arXiv:2201.00073v1 [math.ST] 31 Dec 2021

Kernel Two-Sample Tests in High Dimension: Interplay Between Moment Discrepancy and Dimension-and-Sample Orders

Jian Yan and Xianyang Zhang*

Texas A&M University

Abstract Motivated by the increasing use of kernel-based metrics for high-dimensional and large-scale data, we study the asymptotic behavior of kernel two-sample tests when the dimension and sample sizes both diverge to infinity. We focus on the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) with the kernel of the form $k(x, y) = f(\|x-y\|_2^2/\gamma)$, including MMD with the Gaussian kernel and the Laplacian kernel, and the energy distance as special cases. We derive asymptotic expansions of the kernel two-sample statistics, based on which we establish the central limit theorem (CLT) under both the null hypothesis and the local and fixed alternatives. The new non-null CLT results allow us to perform asymptotic exact power analysis, which reveals a delicate interplay between the moment discrepancy that can be detected by the kernel two-sample tests and the dimension-and-sample orders. The asymptotic theory is further corroborated through numerical studies. Our findings complement those in the recent literature and shed new light on the use of kernel two-sample tests for high-dimensional and large-scale data.
Keywords: High Dimensionality, Kernel Method, Power Analysis, Two-Sample Testing

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Nonparametric two-sample testing, aiming to determine whether two collections of samples are from the same distribution without specifying the exact parametric forms of the distributions, is one of the fundamental problems in statistics. Such tests have found applications in various areas such as bioinformatics, anomaly detection, model criticism, audio and image processing. The most traditional tools in this domain include the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test [Smirnov (1939)], Cramér–von Mises test [Anderson (1962)], Wald-Wolfowitz runs test [Wald and Wolfowitz (1940)], and Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney test [Mann and Whitney (1947)]. Extensions and generalizations of these tests were studied in Darling (1957), Weiss (1960), Bickel (1969), Friedman and Rafsky (1979), among many others.

Modern nonparametric tests have been developed based on integral probability metrics [Sriperumbudur et al. (2012)]. Notable members include the kernel Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) two-sample test [Gretton et al. (2012)] and energy distance-based two-sample test [Székely et al. (2004)]. These metrics are gaining increasing popularity in both the statistics and machine learning communities and they have been applied to a plethora of statistical problems including goodness-of-fit testing [Székely and Rizzo (2005)], nonparametric analysis of variance [Rizzo and Székely (2010)], change-point detection [Matteson and James (2014); Chakraborty and Zhang (2021)], finding representative points of a distribution [Mak and Joseph (2018)] and controlled variable selection [Romano et al. (2020)].

1.2 Motivation and related works

In the past decade, high-dimensional and large-scale data are becoming prevalent, particularly in machine learning and deep learning applications, and the attention to the kernel two-sample testing for high-

*Zhang and Yan acknowledge partial support from NSF DMS-1607320 and NSF DMS-1811747. Address correspondence to Xianyang Zhang (zhangxiany@stat.tamu.edu).

dimensional and large-scale data is also naturally increasing. Examples include training and evaluating deep generative networks [Li et al. (2015); Bińkowski et al. (2018)], domain adaptation [Yan et al. (2017)], deep transfer learning [Long et al. (2017)], and variational auto-encoder [Louizos et al. (2015)].

Motivated by the increasing use of kernel and distance-based metrics for high-dimensional and large-scale data, we propose to investigate the asymptotic behaviors of these metrics when the dimension and sample sizes both diverge to infinity. Through numerical studies, Reddi et al. (2015) showed that the power of MMD-based two-sample tests drops polynomially with increasing dimension against the alternatives, where the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the pairs of distributions remains constant. When the sample sizes are fixed, and the dimension diverges to infinity, Chakraborty and Zhang (2019) and Zhu and Shao (2021) showed that the energy distance and MMD only detect the equality of means and the traces of covariance matrices. A recent arXiv paper by Gao and Shao (2021) proved that when the dimension grows much slower than the sample sizes, the MMD-based two-sample test has asymptotic power approaching one under some specific alternatives. Other related works include Zhu et al. (2020), Gao et al. (2021) and Han and Shen (2021) which study the kernel and distance-based dependence metrics in high dimensions.

1.3 Our contributions

Despite the recent advancements in understanding the behaviors of the kernel and distance-based metrics in high-dimension, a complete picture of the power behavior of the kernel two-sample tests under different dimension-and-sample orders is still lacking. In this work, we aim to address the following open problems in the literature:

(i) *Can the kernel-based metrics completely characterize the discrepancy between two distributions when the dimension and sample sizes both diverge to infinity?*

(ii) *What features of the distributions are characterized by the kernel two-sample statistics for specific dimension and sample size orders?*

(iii) *What is the interplay between the moment discrepancy that can be detected by the kernel two-sample tests and the dimension-and-sample orders?*

(iv) *What is the impact of the choice of kernels and bandwidths on the asymptotic power in high dimension?*

To address these questions, we focus on the kernel two-sample statistics using the kernel of the form $k(x, y) = f(\|x - y\|_2^2/\gamma)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and the bandwidth $\gamma > 0$, where f is a sufficiently smooth function. Examples include the energy distance and the MMD with the Gaussian kernel, Laplacian kernel, rational quadratic kernel, and wave kernel. We derive asymptotic expansions of the kernel two-sample statistics, based on which we establish the central limit theorem (CLT) under both the null hypothesis and the local and fixed alternatives. The CLT under the null has been previously proved in Theorem B.3 of Chakraborty and Zhang (2019) and Theorem 3.2.1 of Gao and Shao (2021) under a set of abstract moment conditions. In contrast, our results are obtained under a general multivariate model specified in (2)-(3) below, which does not impose any restriction on the dimension-and-sample orders. Built on the null CLT and a new variance estimator, we develop a MMD-based two-sample test in high dimension.

To the best of our knowledge, the CLTs under the local and fixed alternatives are new and have not been obtained previously in the literature. The new non-null CLT results enable us to perform asymptotic exact power analysis, which reveals an interesting and delicate interplay between the moment discrepancy that can be detected by the kernel two-sample tests and the dimension-and-sample orders. We summarize these findings in Table 1, which suggests that

the faster the sample size grows relative to the dimension, the higher-order moment discrepancy the kernel tests are capable of detecting.

By analyzing the power functions under different scenarios, we provide answers to problems (i)-(iv). Specifically, we show that

- when N grows slower than $p^{l-1/2}$, MMD mainly detects the discrepancy lying on the first lth moments. Table 1 summarizes the features and explicit quantities captured by MMD for different dimension-and-sample orders;

Dimension and sample size orders	main features captured	explicit quantities
$N = o(\sqrt{p})$	mean and trace of covariance	Δ_0
$N = o(p^{3/2})$	mean and covariance	Δ_0, T_1
$N = o(p^{l-1/2})$	the first lth moments	$\Delta_0, T_1, \ldots, T_{l-1}$
fixed p, growing N	total homogeneity	$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)$

Table 1: Dimension and sample size orders, main features captured by the kernel two-sample statistics as well as the explicit quantities affecting the asymptotic power. The quantities Δ_0 and $\{T_s : 1 \le s \le l-1\}$ are defined in (5), (6), (7) and (9) respectively.

- the features characterized by MMD are encoded in the quantities Δ_0 and $\{T_s : 1 \le s \le l-1\}$. In particular, Δ_0 captures the discrepancy between the mean vectors and the traces of covariance matrices (i.e., the first spectral mean). While T_s quantifies the differences between the tensors formed by higher-order moments, see Section 3.4;
- we summarize several scenarios in Tables 2-3, where the MMD-based test will have trivial or non-trivial power depending on a delicate interplay between the moment discrepancy and the dimension-and-sample orders;
- As a byproduct of the power analysis, we also discover the impact of the kernel and bandwidth on the asymptotic power. See Section 6 for a detailed discussion.

The practical relevance of our theoretical findings are further corroborated through numerical studies. In a broader sense, our discovery is reminiscent of the phenomenon that nonlinear kernel gets linearized as the dimension grows with the sample size [El Karoui (2010); Liang and Rakhlin (2020)]. The take-home message of this work is that

the faster the dimension grows relative to the sample sizes, the stronger linearization effect the kernel and distance-based metrics exhibit.

Our results complement those in the recent literature and shed new light on the use of kernel two-sample tests. We expect similar phenomenon to hold for other kernel methods in the high-dimensional setting.

To end the introduction, we introduce some notation that will be used throughout the paper. For two real-valued sequences $\{x_p\}$ and $\{a_p\}$, we write $x_p = O(a_p)$ if and only if $|x_p/a_p| \le C$ for $p \ge p_0$ and some constant $C > 0$; $x_p = o(a_p)$ if and only if $\lim_{p\to\infty} |x_p/a_p| = 0$. Denote by $x_p = \Omega(a_p)$ if and only if $|x_p/a_p| \ge C > 0$ for $p \ge p_0$ and some constant C; $x_p = \omega(a_p)$ if and only if $\lim_{p\to\infty} |x_p/a_p| = \infty$; $x_p = \Theta(a_p)$ if and only if $0 < C_2 \le |x_p/a_p| \le C_1$ for $p \ge p_0$ and some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. For a real-valued function f that is L-times differentiable, we denote its lth derivative at x by $f^{(l)}(x)$ for $1 \le l \le L$. The function f is said to be of (differentiability) class C^L if the derivatives $\{f^{(l)} : 1 \le l \le L\}$ exist and are continuous. For a matrix or tensor $\mathcal{T}$, we let $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathrm{op}}$ be its operator norm, and $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathrm{F}}$ be its Frobenius norm.

2 Preliminaries

Let $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ and $Y = (y_1, \ldots, y_p)$ be two random vectors taking values in $\mathbb{R}^p$, with respective probability measures $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$. Given the observations $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) from $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$, respectively, we aim to test the following hypothesis

$$H_0 : \mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y \quad \text{versus} \quad H_a : \mathbb{P}_X \neq \mathbb{P}_Y.$$

A broad class of metrics for quantifying the discrepancy between $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$ is the integral probability metric (IPM) defined as

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(Y)] \right|,$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ is a class of real-valued bounded measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^p$. Notable examples include the Dudley metric, the Wasserstein distance, the total variation distance and MMD. When $\mathcal{F}$ is a unit ball in reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), the IPM becomes the MMD which admits a closed-form given by

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \mathbb{E}[k(X, X')] + \mathbb{E}[k(Y, Y')] - 2\mathbb{E}[k(X, Y)],$$

where $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the corresponding reproducing kernel, and (X', Y') is an i.i.d copy of (X, Y). If the kernel k is characteristic [Fukumizu et al. (2007); Gretton et al. (2012)], then $\mathrm{MMD}(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y$. An unbiased estimator of MMD [Gretton et al. (2012)] is given by

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} k(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} k(Y_{j_1}, Y_{j_2}) - \frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i,j} k(X_i, Y_j), \tag{1}$$

which is a two-sample U-statistic. Under H_0, $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ has degeneracy of order $(1, 1)$, and when p is fixed,

$$\frac{nm}{n+m} \mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda_l^2 (z_l^2 - 1), \text{ as } n, m \to \infty,$$

where $\{z_l\}$ is a sequence of independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables, and λ_l's depend on the distribution $\mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y$ and the kernel k.

Here we consider the isotropic stationary kernel of the type $k(X, Y) = f(\|X - Y\|_2^2/\gamma)$, where f is a real-valued function on $[0, +\infty)$ and γ is a bandwidth parameter. Examples include the widely-used Gaussian kernel $f(x) = \exp(-x)$, the Laplacian kernel $f(x) = \exp(-\sqrt{x})$, the rational quadratic kernel $f(x) = (1 + x)^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$ (which is also called Cauchy kernel when $\alpha = 1$, and the inverse multiquadric kernel when $\alpha = 1/2$), and the wave kernel $f(x) = \sin(\sqrt{x})/\sqrt{x}$. We refer the readers to Genton (2001) or Chapter 4 of Williams and Rasmussen (2006) for more examples. Moreover, up to a scaling factor $1/\sqrt{\gamma}$, the energy distance corresponds to $f(x) = -\sqrt{x}$, which can also be viewed as a special case of the class of kernels under consideration. Besides, one can easily verify that, when $f(x) = -x$, $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ reduces to the two-sample statistic for testing the equality of high-dimensional means [Chen and Qin (2010)], up to a scaling factor $2/\gamma$.

3 Null and non-null central limit theorems

3.1 Assumptions and asymptotic expansions

We will cope with MMD using the kernel of the form $k_p(X, Y) = f(\|X - Y\|_2^2/\gamma_p)$, where $\gamma_p = \Theta(p)$. Suppose $\lim_{p\to\infty} \gamma_p/p = c_0$, then $k_p(X, Y)$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\tilde{f}(\|X - Y\|_2^2/p)$ with $\tilde{f}(\cdot) = f(\cdot/c_0)$. Thus, without loss of generality, we shall assume below that $\gamma_p = p$ and suppress the dependence of k on p when there is no confusion. Also, we remark that the order of the bandwidth choice made by the commonly used median heuristic is indeed $\Theta(p)$ [Reddi et al. (2015); Garreau et al. (2017)].

Throughout the analysis, we shall make the following assumptions.

