

# NP Report

Sam Olson

## General Timeline

1897 — Fechner introduces the *method of signs* for succession-dependence.

1938 — Kendall develops the  $\tau$  rank correlation coefficient.

1958 — Kruskal broadens Kendall’s ideas into a general nonparametric testing framework.

1958 to ??? — Others (such as El-Shaarawi, 1992) apply rank-based methods to time series problems.

2024 — Shi et al. (focus of this summary report) develop a “adaptive high-dimensional independence tests” using Kendall’s  $\tau$ .

2025 — Han et al. extend this framework to a broader class of sum-of-powers tests.

## General Summary

The trajectory from Fechner to modern adaptive tests highlights how a simple sign-based idea grew into a major branch of nonparametric inference.

Fechner’s *Kollektivmasslehre* (1897) (Fechner 1897) anticipated many of the ideas behind Kendall’s  $\tau$ . His *method of signs* looked for succession-dependence in sequences of observations, asking whether runs of increases or decreases occurred more often than chance would predict. Though Fechner restricted his comparisons to *adjacent* pairs, the spirit was the same: assess concordance and discordance using only the signs of differences, not their magnitudes. He even applied this method to meteorological series and anthropometric data, extending the idea to two dimensions.

Kendall (1938) (Kendall 1938) generalized Fechner’s idea by considering **all possible pairs** of observations, not just consecutive ones. His  $\tau$  statistic became the canonical **rank correlation coefficient**, widely adopted as a nonparametric alternative to Pearson’s correlation. In this sense, Kendall formalized what Fechner had hinted at decades earlier: a distribution-free measure of association based solely on ranks.

The following decades saw Kendall’s  $\tau$  move beyond descriptive correlation. Kruskal (1958) (Kruskal 1958) emphasized its place within a broader family of nonparametric statistics for ordinal data, framing it as a tool for hypothesis testing rather than mere association. Later, applications expanded to time series, where rank-based measures allowed testing for persistence or independence in hydrological and environmental data (El-Shaarawi and Niculescu 1992; Hamed 2011).

Today, this lineage culminates in the use of Kendall’s  $\tau$  for **independence testing in high dimensions**. Modern methods exploit its distribution-free and robust properties to develop procedures that remain valid under heavy tails or complex dependence structures. In particular, recent adaptive tests (Shi et al. 2024; Han, Ma, and Xie 2025) extend Kendall’s original idea into settings Kendall himself could not have imagined, where dozens or even hundreds of variables may be simultaneously tested for independence.

**Key point:** What began as Fechner’s attempt to quantify succession-dependence has, through Kendall’s formalization and subsequent expansions, become a cornerstone of nonparametric statistics — not only for measuring correlation but also for designing powerful and robust tests of independence.

## Concise Comparison to Kendall’s $\tau$

- **Fechner (1897):** focused on successive changes in time series, measuring whether runs of same-direction changes predominated over alternating changes. His measure was essentially a **sign-based concordance statistic**, but restricted to *adjacent pairs*.
- **Kendall (1938):** generalized this concordance/discordance idea to **all possible pairs** of observations, yielding a general **rank correlation coefficient** applicable beyond time-ordered data (Kendall 1938).

**Key point:** Fechner’s *Abh.* was the first sign-based dependence measure, rooted in succession of values, while Kendall’s  $\tau$  became the general measure of ordinal association.

## Motivation and Relevance

This historical progression highlights why Kendall’s  $\tau$  remains of interest today. Modern work continues to explore distribution-free and rank-based tests of independence:

- Adaptive tests for independence in high dimensions build directly on Kendall’s  $\tau$  (Shi et al. 2024; Han, Ma, and Xie 2025).
- Applications to time series echo Fechner’s original focus (El-Shaarawi and Niculescu 1992).
- Broader treatments of ordinal association (Kruskal 1958) and nonparametric effect size measures (Newson, n.d.) underscore its role as a general nonparametric tool.
- Kendall’s  $\tau$  has also been extended to dependence testing in persistent data (Hamed 2011).

## Recent Development: Shi et al. (2024)

Shi, Jiang, Du, and Miao (2024) tackle the problem of **testing mutual independence** among the components of a high-dimensional random vector:

$$H_0 : X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d \text{ are mutually independent.}$$

This problem is central in modern statistics — for example, in independent component analysis, causal inference, or portfolio management — but especially difficult when the number of variables  $d$  is large relative to the sample size  $n$ .

## Why Kendall’s $\tau$ ?

Classical Pearson correlation-based approaches often assume finite second moments and Gaussian structure. In contrast, Kendall’s  $\tau$  is:

- **Rank-based** and invariant to monotone transformations,
- **Distribution-free**, valid without parametric assumptions,
- **Robust** to heavy-tailed or skewed data, even when variance is infinite.

These properties make it ideal for high-dimensional independence testing.

## Dense vs. Sparse Alternatives

The key difficulty is that dependence can manifest in two very different ways:

- **Dense alternatives:** many weak dependencies across variables.
- **Sparse alternatives:** a few strong dependencies, with most variables independent.

Statistical tests traditionally specialize in one of these regimes:

- **$L_2$ -type tests:** sum of squared pairwise correlations, pooling many small effects (good for dense alternatives).
- **$L_\infty$ -type tests:** maximum pairwise correlation, sensitive to the largest effect (good for sparse alternatives).

But analysts rarely know which type of dependence dominates in practice.

## Methodology

The authors construct **rank-based  $L_2$  and  $L_\infty$  statistics** using Kendall's  $\tau$ :

### $L_2$ -type statistic

$$S_\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega_2}} \left( \sum_{k < \ell} \tau_{k\ell}^2 - \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \omega_1 \right),$$

where  $\omega_1, \omega_2$  are the exact mean and variance of  $\tau_{k\ell}^2$  under  $H_0$ .

