

On boosting the power of Chatterjee’s rank correlation

Zhexiao Lin* and Fang Han†

Abstract

Chatterjee (2021)’s ingenious approach to estimating a measure of dependence first proposed by Dette et al. (2013) based on simple rank statistics has quickly caught attention. This measure of dependence has the unusual property of being between 0 and 1, and being 0 or 1 if and only if the corresponding pair of random variables is independent or one is a measurable function of the other almost surely. However, more recent studies (Cao and Bickel, 2020; Shi et al., 2021b) showed that independence tests based on Chatterjee’s rank correlation are unfortunately rate-inefficient against various local alternatives and they call for variants. We answer this call by proposing revised Chatterjee’s rank correlations that still consistently estimate the same dependence measure but provably achieve near-parametric efficiency in testing against Gaussian rotation alternatives. This is possible via incorporating many right nearest neighbors in constructing the correlation coefficients. We thus overcome the “only one disadvantage” of Chatterjee’s rank correlation (Chatterjee, 2021, Section 7).

Keywords: dependence measure; independence test; rank correlation; right nearest neighbor; local power analysis.

1 Introduction

Consider X, Y to be two random scalars defined on the same probability space. In various scenario one is interested in quantifying the strength of association between X and Y as well as determining the validity of the following null hypothesis,

$$H_0 : X \text{ and } Y \text{ are independent,} \quad (1.1)$$

both based on a finite sample of size n . These two tasks are usually convoluted and together play a pivotal role in many statistics and scientific practices (Pearl, 2009; Josse and Holmes, 2016; Maathuis et al., 2019).

For handling the above two tasks, this paper is focused on such nonparametric rank correlations that measure associations between X and Y using only the ranks of the data. Rank correlations are particularly appealing for continuous X, Y as then the corresponding tests under H_0 are fully distribution-free. Early such proposals include Spearman’s ρ (Spearman, 1904), Kendall’s τ (Kendall, 1938), Gini’s γ (Gini, 1914), and Blomqvist’s β (Blomqvist, 1950), which however cannot arrive at a consistent test of independence. For the sake of testing consistency, Hoeffding (1948), Blum et al. (1961), Yanagimoto (1970), and Bergsma and Dassios (2014) have proposed variants

*Department of Statistics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA; e-mail: zxlin@uw.edu

†Department of Statistics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA; e-mail: fanghan@uw.edu

that not only lead to consistent tests of independence but are also shown to be rate-efficient against many local alternatives; cf. [Dhar et al. \(2016\)](#), [Shi et al. \(2021b\)](#), and [Shi et al. \(2020\)](#).

In a recent manuscript that received much attention, [Chatterjee \(2021\)](#) introduced a new rank correlation coefficient that estimates a correlation measure first proposed by Dette, Siburg, and Stoimenov ([Dette et al., 2013](#)). Compared to the existing ones, this new pair of correlation measure and coefficient appears to have some unusual properties including, in particular, that

- (1) the measure is between 0 and 1, is 0 if and only if X and Y are independent, and is 1 if and only if Y is a measurable function of X almost surely;
- (2) the correlation coefficient has a very simple expression and is an (almost surely) consistent estimator of the measure as long as Y is not almost surely a constant.

Due to the above attractive properties, Chatterjee’s rank correlation is an appealing choice for measuring bivariate association strength, especially in detecting perfect functional dependence ([Cao and Bickel, 2020](#)). On the other hand, for testing H_0 in (1.1), we have known that Chatterjee’s proposal will suffer from a lack of power; cf. the claim made in [Chatterjee \(2021, Section 7\)](#), the analysis conducted in [Cao and Bickel \(2020\)](#) and [Shi et al. \(2021b\)](#), as well as the results in a very recent study ([Shi et al., 2021a](#)). As a matter of fact, the critical detection boundary of the test based on Chatterjee’s rank correlation was calculated to be at $n^{-1/4}$, which is much slower than the usual parametric $n^{-1/2}$ rate ([Auddy et al., 2021](#)). These analyses thus motivate revising Chatterjee’s original proposal to be able to not only detect perfect functional dependence but also attain (near) parametric efficiency in testing independence.

In this paper, we make such a revision by encouraging incorporating a diverging $M = M_n$ many *right* nearest neighbors (NNs) into the construction of the correlation coefficient, which we show is still an almost surely consistent estimator of [Dette et al. \(2013\)](#)’s measure of dependence as long as $M/n \rightarrow 0$. One could then regard the revised statistic as an extension of Chatterjee’s original one from 1-NN-based to M -NN-based. Notably speaking, similar ideas were already pursued in [Deb et al. \(2020, Equations \(3.3\) and \(8.5\)\)](#); see also [Berrett and Samworth \(2019\)](#) for a related proposal that approximates the mutual information ([Berrett et al., 2019](#)) using M -NN-based statistics. However, our approach to incorporating more NNs is distinct from theirs (cf. Remark 2.4 in Section 2). In addition, for guaranteeing a normal limiting null distribution, [Deb et al. \(2020\)](#) required a very small M of order Poly-log n (cf. [Deb et al. \(2020, Theorem 4.1\)](#)). In contrast, the most interesting region in our study takes place when M scales at nearly the same order as n ; see Section 4 ahead.

One main ingredient of this paper pertains to a local power analysis of the proposed revised Chatterjee’s rank correlation coefficients. For facilitating the presentation, our attention is restricted to the Gaussian rotation model that is benchmark in independence testing and has been widely adopted in literature; cf. [Konijn \(1956, Page 301\)](#), [Han et al. \(2017a, Section 4\)](#), [Drton et al. \(2020, Section 4.2\)](#), [Shi et al. \(2020, Section 5\)](#), and [Shi et al. \(2021b, Section 3\)](#). Considering the Pearson correlation between X and Y in a local alternative sequence to be ρ_n , we show that the test based on the revised Chatterjee’s rank correlation has power tending to one as long as

$$\frac{|\rho_n|}{[(n^{1/2}M^{-3/2}) \vee M^{-1/2}] \wedge [(nM)^{-1/4} \vee (n^{-1/2}M^{1/4})]} \rightarrow \infty;$$

here \vee and \wedge represent the maximum and minimum of the two numbers besides it, respectively. In

particular, as M/n slowly converges to 0, the denominator in the above fraction can be arbitrarily close to $n^{-1/2}$, the well known parametric detection boundary (Lehmann and Romano, 2005); on the other hand, as M diverges more and more slowly to infinity, the boundary tends to $n^{-1/4}$, the critical detection boundary of Chatterjee’s original statistic derived in Auddy et al. (2021).

Technically speaking, our analysis hinges on a careful (sharp up to some $\log n$ terms) calculation of the proposed correlation coefficients’ means and variances under both null and local alternatives. A particular focus is on such M that can scale fast with and even at a rate close to n . Analogous results in Chatterjee (2021), Deb et al. (2020), Auddy et al. (2021), and Shi et al. (2021a) are not quite helpful in this regime since they are focused on small M that is either fixed or scales to infinity at a sub-polynomial rate. More specifically,

- (i) we obtain explicit forms of the statistics’ means and variances under the null (cf. Theorem 3.1 ahead) via a brute-force combinatorial analysis that is in contrast to existing ones; the latter is only applicable to small M ;
- (ii) we establish sharp bounds (up to some $\log n$ terms) for the statistics’ means and variances under local alternatives (cf. Theorem 4.1 ahead). Notably speaking, the interplay between different units in our formulation of the correlation coefficients is remarkably more sophisticated as M is large, when those units with not enough right nearest neighbors need to be handled carefully, while negligible if M is small.

To complete the story, a central limit theorem of the proposed statistics under the null is also established whenever M scales at a slower rate than $n^{1/4}$, which however is too slow to be helpful in making the corresponding test attain near-parametrical efficiency.

Paper organization. The rest of the paper is organized as followed. Section 2 reviews the correlation measure proposed by Dette et al. (2013) and introduces our revised correlation coefficients of Chatterjee (2021). Section 3 presents the according tests of independence and establishes their size validity and consistency. Section 4 presents a local power analysis of the proposed tests with (sufficient) detection boundaries under Gaussian rotation models provided. Section 5 illustrates the empirical performance of the proposed statistics via finite-sample studies. Section 6 provides the proof of the main results in this manuscript, with the rest proofs and auxiliary results relegated to an appendix.

Notation. For any integer $n \geq 1$, let $\llbracket n \rrbracket := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $n!$ be the factorial of n . A set consisting of distinct elements x_1, \dots, x_n is written as either $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ or $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$. The corresponding sequence is denoted $[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ or $[x_i]_{i=1}^n$. The notation $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is saved for the indicator function. For a sequence of real numbers a_1, \dots, a_n , we use (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) as a shorthand of $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^\top$. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, write $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. For any two real sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ (or equivalently, $b_n \gtrsim a_n$) if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that $a_n/b_n \leq C$ for all sufficiently large n , and write $a_n \prec b_n$ (or equivalently, $b_n \succ a_n$) if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as n goes to infinity. Write $a_n = O(b_n)$ if $|a_n| \lesssim b_n$ and $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $|a_n| \prec b_n$. For any random variable Z , P_Z represents its law.

2 Correlation measures and coefficients

In the sequel, when considering correlation, we use the term “correlation measure” to represent population quantities and “correlation coefficient” to represent sample quantities. Denote the joint bivariate distribution function of (X, Y) by $F_{X,Y}$ and the marginal distribution functions of X and Y by F_X and F_Y , respectively. Let $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ be n independent copies of (X, Y) . Throughout the rest of this manuscript, we assume (X, Y) to be continuous, i.e., $F_{X,Y}$ is a continuous function. This requirement ensures that with probability one there is no tie in the observed data. Denote \mathcal{P}_c to be the family of bivariate probability measures of (X, Y) such that it is continuous.

2.1 Chatterjee’s rank correlation

This section introduces Chatterjee’s approximation strategy to the following measure of dependence between X and Y , introduced in [Dette et al. \(2013\)](#):

$$\xi = \xi(X, Y) := \frac{\int \text{Var} \{E[\mathbf{1}(Y \geq y) | X]\} dF_Y(y)}{\int \text{Var} \{\mathbf{1}(Y \geq y)\} dF_Y(y)}. \quad (2.1)$$

Compared to many other popular ones ([Hoeffding, 1948](#); [Blum et al., 1961](#); [Yanagimoto, 1970](#); [Bergsma and Dassios, 2014](#); [Shi et al., 2021b](#)), the correlation measure ξ is to us appealing due to its consistency against dependence ([Weihs et al., 2018](#)) as well as capability of detecting perfect functional dependence ([Cao and Bickel, 2020](#)), which we summarize below.

Proposition 2.1 (Theorem 2 in [Dette et al. \(2013\)](#), Theorem 1.1 in [Chatterjee \(2021\)](#)). *For arbitrary $P_{(X,Y)}$ such that Y is not almost surely a constant, ξ belongs to the interval $[0, 1]$ and*

- (1) *consistency of the measure: $\xi = 0$ if and only if X and Y are independent;*
- (2) *detectability of perfect functional dependence: $\xi = 1$ if and only if Y is equal to a measurable function of X almost surely.*

To estimate ξ , Chatterjee ([Chatterjee, 2021](#)) pioneered an ingenious rank-based approach that, to the authors’ knowledge, has not been explored before in literature. To present his idea in a formal way, let’s first introduce some necessary notation. Define

$$R_i := \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}(Y_j \leq Y_i) \quad (2.2)$$

to be the rank of Y_i among $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$. For any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, define

$$j_m(i) := \begin{cases} \text{the index of the } m\text{-th right NN of } X_i, & \text{if the rank of } X_i \text{ is smaller than } n - m + 1; \\ i, & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, $j_m(i)$ is the index $j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{1}(X_i < X_k \leq X_j) = m$$

if there exists such a $j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$; otherwise, let $j_m(i) = i$.

With these notation introduced, results on Chatterjee’s rank correlation coefficient can then be summarized as follows.

Proposition 2.2 (Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 in [Chatterjee \(2021\)](#)). *Chatterjee’s rank correlation coefficient can be formulated as*

$$\xi_n := 1 - \frac{3 \sum_{i=1}^n |R_{j_1(i)} - R_i|}{n^2 - 1}. \quad (2.3)$$

In addition, for any $P_{(X,Y)} \in \mathcal{P}_c$,

- (i) ξ_n converges almost surely to ξ ;
- (ii) further assuming that Y is independent of X , we have $\sqrt{n}\xi_n$ converges in distribution to $N(0, 2/5)$, the Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance 2/5.

2.2 The revised Chatterjee’s rank correlations

The formulation of Chatterjee’s rank correlation in (2.3) suggests it is an 1-NN-based estimator of Dette–Siburg–Stoimenov’s correlation measure ξ , and thus intuitively will suffer from similar efficiency loss as other 1-NN-based estimators in various applications ([Wald and Wolfowitz, 1940](#); [Friedman and Rafsky, 1979](#); [Henze, 1988](#); [Liu and Singh, 1993](#); [Henze and Penrose, 1999](#); [Bhattacharya, 2019](#)).

Indeed, recent results have exhibited that a test of independence based on Proposition 2.2(ii) is inefficient in common classes of smooth alternatives; cf. [Cao and Bickel \(2020\)](#) and [Shi et al. \(2021b\)](#). In a more recent manuscript, [Auddy et al. \(2021\)](#) established that the critical detection boundary of ξ_n lies at $n^{-1/4}$, which is substantially slower than the parametric $n^{-1/2}$ one. These results call for variants of ξ_n that are able to boost the power of independence tests; cf. a clear message delivered in [Deb et al. \(2020, Remark 4.3\)](#).

In this paper we answer this call by introducing the following *revised Chatterjee’s rank correlations* that allow one to take each element’s M right nearest neighbors into account:

$$\xi_{n,M} = \xi_{n,M} \left([(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n \right) := -2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]}. \quad (2.4)$$

Several remarks are in order.

Remark 2.1 (Formulation of $\xi_{n,M}$). In (2.4), $M = M_n \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ represents the number of right nearest neighbors the proposed correlation coefficient $\xi_{n,M}$ will exploit and is allowed to increase to infinity with n . The denominator, $(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]$, is added to ensure $E(\xi_{n,M}) = 0$ under H_0 (checking Theorem 3.1 ahead). For reasons to be detailed later (cf. Theorem 4.2), we recommend a sufficiently large M for improving testing efficiency against dependence.

Remark 2.2 (Distribution-freeness of $\xi_{n,M}$ under H_0). Examining its formulation, it is immediate that for any $M \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ the value of $\xi_{n,M}$ only depends on the coordinate-wise ranks of $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$. The statistic $\xi_{n,M}$ is thus a rank correlation coefficient and accordingly enjoys all the nice properties shared by rank correlations, including in particular the distribution-freeness (i.e., of a distribution that is not dependent on $P_{(X,Y)}$) under H_0 ([Hájek et al., 1999](#); [Drton et al., 2020](#)).

Remark 2.3 (Relation between $\xi_{n,M}$ and ξ_n). In contrast to the coefficient ξ_n introduced in (2.3), in constructing $\xi_{n,M}$ we take the minimum instead of absolute difference. This is an idea pursued in Azadkia and Chatterjee (2021) and Deb et al. (2020) as well; cf. the construction of the correlation coefficient T_n in Azadkia and Chatterjee (2021) and Section 8.3.1 in Deb et al. (2020). However, it is worth pointing that, as $M = 1$,

$$\xi_{n,1} = -2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \min \{R_i, R_{j_1(i)}\}}{(n+1)(n+1/2)}$$

reduces to ξ_n with an asymptotically ignorable small order term; note that $|x| + |y| - |x - y| = 2 \min\{x, y\}$ for any $x, y \geq 0$. More specifically, one has

$$|\xi_{n,1} - \xi_n| = O(1/n), \quad (\text{with probability } 1)$$

so that the difference is of order n^{-1} and thus won't affect the corresponding asymptotic behavior.

Remark 2.4 (Relation to Deb et al. (2020)'s proposal). Our idea to scale up M for boosting the power of rank-based tests is of course not new, and is particularly related to an earlier proposal made in Deb et al. (2020); see, e.g., Equations (3.3) and (8.5) therein. It is hence helpful to point out our new discoveries. First of all, it was observed that using the *right* nearest neighbors, in contrast to using nearest neighbors in both directions, is important. In particular, it plays a central role in our analysis to show that a test based on $\xi_{n,M}$ can reach near-parametric efficiency as M is close to n ; cf. Theorem 4.2 as well as the finite-sample studies in Section 5. Secondly, in (2.4) the normalizing constant $(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]$ was carefully chosen so that the expectation of $\xi_{n,M}$ is exactly zero under H_0 , which holds for arbitrary $M \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$. This type of normalization is important if M is large since in our formulation there exists an un-ignorable fraction of i 's such that $j_m(i) = i$ for some $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$.

Remark 2.5 (Extremal properties of $\xi_{n,M}$). If $Y = f(X)$ for some strictly increasing function $f(\cdot)$, one has $\min \{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = R_i$ and thus

$$\xi_{n,M} = 1 - \frac{3(M+1)/4}{n + (M+1)/4}.$$

On the other hand, if $f(\cdot)$ is a strictly decreasing function, one has $\min \{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = R_{j_m(i)} = R_i - m$ if $R_i \geq m+1$ and $\min \{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = R_i$ if $R_i \leq m$. Some simple calculations then yield

$$\xi_{n,M} = 1 - \frac{3(M+1)[(5n+1)/4 - (2M+1)/3]}{(n+1)[n + (M+1)/4]}.$$

In the above two cases, $\xi_{n,M}$ are both equal to 1 up to a bias of order M/n .