(a) Assume that

$$X_i = \Gamma_1 U_i + \mu_1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{2}$$
$$Y_j = \Gamma_2 V_j + \mu_2, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m, \tag{3}$$

where $\Gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ with $\Gamma_1 \Gamma_1^\top = \Sigma_1$, $\Gamma_2 \Gamma_2^\top = \Sigma_2$, and q could be bigger, equal to or smaller than p. Also, $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are both q-variate i.i.d random vectors satisfying that $\mathbb{E}(U_i) = \mathbb{E}(V_j) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Var}(U_i) = \mathrm{Var}(V_j) = \mathbf{I}_q$. Furthermore, if we write $U_i = (U_i(1), \ldots, U_i(q))$ and $V_j = (V_j(1), \ldots, V_j(q))$, we assume that the components $\{U_i(k)\}_k$ and $\{V_i(k)\}_k$ are independent with each other (not necessarily identically distributed) and $\max_{1 \leq k \leq q} \{\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^8), \mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^8)\} < \infty$.

(b) Under the model in (a), suppose the operator norms of Σ_1 and Σ_2 remain bounded in p, i.e., there exists $K > 0$, such that $\max\{\|\Sigma_1\|_{\mathrm{op}}, \|\Sigma_2\|_{\mathrm{op}}\} \leq K$, for all p. Besides, we assume that $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_i) = \Theta(p)$, for $i = 1, 2$.

(c) $\|\mu_i\|_2^2 = O(p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Under Assumption (b), we further have $\mu_i'\Sigma_j\mu_i \le \|\Sigma_j\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \|\mu_i\|_2^2 = O(p)$ and $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_j(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \le \|\Sigma_j\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 = O(p)$ for $i, j = 1$ or 2.

(d) $\lim_{N\to\infty} n/N = \kappa \in (0, 1)$, where $N = n + m$.

(e) Let $g(x) = f(x^2)$. Then $k(X, Y) = g(\|X - Y\|_2/\sqrt{p})$. We assume that g is a C^3 function on $[0, +\infty)$, and $\sup_{1\le s\le 3} \sup_{x\ge 0} |g^{(s)}(x)| < \infty$.

Assumption (a) is common in the random matrix theory literature, and it has been used in the analysis of the spectrum of kernel random matrix [El Karoui (2010)] and high-dimensional two-sample testing [Bai and Saranadasa (1996); Chen and Qin (2010)]. Assumption (b) requires the eigenvalues of Σ_1 and Σ_2 to be uniformly bounded from above, and the number of nonzero eigenvalues to be of the order $\Theta(p)$. However, we do not require the eigenvalues to be bounded away from zero. Assumption (c) ensures that the Taylor expansions below are around points that are asymptotically bounded. As one can easily verify, Assumption (e) covers MMD with the aforementioned Gaussian kernel, Laplacian kernel, rational quadratic kernel, wave kernel, and the energy distance.

Define

$$\tau_i = 2\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_i)}{p}$$

for $i = 1, 2$, and

$$\tau_3 = \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_1) + \text{tr}(\Sigma_2) + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}{p}.$$

As shown in Section B.1 in the Appendix, we have the following second-order Taylor expansions under Assumption (e):

$$\begin{aligned}
f(p^{-1}\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2) &= f(\tau_1) + f^{(1)}(\tau_1)\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2} + c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^2,\\
f(p^{-1}\|Y_{j_1} - Y_{j_2}\|_2^2) &= f(\tau_2) + f^{(1)}(\tau_2)\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2} + c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2})\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2}^2,\\
f(p^{-1}\|X_i - Y_j\|_2^2) &= f(\tau_3) + f^{(1)}(\tau_3)\widetilde{Z}_{i,j} + c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})\widetilde{Z}_{i,j}^2
\end{aligned}$$

with $\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2} = p^{-1}\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - \tau_1$, $\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2} = p^{-1}\|Y_{j_1} - Y_{j_2}\|_2^2 - \tau_2$ and $\widetilde{Z}_{i,j} = p^{-1}\|X_i - Y_j\|_2^2 - \tau_3$, where $c_{2,\tau_1}(\cdot)$, $c_{2,\tau_2}(\cdot)$ and $c_{2,\tau_3}(\cdot)$ are some bounded functions regardless of the underlying distributions $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$. These expansions are built on Lemma A.1 in the Appendix which generalizes Lemma 7 in Gao et al. (2021).

Plugging the above expansions into the unbiased MMD estimator in (1), we obtain the following expressions

$$\text{MMD}_{n,m}^2 = \Delta_0 + \Delta_1 + \widetilde{\Delta}_2, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_0 &= f(\tau_1) + f(\tau_2) - 2f(\tau_3),\\
\Delta_1 &= \Delta_{1,1} + \Delta_{1,2} + \Delta_{1,3},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{1,1} &= -\frac{2}{p}\bigg[\frac{1}{n(n-1)}f^{(1)}(\tau_1)\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}(X_{i_1} - \mu_1)^\top(X_{i_2} - \mu_1) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)}f^{(1)}(\tau_2)\sum_{j_1\neq j_2}(Y_{j_1} - \mu_2)^\top(Y_{j_2} - \mu_2)\\
&\quad - \frac{2}{nm}f^{(1)}(\tau_3)\sum_{i,j}(X_i - \mu_1)^\top(Y_j - \mu_2)\bigg],\\
\Delta_{1,2} &= -\frac{4}{p}f^{(1)}(\tau_3)\bigg[\frac{1}{n}\sum_i(X_i - \mu_1)^\top(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + \frac{1}{m}\sum_j(Y_j - \mu_2)^\top(\mu_2 - \mu_1)\bigg],\\
\Delta_{1,3} &= \frac{2}{p}\bigg\{[f^{(1)}(\tau_1) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]\cdot\frac{1}{n}\sum_i\|X_i - \mu_1\|_2^2 + [f^{(1)}(\tau_2) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]\cdot\frac{1}{m}\sum_j\|Y_j - \mu_2\|_2^2\bigg\}\\
&\quad - \frac{2}{p}\{[f^{(1)}(\tau_1) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]\text{tr}(\Sigma_1) + [f^{(1)}(\tau_2) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]\text{tr}(\Sigma_2)\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_2 = \frac{1}{p^2}\cdot\Bigg[\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1}-X_{i_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2+\frac{1}{m(m-1)}\sum_{j_1\neq j_2} c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2})(\|Y_{j_1}-Y_{j_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^2$$
$$-\frac{2}{nm}\sum_{i,j} c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})(\|X_i-Y_j\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2\Bigg].$$

Our analysis in Sections 3.2-3.3 below involve two major steps:

Step 1. showing the asymptotic normality of $\Delta_1/\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}$ under the null, local and fixed alternatives;

Step 2. proving that $(\widetilde{\Delta}_2 - T_1)/\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} = o_p(1)$ for some nonrandom quantity T_1 defined in (6) below.

For the result in Step 2 to hold, we require N to grow slower than certain polynomial order of p. When N grows at a faster rate, we need to look into the higher-order terms of $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$. To this end, we shall consider the lth order Taylor expansions of $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ for any $l \geq 3$ in Section 3.4.

3.2 Non-null CLTs based on second-order Taylor series

The goal here is to derive the CLTs under the fixed and local alternatives based on the second-order Taylor expansion in (4). To begin with, we deal with the first-order term Δ_1.

If we assume one of the following two conditions holds

(f1) $(\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top\Sigma_i(\mu_1-\mu_2) = o(N^{-1}\cdot p)$ and $|f^{(1)}(\tau_i)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)| = o(N^{-1/2})$ for i =1 and 2,

(f2) $(\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top\Sigma_i(\mu_1-\mu_2) = \omega(N^{-1}\cdot p)$ or $|f^{(1)}(\tau_i)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)| = \omega(N^{-1/2})$ for i =1 or 2,

then the asymptotic normality of the first-order term Δ_1 can be established.

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumptions (a)-(d), and either (f1) or (f2),*

$$\frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1),\ \textit{as } N\to\infty \textit{ and } p\to\infty.$$

As shown in the proof, under Assumption (f1), we have $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}))$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,3}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}))$, which implies that $(\Delta_{1,2}+\Delta_{1,3})/\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} = o_p(1)$. In this case, the discrepancies between μ_1 and μ_2 and $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2)$ are small enough so that $\Delta_{1,1}$ dominates the other two terms. We view (f1) as a local alternative condition. On the contrary, Assumption (f2) requires μ_1 and μ_2 and $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2)$ to be far apart so as either $\Delta_{1,2}$ or $\Delta_{1,3}$ dominates $\Delta_{1,1}$, which can be regarded as the fixed alternative. Under the local alternative, the CLT can be proved using the martingale CLT [Hall and Heyde (2014)]; under the fixed alternative, the asymptotic normality is readily attainable as both $\Delta_{1,2}$ and $\Delta_{1,3}$ are sums of two independent averages.

Next we analyze the second-order term $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. We work with the variance and the mean of $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$ separately. Under Assumptions (a)-(e), we can show that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-2}).$$

Also, if we define

$$T_1 \coloneqq \frac{1}{p^2}\cdot\Big\{\frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2]+\frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\tau_2)\mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^2]$$
$$-f^{(2)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2]\Big\} \tag{6}$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1 = O(p^{-\frac{3}{2}}).$$

We refer the readers to Section B.2 in the Appendix for the details of the calculations of the variance and the mean of $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. Utilizing the above results, we have the following theorem which establishes the asymptotic normality of $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ under the local alternative (f1).

Theorem 3.2. *Under Assumptions (a)-(e), (f1), and $N = o(p)$,*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \Delta_0 - T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

Using the arguments in Section B.2, we can show that $T_1 = O(p^{-1})$ under Assumptions (a)-(c). Thus we immediately have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Under Assumptions (a)-(e), (f1), and $N = o(\sqrt{p})$,*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \Delta_0}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

Similarly, under the fixed alternative (f2), we have the following theorem and corollary.

Theorem 3.4. *Under Assumptions (a)-(e), and either $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_i (\mu_1 - \mu_2) = \omega(\max\{N \cdot p^{-1}, N^{-1} \cdot p\})$ or $|f^{(1)}(\tau_i) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)| = \omega(\max\{N^{1/2} \cdot p^{-1}, N^{-1/2}\})$ for $i = 1$ or 2,*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \Delta_0 - T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

Corollary 3.5. *Under Assumptions (a)-(e), and either $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_i (\mu_1 - \mu_2) = \omega(\max\{N, N^{-1} \cdot p\})$ or $|f^{(1)}(\tau_i) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)| = \omega(\max\{N^{1/2} \cdot p^{-1/2}, N^{-1/2}\})$ for $i = 1$ or 2,*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \Delta_0}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

Note that the assumption of the fixed alternative (f2) is already incorporated in Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5. If we further assume either $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_i (\mu_1 - \mu_2) = \Theta(N^{-1} \cdot p^a)$ for some $a > 1$ or $|f^{(1)}(\tau_i) - f^{(1)}(\tau_3)| = \Theta(N^{-1/2} \cdot p^b)$ for some $b > 0$, then the condition in Theorem 3.4 becomes either $N = o(p^{(a+1)/2})$ or $N = o(p^{b+1})$, and the condition in Corollary 3.5 becomes either $N = o(p^{a/2})$ or $N = o(p^{b+1/2})$.

3.3 Null CLT and the test statistic

Although the asymptotic normality of $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ under the null $H_0 : \mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y$ can be seen as a special case of Theorem 3.2, the analysis under the null can indeed be refined to obtain a sharper rate of the remainder term $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. As a consequence, the restriction between the sample size N and the data dimension p can be dropped. To be specific, under H_0, we have

$$\Delta_0 = 0,$$

and

$$\Delta_{1,2} = \Delta_{1,3} = 0 \implies \Delta_1 = \Delta_{1,1}.$$

Also, Assumption (f1) is trivially satisfied, and Lemma 3.1 holds under Assumptions (a)-(d). Now let us consider the second-order term $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. As shown in Section 3.2, the restriction between N and p in Theorem 3.2 arises from the variance and the mean of $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. However, as X and Y have the same distribution under H_0,

$$\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}) - \Delta_0 - \mathbb{E}(\Delta_1) = 0,$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}) = \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = 0$. Moreover, under H_0, it can be shown that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-2}),$$

the order of which is smaller than that in the non-null setting. See Section B.3 in the Appendix for the details. Combining the above observations, we have obtained the following theorem under the null.

Theorem 3.6. *Under $H_0 : \mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y$, and Assumptions (a)-(e),*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

In order to formulate a testing procedure based on Theorem 3.6, $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)$ needs to be estimated. As shown in the proof of Lemma 3.1,

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1) = \mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}) = \frac{8}{p^2}\cdot\left\{\frac{1}{n(n-1)}[f^{(1)}(\tau_1)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)+\frac{1}{m(m-1)}[f^{(1)}(\tau_2)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2)+\frac{2}{nm}[f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)\right\}$$

which motivates the following plug-in estimator

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} = \frac{8}{p^2}\left\{\frac{1}{n(n-1)}[f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_1)]^2\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)} + \frac{1}{m(m-1)}[f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_2)]^2\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2)} + \frac{2}{nm}[f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_3)]^2\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)}\right\},$$

where

$$\widehat{\tau_1} = \frac{2}{p}\cdot\frac{1}{n}\sum_i X_i^\top(X_i - \bar{X}_{-i}),$$

$$\widehat{\tau_2} = \frac{2}{p}\cdot\frac{1}{m}\sum_j Y_j^\top(Y_j - \bar{Y}_{-j}),$$

$$\widehat{\tau_3} = \frac{1}{p}\cdot\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_i X_i^\top(X_i - \bar{X}_{-i}) + \frac{1}{m}\sum_j Y_j^\top(Y_j - \bar{Y}_{-j}) + \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} X_{i_1}^\top X_{i_2} + \frac{1}{m(m-1)}\sum_{j_1\neq j_2} Y_{j_1}' Y_{j_2} - \frac{2}{nm}\sum_{i,j} X_i^\top Y_j\right\},$$

with $\bar{X}_{-i}$ ($\bar{Y}_{-j}$) being the sample mean excluding X_i (Y_j). The definitions of $\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)}$, $\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2)}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)}$ can be found on page 7 of Chen and Qin (2010). The above variance estimator is designed to estimate the leading term of the variance of the sample MMD under the local alternative. It appears to be new and is different from the ones recently proposed in the literature, see, e.g., Chakraborty and Zhang (2019) and Gao and Shao (2021).

