

Detecting practically significant dependencies in infinite dimensional data via distance correlations

Holger Dette* Marius Kroll†

November 26, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we take a different look on the problem of testing the independence of two infinite dimensional random variables using the distance correlation. Instead of testing if the distance correlation vanishes exactly, we are interested in the (null)-hypothesis that it does not exceed a certain threshold. Our formulation of the testing problem is motivated by the observation that in many cases it is more reasonable to test for a practically significant dependency since it is rare that a null hypothesis of perfect independence is exactly satisfied. This point of view also reflects statistical practice, where one often classifies the strength of the association in categories such as “small”, “medium” and “large” and the precise definitions depend on the specific application.

To address these problems we develop a pivotal test for the hypothesis that the distance correlation $\text{dcor}(X, Y)$ between two random variables X and Y does not exceed a pre-specified threshold Δ , that is $H_0 : \text{dcor}(X, Y) \leq \Delta$ versus $H_1 : \text{dcor}(X, Y) > \Delta$. We also determine a minimum value $\hat{\Delta}_\alpha$ from the data such that H_0 is rejected for all $\Delta \leq \hat{\Delta}_\alpha$ at controlled type I error α . This quantity can be interpreted as a measure of evidence against the hypothesis of independence.

The new test is applicable to data modeled by a strictly stationary and absolutely regular process $(X_k, Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with components taking values in separable metric spaces of negative type, which includes Euclidean as well as functional data. Our approach is based on a new functional limit theorem for the sequential distance correlation process $\{\text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y) | \lambda \in [0, 1]\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $\text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y)$ is the estimate of the distance correlation from the sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{[n\lambda]}, Y_{[n\lambda]})$.

MSC2020 Classification: 62G10; 62G15; 60F17.

Keywords and phrases: Relevant Hypotheses; Distance Covariance; Distance Correlation; Self-Normalisation; Tests for Independence.

1 Introduction

One of the fundamental problems in statistics is to measure and test for a statistical association between two quantities of interest. Besides the popular Pearson’s correlation

*Faculty of Mathematics, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, holger.dette@rub.de

†Faculty of Mathematics, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, marius.kroll@rub.de

coefficient (Pearson, 1920), Spearman's ρ (Spearman, 1904) and Kendall's τ (Kendall, 1938) numerous other measures have been proposed in the literature for two-dimensional data, see, Hoeffding (1948a) and Blum et al. (1961) for some further early references and Gretton et al. (2008), Heller et al. (2012), Dette et al. (2012), Bergsma and Dassios (2014), Albert et al. (2015), Geenens and Lafaye de Micheaux (2020) and Chatterjee (2021) for some more recent references. Besides these and other measures of dependence the *distance covariance* and *distance correlation* have found considerable interest since their introduction by Székely et al. (2007) and Székely and Rizzo (2009, 2012). These authors discussed the distance covariance in the context of Euclidean data and Lyons (2013) generalised the theory to general separable metric spaces.

The distance covariance proves exceedingly useful as a tool in statistics. Even the early work by Székely et al. (2007) includes critical values for a test of independence based on the distance covariance. Székely and Rizzo (2013) construct a t -test for independence of high-dimensional data; Dehling et al. (2020) test for independence of time-continuous empirical processes; Davis et al. (2018) consider the distance covariance in the context of time series, resulting, among other things, in a goodness-of-fit test; Fokianos and Pitsillou (2017) develop a Box-Ljung-type test for serial independence; Zhou (2012) defines the auto distance covariance and correlation for time series under the assumption of physical dependence; Betken and Dehling (2022+) and Betken et al. (2022+) propose independence tests for long-range and short-range dependent time series. The importance of the distance correlation for measuring dependencies between non-Euclidean data becomes apparent from the work Sejdinovic et al. (2013) who prove that the distance covariance and the Hilbert-Schmidt independence criterion (HSIC) as introduced by Gretton et al. (2005) are in a certain sense equivalent. This provides a new point of view on the rich literature in this field. For some examples we refer to the work of Gretton et al. (2005, 2008) and Gretton and Györfi (2010), who construct HSIC-tests for independence; Zhang et al. (2008) who apply the HSIC to non-iid data; Wang et al. (2021) who test for independence between time series; Sen and Sen (2014) who propose a goodness-of-fit test for linear models. An extensive literature survey of the distance covariance is given in Edelman et al. (2019) and a very recent article on independence testing via distance covariance is Dette and Tang (2024), who propose a distance covariance (and a corresponding independence test) which does not require the existence of moments.

These papers differ in several aspects, such as the type of data, the kind of serial dependence that is assumed (if any), the test statistics and methods to obtain critical values. However, a common feature of all cited references that construct independence tests consists in the fact that these are proposed for the hypothesis of exact independence, which is characterized by a vanishing distance covariance or correlation. We argue that there are many applications where it is fact clear from the scientific problem that the association between two quantities might be small but cannot be exactly 0 (which corresponds to complete independence), and one is in fact interested in testing for a practically significant deviation from independence. For example, Yao et al. (2018) considered the problem of the mutual independence of a part of the components of a high-dimensional vector using sums of the

corresponding pairwise empirical distance covariances. Their test rejects the null hypothesis of vanishing distance covariances, although the authors observe that the dependencies are relatively weak, see Section 7 in in this reference.

In the present paper we therefore take a different point of view on the problem of testing independence of infinite dimensional data via the distance covariance $\text{dcov}(X, Y)$ and correlation $\text{dcor}(X, Y)$ between two random vectors, say X and Y (the precise definition of the distance correlation will be given in equation (2.2) in Section 2.1). Instead of testing for exact independence we propose to test the hypothesis that the distance correlation (covariance) does not exceed a given threshold, say Δ , that is

$$H_0^{\text{rel}} : \text{dcor}(X, Y) \leq \Delta \text{ versus } H_1^{\text{rel}} : \text{dcor}(X, Y) > \Delta . \quad (1.1)$$

Note that these hypotheses include the “classical” null hypothesis of independence, which is obtained by the choice $\Delta = 0$. However in this paper we focus on the case $\Delta > 0$, assuming that it is clear from the scientific context that there is some (potentially small) association between X and Y , and that the real question is if this association is practically significant. This point of view is in line with [Tukey \(1991\)](#), who argues in the context of comparisons of means that ‘*all we know about the world teaches us that the effects of A and B are always different – in some decimal place – for any A and B. Thus asking “Are the effects different?” is foolish.*’ Translated to the problem of independence testing this means that it might not be reasonable to ask if X and Y are dependent (as there usually exists a dependence but its strength might be very small).

The choice of the threshold Δ in (1.1) raises the question when a dependence measure (such as a distance correlation) is *practically significant* and a corresponding answer depends sensitively on the particular problem under consideration. This discussion has a long history in applied statistics and is related to the specification of the effect size (see, for example, [Cohen, 1988](#)), which is used in various disciplines to obtain a better interpretation of p -values for comparing sample means. Several authors transfer this concept to classify the strength of the association in three categories “small” ($\Delta \leq d_\star \leq \Delta_1$), “medium” ($\Delta_1 < d_\star \leq \Delta_2$) or “large” ($\Delta_2 < d_\star \leq 1$), where d_\star denotes a dependence measure taking values in the interval $[0, 1]$. For example using Δ_2 and $d_\star = \text{dcor}(X, Y)$ means that one is testing for a “large” association between X and Y measured with respect to the distance correlation. As pointed out before, the exact definition of the classes varies between different disciplines and the considered measure. Exemplarily, we refer to the recent work of [Brydges \(2019\)](#) and [Lovakov and Agadullina \(2021\)](#) who give recommendations for Pearson’s correlation in the context of gerontology research and social psychology, and to [Huang et al. \(2022\)](#), who consider Spearman’s ρ . Other works discussing these issues from different perspectives are [Hemphill \(2003\)](#); [Bosco et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Quintana \(2016\)](#), and a common aspect in all these references consists in the fact that the authors define a threshold Δ , which should be exceeded to consider an association as *practically significant*.