Remark 2.6 (Finite-sample range of $\xi_{n,M}$). An equivalent form of (2.4) is

$$\xi_{n,M} = -2 + \frac{3 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M (R_i + R_{j_m(i)} - |R_{j_m(i)} - R_i|)}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]}.$$

The largest possible value of the correlation coefficient is then

$$1 - \frac{3(M+1)/4}{n + (M+1)/4},$$

which is attained when $Y = X$ almost surely. On the other hand, since each R_i can appear in the

summation of (2.4) for at most $2M$ times, a straightforward lower bound of $\xi_{n,M}$ is

$$-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3[n - (n+1)(M+1)/4]}{2(n+1)[n + (M+1)/4]}.$$

The finite-sample range of $\xi_{n,M}$ is hence $[-1/2, 1]$ up to a bias of order M/n , which is analogous to that of Chatterjee's correlation coefficient (cf. Remark 9 under Chatterjee (2021, Theorem 1.1)).

Remark 2.7 (Computation complexity). To compute (2.4), one needs to first sort the samples of both $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and then performs the summation over nM terms. The according computation complexity is $O(n \log n + nM)$. If M is $O(\text{Poly-log } n)$, it is nearly linear. On the other hand, the computation of $\xi_{n,M}$ will tend to be quadratic as M is closer to n , a cost seemingly inevitable.

We close this section by establishing strong consistency for the proposed rank correlation coefficient $\xi_{n,M}$ that is in parallel to Proposition 2.2(i).

Theorem 2.1 (Strong consistency of $\xi_{n,M}$). *For any $P_{(X,Y)} \in \mathcal{P}_c$, $\xi_{n,M}$ converges almost surely to ξ as long as $M/n \rightarrow 0$.*

3 Tests of independence

3.1 Elementary properties under the null

We start with some elementary properties of $\xi_{n,M}$ when Y is independent of X . To this end, we first establish the corresponding mean and variance of $\xi_{n,M}$.

Theorem 3.1 (Mean and variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under the null). *Assuming $P_{(X,Y)} \in \mathcal{P}_c$ and H_0 holds, then $E[\xi_{n,M}] = 0$. If further assuming $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $M/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}] = \left[\frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{1}{nM} \right) + \frac{8}{15} \left(\frac{M}{n^2} \right) \right] (1 + o(1)).$$

Remark 3.1. Proposition 2.2 shows that the asymptotic null variance of $\sqrt{n}\xi_n$ is $2/5$ as $M = 1$. In contrast, Theorem 3.1 revealed that $\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}]$ scales at a rate of order $(nM)^{-1} \vee (M/n^2)$, which is always faster than n^{-1} under the theorem conditions, and two constants $2/5$ and $8/15$ each governs one rate. Indeed, the variance will achieve its lowest order $n^{-3/2}$ as M is of order $n^{1/2}$, and is of order close to n^{-1} if M is of order n^γ with γ close to either 0 or 1.

We then establish a central limit theorem (CLT) for $\xi_{n,M}$ under the null. It is in parallel to Proposition 2.2(i); notice that, compared to Theorems 2.1 and 3.1, a strong scaling requirement, $M \prec n^{1/4}$, is enforced for guaranteeing its validity.

Theorem 3.2 (Central limit theorem for $\xi_{n,M}$ under the null). *Assume $P_{(X,Y)} \in \mathcal{P}_c$ and H_0 holds. If further assuming $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $M \prec n^{1/4}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\sqrt{nM} \cdot \xi_{n,M} \text{ converges in distribution to } N(0, 2/5).$$

Remark 3.2 (Technical ingredients of Theorem 3.2). To establish the CLT of $\xi_{n,M}$ under the null, the following Hájek representation of $\xi_{n,M}$ is the key:

$$\hat{\xi}_{n,M} = \frac{6n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} - \frac{6 \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\}}{(n-1)(n+1)}.$$

Noticing that the variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under H_0 is of order $(nM)^{-1}$ as $M \prec n^{1/4}$, we show that $\sqrt{nM}(\xi_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M})$ converges in probability to zero. It then suffices to establish that $\sqrt{nM}\hat{\xi}_{n,M}$ converges in distribution to $N(0, 2/5)$, which is derived via invoking the normal approximation techniques devised in Chatterjee (2008); assuming $M \prec n^{1/4}$ is crucial here.

3.2 Simulation-based tests of independence

This section is focused on testing H_0 in (1.1) based on the revised Chatterjee's correlation coefficient $\xi_{n,M}$ that was introduced in Section 2.

For a given sample $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$, let $\xi_{n,M}$ and $\xi_{n,M}^-$ be the correlation coefficients in (2.4) that are calculated based on $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$ and $[(X_i, -Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$, respectively. We are interested in the following test statistic,

$$\xi_{n,M}^\pm := \max \{\xi_{n,M}, \xi_{n,M}^-\}. \quad (3.1)$$

For approximating the above test statistic's distribution under H_0 , notice that, as X and Y are independent, the joint distribution of $(\xi_{n,M}, \xi_{n,M}^-)$ is distribution-free and a simulation-based test can then be directly implemented. In detail, choosing the number of simulations to be B , in each round $b \in \llbracket B \rrbracket$, one draws a sample $[R_i^{(b)}]_{i=1}^n$ from the uniform distribution over all possibly permutations on $\llbracket n \rrbracket$. We then calculate the value of $\xi_{n,M}^{(b)}$ from (2.4) as follows:

$$\xi_{n,M}^{(b)} = -2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{R_i^{(b)}, R_{g_m(i)}^{(b)}\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]},$$

$$\text{with } g_m(i) := \begin{cases} i+m, & \text{if } i+m \leq n, \\ i, & \text{if } i+m > n. \end{cases}$$

One could similarly calculate the value of $\xi_{n,M}^{-(b)}$ based on $[R_i^{-(b)}]_{i=1}^n$ with $R_i^{-(b)} := n+1 - R_i^{(b)}$ for each $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

Notice that under H_0 , $(\xi_{n,M}^{(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{-(b)})$ will have the same distribution as $(\xi_{n,M}, \xi_{n,M}^-)$ due to independence between X and Y and the distribution-freeness of (relative) ranks; see similar discussions in Section A.2 and Lemma C3 in Han et al. (2017b). We then consider

$$\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} := \max \{\xi_{n,M}^{(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{-(b)}\}.$$

For a given significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the proposed simulation-based test is then

$$\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = \mathbb{1} \left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^\pm \right) \right\} \leq \alpha \right], \quad (3.2)$$

whose size validity and power consistency are guaranteed by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3 (Size validity and consistency). *(i) The test $\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ is size valid in the sense that*

for any fixed $P = P_{(X,Y)} \in \mathcal{P}_c$ satisfying H_0 , denoting $P_{H_0} := P^{\otimes n}$ as the corresponding product measure, we have

$$P_{H_0}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1) \leq \alpha$$

holds for any $n \geq 1$, $B \geq 1$, and $M \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

(ii) The test $\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ is consistent in the sense that for any fixed $P \in \mathcal{P}_c$ violating H_0 , denoting P_{H_1} as the corresponding product measure, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{H_1}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1) = 1$$

as long as $B = B_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $M/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

4 Local power analysis

This section investigates the local power of the simulation-based test $\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ employing the revised Chatterjee's rank correlation $\xi_{n,M}$ introduced in (2.4). For facilitating presentation, we restrict the attention to the following Gaussian rotation model that is benchmark in independence testing (cf. Konijn (1956)).

Assumption 4.1. *The bivariate random vector (X, Y) belongs to the family of Gaussian distributed ones with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ such that*

$$\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with } \rho \in (-1, 1).$$

For the local power analysis in this specified alternative set, we examine the asymptotic power along a sequence of alternatives obtained as

$$H_{1,n} : \rho = \rho_n, \tag{4.1}$$

with $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Due to the construction of the test statistic (3.1), it suffices to consider positive sequences of ρ_n 's. We first establish the mean and variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under (4.1).

Theorem 4.1 (Mean and variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under (4.1)). *Suppose that the considered set of local alternatives satisfies Assumption 4.1. Then concerning with any sequence of alternatives given in (4.1), for any positive sequence $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, as long as $M/\log n \rightarrow \infty$ and $M(\log n)^{3/2}/n \rightarrow 0$,*

(i) *the mean of $\xi_{n,M}$ under $H_{1,n}$ satisfies*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \right| \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \rho_n^2 + \frac{M}{n^2};$$

in particular, if $\rho_n \succ n^{-1}$, we have

$$\frac{M}{n} \rho_n + \rho_n^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \rho_n^2;$$

(ii) *the variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under $H_{1,n}$ satisfies*

$$\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \lesssim \frac{1}{nM} + \frac{M}{n^2} + \frac{M}{n^2} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \frac{1}{n} \rho_n^2.$$

Remark 4.1. It is notable that in the above theorem we only establish an upper bound on $\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]$. However, by calculating the coefficient of each term in the proof of Theorem 4.1(ii), one is also able to show the following lower bound,

$$\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \gtrsim \frac{1}{nM} + \frac{M}{n^2} + \frac{1}{n}\rho_n^2.$$

The upper bound in Theorem 4.1(ii) is therefore rate optimal (up to some $\log n$ terms), although the upper bound of $\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]$ in Theorem 4.1(ii) has been sufficient for our purpose.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1, the following corollary establishes a boundary of ρ_n beyond which the mean of $\xi_{n,M}$ under $H_{1,n}$ shall dominate the standard deviation.

Corollary 4.1. *Suppose that the considered set of local alternatives satisfies Assumption 4.1. Then concerning with any sequence of alternatives given in (4.1), for any positive sequence $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, as long as $M/\log n \rightarrow \infty$, $M(\log n)^{3/2}/n \rightarrow 0$, and*

$$\rho_n \succ \zeta_{n,M} := [(n^{1/2}M^{-3/2}) \vee M^{-1/2}] \wedge [(nM)^{-1/4} \vee (n^{-1/2}M^{1/4})],$$

we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}} = +\infty.$$

Remark 4.2. In view of Theorem 4.1(i) and Remark 4.1, as long as $\rho_n \prec \zeta_{n,M}$, one also has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}} = 0.$$

Combined with Corollary 4.1, the above equation thus shows that $\zeta_{n,M}$ is the critical boundary determining whether the mean of $\xi_{n,M}$ under $H_{1,n}$ will be dominating or will be dominated by its standard deviation.

Combining Theorem 4.1 with Theorem 3.1, we are now ready to establish a sufficient detection boundary of ρ_n beyond which the proposed test is of a power tending to 1. Invoking Theorem 3.2 further, this detection boundary is sharp as long as $M \prec n^{1/4}$.

Theorem 4.2 (Local power analysis). *Suppose that the considered set of local alternatives satisfies Assumption 4.1. Then concerning with any sequence of alternatives given in (4.1), for any sequence $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, as long as $M/\log n \rightarrow \infty$, $M(\log n)^{3/2}/n \rightarrow 0$, $B \rightarrow \infty$,*

(i) as long as $|\rho_n| \succ \zeta_{n,M}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}\left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1\right) = 1;$$

(ii) as long as $|\rho_n| \prec \zeta_{n,M}$ and further assuming $M \prec n^{1/4}$, for any sufficiently small α , it holds that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}\left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1\right) \leq \beta_\alpha,$$

for some $\beta_\alpha < 1$ that only depends on α .




Figure 1: Relation between M and the corresponding (sufficient) detection boundary. Here M is picked to be n^γ and the corresponding (sufficient) detection boundary is $\zeta_{n,M} = n^{-\beta(\gamma)}$. The regime of the solid line is the critical detection boundary of $\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ (referred to Theorem 4.2(ii)), while the regime of the dotted line is a sufficient detection boundary of $\mathsf{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ (referred to Theorem 4.2(i)). The change point from critical detection boundary to sufficient detection boundary is $\gamma = 1/4$ (with $\beta(1/4) = 5/16$).

Remark 4.3 (Relation between M and $\zeta_{n,M}$). Picking $M = n^\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the established boundary in Theorem 4.2 is $\zeta_{n,M} = n^{-\beta}$ with

$$\beta = \beta(\gamma) := \left[\left(\frac{3}{2}\gamma - \frac{1}{2} \right) \wedge \frac{\gamma}{2} \right] \vee \left[\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\gamma}{4} \right) \wedge \left(-\frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right].$$

Easy to check that β is piecewise linear with respect to γ . In particular,

- (i) if $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, then $\beta \rightarrow 1/4$, corresponding to the detection boundary of ξ_n established in [Auddy et al. \(2021\)](#);
- (ii) if $\gamma \rightarrow 1$, then $\beta \rightarrow 1/2$, corresponding to the well known parametric detection boundary ([Lehmann and Romano, 2005](#)).

Figure 1 plots the relation between β and γ . Note that here β is not strictly increasing with γ ; pattern changes at $\gamma = 1/2$ (with $\beta(1/2) = 3/8$) and $\gamma = 2/3$ (with $\beta(2/3) = 1/3$), indicating an intriguing bias-variance tradeoff of the test with regard to the choice of M .

Remark 4.4. [Deb et al. \(2020, Remark 4.3\)](#) conjectured that “allowing for growing [number of nearest neighbors] could potentially lead to information theoretically efficient estimators”. Theorem 4.2 settles this conjecture and shows that a simulation-based test built on the proposed revised Chatterjee’s rank correlations can indeed provably achieve near-parametric efficiency as pushing M to be closer and closer to n ; see also Remarks 2.4 and 4.3 for related discussions.

Remark 4.5. We conjecture that $\zeta_{n,M}$ is always — regardless of how fast M grows to infinity with n — the critical detection boundary of the proposed test in the sense that there exists a constant $C_\alpha < 1$ only depending on α such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{H_{1,n}} \left(T_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1 \right) < C_\alpha$$

for any sequence $|\rho_n| \prec \zeta_{n,M}$. This conjecture is partially supported by Corollary 4.1 and Remark 4.2; see also [Bhattacharya \(2019, Remark 3 and Proposition 1\)](#). To fully resolve it, however, one needs to obtain more information on the null distribution of $\xi_{n,M}$ beyond its mean and variance calculated in Theorem 3.1 for those M 's that are large. This will be an interesting topic for future research.

5 Simulation study

This section develops additional simulation results to illustrate the finite-sample performance of the developed correlation coefficients and the according tests of independence.

First, we examine the sizes and powers of the proposed tests. To this end, the following four sets of tests of independence are considered:

- (T1) the proposed test $T_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm}$ with $M = 1, 20, 100$, and 200;
- (T2) the test based on Hoeffding's D ([Hoeffding, 1948](#));
- (T3) the classic parametric test based on Pearson's correlation coefficient;
- (T4) the test proposed in [Deb et al. \(2020, Section 8.3.1\)](#) with M NNs — both left and right directions are incorporated — considered for each index and $M = 1, 20, 100$, and 200.

Notice that in implementing T4, following [Deb et al. \(2020\)](#) the NNs are calculated based on the ranks of $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ but not the original data, and we select the right one instead of the left if ties exist. Accordingly, as $M = 1$, we select the right nearest neighbor for all points except for the largest. To implement T1 and T4, we use simulation-based tests illustrated in Section 3.2 with $B = 10,000$. On the other hand, asymptotic tests are used to implement T2 and T3. Nominal levels are set to be $\alpha = 0.05$ for all tests.

We perform simulation studies based on the Gaussian rotation model satisfying Assumption 4.1 with $n \in \{1000, 2000, 5000\}$, $\rho_n = \rho_0/\sqrt{n}$, and $\rho_0 \in \{0, 1, 2, 5\}$. The case $\rho_0 = 0$ corresponds to the case when H_0 holds, while the rest three give rise to powers in accordance with different dependence strengths that all shrink to zero. Table 1 illustrates the rejection frequencies for considered tests over 1,000 replicates. Three observations are in line. (i) All the tests considered have empirical sizes close to 0.05, indicating that they are all size valid. (ii) The power of T1 increases as M increases, and is close to that of T2 and T3 when M is large. However, the power of T1 decreases for every considered M , while that of T2 and T3 remain stable. Both observations are in line with the theoretical observations made earlier in Theorem 4.2. (iii) For each M set, the power of T1 dominates that of T4, which echos Remark 2.4.

Secondly, we compare the computation times for $\xi_{n,M}^\pm$ with different n and M chosen as before. To this end, we consider a simple bivariate standard Gaussian model and calculate the averaged computation time for each pair of (n, M) over 1,000 replicates. All experiments are implemented on a laptop with an Apple M1 processor and a 16GB memory. Table 2 illustrates the computation times for the consider tests, which are compared to these of Hoeffding's D and Pearson sample correlation coefficient. We observe that the computation time indeed increases, and is approximately linear, with regard to M .

Lastly, we examine the trajectory of $\xi_{n,M}$ as the data are generated from a bivariate Gaussian distribution with marginal mean 0, variance 1, and correlation $\rho = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$, and 1. To this end, Figure 2 illustrates the boxplots of $\xi_{n,M}$ as n changes from 1000, 2000, to 5000, and M changes from 1, 20, 100, to 200 over 1,000 replicates. For comparison purpose, Figure 2 also plots the curve of the population correlation measure ξ as a function of $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Three observations are in line. (i) For any M considered, the averaged $\xi_{n,M}$ gets closer and closer to the correlation measure as n increases, which supports Theorem 2.1. (ii) As $\rho = 0$, the empirical variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ first decreases and then increases as M increases, which supports Theorem 4.1(ii) and Remark 4.1. On the other hand, as ρ becomes large, the empirical variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ turns to be stable and unchanged with M . (iii) A bias term exists as M is relatively large compared to n , but will shrink towards 0 for each fixed M as n increases. This is as expected (cf. Theorem 2.1) and is a common occurrence in nonparametric statistics problems.

