

Kernel Angle Dependence Measures for Complex Objects

Yilin Zhang and Songshan Yang

*Center of Applied Statistics and Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin
University of China*

April 19, 2023

Abstract

Measuring and testing dependence between complex objects is of great importance in modern statistics. Most existing work relied on the distance between random variables, which inevitably required the moment conditions to guarantee the distance is well-defined. Based on the geometry element “angle”, we develop a novel class of nonlinear dependence measures for data in metric space that can avoid such conditions. Specifically, by making use of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space equipped with Gaussian measure, we introduce kernel angle covariances that can be applied to complex objects such as random vectors or matrices. We estimate kernel angle covariances based on U -statistic and establish the corresponding independence tests via gamma approximation. Our kernel angle independence tests, imposing no-moment conditions on kernels, are robust with heavy-tailed random variables. We conduct comprehensive simulation studies and apply our proposed methods to a facial recognition task. Our kernel angle covariances-based tests show remarkable performances in dealing with image data.

KEY WORDS: Image data, Independence test, Measures of association, Metric spaces, Reproducing kernel Hilbert space.

*Yilin Zhang (Email: yzhang97@ruc.edu.cn) is a Ph.D student, and Songshan Yang (Email: yangss@ruc.edu.cn) is Assistant Professor and the corresponding author of the article, Center of Applied Statistics and Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, P. R. China. Zhang’s research is supported by the Fundamental Research Fund for Central Universities and the Research Fund of Renmin University of China (21XNH157).

1. Introduction

Measuring and testing the dependence between random variables is an important problem in statistical research and has a wide range of applications. With the development of modern technology, it is of great importance to detect the dependence for complex objects. For example, data usually come as images in computer vision research, and it is of great interest to explore the relationship between the images of human faces and facial expressions (Ying and Yu, 2022). Other complex objects are also routinely collected in various applications such as medical imaging, computational biology, and geological analysis (Pan et al., 2020; Moon and Chen, 2022). Most existing independence tests are able to measure the dependence between random vectors and cannot be directly applied to complex objects such as random matrices. Researchers tend to vectorize the random matrices to make the testing methods feasible but such transformation ignores intrinsic features of the data. The above limitation of the current methods motivates us to develop new dependence measures that can be adapted to data in metric spaces.

Let X and Y be random variables on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with joint measure μ and marginal measures μ_X and μ_Y , where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are two separable metric spaces. In this article, we focus on testing

$$H_0 : X \text{ and } Y \text{ are independent} \text{ versus } H_1 : \text{otherwise.}$$

The recent surge of interest in measuring and testing nonlinear dependence mainly focuses on developing dependence measures based on the distances between random variables (Moon and Chen, 2022). The leading example is the distance correlation

(Székely et al., 2007; Székely and Rizzo, 2014), which built dependence metrics between random vectors based on the distances in Euclidean spaces. Motivated by Székely et al. (2007), a series of Euclidean distance-based metrics are proposed such as Yao et al. (2018), Shi et al. (2022) and Deb and Sen (2021). To make these dependence measures adapted to random variables in metric spaces, Gretton et al. (2005) and Gretton et al. (2007) introduced the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion by applying kernels to quantify the distance between random objects. The Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion received considerable attention since it can be applied to complex data such as fMRI signals (Gretton et al., 2005), compositional data (Rudra et al., 2022) and image data (Damodaran et al., 2017; Greenfield and Shalit, 2020). Inspired by Gretton et al. (2005), Pfister et al. (2018); Ke and Yin (2020); Deb et al. (2020) further put forward kernel-based measures that can be widely used in different research areas.

The aforementioned methods are focusing on measuring the “distance” between random variables. To guarantee the distance-based measures are well-defined, it is required to impose moment conditions on kernel functions. Instead of measuring the distance between random variables, some new dependence measures focus on quantifying the “angle” between random variables. Zhu et al. (2017) proposed the projection correlation based on measuring the angle between random vectors in Euclidean spaces. Zhu et al. (2017) imposed no moment conditions, so the independence tests based on projection correlation are robust with heavy-tailed random variables. There is a rich literature motivated by Zhu et al. (2017), and the references include, but not limited to Kim et al. (2020); Li and Zhang (2020); Lai et al. (2021); Xu and Zhu (2022); Liu et al. (2022); Zhang and Zhu (2022). Although these methods possess

solid statistical properties, they failed to measure the dependence for complex objects such as compositional data and random matrices. In addition, the aforementioned methods can only detect the linear dependence structure when the random vectors are high dimensional (Zhu et al., 2020).

To make the angle-based independence tests applicable to complex objects and able to detect the nonlinear dependence for high dimensional data, we introduce the kernel angle dependence measures using reproducing Hilbert kernel spaces. We derive the kernel angle covariances directly from the integration by making use of the good properties of reproducing Hilbert kernel spaces equipped with Gaussian measure (van Zanten and van der Vaart, 2008). Since different kernels can be selected to catch the intrinsic features of different objects, our kernel angle covariances can be adapted to different complex objects in metric spaces. When distance kernel is used, the independence tests based on kernel angle covariances are equivalent to the existing angle-based independence tests using Euclidean distances (Zhu et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2020; Zhang and Zhu, 2022). Compared to Hilbert-Schmidt information criterion (Gretton et al., 2007), our angle-based dependence measures impose no moment conditions on the kernel functions so they are more robust to heavy-tailed random variables. In addition, our framework can induce generalized distance correlation (Sejdinovic et al., 2013) by the integration of the covariance using a certain weight function. In the testing procedure, the existing angle-based dependence tests involve random permutations in approximating the null distributions, which is computationally expensive (Zhu et al., 2017; Xu and Zhu, 2022; Kim et al., 2020). We overcome such challenges using gamma approximation to estimate the null distribution of test statistics, which highly accelerates the testing procedure. Using our framework, other

test statistics on univariate or multivariate random variables can also be extended to metric spaces.

The remaining article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we put forward kernel angle dependence measures by making use of reproducing kernel Hilbert space equipped with Gaussian measures. Then we propose estimates of angle dependence measures based on U-statistics and conduct independence tests based on the corresponding measures. We introduce gamma approximation to estimate the null distributions to avoid random permutations. To demonstrate the performance of the independence tests on complex data, we conduct comprehensive simulation studies and an application to microbiome data in Section 3. In Section 4, we further induce generalized distance covariance by the integration of our framework. Section 5 summarizes our contributions and discusses some potential extensions. We provide the technical proofs in the Appendix.

2. Kernel Angle Based Dependence Measures

2.1. Preliminaries

In this section, we give a brief review of the reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and Gaussian measures, and then establish crucial integral results for the reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces equipped with Gaussian measures.

Suppose $\mathcal{Z}$ is a compact metric space equipped with a finite Borel measure μ , $\mathcal{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space, and $Q : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is the continuous, symmetric, positive definite, and linear bounded operator.

DEFINITION 2.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space of real-valued functions defined on $\mathcal{Z}$. A function $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the reproducing kernel of $\mathcal{H}$ if*

(i) for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $K(\cdot, z) \in \mathcal{H}$;

(ii) for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle f, K(\cdot, z) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = f(z)$.

$\mathcal{H}$ is called a reproducing kernel Hilbert space if it possesses a reproducing kernel.

Moore-Aronszajn Theorem (Berlinet and Thomas-Agnan, 2011, Theorem 3) claimed that, there exists a unique Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_K$ of real-valued functions on $\mathcal{Z}$ with positive semi-definite kernel K as reproducing kernel, for any given positive semi-definite kernel $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. $\phi(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\cdot, z)$ is called the canonical map of K and satisfies that $\langle f, \phi(z) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} = f(z)$.

DEFINITION 2.2. (Da Prato, 2014, Theorem 1.11) A Gaussian measure μ on $\mathcal{H}$, with mean $s \in \mathcal{H}$ and covariance operator Q , has the characteristic function

$$\int_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \exp(i \langle h, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu(dh) = \exp(i \langle f, s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - 2^{-1} \langle Qf, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}),$$

where $h, f \in \mathcal{H}$.

The reproducing kernel Hilbert space arises because it determines the “geometry” of the concentration of the Gaussian measure (van Zanten and van der Vaart, 2008). The spectral view of reproducing kernel Hilbert space provides us the eigenfunctions to represent Gaussian measure, which facilitates us to derive the explicit form of integration results in Lemma 1. We include the detailed derivation in the Appendix.

LEMMA 1. Suppose s_1, s_2 and h are in the separable reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_K$, which has the continuous reproducing kernel $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let μ be the

Gaussian measure on $\mathcal{H}_K$ with mean zero and covariance identity operator. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) \mu(dh) \\ &= 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos\{\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} / (\|s_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \|s_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_K})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

In addition, if $U \in \mathbb{R}$ follows the standard normal distribution, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} E\{1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq U) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq U)\} \mu(dh) \\ &= 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos\{(1 + \langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K})(1 + \|s_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2)^{-1/2}(1 + \|s_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2)^{-1/2}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

The integration results are crucial for the derivation of kernel angle covariances in Section 2.2.

2.2. Kernel Angle Covariances

Suppose $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are separable reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces generated from two universal kernels $K_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $K_2 : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively, and $\phi_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ and $\phi_2 : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ are two canonical maps of K_1 and K_2 .

LEMMA 2. *X and Y are independent if and only if $\text{cov}\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} = 0$ for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Gretton et al. (2005) put forward constraint covariance satisfying that X and Y are independent if and only if $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1, g \in \mathcal{H}_2} \text{cov}\{f(X), g(Y)\} = 0$. To make $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1, g \in \mathcal{H}_2} \text{cov}\{f(X), g(Y)\} < \infty$, Gretton et al. (2005) implicitly required that both K_1 and K_2 are bounded kernels. Inspired by Zhu et al. (2017); Kim et al. (2020), we adopt indicator functions in covariance term and $\text{cov}\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} < \infty$ always holds. This avoids imposing further conditions about the bounded

kernel assumptions or bounded moment assumptions $E\{K_1(X_1, X_2)\} < \infty$ and $E\{K_2(Y_1, Y_2)\} < \infty$.