Developing a statistical tests for the hypotheses (1.1) is non-trivial as one has to control the level under a composite null hypothesis. Consequently, standard tools such as asymptotic inference under independence, permutation or bootstrap tests are not easily applicable

for testing hypotheses of the form (1.1). In the present paper we will develop, for possibly infinite dimensional data, a very simple and pivotal test for these hypotheses. Interestingly, this test turns out to exhibit some monotonicity properties that allow us – even in cases where it is difficult to define a threshold before the experiment – to identify the minimum value of Δ for which H_0 in (1.1) is not rejected at a controlled type I error. This value can be interpreted as a measure of evidence against the null hypothesis.

Our approach is applicable to 2-dimensional stationary time series with components taking values in metric spaces, making it feasible to analyse the dependence between data in spaces with a complex structure. Besides these contributions from the statistical side this work makes also several contributions from a theoretical point of view. In particular we develop an invariance principle for the sequential process of the empirical distance covariance and correlation from dependent random variables taking values in general metric spaces, which is the basic tool for the pivotal inference proposed here.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Distance covariance and correlation in metric spaces

Suppose that $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ are two separable metric spaces equipped with the Borel- σ -algebras. For an $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ -valued random variable (X, Y) with distribution $\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}$ whose marginals \mathbb{P}^X on \mathcal{X} and \mathbb{P}^Y on \mathcal{Y} have finite first moments we define the distance covariance of (X, Y) as

$$\text{dcov}(X, Y) := \text{dcov}(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}) := \int h'(z_1, \dots, z_6) \, d\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}(z_1) \dots \mathbb{P}^{X, Y}(z_6),$$

where $z_i := (x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ ($i = 1, \dots, 6$), and the kernel h' is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h'(z_1, \dots, z_6) := & [d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_1, x_2) - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_1, x_3) - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_2, x_4) + d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_3, x_4)] \\ & \cdot [d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_1, y_2) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_1, y_5) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_2, y_6) + d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_5, y_6)]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

This definition follows that of Lyons (2013), which differs from that of Székely et al. (2007) by a power of 2, i.e. taking the square root of what we call $\text{dcov}(X, Y)$ results in what Székely et al. (2007) call $\mathcal{V}(X, Y)$. The same holds for the distance correlation, to be introduced below.

A key property of the distance covariance is that it vanishes if and only if X and Y are independent: $\text{dcov}(X, Y) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}^{X, Y} = \mathbb{P}^X \otimes \mathbb{P}^Y$. This property holds provided that the underlying metric spaces $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ are of so-called strong negative type. Spaces of negative type (without the ‘strong’) arise when one investigates which metric spaces are isometrically embeddable into Hilbert spaces. This classical theory goes back to Menger (1928a,b, 1931) and Schoenberg (1935, 1937), and it can be shown that a separable metric space $(\mathcal{S}, d_{\mathcal{S}})$ is of negative type if and only if there is an isometric embedding $\phi : (\mathcal{S}, d_{\mathcal{S}}) \rightarrow (H, \|\cdot\|_H^2)$ for some separable Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H)$. If furthermore the map

$$\xi \mapsto \int \phi \, d\xi,$$

where ξ is a signed measure with finite first moments and the integral on the right-hand side is an H -valued Bochner integral, is injective on the set of all Borel probability measures with finite first moments, then $(\mathcal{S}, d_{\mathcal{S}})$ is said to be of strong negative type. This concept is used by [Lyons \(2013\)](#) who proves the equivalence $\text{dcov}(X, Y) = 0$ if and only if X and Y are independent for random variables X and Y that take their values in spaces of strong negative type. For these spaces, therefore, the distance covariance is a useful tool to detect deviations from independence. Many spaces which are useful in practice are of strong negative type. Among them are all separable L_p spaces for any $1 < p \leq 2$; in particular, any separable Hilbert space is of strong negative type (Theorem 3.16 in [Lyons, 2013](#)). For more details on the connection between the distance covariance and the property of (strong) negative type, we refer to [Lyons \(2013\)](#).

A closely related quantity to $\text{dcov}(X, Y)$ is the distance correlation between two random variables X and Y , which is defined as

$$\text{dcor}(X, Y) := \text{dcor}(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}) := \frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X) \text{dcov}(Y, Y)}},$$

whenever $\text{dcov}(X, X), \text{dcov}(Y, Y) > 0$. By [Lyons \(2013\)](#), this is the case if neither X nor Y are almost surely constant. If one of the two random variables is almost surely constant, then the distance correlation is set to 0. It is obvious that the characterisation of independence via the distance covariance carries over to the distance correlation, i.e. $\text{dcor}(X, Y) = 0$ if and only if X and Y are independent. Furthermore, the distance correlation is bounded by 1, with equality if and only if there exists a continuous function $f : (\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that $Y = f(X)$ almost surely and $d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x') = \text{const} \cdot d_{\mathcal{Y}}(f(x), f(x'))$ for all x, x' in the support of $\mathcal{L}(X)$. If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are Euclidean spaces, the function f has the form $f(x) = a + \beta Cx$ for some vector a , a non-zero constant $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and an orthogonal matrix C . See [Lyons \(2013\)](#) for the general result and [Székely et al. \(2007\)](#) for the Euclidean special case.

Given a sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ from a strictly stationary process $(X_k, Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, a natural estimator for the (usually unknown) value $\text{dcov}(X, Y)$ is the empirical distance covariance

$$\text{dcov}_n(X, Y) := \text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$ denotes the empirical measure of $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$. Under the assumption of ergodicity and finite first moments, it holds that this estimator converges almost surely to the true value of the distance covariance,

$$\text{dcov}_n(X, Y) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} \text{dcov}(X, Y).$$

In this generality, in particular for stationary processes, this result can be found in [Kroll \(2022\)](#), though earlier results of this kind are given by [Lyons \(2013\)](#) and [Janson \(2021\)](#) under the assumption of iid data in metric spaces and by [Davis et al. \(2018\)](#) for strictly stationary and mixing data in Euclidean space.

By definition, the empirical distance covariance is a V -statistic of order 6 and kernel h' . Thus, using asymptotic theory for V -statistics it can be shown (Kroll, 2023) that under some technical assumptions (most importantly, $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -moments and absolute regularity), it holds that

$$\sqrt{n}(\text{dcov}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcov}(X, Y)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad (2.3)$$

with $\sigma^2 > 0$ if and only if $\text{dcov}(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}) > 0$ (otherwise, the rate of convergence is of order $1/n$). A similar result will be derived in the present paper for a corresponding estimator, say $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y)$, for the distance correlation. In principles such results can be used to construct an asymptotic level α test for the hypotheses (1.1) by rejecting H_0 for large values of $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y)$. However such a test would require a precise estimation of the asymptotic variance which is difficult for infinite dimensional dependent data. In the present paper we circumvent these problems and construct a pivotal test for the hypotheses (1.1) using a sequential version of $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y)$.

