

Robust Inference for High-dimensional Linear Models with Heavy-tailed Errors via Partial Gini Covariance

Yilin Zhang

Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science

Songshan Yang

Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China

Yunan Wu

Yau Mathematical Science Center, Tsinghua University

and

Lan Wang

Department of Management Science, Miami Herbert Business School,

University of Miami

Abstract

This paper introduces the partial Gini covariance, a novel dependence measure that addresses the challenges of high-dimensional inference with heavy-tailed errors, often encountered in fields like finance, insurance, climate, and biology. Conventional high-dimensional regression inference methods suffer from inaccurate type I errors and reduced power in heavy-tailed contexts, limiting their effectiveness. Our proposed approach leverages the partial Gini covariance to construct a robust statistical inference framework that requires minimal tuning and does not impose restrictive moment conditions on error distributions. Unlike traditional methods, it circumvents the need for estimating the density of random errors, and enhances the computational feasibility and robustness. Extensive simulations demonstrate the proposed method's superior power and robustness over standard high-dimensional inference approaches, such as those based on the debiased Lasso. The asymptotic relative efficiency analysis provides additional theoretical insight on the improved efficiency of the new approach in the heavy-tailed setting. Additionally, the partial Gini covariance extends to the multivariate setting, enabling chi-square testing for a group of coefficients. We illustrate the method's practical application with a real-world data example.

Keywords: Decorrelated score; Heavy-tailed data; High-dimensional data; Partial Gini covariance; Robust statistical inference.

1 Introduction

Modern real-world big data, prevalent in fields such as finance, insurance, climate, and biology, often exhibits heavy-tailed behavior (Peinke et al., 2004; Zubair Ahmad and Kharazmi, 2020; Gupta and Chavan, 2022), characterized by the presence of outliers or extreme values. When faced with heavy-tailed errors, conventional high-dimensional regression methods frequently yield biased estimates, imprecise inference, and untrustworthy risk assessment. For example, Cavanaugh et al. (2015) observed the heavy-tailed phenomenon while analyzing the daily precipitation data from more than 22,000 global stations. Neglecting the contamination of heavy-tailed random errors in such data analysis could result in an underestimation of the likelihood and severity of the events of interest, thereby significantly impacting disaster preparedness and response strategies. While extensive research efforts have been dedicated to statistical inference with heavy-tailed random errors for low-dimensional data (Kotchoni, 2012; Davidson, 2012; Cornea-Madeira and Davidson, 2015), studies on high-dimensional inference with heavy-tailed errors remain limited. This is a crucial gap in the literature, as many real-world applications, such as those in finance, insurance, climate, and biology, involve high-dimensional datasets with heavy-tailed behavior.

In this paper, we introduce the *partial Gini covariance*, a novel dependence measure that serves as a foundation for robust statistical inference in high dimensions. Standard high-dimensional inference procedures based on the debiased Lasso (van de Geer et al., 2014; Javanmard and Montanari, 2014; Zhang and Zhang, 2014) are observed to suffer from inflated type I errors and substantial power loss with heavy-tailed random errors, as demonstrated in the Monte Carlo studies in Section 5. Our new inference procedure addresses three key challenges. First, it effectively handles heavy-tailed random errors, including Cauchy distribution errors, which are often overlooked in the existing literature on high-dimensional robust regression. Second, it is straightforward to implement with minimal tuning requirements, avoiding the complexities involved in selecting the regularization

parameters in high-dimensional regression with heavy-tailed errors. Lastly, it enables valid inference on low-dimensional target regression coefficients without estimating the random errors' density function.

Recent advances in robust high-dimensional estimation have primarily focused on Huber regression (Loh, 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2020). While these approaches relax the sub-Gaussian error assumption, they still require certain moment conditions. For instance, Sun et al. (2020) assumes the existence of the $(1 + \delta)$ -th moment of the random error. The robust inference procedure developed in Han et al. (2022) requires the existence of the first moment of the random error. These moment conditions exclude many heavy-tailed distributions, such as Cauchy or Laplace distributions, that are fundamental to traditional robust statistics. Moreover, high-dimensional Huber-type regression requires tuning two parameters—one for regularization and one for robustification—making it computationally demanding.

Consider the high-dimensional linear regression model

$$Y = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^\top$ is the p -dimensional vector of covariates, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* = (\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_p^*)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the p -dimensional coefficient, ε denotes the random error independent of \mathbf{x} . Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}_p$, where $\mathbf{0}_p$ denotes the p -dimensional zero vector and the intercept is absorbed into ε . The number of covariates p may substantially exceed the sample size n , and notably we do not impose any moment condition on ε . For an arbitrary $1 \leq k \leq p$, we aim to test the significance of target parameter β_k^* in the presence of the high-dimensional nuisance parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-k}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_{k-1}^*, \beta_{k+1}^*, \dots, \beta_p^*)^\top$, and extend this to simultaneous testing the significance of a group of coefficients. Let $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, \varepsilon_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be independent copies of $(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)$. The observed data consist of $\{(Y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ with $Y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon_i$.

The Gini covariance is a useful measure of the dependence between random variables from heavy-tailed distributions, and it is widely applied in areas such as economics (e.g.,

studying the relationship between income and expenditure) and social sciences (Yitzhaki and Schechtman, 2013). In this paper, we introduce the concept of partial Gini covariance, partly inspired by the Rank Lasso procedure (Wang et al., 2020) which incorporates the Gini covariance (Schechtman and Yitzhaki, 1987) into its loss function for robust estimation. We show that the partial Gini covariance, introduced in Section 2, acts as a robust decorrelated score function satisfying Neyman’s orthogonality condition, and serves as the foundation for robust statistical inference in high-dimensional regression. We propose an estimator for the partial Gini covariance in the high-dimensional setting, and based on the estimation, we construct a hypothesis testing procedure and investigate the limiting distributions of the proposed test statistic under both the null hypothesis and the local alternatives.

Our approach differs from inference methods based on Huber regression in that it does not require moment conditions on random errors and it circumvents the complexity of simultaneously tuning two regularization parameters. Unlike the debiased Rank Lasso method, which is informally discussed in Fan, Ma and Wang (2020) for the low-dimensional scenario, we address the more challenging high-dimensional inference problem. Our proposed statistic converges to a normal distribution, and its implementation does not need to estimate the density of the random error. Furthermore, by exploring the double summation expression of the partial Gini covariance, we have considerably relaxed the constraints on the sample size n and the dimension p . Existing quantile-based debiased methods implicitly require $p = o\{\exp(n^{1/5})\}$ when the random errors follow a sub-Gaussian distribution (Belloni et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2014; Bradic and Kolar, 2017), whereas our method only requires $p = o\{\exp(n^{1/3})\}$, despite the discontinuous nature of the sample loss function. Our requirement is also less stringent than that for the debiased Huber regression, which requires $p = o\{\exp(n^{\alpha/3})\}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (Han et al., 2022). In addition, we provide the asymptotic relative efficiency (ARE) between the proposed method and the existing high-dimensional inference methods including Zhang and Zhang (2014); Ning and

Liu (2017); Ma et al. (2017). Our ARE analysis provides additional theoretical insight on the improved efficiency of our approach in the heavy-tailed setting. As illustrated in Figure 1, the efficiency improvement can be substantial, with power performance exceeding four times those of the existing methods when the random error follows a Cauchy distribution.

