

Discussion of “Robust Distance Covariance”

by S. Leyder, J. Raymaekers, and P.J. Rousseeuw

Hallin Marc^{1,2}, Davide La Vecchia³, Hang Liu⁴, and Xinyi Xu⁴

¹Department of Mathematics, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

²Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Czech Academy of Sciences,
Prague, Czech Republic

³Geneva School of Economics and Management, University of Geneva

⁴Department of Statistics and Finance, School of Management, University of
Science and Technology of China

1 Introduction

1.1 Distance covariance and the null hypothesis of independence

Testing the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 of independence between two variables X and Y is an important and fundamental problem in theoretical as well as in applied statistics. Thanks to the fact that they vanish if and only if X and Y are independent, the *distance covariance* $\text{dCov}(X, Y)$ and the corresponding *distance correlation* $\text{dCor}(X, Y)$ are natural measures of the dependence between X and Y . Their empirical versions constitute tests statistics for testing \mathcal{H}_0 against the alternative \mathcal{H}_1 of unspecified forms of dependence. Introduced by Székely et al. (2007), distance covariance and correlation have been thoroughly studied, and are used in a number of applications. In the sequel, we concentrate on distance covariance, but distance correlation clearly enjoys similar properties.

A remark about the notation is in order here. The notation $\text{dCov}(X, Y)$ is somewhat misleading inasmuch as dCov is a function of the joint distribution $P_{(X, Y)}$ of X and Y , not a measurable function of X and Y . The empirical version of $\text{dCov}(X, Y)$, based on a sample

$$(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) := ((X_1^{(n)}, Y_1^{(n)}), \dots, (X_n^{(n)}, Y_n^{(n)})),$$

will be denoted as $\text{dCov}(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)})$ and actually is the function dCov computed at the empirical distribution of the random n -tuple $(X_1^{(n)}, Y_1^{(n)}), \dots, (X_n^{(n)}, Y_n^{(n)})$.

Despite the popularity of the concept, the robustness properties of the empirical distance covariance $\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ remain largely unexplored, though. The present paper by Leyder, Raymaekers, and Rousseeuw—below referred to as [LRR]—is a welcome addition to the literature, palliating this important gap while revealing some intriguing features and proposing ingenious solutions. Three results are of particular interest:

- (i) an explicit form (Proposition 1 and Corollary 2) of the influence functions of $\text{dCov}(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)})$ and $\text{dCor}(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)})$, which are bounded but not redescending (Propositions 2 and 4);

- (ii) an example (Section 3) of a statistic with bounded influence function yet a breakdown value $1/n$ tending to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (iii) a clever trick (the *biloop transformation*) of transforming the data in order to obtain a bounded and redescending influence function.

1.2 Robustness by transformation

Point (iii) above highlights what the authors call “robustness by transformation,” that is, the fact that, for any bijective transformations ψ_1 and ψ_2 , X and Y are independent if and only if $\psi_1(X)$ and $\psi_2(Y)$ are, so that $\text{dCov}(X, Y) = 0$ if and only if $\text{dCov}(\psi_1(X), \psi_2(Y)) = 0$. This is an indication that a non-robust characterization of independence can be turned into a robust one via adequate transformations, and a simple but quite valuable finding of the authors is that these transformations ψ_1 and ψ_2 need not be from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} .

Transformations, moreover, also can be used to avoid the moment assumptions required when considering $\text{dCov}(X, Y)$. This is achieved, for instance, by the classical probability integral transformations $\psi_1 = F_X$ and $\psi_2 = F_Y$ (where F_X and F_Y stand for the distribution functions of X and Y , respectively), the empirical versions $F_X^{(n)}$ and $F_Y^{(n)}$ of which yield the ranks of the observations X_1, \dots, X_n and Y_1, \dots, Y_n . The resulting $\text{dCov}(F_X^{(n)}(X), F_Y^{(n)}(Y))$ then achieves, under the null hypothesis of independence, distribution-freeness (for absolutely continuous X and Y). That transformation can be combined with the use of scores J_1 and J_2 mapping $[0,1)$ to the real line, yielding rank-based test statistics $\text{dCov}(J_1 \circ F_X^{(n)}(X), J_2 \circ F_Y^{(n)}(Y))$. The case of Gaussian scores $J_1 = \Phi^{-1} = J_2$ (where Φ , as usual, denotes the standard normal distribution function), which is briefly mentioned by [LRR] in their Section 4, corresponds to the traditional (van der Waerden or) Gaussian-score rank statistics; but other scores are possible, such as the Wilcoxon scores ($J_1(u) = u = J_2(u)$) or the sign test scores ($J_1(u) = \text{sign}(u - 1/2) = J_2(u)$).

Now, as usual, there is a trade-off between robustness and efficiency: depending on the choice of the ψ_1 and ψ_2 transformations and the scores J_1 and J_2 , what are, in terms of efficiency, the costs (the benefits) of transformation-robustifying the “plain version” $\text{dCov}(X^{(n)}, Y^{(n)})$ of the empirical distance covariance into $\text{dCov}(\psi_1(X^{(n)}), \psi_2(Y^{(n)}))$ or $\text{dCov}(J_1 \circ F_X^{(n)}(X), J_2 \circ F_Y^{(n)}(Y))$? The answer is not immediate, and that issue, in [LRR], is not considered. Some power features of the rank-based transformations, such as Chernoff-Savage or Hodges-Lehmann results, could be obtained along the lines developed in Hallin and Paindaveine (2008) for the traditional Wilks test of independence.