2.2 Absolutely regular processes

Our main results are valid for weakly dependent data-generating processes. More precisely, we assume that the underlying process is β -mixing, also known as absolute regularity. The β -mixing coefficient of two σ -algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is defined as

$$\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^J |\mathbb{P}(A_i \cap B_j) - \mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(B_j)|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite partitions $A_1, \dots, A_I \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B_1, \dots, B_J \in \mathcal{B}$, $I, J \in \mathbb{N}$. A stochastic process $(U_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called β -mixing or absolutely regular if

$$\beta(n) = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta(\mathcal{F}_1^j, \mathcal{F}_{j+n}^\infty) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

where \mathcal{F}_i^j denotes the σ -algebra generated by U_i, \dots, U_j . For much more information on mixing processes, we refer to Bradley (2007). The class of absolutely regular processes trivially includes i.i.d. processes, but also certain time series models, e.g. ARMA models (under some technical assumptions on their characteristic polynomials; Mokkadem, 1988)

3 Pivotal inference for distance covariance and correlation

Suppose that (X_k, Y_k) , $1 \leq k \leq n$, are copies of some generic random vector $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are separable metric spaces of negative type. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\text{dcov}_n(X, Y)$ and $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y)$ denote the empirical distance covariance and distance correlation, respectively, based on the sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$. Recalling the definition of $\text{dcov}_n(X, Y)$ in (2.2) we define for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$\text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) := \text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}), \quad (2.4)$$

as the sequential empirical distance covariance from the sample of $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor})$, where $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}$ is the empirical measure of $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor})$. Similarly, we define for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ the measures $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}^{X, X}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}^{Y, Y}$ as the empirical distributions of the samples $(X_1, X_1), \dots, (X_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}, X_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor})$ and $(Y_1, Y_1), \dots, (Y_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor})$, respectively, and consider the corresponding distance variances

$$\text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, X) := \text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}^{X, X}), \quad \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(Y, Y) := \text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}^{Y, Y}). \quad (2.5)$$

The main theoretical tool for the construction of a pivotal test for the hypotheses (1.1) is the following limiting result, which gives the weak convergence of the 3-dimensional sequential process defined by (2.4) and (2.5).

Theorem 1. *For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ define the random vector*

$$X_n(\lambda) := \frac{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix}, \quad X(\lambda) := \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix},$$

and consider the processes $X_n := (X_n(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$ and $X := (X(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$. Suppose that $\text{dcov}(X, Y) \neq 0$, that both \mathbb{P}^X and \mathbb{P}^Y have finite $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -moments for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and that the sample generating process $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is strictly stationary and absolutely regular with mixing rate $\beta(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ for some $r > 6 + 24/\varepsilon$. Then there exist (possibly on a richer probability space) independent standard Brownian motions $B_i = (B_i(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, such that

$$\sqrt{n}(X_n - X) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])^3$, where $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ denotes the set of all bounded functions on the unit interval. The matrix Γ is a covariance matrix depending on the distribution of the sample generating process.

Next we introduce a normalizing factor for the statistic $\text{dcov}_n(X, Y)$, which is defined by

$$V_{n, \text{dcov}} := \left\{ \int \left(\frac{\lambda \lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}{n} \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) - \lambda^2 \text{dcov}_n(X, Y) \right)^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where γ is some fixed probability measure on the interval $[0, 1]$ with finite p -moments for some $p < -1$. Similarly, we define

$$\text{dcor}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) := \text{dcor}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}) \quad (2.6)$$

as the sequential empirical distance correlation of the sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor})$ and set

$$V_{n,\text{dcor}} := \left\{ \int \left(\frac{n\lambda^2}{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \text{dcor}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) - \lambda \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) \right)^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

as a normalizing factor for the statistic $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y)$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that both X and Y have finite $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -moments for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and that the sample generating process $(X_k, Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is strictly stationary and absolutely regular with mixing rate $\beta(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ for some $r > 6 + 24/\varepsilon$, and that $\text{dcov}(X, Y) > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\tau \geq 0$ and a standard Brownian motion $(B(\lambda))_{\lambda \geq 0}$ such that*

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ V_{n,\text{dcor}} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \tau \begin{pmatrix} B(1) \\ \left\{ \int \lambda^2 (B(\lambda) - \lambda B(1))^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Theorem 3. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Then there exists a constant $\tau \geq 0$ and a standard Brownian motion $(B(\lambda))_{\lambda \geq 0}$ such that*

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y) \\ V_{n,\text{dcor}} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \tau \begin{pmatrix} B(1) \\ \left\{ \int \lambda^2 (B(\lambda) - \lambda B(1))^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

These results can be used to derive a test for the hypothesis (1.1) of a practically significant deviation from independence measured by distance correlation (a similar test can be derived if the dependence is measured with respect to the distance covariance). To be precise, let $w_{1-\alpha}$ denote the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the distribution of the random variable

$$W := \frac{B(1)}{\left\{ \int \lambda^2 (B(\lambda) - \lambda B(1))^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad (2.7)$$

then, if $\tau > 0$, it follows from Theorem 3 and the continuous mapping theorem that

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y)}{V_{n,\text{dcor}}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} W. \quad (2.8)$$

Therefore, we propose to reject the null hypothesis in (1.1), whenever

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n,\text{dcor}}} > w_{1-\alpha}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $w_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the distribution of the random variable W . The following result shows that this decision rule defines a consistent asymptotic level α test.

Proposition 1. *Let $\Delta > 0$ be fixed and assume that the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied. If $\tau > 0$, then the test defined by (2.9) has asymptotic level α and is consistent. More precisely, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} > w_{1-\alpha} \right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) < \Delta, \\ \alpha & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) = \Delta, \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) > \Delta. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1.

- (a) The hypotheses in (1.1) are nested. By definition it is clear that a rejection of H_0 in (1.1) by the test (2.9) for $\Delta = \Delta_0$ also yields rejection of H_0 for all $\Delta < \Delta_0$. By the sequential rejection principle, we may simultaneously test the hypotheses in (1.1) for different $\Delta \geq 0$ starting at $\Delta = 0$ and increasing Δ to find the minimum value of Δ , say

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Delta}_\alpha &:= \min \{ \Delta \geq 0 \mid \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) \leq \Delta + w_{1-\alpha} V_{n, \text{dcor}} \} \\ &= \max \{ 0, \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - w_{1-\alpha} V_{n, \text{dcor}} \} \end{aligned}$$

for which H_0 in (1.1) is not rejected. In particular, as the null hypothesis is accepted for all thresholds $\Delta \geq \hat{\Delta}_\alpha$ and rejected for $\Delta < \hat{\Delta}_\alpha$, the quantity $\hat{\Delta}_\alpha$ could be interpreted as a measure of evidence against the hypothesis of perfect independence at a controlled type I error. Moreover, if $\text{dcor}(X, Y) > 0$ it is easy to see from (2.8) that the interval

$$I_n := [\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) + w_{\alpha/2} V_{n, \text{dcor}}, \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) + w_{1-\alpha/2} V_{n, \text{dcor}}]$$

defines an asymptotic $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence interval for $\text{dcor}(X, Y)$.

- (b) By a similar argument we can construct a consistent asymptotic level α test for the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \text{dcov}(X, Y) \leq \Delta \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \text{dcov}(X, Y) > \Delta,$$

which rejects the null hypothesis whenever $\text{dcov}_n(X, Y) > \Delta + w_{1-\alpha} V_{n, \text{dcov}}$.

Remark 2. Closely related to this decision problem are the hypotheses

$$H_0^{\text{sim}} : \text{dcor}(X, Y) \geq \Delta \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1^{\text{sim}} : \text{dcor}(X, Y) < \Delta. \quad (2.10)$$

Hypotheses of this type have found considerable attention in the biostatistics literature, where the problem are referred to bioequivalence testing (see, for example, the monograph of Wellek, 2010). In the present context rejecting (2.10) allows to work under approximate independence at a controlled type I error. A test for these hypotheses can easily be developed in the same spirit. In this case the null hypothesis in H_0^{sim} is rejected, whenever

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} < w_\alpha, \quad (2.11)$$

and this test has asymptotic level α and is consistent, that is.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} < w_\alpha \right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) > \Delta, \\ \alpha & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) = \Delta, \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) < \Delta. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we can also determine a minimal value $\hat{\Delta}_{\alpha, \text{sim}}$ such that H_0^{sim} is rejected for all $\Delta > \hat{\Delta}_{\alpha, \text{sim}}$ at a controlled type I error α .

