

Asymptotic Normality of Gini Correlation in High Dimension with Applications to the K-sample Problem

Yongli Sang^a and Xin Dang^{b*}

^aDepartment of Mathematics, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA 70504, USA

^bDepartment of Mathematics, University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677, USA

March 2, 2022

Abstract

The categorical Gini correlation proposed by Dang *et al.* [6] is a dependence measure between a categorical and a numerical variables, which can characterize independence of the two variables. The asymptotic distributions of the sample correlation under the dependence and independence have been established when the dimension of the numerical variable is fixed. However, its asymptotic distribution for high dimensional data has not been explored. In this paper, we develop the central limit theorem for the Gini correlation for the more realistic setting where the dimensionality of the numerical variable is diverging. We then construct a powerful and consistent test for the K -sample problem based on the asymptotic normality. The proposed test not only avoids computation burden but also gains power over the permutation procedure. Simulation studies and real data illustrations show that the proposed test is more competitive to existing methods across a broad range of realistic situations, especially in unbalanced cases.

Keywords: Asymptotic normality; Categorical Gini correlation; Distance correlation; High dimensional K-sample test.

MSC 2010 subject classification: 62H15, 62H20

1 Introduction

Recently, Dang *et al.* [6] proposed a categorical Gini correlation, $\text{gCor}(\mathbf{X}, Y)$, to measure the dependence between a numerical variable \mathbf{X} and a categorical variable Y which has K levels. This dependence measure has been shown appealing for its nice properties. Firstly, it can mutually characterize the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , i.e., \mathbf{X} and Y are independent if and only if it is zero. Secondly, the Gini correlation has a nice interpretation as a ratio of the between Gini variation and the total Gini variation, analogous to Pearson R^2 in ANOVA model. Thirdly, it is ready to be generalized to the kernel reproducing Hilbert space to deal with complex data type of \mathbf{X} [33].

Székely, Rizzo and Bakirov [26] introduced the distance correlation, $\text{dCor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$, for all random vectors \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} in arbitrary dimensions and it has attracted much attention since then, see e.g. [10, 18, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35] and references therein. When the variable \mathbf{Y} in $\text{dCor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$

*CONTACT: Xin Dang; Email: xdang@olemiss.edu

is categorical, the new Gini correlation is very closely related to the distance correlation. For example, when the categorical variable Y takes two values ($K = 2$), the two correlations are only different on a scaling factor. While for the general K , $\text{gCor}(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ has a better presentation and easier interpretation than $\text{dCor}(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ because the Gini correlation considers the nature of the categorical variable. And the sample Gini correlation is more computationally and statistically efficient than the sample distance correlation.

A fruitful research has been developed to study the asymptotic distributions of the sample distance correlation in different scenarios. For $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, the standard sample distance correlation converges in distribution to a mixture of chi-squared distribution as the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$ and p, q are fixed [26]; a bias corrected version of the sample correlation proposed in [29] to address the bias problem of the standard one in high dimension; Huo and Székely [14] showed that the unbiased estimator converges to a mixture of centralized chi-squared distributions for fixed p, q ; while when $p, q \rightarrow \infty$ and n is fixed, Székely and Rizzo [29] derived a t -distribution limit of the unbiased sample correlation by assuming that the components of the high-dimensional vectors are i.i.d. (independently and identically distributed); Zhu *et al.* [34] extended the result to more general assumptions in the high-dimensional medium-sample-size setting (HDMSS) and Gao *et al.* [10] have developed central limit theorems in a more realistic setting where both sample size and dimensionality diverge in the full range (HDHSS). Motivated by their inspiring results, we will study the asymptotic distributions of the sample Gini correlation in high dimension when both the sample size and the dimensionality diverge to infinity, which has not been addressed in literature. Dang *et al.* [6] studied the asymptotic distribution of the V -statistical sample correlation, $\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ in (6), when the dimension p of \mathbf{X} is fixed. They proved that $\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ admits a normal limit when \mathbf{X} and Y are dependent and converges in distribution to a quadratic form of centered Gaussian random variables when $\text{gCor}(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 0$. We will work with an unbiased U -statistical correlation, $\text{gCor}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ of (10), in high dimension. The first objective of this paper is to establish the asymptotic distribution of $\text{gCor}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ when both the sample size and the dimensionality are diverging.

As the distance correlation, zero Gini correlation mutually implies the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , which can be applied to the K -sample problem. Testing the equality of K distributions from independent random samples is a classical statistical problem encountered in almost every field. Due to its fundamental importance and wide applications, research for this K -sample problem has been kept active since 1940's. For example, the widely used and well-studied tests such as Cramér-von Mises test [16], Anderson-Darling test [7, 24] and their variations utilize different norms on the difference of empirical distribution functions, while some [1, 20] are based on the comparison of density estimators if the underlying distributions are continuous. Other tests [25, 9] are based on characteristic function difference measures. Rizzo and Székely [22] proposed a new method called distance components (DISCO) by partitioning the total distance dispersion of the pooled samples into the within distance and between distance components analogous to the way of variances components in ANOVA. The test statistic is the ratio of the between variation and the within variation, where the between variation is the weighted sum of all two-sample energy distances. Equivalently, Dang *et al.* [6] conducted a test based on the ratio of the between variation and the total variation, in which the ratio defines a dependence measure. Heller, Heller and Gorfine [12] and Heller *et al.* [13] proposed a dependence test based on rank distances. All those distance-based tests require a permutation procedure to determine the critical values. Sang, Dang and Zhao [23] developed a nonparametric test applying the jackknife empirical likelihood which has a standard limiting chi-squared distribution. Other tests viewing the K -sample test as an independent test between a numerical and categorical variable can be found in [4, 15, 32]. However, most of the afore-mentioned work focuses on the

fixed dimensional case and perform poorly or may even fail in high dimension.

Recently, several distance-based tests for two-sample problem have been proposed in high dimension, see [3, 5, 18, 35]. Li [18] constructed a test based on interpoint distances under HDLSS. Zhu and Shao [35] studied the two-sample problem using energy distance (ED) and maximum mean discrepancy with Gaussian and Laplacian kernels under HDLSS and HDMSS, in which they have shown that all these tests are inconsistent constructed under some scenarios. The general K -sample testing in high dimension will be more challenging and the results in literature are very scarce. Mukhopadhyay and Wang [21] constructed a graph-based nonparametric approach under HDLSS. However, the power for the test is extremely low under some settings. Gao *et al.* [10] tested the K -sample problem in high dimension based the distance correlation. Our second objective is to use the asymptotic results of the Gini correlation to construct a powerful dependence-based K -sample test in high dimension. The simulation study shows that our test performs similarly to the test based on distance correlation when the sample sizes are equal. However, the Gini correlation based test has higher powers than that of the distance correlation based one in the unbalanced cases. Both the dependence based tests are better than the graph based test.

Throughout this paper, if not mentioned otherwise, the letter C , with or without a subscript, denotes a generic positive finite constant whose exact value is independent of sample sizes and may change from line to line. $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm, that is, $\|\mathbf{a}\| = \sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \cdots + a_p^2}$ for a p -vector, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p)^T$, in \mathbb{R}^p . For two sequences, a_n, b_n , of real numbers, $a_n = o(b_n)$ means $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$, and $a_n = O(b_n)$ means $L \leq a_n/b_n \leq U$ for some finite constants L and U . For random variable sequences, similar notations $o_p(n)$ and $O_p(n)$ are used to stand for the relationships holding in probability.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the Gini correlation between a numerical and categorical variable and review the existing statistical inference. Section 3 presents a U -estimator for the Gini correlation and the central limit theorem for the U -estimator when both the sample sizes and dimensionality are diverging. The K -sample test is proposed and its consistency is established. In Section 4, we conduct simulation studies to evaluate the performance of the performance of the proposed test statistic. A real data analysis is illustrated in Section 5 to compare the proposed test with current existing approaches. We conclude and discuss future works in Section 6. Some detailed derivations of Remarks and all technical proofs are provided in Appendix.

2 Categorical Gini correlation

2.1 Gini correlation

Suppose that the categorical variable Y takes values L_1, \dots, L_K and its distribution P_Y is $P(Y = L_k) = p_k > 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Assume that the conditional distribution of a p -variate numerical variable \mathbf{X} given $Y = L_k$ is F_k . Then the joint distribution of \mathbf{X} and Y is $p_k F_k(\mathbf{x})$ and the marginal distribution of \mathbf{X} is $F = \sum_k p_k F_k$. When the conditional distribution of \mathbf{X} given Y is the same as the marginal distribution of \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{X} and Y are independent. Otherwise, they are dependent. The categorical Gini covariance and correlation measure dependence based on the weighted distance between marginal and conditional distributions.

