

# Transport Dependency: Optimal Transport Based Dependency Measures

Thomas Giacomo Nies<sup>\*†</sup>  
thomas.nies@uni-goettingen.de

Thomas Staudt<sup>\*†</sup>  
thomas.staudt@uni-goettingen.de

Axel Munk<sup>\*†‡</sup>  
amunk1@gwdg.de

## Abstract

Finding meaningful ways to determine the dependency between two random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  is a timeless statistical endeavor with vast practical relevance. In recent years, several concepts that aim to extend classical means (such as the Pearson correlation or rank-based coefficients like Spearman's  $\rho$ ) to more general spaces have been introduced and popularized, a well-known example being the distance correlation. In this article, we propose and study an alternative framework for measuring statistical dependency, the *transport dependency*  $\tau \geq 0$ , which relies on the notion of optimal transport and is applicable in general Polish spaces. It can be estimated consistently via the corresponding empirical measure, is versatile and adaptable to various scenarios by proper choices of the cost function, and intrinsically respects metric properties of the ground spaces. Notably, statistical independence is characterized by  $\tau = 0$ , while large values of  $\tau$  indicate highly regular relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . Indeed, for suitable base costs,  $\tau$  is maximized if and only if  $\zeta$  can be expressed as 1-Lipschitz function of  $\xi$  or vice versa. Based on sharp upper bounds, we exploit this characterization and define three distinct dependency coefficients (a-c) with values in  $[0, 1]$ , each of which emphasizes different functional relations. These *transport correlations* attain the value 1 if and only if  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$ , where  $\varphi$  is a) a Lipschitz function, b) a measurable function, c) a multiple of an isometry. The properties of coefficient c) make it comparable to the distance correlation, while coefficient b) is a limit case of a) that was recently studied independently by Wiesel (2021). Numerical results suggest that the transport dependency is a robust quantity that efficiently discerns structure from noise in simple settings, often out-performing other commonly applied coefficients of dependency.

*Keywords:* transport dependency, transport correlation, optimal transport, statistical dependence, mutual information, correlation, distance correlation

*MSC 2020 Subject Classification:* primary 62H20, 49Q22; secondary 62R20, 62G35, 60E15

---

<sup>\*</sup>Institute for Mathematical Stochastics, University of Göttingen

<sup>†</sup>Cluster of Excellence: Multiscale Bioimaging (MBExC), University Medical Center, Göttingen

<sup>‡</sup>Max Planck Institute for Biophysical Chemistry, Göttingen

# 1 Introduction

In this article, we explore a method to quantify the statistical dependence between two random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  on Polish spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  via optimal transport. The core idea is to calculate the effort necessary to transform the joint distribution  $\gamma$  of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  into the product  $\mu \otimes \nu$  of their marginal distributions  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . This motivates the definition of the *transport dependency*

$$\tau(\xi, \zeta) = \tau(\gamma) = T_c(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu) = \inf_{\pi} \int c \, d\pi, \quad (1)$$


where  $T_c$  is the optimal transport cost with (non-negative) base costs  $c$  on  $X \times Y$ . The infimum on the right is taken over the set of all couplings between  $\gamma$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$ , i.e., distributions  $\pi$  with marginals  $\gamma$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$  (see Villani 2008 for a comprehensive treatment). If the cost function has benign properties, the transport dependency  $\tau$  displays many traits that are attractive for a measure of statistical association. For example, if  $c$  is a metric (or a power thereof), then  $\tau(\gamma) = 0$  if and only if  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ , which is the case of statistical independence of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . Figure 1a illustrates the intuition behind this concept.

On Euclidean spaces, idea (1) of applying an optimal transport distance between a coupling  $\gamma$  and the product  $\mu \otimes \nu$  of its marginals was recently introduced into the machine learning literature under the names *Wasserstein dependence measure* (Ozair et al. 2019) and *Wasserstein total correlation* (Xiao and Wang 2019), where it was used to improve results during representation learning. Moreover, a close relative to the transport dependency  $\tau$  was recently explored in a statistical context. If  $(\gamma_x)_{x \in X}$  denotes the disintegration of  $\gamma$  with respect to the first coordinate (i.e.,  $\gamma_x$  is the law of  $\zeta$  given  $\xi = x$ ), Wiesel (2021) proposed, up to normalization, the association measure

$$\tau^Y(\xi, \zeta) = \tau^Y(\gamma) = \int T_{c_Y}(\gamma_x, \nu) \mu(dx), \quad (2)$$

where  $c_Y$  is (the power of) a metric on the space  $Y$ . He further shows that this quantity exhibits a list of desirable properties advanced by the work of Chatterjee (2020), and suggests a method by which it can be estimated consistently. Even though (2) appears to address a different problem when compared to (1) – after all, the optimal transport in  $\tau^Y$  is calculated only on  $Y$ , once per  $x \in X$ , and the metric structure of  $X$  plays no role – it is in fact a special case: if transport along the space  $X$  is forbidden by choosing costs  $c$  that assume the value  $\infty$  for movements of mass that are not vertical (see Figure 1b), then  $\tau$  reduces to the expression in (2). We therefore call  $\tau^Y(\gamma)$  the *marginal transport dependency* of  $\gamma$ . In the course of our exploration of  $\tau$ , the marginal transport dependency will naturally emerge both as an upper bound and as a limiting case. Previously, integrals of the form (2) have also appeared in the context of generalization bounds for statistical learning problems (Zhang et al. 2018; Lopez and Jog 2018; Wang et al. 2019), and a special case of  $\tau^Y$  has been employed by Xiao and Wang (2019) in order to improve estimates of the dependency gap in representation learning tasks.


**Mutual information.** The underlying idea of quantifying dependency as a measure of discrepancy between the joint distribution of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  and the product distribution of their marginals reaches far back. In his landmark work, Shannon (1948) introduced the mutual information



**Figure 1:** Illustration of the (marginal) transport dependency. Sketch (a) shows how mass could be moved in an optimal way when transforming  $\mu \otimes \nu$  into  $\gamma$  (visualized on level sets). The closer  $\gamma$  is to  $\mu \otimes \nu$ , the less mass has to be transported and the smaller the value of  $\tau(\gamma)$  will be. Sketch (b) displays the same situation as (a), but this time transport along the space  $X$  is forbidden and mass has to be transported vertically, which is clearly less optimal.

$M(\gamma) = D(\gamma | \mu \otimes \nu)$ , where the Kullback-Leibler divergence  $D$  is used to compare  $\gamma$  to  $\mu \otimes \nu$ . The mutual information has become an indispensable tool for measuring the information content stored in the relation between random variables and has found application in feature selection (Estévez et al. 2009), image registration and alignment (Maes et al. 1997; Pluim et al. 2000; Viola and Wells III 1997), clustering (Kraskov et al. 2005), and independence testing (Berrett and Samworth 2019), besides others. Its immediate use for statistical data analysis, however, is complicated by several issues. For example, it is often inconvenient to estimate  $M(\gamma)$  from data, as density estimates or binning / clustering methods are necessary and estimation suffers from the curse of dimensionality (Hall and Morton 1993; Paninski and Yajima 2008; Berrett et al. 2019). Furthermore, the mutual information itself does not respect topological or metric properties of the coupling  $\gamma$ , as rearrangements of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  by measurable functions leave  $M(\gamma)$  invariant. In this sense, the mutual information is not able to distinguish chaotic relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  from well-behaved ones (see Figure 2). Still, the mutual information and its surrogates, such as the mutual information dimension (Sugiyama and Borgwardt 2013) or the maximal information coefficient (Reshef et al. 2011), have proven to be useful tools for detecting statistical dependency in data analysis.

**Distance covariance.** Another popular approach to measure dependency by comparing  $\gamma$  to  $\mu \otimes \nu$  is the *distance covariance* proposed by Székely et al. (2007). If  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^r$  and  $\mathbb{R}^q$  for  $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$ , the (Euclidean) distance covariance between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  is a weighted  $L_2$  distance between the joint characteristic function  $f_\gamma$  and the product of the



**Figure 2:** Marginal and joint distribution of random variables  $\xi \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  and  $\zeta = f_n(\xi) \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  for zigzag functions  $f_n$  with  $n$  linear segments for  $n = 1$  in (a) and  $n = 8$  in (b). The drawn arrows illustrate how the optimal transport between  $\mu \otimes \nu$  and  $\gamma$  could look like. Note that the mutual information and related concepts that only measure the information content do not distinguish between the two scenarios. In contrast, dependency measures that are aware of metric or topological properties, like the transport dependency  $\tau$  or the distance covariance, assign a (much) lower degree of dependence to scenario (b). This discrepancy stresses an important point: should deterministic but chaotic relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  maximize a measure for statistical dependency? After all, one may not be able to recover the relation in practice and distinguish it from noise if data is limited.

individual characteristic functions  $f_\mu$  and  $f_\nu$ ,

$$\text{dcov}^2(\xi, \zeta) = \frac{1}{c_r c_q} \int \frac{|f_Y(t, s) - f_\mu(t)f_\nu(s)|^2}{\|t\|^{1+r}\|s\|^{1+q}} \lambda^r(dt) \lambda^q(ds), \quad (3)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean norm,  $c_d$  is a constant only depending on the dimensions  $d$ , and  $\lambda^d$  denotes the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Lyons (2013) later proposed a generalization of (3) to metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ . Subsequent work by Jakobsen (2017) established that these spaces have to be separable in order to provide a sound theory, see also Lyons (2018). The generalized distance covariance takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dcov}^2(\xi, \zeta) &= \mathbb{E}[d_X(\xi, \xi') d_Y(\zeta, \zeta')] + \mathbb{E}[d_X(\xi, \xi')] \mathbb{E}[d_Y(\zeta, \zeta')] \\ &\quad - 2 \mathbb{E}[d_X(\xi, \xi') d_Y(\zeta, \zeta'')], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $(\xi', \zeta') \sim \gamma$  and  $\zeta'' \sim \nu$  are independent copies of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . If the metric spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  are of strong negative type<sup>1</sup>, one can show that  $\text{dcov}^2(\xi, \zeta)$  as defined above is indeed non-negative, and that it vanishes if and only if  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are statistically independent (Lyons 2013;

<sup>1</sup>A separable metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is of *negative type* iff there is an isometric embedding  $\varphi$  of  $(X, d_X^{1/2})$  into a separable Hilbert space. This condition asserts  $\text{dcov}^2 \geq 0$ . If the mean embedding  $\mu \mapsto \int \varphi d\mu$  for probability measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  with finite first  $d_X$ -moment is additionally injective, the space  $(X, d_X)$  is of *strong negative type* and  $\text{dcov} = 0$  characterizes independence. Examples for spaces of negative type are  $L_p$  spaces for  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , ultrametric spaces, and weighted trees (Meckes 2013, Theorem 3.6). Known counter examples are  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $l_p$  norms for  $p > 2$  (see the references in Lyons 2013).

Jakobsen 2017). Together with fast computability on data and a well-understood limit theory, this renders the distance covariance a compelling instrument for non-parametric (i.e., without assuming a specific dependency model) independence testing (Yao et al. 2016; Castro-Prado and González-Manteiga 2020; Chakraborty and Zhang 2019) and related problems, like independent component analysis (Matteson and Tsay 2017). Moreover, the work of Sejdinovic et al. (2013) has established the equivalence of the distance covariance and the *Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion* (Gretton et al. 2005). Corollary 26 in (Sejdinovic et al. 2013) additionally clarifies that the general distance covariance (4) can be understood as the *maximum mean discrepancy* (MMD, see Gretton et al. 2012) between  $\mu$  and  $\nu \otimes \nu$  under a suitable kernel choice.

The distance covariance possesses a natural upper bound that only depends on the marginal measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , namely  $\text{dcov}^2(\xi, \zeta) \leq \text{dcov}(\xi, \xi) \cdot \text{dcov}(\zeta, \zeta)$ . Through normalization with this bound, a coefficient that assumes values in  $[0, 1]$  can be defined. This coefficient, called the *distance correlation*  $\text{dcor}$ , can be used as a surrogate for classical coefficients of dependency, like the Pearson correlation, in the general setting of separable metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  of strong negative type. It has the following two distinguishing characteristics (Lyons 2013):

- $\text{dcor}(\xi, \zeta) = 0$  iff  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are independent,
- $\text{dcor}(\xi, \zeta) = 1$  iff there is a  $\beta > 0$  and an isometry  $\varphi: (X, \beta d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  with  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$ ,

where  $\varphi$  only has to be defined  $\mu$ -almost surely. This lends the distance covariance a neat and tangible interpretation: while the Pearson correlation measures the degree of *linear* functional dependency between random variables, the distance correlation measures a degree of *isometric* functional dependency (up to scalings). For the Euclidean case, this means that a value of  $\text{dcor}(\xi, \zeta) = 1$  is assumed if and only if  $\zeta = \beta (A\xi + a)$ , where  $A$  is an orthogonal matrix,  $a$  a shift vector, and  $\beta > 0$  (at least if the support of  $\mu$  contains an open set). Other relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ , even if they are deterministic, result in smaller values  $\text{dcor}(\xi, \zeta) < 1$ . Indeed, the more chaotic the relation becomes, the further away one is from an isometric dependency, and the lower the value of the distance correlation will typically be (see Figure 2). This draws a sharp distinction to other (non-parametric) concepts of dependency, like the mutual information or several recently proposed coefficients of association (Chatterjee 2020; Wiesel 2021; Deb et al. 2020), which assume maximal values for *any measurable* deterministic relation – not only for structured ones.

**Other measures of association.** On a more general note, when one looks past a number of classical concepts of correlation that are universally applied (like the Pearson correlation, Spearman’s  $\rho$ , or Kendall’s  $\tau$ ), the statistical literature on how to best measure dependency in applications quickly becomes immensely broad and scattered. Besides the approaches mentioned above, suggestions include maximal correlation coefficients (Gebelein 1941; Koyak 1987), rank or copula based methods (Schweizer and Wolff 1981; Dette et al. 2013; Marti et al. 2017), or various measures acting on the distribution of pairwise distances (Friedman and Rafsky 1983; Heller et al. 2013), to only cite a few. For a more complete survey, see Tjøstheim et al. (2018).

Another class of data analysis and exploration techniques to be mentioned in this context are those that quantify how multiple data sets are *spatially* associated. A prominent example is

Ripley’s  $K$  function (Ripley 1976), for which new developments have recently been advanced (Amgad et al. 2015). Regarding functional data analysis, we refer to (Petersen and Müller 2019; Dubey and Müller 2019). For colocalization problems in cell microscopy, we mention Wang et al. (2017), who propose a statistically optimal colocalization metric based on Kendall’s  $\tau$ , and Tameling et al. (2021), who suggest certain surrogates of the optimal transport plan for quantifying colocalization.

**Transport dependency.** A primary reason for the widely scattered literature on this topic is that the notion of “dependency”, and what exactly is meant and intended by it, eludes the reduction to a real number that suits all needs. One important demarcation line in this regard has already been stressed: do we aim to measure dependency in a purely stochastic sense (like with the mutual information), or do we also seek to impose structural conditions, like linearity (Pearson correlation), monotonicity (rank correlations), or metric compatibility (distance correlation)? In this work, we establish the transport dependency as a principled tool that can bridge the gap between unstructured and structured dependency quantification, providing flexibility to be tailored to a wide range of use cases.

On an abstract level, the transport dependency  $\tau(\gamma)$  defined in equation (1) features a series of attractive and intuitive properties. Under mild assumptions on the costs  $c$ , it is true that  $\tau(\gamma) = 0$  characterizes independence (e.g., if  $c$  is a metric, see Theorem 1), and that  $\tau(\gamma)$  can consistently be estimated by  $\tau(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ , where  $\hat{\gamma}_n$  is the empirical measure (e.g., if  $c$  is continuous and obeys some moment conditions, see Theorem 2). Furthermore, the transport dependency does not explicitly rely on how  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are embedded into the respective spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , but only on the chosen cost structure on them. In particular, the value  $\tau(\gamma)$  does not change under (marginal) transformations of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  that leave the costs invariant (Proposition 2). The transport dependency is also a convex functional on the space of probability measures on  $X \times Y$  with fixed marginals (Proposition 1). Thus, under convex contamination models commonly studied in robust estimation theory (Huber 1992; Horowitz and Manski 1995), polluting  $\gamma$  with a distribution  $\gamma'$  of smaller transport dependency  $\tau(\gamma') < \tau(\gamma)$  and the same marginals will inevitably decrease the measured dependence,


$$\tau((1-t)\gamma + t\gamma') < \tau(\gamma)$$

for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ . Similarly, if  $c$  is a translation invariant cost on vector spaces, then convolutions of  $\gamma$  with any (product) kernel  $\kappa$  cannot increase the transport dependency (see Theorem 4), meaning

$$\tau(\gamma * \kappa) \leq \tau(\gamma).$$

Since the convolution of measures  $\gamma$  and  $\kappa$  is equivalent to taking the sum of independent random variables  $(\xi, \zeta) \sim \gamma$  and  $(\xi', \zeta') \sim \kappa$ , this implies that additive contaminations with independent noise never increase the value of  $\tau$ . We also show that it is possible to upper bound  $\tau$  in instructive ways. If  $c_Y$  is a marginal cost on  $Y$  that bounds  $c$  suitably, we derive the inequality

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \int c_Y d(\nu \otimes \nu) = \mathbb{E}[c_Y(\zeta, \zeta')], \quad (5)$$



**Figure 3:** Projection onto the graph of an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  under costs  $c = d^p$  as in (6). By applying the triangle inequality of  $d_Y$  and the Lipschitz property  $d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2)) \leq \alpha d_X(x_1, x_2)$ , one can see that the cost-optimal way to move any point  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$  to the graph of  $\varphi$  is to simply shift it up- or downwards.

where  $\zeta, \zeta' \sim \nu$  are independent (Proposition 6). This inequality is central for normalizing  $\tau$  and deriving dependency coefficients living in  $[0, 1]$ .

A particularly interesting theory unfolds when the structure of the costs  $c$  on the space  $X \times Y$  is restricted to a specific form. If  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  are Polish metric spaces, additive costs

$$c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = (\alpha \cdot d_X(x_1, x_2) + d_Y(y_1, y_2))^p \quad (6)$$

for  $\alpha, p > 0$ , where  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ , play a special role. The primary reason why costs of this form are fertile for our purposes is visualized in Figure 3: the price of moving any point  $(x, y)$  in  $X \times Y$  to the graph of an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ , which satisfies

$$d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2)) \leq \alpha \cdot d_X(x_1, x_2)$$

for all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ , is minimized by vertical movements, i.e., by the projection  $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \varphi(x))$ . Under suitable conditions, this (locally optimal) choice of movement corresponds to a valid transport plan that is globally optimal under  $c$ . As a consequence, we find that our upper bounds are sharp if and only if the support of  $\gamma$  coincides with the graph of an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz function. In other words,  $\tau(\gamma)$  assumes upper bound (5) if and only if  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  for an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz map  $\varphi$  (Theorem 7 and Corollary 1).

**Transport correlation.** We use the special properties of the transport dependency under costs of the form (6) to propose a family  $\rho_\alpha \in [0, 1]$  of coefficients for  $\alpha > 0$  that are tuned to detect  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz associations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . The  $\alpha$ -transport correlation is defined by

$$\rho_\alpha(\xi, \zeta) = \rho_\alpha(\gamma) = \left( \frac{\tau(\gamma)}{\int d_Y^p d(\nu \otimes \nu)} \right)^{1/p},$$

where the scaling by the inverse of bound (5), which we assume to be positive, guarantees that  $0 \leq \rho_\alpha \leq 1$ . Two of the hallmark features of  $\rho_\alpha$  are (Proposition 9)

- $\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are independent,
- $\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = 1$  iff there is an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz function  $\varphi: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  with  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$ ,

where  $\varphi$  only needs to be defined  $\mu$ -almost surely. Therefore, we may view  $\rho_\alpha$  as a general alternative to Pearson's correlation coefficient that measures the degree of association not in terms of best approximation by linear functions, but by  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz functions. Later, we will see that the idea behind  $\rho_\alpha$  can fluently be extended to the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  (Theorem 6). In this case, the transport dependency  $\tau$  is equal to the marginal transport dependency defined in (2), while upper bound (5) stays valid. One can then show that the resulting coefficient  $\rho_\infty$ , which we name *marginal transport correlation*, satisfies (Proposition 10)

- $\rho_\infty(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are independent,
- $\rho_\infty(\gamma) = 1$  iff there is a measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  with  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$ ,

where the equality  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  only has to hold  $\mu$ -almost surely. In fact, the marginal transport correlation  $\rho_\infty$  is equal to the measure of association introduced by Wiesel (2021).


