

# Conditional uncorrelation equals independence

Dawid Tarłowski

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University,  
Łojasiewicza 6, Kraków, 30-348, Poland.

Contributing authors: [dawid.tarlowski@gmail.com](mailto:dawid.tarlowski@gmail.com);  
[dawid.tarlowski@im.uj.edu.pl](mailto:dawid.tarlowski@im.uj.edu.pl), ORCID 0000-0002-6824-4568;

## Abstract

It is well known that the independent random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are uncorrelated in the sense  $E[XY] = E[X] \cdot E[Y]$  and that the implication may be reversed in very specific cases only. This paper proves that under general assumptions the conditional uncorrelation of random variables, where the conditioning takes place over the suitable class of test sets, is equivalent to the independence. It is also shown that the mutual independence of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  is equivalent to the fact that any conditional correlation matrix equals to the identity matrix.

**Keywords:** correlation, independence, linear dependence, conditional moments

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are two independent integrable real-valued random variables then they are uncorrelated in the sense  $E[XY] = E[X] \cdot E[Y]$  and that this implication cannot be reversed unless very specific assumptions on  $X$  and  $Y$  are satisfied, David (2009). More, even the uncorrelation of all the higher moments of  $X$  and  $Y$  is not enough to force the independence, De Paula (2008). This paper proves that under general assumptions the conditional uncorrelation of random variables, where the conditioning takes place over the class  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$  or  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , is equivalent to the independence. This solves Problem 6327 from Chernoff, Móri et al. (1981) which, according to my knowledge, is solved only in the case where the vector  $(X, Y)$  has a joint probability density  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , see Jaworski, Jelito, Pitera (2024) which applies copula functions to the problem (under some additional technical assumptions on  $f$ ). Theorem 1 from the next section shows that the independence of  $X$  and  $Y$  is equivalent to the conditional uncorrelation for all types of random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  and any dependencies between them. The direct conclusion is that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are not independent then there is some rectangle  $[a, b] \times [c, d]$  conditioning on which

we have the nonzero Pearson correlation coefficient. The motivation for such study comes from the developing field of conditional statistics which have proved to provide useful applications and nontrivial theoretical problems, see for instance Hebda-Sobkowicz et al.(2020), Jaworski-Pitera (2016), Jaworski-Pitera (2020), Jelito-Pitera (2021), Jaworski et al. (2024), Pitera et al. (2022), Navarro et al. (1998). For the previous papers on the conditional correlations one can see, for instance, Akeman et al. (1984), Baba et al. (2004), Lawrance (1976). The general methodology we will present here is, roughly speaking, about using the properties of the Radon-Nikodym derivative to reduce the problem of conditional uncorrelation to the one-dimensional conditioning which is well understood, Navarro et al. (1998). The presented approach allows to prove other general statements about the independence and Theorem 2 shows that the mutual independence of the marginals of the random vector  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is equivalent to the fact that any conditional correlation matrix of  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  equals to the identity matrix. Section 2 introduces the basic definitions and presents the main results. Section 3 presents the necessary theory and proves Theorems 1 and 2.

## 2 Conditional uncorrelation and the main results

Let  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. The space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is naturally equipped with the sigma-algebra of Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $Z: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a random vector iff  $Z^{-1}(C) \in \Sigma$  for any  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . The probability distribution of the random vector  $Z$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{P}_Z$  and given by  $\mathbb{P}_Z(C) = \mathbb{P}[Z \in C]$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . For any  $A \in \Sigma$  with  $\mathbb{P}[A] > 0$  the  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot|A]$  will denote the conditional probability measure:

$$\mathbb{P}[C|A] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[C \cap A]}{\mathbb{P}[A]}, C \in \Sigma.$$

Let  $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a random variable and let  $1_A$  denote the characteristic function of  $A$ , i.e.  $1_A(x) = 1$  for  $x \in A$  and  $1_A(x) = 0$  for  $x \notin A$ . If the expectation  $E[X1_A] = \int_A X d\mathbb{P}$  exists, the conditional expectation  $E[X|A]$  is defined by  $E[X|A] = \int_{\Omega} X d\mathbb{P}(\cdot|A)$  and satisfies  $E[X|A] = \frac{E[X1_A]}{\mathbb{P}[A]}$ . If  $A = \{X \in C\}$ , where  $C \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a Borel set with  $\mathbb{P}_X(C) = \mathbb{P}[X \in C] > 0$ , then

$$E[X|A] = E[X|X \in C] = \frac{E[X1_C(X)]}{\mathbb{P}_X(C)}.$$

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are non-constant random variables with  $E[X^2] < \infty$  and  $E[Y^2] < \infty$  then both the covariance and the (Pearson's) correlation are well defined:

$$cov(X, Y) = E[XY] - E[X] \cdot E[Y] \quad \text{and} \quad cor(X, Y) = \frac{cov(X, Y)}{sd(X) \cdot sd(Y)},$$

where  $sd(Z) = \sqrt{E[Z^2] - (E[Z])^2}$  denotes the standard deviation of  $Z$ .