Denote ψ_k and ψ as the characteristic functions of F_k and F , respectively and define a

weighted L_2 distance between ψ_k and ψ as

$$T(F_k, F) = c(p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \frac{|\psi_k(\mathbf{t}) - \psi(\mathbf{t})|^2}{\|\mathbf{t}\|^{p+1}} d\mathbf{t}, \quad (1)$$

where $c(p) = \Gamma((p+1)/2)/\pi^{(p+1)/2}$. Then the Gini covariance between \mathbf{X} and Y is defined as

$$\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k T(F_k, F). \quad (2)$$

We see that $\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) \geq 0$ and $\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 0$ mutually implies independence of \mathbf{X} and Y . In fact, $T(F_k, F)$ in (1) is the energy distance defined in Székely & Rizzo [28, 30] that can be written as

$$T(F_k, F) = 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_1\| - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)}\| - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\|, \quad (3)$$

where $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)$ and $(\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)})$ are independent pair variables independently from F and F_k respectively. Therefore, the Gini covariance defined by (2) is a weighted average of energy distance between $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$ and \mathbf{X} . Another interpretation of the Gini covariance is the between Gini mean difference variation (GMD) that is represented as

$$\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \Delta - \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \Delta_k,$$

where $\Delta = \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\|$ is the GMD of F and $\Delta_k = \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)}\|$ is the GMD of F_k . The Gini correlation is the ratio of between variation and overall variation. That is,

$$\text{gCor}(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \frac{\Delta - \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \Delta_k}{\Delta}. \quad (4)$$

The Gini correlation has a range of $[0, 1]$. It is zero if and only if numerical variable \mathbf{X} and categorical variable Y is independent. Hence it is also called the categorical Gini correlation.

2.2 Relationship between distance covariance and Gini covariance

The famous distance covariance and correlation proposed by [26] considers dependence between two sets of continuous random variables. The extension to general metric space by the work of Lyons [19] admits their flexibility for different data types (continuous, discrete or mixed) in different dimensions. For a numerical \mathbf{X} and a categorical Y , the distance covariance [6] is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) &= c(p) \sum_{k=1}^K \int \frac{(p_k \psi_k(\mathbf{t}) - p_k \psi(\mathbf{t}))^2}{\|\mathbf{t}\|^{p+1}} d\mathbf{t} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K p_k^2 T(F_k, F). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Compared with the equations (2) and (5), both the Gini covariance and the distance covariance are weighted averages of energy distances between \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$. However, with its weights summing up to one, the Gini covariance clearly has a better and more natural interpretation than the distance counterpart.

We summarize the connection between the two covariances in the following remarks.

Remark 2.1 For $K = 2$, $dCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 2p_1p_2gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 2p_1^2p_2^2T(F_1, F_2)$.

Use the discrete metric for the categorical variable, that is, $|y_1 - y_2| = 1$ if $y_1 \neq y_2$ and 0 otherwise. Then we have $dCov(Y, Y) = 4p_1^2p_2^2$ in the case of $K = 2$, and hence $gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = dCov(\mathbf{X}, Y)/\sqrt{dCov(Y, Y)}$. The Gini correlation and distance correlation are only different on a scaling factor that is independent with the distribution of Y .

Remark 2.2 In the balance case of $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_K = 1/K$, $gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = K dCov(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ and $gCor(\mathbf{X}, Y)/\sqrt{K-1} = dCov(\mathbf{X}, Y)/\sqrt{dCov(Y, Y)}$.

Remark 2.3 In the unbalanced cases with $K \geq 3$, due to its squared weights, the distance covariance is dominated by the classes with large probabilities and the contribution from smaller classes is substantially reduced. This explains why our Gini approach is more appropriate than the distance one for the unbalanced multi-class problem.

2.3 Current inference of Gini correlation

Suppose a sample $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{X}_1, Y_1), (\mathbf{X}_2, Y_2), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n, Y_n)\}$ is drawn from the joint distribution of \mathbf{X} and Y . We can write $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2 \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_K$, where $\mathcal{D}_k = \{\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_k}^{(k)}\}$ is the sample with $Y_i = L_k$ and n_k is the number of sample points in the k^{th} class. Dang *et al.* [6] estimated the Gini correlation for (4) as

$$\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k}{\tilde{\Delta}} = \frac{\tilde{\Delta} - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k}{\tilde{\Delta}}, \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{p}_k = n_k/n$, and

$$\tilde{\Delta}_k = n_k^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n_k} \|\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}\|, \quad \tilde{\Delta} = n^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\|. \quad (7)$$

The estimators in (7) are V Statistics, which are biased. They worked with biased sample versions to avoid dealing with complicated constants in the ensuing result of $\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y)$. Under the classical setting that the dimension p is fixed, they derived the following theorems on the asymptotic behavior of the sample Gini correlation.

Theorem 2.1 (Dang *et al.* [6]) Suppose that $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}\|^2 < \infty$, $p_k > 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $gCor(\mathbf{X}, Y) \neq 0$.

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y) - gCor(\mathbf{X}, Y)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_g^2),$$

where σ_g^2 is the asymptotic variance.

Theorem 2.2 (Dang *et al.* [6]) If $gCor(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}\|^2 < \infty$ and $p_k > 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$, then

$$n\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{4}{\Delta} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^K (1 - p_k) \lambda_s Z_{s,k}^2 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq K} \sqrt{p_k p_l} \lambda_s Z_{s,k} Z_{s,l} \right],$$

where $Z_{s,k}$ ($k = 1, \dots, K, s = 1, 2, \dots$) are independent standard normal variates and λ_s are non-negative coefficients.

Theorem 2.2 shows that under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , $\hat{\rho}_g(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ converges to a quadratic form of normal random variables when p is fixed. The inference for the Gini correlation in high dimension has not been explored and we will fill this gap by developing the asymptotic distributions when both the sample sizes and the dimensionality diverge to infinity.

3 High-dimensional Gini covariance and correlation

When the dimension p is large, the sample correlation (6) may have some issues about the bias. Therefore, we will estimate the GMDs in (3) by unbiased U -statistics. That is,

$$\hat{\Delta} = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\| := U_n; \quad \hat{\Delta}_k = \binom{n_k}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} \|\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}\| := U_{n_k}. \quad (8)$$

Thus Gini covariance and correlation can be estimated by

$$\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \hat{\Delta} - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \hat{\Delta}_k = U_n - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k U_{n_k} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\text{gCor}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\hat{\Delta}} = \frac{U_n - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k U_{n_k}}{U_n}, \quad (10)$$

respectively. Both of them are functions of U -statistics U_n and U_{n_k} 's. We shall focus on the asymptotic distribution of $\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$. The application of Slutsky's theorem allows us to obtain the result on $\text{gCor}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ immediately.

Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , the sample Gini covariance gCov_n in (9) is a linear combination of U -statistics with first-order degeneracy. By classical theory about U statistics in the fixed dimensional asymptotic (fixed dimension with sample sizes diverge to infinity), a non-normal limiting distribution holds, a similar result as stated in Theorem 2.2. However, as the dimension goes large, the degenerate U -statistic will admit a normal limit, which will be revealed in the next section.

3.1 Asymptotic normality

By the Hoeffding decomposition, we have

$$U_n = \Delta + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_i\| | \mathbf{X}_i) - \Delta\} + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j),$$

where

$$d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = \|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\| - \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\| | \mathbf{X}_1) - \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\| | \mathbf{X}_2) + \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2\| \quad (11)$$

is called the double centered distance that is the second order centered projection of the kernel function of U_n . Analogously,

$$U_{n_k} = \Delta_k + \frac{2}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}\| | \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}) - \Delta_k\} + \binom{n_k}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}).$$

Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , we have $F_1 = F_2 = \dots = F_K = F$. Hence $\Delta = \Delta_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \frac{2}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}\| | \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_i\| | \mathbf{X}_i).$$

Then we can represent (9) as

$$\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \binom{n_k}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}), \quad (12)$$

under the null that \mathbf{X} and Y are independent.

Thanks to the appealing orthogonal properties stated in Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2, the double centered version of the Gini covariance in (12) has advantages over (9) in deriving the limit theorem of gCov_n when both the sample size and the dimensionality diverge to infinity.

Theorem 3.1 *Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , and conditions C1-C3 stated in Appendix, as $\min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\} \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\sigma_0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where σ_0^2 is the variance of $\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ given by (16) in Appendix.