Both the  $\alpha$ -transport correlation and the marginal transport correlation are asymmetric concepts that only measure to what extent  $\zeta$  can be understood as a function of  $\xi$ , not the other way around. If symmetry is desired, the coefficients can easily be adapted, for example by taking the maximum of  $\rho_\alpha(\xi, \zeta)$  and  $\rho_\alpha(\zeta, \xi)$ . Another way to obtain a symmetric dependency coefficient consists in choosing  $\alpha_*^p = \int d_Y^p d(\nu \otimes \nu) / \int d_X^p d(\mu \otimes \mu)$  and setting  $\rho_* = \rho_{\alpha_*}$ . This defines the *isometric transport correlation*, which is symmetric in  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  and has the following properties (Proposition 11):

- $\rho_*(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are independent,
- $\rho_*(\gamma) = 1$  iff there is a  $\beta > 0$  and an isometry  $\varphi: (X, \beta d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  with  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$ ,

where, again,  $\varphi$  only needs to be defined  $\mu$ -almost surely (and  $\beta$  has to equal  $\alpha_*$ ). This shows that the coefficient  $\rho_*$  assumes its extremal values  $\rho_*(\gamma) = 0$  and  $\rho_*(\gamma) = 1$  for the same joint distributions  $\gamma$  as the distance correlation  $\text{dcor}$ . It may thus be explored as a principled alternative to  $\text{dcor}$  for quantifying dependency in general Polish spaces. When we inspect commonalities of and differences between  $\rho_\alpha$ ,  $\rho_*$ ,  $\text{dcor}$ , and a series of other dependency coefficients later on (Section 6), we find that their absolute values are often comparable in nature, but that their performance when testing for independence can differ considerably. Figure 4 conveys a first impression along this line, highlighting the interpretation of  $\rho_\alpha$  as a coefficient well suited to detect  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ .

The article is structured as follows. We begin by introducing our notation and the basic definitions of optimal transport and the transport dependency in Section 2. Section 3 revolves around establishing a number of general properties of  $\tau$  as a functional on  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ . This entails convexity, invariance properties, continuity, the behavior under convolutions, as well as upper bounds. We also recover the marginal transport dependency as a limit case. In Section 4, we consider additive costs like (6) and focus on the distinguished role of contracting relations between random variables. The results in this section may be regarded as our main findings,





**Figure 4:** Power of independence tests under increasing levels of noise. The upper row depicts exemplary samples of size  $n = 50$  at varying noise levels  $\epsilon$ . The undisturbed samples ( $\epsilon = 0$ ) are drawn from the graph of a 3-Lipschitz zigzag function. The figure on the bottom depicts the power of level 0.1 permutation tests for independence that are based on  $\rho_*$ ,  $\rho_\alpha$  for  $\alpha = 3$ , the distance correlation, the Pearson correlation, the Spearman correlation, and the maximal information coefficient. See Section 6 for more details on the numerical setting and the applied permutation tests.

since they lend the concept of transport dependency a clean interpretation. We make use of this interpretation in Section 5, where we introduce the transport correlation  $\rho_\alpha$  and show that this family of coefficients features the properties summarized above. Section 6 concludes our work with a series of elementary numerical examples that hint at the potential of the transport dependency, comparing it to other measures of association. Proofs omitted in the main text in favor of a better reading flow are collected in Appendix A, and additional simulations can be found in Appendix B.

**Discussion and Outlook.** Our work establishes the transport dependency as a versatile tool for the quantification of dependency between random variables. We particularly underscore that the transport correlation  $\rho_\alpha$  provides a systematic way to interpolate between structured ( $\alpha < \infty$ ) and unstructured ( $\alpha = \infty$ ) dependency quantification through the selection of suitable cost functions. Moreover, the general flexibility of  $\tau$  to work with any costs  $c$ , which do not even have to be based on metrics, could be attractive for a range of practical applications, as state of the art methods for comparing complex objects are often engineered in an ad-hoc fashion without strong mathematical guarantees. One prospect in this regard are nonparametric independence tests guided by arbitrary heuristics of similarity. In addition, probing the transport dependency of a data set under a range of different costs  $c$  might expose structural properties of the data, which could render  $\tau$  to become a handy tool for exploration.

Despite the apparent conceptual appeal, however, we do not want to conceal a major obstacle when the transport dependency is applied to data, which is its heavy computational burden. For the (naive) estimation of  $\tau$  based on  $n$  points of data, an optimal transport problem of size  $n \times n^2$  has to be solved. For generic exact optimal transport solvers, this leads to excessively long run times even for moderate problem sizes of, say,  $n \approx 500$ . By making use of an elaborate

approximation method of optimal transport costs via entropy regularization (Cuturi 2013) proposed by Schmitzer (2019), we verify in our simulations (Section 6) that  $\tau$  can accurately be calculated for  $n = 1000$  in a matter of seconds to minutes on a modern GPU. Still, it is much more time consuming to compute  $\tau$  than alternative coefficients of dependency, like the distance correlation. Since the application of optimal transport based methods and its surrogates to large datasets is an active research topic that steadily advances, however, it might only be a matter of time until current computational barriers are further mitigated and eventually overcome (for recent algorithmic progress, see for example Lin et al. 2019; Sommerfeld et al. 2019; Erbar et al. 2020; Jacobs and Léger 2020; Liu et al. 2021). Another potential hurdle for the application of  $\tau$  on data sets is the (in part severe) bias that comes along with the empirical estimation of optimal transport costs, especially in high dimensions. Refining the theory of transport dependency to settings with structural regularity (like grid-based ground spaces) and devising specialized estimators might offer opportunity for improvements in this respect.

To conclude, we want to stress that the exposition in this article should be regarded as a mere first step towards exploring how optimal transport can best be utilized to measure the statistical association between random variables. While our simulations do serve as a proof of concept of the capabilities of the transport dependency, it has yet to be vetted and challenged in real world applications. Furthermore, a dedicated statistical theory – including distributional/asymptotic results or statistically efficient estimators – and a better understanding of  $\tau$  in high-dimensional settings remain outstanding and will have to be addressed in the future.

## 2 Optimal transport and transport dependency

In the following, we are always concerned with probability distributions on Polish spaces (which are separable and completely metrizable topological spaces) equipped with their respective Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. On these spaces, analytic properties of optimal transport are well understood (Rachev and Rüschendorf 1998; Villani 2008; Ambrosio et al. 2008; Santambrogio 2015) and we have the general toolbox of disintegration, or conditioning, of measures at our disposal. See Kallenberg (2006) for a general treatment of this topic and Chang and Pollard (1997) for a view on conditioning through the lens of disintegration.

**Notation.** We denote the set of all probability measures on a Polish space  $X$  by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . The integration of a (Borel-)measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with respect to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  is flexibly denoted as  $\int f(x) \mu(dx)$ ,  $\int f d\mu$ , or simply  $\mu f$ . Every measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  between Polish spaces induces a pushforward map  $\varphi_*: \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$  via  $\mu \mapsto \varphi_*\mu = \mu \circ \varphi^{-1}$ . We write  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  if a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  converges weakly (or in distribution) to  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . The product  $X \times Y$  of two Polish spaces is again Polish if equipped with its product topology. We write  $p^X$  and  $p^Y$  for the Cartesian projections onto the spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , and we let

$$(\varphi, \psi)(x) = (\varphi(x), \psi(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi \times \psi)(x, y) = (\varphi(x), \psi(y))$$

for suitable functions  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ . The notation  $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  is used to denote the set of couplings (or transport plans) between measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . Thus,  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$

is a joint distribution on  $X \times Y$  with marginals  $p_*^X \gamma = \mu$  and  $p_*^Y \gamma = \nu$ . We also write  $C(\mu, \cdot)$  or  $C(\cdot, \nu)$  for the subsets of  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  where only one marginal distribution is fixed. If we want to condition  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  on one of its components, we use the shorthand notation

$$\gamma(dx, dy) = \gamma(x, dy) \mu(dx)$$

to indicate a disintegration of  $\gamma$  along the space  $X$ , where  $\gamma(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  is a probability distribution for each  $x \in X$ . The family  $(\gamma(x, \cdot))_{x \in X}$  is a probability kernel (or Markov kernel or stochastic kernel), which means that the mapping  $x \mapsto \gamma(x, A)$  is measurable for each Borel set  $A \subset Y$ . Analog notation will be used for conditioning on  $y \in Y$  or if products of more than two spaces are considered.

Whenever convenient, we may express our arguments in terms of random elements instead of probability measures. Typically, we then refer to  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  as random elements on the spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ . Their joint law is usually  $(\xi, \zeta) \sim \gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$ . Note that  $\gamma(x, \cdot)$  is the conditional distribution of  $\zeta$  given  $\xi = x$  and vice versa for  $\gamma(\cdot, y)$ , and that the pushforward  $f_* \gamma$  equals the law of  $f(\xi, \zeta)$  whenever  $f: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$  is a measurable map into a Polish space.

We call a lower semi-continuous function  $c: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  a *cost function* on  $X$  if it is symmetric and vanishes on the diagonal, meaning  $c(x_1, x_2) = c(x_2, x_1)$  and  $c(x, x) = 0$  for all  $x, x_1, x_2 \in X$ . Sometimes we require  $c(x_1, x_2) > 0$  for  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , in which case we call the cost function *positive*. Finally, the *c-diameter* of a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  is defined as

$$\text{diam}_c \mu = \int c(x_1, x_2) d\mu(x_1) d\mu(x_2) = (\mu \otimes \mu) c,$$

where  $\mu \otimes \mu$  denotes the product measure of  $\mu$  with itself.

**Optimal transport.** The *optimal transport cost*  $T_c$  between measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  for base costs  $c$  on a Polish space  $X$  is defined as

$$T_c(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)} \pi c. \quad (7)$$

Within the assumptions we work in, an *optimal transport plan*  $\pi^*$  that attains the infimum in equation (7) always exists if  $c$  is lower semi-continuous (Villani 2008, Theorem 4.1). In general, optimal transport plans need not be unique. If  $c = d^p$  for a metric  $d$  on  $X$  with  $p \geq 1$ , the quantity  $T_c(\mu, \nu)^{1/p}$  is called the *p-Wasserstein distance* and is a metric on the probability measures in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  that have finite  $p$ -th moments.

When a transport plan  $\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)$  is concentrated on the graph of a function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow X$ , then  $\varphi$  is called *transport map* and satisfies  $\varphi_* \mu = \nu$  and  $(\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu = \pi$ . Under certain conditions on  $\mu, \nu$ , and  $c$ , optimal transport plans  $\pi^*$  that minimize (7) correspond to optimal transport maps  $\varphi^*$  (see Villani 2008; Santambrogio 2015). For example, this always holds when  $\mu$  has a Lebesgue density in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $c$  is given by an  $l_p$  norm with  $p > 1$ .

The optimal transport problem (7) can alternatively be stated in its dual formulation,

$$T_c(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{f \oplus g \leq c} \mu f + \nu g, \quad (8)$$

where  $(f \oplus g)(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1) + g(x_2)$  and where the supremum is taken over bounded and continuous functions  $f$  and  $g$ . This fact is commonly known as Kantorovich-duality, dating back to Kantorovich (1942). Like for the existence of transport plans, the cost function  $c$  being lower semi-continuous is sufficient for (7) and (8) to coincide (Villani 2008, Theorem 5.10). If  $c$  is a metric, (8) takes the particular form

$$T_c(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_1(X)} \mu f - \nu f, \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{Lip}_1(X)$  denotes all real valued 1-Lipschitz functions on  $X$  with respect to  $c$ . Note that this is a special case of an integral probability metric (Müller 1997; Sriperumbudur et al. 2012).

The literature on optimal transport is vast, deep, and fragmented over many disciplines, reaching from analysis over statistics and optimization to economics. Apart from the analytical work cited before, valuable resources are the recent monograph by Panaretos and Zemel (2020), which studies the Wasserstein space from a statistical perspective, and a book by Peyré and Cuturi (2019), which focuses on computational aspects of optimal transport.

**Transport dependency.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces, and let  $c$  be a cost function on the product space  $X \times Y$ . Recall that  $p^X$  and  $p^Y$  denote the Cartesian projections onto the spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ . We define the ( $c$ -)transport dependency  $\tau_c: \mathcal{P}(X \times Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  via

$$\tau(\gamma) = \tau_c(\gamma) = T_c(\gamma, p_*^X \gamma \otimes p_*^Y \gamma),$$

where we usually omit the cost function  $c$  in the subscript if it is apparent from the context. Each coupling  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  can be understood as the joint distribution of random elements  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  with laws  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . In this case, the value  $\tau(\xi, \zeta) = \tau(\gamma)$  quantifies how much the distribution of  $(\xi, \zeta)$  deviates from the joint distribution  $\mu \otimes \nu$  that  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  would have if they were independent. One can easily see that  $\tau(\xi, \zeta) = 0$  in case of statistical independence. If  $c$  is a positive cost function, this criterion is even sufficient for independence of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ .

**Theorem 1 (independence):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $c$  a positive cost function on  $X \times Y$ . Then  $\tau(\gamma) = 0$  if and only if  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$  for some  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ .

*Proof.* If  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ , picking the transport plan  $\pi = (\text{id}, \text{id})_*(\mu \otimes \nu) \in C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  asserts that  $0 \leq \tau(\gamma) \leq \pi c = 0$ , where we used that  $c \geq 0$  and that  $c$  vanishes on the diagonal. Conversely, if  $\tau(\gamma) = 0$  for some  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$ , we find  $\pi^* c = 0$  for the optimal plan  $\pi^*$ , so  $c = 0$  holds  $\pi^*$ -almost surely. Since  $c$  is positive, this implies  $\pi^* \{(x, y, x, y) \mid x \in X, y \in Y\} = 1$ . Consequently, it follows that  $\pi^* = (\text{id}, \text{id})_*(\mu \otimes \nu) \in C(\mu \otimes \nu, \mu \otimes \nu)$ , establishing  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ .  $\square$

**Example 1 (Multivariate Gaussian):** Let  $(\xi, \zeta)$  be a pair of real valued and normally distributed random vectors on  $X \times Y = \mathbb{R}^{r+q}$  that follow a joint distribution  $\gamma = \mathcal{N}(\eta, \Sigma)$

so that

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^r, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^q, \Sigma_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, \Sigma_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}, \Sigma_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q}$  and  $\Sigma_{21} = \Sigma_{12}^T$ . Since independence of normal random variables is characterized by zero correlation, the independent coupling is given by

$$\mu \otimes \nu = \mathcal{N}(\eta, \Sigma_{\text{ind}}) \quad \text{with} \quad \Sigma_{\text{ind}} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As costs on the space  $X \times Y$ , we consider the squared Euclidean distance

$$c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 + \|y_1 - y_2\|^2$$

for  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^q$ . In this setting, evaluating the transport dependence of  $\gamma$  corresponds to computing the square of the 2-Wasserstein distance between two normal distributions. We obtain (Dowson and Landau 1982)

$$\tau(\gamma) = 2 \text{trace}(\Sigma_{11}) + 2 \text{trace}(\Sigma_{22}) - 2 \text{trace} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^2 & \Sigma_{11}\Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{22}\Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}^{1/2} \right). \quad (10)$$

If  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are univariate random variables, a more explicit formula can easily be derived. Let the covariance matrix be given by

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \\ \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$ . Then, using an identity provided in (Levinger 1980), we can compute the square root of the  $2 \times 2$  matrix appearing in (10) and obtain

$$\tau(\gamma) = 2 \left( \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - \sqrt{\sigma_1^4 + \sigma_2^4 + 2\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \right). \quad (11)$$


If  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$  for some  $\sigma > 0$ , this expression simplifies to

$$\tau(\gamma) = 2\sigma^2 \left( 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \right).$$

As to be expected, the transport dependency between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  is a strictly increasing function of the correlation  $\rho^2$ . Its minimal value is 0 for  $\rho = 0$  and its maximal value is  $(4 - 2\sqrt{2})\sigma^2 \approx 1.2\sigma^2$  for  $\rho = \pm 1$  (if  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$ ). Note that the mutual information and the Euclidean distance covariance also have closed forms in the bivariate normal setting. These are given by  $M(\gamma) = -\log(1 - \rho^2)/2$  and

$$\text{dcov}^2(\gamma) = \frac{4\sigma^2}{\pi} \left( \rho \arcsin \rho + \sqrt{1-\rho^2} - \rho \arcsin(\rho/2) - \sqrt{4-\rho^2} + 1 \right),$$

see Gelfand (1959) and Székely et al. (2007). Figure 5 depicts how the values of  $\tau$  compare to these measures of dependency as a function of  $\rho$ .



**Figure 5:** Behavior of selected dependency measures in the bivariate case  $\xi, \zeta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  with  $\text{cov}(\xi, \zeta) = \rho$ , as discussed in Example 1. Graph (a) shows the mutual information (which diverges as  $\rho^2 \rightarrow 1$ ), the Euclidean distance covariance (3), the marginal transport dependency (2), and the general transport dependency as function of  $\rho^2$ . Graph (b) shows the latter three quantities normalized such that their respective maximal value equals 1 for  $\rho^2 = 1$ . See the forthcoming Example 5 for a closed form of the marginal transport dependency  $\tau^Y$  in this setting.

### 3 General properties

The transport dependency features several desirable traits for a measure of statistical association. In this section, we discuss a series of its general properties, including convexity, symmetry, continuity, and the behavior under convolutions. We also establish three distinct upper bounds, one of which corresponds to the special case of  $\tau$  when movement of mass along the space  $X$  is forbidden. This naturally leads to the definition of the marginal transport dependency.

**Convexity and invariance.** The optimal transport cost  $T_c$  is convex in both of its arguments. As a consequence, the transport dependency  $\tau$  can also be shown to be convex, albeit with some restrictions. Following the arguments in Villani (2008, Theorem 4.8), it is straightforward to establish convexity on subsets of  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  that share (at least) one marginal.

**Proposition 1 (convexity):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $c$  a cost function on  $X \times Y$ . Fix marginal distributions  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . Then the transport dependency  $\tau$  is convex when restricted to  $C(\mu, \cdot)$  or  $C(\cdot, \nu)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in C(\mu, \cdot)$  with second marginals  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and let  $\pi_i^*$  be an optimal transport plan between  $\gamma_i$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu_i$  with respect to  $c$ . Then, defining  $\gamma_t = (1-t)\gamma_0 + t\gamma_1$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  (and similarly  $\nu_t$ ), we find  $\gamma_t \in C(\mu, \nu_t)$  and  $\pi_t = (1-t)\pi_0^* + t\pi_1^* \in C(\gamma_t, \mu \otimes \nu_t)$ . Hence,

$$\tau(\gamma_t) = T_c(\gamma_t, \mu \otimes \nu_t) \leq \pi_t c = (1-t)\tau(\gamma_0) + t\tau(\gamma_1),$$

which establishes convexity on  $C(\mu, \cdot)$ . The result on  $C(\cdot, \nu)$  follows analogously.  $\square$

Note that the marginal restrictions on the convexity in Proposition 1 are reasonable, since  $\tau$  cannot be convex on the whole space  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ . In fact, if it were, then

$$0 \leq 2\tau(\delta_{z_1}/2 + \delta_{z_2}/2) \leq \tau(\delta_{z_1}) + \tau(\delta_{z_2}) = 0,$$

where  $\delta_{z_i}$  denotes the point mass at  $z_i$  for points  $z_1, z_2 \in X \times Y$ . Pursuing this thought further, it is easy to see that  $\tau$  would have to vanish on all empirical measures – which it clearly does not. The same argument holds for any other dependency measure as soon as it assigns the value 0 to point measures, which shows that convexity on all of  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  is generally not desirable. On the contrary, it is intuitive to expect the amount of dependency inherent in  $t\gamma_1 + (1-t)\gamma_2$  to exceed the one in  $\gamma_1$  or  $\gamma_2$  individually if the supports are sufficiently distinct.