Based on the Lemma 2, we propose kernel angle covariance

$$\text{KAcov}(X, Y) = c \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} d\omega(u, v) \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg) \quad (2.3)$$

To derive the explicit form of the kernel angle covariance, we set scale parameter $c = 4\pi^2$, and μ_1, μ_2 to be Gaussian measures with means zero and covariances identity operators for $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$. Let $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(X)$ and $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(Y)$. We consider three different choices of weight functions $\omega(u, v)$: (1) $d\omega_1(u, v) = d\Phi_2(u, v)$; (2) $d\omega_2(u, v) = dF_{U,V}(u, v)$; (3) $d\omega_3(u, v) = dF_U(u)F_V(v)$, where Φ_p represents cumulative distribution function for p -dimensional standard normal variable, $F_U(u)$, $F_V(v)$ and $F_{U,V}(u, v)$ are the cumulative distribution functions for U , V and (U, V) , respectively.

We denote $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$ using corresponding weight functions $\omega_m(u, v)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$. By applying integral results in Lemma 1, we can derive the expressions for $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$ in Theorem 1. Suppose that $\{(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is a random sample of (X, Y) . $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ can be represented using the first six independent copies of (X, Y) .

Theorem 1. *We represent $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ as follows:*

$$(1) \text{KAcov}_1(X, Y) = E\{\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2) - 2\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_3) \\ + \text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\text{ang}'_2(Y_3, Y_4)\};$$

$$(2) \text{KAcov}_2(X, Y) = E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5)\text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_5) - 2\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5)$$

$$\text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_3; Y_5) + \text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5)\text{ang}_2(Y_3, Y_4; Y_5)\};$$

$$(\beta) \text{ KAcov}_3(X, Y) = E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5)\text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_6) - 2\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5) \\ \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_3; Y_6) + \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5)\text{ang}_2(Y_3, Y_4; Y_6)\},$$

where $\text{ang}'_1(X_i, X_j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arccos [\{K_1(X_i, X_j) + 1\}\{K_1(X_i, X_i) + 1\}^{-1/2}\{K_1(X_j, X_j) + 1\}^{-1/2}]$ and $\text{ang}_1(X_i, X_j; X_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arccos [\{K_1(X_i, X_j) - K_1(X_i, X_k) - K_1(X_j, X_k) + K_1(X_k, X_k)\}\{K_1(X_i, X_i) - 2K_1(X_i, X_k) + K_1(X_k, X_k)\}^{-1/2}\{K_1(X_j, X_j) - 2K_1(X_j, X_k) + K_1(X_k, X_k)\}^{-1/2}]$. $\text{ang}'_2(Y_i, Y_j)$ and $\text{ang}_2(Y_i, Y_j; Y_k)$ are expressed in an analogous manner. If $j = k$ or $i = k$, $\text{ang}_2(X_i, X_j; X_k) = \text{ang}_2(Y_i, Y_j; Y_k) = 0$.

Suppose that the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}'_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathbb{R}$, which has the induced inner product $\langle (f_1, a_1), (f_2, a_2) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}'_1} = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} + a_1 a_2$ for $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. $\mathcal{H}'_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}_2 \times \mathbb{R}$ has analogous induced inner product. $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_m}$ are zero elements in $\mathcal{H}_m, m = 1, 2$. Actually, both $\text{ang}'_1(X_i, X_j)$ and $\text{ang}_1(X_i, X_j; X_k)$ can be represented as the angle formed by three points in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}'_1$. $\text{ang}'_1(X_i, X_j)$ represents the angle formed by three points $(\phi_1(X_i), 0)$, $(\phi_1(X_j), 0)$ and $(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_1}, 1)$, and $(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_1}, 1)$ is the vertex. $\text{ang}_1(X_i, X_j; X_k)$ represents the angle formed by $(\phi_1(X_i), 0)$, $(\phi_1(X_j), 0)$ and $(\phi_1(X_k), 0)$, and $(\phi_1(X_k), 0)$ is the vertex. The two angles are illustrated in Figure 1. $\text{ang}'_1(Y_i, Y_j)$ and $\text{ang}_1(Y_i, Y_j; Y_k)$ can also be seen as angles in $\mathcal{H}'_2$.




Figure 1: The left panel is the angle for $\text{ang}(X_i, X_j; X_k)$, and the right panel is the angle for $\text{ang}'(X_i, X_j)$.

Specifically, $\text{KAcov}_1(X, Y)$ uses $(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_1}, 1)$ and $(\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_2}, 1)$ as vertexes, $\text{KAcov}_2(X, Y)$

uses $(\phi_1(X_5), 0)$ and $(\phi_2(Y_5), 0)$ as vertexes, and $\text{KAcov}_3(X, Y)$ uses $(\phi_1(X_5), 0)$ and $(\phi_2(Y_6), 0)$ as vertexes. Then, kernel angle correlations can be defined by $\text{KAC}_m(X, Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{KAcov}_m(X, Y) \{ \text{KAcov}_m(X, X) \text{KAcov}_m(Y, Y) \}^{-1/2}$ for $m = 1, 2, 3$.

Our kernel angle dependence measures can be adapted to complex objects with different choices of kernels. In particular, when $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$, $K_1(X_1, X_2) = X_1^\top X_2$ and $K_2(Y_1, Y_2) = Y_1^\top Y_2$, $\text{KAcov}_1(X, Y)$, $\text{KAcov}_2(X, Y)$ and $\text{KAcov}_3(X, Y)$ are equivalent to the improved projection covariance (Zhang and Zhu, 2022), projection covariance (Zhu et al., 2017) and multivariate Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt coefficient (Kim et al., 2020, Theorem 7.2), respectively.

2.3. *U-statistic Estimates and the Asymptotics*

We build estimates for $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ upon U -statistics (Serfling, 1980). To simplify the notations, we define $a'_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_1(X_i, X_j)$, $b'_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_2(Y_i, Y_j)$, $a_{ijk} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}_1(X_i, X_j; X_k)$ and $b_{ijk} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}_2(Y_i, Y_j; Y_k)$ for $i, j, k = 1, \dots, n$. The estimates for $\text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(n)_4\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l)}^n (a'_{ij}b'_{ij} - 2a'_{ij}b'_{ik} + a'_{ij}b'_{kl}), \\ \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(n)_5\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l,r)}^n (a_{ijr}b_{ijr} - 2a_{ijr}b_{ikr} + a_{ijr}b_{klr}), \\ \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(n)_6\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l,r,t)}^n (a_{ijr}b_{ijt} - 2a_{ijr}b_{ikt} + a_{ijr}b_{klt}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $(n)_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n(n-1) \cdots (n-m+1)$, and (i, j, k, l) , (i, j, k, l, r) and (i, j, k, l, r, t) are taken over the indexes from $\{1, \dots, n\}$ that are different from each other. We provide

an equivalent representation of equation (2.4) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y) &= \{n(n-3)\}^{-1} \left[\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}') \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2(n-2)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{B}' \mathbf{1}_n + \{(n-1)_2\}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{B}' \mathbf{1}_n \right], \\
\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y) &= \{n(n-1)(n-4)\}^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^n \left[\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{B}_r) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2(n-3)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{B}_r \mathbf{1}_{n-1} + \{(n-2)_2\}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{1}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{B}_r \mathbf{1}_{n-1} \right], \\
\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y) &= \{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-5)\}^{-1} \sum_{(r,t)}^n \left[\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{rt} \mathbf{B}_{tr}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2(n-4)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{n-2}^T \mathbf{A}_{rt} \mathbf{B}_{tr} \mathbf{1}_{n-2} + \{(n-3)_2\}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{n-2}^T \mathbf{A}_{rt} \mathbf{1}_{n-2} \mathbf{1}_{n-2}^T \mathbf{B}_{tr} \mathbf{1}_{n-2} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with all elements equal to one, $\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{B}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\mathbf{A}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a'_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{B}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b'_{ij})$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{B}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ with $\mathbf{A}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_{ijk})$ and $\mathbf{B}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b_{ijk})$ for $i, j \neq k$, $\mathbf{A}_{rt}, \mathbf{B}_{tr} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-2) \times (n-2)}$ with $\mathbf{A}_{rt} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_{ijr})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{tr} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b_{ijt})$ for $i, j \neq t, i, j \neq r$. Equations in (2.5) indicate that the computation complexities of $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y)$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ are $O(n^2)$, $O(n^3)$ and $O(n^4)$ respectively. The estimates for kernel angle correlations are $\widehat{\text{KAC}}_m(X, Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y) \{\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, X) \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(Y, Y)\}^{-1/2}$ for $m = 1, 2, 3$, correspondingly.

Theorem 2. *For $m = 1, 2, 3$, we have*

(1) *when X and Y are independent,*

$$n \widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{m,j} (\zeta_{1,m,j}^2 - 1);$$

(2) when X and Y are not independent,

$$n^{1/2}\{\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y) - \text{KAcov}_m(X, Y)\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_m^2),$$

as n diverges to infinity. Here, $\{\zeta_{1,m,j}, m = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are independent and follow the standard normal distribution, and $\{\eta_{m,j}, m = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are the eigenvalues of the corresponding Hilbert-Schmidt integral operator depending on the distributions of X and Y . $\sigma_m, m = 1, 2, 3$ are given in (E.1), (E.2) and (E.3) in the Appendix.

Theorem 2 establishes the asymptotics for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y)$ under both the null and alternative hypothesis. Under the null hypothesis, $n\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y)$ converges in distribution to $I_{1,m} - I_{2,m}$, where

$$I_{1,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{m,j} \zeta_{1,m,j}^2 \text{ and } I_{2,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{m,j}.$$

The distributions of $I_{1,m} - I_{2,m}, m = 1, 2, 3$ are not intractable, since parameters $\{\eta_{m,j}, m = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are unknown. To make kernel angle independence tests into practice, the researchers often implement random permutations to approximate the distribution of $I_{1,m} - I_{2,m}$, which results in heavy computational burdens. To accelerate the testing procedure, we introduce gamma approximations (Welch, 1938; Satterthwaite, 1946) to estimate the distribution of the test statistics, which approximate the distribution of $I_{1,m}$ using Gamma distribution by matching the first two moments of $I_{1,m}$. By defining $a_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\}E\{\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2)\}$, $b_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{KAcov}_1(X_1, X_2)\}E\{\text{KAcov}_1(Y_1, Y_2)\}$, $a_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\}E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2;$

$Y_3)\}$ and $b_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\}E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\}$, we derive the shape α_m and rate parameters β_m of Gamma distributions in the proof of Theorem 2, where $\alpha_1 = a_1^2/(2b_1)$, $\beta_1 = a_1/(2b_1)$, $\alpha_2 = a_2^2/(2b_2)$, $\beta_2 = a_2/(2b_2)$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_3 = \beta_2$. Given the fact that $I_{2,m} = E(I_{1,m}) = \alpha_m\beta_m^{-1}$, the distributions $I_{1,m} - I_{2,m}$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ can be approximated by $\text{Gamma}(\alpha_m, \beta_m) - \alpha_m\beta_m^{-1}$ respectively.

