \{\lambda_v, v = 1, 2, \ldots\} \) is an arrangement of \( \{\lambda_{v_1, v_2}, v_1, v_2 = 1, 2, \ldots\} \), and \( \psi_v \) is the normalized eigenfunction associated with \( \lambda_v \). For each positive integer \( K \), define the “truncated” U-statistic as

\[
H_{n,2,K} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j}^{K} \lambda_v \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_j \right) \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_j, Y^{(2)}_i \right).
\]

Notice that \( nH_{n,2} \) and \( nH_{n,2,K} \) can be written as

\[
nH_{n,2} = \frac{n}{n-1} \left( \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left\{ n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i \right) \right\}^2 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i \right) \right\}^2 \right] \right),
\]

\[
nH_{n,2,K} = \frac{n}{n-1} \left( \sum_{v=1}^{K} \lambda_v \left\{ n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i \right) \right\}^2 - \sum_{v=1}^{K} \lambda_v \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i \right) \right\}^2 \right] \right).
\]

For the sake of presentation simplicity, let \( S_{n,v} \) denote \( n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}_i, Y^{(2)}_i \right) \) hereafter.

To derive the limiting null distribution of \( (nH_{n,2}, \Lambda_n) \), we first derive the limiting null distribution of \( (nH_{n,2,K}, T_n) \) for each integer \( K \). Observe that

\[
E(S_{n,v}) = 0, \quad \text{var}(S_{n,v}) = 1, \quad \text{cov}(S_{n,v}, T_n) \to d_v \Delta_0,
\]

\[
E(T_n) = 0, \quad \text{var}(T_n) = \mathcal{J}_X(0),
\]

where \( d_v \equiv \text{cov}\left\{ \psi_v(Y), L'(Y; 0) \right\} \). There exists at least one \( v \geq 1 \) such that \( d_v \neq 0 \). Indeed, applying Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 4.2 in Nandy et al. (2016) yields

\[
\left\{ \psi_v(x), v = 1, 2, \ldots \right\} = \left\{ \psi^{(1)}_{v_1} \left( x^{(1)} \right) \psi^{(2)}_{v_2} \left( x^{(2)} \right), v_1, v_2 = 1, 2, \ldots \right\},
\]

where

\[
\psi^{(1)}_{v_1} \left( x^{(1)} \right) \psi^{(2)}_{v_2} \left( x^{(2)} \right) \equiv 2 \cos \left\{ \pi v_1 F_{Y^{(1)}} \left( x^{(1)} \right) \right\} \cos \left\{ \pi v_2 F_{Y^{(2)}} \left( x^{(2)} \right) \right\}
\]

is associated with eigenvalue \( \lambda^0_{v_1, v_2} \) defined in Proposition 2.4. Since

\[
EY^{(k)} = E\left\{ f'_{Y^{(k)}} \left( Y^{(k)} \right) / f_{Y^{(k)}} \left( Y^{(k)} \right) \right\} = 0,
\]

\( \{\psi_v(x)\}_{v=1}^{\infty} \) forms a complete orthogonal basis for the family of functions of the form (4.1): \( d_v = 0 \) for all \( v \) thus entails

\[
\mathcal{J}_X(0) = E[\{L'Y; 0)\}^2] = E\left[ \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} d_v \psi_v \left( Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)} \right) \right\}^2 \right] = \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} d_v^2 = 0,
\]

which contradicts Assumption 3.1(iii). Therefore, \( d_v \neq 0 \) for some \( v^* \). Applying the multivariate central limit theorem (Bhattacharya and Ranga Rao, 1986, Equation (18.24)), we deduce that under the null,

\[
(S_{n,1}, \ldots, S_{n,K}, T_n) \to (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_K, V_K) \quad \text{in distribution},
\]

where

\[
(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_K, V_K) \sim N_{K+1} \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0_K \vspace{0.2cm} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} I_K & \Delta_0 v^T \\
\Delta_0 & \Delta_0^2 \mathcal{J} \end{pmatrix} \right),
\]