Recalling that  $\tau(\mu \otimes \nu) = 0$  for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , one interesting conclusion of Proposition 1 is that the map  $t \mapsto \tau(\gamma_t)$  with  $\gamma_t = (1-t)\gamma + t(\mu \otimes \nu)$  for  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  is convex, monotonically decreasing, and that it satisfies

$$\tau(\gamma_t) \leq (1-t)\tau(\gamma).$$

Therefore, the contamination of  $\gamma$  with an independent contribution consistently decreases the transport dependency. When  $c$  is a metric, we even find equality

$$\tau(\gamma_t) = (1-t)\tau(\gamma)$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . In this case, the optimal transport plan  $\pi_t^*$  mediating between  $\gamma_t$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$  will not move the mass  $t(\mu \otimes \nu)$  at all. Only the transportation of  $(1-t)\gamma$  to the remainder  $(1-t)(\mu \otimes \nu)$  contributes to  $\tau(\gamma_t)$ , which can be validated via the dual formulation (9):

$$\tau(\gamma_t) = \sup(\gamma_t f - (\mu \otimes \nu) f) = (1-t) \sup(\gamma f - (\mu \otimes \nu) f) = (1-t)\tau(\gamma),$$

where both suprema are taken over  $f \in \text{Lip}_1(X \times Y)$  with respect to  $c$ .

Next, we shed some light on the symmetries of the transport dependency  $\tau$ . They follow from a fundamental statement of invariance of the optimal transport cost (a proof is provided in Appendix A).

**Lemma 1:** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $c$  be a cost function on  $Y$ . Consider a measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  and let  $c_f$  denote the induced cost function on  $X$  defined by  $c_f(x, x') = c(f(x), f(x'))$ . Then for any  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,

$$T_c(f_*\mu, f_*\nu) = T_{c_f}(\mu, \nu).$$

Let us consider a measurable function  $f$  that maps  $X \times Y$  into itself. In order to be able to apply Lemma 1 to  $\tau(\gamma)$  for  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ , we have to require that  $f_*(\mu \otimes \nu)$  is again a product measure of, say, distributions  $\mu'$  and  $\nu'$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ . When  $f_*\gamma$  has the same marginals  $\mu'$  and  $\nu'$ , we may conclude

$$\tau_c(f_*\gamma) = \tau_{c_f}(\gamma).$$

If, in addition, applying  $f$  does not affect the costs  $c$ , meaning that  $c = c_f$ , we even obtain the invariance relation

$$\tau_c(f_*\gamma) = \tau_c(\gamma). \quad (12)$$

This observation is particularly potent if  $c$  is a function of marginal costs.

**Proposition 2 (invariance):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $c$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$  satisfying

$$c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = h(c_X(x_1, x_2), c_Y(y_1, y_2))$$

for marginal costs  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  on  $X$  and  $Y$ , and a measurable function  $h: [0, \infty]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . If  $f_X: X \rightarrow X$  and  $f_Y: Y \rightarrow Y$  are measurable maps that leave  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  invariant, then  $f = f_X \times f_Y$  leaves  $c$  invariant and (12) holds for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ .

*Proof.* For  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , it is sufficient to observe that  $c_f = c$  as well as  $f_*(\mu \otimes \nu) = f_{X*}\mu \otimes f_{Y*}\nu$  and  $f_*\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(f_{X*}\mu, f_{Y*}\nu)$ , which makes Lemma 1 applicable.  $\square$

If  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  are (based on) metrics and  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are random elements on  $X$  and  $Y$ , we conclude that applying isometries to either  $\xi$  or  $\zeta$  does not change the value  $\tau(\xi, \zeta)$ . In other words,  $\tau$  measures dependency in a way that is indifferent to isometric transformations on the margins, a property that is shared by the distance covariance (4). We also note that Proposition 2 can readily be generalized to cost preserving maps between distinct Polish spaces.

**Example 2 (invariance in Euclidean space):** Let  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  be random vectors in  $X = \mathbb{R}^r$  and  $Y = \mathbb{R}^q$ . If  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  denote the respective Euclidean metrics and  $c$  takes the form  $h(c_X, c_Y)$ , for example  $c = c_X^2 + c_Y^2$  as in Example 1, Proposition 2 asserts that

$$\tau(\xi, \zeta) = \tau(A\xi + a, B\zeta + b)$$

for all orthogonal matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  as well as vectors  $a \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^q$ .

**Continuity and convergence.** The optimal transport cost  $T_c$  with lower semi-continuous base costs  $c$  is again lower semi-continuous with respect to the weak convergence of measures. This property carries over to the transport dependency.

**Proposition 3 (lower semi-continuity):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $c$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$ . Then  $\tau$  is lower semi-continuous with respect to weak convergence.

*Proof.* Let  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  be a sequence of probability measures that weakly converges to  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . By the continuous mapping theorem, the respective marginals  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  weakly converge to  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . According to Billingsley (2013, Theorem 2.8), this implies weak convergence of the product measures  $\mu_n \otimes \nu_n$  to  $\mu \otimes \nu$ .



The result of the proposition now follows along the lines of the proof of the lower semi-continuity of the optimal transport cost (see for example Santambrogio 2015, Proposition 7.4, which requires only slight adaptations to make it work for sequences in both arguments of  $T_c$ ).  $\square$

To approach proper continuity of  $\tau$ , we will need a stronger set of assumptions, since the optimal transport cost  $T_c$  is in general not continuous under weak convergence, even for continuous costs  $c$  (cf. Santambrogio 2015, Proposition 7.4). Indeed, we have to sharpen the notion of convergence  $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ . To this end, we equip the Polish space  $X$  with a compatible metric  $d_X$  that (completely) metrizes its topology. For  $p \geq 1$ , we define the set of probability distributions with finite  $p$ -th moment by

$$\mathcal{P}_p(X) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) \mid \mu d_X^p(\cdot, x_0) < \infty \text{ for some } x_0 \in X\},$$

and we say that a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  converges  $p$ -weakly to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$  if

$$\mu_n \rightarrow \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p \rightarrow \mu d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p \quad (13)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $x_0 \in X$ . It is a well known fact (going back to Mallows 1972) that the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance metrizes this particular form of convergence (see Villani 2008, Theorem 6.9 for a general proof), so (13) is equivalent to  $T_{d_X^p}(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that the anchor point  $x_0$  in these definitions does not matter and can be replaced by any other point in  $X$ .

On products  $X \times Y$  of two Polish metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , there are many different ways to choose a compatible metric. For simplicity, we pick

$$d(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = d_X(x_1, x_2) + d_Y(y_1, y_2) \quad (14)$$

for  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$  in the following statement, even though any equivalent metric, like  $d = \max(d_X, d_Y)$ , would work as well. The proof can be found in Appendix A.

**Proposition 4 (continuity):** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish metric spaces and let  $c$  be a continuous cost function on  $X \times Y$  bounded by  $c \leq d^p$  for  $p \geq 1$  and  $d$  as in (14). If the sequence  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges  $p$ -weakly to  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(X \times Y)$ , then  $\tau(\gamma_n) \rightarrow \tau(\gamma)$ .

One significant consequence of Proposition 4 is the guarantee of consistency when empirically estimating  $\tau(\gamma)$ . Let  $(\xi_i, \zeta_i) \sim \gamma$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  be  $n$  independent and identically distributed random variables. We denote the empirical measure associated to  $\gamma$  by

$$\hat{\gamma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(\xi_i, \zeta_i)}, \quad (15)$$

which is a random element in  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ . The next result shows that we can simply plug  $\hat{\gamma}_n$  in  $\tau$  to obtain a strongly consistent estimator of  $\tau(\gamma)$ .

**Theorem 2 (consistency):** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish metric spaces and  $c$  a continuous cost function on  $X \times Y$  bounded by  $c \leq d^p$  for some  $p \geq 1$  and  $d$  as in (14). If  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_p(X \times Y)$ , then almost surely

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\hat{\gamma}_n) = \tau(\gamma).$$

*Proof.* We know that  $\hat{\gamma}_n \rightarrow \gamma$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (Varadarajan 1958). Furthermore, for any anchor point  $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times Y$ , the strong law of large numbers implies that the convergence

$$\hat{\gamma}_n d(\cdot, (x_0, y_0))^p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d((\xi_i, \zeta_i), (x_0, y_0))^p \rightarrow \gamma d(\cdot, (x_0, y_0))^p < \infty$$

holds almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This makes Proposition 4 applicable and the assertion follows.  $\square$

Later on, when we consider the transport correlation coefficients  $\rho_\alpha$  in Section 5, we face costs that are normalized in a way that depends on  $\gamma$ . In order to show that continuity and consistency are preserved in this setting, we need a slight extension of our previous results to uniformly perturbed cost functions. We write  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  to denote the sup-norm of a real valued function and use the convention  $0/0 = 1$  in the following statement.

**Proposition 5 (varying costs):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $c$  and  $c_n$  be cost functions on  $X \times Y$  that satisfy  $\|c/c_n - 1\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  such that  $\tau_c(\gamma) < \infty$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_n}(\gamma_n) = \tau_c(\gamma) \quad \text{implies} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_n}(\gamma_n) = \tau_c(\gamma).$$

*Proof.* We set  $a_n = \max(\|c/c_n - 1\|_\infty, \|c_n/c - 1\|_\infty)$  and observe  $a_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by the assumption of uniform convergence. Applying Lemma 4 provided in Appendix A, we can control the deviation of  $\tau_{c_n}$  from  $\tau_c$  and find, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_{c_n}(\gamma_n) - \tau_c(\gamma)| &\leq |\tau_{c_n}(\gamma_n) - \tau_c(\gamma_n)| + |\tau_c(\gamma_n) - \tau_c(\gamma)| \\ &\leq a_n(1 + a_n) \tau_c(\gamma_n) + |\tau_c(\gamma_n) - \tau_c(\gamma)| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We also want to present an alternative continuity statement with explicit bounds in case that  $c$  is *equal* to the power of a metric  $d$  on  $X \times Y$ . This time, we need nothing more than the triangle inequality, so  $d$  may in fact be a pseudo-metric.

**Theorem 3:** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $c = d^p$  for a (pseudo-)metric  $d$  on  $X \times Y$ . Assume that  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  with  $\tau(\gamma), \tau(\gamma') < \infty$ . Then, for any  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$|\tau(\gamma)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma')^{1/p}| \leq T_c(\gamma, \gamma')^{1/p} + T_c(\mu \otimes \nu, \mu' \otimes \nu')^{1/p}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $d$  satisfies the triangle inequality, so does  $\rho = T_c^{1/p}$  (see Villani 2008, Definition 6.1). Furthermore, the stated inequality is trivial if the right hand side is  $\infty$ . Thus, we can assume  $\rho(\gamma, \gamma') < \infty$  and  $\rho(\mu \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v') < \infty$ . Then also  $\rho(\gamma', \mu \otimes v) \leq \rho(\gamma', \mu' \otimes v') + \rho(\mu \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v') < \infty$ . Now, the result follows from applying the reverse triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(\gamma)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma')^{1/p}| &= |\rho(\gamma, \mu \otimes v) - \rho(\gamma', \mu' \otimes v')| \\ &\leq |\rho(\gamma, \mu \otimes v) - \rho(\gamma', \mu \otimes v)| + |\rho(\gamma', \mu \otimes v) - \rho(\gamma', \mu' \otimes v')| \\ &\leq \rho(\gamma, \gamma') + \rho(\mu \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v'). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

If the metric  $d$  on  $X \times Y$  in the statement above is given in terms of marginal metrics  $d_X$  and  $d_Y$  on  $X$  and  $Y$ , like  $d = d_X + d_Y$ , then one can apply the triangle inequality and upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} T_c(\mu \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v')^{1/p} &\leq T_c(\mu \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v)^{1/p} + T_c(\mu' \otimes v, \mu' \otimes v')^{1/p} \\ &\leq T_{c_X}(\mu, \mu')^{1/p} + T_{c_Y}(v, v')^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2 T_c(\gamma, \gamma')^{1/p} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

for  $c_X = d_X^p$  and  $c_Y = d_Y^p$ . In this situation, Theorem 3 implies that  $\tau^{1/p}$  is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance, which can be used to deduce rates of convergence of the empirically estimated transport dependency  $\tau(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ . More specifically, combining Theorem 3 and observation (16) yields

$$|\tau(\hat{\gamma}_n)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma)^{1/p}| \leq 3 T_c(\hat{\gamma}_n, \gamma)^{1/p}. \quad (17)$$

Any result on convergence rates  $T_c(\hat{\gamma}_n, \gamma)^{1/p} \rightarrow 0$  can therefore be used to derive analog rates for  $\tau(\hat{\gamma}_n)^{1/p} \rightarrow \tau(\gamma)^{1/p}$ . One example is a bound on the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance for compact spaces derived by Weed and Bach (2019). For any  $s$  greater than the *upper Wasserstein dimension* of  $\gamma$  (as defined in their work), their results imply

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\tau(\hat{\gamma}_n)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma)^{1/p}| \right] \leq K n^{-1/s},$$

where  $K > 0$  is a constant that does not depend on  $n$ . Other recent convergence result that can be applied in the context of (17) include distributional limits on countable spaces (Taming et al. 2019) and finite sample convergence rates on unbounded spaces (Lei 2020).

**Convolutions.** In many statistical applications, the sum of independent random elements plays a distinguished role. Regression models, for example, assume a relation of the form  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  for random variables  $\zeta$  and  $\xi$  determined by a function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  between two vector spaces. Instead of observing samples of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  directly, however, only polluted versions  $\xi + \epsilon_X$  and  $\zeta + \epsilon_Y$  are accessible, where  $\epsilon_X$  and  $\epsilon_Y$  are considered to be noise contributions independent of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . In this case, the distribution  $\mu$  of  $\xi$  and the actually observed distribution  $\tilde{\mu}$  of  $\xi + \epsilon_X$  are related by a convolution:

$$\tilde{\mu} = \mu * \kappa_X, \quad \text{where} \quad (\mu * \kappa_X)(A) = \int \mathbb{1}_A(x_1 + x_2) (\mu \otimes \kappa_X)(dx_1, dx_2)$$

for any Borel-measurable set  $A \subset X$ , and where  $\kappa_X$  denotes the law of  $\epsilon_X$ . An analog relation holds for  $\zeta \sim \nu$  with noise distribution  $\kappa_Y$ , and the joint distributions of  $(\xi, \zeta)$  and  $(\xi + \epsilon_X, \zeta + \epsilon_Y)$  are connected by

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma * \kappa, \quad \text{where} \quad \kappa = \kappa_X \otimes \kappa_Y.$$

In the following, we investigate how the transport dependency  $\tau(\gamma * \kappa)$  is related to the (noise-free) value  $\tau(\gamma)$ . As preparation, we take a look at the effect of convolutions on optimal transport costs if the base cost is translation invariant. We work in Polish vector spaces, by which we mean topological vector spaces that are Polish; examples include separable Banach spaces. A proof of the following statement is provided in Appendix A.

**Lemma 2:** Let  $X$  be a Polish vector space and  $c(x_1, x_2) = h(x_1 - x_2)$  for  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  a translation invariant cost function on  $X$ . For any probability measures  $\mu, \nu$ , and  $\kappa$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ ,

$$T_c(\mu * \kappa, \nu * \kappa) \leq T_c(\mu, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad T_c(\mu, \mu * \kappa) \leq \kappa h.$$

When trying to apply Lemma 2 to the transport dependency  $\tau(\gamma) = T_c(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  for  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  in a sensible manner, we have to make sure that the convolution of  $\mu \otimes \nu$  with a kernel  $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  is again a product distribution. As long as we restrict ourselves to product kernels of the form  $\kappa = \kappa_X \otimes \kappa_Y$  with  $\kappa_X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\kappa_Y \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , this condition is always satisfied and Lemma 2 can be put to use.

**Theorem 4 (convolution):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish vector spaces and let  $c$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$  that satisfies  $c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = h(x_1 - x_2, y_1 - y_2)$  for  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$  and some  $h: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  and  $\kappa = \kappa_X \otimes \kappa_Y$  with  $\kappa_X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\kappa_Y \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , it holds that

$$\tau(\gamma * \kappa) \leq \tau(\gamma).$$

If additionally  $c = d^p$  and  $\tau(\gamma) < \infty$  for a (pseudo-)metric  $d$  on  $X \times Y$  with  $p \geq 1$ , then

$$\tau(\gamma)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma * \kappa)^{1/p} \leq 2(\kappa h)^{1/p}.$$

*Proof.* One can easily check that  $\gamma * \kappa \in \mathcal{C}(\mu * \kappa_X, \nu * \kappa_Y)$  and  $(\mu \otimes \nu) * \kappa = (\mu * \kappa_X) \otimes (\nu * \kappa_Y)$ . Therefore,  $\tau(\gamma * \kappa) = T_c(\gamma * \kappa, (\mu \otimes \nu) * \kappa)$  and Lemma 2 can be applied, which yields the first result. For the second result, we recall Theorem 3 and use the second part of Lemma 2 to find

$$\tau(\gamma)^{1/p} - \tau(\gamma * \kappa)^{1/p} \leq T_c(\gamma, \gamma * \kappa)^{1/p} + T_c(\mu \otimes \nu, (\mu \otimes \nu) * \kappa)^{1/p} \leq 2(\kappa h)^{1/p},$$

which finishes the proof.  $\square$

Theorem 4 unveils a fundamental property of the transport dependency: if a coupling  $\gamma$  is blurred by the convolution with a product kernel, then  $\tau$  never increases. Intuitively, this is a desirable trait. In common regression settings with Gaussian noise, for example, it guarantees that  $\tau$  monotonically decreases with increasing standard deviation of the noise. At the same

time, the second part of Theorem 4 lets us control by how much we decrease the transport dependency at most.

Example 3 (Gaussian additive noise): Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^r$  and  $Y = \mathbb{R}^q$  and consider squared Euclidean costs of the form  $c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = h(x_1 - x_2, y_1 - y_2) = \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 + \|y_1 - y_2\|^2$ , where  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ . Under Gaussian noise contributions  $\kappa_X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_X)$  and  $\kappa_Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_Y)$ , where  $\Sigma_X$  and  $\Sigma_Y$  are covariance matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ , Theorem 4 states that

$$\tau(\gamma)^{1/2} \geq \tau(\gamma * \kappa)^{1/2} \geq \tau(\gamma)^{1/2} - 2(\text{trace } \Sigma_X + \text{trace } \Sigma_Y)^{1/2}$$

for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  with  $\tau(\gamma) < \infty$ .

Example 4 (Manhattan-type costs): If  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and  $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$  are separable Banach spaces and the costs  $c$  are given by  $h = \|\cdot\|_X + \|\cdot\|_Y$ , application of Theorem 4 yields

$$\tau(\gamma) \geq \tau(\gamma * \kappa) \geq \tau(\gamma) - 2 \left( \int \|x\|_X \kappa_X(dx) + \int \|y\|_Y \kappa_Y(dy) \right)$$


for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ ,  $\kappa_X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , and  $\kappa_Y \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , as long as  $\tau(\gamma) < \infty$  holds.