- Asymptotically:  $S_\tau \sim N(0, 1)$ .
- Pools weak signals across many pairs  $\rightarrow$  powerful for dense dependence.
- Limitation: poor when only a few strong signals exist.

### $L_\infty$ -type statistic

$$M_\tau = \frac{1}{\omega_1} \max_{k < \ell} \tau_{k\ell}^2 - 4 \ln d + \ln \ln d.$$

- Asymptotically:  $M_\tau$  follows a Gumbel distribution.
- Sensitive to the largest pairwise correlation  $\rightarrow$  powerful for sparse dependence.
- Limitation: slow convergence in finite samples.

## Adaptive combination

To cover both regimes, the authors define:

$$C_\tau = \min\{1 - F(M_\tau), 1 - \Phi(S_\tau)\},$$

where  $F$  is the Gumbel CDF and  $\Phi$  the standard normal CDF.

Key theoretical results:

1. **Asymptotic independence:**  $S_\tau$  and  $M_\tau$  are asymptotically independent under  $H_0$ , despite both being based on Kendall’s  $\tau$ .

- Justified by U-statistic theory and bounding higher-order moments.
- Holds without moment restrictions (even infinite variance).

2. **Null distribution of  $C_\tau$ :** If  $d \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n$  large, and  $\ln d = o(n^{1/3})$ , then

$$C_\tau \xrightarrow{d} W = \min\{A, B\}, \quad A, B \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1].$$

So the null CDF is  $H(t) = 2t - t^2$ . This provides a simple rejection rule: reject  $H_0$  if  $C_\tau < 1 - \sqrt{1 - \alpha}$ .

3. **Robustness:** Because Kendall’s  $\tau$  is rank-based, the test is valid under monotone transformations and non-normal distributions.

## Simulation Results

The authors benchmark  $C_\tau$  against both Pearson- and rank-based competitors.

- **Size control:**

- Pearson-based methods often inflate type I error under heavy tails.
- $C_\tau$ ,  $S_\tau$ , and  $M_\tau$  maintain nominal size, even under Cauchy data (infinite variance).

- **Power:**

- Dense dependence  $\rightarrow S_\tau$  excels,  $M_\tau$  weak.
- Sparse dependence  $\rightarrow M_\tau$  excels,  $S_\tau$  weak.
- $C_\tau$  consistently adapts, performing near the best of both.

- **Finite samples:** Using Monte Carlo-calibrated critical values improves  $M_\tau$ ’s finite-sample behavior.

## Applications

1. **Welding dataset (4 variables,  $n = 40$ ):**

- Variables: voltage, current, feed speed, airflow.
- Heavy-tailed, skewed data.
- $S_\tau$  and  $C_\tau$  strongly reject independence ( $p < 0.01$ ).
- Pearson-based Schott test fails to reject  $\rightarrow$  highlights robustness of rank-based tests.

2. **Biochemical dataset (8 serum measures):**

- Control group:  $C_\tau = 0.008$  ( $p = 0.016$ )  $\rightarrow$  strong dependence.
- Alcohol group:  $C_\tau = 0.042$  ( $p = 0.081$ )  $\rightarrow$  weaker evidence.
- Suggests biological differences in dependence structure between groups.

## Conclusion

Shi et al. (2024) provide a **practical, distribution-free, and adaptive procedure** for high-dimensional independence testing. By combining  $L_2$ - and  $L_\infty$ -type rank-based statistics, the method adapts automatically to dense or sparse dependence structures without requiring parametric assumptions.

A more recent contribution by Han et al. (2025) (Han, Ma, and Xie 2025) generalizes this framework further, introducing **sum-of-powers statistics** that extend beyond squares and maxima. While more technical, this shows how Kendall’s century-old idea continues to inspire active methodological development.

## Next Steps

- Add a section on **Consulting Application**: how Kendall’s  $\tau$ -based adaptive tests could be used in practice (e.g., survey data, biochemical or environmental measurements).
- Conclude with reflections: Kendall’s  $\tau$  is not just a historical curiosity but an active area of research that bridges foundational nonparametric methods and cutting-edge high-dimensional inference.

## References

- El-Shaarawi, A. H., and Stefan P. Niculescu. 1992. “On Kendall’s Tau as a Test of Trend in Time Series Data.” *Environmetrics* 3 (4): 385–411.
- Fechner, Gustav Theodor. 1897. *Kollektivmasslehre*. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann. <https://www.google.com/books/edition/Kollektivmasslehre/bgQZAAAAMAAJ?hl=en>.
- Hamed, K. H. 2011. “The Distribution of Kendall’s Tau for Testing the Significance of Cross-Correlation in Persistent Data.” *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 56 (5): 841–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2011.586948>.
- Han, Lijuan, Yun Ma, and Junshan Xie. 2025. “An Adaptive Test of the Independence of High-Dimensional Data Based on Kendall Rank Correlation Coefficient.” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 37 (3): 632–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10485252.2024.2435852>.
- Kendall, M. G. 1938. “A New Measure of Rank Correlation.” *Biometrika* 30 (1/2): 81–93. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2332226>.
- Kruskal, William H. 1958. “Ordinal Measures of Association.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 53 (284): 814–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1958.10501481>.
- Newson, Roger. n.d. “Parameters Behind ‘Nonparametric’ Statistics: Kendall’s Tau, Somers’ d and Median Differences.” Working paper, King’s College London.
- Shi, Xiangyu, Yuanyuan Jiang, Jiang Du, and Zhuqing Miao. 2024. “An Adaptive Test Based on Kendall’s Tau for Independence in High Dimensions.” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 36 (4): 1064–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10485252.2023.2296521>.