6 Proof of the main results

This section provides the proof of Theorems 3.1 and 4.1. In the following, we use \mathbf{X} to represent (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) . For any function f , we use $\|f\|_\infty$ to represent its supremum norm.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is based on the following lemma, which provides some necessary information on ranks.

Lemma 6.1. *Recall the definition of R_i 's in (2.2). Assuming Y is continuous, $[R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n]$ then follows a random permutation satisfying*

$$P(R_1 = i_1, R_2 = i_2, \dots, R_n = i_n) = 1/n!, \quad \text{for each } i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \dots \neq i_n \in \llbracket n \rrbracket.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} E[R_1] &= \frac{n+1}{2}, \quad E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] = \frac{n+1}{3}, \quad \text{Var}[R_1] = \frac{(n+1)(n-1)}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[R_1, R_2] = -\frac{n+1}{12}, \\ \text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_2, R_3\}] &= -\frac{n+1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_1, R_2\}] = \frac{(n-2)(n+1)}{24}, \\ \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_3, R_4\}] &= -\frac{4(n+1)}{45}, \quad \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}] = \frac{(n+1)(4n-17)}{180}, \\ \text{Var}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] &= \frac{(n-2)(n+1)}{18}. \end{aligned}$$

Table 1: Rejection frequencies of the tests over 1,000 replicates.

ρ_0	n	$\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}$				Hoeffding	Pearson
		$M = 1$	$M = 20$	$M = 100$	$M = 200$		
0	1000	0.056	0.057	0.045	0.048	0.045	0.049
	2000	0.056	0.057	0.040	0.054	0.057	0.044
	5000	0.049	0.049	0.055	0.049	0.059	0.045
1	1000	0.040	0.069	0.119	0.161	0.151	0.152
	2000	0.062	0.061	0.099	0.158	0.156	0.186
	5000	0.046	0.054	0.081	0.091	0.137	0.152
2	1000	0.075	0.154	0.365	0.427	0.422	0.528
	2000	0.058	0.140	0.262	0.336	0.423	0.518
	5000	0.059	0.084	0.170	0.229	0.431	0.511
5	1000	0.176	0.851	0.982	0.997	0.993	0.999
	2000	0.131	0.706	0.964	0.980	0.998	1.000
	5000	0.089	0.413	0.847	0.897	0.996	1.000
Deb et al. (2020)							
		$M = 1$	$M = 20$	$M = 100$	$M = 200$		
0	1000	0.054	0.047	0.047	0.050		
	2000	0.056	0.056	0.050	0.054		
	5000	0.050	0.047	0.052	0.055		
1	1000	0.044	0.054	0.071	0.044		
	2000	0.062	0.057	0.059	0.060		
	5000	0.046	0.050	0.059	0.076		
2	1000	0.077	0.109	0.138	0.106		
	2000	0.059	0.089	0.110	0.117		
	5000	0.059	0.067	0.091	0.093		
5	1000	0.188	0.626	0.779	0.633		
	2000	0.128	0.413	0.710	0.635		
	5000	0.096	0.267	0.528	0.582		

Table 2: Computation times of $\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}$, Hoeffding’s D , and Pearson’s correlation coefficient. The computation times here are in 10^{-2} seconds and averaged over 1,000 replicates.

	$\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}$				Hoeffding	Pearson
	$M = 1$	$M = 20$	$M = 100$	$M = 200$		
$n = 1000$	0.03	0.27	1.32	2.60	0.02	0.07
$n = 2000$	0.06	0.54	2.44	4.76	0.03	0.13
$n = 5000$	0.12	1.20	5.82	11.57	0.06	0.32




Figure 2: Statistics of the calculated $\xi_{n,M}$'s corresponding to $n = 1000, 2000, 5000$ (from left to right) and $M = 1, 20, 100, 200$ (from top to bottom) over 1,000 replicates. In each figure the red solid line stands for the theoretical $\xi(\rho)$, the blue dash line stands for the averaged $\xi_{n,M}$ at $\rho = 0, 0.2, \dots, 1$, and in each boxplot the two hinges represent the 25% and 75% quantiles.

Step I. This step calculates $E_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}]$ (in the sequel shorthanded as $E[\xi_{n,M}]$). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\xi_{n,M}] &= E\left[-2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]}\right] \\
&= -2 + \frac{6}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\}\right] \\
&= -2 + \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{m=1}^M E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\}\right]. \tag{6.1}
\end{aligned}$$

For any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\}\right] \\
&= E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) \neq 1)\right] + E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) = 1)\right] \\
&= E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) \neq 1)\right] + E\left[R_1 \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) = 1)\right] \\
&= P(j_m(1) \neq 1) E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mid j_m(1) \neq 1\right] + P(j_m(1) = 1) E\left[R_1 \mid j_m(1) = 1\right] \\
&= P(j_m(1) \neq 1) E\left[E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mid j_m(1) \neq 1, \mathbf{X}\right] \mid j_m(1) \neq 1\right] \\
&\quad + P(j_m(1) = 1) E\left[E\left[R_1 \mid j_m(1) = 1, \mathbf{X}\right] \mid j_m(1) = 1\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Conditional on $\{j_m(1) \neq 1\}$ and \mathbf{X} , $j_m(1)$ is an index different from 1. Under independence between X and Y , $[R_i]_{i=1}^n$ is independent of \mathbf{X} . Then from Lemma 6.1,

$$E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\} \mid j_m(1) \neq 1, \mathbf{X}\right] = \frac{n+1}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad E\left[R_1 \mid j_m(1) = 1, \mathbf{X}\right] = \frac{n+1}{2}.$$

On the other hand, for any \mathbf{X} , the cardinality of $\{i : j_m(i) = i\}$ is m . Then $P(j_m(1) = 1) = m/n$ and $P(j_m(1) \neq 1) = 1 - m/n$ since $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. Then

$$E\left[\min\{R_{j_m(1)}, R_1\}\right] = \frac{n+1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right) + \frac{n+1}{2} \frac{m}{n} = \frac{n+1}{3} + \frac{n+1}{6} \frac{m}{n}.$$

Substituting it into (6.1) yields

$$E[\xi_{n,M}] = -2 + \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{m=1}^M \left[\frac{n+1}{3} + \frac{n+1}{6} \frac{m}{n}\right] = 0.$$

Step II. This step calculates the variance of $\xi_{n,M}$ under H_0 (shorthanded as $\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}]$). For this, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}] &= \text{Var}\left[-2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]}\right] \\
&= \frac{36}{(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \text{Var}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}\right] \\
&= \frac{36}{(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \left\{E\left[\text{Var}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right] + \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right]. \quad (6.2)$$

Under the independence of X and Y , for the second term in (6.2), we have

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] = 0.$$

We then decompose the first term in (6.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{m, m'=1 \\ m \neq m'}}^M \text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{i, l=1 \\ i \neq l}}^n \sum_{m, m'=1}^M \text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

We consider each term in (6.3) separately and proceed in three substeps. From the independence of $[R_i]_{i=1}^n$ and \mathbf{X} , we assume $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ is increasing without loss of generality.

Step II-1. For any \mathbf{X} and $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, the number of $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ such that $j_m(i) = i$ is m . Then the number of pairs (i, m) among $\{(i, m) : i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket\}$ such that $j_m(i) = i$ is $M(M+1)/2$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] = \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \text{Var}[R_1] + \left[nM - \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \right] \text{Var}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}].$$

Step II-2. For any $m \neq m' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, the number of $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ such that $j_m(i) = i, j_{m'}(i) = i$ is $\min\{m, m'\}$, and the number of i such that $j_m(i) = i, j_{m'}(i) \neq i$ or $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(i) = i$ is $|m - m'|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{m, m'=1 \\ m \neq m'}}^M \text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &= \frac{(M-1)M(M+1)}{3} \text{Var}[R_1] + \frac{(M-1)M(M+1)}{3} \text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_1, R_2\}] \\ &+ \left[nM(M-1) - \frac{2}{3}(M-1)M(M+1) \right] \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Step II-3. This substep is relatively sophisticated. Assume $i, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $i < l$. Then for any $m, m' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, the possible cases for (i, l, m, m') , the number of such (i, l, m, m') and the corresponding covariance value are as followed:

(a) $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) \neq l, j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l)$. The value is $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}]$.

Let $j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l) = k$. For any $k \geq M+1$, there can be $\binom{M}{2}$ pairs (i, l) and the corresponding $(m, m') = (k-i, k-l)$. For any $3 \leq k \leq M$, there can be $\binom{k-1}{2}$ pairs (i, l) . Then the total

number is

$$(n-M) \binom{M}{2} + \sum_{k=3}^M \binom{k-1}{2} = \frac{(n-M)(M-1)M}{2} + \frac{(M-2)(M-1)M}{6}.$$

- (b) $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) \neq l, j_m(i) = l$. The value is $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}]$.

Let $j_m(i) = l = k$. For any $M+1 \leq k \leq n-M$, m, m' are arbitrary. Then there can be M^2 pairs (m, m') and the corresponding $(i, l) = (k-m, k)$. For any $k \leq M$, m' is arbitrary, but $m \leq k-1$. Then there can be $(k-1)M$ pairs (m, m') . For any $k \geq n-M+1$, m is arbitrary, but $m' \leq n-k$. Then there can be $(n-k)M$ pairs (m, m') . Then the total number is

$$(n-2M)M^2 + \sum_{k=1}^M (k-1)M + \sum_{k=n-M+1}^{n-1} (n-k)M = (n-2M)M^2 + (M-1)M^2.$$

- (c) $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) \neq l, j_m(i) \neq l, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)$. The value is $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_3, R_4\}]$.

The total number is $n(n-1)M^2/2$ minus the sum of other cases.

- (d) $j_m(i) = i, j_{m'}(l) \neq l$. The value is $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_2, R_3\}]$.

For any pairs (i, l) and $i \geq n-M+1$, the number of m such that $j_m(i) = i$ is $i - (n-M)$, and the number of m' such that $j_{m'}(l) \neq l$ is $n-l$. Then there can be $[i - (n-M)](n-l)$ pairs (m, m') . Then the total number is

$$\sum_{\substack{i, l=n-M+1 \\ i < l}}^n [i - (n-M)](n-l) = \frac{(M-2)(M-1)M(M+1)}{24}.$$

- (e) $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) = l, j_m(i) = l$. The value is $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_1, R_2\}]$.

For any $l \geq n-M+1$, the number of m' such that $j_{m'}(l) = l$ is $l - (n-M)$. The number of i such that $j_m(i) = l$ is M and the corresponding $m = l - i$. Then there can be $[l - (n-M)]M$ pairs (m, m') . Then the total number is

$$\sum_{l=n-M+1}^n [l - (n-M)]M = \frac{M^2(M+1)}{2}.$$

- (f) $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) = l, j_m(i) \neq l$. The value is $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_2, R_3\}]$.

We first consider the number of (i, l, m, m') such that $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) = l$.

For any $l \geq n-M+1$, the number of m' such that $j_{m'}(l) = l$ is $l - (n-M)$. For any $i \leq n-M$, the number of m such that $j_m(i) \neq i$ is M . For any $n-M+1 \leq i < l$, the number of m such that $j_m(i) \neq i$ is $n-i$. Then for any $l \geq n-M+1$, the number of pairs (i, m) is

$$(n-M)M + \sum_{i=n-M+1}^{l-1} (n-i) = (l-1)M - \frac{[l - (n-M)][l - (n-M) - 1]}{2}.$$

Then the total number of $j_m(i) \neq i, j_{m'}(l) = l$ is

$$\sum_{l=n-M+1}^n \left[(l-1)M - \frac{[l - (n-M)][l - (n-M) - 1]}{2} \right] [l - (n-M)]$$

$$= \frac{nM^2(M+1)}{2} - \frac{M(M+1)(7M^2+7M-2)}{24}.$$

Combined with (e), the total number of this case is

$$\frac{nM^2(M+1)}{2} - \frac{M(M+1)(7M^2+19M-2)}{24}.$$

(g) $j_m(i) = i, j_{m'}(l) = l$. The value is $\text{Cov}[R_1, R_2]$.

For any pairs (i, l) and $i \geq n-M+1$, the number of pairs (m, m') such that $j_m(i) = i, j_{m'}(l) = l$ is $[i - (n-M)][l - (n-M)]$. Then the total number is

$$\sum_{\substack{i, l = n-M+1 \\ i < l}}^n [i - (n-M)][l - (n-M)] = \frac{(M-1)M(M+1)(3M+2)}{24}.$$

Notice that we assume $i < l$, and the number for each case is the same for $i > l$.

Together with (6.3), Lemma 6.1 and the number of each case, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &= nM \left(\frac{1}{18} n^2 \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{12} n^2 \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} n^2 \right) + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n^2 \right) + \left(2nM^2 - 2M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n^2 \right) + \left(n^2 M^2 - nM^3 \right) \left(-\frac{4}{45} n \right) \\ & \quad + M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} n^2 \right) + nM^3 \left(-\frac{1}{12} n \right) + o(n^3 M) + o(n^2 M^3) \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{90} n^3 M + \frac{2}{135} n^2 M^3 \right] (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting them to (6.2), we have obtained

$$\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}] = \left[\frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{1}{nM} \right) + \frac{8}{15} \left(\frac{M}{n^2} \right) \right] (1 + o(1)),$$

and thus finished the proof. \square

6.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof of Theorem 4.1(i). Resembling the proof of Theorem 3.1, in the following we shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{H_1}[\xi_{n,M}]$ and $\text{Var}_{H_1}[\xi_{n,M}]$ by $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M}]$ and $\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}]$.

From (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[-2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \right] \\ &= -2 + \frac{6}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Notice that, for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, if $j_m(i) \neq i$, then

$$\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\});$$

if $j_m(i) = i$, then

$$\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = R_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq Y_i) = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq Y_i).$$

We accordingly have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{nM} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{nM} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) + R_i \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \left(\min\{R_1, R_{j_m(1)}\} \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) \neq 1) + R_1 \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) = 1) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min\{R_1, R_{j_U(1)}\} \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) + R_1 \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left[1 + \sum_{k \neq 1, k \neq j_U(1)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \right] \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left[1 + \sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq Y_1) \right] \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \\ &= 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \neq 1, k \neq j_U(1)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq Y_1) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \\ &= 1 + (n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) \right] + (n-1) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \\ &= 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] + (n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \right], \tag{6.5} \end{aligned}$$

where U follows a uniform distribution over $\llbracket m \rrbracket$ (cf. (A.3)) and $Y \sim F_Y$ is independent of $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$. Then it suffices to establish the rate of

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \right].$$

We consider the expectation conditional on \mathbf{X} and U . Denote the conditional distribution of Y given X by $F_{Y|X}$ and the density function of Y by f_Y . Then conditional on \mathbf{X} and U ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}, U \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) \mid \mathbf{X}, U \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\}) \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \mid \mathbf{X}, U \right] \\ &= \int \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) \neq 1) \\ & \quad + \int \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \\ &= \int \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \\ & \quad + \int \left[1 - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \\ &= \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right]^2 f_Y(y) dy + 2 \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right]^2 f_Y(y) dy + \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \\
& + \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \\
& + \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] F_Y(y) f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \\
& + \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[F_Y(y) + F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \\
& =: T_1 + 2T_2 + T_3 + T_4 + T_5 + T_6 + T_7.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

For T_1 , we have

$$T_1 = \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right]^2 f_Y(y) dy = P(Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_2, Y_3\}) = \frac{1}{3}, \tag{6.7}$$

where Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 are three independent copies of Y from F_Y .

For T_2 , from Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[T_2] &= E \left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \right] \\
&= \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] E \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

since X_1 is from F_X and is independent of U .

For T_3 , we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *We have*

$$E[T_3] = \left[\int f_Y^3(y) dy \right] \rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2).$$

For T_4 and T_5 , we have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.3. *We have $T_4 \geq 0$ and*

$$\frac{M}{n} \rho_n + o(\rho_n^2) \lesssim E[T_4] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2).$$

Lemma 6.4.

$$E[|T_5|] \lesssim \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2).$$

For T_6 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[T_6] &= \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] F_Y(y) f_Y(y) dy E[\mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)] \\
&= P(Y_1 \leq Y_2 \leq Y_3) \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M E[\mathbf{1}(j_m(1) = 1)] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{6} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{m}{n} \right] = \frac{M+1}{12n},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 are three independent copies of Y from F_Y .

For T_7 , we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. $|E[T_7]| = o(\rho_n^2)$.