The role of convolutions in the theory of optimal transport has recently been emphasized in the context of *smoothed optimal transport*, where the quantity  $T_c^\kappa(\mu, \nu) = T_c(\mu * \kappa, \nu * \kappa)$  for a suitable kernel  $\kappa$ , often Gaussian, is used as an approximation of  $T_c$  (Goldfeld et al. 2020; Goldfeld and Greenewald 2020; Chen and Niles-Weed 2020). This smoothed transport cost has a series of desirable properties that distinguish it from vanilla optimal transport. Most notably, it does not suffer from the curse of dimensionality when estimated from empirical data, which makes it a promising candidate for applications.

**Upper bounds.** Our next goal is to derive upper bounds of the transport dependency. We take the common route of bounding the infimum in definition (7) of the optimal transport problem by explicitly constructing transport plans  $\pi$  with feasible marginals. The overall idea behind our constructions is to restrict the transport in  $X \times Y$  to the fibers  $X \times \{y\}$  and  $\{x\} \times Y$  for  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ . For this reason, we often have to deal with costs of the form  $c(x, y_1, x, y_2)$  or  $c(x_1, y, x_2, y)$ , and we will thus assume that the cost function  $c$  is controlled by suitable marginal costs  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  on  $X$  and  $Y$  via

$$c_X(x_1, x_2) \geq \sup_{y \in Y} c(x_1, y, x_2, y) \quad \text{and} \quad c_Y(y_1, y_2) \geq \sup_{x \in X} c(x, y_1, x, y_2) \quad (18)$$

for all  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$ . To gain some intuition for the (in total three) upper bounds we propose in the following, Figure 6 can be consulted. We start with a simple but fundamental inequality that controls  $\tau(\gamma)$  in terms of the diameters of the marginal distributions of  $\gamma$ .



**Figure 6:** Different transport plans between  $\gamma \in C(\mu \otimes \nu)$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$  for  $\gamma = \text{Unif}\{(1, 6), (2, 1), (4, 2), (4, 5)\}$ . Each arrow corresponds to the movement of  $1/16$  parts of mass. Graph (a) shows the optimal transport plan  $\pi^*$  under  $l_2$  (or  $l_1$ ) costs on  $X \times Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ , while the plans  $\pi_1$  to  $\pi_3$  in (b-d) correspond to the three upper bounds established in Proposition 6 to 8. The example was chosen such that all bounds are different, and we find  $\pi^*c < \pi_2c < \pi_3c < \pi_1c$ . The difference between  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_3$  is that the vertical movement of mass on the fiber  $x = 4$  is optimal in case of  $\pi_3$ , while it is clearly not for  $\pi_1$ . The plan  $\pi_2$  corresponds to the best assignment if transport is restricted to vertical and horizontal movements.

**Proposition 6:** Let  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  in Polish spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ . If the cost function  $c$  on  $X \times Y$  satisfies the marginal bounds (18), then

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu. \quad (19)$$

By symmetry, the inequality  $\tau(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}_{c_X} \mu$  holds as well.

*Proof.* In order to bound  $T_c$  from above, we explicitly construct a transport plan  $\pi_1$  that mediates between  $\gamma$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$ . We choose it in such a way that no transport within  $X$  takes place. To this end, let  $r(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = (x_1, y_1, x_1, y_2)$  be a mapping from  $X \times Y$  to itself. We set  $\pi_1 = r_*(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$ , which can easily be checked to be an element in  $C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$ . Therefore,

$$T_c(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu) \leq \pi_1 c = \int c(x_1, y_1, x_1, y_2) \gamma(dx_1, dy_1) \gamma(dx_2, dy_2) \leq (\nu \otimes \nu) c_Y, \quad (20)$$

where we made use of condition (18) to bound  $c$  by  $c_Y$ . This establishes  $\tau(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$ .  $\square$

The preceding arguments can equivalently be formulated in the language of random variables. When  $(\xi, \zeta) \sim \gamma$  and  $(\xi', \zeta') \sim \mu \otimes \nu$ , the construction of  $\pi_1$  above corresponds to the dependency structure  $\xi = \xi'$ , while  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta'$  remain independent. This prevents any transport within the space  $X$ . To clarify the transport along  $Y$ , we can condition on  $\xi = x$  and slightly reformulate

equation (20) as

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \int \left( \int c_Y(y_1, y_2) \gamma(x, dy_1) \nu(dy_2) \right) \mu(dx). \quad (21)$$

The inner integral on the right hand side is the transport cost between  $\gamma(x, \cdot)$  and  $\nu$  along the product plan  $\pi_x = \gamma(x, \cdot) \otimes \nu$ . Thus, for each fixed  $x$ , the plan  $\pi_x$  evenly smears the measure  $\nu$  into  $\gamma(x, \cdot)$ . If  $\zeta$  is a function of  $\xi$ , meaning  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  for some measurable map  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ , this implies that  $\pi_x$  moves all mass from  $\nu$  to the single point  $\varphi(x)$ . Consequently, the vertical projection

$$t(x, y) = (x, \varphi(x)) \quad (22)$$

is the transport map that corresponds to  $\pi_1$ . Indeed, one can check that the two identities  $t_*(\mu \otimes \nu) = \gamma$  and  $(t, \text{id})_*(\mu \otimes \nu) = \pi_1$  hold in this setting.

While the upper bound  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$  will play an important role later on (see Section 4 and 5), it is apparent that the plan  $\pi_1$  leading to Proposition 6 is quite crude in general and can likely be improved. The following two results do so in different ways.

**Proposition 7:** Let  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  in Polish spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ . If the cost function  $c$  on  $X \times Y$  satisfies the marginal bounds (18), then

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}_{c_{XY}} \gamma \leq \min(\text{diam}_{c_X} \mu, \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu), \quad (23)$$

where  $c_{XY}: (X \times Y)^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is a cost function defined by

$$c_{XY}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \min(c_X(x_1, x_2), c_Y(y_1, y_2)).$$

The idea of the proof is straightforward and similar to Proposition 6, in that we construct a feasible transport plan  $\pi_2 \in C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  by vertical or horizontal movements. This time, however, we do not globally enforce vertical or horizontal movements, but we locally move mass along  $Y$  if  $c_Y \leq c_X$  and along  $X$  otherwise. In Appendix A, we show that this idea indeed leads to a valid transport plan that attains the upper bound in (23). Note that it is crucial that both  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  are symmetric, as there is no guarantee that the constructed plan  $\pi_2$  has the correct marginals otherwise. Furthermore, our arguments explicitly rely on the product structure of  $\mu \otimes \nu$ , as well as on the fact that  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are the marginals of  $\gamma$ . As far as we can see, there is thus no way to generalize the upper bounds in Proposition 6 and 7 to more generic optimal transport costs  $T_c(\gamma, \gamma')$  with  $\gamma' \neq \mu \otimes \nu$ .

Analog to (22), we can again state an explicit transport map for the plan  $\pi_2$  in case of (suitable) deterministic couplings. If  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  is induced by an invertible and bimeasurable function  $\varphi$ , one can show that  $\pi_2 = (t, \text{id})_*(\mu \otimes \nu)$  for the mapping

$$t(x, y) = \begin{cases} (x, \varphi(x)) & \text{if } c_Y(y, \varphi(x)) \leq c_X(\varphi^{-1}(y), x), \\ (\varphi^{-1}(y), y) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

**Marginal transport dependency.** Finally, we present a third upper bound of the transport dependency, which corresponds to the *marginal transport dependency*<sup>2</sup>

$$\tau^Y(\gamma) = \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma) = \int T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu) \mu(dx) \quad (24)$$

that was already mentioned in the introduction. Again, we typically suppress the dependence on  $c_Y$  in our notation if the costs are apparent from the context.

**Proposition 8:** Let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  in Polish spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ . If the cost function  $c$  on  $X \times Y$  satisfies the marginal bounds (18) for a continuous  $c_Y$ , then

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \tau^Y(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu. \quad (25)$$

An analog inequality with the roles of  $(X, \mu)$  and  $(Y, \nu)$  reversed holds if  $c_X$  is continuous.

This result is a natural refinement of Proposition 6: instead of choosing the conditional plans  $\pi_x$  between  $\gamma(x, \cdot)$  and  $\nu$  as product measures, as it is done in (21), they are chosen optimally. Details can be found in Appendix A.

Besides its function as an upper bound, the marginal transport dependency is interesting as a measure of association in its own right. Since  $\tau^Y$  disregards the cost structure on  $X$ , it is a promising candidate to quantify dependency in asymmetric settings where points in  $X$  cannot be moved from one to another in a meaningful way, for instance if  $X$  is categorical. One of the key characteristics of  $\tau^Y(\gamma)$  is that it equals the upper bound  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$  if and only if  $\gamma$  is induced by a function from  $X$  to  $Y$  (see Appendix A for a proof).

**Theorem 5 (maximal marginal transport dependency):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $c_Y$  a positive continuous cost function on  $Y$ . For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , and  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu < \infty$ , the equality

$$\tau^Y(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$$

holds if and only if  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for a measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ .

It is worth pointing out that the marginal transport dependency defined in equation (24) is in fact a special case of the general transport dependency  $\tau$  under costs of the form

$$c_\infty(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \begin{cases} c_Y(y_1, y_2) & \text{if } x_1 = x_2, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

This indicates that  $\tau^Y$  arises as limit case if movements within the space  $X$  become prohibitively expensive, such that all transport eventually withdraws to the fibers  $\{x\} \times Y$  for  $x \in X$ . The following result, which is proved in Appendix A, confirms that this intuition is accurate.

<sup>2</sup>Note that we have to assume that the mapping  $x \mapsto T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu)$  is measurable for this definition to make sense. If  $c_Y$  is continuous, measurability is guaranteed by Villani (2008, Corollary 5.22).



**Theorem 6 (marginal transport dependency as limit):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces. For  $\alpha > 0$ , let  $c_\alpha$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$  that satisfies

$$c_\alpha(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \begin{cases} = c_Y(y_1, y_2) & \text{if } x_1 = x_2, \\ \geq \max(\alpha c_X(x_1, x_2), c_Y(y_1, y_2)) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where  $c_Y$  is a continuous cost function on  $Y$  and  $c_X$  a positive cost function on  $X$ . Then, for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$ ,

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma) = \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) = \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma).$$

**Example 5 (Multivariate Gaussian, part 2):** We revisit the Gaussian setting of Example 1. Recall that  $(\xi, \zeta) \sim \gamma = \mathcal{N}(\eta, \Sigma)$ , where  $\eta$  is a mean vector and  $\Sigma$  a covariance matrix with blocks  $\Sigma_{11}$ ,  $\Sigma_{12}$ ,  $\Sigma_{21} = \Sigma_{12}^T$  and  $\Sigma_{22}$ . This time, we work with costs of the form

$$c_\alpha(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \alpha \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 + \|y_1 - y_2\|^2 \quad (26)$$

for  $\alpha > 0$ . Since these costs can be interpreted as scaling  $\xi$  by the factor  $\sqrt{\alpha}$  under the usual squared Euclidean distance  $c_1$ , we can employ the same arguments as in Example 1 and find expressions for  $\tau_{c_\alpha}$  via replacing  $\Sigma_{11}$  by  $\alpha \Sigma_{11}$  and  $\Sigma_{12}$  by  $\sqrt{\alpha} \Sigma_{12}$ . Adapting equation (10) in this way yields


$$\tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma) = 2\alpha \text{trace}(\Sigma_{11}) + 2 \text{trace}(\Sigma_{22}) - 2 \text{trace} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2 \Sigma_{11}^2 & \alpha^{3/2} \Sigma_{11} \Sigma_{12} \\ \alpha^{1/2} \Sigma_{22} \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}^{1/2} \right).$$

According to Theorem 6, the right hand side converges to the marginal transport dependency  $\tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma)$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $c_Y$  is the squared Euclidean distance. In the bivariate case (11), this limit can readily be calculated and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma) &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma) \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} 2 \left( \alpha \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - \sqrt{\alpha^2 \sigma_1^4 + \sigma_2^4 + 2\alpha \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2 \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \\ &= 2\sigma_2^2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Figure 7 displays the average transport of mass occurring in this setting as a function of  $\alpha$ .

Note that it is not straightforward to estimate the marginal transport dependency from empirical data  $\hat{\gamma}_n$ . Since the costs  $c_\infty$  are not continuous, we cannot apply Proposition 4 and thus cannot expect consistency of  $\tau^Y(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ . In fact, a similar obstacle that affects other quantifiers of unstructured dependency, like the mutual information, also arises here: in settings where  $\mu$  is diffuse, empirical data  $\hat{\gamma}_n$  with marginals  $\hat{\mu}_n$  and  $\hat{\nu}_n$  likely obeys functional relations  $\hat{\gamma}_n = (\text{id}, \hat{\phi}_n)_* \hat{\mu}_n$ , in



**Figure 7:** Transport dependency under increasing values of  $\alpha$  in the setting of Example 5. The costs are given as weighted squared Euclidean distances of the form  $c_\alpha = \alpha c_X + c_Y$ , see equation (26). Shown is the actual transport dependency  $\tau_{c_\alpha}(y)$  in the bivariate normal case for  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$  and  $\rho = 0.75$  (with optimal transport plan  $\pi_\alpha^*$ ), as well as the average vertical ( $\pi_\alpha^* c_Y$ ) and horizontal ( $\pi_\alpha^* c_X$ ) transport cost. For  $\alpha = 0$ , transport along  $X$  is free and thus governs  $\pi_0^*$ . For  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , movements along  $X$  become prohibitively expensive and all mass is eventually transported exclusively along  $Y$  (as predicted by Theorem 6).

which case  $\tau^Y(\hat{y}_n)$  is not informative (since it always equals  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \hat{v}_n$  via Theorem 5).

A usual counter measure in this situation is to preprocess  $\hat{y}_n$ . In Euclidean settings, for example, it is common to first estimate a smooth density or to bin the data. In both cases, one would typically pick a kernel size or bin width  $h_n$  that decreases to 0 as  $n$  grows. If  $h_n$  is chosen suitably for the setting at hand, one obtains a consistent estimator (see Tsybakov 2008). In a certain sense, the limiting procedure of  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  in Theorem 6 has a similar effect: a finite  $\alpha < \infty$  allows for some leeway along the space  $X$  when matching  $\hat{y}_n$  with  $\hat{\mu}_n \otimes \hat{v}_n$ , and this leeway becomes progressively smaller as  $\alpha$  increases. Indeed, it is possible to find suitable sequences  $\alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $\tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\hat{y}_n)$  is a consistent estimator of  $\tau^Y(y)$  under mild assumptions. The following application of Theorem 6 serves as a proof of concept for this idea, even though the choice of  $\alpha_n$  can likely be improved.

Example 6 (estimation of marginal transport dependency): Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish metric spaces,  $c_Y = d_Y^p$ , and  $c_\alpha = (\alpha d_X + d_Y)^p$  for  $p \geq 1$ . Moreover, assume  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  to have a finite  $p$ -moment with respect to the metric  $d = d_X + d_Y$  (which in particular implies  $\tau_{c_\alpha}(y) < \infty$  for all  $0 < \alpha \leq \infty$ ) and let  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a diverging sequence. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\hat{y}_n)^{1/p} - \tau_{c_Y}^Y(y)^{1/p} \right| \right] &\leq \\ &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\hat{y}_n)^{1/p} - \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(y)^{1/p} \right| \right] + \left| \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(y)^{1/p} - \tau_{c_Y}^Y(y)^{1/p} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6, the second summand converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The first summand

can be controlled by Theorem 3 and bound (17), yielding

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\hat{y}_n)^{1/p} - \tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\gamma)^{1/p} \right| \right] \leq 3 \mathbb{E} \left[ T_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\gamma, \hat{y}_n)^{1/p} \right] \leq 3 \alpha_n \mathbb{E} \left[ T_{c_1}(\gamma, \hat{y}_n)^{1/p} \right].$$

This reveals that  $\tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\hat{y}_n)$  is a consistent estimator of  $\tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma)$  under the assumption

$$\alpha_n = o \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ T_{c_1}(\gamma, \hat{y}_n)^{1/p} \right]^{-1} \right).$$

One can therefore use the asymptotic convergence rates discussed in the context of equation (17) to find a suitable sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

Another route to consistently estimate the marginal transport dependency from data was recently proposed in Wiesel (2021), who, independently from our work, also considered expressions of the form (24). He derives convergence rates if  $\tau^Y(\gamma)$  is estimated by  $\tau^Y(\tilde{y}_n)$  for a so-called adapted empirical measure  $\tilde{y}_n$ . One example for such an adaptation is the projection of the individual observations  $\xi_i$  and  $\zeta_i$  to a grid in the unit cube (see Backhoff et al. 2020).

## 4 Contractions

Up to this point, we were concerned with universal properties of the transport dependency for generic cost functions. We now focus on a particular additive cost structure that enables us to characterize under which conditions the bounds of the previous section are sharp.

In the following, we equip the Polish space  $X$  with a (general) cost function  $k_X$  and the Polish space  $Y$  with a lower semi-continuous (pseudo-)metric  $d_Y$ . We consider costs of the form

$$c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = h(k_X(x_1, x_2) + d_Y(y_1, y_2)) \quad (27a)$$

for  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$ , where  $h: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a strictly increasing function that satisfies  $h(0) = 0$ . We also fix the marginal costs

$$c_X = h \circ k_X \quad \text{and} \quad c_Y = h \circ d_Y, \quad (27b)$$

which fulfill condition (18). Therefore,  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$  are suited for application in the previously derived upper bounds (Proposition 6 to 8).

To state our findings, we first define couplings that describe contractions between  $X$  and  $Y$ . For given  $d_Y$  and  $k_X$  as above, we say that  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  is *contracting* (on its support) if

$$d_Y(y_1, y_2) \leq k_X(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{for all} \quad (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \text{supp } \gamma. \quad (28)$$

We also need a slightly weaker condition and say that  $\gamma$  is *almost surely contracting* if (28) holds  $(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$ -almost surely (but not necessarily on each single pair of points of the support). Our next result characterizes contracting couplings as those that maximize the transport dependency for fixed marginals and attain the upper bound in Proposition 6.

**Theorem 7 (contracting couplings):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces,  $c$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$  of the form (27), and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\cdot, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . If  $\gamma$  is contracting,

$$\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu. \quad (29)$$

Conversely, if  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu < \infty$  and (29) holds, then  $\gamma$  is almost surely contracting.

The second assertion in this statement is a direct consequence of the upper bound in Proposition 7. For the first claim, we use disintegration to insert a suitable auxiliary variable into the integrals  $\pi c$  for arbitrary  $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$ , after which we can exploit  $d_Y \leq k_X$  as well as the triangle inequality of  $d_Y$ . This line of argumentation reveals that vertical movements are indeed globally optimal when transporting to a contracting coupling  $\gamma$  – an idea that was already anticipated in Figure 3 of the introduction. Details of the proof are documented in Appendix A.

Note that the distinction between “contracting” and “almost surely contracting” in Theorem 7 is necessary under the stated generality. Indeed, one can construct almost surely contracting couplings  $\gamma$  such that, e.g.,  $\tau(\gamma) = 0$  and  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu > 0$ . This can only be done, however, if the costs are not continuous. If  $d_Y$  and  $k_X$  are continuous, then every almost surely contracting coupling is also contracting on its support, and the two concepts coincide (see Lemma 7 in Appendix A). In this case, Theorem 7 implies the equivalence

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\cdot, \nu) \text{ is contracting} \quad \iff \quad \tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu.$$

Another crucial observation is that contracting couplings are, under mild assumptions, always deterministic. In fact, if  $d_Y$  is a proper metric and  $h$  is continuous, Proposition 8 and Theorem 5 show that any  $\gamma$  satisfying (29) is induced by a function. Furthermore, if a measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  is  $\mu$ -almost surely contracting, meaning that there is a Borel set  $A \subset X$  with  $\mu(A) = 1$  and

$$d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2)) \leq k_X(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2 \in A, \quad (30)$$

then  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  is contracting and (29) holds under assumptions of continuity. The following corollary collects these observations into a useful statement.