If  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$  are Borel sets with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X, Y)}(A \times B) = \mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B] > 0$  then one can consider the corresponding conditional covariance and the conditional correlation, i.e. for  $U = \{X \in$

$A, Y \in B\}$  one may calculate those coefficients with respect to the conditional probability  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot|U]$ . The conditional covariance  $cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y)$  is thus given by

$$cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = E[XY|X \in A, Y \in B] - E[X|X \in A, Y \in B] \cdot E[Y|X \in A, Y \in B],$$

assuming that the above expectations exists, and the conditional correlation  $cor_{(A,B)}(X, Y)$  satisfies

$$cor_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = \frac{cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y)}{sd_{(A,B)}(X) \cdot sd_{(A,B)}(Y)},$$

where  $sd_{(A,B)}(\cdot)$  is the standard deviation with respect to the conditional probability  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot|U] = \mathbb{P}[\cdot|X \in A, Y \in B]$ . Those conditional statistics are easy to estimate in practice: given the sample of pairs of observations  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ , one just calculates the standard covariance and correlation coefficients on the subsample of  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$  determined by

$$\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : (x_i, y_i) \in A \times B\}.$$

The mathematical justification of this procedure follows directly from the properties of the conditional probability: if the random vectors  $Z_i = (X_i, Y_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , are i.i.d. and  $\mathbb{P}[Z_1 \in A \times B] > 0$  then for

$$N_1 := \min\{n : Z_n \in A \times B\} \text{ and } N_{k+1} := \min\{n > N_k : Z_n \in A \times B\}$$

the random variables  $Z_{N_1}, Z_{N_2}, \dots$  are independent and have probability distribution equal to the conditional distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{Z_1}[\cdot|Z_1 \in A \times B]$ , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_{N_k} \in D] = \mathbb{P}[Z_1 \in D|Z_1 \in A \times B], \quad D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2), k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If the  $X$  and  $Y$  are not square - integrable (in practice, for instance, the data may exhibit heavy tails), the tests based on the classical covariance fail to work properly. At the same time, the conditional covariance is well defined for any bounded rectangle  $A \times B$  and one may consider the conditional covariance instead of the classical one, see Jaworski et al. (2024) for other applications.

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent in the sense  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(D_1 \times D_2) = \mathbb{P}_X(D_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}_Y(D_2)$ ,  $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $cov(X, Y) = 0$  and  $cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = 0$  for any admissible test set  $A \times B$ . The theorem below states that this implication may be reversed.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$ . For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$ , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1)  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent,
- 2) for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B) > 0$ ,

$$cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = 0.$$

*Under additional assumption:  $E|X| < \infty$  and  $E|Y| < \infty$ , we may replace the bounded intervals with the family  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  ( or with  $\{(-\infty, t] : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ).*

In conclusion, the square-integrable random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent iff they are uncorrelated conditioning on the tails  $\{X \geq t\}$  and  $\{Y \geq s\}$ , i.e. for any  $t, s$  with  $\mathbb{P}[X \geq t, Y \geq s] > 0$  the following function

$$H(t, s) = \text{cor}_{([t, \infty), [s, \infty))}(X, Y) \quad (1)$$


is constant and equal to zero.

Below, just for illustration, we consider the textbook example of  $(X, Y)$  with dependent but uncorrelated normal-distributed marginals, Broffitt (1986).

**Example 1.** Let  $X$  and  $Z$  be independent and such that  $\mathbb{P}_X = N(0, 1)$  and  $\mathbb{P}[Z = 1] = \mathbb{P}[Z = -1] = \frac{1}{2}$ . Define  $Y = Z \cdot X$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathbb{P}_Y = N(0, 1)$ ,  $X$  and  $Y$  are not independent and at the same time they are uncorrelated:  $E[XY] = E[ZX^2] = E[Z] \cdot E[X^2] = 0 = E[Y] \cdot E[X]$ . We will take a look on the behaviour of the function

$$h(t) = H[t, t] = \text{cor}_{((-\infty, t], (-\infty, t])}(X, Y).$$

This function may be calculated analytically but instead we draw the sample  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$  of size  $n = 10^3$  and calculate the conditional correlations numerically, see Figure 1 below. The conditional correlation coefficient increases until it reaches value 1 at  $t = 0$  as the condition  $\{X \geq 0, Y \geq 0\}$  implies full linear dependence  $X = Y$ .



**Fig. 1** estimated conditional correlation of  $X, Y$  given  $\{X \geq t, Y \geq t\}$ , the sample size  $n = 10^3$

The proof of Theorem 1 may be found in the next section. It is based on the properties of the Radon-Nikodym derivative and the conditional moments from Navarro et al. (1998). The same technique will allow us to prove Theorem 2 which characterizes the mutual independence of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  by the conditional correlation matrix  $\Sigma_U \in M(n, n)$  given by

$$\Sigma_U[i, j] = \text{cor}_U(X_i, X_j), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $U = \{X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n\}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{P}[U] > 0$  and  $A_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and the correlation  $cor_U(X_i, X_j)$  is calculated with respect to the conditional probability  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot|U]$ . If for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $U = \{X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n\}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[U] > 0$  we have  $sd_U(X_j) = 0$  then we shortly define

$$cor_U(X_i, X_j) := 1_{\{j\}}(i) = \delta_{i,j} \text{ (Kronecker delta)}$$

which avoids unnecessary technicalities.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be random variables and  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b]: a < b\}$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are mutually independent,*
2. *for any  $U = \{X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n\}$  with  $A_i \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathbb{P}[U] > 0$  the conditional correlation matrix equals to the identity matrix*

$$\Sigma_U = I_n,$$

(in case  $sd_U(X_j) = 0$  let  $cor_U(X_i, X_j) := \delta_{i,j}$ ).