Additionally, we extend the concept of partial Gini covariance to the multivariate case and establish an asymptotic chi-square test to test the significance of a multivariate coefficient vector. We conduct extensive simulation studies and compare our method with three prominent existing methods, including the debiased Lasso (van de Geer et al., 2014; Javanmard and Montanari, 2014; Zhang and Zhang, 2014), the partial Pearson covariance-based method (Ning and Liu, 2017) and partial quantile covariance-based methods (Li et al., 2015; Ma et al., 2017). Our results demonstrate that our approach exhibits superior robustness and efficiency in handling high-dimensional data with heavy-tailed random errors.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the concept of partial Gini covariance and establish the corresponding estimation method. In Section 3, we propose a statistical inference procedure for high-dimensional linear regression and establish asymptotic properties of the test statistic under both the null and alternative hypotheses. Furthermore, we extend the notion of partial Gini covariance to the multivariate scenario and construct a chi-square test. In Section 4, we compare our methods with standard approaches for high-dimensional inference and analyze the asymptotic relative efficiency. Section 5 provides comprehensive simulation studies for testing the significance of both univariate and multivariate coefficients. We illustrate the application of the new methods using a real-world data example in Section 6. Technical proofs are deferred to the Supplementary Material.

2 Partial Gini Covariance

To construct a test statistic that effectively handles heavy-tailed errors in the high-dimensional setting, we introduce a novel measure called the partial Gini covariance in Section 2.1. We then discuss how to estimate the partial Gini covariance in high dimensional settings in Section 2.2.

2.1 Partial Gini Covariance and Neyman Orthogonality

To introduce the notion of partial Gini covariance, we first recall that the Gini covariance between two random variables Y and X is defined as

$$\text{Gcov}(Y, X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{cov} \{F_Y(Y), X\},$$

where $F_Y(y)$ is the cumulative distribution function of Y , and $\text{cov}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the covariance function. It is the basic building block for Gini regression (Olkin and Yitzhaki, 1992), the loss function of which can be written as

$$\text{Gcov}(Y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, Y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \{ |(Y_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}_i) - (Y_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}_j)| \},$$

where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; Y_i and Y_j are independent copies of Y ; \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j are independent copies of \mathbf{x} (e.g., Lerman and Yitzhaki (1984), Section 2.1.3 of Yitzhaki and Schechtman (2013)). Gini regression is known to be equivalent to the popular rank regression loss function with the Wilcoxon score function (Jaekel, 1972; Hettmansperger and McKean, 1998), which enjoys superior robustness and efficiency properties.

For $1 \leq k \leq p$, we denote $\mathbf{z}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{x}_{-k}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{-k} = (X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}, \dots, X_p)^\top$, for notational simplicity. To measure the dependence between Y and X_k adjusting for the confounder \mathbf{z}_k in the heavy-tailed case, we introduce an intuitive new concept, *partial Gini covariance*. We first regress X_k on \mathbf{z}_k and denote $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \{ (X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_k)^2 \}$. Then, we regress Y on \mathbf{z}_k using Gini regression and denote $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbb{E} \{ (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k) F_{Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}(Y$

$-\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k)$, where $F_{Y-\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}(\cdot)$ represents the cumulative distribution function of the random variable $Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k$. The partial Gini covariance between Y and X_k given \mathbf{z}_k is defined as

$$\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) = \text{cov} \left\{ F_{Y-\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k), X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k \right\}. \quad (2)$$

The partial Gini covariance thus is the Gini covariance between $Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k$ and $X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k$. We observe that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ satisfies an important moment condition when $E(\mathbf{z}_k) = \mathbf{0}_{p-1}$ and $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$ follows continuous distribution:

$$E \left\{ \mathbf{z}_k F_{Y-\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k) \right\} = \mathbf{0}_{p-1}. \quad (3)$$

The equation holds since the derivative of $E \left\{ (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k) F_{Y-\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k) \right\}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ equals zero, which is proved in the Supplementary Materials. As a result, the Gini covariance between $Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k$ and covariate \mathbf{z}_k equals zero.

It is clear that Y has a bounded influence for the partial Gini covariance as its effect is through $F(\cdot)$, which is bounded. Meanwhile, Lemma 1 below shows the partial Gini covariance in (2) enjoys a property called Neyman orthogonality, which ensures small errors in estimating the nuisance parameters do not significantly affect the estimation of the parameter of interest (Neyman, 1959, 1979; Chernozhukov et al., 2015). The bounded influence and the Neyman orthogonality together provide the foundation for robust inference in high dimensions.

Define $M(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \text{cov} \left\{ F_{Y-\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k), X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_k \right\}$.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose Condition (C1) in Section 3.1 holds. When $\beta_k^* = 0$, we have*

$$\left. \frac{\partial M(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right|_{(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})=(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k)} = \mathbf{0}_{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\partial M(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right|_{(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})=(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k)} = \mathbf{0}_{p-1}.$$

Lemma 1 indicates that the estimation of $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k)$ is locally insensitive to small perturbations of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$. As the result, the estimate for the partial Gini covariance can still achieve root- n asymptotic normality even when the estimation bias measured in the L_2 norm of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$ is of order $O\{(n^{-1/2} \log p)^{1/2}\}$ in high dimensions.

2.2 The Estimation of Partial Gini Covariance in High Dimensions

We are interested in the high-dimensional scenario where p is much larger than n ($p \gg n$). To overcome the overfitting due to high dimensionality, we use regularized estimates with sparsity assumptions on both $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$.

Estimation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$. We adopt the regularized Gini regression (or equivalently rank regression) to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ in the high-dimensional setting. Specifically, the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ is defined as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}_1(Y, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-1})^\top$ and $\mathcal{L}_1(Y, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the regularized Gini loss function given by

$$\mathcal{L}_1(Y, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{n(n-1)\}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |(Y_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i}) - (Y_j - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,j})| + \lambda_{Y,G,k} \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} |\theta_l|. \quad (4)$$

The estimation error bound for the high-dimensional regularized rank Lasso was derived in Wang et al. (2020). Rank Lasso enjoys two particularly appealing properties. First, it possesses desirable robustness and efficiency in the presence of heavy-tailed error contamination. Second, its implementation is free of tuning parameter in the sense that $\lambda_{Y,G,k}$ could be simulated without knowledge of the random error distribution. Specifically, let $\mathbf{s}_n = -2\{n(n-1)\}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z}_{k,i} r_i$ denote the subgradient, with $\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ following the uniform distribution on the permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Wang et al. (2020) showed that for any given $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$ and $c > 1$, the choice of the tuning parameter $\lambda_{Y,G,k} = c F_{\|\mathbf{s}_n\|_\infty}^{-1}(1 - \alpha_0)$, where $F_{\|\mathbf{s}_n\|_\infty}^{-1}(1 - \alpha_0)$ denotes $(1 - \alpha_0)$ -quantile of the distribution of $\|\mathbf{s}_n\|_\infty$, ensures a desirable estimation accuracy with high probability. It is noted that the distribution of \mathbf{s}_n does not depend on the error distribution.

Estimation of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$. The estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$ is defined as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \mathcal{L}_2(X_k, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\gamma})$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_2(X_k, \mathbf{z}_k; \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i})^2 + \lambda_{X,k} \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} |\gamma_l|.$$

with $\lambda_{X,k}$ being the tuning parameter.

Estimation of the partial Gini covariance. Denote $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{k,i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$ and let $R(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{k,i})$

be the rank of $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{k,i}$ among $\{\widehat{\varepsilon}_{k,i}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Our estimate for $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i}) \{R(\widehat{\varepsilon}_{k,i})/n - 1/2\} \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i}) \{1(\widehat{\varepsilon}_{k,i} \geq \widehat{\varepsilon}_{k,j}) - 1/2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The penalized Gini regression method used to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}$ and the indicator function in $\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k)$ both contribute to the robustness of the estimated partial Gini covariance. Furthermore, the estimate is computationally efficient.