Theorem 3.1 reveals that a degenerate U -statistic admits a normal limit due to the high dimensionality. This is surprisingly inspiring to deal with problems which can be estimated by U -statistics in high dimension.

Remark 3.1 *From (17), $\sigma_0^2 = (2K - 2)\mathbb{E}d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)/n^2 + o(n^{-2})$. Not like \sqrt{n} in the usual CLT, the rate in Theorem 3.1 is n due to the quadratic nature of $\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$.*

To make inference, we will estimate σ_0^2 by a consistent estimator $\hat{\sigma}_0^2$

$$\hat{\sigma}_0^2 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k^2 \binom{n_k}{2}^{-1} - \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \right) V_n^2(\mathbf{X}), \quad (13)$$

where $V_n^2(\mathbf{X})$ is the bias-corrected estimator for the squared distance variance in [29],

$$V_n^2(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{n(n-3)} \sum_{1 \leq k \neq l \leq n} A_{k,l}^2$$

with $A_{k,l}$ being the centered sample distance, which is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,l} = & \|\mathbf{X}_k - \mathbf{X}_l\| - \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_l\| - \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{X}_k - \mathbf{X}_j\| \\ & + \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\|. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.2 *Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , and conditions C1-C3 stated in Appendix, as $\min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\} \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\hat{\sigma}_0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

The estimators in (8) are U -statistics and hence ratio consistent, $\frac{\hat{\Delta}}{\Delta} \rightarrow 1$ in probability. By applying Slutsky's theorem, we have the CLT for the Gini correlation.

Corollary 3.1 *Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , and conditions **C1-C3** stated in Appendix, as $\min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\} \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\hat{\Delta}}{\hat{\sigma}_0} gCor_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

From Theorems 2.2 and 3.1, we see that under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , as the dimensionality of the numerical variable goes large, the complicate quadratic form of normal distributions converges to a normal distribution.

3.2 High-dimensional K -sample test

These established CLTs in Section 3.1 can be applied to test the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y . We will use the CLT for the Gini covariance, Theorem 3.2, due to its simple representation. Hence, the independence test can be stated as

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = 0, \quad \text{vs} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) > 0. \quad (14)$$

Note that the null hypothesis of the test in (14) is equivalent to the null of the K -sample test

$$\mathcal{H}'_0 : F_1 = F_2 = \dots = F_K = F.$$

By Theorem 3.2, we can reject \mathcal{H}_0 or \mathcal{H}'_0 if $gCov_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) > Z_\alpha \hat{\sigma}_0$ at level α , where Z_α is the $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ percentile of the standard normal distribution.

For $K = 2$, the two sample problem, the proposed test is asymptotically equivalent to the test based on distance covariance because $gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) = dCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) / \sqrt{dCov(Y, Y)}$ and hence two test statistics estimate a same population quantity. By Remark 2.1, they are also asymptotically equivalent to Székely's energy test [25, 2] that is based on energy statistic between F_1 and F_2 .

Theorem 3.2 allows us to avoid computation burden of the permutation tests. As demonstrated in the simulation, the test based on the limiting normality is more powerful than the permutation tests. The power function for the proposed test is

$$P_n(\alpha) = P(gCov_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) > Z_\alpha \hat{\sigma}_0 \mid \mathcal{H}_1).$$

The test consistency is established in the below theorem.

Theorem 3.3 *For any alternative \mathcal{H}_1 satisfying conditions **C1** & **C4**, as $\min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\} \rightarrow \infty$, $p_k > 0$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$P_n(\alpha) = P(gCov_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) > Z_\alpha \hat{\sigma}_0 \mid \mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow 1.$$

Condition **C1** is the usual assumption on the finite second moments. $\sqrt{n}gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) \rightarrow \infty$ in Condition **C4** requires dependence of \mathbf{X} and Y cannot be too weak. We might state a local alternative as

$$\mathcal{H}'_1 : gCov(\mathbf{X}, Y) \geq Cn^{-t}, \quad \text{for } t < 1/2.$$

The proposed test is able to detect the dependence under \mathcal{H}'_1 .

4 Simulation study

In this section, we conduct three simulation studies to verify the theoretical properties of the standardized Gini covariance statistic and compare its performance in K -sample tests with others.

4.1 Limiting normality

We generate independent K samples from the same multivariate normal distributions and compute the standardized Gini covariance statistic. The procedure is repeated 5000 times. The setup parameters are listed below.

Example 1. $K = 5$ samples of sizes $\mathbf{n} = (30, 40, 50, 60, 70)$ are generated from $\mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$, where $p = 5, 50, 200, 500$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma} = (\Sigma_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.7^{|i-j|}$.

For each dimension p , the histogram of 5000 standardized Gini covariance statistics is plotted in Figure 1. Also the kernel density estimation (KDE) curve and the standard normal density curve are added to the histogram plot to visualize closeness between empirical density and asymptotical density functions. For $p = 5$ in Figure 1(a), the histogram is slightly right-skewed and there is some discrepancy between KDE and the normal curve. But when dimension increases, the discrepancy becomes less and diminishes as shown in Figure 1(b)-(d). We also calculate the maximum point distance between KDE and Normal density function as a measure of discrepancy in Table 1. It is clear that the difference decreases with dimensionality. Comparing with the scaled distance covariance statistic, the Gini one has a better normal approximation in each dimension.

Distance	$p = 5$	$p = 50$	$p = 200$	$p = 500$
Dist(KDE _{g} , Normal)	0.1176	0.0478	0.0294	0.0177
Dist(KDE _{d} , Normal)	0.1290	0.0493	0.0338	0.0207

Table 1: The maximum point distances between the kernel density estimation function and standard normal density function. KDE _{g} is for rescaled $gCov_n$ and KDE _{d} for $dCov_n$.

4.2 Size and power in K-sample tests

In this simulation, we compare five methods for K sample problem. Two of them are permutation tests. The one based on distance covariance in high dimension has been studied in [35] for $K = 2$. Here we examine both permutation tests for K sample problem in high dimension. Five methods are

gCov: our proposed method using rescaled Gini covariance statistic and the normal percentile as the critical value.

gCov-perm: permutation test using Gini covariance statistic.

dCov: the method using rescaled distance covariance statistic with set difference as metric in categorical y labels and using the percentile of the standard normal as the critical value.

dCov-perm: permutation test using distance covariance statistic.




Figure 1: Histograms of the standardized Gini covariance statistic in Example 1 with kernel density estimation curves in red and standard normal density curves in blue.

GLP: graphic LP polynomial basis function method proposed in [21].

We consider $K = 3$ case in dimensions $p = 200, 500$ with the equal size $\mathbf{n} = (40, 40, 40)$, slightly unbalanced size $\mathbf{n} = (50, 40, 30)$ and heavily unbalanced size $\mathbf{n} = (72, 36, 12)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 &= \mathbf{0}_p; \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = (\Sigma_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \text{ where } \Sigma_{ij} = 0.7^{|i-j|}; \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 &= (0.1 \times \mathbf{1}_{\beta p}^T, \mathbf{0}_{(1-\beta)p}^T)^T; \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \mathbf{D}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1, \text{ where } \mathbf{D}_1 = \text{diag}(1.1 \times \mathbf{1}_{\beta p}^T, \mathbf{1}_{(1-\beta)p}^T); \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_3 &= (0.2 \times \mathbf{1}_{\beta p}^T, \mathbf{0}_{(1-\beta)p}^T)^T; \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 = \mathbf{D}_2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_2, \text{ where } \mathbf{D}_2 = \text{diag}(1.2 \times \mathbf{1}_{\beta p}^T, \mathbf{1}_{(1-\beta)p}^T). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\beta \in [0, 1]$ is the proportion of the p components for which 3 samples differ in mean and in variance.

Example 2. Generate $\mathbf{X}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$, $\mathbf{X}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)$ and $\mathbf{X}_3 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_3, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3)$ samples.