If the second moments are finite  $E|X_i|^2 < \infty$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the bounded intervals may be replaced with  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty): t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  (or with  $\mathcal{K} = \{(-\infty, t]: t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ).

We end this section with the following example.

**Example 2.** *Consider the following linear model*

$$Y = \alpha_1 \cdot X_1 + \dots + \alpha_n X_n + \varepsilon,$$

where  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a vector and  $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a random vector. By Theorem 1, the  $\varepsilon$  is independent of the predictor  $\hat{Y} := \alpha_1 \cdot X_1 + \dots + \alpha_n X_n$  iff for any admissible  $t, s$  we have

$$cor_{[t, \infty), [s, \infty)}(\varepsilon, \hat{Y}) = 0.$$

By Theorem 2, the variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are mutually independent iff the conditional correlation matrix equals to the identity matrix:  $\Sigma_U = I_n$ , given any admissible condition  $U = \{X_1 \geq t_1, \dots, X_n \geq t_n\}$

### 3 Conditional uncorrelation equals independence

Before we start proving theorems 1 and 2 we will need to introduce two lemmas and one observation. Let us start with the following lemma which follows directly from the results of Navarro et al. (1998).

**Lemma 3.** 1. *For any random variable  $X$ , the function*

$$(a, b) \rightarrow E[X|X \in [a, b]] \tag{2}$$

*uniquely determines the probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}_X$  (the domain of the function is the set of pairs  $a < b$  with  $\mathbb{P}_X([a, b]) > 0$ ).*

2. *For any random variable  $X$  with  $E|X| < \infty$ , the function*

$$t \rightarrow E[X|X \geq t] \tag{3}$$

*uniquely determines the probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}_X$  (the domain of the function is the set of  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[X \geq t] > 0$ ).*

Let  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{R})$  denote the set of Borel probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . In the whole paper we assume that

$$\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\} \text{ or } \mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

although other types of intervals could be considered as well. For any  $P \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{R})$  let

$$\mathcal{K}_P^+ = \{A \in \mathcal{K} : P(A) > 0\}.$$

Paper Navarro et al. (1998) shows how the function

$$\mathcal{K}_P^+ \ni A \rightarrow \frac{\int_A x dP(x)}{P(A)} \in \mathbb{R}$$

(uniquely) determines the distribution function  $F_P(t) = P((-\infty, t])$  (in case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  it is assumed that  $P$  has a first moment:  $\int_A |x| dP(x) < \infty$ ). Observation 4 is a consequence of Lemma 3.

**Observation 4.** *If  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are two probability measures (with finite first moments in case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ) and  $\mathcal{K}_{P_2}^+ \subset \mathcal{K}_{P_1}^+$ , then conditioning*

$$\frac{\int_A x dP_2(x)}{P_2(A)} = \frac{\int_A x dP_1(x)}{P_1(A)}, \quad A \in \mathcal{K}_{P_2}^+ \quad (4)$$

forces  $\mathcal{K}_{P_1}^+ = \mathcal{K}_{P_2}^+$  and, by Lemma 3,  $P_2(A) = P_1(A)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof.* Let us assume that  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are random variables with  $\mathbb{P}_{X_i} = P_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , so we may use the convenient notation  $E[X_i | X_i \in A] = \frac{\int_A x P_i(dx)}{P_i(A)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

**1.** Consider the case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$  which does not assume the existence of the first moments. Assume for a contradiction that for some  $c < d$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{X_1}([c, d]) > 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_{X_2}([c, d]) = 0.$$

We have  $\mathbb{P}_{X_2}(\mathbb{R} \setminus [c, d]) = 1$  and without loss of generality we assume that  $\mathbb{P}_{X_2}((d, +\infty)) > 0$ . Let

$$x := \inf\{y > d : \mathbb{P}_{X_2}([c, y]) > 0\}. \quad (5)$$

For any  $h > 0$  we have  $\mathbb{P}[X_2 \in [c, x+h]] > 0$  and, by (4),

$$E[X_1 | X_1 \in [c, x+h]] = E[X_2 | X_2 \in [c, x+h]].$$

From the assumptions  $\mathbb{P}[X_2 \in [c, x]] = 0$ , and thus  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} E[X_2 | X_2 \in [c, x+h]] = x$ . Hence

$$E[X_1 | X_1 \in [c, x]] = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} E[X_1 | X_1 \in [c, x+h]] = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} E[X_2 | X_2 \in [c, x+h]] = x.$$

