

Almost opposite regression dependence in bivariate distributions

Karl Friedrich Siburg

Preprint 2013-16

Dezember 2013

provided by Eldorado

Fakultät für Mathematik Technische Universität Dortmund Vogelpothsweg 87 44227 Dortmund

tu-dortmund.de/MathPreprints

Almost opposite regression dependence in bivariate distributions

Karl Friedrich Siburg Fakultät für Mathematik Technische Universität Dortmund Vogelpothsweg 87 44227 Dortmund Germany

Pavel A. Stoimenov International Energy Company Vienna Austria

December 9, 2013

Abstract

Let *X*, *Y* be two continuous random variables. Investigating the regression dependence of *Y* on *X*, respectively, of *X* on *Y*, we show that the two of them can have almost opposite behavior. Indeed, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we construct a bivariate random vector (X, Y) such that the respective regression dependence measures $r_{2|1}(X,Y), r_{1|2}(X,Y) \in [0,1]$ introduced in Dette et al. (2013) satisfy $r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 1$ as well as $r_{1|2}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$.

1 Introduction and results

Recently, Dette et al. (2013) presented a new approach to the problem of ordering and measuring regression dependence in the bivariate case. Let (X, Y) be a bivariate random vector. Since regression dependence is a directional relationship, it is first necessary to specify the direction of interest. Without loss of generality, consider the dependence of *Y* on *X*. The fundamental idea behind regression is predictability – the more predictable *Y* is from *X*, the more regression dependent they are. It is straightforward to single out the two extreme cases: independence and almost sure functional dependence, when there exists a Borel measurable function *g* such that Y = g(X) with probability one (Lancaster, 1963). In the former case, *X* provides no information about *Y*, whereas in the latter case there is perfect predictability of *Y* from *X*.

Apart from the two extreme cases, however, there exists a variety of intermediate ones with a certain degree of regression dependence. In order to measure the strength of dependence of *Y* on *X*, Dette et al. (2013) defined a nonparametric measure of regression dependence, $r_{2|1}(X,Y) \in [0,1]$. Beside being monotone in a regression dependence order, the measure takes on its extreme values precisely at independence and almost sure functional dependence, respectively, i.e., we have

(i) $r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 1$ if and only if *Y* is a.s. a Borel function of *X*.

(ii) $r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 0$ if and only if *X* and *Y* are independent.

Analogously, one can define a measure $r_{1|2}(X,Y) = r_{2|1}(Y,X)$ measuring the degree of dependence of *X* on *Y*.

We point out that it is important to have equivalences in both of the properties (i) and (ii), because only then the value $r_{2|1}(X,Y)$ can serve as a genuine measure of how much *Y* is dependent on *X*. Indeed, if we only had $r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 0$ if (but not only if) *X* and *Y* are independent, then an assertion like $r_{2|1}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$ would not imply that *Y* is 'almost independent' from *X*.

The following is the main result of the present paper.

Theorem 1. For any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a random vector (X, Y) such that

the following assertions hold:

- 1. $r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 1$, i.e., Y is a.s. a Borel function of X.
- 2. $r_{1|2}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give a quick review of the construction in Dette et al. (2013) of the nonparametric measure $r_{2|1}$ of regression dependence. Section 3 then contains the proof of Theorem 1, and relates this result to other problems in the literature.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall the basic notion of copula and the definition of the nonparametric measure of regression dependence introduced in Dette et al. (2013). A (two-dimensional) copula is a function $C: I^2 \to I$ with I := [0, 1], satisfying the following conditions:

- 1. C(x,0) = C(0,y) = 0 for all $x, y \in I$
- 2. C(x, 1) = x and C(1, y) = y for all $x, y \in I$
- C is 2-increasing, i.e., C(x₂,y₂) − C(x₂,y₁) − C(x₁,y₂) + C(x₁,y₁) ≥ 0 for all rectangles [x₁,x₂] × [y₁,y₂] ⊂ I².

These conditions imply further key properties. A copula is Lipschitz continuous and increasing in each argument; therefore, its partial derivatives exist a.e. on I^2 . We refer the reader to Nelsen (2006) for more information about copulas.

Given two continuous random variables X and Y with corresponding copula C, the measure of regression dependence $r_{2|1}(X,Y)$ introduced in Dette et al. (2013) is defined by

$$r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 6 \|\partial_1 C\|_2^2 - 2 = 6 \int_{I^2} |\partial_1 C(x,y)|^2 d(x,y) - 2$$
(1)

where ∂_1 denotes the partial derivative with respect to the first variable and $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the L^2 -norm on I^2 . The quantity $r_{2|1}$ measures the degree of dependence of *Y* on *X*. It is a measure of regression dependence with respect to two natural regression dependence orders, also introduced in Dette et al. (2013).