Summing up (6.7), (6.8), Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3, Lemma 6.4, (6.9), Lemma 6.5, we establish the rate of $E[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})]$:

$$\frac{M}{n}\rho_n + \rho_n^2 \lesssim E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right] - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{M+1}{12n} \lesssim \frac{M}{n}\sqrt{\log n}\rho_n + \rho_n^2 + \frac{M}{n^2}. \quad (6.10)$$

Combining (6.4) and (6.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} E[\xi_{n,M}] &= -2 + \frac{6nM}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \\ &\quad \left\{1 + E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1)\mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] + (n-2)E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right]\right\} \\ &= -2 + \frac{6n(n-2)M}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left[\frac{1}{3} + \frac{M+1}{12n}\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{6n(n-2)M}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left\{E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right] - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{M+1}{12n}\right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{6nM}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left\{1 + E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1)\mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right]\right\} \\ &= -2 + \frac{2(n-2)}{n+1} + 6\left\{E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right] - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{M+1}{12n}\right\}(1 + o(1)) \\ &\quad + \frac{6nM}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left\{1 + E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1)\mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right]\right\} \\ &= 6\left\{E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right] - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{M+1}{12n}\right\}(1 + o(1)) \\ &\quad - \frac{3(M+1)/2}{(n+1)[n + (M+1)/4]} + \frac{6nM}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1)\mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] \\ &= 6\left\{E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_U(1)}\})\right] - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{M+1}{12n}\right\}(1 + o(1)) + O\left(\frac{M}{n^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to

$$0 \leq E\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq Y_1)\mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] \leq P(j_U(1) = 1) = \frac{M+1}{2n}.$$

We thus proved the first claim by (6.10). Regarding the second claim, notice that if $\rho_n \succ n^{-1}$, we have $\rho_n^2 \succ M/n^2$ and accordingly

$$\frac{M}{n}\rho_n + \rho_n^2 \lesssim E[\xi_{n,M}] \lesssim \frac{M}{n}\sqrt{\log n}\rho_n + \rho_n^2,$$

and thus finish the whole proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1(ii). Invoking the law of total variance yields

$$\text{Var}[\xi_{n,M}] = E\left[\text{Var}\left[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right] + \text{Var}\left[E\left[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right]. \quad (6.11)$$

For the first term in (6.11), we have

$$E\left[\text{Var}\left[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{36}{(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{m, m'=1 \\ m \neq m'}}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{i, l=1 \\ i \neq l}}^n \sum_{m, m'=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{i, l=1 \\ i \neq l}}^n \sum_{m, m'=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = i) \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{i, l=1 \\ i \neq l}}^n \sum_{m, m'=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l)) \right] \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{i, l=1 \\ i \neq l}}^n \sum_{m, m'=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] \right\}. \tag{6.12}
\end{aligned}$$

We then establish the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $r_n = \frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \rho_n^2$. Then for any $i, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m, m' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{18} \right| \lesssim r_n, \\
&\left| \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad m \neq m', \\
&\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad i \neq l, \\
&\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = i) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad i \neq l, \\
&\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l)) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad i \neq l, \\
&\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] + \frac{4}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad i \neq l.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that in (6.12), the number in the first sum is nM , the second is $nM(M-1)$ and the remaining four are $n(n-1)M^2$. Combining (6.12) and Lemma 6.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{n^4 M^2} \left[\left(n^3 M + n^3 M(M-1) + 4n^2(n-1)M^2 \right) r_n \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left| \frac{1}{18}n^3M + \frac{1}{45}n^3M(M-1) + \frac{3}{45}n^2(n-1)M^2 - \frac{4}{45}n^2(n-1)M^2 \right| \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{n^4M^2} \left[n^3M^2r_n + n^3M \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{nM} + \frac{M}{n^2} + \frac{M}{n^2} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n} + \frac{1}{n} \rho_n^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

For the second term in (6.11), we establish the following lemma.

Lemma 6.7. *Recalling $r_n = \frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n} + \rho_n^2$, we have*

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X}] \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{n} r_n.$$

Combining (6.13) and Lemma 6.7, we obtain

$$\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \lesssim \frac{1}{nM} + \frac{M}{n^2} + \frac{M}{n^2} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n} + \frac{1}{n} \rho_n^2,$$

and thus complete the proof. \square

A Proof of the rest results

Additional notation. We use \xrightarrow{d} , \xrightarrow{p} , and $\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}$ to denote convergence in distribution, convergence in probability, and almost sure convergence, respectively. For a sequence of random variables $[X_n]_n$ and a real sequences $[a_n]_n$, we write $X_n = O_P(a_n)$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that $P(|X_n| \geq C|a_n|) < \epsilon$ for all n large enough, and $X_n = o_P(a_n)$ if for any $c > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|X_n| \geq c|a_n|) = 0$.

A.1 Proofs of results in Section 2

A.1.1 Proof of Remark 2.3

Proof of Remark 2.3. From the definition of Chatterjee's correlation coefficient,

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_n &= 1 - \frac{3 \sum_{i=1}^n |R_{j_1(i)} - R_i|}{n^2 - 1} \\
&= 1 - \frac{3}{n^2 - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(R_i + R_{j_1(i)} - 2 \min\{R_i, R_{j_1(i)}\} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{6}{n^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^n \min\{R_i, R_{j_1(i)}\} - \frac{3}{n^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i + R_{j_1(i)}) + 1 \\
&= \frac{n+1/2}{n-1} \xi_{n,1} - \frac{3}{n^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i + R_{j_1(i)}) + \frac{3n}{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing $[R_i]_{i=1}^n$ is a permutation of $\llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i + R_{j_1(i)}) - n(n+1) \right| \leq n-1,$$

since for any $i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, the difference of R_i and R_j can be at most $n - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{n+1/2}{n-1} \xi_{n,1} - \xi_n \right| &= \left| \frac{3}{n^2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i + R_{j_1(i)}) - \frac{3n}{n-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{3}{n^2-1} (n-1) + \left| \frac{3n(n+1)}{n^2-1} - \frac{3n}{n-1} \right| \\ &= \frac{3}{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\xi_{n,1}$ is bounded, the proof is complete. \square

A.1.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $G(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y \geq y)]$ and $G_X(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y \geq y) | X]$. We shorthand F_Y by F . Let $Q := \int \text{Var}(G_X(y)) dF(y)$ and $S := \int G(y)(1 - G(y)) dF(y)$. Then from (2.1), $\xi = Q/S$. Denote

$$Q_{n,M} := \frac{1}{nM} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{F_n(Y_i), F_n(Y_{j_m(i)})\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_n(Y_i)^2,$$

where $F_n(y) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq y)$ and $G_n(y) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_i \geq y)$ are the empirical counterparts of F and G , respectively.

Step I. This step establishes the almost surely convergence of $Q_{n,M}$ to Q .

Step I-1. Define the population counterpart of $Q_{n,M}$ by

$$Q'_{n,M} = \frac{1}{nM} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{F(Y_i), F(Y_{j_m(i)})\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G(Y_i)^2,$$

Since G and G_n are bounded by 1, we have

$$|Q_{n,M} - Q'_{n,M}| \leq 3\Delta_n,$$

where $\Delta_n := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(y) - F(y)| + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |G_n(y) - G(y)|$.

From Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Since $|\Delta_n| \leq 2$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_n] = 0$ and hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|Q_{n,M} - Q'_{n,M}| = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Step I-2. For any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\min\{F(Y_i), F(Y_{j_m(i)})\} = \int \mathbb{1}(Y_i \geq y) \mathbb{1}(Y_{j_m(i)} \geq y) dF(y).$$

Conditional on \mathbf{X} , $[Y_i]_{i=1}^n$ are independent. Then for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i \geq y) \mathbb{1}(Y_{j_m(i)} \geq y)] = G_{X_i}(y) G_{X_{j_m(i)}}(y).$$

From Fubini's theorem and $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d,

$$\mathbb{E}[Q'_{n,M}] = \int \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}[G_{X_1}(y) G_{X_{j_m(1)}}(y)] - G(y)^2 \right] dF(y)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int \left[\mathbb{E}[G_{X_1}(y)^2] - G(y)^2 \right] dF(y) \\
&\quad + \int \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}[G_{X_1}(y)(G_{X_{j_m(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y))] \right] dF(y).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

The first term is exactly Q from the definition.

Step I-3. This substep proves that the second term converges to zero.

Consider U to be the uniform distribution over $\llbracket M \rrbracket$, i.e., for any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\mathbb{P}(U = m) = 1/M. \tag{A.3}$$

Denote the probability measure of X by μ . For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, since $X_{j_U(1)} = X_1$ when $j_U(1) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{j_U(1)} - X_1\right| \geq \epsilon \mid X_1 = x\right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{j_U(1)} - X_1\right| \geq \epsilon, j_U(1) \neq 1 \mid X_1 = x\right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{j_U(1)} - x\right| \geq \epsilon, j_U(1) \neq 1 \mid X_1 = x\right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}(n-1, \mu([x, x+\epsilon])) \leq U-1, j_U(1) \neq 1\right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}(n-1, \mu([x, x+\epsilon])) \leq U-1\right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}(n-1, \mu([x, x+\epsilon])) \leq M-1\right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $U \leq M$ and $M/n \rightarrow 0$.

Then from dominated convergence theorem, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|X_{j_U(1)} - X_1| \geq \epsilon) = 0$ and then

$$X_{j_U(1)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} X_1.$$

For any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, there can be at most one i such that $X_{j_m(i)} = X_j$ and $X_i \neq X_j$ since there is no tie with probability one. Then from the proof of Lemma 9.4 in [Chatterjee \(2021\)](#), for any nonnegative measurable function f ,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{j_m(1)})] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)],$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{j_U(1)})] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}[f(X_{j_m(1)})] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)]. \tag{A.4}$$

For any measurable function f and probability measure ν , from Lemma 9.5 in [Chatterjee \(2021\)](#), essentially Lusin's theorem, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compactly supported continuous function g such that $\nu(\{x : f(x) \neq g(x)\}) < \epsilon$. We take ν to be the probability measure of X_1 . Then for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|f(X_{j_U(1)}) - f(X_1)| \geq \delta) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|g(X_{j_U(1)}) - g(X_1)| \geq \delta) + \mathbb{P}(f(X_1) \neq g(X_1)) + \mathbb{P}(f(X_{j_U(1)}) \neq g(X_{j_U(1)})).
\end{aligned}$$

From continuous mapping theorem and $X_{j_U(1)} \xrightarrow{p} X_1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|g(X_{j_U(1)}) - g(X_1)| \geq \delta) = 0.$$

From the definition of g ,

$$P(f(X_1) \neq g(X_1)) < \epsilon.$$

From (A.4),

$$P(f(X_{j_U(1)}) \neq g(X_{j_U(1)})) \leq 2P(f(X_1) \neq g(X_1)) < 2\epsilon.$$

Combining the above derivations together yields

$$f(X_{j_U(1)}) \xrightarrow{p} f(X_1).$$

For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $G_x(y)$ is a measurable function with respect to x . We take $f(x)$ to be $G_x(y)$. Since $G_x(y)$ is bounded by 1, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[|G_{X_{j_U(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y)|] = 0$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M E[G_{X_1}(y)(G_{X_{j_m(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y))] \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M E|G_{X_{j_m(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y)| \\ & = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E|G_{X_{j_U(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y)| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking dominated convergence theorem then implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M E[G_{X_1}(y)(G_{X_{j_m(1)}}(y) - G_{X_1}(y))] \right] dF(y) = 0.$$

Step I-4. Combining (A.1) and (A.2) shows

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[Q_{n,M}] = Q.$$

From Lemma 9.11 in Chatterjee (2021), essentially bounded difference inequality, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any n and $t > 0$,

$$P(|Q_{n,M} - E[Q_{n,M}]| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-Cnt^2).$$

Then using Borel–Cantelli Lemma, $Q_{n,M} - E[Q_{n,M}] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ and then

$$Q_{n,M} \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q.$$

Step II. Let

$$S_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_n(Y_i)(1 - G_n(Y_i)).$$

From the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Chatterjee (2021), $S_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} S$ and then

$$Q_{n,M}/S_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \xi. \tag{A.5}$$

From (2.2), for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\min\{F_n(Y_i), F_n(Y_{j_m(i)})\} = \frac{1}{n} \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}.$$

Some simple calculation gives

$$Q_{n,M} = \frac{1}{n^2 M} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} - \frac{(n+1)(2n+1)}{6n^2} \quad \text{and} \quad S_n = \frac{1}{6} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right),$$

and accordingly

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q_{n,M}}{S_n} &= \frac{6}{M(n+1)(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} - \frac{2n+1}{n-1} \\ &= \frac{n + (M+1)/4}{n-1} \xi_{n,M} + \frac{M-1}{2(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then due to (A.5) and $M/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\xi_{n,M} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \xi.$$

This completes the proof. \square

A.2 Proofs of results in Section 3

A.2.1 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The proof is divided into three steps.

Step I. This step establishes the Hájek representation of $\xi_{n,M}$.

Let $F_Y^{(n)}$ be the empirical cumulative distribution function of the sample $[Y_i]_{i=1}^n$. Since

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \min\{R_i, R_j\} = \frac{(n-1)n(n+1)}{3},$$

we have by (2.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{n,M} &= -2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \\ &= \frac{6}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} - \frac{6}{(n-1)n(n+1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \min\{R_i, R_j\} \\ &= \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{F_Y^{(n)}(Y_i), F_Y^{(n)}(Y_{j_m(i)})\} \\ &\quad - \frac{6}{(n-1)(n+1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \min\{F_Y^{(n)}(Y_i), F_Y^{(n)}(Y_j)\}, \end{aligned}$$

Introduce

$$\widehat{\xi}_{n,M} = \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\}$$

$$- \frac{6}{(n-1)(n+1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\}$$

and $\sigma_{n,M}^2 = \frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{1}{nM} \right) + \frac{8}{15} \left(\frac{M}{n^2} \right).$

The goal of this step is to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{n,M}^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(\xi_{n,M} - \widehat{\xi}_{n,M} \right)^2 = 0.$$

Step I-1. This substep calculates $\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\xi}_{n,M})^2]$. Notice that under independence of X and Y and Y is continuous, $[F_Y(Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d from uniform distribution $U(0, 1)$ over $[0, 1]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\xi}_{n,M}] &= \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{M(M+1)}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \left(nM - \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{6}{(n-1)(n+1)} \left(\frac{1}{3} n(n-1) \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}[U_1] = 1/2$ and $\mathbb{E}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}] = 1/3$ for two independent copies U_1 and U_2 from $U(0, 1)$.

For four independent copies U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 from $U(0, 1)$, simple calculations show

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[U_1] &= \frac{1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[U_1, U_2] = 0, \quad \text{Cov}[U_1, \min\{U_2, U_3\}] = 0, \quad \text{Cov}[U_1, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{1}{24}, \\ \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}] &= 0, \quad \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}] = \frac{1}{45}, \quad \text{Var}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{1}{18}. \end{aligned}$$

Then analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\} \right] \\ &= nM \left(\frac{1}{18} \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{12} \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} \right) + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} \right) + \left(2nM^2 - 2M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} \right) + M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} \right) + o(nM) + o(M^3) \\ &= \frac{4}{45} nM^2 + \left[\frac{1}{90} nM + \frac{1}{108} M^3 \right] (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var} \left[\sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\} \right] \\ &= n(n-1) \text{Var}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}] + n(n-1)(4n-7) \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}] \\ &\quad + n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3) \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}] \\ &= \frac{4}{45} n^3 (1 + O(n^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\}, \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\} \right] \\ &= \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \text{Cov} \left[U_1, \sum_{i \neq j} \min\{U_i, U_j\} \right] + \left[nM - \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \right] \text{Cov} \left[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \sum_{i \neq j} \min\{U_i, U_j\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \left[2(n-1) \text{Cov}[U_1, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] + (n-1)(n-2) \text{Cov}[U_1, \min\{U_2, U_3\}] \right] \\
&\quad + \left[nM - \frac{M(M+1)}{2} \right] \left[2 \text{Var}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}] + 4(n-2) \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}] \right] \\
&\quad + (n-2)(n-3) \text{Cov}[\min\{U_1, U_2\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}] \Big] \\
&= \frac{4}{45} n^2 M - \frac{1}{360} n M^2 (1 + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\xi}_{n,M})^2] = \text{Var}[\hat{\xi}_{n,M}] \\
&= \frac{36n^2}{(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{36}{(n-1)^2(n+1)^2} \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\} \right] - \frac{72n}{(n-1)(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \\
&\quad \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\}, \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j)\} \right] \\
&= \sigma_{n,M}^2 (1 + o(1)). \tag{A.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Step I-2. This substep calculates $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M} \hat{\xi}_{n,M}]$. The following lemma provides some necessary information to this end.

