

# An adaptive test based on Kendall's tau for independence in high dimensions

Sam Olson

# Synopsis of Paper

- Testing the mutual independence for high-dimensional data.
- Known that  $L_2$ -type statistics have lower power under sparse alternatives and  $L_\infty$ -type statistics have lower power under dense alternatives in high dimensions.
- With this in mind, develop an adaptive test based on Kendall's  $\tau$  to compromise both situations of the alternative, which can automatically be adapted to the underlying data.
- Establish the asymptotic joint distribution of  $L_2$ -type and  $L_\infty$ -type statistics based on Kendall's  $\tau$  under mild assumptions and the asymptotic null distribution of the proposed statistic.
- Apply simulation to assess how well the test does compared to other testing methods, results that indicate the adaptive test performs well in either dense or sparse cases.

# What is Kendall's $\tau$

$$\tau = \frac{(\text{Count of concordant pairs}) - (\text{Count of discordant pairs})}{(\text{Number of pairs})}$$

- Where concordant: Text
- And where discordant: Text
- There are other types of Kendall's  $\tau$ , e.g.,  $\tau - a$ ,  $\tau - b$ ,  $\tau - c$

# How Does This Fit Into a Broader Narrative?

- **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.
- **1958–1990s** — Others (e.g., El-Shaarawi, 1992) apply rank-based methods to time series.
- **2024** — Shi et al. develop adaptive high-dimensional independence tests using Kendall's  $\tau$ .
- **2025** — Han et al. extend to a broader class of sum-of-powers tests.

# General Summary I

In *Kollektivmasslehre* (Fechner 1897) created a “precursor” to Kendall’s  $\tau$ . His method of signs looked for consecutive-dependence in sequences of observations: Assess concordance and discordance using only the signs of differences, not their magnitudes.

Kendall (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.

Kruskal (Kruskal 1958) emphasized  $\tau$ ’s place within a broader family of nonparametric statistics for ordinal data, within the framework of formal hypothesis testing.

Rank-based measures then spread to time series, enabling tests for persistence/independence in various settings (El-Shaarawi and Niculescu 1992; Hamed 2011).

And now, we apply these methods (use Kendall's  $\tau$ ) for the purposes of robust, distribution-free procedures, assessing both how and under what circumstances these tests of independence may be applied (e.g., whether the type of data or problem would lend itself to such an application) (Shi et al. 2024; Han, Ma, and Xie 2025).

# How Is This Non-Parametric?

- We make no distributional assumptions of the variables (covariates or otherwise) we wish to test for independence.
- Doesn't mean the statistic (Kendall  $\tau$ ) is distribution-free though! Just the inputs going into it!

# Why This, and Why Now?

Modern work continues to exploit distribution-free, rank-based tests of independence:

Adaptive high-dimensional tests building on Kendall's  $\tau$  (Shi et al. 2024; Han, Ma, and Xie 2025).

Time-series applications echoing Fechner's focus (El-Shaarawi and Niculescu 1992).

Broader treatments of ordinal association and nonparametric effects (Kruskal 1958; Newson, n.d.).

Persistence testing with ranks in environmental contexts (Hamed 2011).



## Problem

$H_0 : X_1, \dots, X_d$  are mutually independent

## Why Kendall's $\tau$ ?

- Rank-based; distribution-free; robust to heavy tails.

## Dense vs. Sparse

- **Dense:** many weak deps  $\Rightarrow$  sum-type ( $L_2$ ).
- **Sparse:** few strong deps  $\Rightarrow$  max-type ( $L_\infty$ ).

## Method (sketch)

- Build  $L_2$  and  $L_\infty$  from pairwise  $\tau_{k\ell}$ .
- $S_\tau \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$ ;  $M_\tau \Rightarrow \text{Gumbel}$ .
- Adaptive p-value:

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

## Theory (high level)

$S_\tau$  and  $M_\tau$  asymptotically independent;  $W = \min U_1, U_2$  with  $U_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$  so  $H(t) = 2t - t^2$ .