4 Finite Sample Properties

In this section we investigate the performance of the proposed test in a variety of models. As the reference measure γ in the definition of the test statistic $V_{n, \text{dcor}}$ we use the discrete uniform distribution concentrated on the points $j/20$, $j = 1, \dots, 19$. The corresponding quantiles of the distribution the random variable W defined in (2.7) are given in Table 1 which have been calculated by 1 000 000 simulation runs. All empirical rejection probabilities reported in the following discussion have been determined by 1000 simulation runs and the nominal level is $\alpha = 5\%$ in all cases under consideration.

$1 - \alpha$	90%	95%	99%
$w_{1-\alpha}$	7.13	9.89	16.40

Table 1: $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles $w_{1-\alpha}$ of the distribution of the random variable W defined in (2.7) with γ chosen as the discrete uniform distribution concentrated on the points $j/20$, $j = 1, \dots, 19$. The corresponding α -quantiles are obtained by the symmetry of the distribution of W , that is $w_\alpha = -w_{1-\alpha}$.

First, we generate data $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ from a 2-dimensional vector autoregressive (VAR) process, i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_n \\ Y_n \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} X_{n-1} \\ Y_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon_n, \quad (2.12)$$

where the ε_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. centred Gaussian random vectors with covariance matrix Σ . The matrix A is chosen as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1/5 \\ 1/5 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and Σ is given by

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for appropriate choices of ρ .

In Figure 1 we display the empirical rejection rate of the test (2.9) for the hypotheses (1.1) in the VAR model (2.12) for different values of ρ . The results reflect the qualitative




Figure 1: Empirical rejection rates of the test (2.9) for the hypotheses (1.1) for different thresholds Δ and sample sizes n . The dotted lines represent Δ (vertical) and the nominal level $\alpha = 5\%$ (horizontal). The data are simulated according to the VAR model (2.12).

behavior of the test (2.9) described in Proposition 1. In the “interior” of the null hypothesis ($\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) < \Delta$) the empirical rejection probabilities are close 0 and they quickly increase under the alternative ($\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) > \Delta$). At the “boundary” of the hypotheses ($\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) = \Delta$) the empirical rejection probabilities are smaller than the the nominal level α (which is predicted by Proposition 1 as the limit in this case).

A key advantages of testing relevant hypotheses is that one may freely switch the roles of null hypothesis and alternative, and so a type II error is of less concern than in classical testing problems. To illustrate this fact we display in Figure 2 the rejection rates of the test (2.11) for the hypotheses 2. These results correspond to the theoretical findings in Remark 2. We observe that the type I error is very small under the null hypotheses and that larger sample sizes are required to reject the null hypothesis in (1.1) with reasonable power.

To investigate the performance of our test in the functional setting, we simulate a ten-dimensional VAR process $(C_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$C_k = C_{k-1}/2 + \eta_k,$$




Figure 2: Empirical rejection rates of the test (2.11) for the hypotheses (2.10) for different thresholds Δ and sample sizes n . The dotted lines represent Δ (vertical) and the nominal level $\alpha = 5\%$ (horizontal). The data are simulated according to the VAR model (2.12).

where the η_k are i.i.d. centred Gaussian random vectors with covariance matrix $(\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,10}$, where either

$$\sigma_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ \rho & \text{if } |i - j| = 5, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

or

$$\sigma_{ij} = \rho^{|i-j|} \quad (2.14)$$

for appropriate choices of ρ . Writing $C_k^{(j)}$ for the j -th coordinate of C_k , we define the random functions X_k and Y_k by

$$(X_k, Y_k) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad s \mapsto \left(\sum_{j=0}^4 C_k^{(j+1)} \varphi_j(s), \sum_{j=0}^4 C_k^{(j+6)} \varphi_j(s) \right), \quad (2.15)$$

where $\varphi_0 = 1$, $\varphi_{2j}(s) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi j s)$ and $\varphi_{2j-1}(s) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi j s)$. The two covariance matrices in Eqs. (2.13) and (2.14) and variations of ρ result in different population values of




Figure 3: Empirical rejection rates of the test (2.9) for the hypotheses (1.1) for different thresholds Δ and sample sizes n . The dotted lines represent Δ (vertical) and the nominal level $\alpha = 5\%$ (horizontal). The data are simulated according to (2.15) with covariance matrix (2.13).

$\text{dcor}(X, Y)$, which we estimate by averaging 100 independent simulations of $\text{dcor}_{1000}(X, Y)$. The simulation results for our functional data are given in Figures 3 and 4. These results confirm our theoretical findings in the case of functional data. In most scenarios the nominal level $\alpha = 5\%$ is well approximated at the boundary of the hypotheses ($\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) = \Delta$). In the interior of the null hypothesis ($\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) < \Delta$) the type I error is smaller than the nominal level, while the rejection probabilities quickly increase with increasing dependence measured by $\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) > \Delta$.




Figure 4: Empirical rejection rates of the test (2.9) for the hypotheses (1.1) for different thresholds Δ and sample sizes n . The dotted lines represent Δ (vertical) and the nominal level $\alpha = 5\%$ (horizontal). The data are simulated according to (2.15) with covariance matrix (2.14).

5 Proofs

5.1 Preliminaries and Proof of Theorem 1

Throughout this section, we use the notations $Z := (X, Y)$, $Z_n := (X_n, Y_n)$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$, $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n^X$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n^Y$ for the empirical versions of the distributions $\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}$, \mathbb{P}^X and \mathbb{P}^Y , respectively. For an index set T , $\ell^\infty(T)$ denotes the space of bounded functions on T equipped with the supremum norm.

Lemma 1. Let $(S, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow S$ two functions. Suppose that $\|g(n)\| > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $(\|g(n)\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a monotonically increasing sequence. Then the two following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$,
- (ii) $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} f(k) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$.

Proof. The implication from (ii) to (i) is obvious, so we prove the reverse.

Suppose that (i) holds. Then, by definition of the Landau symbol \mathcal{O} , there exist a constant $c_0 > 0$ and some threshold $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|f(n)\| \leq c_0 \|g(n)\|$ for all $n > N$. For any $1 \leq k \leq N$, let us define $c_k := \|f(k)\|/\|g(k)\|$ and $C := \max_{0 \leq k \leq N} c_k$. These quantities are well-defined because we assumed that $\|g(n)\|$ is strictly positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By construction, we have

$$f(n) \leq C \|g(n)\| \quad (2.16)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let k_n denote the argumentum maximi of $f(k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$, i.e. it holds that $f(k_n) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} f(k)$. Then,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} f(k) = f(k_n) \leq C \|g(k_n)\| \leq C \|g(n)\|,$$

where we have used the definition of k_n in the first equality, (2.16) in the first inequality and the fact that the sequence $(\|g(n)\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is isotone by assumption in the second inequality. This is exactly the defining inequality of (ii), which completes our proof. \square

Lemma 2. *Let $W = (W(\lambda))_{\lambda \geq 0}$ be a Brownian motion. Let $\Delta_n = (\Delta_n(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$ be the element of $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ defined by*

$$\Delta_n(\lambda) := W(n\lambda) - W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor).$$

Then $\|\Delta_n\|_\infty = \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} |\Delta_n(\lambda)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^\alpha)$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. Before we begin our proof, let us point out that this lemma is not an immediate consequence of the well-known fact that the sample paths of a Brownian motion are almost surely locally Hölder continuous for any Hölder exponent smaller than $1/2$. This is because the Hölder constant depends on the compact set on which the sample path is considered, which in our case would be the interval $[0, n\lambda]$, and so the Hölder constant may (and indeed does) grow with n .