**Corollary 1 (contracting deterministic couplings):** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $c$  be a cost function on  $X \times Y$  of the form (27), where  $h$  and  $k_X$  are continuous and  $d_Y$  is a continuous metric. Let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , and  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu < \infty$ . Then

$$\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$$

holds if and only if  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for a  $\mu$ -almost surely contracting function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ .

*Proof of Corollary 1.* Let  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  be  $\mu$ -almost surely contracting such that  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$ . By a change of variables,

$$(\gamma \otimes \gamma)(d_Y \leq k_X) = (\mu \otimes \mu)(d_\varphi \leq k_X) = 1,$$

where  $d_\varphi(x_1, x_2) = d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2))$  for any  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . Therefore,  $\gamma$  is almost surely contracting. Since  $k_X$  and  $d_Y$  are continuous, we can apply Lemma 7 to conclude that  $\gamma$  is contracting on its support. By Theorem 7,  $\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$  follows.

For the reverse direction, we consult the upper bound in Proposition 8 to find that  $\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$  implies  $\tau^Y(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$ . Consequently, Theorem 5 establishes the existence of a measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  with  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$ . It is left to show that  $\varphi$  is  $\mu$ -almost surely contracting. According to Lemma 7 and Theorem 7,  $\gamma$  is contracting on its support. We can therefore consider the set  $A = (\text{id}, \varphi)^{-1}(\text{supp } \gamma)$  and conclude that both  $\mu(A) = \gamma(\text{supp } \gamma) = 1$  and

$$d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2)) \leq d_X(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2 \in A,$$

since all tuples  $(x, \varphi(x)) \in X \times Y$  for  $x \in A$  are elements of the support of  $\gamma$ .  $\square$

A point that deserves emphasis is that Corollary 1 actually provides a characterization of Lipschitz and Hölder functions, as well as of isometries. If  $k_X$  is set to  $\alpha \cdot d_X$  for a metric  $d_X$  on  $X$ , then condition (30) is equivalent to  $\varphi$  being  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz  $\mu$ -almost surely. Similarly, under the choice  $k_X = \alpha \cdot d_X^\beta$  for  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , condition (30) coincides with the  $\beta$ -Hölder criterion for  $\varphi$  (with constant  $\alpha$ ). Finally, the simultaneous equality


$$\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_X} \mu = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$$

for  $k_X = d_X$  holds if and only if  $\varphi$  is  $\mu$ -almost surely an isometry from  $(X, d_X)$  to  $(Y, d_Y)$ . In this context, it might be interesting to note that a  $\mu$ -almost sure contraction  $\varphi$  in the setting of Corollary 1 can always be uniformly extended to the full support of  $\mu$  if  $(Y, d_Y)$  is a Polish metric space (see Lemma 8 in Appendix A). In other words: if  $d_Y$  completely metrizes the topological space  $Y$ , then we can always assume  $A = \text{supp } \mu$  in definition (30). In particular, the map  $\varphi$  in Corollary 1 can be chosen to be continuous on the support of  $\mu$ .

To conclude this section, we want to highlight that the preceding results equip the transport dependency with a powerful interpretation as quantifier of structural dependence: the larger the transport dependency  $\tau(\xi, \zeta)$  between two random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  is, the more they have to be associated in a contracting manner. Intuitively, this means that the conditional law of  $\zeta \mid \xi = x$  must behave well as a function of  $x \in X$ , judged in terms of  $k_X$  and  $d_Y$ . In fact, the highest possible degree of transport dependency for fixed marginals is (under continuity assumptions) only assumed if  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are deterministically related by  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  for a contraction  $\varphi$ . Other deterministic relations between  $\zeta$  and  $\xi$ , which exhibit rapid changes that break condition (30), are assigned a lower degree of dependency. This way of dependency quantification might often be desirable, especially in situations where quickly oscillating or chaotic relations between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  practically cannot (or should not) be distinguished from actual noise.

## 5 Transport correlation

In this section, we introduce several coefficients of association that are based on the transport dependency. The central ingredient is upper bound (19) in Proposition 6, which can be used to



**Figure 8:** Example for which the upper bounds (19), (23), and (25) are not sharp. The marginal distributions are  $\mu = \nu = \text{Unif}\{1, 2, 3\}$ . **(a)** One can show that  $\gamma^* = \text{Unif}\{(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3)\}$  maximizes  $\tau(\gamma)$  over  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$ , assuming the value  $\tau^* = 2(2 + \sqrt{2})/9$  if  $c$  is the Euclidean distance on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . The visualized plan  $\pi^*$  is optimal. **(b)** All of the established upper bounds move mass along a plan  $\pi$  that is restricted to vertical or horizontal transports. The total transportation cost is  $8/9 > \tau^*$ . Note that the Euclidean distance on  $X \times Y$  can *not* be expressed in the additive form (27a).

scale  $\tau$  to the interval  $[0, 1]$  in a way that only depends on the marginal distributions. Without further assumptions, however, bound (19) is not necessarily sharp, and values close to 1 may be impossible (see Figure 8 for an illustrative example in this regard). In the following, we therefore focus on cost structures of the form (27a). In this setting, the conditions under which  $\tau$  assumes its upper bounds are well understood (Theorem 7 and Corollary 1 in Section 4), which makes the resulting coefficients more expressive.

For the sake of clarity, we work in a slightly less general setting than in Section 4 and right away assume  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  to be Polish metric spaces, restricting to costs

$$c(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = (\alpha \cdot d_X(x_1, x_2) + d_Y(y_1, y_2))^p \quad (31)$$

for  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ ,  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ , and  $\alpha, p > 0$ . In what follows,  $d_X$ ,  $d_Y$ , and  $p$  are usually considered to be fixed, and we mainly explore the influence of  $\alpha$ . We call a map  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  a *dilatation* if there exists some  $\beta > 0$  such that

$$d_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2)) = \beta d_X(x_1, x_2)$$

for all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . A dilatation can be thought of as an isometry from  $(X, \beta d_X)$  to  $(Y, d_Y)$ , i.e., an isometry up to the correct scaling. We also recall the notion of  $p$ -weak convergence on  $\mathcal{P}_p(X \times Y)$ , which was introduced and discussed in the context of continuity (Section 3).

For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\cdot, \nu)$  with  $0 < \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu < \infty$ , we define the  $\alpha$ -transport correlation via

$$\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = \left( \frac{\tau(\gamma)}{\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu} \right)^{1/p}. \quad (32)$$

This dependency coefficient has a series of interesting properties, most of which are direct consequences of our previous findings. For detailed proofs, see Appendix A.

**Proposition 9 ( $\alpha$ -transport correlation):** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish metric spaces. For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , and  $0 < \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu < \infty$ , the  $\alpha$ -transport correlation defined in (32) for  $0 < \alpha < \infty$  has the following properties:

1.  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ ,
2.  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = 1$  iff  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for an  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz function  $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ ,
3.  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma) = \rho_\alpha(\gamma')$  if  $\gamma' = (f_X, f_Y)_* \gamma$  for isometries  $f_X : X \rightarrow X$  and  $f_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$ ,
4.  $\gamma \mapsto \rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p$  is convex when restricted to  $\mathcal{C}(\cdot, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  for fixed  $\nu$ ,
5.  $\rho_{\alpha_n}(\gamma_n) \rightarrow \rho_\alpha(\gamma)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges  $p$ -weakly to  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$ ,
6.  $\alpha \mapsto \rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p$  is monotonically increasing for all  $p > 0$  and concave if  $p \leq 1$ ,

where the functions  $\varphi$ ,  $f_X$ , and  $f_Y$  only have to be defined  $\mu$ - or  $\nu$ -almost surely.

Properties 1 and 2 lend the transport correlation a distinctive interpretation as dependency coefficient that identifies Lipschitz relations between random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . This makes  $\rho_\alpha$  a flexible tool for quantifying the degree of association between  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ , especially when we have a clear picture of how structured a deterministic relation  $\varphi$  with  $\zeta = \varphi(\xi)$  should at least be in order to be distinguished from noise. Properties 3 to 5 state that  $\rho_\alpha$  benefits from the general properties of the transport dependency  $\tau$ . For example, property 5 implies that  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma)$  can be estimated consistently just by plugging the empirical measure  $\hat{\gamma}_n$  in definition (32).

Based on our earlier findings in Theorem 5 and 6, it is possible to extend  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma)$  to  $\alpha = \infty$  as a special case. Effectively, this means employing the marginal transport dependency (24) in equation (32), which leads us to define the  $\infty$ -transport correlation or *marginal transport correlation*

$$\rho_\infty(\gamma) = \left( \frac{\tau_{d_Y^p}^Y(\gamma)}{\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu} \right)^{1/p}. \quad (33)$$

**Proposition 10 (marginal transport correlation):** Let  $X$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish (metric) spaces. For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , and  $0 < \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu < \infty$ , the marginal transport correlation defined in (33) has the following properties:

1.  $\rho_\infty(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ ,
2.  $\rho_\infty(\gamma) = 1$  iff  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for a measurable function  $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ ,
3.  $\rho_\infty(\gamma) = \rho_\infty(\gamma')$  if  $\gamma' = (f_X, f_Y)_* \gamma$  for a measurable injection  $f_X : X \rightarrow X$  and a dilatation  $f_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$ ,
4.  $\gamma \mapsto \rho_\infty(\gamma)^p$  is convex when restricted to  $\mathcal{C}(\cdot, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  for fixed  $\nu$ ,

where the functions  $\varphi$ ,  $f_X$ , and  $f_Y$  only have to be defined  $\mu$ - or  $\nu$ -almost surely.

The differences in Proposition 9 and 10 reflect that  $\rho_\alpha$  progressively loses its sense for the metrical structure of  $X$  when  $\alpha$  is increased. In the limit  $\alpha = \infty$ , the Lipschitz restrictions appearing in Proposition 9 are dissolved and only conditions of measurability remain.

Since we normalize with the diameter of  $\nu$  instead of the one of  $\mu$  in definition (32), the transport correlation  $\rho_\alpha$  singles out relations in the direction  $X \rightarrow Y$ . One possibility to compensate for this asymmetry is to adapt the value of  $\alpha$  by choosing

$$\alpha_* = \left( \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu / \text{diam}_{d_X^p} \mu \right)^{1/p}. \quad (34)$$

The coefficient  $\rho_* = \rho_{\alpha_*}$ , which we call *isometric transport correlation*, takes the form

$$\rho_*(\gamma) = (\tau_{c_*}(\gamma))^{1/p}, \quad \text{where} \quad c_*(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \left( \frac{d_X(x_1, x_2)}{(\text{diam}_{d_X^p} \mu)^{1/p}} + \frac{d_Y(y_1, y_2)}{(\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu)^{1/p}} \right)^p \quad (35)$$

for  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ . We can interpret (35) as first normalizing the metric measure spaces  $(X, d_X, \mu)$  and  $(Y, d_Y, \nu)$  by their  $p$ -diameters before calculating the transport dependency.

**Proposition 11 (isometric transport correlation):** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be Polish metric spaces. For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  such that  $0 < \alpha_* < \infty$  in (34) is well defined, the isometric transport correlation (35) has the following properties:

1.  $\rho_*(\gamma) = 0$  iff  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$ ,
2.  $\rho_*(\gamma) = 1$  iff  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  or  $\gamma = (\psi, \text{id})_* \nu$  for dilatations  $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$  or  $\psi : Y \rightarrow X$ ,
3.  $\rho_*(\gamma) = \rho_*(\gamma')$  if  $\gamma' = (f_X, f_Y)_* \gamma$  for dilatations  $f_X : X \rightarrow X$  and  $f_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$ ,
4.  $\gamma \mapsto \rho_*(\gamma)^p$  is convex when restricted to  $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  for fixed  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ ,
5.  $\rho_*(\gamma_n) \rightarrow \rho_*(\gamma)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges  $p$ -weakly to  $\gamma$ ,
6.  $\rho_*(\gamma) = \rho_*(\gamma')$  if  $\gamma' = f_* \gamma$  for the symmetry map  $f(x, y) = (y, x)$ ,

where the functions  $\varphi, \psi, f_X$ , and  $f_Y$  only have to be defined  $\mu$ - or  $\nu$ -almost surely.

Note that the dilatation  $\varphi$  in property 2 above actually has to be an isometry from  $(X, \alpha_* d_X)$  to  $(Y, d_Y)$ , i.e., the correct scaling is given by  $\beta = \alpha_*$  such that  $\text{diam}_{(\alpha_* d_X)^p} \mu = \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu$ .

To conclude, we want to mention another symmetric coefficient of association built on top of the transport dependency. Instead of dividing by the diameter of  $\nu$  in (32), we divide by the minimum of the diameters of  $\nu$  and  $\mu$ . Setting  $\alpha = 1$  in (31), this results in the coefficient

$$\left( \frac{\tau_c(\gamma)}{\min(\text{diam}_{d_X^p} \mu, \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu)} \right)^{1/p}. \quad (36)$$

This coefficient has similar properties to the isometric transport correlation and even equals  $\rho_*$  if the two diameters coincide. In general, however, it assumes its maximal value 1 if  $\gamma$  describes



a 1-Lipschitz function from  $X$  to  $Y$  or a 1-Lipschitz function from  $Y$  to  $X$ . We call (36) the *contracting transport correlation*, but will focus our subsequent work on the other coefficients established in this section.

## 6 Applications

To assess the actual usefulness of the transport dependency for applications, we next investigate the performance of the coefficients  $\rho_\alpha$  and  $\rho_*$  on empirical data. In particular, we conduct a series of benchmarks that illuminate basic properties and demonstrate commonalities and differences to other commonly used coefficients of association. In what follows, we restrict our attention to the choice  $p = 1$  in the cost structure (31); additional simulations that cover  $p = 1/2$  and  $p = 2$  and that adopt alternative dependency models can be found in Appendix B.

**Setting.** We consider Euclidean spaces  $X = \mathbb{R}^r$  and  $Y = \mathbb{R}^q$  for  $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$ , and equip them with their respective Euclidean metrics  $d_X$  and  $d_Y$ . We focus on joint distributions  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^q)$  that are typically either given deterministically via  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for  $\varphi: [0, 1]^r \rightarrow [0, 1]^q$  and  $\mu = \text{Unif}[0, 1]^r$  (i.e., concentrated on the graph of a function), or by placing (uniform) mass on more general shapes in  $[0, 1]^{r+q}$ . The number of samples independently drawn from  $\gamma$  for the purpose of empirical estimation is denoted by  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we write  $\hat{\gamma}_n$  to refer to the corresponding empirical measure, see equation (15). To study the influence of statistical noise, we consider convex contamination models of the form

$$\gamma^\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon) \gamma + \epsilon (\mu \otimes \nu), \quad (37)$$

where  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  denotes the noise level distorting  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$ . Observations  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^q$  sampled from  $\gamma^\epsilon$  are with probability  $(1 - \epsilon)$  randomly drawn from  $\gamma$  and with probability  $\epsilon$  randomly drawn from  $\mu \otimes \nu$ . Further simulations that use additive Gaussian noise instead are provided in Appendix B.

Our numerical study compares different dependency coefficients that assume values in  $[0, 1]$ . Besides the isometric and  $\alpha$ -Lipschitz transport correlations  $\rho_*$  and  $\rho_\alpha$  for  $\alpha > 0$ , which were introduced in the previous section, we consider the following commonly applied quantities:

- cor** the Pearson correlation. It is only applicable if  $r = q = 1$ . Since it assumes values in  $[-1, 1]$ , we always report its absolute value.
- spe** the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. It is only applicable if  $r = q = 1$  and is comparable to Kendall's  $\tau$ , another popular rank based correlation coefficient.
- dcor** the Euclidean distance correlation (Székely et al. 2007), based on the distance covariance defined in equation (3). It is applicable for all  $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$ . In its generalized form (4), it is also applicable in generic (separable) metric spaces of (strong) negative type. As discussed previously, several of its properties make it comparable to  $\rho_*$ .
- mic** the maximal information coefficient (Reshef et al. 2011). It is only applicable if  $r = q = 1$ . For its estimation, we use the estimator  $\text{mic}_\epsilon$  (Reshef et al. 2016), which we compute via the tools provided by Albanese et al. (2012). The two algorithmic parameters  $c$  and  $\alpha$  were set to 5 and 0.75, respectively (as recommended in Albanese et al. 2018).

For each of these coefficients, generically called  $\rho$  for the moment, we are interested in several features. Apart from the actual value of  $\rho(\gamma)$ , which signifies the amount of dependency attributed to  $\gamma$ , we look at the variance and bias of  $\rho(\hat{\gamma}_n)$  as an estimator of  $\rho(\gamma)$  when data is limited. To check how well the coefficients are able to distinguish structure from noise, we also include the results of permutation tests for independence (see Lehmann and Romano (2006, Section 15.2) or Janssen and Pauls (2003) for background on permutation based tests).


The  $\rho$ -based permutation test we employ works as follows: for given data  $z = (x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n \in (X \times Y)^n$ , assumed to be sampled from  $\gamma^{\otimes n}$ , we write  $\rho(z)$  for the empirical estimate of  $\rho(\gamma)$  based on  $z$ . Furthermore, we denote  $z_\sigma = (x_i, y_{\sigma(i)})_{i=1}^n$ , where  $\sigma$  is a permutation of  $n$  elements. For the test, we randomly select  $m$  permutations  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$  and reject the null hypothesis that  $z$  is sampled from an independent coupling  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$  if

$$|\{i : \rho(z_{\sigma_i}) > \rho(z)\}| \leq k \quad (38)$$

for some  $k \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ . Since a permutation of the second components does not affect the distribution of  $\gamma^{\otimes n}$  if  $\gamma = \mu \otimes \nu$  is a product coupling, this leads to a level  $(k+1)/(m+1)$  test. In all of our applications, we choose  $k$  and  $m$  such that this level is  $\leq 0.1$ . Note that the power of the permutation test will usually increase if  $m$  is increased while the level is held constant.

**Computation.** One issue that seriously affects our numerical work is the computational effort when solving optimal transport problems. In order to calculate the transport dependency based on  $n$  data points, we are faced with finding an optimal coupling with  $n \times n^2$  entries. For generic algorithms, for example the network simplex, this implies a runtime of  $O(n^5)$  (up to logarithmic factors; see Peyré and Cuturi (2019) for more details on computational aspects). For this reason, we have to choose moderate sample sizes, like  $n = 50$ , when the transport correlation is evaluated repeatedly (i.e., thousands of times) for Monte Carlo simulations. We also restrict the number of permutations to  $m = 29$  when testing under the transport correlation. For all other coefficients, which can be calculated much faster,  $m = 999$  is chosen.

In settings with  $n \leq 100$ , we make use of solvers based on the network simplex provided by the python optimal transport (POT) package (Flamary and Courty 2017). To still be able to capture the behavior of  $\rho_\alpha$  and  $\rho_*$  for larger values of  $n$ , we additionally employ our own implementation of an approximation scheme recently proposed by Schmitzer (2019). It is based on the Sinkhorn algorithm for entropically regularized optimal transport (Cuturi 2013) and operates by successively decreasing the regularization constant  $\eta$  until a suitable approximation of the non-regularized problem is obtained. While  $\eta$  is scaled down, in our case from  $\eta = 10^{-1}$  to  $\eta = 10^{-3}$ , the increasing sparsity of the transport plan (after entries with negligible values  $\leq 10^{-15}$  are removed) can be exploited to boost performance by using sparsity-optimized data structures. On systems equipped with a modern GPU, we can thereby calculate the transport dependency for generic costs accurately for sample sizes up to  $n = 1000$  (as is done in Figure 13) within a couple of seconds to minutes. Note, however, that we do not make use of the multi-resolution ansatz described by Schmitzer (2019), which might open the door to still larger sample sizes. Another way to ameliorate computational barriers is to restrict to data on grids (see,




**Figure 9:** Comparison of several dependency coefficients on two dimensional geometries. As reference, independent  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]^2$  noise has also been simulated (bottom right). For each geometry, the scatter plot on top displays an exemplary sample of size  $n = 50$ . The box plots below summarize the values of the empirically estimated coefficients based on 100 such samples. For the sake of visualization, boxes in the box plot are replaced by single dots if their extent would be smaller than 0.1.

e.g., Schrieber et al. (2016) for benchmarks of different optimal transport algorithms applied to images) or to utilize resampling techniques (Sommerfeld et al. 2019).