As  $E[X_1 | X_1 \in [c, x]] = x$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}[X_1 \in [c, x]] = 0$ . This forces  $x = d$  and

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 \in [c, d]] = \mathbb{P}[X_1 = d] > 0.$$

It remains to show that  $\mathbb{P}_{X_1}(\{d\}) > 0$  contradicts  $\mathbb{P}_{X_2}(\{d\}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{X_2}([c, d]) = 0$ . By definition of  $d = x$  given by (5), and by  $\mathbb{P}_{X_2}(\{d\}) = 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{X_2}([d+h, d+1]) > 0$  for any small  $h > 0$ . We thus may write (recall that  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{P}_{X_2}}^+ \subset \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{P}_{X_1}}^+$ ):

$$E[X_i|X_i \in (d, d+1)] = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} E[X_i|X_i \in [d+h, d+1]], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Hence, by (4),

$$E[X_1|X_1 \in (d, d+1)] = E[X_2|X_2 \in (d, d+1)]. \quad (6)$$

Let

$$M := E[X_1|X_1 \in [d, d+1]] = E[X_2|X_2 \in [d, d+1]].$$

We have, by  $\mathbb{P}[X_2 = d] = 0$ , by (6) and next by  $\mathbb{P}[X_1 = d] > 0$ ,

$$M = E[X_2|X_2 \in [d, d+1]] = E[X_2|X_2 \in (d, d+1)] = E[X_1|X_1 \in (d, d+1)] > E[X_1|X_1 \in [d, d+1]] = M,$$

a contradiction.

**2.** The proof of the case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  (with  $E[|X_i|] < \infty, i = 1, 2$ ) is not very different than the above proof: first we show that for

$$x_i := \inf\{y : \mathbb{P}[X_i \in [y, +\infty)] > 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

the conditioning (4) (and the equality  $E[X_1] = E[X_2]$ ) force  $x_1 = x_2$ , and next it remains to show that the situation  $\mathbb{P}[X_2 = x_2] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}[X_1 = x_1] > 0$  would lead to a contradiction.  $\square$

Now we will introduce some notation and definitions from measure theory, see Dudley (2018) or Rudin (1986) for more. Let  $M^1(\Omega, \Sigma)$  denote the set of probability measures on the measurable space  $(\Omega, \Sigma)$  and let  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{R})$  denote the set of Borel probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We will say that  $Q$  is a nonnegative measure on  $(\Omega, \Sigma)$  if  $Q$  is of the form  $Q = c \cdot P$ , where  $c \geq 0$  and  $P \in M^1(\Omega, \Sigma)$ . We will say that  $Q$  is a signed measure if it is of the form  $Q = c_1 \cdot P_1 - c_2 \cdot P_2$ , where  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$  and  $P_1, P_2 \in M^1(\Omega, \Sigma)$ . We will say that a signed measure  $Q$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $P \in M^1(\Omega, \Sigma)$ , denoted by  $Q < P$ , if for any  $A \in \Sigma$  with  $P(A) = 0$  we have  $Q(A) = 0$ . For example, if  $X$  is a random variable with  $E[X] = \int_{\Omega} |X| d\mathbb{P} < \infty$  then  $Q$  given by

$$Q(A) = E[1_A(X)X] = \int_A x d\mathbb{P}_X(x), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

is a signed measure on the measurable space  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  with  $Q < \mathbb{P}_X$ . A Borel measurable function  $h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Radon-Nikodym derivative of a signed measure  $Q$  with respect to a nonnegative measure  $P$ , denoted by  $\frac{dQ}{dP}(x) = h(x)$ , if we have

$$Q(A) = \int_A h(x)P(dx), \quad A \in \Sigma.$$

By Radon-Nikodym theorem, for any signed measure  $Q$  and a nonnegative measure  $P$ , the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{dQ}{dP}$  exists if and only if  $Q < P$ . A useful property is that  $Q_2 < Q_1$  and  $Q_1 < P$ , and  $\frac{dQ_2}{dP}(x) = h_2(x)$ ,  $\frac{dQ_1}{dP}(x) = h_1(x)$ , then

$$\frac{dQ_2}{dQ_1}(x) = \frac{h_2(x)}{h_1(x)} \cdot 1_{\{z: h_1(z) > 0\}}(x). \quad (7)$$

Now we are ready to prove the following lemma. As in the previous section, all the random variables are defined on the probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $X$  and  $Z$  be random variables with  $Z \geq 0$ ,  $E[Z] < \infty$  and  $E[XZ] < \infty$ . Define the nonnegative measure  $Q_1$  and the signed measure  $Q_2$ , both on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ , by:*

$$Q_1(A) = E[1_A(X)Z], \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \text{and} \quad Q_2(A) = E[1_A(X)XZ], \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

We have

$$\frac{dQ_2}{dQ_1}(x) = x.$$

*Proof.* On the measurable space  $(\Omega, \Sigma_X)$ , where  $\Sigma_X = \{X^{-1}(C) : C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\}$ , we define two measures  $\hat{Q}_1$  and  $\hat{Q}_2$  by

$$\hat{Q}_1(X^{-1}(C)) = Q_1(C) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{Q}_2(X^{-1}(C)) = Q_2(C), \quad C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