1.3 Beyond bivariate independence

While the introduction, by Székely et al. (2007), of distance covariance was aiming at characterizing independence between vectors (i.e., (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ with $\max(d_1, d_2) > 1$), [LRR] are limiting their investigation to the bivariate case $d_1 = 1 = d_2$. Their introduction briefly mentions that multivariate \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} simply should be replaced with their Euclidean norms $\|\mathbf{X}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{Y}\|$; how to perform that replacement is not completely clear, though. Nor are the applicability and the performance of the [LRR] approach beyond the case of bivariate (X, Y) . Below, we discuss the possibility of extending distance covariance and [LRR]’s robustness results to \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} taking values in \mathbb{R}^d , on (hyper)spheres, or on more general Riemannian manifolds.

Actually, a rank-based extension of distance covariance for random vectors has been developed by Shi et al. (2022a and b) and Deb and Sen (2023), the results of whom we rapidly mention in Section 2. In Section 3, we further extend their multivariate approach to directional observations—taking values on (hyper)spheres. Extensions to more general compact Riemannian manifolds follow along similar lines, and we are currently working on it, but is not without some pitfalls. For instance, the equivalence between zero distance covariance and independence (the fundamental property justifying distance-covariance-based tests of independence in \mathbb{R}^d), in general, no longer holds for variables taking values on (hyper)spheres: see Section 3.2. The central idea of our approach is a combination of the distribution-free concepts of multivariate ranks and signs defined in Hallin et al. (2024) with distance covariance, via a suitable data transformation from hyperspheres to tangent spaces—a further illustration of the power of an adequate application of the “robustness by transformation” idea developed in [LRR].

2 Distance covariance in \mathbb{R}^d

Distance covariance in Székely et al. (2007) was introduced for $(\mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2})$ -valued data. Building on the concepts introduced in Chernozhukov et al. (2017) and Hallin et al. (2021), the corresponding rank-based versions only came some ten years later, with Shi et al. (2022a) and (2022b) and, in a slightly different form, with Deb and Sen (2023). We only briefly sketch their definitions (Section 2.1), and suggest (Section 2.2) how to robustify them, along the same lines as in [LRR], into statistics with redescending influence functions.

2.1 Rank-based distance covariance in \mathbb{R}^d

A major difficulty stems from the fact that \mathbb{R}^d , for $d > 1$, is not canonically ordered, so that the very definition of ranks is problematic. None of the many attempts—marginal ranks, depth-based ranks, spatial ranks, Mahalanobis or elliptical ranks, . . . we refer to the online appendix of Hallin et al. (2021) for details and references—to provide a concept of rank in this multivariate context was fully satisfactory until measure-transportation-based definitions were considered. Chernozhukov et al. (2017) and, under the name of *center-outward distribution function*, Hallin et al. (2021) consider the (a.s.) unique gradient of convex function $\mathbf{F}_\pm \equiv \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Z};\pm}$ pushing the distribution \mathbf{P} of some d -dimensional random variable \mathbf{Z} forward to the spherical uniform U_d over the unit ball \mathbb{S}_d and show that it enjoys the typical properties of a distribution function.

Based on a sample $\mathbf{Z}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(n)}$ of i.i.d. copies of $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathbf{P}$, Hallin et al. (2021) also propose empirical versions of \mathbf{F}_\pm . For instance, the empirical optimal transport $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}$ of the sample to a grid of n i.i.d. points with spherical uniform distribution U_d is a consistent (in the Glivenko-Cantelli sense) estimator of \mathbf{F}_\pm . But, for finite n , $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z})$ does not enjoy the independence property of $\mathbf{U} \sim U_d$, namely, independence between $\|\mathbf{U}\|$ and $\mathbf{U}/\|\mathbf{U}\|$: $\|\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z})\|$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z})^{(n)}/\|\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z})\|$ are only asymptotically mutually independent. Also, $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}$ does not decompose into mutually independent ranks and signs, and does not provide empirical quantile contours. A more structured grid, which involves a factorization of n into $n = n_R n_S + n_0$ where n_R , n_S , and n_0 are integers such that $n_0 < \min(n_R, n_S)$, provides an empirical and still Glivenko-Cantelli-consistent (as both n_R and n_S tend to infinity) version $\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}$ of \mathbf{F}_\pm . Contrary to $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}$, $\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}$ enjoys, for any n (and with a tie-breaking procedure in case $n_0 > 1$) the independence property of $\mathbf{U} \sim U_d$. Hallin et al. (2021) then define

the rank and the sign of $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)}$ as $R_i^{(n)} := (n_R + 1) \|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)})\|$ and $\mathbf{S}_i^{(n)} := \mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)}) / \|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)})\|$, respectively. We refer to Hallin et al. (2021) for details and to Hallin (2022) for a review.