Denote $s_X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k\|_0$ and $s_{Y,G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}\|_0$. When the covariates follow the sub-Gaussian distribution, $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}\|_2 = O_p(\lambda_{Y,G,k} s_{Y,G}^{1/2})$ and $\lambda_{Y,G,k} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\}$ under the lower restricted eigenvalue condition and the random error condition (Wang et al., 2020). Under the lower restricted eigenvalue condition, $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k\|_1 = O_p(\lambda_{X,k} s_X)$, where $\lambda_{X,k} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\}$ (Fan, Li, Zhang and Zou, 2020). We relegate the lower restricted eigenvalue condition and the random error condition to the Supplementary Material.

3 The New Inference Procedures

3.1 Testing the Significance of a Target Covariate

We consider the target parameter of interest β_k^* , with \mathbf{z}_k representing the vector of high-dimensional confounders. Our main objective is to test the following hypothesis:

$$H_{0,k} : \beta_k^* = 0 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1,k} : \beta_k^* \neq 0. \quad (6)$$

We impose the following regularity conditions to facilitate our technical derivation.

(C1) Let $F_{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2}(\cdot)$ denote the distribution function of $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$. $F_{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2}(\cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R} .

(C1') $F_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $F_{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2}(\cdot)$ are second order differentiable, with first and second order derivatives uniformly bounded by a constant $B_\varepsilon > 0$.

(C2) There exists some constant $c_1 > 0$ such that $E\{\exp(t\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x})\} \leq \exp(c_1 t^2/2)$ for each fixed $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{S}^{d-1} is the surface of d -dimensional unit ball.

(C3) $s_X n^{-1/2} \log p = o(1)$ and $n^{-1/2} s_{Y,G} \log(p) \{\log(n \vee p)\}^{1/2} = o(1)$.

Condition (C1) and its strengthened version Condition (C1') allow the random error ϵ to follow a heavy-tailed distribution such as the Cauchy distribution, relaxing the standard normality or sub-gaussianity assumption on ϵ . Condition (C2) states that the covariates follow the sub-Gaussian distribution, which is common in high-dimensional inference literature (Javanmard and Montanari, 2014; Ning and Liu, 2017). The sparsity assumption in Condition (C3) is typically imposed in the inference of high-dimensional quantile regression (Brdic and Kolar, 2017) or composite quantile regression (Zhao et al., 2014) for controlling the supremum of an empirical process. Condition (C3) also provides relations among the sample size, the dimension of the data, and the sparsity levels of the regression coefficients. When s_X and $s_{G,Y}$ are finite, this condition is equivalent to $\log(p) = o(n^{1/3})$. Compared with the conditions for the inference of high-dimensional quantile regression models (Zhao et al., 2014; Belloni et al., 2014), which require $\log(p) = o(n^{1/5})$ under the sub-Gaussian setting, the condition in our context is notably less restrictive. This relaxation is facilitated by the double summation form in (5), see the proof of Theorem 1.

We first demonstrate that the testing problem in (6) is equivalent to the following hypothesis testing problem based on the partial Gini covariance:

$$H_{0,k}^G : \text{pGcov}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) = 0 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1,k}^G : \text{pGcov}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \neq 0. \quad (7)$$

To see the above equivalence intuitively, it is known that the population parameter β^* can be expressed as $\arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} E\{|(Y_i - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}_i) - (Y_j - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}_j)|\}$ (see, e.g., Hettmansperger and McKean (2010)). Hence, we also have $\beta^* = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \text{Gcov}(Y - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, Y - \beta^\top \mathbf{x})$. If $\beta_k^* = 0$, the derivative of $\text{Gcov}(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - bX_k, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - bX_k)$ with respect to b at $b = 0$ equals zero. Following the similar derivation as that in Section S.1 of the Supplementary

Material, we can show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \text{Gcov}(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - bX_k, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - bX_k)}{\partial b} \Big|_{(\boldsymbol{\theta}, b) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,k}, 0)} \right\} = -4 \cdot \text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k).$$

The equivalence of the two hypotheses thus follows by noting that $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) = 0$ when $\beta_k^* = 0$. The the equivalence between (6) and (7) is formally stated in Lemma 2 below.

LEMMA 2. *Under Condition (C1), $\beta_k^* = 0$ if and only if $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) = 0$.*

Let $f_{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2}(\cdot)$ be the density function of $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$. Define $\sigma_{G,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 12^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ (X_{ki} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2 \right\}$.

Theorem 1 below states the asymptotic normality of $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k)$ under both the null and local alternative hypotheses.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Conditions (C1'), (C2) and (C3) hold. We also assume that*

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k}\|_0 \leq c_2 s_{Y,G} \tag{8}$$

and $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k\|_2$ is bounded.

(i) *Under $H_{0,k}$ in (6), $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{G,k}^2)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where “ \xrightarrow{d} ” stands for “converges in distribution”.*

(ii) *Under $H_{1,k,n} : \beta_k^* = n^{-1/2} \beta_{k,0}$ with $\beta_{k,0} \neq 0$, $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k \mid \mathbf{z}_k) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(f_{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2}(0) \beta_{k,0}, \sigma_{G,k}^2)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark. Assumption (8) is commonly adopted for high-dimensional statistical inference (Guo et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2014). For rank Lasso, we verify that (8) holds with high probability in the Supplementary Material.

It follows from Theorem 1 that the asymptotic variance of partial Gini covariance is $\sigma_{G,k}^2 = 12^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ (X_{ki} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2 \right\}$ under $H_{0,k}$. This result has two important implications. First, the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{G,k}^2$ is independent of the distribution of Y , allowing for Y with a heavy-tailed distribution. Thus it ensures the robustness of the test based on the

partial Gini covariance. Second, the result eliminates the need for error density estimation, distinct from the robust test statistics based on debiased rank Lasso estimator (Fan, Ma and Wang, 2020), where the asymptotic variance depends on the density of the random error.

To conduct the hypothesis test (6), we employ $\widehat{\sigma}_{G,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (12n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ki} - \widehat{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2$ as the estimate of $\sigma_{G,k}^2$. By Corollary 4.3 of Ning and Liu (2017), $\widehat{\sigma}_{G,k}^2$ is a consistent estimate of $\sigma_{G,k}^2$. We reject $H_{0,k}$ in (6) at a significance level of α if

$$n^{1/2} \left| \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k) / \widehat{\sigma}_{G,k} \right| \geq Z_{\alpha/2},$$

where $Z_{\alpha/2}$ is the the upper $\alpha/2$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution. The proof of Theorem 1 is challenging due to the high dimensionality and the discontinuity of the indicator function. To overcome this obstacle, we employ decoupling techniques for the U process, which effectively manages the discontinuity term. Further details can be found in the Supplementary Material.

3.2 Simultaneous Testing the Significance of a Group of Covariates

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{k_1, \dots, k_d\}$ denote the index set of the parameters of interest, where $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathcal{S}|$ denotes the cardinality of the set \mathcal{S} . Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}^* = (\beta_{k_1}^*, \dots, \beta_{k_d}^*)^\top$ represent the corresponding sub-vector of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$. We now consider testing if these coefficients are simultaneously zero:

$$H_{0,\mathcal{S}} : \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}^* = \mathbf{0}_d, \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1,\mathcal{S}} : \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}^* \neq \mathbf{0}_d. \quad (9)$$

To construct the test statistic, we define the multivariate partial Gini covariance by

$$\text{pGcov}(Y, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} \mid \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{cov} \left\{ F_{Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}), \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}} \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = (X_{k_1}, \dots, X_{k_d})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-d}$ is the sub-vector removing $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}}$ from \mathbf{x} . Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,\mathcal{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \text{E} \left\{ (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}) F_{Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}} (Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}) \right\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-d) \times d}} \text{E} (\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}}\|_2^2)$. Lemma 3 below is an extension of Lemma 2.