We conduct 1000 simulations. The size and power of each test are computed and reported in Table 2. The column $\beta = 0.0$ corresponds to the size of tests. Several observations can be drawn. All tests maintain the nominal level 5% quite well. Permutation tests are slightly less

powerful than their corresponding counterparts. GLP test is inferior to others in all cases. In the equal size case, Gini method $gCov$ produces almost the same size and power as $dCov$, which is in the line of Remark 2.2. While in the unbalanced cases, our Gini method gains 1% - 6% power advantage over the distance one. An intuitive interpretation of the advantage is stated in Remark 2.3.

p	n	method	$\beta = 0.0$	$\beta = 0.2$	$\beta = 0.4$	$\beta = 0.6$	$\beta = 0.8$	$\beta = 1.0$
200	(40,40,40)	gCov	.052	.171	.421	.692	.864	.966
		gCov-perm	.050	.123	.327	.609	.815	.942
		dCov	.053	.172	.423	.691	.867	.966
		dCov-perm	.043	.159	.416	.665	.852	.954
		GLP	.060	.098	.254	.466	.720	.875
	(50,40,30)	gCov	.065	.183	.484	.718	.882	.949
		gCov-perm	.061	.133	.402	.621	.823	.914
		dCov	.068	.170	.454	.699	.873	.948
		dCov-perm	.062	.160	.417	.664	.858	.948
		GLP	.069	.096	.241	.455	.687	.845
	(72,36,12)	gCov	.058	.155	.282	.476	.632	.814
		gCov-perm	.049	.110	.212	.391	.555	.749
		dCov	.063	.112	.233	.444	.606	.802
		dCov-perm	.060	.104	.215	.419	.571	.780
		GLP	.066	.090	.178	.264	.403	.577
500	(40,40,40)	gCov	.061	.268	.665	.942	.997	1.00
		gCov-perm	.063	.207	.587	.904	.993	1.00
		dCov	.063	.274	.667	.943	.997	1.00
		dCov-perm	.060	.269	.654	.934	.998	1.00
		GLP	.049	.143	.455	.812	.971	.999
	(50,40,30)	gCov	.052	.340	.801	.972	.997	.999
		gCov-perm	.055	.280	.727	.950	.990	.999
		dCov	.058	.313	.776	.961	.995	.999
		dCov-perm	.051	.308	.762	.956	.994	.998
		GLP	.059	.156	.428	.800	.956	.993
	(72,36,12)	gCov	.051	.231	.493	.769	.923	.979
		gCov-perm	.055	.154	.399	.671	.901	.968
		dCov	.054	.175	.426	.721	.916	.978
		dCov-perm	.052	.172	.420	.711	.909	.976
		GLP	.047	.109	.240	.450	.688	.853

Table 2: Size and Power of Tests for $K = 3$ samples in Example 2.

Example 3. Let $\mathbf{Z}_k = (Z_{k1}, Z_{k2}, \dots, Z_{kp})^T - \mathbf{1}_p$, where for $k = 1, 2, 3$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$, Z_{kj} 's are i.i.d. from $\text{Exp}(1)$. Then generate $\mathbf{X}_1 \sim \Sigma_1^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}_1$, $\mathbf{X}_2 \sim \Sigma_2^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}_2$, $\mathbf{X}_3 \sim \Sigma_3^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}_3$ samples.

Although the distributions are not elliptically symmetric, the patterns and observations from this simulation are very similar to those in Example 2 for all tests but GLP. We present the results in Figure 2. GLP seems sensitive to the symmetry of distributions not only in terms of

performance as well as in terms of computation. The GLP algorithm includes a middle step to perform K -mean clustering, and that step occasionally stops especially for unbalanced sample sizes. The GLP is slightly oversized and its power is extremely low.




Figure 2: Size and power of tests in Example 3. Dashed horizontal line is the nominal level 0.05.

5 Real data analysis

Two data sets from UCI machine learning repository [8] are studied for K sample tests.

5.1 LSVT voice rehabilitation data

The first data is LSVT Voice Rehabilitation dataset. After speech rehabilitation treatments in Parkinson’s disease, 126 patients were evaluated based on 310 attributes. Refer to [31] for details of the data set and dysphonia measure attributes. Phonations of 42 patients were evaluated as ‘acceptable’, while 84 patients had ‘unacceptable’ phonations. This data set has the dimension larger than the sample size. Our goal is to test whether or not phonation features have a same distribution in the ‘acceptable’ group and the ‘unacceptable’ group, which is a $K = 2$ sample

problem. Before we perform the test, we do some exploratory data analysis to visualize the data in the original high dimensional space and the data projected in low dimensional space.




Figure 3: Heatmaps and 2 dimensional PCA projections of Voice rehabilitation data of all 310 variables and of the selected 12 variables.

A heatmap on all 310 variables is plotted in Figure 3(a) in which the values are centered and scaled by each column variable. The top third rows are for the acceptable group, while the bottom two thirds for the unacceptable group. It is quite difficult to view differences between two groups. However, the difference shows in the heatmap on the selected 12 variables in Figure 3(b). The selected 12 variables are those with its categorical Gini correlation greater than 0.1.

We also conduct principal component analysis (PCA) on all variables. The proportions of variance of first two principal components (PC) are 32.29% and 19.87%, altogether accounting for 52.16% of the total variance. The data are projected on the plane of the first two PC's shown in the left panel of Figure 3(c) in which several patients with unacceptable evaluation are clearly outliers. We also plot data projection on the first two PC's when PCA is conducted on the selected 12 variables in Figure 3(d). From it, we can see that the unacceptable group tends to have larger values in the first PC. After a simple feature selection to reduce dimensionality, the separation of two groups is more evident. In the next, we perform formal tests on equality

of distributions of two groups. The test of distributions on all 310 variables and the test of distributions on the 12 selected variables are conducted.

	gCov	gCov-perm	dCov	dCov-perm	GLP
all 310 variables	0.0011	0.0211	0.0013	0.0193	0.5124
12 selected variables	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	Li-loc	Li-scal	Li-both	Szekely	BG
all 310 variables	0.0204	0.3190	0.0197	0.0166	0.3272
12 selected variables	0.0000	0.0958	0.0000	0.0000	0.0009

Table 3: p-values of various 2 sample tests for all features and for the select 12 features in LSVT Voice rehabilitation data.

Besides the five methods considered in Section 4.2, five 2-sample test methods are added for comparison. Three methods are proposed in [18] and denoted as Li-loc, Li-scal and Li-both. Székely’s energy test statistic in high dimension is also studied in [18]. It is asymptotically normally distributed, equivalent to gCov and dCov, but its variance estimation is different and quite complicate in [18] and we include it for comparing its efficiency on variance estimation. The last considered method denoted as BG is proposed by Biswas and Ghosh in [3]. The p-values of those ten methods are reported in Table 3.

With the feature selection to reduce dimension, all methods except for Li-scal strongly reject the equality of two distributions. While for the high dimension data, three methods GLP, Li-scal and BG fail to conclude different distributions in two groups. The gCov and dCov methods provide the most significant evidence on the differences of two groups.

5.2 Arcene data

The second data set we apply to is Arcene mass-spectrometric data for 900 patients from cancer group and healthy group. The data set was merged from three resources on ovarian cancer data and prostate cancer data. The preprocessing steps of limiting the mass range, averaging the technical repeats, removing the baseline, smoothing, rescaling and aligning the spectra were prepared to reduce disparity between data sources. Arcene data have 10000 features including 7000 real features and 3000 random probes. The dimension is much higher than the sample size. The data was formatted for benchmarking variable selection algorithms for the two class classification problem in 2003 NIPS, the top conference on machine mining and computational neuroscience. The data were partitioned to training, validation, and test set. For the training and validation set, each has 44 cancer positives and 56 negatives, while the test set has 310 positives and 390 negatives. Refer to [11] for details about the data preparation and NIPS challenge results.

	gCov	gCov-perm	dCov	dCov-perm	GLP
p-value	0.5394	0.4530	0.4132	0.3160	0.0389

Table 4: p-values of testing whether training data, testing data and validation data in ARCENE have a same distribution.

Rather than conducting two sample test, we perform 3 sample testing on distributional equality of the training data, validation data and test data. That is the assumption and the logic behind the procedure of using training data to build model, using validation data to select

model and using test data to assess model. P-values of five methods are reported in Table 4. Only GLP rejects the equality with p-value 0.0389, while the other four methods with large p-values support the equality assumption that makes the data mining challenge competition valid.

6 Conclusions and future work

The categorical Gini correlation is an alternative to the distance correlation to measure the correlation between a p -variate numeric variable \mathbf{X} and a categorical variable Y . But the Gini one has nice presentation and better interpretation. It is closely related to the distance correlation but has more appealing properties. When p is fixed, Dang *et al.* [6] showed that the sample Gini correlation converges in distribution to a quadratic form of normal distributions under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y . In this paper, we have studied the inference of the categorical Gini correlation in a more realistic setting where both the sample size and the dimensionality are diverging. One of our main results, Theorem 3.1, reveals that those complicated quadratic forms of normal random variables admits a normal limit as the dimensionality p diverges to infinity. Based on these asymptotic distributions, a new consistent K -sample test has been developed. Both simulation studies and real data illustrations have shown the proposed test performs uniformly better than the distance correlation based test for unbalanced cases.