Building on these concepts, Shi et al. (2022b) introduce a “rank-based” version of $\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ as the empirical counterpart of a particular case of the more general concept of *generalized symmetric covariance*, a direct definition of which is

$$\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \text{dCov}(\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})). \quad (2.1)$$

For $d_1 = 1 = d_2$, \mathbf{F}_\pm reduces to $2F - 1$ and it is easy to see that

$$\text{dCov}(X, Y) = \text{dCov}(2F_X(X) - 1, 2F_Y(Y) - 1) = 4\text{dCov}(F_X(X), F_Y(Y))$$

which, except for the inessential factor 4, is the traditional population version of the rank-based distance covariance. Shi et al. (2022b) moreover allow for *scores*: denoting by J_1 and J_2 two continuous mappings from $[0, 1)$ to \mathbb{R}_+ , they define the (J_1, J_2) -scored distance covariance as

$$\text{dCov}_{J_1, J_2}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \text{dCov}\left(J_1\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})\|}, J_2\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})\|}\right). \quad (2.2)$$

In order to avoid unnecessarily heavy notation, and whenever the context is clear, we use the same notation $\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}$ for the marginal empirical transports $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X};\pm}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y};\pm}^{(n)}$ computed from the \mathbf{X} - and the \mathbf{Y} -samples. The empirical versions $\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ and $\text{dCov}_{J_1, J_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ of (2.1) and (2.2), based on a sample $(\mathbf{X}_1^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}) \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_n^{(n)})$ and involving the center-outward ranks and signs of the \mathbf{X} - and the \mathbf{Y} -samples, respectively, are obtained by substituting in (2.1) the empirical distribution of the n -tuple $(\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)}), \mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)}), i = 1, \dots, n)$ for the joint distributions of $(\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}))$ and, in (2.2), the empirical distribution of

$$\left(J_1\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})\|}, J_2\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})\|}, i = 1, \dots, n\right) \quad (2.3)$$

for the joint distribution of

$$J_1\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})\|}, J_2\left(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})\|\right) \frac{\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})}{\|\mathbf{F}_\pm^{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})\|},$$

respectively. This yields, for scores $J_k(u) = (F_{\chi_{d_k}^2}^{-1}(u))^{1/2}$, $k = 1, 2$ ($F_{\chi_d^2}$ the χ_d^2 distribution function with d degrees of freedom) a van der Waerden version of (2.1), for $J_1(u) = u = J_2(u)$, the Wilcoxon distance covariance (also considered in Shi et al. (2022a, 2022b), and, for $J_1(u) = 1 = J_2(u)$, a sign-test-score version of the same.

Substituting $\mathbf{F}_{0;\pm}^{(n)}$ for $\mathbf{F}_\pm^{(n)}$, alternative versions of $\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ and $\text{dCov}_{J_1, J_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ are obtained in an obvious way; they, however, do not fully deserve the qualification of “rank-based” distance covariance statistics.

2.2 A bounded redescending influence function for rank-based distance covariance in \mathbb{R}^d ?

Neither the original distance covariance between random vectors nor its rank-based versions have been studied from the point of view of robustness. Extending the bivariate results developed

by [LRR] would be a natural continuation of their work. In particular, bounded redescending influence functions are likely to result from the following extensions of their biloop strategy.

The biloop transformation, actually, can be considered as a “bivariate score function” \mathbf{J} acting on the modulus of the center-outward distribution function, which is non-negative. Therefore, defining \mathbf{J}_k as $\psi_\infty \circ J_k$, $k = 1, 2$, with

$$\psi_\infty^+(u) := \begin{pmatrix} c(1 + \cos(2\pi \tanh(u/c) + \pi)) \\ \sin(2\pi \tanh(u/c)) \end{pmatrix}$$

(ψ_∞^+ 's graph is the right-hand part of Figure 6), we suggest $\text{dCov}_{\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ (a distance covariance between a $2d_1$ -dimensional random vector and a $2d_2$ -dimensional one) as a robustification of $\text{dCov}_{J_1, J_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)})$ (which is a distance covariance between a d_1 - and a d_2 -dimensional random vector). Note that the biloop nature of the transformation is taken care of by the fact that the scored quantities $\mathbf{J}(\|\mathbf{F}_\pm\|)$, in (2.2), are multiplied by the “multivariate signs” $\mathbf{F}_\pm/\|\mathbf{F}_\pm\|$ which are uniform over the unit sphere.

This yields, for the same choices of J_1 and J_2 as above, robustified versions of the van der Waerden, Wilcoxon, and sign-test-scores rank-based distance covariances. We conjecture that the corresponding influence functions are bounded and redescending.

3 Distance covariance for directional data

Section 2 takes care of distance covariances for multivariate real data. Further extensions, however, are highly desirable and have not been explored so far. In this section, we are sketching a possible extension to directional data, that is, to random directions distributed on hyperspheres. We conjecture that extensions to other compact non-linear Riemannian manifolds, such as tori and products of hyperspheres, are feasible using the same methodology, along with the nonparametric tools for Riemannian manifolds developed by Hallin and Liu (2024). Here, we restrict the exposition to the case of hyperspheres.