LEMMA 3. Under Condition (C1), $\beta_S^* = \mathbf{0}_d$ if and only if $\text{pGcov}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S) = \mathbf{0}_d$.

Based on Lemma 3, testing (9) is equivalent to testing

$$H_{0,S}^G : \text{pGcov}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S) = \mathbf{0}_d, \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_{1,S}^G : \text{pGcov}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}_d.$$

To construct the test statistics, we first apply Gini regression with Lasso penalty and obtain an estimate of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,S}$ as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}_1(Y, \mathbf{z}_S; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with the tuning parameter $\lambda_{Y,G,S}$. To estimate $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S$, we use node-wise least square regression with Lasso penalty (van de Geer et al., 2014; Javanmard and Montanari, 2014; Zhang and Zhang, 2014). Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{k_1}, \dots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{k_d})$ be the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S$. For $j = 1, \dots, d$, by using Lasso penalty with the tuning parameter λ_{X,k_j} ,

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{k_j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} (2n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_{k_j,i} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_{S,i}\|_2^2 + \lambda_{X,k_j} \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1.$$

Similarly to the univariate case, the error bounds for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,S}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S$ have been derived in the previous work. Based on Wang et al. (2020), we have $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,S} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{G,S}\|_2 = O_p(\lambda_{Y,G,S} s_{Y,G}^{1/2})$, where $\lambda_{Y,G,S} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\}$. According to Fan, Li, Zhang and Zou (2020), we have $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_S - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S\|_1 = O_p(\lambda_{X,S} s_X)$, where $\lambda_{X,S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{\lambda_{X,k_j}, j = 1, \dots, d\} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\}$.

Define $\varepsilon_{S,i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,S}^\top \mathbf{z}_{S,i}$. The estimate for $\text{pGcov}(Y, X_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S)$ is

$$\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\mathbf{x}_{S,i} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_S^\top \mathbf{z}_{S,i} \right) \{1(\widehat{\varepsilon}_{S,i} \geq \widehat{\varepsilon}_{S,j}) - 1/2\}.$$

To test (9), we propose the following chi-square test statistic

$$\widehat{W}_{G,S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{G,S}^{-1} \widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, \mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{z}_S),$$

where

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{G,S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (12n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbf{x}_{S,i} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_S^\top \mathbf{z}_{S,i} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{S,i} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_S^\top \mathbf{z}_{S,i} \right)^\top$$

is the estimate of the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{G,S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 12^{-1} \text{cov}(\mathbf{x}_S - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S^\top \mathbf{z}_S)$. The asymptotic distributions for $\widehat{W}_{G,S}$ under both the null hypothesis and the local alternatives are given in Theorem 2 below.

Theorem 2. *Suppose Conditions (C1'), (C2), and (C3) are valid, $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,S}\|_0 \leq c_2 s_{Y,G}$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_S\|_F$ is bounded.*

(i) *Under $H_{0,S}$, $n\widehat{W}_{G,S} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_d^2$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where χ_d^2 stands for the chi-square distribution with d degrees of freedom;*

(ii) *Under $H_{1,S,n} : \boldsymbol{\beta}_S^* = n^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S,0}$ with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S,0} \neq \mathbf{0}_d$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$n\widehat{W}_{G,S} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_d^2\{144f_{\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2}(0)^2\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S,0}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{G,S}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S,0}\},$$

where $\chi_d^2(\mu)$ is the noncentral chi-square distribution with d degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter μ .

Theorem 2 implies that $\widehat{W}_{G,S}$ has nontrivial power in detecting the local alternatives even if $\boldsymbol{\beta}_S^*$ converges to 0 at the rate of $n^{-1/2}$. When $\boldsymbol{\beta}_S^*$ is a nonzero vector of constants (or fixed alternative), the power of the above test converges to one as n diverges.

4 Power Advantages for Heavy-tailed Error Distributions: Comparison with Existing Methods

In this section, we conduct a detailed power comparison between our proposed testing method and those utilizing partial Pearson covariance and partial quantile covariance. Our analysis reveals that the proposed method can be substantially more efficient than the partial Pearson covariance approach, particularly in scenarios with heavy-tailed random errors. Furthermore, the analysis suggests greater power than the method based on partial quantile covariance under local alternatives.

4.1 Comparison with the Method Based on Partial Pearson Covariance

We derive the efficiency gain of the new test based on the partial Gini covariance versus the one based on partial Pearson covariance in the presence of heavy-tailed random errors. The partial Pearson covariance, proposed by Yule (1897), is a classical tool for testing the significance of the coefficient in the linear model. In the high-dimensional settings, the estimate for partial Pearson covariance is given by

$$\widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{P,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})(X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki}), \quad (10)$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{P,k} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (2n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k,i})^2 + \lambda_{Y,P,k} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1$ with $\lambda_{Y,P,k}$ being the tuning parameter. Under the null hypothesis, (10) is asymptotically equivalent to the test statistic proposed by Zhang and Zhang (2014). Therefore, the following comparison also includes some earlier testing methods including Zhang and Zhang (2014); van de Geer et al. (2014); Javanmard and Montanari (2014). Meanwhile, (10) is also equivalent to the decorrelated score test of Ning and Liu (2017) for the linear regression model.

They further proved that $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ converges to the normal distribution with mean zero and variance $\sigma_{P,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E(\varepsilon^2) \cdot E\{(X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k)^2\}$ under $H_{0,k}$, and proposed to test (6) based on the statistic $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) / \widehat{\sigma}_{P,k}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{P,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{P,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2\} \{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2\}$. It is important to note that $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) / \widehat{\sigma}_{P,k}$ is only applicable to test (6) when $E(\varepsilon^2)$ exists. Thus, $\widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ may not perform well when ε is heavy-tailed.

To compare the performance of the tests using $\widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ and $\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ for (6), we derive Pitman's asymptotic relative efficiency (ARE) (Pitman, 1948; Noether, 1955) of these two tests. Pitman's ARE is a useful measure for comparing the performance of two statistical tests in large samples. It is defined as the ratio of the sample sizes needed by two tests to achieve the same power under a sequence of local alternatives.

Specifically, we consider model (1). The Pitman sequence of the local alternatives is given by:

$$H_{1,k,n} : \beta_k^* = n^{-1/2}\beta_{k,0},$$

where $\beta_{k,0} > 0$ is a constant. For ease of presentation, we assume that \mathbf{z}_k and X_k are independent of each other. Under this condition, we can derive Pitman’s ARE as follows:

$$\text{ARE}\left(\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k), \widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)\right) = 12\text{var}(\epsilon)f_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}^2(0). \quad (11)$$

The proof is relegated in Supplementary Material. (11) indicates that the ARE solely relies on the distribution of ϵ . In Table 1, we present the values of ARE with different distributions of ϵ . It can be observed that $\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ demonstrates comparable performance with $\widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ when ϵ follows the normal distribution while exhibits significantly higher power when ϵ is heavy-tailed.

Table 1: The asymptotic relative efficiency for $\widehat{\text{pGcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ and $\widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ under different distributions of ϵ . We consider 5 different error distributions including, Normal(0,1): standard normal distribution; Uniform[0,1]: uniform distribution on [0, 1]; $T_3(0,1)$: t -distribution with 3 degrees of freedom; Exp(1) exponential distribution with rate 1; and LogNormal(0,1): log-normal distribution.