The Gini covariance has been generalized to a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) in [33] as follows.

$$\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y; d_\kappa) = \mathbb{E}\{d_\kappa(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\} - \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbb{E}\{d_\kappa(\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)})\}, \quad (15)$$

where $d_\kappa(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \kappa(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - 2\kappa(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)}$, the distance in the feature space induced by positive definite kernel κ . More specifically, a positive definite kernel, $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, implicitly defines an embedding map:

$$\phi : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \phi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{F},$$

via an inner product in the feature space \mathcal{F} :

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}_1), \phi(\mathbf{x}_2) \rangle, \quad \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Replacing the expectations in (15) by the corresponding U -statistics and replacing p_k by \hat{p}_k , we obtain the sample kernelized Gini covariance $\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y; d_\kappa)$.

It is not difficult to see that the proof of Theorem 3.1 can be copied for a CLT result of $\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y; d_\kappa)$ by replacing $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$ by $d_\kappa(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$. With a choice of bounded kernel such as the popular radial basis function kernel (RBF), the moment condition C1 can even be dropped.

As long as pairwise (dis)similarities are available, kernel Gini covariance can be used for complex data type. It will be interesting to adopt kernel Gini covariance and correlation based on neural tangent kernel (NTK) in the study of deep artificial neural networks (ANN). Continuations of this work could take this direction as well as the following directions.

- The permutation test based on Gini covariances in high dimension has demonstrated its size and power empirically. A theoretical and rigorous treatment is needed.

- When \mathbf{X} and Y are dependent, the CLT holds for the sample Gini covariance gCov_n . Under the null that \mathbf{X} and Y are independent, gCov_n is a U -statistic representation with first order degeneracy but admits a normal limit in the high dimension. Therefore, we would expect a non-null CLT for gCov_n when $p \rightarrow \infty$.
- In this study, the number of levels of Y is fixed and finite. However, some applications like Poisson process have infinity levels. In some applications like discretization procedure, the number of levels might increase as sample size increases. It is interesting to study estimation of Gini correlation in those cases and explore its asymptotical distribution when n, p and K diverge.

7 Appendix

Let $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_3$ and \mathbf{X}_4 be independent random variables from F . We will adopt the following notations through this section.

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi(\mathbf{X}_1) &= \mathbb{E}\left(d^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1) | \mathbf{X}_1\right), \\
\sigma^2 &= \mathbb{E}\xi(\mathbf{X}_1), \\
\gamma^4 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\xi^2(\mathbf{X}_1)\right), \\
\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) &= \mathbb{E}\left((d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1) | \mathbf{X}_1)(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2)\right), \\
\tau^4 &= \mathbb{E}(\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2, \\
\omega^4 &= \mathbb{E}d^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that $\gamma^4 > \sigma^4 > \tau^4$ and $\omega^4 > \sigma^4$ by the Jensen's inequality.

Lemma 7.1 *If $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}\|^4 < \infty$, then $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (11) satisfies*

1. $\mathbb{E}d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$;
2. $\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_1) = \mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$;
3. $\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)) = 0$;
4. $\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_3, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_4, \mathbf{X})) = 0$;
5. $\mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_3, \mathbf{X})) = 0$;
6. $\mathbb{E}(d^3(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X})d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X})) = 0$.
7. $\mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)) = \sigma^2$;
8. $\mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)) = \gamma^4$.

Proof. It is straightforward to obtain that $\mathbb{E}d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_1) = \mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$. By the double expectation argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3) | \mathbf{X}_1)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_1)\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3) | \mathbf{X}_1)\} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The other properties can be proved similarly. ■

Lemma 7.2 *If $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}\|^4 < \infty$, we have*

1. $\mathbb{E}\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$,
2. $\mathbb{E}(\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)) = 0$,
3. $\mathbb{E}[d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_3)d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_4)d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_4)] = \tau^4$,
4. $\mathbb{E}(\xi(\mathbf{X}_1)\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 = 0$.

Proof. $\mathbb{E}\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = 0$ follows directly from the property 3 in Lemma 7.1. Using the double expectation argument and properties in Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2) \mid \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_3) \mid \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_3)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_3) \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}')\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1) \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}')\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2) \mid \mathbf{X})\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_3) \mid \mathbf{X}')\} \\
&= 0, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)]^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_2) \mid \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_2) \mid \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_3)d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_3)d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_4)d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_4)) \\
&= \tau^4, \\
& \mathbb{E}(\xi(\mathbf{X}_1)\eta(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1) \mid \mathbf{X}_1)\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1) \mid \mathbf{X}_1)\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}'', \mathbf{X}_2) \mid \mathbf{X}_2)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}'', \mathbf{X}_2)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_1)d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}_1) \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}')\mathbb{E}(d(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}'') \mid \mathbf{X}'')\} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 7.2. ■

We then list the conditions that we will need as follows.

C1. $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}\|^4 < \infty, \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^4 < \infty, k = 1, \dots, K;$

C2. $\frac{\omega^4}{n\sigma^4} \rightarrow 0;$

C3. $\frac{\tau^4}{\sigma^4} \rightarrow 0;$

C4. $\sqrt{n}\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) \rightarrow \infty.$

Remark 7.1 *Our conditions C2 and C3 are corresponding to conditions (18) and (19) in [10] when $\tau = 1$. In fact, condition C2 can be weakened to be $\frac{\mathbb{E}(|d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)|^{2+2\alpha})}{n^\alpha\sigma^4} \rightarrow 0$ for some constant $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. However, it is hard to check the condition when $0 < \alpha < 1$.*

Lemma 7.3 *Under conditions C2,*

$$\frac{\gamma^4}{n\sigma^4} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is easy to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^4 &= \mathbb{E}(d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X})d^2(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X})) \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}d^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}))^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}d^4(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}))^{1/2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}d^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2).\end{aligned}$$

By condition C2, we have $\frac{\gamma^4}{n\sigma^4} \rightarrow 0$. ■

7.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , by Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_0^2 &= Var\left(\left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k^2 Var\left(\left(\binom{n_k}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)})\right) \\ &\quad - 2\left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \left(\binom{n_k}{2}\right)^{-1} Cov\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j), \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)})\right) \\ &= \left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1} Var\left(d(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k^2 \left(\binom{n_k}{2}\right)^{-1} Var\left(d(\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)})\right) \\ &\quad - 2\left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k Var\left(d(\mathbf{X}_1^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(k)})\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k^2 \left(\binom{n_k}{2}\right)^{-1} - \left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1}\right) \mathbb{E}d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \tag{16}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{2K-2}{n^2} \mathbb{E}d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) + o(n^{-2}), \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbb{E}d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = V^2(\mathbf{X})$ is the squared distance variance in [26].

For a short presentation, we denote $gCov_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ as G_n , which is

$$G_n := \left(\binom{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \left(\binom{n_k}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_k} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}).$$

In order to show the asymptotic normality of G_n , we construct a martingale sequence as follows. Assume that \mathbf{X}_i 's have been sorted by Y_i 's, that is, $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$, $\mathbf{X}_{n_1+1+i} = \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, i = 1, \dots, n_2$, ..., $\mathbf{X}_{n_1+\dots+n_{k-1}+i} = \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}, i = 1, \dots, n_k$. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma\{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_l\}$ with $l = 1, 2, \dots, n$. \mathbb{E}_l denotes the conditional expectation given \mathcal{F}_l . Define

$$M_{n,l} = (\mathbb{E}_l - \mathbb{E}_{l-1})G_n.$$

$\{M_{n,l}, 1 \leq l \leq n\}$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to the nested σ -fields $\{\mathcal{F}_l, 1 \leq l \leq n\}$. Also under the independence,

$$\sum_{l=1}^n M_{n,l} = (\mathbb{E}_n - \mathbb{E}_0)G_n = G_n - \mathbb{E}G_n = G_n.$$

We need to establish the asymptotic normality of $\sum_{l=1}^n M_{n,l}$. Without loss of generality, we will prove the case for $K = 3$.

We first work out the representations of $M_{n,l}$ by using the properties in Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2. Depending on l , $M_{n,l}$ have three forms.