The following theorem establishes the ratio consistency of $\widehat{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}$ under the local alternative.

Theorem 3.7. *Under Assumptions (a)-(e) and (f1),*

$$\frac{\widehat{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

Based on Theorems 3.6-3.7, we propose a test for H_0 as follows: at level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, reject H_0 if

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}} > z_{1-\alpha}$$

and fail to reject H_0 otherwise, where $z_{1-\alpha}$ is the $100(1-\alpha)$th quantile of $N(0,1)$. We shall conduct an asymptotic power analysis of this test in Section 4.

3.4 Non-null CLTs based on higher-order Taylor series

Theorems 3.2-3.4 indicate that when N grows slower than certain order of p, the kernel two-sample test is capable of characterizing the discrepancy between the mean vectors and the covariance matrices through the quantities Δ_0 and T_1. A natural question to ask is what high-order features are captured by the MMD if N grows faster than the rates specified in Theorems 3.2-3.4. To answer this question, we perform a more in-depth analysis based on the high-order Taylor series. We need to strengthen the moment assumption in Assumptions (a) and (e) as follows: for some $l \geq 3$,

(a′) The other parts in Assumption (a) remain the same. We additionally require that

$$\max_{1\le k\le q}\{\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^{4l}),\mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^{4l})\}<\infty;$$

(e′) Assume that g is a C^l function on $[0,+\infty)$, and $\sup_{1\le s\le l}\sup_{x\ge 0}|g^{(s)}(x)|<\infty$.

Consider the lth order Taylor expansion (see Section B.1):

$$f(p^{-1}\|X_{i_1}-X_{i_2}\|_2^2)=f(\tau_1)+\sum_{s=1}^{l-1}\frac{f^{(s)}(\tau_1)}{s!}\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}+c_{l,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}^l_{i_1,i_2},$$

where $c_{l,\tau_1}(\cdot)$ is some bounded function. Analogous expansions hold for $f(p^{-1}\|Y_{j_1}-Y_{j_2}\|_2^2)$ and $f(p^{-1}\|X_i-Y_j\|_2^2)$. Then the unbiased MMD estimator can be decomposed as

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}=\Delta_0+\sum_{s=1}^{l-1}\Delta_s+\widetilde{\Delta}_l,$$

where

$$\Delta_s=\frac{1}{s!}\cdot\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)}f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}+\frac{1}{m(m-1)}f^{(s)}(\tau_2)\sum_{j_1\neq j_2}\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}-\frac{2}{nm}f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\sum_{i,j}\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}\right]$$

for $1\le s\le l-1$, and

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_l=\frac{1}{p^l}\cdot\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}c_{l,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1}-X_{i_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^l+\frac{1}{m(m-1)}\sum_{j_1\neq j_2}c_{l,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2})(\|Y_{j_1}-Y_{j_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^l\right.$$
$$\left.-\frac{2}{nm}\sum_{i,j}c_{l,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})(\|X_i-Y_j\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^l\right].$$

Following similar arguments as in Section B.2, one can show that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l)=O(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-l}).$$

In addition, if we assume that

(g) for $2\le s\le l-1$, $\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{1,2}|X_1]-f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{1,1}|X_1])=o(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-1})$ and $\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_2)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{1,2}|Y_1]-f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{1,1}|Y_1])=o(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-1})$,

we have for $2\le s\le l-1$,

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_s)=o(N^{-2}\cdot p^{-1}).$$

See more details for the analysis of the variances of $\Delta_s, 2\le s\le l-1$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_l$ in Section B.4 in the Appendix. Assumption (g) imposes a type of local alternative ensuring that $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)$ is the dominant term of the variance of the sample MMD. To illustrate Assumption (g), we present the following result.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose $\mu_1=\mu_2=\mu$ and $\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$. Under Assumptions (a) and (b), we have*

$$|\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^2_{1,2}|X_1]-f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^2_{1,1}|X_1])|=O\left(p^{-7/2}\sum_k(\mu^{(1)}_{k,3}-\mu^{(2)}_{k,3})^2\right),$$

where $\mu^{(1)}_{k,3}=\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^3)$ and $\mu^{(2)}_{k,3}=\mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^3)$. Moreover, when $X_i=U_i+\mu$ and $Y_j=V_j+\mu$,

$$|\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^2_{1,2}|X_1]-f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^2_{1,1}|X_1])|=O\left(p^{-4}\sum_k(\mu^{(1)}_{k,3}-\mu^{(2)}_{k,3})^2\right).$$

As a result of Proposition 3.8, Assumption (g) holds for $l = 3$ provided that $\sum_k (\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})^2 = o(N^{-1} \cdot p^{5/2})$. When $X_i = U_i + \mu$ and $Y_j = V_j + \mu$, the condition becomes $\sum_k (\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})^2 = o(N^{-1} \cdot p^3)$, which holds if $\max_k |\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)}| \le C$ and $N = o(p^2)$ for some constant $C > 0$.

Theorem 3.9. *Under Assumptions (a′), (b), (c), (d), (e′), (f1), (g) and $N = o(p^{l-1})$,*

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

Below we study the effects from the higher-order moments. To disentangle the higher-order effects, we assume throughout the following discussions that X and Y share the first $(l-1)$th moments, i.e., $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$, $\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^s) = \mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^s)$ for $s \le l-1$ and $1 \le k \le q$. We begin by analyzing the higher-order effects on the population MMD. Define

$$T_{s-1} := \frac{1}{s! p^s} f^{(s)}(\tau) \cdot \left\{ \mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] - 2\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] \right\} \tag{7}$$

for $s \ge 2$, where $\tau = \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3$.

Remark 1. Suppose all the moments of U_i and V_j exist. Applying the Taylor series expansion to the population MMD, we get

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} T_s,$$

as $p \to \infty$. It suggests that the combined effect from Δ_0 and all T_s's is equivalent to that of the population MMD. When the first $(l-1)$th moments of X and Y coincide, $\Delta_0 = 0$ and $T_s = 0$ for $1 \le s \le l-2$, which can be shown using the arguments in Section B.5 in the Appendix. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \sum_{s=l-1}^{\infty} T_s, \tag{8}$$

which indicates that MMD detects the discrepancy lying on the higher-order moments through the quantity $\sum_{s=l-1}^{\infty} T_s$.

The expansion in (8) motivates us to study the properties of T_s for $s \ge l-1$. For any $0 \le a \le l/2$, define two tensors

$$\mathcal{T}_{1,l}^{(a)} = (\mu_{1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}}^{(a)})_{1 \le i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{l-a} \le p},$$
$$\mathcal{T}_{2,l}^{(a)} = (\mu_{2,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}}^{(a)})_{1 \le i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{l-a} \le p},$$

where

$$\mu_{1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}}^{(a)} = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a} (x_{i_s} - \mathbb{E}[x_{i_s}])^2 \prod_{s=a+1}^{l-a} (x_{i_s} - \mathbb{E}[x_{i_s}]) \right]$$

and $\mu_{2,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}}^{(a)}$ is defined in a similar fashion with respect to Y. Write $\mathbf{i}(a - a_1 - a_2) = (i_1, \ldots, i_{a-a_1-a_2})$ and $\mathbf{j}(a_1) = (j_1, \ldots, j_{a_1})$. Set

$$B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2), \mathbf{j}(a_1)} := \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} (x_{i_s} - \mathbb{E}[x_{i_s}]) \prod_{s=1}^{a_1} (x_{j_s} - \mathbb{E}[x_{j_s}])^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} (y_{i_s} - \mathbb{E}[y_{i_s}]) \prod_{s=1}^{a_1} (y_{j_s} - \mathbb{E}[y_{j_s}])^2 \right].$$

We have the following result.

Lemma 3.10. *Under $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$, $\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^s) = \mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^s)$ for $s \le l-1$ and $1 \le k \le q$, we have for any $l \ge 3$,*

$$T_{l-1} = \frac{f^{(l)}(\tau)}{p^l} \sum_{0 \le 2a \le l} (-2)^{l-2a} \frac{1}{a! a! (l-2a)!} \|\mathcal{T}_{1,l}^{(a)} - \mathcal{T}_{2,l}^{(a)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2. \tag{9}$$

Under Assumption (b), $T_{l-1} = O(p^{-l+1})$. Assume additionally that

(h) $\sum_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}(a_1)} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)} \right)^2 = O(p^{a+a_1-a_2-l+1})$ *for* $|a_1 - a_2| \le a - l$, $0 \le a_1 + a_2 \le a$ *and* $l \le a \le s \le 2(l-1)-1$,

which holds automatically when $X_i = U_i + \mu$ *and* $Y_j = V_j + \mu$. *Then we have* $T_{s-1} = O(p^{-l+1})$ *for any* $l \le s \le 2(l-1)-1$. *As a consequence,* $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = O(p^{-l+1})$.

Corollary 3.11. *Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 3.10 hold. If* $N = o(p^{l-3/2})$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \text{ as } N \to \infty \text{ and } p \to \infty.$$

4 Power analysis

Based on the CLT results, we study the power behavior of the test

$$\phi_{n,m}(\alpha) = \mathbf{1}\left\{ \frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}} > z_{1-\alpha} \right\}, \tag{10}$$

under the local alternative. We focus on two scenarios:

S1. There is a discrepancy among the first two moments which satisfies (f1).

S2. The first $(l-1)$th moments are equal and Assumptions (g) and (h) hold, while there is a discrepancy between the lth moments for $l \ge 3$.

Under S1, in view of Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, the asymptotic power function of the test $\phi_{n,m}(\alpha)$ is given by

$$\Phi\left(-z_{1-\alpha} + \frac{\Delta_0 + T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \right). \tag{11}$$

where Φ is the cdf of $N(0,1)$. We observe that:

O1-S1. When

$$N = o(\sqrt{p}) \text{ and } \Delta_0 = o(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}),$$

or

$$N = o(p) \text{ and } \Delta_0 + T_1 = o(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}),$$

the test has trivial power;

O2-S1. When $N = o(p)$ and $\Delta_0 + T_1 = \Theta(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$, the test has nontrivial power between $(0,1)$;

O3-S1. When $N = o(p)$ and $\Delta_0 + T_1 = \omega(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$, the test has power approaching one asymptotically.

Under S2, by Theorem 3.9, the corresponding power function is equal to

$$\Phi\left(-z_{1-\alpha} + \frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \right), \quad l \ge 3. \tag{12}$$

We have the following observations:

O1-S2. Note that $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = O(p^{-l+1})$. When

$$N = o(p^{l-3/2}),$$

or

$$N = o(p^{l-1}) \text{ and } \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = o(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}),$$

the test has trivial power;

O2-S2. When $N = o(p^{l-1})$ and $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \Theta(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$, the test has nontrivial power between $(0, 1)$;

O3-S2. When $N = o(p^{l-1})$ and $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \omega(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$, the test has power approaching one asymptotically.

O4-S2. Suppose $N = o(p^{l-1})$ and

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \Theta(p^{-l+1}).$$

When $N = o(p^{l-3/2})$, the test has trivial power; When $N = \Theta(p^{l-3/2})$, the test has asymptotic power between $(0, 1)$; When $N = \omega(p^{l-3/2})$, the test has power approaching one asymptotically.

As shown in Section B.5, the equality of the first l moments is a sufficient condition for $T_{l-1} = 0$. Regarding Δ_0, we have the following necessary and sufficient condition for $\Delta_0 = 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose f is strictly decreasing and strictly convex on $(0, +\infty)$. Then*

$$\Delta_0 = 0 \text{ iff } \mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1) = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2).$$

As one can verify, the strict monotonicity and convexity assumption on f is satisfied for the Gaussian/Laplacian/rational quadratic kernels and the energy distance.

4.1 When is the power trivial?

The result in O1 complements the finding in Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 of Chakraborty and Zhang (2019) which state that with n, m fixed and $p \to +\infty$, test based on energy distance has trivial power whenever

$$\mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1) = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2). \tag{13}$$

As seen from O1-S1, the MMD-based test with the kernel satisfying the condition in Lemma 4.1 remains to have trivial power under (13) as long as $N = o(\sqrt{p})$. Moreover, some algebra shows that under (13)

$$T_1 = \frac{2f^{(2)}(\tau)\|\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2}{p^2},$$

where $\tau = \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3$. When N grows faster than $o(\sqrt{p})$, our result suggests that the power of the MMD-based test could be either trivial or non-trivial depending on the magnitude of the Frobenius norm of the difference between the two covariance matrices.

Under $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$, we note that $\Delta_0 = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_2] = T_1 = 0$, $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_2) = O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-2})$, $\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_3) - T_2 = O(p^{-2})$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_3) = O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-3})$. In the regime $N = o(p^{3/2})$, the asymptotic power function of the MMD-based test is thus given by

$$\Phi\left(-z_{1-\alpha} + \frac{T_2}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}\right).$$

By Lemmas 3.10, we have $T_2 = O(p^{-2})$. Thus when Assumptions (g)-(h) hold and

$$N = o(p^{3/2}), \quad \mu_1 = \mu_2, \quad \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2,$$

the MMD-based test has trivial power. In other words, when the discrepancy is lying on the third order or higher order moments, it is necessary for N to grow at least as fast as $p^{3/2}$ for the test to have non-trivial power. More generally, by Corollary 3.11, when Assumptions (g)-(h) hold and

$$N = o(p^{l-3/2}) \text{ and the first } (l-1)\text{th moments of } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are equal}$$

for $l \geq 3$, the MMD-based test has trivial power.