ϵ	Normal(0,1)	Uniform[0,1]	$T_3(0,1)$	Exp(1)	LogNormal(0,1)
ARE	0.955	1.000	1.901	3.000	7.353

4.2 Comparison with the Method Based on Partial Quantile Covariance

In the context of robust regression, quantile-based methods are among the most common approaches. Several studies have investigated variable selection within these methods (Wu and Liu, 2009; Wang et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Notably, significant advancements have been made by Li et al. (2015) and Ma et al. (2017), who introduced the concept of partial

quantile covariance to quantify the interplay between variables Y and X_k , while taking into account the confounding influence of covariates $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$. The partial quantile covariance is defined as follows:

$$\text{pQcov}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) = \text{cov} \left\{ \psi_\tau(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - Q_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}), X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k \right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{(\boldsymbol{\theta}, a)} \mathbb{E} \{ \rho_\tau(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - Q_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}) \}$. The partial quantile covariance and partial Gini covariance are closely related. To bridge these two measures, we introduce an intermediate concept. Inspired by Zou and Yuan (2008), who proposed composite quantile regression to simultaneously consider T levels of quantile $\tau_t \in [0, 1]$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ simultaneously, we define the partial composite quantile covariance as

$$\text{pCQcov}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{cov} \left\{ T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi_{\tau_t}(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{CQ,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - Q_{\tau_t, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{CQ,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}), X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k \right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{CQ,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbb{E} \{ T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_{\tau_t}(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k - Q_{\tau_t, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}) \}$. In the case where $\tau_t = t/(T+1)$, we can establish Proposition 1.

PROPOSITION 1. $\text{pCQcov}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \rightarrow \text{pGcov}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

In this study, we aim to formulate the asymptotic normality of the partial quantile covariance in the high dimensional case, extending the work of Li et al. (2015) which was limited to the case where p is finite. Denote

$$(\widehat{Q}_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{Q,k}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau(Y_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki} - \eta) + \lambda_{Y, Q, k} \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} |\theta_l|, \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda_{Y, Q, k}$ is the tuning parameter. Then we define the estimate for partial quantile covariance in high-dimensional settings is

$$\widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{Q,k} - \widehat{Q}_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k})(X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki}).$$

Let $s_{Y, Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}\|_0$ be the sparsity level for quantile regression. We impose the following conditions to establish the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$:

$$(C3^*) \quad \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k\|_1 = O_p(\lambda_{X,k} s_X), \quad \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{Q,k} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}\|_2 + \|\widehat{Q}_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k} - Q_{\tau, Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{Q,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}\|_2 = O_p(\lambda_{Y,Q,k} s_{Y,Q}^{1/2}),$$

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{Q,k}\|_0 \leq c_3 s_{Y,Q}. \quad \lambda_{X,k} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\} \text{ and } \lambda_{Y,Q,k} = O\{(n^{-1} \log p)^{1/2}\}.$$

$$(C4^*) \quad s_X n^{-1/2} \log p = o(1) \text{ and } s_{Y,Q}^{3/4} \log(n \vee p) \{(\log p)/n\}^{1/4} = o(1).$$

Condition (C3*) includes the estimation error bound of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{Q,k}$ derived in the previous literature (Belloni and Chernozhukov, 2011). A similar condition is imposed in Zhao et al. (2014) for testing high dimensional composite quantile regression coefficients. When s_X and $s_{Q,Y}$ are finite, Condition (C4*) is equivalent to $\log p = o(n^{1/5})$. This condition has been imposed in Belloni et al. (2014) and Zhao et al. (2014), which focus on the inference of the high-dimensional quantile regression model when ϵ is sub-Gaussian.

$$\text{Denote } \sigma_{Q,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tau - \tau^2) E\{(X_k - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_k)^2\}.$$

Theorem 3. *Suppose Conditions (C2), (C1'), (C3*), and (C4*) are valid.*

$$(i) \quad \text{Under } H_{0,k}, \quad n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{Q,k}^2) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

$$(ii) \quad \text{Under } H_{1,k}, \quad \widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \longrightarrow \text{pQcov}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

To conduct hypothesis test, we determine whether to reject $H_{0,k}$ in (6) based on the value of $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) / \widehat{\sigma}_{Q,k}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{Q,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\tau - \tau^2) \{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2\}$. This test, using $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) / \widehat{\sigma}_{Q,k}$ for (6), is more restrictive than the proposed test based on partial Gini covariance, which requires $\log(p) = o(n^{1/3})$, as it necessitates $\log(p) = o(n^{1/5})$.

An issue arises when assessing the effectiveness of $\widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$. Denote $\mu_Q(\beta_k^*) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{pQcov}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$. $\mu'_Q(\beta_k^*)$ goes to 0 at $\beta_k^* = 0$. Consider a specific scenario where both X_k and ε follow the standard normal distributions, and X_k is independent with \mathbf{x}_{-k} . Rather than calculating $\mu'_Q(0)$, we investigate the limiting behavior of $\mu'_Q(n^{-1/2} \beta_{k,0})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is straightforward to derive

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu'_Q(n^{-1/2} \beta_{k,0}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (13)$$

This limit indicates that $\widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ might be too small under local alternatives when covariates are mutually independent, leading to poor performance in testing (6). This aspect has not been previously addressed in the literature. We illustrate the empirical power for $\widehat{\text{pQcov}}_\tau(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ in Section 5.1, which indeed confirms this observation. The derivation of Equation (13) is provided in the Supplementary Material.

5 Simulation Studies

5.1 Partial Gini Covariance Based Tests

In this section, we present the finite sample performance of the partial Gini covariance-based test. We consider two studies for our analysis. The first study aims to examine the empirical size of the partial Gini covariance-based test and partial quantile covariance-based test. The second study focuses on comparing the power performance of other high-dimensional independence tests against others. Throughout the simulations, we generate $\mathbf{x}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^\top$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ independently from multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance Σ , where $(\Sigma)_{s,t} = 0.5^{|s-t|}$. We consider the following linear model, for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$Y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon_i.$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ here is set as $(\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_{10}^*, \mathbf{0}_{p-10})^\top$, and $\varepsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ are generate independently from \mathbf{x}_i . We consider three different noise settings: (i) $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, (ii) $\varepsilon \sim T_2(0, 1)$, (iii) $\varepsilon \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$. $T_2(0, 1)$ represents standard t distribution with 2 degrees of freedom. The latter two are both heavy-tailed distributions. We fix $n = 200$ and consider $p = 500$ and $p = 2000$ under three different distributions of ε_i respectively.

We compare the empirical distributions of six test statistics in the following context, which can be divided into two types. The first type is partial covariance-based tests, involving partial Gini covariance-based test statistic, quantile partial covariance-based test

statistic with $\tau = 0.5$, and partial Pearson covariance-based test statistic. To ensure that linear coefficients $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{P,k}$ are correctly specified in partial Pearson covariance under heavy-tailed cases, we also implement another modified estimate by applying rank Lasso (Wang et al., 2020). The estimate is denoted as

$$\widetilde{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})(X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki}),$$

The corresponding test statistic is $n^{1/2} \widetilde{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k) / \widetilde{\sigma}_{P,k}$, where $\widetilde{\sigma}_{P,k}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{G,k}^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2\} \{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ki} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_k^\top \mathbf{z}_{ki})^2\}$. The second group includes debiased Lasso (Zhang and Zhang, 2014) and its bootstrap version Dezeure et al. (2017). These two test statistics are implemented using R package `hdi` with 101 times of bootstrap.

Study 1. In this study, we examine the empirical sizes of the aforementioned test statistics. We set $\beta_1^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = \beta$ and vary β in $\{0.2, 0.4, \dots, 1\}$. We test the hypothesis $H_{0,11}$, which represents the independent case. Here, the significant level α is set to 0.05. The empirical sizes under six scenarios are presented in Table 2.