Lemma A.1. *Let $[U_i]_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of i.i.d random variables from $U(0, 1)$. Let $[R_i^U]_{i=1}^n$ be the corresponding ranks. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Cov}[R_1^U, U_1] = \frac{n-1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[R_1^U, U_2] = -\frac{1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[R_1^U, \min\{U_2, U_3\}] = -\frac{1}{12}, \\
&\text{Cov}[R_1^U, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{n-2}{24}, \quad \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1^U, R_2^U\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}] = -\frac{4}{45}, \\
&\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1^U, R_2^U\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}] = \frac{4n-17}{180}, \quad \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1^U, R_2^U\}, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{n-2}{18}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the ranks $[R_i]_{i=1}^n$ of $[Y_i]_{i=1}^n$ are the ranks of $[F_Y(Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$, and $[F_Y(Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d from $U(0, 1)$. Then by Lemma A.1 and analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\} \right] \\
&= nM \left(\frac{1}{18} n \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{12} n \right) + \frac{1}{3} M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} n \right) + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n \right) \\
&\quad + \left(nM^2 - nM - \frac{2}{3} M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n \right) + \left(2nM^2 - 2M^3 \right) \left(\frac{1}{45} n \right) + \left(n^2 M^2 - nM^3 \right) \left(-\frac{4}{45} \right) \\
&\quad + M^3 \left(\frac{1}{24} n \right) + nM^3 \left(-\frac{1}{12} \right) + o(n^2 M) + o(nM^3) \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{90} n^2 M + \frac{2}{135} nM^3 \right] (1 + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the values of

$$\text{Cov} \left[R_i, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right] \text{ and } \text{Cov} \left[\min \{ R_i, R_j \}, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right]$$

are homogenous for $i \neq j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n R_i$, $\sum_{i \neq j} \min \{ R_i, R_j \}$ are constants. Then for any $i \neq j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov} \left[R_i, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n R_i, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right] = 0, \\ & \text{Cov} \left[\min \{ R_i, R_j \}, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i \neq j} \min \{ R_i, R_j \}, \sum_{k \neq \ell} \min \{ F_Y(Y_k), F_Y(Y_\ell) \} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{ R_i, R_{j_m(i)} \}, \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{ F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j) \} \right] = 0.$$

Since $\sum_{i \neq j} \min \{ R_i, R_j \}$ is a constant, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M} \hat{\xi}_{n,M}] &= \text{Cov}[\xi_{n,M}, \hat{\xi}_{n,M}] \\ &= \frac{36n}{(n+1)^2[nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{ R_i, R_{j_m(i)} \}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{ F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)}) \} \right] \\ &= \sigma_{n,M}^2(1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Step I-3. From Theorem 3.1, $\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{n,M})^2] = \sigma_{n,M}^2(1 + o(1))$. Combining (A.6) and (A.7), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{n,M}^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(\xi_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M} \right)^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{n,M}^{-2} \left(\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{n,M})^2] + \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\xi}_{n,M})^2] - 2\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M} \hat{\xi}_{n,M}] \right) = 0. \tag{A.8}$$

Step II. This step transforms $\hat{\xi}_{n,M}$ to a function of sequence with local dependence. To this end, define

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\xi}_{n,M} &= \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{ F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)}) \} \\ &\quad - \frac{12}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_Y(Y_i)^2 + F_Y(Y_i) - \frac{1}{3} \right) - \frac{2n}{n+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{\xi}_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M} \\ &= \frac{6n}{n+1} \left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \min \{ F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_j) \} - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_Y(Y_i)^2 + F_Y(Y_i) - \frac{1}{3} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for two independent copies U_1 and U_2 from $U(0, 1)$, $E[\min\{U_1, U_2\}] = 1/3$ and $E[\min\{U_1, U_2\} | U_1] = -U_1^2/2 + U_1$. Then by Hájek projection of U-statistics ([van der Vaart, 1998](#), Theorem 12.3),

$$E[(\check{\xi}_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M})^2] = O(n^{-2}),$$

so that

$$\check{\xi}_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M} = O_P(n^{-1}).$$

Since $\sigma_{n,M}^2 \succ n^{-2}$, we then have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{n,M}^{-2} E(\check{\xi}_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M})^2 = 0 \quad \text{so that} \quad \sigma_{n,M}^{-1}(\check{\xi}_{n,M} - \hat{\xi}_{n,M}) = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Step III. This step establishes the central limit theorem of $\check{\xi}_{n,M}$. We first cite a result on the central limit theorem for a sequence with local dependence. For related definitions of interaction rule and Kantorovich-Wasserstein distance, please refer to [Chatterjee \(2008, Section 2\)](#).

Lemma A.2. ([Chatterjee, 2008, Theorem 2.5](#)) Let \mathcal{W} be a measurable space and $f : \mathcal{W}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable map admitting a symmetric interaction rule G . Let $[W_i]_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of i.i.d \mathcal{W} -valued random variables and $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_n)$. Let $T = f(\mathbf{W})$ and $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(T)$. Let $[\tilde{W}_i]_{i=1}^\infty$ be independent copies of $[W_i]_{i=1}^\infty$. Let $\mathbf{W}^j = (W_1, \dots, W_{j-1}, \tilde{W}_j, W_{j+1}, \dots, W_n)$ for each $j \in [n]$ and define $\Delta_j f = f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{W}^j)$. Let $D = \max_{j \in [n]} |\Delta_j f|$. Let G' be an arbitrary symmetric extension of G on \mathcal{W}^{n+4} and take

$$\delta = 1 + \text{the degree of the vertex 1 in } G'(W_1, \dots, W_{n+4}).$$

Then

$$\delta_T \leq \frac{Cn^{1/2}}{\sigma^2} \left(E[D^8]\right)^{1/4} \left(E[\delta^4]\right)^{1/4} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^3} \sum_{j=1}^n E[|\Delta_j f|^3],$$

where C is a universal constant and δ_T is the Kantorovich-Wasserstein distance between the law of $(T - E[T])/\sqrt{\text{Var}[T]}$ and the standard Gaussian law.

Let $Z_i = (X_i, Y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^n$. To apply Lemma A.2, we take \mathcal{W} to be \mathbb{R}^2 , f to be $\check{\xi}_{n,M}(\cdot)$, and $T = \check{\xi}_{n,M}(\mathbf{Z})$.

Step III-1. This substep identifies an interaction rule. For each $i \in [n]$ and $m \in [M]$, let $j_m^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$ be defined by samples \mathbf{Z} and $\mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i) = \{j_m^{\mathbf{Z}}(i), m \in [M]\}$ be the set of indices containing all right m -NN of i with $m \in [M]$. Let $\mathcal{E}(G)$ be the edge set of graph G . Given any $\mathbf{Z} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^n$, let $G(\mathbf{Z})$ be the (undirected) graph on $[n]$ such that i and j are connected, i.e., $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}))$, if and only if $j \in \mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$ or $i \in \mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(j)$. It is easy to check G is symmetric.

To prove G is an interaction rule, we consider any $\mathbf{Z} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = (\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^n$, where $\tilde{Z}_i = (\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)$ for each $i \in [n]$. For any $i \in [n]$, let \mathbf{Z}^i be the vector obtained by replacing Z_i with \tilde{Z}_i in \mathbf{Z} . For any $i, j \in [n]$ and $i \neq j$, let \mathbf{Z}^{ij} be the vector obtained by replacing Z_i with \tilde{Z}_i and Z_j with \tilde{Z}_j in \mathbf{Z} . For any $k, \ell \in [n]$ and $k \neq \ell$, assume k and ℓ are not connected in $G(\mathbf{Z})$, $G(\mathbf{Z}^k)$, $G(\mathbf{Z}^\ell)$, $G(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$. It suffices to verify $f(\mathbf{Z}) - f(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$.

Define $A_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i) := \{j : j_m^{\mathbf{Z}}(j) = i \text{ for some } m \in [M]\}$. We shorthand $\mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$, $A_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$ by $\mathcal{J}_M(i)$, $A_M(i)$; $\mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}^k}(i)$, $A_M^{\mathbf{Z}^k}(i)$ by $\mathcal{J}_M^k(i)$, $A_M^k(i)$; $\mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}^\ell}(i)$, $A_M^{\mathbf{Z}^\ell}(i)$ by $\mathcal{J}_M^\ell(i)$, $A_M^\ell(i)$; $\mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell}}(i)$, $A_M^{\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell}}(i)$ by $\mathcal{J}_M^{k\ell}(i)$, $A_M^{k\ell}(i)$.

Define

$$f_i(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_m(i)})\}$$

for each $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, which is a function of Y_i and $Y_j, j \in \mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$. We then establish $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ for each $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

If $i = k$, then $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M(i) \cap \mathcal{J}_M^\ell(i)$ since $(k, \ell) \notin \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z})) \cup \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}^\ell))$. Then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell)$. We also have $f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ since $(k, \ell) \notin \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}^k)) \cup \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell}))$. Then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$.

If $i \in A_M(k)$ and $i \neq k, \ell$, we have $k \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)$. Then $k \in \mathcal{J}_{M+1}^\ell(i)$ since we only replace Z_ℓ by \tilde{Z}_ℓ for $\ell \neq i, k$. Then $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}^\ell(i)$ since $(k, \ell) \notin \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}^\ell))$ and $i \neq k, \ell$. Notice that $k \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)$ implies $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}(i)$ since $(k, \ell) \notin \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}))$. Then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell)$ by combining $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}(i)$ and $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}^\ell(i)$. On the other hand, $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}(i)$ implies $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M^k(i)$ and $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_{M+1}^\ell(i)$ implies $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M^{k\ell}(i)$ since we only replace Z_k by \tilde{Z}_k for $k \neq i, \ell$. Then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ by combining $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M^k(i)$ and $\ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M^{k\ell}(i)$. Then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$.

If $i = \ell$ or $i \in A_M(\ell), i \neq k, \ell$, we can establish $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k), f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ in the same way and then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$. The symmetry of the problem implies that the result still holds for $i \in A_M^k(k) \cup A_M^k(\ell) \cup A_M^\ell(k) \cup A_M^\ell(\ell) \cup A_M^{k\ell}(k) \cup A_M^{k\ell}(\ell)$. If $i \notin A_M(k) \cup A_M(\ell) \cup A_M^k(k) \cup A_M^k(\ell) \cup A_M^\ell(k) \cup A_M^\ell(\ell) \cup A_M^{k\ell}(k) \cup A_M^{k\ell}(\ell)$ and $i \neq k, \ell$, then $k, \ell \notin \mathcal{J}_M(i) \cup \mathcal{J}_M^k(i) \cup \mathcal{J}_M^\ell(i) \cup \mathcal{J}_M^{k\ell}(i)$ and then $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$.

Then it is easy to verify $f(\mathbf{Z}) - f(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ from the definition of f and the fact that $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = f_i(\mathbf{Z}^\ell) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^{k\ell})$ for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

Step III-2. This substep applies Lemma A.2.

For the symmetric extension of G on $(\mathbb{R}^2)^{n+4}$, given any $\mathbf{Z}' \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^{n+4}$, let $G'(\mathbf{Z}')$ be the graph on $\llbracket n+4 \rrbracket$ such that i and j are connected if and only if $j \in \mathcal{J}_{M+4}^{\mathbf{Z}'}(i)$ or $i \in \mathcal{J}_{M+4}^{\mathbf{Z}'}(j)$. If $j \in \mathcal{J}_M^{\mathbf{Z}}(i)$ for some $\mathbf{Z} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^n$, then $j \in \mathcal{J}_{M+4}^{\mathbf{Z}'}(i)$, where \mathbf{Z}' is obtained by adding four elements to \mathbf{Z} . This is equivalent to $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(G'(\mathbf{Z}'))$ if \mathbf{Z} is embedded in \mathbf{Z}' . Then $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{Z}))$ implies $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(G'(\mathbf{Z}'))$. It is easy to check G' is symmetric. And the degree of vertex 1 can be at most $2(M+4)$ for G' since the cardinalities of $\mathcal{J}_{M+4}^{\mathbf{Z}'}(1)$ and $A_{M+4}^{\mathbf{Z}'}(1)$ are both bounded by $M+4$ for any $\mathbf{Z}' \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^{n+4}$.

For any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, we consider the value $f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k)$.

If $i \in A_M(k) \setminus A_M^k(k)$ and $i \neq k$, then

$$f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_k)\} - \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_M^k(i)})\}.$$

If $i \in A_M^k(k) \setminus A_M(k)$ and $i \neq k$, then

$$f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_{j_M(i)})\} - \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(\tilde{Y}_k)\}.$$

If $i \in A_M^k(k) \cap A_M(k)$ and $i \neq k$, then

$$f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(Y_k)\} - \min \{F_Y(Y_i), F_Y(\tilde{Y}_k)\}.$$

If $i \notin A_M^k(k) \cup A_M(k)$ and $i \neq k$, then

$$f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) = 0.$$

Since $0 \leq F_Y \leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) \right| \\ & \leq |f_k(\mathbf{Z}) - f_k(\mathbf{Z}^k)| + |A_M(k) \setminus A_M^k(k)| + |A_M^k(k) \setminus A_M(k)| + |A_M^k(k) \cap A_M(k)| \\ & \leq 3M, \end{aligned}$$

where $|A|$ is the cardinality of A when A is a set, and the last step is from $|A_M^k(k) \cup A_M(k)| \leq 2M$.

From (A.9),

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_k f| = |f(\mathbf{Z}) - f(\mathbf{Z}^k)| & \leq \frac{6n}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{Z}) - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{Z}^k) \right| \\ & + \frac{12}{n+1} \left| \frac{1}{2} \left(F_Y(Y_k)^2 - F_Y(\tilde{Y}_k)^2 \right) - \left(F_Y(Y_k) - F_Y(\tilde{Y}_k) \right) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 3.1, (A.8), and (A.10),

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{\xi}_{n,M}] = \sigma_{n,M}^2(1 + o(1)).$$

Then from Lemma A.2,

$$\delta_T \lesssim \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma_{n,M}^2} n^{-2} M + \frac{1}{\sigma_{n,M}^3} n^{-2} = \frac{n^{-3/2} M}{n^{-1} M^{-1} + n^{-2} M} + \frac{n^{-2}}{n^{-3/2} M^{-3/2} + n^{-3} M^{3/2}}.$$

If $M \prec n^{1/4}$, then $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ and then

$$(\tilde{\xi}_{n,M} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\xi}_{n,M}]) / \sqrt{\text{Var}[\tilde{\xi}_{n,M}]} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Since $\text{Var}[\tilde{\xi}_{n,M}] = \sigma_{n,M}^2(1 + o(1))$ and it is easy to check $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\xi}_{n,M}] = 0$, then

$$\sigma_{n,M}^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_{n,M} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Due to (A.8) and (A.10),

$$\sigma_{n,M}^{-1} \xi_{n,M} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Notice that when $M \prec n^{1/4}$, $\sigma_{n,M}^2 = (2/5)(nM)^{-1}(1 + o(1))$. We then have

$$\sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 2/5),$$

and thus complete the proof. \square

A.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof of Theorem 3.3(i). Notice that

$$(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \right\} \geq (1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}^{\circ} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{\pm}, U_b \right) \right\},$$

where U_1, \dots, U_B are i.i.d Bernoulli random variables of equal probabilities to be 0 or 1, and

$$\mathbb{1}^{\circ}(x, y, u) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}(x \geq y), & \text{if } x \neq y, \\ u, & \text{if } x = y. \end{cases}$$

Under H_0 , we have $\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(1)}, \dots, \xi_{n,M}^{\pm(B)}, \xi_{n,M}^{\pm}$ are i.i.d. and accordingly

$$(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}^\circ \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{\pm}, U_b \right) \right\}$$

is discretely uniformly distributed over

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{1+B}, \frac{2}{1+B}, \dots, \frac{1+B}{1+B} \right\}.$$

As a consequence, under H_0

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \right\} \leq \alpha \right] &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}^\circ \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{\pm}, U_b \right) \right\} \leq \alpha \right] \\ &= \frac{\lfloor (1+B)\alpha \rfloor}{1+B} \leq \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3(ii). Let

$$\Xi_n^{(b)} := \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right).$$

Then

$$(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \right\} = (1+B)^{-1} + (1+B)^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \Xi_n^{(b)}.$$

Since $M/n \rightarrow 0$, from Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\xi_{n,M}^{(b)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0, \quad \xi_{n,M}^{-(b)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0, \quad \xi_{n,M} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \xi_{H_1},$$

where $\xi_{H_1} > 0$ is the value of ξ under the fix alternative H_1 . One then has

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_n^{(b)} &= \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1} \left(\max \{ \xi_{n,M}^{(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{-(b)} \} \geq \max \{ \xi_{n,M}, \xi_{n,M}^- \} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{1} \left(\max \{ \xi_{n,M}^{(b)}, \xi_{n,M}^{-(b)} \} \geq \xi_{n,M} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{-(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $B = B_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $[\Xi_n^{(b)}]_{b=1}^{B_n}$ are exchangeable. Applying Lemma 1.1 in [Patterson and Taylor \(1985\)](#), we obtain

$$B_n^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \Xi_n^{(b)} = \mathbb{E} \left(\Xi_n^{(1)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right),$$

where \mathcal{G}_n is the σ -field generated by

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \Xi_n^{(b)}, \sum_{b=1}^{B_{n+1}} \Xi_{n+1}^{(b)}, \dots \right).$$

Since $[\mathcal{G}_n]_{n=1}^\infty$ is decreasing and $\mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\infty$, where $\mathcal{G}_\infty = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_n$, $0 \leq \Xi_n^{(1)} \leq 1, \Xi_n^{(1)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$, applying

Lemma 2(c) in [Isaac \(1979\)](#) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\Xi_n^{(1)} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\right) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}\left(0 \mid \mathcal{G}_\infty\right) = 0,$$

which implies

$$B_n^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \Xi_n^{(b)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

We accordingly have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_1}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n, M}^\pm} = 1) = \mathbb{P}\left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}\left(\xi_{n, M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n, M}^\pm\right)\right\} \leq \alpha\right] = 1,$$

and complete the proof. \square

A.3 Proofs of results in Section 4

A.3.1 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof of Theorem 4.2(i). By symmetry, without loss of generality we may consider the sequence to be positive. For any integer $B \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, with a little bit abuse of notation, define

$$G_{\xi^\pm}(x) := \mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\xi_{n, M}^\pm < x) \quad \text{and} \quad G_B := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}(\xi_{n, M}^{\pm(b)} < x).$$

Considering any given sample $[(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n, M}^\pm} = 1 \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}\left(\xi_{n, M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n, M}^\pm\right)\right\} \leq \alpha \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}\left(\xi_{n, M}^{\pm(b)} < \xi_{n, M}^\pm\right)\right\} \geq 1 - \alpha \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[G_B(\xi_{n, M}^\pm) \geq 1 - \left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right)\alpha \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[G_B(\xi_{n, M}^\pm) \geq 1 - \alpha \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_{\xi^\pm}(x) - G_B(x) > \epsilon\right) \leq \exp(-2B\epsilon^2).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n, M}^\pm} = 1 \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(G_{\xi^\pm}(\xi_{n, M}^\pm) \geq 1 - \alpha + \epsilon \mid [(X_i, Y_i)]_{i=1}^n\right) - \exp(-2B\epsilon^2).$$