Suppose that $\mathbf{z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Z_1, \dots, Z_p)^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. In practice, we should choose different kernels for different types of data to improve the performance of the tests. For low dimension random vector, we suggest Gaussian kernel $K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = \exp\{-\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2^2/\gamma^2\}$ and Laplacian kernel $K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = \exp\{-\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2/\gamma\}$ (Sriperumbudur et al., 2011), where γ is the median of pairwise distances of random vectors (Schölkopf et al., 2002). Distance kernel $K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = (\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_2^\alpha + \|\mathbf{z}_2\|_2^\alpha - \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2^\alpha)/2$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ (Sejdinovic et al., 2013, Example 15) is another possible choice. When $\alpha = 2$, $K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = \mathbf{z}_1^T \mathbf{z}_2$ corresponds to inner product in Euclidean space. For high dimensional random vector, Zhu et al. (2020); Yan and Zhang (2021) pointed out that if the kernel $K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)$ is a smooth function of $\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2^2$ (i.e. Gaussian kernel, Laplacian kernel, and distance kernel), the dependence measures with such kernels can only detect the linear dependence. To overcome such difficulty, we suggest L^1 -norm based kernel (Sarkar et al., 2020; Sarkar and Ghosh, 2018)

$$K(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = 2^{-1} \left\{ \left(\sum_{u=1}^p |Z_{1u}| \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{u=1}^p |Z_{2u}| \right)^2 - \left(\sum_{u=1}^p |Z_{1u} - Z_{2u}| \right)^2 \right\}.$$

For the symmetric positive definite matrix, Arsigny et al. (2007) proposed log-Euclidean distance, which is the geodesic distance on the manifold. We denote the corresponding

log-Euclidean kernel as

$$K(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = 2^{-1} \{ \|\log(\mathbf{Z}_1)\|_F^2 + \|\log(\mathbf{Z}_2)\|_F^2 - \|\log(\mathbf{Z}_1) - \log(\mathbf{Z}_2)\|_F^2 \},$$

where $\log(\mathbf{Z})$ represents the logarithm for matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius matrix norm.

3. Numerical Studies

In this section, we conduct extensive simulations to examine the performance of our proposed independence tests based on $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_m(X, Y)$ for $m = 1, 2, 3$. We consider three different objects and select suitable kernels for them. We examine the estimation accuracy of gamma approximation for the critical value and compare the power of the proposed tests with other existing methods. We include four existing distance-based independence tests in the simulation studies, which are the distance correlation test (Székely et al., 2007), Ball covariance test (Pan et al., 2020), Hilbert-Schmidt information criterion (Gretton et al., 2007) and the multivariate test of (Heller et al., 2013). 199 random permutations are used to approximate the distributions under the null hypothesis for these four existing tests. We set sample size $n = 100$ and report empirical size and power based on 500 replicates. Throughout the simulations, X and $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ are univariate random variables, $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are random vectors and $\mathbf{X}$, and $\mathbf{Y}$ are random matrices.

Study 1. We first test dependence between low-dimensional random vectors $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X_1, \dots, X_5)^T$ and $\mathbf{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Y_1, \dots, Y_5)^T$. We choose distance kernel and Laplacian kernel for $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$. Three scenarios are considered as follows:

(1) Linear: $Y_j = 0.4X_j + 0.2X_{j+1} + 2\lambda\varepsilon_j$ for $j = 1, 2$;

(2) Log: $Y_j = 1.2\log(X_j^2) + 6\lambda\varepsilon_j$ for $j = 1, 2$;

(3) Quadratic: $Y_j = 0.2(X_j - 2)^2 + 6\lambda\varepsilon_j$ for $j = 1, 2$.

We generate $X_j, j = 1, \dots, 5$ and $Y_j, j = 3, 4, 5$ independently from the standard normal distribution, or $\varepsilon_j, j = 1, 2$ from two different distributions, standard normal distribution, and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. We first examine whether these tests can control type I error. To generate data when $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are independent, we generate two independent pairs $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2)$. We test the dependence between $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_2$. We fix $\lambda = 1$ and report the empirical size at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ in Table 1. Then, we compare power performances by testing dependence between $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_1$. Figure 2 depicts the empirical powers over $\lambda \in \{0.1, \dots, 1\}$.

Table 1: The empirical sizes of tests under three scenarios with noises of standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The tests include the distance correlation test (DC), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013) (HHG), the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion with Gaussian kernel (HSIC), Ball covariance test (Ball), $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), m = 1, 2, 3$ using distance kernel and Laplacian kernel.

(1)		DC	HHG	HSIC	Ball	$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{Laplacian}}$
	z	0.052	0.044	0.058	0.050	0.054
	t_3	0.050	0.058	0.056	0.044	0.064
		$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{distance}}$
	z	0.048	0.056	0.052	0.048	0.050
	t_3	0.062	0.064	0.064	0.064	0.062
(2)		DC	HHG	HSIC	Ball	$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{Laplacian}}$
	z	0.048	0.056	0.044	0.052	0.054
	t_3	0.038	0.036	0.050	0.046	0.038
		$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{distance}}$
	z	0.044	0.062	0.052	0.050	0.054
	t_3	0.046	0.044	0.052	0.040	0.046
(3)		DC	HHG	HSIC	Ball	$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{Laplacian}}$
	z	0.046	0.052	0.040	0.050	0.064
	t_3	0.046	0.050	0.044	0.054	0.068
		$\text{KAcov}_{1,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{2,\text{distance}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{Laplacian}}$	$\text{KAcov}_{3,\text{distance}}$
	z	0.054	0.064	0.054	0.064	0.048
	t_3	0.056	0.068	0.060	0.066	0.060

Table 1 confirms that all methods control the type I error very well at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Figure 2 illustrates that if we use the same kernel for $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$, the corresponding tests based on them have similar performance. We also find that our tests using distance kernel outperform other tests in the linear dependent case, and our tests using Laplacian kernel outperform others in log and quadratic dependent cases. The result indicates that different kernels are suitable for detecting different dependent structures.

Study 2. We test dependence between high-dimensional random vectors $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X_1, \dots, X_{100})^\top$ and $\mathbf{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Y_1, \dots, Y_{100})^\top$. We choose L^1 -norm based kernel for both $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$, and consider the following three scenarios :

- (4) Circle: $Y_j = 1.5(1 - X_j^2)^{1/2}Z_j + \lambda\varepsilon_j$; $\text{pr}(Z_j = \pm 1) = 1/2$, for $j = 1, \dots, 100$.
- (5) Two Parabola: $Y_j = X_j^2Z_j + 0.7\lambda\varepsilon_j$, $\text{pr}(Z_j = \pm 1) = 1/2$, for $j = 1, \dots, 100$;
- (6) Sinusodial: $Y_j = \sin(4\pi X_j) + 4\lambda\varepsilon_j$, for $j = 1, \dots, 100$.

We generate $X_j, j = 1, \dots, 100$ independently from uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, and noise $\varepsilon_j, j = 1, \dots, 100$ from the standard normal distribution and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. Similarly to Study 1, we conduct the independent tests for $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_2)$ generated from the above three scenarios. We report the empirical size in Table 2 at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. To compare the power performances, we test dependence between $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_1$, and depict the empirical powers over $\lambda \in \{0.1, \dots, 1\}$ in Figure 3.

Table 2 confirms that when data are high dimensional random vectors, all meth-




Figure 2: The empirical powers of tests under three scenarios with noise of standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The horizontal axis represents λ which controls the size of noise and the vertical axis represents the empirical power. We use different marks to represents different tests, distance correlation test: $\circ$; the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013): $\triangle$; the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion with Gaussian kernel: $+$; Ball covariance test: $\times$; $\text{KAcov}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using Laplacian kernel: $\diamond$; $\text{KAcov}_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using Laplacian kernel: $\boxtimes$; $\text{KAcov}_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using Laplacian kernel: $\diamondsuit$; $\text{KAcov}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using distance kernel: ∇ ; $\text{KAcov}_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using distance kernel: $*$; $\text{KAcov}_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using distance kernel: $\oplus$.

Table 2: The empirical sizes of tests under three scenarios with noises of standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The tests include the distance correlation test (DC), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013) (HHG), the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion with Gaussian kernel (HSIC), Ball covariance test (Ball), $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ using L^1 -norm based kernel.

		DC	HHG	HSIC	Ball	KAcov_1	KAcov_2	KAcov_3
(4)	z	0.042	0.068	0.044	0.056	0.044	0.050	0.044
	t_3	0.038	0.034	0.040	0.046	0.052	0.052	0.050
(5)	z	0.032	0.056	0.046	0.068	0.046	0.048	0.044
	t_3	0.060	0.054	0.058	0.058	0.050	0.048	0.040
(6)	z	0.064	0.024	0.068	0.050	0.050	0.056	0.052
	t_3	0.052	0.040	0.050	0.046	0.052	0.044	0.042

ods work well in controlling the empirical sizes. Figure 3 illustrates the superiority of our tests with L^1 norm-based kernels in terms of power performances. For example, other tests have empirical powers less than 0.2 and the proposed tests $\text{KAcov}_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ have power close to 1 in the circle-dependent scenario. Additionally, the proposed tests have similar performance with different noises, which indicates that the proposed tests are robust to heavy-tailed noise.

Study 3. We implement dependence tests between random matrices. We choose the log-Euclidean kernel for the symmetric positive definite matrix and the Laplacian kernel for univariate random variables in our proposed tests. We compare the proposed tests with the generalized distance correlation test (Sejdinovic et al., 2013), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013), and the Ball covariance test (Pan et al., 2020). Since these three methods are distance based, we can also calculate the distance between matrices based on the log-Euclidean kernel, where the distance between matrices $\mathbf{Z}_1$ and $\mathbf{Z}_2$ is $d(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{K(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_1) + K(\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Z}_2) - 2K(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)\}^{1/2}$. We consider the following three scenarios:

(7) Matrix-matrix : $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. $(\mathbf{X})_{rl} = 1/(1 + Z_1^2)$ and $(\mathbf{Y})_{rl} = 1/(1 + Z_2^2)$ for




Figure 3: The empirical power of tests under three scenarios with noise of standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The horizontal axis represents λ which controls the size of noise and the vertical axis represents the empirical power. We use different marks to represents different tests, distance correlation test: ○; the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013): △; the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion with Gaussian kernel: +; Ball covariance test: ×; $\text{KAcov}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using L^1 norm kernel: ◇; $\text{KAcov}_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using L^1 norm kernel: ▽; $\text{KAcov}_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using L^1 norm kernel: ⊠.