3.1 Data on hyperspheres

Data with values on the sphere appear in a wide range of applications—environmental sciences (wind directions analysis in meteorology), astronomy (directions of cosmic rays or stars), earth sciences (locations of an earthquake’s epicentre on the surface of the earth), and biology (circadian rhythms, studies of animal navigation): see, e.g., the monograph by Ley and Verdebout (2017). The specific nature and difficulty with such data lies in the curvature of their sample space: hyperspheres or circles are non-linear manifolds.

Although this type of data recently attracted a surge of activity, the problem of testing independence between two directional variables seldom has been addressed, and some of the methods proposed, such as in Johnson and Shieh (2002), for all their theoretical interest, are hardly implementable. The “robustness by data transformation paradigm” emphasized in [LRR] opens the door to new developments and novel independence testing procedures. In this section, we discuss some ideas which, we believe, are paving the way to such developments.

Let us first introduce some notation. Denote by \mathcal{S}^{d-1} the unit (hyper)sphere in \mathbb{R}^d . The geodesic distance between \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} is $d_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = |\arccos(\mathbf{z}_1^T \mathbf{z}_2)|$. When equipped with the geodesic distance, \mathcal{S}^{d-1} is a separable complete metric space, hence a Polish metric space with

Borel σ -field \mathcal{B}^{d-1} , say. The notation $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{Z}}$ is used for the probability distribution of the \mathcal{S}^{d-1} -valued random direction \mathbf{Z} . Finally, given a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} and a point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}$ (this includes the hypersphere \mathcal{S}^{d-1}), denote by $T_{\mathbf{z}}\mathcal{M}$ the tangent space of \mathcal{M} at \mathbf{z} , and by $\partial\mathcal{M}$ the boundary of \mathcal{M} .

3.2 Two problems

Let \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} denote two random directions defined on the same (unspecified) probability space, with values in \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} and \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} , respectively. As in [LRR], we are interested in testing the null hypothesis

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{X} \text{ and } \mathbf{Y} \text{ are independent,} \quad (3.1)$$

based on a sample $(\mathbf{X}_1^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_n^{(n)})$ of n independent copies of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) . A natural question is: can we, as in [LRR], use distance covariance (preferably, robust versions thereof) for the hypothesis testing problem (3.1)? Natural as it is, this objective nevertheless runs into two serious theoretical and methodological problems.

- (i) *Problem 1* (Hyperspheres are not metric spaces of *strong negative type*) A metric space \mathcal{X} with metric $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ is of *negative type* if, for any $n \geq 2$, $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 0$, $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \alpha_i \alpha_j d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \leq 0$. Let $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of probability measures on \mathcal{X} with finite first-order moment. We say that $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is of *strong negative type* if (a) $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is of negative type and (b) for any $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) d(\mathbf{P}_1 - \mathbf{P}_2)^{\otimes 2}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = 0$$

iff $\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{P}_2$. Lyons (2013, Theorem 3.11 and Proposition 3.15) shows that, for two random vectors \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} with values in $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$, respectively, and finite first-order moments, mutual independence is equivalent to $\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = 0$ if and only if both \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are metric spaces of strong negative type. For the unit hypersphere \mathcal{S}^{d-1} equipped with the geodesic distance, Lyons (2020) proves that a subset \mathcal{X} of \mathcal{S}^{d-1} is of strong negative type if and only if it contains at most one pair of antipodal points. As a consequence, distance covariance tests of independence between directional variables \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are inappropriate unless the support of \mathbf{X} and the support of \mathbf{Y} both contain at most one pair of antipodal points. This, at first sight, precludes the application of distance-covariance-based tests on (hyper)spheres.

- (ii) *Problem 2* (Distribution-freeness) Assuming that point (i) can be taken care of, a typical issue, if a test based on distance covariance is to be implemented, is that the (asymptotic) null distribution of dCov^2 depends on the (typically unspecified) distributions of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} . This dependence is usually hard to deal with (both theoretically and numerically): see Remark 4.4 in Deb and Sen (2023) for a discussion of this issue. If a distribution-free version of the distance covariance statistic can be defined for $d \geq 2$ (similar to the definition for $d = 1$ in Section 2.1), then critical values can be obtained, with arbitrary precision, by simulations.

In the next two sections, we show how [LRR]'s robustness by transformation principle, combined with the theory of optimal transportation on hyperspheres (more generally, on compact Riemannian manifolds) and the introduction of directional ranks and signs, provides a solution to these two problems.

3.3 Measure transportation and directional distance covariance

Let us start with a brief definition of the concepts to be used. The theory of measure transportation,¹ which can be traced back to Monge (1781) and Kantorovich (1960), has been successfully applied in a variety of areas, including statistics, economics, machine learning, computer science, to mention only a few: see, e.g., (Galichon, 2017; Hallin, 2022; La Vecchia et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2025) and references therein.

In statistics, based on measure transportation, Chernozhukov et al. (2017) (under the name of *Monge-Kantorovich ranks*) and Hallin et al. (2021) (under the name of *center-outward ranks*) introduce novel notions of ranks (and signs and quantiles) in \mathbb{R}^d that enjoy all the properties expected from such concepts—among which (for the ranks and the signs) distribution-freeness. The approach and the terminology we are adopting here is that of Hallin et al. (2021, 2024).