1. For $1 \leq l \leq n_1$, $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma\{\mathbf{X}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_l^{(1)}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(G_n|\mathcal{F}_l) &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) | \mathcal{F}_l\right) - \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_1 \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) | \mathcal{F}_l\right) \\ &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) - \hat{p}_1 \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \\ &= -\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}), \\ \mathbb{E}(G_n|\mathcal{F}_{l-1}) &= -\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$M_{n,l} = (\mathbb{E}_l - \mathbb{E}_{l-1})G_n = -\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}).$$

2. For $n_1 < l \leq n_1 + n_2$, $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma\{\mathbf{X}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_1}^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{l-n_1}^{(2)}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(G_n|\mathcal{F}_l) &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) | \mathcal{F}_l\right) - \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_1 \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) | \mathcal{F}_l\right) \\ &\quad - \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_2 \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) | \mathcal{F}_l\right) \\ &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \right\} \\ &\quad - \hat{p}_1 \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) - \hat{p}_2 \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &= \left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1} - \hat{p}_1 \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \\ &\quad + \left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1} - \hat{p}_2 \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &= -\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) - \frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$M_{n,l} = -\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}).$$

3. For $n_1 + n_2 < l \leq n$, $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma\{\mathbf{X}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_1}^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n_2}^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_1^{(3)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{l-n_1-n_2}^{(3)}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(G_n | \mathcal{F}_l) \\ &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) | \mathcal{F}_l \right) - \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_1 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) | \mathcal{F}_l \right) \\ & - \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_2 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) | \mathcal{F}_l \right) - \binom{n_3}{2}^{-1} \hat{p}_3 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_3} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) | \mathcal{F}_l \right) \\ &= \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \right. \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \left. \right\} \\ & - \hat{p}_1 \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) - \hat{p}_2 \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ & - \hat{p}_3 \binom{n_3}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \\ &= \left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1} - \hat{p}_1 \binom{n_1}{2}^{-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) + \left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1} - \hat{p}_2 \binom{n_2}{2}^{-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ & + \left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1} - \hat{p}_3 \binom{n_3}{2}^{-1} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ & + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \\ &= -\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) - \frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ & + \frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ & + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$M_{n,l} = -\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}).$$

In order to apply martingale central limit theorem to the constructed martingale sequence, $M_{n,l}, l = 1, \dots, n$, we need the Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5.

Lemma 7.4 *Under conditions C1-C3 and the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , as $\min\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K\} \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2}{\sigma_0^2} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where $\sigma_{n,l}^2 = \mathbb{E}_{l-1}(M_{n,l}^2)$.

Proof. We first obtain three formulas of $\sigma_{n,l}^2$ according to l .

1. For $l \leq n_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{n,l}^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{l-1}(M_{n,l}^2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(-\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\ &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\ &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\ &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \middle| \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq l-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

2. For $n_1 < l \leq n_1 + n_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{n,l}^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(-\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(-\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{l-n_1-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(-\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\ &= \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-n_1-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) + \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq l-n_1-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad - \frac{8(n-n_2)}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n_1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

3. For $n_1 + n_2 < l \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{n,l}^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(-\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{l-1} \right\} \\
&= \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n_1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) + 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\
&\quad - 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \\
&\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n_2} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) - 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \\
&\quad + \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}) + \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq l-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2 \right) &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{l=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{l=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-n_1-1} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{l=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right)^2 + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{l=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{l=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{l=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left(d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}) \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{2n_1(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)} + \frac{2n_2(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)} + \frac{2n_3(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4n_1n_2 + 4n_1n_3 + 4n_2n_3}{n^2(n-1)^2} \right) \mathbb{E} d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \\
&= \frac{2}{n^2(n-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{n_1(n-n_1)^2}{(n_1-1)} + \frac{n_2(n-n_2)^2}{(n_2-1)} + \frac{n_3(n-n_3)^2}{(n_3-1)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2n_1n_2 + 2n_1n_3 + 2n_2n_3 \right\} \mathbb{E} d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to show that

$$\sigma_0^2 = \text{var}(G_n) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2 \right). \tag{18}$$

To complete the proof of Lemma 7.4, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{\text{var}(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2)}{\text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (19)$$

We partition $\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2$ into two parts, that is,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{n,k}^2 := R_n^{(1)} + R_n^{(2)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^{(1)} &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-n_2-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}), \\ R_n^{(2)} &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k-n_1-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad - \frac{8(n-n_2)}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-n_1-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n_1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)}) + 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad - 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n_2} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) \\ &\quad - 2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{k-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k-n_1-n_2-1} \eta(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}). \end{aligned}$$

Under independence of \mathbf{X} and Y and by the properties in Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2, $R^{(1)}$ and $R^{(2)}$ are orthogonal, that is,

$$\mathbb{E}(R_n^{(1)} R_n^{(2)}) = 0.$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(R_n^{(1)})^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right. \\
&\quad + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \\
&\quad + \left. \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-n_2-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}) \right\}^2 \\
&:= \mathbb{E}\left\{ A^2 + B^2 + C^2 + D^2 + E^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2AB + 2AC + 2AD + 2AE + 2BC + 2BD + 2BE + 2CD + 2CE + 2DE \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}A^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right\}^2 \\
&= \frac{16(n-n_1)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^4} \left\{ \frac{(n_1-1)(2n_1-1)n_1}{6} \gamma^4 + \left(\frac{n_1(n_1-1)^2(n_1-2)}{4} + \frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)}{6} \right) \sigma^4 \right\}, \\
\mathbb{E}B^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right\}^2 \\
&= \frac{16(n-n_2)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_2-1)^4} \left\{ \frac{(n_2-1)(2n_2-1)n_2}{6} \gamma^4 + \left(\frac{n_2(n_2-1)^2(n_2-2)}{4} + \frac{n_2(n_2-1)(n_2-2)}{6} \right) \sigma^4 \right\}, \\
\mathbb{E}C^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(1)}) \right)^2 = \binom{n}{2}^{-4} (n_2+n_3)^2 \{n_1\gamma^4 + n_1(n_1-1)\sigma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}D^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\binom{n}{2}^{-2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(2)}) \right)^2 = \binom{n}{2}^{-4} n_3^2 \{n_2\gamma^4 + n_2(n_2-1)\sigma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}E^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \sum_{k=n_1+n_2+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-n_1-n_2-1} \xi(\mathbf{X}_i^{(3)}) \right\}^2 \\
&= \frac{16(n-n_3)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_3-1)^4} \left\{ \frac{(n_3-1)(2n_3-1)n_3}{6} \gamma^4 + \left(\frac{n_3(n_3-1)^2(n_3-2)}{4} + \frac{n_3(n_3-1)(n_3-2)}{6} \right) \sigma^4 \right\}, \\
\mathbb{E}AB &= \frac{16(n-n_1)^2(n-n_2)^2}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}AC &= \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \frac{4(n-n_1)^3}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \left(\frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} \gamma^4 + \left(\frac{n_1(n_1-1)(n_1-2)}{2} + \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} \right) \sigma^4 \right), \\
\mathbb{E}AD &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{n_3 n_2} \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}AE &= \frac{4(n-n_1)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_1-1)^2} \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} \frac{n_3(n_3-1)}{2} \sigma^4,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}BC &= \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \binom{n}{2}^{-2} n_1(n-n_1) \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}BD &= \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \frac{4n_3(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \left(\frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} \gamma^4 + \left(\frac{n_2(n_2-1)(n_2-2)}{2} + \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} \right) \sigma^4 \right), \\
\mathbb{E}BE &= \frac{4(n-n_2)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_2-1)^2} \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} \frac{n_3(n_3-1)}{2} \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}CD &= \binom{n}{2}^{-4} n_1 n_2 n_3 (n_2 + n_3) \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}CF &= \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \binom{n}{2}^{-2} n_1(n_2+n_3) \frac{n_3(n_3-1)}{2} \sigma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}DE &= \frac{4(n-n_3)^2}{n^2(n-1)^2(n_3-1)^2} \binom{n}{2}^{-2} n_2 n_3 \frac{n_3(n_3-1)}{2} \sigma^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(R_n^{(1)})^2 &= \frac{4}{n^4(n-1)^4} \left\{ \frac{n_1^2(n-n_1)^4}{(n_1-1)^2} + \frac{n_2^2(n-n_2)^4}{(n_2-1)^2} + \frac{n_3^2(n-n_3)^4}{(n_3-1)^2} \right. \\
&\quad + 4n_1^2 n_2^2 + 4n_1^2 n_3^2 + 4n_2^2 n_3^2 + 8n_1^2 n_2 n_3 + 8n_1 n_2^2 n_3 + 8n_1 n_2 n_3^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2n_1 n_2 (n-n_1)^2 (n-n_2)^2}{(n_1-1)(n_2-1)} + \frac{2n_1 n_3 (n-n_1)^2 (n-n_3)^2}{(n_1-1)(n_3-1)} + \frac{2n_2 n_3 (n-n_2)^2 (n-n_3)^2}{(n_2-1)(n_3-1)} \\
&\quad + \frac{4n_1^2 n_2 + 4n_1^2 n_3 + 4n_1 n_2 n_3}{n_1-1} (n-n_1)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{4n_1 n_2^2 + 4n_2^2 n_3 + 4n_1 n_2 n_3}{n_2-1} (n-n_2)^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4n_1 n_3^2 + 4n_2 n_3^2 + 4n_1 n_2 n_3}{n_3-1} (n-n_3)^2 \right\} \sigma^4 + O(n^{-5}) \gamma^4 + o(n^{-4}) \\
&= \frac{16\sigma^4}{n^4} + O(n^{-5}) \gamma^4 + o(n^{-4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, after a tedious evaluation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(R_n^{(2)})^2 &= \tau^4 \binom{n}{2}^{-4} \left\{ n_1^1 (n_2 + n_3)^2 + n_3^2 n_2^2 + 4n_1 n_2 n_3^2 + \frac{n_1(n_2 + n_3)^3}{3} + \frac{n_2(n_1 + n_3)^3}{3} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 4n_1 n_2 n_3 (n_1 + n_3) \right\} + o(n^{-4}) \\
&= O(n^{-4}) \tau^4 + o(n^{-4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\text{var}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{n,k}^2\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{n,k}^2\right)^2 - \left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{n,k}^2\right)\right\}^2 = \mathbb{E}(R_n^{(1)})^2 + \mathbb{E}(R_n^{(2)})^2 - \text{var}^2(G_n).$$