Here \( 0_K \) denotes a zero vector of dimension \( K \), \( I_K \) denotes an identity matrix of dimension \( K \), \( \mathcal{J} \) is
short for $\mathcal{I}_X(0)$, and $v = (d_1, \ldots, d_K)$. Thus $V_K$ can be expressed as

$$
(\Delta_0^2)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\},
$$

where $c_v \equiv \mathcal{I}^{-1/2} d_v$, and $\xi_0$ is standard Gaussian and independent of $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_K$. Then by the continuous mapping theorem (van der Vaart, 1998, Theorem 2.3) and Slutsky’s theorem (van der Vaart, 1998, Theorem 2.8), we have under the null,

$$(nH_{n,2,K}, T_n) \to \left( \sum_{v=1}^{K} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right), \left( \Delta_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} \right)$$

in distribution. (4.5)

Moreover, we claim that under the null,

$$(nH_{n,2}, T_n) \to \left( \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right), \left( \Delta_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} \right)$$

in distribution, (4.6)

via the following argument. Denote

$$M_K \equiv \sum_{v=1}^{K} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right), \quad V_K \equiv \left( \Delta_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{K} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\},$$

$$M \equiv \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right), \quad \text{and} \quad V \equiv \left( \Delta_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\}.$$

To prove (4.6), it suffices to prove that for any real numbers $a$ and $b$,

$$\left| E \left\{ \exp \left( ia_n H_{n,2} + ib T_n \right) \right\} - E \left\{ \exp \left( ia M + ib V \right) \right\} \right| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \quad (4.7)$$

where $i$ denotes the imaginary unit. We have

$$\left| E \left\{ \exp \left( ia_n H_{n,2} + ib T_n \right) \right\} - E \left\{ \exp \left( ia M + ib V \right) \right\} \right| \leq \left| E \left\{ \exp \left( ia_n H_{n,2} + ib T_n \right) \right\} - E \left\{ \exp \left( ia H_{n,2,K} + ib T_n \right) \right\} \right|$$

$$+ \left| E \left\{ \exp \left( ia H_{n,2,K} + ib T_n \right) \right\} - E \left\{ \exp \left( ia M_K + ib V_K \right) \right\} \right|$$

$$+ \left| E \left\{ \exp \left( ia M_K + ib V_K \right) \right\} - E \left\{ \exp \left( ia M + ib V \right) \right\} \right| \equiv I + II + III, \quad \text{say,}$$

where in view of page 82 of Lee (1990) and Equation (4.3.10) in Koroljuk and Borovskich (1994),

$$I \leq E \left| \exp \left\{ ia \left( H_{n,2} - H_{n,2,K} \right) \right\} - 1 \right| \leq \left\{ E \left| a \left( H_{n,2} - H_{n,2,K} \right) \right|^2 \right\}^{1/2} = \left( \frac{2na^2}{n-1} \sum_{v=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_v^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

and

$$III \leq E \left| \exp \left\{ ia \left( M_K - M \right) + ib \left( V_K - V \right) \right\} - 1 \right| \leq \left\{ E \left| a \left( M_K - M \right) + b \left( V_K - V \right) \right|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq 2 \left( 2a^2 \sum_{v=K+1}^{\infty} \lambda_v^2 + 2b^2 \Delta_0^2 \sum_{v=K+1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2}. $$
Since by Remark 3.1 in Nandy et al. (2016),
\[
\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v^2 = \begin{cases} 
1/8100 & \text{when } \mu = D, R, \\
1/225 & \text{when } \mu = \tau^*,
\end{cases}
\]
we conclude that, for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( K_0 \) such that \( I < \epsilon/3 \) and \( III < \epsilon/3 \) for all \( n \) and all \( K \geq K_0 \). For this \( K_0 \), we have \( II < \epsilon/3 \) for all sufficiently large \( n \) by (4.5). These together prove (4.7). We also have, using the idea from Hájek and Šidák (1967, p. 210–214) (see also Gieser, 1993, Appendix B), under the null
\[
\Lambda_n - T_n + \Delta_0^2 I/2 \to 0 \quad \text{in probability.} \tag{4.8}
\]
Combining (4.6) and (4.8) yields that under the null,
\[
(nH_{n,2}, \Lambda_n) \to \left( \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right), \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} - \frac{\Delta_0^2 I}{2} \right) \quad \text{in distribution.} \tag{4.9}
\]
Using the fact \( H_{n,1} = 0 \) and Equation (1.6.7) in Lee (1990, p. 30) yields that \( (n\mu_n, \Lambda_n) \) has the same limiting distribution as (4.9) under the null.

