

On the extensions of the Chatterjee-Spearman test

Qingyang Zhang

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Arkansas, AR 72701

Email: qz008@uark.edu

Abstract

Chatterjee (2021) introduced a novel independence test that is rank-based, asymptotically normal and consistent against all alternatives. One limitation of Chatterjee's test is its low statistical power for detecting monotonic relationships. To address this limitation, in our previous work (Zhang, 2024, *Commun. Stat. - Theory Methods*), we proposed to combine Chatterjee's and Spearman's correlations into a max-type test and established the asymptotic joint normality. This work examines three key extensions of the combined test. First, motivated by its original asymmetric form, we extend the Chatterjee-Spearman test to a symmetric version, and derive the asymptotic null distribution of the symmetrized statistic. Second, we investigate the relationships between Chatterjee's correlation and other popular rank correlations, including Kendall's tau and quadrant correlation. We demonstrate that, under independence, Chatterjee's correlation and any of these rank correlations are asymptotically joint normal and independent. Simulation studies demonstrate that the Chatterjee-Kendall test has better power than the Chatterjee-Spearman test. Finally, we explore two possible extensions to the multivariate case. These extensions expand the applicability of the rank-based combined tests to a broader range of scenarios.

Keywords: Chatterjee's correlation; combined test; symmetrized statistic; multivariate association

1 Introduction

Let X and Y be two continuous random variables, and $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ be n independent and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) samples of (X, Y) . In this work, we are interested in the following classical independence

test, formulated as

$$H_0 : X \perp Y,$$

$$H_a : X \not\perp Y.$$

The problem of testing independence has been examined from multiple perspectives, leading to the development of numerous testing methods. Rank-based methods, in particular, have gained increasing attention due to their nice properties such as distribution-freeness and B-robustness [1]. Spearman's and Kendall's rank correlations are widely used for measuring and detecting monotonic relationships between variables. However, they are not suitable for analyzing non-monotonic associations and may have low statistical power in such cases. To address this limitation, several novel rank tests have been proposed including Hoeffding's D [2], Bergsma-Dassios' τ^* [3], and Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt's R [4]. These tests are consistent against all alternatives, meaning that they can detect both monotonic and non-monotonic associations. Recently, Chatterjee (2021) introduced a new correlation test that is also rank-based and consistent, but unlike the aforementioned tests, Chatterjee's test has a simple asymptotic theory which enables analytical calculation of p-value [5]. Due to its nice properties, Chatterjee's test has been extensively studied including its asymptotic behavior, local power analysis, extensions and applications [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. For a recent survey about this important method, see Chatterjee (2022) [19].

We begin by the definition of Chatterjee's correlation. Assuming that X_i 's and Y_i 's have no ties, the *i.i.d.* samples can be uniquely arranged as $(X_{(1)}, Y_{(1)}), \dots, (X_{(n)}, Y_{(n)})$, such that $X_{(1)} < \dots < X_{(n)}$. Here $Y_{(1)}, \dots, Y_{(n)}$ denote the concomitants. Let R_i be the rank of $Y_{(i)}$, i.e., $R_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{Y_{(k)} \leq Y_{(i)}\}$, Chatterjee's correlation is defined as

$$\xi_n(X, Y) = 1 - \frac{3 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |R_{i+1} - R_i|}{n^2 - 1}. \quad (1)$$

Chatterjee (2021) showed that $\xi_n(X, Y)$ converges almost surely to the following population quantity

$$\xi(X, Y) = \frac{\int V(E(\mathbb{1}\{Y \geq t|X\}))dF_Y(t)}{\int V(\mathbb{1}\{Y \geq t\})dF_Y(t)}. \quad (2)$$

which is known as the Dette-Siburg-Stoimenov (DSS) measure [20]. Notably, the DSS measure is 0 if and only if X and Y are independent, and 1 if Y is a measurable function of X . Both $\xi_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi(X, Y)$ are asymmetric, and a symmetrized version of $\xi_n(X, Y)$ is studied in [12].

Under independence (i.e., $\xi(X, Y) = 0$), one can show $E[\xi_n(X, Y)] = 0$. Zhang (2023) derived the finite-sample variance

$$V[\sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)] = \frac{n(n-2)(4n-7)}{10(n+1)(n-1)^2}.$$

Furthermore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)$ converges to a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 2/5 [5]. Lin & Han (2022) established the central limit theorem of $\xi_n(X, Y)$ under arbitrary dependence structures, as long as Y is not a measure function of X .

While $\xi_n(X, Y)$ is sensitive to non-monotonic associations, particularly those with oscillating patterns like sinusoids, it exhibits substantially lower power for monotonic associations compared to other rank tests such as D , R and τ^* . This limitation of Chatterjee's test could be a practical concern, prompting recent efforts to improve its power. For instance, Lin & Han (2023) constructed a new test statistic by incorporating multiple right nearest neighbors. In our previous work [6], we proposed to combine Chatterjee's and Spearman's correlations, where the former is sensitive to non-monotonic associations while the latter is powerful in detecting monotonic associations. Moreover, we established the asymptotic independence and joint normality of the two correlations being combined. To be specific, under independence, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} S_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(X, Y) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This motivated us to define the following max-type statistic that combines the strengths of both correlations

$$I_n(X, Y) = \max\{|S_n(X, Y)|, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(X, Y)\}.$$

While our previous simulation studies demonstrated the effectiveness of $I_n(X, Y)$ under various correlation patterns, several key aspects remain unexplored. First, same as $\xi_n(X, Y)$, the combined measure $I_n(X, Y)$ is asymmetric. Misspecifying the order of (X, Y) may lead to reduced power, particularly for non-monotonic relationships. This is especially critical in applications like gene co-expression analysis, where symmetric tests are generally preferred. Second, Zhang (2024) focused on combining Chatterjee's correlation with Spearman's correlation. How does it perform with other rank correlations such as Kendall's tau or quadrant correlation? Third, the current Chatterjee-Spearman test is limited to random scalars. Can we extend this framework to handle random vectors?

This paper addresses these limitations by proposing several extensions. Section 2 introduces the new tests

derived from our framework, including a symmetric version of the Chatterjee-Spearman test, the Chatterjee-Kendall test, and the Chatterjee-quadrant test. Their multivariate counterparts are also explored. Section 3 evaluates the performance of these new tests under various scenarios using simulation studies. Section 4 discusses and concludes the paper with some future perspectives.

2 Method

2.1 Extension to the symmetric case

The asymmetric test based on $I_n(X, Y)$ requires specifying a response variable Y and an independent variable X . Switching X and Y may lead to different test results. We give an example here. Let X be a uniform random variable on $[-1, 1]$ and $Y = |X| + 0.1Z$, where $X \perp Z$ and $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. For $n = 100$, we have $I_n(X, Y) \approx 1.072$ (p-value ≈ 0) while $I_n(Y, X) \approx 0.061$ (p-value ≈ 0.667).