# Results I

Under various settings, we compare the following methods:

$S_r$ : Text

$TS_\tau$ : Text

$MS_\tau$ : Text

$M_r$ : Text

$TM_\tau$ : Text

$MM_\tau$ : Text

$TC_\tau$ : Text

$MC_\tau$ : Text

$PE_r$ : Text

$U_{\min}$ : Text

# Results II

$n$	50				100			
	50	100	200	400	50	100	200	400
<i>Model 1</i>								
$S_r$	0.042	0.055	0.048	0.053	0.047	0.044	0.047	0.049
$TS_\tau$	0.044	0.053	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.043	0.053	0.053
$MS_\tau$	0.046	0.057	0.052	0.051	0.056	0.045	0.055	0.055
$M_r$	0.013	0.007	0.001	0.001	0.021	0.020	0.013	0.009
$TM_\tau$	0.029	0.028	0.018	0.013	0.029	0.027	0.027	0.033
$MM_\tau$	0.044	0.063	0.052	0.051	0.041	0.047	0.044	0.052
$TC_\tau$	0.037	0.037	0.031	0.029	0.040	0.036	0.037	0.044
$MC_\tau$	0.042	0.056	0.047	0.040	0.049	0.048	0.056	0.053
$PE_r$	0.168	0.135	0.080	0.073	0.068	0.058	0.053	0.051
$U_{\min}$	0.060	0.073	0.065	0.072	0.062	0.060	0.061	0.055
<i>Model 2</i>								
$S_r$	0.418	0.439	0.432	0.440	0.578	0.568	0.577	0.574
$TS_\tau$	0.040	0.057	0.054	0.044	0.047	0.053	0.049	0.045
$MS_\tau$	0.043	0.057	0.056	0.047	0.051	0.054	0.053	0.045
$M_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.024	0.020	0.016	0.014	0.032	0.036	0.037	0.028
$MM_\tau$	0.041	0.056	0.052	0.040	0.054	0.054	0.058	0.051
$TC_\tau$	0.038	0.040	0.038	0.033	0.044	0.043	0.049	0.035
$MC_\tau$	0.045	0.055	0.052	0.045	0.052	0.055	0.072	0.043
$PE_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$U_{\min}$	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Model 3</i>								
$S_r$	0.056	0.057	0.061	0.059	0.051	0.062	0.051	0.059
$TS_\tau$	0.048	0.045	0.047	0.056	0.047	0.049	0.046	0.048
$MS_\tau$	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.057	0.052	0.052	0.049	0.049
$M_r$	0.091	0.156	0.225	0.360	0.141	0.264	0.493	0.765
$TM_\tau$	0.033	0.020	0.016	0.017	0.034	0.026	0.030	0.030
$MM_\tau$	0.052	0.045	0.053	0.042	0.055	0.043	0.051	0.052
$TC_\tau$	0.044	0.031	0.033	0.034	0.041	0.041	0.042	0.031
$MC_\tau$	0.047	0.046	0.052	0.048	0.053	0.049	0.063	0.041
$PE_r$	0.387	0.448	0.564	0.731	0.198	0.284	0.427	0.677
$U_{\min}$	NA	0.057	NA	NA	0.046	0.056	0.053	NA