**Step III.** Finally employing Le Cam’s third lemma (van der Vaart, 1998, Theorem 6.6) yields that under the alternative
\[
\Pr(n\mu_n \leq q_{1-\alpha})
\]
\[
\to E \left( I \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v \left( \xi_v^2 - 1 \right) \leq q_{1-\alpha} \right\} \times \exp \left[ \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} - \frac{\Delta_0^2 I}{2} \right] \right)
\]
\[
\leq E \left( I \left\{ \left| \xi_v^* \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{(q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v)}{\lambda_v^*}} \right\} \times \exp \left[ \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v \xi_v + \left( 1 - \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} - \frac{\Delta_0^2 I}{2} \right] \right)
\]
\[
= E \left( I \left\{ \left| \xi_v^* \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{(q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v)}{\lambda_v^*}} \right\} \times \exp \left[ \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \left\{ c_v \xi_v^* + \left( 1 - c_v^2 \right)^{1/2} \xi_0 \right\} - \frac{\Delta_0^2 I}{2} \right] \right)
\]
\[
= \Phi \left( \left( \frac{q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v}{\lambda_v^*} \right)^{1/2} - c_v \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \right) - \Phi \left( - \left( \frac{q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v}{\lambda_v^*} \right)^{1/2} - c_v \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} \right)
\]
\[
\leq 2 \left( \frac{q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v}{\lambda_v^*} \right)^{1/2} \varphi \left( \left| c_v \right| \left( \Delta_0^2 I \right)^{1/2} - \left( \frac{q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v}{\lambda_v^*} \right)^{1/2} \right), \tag{4.10}
\]
for some \( v^* \) such that \( d_{v^*} = 0 \) and thus \( c_{v^*} = \Delta_0^{-1/2} d_{v^*} \neq 0 \) and
\[
\left| \Delta_0 \right| \geq \left| c_{v^*} \right|^{-1} \Delta_0^{-1/2} \left( \frac{q_{1-\alpha} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v}{\lambda_v^*} \right)^{1/2},
\]
where \( \Phi \) and \( \varphi \) are the distribution function and density function of the standard normal distribution, respectively. There exists a constant \( C_\beta \) such that (4.10) is smaller than \( \beta/2 \) as long as \( \left| \Delta_0 \right| \geq C_\beta \), regardless of whether \( c_{v^*} \) is positive or negative. This concludes the proof.

**B Goodness-of-fit alternatives.** This is similar to the proof for family (A). The only difference lies in proving the existence of at least one \( v \geq 1 \) such that \( d_v \neq 0 \), where \( d_v \equiv \text{cov[}\psi_v(Y), L'(Y; 0)] \). Indeed, recall that
\[
\left\{ \psi_v(x), v = 1, 2, \ldots \right\} = \left\{ \psi_{v_1}^{(1)}(x^{(1)}), \psi_{v_2}^{(2)}(x^{(2)}), v_1, v_2 = 1, 2, \ldots \right\},
\]
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where
\[ \psi_{v_1}^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) \psi_{v_2}^{(2)}(x^{(2)}) \equiv 2 \cos \{ \pi v_1 F_Y(x^{(1)}) \} \cos \{ \pi v_2 F_Y(x^{(2)}) \}. \]

Since
\[ \{ \psi_{v_1}^{(1)}(x^{(1)}) \psi_{v_2}^{(2)}(x^{(2)}), v_1, v_2 = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \} \]
forms a complete orthogonal basis of the set of square integrable functions, \( d_v = 0 \) for all \( v \geq 1 \) thus entails \( g(x)/f_0(x) = L'(x, 0) + 1 = h_1(x^{(1)}) + h_2(x^{(2)}) \) for some functions \( h_1, h_2 \), which contradicts Assumption 3.2(ii).