These measure-transportation-based techniques have been used to construct new distribution-free tests of independence in *Euclidean spaces*, defining, in particular, rank-based distance covariance test statistics for vector independence: see Section 2.1. Based on optimal transportation (since variances in the context are finite), Hallin et al. (2024) on hyperspheres and Hallin and Liu (2024) on more general compact Riemannian manifolds also define distribution-free ranks and signs. The directional distance covariance and the testing procedures we are proposing below are building on these theoretical and methodological developments.

3.4 Population concepts: directional distribution and quantile functions

Before proceeding further, let us summarize some key results of Hallin et al. (2024), who propose directional concepts of distribution and quantile functions inducing a distribution-specific system of curvilinear parallels and (hyper)meridians on the sphere. For any distributions P and Q on $(\mathcal{S}^{d-1}, \mathcal{B}^{d-1})$, let $\mathcal{S}(P, Q)$ denote the set of all measurable maps $\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ such that for all $V \in \mathcal{B}^{d-1}$, $(\mathbf{S}\#P)(V) := P(\mathbf{S}^{-1}(V)) = Q(V)$ —in the measure transportation terminology, the set of transport maps \mathbf{S} *pushing* P *forward to* Q . The optimal transportation (OT) problem on \mathcal{S}^{d-1} consists in minimizing, for given P and Q and over $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S}(P, Q)$, the quantity

$$C(\mathbf{S}) := \int_{\mathcal{S}^{d-1} \times \mathcal{S}^{d-1}} c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z})) dP(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{where} \quad c(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) := d_{\mathcal{S}}^2(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)/2. \quad (3.2)$$

Proposition 1 in Hallin et al. (2024) establishes the existence and P -a.s. uniqueness of the solution $\mathbf{S}_{P, Q}$ and Proposition 2 shows that it is a homeomorphism (hence, is continuously invertible) between \mathcal{S}^{d-1} and \mathcal{S}^{d-1} ; call *geodesic Wasserstein distance* between P and Q the value $C(\mathbf{S}_{P, Q})$ of the minimum. When Q is the uniform P^U over \mathcal{S}^{d-1} , call $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_P$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_P := \mathbf{F}_P^{-1}$ the *directional distribution function* and the *directional quantile function* of P , respectively (parallel to \mathbf{F}_P and \mathbf{Q}_P , the notation \mathbf{F}_Z and \mathbf{Q}_Z will be used in an obvious way for $Z \sim P$). These definitions are a natural extension of the classical univariate ones, where the distribution function F of a real-valued random variable $Z \sim P^Z$ is pushing P^Z forward to the uniform $U_{[0,1]}$ over the unit interval.

Hallin et al. (2024) first define collections of nested regions of \mathcal{S}^{d-1} with P^U -probability contents $\tau \in [0, 1]$ centered at some submanifold \mathcal{S}_0^{d-1} with zero P^U -probability content. These regions have the interpretation of quantile regions of order $\tau \in [0, 1]$ for the uniform P^U , with median

¹Note that the expression *optimal* (for squared Euclidean distance transportation costs) *transportation* (OT) only makes sense in the context of probability measures with finite second order moments—a condition which is automatically satisfied for variables with values on compact manifolds.

set \mathcal{S}_0^{d-1} . For the sake of simplicity, we follow Hallin et al. (2024) and restrict \mathcal{S}_0^{d-1} to be a singleton $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}\}$; other choices are possible, though (e.g., the equator associated with some pole $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ —see Hallin and Liu (2024)). Since $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$ is fully symmetric, the choice of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is to be based on \mathbf{P} , and Hallin et al. (2024) propose for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ the image by \mathbf{F} of \mathbf{P} 's Fréchet mean $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{Fréchet}}^{\mathbf{P}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathcal{S}^{d-1}} c(\mathbf{z}, x) d\mathbf{P}(x)$ (in case of multiple Fréchet means, pick an arbitrary one or choose some centroid of the Fréchet mean set). Due to the rotational symmetry of $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$ with respect to $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the collection of nested spherical caps centered at $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$ -probability contents τ constitutes a natural family of quantile regions for the uniform $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$. Hallin et al. (2024) then define the τ -quantile region $\mathbb{C}_\tau = \mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{P}}$ of \mathbf{P} as the image by \mathbf{Q} of the τ -quantile region $\mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}}$ of $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}} &:= \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} : F_*(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq 1 - \tau\}, \\ \mathbb{C}_\tau = \mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{P}} &:= \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} : F_*(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq 1 - \tau\}, \end{aligned}$$

with boundaries (quantile *contours*)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}} &:= \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} : F_*(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 1 - \tau\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{P}} = \mathcal{C}_\tau &:= \mathbf{Q}(\mathcal{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} : F_*(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 1 - \tau\}, \end{aligned}$$

where F_* is the distribution function of $\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ where $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{U}}$, which takes the form

$$F_*(u) := \int_{-1}^u (1 - s^2)^{(d-3)/2} ds / \int_{-1}^1 (1 - s^2)^{(d-3)/2} ds, \quad -1 \leq u \leq 1$$

and adjusts the size of the spherical caps $\mathbb{C}_\tau^{\mathbf{U}}$ to achieve probability content τ .