To construct a symmetric test, we need to derive the asymptotic joint distribution of $S_n(X, Y)$, $\xi_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi_n(Y, X)$ under independence. The following two lemmas provide the asymptotic covariances, indicating that the three components are asymptotically uncorrelated.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 1 in [6]). *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$\text{Cov}[S_n(X, Y), \xi_n(X, Y)] = 0,$$

for any $n \geq 2$.

Lemma 2 (Corollary 1 in [12]). *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$\text{Cov}[\sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)] = O(1/n).$$

Furthermore, using Cramér-Wold device, we show that $S_n(X, Y)$, $\xi_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi_n(Y, X)$ are asymptotically joint normal (the detailed proof is lengthy and we give it in Appendix A.1). Together with Lemmas 1 and 2, we have the following theorem

Theorem 1. *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} S_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(Y, X) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Our Theorem 1 generalizes the main results in [6] and [12]. Similar to [6], we consider the following max-type statistic

$$\tilde{I}_n^S(X, Y) = \max\{|S_n(X, Y)|, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(Y, X)\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\tilde{I}_n^S(X, Y)$ is both nonnegative and symmetric, i.e., $\tilde{I}_n^S(X, Y) = \tilde{I}_n^S(Y, X)$. Moreover, using Theorem 1, we can calculate its asymptotic p-value:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sqrt{n}\tilde{I}_n^S(X, Y) > z) &\approx 1 - \Phi^2(z) [1 - 2\Phi(-z)] \\ &= 1 + \Phi^2(z) - 2\Phi^3(z), \end{aligned}$$

where $z \geq 0$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ represents the cumulative distribution function (*c.d.f.*) of the standard normal distribution.

2.2 Extension to other rank correlations

This section explores the relationships between Chatterjee's correlation and some other rank correlations suitable for constructing new tests. We focus on Kendall's correlation and the quadrant correlation (also called quadrant count ratio), because, like Spearman's correlation, they capture monotonic relationships between variables. These two rank correlations are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n(X, Y) &= \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}[(X_i - X_j)(Y_i - Y_j)], \\ Q_n(X, Y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sgn}[(X_i - \text{med}_n(X))(Y_i - \text{med}_n(Y))], \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{med}_n(X)$ represents the sample median of (X_1, \dots, X_n) . Their population counterparts are

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(X, Y) &= E \{ \text{sgn}[(X_1 - X_2)(Y_1 - Y_2)] \}, \\ Q(X, Y) &= E \{ \text{sgn}[(X - \text{med}(X))(Y - \text{med}(Y))] \},\end{aligned}$$

where (X_1, Y_1) and (X_2, Y_2) represent two independent copies of (X, Y) , and $\text{med}(X)$ is the median of X .

Under independence and a sample size of n , it is well-known that $E[\tau_n(X, Y)] = E[Q_n(X, Y)] = 0$. The variance of $\sqrt{n}\tau_n(X, Y)$ is provided by [22]

$$V[\sqrt{n}\tau_n(X, Y)] = \frac{2(2n+5)}{9(n-1)}.$$

The finite-sample variance of the quadrant correlation, to the best of our knowledge, has not been reported in the literature, therefore we derive the formula in Lemma 3. Interestingly, due to different sample median definitions for odd and even sample sizes, the variances exhibit slight discrepancies, although both converge to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof for Lemma 3 is provided in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 3. *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$V[\sqrt{n}Q_n(X, Y)] = \begin{cases} (n-1)/n, & n \text{ is odd} \\ n/(n-1), & n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

for any $n \geq 2$.

To investigate their asymptotic joint distribution, we first establish in Lemma 4 (proven in Appendix A.3) that $\xi_n(X, Y)$, $\tau_n(X, Y)$ and $Q_n(X, Y)$ are uncorrelated for any sample size.

Lemma 4. *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$\text{Cov}[\tau_n(X, Y), \xi_n(X, Y)] = 0$$

$$\text{Cov}[Q_n(X, Y), \xi_n(X, Y)] = 0$$

for any $n \geq 2$.

While Lemma 4 demonstrates the uncorrelatedness between $\xi_n(X, Y)$, $\tau_n(X, Y)$ and $Q_n(X, Y)$, it is important to note that these statistics are generally dependent. For instance, under independence and $n = 3$, we have $\text{Cov}[|\tau_n(X, Y)|, \xi_n(X, Y)] = 1/18$, indicating that $\xi_n(X, Y)$ and $\tau_n(X, Y)$ are uncorrelated but dependent. To establish the asymptotic independence, we also need to prove their asymptotic joint normality (similar to Theorem 1). Theorem 2 below gives the asymptotic joint distributions for both $\{\sqrt{n}\tau_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)\}$ and $\{\sqrt{n}Q_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)\}$ (proof in Appendix A.4).

Theorem 2. *If X and Y are independent, we have*

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(Y, X) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 4/9 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} Q_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(X, Y) \\ \xi_n(Y, X) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the convergence of $\{\sqrt{n}\tau_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)\}$ and $\{\sqrt{n}Q_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)\}$ to bivariate normal distributions.

[Figure 1 about here]

[Figure 2 about here]

Theorem 2 has an immediate application in constructing two combined tests, the Chatterjee-Kendall test and the Chatterjee-quadrant test, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_n^{\tau}(X, Y) &= \max\{|\tau_n(X, Y)|, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(Y, X)\}, \\ \tilde{I}_n^Q(X, Y) &= \max\{3/2 \cdot |Q_n(X, Y)|, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(Y, X)\}, \end{aligned}$$

Importantly, both tests admit analytical p-value calculations

$$P(\sqrt{n}\tilde{I}_n^{\tau}(X, Y) > z) \approx 1 - \Phi^2(z) [1 - 2\Phi(-z)],$$

$$P(\sqrt{n}\tilde{I}_n^Q(X, Y) > z) \approx 1 - \Phi^2(z) [1 - 2\Phi(-z)].$$

The performance of the three symmetric tests, $\tilde{I}_n^S(X, Y)$, $\tilde{I}_n^{\tau}(X, Y)$ and $\tilde{I}_n^Q(X, Y)$, is evaluated in Section 3. Our simulation studies indicate that all tests control the type I error rate effectively. However, the Chatterjee-Kendall test demonstrates the best statistical power across all settings (linear, quadratic, sinusoidal, and stepwise).

2.3 Extension to the multivariate case

This section explores the extensions of the proposed tests to the multivariate case. We begin by introducing multivariate versions of $S_n(X, Y)$, $\tau_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi_n(X, Y)$. We omit the multivariate extension of the quadrant correlation due to its low statistical power observed for univariate variables in the simulation studies of Section 3.

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ be two random vectors, and $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{Y}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ be *n i.i.d* samples of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) . The multivariate ranks are defined as

$$R_i^{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{X}_j \leq \mathbf{X}_i),$$

$$R_i^{\mathbf{Y}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{Y}_j \leq \mathbf{Y}_i),$$

$$R_i^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{X}_j \leq \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_j \leq \mathbf{Y}_i),$$

where $\mathbf{X}_j \leq \mathbf{X}_i$ denotes element-wise comparison (i.e., all elements in \mathbf{X}_j are less than or equal to the corresponding elements in \mathbf{X}_i).