Analogously, one can define a measure

$$r_{1|2}(X,Y) = 6 \|\partial_2 C\|_2^2 - 2 = r_{2|1}(Y,X)$$

such that this quantity measures the degree of dependence of X on Y.

3 Two proofs of Theorem 1

In this section, we will construct two sequences (X_n, Y_n) of bivariate random vectors such that

$$r_{2|1}(X_n, Y_n) = 1 \text{ for all } n, \tag{2}$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} r_{1|2}(X_n, Y_n) = 0.$$
(3)

This proves Theorem 1. In fact, we will construct sequences of copulas C_n rather than the random variables themselves. This is sufficient because the measures $r_{2|1}$ and $r_{1|2}$ depend only on the corresponding copula. For the construction of these copulas, we use the so-called gluing method developed in Siburg and Stoimenov (2008a). For the convenience of the reader, we quickly recall its definition.

Given two copulas C_1, C_2 and a parameter $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we define the function

$$(C_1 \circledast_{x=\theta} C_2)(x, y) = \begin{cases} \theta C_1\left(\frac{x}{\theta}, y\right) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \theta\\ (1-\theta)C_2\left(\frac{x-\theta}{1-\theta}, y\right) + \theta y & \text{if } \theta \le x \le 1 \end{cases}$$
(4)

Thus, $C_1 \circledast_{x=\theta} C_2$ corresponds to gluing the two copulas C_1 and C_2 : it equals C_1 , rescaled and fit into the rectangle $[0, \theta] \times I$, and equals $C_2 + \theta y$, rescaled



Figure 1: The support of the singular copula C in Example 1

and fit into $[\theta, 1] \times I$. It is shown in Siburg and Stoimenov (2008a) that the gluing process yields a copula again, i.e., $C_1 \circledast_{x=\theta} C_2$ is a copula for any parameter θ . For later purposes, we need also the gradient of the resulting copula which is given by

$$\nabla(C_1 \circledast_{x=\theta} C_2)(x, y) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial x} \left(\frac{x}{\theta}, y\right), \theta \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial y} \left(\frac{x}{\theta}, y\right)\right) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \theta \\ \\ \left(\frac{\partial C_2}{\partial x} \left(\frac{x-\theta}{1-\theta}, y\right), (1-\theta) \frac{\partial C_2}{\partial y} \left(\frac{x-\theta}{1-\theta}, y\right) + \theta\right) & \text{if } \theta \le x \le 1 \end{cases}$$
(5)

Let us first illustrate the glueing construction with a fundamental example. Recall that a copula *C* is called singular if its density $\partial^2 C / \partial x \partial y$ vanishes almost everywhere in I^2 . Moreover, the support of a copula *C* is defined as the complement of the union of all (relatively) open subsets of I^2 whose measure, induced by *C*, is zero. We refer to Nelsen (2006) for more details.

Example 1. Let $\theta \in (0,1)$, and suppose that the probability θ is uniformly distributed along the line segment joining (0,0) and $(\theta,1)$, and the probability $1 - \theta$ is uniformly distributed along the segment between $(\theta,1)$ and

(1,0). Consider the resulting singular copula C_{θ} whose support consists of these two line segments; see Figure 1. It follows (see (Nelsen, 2006, Ex. 3.3)) that

$$C_{\theta}(x,y) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \le \theta y \\ \theta y & \text{if } \theta y < x < 1 - (1 - \theta)y \\ x + y - 1 & \text{if } 1 - (1 - \theta)y \le x. \end{cases}$$

Note that C_{θ} can be written as the gluing

$$C_{\theta} = C^+ \circledast_{x=\theta} C^-$$

where $C^+(x,y) = \min(x,y)$ and $C^-(x,y) = \max(x+y-1,0)$ are the upper and lower Fréchet-Hoeffding bound, respectively.

Since the support of C_{θ} is a graph over the *x*-axis, this copula links random variables *X* and *Y* where *Y* is completely dependent on *X*. This follows from Dette et al. (2013, Prop. 1) and the fact that a function is Borel measurable if and only if its graph is Borel measurable and has probability one (Buckley, 1974). On the other hand, *X* is not completely dependent on *Y* because the support of C_{θ} is not a graph over the *y*-axis.

This example will serve as a fundamental building block for our final construction of copulas C_n satisfying (2) and (3).