To prove (19), we only need to show that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2)^2}{\text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 1.$$

This is true, because

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{n,k}^2\right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}(R_n^{(1)})^2 + \mathbb{E}(R_n^{(2)})^2 \\
&= \frac{4}{n^4(n-1)^4} \left\{ \frac{n_1^2(n-n_1)^4}{(n_1-1)^2} + \frac{n_2^2(n-n_2)^4}{(n_2-1)^2} + \frac{n_3^2(n-n_3)^4}{(n_3-1)^2} \right. \\
&\quad + 4n_1^2n_2^2 + 4n_1^2n_3^2 + 4n_2^2n_3^2 + 8n_1^2n_2n_3 + 8n_1n_2^2n_3 + 8n_1n_2n_3^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2n_1n_2(n-n_1)^2(n-n_2)^2}{(n_1-1)(n_2-1)} + \frac{2n_1n_3(n-n_1)^2(n-n_3)^2}{(n_1-1)(n_3-1)} + \frac{2n_2n_3(n-n_2)^2(n-n_3)^2}{(n_2-1)(n_3-1)} \\
&\quad + \frac{4n_1^2n_2 + 4n_1^2n_3 + 4n_1n_2n_3}{n_1-1}(n-n_1)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{4n_1n_2^2 + 4n_2^2n_3 + 4n_1n_2n_3}{n_2-1}(n-n_2)^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4n_1n_3^2 + 4n_2n_3^2 + 4n_1n_2n_3}{n_3-1}(n-n_3)^2 \right\} \sigma^4 + O(n^{-5})\gamma^4 + o(n^{-4}) + O(n^{-4})\tau^4 \\
&= \frac{16\sigma^4}{n^4} + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is obtained under conditions **C2** and **C3** and Lemma (7.3). From (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var}^2(G_n) &= \frac{4}{n^4} \left(\frac{n_1}{n_1-1} + \frac{n_2}{n_2-1} + \frac{n_3}{n_3-1} - \frac{n}{n-1} \right)^2 \sigma^4 \\
&= \frac{16\sigma^4}{n^4} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $\min\{n_1, n_2, n_3\} \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2)^2}{\text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\text{var}(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2)}{\text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 0.$$

The last step of the proof is to apply Chebyshev's inequality together with (18) and (19). More specifically, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2}{\sigma_0^2} - 1\right| > \varepsilon\right) = P\left(\left|\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2 - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2\right)\right| > \varepsilon \text{var}(G_n)\right) \leq \frac{\text{var}(\sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_{n,l}^2)}{\varepsilon^2 \text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 0.$$

This completes the proof for Lemma 7.4. ■

Lemma 7.5 *Under conditions **C1-C2** and the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y , as $\min\{n_1, n_2, n_3\} \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E}(M_{n,l}^4)}{\text{var}^2(G_n)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Now we compute $\mathbb{E}M_{n,l}^4$ under the independence of \mathbf{X} and Y .

1. For $1 \leq l \leq n_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}M_{n,l}^4 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{-\frac{2(n-n_1)}{n(n-1)(n_1-1)}\sum_{j=1}^{l-1}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(1)})\right\}^4 \\
&= \frac{16(n-n_1)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^4}\{(l-1)\mathbb{E}d^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_l) + 3(l-1)(l-2)\mathbb{E}d^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_l)d^2(\mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_l)\} \\
&= \frac{16(n-n_1)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^4}\{(l-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-1)(l-2)\gamma^4\};
\end{aligned}$$

2. For $n_1 < l \leq n_1 + n_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}M_{n,l}^4 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{-\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)}\sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-1}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(2)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)})\right\}^4 \\
&= \mathbb{E}A^4 + \mathbb{E}B^4 + 6\mathbb{E}A^2B^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}A^4 &= \frac{16(n-n_2)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_2-1)^4}\{(l-n_1-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-n_1-1)(l-n_1-2)\gamma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}B^4 &= \binom{n}{2}^{-4}\{n_1\omega^4 + 3n_1(n_1-1)\gamma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}A^2B^2 &= \left(-\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)}\right)^2\binom{n}{2}^{-2}\{n_1(l-n_1-1)\}\gamma^4.
\end{aligned}$$

3. For $n_1 + n_2 < l \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}M_{n,l}^4 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{-\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)}\sum_{j=1}^{l-n_1-n_2-1}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_j^{(3)}) + \binom{n}{2}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(1)})\right. \\
&\quad \left.+ \binom{n}{2}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_2}d(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{X}_i^{(2)})\right\}^4 \\
&= \mathbb{E}A^4 + \mathbb{E}B^4 + \mathbb{E}C^4 + 6(\mathbb{E}A^2B^2 + \mathbb{E}A^2C^2 + \mathbb{E}B^2C^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}A^4 &= \frac{16(n-n_3)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_3-1)^4}\{(l-n_1-n_2-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-n_1-n_2-1)(l-n_1-n_2-2)\gamma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}B^4 &= \binom{n}{2}^{-4}\{n_1\omega^4 + 3n_1(n_1-1)\gamma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}C^4 &= \binom{n}{2}^{-4}\{n_2\omega^4 + 3n_2(n_2-1)\gamma^4\}, \\
\mathbb{E}A^2B^2 &= \left(-\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)}\right)^2\binom{n}{2}^{-2}\{n_1(l-n_1-n_2-1)\}\gamma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}A^2C^2 &= \left(-\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)}\right)^2\binom{n}{2}^{-2}\{n_2(l-n_1-n_2-1)\}\gamma^4, \\
\mathbb{E}B^2C^2 &= \binom{n}{2}^{-4}n_1n_2\gamma^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E} M_{n,l}^4 &= \sum_{l=1}^{n_1} \frac{16(n-n_1)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^4} \{(l-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-1)(l-2)\gamma^4\} \\
&+ \sum_{l=n_1+1}^{n_2} \left\{ \frac{16(n-n_1)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_1-1)^4} \{(l-n_1-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-n_1-1)(l-n_1-2)\gamma^4\} \right. \\
&+ \binom{n}{2}^{-4} \{n_1\omega^4 + 3n_1(n_1-1)\sigma^4\} + 6\left(\frac{2(n-n_2)}{n(n-1)(n_2-1)}\right)^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \{n_1(l-n_1-1)\}\gamma^4 \Big\} \\
&+ \sum_{l=n_1+n_2+1}^n \left\{ \frac{16(n-n_3)^4}{n^4(n-1)^4(n_3-1)^4} \{(l-n_1-n_2-1)\omega^4 + 3(l-n_1-n_2-1) \right. \\
&(l-n_1-n_2-2)\gamma^4\} \\
&+ \binom{n}{2}^{-4} \{n_1\omega^4 + 3n_1(n_1-1)\sigma^4\} + \binom{n}{2}^{-4} \{n_2\omega^4 + 3n_2(n_2-1)\gamma^4\} \\
&+ 6\left(-\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)}\right)^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \{n_1(l-n_1-n_2-1)\}\gamma^4 \\
&+ 6\left(\frac{2(n-n_3)}{n(n-1)(n_3-1)}\right)^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-2} \{n_2(l-n_1-n_2-1)\}\gamma^4 + 6\binom{n}{2}^{-4} n_1 n_2 \gamma^4 \\
&= O(n^{-5})\gamma^4 + O(n^{-5})\omega^4 \\
&= o(n^{-4})\sigma^4.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality is due to Condition **C2** and Lemma 7.3. This completes the proof of this lemma. ■

Lemma 7.5 implies that the Lindeberg's condition holds. Along with Lemma 7.4, an application of the martingale CLT completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

7.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

As $\hat{\sigma}_0$ in (13) is a ratio consistent estimator for σ_0 , it is sufficient to show that $\frac{\text{gCov}_n(X, Y)}{\sigma_0} > C$ for any arbitrarily large constant $C > 0$ under \mathcal{H}_1 .