Summing the ranks yields

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\mathbf{X}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{\mathbf{X}}, \\ R^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{\mathbf{Y}}, \\ R^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} &= \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}. \end{aligned}$$

Grothe et al. (2014) proposed the following multivariate versions of τ_n and S_n

$$\tau_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{n(n-1)R^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} - R^{\mathbf{X}}R^{\mathbf{Y}}}{\sqrt{R^{\mathbf{X}}R^{\mathbf{Y}}[n(n-1) - R^{\mathbf{X}}][n(n-1) - R^{\mathbf{Y}}]}},$$

and

$$S_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{S_{\mathbf{XY}}}{\sqrt{S_{\mathbf{X}}S_{\mathbf{Y}}}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathbf{XY}} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{\mathbf{X}}R_i^{\mathbf{Y}} - \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^2} R^{\mathbf{X}}R^{\mathbf{Y}} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} R^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}, \\ S_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{\mathbf{X}}(1 - R_i^{\mathbf{X}}) - \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^2} (R^{\mathbf{X}})^2, \\ S_{\mathbf{Y}} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{\mathbf{Y}}(1 - R_i^{\mathbf{Y}}) - \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^2} (R^{\mathbf{Y}})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Grothe et al. (2014) further established the asymptotic normality of $\tau_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and $S_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ by employing the delta method [23].

Azadkia & Chatterjee (2021) proposed a multivariate extension of Chatterjee's correlation based on nearest neighbors, but this method requires a random scalar for Y , thus is not applicable here [10]. Chatterjee (2022) introduced a multivariate extension of $\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ using Borel isomorphism. This extension transforms a random vector into a random scalar (preserving its key properties), and works without requiring any distributional assumptions. Let $\eta(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel merging function (Chatterjee gave an example using binary expansion, implemented in R package *XICOR*). One can define

$$\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \xi_n[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})],$$

and show that any result about the univariate case can be transferred to $\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ [19]. An immediate result is that for $\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y}$, $\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \rightarrow N(0, 2/5)$. Therefore we consider the following combinations

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{I}_n^S(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \max(|S_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})|/\sigma_S, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}), \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})), \\ \tilde{I}_n^\tau(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \max(|\tau_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})|/\sigma_\tau, \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}), \sqrt{5/2}\xi_n(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})),\end{aligned}$$

where σ_S and σ_τ represent the asymptotic standard deviations of $\sqrt{n}S_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and $\sqrt{n}\tau_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ under independence. It is noteworthy that σ_S and σ_τ depend on the dimensions of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} . Grothe et al. (2014) suggested a gradient-based plug-in method for estimating them.

Unlike the univariate case, deriving the asymptotic null distribution of the multivariate test statistics is challenging due to different functional forms of $S_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ (a ratio statistics) and $\xi_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ (a summation). Therefore we suggest a permutation test to evaluate the significance. First, we randomly shuffle $(\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ for B times. For each permutation, we calculate $\tilde{I}_n^S(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and $\tilde{I}_n^\tau(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ based on the shuffled data. The resulting $\tilde{I}_n^S(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and $\tilde{I}_n^\tau(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ are used to approximate the null distributions and estimate the p-values. An additional benefit of permutation tests is that they can directly estimate the unknown standard deviations σ_S and σ_τ , from the shuffled data.

Alternatively, one may consider a simpler form of the multivariate Kendall and Spearman correlations, instead of those introduced by [23]. Recall that under Borel isomorphism and $\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y}$, $[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})]$ become independent random scalars, thus all the previously established asymptotic results for the univariate case directly apply to the multivariate case. For instance, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_n[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})] \\ \xi_n[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})] \\ \xi_n[\eta(\mathbf{Y}), \eta(\mathbf{X})] \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 4/9 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} S_n[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})] \\ \xi_n[\eta(\mathbf{X}), \eta(\mathbf{Y})] \\ \xi_n[\eta(\mathbf{Y}), \eta(\mathbf{X})] \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/5 \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

While the max-type test statistic can be constructed using the same formula as in the univariate case, our

simulations in Section 3 suggest that the Borel isomorphism approach might not be ideal for Spearman’s and Kendall’s correlations. In fact, these tests may have extremely low statistical power, particularly for detecting monotonic relationships. Therefore we recommend the first approach employing permutation tests based on Grothe et al.’s formulas.

3 Simulation studies

To evaluate the performance of the proposed tests, we conducted two simulation studies. The first focused on the univariate case, comparing the empirical power of seven independence tests: Chatterjee (ξ_n), Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n), Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n), Chatterjee-quadrant (ξ_n, Q_n), Hoeffding’s D , Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt’s R , and Bergsma-Dassios’ τ^* , under sample sizes $\{20, 40, 60, 80, 100\}$. For a fair comparison, we used the symmetrized version for all asymmetric tests. The calculations of D_n , R_n and τ_n^* were performed using R package *independence*. The following four alternatives were considered, where $X \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$, $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and $Z \perp X$

1. Linear: $Y = X + Z$
2. Quadratic: $Y = X^2 + 0.3Z$.
3. Stepwise (monotonic): $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{-1 \leq X \leq -0.5\}} + 2 * \mathbb{1}_{\{-0.5 < X \leq 0\}} + 3 * \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < X \leq 0.5\}} + 4 * \mathbb{1}_{\{0.5 < X \leq 1\}} + 2Z$.
4. Sinusoid: $Y = \cos(2\pi X) + 0.75Z$.

Table 1 summarizes the empirical power of the tests based on 5,000 simulation runs at the significance level of 0.05. First, we observe that Hoeffding’s D , Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt’s R , and Bergsma-Dassios’ τ^* show similar power across all settings. In particular, these tests are powerful for the linear, quadratic and stepwise settings, but not for the sinusoidal setting. The symmetrized Chatterjee test has high power for the two non-monotonic settings (quadratic and sinusoidal), but performs poorly in the linear and stepwise settings. For the three combined tests that we proposed, Chatterjee-Spearman and Chatterjee-Kendall outperform Chatterjee-quadrant especially for the two monotonic settings (linear and stepwise). For instance, in the stepwise setting with $n = 40$, Chatterjee-Kendall and Chatterjee-Spearman achieve a power of 0.827 and 0.809, respectively, compared to 0.527 for Chatterjee-quadrant. In most settings, Chatterjee-Kendall and

Chatterjee-Spearman perform comparably. However, for relatively small sample sizes, Chatterjee-Kendall is more powerful than Chatterjee-Spearman. For instance, in the linear and stepwise settings with $n = 20$, the power of Chatterjee-Kendall is about 5-6% higher than Chatterjee-Spearman.

Table 2 summarizes the empirical size of the tests over 50,000 simulation runs, where $X \perp Y$, $X \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$ and $Y \sim N(0, 1)$. It can be seen that all seven tests control the Type I error rate at the nominal level of 0.05. Some of tests are, however, slightly conservative for small sample sizes (0.037 for ξ_n and 0.038 for (ξ_n, S_n) under $n = 20$).