First proof of Theorem 1. We start with the copula $C^+ \circledast_{x=\theta} C^-$ from Example 1 where, in order to simplify calculations, we set $\theta = 1/2$. Then we define C_n inductively by

$$C_1 = C^+ \circledast_{x=1/2} C^-$$
$$C_{n+1} = C_n \circledast_{x=1/2} C_n$$

for $n \ge 1$. We claim that

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_1 C_n(x, y)|^2 d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}$$
(6)



Figure 2: The gradient of the copula C_3 in the first proof of Theorem 1

for all $n \ge 1$, as well as

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_2 C_n(x, y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x, y) \to \frac{1}{3}$$
(7)

as $n \to \infty$. These relations imply that

$$r_{2|1}(X,Y) = 6 \int_{I^2} |\partial_1 C_n(x,y)|^2 d(x,y) - 2 = 1$$

for all *n*, as well as

$$r_{1|2}(X,Y) = 6 \int_{I^2} |\partial_2 C_n(x,y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x,y) - 2 \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, which are precisely the assertions (2) and (3) that we wanted to prove.

For the proof of (6) and (7), we have to calculate the gradient ∇C_n . Using (5) and the fact that $1 - \theta = \theta = 1/2$, we see that $\partial C_n/\partial x = 1$ in the upper and $\partial C_n/\partial x = 0$ in the lower triangles formed by the line segments of the support of C_n , and the second component $\partial C_n/\partial y$ takes the values $0, 1/2^n, 2/2^n, \dots, (2^n - 1)/2^n, 1$ respectively; see Figure 2 for the case n = 3.

Since the gradient of C_n is constant on each triangle, the integration reduces to multiplying the square of the respective constant with the area of

the corresponding triangle. Thus, considering the first component of the gradient, we obtain

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_1 C_n(x,y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}$$

for each $n \ge 1$, proving (6).

The integral for the second component amounts to

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_2 C_n(x,y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x,y) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{2^n-1} \left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2^n}\right] + 1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$$

where the last term stems from the triangle containing the vertex (1,1) which is just half as big as the other ones. Using the formula

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} i^2 = k^3/3 + \mathcal{O}(k^2)$$

we conclude that

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_2 C_n(x,y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} + \left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)^3 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{2^n-1} i^2 = \frac{1}{3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)$$

as $n \to \infty$, proving also our claim (7).

We conclude this section with a second proof of Theorem 1 where we use an even simpler building block than in the previous one.

Second proof of Theorem 1. Choosing C^+ as a building block instead of $C^+ \circledast_{x=1/2}$ C^- , we consider the copulas

$$C_1 = C^+$$
$$C_{n+1} = C_n \circledast_{x=1/2} C_n$$

for $n \ge 1$. We claim that both (6) and (7) hold also for this choice of copula C_n .

Setting $\theta = 1/2$ in (5), one sees that $\partial_1 C_n$ takes the values 0 and 1, each in 2^{n-1} triangles of area $1/2^n$; compare Figure 3 indicating the gradient of

$$C_3 = (C^+ \circledast_{x=1/2} C^+) \circledast_{x=1/2} (C^+ \circledast_{x=1/2} C^+).$$



Figure 3: The gradient of the copula C_3 in the second proof of Theorem 1

Therefore,

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_1 C_n(x, y)|^2 d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}$$

for each $n \ge 1$, proving (6).

The second component $\partial_2 C_n$ takes the values $0, 1/2^{n-1}, 2/2^{n-1}, \dots, (2^{n-1}-1)/2^{n-1}, 1$ respectively, so that we obtain

$$\int_{I^2} |\partial_2 C_n(x,y)|^2 d(x,y) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{2^n - 1} \left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2^n}\right] + 1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} + \left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)^3 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{2^n - 1} i^2$$
$$= \frac{1}{3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)$$

for $n \to \infty$, proving also (7).

Finally, we would like to point out that these examples also provide a positive answer to a question stated in Siburg and Stoimenov (2008b). Namely, for both our examples above we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{I^2} |\nabla C_n(x, y)|^2 \mathrm{d}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} = \frac{5}{6},$$
(8)

which shows that the bound 5/6 given in Siburg and Stoimenov (2008b, Thm. 18(ii)) and Siburg and Stoimenov (2010, Thm. 4.3(ii)) is sharp.

References

- Buckley, J. J. (1974). Graphs of measurable functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 44(1), 78–80.
- Dette, H., K. F. Siburg, and P. A. Stoimenov (2013). A copula-based nonparametric measure of regression dependence. *Scand. J. Stat.* 40(1), 21– 41.
- Lancaster, H. O. (1963). Correlation and complete dependence of random variables. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 34, 1315–1321.
- Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An introduction to copulas* (second ed.). New York: Springer.
- Siburg, K. F. and P. A. Stoimenov (2008a). Gluing copulas. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods* 37(19), 3124–3134.
- Siburg, K. F. and P. A. Stoimenov (2008b). A scalar product for copulas. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 344(1), 429–439.
- Siburg, K. F. and P. A. Stoimenov (2010). A measure of mutual complete dependence. *Metrika* 71(2), 239–251.