Dimension and sample size orders	Common features
fixed N, growing p	$\mu_1 = \mu_2, \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1) = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2)$
$N = o(\sqrt{p})$	$\mu_1 = \mu_2, \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1) = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2)$
$N = o(p^{3/2})$	$\mu_1 = \mu_2, \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and Assumptions (g)-(h) hold
$N = o(p^{l-3/2})$	the first $(l-1)$th moments are equal and Assumptions (g)-(h) hold
$N = o(p^{l-1})$	$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = o(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$ and Assumption (g) holds

Table 2: When do the MMD-based tests have trivial power?

4.2 When is the power approaching one?

It may seem counter-intuitive to have an upper bound on the growth rate of N (i.e., $N = o(p)$ and $N = o(p^{l-1})$) for the test to have nontrivial power in O2 and O3. We note that these restrictions are from Theorems 3.2 and 3.9, which enable us to get the asymptotic exact forms of the power functions under these two scenarios. The restrictions are certainly unnecessary for the test to have nontrivial power provided that the discrepancy between the two distributions is large enough. To see this, suppose there is a discrepancy between the first two moments. Consider the expansion

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\Delta_0 + T_1 + \Delta_1 + (\widetilde{\Delta}_2 - \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2)) + (\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}.$$

Recall that $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1) = O(p^{-1} \cdot N^{-2})$, $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(p^{-2} \cdot N^{-1})$, and $\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1 = O(p^{-3/2})$. If

$$\Delta_0 + T_1 = \omega(\max\{p^{-3/2}, p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}, p^{-1} \cdot N^{-1/2}\}), \tag{14}$$

then the asymptotic power converges to one. When p and N are of the same order and the difference lies on the means, the above rate is not only sufficient but also necessary in view of equation (3.11) of Chen and Qin (2010) which suggests that under the local alternatives, the power will approach one only if $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|^2 = \omega(p^{1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$. Note that for linear kernel (i.e., $f(x) = -x$), $\Delta_0 = 2\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|^2/p$ and the condition in (14) is consistent with theirs. As the order of Δ_0 can be as larger as $\Theta(1)$, we do not need additional restriction on the dimension-and-sample orders for (14) to be satisfied.

Considering S2 (where Assumption (h) can be dropped), we have the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} &= \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\sum_{s=2}^{l-1} \Delta_s}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\widetilde{\Delta}_l}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \\ &= O_p(1) + \frac{(\widetilde{\Delta}_l - \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l)) + \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\mathbb{E}(\Delta_s) = 0$ for $1 \le s \le l-1$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}) = \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l) = \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)$. In this case, the power approaches one asymptotically whenever

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \omega(\max\{p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}, N^{-1/2} \cdot p^{-l/2}\}). \tag{15}$$

5 Simulations

In this section, we perform simulation studies to validate the theoretical results established in previous sections. We consider the balanced case $n = m$. As for the kernel k, we consider the Gaussian kernel $k(x, y) = \exp(-\|x - y\|_2^2/\gamma)$, Laplacian kernel $k(x, y) = \exp(-\|x - y\|_2/\sqrt{\gamma})$ and the energy distance (up to a scaling factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$) $k(x, y) = -\|x - y\|_2/\sqrt{\gamma}$ with the bandwidth $\gamma = 2p$.

Dimension-and-sample orders	Discrepancy between $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$
$N = o(\sqrt{p})$	$\Delta_0 = \Omega(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$
$N = o(p)$	$\Delta_0 + T_1 = \Omega(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$
No restriction	$\Delta_0 + T_1 = \omega(\max\{p^{-3/2}, p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}, p^{-1} \cdot N^{-1/2}\})$
$N = o(p^{l-1})$	the first $(l-1)$th moments are equal and Assumptions (g) holds $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \Omega(p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1})$
No restriction	the first $(l-1)$th moments are equal and Assumption (g) holds $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \omega(\max\{p^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1}, N^{-1/2} \cdot p^{-l/2}\})$

Table 3: When do the MMD-based tests have non-trivial power?

5.1 Accuracy of the normal approximation under the null

We start by verifying the null CLT derived in Section 3.3.

Example 1. We generate i.i.d. samples $X_i = \Sigma^{1/2} U_i + \mu$, $1 \le i \le n$ and $Y_j = \Sigma^{1/2} V_j + \mu$, $1 \le j \le m$ from the following models:

1. $U_i(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0,1)$ and $V_j(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0,1)$ for $1 \le k \le p$. Also, $\mu = \mathbf{0}_{p\times 1} = (0, \ldots, 0)^\top$ and $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ with $\sigma_{ij} = 0.5^{|i-j|}$.

2. $U_i(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathrm{Poisson}(1) - 1$ and $V_j(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathrm{Poisson}(1) - 1$ for $1 \le k \le p$. Also, $\mu = \mathbf{1}_{p\times 1} = (1, \ldots, 1)^\top$ and $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ with $\sigma_{ij} = 0.5^{|i-j|}$.

3. $U_i(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathrm{Exponential}(1) - 1$ and $V_j(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathrm{Exponential}(1) - 1$ for $1 \le k \le p$. Also, $\mu = \mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}$ and $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ with $\sigma_{ii} = 1$ for $1 \le i \le p$, $\sigma_{ij} = 0.25$ if $1 \le |i-j| \le 2$ and $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

We consider three different high-dimensional settings $(n, p) \in \{(32, 1000), (200, 200), (1000, 100)\}$ where $n \approx p^{0.5}, p, p^{1.5}$ respectively. We compare the standard normal quantiles with the corresponding sample quantiles of the test statistics. As can be seen from Figure 1, the normal approximation appears to be quite accurate in all cases.

5.2 Power behavior

Next, we analyze the power behavior of the test (10) in the case of Theorems 3.2 where there is a discrepancy among the first two moments. For a given model, we can compute Δ_0, T_1 and hence the power function (11).

We consider the following two examples. In Example 2, the mean vectors differ and the covariance matrices are equal. In Example 3, the mean vectors are the same while the covariance matrices differ.

Example 2. $X_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}, I_p)$ for $1 \le i \le n$, and $Y_j \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2p}}\mathbf{1}_{p\times 1}, I_p)$ for $1 \le j \le m$.

Example 3. $X_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}, I_p)$ for $1 \le i \le n$, and $Y_j \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}, \Sigma)$ for $1 \le j \le m$, where $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ with $\sigma_{ij} = 0.7^{|i-j|}$.

We try $p = 800$ and $n = p^d$, where d ranges from 0.5 to 0.95 with the spacing 0.05. We plot the power of these tests when the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ or 0.1. Figures 2 and 3 show that the empirical power is consistent with that predicted by our theory.

Finally, we validate the power behavior of the test in the case of Theorem 3.9, where the difference between the two distributions lies on the higher order moments.

Example 4. $X_i(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(1,1)$ for $1 \le i \le n, 1 \le k \le p$, and $Y_j(k) \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathrm{Poisson}(1)$ for $1 \le j \le m, 1 \le k \le p$. We try $p = 50$, and $n = p^d$ where d ranges from 1 to 1.9 with the spacing 0.1.




Figure 1: QQ plots for the MMD-based test statistics, where the results are obtained based on 500 replications.




Figure 2: Empirical power and theoretical power for the MMD-based test, where the difference between the two distributions lies on the mean vectors. The results are obtained based on 1000 replications.




Figure 3: Empirical power and theoretical power for the MMD-based test, where the difference between the two distributions lies on the second-order moments. The results are obtained based on 1000 replications.




Figure 4: Empirical power and theoretical power for the MMD-based test, where the difference between the two distributions lies on the third-order moments. The results are obtained based on 1000 replications.

As the first two moments are equal and $N = o(p^2)$, the asymptotic power of the MMD-based test is given by (12) with $l = 3$ in Theorem 3.9. As seen from Figure 4, the empirical power curve matches with the asymptotic power function, where we estimate the population MMD in the power function using Monte Carlo method. Besides, we can verify that Assumptions (g)-(h) hold as X and Y have independent components. When $N = o(p^{3/2})$, the empirical power is close to the nominal level, which is consistent with the result in Corollary 3.11. A recent result in Proposition 3.4.3 of Gao and Shao (2021) requires $p = o(N^{1/3})$ for the MMD-based test to have asymptotic power approaching one when the difference between the two distributions lies on the third-order moments. Our theory and numerical study suggest that the MMD-based test will have nontrivial power when $p = O(N^{2/3})$.

6 Impact of kernel and bandwidth on power

In this section, we investigate the impact of kernel and bandwidth on the asymptotic and finite sample power behaviors in the regime $N = o(p)$. Our results shed some lights on how to select the optimal kernel that maximizes the power with respect to some specific alternatives.

6.1 Case 1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ and $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$

Ramdas et al. (2015) found that the MMD-based tests with different kernels and bandwidths have asymptotically equal power under the mean difference alternatives. We observe a similar phenomenon in Example 2 above, where the asymptotic power is not affected by the choice of kernels and bandwidths. To understand this phenomenon, let us assume that $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 = \Theta(1)$. Then we have

$$\Delta_0 = -2f^{(1)}(\tau_1)\frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}{\gamma}(1 + o(1))$$

Kernel	$f(x)$	$h(\gamma)$	Impact of bandwidth γ on power
Gaussian	$\exp(-x)$	γ^{-1}	The power increases when γ decreases
Laplacian	$\exp(-\sqrt{x})$	$\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{C}\gamma}+\frac{1}{C})$	The power increases when γ decreases
Energy	$-\sqrt{x}$	$\frac{1}{2C}$	The power is unrelated to γ
Rational Quadratic	$(1+x)^{-\alpha}$	$\frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma+C}$	The power increases when γ decreases

Table 4: Impact of bandwidth on the asymptotic power for different kernels in Case 2, where $C = 2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)$.

by the Taylor expansion. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1) = \frac{8}{\gamma^2}\{f^{(1)}(\tau_1)\}^2\left\{\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2) + \frac{2}{nm}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)\right\}(1+o(1)).$$

By (6), it is not hard to verify that $T_1 = O(p^{-2}) = o(\Delta_0)$. Suppose $f^{(1)}(\tau_1) < 0$ which is the case for energy distance and MMD with the Gaussian kernel or Laplacian kernel. Then the asymptotic power relies on

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\|\mu_1-\mu_2\|_2^2}{\sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2) + \frac{2}{m(m-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2) + \frac{4}{nm}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)}}(1+o(1)),$$

which is independent of the kernel and bandwidth.

6.2 Case 2: $\mu_1 = \mu_2, \mathbf{tr}(\Sigma_1) = \mathbf{tr}(\Sigma_2)$ but $\Sigma_1 \neq \Sigma_2$

In this case, we have $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3$ and $\Delta_0 = 0$. By the expression of T_1 in Section 4.1, the asymptotic power depends on

$$\frac{T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{f^{(2)}(\tau)}{|f^{(1)}(\tau)|}\frac{\gamma^{-1}\|\Sigma_1-\Sigma_2\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2}{\sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2) + \frac{2}{m(m-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2) + \frac{4}{nm}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)}}(1+o(1)),$$

where $\tau = 2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)/\gamma$. In Example 3, the bandwidth $\gamma = 2p$ and $\tau = 1$. Hence $f^{(2)}(\tau)/|f^{(1)}(\tau)| = 1$ for both the Gaussian kernel and Laplacian kernel, which explains why the asymptotic powers for the Gaussian kernel and Laplacian kernel are the same in Figure 3.

For fixed bandwidth, the optimal kernel is the one which has the largest value of $f^{(2)}(\tau)/|f^{(1)}(\tau)|$. For fixed kernel, the bandwidth affects the power through

$$h(\gamma) = \frac{f^{(2)}(2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)/\gamma)}{|f^{(1)}(2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)/\gamma)|\cdot\gamma}.$$

For the energy distance, the bandwidth γ only acts as a scaling factor, and thus it does not affect the power. For other choices of kernels, the power increases when the bandwidth decreases; see Table 4. Below we provide some numerical evidence on how the choice of kernels and bandwidth affects the power, where we follow the setting in Example 3.

Example 5. $X_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}, I_p)$ for $1 \le i \le n$, and $Y_j \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}_{p\times 1}, \Sigma)$ for $1 \le j \le m$, where $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ with $\sigma_{ij} = 0.5^{|i-j|}$. We try $p = 800$, and $n = m = p^d$ where d ranging from 0.5 to 0.95 with the spacing 0.05. We use the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ in the following two scenarios.

1. Fixing the bandwidth $\gamma = p$, we compare the power of the MMD-based tests using the Gaussian, Laplacian, rational quadratic (RQ) kernel (with $\alpha = 1/2$) and energy distance.

2. We compare the power of the MMD-based tests using the Gaussian kernel with different bandwidth $\gamma \in \{0.5p, p, 1.5p, 2p\}$.




Figure 5: Impact of the kernel and bandwidth on the empirical power, where the results are based on 1000 replications.

In the first scenario, the bandwidth $\gamma = p$ is fixed and $\tau = 2$. Simple algebra shows that

$$h_{\text{Gaussian}}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{p} > h_{\text{Laplacian}}(\gamma) = \frac{0.6}{p} > h_{\text{RQ}}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2p} > h_{\text{Energy}}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{4p}.$$

As seen from Figure 5, the MMD-based test using Gaussian kernel has the highest power, followed by the Laplacian kernel and the RQ kernel (with $\alpha = 1/2$). The energy distance-based test has the lowest power. In the second scenario, the empirical power increases when the bandwidth decreases. The empirical observations from Figure 5 match with the theoretical results in Table 4.