3.5 Empirical counterparts: directional ranks, signs, and quantiles

Let $\mathbf{Z}^{(n)} = \{\mathbf{Z}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(n)}\}$ denote a sample of n i.i.d. copies of $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathbf{P}$. As in \mathbb{R}^d , two empirical versions of $\mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{P}}$, $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$, can be defined, with the difference that $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$ here is the result of a two-step procedure of which $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ is the first step. Both $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$ are Glivenko-Cantelli consistent, but only $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$ yields quantile contours, ranks, and signs. Let us describe the two-step construction of $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$.

The first step involves the estimation of a pole $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ for \mathbf{P} —for instance, the empirical Fréchet mean $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{Fréchet}}^{(n)}$ —along with an estimation $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ of \mathbf{F} . The latter is obtained as the mapping from the sample $\mathbf{Z}^{(n)}$ to an adequate grid $\mathfrak{G}_0^{(n)} = \{\mathfrak{g}_{0;1}^{(n)}, \dots, \mathfrak{g}_{0;n}^{(n)}\} \subset \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ minimizing, over the set $\Pi^{(n)}$ of all permutations π of the integers $\{1, \dots, n\}$, $\sum_{i=1}^n c(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)}, \mathfrak{g}_{0;\pi(i)}^{(n)})$ (with $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined in (3.2)). The solution $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ of this minimization problem is the optimal transport pushing the empirical distribution of the sample forward to the empirical distribution of the grid $\mathfrak{G}_0^{(n)}$. The only condition required for the consistency of $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ is the weak convergence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, of the empirical distribution over $\mathfrak{G}_0^{(n)}$ to the uniform over \mathcal{S}^{d-1} ; to fix the ideas, let us assume that $\mathfrak{G}_0^{(n)}$ is obtained as an i.i.d. n -tuple of uniform over \mathcal{S}^{d-1} variables. This minimization is an optimal pairing problem for which efficient algorithms are available. The resulting $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}$ does not allow for the construction of empirical quantile regions and contours, ranks, or signs. However, it determines a data-driven pole $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)} := \mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(n)})$ for the uniform, around which the grid to be used in the

second step will be based, and provides each observation $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)}$ with a *latitude* $1 - \langle \mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)}), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)} \rangle$ and a (*hyper*)*longitude*—the intersection of the geodesic connecting $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)})$ with the equatorial region associated with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$, i.e., the $(d-2)$ -hypersphere \mathcal{S}^{d-2} of the equatorial hyperplane determined by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$; this equatorial hyperplane coincides with the translation $T_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}} \mathcal{S}^{d-1} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$ of the tangent space at $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$.

The second step involves a second grid, $\mathfrak{G}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}}^{(n)}$, based, as in \mathbb{R}^d , a factorization of n into $n_R n_S + n_0$ with $n_0 < \min(n_R, n_S)$. This second grid consists of the $n_R n_S$ intersections of n_S uniformly distributed (hyper)meridians (geodesics connecting $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$ and $-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$) with a uniform array of n_R *parallels* (a parallel is the collection of points with given latitude), along with n_0 copies of the pole $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$. Denote by $\mathbf{F}^{(n)} \equiv \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(n)}$ the optimal transport from the empirical distribution of the sample to the empirical distribution over this second grid. The directional ranks $R_i^{(n)}$ (taking values $1, \dots, n_R$) and signs $\mathbf{S}_i^{(n)}$ (taking values in the $(d-2)$ -hypersphere of the equatorial hyperplane determined by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$) to be used below can be defined as functions of $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)})$. We refer to Section 4.2 of Hallin et al. (2024) for explicit formulas.

3.6 A rank-based directional distance covariance test of independence

Let us show how the ranks and signs obtained by letting $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)} = \mathbf{X}_i^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_i^{(n)} = \mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)}$ in the procedures described in Section 3.5 allow for constructing distance covariance statistics that simultaneously take care of the two problems—distribution-freeness and the fact that the hypersphere is not of strong negative type—mentioned in Section 3.2.

Recall that $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ are homeomorphic transformations of \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} and \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} , respectively. Therefore, testing the mutual independence of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} is equivalent to testing the mutual independence of the transformed variables $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y})$. This suggests considering a distribution-free test based on the empirical distance covariance between the transformed observations

$$\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_1^{(n)}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_n^{(n)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_n^{(n)}) \quad (3.3)$$

or

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_1^{(n)}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_n^{(n)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_n^{(n)}) \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$ stand for the optimal transports obtained, for $\mathbf{X}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n^{(n)}$, respectively, in Step 1 of Section 3.5, $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$ for the optimal transports obtained in Step 2 (with, using obvious notation for the poles $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$, grids $\mathfrak{G}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}}^{(n)}$ over \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} for $\mathbf{X}^{(n)}$ and $\mathfrak{G}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}}^{(n)}$ over \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} for $\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}$). Note that these n -tuples of transformed data are uniformly distributed over the $n!$ permutations of their respective grids, hence distribution-free; contrary to $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$, however, $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$ do not define ranks and signs in Section 3.5.