Our second simulation study investigates the performance of the multivariate tests (Section 2.3), including Chatterjee (ξ_n), Spearman (S_n), Kendall (τ_n), Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n), and Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n). We evaluate two approaches for multivariate versions of S_n and τ_n : one based on Grothe et al.'s formulas and the other based on Borel isomorphism. For Grothe et al.'s method, the p-values are calculated using 5,000 random permutations. For Borel isomorphism method, we calculated p-values analytically. The following two alternatives were considered, where $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and $Z \perp \mathbf{X}$

1. Linear: $\mathbf{X} = (X_{[1]}, X_{[2]}, X_{[3]})$, $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_{[1]}, Y_{[2]}, Y_{[3]})$, where $X_{[i]} \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

$$\begin{cases} Y_{[1]} &= X_{[1]} - X_{[2]} + 2X_{[3]} + 2Z, \\ Y_{[2]} &= -X_{[1]} + 3X_{[2]} - \frac{1}{2}X_{[3]} + 2Z, \\ Y_{[3]} &= \frac{3}{2}X_{[1]} + X_{[2]} + 2X_{[3]} + 2Z. \end{cases}$$

2. Nonlinear: $\mathbf{X} = (X_{[1]}, X_{[2]}, X_{[3]})$, $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_{[1]}, Y_{[2]}, Y_{[3]})$, where $X_{[i]} \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

$$\begin{cases} Y_{[1]} &= 2X_{[1]}^2 + 4|X_{[2]}| + \cos(2\pi X_{[3]}) + 2Z, \\ Y_{[2]} &= 2\cos(2\pi X_{[1]}) + 3X_{[2]}^2 + |X_{[3]}| + 2Z, \\ Y_{[3]} &= 3|X_{[1]}| + 2\cos(2\pi X_{[2]}) + 2X_{[3]}^2 + 2Z. \end{cases}$$

Table 3 summarizes the empirical power of the five tests, where the Grothe et al.'s formula is used for the multivariate versions of S_n and τ_n . The results are consistent with the univariate case: Chatterjee's correlation remains the most powerful test in the nonlinear setting but the least powerful in the linear setting. In contrast, Spearman's and Kendall's tests are powerful in the linear setting, but suffering from extremely low power

in the nonlinear setting. Notably, in the linear setting, Kendall’s test is substantially more powerful than Spearman’s test (10-23% difference). The Chatterjee-Kendall test has the overall best power for both settings and all sample sizes. All the five tests control the type I error rate as they are permutation-based.

Table 4 summarizes the empirical power of the five tests, where the multivariate S_n and τ_n are computed using Borel isomorphism. Interestingly, Kendall’s correlation outperforms the others in both linear and nonlinear settings. This might seem counterintuitive as Kendall’s test typically measures monotonic associations. However, in the linear setting, all the tests exhibit low statistical power. These findings suggest that under Borel isomorphism, combining ξ_n with S_n or τ_n might not be ideal for multivariate data, unlike the complementary behavior observed in the univariate case. Therefore for practical applications, we recommend the permutation tests based on Grothe et al.’s formulas, which offer better overall power.

Table 5 presents the empirical size of the tests based on Borel isomorphism, where it can be seen that several tests including multivariate Kendall, Spearman and Chatterjee-Kendall fail to control the Type I error rate, especially for smaller sample sizes. This suggests that a permutation test might be necessary for these tests to ensure the control of Type I error rate.

4 Discussion and conclusions

Chatterjee’s correlation has gained significant interest due to its simple form and appealing statistical properties. The only one disadvantage is its inferior performance in testing monotonic associations. Our prior work addressed this by combining it with Spearman’s correlation, which is powerful in detecting monotonic associations. This work delves into three key extensions of the Chatterjee-Spearman correlation. Firstly, we examine the symmetrized version of the statistic, along with its asymptotic distribution. This eliminates the need to designate response and independent variables in practical applications, allowing for direct application to diverse datasets, such as gene co-expression data. Secondly, we demonstrate the adaptability of this framework by showing that Spearman’s correlation can be substituted with other rank-based measures like Kendall’s τ or quadrant correlation. This is because Chatterjee’s correlation and these alternatives are also asymptotically normal and independent under the null hypothesis. Simulation studies demonstrate the competitiveness of the symmetrized Chatterjee-Spearman and Chatterjee-Kendall correlations with existing tests. Notably, the Chatterjee-Kendall correlation exhibits slightly better power, particularly for smaller samples. Thirdly, we explore how these new tests can be adapted for analyzing

multivariate data. These extensions significantly broaden the applicability of this method, making it suitable for a wider range of scenarios.

The methods introduced in this paper have some limitations. The multivariate extensions based on Grothe et al.'s formulas are currently restricted to low dimensions because they rely on multivariate ranks $\{R_i^X, R_i^Y, R_i^{(X,Y)}\}$, which can be zeros or very sparse under high dimensions ($\min(p, q) \gg n$), leading to extremely low testing power. For high-dimensional independence testing, established methods such as the distance correlation t-test by Székely & Rizzo (2013) are preferable [24].

While our simulation studies suggest superior power for the Chatterjee-Kendall test compared to existing rank correlations, there is a lack of theoretical justification. By investigating their power against local rotation and mixture alternatives, Shi et al. (2021) showed that Chatterjee's correlation is unfortunately sub-optimal compared to Hoeffding's D , Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt's R , and Bergsma-Dassios' τ^* [7]. An important question is that if the Chatterjee-Kendall and Chatterjee-Spearman tests are also sub-optimal compared to D , R and τ^* under certain local alternatives. This is a challenging question that deserves further investigation, and we leave it for future work.

Acknowledgement

The work was supported by an NSF DBI Biology Integration Institute (BII) Grant (Award No. 2119968; PI-Ceballos).

Competing Interests

The author has declared that no competing interests exist.

Appendix

A.1. Proof of Theorem 1

We begin with some necessary notations. For data rearranged with respect to X , i.e., $\{(X_{(1)}, Y_{X(1)}), \dots, (X_{(n)}, Y_{X(n)})\}$, where $X_{(1)} < \dots < X_{(n)}$ and $\{Y_{X(1)}, \dots, Y_{X(n)}\}$ denote the concomitants, let $R(Y_{X(i)})$ be the rank of $Y_{X(i)}$, i.e.,

$R(Y_{X(i)}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{Y_{(j)} \leq Y_{X(i)}\}$. On the other hand, $\{X_{Y(1)}, \dots, X_{Y(n)}\}$ denote the concomitants, and $R(X_{Y(i)})$ is the rank of $X_{Y(i)}$. Then the two Chatterjee correlations and Spearman correlation can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_n(X, Y) &= 1 - \frac{3}{n^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |R(Y_{X(i+1)}) - R(Y_{X(i)})|, \\ \xi_n(Y, X) &= 1 - \frac{3}{n^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |R(X_{Y(i+1)}) - R(X_{Y(i)})|, \\ S_n(X, Y) &= 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n [i - R(Y_{X(i)})]^2}{n(n^2 - 1)} = -\frac{3(n+1)}{n-1} + \frac{12 \sum_{i=1}^n i R(Y_{X(i)})}{n(n^2 - 1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Under independence, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V[\sqrt{n}S_n(X, Y)] = 1$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V[\sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V[\sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)] = 2/5$. Also, by Lemmas 1 and 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}[\sqrt{n}S_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y)] &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}[\sqrt{n}S_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)] &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}[\sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)] &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we only need to show the joint normality of $[\sqrt{n}S_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(X, Y), \sqrt{n}\xi_n(Y, X)]$. Our proof is a generalization of the proofs for Lemma 3 in [12] and Lemma 2 in [6].