Picking $\epsilon = \alpha/2$ and then taking expectation over both sides yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{1, n}}(\mathsf{T}_{\alpha, B}^{\xi_{n, M}^\pm} = 1) \geq \mathbb{P}_{H_{1, n}}\left(G_{\xi^\pm}(\xi_{n, M}^\pm) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\right) - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2).$$

Introduce $t_\alpha := \sqrt{2\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2]/\alpha}$. Then from Markov's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\xi_{n,M}^\pm \geq t_\alpha) \leq \mathbb{P}_{H_0}((\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2 \geq t_\alpha^2) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2]}{t_\alpha^2} = \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1) \geq \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\xi_{n,M}^\pm \geq t_\alpha) - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2).$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}] = \mathbb{E}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}^-] = 0$ from Theorem 3.1, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{H_0}[\max\{\xi_{n,M}, \xi_{n,M}^-\}]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{H_0}[|\xi_{n,M}| + |\xi_{n,M}^-|]^2 \\ &\leq 2(\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M})^2] + \mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^-)^2]) \\ &= 2(\text{Var}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}] + \text{Var}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}^-]) \\ &= 4\text{Var}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}]. \end{aligned}$$

From the assumptions and Corollary 4.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}} = +\infty.$$

From Theorem 3.1, we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{H_0}[\xi_{n,M}]}} = +\infty.$$

Then for any $K > 0$, there exist $N_K > 0$ such that for any $n > N_K$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \geq K\sqrt{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] \geq K\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2]}.$$

From Markov's inequality, for any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\xi_{n,M} \geq \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] - t) \geq 1 - \frac{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{t^2}.$$

Take $t = (1 - \sqrt{2/\alpha}/K)\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]$, where we assume K is large enough so that t is positive. Then for any $n > N_K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\xi_{n,M}^\pm > \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2]}) - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\xi_{n,M} > \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[(\xi_{n,M}^\pm)^2]}) - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}}(\xi_{n,M} > \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha}}\frac{1}{K}\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]) - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{t^2} - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}]}{(1 - \sqrt{2/\alpha}/K)^2(\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}])^2} - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq 1 - \frac{1/K^2}{(1 - \sqrt{2/\alpha}/K)^2} - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2) \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{(K - \sqrt{2/\alpha})^2} - \exp(-B\alpha^2/2).
\end{aligned}$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $(K - \sqrt{2/\alpha})^{-2} < \epsilon$ for K sufficiently large, then together with $B \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}} \left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}} = 1 \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we then have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}} \left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}} = 1 \right) = 1,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2(ii). Since $B \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we can assume $B > \alpha^{-1} - 1$. Let $\xi_{n,M}^{[1]}, \dots, \xi_{n,M}^{[B]}$ be a rearrangement of $\xi_{n,M}^{(1)}, \dots, \xi_{n,M}^{(B)}$ such that

$$\xi_{n,M}^{[1]} \leq \xi_{n,M}^{[2]} \leq \dots \leq \xi_{n,M}^{[B]}.$$

From (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}} &= \mathbb{1} \left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \right\} \leq \alpha \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{1} \left[(1+B)^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1} \left(\xi_{n,M}^{(b)} \geq \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} \right) \right\} \leq \alpha \right] \\
&= \mathbb{1} \left[\sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} > \sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M}^{[1+B-\lfloor \alpha(1+B) \rfloor]} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function.

Let $\Phi_{2/5}(\cdot), \Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(\cdot)$ be the cumulative distribution function and quantile function of $N(0, 2/5)$. Then for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, from Theorem 3.2,

$$B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}(\sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M}^{(b)} \leq y) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \Phi_{2/5}(y).$$

Then from Theorem 3.1 in Hoeffding (1952), we have

$$\sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M}^{[1+B-\lfloor \alpha(1+B) \rfloor]} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1 - \alpha).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}} \left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^{\pm}} = 1 \right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}} \left(\sqrt{nM} \xi_{n,M}^{\pm} > \Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1 - \alpha) \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{nM \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[(\xi_{n,M}^{\pm})^2]}{[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)]^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{2}{[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1-\alpha)]^2} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} nM \left(\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[(\xi_{n,M})^2] + \mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[(\xi_{n,M}^-)^2] \right) \\
&= \frac{2}{[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1-\alpha)]^2} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} nM \left(\text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] + (\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}])^2 + \text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}^-] + (\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}^-])^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

If $|\rho_n| \prec \zeta_{n,M}$ and $M \prec n^{1/4}$, from Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} nM \text{Var}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}] = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} nM (\mathbb{E}_{H_{1,n}}[\xi_{n,M}])^2 = O(1).$$

It is easy to check that the above bounds also hold for $\xi_{n,M}^-$. Then we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_{1,n}} \left(\mathbb{T}_{\alpha,B}^{\xi_{n,M}^\pm} = 1 \right) \leq \frac{C}{[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1-\alpha)]^2},$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$.

Then for any sufficiently small α such that $C[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1-\alpha)]^{-2} < 1$, we take $\beta_\alpha = C[\Phi_{2/5}^{-1}(1-\alpha)]^{-2}$ and complete the proof. \square

A.4 Proofs of results in Section 6

A.4.1 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Proof of Lemma 6.1. The first claim is a well known property of ranks. For the rest,

$$(1) \mathbb{E}[R_1] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n k = \frac{n+1}{2}.$$

(2) For $\mathbb{E}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}]$, we consider the set of pairs $\{(a, b) : a, b \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b\}$. The cardinality of this set is $n(n-1)$ and then we have $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = a, R_2 = b) = 1/[n(n-1)]$ for any $a, b \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b$. The number of pairs (a, b) with $a \neq b$ such that $\min\{a, b\} = k$ is $2(n-k)$ for any $k \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2(n-k)k = \frac{n+1}{3}.$$

(3) For $\text{Var}[R_1]$, we have

$$\text{Var}[R_1] = \mathbb{E}[R_1^2] - [\mathbb{E}[R_1]]^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n k^2 - \left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{(n+1)(n-1)}{12}.$$

(4) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, R_2]$, we have

$$\text{Cov}[R_1, R_2] = \mathbb{E}[R_1 R_2] - \mathbb{E}[R_1] \mathbb{E}[R_2] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n kl - \left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)^2 = -\frac{n+1}{12},$$

since

$$\sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n kl = \frac{(n-1)n(n+1)(3n+2)}{12}.$$

(5) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_2, R_3\}]$, we consider the set of triples $\{(a, b, c) : a, b, c \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b \neq c\}$. The cardinality of this set is $n(n-1)(n-2)$ and then we have $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = a, R_2 = b, R_3 = c) = 1/[n(n-1)(n-2)]$ for any $a, b, c \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b \neq c$. For any $k, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, k < l$, the number of triples

(a, b, c) with $a \neq b \neq c$ such that

$$a = k, \min\{b, c\} = l$$

is $2(n - l)$, and the number of triples such that

$$a = l, \min\{b, c\} = k$$

is $2(n - k - 1)$. Then the total number of triples is $4n - 2(k + l) - 2$. Then

$$E[R_1 \min\{R_2, R_3\}] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{\substack{k, l=1 \\ k < l}}^n kl[4n - 2(k + l) - 2] = \frac{(n+1)(2n+1)}{12},$$

since

$$\sum_{\substack{k, l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n kl(k + l) = \frac{(n-1)n^2(n+1)^2}{3}.$$

We accordingly derive

$$\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_2, R_3\}] = E[R_1 \min\{R_2, R_3\}] - E[R_1]E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] = -\frac{n+1}{12}.$$

(6) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_1, R_2\}]$, for any $k \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, the number of pairs (a, b) with $a \neq b$ such that

$$a = k, \min\{a, b\} = k$$

is $n - k$. For any $k, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, k < l$, the number of pairs (a, b) with $a \neq b$ such that

$$a = k, \min\{a, b\} = l$$

is 0, and such that

$$a = l, \min\{a, b\} = k$$

is 1. We then conclude

$$E[R_1 \min\{R_1, R_2\}] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \left[\sum_{\substack{k, l=1 \\ k < l}}^n kl + \sum_{k=1}^n (n-k)k^2 \right] = \frac{(n+1)(5n+2)}{24},$$

which implies

$$\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{R_1, R_2\}] = E[R_1 \min\{R_1, R_2\}] - E[R_1]E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] = \frac{(n-2)(n+1)}{24}.$$

(7) For $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_3, R_4\}]$, we consider the set of $\{(a, b, c, d) : a, b, c, d \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b \neq c \neq d\}$. The cardinality of this set is $n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)$ and then we have $P(R_1 = a, R_2 = b, R_3 = c, R_4 = d) = 1/[n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)]$ for any $a, b, c, d \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, a \neq b \neq c \neq d$. For any $k, l \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket, k < l$, the number of pairs (a, b, c, d) with $a \neq b \neq c \neq d$ such that

$$\min\{a, b\} = k, \min\{c, d\} = l$$

is $4(n-l)(n-k-2)$, and such that

$$\min\{a, b\} = l, \min\{c, d\} = k$$

is also $4(n-l)(n-k-2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E[\min\{R_1, R_2\} \min\{R_3, R_4\}] &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k < l}}^{n-1} 8(n-l)(n-k-2)kl \\ &= \frac{(n+1)(5n+1)}{45}, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n k^2 l^2 = \frac{(n-1)n(n+1)(2n-1)(2n+1)(5n+6)}{180}.$$

We accordingly obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_3, R_4\}] &= E[\min\{R_1, R_2\} \min\{R_3, R_4\}] - [E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}]]^2 \\ &= -\frac{4(n+1)}{45}. \end{aligned}$$

(8) For $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}]$, for any $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, the number of triples (a, b, c) with $a \neq b \neq c$ such that

$$\min\{a, b\} = k, \min\{a, c\} = k$$

is $(n-k)(n-k-1)$. For any $k, l \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket, k < l$, the number of triples (a, b, c) with $a \neq b \neq c$ such that

$$\min\{a, b\} = k, \min\{a, c\} = l$$

is $2(n-l)$, and such that

$$\min\{a, b\} = l, \min\{a, c\} = k$$

is also $2(n-l)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E[\min\{R_1, R_2\} \min\{R_1, R_3\}] &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \left[\sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k < l}}^{n-1} 4(n-l)kl + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k)(n-k-1)k^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{(n+1)(8n+1)}{60}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{R_1, R_3\}] &= E[\min\{R_1, R_2\} \min\{R_1, R_3\}] - [E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}]]^2 \\ &= \frac{(n+1)(4n-17)}{180}. \end{aligned}$$

(9) For $\text{Var}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}]$, we have

$$E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}^2] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2(n-k)k^2 = \frac{n(n+1)}{6},$$

implying

$$\text{Var}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}] = E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}^2] - [E[\min\{R_1, R_2\}]]^2 = \frac{(n-2)(n+1)}{18}.$$

The whole proof is thus complete. \square

A.4.2 Proof of Lemma 6.2

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Under the assumptions of the theorem,

$$Y|X = x \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma^2),$$

where $\mu_x = \rho_n x$ and $\sigma^2 = 1 - \rho_n^2$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, μ_x is of order ρ_n as $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$. Accordingly,

$$\lim_{\rho_n \rightarrow 0} \rho_n^{-2}(1/\sigma - 1) = 1/2. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Denote the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal by $\Phi(\cdot)$. Employing Taylor's expansion at y ,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_Y(y) &= \Phi\left(\frac{y - \mu_{X_1}}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi(y) \\ &= \Phi\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi(y) \\ &= f_Y(y) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right) + \frac{1}{2} f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where y_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_1)/\sigma$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right]^2 \\ &= f_Y^2(y) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^2 + f_Y(y) f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^3 + \frac{1}{4} [f'_Y(y_x)]^2 \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^4. \end{aligned}$$

(1) We first handle the last two terms. Notice that from (A.11),

$$\left|\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right)|y| + \frac{1}{\sigma} \rho_n |X_1| = \left[\frac{1}{2}|y|\rho_n^2 + |X_1|\rho_n\right](1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Since f'_Y is uniformly bounded for the normal distribution, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|f_Y(y) f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^3 + \frac{1}{4} [f'_Y(y_x)]^2 \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^4\right| \\ &\leq 4f_Y(y) \|f'_Y\|_\infty \left[\frac{1}{8}|y|^3 \rho_n^6 + |X_1|^3 \rho_n^3\right](1 + o(1)) + 2\|f'_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[\frac{1}{16}y^4 \rho_n^8 + X_1^4 \rho_n^4\right](1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (A.12) and the inequality $(a + b)^n \leq 2^{n-1}(|a|^n + |b|^n)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since the fourth moments of X and Y are bounded for the normal distribution, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int \left|f_Y(y) f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^3 + \frac{1}{4} [f'_Y(y_x)]^2 \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^4\right| f_Y(y) dy\right] = o(\rho_n^2).$$

(2) We then turn to the first term. For it, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} X_1^2 \rho_n^2\right| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right)^2 y^2 + 2\frac{1}{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right) |y| |X_1| \rho_n \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{4} y^2 \rho_n^4 + |y| |X_1| \rho_n^3\right](1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

(3) Combining the above two steps yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[T_3] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right]^2 f_Y(y) dy \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y \right)^2 f_Y^3(y) dy \right] + o(\rho_n^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[\int f_Y^3(y) dy \right] \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] \rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[\int f_Y^3(y) dy \right] \rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2) \\
&= \left[\int f_Y^3(y) dy \right] \rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

and we thus complete the proof. \square

A.4.3 Proof of Lemma 6.3

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Before proving Lemma 6.3 (as well as Lemma 6.4 ahead), we first establish the following two lemmas about k -nearest neighbors.

The first lemma establishes the convergence rate of $X_{j_m(1)}$ to X_1 for any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, where M is allowed to increase with n .

Lemma A.3. *Let $W_{n,1}, \dots, W_{n,n}$ be n independent copies from a probability measure P_n that is over \mathbb{R} and is allowed to change with n . Assume P_n is supported on $[-D_n, D_n]$ for some positive constant D_n also allowed to change with n . Then for any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{n,j_m(1)} - W_{n,1}] \leq 2 \frac{m}{n} D_n,$$

where $j_m(1)$ is the index of the m -th right NN of $W_{n,1}$ and is 1 if m -th right NN does not exist.

We then cite a result on the lower bound of the k -nearest neighbor distance without proof (although we consider the triangular array setting, the proof is the same).

Lemma A.4. *(Biau and Devroye, 2015, Theorem 4.1) Let $W_{n,1}, \dots, W_{n,n} \in \mathbb{R}$ be n independent copies from a probability measure with density f_n . Assume that $\{\|f_i\|_\infty\}_{i=1}^\infty$ are uniformly bounded by a universal constant C_0 . If $k/\log n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then with probability one, for all n large enough,*

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| W_{(k)}(x) - x \right| \geq C \frac{k}{n},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant only depending on C_0 , and $W_{(k)}(x)$ is the k -nearest neighbor of x among $\{W_{n,i}\}_{i=1}^n$.

Upper bound. To prove Lemma 6.3, we first consider the upper bound. Since T_4 depends on the discrepancy between X_1 and $X_{j_U(1)}$, and X has unbounded support, we first truncate it to two parts and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[T_4] = \mathbb{E} \left[T_4 \mathbf{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[T_4 \mathbf{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| > D_n \right) \right], \tag{A.14}$$

where we take $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$.

(1) For the second term on the righthand side of (A.14), noticing $|T_4|$ is bounded by 2, by Gaussian tail probability,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|T_4\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| > D_n\right)\right|\right] \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| > D_n\right) \leq 4n\exp(-D_n^2/2),$$

(2) For the first term on the righthand side of (A.14), we perform an analysis similar to that of Lemma 6.2. In detail, invoking Taylor expansion at y gives

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) &= F_Y(y) + f_Y(y)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right) + \frac{1}{2}f'_Y(y)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^2 + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}f''_Y(y_x)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^3, \\ F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) &= F_Y(y) + f_Y(y)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y\right) + \frac{1}{2}f'_Y(y)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y\right)^2 + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}f''_Y(y'_x)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y\right)^3, \end{aligned}$$

where y_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_1)/\sigma$, and y'_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)})/\sigma$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma}f_Y(y)(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\rho_n + \frac{1}{2\sigma}f'_Y(y)(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\left[2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right)y - \frac{1}{\sigma}(X_1 + X_{j_U(1)})\rho_n\right]\rho_n \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}f''_Y(y_x)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^3 - \frac{1}{6}f''_Y(y'_x)\left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y\right)^3. \end{aligned}$$

(2.1) We first consider the first term. Conditional on the event $\{\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\}$, $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ are still i.i.d, but with the probability measure $X \mid \{|X| \leq D_n\}$, which is supported on $[-D_n, D_n]$. Then from Lemma A.3, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma}f_Y(y)(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\rho_n\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma}f_Y(y)(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\rho_n \mid \max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right] \\ &\leq 2f_Y(y)\left[\frac{M}{n}D_n\rho_n\right]\frac{1}{\sigma} \\ &= 2f_Y(y)\left[\frac{M}{n}D_n\rho_n\right]\left[1 + \frac{1}{2}\rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

(2.2) For the second term, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{2\sigma}f'_Y(y)(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\left[2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right)y - \frac{1}{\sigma}(X_1 + X_{j_U(1)})\rho_n\right]\rho_n\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right|\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}f'_Y(y)\mathbb{E}\left[\left|(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\left[y\rho_n^2 - (X_1 + X_{j_U(1)})\rho_n\right]\rho_n\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right|\right](1 + o(1)) \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{2}\|f'_Y\|_\infty|y|\mathbb{E}\left[(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right]\rho_n^3\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \frac{1}{2}\|f'_Y\|_\infty\mathbb{E}\left[(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\left|X_1 + X_{j_U(1)}\right|\mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i\in\llbracket n\rrbracket}|X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right]\rho_n^2\right](1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left[\|f_Y'\|_\infty |y| \frac{M}{n} D_n \rho_n^3 + 2 \|f_Y'\|_\infty \frac{M}{n} D_n^2 \rho_n^2 \right] (1 + o(1)),$$

where the last step is due to that $|X_1 + X_{j_U(1)}| \leq 2D_n$ given the event $\{\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$ and Lemma A.3.