By the definitions of  $\hat{Q}_1$  and  $\hat{Q}_2$ ,  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ , and next by the definition of the conditional expectation  $E[Z|X] = E[Z|\Sigma_X]$ ,

$$\hat{Q}_1(X^{-1}(C)) = Q_1(C) = \int_{X^{-1}(C)} Z d\mathbb{P} = \int_{X^{-1}(C)} E[Z|\Sigma_X] d\mathbb{P}$$

and

$$\hat{Q}_2(X^{-1}(C)) = Q_2(C) = \int_{X^{-1}(C)} XZ d\mathbb{P} = \int_{X^{-1}(C)} XE[Z|\Sigma_X] d\mathbb{P}$$

which implies

$$\frac{d\hat{Q}_1}{d\mathbb{P}} = E[Z|\Sigma_X] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\hat{Q}_2}{d\mathbb{P}} = XE[Z|\Sigma_X]. \quad (8)$$

Above, from the formal perspective,  $\mathbb{P}$  is treated as a probability measure on the space  $(\Omega, \Sigma_X)$  which is smaller than  $(\Omega, \Sigma)$ . From (8), by (7), we have:

$$\frac{d\hat{Q}_2}{d\hat{Q}_1} = X.$$

Hence, by the definition of the Radon-Nikodym derivative and by standard change of variables,

$$Q_2(C) = \hat{Q}_2(X^{-1}(C)) = \int_{X^{-1}(C)} X d\hat{Q}_1 = \int_{\Omega} 1_C(X) X d\hat{Q}_1 =$$



$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} 1_C(x) x dQ_1(x) = \int_C x Q_1(dx)$$

which implies  $\frac{dQ_2}{dQ_1}(x) = x$ . □

Now we are ready to prove the main results. We start with **Theorem 1**: Assume that  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  contains the family  $\{[a, b]: a < b\}$ . For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$ , the following conditions are equivalent:

- 1)  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent,
- 2) for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B) > 0$ ,

$$E[XY|X \in A, Y \in B] = E[X|X \in A, Y \in B] \cdot E[Y|X \in A, Y \in B].$$

Under additional assumption:  $E|X| < \infty$  and  $E|Y| < \infty$ , we may replace the bounded intervals with the family  $\{[t, \infty): t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  ( or with  $\{(-\infty, t]: t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ).

*Proof.* We will prove the theorem under the assumption  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b]\}_{a < b}$  or  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ . **1.** We will start with the direct implication "1)  $\Rightarrow$  2)". The independence:

$$\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B] = \mathbb{P}[X \in A] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Y \in B], \quad A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

implies

$$E[X 1_A(X) \cdot Y 1_B(Y)] = E[X \cdot 1_A(X)] \cdot E[Y \cdot 1_B(Y)], \quad A, B \in \mathcal{K},$$

and, by the definition of the conditional expectation, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A, B) > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E[XY|X \in A, Y \in B] &= \frac{E[XY 1_{(A \times B)}(X, Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B]} = \\ &= \frac{E[X 1_A(X)] \cdot E[Y 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B]} \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = \frac{E[X 1_A(X)] \cdot E[Y 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B]} \cdot \frac{E[1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[Y \in B]} \cdot \frac{E[1_A(X)]}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A]} = \\ &= \frac{E[X 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)] \cdot E[Y 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B] \cdot \mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B]} = E[X|X \in A, Y \in B] \cdot E[Y|X \in A, Y \in B]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we will prove the second implication "2)  $\Rightarrow$  1)".

**2.** Assume that  $E|X| < \infty$  and  $E|Y| < \infty$ .

**2a.** We will now consider the case  $\mathbb{P}[Y > 0] = 1$ . Fix  $B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[Y \in B] > 0$  which implies that  $E[Y 1_B(Y)] > 0$ . More, for any  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  we have

$$E[1_A(X) 1_B(Y)] > 0 \Leftrightarrow E[Y 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)] > 0.$$

From condition 2) of the theorem, for any  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B) = E[1_A(X) 1_B(Y)] > 0$  we have

$$\frac{E[XY 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B)} = \frac{E[X 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B)} \cdot \frac{E[Y 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B)}$$

and thus

$$\frac{E[XY1_A(X)1_B(Y)]}{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)]} = \frac{E[X1_A(X)1_B(Y)]}{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)]}. \quad (9)$$

Note that

$$\hat{P}_1(A) = E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)] \text{ and } \hat{Q}_1(A) = E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)], A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

are nonnegative Borel measures with the same class of null sets  $\hat{P}_1(A) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \hat{Q}_1(A) = 0$ . We now normalize those measures to obtain the corresponding probability measures:

$$Q_1(A) := \frac{1}{E[Y1_B(Y)]} \cdot E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)], A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$$

and

$$P_1(A) := P[X \in A | Y \in B] = \frac{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)]}{E[1_B(Y)]}, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