7 Future works

We have systematically studied the asymptotic behaviors of the MMD-based test when the dimension and sample sizes both diverge to infinity. We established the CLT for the MMD-based test statistics under the null hypothesis and local and fixed alternatives. Built on the non-null CLT and other intermediate results, we studied the power behaviors of the MMD-based test under several scenarios, where the MMD-based test will have either trivial or non-trivial power, depending on a delicate interplay between the moment discrepancy and the sample-and-dimension orders. These theoretical findings are validated through numerical studies.

We mention two future research directions. First, as HSIC can be viewed as MMD applied to the joint distribution between X and Y and the product of the two marginals, we expect similar results to hold for HSIC. A recent work along this direction is Han and Shen (2021). Second, it would be very interesting to study the high-dimensional behaviors of other popular discrepancy measures in the literature, such as the kernelized Stein discrepancy (Chwialkowski et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2016) and the Wasserstein distance.

Appendix A Some useful lemmas

Lemma A.1. *Consider a function of the form $h(x) = g((a+x)^{1/2})$ for $a > 0$ and $x \geq -a$, where g is a real-valued function defined on $[0, +\infty)$. Suppose*

$$\sup_{1 \leq s \leq l+1} \sup_{x \geq 0} |g^{(s)}(x)| < \infty.$$

Then we can write h as

$$h(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{l} \frac{h^{(s)}(0) x^s}{s!} + c_{l+1,a}(x) x^{l+1}, \quad \sup_{x \geq -a} |c_{l+1,a}(x)| \leq C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and any $x \geq -a$. The subscripts of the function $c(x)$ are used to indicate the dependency on $l+1$ and a.

Proof. Our goal is to show for any $x \geq -a$

$$\left| h(x) - \sum_{s=0}^{l} \frac{h^{(s)}(0) x^s}{s!} \right| \leq C|x|^{l+1}$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$. First of all, some algebra yields that

$$h^{(l+1)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{R} \frac{b_i(x)}{(a+x)^{c_i}}, \tag{16}$$

where $0 \leq c_i \leq l + 1/2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq R$, and $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq R} \sup_{x \geq -a} |b_i(x)| < \infty$ under our assumption.

When $x \geq 0$, the result holds by using the Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder. We consider the case where $-a \leq x \leq 0$. Using the Taylor expansion with integral remainder, we have

$$h(x) - \sum_{s=0}^{l} \frac{h^{(s)}(0) x^s}{s!} = \int_0^x \frac{h^{(l+1)}(t)(x-t)^l}{l!} dt := r(x).$$

We show that $r(x)/x^{l+1}$ is well defined at the two boundary points 0 and $-a$. By the L'Hospital's rule,

$$\lim_{x \to 0^-} \left| \frac{r(x)}{x^{l+1}} \right| = \left| \frac{h^{(l+1)}(0)}{(l+1)!} \right|.$$

On the other hand, when $x = -a$, we have

$$r(-a) = \frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l!} \int_{-a}^{0} h^{(l+1)}(t)(a+t)^l dt.$$

By (16), it is not hard to verify that

$$\left| \frac{r(-a)}{(-a)^{l+1}} \right| < \infty.$$

Therefore, the function $r(x)/x^{l+1}$ is continuous on the closed interval $[-a, 0]$. By the extreme value theorem, there must exist a $C > 0$ such that $|r(x)/x^{l+1}| \leq C$. The conclusion thus follows by combining the results for $x \geq 0$ and $-a \leq x \leq 0$. □

Lemma A.2. *Suppose U is a vector with independent entries $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^q$ such that $\mathbb{E}(u_i) = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(u_i^2) = 1$, and $\mathbb{E}(u_i^l) = \mu_{i,l}$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ and $l \geq 3$. Then if $\max_i \mu_{i,4} < \infty$ and $A_{q \times q}$ is a deterministic symmetric matrix, we have*

$$\mathrm{Var}(U^\top A U) = 2\mathrm{tr}(A^2) + \sum_{i=1}^{q} \delta_i a_{ii}^2,$$

where $\delta_i = \mu_{i,4} - 3$.

Proof. We have

$$\mathbb{E}(U^\top AU) = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}\mathbb{E}(u_i u_j) = \mathrm{tr}(A),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AU)^2] &= \sum_{i_1,j_1}\sum_{i_2,j_2} a_{i_1j_1}a_{i_2j_2}\mathbb{E}(u_{i_1}u_{i_2}u_{j_1}u_{j_2}) \\ &= \sum_i \mathbb{E}(u_i^4)a_{ii}^2 + 2\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i\neq j} a_{ii}a_{jj} \\ &= \sum_i \delta_i a_{ii}^2 + 2\mathrm{tr}(A^2) + [\mathrm{tr}(A)]^2.\end{aligned}$$

The result thus follows. □

Lemma A.3. *Suppose U is a vector with independent entries $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^q$ such that $\mathbb{E}(u_i) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(u_i^l) = \mu_{i,l}$ for $1 \le i \le q$ and $l \ge 2$. Then if $\max_i |\mu_{i,l}| \le \mu_l < \infty$ for $l \le L$ and $a_{q\times 1}$ is a deterministic column vector, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[(a^\top U)^L] = O(\|a\|_2^L).$$

Proof. Note that $\|a\|_p \le \|a\|_q$ for $p \ge q \ge 1$, where $\|a\|_p = (\sum_i |a_i|^p)^{1/p}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}[(a^\top U)^L]| &= \Big|\sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_L}\prod_{l=1}^L a_{i_l}\cdot\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{l=1}^L u_{i_l}\Big)\Big| \le \sum_{\{l_j\}:l_j\ge 2,\sum_j l_j = L} C\cdot\prod_j \|a\|_{l_j}^{l_j}\mu_{l_j} \\ &\le C\cdot\sum_{\{l_j\}:l_j\ge 2,\sum_j l_j = L}\prod_j \|a\|_2^{l_j}\mu_{l_j} \le C\cdot\|a\|_2^L\cdot\sum_{\{l_j\}:l_j\ge 2,\sum_j l_j = L}\prod_j \mu_{l_j} = O(\|a\|_2^L),\end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant related to L only. □

Lemma A.4. *Suppose U and V are two independent but not necessarily identically distributed random vectors taking values in $\mathbb{R}^q$. The entries of U and V are also independent, and we denote the i-th entry of U and V by u_i and v_i respectively. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}(u_i) = \mathbb{E}(v_i) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}(u_i^l) = \mu_{i,l}$, $\mathbb{E}(v_i^l) = s_{i,l}$ for $1 \le i \le q$ and $l \ge 2$. Then if $\max_i |\mu_{i,l}| \le \mu_l < \infty, \max_i |s_{i,l}| \le s_l < \infty$ for $l \le L$ and $A_{q\times q}$ is a deterministic but not necessarily symmetric matrix, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AV)^L] = O((\mathrm{tr}(AA^\top))^{L/2}).$$

Proof. As

$$\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AV)^L] = \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_L}\sum_{j_1,\cdots,j_L}\prod_{l=1}^L a_{i_l j_l}\cdot\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{l=1}^L u_{i_l}\prod_{l=1}^L v_{j_l}\Big),$$

the result follows by considering the possible combinations of the indices $i_1,\cdots,i_L$ and $j_1,\cdots,j_L$. For illustration and conciseness, we only present the calculations for $L = 3$ and 4 as the proof for general L follows the same route. For $L = 3$, we note that

$$|\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AV)^3]| \le \mu_3 s_3\sum_{i,j}|a_{ij}|^3 \le \mu_3 s_3\Big(\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2\Big)^{3/2} = \mu_3 s_3\cdot(\mathrm{tr}(AA^\top))^{3/2}.$$

For $L=4$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AV)^4] &\le \mu_4 s_4 \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^4 + 3\mu_4 s_2^2 \sum_i \sum_{j_1\neq j_2} a_{ij_1}^2 a_{ij_2}^2 + 3\mu_2^2 s_4 \sum_{i_1\neq i_2} \sum_j a_{i_1 j}^2 a_{i_2 j}^2 \\ &\quad + \mu_2^2 s_2^2 \sum_{i_1\neq i_2} \sum_{j_1\neq j_2} (3a_{i_1 j_1}^2 a_{i_2 j_2}^2 + 6a_{i_1 j_1} a_{i_1 j_2} a_{i_2 j_1} a_{i_2 j_2}) \\ &\le (\mu_4 s_4 + 3\mu_4 s_2^2 + 3\mu_2^2 s_4 + 3\mu_2^2 s_2^2) \cdot \Big(\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2\Big)^2 + 6\mu_2^2 s_2^2 \cdot \sum_{i_1,i_2} \Big(a_{i_1 i_2}^{(2)}\Big)^2 \\ &= O((\mathrm{tr}(AA^\top))^2) + O(\mathrm{tr}((AA^\top)^2)),\end{aligned}$$

where $AA^\top = (a_{ij}^{(2)})_{q\times q}$. Since $AA^\top$ is positive semi-definite, we have

$$\mathrm{tr}((AA^\top)^l) \le (\mathrm{tr}(AA^\top))^l.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}[(U^\top AV)^4] = O((\mathrm{tr}(AA^\top))^2)$. □

Appendix B Technical details

B.1 Taylor expansion for the kernel function

Consider $k(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = f(p^{-1}\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2)$ for illustration. The Taylor expansions of $f(p^{-1}\|Y_{j_1} - Y_{j_2}\|_2^2)$ and $f(p^{-1}\|X_i - Y_j\|_2^2)$ follow the same line.

Let $g(x) = f(x^2)$ as defined in Assumption (e) and write $\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2} = p^{-1}\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - \tau_1$. Under the assumption $\sup_{1\le s\le l+1}\sup_{x\ge 0}|g^{(s)}(x)| < \infty$, we can apply Lemma A.1 with $x = \widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}$, $a = \tau_1$ and $h(x) = g((a+x)^{1/2})$ to obtain

$$h(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}) = \sum_{s=0}^{l} \frac{h^{(s)}(0)\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^s}{s!} + c_{l+1,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^{l+1}, \tag{17}$$

where $c_{l+1,\tau_1}(\cdot)$ is a bounded function.

Note that f is related to h through $f(x+a) = h(x)$ and hence $f^{(s)}(x+a) = h^{(s)}(x)$ for any $s \ge 0$. Thus (17) implies that

$$f(p^{-1}\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2) = f(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2} + \tau_1) = \sum_{s=0}^{l} \frac{f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^s}{s!} + c_{l+1,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^{l+1}.$$

B.2 The variance and the mean of the second-order term in the non-null setting

We first handle the variance of $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. Define $P_1 = \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2$, $P_2 = \frac{1}{m(m-1)}\sum_{j_1\neq j_2} c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2})(\|Y_{j_1} - Y_{j_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau_2)^2$ and $P_3 = -\frac{2}{nm}\sum_{i,j} c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})(\|X_i - Y_j\|_2^2 - p\tau_3)^2$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(P_1) &= \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^2}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}\sum_{i_3\neq i_4} \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2, c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_3,i_4})(\|X_{i_3} - X_{i_4}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\ &= \frac{4}{n^2(n-1)^2}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}\sum_{i_3\neq i_1,i_2} \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2, c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_3})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_3}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n^2(n-1)^2}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} \mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\ &= \frac{4(n-2)}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2, c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,3})(\|X_1 - X_3\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2],\end{aligned}$$

where X_1, X_2, X_3 are i.i.d copies of X. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(P_1) &\le \frac{4(n-2)}{n(n-1)}\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2]\cdot\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,3})(\|X_1-X_3\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2]} \\
&\quad+\frac{2}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2] \\
&= \frac{2(2n-3)}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^2] \le \frac{2(2n-3)}{n(n-1)}\mathbb{E}[c_{2,\tau_1}^2(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^4] \\
&= O(N^{-1})\cdot\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^4],
\end{aligned}$$

since $c_{2,\tau_1}(\cdot)$ is bounded. Hence we need to study the term $\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^4]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^4] &= \mathbb{E}\{[\|X_1-\mu_1\|_2^2+\|X_2-\mu_1\|_2^2-2(X_1-\mu_1)^\top(X_2-\mu_1)-2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)]^4\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{[U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_1-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)+U_2^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1)-2U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2]^4\} \\
&\le C\cdot\{\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_1-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))^4]+\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2)^4]\},
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C>0$. Using Lemma A.4, we know that $\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2)^4]=O(\mathrm{tr}^2(\Sigma_1^2))=O(p^2)$. Thus, we only need to analyze the term $\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_1-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))^4]$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_1-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))^4] &= \mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sum_k s_{kk}(U_1(k)^2-1)+\sum_{k_1\neq k_2}s_{k_1k_2}U_1(k_1)U_1(k_2)\bigg)^4\bigg] \\
&\le 2^3\times\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sum_k s_{kk}(U_1(k)^2-1)\bigg)^4+\bigg(\sum_{k_1\neq k_2}s_{k_1k_2}U_1(k_1)U_1(k_2)\bigg)^4\bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Here $s_{k_1k_2}$ is the (k_1,k_2)th element of $\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1$. For the off-diagonal sum, we use the decoupling technique (see Remark 6.1.3 in Vershynin (2018)) to replace it with $U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2$, where U_2 is an i.i.d. copy of U_1, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sum_{k_1\neq k_2}s_{k_1k_2}U_1(k_1)U_1(k_2)\bigg)^4\bigg]\le\mathbb{E}\left[(4U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_2)^4\right]=O(\mathrm{tr}^2(\Sigma_1^2))=O(p^2).$$