Let $F_X(x)$ and $F_Y(y)$ be the *c.d.f.*'s of X and Y , $\widehat{F}_X(x)$ and $\widehat{F}_Y(y)$ be the empirical *c.d.f.*'s, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{F}_X(x) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{X_i \leq x\}, \\ \widehat{F}_Y(y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq y\},\end{aligned}$$

and $\widehat{F}_X(X_{Y(i)}) = R(X_{Y(i)})/n$. In addition, we define $U_i := F_X(X_{Y(i)})$ and $V_i := F_Y(Y_{X(i)})$. It is straightforward that under independence of X and Y , (U_1, \dots, U_n) are *i.i.d.* uniform on $[0, 1]$. However, it should be noted that (U_1, \dots, U_n) and (V_1, \dots, V_n) are generally dependent. For ξ_n , using Equations 5-8 in [26], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |R(Y_{X(i+1)}) - R(Y_{X(i)})| - n^2/3}{n\sqrt{n}} &\stackrel{d}{\approx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left[|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2U_i(1 - U_i) - \frac{2}{3} \right], \\ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |R(X_{Y(i+1)}) - R(X_{Y(i)})| - n^2/3}{n\sqrt{n}} &\stackrel{d}{\approx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left[|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2V_i(1 - V_i) - \frac{2}{3} \right],\end{aligned}$$

where $\overset{d}{\approx}$ represents asymptotic equivalence in distribution. For S_n , from the proof of Lemma 2 in [6], we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n iR(Y_{X(i)}) - n^3/4}{n^3} \overset{d}{\approx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{i}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right] U_i.$$

Recall that $U_i := F_X(X_{Y(i)})$ and $V_i := F_Y(Y_{X(i)})$, it suffices to show that for any constants $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$, the following quantity converges to a normal distribution

$$\begin{aligned} J_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n & \left[a|F_X(X_i) - F_X(X_{N_X(i)})| + 2aF_X(X_i)(1 - F_X(X_i)) \right. \\ & + b|F_Y(Y_i) - F_Y(Y_{N_Y(i)})| + 2bF_Y(Y_i)(1 - F_Y(Y_i)) \\ & \left. + c \left(\frac{i}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right) F_X(X_i) + \frac{2(a+b)}{3} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $(X_{N_X(i)}, Y_{N_Y(i)})$ represents the right nearest neighbor of (X_i, Y_i) in terms of X (define $N_X(i) = 1$ if $X_i = X_{(n)}$). Here, J_n is the sum of dependent variables, and we leverage Chatterjee's central limit theorem based on interaction graphs [25, 9]. Motivated by [9], we define a graphical rule \mathcal{G} using J_n , which we will show to be an interaction rule (Section 2.3 of [25], page 5). Let $\mathcal{M} := \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}$ and $\mathcal{M}' := \{(X'_1, Y'_1), \dots, (X'_n, Y'_n)\}$ be two *i.i.d.* samples and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^i &:= \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X'_i, Y'_i), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}, \\ \mathcal{M}^j &:= \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X'_j, Y'_j), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}, \\ \mathcal{M}^{ij} &:= \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X'_i, Y'_i), \dots, (X'_j, Y'_j), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Following Equation 4.17 of [9], we define $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}^X(i, j) = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } X_i > X_j \\ \#\{l : X_i < X_l < X_j\}, & \text{if } X_i < X_j, \end{cases}$$

and

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}^Y(i, j) = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } Y_i > Y_j \\ \#\{l : Y_i < Y_l < Y_j\}, & \text{if } Y_i < Y_j. \end{cases}$$

For a pair of indices $\{i, j\}$, there is an edge between them if there exists an $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, such that

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}^X(l, i) \leq 2 \text{ and } D_{\mathcal{M}}^X(l, j) \leq 2$$

or

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}^Y(l, i) \leq 2 \text{ and } D_{\mathcal{M}}^Y(l, j) \leq 2.$$

It is obvious that this rule is invariant under relabeling of indices, therefore it is symmetric (see the definition of symmetric rules in [25], page 5). The statistic $J_n(\mathcal{M})$ can be decomposed into three parts

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n,1}(\mathcal{M}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|F_X(X_i) - F_X(X_{N_Y(i)})|], \\ J_{n,2}(\mathcal{M}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|F_Y(Y_i) - F_Y(Y_{N_X(i)})|], \\ J_{n,3}(\mathcal{M}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[2aF_X(X_i)(1 - F_X(X_i)) + 2bF_Y(Y_i)(1 - F_Y(Y_i)) + c \left(\frac{i}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right) F_X(X_i) + \frac{2(a+b)}{3} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We also need to show that $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ is an interaction rule. For any $\{i, j\}$, if there is no edge between them, there does not exist an $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, such that $D_{\mathcal{M}}^X(l, i) \leq 2$ and $D_{\mathcal{M}}^X(l, j) \leq 2$. Following Lemma 4 of [9], and Lemma 3 of [12]

$$J_{n,1}(\mathcal{M}) - J_{n,1}(\mathcal{M}^i) - J_{n,1}(\mathcal{M}^j) + J_{n,1}(\mathcal{M}^{ij}) = 0,$$

$$J_{n,2}(\mathcal{M}) - J_{n,2}(\mathcal{M}^i) - J_{n,2}(\mathcal{M}^j) + J_{n,2}(\mathcal{M}^{ij}) = 0.$$

The third part, $J_{n,3}$, does not involve nearest neighbor, and it can be easily verified that $J_{n,3}(\mathcal{M}) - J_{n,3}(\mathcal{M}^i) - J_{n,3}(\mathcal{M}^j) + J_{n,3}(\mathcal{M}^{ij}) = 0$. Therefore $J_n(\mathcal{M}) - J_n(\mathcal{M}^i) - J_n(\mathcal{M}^j) + J_n(\mathcal{M}^{ij}) = 0$, i.e., \mathcal{G} is a symmetric interaction rule. The extended graph \mathcal{G}' on $\{1, 2, \dots, n+4\}$ can be constructed same as in Lemma 3 of [12]. Using Theorem 2.5 of [25], there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\mathcal{D}(J_n) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}\sigma^2} + \frac{C}{2\sqrt{n}\sigma^3},$$

where $\sigma^2 = \text{V}(J_n)$, and $\mathcal{D}(J_n)$ is the Wasserstein distance between $(J_n - E(J_n))/\sigma$ and $N(0, 1)$.