$r \neq l$, $(\mathbf{X})_{rr} = 1$ and $(\mathbf{Y})_{rr} = 1$ for $r = 1, 2, 3$;

(8) Block matrix: $\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, where $(\mathbf{Z}_1)_{11} = (\mathbf{Z}_1)_{22} = (\mathbf{Z}_2)_{11} = (\mathbf{Z}_2)_{22} = 1$, $(\mathbf{Z}_1)_{12} = (\mathbf{Z}_1)_{21} = 1/(1 + Z_1^2)$ and $(\mathbf{Z}_2)_{12} = (\mathbf{Z}_2)_{21} = 1/(1 + Z_2^2)$. $\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_1)$ and $\mathbf{Y} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Z}_2)$;

(9) Matrix-vector: $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}$. $(\mathbf{X})_{rl} = 1/(1 + Z_1^2)$ for $r \neq l$, $(\mathbf{X})_{rr} = 1$ for $r = 1, 2, 3$. $Y = (Z_2 - 2)^2$.

We generate Z_1 and Z_2 from two the binomial normal distribution and the binomial t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. Both binomial normal distribution and binomial t distribution have zero mean and covariance matrix or scale matrix as Σ , where $(\Sigma)_{11} = (\Sigma)_{22} = 1$ and $(\Sigma)_{12} = (\Sigma)_{21} = \rho$. Similar to previous studies, we construct the independent sample and report the empirical size in Table 3 at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. We report the empirical powers over $\rho \in \{0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9\}$ in Figure 4.

Table 3: The empirical sizes of tests under three scenarios with (Z_1, Z_2) from standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The tests include the generalized distance correlation test (GDC), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013) (HHG), the Ball covariance test (Ball), $\text{KAcov}_m, m = 1, 2, 3$.

		GDC	HHG	Ball	KAcov_1	KAcov_2	KAcov_3
(7)	z	0.048	0.038	0.056	0.068	0.068	0.064
	t_3	0.044	0.044	0.050	0.042	0.050	0.052
(8)	z	0.044	0.052	0.044	0.058	0.056	0.060
	t_3	0.056	0.044	0.060	0.056	0.068	0.056
(9)	z	0.034	0.044	0.042	0.050	0.054	0.054
	t_3	0.050	0.058	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.048

Table 3 confirms that all methods can control the empirical sizes of tests when data are random matrices. Figure 4 illustrates our methods have better performance in detecting the dependence structures than other existing methods.




Figure 4: The empirical powers of tests under three scenarios with (Z_1, Z_2) from standard normal distribution (z) and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom (t_3). The horizontal axis represents ρ which controls the strength of dependence and the vertical axis represents the empirical power. We use different marks to represent different tests: the generalized distance correlation test: $\circ$; the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013): $\triangle$; Ball covariance test: $+$; KAcov₁: $\times$; KAcov₂: $\diamond$; KAcov₃: ∇ .

4. Real Data Analysis

4.1. Facial Expression Data

Recognizing emotion through facial expressions has attracted broad attention due to its numerous potential applications in human-computer interaction (Rosenberg and Ekman, 2020). In recognition tasks, it is of great help to screen out unimportant areas in a large image to build features for further classification or prediction. To address this issue, we apply our proposed methods to test the dependence between facial areas and emotions. We choose the dataset, Realworld affective face multi-label (RAF-ML), which is collected by Li and Deng (2019). This dataset contains 4908 aligned facial images, and every image is assigned by a probability vector of six emotions including anger, disgust, fear, joy, sadness, and surprise. We segment each image into 8 areas including left head, right head, left eye, right eye, nose, mouth, left cheek, and right cheek. The segmented facial images with probability vectors of emotions are displayed in Figure 5.

To construct symmetric semi-definite positive matrices to describe the facial images, we follow the commonly used procedures in face recognition (Wang et al., 2018). Firstly, we convert the RGB image to the gray image by averaging the RGB values. Then we calculate the covariance matrices of the feature vector $(I_{(u,v)}, u, v, G_{(u,v)}^{0,0}, \dots, G_{(u,v)}^{4,7})$ in each subfigure, where u, v are the coordinates within the subfigure, $I_{(u,v)}$ represents the average illumination values at position (u, v) , and $G_{(u,v)}^{0,0}, \dots, G_{(u,v)}^{4,7}$ are the 2D Gabor wavelet features at position (u, v) . The orientation and direction of 2D Gabor wavelet transformation are 5 and 8, respectively. We randomly select $n = 200$ images and conduct independence tests between 8 covariance matrices of different




Figure 5: Segmented facial images with probabilities of 6 emotions. The RGB images are of size 100×100 . Lower-left coordinates and top-right coordinates of 8 areas are, left head: $(0, 85), (50, 100)$; right head: $(50, 85), (100, 100)$; left eye: $(0, 55), (50, 85)$; right eye: $(50, 55), (100, 85)$; nose: $(15, 35), (85, 55)$; mouth: $(15, 0), (85, 35)$; left cheek: $(0, 0), (15, 55)$; right cheek: $(85, 0), (100, 55)$. Six emotions are anger, disgust, fear, joy, sadness, and surprise.

facial areas and the vector of emotions. We compare 6 methods that can be applied to matrix-valued data. They are the generalized distance correlation test (Sejdinovic et al., 2013), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013), the Ball covariance test (Pan et al., 2020) and our methods using KAcov_m , $m = 1, 2, 3$. The distances between matrices are calculated using the log-Euclidean kernel, and the distances between vectors are calculated using distance kernels or Euclidean distances. We report p -values of these independence tests in Table 4.

Table 4 demonstrates left eye, right eye, nose, and mouth are the four most related areas with emotions. In addition, 5 of these 6 methods also detect the dependence between the right cheek and emotions. This may be due to some faces turning to the left, e.g., (c) in Figure 5. By contrast, the generalized distance correlation test fails to detect such dependence. These dependent areas can serve as important features for further prediction or classification.

4.2. Microbial Communities Data

Table 4: p -values of independence tests between covariances matrices of 8 facial areas and the vector of emotions. The tests include the generalized distance correlation test (GDC), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013) (HHG), the Ball covariance test (Ball), $\text{KAcov}_m, m = 1, 2, 3$.

	GDC	HHG	Ball	KAcov_1	KAcov_2	KAcov_3
Left head	0.370	0.406	0.275	0.276	0.401	0.394
Right head	0.730	0.770	0.785	0.701	0.753	0.748
Left eye	0.010	0.005	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Right eye	0.015	0.020	0.060	<0.001	0.011	0.012
Nose	0.005	0.014	0.010	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Mouth	0.010	0.005	0.005	<0.001	0.002	0.002
Left cheek	0.660	0.480	0.410	0.365	0.360	0.369
Right cheek	0.170	0.009	0.025	0.002	0.030	0.031

The microbial communities in the human intestinal have significant impacts on human health, and their states are associated with a series of host factors. In this study, we test the dependence between age and intestinal microbiota by our proposed methods. The data are collected by Lahti et al. (2014) and can be downloaded from <https://datadryad.org/stash/dataset/doi:10.5061/dryad.pk75d>. The dataset includes 130 genus-like phylogenetic groups that cover the majority of the known bacterial diversity of the human intestine. The Absolute Human Intestinal Tract Chip (HITChip) signal estimates of these 130 phylogenetic groups are provided. The sample includes 1006 adults in 15 countries, and the age, sex, and BMI groups of the subjects are also included in the dataset.

We remove the empty values in the dataset. According to BMI and Sex, we divide the data into eight groups, which are lean male ($n_1 = 189$), lean female ($n_2 = 304$), overweight male ($n_3 = 102$), overweight female ($n_4 = 102$), obese male ($n_5 = 91$), obese female ($n_6 = 133$), severeobese male ($n_7 = 30$), and severeobese female ($n_8 = 70$). In each group we test dependence between age (X) and 130 phylogenetic groups ($\mathbf{y}$). We compare five independence tests including the distance correlation

test (Székely et al., 2007), the Ball covariance test (Pan et al., 2020), Hilbert-Schmidt information criterion (Gretton et al., 2007) using Gaussian kernel, the multivariate test of (Heller et al., 2013) and our methods $\text{KAcov}_m(X, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ with the distance kernel for X and L^1 -norm based kernel for $\mathbf{y}$.

In Table 5, we report the p -values for these tests for eight groups. From the table, we can see that the p -values of our tests using $\text{KAcov}_m(X, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ are less than 0.1, which indicates the strong dependence between age and phylogenetic groups. This result is the same as Zhang and Dao (2020). By contrast, the p -values of the other four methods are larger than 0.2 in overweight male group and severeobese male group, which shows that they fail to detect dependence in these groups.

Table 5: The p -values of tests in eight groups. The tests include the distance correlation test (DC), the multivariate test of Heller et al. (2013) (HHG), the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion using Gaussian kernel (HSIC), Ball covariance test (Ball), $\text{KAcov}_m(X, \mathbf{y})$, $m = 1, 2, 3$ using distance kernel for X and L^1 -norm based kernel for $\mathbf{y}$.

		DC	HHG	HSIC	Ball	KAcov_1	KAcov_2	KAcov_3
lean	male	0.005	0.004	0.005	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	female	0.005	0.004	0.005	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
overweight	male	0.225	0.210	0.335	0.225	0.002	<0.001	<0.001
	female	0.020	0.156	0.010	0.155	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
obese	male	0.060	0.074	0.095	0.190	<0.001	0.073	0.073
	female	0.030	0.121	0.035	0.080	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
severeobese	male	0.225	0.296	0.380	0.370	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	female	0.055	0.015	0.005	0.010	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

5. Extension: Connection with Generalized Distance Covariance

In this section, we provide a new integral derivation for generalized distance covariance (Sejdinovic et al., 2013) by applying (2.3).