Preprints ab 2012/01

2013-16	Karl Friedrich Siburg Almost opposite regression dependence in bivariate distributions
2013-15	Christian Palmes and Jeannette H. C. Woerner The Gumbel test and jumps in the volatility process
2013-14	Karl Friedrich Siburg, Katharina Stehling, Pavel A. Stoimenov, Jeannette H. C. Woerner An order for asymmetry in copulas, and implications for risk management
2013-13	Michael Voit Product formulas for a two-parameter family of Heckman-Opdam hypergeometric functions of type BC
2013-12	B. Schweizer and M. Veneroni Homogenization of plasticity equations with two-scale convergence methods
2013-11	Sven Glaser A law of large numbers for the power variation of fractional Lévy processes
2013-10	Christian Palmes and Jeannette H.C. Woerner The Gumbel test for jumps in stochastic volatility models
2013-09	Agnes Lamacz, Stefan Neukamm, and Felix Otto Moment bounds for the corrector in stochastic homogenization of a percolation model
2013-08	Frank Klinker Connections on Cahen-Wallach spaces
2013-07	Andreas Rätz and Matthias Röger Symmetry breaking in a bulk-surface reaction-diffusion model for signaling networks
2013-06	Gilles Francfort and Ben Schweizer A doubly non-linear system in small-strain visco-plasticity
2013-05	Tomáš Dohnal Traveling Solitary Waves in the Periodic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with Finite Band Potentials
2013-04	Karl Friedrich Siburg, Pavel Stoimenov, and Gregor N.F. Weiß Forecasting Portfolio-Value-at-Risk with Nonparametric Lower Tail Dependence Estimates
2013-03	Martin Heida On thermodynamics of fluid interfaces
2013-02	Martin Heida Existence of soulutions for two types of generalized versions of the Cahn-Hilliard equation
2013-01	T. Dohnal, A. Lamacz, B. Schweizer Dispersive effective equations for waves in heterogeneous media on large time scales
2012-19	Martin Heida On gradient flows of nonconvex functionals in Hilbert spaces with Riemannian metric and application to Cahn-Hilliard equations

2012-18	R.V. Kohn, J. Lu, B. Schweizer, and M.I. Weinstein A variational perspective on cloaking by anomalous localized resonance
2012-17	Margit Rösler and Michael Voit Olshanski spherical functions for infinite dimensional motion groups of fixed rank
2012-16	Selim Esedoglu, Andreas Rätz, Matthias Röger Colliding Interfaces in Old and New Diffuse-interface Approximations of Willmore-flow
2012-15	Patrick Henning, Mario Ohlberger and Ben Schweizer An adaptive multiscale finite element method
2012-14	Andreas Knauf, Frank Schulz, Karl Friedrich Siburg Positive topological entropy for multi-bump magnetic fields
2012-13	Margit Rösler, Tom Koornwinder, and Michael Voit Limit transition between hypergeometric functions of type BC and Type A
2012-12	Alexander Schnurr Generalization of the Blumenthal-Getoor Index to the Class of Homogeneous Diffusions with Jumps and some Applications
2012-11	Wilfried Hazod Remarks on pseudo stable laws on contractible groups
2012-10	Waldemar Grundmann Limit theorems for radial random walks on Euclidean spaces of high dimensions
2012-09	Martin Heida A two-scale model of two-phase flow in porous media ranging from porespace to the macro scale
2012-08	Martin Heida On the derivation of thermodynamically consistent boundary conditions for the Cahn-Hilliard-Navier-Stokes system
2012-07	Michael Voit Uniform oscillatory behavior of spherical functions of GL_n/U_n at the identity and a central limit theorem
2012-06	Agnes Lamacz and Ben Schweizer Effective Maxwell equations in a geometry with flat rings of arbitrary shape
2012-05	Frank Klinker and Günter Skoruppa Ein optimiertes Glättungsverfahren motiviert durch eine technische Fragestellung
2012-04	Patrick Henning, Mario Ohlberger, and Ben Schweizer Homogenization of the degenerate two-phase flow equations
2012-03	Andreas Rätz A new diffuse-interface model for step flow in epitaxial growth
2012-02	Andreas Rätz and Ben Schweizer Hysteresis models and gravity fingering in porous media
2012-01	Wilfried Hazod Intrinsic topologies on H-contraction groups with applications to semistability