Figure 1: Empirical sizes of tests

# Results III

$n$	50				100			
	50	100	200	400	50	100	200	400
<i>Model 4</i>								
$S_r$	0.434	0.918	0.999	1.000	0.178	0.651	0.993	1.000
$TS_\tau$	0.375	0.876	0.998	1.000	0.158	0.574	0.986	1.000
$MS_\tau$	0.362	0.873	0.998	1.000	0.155	0.577	0.986	1.000
$M_r$	0.015	0.018	0.008	0.003	0.036	0.026	0.021	0.024
$TM_\tau$	0.036	0.044	0.040	0.041	0.040	0.044	0.046	0.053
$MM_\tau$	0.071	0.099	0.120	0.113	0.063	0.069	0.079	0.094
$TC_\tau$	0.380	0.878	0.999	1.000	0.168	0.582	0.988	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.393	0.894	0.999	1.000	0.192	0.621	0.989	1.000
$PE_r$	0.510	0.925	0.999	1.000	0.207	0.654	0.994	1.000
$U_{\min}$	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.993	1.000	1.000	1.000
<i>Model 5</i>								
$S_r$	0.891	0.927	0.956	0.971	0.866	0.914	0.947	0.972
$TS_\tau$	0.856	0.952	0.990	1.000	0.752	0.887	0.976	0.995
$MS_\tau$	0.853	0.951	0.990	0.999	0.748	0.888	0.977	0.995
$M_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.426	0.514	0.594	0.722	0.308	0.407	0.530	0.684
$MM_\tau$	0.545	0.691	0.823	0.907	0.377	0.492	0.639	0.801
$TC_\tau$	0.888	0.967	0.994	1.000	0.794	0.908	0.987	0.997
$MC_\tau$	0.896	0.973	0.997	1.000	0.819	0.923	0.992	0.998
$PE_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$U_{\min}$	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Figure 2: Empirical powers of tests in dense cases.

# Results IV

$n$	50				100			
	50	100	200	400	50	100	200	400
<i>Model 6</i>								
$S_r$	0.053	0.060	0.054	0.055	0.082	0.069	0.056	0.054
$TS_\tau$	0.050	0.058	0.051	0.050	0.077	0.062	0.059	0.054
$MS_\tau$	0.048	0.059	0.054	0.048	0.077	0.064	0.061	0.055
$M_r$	0.201	0.307	0.504	0.757	0.845	0.963	0.999	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.210	0.329	0.533	0.793	0.786	0.936	0.996	1.000
$MM_\tau$	0.260	0.425	0.645	0.861	0.809	0.944	0.997	1.000
$TC_\tau$	0.182	0.281	0.473	0.746	0.734	0.918	0.993	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.194	0.323	0.531	0.767	0.754	0.926	0.995	1.000
$PE_r$	0.492	0.605	0.760	0.926	0.860	0.956	0.997	1.000
$U_{\min}$	0.233	0.289	0.371	0.347	0.763	0.874	0.946	0.976
<i>Model 7</i>								
$S_r$	0.433	0.435	0.431	0.436	0.577	0.568	0.578	0.575
$TS_\tau$	0.086	0.077	0.057	0.052	0.075	0.057	0.057	0.043
$MS_\tau$	0.081	0.076	0.056	0.049	0.073	0.059	0.062	0.045
$M_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.806	0.869	0.924	0.951	0.646	0.727	0.783	0.836
$MM_\tau$	0.834	0.904	0.952	0.967	0.687	0.760	0.820	0.870
$TC_\tau$	0.755	0.833	0.895	0.933	0.592	0.682	0.755	0.798
$MC_\tau$	0.769	0.853	0.918	0.941	0.615	0.704	0.778	0.812
$PE_r$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$U_{\min}$	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Figure 3: Empirical powers of tests in sparse cases.