From the table, it is evident that the sizes of the proposed test and the test based on partial quantile covariance are well-controlled at approximately 0.05 under three different noise settings. In contrast, both of the two partial Pearson covariance-based test statistics are overly conservative when ε follows heavy-tailed distributions. In fact, partial Pearson covariance-based test statistics failed to converge to the normal distribution, because the asymptotic variances of estimated partial Pearson covariance $n^{1/2} \widehat{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$ and $n^{1/2} \widetilde{\text{pPcov}}(Y, X_k | \mathbf{z}_k)$, do not exist. As for two debiased Lasso-based test statistics, the empirical sizes cannot be well-controlled when ε follows heavy-tailed distributions. For instance, when $(n, p) = (200, 2000)$ and ε follow t distribution with 2 degrees of freedom, the empirical size of debiased Lasso-based tests reach 0.100. This observation highlights the importance of employing rank-based partial covariance to achieve the asymptotic normality of the test.

Study 2. We examine the empirical power performance of the test statistics in Study 1.

Table 2: The empirical sizes of six test statistics when β vary in $\{0.2, 0.4, \dots, 1\}$: partial Gini covariance based tests (pGcov); partial quantile covariance based tests (pQcov); partial Pearson covariance based tests (pPcov); modified partial Pearson covariance based tests (pPcov_m); de-biased Lasso based tests (dBeta); de-biased Lasso based tests using bootstrap (dBeta_b).

β	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1
	$(n, p) = (200, 500), \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$					$(n, p) = (200, 2000), \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$				
pGcov	0.040	0.066	0.058	0.054	0.040	0.038	0.052	0.060	0.042	0.060
pQcov	0.054	0.052	0.064	0.048	0.044	0.034	0.040	0.036	0.060	0.050
pPcov	0.048	0.050	0.048	0.046	0.048	0.050	0.060	0.056	0.076	0.066
pPcov _m	0.034	0.054	0.048	0.062	0.048	0.038	0.038	0.054	0.042	0.050
dBeta	0.050	0.066	0.054	0.058	0.046	0.056	0.066	0.064	0.076	0.072
dBeta _b	0.040	0.050	0.074	0.066	0.048	0.042	0.044	0.066	0.046	0.054
	$(n, p) = (200, 500), \varepsilon \sim T_2(0, 1)$					$(n, p) = (200, 2000), \varepsilon \sim T_2(0, 1)$				
pGcov	0.050	0.060	0.062	0.054	0.052	0.052	0.062	0.056	0.062	0.060
pQcov	0.050	0.054	0.060	0.038	0.060	0.054	0.054	0.056	0.060	0.056
pPcov	0.050	0.044	0.054	0.044	0.042	0.038	0.076	0.048	0.068	0.066
pPcov _m	0.026	0.032	0.030	0.030	0.042	0.026	0.042	0.032	0.040	0.028
dBeta	0.048	0.056	0.066	0.058	0.076	0.052	0.082	0.066	0.092	0.100
dBeta _b	0.066	0.078	0.070	0.046	0.054	0.058	0.074	0.062	0.076	0.064
	$(n, p) = (200, 500), \varepsilon \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$					$(n, p) = (200, 2000), \varepsilon \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$				
pGcov	0.034	0.052	0.056	0.050	0.068	0.050	0.054	0.068	0.054	0.066
pQcov	0.050	0.060	0.052	0.048	0.040	0.044	0.040	0.048	0.060	0.058
pPcov	0.016	0.018	0.030	0.036	0.050	0.018	0.044	0.030	0.032	0.044
pPcov _m	0.018	0.026	0.022	0.026	0.030	0.018	0.024	0.012	0.020	0.022
dBeta	0.034	0.070	0.058	0.064	0.060	0.074	0.058	0.050	0.052	0.068
dBeta _b	0.042	0.070	0.070	0.074	0.068	0.088	0.062	0.056	0.062	0.072

In this study, we test $H_{0,1}$. We keep $\beta_2^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = 1$ and vary β_1^* in $\{0, 0.1, \dots, 1\}$ to control the signal strength. When $\beta_1^* = 0$, the null hypothesis is true. Here, we reject the null hypothesis at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. The other settings remain the same as in Study 1. The empirical powers are depicted in Figure 1.

From Figure 1, we observe that as the signal strength β_1^* increases, all the tests demonstrate improved power performance. Notably, when the noise follows the standard normal distribution, the partial Gini covariance-based test shows power performance comparable to the partial Pearson-based tests and two debiased Lasso-based tests. The power of the test based on partial quantile covariance grows slowly as β_1^* increases, compared with the other five methods. This phenomenon can be attributed to equation (13), which quantifies Pitman's efficiency of partial quantile covariance. When noise follows t or Cauchy distribution, the power of our proposed partial Gini covariance outperforms the other five methods in terms of power. The simulation results echo the discussion about asymptotic relative efficiency in equation (11). In addition, Figure 1 illustrates that the two partial Pearson covariance tests and two de-biased Lasso tests display similar empirical power performance.

5.2 Partial Gini Chi-square Tests

We investigate the empirical sizes and powers of chi-square test statistics based on multivariate partial Gini covariance, with the same high-dimensional model as discussed in the previous subsection. In this study, we test the hypothesis $H_{0,\mathcal{S}}$. To be specific, we consider two cases:

$$(1) \mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, 3\}, \beta_4^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = 1;$$

$$(2) \mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, 10\}, \beta_4^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = 0.$$

In the first case, we test 3 elements, with all elements greater than 0 under the alternative hypothesis. The second case represents a sparse scenario, where only 3 out of the 10




Figure 1: The empirical powers of six test statistics: partial Gini covariance based tests (pGcov); partial quantile covariance based tests (pQcov); partial Pearson covariance based tests (pPcov); modified partial Pearson covariance based tests (pPcov_m); de-biased Lasso based tests (dBeta); de-biased Lasso based tests using bootstrap (dBeta_b). The horizontal axis represents the signal strength β_1^* .

elements are non-zero. We vary $\beta = \beta_1^* = \beta_2^* = \beta_3^*$ in $\{0, 0.1, \dots, 1\}$ to control the dependence level. Specifically, when $\beta = 0$, the null hypothesis holds true. Here, we reject the null hypothesis at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. The empirical sizes and powers are reported in Table 3. Table 3 confirms that the sizes of proposed methods are well-controlled

Table 3: The empirical sizes powers of our proposed chi-square tests based on multivariate partial Gini covariance. Three different distributions of ε are considered: standard normal distribution ($\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$); standard t distribution with 2 degrees of freedom ($T_2(0, 1)$); standard Cauchy distribution ($\text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$).

β	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
Case 1: $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\beta_4^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = 1$											
$(n, p) = (200, 500)$											
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.056	0.492	0.972	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$T_2(0, 1)$	0.050	0.224	0.742	0.970	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$	0.052	0.158	0.402	0.700	0.906	0.968	0.996	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$(n, p) = (200, 2000)$											
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.050	0.200	0.728	0.972	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$T_2(0, 1)$	0.062	0.122	0.404	0.794	0.950	0.992	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$	0.060	0.096	0.190	0.404	0.624	0.816	0.926	0.952	0.976	0.984	0.998
Case 2: $\mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, 10\}$, $\beta_4^* = \dots = \beta_{10}^* = 0$											
$(n, p) = (200, 500)$											
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.058	0.392	0.956	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$T_2(0, 1)$	0.040	0.150	0.668	0.936	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$	0.052	0.088	0.270	0.624	0.862	0.936	0.994	0.998	0.998	1.000	1.000
$(n, p) = (200, 2000)$											
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.046	0.284	0.850	0.992	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$T_2(0, 1)$	0.036	0.142	0.446	0.820	0.970	0.986	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\text{Cauchy}(0, 1)$	0.052	0.064	0.144	0.346	0.578	0.776	0.872	0.936	0.976	0.988	0.994

in both cases, given the fact that all the empirical sizes are around 0.05 when $\beta = 0$. When

$\beta > 0$, we can find that the empirical power has better performance as the dependence strength level β increases. The empirical powers of our tests approach 1 as β increases.