DEFINITION 5.1. The function $\rho : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called semimetric on $\mathcal{Z}$, if it satisfies

$$(i) \quad \rho(z_1, z_2) = \rho(z_2, z_1),$$

$$(ii) \quad \rho(z_1, z_2) = 0 \text{ if and only if } z_1 = z_2,$$

for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$. $(\mathcal{Z}, \rho)$ is a semimetric space. In addition, the semimetric space $(\mathcal{Z}, \rho)$ is of negative type, if for any $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, it satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \rho(z_i, z_j) \leq 0, \text{ where } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = 0.$$

Suppose $\tilde{\rho}_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and $\tilde{\rho}_2 : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ are semimetric of negative type, Sejdinovic et al. (2013) put forward generalized distance correlation as $E\{\tilde{\rho}_1(X_1, X_2)^q \tilde{\rho}_2(Y_1, Y_2)^q - 2\tilde{\rho}_1(X_1, X_2)^q \tilde{\rho}_2(Y_1, Y_3)^q + \tilde{\rho}_1(X_1, X_2)^q \tilde{\rho}_2(Y_3, Y_4)^q\}$ with $0 < q \leq 1$, $\tilde{\rho} : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is generated by $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $\tilde{\rho}(Z_1, Z_2) = K(Z_1, Z_1) + K(Z_2, Z_2) - 2K(Z_1, Z_2)$. When $q = 1/2$, $\tilde{\rho}_1$ and $\tilde{\rho}_2$ are generated by K_1 and K_2 respectively. Then the generalized distance covariance is

$$\text{GDcov}(X, Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\rho_1(X_1, X_2)\rho_2(Y_1, Y_2) - 2\rho_1(X_1, X_2)\rho_2(Y_1, Y_3) + \rho_1(X_1, X_2)\rho_2(Y_3, Y_4)\},$$

where $\rho_1(X_1, X_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \{K_1(X_1, X_1) - 2K_1(X_1, X_2) + K_1(X_2, X_2)\}^{1/2}$ and $\rho_2(Y_1, Y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\phi_2(Y_1) - \phi_2(Y_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \{K_2(Y_1, Y_1) - 2K_2(Y_1, Y_2) + K_2(Y_2, Y_2)\}^{1/2}$.

Theorem 3. Suppose the weight function $d\omega_4(u, v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} du \times v$ and the scale parameter

$$c = (\pi/32)^{1/2}.$$

$$\text{GDcov}(X, Y) = c \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} d\omega_4(u, v) \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg),$$

Theorem 3 provides the integration form for generalized distance covariance in the following theorem.

$\text{KAcov}_1(X, Y)$ and $\text{KAcov}_3(X, Y)$ can also be seen as members of generalized distance covariance. By defining $\rho'_{\text{angle},1}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_1(x_1, x_2)$, $\rho'_{\text{angle},2}(y_1, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_2(y_1, y_2)$, $\rho_{\text{angle},1}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{ang}_1(x_1, x_2; X_3)\}$ and $\rho_{\text{angle},2}(y_1, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{\text{ang}_2(y_1, y_2; Y_3)\}$, we can represent $\text{KAcov}_1(X, Y) = E\{\rho'_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho'_{\text{angle},2}(Y_1, Y_2) - 2\rho'_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho'_{\text{angle},2}(Y_1, Y_3) + \rho'_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho'_{\text{angle},2}(Y_3, Y_4)\}$ and $\text{KAcov}_3(X, Y) = E\{\rho_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho_{\text{angle},2}(Y_1, Y_2) - 2\rho_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho_{\text{angle},2}(Y_1, Y_3) + \rho_{\text{angle},1}(X_1, X_2)\rho_{\text{angle},2}(Y_3, Y_4)\}$.

PROPOSITION 1. $(\mathcal{X}, \rho_{\text{angle},1})$, $(\mathcal{Y}, \rho_{\text{angle},2})$, $(\mathcal{X}, \rho'_{\text{angle},1})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \rho'_{\text{angle},2})$ are semimetric spaces of negative type.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article, we introduce kernel angle dependence measures in metric spaces. By making use of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space equipped with Gaussian measure, we derive kernel angle covariances with simple and explicit forms via direct integration. This group of dependence measures can be adapted to various complex objects, including low dimensional vectors, high dimensional vectors, and symmetric positive definite matrices. It also incorporates several existing angle-based measures in Euclidean space. We build estimates for kernel angle covariance upon U -statistics and adopt Gamma approximation in the testing procedure to accelerate the tests.

We conduct comprehensive simulations on three different complex objects, which demonstrate the remarkable performances of the proposed independence tests. The framework can also be used to generalize other test statistics such as Mann–Whitney test statistics and Kendall’s tau.

REFERENCE

- Arsigny, V., Fillard, P., Pennec, X., and Ayache, N. (2007). “Geometric means in a novel vector space structure on symmetric positive-definite matrices.” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, **29(1)**, 328–347.
- Berlinet, A. and Thomas-Agnan, C. (2011). *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bogomolny, E., Bohigas, O., and Schmit, C. (2007). “Distance matrices and isometric embeddings.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0710.2063*.
- Da Prato, G. (2014). *Introduction to stochastic analysis and Malliavin calculus*, volume 13. Springer.
- Damodaran, B.B., Courty, N., and Lefèvre, S. (2017). “Sparse hilbert schmidt independence criterion and surrogate-kernel-based feature selection for hyperspectral image classification.” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, **55(4)**, 2385–2398.
- Deb, N., Ghosal, P., and Sen, B. (2020). “Measuring association on topological spaces using kernels and geometric graphs.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01768*.

- Deb, N. and Sen, B. (2021). “Multivariate rank-based distribution-free nonparametric testing using measure transportation.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–16.
- Greenfeld, D. and Shalit, U. (2020). “Robust learning with the hilbert-schmidt independence criterion.” In “International Conference on Machine Learning,” pages 3759–3768. PMLR.
- Gretton, A., Fukumizu, K., Teo, C., Song, L., Schölkopf, B., and Smola, A. (2007). “A kernel statistical test of independence.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **20**.
- Gretton, A., Smola, A., Bousquet, O., Herbrich, R., Belitski, A., Augath, M., Murayama, Y., Pauls, J., Schölkopf, B., and Logothetis, N. (2005). “Kernel constrained covariance for dependence measurement.” In “International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics,” pages 112–119. PMLR.
- Gupta, S.S. (1963). “Probability integrals of multivariate normal and multivariate t_1 .” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **34(3)**, 792–828.
- Heller, R., Heller, Y., and Gorfine, M. (2013). “A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances.” *Biometrika*, **100(2)**, 503–510.
- Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (2004). *Probability essentials*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ke, C. and Yin, X. (2020). “Expected conditional characteristic function-based measures for testing independence.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **115(530)**, 985–996.

- Kim, I., Balakrishnan, S., and Wasserman, L. (2020). “Robust multivariate nonparametric tests via projection averaging.” *The Annals of Statistics*, **48(6)**, 3417–3441.
- Lahti, L., Salojärvi, J., Salonen, A., Scheffer, M., and De Vos, W.M. (2014). “Tipping elements in the human intestinal ecosystem.” *Nature Communications*, **5(1)**, 1–10.
- Lai, T., Zhang, Z., Wang, Y., and Kong, L. (2021). “Testing independence of functional variables by angle covariance.” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **182**, 104711.
- Li, S. and Deng, W. (2019). “Blended emotion in-the-wild: Multi-label facial expression recognition using crowdsourced annotations and deep locality feature learning.” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, **127(6-7)**, 884–906.
- Li, Z. and Zhang, Y. (2020). “On a projective ensemble approach to two sample test for equality of distributions.” In “International Conference on Machine Learning,” pages 6020–6027. PMLR.
- Liu, J., Si, Y., Xu, W., and Zhang, R. (2022). “A new nonparametric extension of anova via a projection mean variance measure.” *Statistica Sinica*, **32(1)**, 367–390.
- Moon, H. and Chen, K. (2022). “Interpoint-ranking sign covariance for the test of independence.” *Biometrika*, **109(1)**, 165–179.
- Pan, W., Wang, X., Zhang, H., Zhu, H., and Zhu, J. (2020). “Ball covariance: A generic measure of dependence in banach space.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **115(529)**, 307–317.
- Pfister, N., Bühlmann, P., Schölkopf, B., and Peters, J. (2018). “Kernel-based tests for

- joint independence.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **80(1)**, 5–31.
- Rosenberg, E.L. and Ekman, P. (2020). *What the face reveals: Basic and applied studies of spontaneous expression using the Facial Action Coding System (FACS)*. Oxford University Press.
- Rudra, P., Baxter, R., Hsieh, E.W., and Ghosh, D. (2022). “Compositional data analysis using kernels in mass cytometry data.” *Bioinformatics Advances*, **2(1)**. Vbac003.
- Sarkar, S., Biswas, R., and Ghosh, A.K. (2020). “On some graph-based two-sample tests for high dimension, low sample size data.” *Machine Learning*, **109(2)**, 279–306.
- Sarkar, S. and Ghosh, A.K. (2018). “On some high-dimensional two-sample tests based on averages of inter-point distances.” *Stat*, **7(1)**, e187.
- Satterthwaite, F.E. (1946). “An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components.” *Biometrics Bulletin*, **2(6)**, 110–114.
- Schölkopf, B., Smola, A.J., Bach, F., et al. (2002). *Learning with kernels: support vector machines, regularization, optimization, and beyond*. MIT press.
- Sejdinovic, D., Sriperumbudur, B., Gretton, A., and Fukumizu, K. (2013). “Equivalence of distance-based and rkhs-based statistics in hypothesis testing.” *The Annals of Statistics*, **41(5)**, 2263–2291.
- Serfling, R.L. (1980). *Approximation Theorems in Mathematical Statistics*. New York: Wiley.