**Recognizing shapes.** We begin with an investigation of the behavior of the afore mentioned coefficients in two dimensional settings, meaning  $r = q = 1$ . Figure 9 contains box plots depicting the coefficients' performance on simple geometries, like lines or circles, for  $n = 50$  samples. As a point of reference, we also include uniform noise on  $[0, 1]^2$ .

To showcase the Lipschitz-selectivity of  $\rho_\alpha$ , we chose to include the coefficient  $\rho_3$  for  $\alpha = 3$ . Recall that this implies  $\rho_3(\gamma) = 1$  whenever  $\gamma$  is concentrated on the graph of a function whose slope is at most 3. Figure 9 confirms this property of  $\rho_3$ , which is the only coefficient to assign maximal dependency to the zigzag function with slope 3 and the polynomial. On the zigzag function with 5 segments (and thus slope 5), it has already decreased to about 0.7. In this context, the mic, which generally achieves high values on all geometries, performs notably well. It is also the coefficient that most clearly distinguishes the pretzel example from noise. Another




**Figure 10:** Dependency coefficients applied to increasingly noisy datasets according to the convex noise model in (37), where  $\gamma$  is given in terms of the identity on  $[0, 1]$ . The scatter plots on the top show exemplary samples drawn from  $\gamma^\epsilon$  of size  $n = 50$ . The box plots are based on 100 such samples. The power curves on the bottom display the results of the permutation tests described in (38). To estimate the power, 1000 tests were conducted per value of  $\epsilon$  for each coefficient. The significance level (dashed line) of these tests is 10%.

noteworthy observation is that  $\rho_*$  and  $\text{dcor}$  indeed behave comparably, especially on functional relations. On non-functional patterns, like the circle or the cross,  $\rho_*$  assumes somewhat higher values than  $\text{dcor}$ . At the same time, the bias of  $\rho_*$  on independent noise (for which values of 0 are expected in the limit of large  $n$ ) is slightly higher than the one of  $\text{dcor}$ , albeit with a smaller variance. Finally, as to be expected, the Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients do a poor job at discerning non-monotonic structures. In case of the circle, for example, the values of these coefficients are systematically lower than when confronted with random noise.

**Behavior under noise.** Our next simulations concern the performance under convex noise models  $\gamma^\epsilon$  as defined in equation (37). Figure 10 and 11 illustrate the coefficients' empirical estimates and their power when used for independence testing in case that  $\gamma$  is deterministically given in terms of the identity (Figure 10) or the zigzag function with maximal slope 5 (Figure 11). In Appendix B, this type of comparison can be found for most other distributions considered in Figure 9 as well, and we also present results under additive Gaussian noise.

In case of the identity, all coefficients seem to behave roughly similar, especially for small noise levels. Under pure noise ( $\epsilon = 1$ ), for which the coefficients should attain the value 0 in the




**Figure 11:** Dependency coefficients applied to increasingly noisy datasets according to the convex noise model in (37), where  $\gamma$  is given in terms of a zigzag function with maximal slope 5. See Figure 10 for a description of the individual graphs.

limit of large  $n$ , the transport correlation exhibits a comparably large bias at a relatively small variance. This trend of high biases becomes even more serious in higher dimensions and is further investigated below (Figure 13). Regarding the test performance, the power curves in Figure 10 reveal that all coefficients except  $\rho_*$  and mic perform comparably. The power of  $\rho_*$  is consistently higher than its competitors', while mic performs notably worse.

The picture changes substantially for the zigzag example in Figure 11. Due to the absence of monotonicity, cor and spe are not able to distinguish data points originated from the zigzag function from the ones coming from the independence coupling of its marginals. The coefficient dcor and, to a lesser extend,  $\rho_*$  also assume lower values and can only partially discern the dependency structure under noise. Meanwhile, the coefficients mic and specifically  $\rho_3$  lie systematically higher and are still able to recognize dependency under high noise levels.

**Adaptability.** In Figure 4 of the introduction, we already noted that  $\rho_3$  performs very well on a 3-Lipschitz functional relation. Additionally, Figure 11 testifies that  $\rho_3$  also outperforms all other considered coefficients when applied to a 5-Lipschitz relation. It stands to reason, however, that  $\rho_5$  would do even better than  $\rho_3$  in this setting. To further examine the claim that adapting  $\alpha$  to the slopes inherent in  $\gamma$  improves the performance, we conducted a series of numerical experiments with functions of different maximal slope and varying  $\alpha$ . The findings are displayed in Figure 12, where the power of  $\rho_\alpha$ -based permutation tests is plotted as a function of  $\alpha$  (for




**Figure 12:** Influence of  $\alpha$  on the test performance of  $\rho_\alpha$  for linear (a) and sine (b) dependencies at a noise level of  $\epsilon = 0.75$ , see (37). The graphs on the top display exemplary samples together with the actual functional relations encoded in  $\gamma$  for different slopes. From left to right, the respective curves have maximal slopes of 1, 3, and 5 in both (a) and (b). The respective values of  $\alpha \in \{1, 3, 5\}$  are marked as vertical lines in the power plot below. For each value of  $\alpha$ , the power is estimated based on 500 samples of size  $n = 50$ .


fixed noise levels  $\epsilon = 0.75$ ). The results clearly suggest that choosing a value of  $\alpha$  close to the Lipschitz constant of the actual functional relation in  $\gamma$  can significantly improve the test performance. If  $\alpha$  is chosen too small or too large, the power systematically declines.

**Bias and higher dimensions.** Another prevalent trend in the numerical results so far is the notable bias of  $\rho_*$  and  $\rho_\alpha$  on independent noise (i.e., for  $\epsilon = 1$ ), where we expect a value of 0 for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact, empirical estimators of optimal transport distances are known to be susceptible to a certain degree of bias, especially in high dimensions. In Figure 13, we therefore take a look at the empirical estimation of  $\rho_*$  and compare it to dcor in settings of different dimensions for sample sizes  $n$  running from 10 to 1000. We observe that the bias of  $\rho_*$  and dcor seem comparable for  $r = q = 1$ . If the dimensions are chosen higher, the bias increases much quicker for  $\rho_*$  than for dcor. At the same time, the variance of the  $\rho_*$  estimates is (in part much) smaller for all choices of dimensions. Indeed, in case of  $r = q = 5$  and  $n = 1000$ , the estimated standard deviation of  $\rho_*$  is multiple times smaller than the one of dcor, even though the bias is substantial ( $\rho_* \approx 0.72$ , while  $\text{dcor} \approx 0.13$ ).

A high bias in itself does not necessarily mean that  $\rho_*$  is blind to dependencies in high dimensions, however. Figure 14 reveals that simple linear structures with noise of the form (37) are still recognized somewhat better via  $\rho_*$  than via dcor for  $n = 50$ , particularly in the setting  $r = q = 5$ . To examine a more involved example, we also look at spherical dependencies, where  $\gamma$  is the uniform distribution on the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{r+q-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^q$ . In this case, the results are more unintuitive and prompt several questions. First of all, spherical dependencies are separated from noise (much) better by the transport correlation than by dcor in settings with  $r, q \in \{1, 2\}$ .



**Figure 13:** Empirical estimates of the isometric transport correlation and the distance correlation as a function of the sample size  $n$  in different dimensions  $r$  and  $q$ . The true distribution in the respective graphs is given by the product measure  $\gamma = \text{Unif}[0, 1]^r \otimes \text{Unif}[0, 1]^q$ . Therefore,  $\rho_*(\gamma) = \text{dcor}(\gamma) = 0$  is the (unbiased) value to be expected for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The shaded error regions correspond to  $\pm$  three times the estimated standard deviation. The number of samples employed for the estimation of the mean and variance was adaptively decreased from 500 for  $n = 10$  to 20 for  $n = 1000$ .



**Figure 14:** Test performance of the isometric transport correlation and the distance correlation in different dimensions  $r$  and  $q$ . Shown are results for both linear and spherical relations under the noise model (37). In the former case,  $\gamma$  is given by  $(\text{id}, \text{id})_* \text{Unif}[0, 1]^r$  if  $r = q$  and by  $(\text{id}, \text{pr}_1)_* \text{Unif}[0, 1]^r$  in case of  $r = 2$  and  $q = 1$ , where  $\text{pr}_1$  denotes the projection on the first coordinate. In case of the sphere,  $\gamma$  is uniformly distributed on the surface  $\mathbb{S}^{r+q-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+q}$ . For all power curves, 1000 samples of size  $n = 50$  were used.

At the same time, for  $r = q = 5$ , both the distance correlation and the transport correlation consistently exhibit test powers that are smaller than 0.1, meaning that a random sample from the sphere regularly results in *lower* estimates of  $\rho_*$  and dcor than drawing from the corresponding marginals  $\mu \otimes \nu$  would. This effect is particularly severe in case of the transport dependency. Even though this observation could (in part) be caused by the small sample size  $n = 50$ , which might not be sufficient for detecting non-trivial dependencies in higher dimensions, it demonstrates that the properties of the transport correlation in more complex settings remain an open issue that merit further investigation.

**Acknowledgements.** Thomas Giacomo Nies acknowledges support of DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, German Research Foundation) CRC 1456. Thomas Staudt acknowledges support of DFG RTG 2088. Axel Munk is supported by, and Thomas Giacomo Nies and Thomas Staudt were in part funded by, the DFG under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2067/1-390729940. We also want to thank Facundo Memoli and Yoav Zemel for insightful discussions in the initial phase of this project.

## References

- Albanese, D., M. Filosi, R. Visintainer, S. Riccadonna, G. Jurman, and C. Furlanello (2012). “minerva and minepy: a C engine for the MINE suite and its R, Python and MATLAB wrappers”. *Bioinformatics* 29.3, pp. 407–408.
- Albanese, D., S. Riccadonna, C. Donati, and P. Franceschi (2018). “A practical tool for maximal information coefficient analysis”. *GigaScience* 7.4. giy032.
- Ambrosio, L., N. Gigli, and G. Savaré (2008). *Gradient Flows: In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Amgad, M., A. Itoh, and M. M. K. Tsui (2015). “Extending Ripley’s K-function to quantify aggregation in 2-D grayscale images”. *PloS one* 10.12, e0144404.
- Backhoff, J., D. Bartl, M. Beiglböck, and J. Wiesel (2020). “Estimating processes in adapted Wasserstein distance”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07261*.
- Berrett, T. B. and R. J. Samworth (2019). “Nonparametric independence testing via mutual information”. *Biometrika* 106.3, pp. 547–566.
- Berrett, T. B., R. J. Samworth, and M. Yuan (2019). “Efficient multivariate entropy estimation via  $k$ -nearest neighbour distances”. *Annals of Statistics* 47.1, pp. 288–318.
- Billingsley, P. (2013). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Castro-Prado, F. and W. González-Manteiga (2020). “Nonparametric independence tests in metric spaces: what is known and what is not”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14150*.
- Chakraborty, S. and X. Zhang (2019). “A new framework for distance and kernel-based metrics in high dimensions”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13469*.
- Chang, J. T. and D. Pollard (1997). “Conditioning as disintegration”. *Statistica Neerlandica* 51 (3), pp. 287–317.
- Chatterjee, S. (2020). “A New Coefficient of Correlation”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 0.0, pp. 1–21.



- Chen, H.-B. and J. Niles-Weed (2020). “Asymptotics of smoothed Wasserstein distances”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00738*.
- Cuturi, M. (2013). “Sinkhorn distances: lightspeed computation of optimal transport”. In: *NIPS*. Vol. 2, 3, p. 4.
- Deb, N., P. Ghosal, and B. Sen (2020). “Measuring association on topological spaces using kernels and geometric graphs”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01768*.
- Dette, H., K. F. Siburg, and P. A. Stoimenov (2013). “A copula-based non-parametric measure of regression dependence”. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 40.1, pp. 21–41.
- Dowson, D. and B. Landau (1982). “The Fréchet distance between multivariate normal distributions”. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 12.3, pp. 450–455.
- Dubey, P. and H.-G. Müller (2019). “Functional models for time-varying random objects”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10829*.
- Erbar, M., M. Rumpf, B. Schmitzer, and S. Simon (2020). “Computation of optimal transport on discrete metric measure spaces”. *Numerische Mathematik* 144.1, pp. 157–200.
- Estévez, P. A., M. Tesmer, C. A. Perez, and J. M. Zurada (2009). “Normalized mutual information feature selection”. *IEEE Transactions on neural networks* 20.2, pp. 189–201.
- Flamary, R. and N. Courty (2017). *POT Python Optimal Transport library*.
- Friedman, J. H. and L. C. Rafsky (1983). “Graph-theoretic measures of multivariate association and prediction”. *The Annals of Statistics* 11.2, pp. 377–391.
- Gebelein, H. (1941). “Das statistische Problem der Korrelation als Variations- und Eigenwertproblem und sein Zusammenhang mit der Ausgleichsrechnung”. *ZAMM-Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics/Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik* 21.6, pp. 364–379.
- Gelfand, I. M. (1959). “Calculation of the amount of information about a random function contained in another such function”. *Ann. Mathematical Society Translation Ser. 2* 12, pp. 199–246.
- Goldfeld, Z. and K. Greenewald (2020). “Gaussian-smooth optimal transport: metric structure and statistical efficiency”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09206*.
- Goldfeld, Z., K. Greenewald, J. Niles-Weed, and Y. Polyanskiy (2020). “Convergence of smoothed empirical measures with applications to entropy estimation”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 66.7, pp. 4368–4391.
- Gretton, A., K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola (2012). “A kernel two-sample test”. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13.1, pp. 723–773.
- Gretton, A., O. Bousquet, A. Smola, and B. Schölkopf (2005). “Measuring statistical dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt norms”. In: *International conference on algorithmic learning theory*. Springer, pp. 63–77.
- Hall, P. and S. C. Morton (1993). “On the estimation of entropy”. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 45.1, pp. 69–88.
- Heller, R., Y. Heller, and M. Gorfine (2013). “A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances”. *Biometrika* 100.2, pp. 503–510.
- Horowitz, J. L. and C. F. Manski (1995). “Identification and robustness with contaminated and corrupted data”. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 281–302.

- Huber, P. J. (1992). “Robust estimation of a location parameter”. In: *Breakthroughs in statistics*. Springer, pp. 492–518.
- Jacobs, M. and F. Léger (2020). “A fast approach to optimal transport: the back-and-forth method”. *Numerische Mathematik* 146.3, pp. 513–544.
- Jakobsen, M. E. (2017). “Distance covariance in metric spaces: non-parametric independence testing in metric spaces”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03490*.
- Janssen, A. and T. Pauls (2003). “How do bootstrap and permutation tests work?” *Annals of statistics* 31.3, pp. 768–806.
- Kallenberg, O. (2006). *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kantorovich, L. V. (1942). “On the translocation of masses”. In: *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR (NS)*. Vol. 37, pp. 199–201.
- Kechris, A. (2012). *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Vol. 156. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Koyak, R. A. (1987). “On measuring internal dependence in a set of random variables”. *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 1215–1228.
- Kraskov, A., H. Stögbauer, R. G. Andrzejak, and P. Grassberger (2005). “Hierarchical clustering using mutual information”. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 70.2, p. 278.
- Lehmann, E. L. and J. P. Romano (2006). *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Lei, J. (2020). “Convergence and concentration of empirical measures under Wasserstein distance in unbounded functional spaces”. *Bernoulli* 26.1, pp. 767–798.
- Levinger, B. W. (1980). “The square root of a  $2 \times 2$  matrix”. *Mathematics Magazine* 53.4, pp. 222–224.
- Lin, T., N. Ho, and M. Jordan (2019). “On efficient optimal transport: an analysis of greedy and accelerated mirror descent algorithms”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, pp. 3982–3991.
- Liu, J., W. Yin, W. Li, and Y. T. Chow (2021). “Multilevel optimal transport: a fast approximation of Wasserstein-1 distances”. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 43.1, A193–A220.
- Lopez, A. T. and V. Jog (2018). “Generalization error bounds using Wasserstein distances”. In: *2018 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW) (Guangzhou)*. IEEE.
- Lyons, R. (2013). “Distance covariance in metric spaces”. *The Annals of Probability* 41.5, pp. 3284–3305.
- Lyons, R. (2018). “Errata to “Distance covariance in metric spaces””. *Annals of Probability* 46.4, pp. 2400–2405.
- Maes, F., A. Collignon, D. Vandermeulen, G. Marchal, and P. Suetens (1997). “Multimodality image registration by maximization of mutual information”. *IEEE transactions on Medical Imaging* 16.2, pp. 187–198.
- Mallows, C. L. (1972). “A note on asymptotic joint normality”. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 508–515.
- Marti, G., S. Andler, F. Nielsen, and P. Donnat (2017). “Exploring and measuring non-linear correlations: copulas, lightspeed transportation and clustering”. In: *NIPS 2016 Time Series Workshop*. PMLR, pp. 59–69.
- Matteson, D. S. and R. S. Tsay (2017). “Independent component analysis via distance covariance”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112 (518), pp. 623–637.

- Meckes, M. W. (2013). “Positive definite metric spaces”. *Positivity* 17.3, pp. 733–757.
- Müller, A. (1997). “Integral probability metrics and their generating classes of functions”. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pp. 429–443.
- Ozair, S., C. Lynch, Y. Bengio, A. v. d. Oord, S. Levine, and P. Sermanet (2019). “Wasserstein dependency measure for representation learning”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11780*.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Y. Zemel (2020). *An Invitation to Statistics in Wasserstein Space*. Springer Nature.
- Paninski, L. and M. Yajima (2008). “Undersmoothed kernel entropy estimators”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 54.9, pp. 4384–4388.
- Petersen, A. and H.-G. Müller (2019). “Wasserstein covariance for multiple random densities”. *Biometrika* 106.2, pp. 339–351.
- Peyré, G. and M. Cuturi (2019). “Computational optimal transport: with applications to data science”. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 11.5-6, pp. 355–607.
- Pluim, J. P., J. A. Maintz, and M. A. Viergever (2000). “Image registration by maximization of combined mutual information and gradient information”. In: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, pp. 452–461.
- Rachev, S. T. and L. Rüschemdorf (1998). *Mass Transportation Problems: Volume I: Theory, Volume II: Applications*. Vol. 1. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Reshef, D. N., Y. A. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, S. R. Grossman, G. McVean, P. J. Turnbaugh, E. S. Lander, M. Mitzenmacher, and P. C. Sabeti (2011). “Detecting novel associations in large data sets”. *Science* 334 (6062), pp. 1518–1524.
- Reshef, Y. A., D. N. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, P. C. Sabeti, and M. Mitzenmacher (2016). “Measuring dependence powerfully and equitably”. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17.1, pp. 7406–7468.
- Ripley, B. D. (1976). “The second-order analysis of stationary point processes”. *Journal of applied probability* 13.2, pp. 255–266.
- Santambrogio, F. (2015). *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians*. Vol. 55. Springer, pp. 58–63.
- Schmitzer, B. (2019). “Stabilized sparse scaling algorithms for entropy regularized transport problems”. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 41.3, A1443–A1481.
- Schrieber, J., D. Schuhmacher, and C. Gottschlich (2016). “Dotmark—a benchmark for discrete optimal transport”. *IEEE Access* 5, pp. 271–282.
- Schweizer, B. and E. F. Wolff (1981). “On nonparametric measures of dependence for random variables”. *Annals of Statistics* 9.4, pp. 879–885.
- Sejdinovic, D., B. Sriperumbudur, A. Gretton, and K. Fukumizu (2013). “Equivalence of distance-based and RKHS-based statistics in hypothesis testing”. *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 2263–2291.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). “A mathematical theory of communication”. *The Bell system technical journal* 27.3, pp. 379–423.
- Sommerfeld, M., J. Schrieber, Y. Zemel, and A. Munk (2019). “Optimal transport: fast probabilistic approximation with exact solvers”. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20.105, pp. 1–23.