We now derive the variance term σ^2 . Let $d_i = i/(n+1) - 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i) + cd_iU_i + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} \\ &= V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)] \right\} + V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$+ Cov \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} \quad (4)$$

$$+ Cov \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right\}, \quad (5)$$

$$+ Cov \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right\}, \quad (6)$$

$$+ V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right). \quad (7)$$

From Equation (14) in [26], term (3) is $2(a^2 + b^2)/45 + O(1/n)$. From Lemma 3 of [12], term (4) is $O(1/n)$. Using the facts that for two independent variables $(U_1, U_2) \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, $V(U_1) = 1/12$, $Cov(U_1, U_1^2) = 1/12$, and $Cov(|U_1 - U_2|, U_1) = 0$, it can be shown that

$$Cov \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right\} = 0,$$

and

$$V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right) = c^2 \left(\frac{2n+1}{72n+1} - \frac{1}{48} \right) = \frac{c^2}{144} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Term (6) is a covariance, therefore it is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2} V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n cd_iU_i \right) + \frac{1}{2} V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} = \frac{b^2}{45} + \frac{c^2}{288} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Therefore we have

$$\frac{2a^2}{45} + \frac{b^2}{45} + \frac{c^2}{288} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \leq \sigma^2 \leq \frac{2a^2}{45} + \frac{b^2}{15} + \frac{c^2}{96} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

and the Wasserstein distance between $(J_n - E(J_n))/\sigma$ and $N(0, 1)$ converges to 0, which completes the proof.

A.2. Proof of Lemma 2

First, we rewrite the quadrant correlation as

$$Q_n(X, Y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i,$$

where

$$Z_i = \text{sgn}[(X_i - \text{med}_n(X))(Y_i - \text{med}_n(Y))].$$

We now derive $V(Z_i)$ and $\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j)$. Due to the difference in how the sample median is defined for odd and even sample sizes, the expressions of variance and covariance will also differ. Therefore, we discuss the two cases separately. When n is even, we have $V(Z_i) = E(Z_i^2) = 1$ and $\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j) = E(Z_i Z_j)$. The expectation $E(Z_i Z_j)$ can be decomposed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E(Z_i Z_j) &= E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] P[X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] \\ &\quad + E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] \\ &\quad + 2E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X) > X_j] P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X) > X_j]. \end{aligned}$$

The probabilities can be derived as follows

$$\begin{aligned} P[X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{\binom{\frac{n}{2}}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}, \\ P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X) > X_j] &= \frac{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{n}{4(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}, \\ P[X_i < \text{med}_n(X) < X_j] &= \frac{n}{4(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional expectations can be derived as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] &= P(Z_i Z_j = 1) - P(Z_i Z_j = -1) = -\frac{1}{n-1}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= -\frac{1}{n-1}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{1}{n-1}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{1}{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summarizing the results above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j) &= \frac{1}{(n-1)^2}, \\
V[Q_n(X, Y)] &= \frac{1}{n^2} [nV(Z_i) + n(n-1)\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j)] \\
&= \frac{n}{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

When n is odd, we have $V(Z_i) = E(Z_i^2) = P(Z_i \neq 0) = (n-1)^2/n^2$. The covariance $\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j) = E(Z_i Z_j)$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
E(Z_i Z_j) &= 2E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)]P[X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] \\
&\quad + 2E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)]P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)].
\end{aligned}$$

The probabilities can be derived as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
P[X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{\binom{\frac{n-1}{2}}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{n-3}{4n}, \\
P[X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{\binom{\frac{n-1}{2}}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{n-1}{4n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The conditional expectations are

$$\begin{aligned}
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] &= -\frac{1}{n}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i < \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= -\frac{1}{n}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j > \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{1}{n}, \\
E[Z_i Z_j | X_i > \text{med}_n(X), X_j < \text{med}_n(X)] &= \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j) &= \frac{1}{n^2}, \\
V[Q_n(X, Y)] &= \frac{1}{n^2} [nV(Z_i) + n(n-1)\text{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j)] \\
&= \frac{n-1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

A.3. Proof of Lemma 4

We first show the uncorrelatedness between $\xi_n(X, Y)$ and $\tau_n(X, Y)$. Ignoring the constants, we need show

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |R_{k+1} - R_k|, \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = 0.$$

We first derive $\text{Cov}[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)]$. For the ease of notation, for any $i < j$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \text{Cov}[R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k = i, \\
A_2 &= \text{Cov}[R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k = j, \\
A_3 &= \text{Cov}[R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k \neq i, j.
\end{aligned}$$

Under independence, (R_1, \dots, R_n) is a random permutation of $(1, \dots, n)$. Furthermore, by symmetry, we have $A_3 = 0$ and $A_1 + A_2 = 0$. To be specific,

$$A_1 = \frac{(n+1)(n+5)}{6(n-1)} - \frac{2(n+2)}{n} - \frac{2}{n(n-1)}.$$

For $i = 1$ and $j = n$,

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = A_1 + A_2 = 0.$$

For $i = 1$ and $j \neq n$,

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = A_2.$$

For $i \neq 1$ and $j = n$,

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = A_1.$$

For $i \neq 1, n$ and $j \neq 1, n$

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = 0.$$

Summarizing the results above, we have

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_k, \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = 0. \quad (8)$$

Similarly, for $\text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)]$, we define

$$A_4 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k \neq i, j, k+1 \neq i, j,$$

$$A_5 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k = i, k+1 = j,$$

$$A_6 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k = i, k+1 \neq j,$$

$$A_7 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k+1 = i, k \neq j,$$

$$A_8 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k = j, k+1 \neq i,$$

$$A_9 = \text{Cov}[\min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j)], \text{ for } k+1 = j, k \neq i,$$

where by symmetry, we have $A_4 = A_5 = 0$, $A_6 = A_7$, $A_8 = A_9$ and $A_6 + A_8 = 0$.

For $i = 1$ and $j = n$,

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = A_6 + A_9 = 0.$$

For $i = 1$ and $j < n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] &= A_8, \text{ for } j = i + 1 \\ \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] &= A_6 + A_7 + A_8 = -A_8, \text{ for } j > i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

For $1 < i < j < n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] &= A_7 + A_8 = 0, \text{ for } j = i + 1 \\ \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] &= A_6 + A_7 + A_8 + A_9 = 0, \text{ for } j > i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The covariance for $i > 1$ and $j = n$ is same as the one for $i = 1$ and $j < n$. Summarizing the results above, we have

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(R_{k+1}, R_k), \sum_{i < j} \text{sgn}(R_i - R_j) \right] = 0. \quad (9)$$

Therefore by Equations 8 and 9, we have $\text{Cov}[\xi_n(X, Y), \tau_n(X, Y)] = 0$.

The proof for quadrant correlation is straightforward. Without loss of generality, we assume odd sample size

$$Q_n(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sgn} \left[\left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \left(R_i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right].$$

Under independence, (R_1, \dots, R_n) is a random permutation of $(1, \dots, n)$. By symmetry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov} \left\{ |R_{k+1} - R_k|, \text{sgn} \left[\left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \left(R_i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right] \right\} &= 0, \text{ for } k = i, \\ \text{Cov} \left\{ |R_{k+1} - R_k|, \text{sgn} \left[\left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \left(R_i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right] \right\} &= 0, \text{ for } k + 1 = i, \\ \text{Cov} \left\{ |R_{k+1} - R_k|, \text{sgn} \left[\left(i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \left(R_i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right] \right\} &= 0, \text{ for } k \neq i, k + 1 \neq i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Cov[\xi_n(X, Y), Q_n(X, Y)] = 0$.