- Shi, H., Drton, M., and Han, F. (2022). “Distribution-free consistent independence tests via center-outward ranks and signs.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **117**(537), 395–410.
- Sriperumbudur, B.K., Fukumizu, K., and Lanckriet, G.R. (2011). “Universality, characteristic kernels and rkhs embedding of measures.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **12**(7).
- Székely, G.J. and Rizzo, M.L. (2014). “Partial distance correlation with methods for dissimilarities.” *The Annals of Statistics*, **42**(6), 2382–2412.
- Székely, G.J., Rizzo, M.L., and Bakirov, N.K. (2007). “Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances.” *The Annals of Statistics*, **35**(6), 2769–2794.
- van Zanten, J. and van der Vaart, A. (2008). “Reproducing kernel hilbert spaces of gaussian priors.” In “Pushing the limits of contemporary statistics: contributions in honor of Jayanta K. Ghosh,” pages 200–222. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Wainwright, M.J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, B., Hu, Y., Gao, J., Ali, M., Tien, D., Sun, Y., and Yin, B. (2018). “Low rank representation on spd matrices with log-euclidean metric.” *Pattern Recognition*, **76**, 623–634.
- Welch, B.L. (1938). “The significance of the difference between two means when the population variances are unequal.” *Biometrika*, **29**(3/4), 350–362.
- Xu, K. and Zhu, L. (2022). “Power analysis of projection-pursuit independence tests.” *Statistica Sinica*, **32**, 417–33.

- Yan, J. and Zhang, X. (2021). “Kernel two-sample tests in high dimension: Interplay between moment discrepancy and dimension-and-sample orders.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00073*.
- Yao, S., Zhang, X., and Shao, X. (2018). “Testing mutual independence in high dimension via distance covariance.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **80**(3), 455–480.
- Ying, C. and Yu, Z. (2022). “Fréchet sufficient dimension reduction for random objects.” *Biometrika*, **109**(4), 975–992.
- Zhang, Q. and Dao, T. (2020). “A distance based multisample test for high-dimensional compositional data with applications to the human microbiome.” *BMC Bioinformatics*, **21**(9), 1–17.
- Zhang, Y. and Zhu, L. (2022). “Projective independence tests in high dimensions: the curses and the cures.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **(under review)**.
- 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.
- Zhu, L., Xu, K., Li, R., and Zhong, W. (2017). “Projection correlation between two random vectors.” *Biometrika*, **104**(4), 829–843.

Supplement to “Kernel Angle Dependence Measures for Complex Objects”

In this Supplement Material, we provide all the proofs in the main context. For the notation clarity, we denote $B(\mathcal{X})$ as the subset of $C(\mathcal{X})$, which are continuous functions bounded by 1 with respect to infinite norm. $B(\mathcal{Y})$ is denoted in an analogous manner.

A Technical Lemmas

In the following context, we provide a spectral view of reproducing kernel Hilbert space and introduce the important series representation for the inner product. Then, we introduce Gaussian measures and consider a special case, the Gaussian measure with covariance identity operator. By making use of the series representation, we derive the integration results for the reproducing kernel Hilbert space equipped with Gaussian measure using identity covariance operator in Lemma 1 and A.6.

Given real-valued reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_K$ with reproducing kernel $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if K is continuous, we define the integral operator $T_K : L^2(\mathcal{Z}, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{Z}, \mu)$ by

$$(T_K f)(\cdot) = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} K(\cdot, z) f(z) d\mu(z),$$

According to Mercer’s Theorem (Wainwright, 2019, Theorem 12.20), there is an orthonormal basis $\{\psi_j\}$ of $L^2(\mathcal{Z}, \mu)$ consisting of eigenfunctions T_K such that the corresponding sequence of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}$ are non-negative. $K(z_1, z_2)$ has the represen-

tation

$$K(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(z_1) \psi_j(z_2),$$

where the convergence is absolute and uniform. And this series representation refers to Mercer's representation of K . This representation gives an explicitly characterization of reproducing kernel Hilbert space (Wainwright, 2019, Corollary 12.26). For any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{H}_K$,

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle g_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle g_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is separable Hilbert space, $h, f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $Q : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is continuous, symmetric and positive linear operator. According to Da Prato (2014, Theorem 1.11), a Gaussian measure μ on $\mathcal{H}$ with mean zero and covariance operator Q , has the characteristic function as

$$\int_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \exp(i \langle h, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu(dh) = \exp(-2^{-1} \langle Qf, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

Let $\{e_j\}$ be orthonormal eigenfunctions and $\{\sigma_j\}$ be corresponding eigenvalues, satisfying that $Qe_j = \sigma_j e_j$. The Gaussian measure μ has the following representation,

$$\mu(dh) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu_m(dh), \text{ where } \mu_m(dh) = (2\pi\sigma_m)^{-1/2} \exp\{-\langle h, e_m \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 / (2\sigma_m)\} d\langle h, e_m \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For the reproducing kernel Hilbert space equipped with Gaussian measures using mean zero and covariance identity operator, we choose a special orthonormal basis in

$\mathcal{H}_K, \{\lambda_j^{1/2}\psi_j\}$. For $h \in \mathcal{H}_K$, denote $h_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle h, \lambda_j^{1/2}\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}$. Using the representation of inner product in reproducing kernel Hilbert space (A.1), we have $h_j = \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}$. By applying (A.2), we get

$$\mu(dh) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-h_j^2/2) dh_j.$$

With this preparation knowledge, we will prove Lemma 1 and A.6.

LEMMA A.3. (*Gupta, 1963, Page 801*) *Let $(Z_1, Z_2)^T$ be the bivariate normally distribution with mean 0 and correlation ρ . Then, $\text{pr}(Z_1 \leq 0, Z_2 \leq 0) = 4^{-1} + (2\pi)^{-1} \arcsin \rho$.*

LEMMA A.4. *Let $\mathbf{z}_1$ and $\mathbf{z}_2$ be two vectors in $\mathbb{R}^p$. Suppose $\mathbf{x}$ is a random vector in $\mathbb{R}^p$ and follows the multivariate standard normal distribution. Then, $E\{1(\langle \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0)1(\langle \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0)\} = 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos\{\mathbf{z}_1^T \mathbf{z}_2 / (\|\mathbf{z}_1\| \|\mathbf{z}_2\|)\}$.*

Proof of Lemma A.4: $\langle \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ follow normal distribution with mean 0 and correlation $\mathbf{z}_1^T \mathbf{z}_2 / (\|\mathbf{z}_1\| \|\mathbf{z}_2\|)$. From Lemma A.3, we can straightly derive that $E\{1(\langle \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0)1(\langle \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0)\} = 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos\{\mathbf{z}_1^T \mathbf{z}_2 / (\|\mathbf{z}_1\| \|\mathbf{z}_2\|)\}$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 1: We prove the first equation. As previously discussed, we choose orthonormal basis $\{\lambda_j^{1/2}\psi_j\}$ to represent Gaussian measure with zero mean identity covariance operator. We derive the integral that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) \mu(dh) \\ &= \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq 0\right) 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq 0\right) \mu(dh). \end{aligned}$$

Using the uniformity of the series representation and Fubini's Theorem, the above

formula equals the following equation as M diverges to infinity.

$$\int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq 0 \right) 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq 0 \right) \mu(dh).$$

This integral term equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0 \right) 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0 \right) \mu(dh) \\ &= \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0 \right) 1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0 \right) \mu_1(dh) \dots \mu_M(dh) \\ &= 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos \left\{ \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right)^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right)^{-1/2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality can be established by applying Lemma A.4. As M goes to infinity, we apply the series representation (A.1) and derive the final result as,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} 1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq 0) \mu(dh) \\ &= 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos \{ \langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} / (\|s_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \|s_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the above paradigm of the proof, we prove the second equation. We derive

the integral that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}} 1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq u) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq u) d\Phi_1(u) \mu(dh) \\
&= \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}} 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq u\right) \\
&\quad 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \leq u\right) d\Phi_1(u) \mu(dh).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the uniformity of the series representation and Fubini's Theorem, the above formula equals the following equation as M diverges to infinity.

$$\int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}} 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq u\right) 1\left(\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq u\right) d\Phi_1(u) \mu(dh).$$

Denote $\mathbf{h} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (h_1, \dots, h_M, u)^T$, we know $\mathbf{h}$ follows $M + 1$ dimensional standard multivariate normal distribution. Let $\Phi_{M+1}(\mathbf{h})$ be the $M + 1$ dimensional standard multivariate normal distribution function. The above integration equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{M+1}} 1\left\{(-1)u + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0\right\} \\
&\quad 1\left\{(-1)u + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1/2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} h_j \leq 0\right\} d\Phi_{M+1}(\mathbf{h}) \\
&= 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos \left\{ \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_1, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}^2\right)^{-1/2} \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s_2, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2}^2\right)^{-1/2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The above equality can be established by applying Lemma A.4. As M goes to infinity,

we complete the proof for the second equation.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}} 1(\langle s_1, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq u) 1(\langle s_2, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq u) d\Phi_1(u) \mu(dh) \\ = & 2^{-1} - (2\pi)^{-1} \arccos\{(1 + \langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K})(1 + \|s_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2)^{-1/2}(1 + \|s_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2)^{-1/2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA A.5. *Let $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. $\mathbf{z}$ follows multivariate standard normal distribution. We have $E\{|\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{x}|\} = 2(2\pi)^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|$.*

Proof of Lemma A.5: Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$. Else, we can do orthogonal transformation and inverse of orthogonal transformation for $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ respectively. And $\mathbf{z}$ still follows normal distribution. Let $\mathbf{z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_p)$.

$$\begin{aligned} E\{|\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{x}|\} &= \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{x}| \exp\{-\|\mathbf{z}\|^2/2\} d\mathbf{z} \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\| \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m} |Z_1| \exp\{-\|\mathbf{z}\|^2/2\} d\mathbf{z} = 2(2\pi)^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is derived via direct integration using spherical coordinates. □

LEMMA A.6. *Suppose s and h are in separable reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_K$, which has reproducing kernel $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let μ be Gaussian measure on $\mathcal{H}_K$ with mean zero and identity covariance operator. Then,*

$$\int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} |\langle s, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}| \mu(dh) = 2(2\pi)^{-1/2} \|s\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.6: We choose orthonormal basis $\{\lambda_m^{1/2} \psi_m\}$ to represent Gaussian measure with zero mean identity covariance operator. Then, we derive the inte-

gral that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} |\langle s, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}| \mu(dh) \\
&= \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \left| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \right| \mu(dh) \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \left| \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{-1} \langle s, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_j \rangle_{L^2} \right| \mu_1(dh) \dots \mu_M(dh). \tag{A.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we calculate the integral term .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \left| \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m^{-1} \langle s, \psi_m \rangle_{L^2} \langle h, \psi_m \rangle_{L^2} \right| \mu_1(dh) \dots \mu_M(dh) \\
&= \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} \left| \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m^{-1/2} \langle s, \psi_m \rangle_{L^2} h_m \right| \mu_1(dh) \dots \mu_M(dh) \\
&= \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m^{-1} \langle s, \psi_m \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging the above integral result into (A.3), we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{h \in \mathcal{H}_K} |\langle s, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}| \mu(dh) \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m^{-1} \langle s, \phi_m \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{1/2} = \left\{ \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m^{-1} \langle s, \phi_m \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{1/2} = \|s\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B Proof of Lemma 2

We first provide the definition of universal kernel and then prove the this theorem.