Now, the transformed data (3.3) and (3.4) still take values in \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} and \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} , which contain infinitely many pairs of antipodal points, thus failing to be of the strongly negative type. Computing distance covariances between them, therefore, remains theoretically meaningless. To circumvent this problem, we propose a further transformation or, more precisely, a class of further bijective transformations of $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})$ (of $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})$), $i = 1, \dots, n$ mapping \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} and \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} to Euclidean spaces; being bijective, these transformations are preserving the null hypothesis of independence, while allowing for a meaningful notion of distance covariance.

For any point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, there exist homeomorphisms $\varphi : \mathcal{S}^{d-1} \setminus \{-\mathbf{z}\} \rightarrow K^{d-1}$, where K^{d-1} is some open subset of the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{z}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ of \mathcal{S}^{d-1} at \mathbf{z} . Letting φ_1 and φ_2 denote such transformations for $\mathbf{z}_1 \in \mathcal{S}^{d_1-1}$ and $\mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$, respectively consider

$$\varphi_1 \circ \mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2 \circ \mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)} \quad \text{or} \quad \varphi_1 \circ \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2 \circ \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}. \quad (3.5)$$

By construction, φ_1 and φ_2 map the observation $(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)}) \in (\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} \setminus \{-\mathbf{z}_1\}) \times (\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} \setminus \{-\mathbf{z}_2\})$ to $K^{d_1-1} \times K^{d_2-1} \subset T_{\mathbf{z}_1}\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} \times T_{\mathbf{z}_2}\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$, which is a product of Euclidean spaces over which dCov is defined as usual. Natural choices for \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 are the empirical poles $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}$ (values of \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 coinciding with any $-\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)}$ and $-\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)}$ are to be avoided lest the corresponding observation is lost). We then propose the following definition of a directional distance covariance statistic.

Definition 3.1 (Directional distance covariance). (i) Define the (φ_1, φ_2) -directional distance covariance of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) with values in $\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} \times \mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$ as

$$\text{dCov}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \text{dCov}(\varphi_1(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X})), \varphi_2(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}))), \quad (3.6)$$

where φ_1 and φ_2 are bijective mappings from $\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} \setminus \{-\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{X}}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} \setminus \{-\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{Y}}\}$ to open subsets K^{d_1-1} of $T_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{X}}}\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1}$ and K^{d_2-1} of $T_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{Y}}}\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$, respectively.

- (ii) With bijective mappings φ_1 and φ_2 from $\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1} \setminus \{-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1} \setminus \{-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}\}$ to open subsets K^{d_1-1} of $T_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1}$ and K^{d_2-1} of $T_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$, empirical versions of (3.6) are the statistics $\text{dCov}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) := \text{dCov}(\varphi_1(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)})), \varphi_2(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)})))$ (which is rank-based), and $\text{dCov}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) := \text{dCov}(\varphi_1(\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^{(n)})), \varphi_2(\mathbf{F}_{0;\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)})))$; both are distribution-free under the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 of independence between \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} .

Distribution-free tests of independence then can be constructed, which are rejecting \mathcal{H}_0 for “large values” of test statistics of the form

$$\widetilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)} := n \text{dCov}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^2(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) \quad \text{or} \quad \widetilde{W}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)} := n \text{dCov}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}^2(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) \quad (3.7)$$

(the factor n entails convergence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the null distributions of $\widetilde{W}^{(n)}$ and $\widetilde{W}_0^{(n)}$ to a nondegenerate limit, as in Theorem 3.1 of Shi et al. (2020)).

Both $\widetilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ and $\widetilde{W}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ have their own merits. On the one hand, $\widetilde{W}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ is of less computational complexity than $\widetilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ since it does not require the second optimal transport in Step 2 of Section 3.5. On the other hand, unlike $\widetilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$, it does not fully qualify as “rank-based.” As for the choice of φ_1 and φ_2 , one may privilege bounded functions yielding robustness features, pretty much in the same spirit as the function ψ_{∞} introduced in [LRR].

A natural specification of φ_1 and φ_2 in $\widetilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$, yielding a class of tests that are closely related to the classical examples of rank- and sign-based scores in the univariate setting and share the same spirit as the measure-transportation-based inference procedures (estimation and testing) developed in Hallin et al. (2022, 2023); Hallin and Liu (2023) for \mathbb{R}^d -valued data is

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}_i^{(n)})) = \varphi_{11} \left(\frac{R_{\mathbf{X},i}^{(n)}}{n_R + 1} \right) \varphi_{12}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},i}^{(n)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{(n)})) = \varphi_{21} \left(\frac{R_{\mathbf{Y},i}^{(n)}}{n_R + 1} \right) \varphi_{22}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y},i}^{(n)}),$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (3.8)$$

(with obvious notation for $R_{\mathbf{X},i}^{(n)}$, $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},i}^{(n)}$, $R_{\mathbf{Y},i}^{(n)}$, and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y},i}^{(n)}$) where we assume that φ_{11} and φ_{21} are continuous and bijective functions mapping $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} while φ_{12} and φ_{22} are continuous and bijective mappings from \mathcal{S}^{d_1-2} and \mathcal{S}^{d_2-2} to the tangent spaces $T_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d_1-1}$ and $T_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d_2-1}$, respectively.