6 Real Data Application

In this section, we apply our methods to a car pricing dataset. Our goal is to identify the variables that are significant in predicting the car price. The dataset comes from market surveys conducted across the United States by the Chinese automobile company Geely Auto and is available for download from <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/goyalshalini93/car-data>. The data comprises $n = 205$ different cars with 25 variables including the price and other 24 variables related to the car characteristic. We remove 5 description variables such as car names and focus on the remaining 19 predictors.

We consider six methods, as discussed in Section 5.1, which include partial Gini covariance, quantile partial covariance with $\tau = 0.5$, partial Pearson covariance, and partial Pearson covariance modified-based test statistics. To transform the real dataset into a high-dimensional one and further examine our methods in controlling type I error, we artificially create 380 variables obtained by 20 different permutations of the row order of the original 19 predictors. This results in a dimensionality of $p = 380 + 19 = 399$. For each true covariate, we calculate the partial covariances-based test statistics and the corresponding p -values. To examine whether our methods can control the empirical size, we set different significance levels $\alpha \in \{0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$ and report the rejection proportions among 380 simulated variables in Table 4. From the table, we can see that the rejection proportions of partial Gini covariance and partial quantile covariance are around the significance levels, which indicates that these two methods work well in controlling type I errors. In contrast, tests based on partial Pearson covariance and debiased Lasso tend to be conservative. This is mainly due to the heavy-tailed distribution of the response variable.

To further identify the variables that are significant in predicting the price, we report

Table 4: The rejection proportions among 380 simulated variables at significance levels $\alpha \in \{0.01, 0.5, 0.1\}$. Six independence test statistics include: partial Gini covariance (pGcov), partial quantile covariance (pQcov) with $\tau = 0.5$, partial Pearson covariance (pPcov), modified partial Pearson covariance (pPcov_m), de-biased Lasso (dBeta), and de-biased Lasso using bootstrap based tests (dBeta_b).

α	0.01	0.05	0.1		0.01	0.05	0.1
pGcov	0.011	0.053	0.105	pQcov	0.008	0.061	0.113
pPcov	0.003	0.024	0.061	pPcov _m	0.008	0.042	0.089
dBeta	0.008	0.037	0.076	dBeta _b	0.011	0.031	0.076

the test statistics and corresponding p -values for 19 original variables in Table 5. From the results in Table 5, we observe that our method has selected 7 variables with p -values less than 0.05. Notably, these 7 variables include the 4 variables selected by partial quantile covariance and 2 by modified partial Pearson covariance. This phenomenon indicates that our method has larger power in testing compared with other methods, which echoes the theoretical and simulation results in Section 5. Due to the heavy-tailed distribution of the response, the partial Pearson covariance-based test does not work well and has inconsistent results with the previously mentioned three methods. The two debiased Lasso methods, despite employing the same test statistics, produce distinct p -values. This inconsistency indicates the price follows heavy-tailed distribution and the debiased Lasso methods are not applicable.

We further conduct our partial Gini chi-square test to examine its performance when the coefficients are multivariate. Specifically, we consider three different sets: (1) $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\text{“curbweight”}, \text{“horsepower”}, \text{“citympg”}\}$ includes variables whose p -value is less than 0.01 in partial Gini covariance test.; (2) $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{\text{“enginelocation”}, \text{“carlength”}, \text{“carwidth”}, \text{“curbweight”}, \text{“cylindernumber”}, \text{“horsepower”}, \text{“citympg”}\}$ includes variables whose p -value is less than 0.05 in partial Gini covariance test. (3) \mathcal{S}_3 is all 19 original variables. We report the test statistics and corresponding p -values of these three tests in Table 6, with all three p -values

Table 5: The test statistics and corresponding p -values for 19 original variables. Six independence test statistics include partial Gini covariance (pGcov), partial quantile covariance (pQcov) with $\tau = 0.5$, partial Pearson covariance (pPcov), modified partial Pearson covariance (pPcov_{*m*}), de-biased Lasso (dBeta), and de-biased Lasso using bootstrap based tests (dBeta_{*b*}).

	symboling	fueltype	aspiration	doornumber	enginelocation
pGcov	1.841 (0.066)	-1.952 (0.051)	-0.647 (0.517)	-0.295 (0.768)	-2.086 (0.037)
pQcov	1.209 (0.226)	-0.823 (0.411)	0.025 (0.979)	0.334 (0.738)	-1.992 (0.046)
pPcov	0.554 (0.580)	-0.753 (0.451)	1.140 (0.254)	-0.593 (0.553)	-1.840 (0.066)
pPcov _{<i>m</i>}	1.009 (0.313)	-1.327 (0.185)	0.859 (0.390)	-1.142 (0.254)	-1.516 (0.129)
dBeta	0.994 (0.320)	-1.129 (0.259)	0.987 (0.323)	-0.656 (0.512)	-6.431 (<0.001)
dBeta _{<i>b</i>}	0.994 (0.598)	-1.129 (0.500)	0.987 (0.147)	-0.656 (0.618)	-6.431 (0.010)
	wheelbase	carlength	carwidth	carheight	curbweight
pGcov	1.057 (0.290)	2.181 (0.029)	2.543 (0.011)	-0.222 (0.824)	5.069 (<0.001)
pQcov	1.735 (0.083)	1.381 (0.167)	3.019 (0.003)	0.924 (0.356)	4.086 (<0.001)
pPcov	1.778 (0.075)	-1.455 (0.146)	2.713 (0.007)	0.488 (0.626)	1.739 (0.082)
pPcov _{<i>m</i>}	0.918 (0.359)	1.116 (0.264)	1.894 (0.058)	-0.669 (0.505)	2.745 (0.006)
dBeta	1.734 (0.079)	-0.701 (0.483)	4.784 (<0.001)	0.545 (0.586)	3.558 (<0.001)
dBeta _{<i>b</i>}	1.734 (0.029)	-0.701 (0.049)	4.784 (0.010)	0.545 (0.245)	3.558 (0.029)
	cylindernumber	enginesize	boreratio	stroke	compressionratio
pGcov	2.415 (0.016)	1.757 (0.079)	1.474 (0.140)	-0.193 (0.847)	0.177 (0.859)
pQcov	-1.191 (0.234)	0.966 (0.334)	-0.731 (0.465)	-1.547 (0.122)	1.684 (0.092)
pPcov	-1.784 (0.074)	2.555 (0.011)	-2.580 (0.010)	-3.026 (0.002)	0.122 (0.902)
pPcov _{<i>m</i>}	2.024 (0.043)	1.742 (0.081)	0.811 (0.418)	0.124 (0.901)	0.007 (0.995)
dBeta	-1.478 (0.139)	8.024 (<0.001)	-1.711 (0.087)	-1.932 (0.053)	-0.708 (0.479)
dBeta _{<i>b</i>}	-1.478 (0.108)	8.024 (0.010)	-1.711 (0.010)	-1.932 (0.010)	-0.708 (0.735)
	horsepower	peakrpm	citympg	highwaympg	
pGcov	3.248 (0.001)	1.352 (0.176)	-2.622 (0.009)	-0.534 (0.594)	
pQcov	3.376 (0.001)	0.937 (0.349)	-1.340 (0.174)	0.242 (0.809)	
pPcov	1.356 (0.175)	2.434 (0.015)	-0.234 (0.815)	-0.288 (0.773)	
pPcov _{<i>m</i>}	1.408 (0.159)	1.165 (0.244)	-0.753 (0.451)	-1.029 (0.303)	
dBeta	2.656 (0.008)	2.411 (0.016)	-0.503 (0.615)	-0.187 (0.851)	
dBeta _{<i>b</i>}	2.656 (0.068)	2.411 (0.010)	-0.503 (0.657)	-0.187 (0.794)	

less than 0.001. This implies that among all three subsets of variables, at least one is significant in predicting the car price, which is consistent with the results shown above.