LEMMA B.7. (*Jacod and Protter, 2004, Theorem 10.1*) Let X and Y be random variables on metric spaces. X and Y are independent if and only if $\text{cov}\{f(X), g(Y)\} = 0$ for any pair (f, g) of bounded, continuous functions.

DEFINITION B.1. A continuous kernel $K : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a compact metric space $(\mathcal{Z}, d)$ is called universal if and only if the reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ induced by the kernel K is dense in the space of continuous functions on $\mathcal{Z}$, with respect to the infinity norm.

When X and Y are independent, it is obvious that $\text{cov}\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} = 0$ for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$. We complete the “if” part using the proof by contradiction.

Suppose that X and Y are not independent, given $\text{cov}\{1(f(X) \leq u), 1(g(Y) \leq v)\} = 0$ for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$. From Theorem B.7, there must exist $f_0 \in B(\mathcal{X})$ and $g_0 \in B(\mathcal{Y})$ that $\text{cov}\{f_0(X), g_0(Y)\} = c$, where $1 \geq c > 0$.

Given that $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are induced by continuous universal kernel, from the Definition B.1, we know that $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are dense in $C(\mathcal{X})$ and $C(\mathcal{Y})$ with respect to infinite norm respectively. Therefore, we can find $f^* \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $g^* \in \mathcal{H}_2$ that $\|f^* - f_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|g^* - g_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$, where $c/3 > \varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}\{f^*(X), g^*(Y)\} &= \text{cov}\{f^*(X) - f_0(X) + f_0(X), g^*(Y) - g_0(Y) + g_0(Y)\} \\
&= \text{cov}\{f_0(X), g_0(Y)\} + \text{cov}\{f^*(X) - f_0(X), g^*(Y) - g_0(Y)\} \\
&\quad + \text{cov}\{f_0(X), g^*(Y) - g_0(Y)\} + \text{cov}\{g_0(Y), f^*(X) - f_0(X)\} \\
&\geq \text{cov}\{f^*(X), g^*(Y)\} - \varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon[|E\{f_0(X)\}| + |E\{g_0(Y)\}|] \\
&\geq c - \varepsilon^2 - 2\varepsilon > c/9.
\end{aligned}$$

Given the above inequality, the fact $\text{cov}\{1(f^*(X) \leq u), 1(g^*(Y) \leq v)\} = 0$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$ doesn't hold up. The proof is complete for this contradiction. $\square$

C Proof of Theorem 1

Firstly, we prove statement (i). We rewrite the covariance term as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}\{1(\langle \phi_1(X), f \rangle \leq u), 1(\langle \phi_2(Y), g \rangle \leq v)\} \\ = & E\{1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_1), g \rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_3), g \rangle \leq v)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The square of the covariance can be represented as the expectation form.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}^2\{1(\langle \phi_1(X), f \rangle \leq u), 1(\langle \phi_2(Y), g \rangle \leq v)\} \tag{C.1} \\ = & E\left[\{1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_1), g \rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_3), g \rangle \leq v)\} \right. \\ & \left. \{1(\langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_2), g \rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_4), g \rangle \leq v)\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini's Theorem, we can exchange the order of integrals.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(\langle \phi_1(X), f \rangle \leq u), 1(\langle \phi_2(Y), g \rangle \leq v)\} d\Phi(u, v) \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg) \\ = & E\left[\int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \{1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_1), g \rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u) \right. \\ & 1(\langle \phi_2(Y_3), g \rangle \leq v)\} \{1(\langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle \leq u)1(\langle \phi_2(Y_2), g \rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle \leq u) \\ & \left. 1(\langle \phi_2(Y_4), g \rangle \leq v)\} d\Phi(u, v) \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg)\right]. \tag{C.2} \end{aligned}$$

The integral term of equation (C.2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{H}'_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}'_2} \{1(\langle(\phi_1(X_1), -1), (f, u)\rangle \leq 0)1(\langle(\phi_2(Y_1), -1), (g, v)\rangle \leq 0) - \\
& \quad 1(\langle(\phi_1(X_1), -1), (f, u)\rangle \leq 0)1(\langle(\phi_2(Y_3), -1), (g, v)\rangle \leq 0)\} \\
& \quad \{1(\langle(\phi_1(X_2), -1), (f, u)\rangle \leq 0)1(\langle(\phi_2(Y_2), -1), (g, v)\rangle \leq 0) - \\
& \quad 1(\langle(\phi_1(X_2), -1), (f, u)\rangle \leq 0)1(\langle(\phi_2(Y_4), -1), (g, v)\rangle \leq 0)\} \mu'_1(df) \mu'_2(dg).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

By applying Lemma 1 repeatedly, we can simplify the equation (C.3) as $(2\pi)^{-2} \{ \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2) \text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2) - 2 \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2) \text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_3) + \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2) \text{ang}_1(Y_3, Y_4) \}$. Taking expectation, we complete the proof for statement (i).

Next, we simplify the result in (ii). Following the proof for (i), we can similarly derive equation (C.1). Given f and g , $F_{U,V}(u, v)$ is the distribution function for $(\langle\phi_1(X_5), f\rangle, \langle\phi_2(Y_5), g\rangle)^T$. Combined with equation (C.1), the innermost integral can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2 \{1(\langle\phi_1(X), f\rangle \leq u), 1(\langle\phi_2(Y), g\rangle \leq v)\} dF_{U,V}(u, v) \\
& = E \left[\left\{ 1(\langle\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_5), f\rangle \leq 0) 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_1) - \phi_2(Y_5), g\rangle \leq 0) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_5), f\rangle \leq 0) 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_3) - \phi_2(Y_5), g\rangle \leq 0) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left\{ 1(\langle\phi_1(X_2) - \phi_1(X_5), f\rangle \leq 0) 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_2) - \phi_2(Y_5), g\rangle \leq 0) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_2) - \phi_1(X_5), f\rangle \leq 0) 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_4) - \phi_2(Y_5), g\rangle \leq 0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's Theorem, we can exchange the order of the two integrals with the expec-

tation. Applying the integral result of Lemma 1 repeatedly, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& 4\pi^2 \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(\langle\phi_1(X), f\rangle \leq u), 1(\langle\phi_2(Y), g\rangle \leq v)\} dF_{U,V}(u, v) \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg) \\
&= E\{\text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_5) - \text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_2, Y_3; Y_5) \\
&\quad - \text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_4; Y_5) + \text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_3, Y_4; Y_5)\} \\
&= E\{\text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_5) - 2\text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_3; Y_5) \\
&\quad + \text{ang}_2(X_1, X_2; X_5) \text{ang}_2(Y_3, Y_4; Y_5)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof for Theorem 1 (ii). Given f and g , $F_U(u)F_V(v)$ is the distribution function for $(\langle\phi_1(X_5), f\rangle, \langle\phi_2(Y_6), g\rangle)^T$. Using this fact, Theorem 1 (iii) can be proved following the same paradigm. We omit the details here. $\square$

D Proof of Theorem 2

Following the equation (C.1), we can further rewrite the square of covariance term $4\text{cov}^2\{1(\langle\phi_1(X), f\rangle \leq u), 1(\langle\phi_2(Y), g\rangle \leq v)\}$ via direct calculation as

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\{1(\langle\phi_1(X_1), f\rangle \leq u) - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_2), g\rangle \leq u)\}^2 \{1(\langle\phi_2(Y_1), f\rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_2), g\rangle \leq v)\}^2 \right. \\
& \quad - \{1(\langle\phi_1(X_1), f\rangle \leq u) - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_2), g\rangle \leq u)\}^2 \{1(\langle\phi_2(Y_1), f\rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_4), g\rangle \leq v)\}^2 \\
& \quad - \{1(\langle\phi_1(X_1), f\rangle \leq u) - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_2), g\rangle \leq u)\}^2 \{1(\langle\phi_2(Y_2), f\rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_3), g\rangle \leq v)\}^2 \\
& \quad \left. + \{1(\langle\phi_1(X_1), f\rangle \leq u) - 1(\langle\phi_1(X_3), g\rangle \leq u)\}^2 \{1(\langle\phi_2(Y_3), f\rangle \leq v) - 1(\langle\phi_2(Y_4), g\rangle \leq v)\}^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Given the integral result that

$$\int_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \{1(\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle \leq u) - 1(\langle \phi_1(X_2), g \rangle \leq u)\}^2 du = |\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle - \langle \phi_1(X_2), g \rangle|$$

We can apply Fubini's Theorem and get

$$\begin{aligned} & 4^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(\langle \phi_1(X), f \rangle \leq u), 1(\langle \phi_2(Y), g \rangle \leq v)\} dudv \\ = & E \left[|\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle - \langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle| |\langle \phi_2(Y_1), g \rangle - \langle \phi_2(Y_2), g \rangle| \right. \\ & - |\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle - \langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle| |\langle \phi_2(Y_1), g \rangle - \langle \phi_2(Y_4), g \rangle| \\ & - |\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle - \langle \phi_1(X_2), f \rangle| |\langle \phi_2(Y_2), g \rangle - \langle \phi_2(Y_3), g \rangle| \\ & \left. + |\langle \phi_1(X_1), f \rangle - \langle \phi_1(X_3), f \rangle| |\langle \phi_2(Y_3), g \rangle - \langle \phi_2(Y_4), g \rangle| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above equation, we apply Fubini's Theorem again. Using the result of Lemma A.6 repeatedly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\pi/32)^{1/2} \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \int_{\mathcal{H}_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{cov}^2\{1(\langle \phi_1(X), f \rangle \leq u), 1(\langle \phi_2(Y), g \rangle \leq v)\} dudv \mu_1(df) \mu_2(dg) \\ = & E \left[\|\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|\phi_2(Y_1) - \phi_2(Y_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} - 2\|\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|\phi_2(Y_1) - \right. \\ & \left. \phi_2(Y_3)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} + \|\phi_1(X_1) - \phi_1(X_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|\phi_2(Y_3) - \phi_2(Y_4)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \right] \\ = & E [\rho_1(X_1, X_2) \rho_2(Y_1, Y_2) - 2\rho_1(X_1, X_2) \rho_2(Y_1, Y_3) + \rho_1(X_1, X_2) \rho_2(Y_3, Y_4)]. \end{aligned}$$

□

E Proof of Theorem 2

We shall prove this theorem following two steps.