(2.3) For the third term, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, from (A.12),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{6} f_Y''(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y \right)^3 - \frac{1}{6} f_Y''(y'_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y \right)^3 \right| \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{6} \|f_Y''\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[\left(|y|^3 \rho_n^6 + 4|X_1|^3 \rho_n^3 + 4|X_{j_U(1)}|^3 \rho_n^3 \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] (1 + o(1)) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{6} \|f_Y''\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[\left(|y|^3 \rho_n^6 + 20|X_1|^3 \rho_n^3 + 16|X_{j_U(1)} - X_1|^3 \rho_n^3 \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] (1 + o(1)) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{6} \|f_Y''\|_\infty \left[|y|^3 \rho_n^6 + 20 \mathbb{E}[|X_1|^3] \rho_n^3 + 128 \frac{M}{n} D_n^3 \rho_n^3 \right] (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to Lemma A.3 and the fact that $|X_{j_U(1)} - X_1| \leq 2D_n$ given the event $\{\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$.

(2.4) Summarizing the above three steps, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[T_4 \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] \\ & = \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right] f_Y(y) dy \\ & \leq 2 \left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] f_Y^2(y) dy \right] \frac{M}{n} D_n \rho_n + o(\rho_n^2), \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

if $MD_n^3/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; recall we pick $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$ so that this is true as long as $M(\log n)^{3/2}/n \rightarrow 0$.

Lower bound. We then consider the lower bound. Let $f_X^{(n)}$ be the density of $X | \{|X| \leq D_n\}$. Since $D_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and f_X is bounded, it is true that $\{f_X^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^n$ is uniformly bounded by a universal constant.

Notice that conditional on the event $\{\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$, $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ are n independent copies from $f_X^{(n)}$. We then consider the probability measure of X_1 conditional on $[X_i]_{i=2}^n$, the event $\{\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$ and the event $\{j_m(1) \neq 1\}$. This probability measure depends on $[X_i]_{i=2}^n$, D_n , and m . For any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, conditional on $\{j_m(1) \neq 1\}$, we always have

$$X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(m)}(x) - x|,$$

where $X_{(m)}(x)$ is the m -nearest neighbor of x among $\{X_i\}_{i=2}^n$. We can then take expectation with respect to this probability measure and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_1} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| [X_i]_{i=2}^n, j_m(1) \neq 1, \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(m)}(x) - x|. \tag{A.16}$$

Then from Lemma A.4, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \left(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1 \right) \rho_n \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \rho_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \rho_n \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \rho_n \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{P} \left(j_m(1) \neq 1 \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| j_m(1) \neq 1, \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \rho_n \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \mathbb{P} \left(j_M(1) \neq 1 \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| j_m(1) \neq 1, \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1} = (X_2, \dots, X_n)$. Notice that from (A.16) and that the distance of m -NN is increasing with respect to m for any point,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| j_m(1) \neq 1, \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{X_1} \left[\left(X_{j_m(1)} - X_1 \right) \middle| [X_i]_{i=2}^n, j_m(1) \neq 1, \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \setminus \{1\}} |X_i| \leq D_n \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1}} \left[\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(m)}(x) - x| \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \setminus \{1\}} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor}^M \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1}} \left[\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(m)}(x) - x| \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \setminus \{1\}} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor}^M \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1}} \left[\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor)}(x) - x| \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \setminus \{1\}} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_{\setminus 1}} \left[\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |X_{(\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor)}(x) - x| \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \setminus \{1\}} |X_i| \leq D_n \right] \\
&\gtrsim \frac{M}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function and we apply Lemma A.4 by taking $k = \lfloor M/2 \rfloor$ since $M/\log n \rightarrow \infty$.

Notice that conditional on the event $\{\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$, $[X_i]_{i=1}^n$ are still i.i.d. Then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(j_M(1) \neq 1 \middle| \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) = 1 - \frac{M}{n}.$$

Then we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \left(X_{j_U(1)} - X_1 \right) \rho_n \mathbb{1} \left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gtrsim \frac{1}{\sigma} f_Y(y) \frac{M}{n} \rho_n \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right) \mathbb{P}\left(j_M(1) \neq 1 \mid \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right) \\
&\gtrsim f_Y(y) \frac{M}{n} \rho_n \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \rho_n^2 + o(\rho_n^2)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

since $\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right)$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(j_M(1) \neq 1 \mid \max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right)$ both converge to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Combining (A.15) and (A.17) implies

$$\frac{M}{n} \rho_n + o(\rho_n^2) \lesssim E[T_4] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} D_n \rho_n + n \exp(-D_n^2/2) + o(\rho_n^2).$$

Plugging $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$ in, we have

$$\frac{M}{n} \rho_n + o(\rho_n^2) \lesssim E[T_4] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{n^3}{M}\right)} \rho_n + \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2) \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2)$$

and thus complete the proof. \square

A.4.4 Proof of Lemma 6.4

Proof of Lemma 6.4. For T_5 , we have:

$$E[|T_5|] = E\left[|T_5| \mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right] + E\left[|T_5| \mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| > D_n\right)\right],$$

where we take $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$.

Noticing $|T_5|$ is bounded by 4 since the cumulative distribution function is bounded by 1, Gaussian tail probability yields

$$E\left[|T_5| \mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| > D_n\right)\right] \leq 4 \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| > D_n\right) \leq 8n \exp(-D_n^2/2).$$

Taylor expansion at y then gives

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) &= F_Y(y) + f_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right), \\
F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) &= F_Y(y) + f_Y(y'_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)}}{\sigma} - y\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where y_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_1)/\sigma$, and y'_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_{j_U(1)})/\sigma$.

Then for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| f_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right) f_Y(y'_x) \left(\frac{\rho_n}{\sigma} (X_{j_U(1)} - X_1)\right) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[|y| \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right) (X_{j_U(1)} - X_1) \rho_n + \frac{1}{\sigma} |X_1| (X_{j_U(1)} - X_1) \rho_n^2 \right] \\
&= \|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[\frac{1}{2} |y| (X_{j_U(1)} - X_1) \rho_n^3 + |X_1| (X_{j_U(1)} - X_1) \rho_n^2 \right] (1 + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[\left| \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_Y(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] \mathbb{1}\left(\max_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |X_i| \leq D_n\right) \right| \right] \\
&\leq \|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[|y| \frac{M}{n} D_n \rho_n^3 + 2 \frac{M}{n} D_n^2 \rho_n^2 \right] (1 + o(1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to Lemma A.3 and $|X_1| \leq D_n$ given the event $\{\max_{i \in [n]} |X_i| \leq D_n\}$.

Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|T_5| \mathbf{1}\left(\max_{i \in [n]} |X_i| \leq D_n\right)\right] \leq \|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[\mathbb{E}[|Y|] \frac{M}{n} D_n \rho_n^3 + 2 \frac{M}{n} D_n^2 \rho_n^2\right] (1 + o(1)) = o(\rho_n^2),$$

if $MD_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; given $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$, this is true as long as $M \log n/n \rightarrow 0$.

Since we take $D_n = \sqrt{2 \log(n^3/M)}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|T_5| \mathbf{1}\left(\max_{i \in [n]} |X_i| > D_n\right)\right] \leq 8n \exp(-D_n^2/2) \lesssim \frac{M}{n^2}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we have proved

$$\mathbb{E}[|T_5|] \lesssim \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2)$$

and thus complete the proof. \square

A.4.5 Proof of Lemma 6.5

Proof of Lemma 6.5. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_7] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right] \left[F_Y(y) + F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - 1\right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right]^2 f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right] \left[2F_Y(y) - 1\right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term,

$$F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_Y(y) = f_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right),$$

where y_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_1)/\sigma$. Together with (A.12),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right]^2 f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int 2\|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \left[\frac{1}{4}y^2 \rho_n^4 + X_1^2 \rho_n^2\right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] (1 + o(1)) \\ &= 2\|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \rho_n^2 \mathbb{E}\left[X_1^2 \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1)\right] (1 + o(1)) + o(\rho_n^2) \\ &\leq 2\|f_Y\|_\infty^2 \rho_n^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_1^4] \mathbb{P}(j_U(1) = 1)} (1 + o(1)) + o(\rho_n^2) = o(\rho_n^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is from Hölder's inequality and $\mathbb{P}(j_U(1) = 1) = o(1)$.

For the second term,

$$F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_Y(y) = f_Y(y) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right) + \frac{1}{2} f_Y'(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right)^2,$$

where y_x is between y and $(y - \rho_n X_1)/\sigma$.

Notice that

$$\int \left[2F_Y(y) - 1\right] f_Y^2(y) dy = 0.$$

Then together with (A.12),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[2F_Y(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left[f_Y(y) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y \right) + \frac{1}{2} f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y \right)^2 \right] \left[2F_Y(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1 \right) y f_Y(y) + \frac{1}{2} f'_Y(y_x) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y \right)^2 \right] \left[2F_Y(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int y \left[2F_Y(y) - 1 \right] f_Y^2(y) dy \right| \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1 \right) \mathbb{P}(j_U(1) = 1) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\|f'_Y\|_\infty \int \left[\frac{1}{4} y^2 \rho_n^4 + X_1^2 \rho_n^2 \right] \left[2F_Y(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbf{1}(j_U(1) = 1) \right] (1 + o(1)) = o(\rho_n^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is also from Hölder's inequality and $\mathbb{P}(j_U(1) = 1) = o(1)$. This shows $|E[T_7]| = o(\rho_n^2)$. \square

A.4.6 Proof of Lemma 6.6

Proof of Lemma 6.6.

The first term. Conditional on \mathbf{X} , if $j_m(i) \neq i$,

$$\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbf{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}).$$

If $j_m(i) = i$, then

$$\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}(Y_k \leq Y_i).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbf{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}(Y_k \leq Y_i) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right] \\
&= (n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \right] \\
&\quad + (n-2)(n-3) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbf{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \right] \\
&\quad + (n-1) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right] \\
&\quad + (n-1)(n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbf{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbf{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right] \\
&= (n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
&\quad + (n-2)(n-3) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbf{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right] \\
& + 2(n-2) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \right], \quad (\text{A.18})
\end{aligned}$$

where Y, \tilde{Y} are two independent random variables from F_Y and are both independent with \mathbf{X} .

Notice that the sum of the third and the fourth term in (A.18) is dominated by $(2n-3)\mathbb{P}(j_m(i) = i)$ since the variance and the covariance of indicator functions are bounded by 1. Then the sum is $O(M/n) = o(n)$ since $M/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since the first term is of order n and the second term is of order n^2 , then it suffices to consider the second term.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\max\{Y, \tilde{Y}\} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in the same way as (6.6), where we take $U = m$, and analogous to (6.10), we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\max\{Y, \tilde{Y}\} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{6} \right| \lesssim r_n, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $1/6$ is from the fact that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max\{Y_1, Y_2\} \leq \min\{Y_3, Y_4\} \right) = \frac{1}{6},$$

for four independent copies Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4 from F_Y .

Similar to (6.6), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_1, Y_{j_m(1)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] = \sum_{s=1}^7 T_{m,s}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where $T_{m,s}$ corresponds to T_s in (6.6) for any $s \in \llbracket 7 \rrbracket$, while replacing U by m .

It is easy to check that $[T_{m,s}]_{s=1}^7$ also satisfies (6.7), (6.8), Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3, Lemma 6.4, (6.9), Lemma 6.5 for any $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$.

We then establish the following lemma.

Lemma A.5. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s=2}^7 T_{m,s} \right)^2 \right] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n} + \rho_n^2.$$

From (A.20) and the independence of Y and \tilde{Y} ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s=1}^7 T_{m,s} \right)^2 \right].$$

Since $T_{m,1} = 1/3$ for any \mathbf{X} , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{9} + \frac{2}{3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=2}^7 T_{m,s} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s=2}^7 T_{m,s} \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From (6.10) and Lemma A.5,

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{9} \right| \lesssim r_n. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Combine (A.19) and (A.21),

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{18} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then from (A.18),

$$\left| \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{18} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

The second term. Analogous to (A.18), for $m \neq m'$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) \neq i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) \neq i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) = i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) = i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_{m'}(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) \neq i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_{m'}(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) \neq i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) = i) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(i) = i) \right] \\ &= (n-3)(n-4) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + O(n), \end{aligned}$$

where $(n-3)(n-4)$ is from the fact that the number of pairs (k, k') such that $k, k' \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, k \neq k'$ and $k, k' \neq i, j_m(i), j_{m'}(i)$ given events $\{j_m(i) \neq i\}$ and $\{j_{m'}(i) \neq i\}$ is $(n-3)(n-4)$. $O(n)$ corresponds to the first term and the last two terms in (A.18) since the coefficients are of order at most n .

Analogous to (A.19),

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{2}{15} \right| \lesssim r_n,$$

where $2/15$ is from the fact that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_3, Y_4\}, Y_2 \leq \min\{Y_3, Y_5\} \right) = \frac{2}{15},$$

for five independent copies Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5 from F_Y .

Analogous to (A.21),

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{9} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_{m'}(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then for any $m \neq m' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_i, R_{j_{m'}(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

The third term. Analogous to (A.18), for any $i \neq l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m, m' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \right] \\ = & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l, k \neq j_{m'}(l)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \right] \\ = & (n-3)(n-4) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \right] \\ & + (n-2)(n-3) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \right] \\ & + (n-3) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \right] \\ & + (n-3) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \Big] \\
& + (n-3) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y_{j_{m'}(l)} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \Big] \\
& + (n-2) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \Big] \\
& + (n-2) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \Big] + O(1) \\
& = (n-3)(n-4) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \Big] \\
& + (n-2)(n-3) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \Big] + O(1). \\
& = (n-3)(n-4) \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \Big] + O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

In the above derivation the term $(n-3)(n-4)$ is due to that the number of pairs (k, k') such that $k, k' \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, k \neq k'$ and $k, k' \neq i, j_m(i), l, j_{m'}(l)$ given events $\{j_m(i) = l\} \cup \{j_{m'}(l) \neq l\}$ is $(n-3)(n-4)$. The term $(n-2)(n-3)$ is calculated in the same way. The last two steps are from the fact that $P(j_m(i) = l)$ is of order n^{-1} .

Since l is an arbitrary index such that $l \neq i$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \Big] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \Big] \\
& = \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \Big] \\
& = \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbb{E} \Big[\text{Cov} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] + O\left(\frac{M}{n^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $P(j_m(i) = i)$ is of order M/n .

The fourth term. This is the same as the third term and accordingly omitted.

The fifth term. Analogous to (A.19),

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \Big[\mathbb{E} \Big[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \Big] \Big| \mathbf{X} \Big] \right] - \frac{2}{15} \Big| \lesssim r_n,$$

where $2/15$ is from the fact that

$$P\left(Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_3, Y_4\}, Y_2 \leq \min\{Y_3, Y_5\}\right) = \frac{2}{15},$$

for five independent copies Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5 from F_Y .

Analogous to (A.21),

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{9} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_{j_m(i)}, Y_{j_{m'}(j_m(i))}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then for any $i \neq l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = l) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

We can establish in the same way that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = i) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n,$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l)) \right] - \frac{1}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

The sixth term. Analogous to (A.18),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] \\ = & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l, k \neq j_{m'}(l)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \Big] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l, k \neq j_{m'}(l)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l) \Big] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j_m(i)} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \Big] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \sum_{k \neq l} \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i) \mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l) \Big] \\ = & (n-4) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \Big] \\ & + (n-4) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \Big] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_{j_m(i)} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y_l \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y_{j_{m'}(l)} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)(n-5)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + n(1+o(1))\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i)\mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) \neq l)\right] \\
& + n(1+o(1))\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i)\mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l)\right] \\
& + n(1+o(1))\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(\tilde{Y} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) = i)\mathbb{1}(j_{m'}(l) = l)\right] + O(1) \\
& = (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_{j_m(i)} \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y_l \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] \\
& + (n-4)\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Cov}\left[\mathbb{1}(Y_{j_{m'}(l)} \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l))\right] + O(1), \tag{A.22}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first $n-4$ is from the fact that the number of $k \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ such that $k \neq i, j_m(i), l, j_{m'}(l)$ given events $\{j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)\}$ is $n-4$. Other four are in the same way. The last equation is from the fact that $Y, Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}, \tilde{Y}, Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}$ are mutually independent given events

$\{j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)\}$.

We first consider the first term in (A.22). Since $P(\{j_m(i) = l\} \cup \{j_{m'}(l) = i\} \cup \{j_m(i) = j_{m'}(l)\})$ is of order n^{-1} , then

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] \\ &= E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to (A.19),

$$\left| E \left[E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{5} \right| \lesssim r_n,$$

where $1/5$ is from the fact that

$$P(Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_2, Y_3\}, Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_4, Y_5\}) = \frac{1}{5},$$

for five independent copies Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5 from F_Y .