Now fix some arbitrary $\alpha > 0$. For any $s \geq 0$, define $W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)}(s) = W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor + s) - W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)$. By standard arguments, one can show that $W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)} := (W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)}(s))_{s \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion. Because $|n\lambda - \lfloor n\lambda \rfloor| < 1$, there is some $t = t(n, \lambda) \in [0, 1]$ such that $W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)}(t) = \Delta_n(\lambda)$. Thus,

$$|\Delta_n(\lambda)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)}(s)|,$$

and so

$$\|\Delta_n\|_\infty = \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} |\Delta_n(\lambda)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |W^{(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor)}(s)| = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |W^{(k)}(s)|. \quad (2.17)$$

By Lemma 16 in [Freedman \(1971\)](#), it holds for any Brownian motion B that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq K} |B(s)| \geq b \right) \leq 4\mathbb{P} \left(B(1) \geq bK^{-1/2} \right) \quad (2.18)$$

for all $b, K > 0$. Combining Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18) yields for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_n\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |W^{(k)}(s)| \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |W^{(k)}(s)| \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha\right) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbb{P}\left(W^{(k)}(1) \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha\right) \\ &= 4(n+1)\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

for some standard normally distributed random variable Z . Using the tail bound $\mathbb{P}(Z > t) \leq \exp(-t^2/2)/(\sqrt{2\pi}t)$ for the standard normal distribution ($t \geq 0$) gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_n\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon n^\alpha) \leq cn^{1-\alpha} \exp(-(\varepsilon^2/2)n^{2\alpha}) = o(1)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, which yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|n^{-\alpha}\Delta_n\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and proves our claim. \square

The following lemma is a consequence of Theorem 4 in [Kuelbs and Philipp \(1980\)](#). By the term ‘weakly stationary’ we mean the condition that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{\alpha+n,i}\xi_{\alpha+1,j}] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,i}\xi_{1,j}]$ for all $\alpha, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. It is valid for α -mixing processes, which is a weaker assumption than absolute regularity. The α -mixing coefficient of two σ -algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is defined by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|,$$

and a stochastic process $(\xi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called α -mixing or strongly mixing if

$$\alpha(n) = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha\left(\mathcal{F}_1^j, \mathcal{F}_{j+n}^\infty\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where \mathcal{F}_i^j is the σ -algebra generated by ξ_i, \dots, ξ_j . We again refer to [Bradley \(2007\)](#) for more information.

Lemma 3. *Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a weakly stationary and strongly mixing sequence of centred \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables whose $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -moments uniformly bounded for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose that the mixing coefficients $(\alpha(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy $\alpha(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ with $r = (1 + \delta)(1 + 2/\varepsilon)$ for some $\delta > 0$. Define the partial sum process $S_n := (S_n(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$ by*

$$S_n(\lambda) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \xi_i.$$

Then there exist (possibly on a richer probability space) independent standard Brownian motions $B_i = (B_i(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, such that

$$S_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ \vdots \\ B_d \end{pmatrix}$$

in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])^d$, and the $d \times d$ matrix $\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ is given by

$$\gamma_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{1i}\xi_{1j}] + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{ki}\xi_{1j}] + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{1i}\xi_{kj}] = \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} \text{Cov}(\xi_{ki}, \xi_{lj}) < \infty,$$

with ξ_{ki} denoting the i -th coordinate of the vector ξ_k .

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that the $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -moments of the random variables ξ_n are bounded by 1. If this is not the case, we can achieve it by rescaling the ξ_n .

By Theorem 4 in [Kuelbs and Philipp \(1980\)](#), there exist (possibly on a richer probability space) independent Brownian motions $W_i = (W_i(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda < \infty}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i - \Gamma^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} W_1(n) \\ \vdots \\ W_d(n) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}) \quad (2.19)$$

almost surely for some $\gamma > 0$ depending only on δ, ε and d . By Lemma 1, Eq. (2.19) is equivalent to

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i - \Gamma^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} W_1(k) \\ \vdots \\ W_d(k) \end{pmatrix} \right| = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$$

almost surely. Thus, for any $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \xi_i - \Gamma^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} W_1(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) \\ \vdots \\ W_d(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i - \Gamma^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} W_1(k) \\ \vdots \\ W_d(k) \end{pmatrix} \right| = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$$

almost surely, and so

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \xi_i - \Gamma^{1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} W_1(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) \\ \vdots \\ W_d(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma}) \quad (2.20)$$

almost surely uniformly in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. For ease of notation, let us write $W = (W_1, \dots, W_d)^T$. Then

$$W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) = W(n\lambda) + W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor) - W(n\lambda) =: W(n\lambda) + \Delta_n(\lambda).$$

Denote by $\Delta_n^{(1)}, \dots, \Delta_n^{(d)}$ the coordinate functions of Δ_n . Then $\Delta_n^{(i)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{n})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ by Lemma 2, and so

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|\Delta_n^{(i)}\|_{\infty} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{n}).$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $1 \leq i \leq d$, the rescaled Brownian motion $(W_i(n\lambda)/\sqrt{n})_{0 \leq \lambda < \infty}$ is again a standard Brownian motion, and so the entire vector-valued process $(W(n\lambda)/\sqrt{n})_{0 \leq \lambda < \infty}$ is equal in distribution to $B := (B_1, \dots, B_d)$, where the B_i are independent standard Brownian motions. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor))_{0 \leq \lambda < \infty} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(W(n\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda < \infty} + \frac{\Delta_n}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} B.$$

Using (2.20), we therefore get

$$S_n = \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(W(\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} + \mathcal{O}_{a.s.}(n^{-\gamma}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} B,$$

where the symbol $\mathcal{O}_{a.s.}$ means the usual Landau symbol with the bound holding almost surely. \square

The empirical distance covariance $\text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n)$ defined in (2.10) is a V -statistics with kernel function h' given in (2.1). Let

$$h(z_1, \dots, z_6) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_6} h'(z_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, z_{\sigma(6)}),$$

be the symmetrisation of h' , where \mathfrak{S}_6 denotes the symmetric group of order 6. Then, as any V -statistic with kernel g' is equal to the V -statistic with kernel g , where g is the symmetrisation of g' , the empirical distance covariance may also be expressed as a V -statistic with kernel h .

We shall require the so-called Hoeffding decomposition. If U_1, \dots, U_n are observations from a stationary process with marginal distribution ξ and g is a symmetric kernel of order m , then the V -statistic with kernel g based on U_1, \dots, U_n allows for a representation of the form

$$V_g(U_1, \dots, U_n) = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{m}{i} V_n^{(i)}(g; \xi),$$

where each $V_n^{(i)}(g; \xi)$ is the V -statistic with kernel function

$$g_i(u_1, \dots, u_i; \xi) = \sum_{k=0}^i \binom{i}{k} (-1)^{i-k} \mathbf{g}_k(u_1, \dots, u_k; \xi),$$

with

$$\mathbf{g}_k(u_1, \dots, u_k; \xi) = \int g(u_1, \dots, u_m) d\xi^{m-k}(u_{k+1}, \dots, u_m).$$

The Hoeffding decomposition is a widely used tool in the theory of U - and V -statistics; for this particular version, see for instance [Denker and Keller \(1983\)](#). Its name goes back to [Hoeffding \(1948b\)](#) who first used it for U -statistics. The advantage of this representation is that the g_i are degenerate kernel functions, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[g_i(U_1, u_2, \dots, u_i)] = 0$ almost surely.

The following technical lemma is essentially Lemma 3 in [Arcones \(1998\)](#), but stated for V -statistics instead of U -statistics. For a detailed proof of this generalised version, see Lemma 2.3 in [Kroll \(2023\)](#).