# Results V

$n$	50				100			
	50	100	200	400	50	100	200	400
$\rho = 0.02$								
$TS_\tau$	0.078	0.185	0.400	0.782	0.168	0.413	0.822	0.993
$MS_\tau$	0.072	0.179	0.399	0.776	0.168	0.420	0.828	0.993
$TM_\tau$	0.033	0.024	0.014	0.018	0.045	0.054	0.045	0.029
$MM_\tau$	0.056	0.062	0.055	0.057	0.073	0.077	0.074	0.057
$TC_\tau$	0.093	0.191	0.404	0.783	0.179	0.430	0.827	0.993
$MC_\tau$	0.101	0.225	0.450	0.815	0.201	0.461	0.856	0.994
$\rho = 0.04$								
$TS_\tau$	0.387	0.764	0.972	0.998	0.809	0.990	1.000	1.000
$MS_\tau$	0.375	0.759	0.972	0.998	0.803	0.990	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.043	0.044	0.022	0.029	0.089	0.082	0.087	0.101
$MM_\tau$	0.080	0.108	0.081	0.074	0.126	0.130	0.141	0.160
$TC_\tau$	0.395	0.766	0.974	0.998	0.814	0.991	1.000	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.415	0.796	0.981	0.998	0.826	0.991	1.000	1.000
$\rho = 0.06$								
$TS_\tau$	0.781	0.981	0.998	1.000	0.993	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MS_\tau$	0.772	0.980	0.998	1.000	0.993	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.061	0.065	0.055	0.048	0.142	0.183	0.172	0.177
$MM_\tau$	0.110	0.128	0.149	0.132	0.211	0.257	0.270	0.279
$TC_\tau$	0.786	0.981	0.998	1.000	0.993	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.799	0.983	0.998	1.000	0.995	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\rho = 0.08$								
$TS_\tau$	0.958	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MS_\tau$	0.957	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TM_\tau$	0.125	0.106	0.091	0.074	0.283	0.299	0.356	0.376
$MM_\tau$	0.182	0.201	0.245	0.176	0.379	0.402	0.486	0.527
$TC_\tau$	0.961	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.964	0.998	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Figure 4: Empirical powers under various strengths of dependence in dense cases.

# Results VI

$n$	50				100			
	50	100	200	400	50	100	200	400
$\rho = 0.6$								
$TS_\tau$	0.056	0.064	0.054	0.042	0.111	0.078	0.051	0.062
$MS_\tau$	0.057	0.062	0.055	0.044	0.108	0.079	0.055	0.059
$TM_\tau$	0.571	0.408	0.271	0.174	0.990	0.973	0.952	0.891
$MM_\tau$	0.636	0.511	0.399	0.274	0.993	0.979	0.957	0.911
$TC_\tau$	0.512	0.363	0.238	0.155	0.984	0.962	0.926	0.866
$MC_\tau$	0.534	0.399	0.287	0.179	0.986	0.965	0.942	0.875
$\rho = 0.7$								
$TS_\tau$	0.085	0.070	0.055	0.045	0.204	0.095	0.055	0.058
$MS_\tau$	0.077	0.070	0.056	0.045	0.203	0.097	0.055	0.062
$TM_\tau$	0.876	0.828	0.698	0.561	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.997
$MM_\tau$	0.902	0.875	0.806	0.651	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.998
$TC_\tau$	0.902	0.875	0.806	0.651	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.998
$MC_\tau$	0.860	0.803	0.690	0.535	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.997
$\rho = 0.8$								
$TS_\tau$	0.129	0.087	0.060	0.045	0.356	0.122	0.062	0.059
$MS_\tau$	0.117	0.080	0.061	0.044	0.354	0.126	0.066	0.061
$TM_\tau$	0.992	0.988	0.973	0.951	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MM_\tau$	0.995	0.996	0.988	0.969	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TC_\tau$	0.987	0.983	0.960	0.929	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MC_\tau$	0.987	0.987	0.974	0.942	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\rho = 0.9$								
$TS_\tau$	0.197	0.097	0.062	0.050	0.621	0.201	0.082	0.065
$MS_\tau$	0.187	0.096	0.064	0.046	0.616	0.204	0.089	0.065
$TM_\tau$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MM_\tau$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$TC_\tau$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$MC_\tau$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Figure 5: Empirical powers under various strengths of dependence in sparse cases.



# Conclusion

Rank-based adaptive tests are practical and robust; 2025 work generalizes to sum-of-powers (Han, Ma, and Xie 2025).

# Next Steps

- Consulting applications (survey, environmental, biochemical).
- Reflection: Kendall's  $\tau$  connects classic nonparametric tests to modern high-dimension inference.

# References I

- 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>.