We want to reformulate equation (9) in a way which will allow us to use Lemma 5. In this purpose define the following signed measures

$$Q_2(A) := \frac{1}{E[Y1_B(Y)]} \cdot E[XY1_A(X)1_B(Y)], A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

$$P_2(A) := \frac{1}{E[1_B(Y)]} \cdot E[X1_A(X)1_B(Y)], A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

so, for any  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B] > 0$ , equation (9) takes the form

$$\frac{Q_2(A)}{Q_1(A)} = \frac{P_2(A)}{P_1(A)}. \quad (10)$$

Now, we apply Lemma 5 to the pair  $Q_2$  and  $Q_1$  (with  $Z := Y1_B(Y)$ ) which provides the Radon Nikodym-derivative  $\frac{dQ_2}{dQ_1}(x) = x$ . In case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$  Equation (10) forces  $\frac{dP_2}{dP_1}(x) = \frac{dQ_2}{dQ_1}(x)$  (see the differentiation of measures from Mattila (1995)) but in case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  we need to use Lemma 5 again: the pair  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , by Lemma 5 with  $Z := 1_B(Y)$ , satisfies  $\frac{dP_2}{dP_1}(x) = x$ . Hence, the equation (10) takes the form

$$\frac{\int x Q_1(dx)}{Q_1(A)} = \frac{\int x P_1(dx)}{P_1(A)}, \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{K} \text{ with } P_1(A) > 0.$$

By Observation 4 (see also Navarro et al. (1998) for the details on how to reconstruct the probability distribution from the conditional first moments), we have  $Q_1(A) = P_1(A)$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ . As  $B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_Y(B) > 0$  was fixed arbitrarily, by definitions of  $Q_1$  and  $P_1$ , we have obtained that for all  $B \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B) > 0$ , we have

$$\frac{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)]}{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)]} = \frac{E[Y1_B(Y)]}{E[1_B(Y)]}.$$

Thus, for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B] > 0$  we have ended up with the following

$$E[Y|X \in A, Y \in B] = E[Y|Y \in B]. \quad (11)$$

As the conditioning  $E[Y|X \in A, Y \in B]$  does not depend on  $X$ , it is easy to believe that  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent. As Lemma 5 and Observation 4 and are still warm, we will use them again: Equation (11) may be rewritten as:

$$\frac{\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}[X \in A]} \cdot E[Y 1_A(X) 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[Y \in B|X \in A]} = \frac{E[Y 1_B(Y)]}{\mathbb{P}[Y \in B]} \text{ if } \mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}(A \times B) > 0,$$

which, for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\mathbb{P}_X(A) > 0$ , by Lemma 5, takes the form

$$\frac{\int y \mathbb{P}_Y[dy|X \in A]}{\mathbb{P}[Y \in B|X \in A]} = \frac{\int y \mathbb{P}_Y(dy)}{\mathbb{P}_Y[B]} \text{ for any } B \in \mathcal{K} \text{ with } \mathbb{P}[Y \in B|X \in A] > 0.$$

By Observation 4, we have  $\mathbb{P}_Y(\cdot | X \in A) = \mathbb{P}_Y(\cdot)$ , where  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  is arbitrary with  $\mathbb{P}[X \in A] > 0$ . This implies that  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent (note that if  $\mathbb{P}[X \in A] = 0$  then the event  $\{X \in A\}$  is independent of  $\{Y \in B\}$  for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ ).

**2b.** Now consider the case  $Y > -c$ , where  $c > 0$ . By the assumption,  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally uncorrelated in sense  $cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = 0$  for any admissible  $A, B \in \mathbb{K}$ . We will show that  $X$  and  $Y + c$  are conditionally uncorrelated too. Note that for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  we have  $\mathbb{P}_{(X, Y+c)}(A \times B) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{(X, Y)}(A \times (B - c)) > 0$ , where  $B - c = \{b - c : b \in B\}$ . Furthermore, the covariance is translation-invariant and the class  $\mathcal{K}$  is translation invariant in sense  $B \in \mathcal{K} \Rightarrow B - c \in \mathcal{K}$ . Thus, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X, Y+c)}(A \times B) > 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} cov_{(A,B)}(X, Y + c) &= cov(X, Y + c|X \in A, Y + c \in B) = \\ &= cov(X, Y|X \in A, Y + c \in B) = cov(X, Y|X \in A, Y \in B - c) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, as we see that  $Y + c$  and  $X$  are conditionally uncorrelated, by point **2a.**  $X$  and  $Y + c$  are independent. Hence,  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent.

**2c.** Now we do not assume that  $Y$  is bounded from below. The random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent if and only if for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[Y > c] > 0$  the  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent with respect to the conditional probability  $\mathbb{P}_c = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | Y > c]$ , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}[X \in A, Y \in B | Y > c] = \mathbb{P}[X \in A | Y > c] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Y \in B | Y > c], \quad A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

For any  $c$  small enough let  $cov_{\mathbb{P}_c}$  denote the covariance calculated on the probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}_c)$ . Note that for any admissible  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  we have  $B \cap [c, \infty) \in \mathcal{K}$  and

$$cov_{\mathbb{P}_c}(X, Y|X \in A, Y \in B) = cov(X, Y|X \in A, Y \in B \cap [c, \infty)) = 0.$$

By **2b.**, the  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent with respect to the conditional probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_c = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | Y \geq c]$ . As  $c$  may be arbitrarily small,  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent.