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) - \text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y))^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left((U_n - \mathbb{E}U_n) - \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k(U_{n_k} - \mathbb{E}U_{n_k}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (p_k - \hat{p}_k)\mathbb{E}U_{n_k}\right)^2 \\
&\leq (2K+1) \left\{ \mathbb{E}(U_n - \mathbb{E}U_n)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k^2 \mathbb{E}(U_{n_k} - \mathbb{E}U_{n_k})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(p_k - \hat{p}_k)^2 (\mathbb{E}U_{n_k})^2 \right\} \\
&\leq (2K+1) \left(\frac{C_1}{n} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\|^2 + C_2 \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{p}_k^2}{n_k} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{p_k(1-p_k)\Delta_k^2}{n_k} \right) \quad (20) \\
&= \frac{C(2K+1)}{n} \left(\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{p}_k \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}_j^{(k)}\|^2 + O(1) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality (20) is obtained by applying the moment inequality of U -statistics from [17] (p.72) and conditional Jensen's inequality. Hence,

$$|\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) - \text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y)| = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

With equation (17), we have

$$\left| \frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\sigma_0} - \frac{\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\sigma_0} \right| = O_p(n^{1/2}) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (21)$$

Under condition C4, $\sqrt{n}\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y) \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) - \text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\text{gCov}(\mathbf{X}, Y)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in probability.} \quad (22)$$

With together (21) and (22), we can conclude that $\frac{\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y)}{\sigma_0} \rightarrow \infty$ in probability. Therefore, $P(\text{gCov}_n(\mathbf{X}, Y) > Z_\alpha \hat{\sigma}_0) \rightarrow 1$. We have completed the proof.

Acknowledgement

Thanks Jun Li for sharing her R codes on two-sample tests with us.

References

- [1] Anderson, N.H., Hall, P. and Titterton, D.M. (1994). Two-sample test statistics for measuring discrepancies between two multivariate probability density functions using kernel-based density estimates. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **50**, 41-54.
- [2] Baringhaus, L. and Franz, C. (2004). On a new multivariate two-sample test. *J. Mult. Anal.*, **88**, 190-206.
- [3] Biswas, M. and Ghosh, A.K. (2014). A nonparametric two-sample test applicable to high-dimensional data. *J. Mult. Anal.*, **123**, 160-171.
- [4] Cai, S., Chen, J. and Zidek, J. (2017). Hypothesis testing in the presence of multiple samples under density ratio models. *Statist. Sinica* **27**(2), 761-783.
- [5] Chen, H. and Friedman, J.H. (2017). A new graph-based two-sample test for multivariate and object data. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, **112**, 397-409.
- [6] Dang, X., Nguyen, D., Chen, X. and Zhang, J. (2021). A new Gini correlation between quantitative and qualitative variables. *Scand. J. Stat.*, **48** (4), 1314-1343.
- [7] Darling, D.A. (1957). The Kolomogorov-Smirnov, Cramér-von Mises tests. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **28**(4), 823-838.
- [8] Dua, D. and Graff, C. (2019). UCI Machine Learning Repository [http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml]. Irvine, CA: University of California, School of Information and Computer Science.
- [9] Fernández, V., Jiménez Gamero, M. and Muñoz García, J. (2008). A test for the two-sample problem based on empirical characteristic functions. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **52**, 3730-3748.

- [10] Gao, L., Fan, Y., Lv, J. and Shao, Q. (2021). Asymptotic distributions of high-dimensional distance correlation inference. *Ann. Stat.*, accepted. DOI:10.1214/20-AOS2024.
- [11] Guyon, I., Gunn, S., Ben-Hur, A., and Dror, G. (2004). Result analysis of the NIPS 2003 feature selection challenge.
- [12] Heller, R., Heller, Y. and Gorfine, M. (2013). A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances. *Biometrika* **100**(2), 503-510.
- [13] Heller, R., Heller, Y., Kauffman, S., Brill, B. and Gorfine, M. (2016). Consistent distribution-free K -sample and independence test for univariate random variables. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **17**(29), 1-54.
- [14] Huo, X. and Székely, G.J. (2016). Fast computing for distance covariance. *Technometrics*, **58**(4), 435-447.
- [15] Jiang, B., Ye, C. and Liu, J. (2015). Nonparametric K -sample tests via dynamic slicing. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **110**, 642-653.
- [16] Kiefer, J. (1959). k -sample analogues of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Cramér-von Mises tests. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **30**, 420-447.
- [17] Koroljuk, V.S. and Borovskich, Y.V.(1994). *Theory of U-statistics. Mathematics and its applications 273*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht Translated from the 1989 Russian original by P.V. Malyshev and D.V. Malyshev and revised by the authors.
- [18] Li, J. (2018). Asymptotic normality of interpoint distances for high-dimensional data with applications to the two-sample problem. *Biometrika*, **105**, 529-546.
- [19] Lyons, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, **41**(5), 3284-3305.
- [20] Martínez-Camblor, P. and de Uña-Álvarez, J. (2009). Non-parametric k -sample tests: Density functions vs distribution functions. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **53**, 3344-3357.
- [21] Mukhopadhyay, S. and Wang, K. (2020). A nonparametric approach to high-dimensional k -sample comparison problem. *Biometrika* **107**(3), 555-572.
- [22] Rizzo, M.L. and Székely, G.J. (2010). Disco Analysis: A nonparametric extension of analysis of variance. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **4**, 1034-1055.
- [23] Sang, Y., Dang, X. and Zhao, Y. (2020). Jackknife empirical likelihood approach for K -sample tests via energy distance. *Canad. J. Statist.*, accepted. DOI: 10.1002/cjs.11611.
- [24] Scholz, F. W. and Stephens, M.A. (1987). K -sample Anderson-Darling tests. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **82**(399), 918-924.
- [25] Székely, G.J. and Rizzo, M.L. (2004). Testing for equal distributions in high dimension. *InterStat* 5 (16.10), 1249-1272.
- [26] Székely, G.J., Rizzo, M.L. and Bakirov, N. (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *Ann. Statist.* **35**(6), 2769-2794.
- [27] Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2009). Brownian distance covariance, *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **3** (4), 1233-1303.

- [28] Székely, G.J. and Rizzo, M.L. (2013a). Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances. *J. Stat. Plan. Infer.* **143**, 1249-1272.
- [29] Székely, G.J. and Rizzo, M.L. (2013b). The distance of correlation t -test of independence in high dimension. *J. Mult. Anal.*, **117**, 193-213.
- [30] Székely, G.J. and Rizzo, M.L. (2017). The energy of data, *Ann. Rev. Stat. Appl.*, **4** (1), 447-479.
- [31] Tsanas, A., Little, M.A., Fox, C. and Ramig, L.O. (2014). Objective automatic assessment of rehabilitative speech treatment in Parkinson's diseases, *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabilitation Eng.*, **22**, 181-191.
- [32] Wang, C., Marriott, P and Li, P. (2017). Testing homogeneity of multiple nonnegative distributions with excess zero observations. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **114**, 146-157.
- [33] Zhang, S., Dang, X., Nguyen, D., Wilkins, D. and Chen, Y. (2021). Estimating feature - label dependence using Gini distance statistics, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, **43** (6), 1947-1963.
- [34] Zhu, C., Zhang, X., Yao, S. and Shao, X. (2020). Distance-based and RKHS-based dependence metrics in high dimension. *Ann. Stat.*, **48**(6), 3366-3394.
- [35] Zhu, C. and Shao, X. (2021). Interpoint distance based two sample tests in high dimension. *Bernoulli*, **27**, 1189-1211.