- Sriperumbudur, B. K., K. Fukumizu, A. Gretton, B. Schölkopf, and G. R. Lanckriet (2012). “On the empirical estimation of integral probability metrics”. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 6, pp. 1550–1599.
- Sugiyama, M. and K. M. Borgwardt (2013). “Measuring statistical dependence via the mutual information dimension”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. IJCAI 2013. AAAI Press, 1692–1698.
- Székely, G. J., M. L. Rizzo, and N. K. Bakirov (2007). “Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances”. *The Annals of Statistics* 35 (6), pp. 2769–2794.
- Tameling, C., M. Sommerfeld, and A. Munk (2019). “Empirical optimal transport on countable metric spaces: distributional limits and statistical applications”. *Annals of Applied Probability* 29.5, pp. 2744–2781.
- Tameling, C., S. Stoldt, T. Stephan, J. Naas, S. Jakobs, and A. Munk (2021). “Colocalization for super-resolution microscopy via optimal transport”. *Nature Computational Science*. To appear.
- Tjøstheim, D., H. Otneim, and B. Støve (2018). “Statistical dependence: beyond Pearson’s  $\rho$ ”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10455*.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2008). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Varadarajan, V. S. (1958). “On the convergence of sample probability distributions”. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics (1933-1960)* 19.1/2, pp. 23–26.
- Villani, C. (2008). *Optimal Transport: Old and New*. Vol. 338. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Viola, P. and W. M. Wells III (1997). “Alignment by maximization of mutual information”. *International journal of computer vision* 24.2, pp. 137–154.
- Wang, H., M. Diaz, J. C. S. Santos Filho, and F. P. Calmon (2019). “An information-theoretic view of generalization via Wasserstein distance”. In: *International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, pp. 577–581.
- Wang, S., E. T. Arena, K. W. Eliceiri, and M. Yuan (2017). “Automated and robust quantification of colocalization in dual-color fluorescence microscopy: a nonparametric statistical approach”. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 27.2, pp. 622–636.
- Weed, J. and F. Bach (2019). “Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance”. *Bernoulli* 25.4A, pp. 2620–2648.
- Wiesel, J. (2021). “Measuring association with Wasserstein distances”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00356*.
- Xiao, Y. and W. Y. Wang (2019). “Disentangled representation learning with Wasserstein total correlation”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.12818*.
- Yao, S., X. Zhang, and X. Shao (2016). “Testing mutual independence in high dimension via distance covariance”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.09380*.
- Zhang, J., T. Liu, and D. Tao (2018). “An optimal transport view on generalization”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03270*.

## A Omitted statements and proofs

This appendix provides detailed proofs for all statements that are not proven in the main text. As a principal strategy, we often employ disintegrations to construct or deconstruct transport plans. This is often not the only viable method, however, and several of our results could alternatively be tackled by other techniques, like exploiting the cyclical monotonicity of optimal transport plans (see Villani 2008).

**Invariance, continuity, and convolutions.** In the following, we provide proofs for Lemma 1 (invariance of optimal transport), Proposition 4 (continuity of the transport dependency), as well as Lemma 2 (properties of optimal transport under convolutions). We furthermore provide the auxiliary Lemma 4 that controls optimal transport costs under uniform changes of the base costs.

*Proof of Lemma 1.* By a change of variables, we can immediately establish  $\pi c_f = (f \times f)_* \pi c$  for any  $\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)$ , where  $(f \times f)_* \pi \in C(f_* \mu, f_* \nu)$ . This shows

$$T_{c_f}(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)} \pi c_f = \inf_{\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)} (f \times f)_* \pi c \geq \inf_{\tilde{\pi} \in C(f_* \mu, f_* \nu)} \tilde{\pi} c = T_c(f_* \mu, f_* \nu).$$

To prove the reverse inequality, we fix some  $\tilde{\pi} \in C(f_* \mu, f_* \nu)$  and explicitly construct a measure  $\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)$  that satisfies  $\pi c_f = \tilde{\pi} c$ .

We construct  $\pi$  in two steps. First, we define an intermediate measure  $\pi'$  by the relation  $\pi'(dx_1, dy_2) = \tilde{\pi}(f(x_1), dy_2) \mu(dx_1)$ . In the second step, we set  $\pi(dx_1, dx_2) = \pi'(dx_1, f(x_2)) \nu(dx_2)$ . It is straightforward to check  $\pi' \in C(\mu, f_* \nu)$  and  $\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)$  by applying substitution and utilizing the properties of conditioning. In a similar vein, consecutive steps of substitution also show

$$\begin{aligned} \pi c_f &= \int c_f(x_1, x_2) \pi(dx_1, dx_2) \\ &= \int c(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \pi'(dx_1, f(x_2)) \nu(dx_2) \\ &= \int c(f(x_1), y_2) \pi'(dx_1, y_2) (f_* \nu)(dy_2) \\ &= \int c(f(x_1), y_2) \pi'(dx_1, dy_2) \\ &= \int c(f(x_1), y_2) \tilde{\pi}(f(x_1), dy_2) \mu(dx_1) \\ &= \int c(y_1, y_2) \tilde{\pi}(y_1, dy_2) (f_* \mu)(dy_1) = \tilde{\pi} c. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes  $T_{c_f}(\mu, \nu) \leq T_c(f_* \mu, f_* \nu)$  and thus the equality of the two transport costs. Note that  $T_c(f_* \mu, f_* \nu)$  and  $T_{c_f}(\mu, \nu)$  do not have to be finite for this result to hold, as all integrands are non-negative.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* In order to prove this claim, we first establish an auxiliary result.

**Lemma 3:** Let  $X$  be a Polish space and  $f, g: X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  continuous functions with  $g \leq f$ . For a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  converging weakly to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n f = \mu f < \infty \quad \text{implies} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n g = \mu g < \infty.$$

*Proof.* Assume  $\mu_n f \rightarrow \mu f < \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . According to Ambrosio et al. (2008, Lemma 5.1.7), this implies that  $f$  is uniformly integrable with respect to  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Fix some  $k > 0$ . Since  $g(x) > k$  implies  $f(x) > k$  for all  $x \in X$ , we find  $\mu_n(\mathbb{1}_{g>k} g) \leq \mu_n(\mathbb{1}_{f>k} f)$  for all  $n$  and conclude that  $g$  is also uniformly integrable with respect to  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . This in turn asserts that  $\mu_n g \rightarrow \mu g$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

We now return to the proof of Proposition 4. We know that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\gamma_n) \geq \tau(\gamma)$  due to the semi-continuity of  $\tau$  (Proposition 3). Thus, it is enough to show  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\gamma_n) =: \bar{\tau} \leq \tau(\gamma)$ . By passing to a (not explicitly named) subsequence, we can assume that  $\tau(\gamma_n)$  converges to  $\bar{\tau}$ .

Let  $\gamma_n \in C(\mu_n, \nu_n)$  and  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  for suitable marginal distributions  $\mu, \mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu, \nu_n \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . Since  $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$  by assumption, we note that  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  and  $\nu_n \rightarrow \nu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by the continuous mapping theorem. Like in the proof of Proposition 3, we conclude that  $\mu_n \otimes \nu_n$  converges weakly to  $\mu \otimes \nu$ . Next, we fix a point  $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times Y$ . According to Lemma 3,  $\mu_n d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p = \gamma_n d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p \rightarrow \gamma d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p = \mu d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where we set  $g(x, y) = d_X(x, x_0)^p$ ,  $f(x, y) = d((x, y), (x_0, y_0))^p$ , and used that  $\gamma_n f \rightarrow \gamma f < \infty$  (by assumption). Therefore,  $\mu_n$  converges  $p$ -weakly to  $\mu$ , and the same holds for  $\nu_n$  by an analog argument.

In the next step, we bound the metric  $d$  on  $X \times Y$  by applying the triangle inequality and using that  $(\sum_{i=1}^4 a_i)^p \leq (4 \max_i a_i)^p \leq 4^p \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i^p$  for numbers  $a_i \geq 0$  with  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ . We find

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)^p &\leq (d_X(x_1, x_0) + d_X(x_2, x_0) + d_Y(y_1, y_0) + d_Y(y_2, y_0))^p \\ &\leq 4^p (d_X(x_1, x_0)^p + d_X(x_2, x_0)^p + d_Y(y_1, y_0)^p + d_Y(y_2, y_0)^p) \\ &=: \delta(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\pi_n^*$  denote an (arbitrary) optimal transport plan between  $\gamma_n$  and  $\mu_n \otimes \nu_n$ , meaning  $\tau(\gamma_n) = \pi_n^* c$ . Applying the previous inequality yields

$$\pi_n^* c \leq \pi_n^* d^p \leq \pi_n^* \delta = 2 \cdot 4^p (\mu_n d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p + \nu_n d_Y(\cdot, y_0)^p),$$

where the right hand side converges as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , since we have established that  $\mu_n$  and  $\nu_n$  converge  $p$ -weakly. As the cost  $c$  is continuous, we can use the stability result in (Villani 2008, Theorem 5.20) and conclude that there is a subsequence  $\pi_{n_k}^*$  of optimal transport plans weakly converging to some optimal  $\pi^* \in C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$ , such that  $\tau(\gamma) = \pi^* c$ . Exploiting that

$$\pi_{n_k}^* \delta \rightarrow 2 \cdot 4^p (\mu d_X(\cdot, x_0)^p + \nu d_Y(\cdot, y_0)^p) = \pi^* \delta < \infty$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we can apply Lemma 3 with  $f = \delta$  and  $g = c$  to finally conclude

$$\bar{\tau} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n^* c = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{n_k}^* c = \pi^* c = \tau(\gamma),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4:** Let  $X$  be a Polish space and let  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  be cost functions on  $X$  that satisfy

$$\max(\|c_1/c_2 - 1\|_\infty, \|c_2/c_1 - 1\|_\infty) \leq a$$

under the convention  $0/0 = 1$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the sup norm and  $a > 0$ . Then for all  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu) < \infty$ , we find  $T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq (1+a)T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu) < \infty$  and

$$|T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu) - T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu)| \leq a \max(T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu), T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu)) \leq a(1+a) T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu).$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* We first note that  $c_1 \leq (1+a)c_2$ , which implies  $T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq (1+a)T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu)$ . Furthermore, if  $\pi_1^*$  and  $\pi_2^*$  denote optimal transport plans between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  under the costs  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , then

$$T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu) - T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu) = \pi_1^* c_1 - \pi_2^* c_2 \leq \pi_2^* |c_1 - c_2| \leq a \pi_2^* c_2 = a T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu)$$

with an analog result for  $T_{c_2}(\mu, \nu) - T_{c_1}(\mu, \nu)$ , which establishes the claims of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* To prove the first inequality, we reach for the dual formulation (8) of optimal transport. For any continuous and bounded potential  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $f_\kappa(x) = \kappa f(x + \cdot)$  for  $x \in X$ . It is easy to check that  $f_\kappa$  is again continuous and bounded. If  $g$  is another potential such that  $f \oplus g \leq c$ , we find

$$f_\kappa(x_1) + g_\kappa(x_2) = \kappa(f(x_1 + \cdot) + g(x_2 + \cdot)) \leq \int c(x_1 + y, x_2 + y) \kappa(dy) = c(x_1, x_2)$$

for any  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  due to the translation invariance of  $c$ . Therefore,  $f_\kappa \oplus g_\kappa \leq c$ . This implies

$$(\mu * \kappa) f + (\nu * \kappa) g = \mu f_\kappa + \nu g_\kappa \leq \sup \mu f' + \nu g' = T_c(\mu, \nu),$$

where the supremum is taken over continuous and bounded potentials  $f'$  and  $g'$  with  $f' \oplus g' \leq c$ . Since  $f$  and  $g$  were arbitrary,  $T_c(\mu * \kappa, \nu * \kappa) \leq T_c(\mu, \nu)$  follows. Note that this arguments holds even if  $T_c(\mu, \nu) = \infty$ , so there are no restrictions on  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .

For the upper bound in the second result, we construct an explicit transport plan  $\pi$  between  $\mu$  and  $\mu * \kappa$ . It is defined by  $\pi f = \int f(x_1, x_1 + x_2) \mu(dx_1) \kappa(dx_2)$  for any measurable map  $f: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . It is straightforward to check that  $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \mu * \kappa)$ , and we can conclude

$$T_c(\mu, \mu * \kappa) \leq \pi c = \int c(x_1, x_1 + x_2) \mu(dx_1) \kappa(dx_2) = \kappa h,$$

where we made use of the translation invariance  $c(x_1, x_2) = h(x_1 - x_2)$  and the symmetry  $c(x_1, x_2) = c(x_2, x_1)$  of  $c$  for any  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . Again, the argument stays valid even if  $T_c(\mu, \mu * \kappa) = \infty$ , so the results holds for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Upper bounds and marginal transport dependency.** The segment ahead establishes the upper bounds in Proposition 7 and 8, and contains proofs for Theorem 5 and 6 concerning the marginal transport dependency. While most of the guiding ideas are straightforward, several technical aspects have to be resolved.

*Proof of Proposition 7.* It is evident that  $c_{XY}$  is a cost function (non-negative, symmetric, lower semi-continuous). Furthermore, the second inequality in (23) follows trivially. To prove the first inequality, we construct a coupling  $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  that aims to prevent either horizontal or vertical movements, depending on which of the associated marginal costs is larger. We therefore define the set

$$S = \{(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \mid c_X(x_1, x_2) \geq c_Y(y_1, y_2)\} \subset (X \times Y)^2,$$

and note that  $S$  is symmetric under exchanging  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$  due to the symmetry of the costs  $c_X$  and  $c_Y$ . We write  $R$  to denote the complement of  $S$ , which is also symmetric. Next, we introduce the function  $r: (X \times Y)^2 \rightarrow (X \times Y)^2$  given by

$$r(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \begin{cases} (x_1, y_1, x_1, y_2) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \in S, \\ (x_2, y_2, x_1, y_2) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The proof is completed once we show that the coupling defined by  $\pi_2 = r_*(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$  has the correct marginals, meaning  $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$ , and that  $\pi_2 c$ , which is an upper bound for  $\tau(\gamma)$ , is in turn upper bounded by  $\text{diam}_{c_{XY}} \gamma$ . The second marginal  $\mu \otimes \nu$  is an immediate consequence of the definition of  $r$  and  $\pi_2$ . To check the first marginal, we consider an arbitrary positive and measurable function  $f: X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then, if  $q$  denotes the two first components of  $r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int f(x_1, y_1) d\pi_2(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) &= \int f(q(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) \\ &= \int \mathbb{1}_S(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) f(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_1, y_2) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) \\ &\quad + \int \mathbb{1}_R(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) f(x_2, y_2) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) \\ &= \int f(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) = \gamma f, \end{aligned}$$

where we swapped the roles of  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$  to establish the third equality. This is permissible due to the symmetry of  $S$  (and  $R$ ). Similarly, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\gamma) &\leq \pi_2 c \\ &= \int_S c(x_1, y_1, x_1, y_2) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) + \int_R c(x_2, y_2, x_1, y_2) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) \\ &\leq \int_S c_Y(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) + \int_R c_X(x_1, x_2) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) \\ &= \int \min(c_X(x_1, x_2), c_Y(y_1, y_2)) d\gamma(x_1, y_1) d\gamma(x_2, y_2) = (\gamma \otimes \gamma) c_{XY}, \end{aligned}$$

where we bounded  $c$  by  $c_Y$  and  $c_X$  via condition (18). □



*Proof of Proposition 8.* In order to prove this result, we first introduce an alternative characterization of the measurability of probability kernels that is employed in Villani (2008).

**Lemma 5 (measurability of kernels):** Let  $X$  be Polish and let  $(\mu_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  be a family of probability measures indexed in a measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . Then

$$\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(A) \text{ is measurable for all Borel sets } A \subset X \iff \omega \mapsto \mu_\omega \text{ is measurable,}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is equipped with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra with respect to the topology of weak convergence of measures.

*Proof.* Theorem 17.24 in Kechris (2012) asserts that the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is generated by functions  $r_A: \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of the form  $\nu \mapsto \nu(A)$  for Borel sets  $A \subset X$ . This means that  $\mathcal{G} = \{r_A^{-1}(B) \mid B \subset [0, 1] \text{ Borel and } A \subset X \text{ Borel}\}$  is a generator of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . In particular, each  $r_A$  is measurable.

Thus, if  $\mu: \omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  is measurable, then  $\omega \mapsto (r_A \circ \mu)(\omega) = \mu_\omega(A)$  is also measurable as composition of measurable functions. Conversely, if  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(A)$  is measurable for each Borel set  $A \subset X$ , then  $\mu^{-1}(G) \in \mathcal{F}$  for each  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a generator, this suffices to show that  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  is measurable.  $\square$

We now return to the proof of Proposition 8, where we aim to improve the inner integral occurring in equation (21). To do so, we let  $\pi_x^* \in C(\gamma(x, \cdot), \mu)$  be an optimal transport plan with respect to the base costs  $c_Y$  for each  $x \in X$ . Corollary 5.22 in Villani (2008) together with the continuity of  $c_X$  and Lemma 5 above guarantee that  $\pi_x^*$  can be selected such that  $(\pi_x^*)_{x \in X}$  is a probability kernel. We can thus define  $\pi_3 \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$  via

$$d\pi_3(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \pi_{x_1}^*(dy_1, dy_2) \delta_{x_1}(dx_2) \mu(dx_1).$$

It can easily be checked that the marginals of  $\pi_3$  match  $\gamma$  and  $\mu \otimes \nu$ . Using condition (18), we find

$$\tau(\gamma) \leq \pi_3 c \leq \int \left( \int c_Y(y_1, y_2) \pi_x^*(dy_1, dy_2) \right) \mu(dx) = \int (\pi_x^* c_Y) \mu(dx),$$

which shows the first inequality of the proposition. To assert the second inequality, one just has to note that  $\pi_x^* c_Y \leq (\gamma(x, \cdot) \otimes \nu) c_Y$  for each  $x \in X$  by construction of  $\pi_x^*$  as optimal plan.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.* We begin the proof by showing the following auxiliary statement.

**Lemma 6:** Let  $X$  be a Polish space and  $c$  a positive continuous cost function on  $X$ . For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $\text{supp } \mu \subset \text{supp } \nu$  and  $T_c(\mu, \nu) < \infty$ , it holds that

$$T_c(\mu, \nu) = (\mu \otimes \nu)c \iff \mu = \delta_x \text{ for some } x \in X.$$

*Proof.* The implication from right to left is trivial, since  $\mu \otimes \nu$  is the only feasible coupling if  $\mu$  is a point mass. To show the reverse direction, we assume that  $\mu \neq \delta_x$  for any  $x \in X$  and show that  $T_c(\mu, \nu) = (\mu \otimes \nu)c$  is impossible. First, we pick two distinct points  $x_1 \neq x_2$  from the support of  $\mu$ . By assumption, these points also lie in the support of  $\nu$ . To show that  $\mu \otimes \nu$  cannot be an optimal transport plan, it is sufficient to show that  $\text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu) = \text{supp} \mu \times \text{supp} \nu$  is not  $c$ -cyclically monotone (Villani 2008). This is easy to see, since for  $(x_1, x_2), (x_2, x_1) \in \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$ , we find

$$c(x_1, x_2) + c(x_2, x_1) > c(x_1, x_1) + c(x_2, x_2) = 0$$

due to the positivity of  $c$ . □

Returning to the proof of Theorem 5, we note that  $\tau^Y(\gamma)$  and  $\text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$  are equal iff

$$\int T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu) \mu(dx) = \int (\gamma(x, \cdot) \otimes \nu) c_Y \mu(dx). \quad (39)$$

Evidently, these two values are the same if  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$ , since this implies  $\gamma(x, \cdot) = \delta_{\varphi(x)}$  for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ . So it only remains to show that equality in (39) implies  $\gamma = (\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu$  for some  $\mu$ -almost surely defined measurable function  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ .

Since the right hand side in (39) is by assumption finite and  $0 \leq T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu) \leq (\gamma(x, \cdot) \otimes \nu) c_Y$  holds for each  $x \in X$ , we find that equality in (39) can only hold if

$$T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu) = (\gamma(x, \cdot) \otimes \nu) c_Y$$

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ . As  $\text{supp} \gamma(x, \cdot) \subset \text{supp} \nu$  also holds for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$  (see below), we can apply Lemma 6 and find that  $\gamma(x, \cdot) = \delta_{\varphi(x)}$  for a  $\mu$ -almost surely defined function  $\varphi$ . The measurability of  $\varphi$  follows from the measurability of the maps  $x \mapsto \gamma(x, A)$  for all Borel sets  $A \subset Y$ , since  $x \in \varphi^{-1}(A)$  is equivalent to  $\gamma(x, A) = 1$  for all  $x \in X$  for which  $\varphi$  is defined by the construction above.

A brief argument to see that  $\text{supp} \gamma(x, \cdot) \subset \text{supp} \nu$  for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$  goes as follows: note that  $\text{supp} \gamma \subset \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu) = \text{supp} \mu \times \text{supp} \nu$  and write

$$1 = \int d\gamma = \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{supp} \nu}(y) \gamma(dx, dy) = \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{supp} \nu}(y) \gamma(x, dy) \mu(dx),$$

which proves that  $\gamma(x, \text{supp} \nu) = 1$  for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 6.* We begin by defining a set that contains all vertical movements along the fibers  $\{x\} \times Y$ , given by  $S = \{(x, y_1, x, y_2) \mid x \in X, y_1, y_2 \in Y\} \subset (X \times Y)^2$ . Due to the definition of  $c_\infty$ , it is evident that

$$\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) = \inf_{\substack{\pi \in C(Y, \mu \otimes \nu) \\ \pi(S)=1}} \pi c_Y. \quad (40)$$

We use this characterization to show that the equality  $\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) = \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma)$  holds. First, we define  $f: S \rightarrow X \times Y^2$  via  $f(x, y_1, x, y_2) = (x, y_1, y_2)$ . For each  $\pi$  that is feasible in the infimum

in (40), we furthermore define  $\pi_x = (f_*\pi)(x, \cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(Y \times Y)$  for  $x \in X$ . One can check that  $\pi_x \in C(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu)$  holds  $\mu$ -almost surely due to the (almost sure) uniqueness property of disintegrations. If  $\pi_x^* \in C(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu)$  are a measurable selection of optimal transport plans for the problem  $T_{c_Y}(\gamma(x, \cdot), \nu)$  as in the proof of Proposition 8, we observe

$$\pi c_Y = \int_S c_Y d\pi = \int c_Y d(f_*\pi) = \int (\pi_x c_Y) \mu(dx) \geq \int (\pi_x^* c_Y) \mu(dx) = \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma).$$

Taking the infimum on the left hand side and applying (40) implies  $\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) \geq \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma)$ . Since we already know  $\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) \leq \tau_{c_Y}^Y(\gamma)$  by Proposition 8, this proves equality.

It is left to show that  $\tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma) \rightarrow \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma)$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $c_\infty \geq c_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha > 0$ , we know that  $\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) \geq \tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma)$  and it is accordingly sufficient to show  $\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma) = \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma)$ . We thus fix  $\bar{\tau} = \liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{c_\alpha}(\gamma)$  and consider a diverging sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \infty)$  such that  $\tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\gamma) \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ . Due to Prokhorov's theorem and the existence of optimal transport plans, we can assume that there are couplings  $\pi_n^*$  and  $\pi_\infty$  in  $C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  that satisfy  $\tau_{c_{\alpha_n}}(\gamma) = \pi_n^* c_{\alpha_n}$  and  $\pi_n^* \rightarrow \pi_\infty$ . We use these properties to lead the assumption  $\infty > \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) > \bar{\tau}$  to a contradiction. If this assumption were true, observe that for any  $k > 0$ ,

$$\infty > \bar{\tau} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n^* c_{\alpha_n} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \pi_n^* c_X \geq k \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n^* c_X \geq k \pi_\infty c_X,$$

where the final inequality follows from the lower semi-continuity of the mapping  $\pi \mapsto \pi h$  under weak convergence for lower semi-continuous integrands  $h$  that are bounded from below (Santambrogio 2015, Proposition 7.1). Since  $k$  is arbitrary, we conclude  $\pi_\infty c_X = 0$ , which implies  $\pi_\infty(S) = 1$  due to the positivity of  $c_X$ . Employing representation (40) of  $\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma)$ , we find the contradiction

$$\tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma) > \bar{\tau} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n^* c_{\alpha_n} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n^* c_Y \geq \pi_\infty c_Y \geq \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma).$$

This establishes  $\bar{\tau} = \tau_{c_\infty}(\gamma)$  and finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Contracting couplings and maps.** We next provide proofs and statements that were omitted in our work on contractions in Section 4. This includes the proof of our main result, Theorem 7, as well as the formulation of two auxiliary statements (Lemma 7 and 8), which simplify Theorem 7 if sufficient regularity is imposed on the involved costs.

*Proof of Theorem 7.* We first show the second part. Assuming that  $\tau(\gamma) = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu < \infty$ , we use the upper bound in Proposition 7 to conclude  $\text{diam}_{c_X \gamma} \gamma = \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$ , which can be stated as

$$\int \min(c_X(x_1, x_2), c_Y(y_1, y_2)) d(\gamma \otimes \gamma)(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = \int c_Y(y_1, y_2) d(\nu \otimes \nu)(y_1, y_2).$$

This implies  $(\gamma \otimes \gamma)(c_Y \leq c_X) = 1$ , since the left hand side in the equality above would otherwise be strictly smaller than the right hand side. Recalling that  $c_X = h \circ k_X$  and  $c_Y = h \circ d_Y$  for a strictly increasing  $h$ , we find  $(\gamma \otimes \gamma)(d_Y \leq k_X) = 1$ , meaning that  $\gamma$  is almost surely contracting.

To prove the first statement, we show that  $\tau(\gamma) \geq \text{diam}_{c_Y} \nu$ , which is sufficient to assert equality due to Proposition 6. Let  $\pi \in C(\mu, \nu)$  be arbitrary. We define  $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}((X \times Y)^2 \times Y)$  via the relation

$d\bar{\lambda}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y, y_2) = \gamma(x_2, dy) d\pi(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ . One can readily establish that integrating out  $y_2 \in Y$  yields a measure  $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma, \gamma) \subset \mathcal{P}((X \times Y)^2)$ . In particular,  $\text{supp } \lambda \subset \text{supp } \gamma \times \text{supp } \gamma$ , which implies  $\lambda(d_Y \leq k_X) = 1$  by the assumption that  $\gamma$  is contracting on its support. Combining this insight with the strict monotonicity of  $h$  and the triangle inequality for  $d_Y$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \pi c &= \int h(k_X(x_1, x_2) + d_Y(y_1, y_2)) d\bar{\lambda}(x_1, y_2, x_1, y, y_2) \\ &\geq \int h(d_Y(y_1, y) + d_Y(y_1, y_2)) d\bar{\lambda}(x_1, y_2, x_1, y, y_2) \\ &\geq \int h(d_Y(y, y_2)) d\bar{\lambda}(x_1, y_2, x_1, y, y_2) \\ &= \int c_Y(y, y_2) dv(y) dv(y_2) = \text{diam}_{c_Y}(v). \end{aligned}$$

One can check that the independence in the final line follows from the definition of  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Taking the infimum over  $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)$  now yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 7:** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and let  $k_X$  and  $d_Y$  be continuous cost functions on  $X$  and  $Y$ . Then  $\gamma$  is contracting on its support iff it is almost surely contracting (with respect to  $k_X$  and  $d_Y$ ).

*Proof of Lemma 7.* It is clear that a contracting coupling  $\gamma$  is almost surely contracting since the set  $(X \times Y)^2 \setminus (\text{supp } \gamma)^2$  is a null set for  $\gamma \otimes \gamma$ . Let  $\gamma$  therefore be almost surely contracting. If  $k_X$  and  $d_Y$  are continuous and there are  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \text{supp } \gamma$  with  $d_Y(y_1, y_2) > k_X(x_1, x_2)$ , then we also find an open neighbourhood  $U \subset (X \times Y)^2$  of  $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \in (\text{supp } \gamma)^2 = \text{supp } (\gamma \otimes \gamma)$  where this inequality is true. By the definition of the support, we conclude  $(\gamma \otimes \gamma)(U) > 0$  and  $\gamma$  thus fails to be almost surely contracting.  $\square$

**Lemma 8 (uniform extension):** Let  $X$  be Polish and  $(Y, d_Y)$  a Polish metric space, and let  $k_X: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a continuous cost function on  $X$ . Any function  $\tilde{\varphi}: D \rightarrow Y$  defined on a subset  $D \subset X$  that satisfies

$$d_Y(\tilde{\varphi}(x_1), \tilde{\varphi}(x_2)) \leq k_X(x_1, x_2) \tag{41}$$

for all  $x_1, x_2 \in D$  can uniquely be extended to a function  $\varphi: \bar{D} \rightarrow Y$  on the closure  $\bar{D}$  of  $D$  that satisfies (41) for all  $x_1, x_2 \in \bar{D}$ . In particular,  $\varphi$  is continuous.

*Proof of Lemma 8.* Let  $x \in \bar{D} \setminus D$  and  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $D$  converging to  $x$ . Set  $y_n = \tilde{\varphi}(x_n)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and observe that  $d_Y(y_n, y_m) \leq k_X(x_n, x_m)$  for all  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, the sequence  $(y_n)_n$  is Cauchy: if it were not Cauchy, there would exist an  $\epsilon > 0$  and values  $n_r, m_r \geq r$  for each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d_Y(y_{n_r}, y_{m_r}) \geq \epsilon$ . However, observing  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} k_X(x_{n_r}, x_{m_r}) \rightarrow 0$  due to

continuity of  $k_X$  leads this to a contradiction. Consequently, the sequence  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a unique limit  $y \in Y$  due to the completeness of  $(Y, d_Y)$ .

The limit point  $y$  does not depend on the chosen sequence: if  $(x'_n)_n$  is another sequence converging to  $x$ , and  $y'$  is the corresponding limit in  $Y$ , continuity of  $d_Y$  and  $k_X$  make sure that

$$0 \leq d_Y(y, y') = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_Y(y_n, y'_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_X(x_n, x'_n) = 0.$$

Therefore, a well-defined extension of  $\tilde{\varphi}$  to  $\bar{D}$  exists. For any  $x, x' \in \bar{D}$ , this extension  $\varphi$  satisfies

$$d_Y(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_Y(\tilde{\varphi}(x_n), \tilde{\varphi}(x'_n)) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_X(x_n, x'_n) = k_X(x, x')$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any sequence  $(x_n, x'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D \times D$  that converges to  $(x, x') \in \bar{D} \times \bar{D}$ .  $\square$

**Properties of the transport correlation.** We next present proofs of Proposition 9 to 11 regarding basic properties of the transport correlation. Most of the claimed properties are direct consequences of previously established results. Additional arguments are mainly required for properties 5 and 6 in Proposition 9 and property 2 in Proposition 11. Recall from Section 5 that we focus on additive costs of the form

$$c = (\alpha d_X + d_Y)^p$$

on Polish metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  for  $\alpha, p > 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 9.* Properties 1 and 2, which characterize when  $\rho_\alpha(\gamma)$  equals 0 and 1, follow from Theorem 1 in Section 2 and from Corollary 1 in Section 4. The invariance in property 3 is a consequence of Proposition 2. If  $\gamma$  is restricted to a set with fixed marginal  $p_*^Y \gamma = \nu$ , then  $\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu$  is constant and convexity of  $\gamma \mapsto \rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p = \tau(\gamma) / \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu$  is guaranteed by convexity of  $\tau$  as stated in Proposition 1. This shows property 4.

We now turn to the continuity in property 5. Let  $\nu_n$  and  $\nu$  denote the respective second marginals of  $\gamma_n$  and  $\gamma$ . For convenience, we write  $\delta_n = \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu_n = (\nu_n \otimes \nu_n) d_Y^p$ . Our first goal is to show that  $p$ -weak convergence of  $\gamma_n$  to  $\gamma$  implies  $\delta_n \rightarrow \delta = \text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To do so, we fix some  $y_0 \in Y$  and define the function

$$f(y_1, y_2) = 2^p (d_Y(y_1, y_0)^p + d_Y(y_0, y_2)^p)$$

for  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ . Noting that  $(a + b)^p \leq 2^p (a^p + b^p)$  for  $a, b \geq 0$ , we find  $d_Y^p \leq f$  by application of the triangle inequality. Consequently,

$$\delta_n = (\nu_n \otimes \nu_n) d_Y^p \leq (\nu_n \otimes \nu_n) f = 2^{p+1} \nu_n d_Y(\cdot, y_0)^p \rightarrow 2^{p+1} \nu d_Y(\cdot, y_0)^p$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The convergence in this inequality follows from the fact that  $\nu_n$  converges  $p$ -weakly if  $\gamma_n$  converges  $p$ -weakly, which was shown in the proof of Proposition 4. Reaching back to Lemma 3 (setting  $g = d_Y^p$ ,  $f = f$ , and  $\mu_n = \nu_n \otimes \nu_n$ ), we conclude that  $\delta_n$  indeed converges to  $\delta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Next, since  $c = (\alpha d_X + d_Y)^p \leq \max(1, \alpha)^p (d_X + d_Y)^p$ , we can apply Proposition 4 and

find  $\tau_c(\gamma_n) \rightarrow \tau_c(\gamma)$ . Setting  $c_n = (\alpha_n d_X + d_Y)^p$ , it is straightforward to see that  $\|c/c_n - 1\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$  due to  $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha > 0$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which lets us use Proposition 5 to obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\alpha_n}(\gamma_n)^p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau_{c_n}(\gamma_n)}{\delta_n} = \frac{\tau_c(\gamma)}{\delta} = \rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p.$$

Finally, the monotonicity of  $\alpha \mapsto \rho_\alpha(\gamma)$  in property 6 is trivial, since  $c$  increases with  $\alpha$ . The concavity of  $\alpha \mapsto \rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p$  for  $p \leq 1$  and fixed  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  with marginals  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  follows from the fact that pointwise infima over concave functions are again concave. Indeed, we have that

$$\rho_\alpha(\gamma)^p = \frac{1}{\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu} \inf_{\pi \in C(\gamma, \mu \otimes \nu)} \pi(\alpha d_X + d_Y)^p,$$

where the mapping  $\alpha \mapsto \pi(\alpha d_X + d_Y)^p$  is concave for any fixed  $\pi$  if  $p \leq 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 10.* Due to Theorem 6, results established for  $\tau$  under generic lower semi-continuous costs  $c$  also hold for the marginal transport dependency with  $\alpha = \infty$ . Therefore, properties 1, 3, and 4 follow from the general results stated in Theorem 1, Proposition 2, and Proposition 1. Note that we can allow dilatations  $f_Y$  in property 3 (instead of just isometries), since we normalize by  $\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu$  in definition (33) of  $\rho_\infty$ , which neutralizes the dilatation factor  $\beta > 0$ . Property 2 relies on the specific cost structure for  $\alpha = \infty$  and was derived separately in Theorem 5.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 11.* Properties 1, 4, and 5 follow in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 9. The symmetry property 6 is trivial and directly visible from the definition of  $\rho_*$ . Property 3 is a consequence of the general invariance of the transport dependence under isometries (Proposition 2). We can extend this to dilatations  $f_X$  and  $f_Y$  since we divide by the respective diameters in definition (35) of  $\rho_*$ , which nullifies any scaling factors.

Regarding property 2, let  $\gamma \in C(\mu, \nu)$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ . We equip the spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  with the scaled metrics

$$\tilde{d}_X = d_X / (\text{diam}_{d_X^p} \mu)^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{d}_Y = d_Y / (\text{diam}_{d_Y^p} \nu)^{1/p}.$$

According to Corollary 1 (combined with Lemma 8), a value of  $\rho_*(\gamma) = 1$  is equivalent to there being a contraction  $\varphi$  from  $(\text{supp } \mu, \tilde{d}_X)$  to  $(Y, \tilde{d}_Y)$  that satisfies  $(\text{id}, \varphi)_* \mu = \gamma$ . This in particular means  $\varphi_* \mu = \nu$ . Defining  $\tilde{d}_\varphi(x_1, x_2) = \tilde{d}_Y(\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2))$  for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \text{supp } \mu$ , we know that  $\tilde{d}_\varphi \leq d_X$  since  $\varphi$  is a contraction. By a change of variables, we calculate

$$(\mu \otimes \mu) \tilde{d}_\varphi^p = (\nu \otimes \nu) \tilde{d}_Y^p = 1 = (\mu \otimes \mu) \tilde{d}_X^p$$

and assert  $\tilde{d}_\varphi = \tilde{d}_X$  to hold  $(\mu \otimes \mu)$ -almost surely. Since  $\tilde{d}_X$  and  $\tilde{d}_\varphi$  are continuous, we can conclude that  $\varphi: (\text{supp } \mu, \tilde{d}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tilde{d}_Y)$  is an isometry. Thus,  $\varphi$  is a dilatation under the metrics  $d_X$  and  $d_Y$ . Note that its dilatation factor  $\beta$  is uniquely given by  $\alpha_*$  defined in equation (34). Due to the symmetry of the setting, the same arguments also hold for  $\psi$  instead of  $\varphi$  by exchanging the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$ .  $\square$

## B Additional Simulations

This appendix contains a range of figures that supplement Section 6 and further illustrate the behaviour of the transport correlation on noisy datasets.

**Convex noise.** Like Figure 10 and 11 in Section 6, the upcoming Figures 15 to 20 compare  $\rho_*$ ,  $\rho_3$ , and several other dependency coefficients under the convex noise model (37) for different geometries  $\gamma$ . One particularly noteworthy observation is that  $\rho_*$  has a higher (or at least the same) discriminative power compared to the distance correlation, Pearson correlation, and Spearman correlation for all geometries considered.

**Gaussian additive noise.** We repeated our previous simulations under a Gaussian additive noise model instead of convex noise (Figure 21 to Figure 28). For a given level of noise  $\sigma > 0$  and a given base distribution  $\gamma$ , we consider the noisy relationships  $(\xi, \zeta) \sim \gamma^\sigma$ , where

$$\gamma^\sigma = \gamma * \kappa \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma \text{Id}_2).$$

In this setting, we notice that the Pearson and Spearman correlations as well as the distance correlation have a higher power than  $\rho_*$  if  $\gamma$  exhibits a clear monotonic tendency. If, on the other hand, the linear correlation of the underlying distribution  $\gamma$  is low, then we observe similar trends as for the convex noise model.

**Influence of  $p$ .** Finally, we use the same distributions and noise models as above to study the effect of the parameter  $p$  on the transport correlation coefficient  $\rho_*$ , see definition (35). From Figure 29 to Figure 44, we compare the values of  $\rho_*$  when the parameter  $p$  is set equal to 0.5, 1, and 2, respectively. The setting is the same as for the previous comparisons, the only difference being that just 9 (instead of 29) random permutations are used for the permutation tests. One observation that holds for all geometries  $\gamma$  is that the box plots of the estimates of  $\tau$  are generally very similar for all  $p$ . In contrast, we observe that the parameter  $p = 0.5$  often provides a (slightly) higher discriminative power against independence than the choices  $p = 1$  or  $p = 2$ .




Figure 15




Figure 16






Figure 17




Figure 18




Figure 19




Figure 20




Figure 21




Figure 22




Figure 23




Figure 24




Figure 25




Figure 26




Figure 27




Figure 28




Figure 29




Figure 30




Figure 31




Figure 32






Figure 33




Figure 34




Figure 35




Figure 36




Figure 37




Figure 38




Figure 39




Figure 40




Figure 41




Figure 42




Figure 43




Figure 44