Analogous to (A.21),

$$\left| E \left[E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{9} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then

$$\left| E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{4}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

For the second term in (A.22), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] \\ &= E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to (A.19),

$$\left| E \left[E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{15} \right| \lesssim r_n,$$

where $1/15$ is from the fact that

$$P(Y_1 \leq \min\{Y_2, Y_3\}, Y_2 \leq \min\{Y_4, Y_5\}) = \frac{1}{15},$$

for five independent copies Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, Y_5 from F_Y .

Analogous to (A.21),

$$\left| E \left[E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] E \left[\mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] - \frac{1}{9} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

Then

$$\left| E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + \frac{2}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n.$$

We can establish in the same way that

$$\left| E \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + \frac{2}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + \frac{2}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n \\ & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}), \mathbb{1}(Y_i \leq \min\{Y_l, Y_{j_{m'}(l)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] + \frac{2}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then from (A.22), for any $i \neq l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Cov} \left[\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\}, \min\{R_l, R_{j_{m'}(l)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq l, j_{m'}(l) \neq i, j_m(i) \neq j_{m'}(l)) \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{4}{45} \right| \lesssim r_n. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

A.4.7 Proof of Lemma 6.7

Proof of Lemma 6.7. From (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] &= \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[-2 + \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_{j_m(i)}, R_i\}}{(n+1)[nM + M(M+1)/4]} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] \\ &= \frac{36}{(n+1)^2 [nM + M(M+1)/4]^2} \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}),$$

we obtain

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] = \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right].$$

To apply Efron-Stein inequality (Theorem 3.1 in Boucheron et al. (2013)), we consider $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and for any $\ell \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$\mathbf{X}_\ell = (X_1, \dots, X_{\ell-1}, \tilde{X}_\ell, X_{\ell+1}, \dots, X_n),$$

where $\{\tilde{X}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^n$ are independent copies of $\{X_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^n$.

We fix $\ell \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$. For any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, denote the m th right nearest neighbor of i in samples \mathbf{X} by $j_m(i)$ and in samples \mathbf{X}_ℓ by $\tilde{j}_m(i)$. Define $A_M(i) := \{j : j_m(j) = i \text{ for some } m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket\}$ in samples \mathbf{X} and $\tilde{A}_M(i) := \{j : \tilde{j}_m(j) = i \text{ for some } m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket\}$ in samples \mathbf{X}_ℓ .

For any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, we consider

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right].$$

If $i = \ell$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_\ell, Y_{j_m(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_\ell, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right].$$

If $i \in A_M(\ell) \setminus \tilde{A}_M(\ell)$ and $i \neq \ell$, then ℓ is one of the M right nearest neighbors of i in samples \mathbf{X} , and is not one of the M right nearest neighbors of i when we replace X_ℓ by \tilde{X}_ℓ . Since the values of other data points except for the ℓ -th remain unchanged, the change in the M right nearest neighbors of i is simply removing ℓ and introducing new $\tilde{j}_M(\ell)$. Also notice that the conditional distribution of Y_ℓ conditional on \mathbf{X} and that conditional on \mathbf{X}_ℓ is different. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_M(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \setminus A_M(\ell)$ and $i \neq \ell$, then in the same way,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_M(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \cap A_M(\ell)$ and $i \neq \ell$, then the M right nearest neighbors of i remain unchanged but the conditional distribution of Y_ℓ changes. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $i \notin \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \cup A_M(\ell)$ and $i \neq \ell$, then the M right nearest neighbors of i remain unchanged and do not contain ℓ . Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right].$$

Let

$$T = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right]$$

and $T^\ell = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right].$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} T - T^\ell &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_\ell, Y_{j_m(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_\ell, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in A_M(\ell) \setminus \tilde{A}_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in A_M(\ell) \setminus \tilde{A}_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_M(\ell)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \setminus A_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_M(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \setminus A_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \cap A_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i=1, i \neq \ell \\ i \in \tilde{A}_M(\ell) \cap A_M(\ell)}}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq \ell}^n \mathbb{1}(Y_k \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_\ell\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{j_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}(Y_\ell \leq \min\{Y_i, Y_{\tilde{j}_m(i)}\}) \mid \mathbf{X}_\ell \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of $A_M(\ell)$ and $\tilde{A}_M(\ell)$, for any given \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{X}_ℓ , we have $|A_M(\ell) \setminus \{\ell\}| \leq M$ and $|\tilde{A}_M(\ell) \setminus \{\ell\}| \leq M$ since ℓ can be the M right nearest neighbors of at most M units. Then for each term above, the number of indicator functions in the sum is of order nM . Then after subtracting $1/3$ for each indicator function, we apply Lemma A.5 and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

and then

$$\mathbb{E}[(T - T^\ell)^2] \lesssim n^2 M^2 \left(\frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n + \rho_n^2} \right),$$

where the constant on the righthand side does not depend on ℓ .

Then from Efron-Stein inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M \min\{R_i, R_{j_m(i)}\} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right] &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(T - T^\ell)^2] \\ &\lesssim n^3 M^2 \left(\frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n + \rho_n^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,M} \mid \mathbf{X}] \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{M}{n} + \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n \rho_n + \rho_n^2} \right)$$

and thus finish the proof. \square

A.5 Proofs of results in the appendix

A.5.1 Proof of Lemma A.1

Proof of Lemma A.1. In the following proof we remove the superscript U for notation simplicity. Notice that for any $i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $i \neq j$,

$$R_i = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{1}(U_k \leq U_i), \quad \min\{R_i, R_j\} = 1 + \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq j} \mathbb{1}(U_k \leq \min\{U_i, U_j\}).$$

From simple calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), U_1] &= \frac{1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), U_2] = -\frac{1}{12}, \quad \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = 0, \\ \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), \min\{U_2, U_3\}] &= -\frac{1}{24}, \quad \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_1 \leq U_2), \min\{U_2, U_3\}] = \frac{1}{24}, \\ \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_3, U_4\}] &= -\frac{2}{45}, \quad \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{1}{18}, \\ \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_3\}] &= -\frac{1}{36}, \quad \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_4\}] = \frac{1}{45}. \end{aligned}$$

(1) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, U_1]$, we have

$$\text{Cov}[R_1, U_1] = (n-1) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), U_1] = \frac{n-1}{12}.$$

(2) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, U_2]$, we have

$$\text{Cov}[R_1, U_2] = \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), U_2] + (n-2) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq U_1), U_2] = -\frac{1}{12}.$$

(3) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{U_2, U_3\}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{U_2, U_3\}] \\ &= 2 \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), \min\{U_2, U_3\}] + (n-3) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_4 \leq U_1), \min\{U_2, U_3\}] = -\frac{1}{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(4) For $\text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{U_1, U_2\}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}[R_1, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] \\ &= \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_2 \leq U_1), \min\{U_1, U_2\}] + (n-2) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq U_1), \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{n-2}{24}. \end{aligned}$$

(5) For $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_3, U_4\}] \\ &= 2 \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_3, U_4\}] + (n-4) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_5 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_3, U_4\}] \\ &= -\frac{4}{45}. \end{aligned}$$

(6) For $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_3\}] \\ &= \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_3\}] + (n-3) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_4\}] \\ &= \frac{4n-17}{180}. \end{aligned}$$

(7) For $\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_2\}]$, we have

$$\text{Cov}[\min\{R_1, R_2\}, \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = (n-2) \text{Cov}[\mathbb{1}(U_3 \leq \min\{U_1, U_2\}), \min\{U_1, U_2\}] = \frac{n-2}{18}.$$

The whole proof is thus complete. \square

A.5.2 Proof of Lemma A.3

Proof of Lemma A.3. We first define $L_i := W_{n,j_m(i)} - W_{n,i}$. Let $\ell_i := W_{n,j_1(i)} - W_{n,i}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &= W_{n,j_m(i)} - W_{n,i} \\ &= [W_{n,j_m(i)} - W_{n,i}] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \\ &= \left[\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (W_{n,j_{k+1}(i)} - W_{n,j_k(i)}) \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \\ &= \left[\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{j_k(i)} \right] \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{j_k(i)} \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i), \end{aligned}$$

where we take $j_0(i) = i$ for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$. We then have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n L_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{j_k(i)} \mathbb{1}(j_m(i) \neq i).$$

For any $j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, the number of $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ such that $j_m(i) \neq i$ and $j = j_k(i)$ for some $k \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$ can be at most $m-1$. Then ℓ_i can appear at most m times in $\sum_{l=1}^n L_l$ for any $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, implying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n L_i \leq m \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i.$$

Let $I_i := [W_{n,i}, W_{n,j_1(i)})$ and $I_i := \emptyset$ if $j_1(i) = i$. Then $[I_i]_{i=1}^n$ are disjoint and I_i has length ℓ_i . Since by assumption $[W_{n,i}]_{i=1}^n \subseteq [-D_n, D_n]$, $\bigcup_{i=1}^n I_i \subseteq [-D_n, D_n]$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n L_i \leq m \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i \leq 2D_n m.$$

To finish the proof, noticing that the fact $[W_{n,i}]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. yields that $[L_i]_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d.,

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{n,j_m(1)} - W_{n,1}] = \mathbb{E}[L_1] \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n L_i\right] \leq 2\frac{m}{n} D_n,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

A.5.3 Proof of Lemma A.5

Proof of Lemma A.5. Since

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{s=2}^7 T_{m,s}\right)^2\right] \leq 6 \sum_{s=2}^7 \mathbb{E}[T_{m,s}^2],$$

then it suffices to consider the upper bound of each term separately.

(1) For $T_{m,2}$, from Taylor's expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_{m,2}^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right] f_Y(y) dy\right]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] f_Y(y) \left(\frac{y - \rho_n X_1}{\sigma} - y\right) f_Y(y) dy\right]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|f_Y\|_\infty \int \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] f_Y(y) dy \left(\frac{1}{2}|y|\rho_n^2 + |X_1|\rho_n\right) (1 + o(1))\right]^2 \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{2}\|f_Y\|_\infty \int y^2 \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] f_Y(y) dy\right]^2 \rho_n^4 \\ &\quad + 2\left[\|f_Y\|_\infty \int \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] f_Y(y) dy\right]^2 \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] \rho_n^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &\lesssim \rho_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

(2) For $T_{m,3}$,

$$T_{m,3} = \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y)\right]^2 f_Y(y) dy.$$

Then $0 \leq T_{m,3} \leq 1$. From Lemma 6.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{m,3}^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[T_{m,3}] \lesssim \rho_n^2.$$

(3) For $T_{m,4}$,

$$T_{m,4} = \int \left[1 - F_Y(y)\right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_m(1)}}(y)\right] f_Y(y) dy.$$

Then $0 \leq T_{m,4} \leq 1$. From Lemma 6.3,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{m,4}^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[T_{m,4}] \lesssim \frac{M}{n} \sqrt{\log n} \rho_n + \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2).$$

(4) For $T_{m,5}$,

$$T_{m,5} = \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - F_{Y|X=X_{j_U(1)}}(y) \right] f_Y(y) dy.$$

Then $|T_{m,5}| \leq 1$. From Lemma 6.4,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{m,5}^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|T_{m,5}|] = \frac{M}{n^2} + o(\rho_n^2).$$

(5) For $T_{m,6}$,

$$T_{m,6} = \int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] F_Y(y) f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1}(j_m(1) = 1)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{m,6}^2] = \left[\int \left[1 - F_Y(y) \right] F_Y(y) f_Y(y) dy \right]^2 \mathbb{P}(j_m(1) = 1) \lesssim \frac{M}{n}.$$

(6) For $T_{m,7}$,

$$T_{m,7} = \int \left[F_Y(y) - F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) \right] \left[F_Y(y) + F_{Y|X=X_1}(y) - 1 \right] f_Y(y) dy \mathbb{1}(j_U(1) = 1).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{m,7}^2] \leq \mathbb{P}(j_m(1) = 1) \lesssim \frac{M}{n}.$$

Putting them together completes the proof. \square

References

- Auddy, A., Deb, N., and Nandy, S. (2021). Exact detection thresholds for Chatterjee's correlation. Available at [arXiv:2104.15140v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.15140v1).
- Azadkia, M. and Chatterjee, S. (2021+). A simple measure of conditional dependence. *Ann. Statist.* (in press).
- Bergsma, W. and Dassios, A. (2014). A consistent test of independence based on a sign covariance related to Kendall's tau. *Bernoulli*, 20(2):1006–1028.
- Berrett, T. B. and Samworth, R. J. (2019). Nonparametric independence testing via mutual information. *Biometrika*, 106(3):547–566.
- Berrett, T. B., Samworth, R. J., and Yuan, M. (2019). Efficient multivariate entropy estimation via k -nearest neighbour distances. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(1):288–318.
- Bhattacharya, B. B. (2019). A general asymptotic framework for distribution-free graph-based two-sample tests. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 81(3):575–602.
- Biau, G. and Devroye, L. (2015). *Lectures on the nearest neighbor method*. Springer Series in the Data Sciences. Springer, Cham.
- Blomqvist, N. (1950). On a measure of dependence between two random variables. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 21(4):593–600.

- Blum, J. R., Kiefer, J., and Rosenblatt, M. (1961). Distribution free tests of independence based on the sample distribution function. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 32(2):485–498.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press.
- Cao, S. and Bickel, P. J. (2020). Correlations with tailored extremal properties. Available at [arXiv:2008.10177v2](#).
- Chatterjee, S. (2008). A new method of normal approximation. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(4):1584–1610.
- Chatterjee, S. (2021+). A new coefficient of correlation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* (in press).
- Deb, N., Ghosal, P., and Sen, B. (2020). Measuring association on topological spaces using kernels and geometric graphs. Available at [arXiv:2010.01768v2](#).
- Dette, H., Siburg, K. F., and Stoimenov, P. A. (2013). A copula-based non-parametric measure of regression dependence. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 40(1):21–41.
- Dhar, S. S., Dassios, A., and Bergsma, W. (2016). A study of the power and robustness of a new test for independence against contiguous alternatives. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 10(1):330–351.
- Drton, M., Han, F., and Shi, H. (2020). High-dimensional consistent independence testing with maxima of rank correlations. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(6):3206–3227.
- Friedman, J. H. and Rafsky, L. C. (1979). Multivariate generalizations of the Wald-Wolfowitz and Smirnov two-sample tests. *Ann. Statist.*, 7(4):697–717.
- Gini, C. (1914). *L'ammontare e la composizione della ricchezza delle nazioni*, volume 62. Fratelli Bocca.
- Hájek, J., Šidák, Z., and Sen, P. K. (1999). *Theory of Rank Tests* (2nd ed.). Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA.
- Han, F., Chen, S., and Liu, H. (2017a). Distribution-free tests of independence in high dimensions. *Biometrika*, 104(4):813–828.
- Han, F., Chen, S., and Liu, H. (2017b). Supplement to “distribution-free tests of independence in high dimensions”. *Biometrika*.
- Henze, N. (1988). A multivariate two-sample test based on the number of nearest neighbor type coincidences. *Ann. Statist.*, 16(2):772–783.
- Henze, N. and Penrose, M. D. (1999). On the multivariate runs test. *Ann. Statist.*, 27(1):290–298.
- Hoeffding, W. (1948). A non-parametric test of independence. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 19(4):546–557.
- Hoeffding, W. (1952). The large-sample power of tests based on permutations of observations. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 23(2):169–192.

- Isaac, R. (1979). Markov-dependent σ -fields and conditional expectations. *Ann. Probab.*, 7(6):1088–1091.
- Josse, J. and Holmes, S. (2016). Measuring multivariate association and beyond. *Statistics surveys*, 10:132.
- Kendall, M. G. (1938). A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1/2):81–93.
- Konijn, H. S. (1956). On the power of certain tests for independence in bivariate populations. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 27(2):300–323.
- Lehmann, E. L. and Romano, J. P. (2005). *Testing statistical hypotheses* (3rd ed.). Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- Liu, R. Y. and Singh, K. (1993). A quality index based on data depth and multivariate rank tests. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 88(421):252–260.
- Maathuis, M., Drton, M., Lauritzen, S., and Wainwright, M., editors (2019). *Handbook of graphical models*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Handbooks of Modern Statistical Methods. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Patterson, R. F. and Taylor, R. L. (1985). Strong laws of large numbers for triangular arrays of exchangeable random variables. *Stochastic Anal. Appl.*, 3(2):171–187.
- Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- Shi, H., Drton, M., and Han, F. (2021a). On Azadkia-Chatterjee’s conditional dependence coefficient. Technical report, Department of Statistics, University of Washington.
- Shi, H., Drton, M., and Han, F. (2021+b). On the power of Chatterjee’s rank correlation. *Biometrika*. (in press).
- Shi, H., Hallin, M., Drton, M., and Han, F. (2020). On universally consistent and fully distribution-free rank tests of vector independence. Available at [arXiv:2007.02186v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.02186v2).
- Spearman, C. (1904). The proof and measurement of association between two things. *Amer. J. Psychol.*, 15(1):72–101.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Wald, A. and Wolfowitz, J. (1940). On a test whether two samples are from the same population. *Ann. Math. Statistics*, 11:147–162.
- Weihs, L., Drton, M., and Meinshausen, N. (2018). Symmetric rank covariances: a generalized framework for nonparametric measures of dependence. *Biometrika*, 105(3):547–562.
- Yanagimoto, T. (1970). On measures of association and a related problem. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 22(1):57–63.