(C) Farlie alternatives. This is very similar to the proof for family (A) by noticing \( L'(x; 0) = \Psi_1(x^{(1)}) \Psi_2(x^{(2)}) \) with \( E\{\Psi_1(X^{(1)})\} = E\{\Psi_2(X^{(2)})\} = 0. \)

4.5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof of Theorem 3.2. (A) Konijn alternatives. Let \( Y_i = (Y_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(2)}) \) and \( X_i = (X_i^{(1)}, X_i^{(2)}) \), \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) be independent copies of \( Y \) and \( X \) with \( \Delta = \Delta_n = n^{-1/2} \Delta_0 \), respectively. Let \( F^{(0)} \) and \( F^{(a)} \) be the (joint) distribution functions of \( (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \) and \( (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \), respectively, and let \( F_i^{(0)} \) and \( F_i^{(a)} \) be the distribution functions of \( Y_i \) and \( X_i \), respectively.

The total variation distance between two distribution functions \( G \) and \( F \) on the same real probability space is defined as
\[ TV(G, F) \equiv \sup_A |\text{pr}_G(A) - \text{pr}_F(A)|, \]
where \( A \) is taken over the Borel field and \( \text{pr}_G, \text{pr}_F \) are respective probability measures induced by \( G \) and \( F \). Furthermore, if \( G \) is absolutely continuous with respect to \( F \), the Hellinger distance between \( G \) and \( F \) is defined as
\[ HL(G, F) \equiv \left\{ \int 2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{dG/dF} \right) dF \right\}^{1/2}. \]

It suffices to prove that for any small \( 0 < \beta < 1 - \alpha \), there exists \( |\Delta_0| = c_\beta \) such that \( TV(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) < \beta \), which could be implied by \( HL(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) < \beta \) using the relation
\[ TV(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) \leq HL(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) \]
(Tsybakov, 2009, Equation (2.20)). We have also known that (Tsybakov, 2009, page 83)
\[ 1 - \frac{1}{2} HL^2(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{2} HL^2(F_i^{(a)}, F_i^{(0)}) \right\}. \]

We then aim to evaluate \( HL^2(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) \) in terms of \( \mathcal{I}_X(0) \) and \( \Delta_0 \). We have by definition
\[ \frac{1}{2} HL^2(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) = E\left[ 1 - \left\{ L(Y_i; \Delta_n) \right\}^{1/2} \right]. \]

Gieser (1993, Appendix B) showed that
\[ nE\left[ 1 - \left\{ L(Y_i; \Delta_n) \right\}^{1/2} \right] = E\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ 1 - \left\{ L(Y_i; \Delta_n) \right\}^{1/2} \right] \right) \to \frac{\Delta_0^2 \mathcal{I}_X(0)}{8}. \]
Therefore, we have
\[1 - \frac{1}{2}HL^2(F^{(a)}, F^{(0)}) \to \exp \left\{ - \frac{\Delta_0^2 I_X(0)}{8} \right\},\]
and the result follows.

**B** **Goodness-of-fit alternatives.** This is similar to the proof for family (A), but here we will use the relation (Tsybakov, 2009, Equation (2.27))
\[TV\left( F^{(a)}, F^{(0)} \right) \leq \left\{ \chi^2 \left( F^{(a)}, F^{(0)} \right) \right\}^{1/2},\]
where the chi-square distance between two distribution functions \(G\) and \(F\) on the same real probability space such that \(G\) is absolutely continuous with respect to \(F\) is defined as
\[\chi^2(G, F) \equiv \int \left( \frac{dG}{dF} - 1 \right)^2 dF.\]
We have also known that (Tsybakov, 2009, page 86)
\[1 + \chi^2 \left( F^{(a)}, F^{(0)} \right) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ 1 + \chi^2 \left( F_i^{(a)}, F_i^{(0)} \right) \right\}.\]
Next we aim to evaluate \(\chi^2 \left( F^{(a)}, F^{(0)} \right)\) in terms of \(\chi^2(G, F_0)\) and \(\Delta_0\). We have by definition
\[\chi^2 \left( F_i^{(a)}, F_i^{(0)} \right) = \chi^2 \left( (1 - \Delta_n) F_0 + \Delta_n G, F_0 \right) = \Delta_n^2 \chi^2(G, F_0) = n^{-1} \Delta_0^2 \chi^2(G, F_0).\]
Therefore, we have
\[1 + \chi^2 \left( F^{(a)}, F^{(0)} \right) \to \exp \left\{ \Delta_0^2 \chi^2(G, F_0) \right\},\]
and the result follows.

**C** **Farlie alternatives.** This is exactly the same as the proof for family (B) by defining (4.3), and hence omitted. \(\square\)
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