A.4. Proof of Theorem 2

By the projection argument in Hájek (1968), $\tau_n(X, Y)$ can be approximated by the following quantity [21]

$$\tilde{\tau}_n(X, Y) = \frac{8}{n^2(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2}\right) \left(R(Y_{X(i)}) - \frac{n+1}{2}\right).$$

Under independence, Han et al. (2017) showed that $\tilde{\tau}_n(X, Y)$ and $\tau_n(X, Y)$ are asymptotic equivalent (see [22], example 4, page 818). Recall that $S_n(X, Y)$ can be rewritten as

$$S_n(X, Y) = \frac{12}{n(n-1)(n+1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(i - \frac{n+1}{2}\right) \left(R(Y_{X(i)}) - \frac{n+1}{2}\right).$$

Therefore under independence, $\tau_n(X, Y)$ is asymptotically equivalent to $2S_n(X, Y)/3$, and Theorem 1 also applies to Kendall's correlation.

For quadrant correlation, similar to the proof of Lemma 2 in [6], we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sgn}[(X_i - \text{med}_n(X))(Y_i - \text{med}_n(Y))] \stackrel{d}{\approx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sgn} \left[\left(i - \frac{n}{2}\right) \left(V_i - \frac{1}{2}\right) \right].$$

where the right-hand side has expectation 0 and variance 1. Same as in Theorem 1, we will show the following quantity converges to a normal distribution for any $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} J_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n & \left[a|F_X(X_i) - F_X(X_{N_Y(i)})| + 2aF_X(X_i)(1 - F_X(X_i)) \right. \\ & + b|F_Y(Y_i) - F_Y(Y_{N_X(i)})| + 2bF_Y(Y_i)(1 - F_Y(Y_i)) \\ & \left. + c \cdot \text{sgn} \left(\frac{i}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \text{sgn} \left(F_X(X_i) - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{2(a+b)}{3} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Same as in Theorem 1, it can be verified that $J_n(\mathcal{M}) - J_n(\mathcal{M}^i) - J_n(\mathcal{M}^j) + J_n(\mathcal{M}^{ij}) = 0$ (see the definitions of $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^i, \mathcal{M}^j, \mathcal{M}^{ij}$ in A.1), i.e., \mathcal{G} is a symmetric interaction rule. Using Theorem 2.5 of [25], there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\mathcal{D}(J_n) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}\sigma^2} + \frac{C}{2\sqrt{n}\sigma^3},$$

where $\sigma^2 = V(J_n)$, and $\mathcal{D}(J_n)$ is the Wasserstein distance between $(J_n - E(J_n))/\sigma$ and $N(0, 1)$.

We now derive σ^2 . Let $d_i = \text{sgn}[i/(n+1) - 1/2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i) + 2bV_i(1 - V_i) + c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right] \right\} \\ &= V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)] \right\} + V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$+ \text{Cov} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} \quad (11)$$

$$+ \text{Cov} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right\}, \quad (12)$$

$$+ \text{Cov} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right\}, \quad (13)$$

$$+ V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right). \quad (14)$$

From Equation (14) in [26], term (10) is $2(a^2 + b^2)/45 + O(1/n)$. From Lemma 3 of [12], term (11) is $O(1/n)$. Using the facts that for two independent variables $(U_1, U_2) \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, $\text{Cov}[\text{sgn}(U_1 - 1/2), U_1] = 1/4$, $\text{Cov}[\text{sgn}(U_1 - 1/2), U_1^2] = 1/4$ and $\text{Cov}[|U_1 - U_2|, \text{sgn}(U_1 - 1/2)] = 0$, it can be shown that for term (12)

$$\text{Cov} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [a|U_{i+1} - U_i| + 2aU_i(1 - U_i)], \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right\} = 0.$$

For term (14), we have

$$V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right) = c^2.$$

Term (13) is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2} V \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n c \cdot d_i \cdot \text{sgn}(U_i - \frac{1}{2}) \right) + \frac{1}{2} V \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [b|V_{i+1} - V_i| + 2bV_i(1 - V_i)] \right\} = \frac{b^2}{45} + \frac{c^2}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Therefore we have

$$\frac{2a^2}{45} + \frac{b^2}{45} + \frac{c^2}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \leq \sigma^2 \leq \frac{2a^2}{45} + \frac{b^2}{15} + \frac{3c^2}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

and the Wasserstein distance between $(J_n - E(J_n))/\sigma$ and $N(0, 1)$ converges to 0. This completes the proof.

References

- [1] Croux, C. & Dehon, C. (2010). Influence functions of the Spearman and Kendall correlation measures. *Statistical Methods and Applications*, 19: 497-515
- [2] Hoeffding, W. (1948). A non-parametric test of independence. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 19(4):546-557
- [3] Bergsma, W. & Dassios, A. (2014). A consistent test of independence based on a sign covariance related to Kendall's tau. *Bernoulli*, 20(2): 1006-1028
- [4] Blum, J. R., Kiefer, J. & Rosenblatt, M. (1961). Distribution free tests of independence based on the sample distribution function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(2):485-498
- [5] Chatterjee, S. (2021). A new coefficient of correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536): 2009-2022
- [6] Zhang, Q. (2024). On relationships between Chatterjee's and Spearman's correlation coefficients. *Communication in Statistics - Theory & Methods*. In press
- [7] Shi, H., Drton, M. & Han, F. (2021). On the power of Chatterjee's rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 109(2): 317-333
- [8] Lin, Z. & Han, F. (2023). On boosting the power of Chatterjee's rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 110(2): 283-299
- [9] Auddy, A., Deb, N. & Nandy, S. (2024). Exact detection thresholds and minimax optimality of Chatterjee's correlation coefficient. *Bernoulli*, 30(2): 1640-1668
- [10] Azadkia, M. & Chatterjee, S. (2021). A simple measure of conditional dependence. *Annals of Statistics*, 49(6): 3070-3102
- [11] Lin, Z. & Han, F. (2022). Limit theorems of Chatterjee's rank correlation. Available at [arXiv:2204.08031](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.08031)
- [12] Zhang, Q. (2023). On the asymptotic null distribution of the symmetrized Chatterjee's correlation coefficient. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 194