Table 6: The partial Gini covariance chi-square test statistics (W_G) and their corresponding p -values.

	\mathcal{S}_1	\mathcal{S}_2	\mathcal{S}_3
W_G	42.530	57.515	163.813
p -values	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The supplementary materials include all the technical proofs.

References

- Belloni, A. and Chernozhukov, V. (2011), ‘l1-penalized quantile regression in high-dimensional sparse models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **39**(1), 82–130.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V. and Kato, K. (2014), ‘Uniform post-selection inference for least absolute deviation regression and other Z-estimation problems’, *Biometrika* **102**(1), 77–94.
- Bradic, J. and Kolar, M. (2017), ‘Uniform inference for high-dimensional quantile regression: linear functionals and regression rank scores’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06209*.
- Cavanaugh, N. R., Gershunov, A., Panorska, A. K. and Kozubowski, T. J. (2015), ‘The probability distribution of intense daily precipitation’, *Geophysical Research Letters* **42**(5), 1560–1567.

- Chernozhukov, V., Hansen, C. and Spindler, M. (2015), ‘Valid post-selection and post-regularization inference: An elementary, general approach’, *Annual Review of Economics* **7**(1), 649–688.
- Cornea-Madeira, A. and Davidson, R. (2015), ‘A parametric bootstrap for heavy-tailed distributions’, *Econometric Theory* **31**(3), 449–470.
- Davidson, R. (2012), ‘Statistical inference in the presence of heavy tails’, *The Econometrics Journal* **15**(1), C31–C53.
- Dezeure, R., Bühlmann, P. and Zhang, C.-H. (2017), ‘High-dimensional simultaneous inference with the bootstrap’, *Test* **26**, 685–719.
- Fan, J., Li, R., Zhang, C.-H. and Zou, H. (2020), *Statistical foundations of data science*, CRC press.
- Fan, J., Ma, C. and Wang, K. (2020), ‘Comment on “a tuning-free robust and efficient approach to high-dimensional regression”’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115**(532), 1720–1725.
- Guo, X., Li, R., Zhang, Z. and Zou, C. (2024), ‘Model-free statistical inference on high-dimensional data’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* pp. 1–12.
- Gupta, N. and Chavan, S. R. (2022), ‘Characterizing the tail behaviour of daily precipitation probability distributions over india using the obesity index’, *International Journal of Climatology* **42**(4), 2543–2565.
- Han, D., Huang, J., Lin, Y. and Shen, G. (2022), ‘Robust post-selection inference of high-dimensional mean regression with heavy-tailed asymmetric or heteroskedastic errors’, *Journal of Econometrics* **230**(2), 416–431.
- Hettmansperger, T. P. and McKean, J. W. (1998), *Robust Nonparametric Statistical Methods*, London: Arnold.

- Hettmansperger, T. P. and McKean, J. W. (2010), *Robust nonparametric statistical methods*, CRC Press.
- Jaeckel, L. A. (1972), ‘Estimating regression coefficients by minimizing the dispersion of the residuals’, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **43**(5), 1449–1458.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014), ‘Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression’, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **15**(1), 2869–2909.
- Kotchoni, R. (2012), ‘Applications of the characteristic function-based continuum GMM in finance’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **56**(11), 3599–3622.
- Lee, E. R., Noh, H. and Park, B. U. (2014), ‘Model selection via bayesian information criterion for quantile regression models’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109**(505), 216–229.
- Lerman, R. I. and Yitzhaki, S. (1984), ‘A note on the calculation and interpretation of the gini index’, *Economics Letters* **15**(3-4), 363–368.
- Li, G., Li, Y. and Tsai, C.-L. (2015), ‘Quantile correlations and quantile autoregressive modeling’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**(509), 246–261.
- Loh, P.-L. (2021), ‘Scale calibration for high-dimensional robust regression’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15**(2), 5933–5994.
- Ma, S., Li, R. and Tsai, C.-L. (2017), ‘Variable screening via quantile partial correlation’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112**(518), 650–663.
- Neyman, J. (1959), Optimal asymptotic tests of composite statistical hypotheses, *in* ‘Probability and Statistics (edited by U. Grenander)’, John Wiley, New York, p. 416–444.

- Neyman, J. (1979), ‘C (α) tests and their use’, *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A* pp. 1–21.
- Ning, Y. and Liu, H. (2017), ‘A general theory of hypothesis tests and confidence regions for sparse high dimensional models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **45**(1), 158–195.
- Noether, G. E. (1955), ‘On a theorem of pitman’, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **26**, 64–68.
- Olkin, I. and Yitzhaki, S. (1992), ‘Gini regression analysis’, *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique* **60**(2), 185–196.
- Peinke, J., Böttcher, F. and Barth, S. (2004), ‘Anomalous statistics in turbulence, financial markets and other complex systems’, *Annalen der Physik* **516**(7-8), 450–460.
- Pitman, E. J. (1948), *Lecture Notes on Nonparametric Statistical Inference: Lectures Given for the University of North Carolina, [Chapel Hill], 1948*, University of North Carolina.
- Schezhtman, E. and Yitzhaki, S. (1987), ‘A measure of association based on gini’s mean difference’, *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* **16**(1), 207–231.
- Sun, Q., Zhou, W.-X. and Fan, J. (2020), ‘Adaptive huber regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115**(529), 254–265.
- van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y. and Dezeure, R. (2014), ‘On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **42**(3), 1166–1202.
- Wang, L., Peng, B., Bradic, J., Li, R. and Wu, Y. (2020), ‘A tuning-free robust and efficient approach to high-dimensional regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115**(532), 1700–1714.

- Wang, L., Wu, Y. and Li, R. (2012), ‘Quantile regression for analyzing heterogeneity in ultra-high dimension’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107**(497), 214–222.
- Wang, L., Zheng, C., Zhou, W. and Zhou, W.-X. (2021), ‘A new principle for tuning-free huber regression’, *Statistica Sinica* **31**(4), 2153–2177.
- Wu, Y. and Liu, Y. (2009), ‘Variable selection in quantile regression’, *Statistica Sinica* **19**(2), 801–817.
- Yitzhaki, S. and Schechtman, E. (2013), *The Gini methodology: a primer on a statistical methodology*, Vol. 272, Springer.
- Yule, G. U. (1897), ‘On the theory of correlation’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **60**(4), 812–854.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014), ‘Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **76**(1), 217–242.
- Zhao, T., Kolar, M. and Liu, H. (2014), ‘A general framework for robust testing and confidence regions in high-dimensional quantile regression’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.8724*.
- Zou, H. and Yuan, M. (2008), ‘Composite quantile regression and the oracle model selection theory’, *The Annals of Statistics* **36**(3), 1108–1126.
- Zubair Ahmad, Eisa Mahmoudi, G. G. H. and Kharazmi, O. (2020), ‘New methods to define heavy-tailed distributions with applications to insurance data’, *Journal of Taibah University for Science* **14**(1), 359–382.