**3.** It remains to consider the case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$  without assuming the existence of the first moments of  $X$  and  $Y$ . To prove that  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent it is sufficient to prove that they are independent with respect to the conditional probability

$$\mathbb{P}_c = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | (X, Y) \in [-c, c]^2]$$

for any  $c > 0$  large enough to have  $\mathbb{P}[(X, Y) \in [-c, c]^2] > 0$ . On the probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}_c)$  the  $X$  and  $Y$  are integrable and conditionally uncorrelated by the assumptions (note that if  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $A \cap [-c, c] \neq \emptyset$  then  $A \cap [-c, c] \in \mathcal{K}$ ), which by point **2.** implies that  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $\mathbb{P}_c$ -independent for any large  $c$ .  $\square$

In the above proof, points **2c.** and **3.** have been done separately because the reasoning from point **3.** does not apply to the class  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . The second theorem may be proved by mathematical induction with use of the same techniques.

**Theorem 2:** Assume that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are random variables and  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$ . For any  $U = \{X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n\}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[U] > 0$  and  $A_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\Sigma_U$  denotes the conditional correlation matrix, i.e.  $\Sigma_U[i, j] = \text{cor}_U(X_i, X_j)$  (if  $\text{sd}_U(X_i) = 0$  let  $\text{cor}_U(X_i, X_j) := \delta_{ij}$ ). The following conditions are equivalent:

1. random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are mutually independent,
2. the conditional correlation matrix equals to the identity matrix, i.e.

$$\Sigma_U = I_n,$$

for any  $U = \{X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n\}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[U] > 0$ .

The bounded intervals may be replaced with  $\mathcal{K} = \{[t, \infty) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  under assumption that  $X_i$  have finite second moments.

*Proof.* The implication "1.  $\Rightarrow$  2." is straightforward and we will focus on "2.  $\Rightarrow$  1." The proof is based on the induction. The case  $n = 2$  is a straightforward conclusion from Theorem 1. Assume that Theorem 2 holds true for some natural  $n \geq 2$  and assume that we are given the random vector  $(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$  which satisfies condition 2., i.e.  $\Sigma_U = I_{n+1}$  for any admissible  $U$ . We may apply Theorem 2 to any  $n$ -dimensional vector of the form  $(X_i)_{i \neq j} = (X_1, \dots, X_{j-1}, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n)$  which implies the mutual independence of  $X_1, \dots, X_{j-1}, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n$ . Thus, to show the induction step it is enough to show that some marginal variable  $X_j$  is independent of the  $n$ -dimensional vector  $(X_i)_{i \neq j}$ . The general induction step from " $n$ " to " $n + 1$ " is the same as in the case from  $n = 2$  to  $n = 3$  but the notation is more complex. We will thus focus on the implication from " $n = 2$ " to " $n = 3$ ". Assume that  $(X, Y, Z) = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ . We will show that  $Y$  is independent of the vector  $(X, Z)$ . The proof is similar the reasoning from the proof of Theorem 1 and we will be a little more concise.

**1.** Assume that  $X, Y, Z$  are square-integrable.

**1a)** Assume that  $Y > 0$ . If  $(A, B, C) \in \mathcal{K}^3$  satisfy  $\mathbb{P}[(X, Y, Z) \in A \times B \times C] > 0$ , then for  $U := \{(X, Y, Z) \in A \times B \times C\}$ , by the assumptions, we have

$$E[X \cdot Y | U] = E[X | U] \cdot E[Y | U]$$

which may be rewritten as

$$\frac{E[XY1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]} = \frac{E[X1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}. \quad (12)$$

We fix  $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[(Y, Z) \in B \times C] > 0$  and we normalize the nonnegative measures  $A \rightarrow E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]$  and  $A \rightarrow E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]$  to obtain the following two probability Borel measures

$$Q_1(A) = \frac{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[Y1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]} \text{ and } P_1(A) = \frac{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}.$$

Now we rewrite (12) with use of  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  and next, as in the proof of Theorem 1, we use the Lemmas 3 and 5 to obtain  $P_1 = Q_1$ , i.e.

$$\frac{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[Y1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]} = \frac{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]} \quad (13)$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $B, C \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(Y,Z)}(B \times C) > 0$ . If  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y,Z)}[A \times B \times C] > 0$  then we rewrite (13) to obtain

$$\frac{E[Y1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]} = \frac{E[Y1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}. \quad (14)$$