Lemma 4. *Let $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a strictly stationary and absolutely regular process and let g be a symmetric and degenerate kernel of order m . Assume that for some $p > 2$ it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[|g(U_{i_1}, \dots, U_{i_m})|^p] < M < \infty$$

for some M uniform in i_1, \dots, i_m . Then it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[|V_g(U_1, \dots, U_n)|^2] \leq 8M^2 m(2m)! \cdot n^{-m} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{d=1}^n d^{m-1} \beta(d)^{(p-2)/p} \right\}.$$

In particular, if $\beta(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ for some $r > mp/(p-2)$, then the sum in the upper bound converges for $n \rightarrow \infty$, and so we get

$$\mathbb{E}[|V_g(U_1, \dots, U_n)|^2] \leq \gamma n^{-m}$$

for some constant γ depending only on M , m and the mixing rate of the sample generating process.

Lemma 4 implies the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Assume that the conditions of Lemma 4 are satisfied including the assumption on the growth rate of the mixing coefficients. Then, even if the kernel g is not degenerate, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(V_g - \mathbb{E}V_g - \binom{m}{c} V_n^{(c)}(g; \xi) \right)^2 \right] = \mathcal{O}(n^{-(c+1)}),$$

where $\xi = \mathcal{L}(U_1)$ and $1 \leq c \leq m$ is the smallest non-zero index such that g_c is not equal to 0 almost surely but $g_{c'}$ is for all $0 < c' < c$.

Proof. Using the Hoeffding decomposition and Lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| V_g - \mathbb{E}V_g - \binom{m}{c} V_n^{(c)}(g; \xi) \right|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=c+1}^m \binom{m}{i} V_n^{(i)}(g; \xi) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq (m-c) \sum_{i=c+1}^m \binom{m}{i} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_n^{(i)}(g; \xi)|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(n^{-(c+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

The constant involved in the Landau symbol only depends on the uniform bound M , the degree m of the kernel, the marginal distribution ξ and the mixing rate of the sample generating process. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Using the definition of h , Minkowski's inequality and Hölder's inequality, one can show that

$$\|h(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_6})\|_{L_p} \leq 64\|X_1\|_{L_{2p}}\|Y_1\|_{L_{2p}}$$

for all $p \geq 1$. Thus, h has uniformly bounded $(2 + \varepsilon/2)$ -moments. By Corollary 1, it then holds that

$$\text{dcov}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}) - \text{dcov}(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) = \frac{1}{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} h_1(Z_i; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) + R_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}),$$

where $R_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, uniformly with respect to $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathbb{P}^{X,X}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{Y,Y}$ denote the distributions of (X, X) and (Y, Y) , respectively, then analogous identities hold for $\text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, X) - \text{dcov}(X, X)$ and $\text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(Y, Y) - \text{dcov}(Y, Y)$. Since $\text{dcov}(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}h_1(Z_1; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y})$, and the left-hand side is non-zero by assumption, the function $h_1(\cdot; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y})$ is non-zero on some set with strictly positive measure (with respect to the distribution $\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}$). Furthermore, Proposition 2.3 in Lyons (2013) implies that both $\text{dcov}(X, X)$ and $\text{dcov}(Y, Y)$ are non-zero as well, and so the same arguments can be used to show that $h_1(\cdot; \mathbb{P}^{X,X})$ and $h_1(\cdot; \mathbb{P}^{Y,Y})$ do not completely vanish on their respective measure's support. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} X_n(\lambda) - X(\lambda) &= \frac{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, Y) - \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(X, X) - \text{dcov}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(Y, Y) - \text{dcov}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix} - \left(\lambda - \frac{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}{n}\right) \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \begin{pmatrix} h_1(Z_i; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) \\ h_1((X_i, X_i); \mathbb{P}^{X,X}) \\ h_1((Y_i, Y_i); \mathbb{P}^{Y,Y}) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} R_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) \\ R_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(\mathbb{P}^{X,X}) \\ R_{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}(\mathbb{P}^{Y,Y}) \end{pmatrix} - \left(\lambda - \frac{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor}{n}\right) \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n\lambda \rfloor} \begin{pmatrix} h_1(Z_i; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) \\ h_1((X_i, X_i); \mathbb{P}^{X,X}) \\ h_1((Y_i, Y_i); \mathbb{P}^{Y,Y}) \end{pmatrix} + o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the bound in the last line is uniformly in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. By Lemma 3, we therefore get (possibly on a richer probability space)

$$\sqrt{n}(X_n - X) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where B_1, B_2, B_3 are independent standard Brownian motions. The covariance matrix Γ is described in the statement of Lemma 3 with

$$\xi_i = \begin{pmatrix} h_1(Z_i; \mathbb{P}^{X,Y}) \\ h_1((X_i, X_i); \mathbb{P}^{X,X}) \\ h_1((Y_i, Y_i); \mathbb{P}^{Y,Y}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Lemma 5. Let γ be a probability measure on $[0, 1]$ with finite p -moments for some $p < -1$ and define the operator $\chi : \ell^\infty([0, 1])^3 \rightarrow (L_2([0, 1], \gamma), \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\gamma)})$ by

$$\chi(f)(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{f_1(\lambda)}{\sqrt{f_2(\lambda)f_3(\lambda)}} & \text{if } f_2(\lambda)f_3(\lambda) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Further, for some constant vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $v_2, v_3 > 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} f : [0, 1] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \lambda &\mapsto \lambda v. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Then χ is Hadamard-differentiable in f tangential to

$$C := \left\{ g \in \ell^\infty([0, 1])^3 \mid g(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)}\right) \text{ for } \lambda \searrow 0 \right\}.$$

Moreover, its Hadamard derivative is given by

$$\chi'_f(h) = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{f_2 f_3}} \\ -\frac{f_1}{2\sqrt{f_2^3 f_3}} \\ -\frac{f_1}{2\sqrt{f_2 f_3^3}} \end{pmatrix}, h \right\rangle,$$

where the inner product is the usual Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^3 taken pointwise.

Proof. Let f be defined by (2.21) and $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1/\sqrt{x_2 x_3}$ if $x_2, x_3 > 0$ and 0 otherwise, then $\chi(f) = g \circ f$. Thus, if $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and $h_n \rightarrow h$ for some $h \in \ell^\infty([0, 1])^3$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi(f + t_n h_n) - \chi(f)}{t_n}(\lambda) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(f(\lambda) + t_n h_n(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{t_n} = \partial_{f(\lambda)} g[h(\lambda)],$$

where $\partial_v g$ denotes the directional derivative of g along a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since g is differentiable on $S := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_2, x_3 > 0\}$ we have $\partial_v g[y] = \langle \nabla g(v), y \rangle$ for all $v \in C$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and the gradient of g is given by

$$\nabla g(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{x_2 x_3}} \\ -\frac{x_1}{2\sqrt{x_2^3 x_3}} \\ -\frac{x_1}{2\sqrt{x_2 x_3^3}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi(f + t_n h_n) - \chi(f)}{t_n}(\lambda) = \langle \nabla g[f(\lambda)], h(\lambda) \rangle \tag{2.22}$$

for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. This map is certainly linear in h , and we only have to verify that this linear operator is continuous on C .