For the diagonal sum, since we have assumed $\max_{1\le k\le q}\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^8)<\infty$ in Assumption (a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sum_k s_{kk}(U_1(k)^2-1)\bigg)^4\bigg] &= \sum_k s_{kk}^4\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_1(k)^2-1\right)^4\right] \\
&\quad+3\sum_{k_1\neq k_2}s_{k_1k_1}^2s_{k_2k_2}^2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_1(k_1)^2-1\right)^2\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_1(k_2)^2-1\right)^2\right] \\
&= O(\lambda_1^3(\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1)\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1))+O(\lambda_1^2(\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1)\mathrm{tr}^2(\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1)) \\
&= O(\lambda_1^3(\Sigma_1)\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))+O(\lambda_1^2(\Sigma_1)\mathrm{tr}^2(\Sigma_1))=O(p^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1(A)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of a positive semi-definite matrix A. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Var}(P_1)=O(N^{-1})\cdot\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-X_2\|_2^2-p\tau_1)^4]=O(N^{-1}\cdot p^2).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(P_2) &= \frac{4(m-2)}{m(m-1)}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})(\|Y_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^2,c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,3})(\|Y_1-Y_3\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^2] \\
&\quad+\frac{2}{m(m-1)}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})(\|Y_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^2] \\
&= O(N^{-1})\cdot\mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_2)^4]=O(N^{-1}\cdot p^2),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(P_3) &= \frac{4}{n^2m^2}\sum_{i_1}\sum_{i_2}\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_1,j_1})(\|X_{i_1}-Y_{j_1}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2, c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_2,j_2})(\|X_{i_2}-Y_{j_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&= \frac{4}{n^2m^2}\sum_{i}\sum_{j_1\neq j_2}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j_1})(\|X_i-Y_{j_1}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2, c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j_2})(\|X_i-Y_{j_2}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{n^2m^2}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2}\sum_{j}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_1,j})(\|X_{i_1}-Y_{j}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2, c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_2,j})(\|X_{i_2}-Y_{j}\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{n^2m^2}\sum_{i}\sum_{j}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})(\|X_i-Y_j\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&= \frac{4(m-1)}{nm}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2, c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,2})(\|X_1-Y_2\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4(n-1)}{nm}\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2, c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{2,1})(\|X_2-Y_1\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{nm}\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^2] \\
&= O(N^{-1})\cdot\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^2-p\tau_3)^4] \\
&= O(N^{-1})\cdot\{\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-\mu_1\|_2^2-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))^4]+\mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1-\mu_2\|_2^2-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2))^4]+\mathbb{E}[((X_1-\mu_1)^\top(Y_1-\mu_2))^4] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[((\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top(X_1-\mu_1))^4]+\mathbb{E}[((\mu_2-\mu_1)^\top(Y_1-\mu_2))^4]\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in the calculations of $\mathrm{Var}(P_1)$ and $\mathrm{Var}(P_2)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1-\mu_1\|_2^2-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1))^4]=O(p^2)$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1-\mu_2\|_2^2-\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2))^4]=O(p^2)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(P_3) &= O(N^{-1})\cdot\{O(p^2)+\mathbb{E}[(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_2V_1)^4]+\mathbb{E}[((\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top\Gamma_1U_1)^4]+\mathbb{E}[((\mu_2-\mu_1)^\top\Gamma_2V_1)^4]\} \\
&= O(N^{-1})\cdot\{O(p^2)+O(\mathrm{tr}^2(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2))+O([(\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top\Sigma_1(\mu_1-\mu_2)]^2)+O([(\mu_2-\mu_1)^\top\Sigma_2(\mu_2-\mu_1)]^2)\} \\
&= O(N^{-1}\cdot p^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma A.3, Lemma A.4 and Assumption (c). Putting together the above results, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2)=p^{-4}\cdot\mathrm{Var}(P_1+P_2+P_3)\leq 3p^{-4}\cdot[\mathrm{Var}(P_1)+\mathrm{Var}(P_2)+\mathrm{Var}(P_3)]=O(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-2}),$$

under Assumptions (a)-(e).

Now we cope with the mean of $\widetilde{\Delta}_2$. Under Assumption (e), we can also perform a third-order Taylor expansion (again see Section B.1):

$$f(p^{-1}\|X_{i_1}-X_{i_2}\|_2^2)=f(\tau_1)+f^{(1)}(\tau_1)\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}+\frac{f^{(2)}(\tau_1)}{2}\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^2+c_{3,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}^3,$$

where $c_{3,\tau_1}(\cdot)$ is bounded. Comparing with the second-order expansion, we immediately have

$$c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})=\frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\tau_1)+c_{3,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2}) &= \frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\tau_2)+c_{3,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2})\widetilde{Y}_{j_1,j_2}, \\
c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j}) &= \frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\tau_3)+c_{3,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{i,j})\widetilde{Z}_{i,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of T_1, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1| \\
&\le \frac{1}{p^2} \cdot \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[|c_{2,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2}) - \frac{1}{2} f^{(2)}(\tau_1)|(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[|c_{2,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2}) - \frac{1}{2} f^{(2)}(\tau_2)|(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_2)^2] + \mathbb{E}[|2c_{2,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1}) - f^{(2)}(\tau_3)|(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau_3)^2] \Big\} \\
&= \frac{1}{p^2} \cdot \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[|c_{3,\tau_1}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})\widetilde{X}_{1,2}|(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[|c_{3,\tau_2}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})\widetilde{Y}_{1,2}|(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_2)^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[|c_{3,\tau_3}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})\widetilde{Z}_{1,1}|(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau_3)^2] \Big\} \\
&\le \frac{C}{p^3} \cdot \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[|\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1|^3] + \mathbb{E}[|\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_2|^3] + 2\mathbb{E}[|\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau_3|^3] \Big\},
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Following the previous calculations of the variance, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}[|\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1|^3] \le \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^4]} = \sqrt{O(p) \cdot O(p^2)} = O(p^{\frac{3}{2}}).
$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E}[|\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_2|^3] = O(p^{3/2})$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau_3|^3] = O(p^{3/2})$. Therefore,

$$
\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1 = O(p^{-\frac{3}{2}}).
$$

B.3 The variance of the second-order term under the null

Under the null $H_0 : \mathbb{P}_X = \mathbb{P}_Y$, let $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = \tau$ and observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{1,3})(\|X_1 - X_3\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,3})(\|Y_1 - Y_3\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{2,1})(\|X_2 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \coloneqq Q_1,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{1,2})(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Y}_{1,2})(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\
&= \mathrm{Var}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{1,1})(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \coloneqq Q_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then along with the calculations in Section B.2, some algebra yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(P_1) &= \frac{4(n-2)}{n(n-1)} Q_1 + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} Q_2, \\
\mathrm{Var}(P_2) &= \frac{4(m-2)}{m(m-1)} Q_1 + \frac{2}{m(m-1)} Q_2, \\
\mathrm{Var}(P_3) &= \frac{4(n+m-2)}{nm} Q_1 + \frac{4}{nm} Q_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Because the two samples are independent, $\mathrm{Cov}(P_1, P_2) = 0$. Also, under H_0, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}(P_1, P_3) &= -\frac{2}{n^2(n-1)m} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \sum_{i_3} \sum_{j} \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_3,j})(\|X_{i_3} - Y_j\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\ &= -\frac{4}{n^2(n-1)m} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} \sum_{j} \mathrm{Cov}[c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{X}_{i_1,i_2})(\|X_{i_1} - X_{i_2}\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2, c_{2,\tau}(\widetilde{Z}_{i_1,j})(\|X_{i_1} - Y_j\|_2^2 - p\tau)^2] \\ &= -\frac{4}{n} Q_1.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathrm{Cov}(P_2, P_3) = -\frac{4}{m} Q_1.$$

In summary, under H_0,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = p^{-4} \cdot \mathrm{Var}(P_1 + P_2 + P_3) &= \frac{2}{p^4}\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)} + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} + \frac{2}{nm}\right](Q_2 - 2Q_1) \\ &\leq \frac{6}{p^4}\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)} + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} + \frac{2}{nm}\right] Q_2,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, i.e., $Q_1 \geq -Q_2$.

As in Section B.2, $Q_2 = O(p^2)$ under Assumption (a)-(e), thus, $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-2})$, the order of which is smaller than the one in the non-null setting.

B.4 The variances of $\Delta_s, 2 \leq s \leq l-1$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_l$ in Theorem 3.9

We first handle the variance of Δ_s for $2 \leq s \leq l-1$ under Assumption (g). Note that we do not require the first $(l-1)$th moments of X and Y to be equal in this case. We aim to show that $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_s) = o(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1})$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_s - \mathbb{E}[\Delta_s] = \frac{1}{s!} \cdot \Bigg[&\frac{1}{n(n-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_1) \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} (\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}]) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_2) \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}]) \\ &- \frac{2}{nm} f^{(s)}(\tau_3) \sum_{i,j} (\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}])\Bigg].\end{aligned}$$

We can express the term inside the square bracket as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n(n-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_1) \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} (\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}]) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_2) \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}]) - \frac{2}{nm} f^{(s)}(\tau_3) \sum_{i,j} (\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}]) \\ =&\frac{1}{n(n-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_1) \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} (\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}|X_{i_1}] - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}|X_{i_2}] + \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i_1,i_2}]) \\ &+ \frac{1}{m(m-1)} f^{(s)}(\tau_2) \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} (\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}|Y_{j_1}] - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}|Y_{j_2}] + \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j_1,j_2}]) \\ &- \frac{2}{nm} f^{(s)}(\tau_3) \sum_{i,j} (\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}|X_i] - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}|Y_j] + \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,j}]) \\ &+ \frac{2}{n} \sum_i (f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i,0}|X_i] - f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{i,0}] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,0}|X_i] + f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{i,0}]) \\ &+ \frac{2}{m} \sum_j (f^{(s)}(\tau_2)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j,0}|Y_j] - f^{(s)}(\tau_2)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}^s_{j,0}] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{0,j}|Y_j] + f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{0,j}]) := I_1 + I_2 + I_3\end{aligned}$$

where the sum of the first three terms is denoted by I_1, and (X_0, Y_0) is an i.i.d. copy of (X, Y).
Using the double-centering property, we have $\mathbb{E}[I_1] = 0$. Also, following Section B.2 and using Lemmas A.3-A.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(I_1) &= O(N^{-2}) \cdot [\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{X}^s_{1,2}) + \mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{Y}^s_{1,2}) + \mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{Z}^s_{1,1})] \\
&= O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-2s}) \cdot \left\{\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_1)^{2s}] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau_2)^{2s}] + \mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau_3)^{2s}]\right\} \\
&= O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-2s}) \cdot \{O(\mathrm{tr}^s(\Sigma_1^2) + O(\mathrm{tr}^s(\Sigma_2^2) + O(\mathrm{tr}^s(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)) \\
&\quad + O([(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_1 (\mu_1 - \mu_2)]^s) + O([(\mu_2 - \mu_1)^\top \Sigma_2 (\mu_2 - \mu_1)]^s)\} \\
&= O(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-s}) = o(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it remains to analyze I_2 (the analysis of I_3 is the same). Note that

$$\mathrm{Var}(I_2) = \frac{4}{n}\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}^s_{1,0}|X_1] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}^s_{1,0}|X_1]).$$

Under Assumption (g), we have $\mathrm{Var}(I_2) = o(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1})$. Similar analysis shows that $\mathrm{Var}(I_3) = o(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1})$, which implies that $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_s) = o(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1})$.

Next, we study $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l)$. Following similar calculations of $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2)$ in Section B.2 and using Lemmas A.3-A.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l) &= O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-2l}) \cdot \left\{\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^{2l}] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^{2l}] + \mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^{2l}]\right\} \\
&= O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-2l})\{O(\mathrm{tr}^l(\Sigma_1^2) + O(\mathrm{tr}^l(\Sigma_2^2) + O(\mathrm{tr}^l(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)) \\
&\quad + O([(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^\top \Sigma_1 (\mu_1 - \mu_2)]^l) + O([(\mu_2 - \mu_1)^\top \Sigma_2 (\mu_2 - \mu_1)]^l)\} \\
&= O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-l}).
\end{aligned}$$

B.5 The mean of $\Delta_s, 2 \le s \le l-1$ when X and Y share the first $(l-1)$th moments

We show that $\mathbb{E}(\Delta_s) = T_{s-1} = 0$ for $2 \le s \le l-1$ when the first $(l-1)$th moments of X and Y match. Observe that T_{s-1} defined in (7) involves the first $2s$th moments of X and Y. Thus it is a non-trivial task to show that $T_{s-1} = 0$ when we only assume the first $(l-1)$th moments of X and Y match. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] - 2\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] \\
&= \sum_{a=0}^{s} \binom{s}{a} (-p\tau)^{s-a} \left\{\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we show that $\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} = 0$, for $a \le s$, when X and Y share the first $(l-1)$th moments.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} &= \sum_{a_1 + a_2 \le a} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2} a!}{a_1! a_2! (a - a_1 - a_2)!} \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|X_2\|_2^{2a_2} (X_1^\top X_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}] \\
&= \sum_{2a_1 \le a} \frac{(-2)^{a-2a_1} a!}{a_1! a_1! (a - 2a_1)!} \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|X_2\|_2^{2a_1} (X_1^\top X_2)^{a-2a_1}] \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{\substack{a_1 > a_2 \\ a_1 + a_2 \le a}} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2} a!}{a_1! a_2! (a - a_1 - a_2)!} \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|X_2\|_2^{2a_2} (X_1^\top X_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}] \\
&:= S_1 + 2S_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that S_1 merely depends on the first ath moments of X. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= \sum_{2a_1 \le a} \frac{(-2)^{a-2a_1} a!}{a_1! a_1! (a - 2a_1)!} \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1} (X_1^\top Y_1)^{a-2a_1}] \\
&= \sum_{2a_1 \le a} \frac{(-2)^{a-2a_1} a!}{a_1! a_1! (a - 2a_1)!} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|Y_2\|_2^{2a_1} (Y_1^\top Y_2)^{a-2a_1}],
\end{aligned}$$

when the first $(l-1)$th moments of X and Y match. Moreover, by conditioning on X_1, $\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|X_2\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top X_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}|X_1]$ entirely depends on the first $(a-1)$th moments of X (since $2a_2+a-a_1-a_2=a+a_2-a_1<a$). Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|X_2\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top X_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}|X_1]=\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top Y_1)^{a-a_1-a_2}|X_1],$$

which implies

$$S_2=\sum_{\substack{a_1>a_2\\ a_1+a_2\le a}}\frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2}a!}{a_1!a_2!(a-a_1-a_2)!}\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top Y_1)^{a-a_1-a_2}].$$