Step 1. We consider the case when X and Y are independent. We prove the asymptotic properties for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y)$ first.

Denote $d_{1,1}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2) + \text{ang}'_1(X_3, X_4) - \text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_3) - \text{ang}'_1(X_2, X_4)$, $d_{1,2}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2) + \text{ang}'_2(Y_3, Y_4) - \text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_3) - \text{ang}'_2(Y_2, Y_4)$ and

$$h_1((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4)) \\ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{4(4!)\}^{-1} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)}^4 d_{1,1}(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}) d_{1,2}(Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}, Y_{i_3}, Y_{i_4}).$$

With straight calculation, we can rewrite $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y)$ as

$$\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y) = \{(n)_4\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l)}^n h_1((X_i, Y_i), (X_j, Y_j), (X_k, Y_k), (X_l, Y_l)).$$

When X and Y are independent, the kernel $h_1(\cdot)$ is a degenerate kernel. We define

$$h_{1,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 6E\{h_1((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4)) \mid (X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)\}.$$

We can simplify this expectation term and get $h_{1,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) = \text{ang}'_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2)$

$\text{ang}'_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2)$, where $\text{ang}'_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{d_{1,1}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) \mid X_1, X_2\}$ and

$\text{ang}'_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{d_{1,2}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4) \mid Y_1, Y_2\}$. According to Serfling (1980, The-

orem 5.5.2), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{1,j}(\zeta_{1,1,j}^2 - 1),$$

where $\{\eta_{1,j}, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are eigenvalues of the integral operator $T_1 : L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times \mu_Y) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times \mu_Y)$.

$$(T_1 f)(x_2, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} h_{1,2}((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) f(x_1, y_1) d\mu_X(x_1) d\mu_Y(y_1).$$

We approximate the distribution for the following term using gamma distribution.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{1,j} \zeta_{1,1,j}^2.$$

The first and second moment can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} E\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{1,j} \zeta_{1,1,j}^2\right\} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{1,j} = E\{h_{1,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_1, Y_1))\} \\ &= E\{\text{ang}'_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_1)\} E\{\text{ang}'_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_1)\} \\ &= E\{\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

And the second moment can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{1,j} \zeta_{1,1,j}^2\right\} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2\eta_{1,j}^2 = 2E\{h_{1,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2))^2\} \\ &= 2E\{\text{ang}'_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2)^2\} E\{\text{ang}'_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2)^2\} \\ &= 2E\{\text{KAcov}_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_1(Y_1, Y_2)\} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the shape and rate parameter α_1 and β_1 are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^2 \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_1(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}, \\ \beta_1 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}'_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{ang}'_2(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right] \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_1(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_1(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove the asymptotic properties for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y)$.

Denote $d_{2,1}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_5) + \text{ang}_1(X_3, X_4; X_5) - \text{ang}_1(X_1, X_3; X_5) - \text{ang}_1(X_2, X_4; X_5)$, $d_{2,2}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_5) + \text{ang}_2(Y_3, Y_4; Y_5) - \text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_3; Y_5) - \text{ang}_2(Y_2, Y_4; Y_5)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & h_2((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5)) \\ & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{4(5!)\}^{-1} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5)}^5 d_{2,1}(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, X_{i_5}) d_{2,2}(Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}, Y_{i_3}, Y_{i_4}, Y_{i_5}), \end{aligned}$$

With straight calculation, we can rewrite $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y)$ as

$$\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y) = \{(n)_5\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l,r)}^n h_2((X_i, Y_i), (X_j, Y_j), (X_k, Y_k), (X_l, Y_l), (X_r, Y_r)).$$

When X and Y are independent, the kernel h is a degenerate kernel. We define $h_{2,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 10E\{h_2((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5)) \mid (X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)\}$. We can simplify this expectation term and get $h_{2,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) = \text{ang}_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2) \text{ang}_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2)$, where $\text{ang}_{1,\text{center}}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{d_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, X_3, X_4, X_5)\}$ and $\text{ang}_{2,\text{center}}(y_1, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{d_{2,2}(y_1, y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5)\}$. According to Serfling (1980, Theorem 5.5.2), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{2,j}(\zeta_{1,2,j}^2 - 1),$$

where $\{\eta_{2,j}, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are eigenvalues of the integral operator $T_2 : L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times$

$$\mu_Y) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times \mu_Y).$$

$$(T_2 f)(x_2, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} h_{2,2}((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) f(x_1, y_1) d\mu_X(x_1) d\mu_Y(y_1).$$

We approximate the distribution for the following term using gamma distribution.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{2,j} \zeta_{1,2,j}^2.$$

The first and second moment can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} E\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{2,j} \zeta_{1,2,j}^2\right\} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{2,j} = E\{h_{2,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_1, Y_1))\} \\ &= E\{\text{ang}_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_1)\} E\{\text{ang}_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_1)\} \\ &= E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\} E\{\text{ang}_2(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\}. \end{aligned}$$

And the second moment can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{2,j} \zeta_{1,2,j}^2\right\} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2\eta_{2,j}^2 = 2E\{h_{2,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2))^2\} \\ &= 2E\{\text{ang}_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2)^2\} E\{\text{ang}_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2)^2\} \\ &= 2E\{\text{KAcov}_3(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_3(Y_1, Y_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the shape and rate parameter α_1 and β_1 are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\} E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\} \right]^2 \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_3(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_3(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}, \\ \beta_2 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\} E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\} \right] \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_3(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_3(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the similar proof for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y)$, denote

$$\begin{aligned} & h_3((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5), (X_6, Y_6)) \\ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \{4(6!)\}^{-1} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6)}^6 d_{2,1}(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, X_{i_5}) d_{2,2}(Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}, Y_{i_3}, Y_{i_4}, Y_{i_6}). \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y)$ as

$$\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y) = \{(n)_6\}^{-1} \sum_{(i,j,k,l,r,t)}^n h_2((X_i, Y_i), (X_j, Y_j), (X_k, Y_k), (X_l, Y_l), (X_r, Y_r), (X_t, Y_t)).$$

When X and Y are independent, the kernel h is a degenerate kernel. We define

$$\begin{aligned} & h_{3,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 15E\{h_3((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5), (X_6, Y_6)) \mid \\ & (X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)\}. \text{ We can simplify this expectation term and get } h_{3,2}((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2)) \\ & = \text{ang}_{1,\text{center}}(X_1, X_2) \text{ang}_{2,\text{center}}(Y_1, Y_2). \text{ According to Serfling (1980, Theorem 5.5.2),} \\ & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

$$n\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{3,j}(\zeta_{1,3,j}^2 - 1),$$

where $\{\eta_{3,j}, j = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are eigenvalues of the integral operator $T_3 : L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times \mu_Y) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu_X \times \mu_Y)$.

$$(T_3 f)(x_2, y_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} h_{3,2}((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) f(x_1, y_1) d\mu_X(x_1) d\mu_Y(y_1).$$

We approximate the distribution for the following term using gamma distribution.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{3,j} \zeta_{1,3,j}^2.$$

The shape and scale parameter can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_3 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_3)\} E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\} \right]^2 \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_3(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_3(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}, \\ \beta_3 &= \left[E\{\text{ang}_1(X_1, X_2; X_1)\} E\{\text{ang}_1(Y_1, Y_2; Y_3)\} \right] \left[2E\{\text{KAcov}_3(X_1, X_2)\} E\{\text{KAcov}_3(Y_1, Y_2)\} \right]^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. We consider the case when X and Y are dependent.

We prove the asymptotic properties for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y)$ first. We define $h_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 4E\{h_1((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4)) \mid (X_1, Y_1)\}$, which can be simplified as $h_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{d_{1,1}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)d_{1,2}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4) \mid (X_1, Y_1)\}$. Denote

$$\sigma_1^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{h_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1)^2\}. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

According to Serfling (1980, Theorem 5.5.1A), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{1/2}\{\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_1(X, Y) - \text{KAcov}_1(X, Y)\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2).$$

Next, we prove the asymptotic properties for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y)$. We define $h_{2,1}(X_1, Y_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 5E\{h_2((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5)) \mid (X_1, Y_1)\}$. Denote

$$\sigma_2^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{h_{2,1}(X_1, Y_1)^2\}. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

According to Serfling (1980, Theorem 5.5.1A), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{1/2}\{\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y) - \text{KAcov}_2(X, Y)\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2).$$

Following the similar paradigm of the prove for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_2(X, Y)$, we can complete the proof for $\widehat{\text{KAcov}}_3(X, Y)$. Denote $h_{3,1}(X_1, Y_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 6E\{h_3((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3), (X_4, Y_4), (X_5, Y_5), (X_6, Y_6)) \mid (X_1, Y_1)\}$, the corresponding variance can be represented as

$$\sigma_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E\{h_{3,1}(X_1, Y_1)^2\}. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

□

F Proof of Proposition 1

We prove $(\mathcal{X}, \rho_{angle,1})$ is semimetric space of negative type and omit the proof for others which can be shown similarly.

Given $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, it is easy to see that $\rho_{angle,1}(x_1, x_2) = \rho_{angle,1}(x_2, x_1)$.

If $x_1 = x_2$, we have $\rho_{angle,1}(x_1, x_2) = 0$. And if $\rho_{angle,1}(x_1, x_2) = 0$, it implies that $\langle \phi_1(x_1) - \phi_1(X), \phi_1(x_2) - \phi_1(X) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \|\phi_1(x_1) - \phi_1(X)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|\phi_1(x_2) - \phi_1(X)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ almost surely. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this equality holds if and only if $\phi_1(x_1) - \phi_1(X) = \phi_1(x_2) - \phi_1(X)$ almost surely. Given $\phi_1(\cdot)$ is injection, we know $x_1 = x_2$.

Next, we show the negative type. Given $x_3 \in \mathcal{X}$, from Bogomolny et al. (2007), we know for fixed x_3 ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \text{ang}_1(x_1, x_2; x_3) \leq 0,$$

By taking expectation of X_3 , this inequality also holds. Thus, $\rho_{angle,1}$ is of negative type. □