For this purpose we fix some $h \in C$. From the specific form of ∇g it follows that $\|\nabla g[f(\lambda)]\|_2 = \lambda^{-1}\|\nabla g(v)\|_2$ for any λ . Thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have for almost all n that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \nabla g[f], h \rangle - \langle \nabla g[f], h_n \rangle\|_{L_2(\gamma)}^2 &= \|\langle \nabla g[f], h - h_n \rangle\|_{L_2(\gamma)}^2 \\ &\leq \|\nabla g[f]\|_2 \|h - h_n\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\nabla g(v)\|_2^2 \int \lambda^{-2} \|h(\lambda) - h_n(\lambda)\|_2^2 d\gamma(\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

By assumption, since $h \in C$, there is some $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1]$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that $\|h(\lambda)\|_2 < c\sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$. If h_n is a sequence in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])^3$ converging to h , then almost all h_n must lie in C with the same threshold λ_0 and constant $2c$. For suppose that for some $\lambda < \lambda_0$ it holds that $\|h_n(\lambda)\|_2 \geq 2c\sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)}$, then

$$\|h_n(\lambda) - h(\lambda)\|_2 \geq c \sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)},$$

but since h_n converges to h , we also have

$$\|h_n(\lambda) - h(\lambda)\|_2 \leq \|h_n - h\|_\infty \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which is a contradiction. It must therefore hold for almost all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\|h_n(\lambda)\|_2 < 2c\sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$, i.e. $h_n \in C$. This also implies that $h - h_n \in C$ for almost all n with the same threshold λ_0 and constant $3c$. Thus, for almost all n ,

$$\lambda^{-2} \|h(\lambda) - h_n(\lambda)\|_2^2 \leq \mathbf{1}_{[0, \lambda_0)}(\lambda) \frac{9c^2 \log \log(1/\lambda)}{\lambda} + \mathbf{1}_{(\lambda_0, 1]} \frac{\max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|h - h_n\|_\infty^2}{\lambda^2}$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, where $\mathbf{1}_A$ denotes the characteristic function of a set A .

Let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrary. Then $\log \log(x) < x^\delta$ if and only if $\log(x) < \exp(x^\delta)$, which holds true for x large enough. Using this for $x = 1/\lambda$, we see that $\log \log(1/\lambda) < \lambda^{-\delta}$ for all λ smaller than some threshold λ_δ , and so for almost all n , $\lambda^{-2} \|h(\lambda) - h_n(\lambda)\|_2^2$ is bounded by

$$D_\delta(\lambda) := \mathbf{1}_{[0, \lambda_\delta)}(\lambda) \lambda^{-1-\delta} + \mathbf{1}_{[\lambda_\delta, \lambda_0)}(\lambda) \frac{9c^2 \log \log(1/\lambda)}{\lambda} + \mathbf{1}_{(\lambda_0, 1]} \frac{\max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|h - h_n\|_\infty^2}{\lambda^2}.$$

For δ small enough that $-1 - \delta > p$, the function D_δ is γ -integrable by assumption. The dominated convergence theorem therefore implies

$$\int \lambda^{-2} \|h(\lambda) - h_n(\lambda)\|_2^2 d\gamma(\lambda) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which together with (2.23) gives us the continuity of the operator $h \mapsto \langle \nabla g[f], h \rangle$. \square

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2 and 3

For the sake of brevity we restrict ourselves to the proof of Theorem 3. Theorem 2 follows by similar but simpler arguments.

Let X_n and X be defined as in Theorem 1. Then, by that theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(X_n - X) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}W,$$

for some covariance matrix $\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $W = (W_1, W_2, W_3)^T$, where the $W_i = (W_i(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$ are independent standard Brownian motions.

Let the set C and the operator χ be defined as in Lemma 5. Then $W \in C$ as a consequence of Corollary 107 in Freedman (1971) (this is the law of the iterated logarithm for the time-inverted one-dimensional Brownian motion). Furthermore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_n(\lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda < 1/n$, and so

$$\sqrt{n}(X_n(\lambda) - X(\lambda)) = -\sqrt{n}\lambda \begin{pmatrix} \text{dcov}(X, Y) \\ \text{dcov}(X, X) \\ \text{dcov}(Y, Y) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\lambda \log \log(1/\lambda)}\right)$$

for $\lambda \searrow 0$. Thus, $\sqrt{n}(X_n - X) \in C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 5 and the Delta method (see, for example, Theorem 3.9.4 in Wellner and van der Vaart, 1996) now imply

$$\sqrt{n}(\chi(X_n) - \chi(X)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \chi'_X \left(\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}W \right). \quad (2.24)$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi'_X \left(\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}W \right) &= \lambda^{-1} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)^3\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)^3}} \end{pmatrix}, \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}W \right\rangle \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \left\langle \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)^3\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)^3}} \end{pmatrix}, W \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the self-adjointness of the matrix $\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Using the notation

$$\alpha = \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y}) := \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)^3\text{dcov}(Y, Y)}} \\ -\frac{\text{dcov}(X, Y)}{2\sqrt{\text{dcov}(X, X)\text{dcov}(Y, Y)^3}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.25)$$

the above identity can be written as

$$\chi'_X \left(\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}W \right) = \lambda^{-1} \langle \alpha, W \rangle.$$

α is a constant with respect to λ , and so $\langle \alpha, W \rangle$ is a centred Gaussian process with covariance function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\langle \alpha, W(\lambda_1) \rangle, \langle \alpha, W(\lambda_2) \rangle) &= \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i W_i(\lambda_1), \sum_{j=1}^3 \alpha_j W_j(\lambda_2) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i^2 \text{Cov}(W_i(\lambda_1), W_i(\lambda_2)) \\ &= \|\alpha\|_2^2 (\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\langle \alpha, W \rangle$ is equal in distribution to $\|\alpha\|_2 B$ for some standard Brownian motion $B = (B(\lambda))_{\lambda \geq 0}$. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\chi'_X \left(\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} W \right) \right) = \mathcal{L} \left(\lambda^{-1} \|\alpha\|_2 B \right). \quad (2.26)$$

Now by definition of the operator χ we get

$$\chi(X_n) - \chi(X) = \left(\frac{n}{[n\lambda]} \text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y) - \lambda^{-1} \text{dcor}(X, Y) \right)_{0 < \lambda \leq 1}.$$

After multiplying both sides with λ^2 , this identity combined with Eqs. (2.24) and (2.26) yields

$$L_n := \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{n\lambda^2}{[n\lambda]} \text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y) - \lambda \text{dcor}(X, Y) \right)_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \|\alpha\|_2 (\lambda B(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}. \quad (2.27)$$

Now define the operators $\eta : \ell^\infty([0, 1]) \rightarrow \ell^\infty([0, 1])$ and $\xi : L_2(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(f) &= (f(\lambda) - \lambda f(1))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1}, \\ \xi(f) &= \left(f(1), \|\eta(f)\|_{L_2(\gamma)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily verified that both operators are continuous (with respect to the supremum norm in the case of η and the $L_2(\gamma)$ -norm in the case of ξ). Furthermore, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \left(\frac{n\lambda^2}{[n\lambda]} \text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y) - \lambda \text{dcor}_n(X, Y) \right)_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left(\left[\frac{n\lambda^2}{[n\lambda]} \text{dcor}_{[n\lambda]}(X, Y) - \lambda \text{dcor}(X, Y) \right] - \lambda [\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y)] \right)_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \\ &= \eta(L_n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

The continuous mapping theorem and (2.27) now imply

$$(\sqrt{n}(\text{dcov}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y)), \sqrt{n}V_{n, \text{dcor}}) = \xi(L_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \xi \left(\|\alpha\|_2 (\lambda B(\lambda))_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \right).$$

This proves the theorem with $\tau = \|\alpha\|_2$.

5.3 Proof of Proposition 1

We have the identity

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} = \frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y)}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} + \frac{\sqrt{n}(\text{dcor}(X, Y) - \Delta)}{\sqrt{n}V_{n, \text{dcor}}}.$$

By Theorem 3 and the continuous mapping theorem, we have

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \text{dcor}(X, Y)}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} W.$$

Thus, by the continuous mapping theorem and Slutsky's lemma,

$$\frac{\text{dcor}_n(X, Y) - \Delta}{V_{n, \text{dcor}}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) < \Delta, \\ W & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) = \Delta, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \text{dcor}(X, Y) > \Delta. \end{cases}$$

Acknowledgements

Financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation; Project-ID 520388526; TRR 391: Spatio-temporal Statistics for the Transition of Energy and Transport) is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- M. Albert, Y. Bouret, M. Fromont, and P. Reynaud-Bouret. Bootstrap and permutation tests of independence for point processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2537–2564, 2015.
- M. A. Arcones. The law of large numbers for U-statistics under absolute regularity. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 3:13–19, 1998.
- W. Bergsma and A. Dassios. A consistent test of independence based on a sign covariance related to Kendall's tau. *Bernoulli*, 20(2):1006 – 1028, 2014.
- A. Betken and H. Dehling. Distance correlation for long-range dependent time series. 2022+. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03041>.
- A. Betken, H. Dehling, and M. Kroll. A bootstrap test for independence of time series based on the distance covariance. 2022+. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.14091>. Preprint.
- J. R. Blum, J. Kiefer, and M. Rosenblatt. Distribution Free Tests of Independence Based on the Sample Distribution Function. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 32(2):485 – 498, 1961.