- [13] Cao, S. & Bickel, P. (2020). Correlations with tailored extremal properties. Available at arXiv:2008.10177
- [14] Deb, N., Ghosal, P. & Sen, B. (2020). Measuring association on topological spaces using kernels and geometric graphs. Available at arXiv:2010.01768
- [15] Huang, Z., Deb, N. & Sen, B. (2020). Kernel partial correlation coefficient - a measure of conditional dependence. Available at arXiv:2012.14804v1
- [16] Shi, H., Drton, M. & Han, F. (2024). On Azadkia-Chatterjee's conditional dependence coefficient. *Bernoulli*, 30(2): 851-877
- [17] Han, F. & Huang, Z. (2022). Azadkia-Chatterjee's correlation coefficient adapts to manifold data. Available at arXiv:2209.11156
- [18] Chatterjee, S. & Vidyasagar, M. (2022). Estimating large causal polytree skeletons from small samples. Available at arXiv:2209.07028
- [19] Chatterjee, S. (2022). A survey of some recent developments in measures of association. Available at arXiv:2211.04702
- [20] Dette, H., Siburg, K.F. & Stoimenov, P.A. (2013). A copula-based non-parametric measure of regression dependence. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 40(1): 21-41
- [21] Hájek, J. (1968). Asymptotic normality of simple linear rank statistics under alternatives. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 39(2): 325-346.
- [22] Han, F., Chen, S. & Liu, H. (2017). Distribution-free tests of independence in high dimensions. *Biometrika*, 104(4):813-828.
- [23] Grothe, O., Schnieders, J. & Segers, J. (2014). Measuring association and dependence between random vectors. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 123(2014): 96-110
- [24] Székely, G. & Rizzo, M. (2013). The distance correlation t-test of independence in high dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 117: 193-213
- [25] Chatterjee, S. (2008). A new method of normal approximation. *Annals of Probability*, 36(4):1584-1610.

- [26] Angus, J.E.. (1995). A coupling proof of the asymptotic normality of the permutation oscillation.
Probability in the Engineering and Informational Science, 9:615-621

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Empirical power for univariate X and Y

setting	n	(ξ_n, S_n)	(ξ_n, τ_n)	(ξ_n, Q_n)	ξ_n	D	R	τ^*
Linear	20	0.500	0.562	0.375	0.247	0.521	0.561	0.564
	40	0.863	0.876	0.563	0.440	0.871	0.885	0.883
	60	0.971	0.973	0.809	0.608	0.974	0.977	0.977
	80	0.996	0.997	0.920	0.708	0.997	0.997	0.997
	100	0.999	0.999	0.951	0.796	0.999	0.999	0.999
Quadratic	20	0.347	0.364	0.354	0.456	0.282	0.213	0.252
	40	0.747	0.750	0.742	0.817	0.772	0.739	0.762
	60	0.915	0.915	0.915	0.948	0.971	0.968	0.972
	80	0.966	0.967	0.967	0.981	0.998	0.997	0.998
	100	0.992	0.992	0.991	0.996	1.000	1.000	1.000
Stepwise	20	0.446	0.508	0.348	0.217	0.477	0.511	0.517
	40	0.809	0.827	0.527	0.397	0.830	0.851	0.848
	60	0.951	0.956	0.776	0.551	0.957	0.963	0.963
	80	0.990	0.990	0.894	0.660	0.992	0.992	0.993
	100	0.998	0.998	0.943	0.750	0.998	0.998	0.998
Sinusoid	20	0.184	0.198	0.202	0.283	0.079	0.075	0.080
	40	0.677	0.678	0.678	0.765	0.139	0.116	0.118
	60	0.888	0.888	0.890	0.931	0.206	0.154	0.172
	80	0.962	0.962	0.963	0.979	0.358	0.234	0.272
	100	0.986	0.986	0.986	0.992	0.534	0.375	0.422

Presented in the table above are the empirical power of seven independence tests: Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n) , Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n) , Chatterjee-quadrant (ξ_n, Q_n) , Chatterjee (ξ_n) , Hoeffding's D , Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt's R , and Bergsma-Dassios' τ^* .

Table 2: Empirical size for univariate X and Y

n	(ξ_n, S_n)	(ξ_n, τ_n)	(ξ_n, Q_n)	ξ_n	D	R	τ^*
20	0.038	0.051	0.048	0.037	0.048	0.049	0.052
40	0.045	0.050	0.046	0.043	0.051	0.053	0.050
60	0.046	0.050	0.046	0.045	0.050	0.049	0.048
80	0.047	0.049	0.051	0.047	0.049	0.050	0.051
100	0.047	0.050	0.049	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.047

Presented in the table above are the empirical size of seven independence tests: Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n) , Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n) , Chatterjee-quadrant (ξ_n, Q_n) , Chatterjee (ξ_n) , Hoeffding's D , Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt's R , and Bergsma-Dassios' τ^* .

Table 3: Empirical power for multivariate \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} based on Grothe et al.'s formulas

setting	n	ξ_n	S_n	τ_n	(ξ_n, S_n)	(ξ_n, τ_n)
Linear	20	0.091	0.293	0.400	0.251	0.375
	40	0.135	0.435	0.659	0.427	0.648
	60	0.170	0.655	0.862	0.635	0.831
	80	0.182	0.733	0.860	0.708	0.872
Nonlinear	20	0.451	0.075	0.080	0.351	0.368
	40	0.692	0.137	0.083	0.475	0.454
	60	0.873	0.165	0.090	0.825	0.805
	80	0.983	0.178	0.099	0.946	0.939

Presented in the table above are the empirical power of five independence tests: Chatterjee (ξ_n), Spearman (S_n), Kendall (τ_n), Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n), and Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n), where S_n and τ_n are based on Grothe et al.'s formulas [23].

Table 4: Empirical power for multivariate \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} based on Borel isomorphism

setting	n	ξ_n	S_n	τ_n	(ξ_n, S_n)	(ξ_n, τ_n)
Linear	20	0.087	0.165	0.190	0.111	0.140
	40	0.097	0.272	0.301	0.212	0.233
	60	0.139	0.389	0.412	0.310	0.339
	80	0.154	0.509	0.527	0.409	0.429
Nonlinear	20	0.305	0.569	0.643	0.485	0.554
	40	0.606	0.868	0.901	0.833	0.865
	60	0.805	0.963	0.969	0.961	0.968
	80	0.916	0.994	0.995	0.994	0.994

Presented in the table above are the empirical power of five independence tests: Chatterjee (ξ_n), Spearman (S_n), Kendall (τ_n), Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n), and Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n), where S_n and τ_n are based on Borel isomorphism [19].

Table 5: Empirical size for multivariate \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} based on Borel isomorphism

n	ξ_n	S_n	τ_n	(ξ_n, S_n)	(ξ_n, τ_n)
20	0.034	0.059	0.078	0.036	0.055
40	0.047	0.052	0.061	0.045	0.051
60	0.048	0.049	0.056	0.048	0.050
80	0.048	0.050	0.055	0.049	0.051

Presented in the table above are the empirical size of five independence tests: Chatterjee (ξ_n), Spearman (S_n), Kendall (τ_n), Chatterjee-Spearman (ξ_n, S_n), and Chatterjee-Kendall (ξ_n, τ_n), where S_n and τ_n are based on Borel isomorphism [19].




Figure 1: Scatterplots of $\tau_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi_n(X, Y)$ under $n = 30, 100, 300, 500$.




Figure 2: Scatterplots of $Q_n(X, Y)$ and $\xi_n(X, Y)$ under $n = 30, 100, 300, 500$.