Similarly, by conditioning on Y_1 first, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{a_1>a_2\\ a_1+a_2\le a}}\frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2}a!}{a_1!a_2!(a-a_1-a_2)!}\mathbb{E}[\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|Y_2\|_2^{2a_2}(Y_1^\top Y_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}]\\ =&\sum_{\substack{a_1>a_2\\ a_1+a_2\le a}}\frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2}a!}{a_1!a_2!(a-a_1-a_2)!}\mathbb{E}[\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|X_1\|_2^{2a_2}(Y_1^\top X_1)^{a-a_1-a_2}].\end{aligned}$$

Combining these results, it is straightforward to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\|X_1-X_2\|_2^{2a}+\mathbb{E}\|Y_1-Y_2\|_2^{2a}-2\mathbb{E}\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^{2a}=0 \text{ for } a\le s \implies \mathbb{E}(\Delta_s)=T_{s-1}=0.$$

Appendix C Proofs of lemmas and theorems

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Following similar calculations in Section 6.2 of Chen and Qin (2010), it is straightforward to show that

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1,1})=\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1,2})=\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1,3})=0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1})&=\frac{8}{p^2}\cdot\left\{\frac{1}{n(n-1)}[f^{(1)}(\tau_1)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)+\frac{1}{m(m-1)}[f^{(1)}(\tau_2)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_2^2)+\frac{2}{nm}[f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)\right\},\\ \mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2})&=\frac{16}{p^2}[f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\left[\frac{1}{n}(\mu_1-\mu_2)^\top\Sigma_1(\mu_1-\mu_2)+\frac{1}{m}(\mu_2-\mu_1)^\top\Sigma_2(\mu_2-\mu_1)\right],\\ \mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,3})&=\frac{4}{p^2}\left\{[f^{(1)}(\tau_1)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\cdot\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Var}(U_1^\top\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1U_1)+[f^{(1)}(\tau_2)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\cdot\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{Var}(V_1^\top\Gamma_2^\top\Gamma_2V_1)\right\}\\ &=\frac{4}{p^2}\left\{[f^{(1)}(\tau_1)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\cdot\frac{1}{n}\left[2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)+\sum_k(\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^4)-3)s_{kk}^2\right]\right.\\ &\quad\left.+[f^{(1)}(\tau_2)-f^{(1)}(\tau_3)]^2\cdot\frac{1}{m}\left[2\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2)+\sum_k(\mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^4)-3)t_{kk}^2\right]\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1^\top\Gamma_1=(s_{kl})_{q\times q}$, $\Gamma_2^\top\Gamma_2=(t_{kl})_{q\times q}$, and we have used Lemma A.2.

Under the local alternative (f1), as $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2})=o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}))$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,3})=o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}))$,

$$\frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}}=\frac{\Delta_{1,1}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1})}}+o_p(1).$$

Note Assumptions (a) and (d) correspond to (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) in Chen and Qin (2010). Besides, under Assumption (b), one may check that

$$\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_i\Sigma_j\Sigma_l\Sigma_h)=O(p)=o(\mathrm{tr}^2[(\Sigma_1+\Sigma_2)^2]),$$

for i, j, l, h =1 or 2, which is (3.6) in Chen and Qin (2010). Therefore, the asymptotic normality of $\Delta_{1,1}$ can be attained by simply mimicking the arguments in Section 6.2 in Chen and Qin (2010). The only difference is the definition of ϕ_{ij} in their proof. In our case,

$$\phi_{ij} = \begin{cases} n^{-1}(n-1)^{-1} f^{(1)}(\tau_1) Z_i^\top Z_j, & \text{if } i, j \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}, \\ -n^{-1} m^{-1} f^{(1)}(\tau_3) Z_i^\top Z_j, & \text{if } i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\} \text{ and } j \in \{n+1, \cdots, n+m\}, \\ m^{-1}(m-1)^{-1} f^{(1)}(\tau_2) Z_i^\top Z_j, & \text{if } i, j \in \{n+1, \cdots, n+m\}, \end{cases}$$

where $Z_i = X_i - \mu_1$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $Z_{j+n} = Y_j - \mu_2$ for $j = 1. \cdots, m$. Then the asymptotic normality can be proved with verification of the conditions of the martingale CLT (see, for example, Corollary 3.1 of Hall and Heyde (2014)). We omit the details here to avoid duplication.

Under (f2), we have either $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2}))$ or $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,3}))$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\Delta_{1,2} + \Delta_{1,3}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2} + \Delta_{1,3})}} + o_p(1).$$

As $\Delta_{1,2} + \Delta_{1,3}$ is a summation of averages of independent variables, the asymptotic normality follows. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Note $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1) = \mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,1})[1 + o(1)] = \Theta(N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1})$ under Assumptions (a)-(d) and (f1). So

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-2}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1 = O(p^{-\frac{3}{2}}) = o(\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}),$$

if $N = o(p)$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widetilde{\Delta}_2 - T_1)^2] = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \Delta_0 - T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\widetilde{\Delta}_2 - T_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Note that $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1) = \mathrm{Var}(\Delta_{1,2} + \Delta_{1,3})[1 + o(1)] = \omega(\max\{p^{-3}, N^{-2} \cdot p^{-1}\})$ under Assumptions (a)-(d) and (f2). As in Theorem 3.2, it can be checked that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) = O(N^{-1} \cdot p^{-2}) = o(\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_2) - T_1 = O(p^{-\frac{3}{2}}) = o(\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}).$$

Hence, the asymptotic normality of $\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}$ can be justified in the same way. □

Proof of Corollary 3.3 & 3.5. The result follows by noting that $T_1 = o(\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)})$ under $N = o(\sqrt{p})$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.6. Note $\widetilde{\Delta}_2 / \sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} = o_p(1)$ under the null. Thus,

$$\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} = \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\widetilde{\Delta}_2}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.7. According to Theorem 2 in Chen and Qin (2010), $\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_i^2)}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)}$ are ratio-consistent estimators of $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_i^2)$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1\Sigma_2)$. Thus, we only need to prove that $f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_i)$ is ratio-consistent to $f^{(1)}(\tau_i)$. We shall show the ratio consistency of $f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_1)$ here. The proofs for $f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_i), i = 2, 3$ are similar.

We note that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_i X_i^\top (X_i - \bar{X}_{-i}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \|X_i\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} X_{i_1}^\top X_{i_2}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\tau}_1) \le 2 \times \frac{4}{p^2} \times \left[\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_i \|X_i\|_2^2\right) + \mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} X_{i_1}^\top X_{i_2}\right)\right],$$

where

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_i \|X_i\|_2^2\right) = \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Var}(\|X_1\|_2^2) \le \frac{C}{n}\cdot\{\mathrm{Var}(\|X_1-\mu_1\|_2^2) + \mathrm{Var}[\mu_1^\top(X_1-\mu_1)]\} = O(p\cdot N^{-1}),$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i_1\neq i_2} X_{i_1}^\top X_{i_2}\right) = \frac{2}{n(n-1)}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_1^2) + \frac{4}{n}\mu_1^\top\Sigma_1\mu_1 = O(p\cdot N^{-1}).$$

Thus, $\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\tau}_1) = O(p^{-1}\cdot N^{-1}) = o(1)$, which implies $\widehat{\tau}_1 \xrightarrow{p} \tau_1$. By the continuous mapping theorem,

$$|f^{(1)}(\widehat{\tau}_1) - f^{(1)}(\tau_1)| = o_p(1) = o_p(f^{(1)}(\tau_1)).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \Gamma = (\gamma_{kl})_{p\times q}$ and $\Gamma^\top\Gamma = (s_{kl})_{q\times q}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mu = 0$ (as otherwise we can work with $X_i - \mu$ and $Y_j - \mu$). Under $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$, which implies $\tau_1 = \tau_3 := \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}_{1,2}^2|X_1] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}_{1,1}^s|X_1] &= p^{-2}f^{(s)}(\tau)\left\{\mathbb{E}[\|X_1-X_2\|_2^4|X_1] - \mathbb{E}[\|X_1-Y_1\|_2^4|X_1]\right\} \\ &= -4p^{-2}f^{(s)}(\tau)\mathbb{E}[\|X_2\|_2^2X_2^\top - \|Y_1\|_2^2Y_1^\top]X_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}_{1,2}^s|X_1] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}_{1,1}^s|X_1]) \\ &= O(p^{-4})\|\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_2^2X - \|Y\|_2^2Y]\|_2^2 \\ &= O(p^{-4})\sum_i\left(\sum_j \mathbb{E}[x_j^2x_i - y_j^2y_i]\right)^2 \\ &= O(p^{-4})\sum_i\left(\sum_j\sum_k \gamma_{j,k}^2\gamma_{i,k}(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})\right)^2 \\ &= O(p^{-4})\sum_i\sum_{j,j'}\sum_{k,k'}\gamma_{j,k}^2\gamma_{i,k}\gamma_{j',k'}^2\gamma_{i,k'}(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})(\mu_{k',3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k',3}^{(2)}) \\ &= O(p^{-4})\sum_{k,k'} s_{k,k}s_{k,k'}s_{k',k'}(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})(\mu_{k',3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k',3}^{(2)}) \\ &\le O(p^{-4})(\sum_{k,k'} s_{k,k'}^2)^{1/2}\left\{\sum_{k,k'} s_{k,k}^2s_{k',k'}^2(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})^2(\mu_{k',3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k',3}^{(2)})^2\right\}^{1/2} \\ &\le O(p^{-7/2})\sum_k(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

When $X_i = U_i + \mu$ and $Y_j = V_j + \mu$, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(f^{(s)}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{X}_{1,2}^s|X_1] - f^{(s)}(\tau_3)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Z}_{1,1}^s|X_1]) = O(p^{-4})\sum_i\left(\mathbb{E}[x_i^3 - y_i^3]\right)^2 = O\left(p^{-4}\sum_k(\mu_{k,3}^{(1)} - \mu_{k,3}^{(2)})^2\right).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Note that $\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m}) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{s=2}^{l-1}\mathbb{E}(\Delta_s) + \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l) = \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)$. Under Assumption (g), we have $\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_s) = o(N^{-2}\cdot p^{-1})$ for $2 \le s \le l-1$. Moreover, when $N = o(p^{l-1})$, $\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l) = O(N^{-1}\cdot p^{-l}) = o(N^{-2}\cdot p^{-1})$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} - \mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} &= \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\sum_{s=2}^{l-1}(\Delta_s - \mathbb{E}(\Delta_s))}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + \frac{\widetilde{\Delta}_l - \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_l)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} \\ &= \frac{\Delta_1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)}} + o_p(1) + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.10. We divide the proof into four parts.

Part 1. Recall that

$$T_{l-1} \coloneqq \frac{1}{l!p^l} f^{(l)}(\tau)\cdot\left\{\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l] - 2\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l]\right\}.$$

Using the binomial expansion formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l] - 2\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^l] \\ =&\sum_{a=0}^{l}\binom{l}{a}(-p\tau)^{l-a}\left\{\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Following the arguments in Section B.5, we can show that $\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} = 0$ whenever $a \le l-1$. Therefore, we only need to consider the term with $a = l$ in the summation. Without loss of generality, we set $\mu = 0$ in the argument below. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2l} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2l} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2l} \\ =&\sum_{0\le a_1+a_2\le l}\frac{(-2)^{l-a_1-a_2}l!}{a_1!a_2!(l-a_1-a_2)!}\Big\{\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|X_2\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top X_2)^{l-a_1-a_2}] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|Y_2\|_2^{2a_2}(Y_1^\top Y_2)^{l-a_1-a_2}] - 2\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1}\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_2}(X_1^\top Y_1)^{l-a_1-a_2}]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Again using the arguments in Section B.5, we can show that the summands will be non-zero only when the orders of X_1 and X_2 (Y_1 and Y_2, X_1 and Y_1) are equal, i.e., $a_1 = a_2$. When $a_1 = a_2 = a$, the summand inside the curly brackets becomes

$$\sum_{1\le i_1,\ldots,i_{l-a}\le p}(\mu^{(a)}_{1,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}} - \mu^{(a)}_{2,i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-a}})^2 = \|\mathcal{T}^{(a)}_{1,l} - \mathcal{T}^{(a)}_{2,l}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2,$$

which thus implies (9).

Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \Gamma = (\gamma_{kl})_{p\times q}$, $\Gamma^\top\Gamma = (s_{kl})_{q\times q}$, $\mu^{(1)}_{k,s} = \mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^s)$ and $\mu^{(2)}_{k,s} = \mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^s)$ for $1 \le k \le q$ and $1 \le s \le l$. Note that $\max_{k,l}|s_{kl}| \le K$ under Assumption (b). For $a = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{1,l} - \mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{2,l}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 &= \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_l}\left\{\sum_k \gamma_{i_1,k}\gamma_{i_2,k}\cdots\gamma_{i_l,k}(\mu^{(1)}_{k,l} - \mu^{(2)}_{k,l})\right\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{k_1,k_2} s^l_{k_1,k_2}(\mu^{(1)}_{k_1,l} - \mu^{(2)}_{k_1,l})(\mu^{(1)}_{k_2,l} - \mu^{(2)}_{k_2,l}) \\ &\le CK^{l-2}\sum_{k_1,k_2} s^2_{k_1,k_2} = CK^{l-2}\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma^\top\Gamma\Gamma^\top\Gamma) = CK^{l-2}\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma^2) = O(p).\end{aligned}$$

Now consider $a \geq 1$. Based on similar calculation as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{T}_{1,l}^{(a)} - \mathcal{T}_{2,l}^{(a)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 &= \sum_{k_1,k_2} (\sum_i \gamma_{i,k_1}^2 \gamma_{i,k_2}^2)^a s_{k_1,k_2}^{l-2a} (\mu_{k_1,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_1,l}^{(2)})(\mu_{k_2,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_2,l}^{(2)}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k_1,k_2} (\sum_i \gamma_{i,k_1}^2 \gamma_{i,k_2}^2)(\sum_i \gamma_{i,k_1}^2 \sum_i \gamma_{i,k_2}^2)^{a-1} \left| s_{k_1,k_2}^{l-2a} (\mu_{k_1,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_1,l}^{(2)})(\mu_{k_2,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_2,l}^{(2)}) \right| \\
&= C \sum_{k_1,k_2} (\sum_i \gamma_{i,k_1}^2 \gamma_{i,k_2}^2)(s_{k_1,k_1} s_{k_2,k_2})^{a-1} \left| s_{k_1,k_2}^{l-2a} (\mu_{k_1,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_1,l}^{(2)})(\mu_{k_2,l}^{(1)} - \mu_{k_2,l}^{(2)}) \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_i \sum_{k_1} \gamma_{i,k_1}^2 \sum_{k_2} \gamma_{i,k_2}^2 = C \sum_i \sigma_{ii}^2 = O(p),
\end{aligned}$$

where C denotes a generic constant that may change from display to display. Therefore, $T_{l=1} = O(p^{-l+1})$.

Part 2. Next we study T_{s-1} for $s \geq l$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] + \mathbb{E}[(\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] - 2\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^2 - p\tau)^s] \\
&= \sum_{a=0}^{s} \binom{s}{a} (-p\tau)^{s-a} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} \right\} \\
&= \sum_{a=l}^{s} \binom{s}{a} (-p\tau)^{s-a} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the arguments in Section B.5. Without loss of generality, we set $\mu = 0$ in the argument below. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq a_1 + a_2 \leq a} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2} a!}{a_1! a_2! (a - a_1 - a_2)!} \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|X_2\|_2^{2a_2} (X_1^\top X_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[\|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|Y_2\|_2^{2a_2} (Y_1^\top Y_2)^{a-a_1-a_2}] - \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_1} \|Y_1\|_2^{2a_2} (X_1^\top Y_1)^{a-a_1-a_2}] - \mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_2^{2a_2} \|Y_1\|_2^{2a_1} (X_1^\top Y_1)^{a-a_1-a_2}] \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the arguments in Section B.5, we can show that the summand vanishes whenever $a + a_1 - a_2 < l$ or $a + a_2 - a_1 < l$. Therefore, we only need to consider those terms with $a - l \geq |a_1 - a_2|$. Expanding the terms inside the curly brackets, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq a_1 + a_2 \leq a, |a_1 - a_2| \leq a - l} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2} a!}{a_1! a_2! (a - a_1 - a_2)!} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_{a_1}, i'_1, \ldots, i'_{a_2}} \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_{a-a_1-a_2}} \\
&\quad \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} x_{i_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{j_s} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} x_{i'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{j_s} \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} y_{i_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{j_s} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} y_{i'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{j_s} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} x_{i_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{j_s} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} y_{i'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{j_s} \right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} x_{i'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{j_s} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} y_{i_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{j_s} \right] \right\} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq a_1 + a_2 \leq a, |a_1 - a_2| \leq a - l} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2} a!}{a_1! a_2! (a - a_1 - a_2)!} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_{a-a_1-a_2}} \\
&\quad \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_{a_1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} x_{j_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{i_s} \right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_1} y_{j_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{i_s} \right] \right\} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j'_1, \ldots, j'_{a_2}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} x_{j'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} x_{i_s} \right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{s=1}^{a_2} y_{j'_s}^2 \prod_{s=1}^{a-a_1-a_2} y_{i_s} \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} \\
\leq &\sum_{0\leq a_1+a_2\leq a, |a_1-a_2|\leq a-l} \frac{(-2)^{a-a_1-a_2}a!}{a_1!a_2!(a-a_1-a_2)!}\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}(a_1)} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)}\right)^2\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\times\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}(a_2)} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_2)}\right)^2\right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}(a_1)} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)}\right)^2 = O(p^{a+a_1-a_2-l+1}),$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^{2a} + \mathbb{E}\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_2^{2a} - 2\mathbb{E}\|X_1 - Y_1\|_2^{2a} = O(p^{a-l+1}),$$

which implies that $T_{s-1} = O(p^{-l+1})$ for $l \leq s \leq 2(l-1)-1$.

Part 3. Applying the Taylor series expansion up to order $2(l-1)$ to the sample MMD, we have

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2_{n,m} = \Delta_0 + \sum_{s=1}^{2(l-1)-1} \Delta_s + \widetilde{\Delta}_{2(l-1)}.$$

Under $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$, $\mathbb{E}(U_1(k)^s) = \mathbb{E}(V_1(k)^s)$ for $s \leq l-1$ and $1 \leq k \leq q$, $T_s = 0$ for $1 \leq s \leq l-2$. By taking expectation on both sides, we get

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = \sum_{s=l}^{2(l-1)-1} T_{s-1} + \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_{2(l-1)}).$$

As $\mathbb{E}[(\|X_1 - X_2\|^2 - p\tau_1)^s] = O(p^{s/2})$, we can show that $\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\Delta}_{2(l-1)}) = O(p^{-l+1})$. Combining with the result that $T_{s-1} = O(p^{-l+1})$ for $l \leq s \leq 2(l-1)-1$, we obtain $\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y) = O(p^{-l+1})$.

Part 4. Finally, we verify Assumption (h) when $X_i = U_i + \mu$ and $Y_j = V_j + \mu$. As X and Y share the first $(l-1)$th moments, for $B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)}$ to be nonzero, $\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)$ and $\mathbf{j}(a_1)$ must share some common indices. Suppose c_1 indices out of $\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)$ and c_2 indices out of $\mathbf{j}(a_1)$ are the same, where $2c_2 + c_1 \geq l$. Fixing the common index and summing over all other indices in $\mathbf{j}(a_1)$, the order of $(\sum_{\mathbf{j}} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)})^2$ is at most $p^{2a_1-2c_2}$. Now summing over $\mathbf{i}$ (note that the number of free indices is at most $a-a_1-a_2-c_1+1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2)}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}(a_1)} B_{\mathbf{i}(a-a_1-a_2),\mathbf{j}(a_1)}\right)^2 =& O(p^{a-a_1-a_2-c_1+1+2a_1-2c_2}) \\
=& O(p^{a+a_1-a_2-c_1-2c_2+1}) = O(p^{a+a_1-a_2-l+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $c_1 + 2c_2 \geq l$. □

Proof of Corollary 3.11. By Lemma 3.10,

$$\mathrm{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{P}_Y)/\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\Delta_1)} = o(1)$$

provided that $N = o(p^{l-3/2})$. The result thus follows from Theorem 3.9.

□

Proof of Lemma 4.1. As the "if" part is trivial, we focus on the "only if" part. Note that

$$0 = \frac{1}{2}\{f(\tau_1) + f(\tau_2)\} - f(\tau_3) \geq f\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{2}\right) - f(\tau_3) \geq 0,$$

where the first inequality follows from the convexity and the second inequality is due to the monotonicity. Thus both inequalities become equalities and we must have $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ and $\tau_1 + \tau_2 = 2\tau_3$, which imply the desired result. □

References

Anderson, T. W. (1962). On the distribution of the two-sample cramer-von mises criterion. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1148–1159.

Bai, Z. and Saranadasa, H. (1996). Effect of high dimension: by an example of a two sample problem. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 311–329.

Bickel, P. J. (1969). A distribution free version of the smirnov two sample test in the p-variate case. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 40(1):1–23.

Bińkowski, M., Sutherland, D. J., Arbel, M., and Gretton, A. (2018). Demystifying mmd gans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01401*.

Chakraborty, S. and Zhang, X. (2019). A new framework for distance and kernel-based metrics in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13469*.

Chakraborty, S. and Zhang, X. (2021). High-dimensional change-point detection using generalized homogeneity metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08976*.

Chen, S. X. and Qin, Y.-L. (2010). A two-sample test for high-dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(2):808–835.

Chwialkowski, K., Strathmann, H., and Gretton, A. (2016). A kernel test of goodness of fit. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2606–2615. PMLR.

Darling, D. A. (1957). The kolmogorov-smirnov, cramer-von mises tests. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28(4):823–838.

El Karoui, N. (2010). The spectrum of kernel random matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(1):1–50.

Friedman, J. H. and Rafsky, L. C. (1979). Multivariate generalizations of the wald-wolfowitz and smirnov two-sample tests. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 697–717.

Fukumizu, K., Gretton, A., Sun, X., and Schölkopf, B. (2007). Kernel measures of conditional dependence. In *NIPS*, volume 20, pages 489–496.

Gao, H. and Shao, X. (2021). Two sample testing in high dimension via maximum mean discrepancy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14913*.

Gao, L., Fan, Y., Lv, J., and Shao, Q.-M. (2021). Asymptotic distributions of high-dimensional distance correlation inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(4):1999–2020.

Garreau, D., Jitkrittum, W., and Kanagawa, M. (2017). Large sample analysis of the median heuristic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07269*.

Genton, M. G. (2001). Classes of kernels for machine learning: a statistics perspective. *Journal of machine learning research*, 2(Dec):299–312.

Gretton, A., Borgwardt, K. M., Rasch, M. J., Schölkopf, B., and Smola, A. (2012). A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):723–773.

Hall, P. and Heyde, C. C. (2014). *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic press.

Han, Q. and Shen, Y. (2021). Generalized kernel distance covariance in high dimensions: non-null clts and power universality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07725*.

Li, Y., Swersky, K., and Zemel, R. (2015). Generative moment matching networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1718–1727. PMLR.

Liang, T. and Rakhlin, A. (2020). Just interpolate: Kernel "ridgeless" regression can generalize. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1329–1347.

Liu, Q., Lee, J., and Jordan, M. (2016). A kernelized stein discrepancy for goodness-of-fit tests. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 276–284. PMLR.

Long, M., Zhu, H., Wang, J., and Jordan, M. I. (2017). Deep transfer learning with joint adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2208–2217. PMLR.

Louizos, C., Swersky, K., Li, Y., Welling, M., and Zemel, R. (2015). The variational fair autoencoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.00830*.

Mak, S. and Joseph, V. R. (2018). Support points. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2562–2592.

Mann, H. B. and Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 50–60.

Matteson, D. S. and James, N. A. (2014). A nonparametric approach for multiple change point analysis of multivariate data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(505):334–345.

Ramdas, A., Reddi, S. J., Poczos, B., Singh, A., and Wasserman, L. (2015). Adaptivity and computation-statistics tradeoffs for kernel and distance based high dimensional two sample testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00655*.

Reddi, S., Ramdas, A., Póczos, B., Singh, A., and Wasserman, L. (2015). On the high dimensional power of a linear-time two sample test under mean-shift alternatives. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 772–780. PMLR.

Rizzo, M. L. and Székely, G. J. (2010). Disco analysis: A nonparametric extension of analysis of variance. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(2):1034–1055.

Romano, Y., Sesia, M., and Candès, E. (2020). Deep knockoffs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(532):1861–1872.

Smirnov, N. V. (1939). On the estimation of the discrepancy between empirical curves of distribution for two independent samples. *Bull. Math. Univ. Moscou*, 2(2):3–14.

Sriperumbudur, B. K., Fukumizu, K., Gretton, A., Schölkopf, B., and Lanckriet, G. R. (2012). On the empirical estimation of integral probability metrics. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:1550–1599.

Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2005). A new test for multivariate normality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 93(1):58–80.

Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., et al. (2004). Testing for equal distributions in high dimension. *InterStat*, 5(16.10):1249–1272.

Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press.

Wald, A. and Wolfowitz, J. (1940). On a test whether two samples are from the same population. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 11(2):147–162.

Weiss, L. (1960). Two-sample tests for multivariate distributions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 31(1):159–164.

Williams, C. K. and Rasmussen, C. E. (2006). *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, volume 2. MIT press Cambridge, MA.

Yan, H., Ding, Y., Li, P., Wang, Q., Xu, Y., and Zuo, W. (2017). Mind the class weight bias: Weighted maximum mean discrepancy for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2272–2281.

Zhu, C. and Shao, X. (2021). Interpoint distance based two sample tests in high dimension. *Bernoulli*, 27(2):1189–1211.

Zhu, C., Zhang, X., Yao, S., and Shao, X. (2020). Distance-based and rkhs-based dependence metrics in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(6):3366–3394.