- F. Bosco, H. Aguinis, K. Singh, J. G. Field, and C. A. Pierce. Correlational effect size benchmarks. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100 2:431–49, 2015.
- R. C. Bradley. *Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions*, volume 1. Kendrick Press, Heber City, 2007.
- C. R. Brydges. Effect Size Guidelines, Sample Size Calculations, and Statistical Power in Gerontology. *Innovation in Aging*, 3(4), 09 2019. ISSN 2399-5300. doi: 10.1093/geroni/igz036. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igz036>. igz036.
- S. Chatterjee. A new coefficient of correlation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 116(536):2009–2022, 2021.
- J. Cohen. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1988.
- R. A. Davis, M. Matsui, T. Mikosch, and P. Wan. Applications of distance correlation to time series. *Bernoulli*, 24:3087–3116, 2018.
- H. Dehling, M. Matsui, T. Mikosch, G. Samorodnitsky, and L. Tafakori. Distance covariance for discretized stochastic processes. *Bernoulli*, 26(4):2758 – 2789, 2020.
- M. Denker and G. Keller. On U-statistics and v. mise’ statistics for weakly dependent processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 64:505–522, 1983.
- H. Dette and J. Tang. New energy distances for statistical inference on infinite dimensional hilbert spaces without moment conditions, 2024.
- H. Dette, K. F. Siburg, and P. A. Stoimenov. A copula-based non-parametric measure of regression dependence. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 40(1):21–41, 2012.
- D. Edelman, K. Fokianos, and M. Pitsillou. An updated literature review of distance correlation and its applications to time series. *International Statistical Review*, 87(2): 237–262, 2019.
- K. Fokianos and M. Pitsillou. Consistent testing for pairwise dependence in time series. *Technometrics*, 59(2):262–270, 2017.
- D. Freedman. *Brownian Motion and Diffusion*. Holden-Day, San Francisco – Cambridge – London – Amsterdam, 1971.
- G. Geenens and P. Lafaye de Micheaux. The Hellinger correlation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, pages 1–15, 2020.
- A. Gretton and L. Györfi. Consistent nonparametric tests of independence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1391 – 1423, 2010.

- A. Gretton, O. Bousquet, A. Smola, and B. Schölkopf. Measuring statistical dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt norms. In S. Jain, H. U. Simon, and E. Tomita, editors, *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 63–77, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-31696-1.
- A. Gretton, C. Fukumizu, K. and Teo, L. Song, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola. A kernel statistical test of independence. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 20, pages 585–592. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008.
- R. Heller, Y. Heller, and M. Gorfine. A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances. *Biometrika*, 100(2):503–510, 12 2012.
- J. Hemphill. Interpreting the magnitude of correlation coefficients. *The American psychologist*, 58:78–9, 02 2003. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.78.
- W. Hoeffding. A Non-Parametric Test of Independence. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 19(4):546 – 557, 1948a.
- W. Hoeffding. A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 19:293–325, 1948b.
- W. Huang, M. Tang, Y.-L. Chen, T.-L. Zhang, T. Hong, J. Li, G.-H. Lv, Y. Yan, Z.-H. Ouyang, and M.-X. Zou. Incidence and risk factors for cerebrovascular-specific mortality in patients with colorectal cancer: A registry-based cohort study involving 563298 patients. *Cancers*, 14:2053, 04 2022. doi: 10.3390/cancers14092053.
- S. Janson. On distance covariance in metric and Hilbert spaces. *Latin American Journal of Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 18:1353–1393, 2021.
- M. G. Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1/2):81–93, 1938. ISSN 00063444.
- M. Kroll. Asymptotic behaviour of the empirical distance covariance for dependent data. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 35:1226–1246, 2022.
- M. Kroll. *The Empirical Distance Covariance of Weakly Dependent Data*. PhD thesis, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 2023. DOI: 10.13154/294-9840.
- J. Kuelbs and W. Philipp. Almost sure invariance principles for partial sums of mixing B-valued random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 8:1003–1036, 1980.
- A. Lovakov and E. Agadullina. Empirically derived guidelines for effect size interpretation in social psychology. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 51:485–504, 02 2021. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2752.
- R. Lyons. Distance covariance in metric spaces. *The Annals of Probability*, 41:3284–3305, 2013.

- K. Menger. Untersuchungen über allgemeine Metrik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:75–163, 1928a.
- K. Menger. Die Metrik des Hilbert’schen Raumes. *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 65:159–160, 1928b.
- K. Menger. New foundation of Euclidean geometry. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 53(4):721–745, 1931.
- A. Mokkadem. Mixing properties of ARMA processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 29:309–315, 1988.
- K. Pearson. Notes on the history of correlation. *Biometrika*, 13(1):25–45, 1920. ISSN 00063444.
- D. Quintana. Statistical considerations for reporting and planning heart rate variability case-control studies. *Psychophysiology*, 54, 12 2016. doi: 10.1111/psyp.12798.
- I. J. Schoenberg. Remarks to Maurice Fréchet’s article “sur la définition axiomatique d’une classe d’espace distances vectoriellement applicable sur l’espace de Hilbert. *Annals of Mathematics*, 36(3):724–732, 1935.
- I. J. Schoenberg. On certain metric spaces arising from euclidean spaces by a change of metric and their imbedding in Hilbert space. *Annals of Mathematics*, 38(4):787–793, 1937.
- D. Sejdinovic, B. Sriperumbudur, A. Gretton, and K. Fukumizu. Equivalence of distance-based and RKHS-based statistics in hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(5): 2263–2291, 2013.
- A. Sen and B. Sen. Testing independence and goodness-of-fit in linear models. *Biometrika*, 101(4):927–942, 2014.
- C. Spearman. The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 15:72 – 101, 1904.
- G. J. Székely and M. L. Rizzo. Brownian distance covariance. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 3:1236–1265, 2009.
- G. J. Székely and M. L. Rizzo. On the uniqueness of distance covariance. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 82:2278–2282, 2012.
- G. J. Székely and M. L. Rizzo. The distance correlation t-test of independence in high dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 117:193–213, 2013.
- G. J. Székely, M. L. Rizzo, and N. K. Bakirov. Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35:2769–2794, 2007.

- J. W. Tukey. The philosophy of multiple comparisons. *Statistical Science*, 6(1):100–116, 1991.
- G. Wang, W. K. Li, and K. Zhu. New HSIC-based tests for independence between two stationary multivariate time series. *Statistica Sinica*, 31:269 – 300, 2021.
- S. Wellek. *Testing statistical hypotheses of equivalence and noninferiority*. CRC Press, 2010.
- J. A. Wellner and A. W. van der Vaart. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York – Berlin – Heidelberg, 1996.
- S. Yao, X. Zhang, and X. Shao. Testing mutual independence in high dimension via distance covariance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80(3):455–480, 2018.
- X. Zhang, L. Song, A. Gretton, and A. Smola. Kernel measures of independence for non-iid data. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 21. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2008/file/addfa9b7e234254d26e9c7f2af1005cb-Paper.pdf.
- Z. Zhou. Measuring nonlinear dependence in time-series, a distance correlation approach. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 33(3):438–457, 2012.