Classical choices for the score functions φ in (3.8) are

- (Wilcoxon scores) $\varphi_{\ell 1}(u) = u$ and $\varphi_{\ell 2}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$;
- (Gaussian or van der Waerden scores) $\varphi_{\ell 1}(u) = [F_{\chi_d^2}^{-1}(u)]^{1/2}$ and $\varphi_{\ell 2}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ where $F_{\chi_d^2}^{-1}$ stands for the quantile function of a chi-square distribution with d (either d_1 or d_2) degrees of freedom.

Both choices yield homeomorphisms from $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} \setminus \{-\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} \setminus \{-\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}\}$ to the open unit disks $\mathbb{D}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}}^{d-1}$ of $T_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ and $\mathbb{D}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}}^{d-1}$ of $T_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{(n)}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, respectively. Both are fine since we are now in a Euclidean space rather than in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} , which takes care of *Problem 1* of Section 3.2.

As for *Problem 2*, $\tilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ and $\tilde{W}_{0; \varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$ (as defined in (3.7)) by construction are jointly distribution-free under the null hypothesis of independence.

Sign-test scores $\varphi_{\ell 1}(u) = 1$ and $\varphi_{\ell 2}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ are another popular choice. However, they are an example of a non-bijective transformation of the original observations, yielding a test (based on the test statistic $\tilde{W}_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}^{(n)}$) that remains distribution-free but fails to detect some types of dependencies.

4 Conclusion

Building on the measure-transportation-based notions of directional ranks and signs defined in Hallin et al. (2024), we show how the “robustness via transformation” principle emphasized by [LRR] extends beyond the case of bivariate independence and also applies in higher-dimension Euclidean spaces and on compact manifolds. The case of directional variables (taking values on (hyper)spheres) is given special attention: although (hyper)spheres are not metric spaces of the strong negative type, we introduce a class of pertinent directional distance covariance test statistics and illustrate their applicability. We hope that this note will open the door to further research directions in line with [LRR].

References

- Chernozhukov, V., A. Galichon, M. Hallin, and M. Henry (2017). Monge-Kantorovich depth, quantiles, ranks and signs. *The Annals of Statistics* 45, 223–256.
- Deb, N. and B. Sen (2023). Multivariate rank-based distribution-free nonparametric testing using measure transportation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118, 192–207.
- Galichon, A. (2017). A survey of some recent applications of optimal transport methods to econometrics. *Econometrics Journal* 20, C1–C11.
- Hallin, M. (2022). Measure transportation and statistical decision theory. *Annual Review of Statistics and its Application* 9, 401–424.

- Hallin, M., E. del Barrio, J. Cuesta-Albertos, and C. Matrán (2021). Center-outward distribution functions, quantiles, ranks, and signs in \mathbb{R}^d . *Annals of Statistics* 48, 1139–1165.
- Hallin, M., D. La Vecchia, and H. Liu (2022). Center-outward R-estimation for semiparametric VARMA models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117, 925–938.
- Hallin, M., D. La Vecchia, and H. Liu (2023). Rank-based testing for semiparametric VAR models: a measure transportation approach. *Bernoulli* 29, 229–273.
- Hallin, M. and H. Liu (2023). Center-outward rank-and sign-based VARMA portmanteau tests: Chitturi, Hosking, and Li–McLeod revisited. *Econometrics and Statistics*.
- Hallin, M. and H. Liu (2024). Quantiles and quantile regression on Riemannian manifolds: a measure-transportation-based approach. *arXiv preprint 2410.15711*.
- Hallin, M., H. Liu, and T. Verdebout (2024). Nonparametric measure-transportation-based methods for directional data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 86, 1172–1196.
- Hallin, M. and D. Paindaveine (2008). *Beyond Parametrics in Interdisciplinary Research : Festschrift in Honor of Professor Pranab K. Sen*, Chapter Chernoff-Savage and Hodges-Lehmann results for Wilks’ test of independence, pp. 184–96. I.M.S. Lecture Notes-Monograph Series.
- Johnson, R. A. and G. S. Shieh (2002). On tests of independence for spherical data-invariance and centering. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 57, 327–335.
- Kantorovich, L. V. (1960). Mathematical methods of organizing and planning production. *Management Science* 6, 366–422.
- La Vecchia, D., E. Ronchetti, and A. Ilievski (2023). On some connections between Esscher’s tilting, saddlepoint approximations, and optimal transportation: A statistical perspective. *Statistical Science* 38, 30–51.
- Ley, C. and T. Verdebout (2017). *Modern Directional Statistics*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Lyons, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *The Annals of Probability* 41, 3284–3305.
- Lyons, R. (2020). Strong negative type in spheres. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 307, 383–390.
- Ma, Y., H. Liu, D. La Vecchia, and M. Lerasle (2025). Inference via robust optimal transportation: theory and methods. *arXiv preprint 2301.06297*.
- Monge, G. (1781). Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Mem. Math. Phys. Acad. Royale Sci.*, 666–704.
- Shi, H., M. Drton, and F. Han (2022). Distribution-free consistent independence tests via center-outward ranks and signs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117, 395–410.
- Shi, H., M. Hallin, M. Drton, and F. Han (2022). On universally consistent and fully distribution-free rank tests of vector independence. *The Annals of Statistics* 50, 1933–1959.
- Székely, G. J., M. L. Rizzo, and N. K. Bakirov (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *The Annals of Statistics* 35, 2769–2794.