Now fix  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $C \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Z)}(A \times C) > 0$  and normalize the nonnegative measures  $B \rightarrow E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]$  and  $B \rightarrow E[1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]$  from the denominators of (14), and again use Lemmas 5 and 3 to obtain:

$$\frac{E[1_A(X)1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{1_A(X)1_C(Z)} = \frac{E[1_B(Y)1_C(Z)]}{E[1_C(Z)]}$$

for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $C \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Z)}(A \times C) > 0$ . In other words, for such  $A, C$  and any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}[Y \in B | X \in A, Z \in C] = \mathbb{P}[Y \in B | Z \in C]. \quad (15)$$

By the assumptions,  $Y$  and  $Z$  are conditionally uncorrelated and thus, as Theorem 2 holds true for  $n = 2$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  are independent. To sum up: for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), C \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Z)}[A \times C] > 0$ , by (15) and by the independence of  $Y$  and  $Z$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[Y \in B | X \in A, Z \in C] = \mathbb{P}[Y \in B | Z \in C] = \mathbb{P}[Y \in B]$$

which implies that  $Y$  is independent of the vector  $(X, Z)$ . This finishes the proof (recall that the marginals  $X$  and  $Z$  are independent by Theorem 2 applied to the 2-dimensional vector  $(X, Z)$ ). **1b)** If there is  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}[Y > c] = 1$  then note that the random variables  $X, Y + c, Z$  satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2 and thus they are mutually independent by point 1a).

This forces the independence of  $X, Y, Z$ .

**1c)** In general case  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ , for any small  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}[Y > c] > 0$  we consider the probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}[\cdot | Y \geq c])$  on which, as we may note, the random vector  $(X, Y, Z)$  satisfy  $\Sigma_U = I_3$  for any admissible  $U$ . By 1b), the marginals  $X, Y, Z$  are mutually independent with respect to  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot | Y \geq c]$  for any  $c$  small enough which implies that they are independent with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .

**2.** At the end note that in case  $\mathcal{K} = \{[a, b] : a < b\}$  we do not need the assumption that  $X, Y, Z$  have finite moments as the conditional standard deviations are finite. Also, note that  $X, Y, Z$  are bounded and conditionally uncorrelated on the probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}_c)$ , where  $c > 0$  is large enough to have the following conditional probability well defined

$$\mathbb{P}_c = [\cdot | X, Y, Z \in [-c, c]].$$

By point **1.**,  $X, Y, Z$  are mutually independent with respect to  $\mathbb{P}_c$  for any large  $c$  which implies that  $X, Y, Z$  are mutually independent with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .  $\square$

**Funding.** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Data availability statement.** No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

**Conflict of interest.** The author has no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article

## References

- [1] Akemann, C. A., Bruckner, A. M., Robertson, J. B., Simons, S., and Weiss, M. L. (1984). Asymptotic conditional correlation coefficients for truncated data. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 99(2), 350-434.
- [2] Baba, K., Shibata, R., and Sibuya, M. (2004). Partial correlation and conditional correlation as measures of conditional independence. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 46(4), 657-664.
- [3] Broffitt, J. D. (1986). Zero correlation, independence, and normality. *The American Statistician*, 40(4), 276-277.
- [4] Chernoff, P. R., Móri, T. F., Szanto, S., Erugin, N. P. and Evans, R. J. (1981). Advanced Problems: 6326-6329. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 88, 68-69.
- [5] David, H. A. (2009). A historical note on zero correlation and independence. *The American Statistician*, 63(2), 185-186.
- [6] De Paula, A. (2008). Conditional moments and independence. *The American Statistician*, 62(3), 219-221.
- [7] Dudley, R. M. (2018). *Real analysis and probability*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- [8] Hebda-Sobkowicz, J., Zimroz, R., Pitera, M., and Wyłomańska, A. (2020). Informative frequency band selection in the presence of non-Gaussian noise—a novel approach based on the conditional variance statistic with application to bearing fault diagnosis. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 145, 106971.
- [9] Jaworski P., Pitera M., (2016), The 20-60-20 Rule, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series B* vol. 21, Issue 4 (2016), 1149-1166
- [10] Jaworski, P., Jelito, D., and Pitera, M. (2024). A note on the equivalence between the conditional uncorrelation and the independence of random variables. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 18(1), 653-673.
- [11] Jaworski, P., Pitera, M. (2020). A note on conditional variance and characterization of probability distributions. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 163, 108800.
- [12] Jelito, D. and Pitera, M. (2021). New fat-tail normality test based on conditional second moments with applications to finance. *Statistical Papers* 62 2083–2108.
- [13] Lawrance, A. J. (1976). On conditional and partial correlation. *The American Statistician*, 30(3), 146-149.
- [14] Mattila P., "Geometry of sets and measures in euclidean spaces". *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 44. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. MR1333890 Zbl 0911.28005
- [15] Navarro, J., Ruiz, J., and Zoroa, N. (1998). A unified approach to characterization problems using conditional expectations. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 69(2), 193-207.
- [16] Pitera, M., Chechkin, A., and Wyłomańska, A. (2022). Goodness-of-fit test for  $\alpha$ -stable distribution based on the quantile conditional variance statistics. *Statistical Methods and Applications*, 31(2), 387-424.
- [17] Rudin, W. (1986). *Real and complex analysis*. MGH, 1986, ISBN: 9780071002769,0071002766