

Doubly Robust Conditional Independence Testing with Generative Neural Networks

Yi Zhang, Linjun Huang, Yun Yang and Xiaofeng Shao *

July 26, 2024

Abstract

This article addresses the problem of testing the conditional independence of two generic random vectors X and Y given a third random vector Z , which plays an important role in statistical and machine learning applications. We propose a new non-parametric testing procedure that avoids explicitly estimating any conditional distributions but instead requires sampling from the two marginal conditional distributions of X given Z and Y given Z . We further propose using a generative neural network (GNN) framework to sample from these approximated marginal conditional distributions, which tends to mitigate the curse of dimensionality due to its adaptivity to any low-dimensional structures and smoothness underlying the data. Theoretically, our test statistic is shown to enjoy a doubly robust property against GNN approximation errors, meaning that the test statistic retains all desirable properties of the oracle test statistic utilizing the true marginal conditional distributions, as long as the product of the two approximation errors decays to zero faster than the parametric rate. Asymptotic properties of our statistic and the consistency of a bootstrap procedure are derived under both null and local alternatives. Extensive numerical experiments and real data analysis illustrate the effectiveness and broad applicability of our proposed test.

Keywords: Conditional Distribution; Conditional Independence Test; Double Robustness; Generative Models; Kernel Method; Maximum Mean Discrepancy.

*Yi Zhang and Linjun Huang are Ph.D. students, Yun Yang is Associate Professor, Xiaofeng Shao is Professor at Department of Statistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Emails: yiz19@illinois.edu, linjunh2@illinois.edu, yy84@illinois.edu and xshao@illinois.edu. Yang's research is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2210717. Shao's research is partially supported by NSF grants DMS-2210002 and DMS-2412833 and research board grants at UIUC.

1 Introduction

Conditional independence (CI) testing plays an important role in various areas of statistics and machine learning. For example, it can be used to examine causal relations (Pearl, 2009), determine the structure of graphical models (Koller and Friedman, 2009) and simplify statistical models by performing variable selection (George, 2000; Azadkia and Chatterjee, 2021) and dimension reduction (Cook and Li, 2002; Li, 2018). In this paper, we focus on testing if two generic random vectors $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ are conditionally independent given a third random vector $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$, where d_X , d_Y and d_Z are positive integers; that is, we test the null hypothesis $H_0 : X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | Z$ against $H_1 : X \not\perp\!\!\!\perp Y | Z$. In general, CI testing is statistically more challenging than independence testing because it requires comparing the joint conditional distribution with the product of two of its marginals simultaneously for each value realized by the conditioning variable Z . For example, as shown in Shah and Peters (2020), there does not exist a CI test that can control the type-I error for all joint distributions of (X, Y, Z) under H_0 while having nontrivial power against any alternative. Typically, to make the conditional independence testing problem feasible, one must restrict the distribution class by introducing identifiable structures to make conditional distributions statistically estimable; see, for example, Neykov et al. (2021). A common identifiable structure employed in classic literature on conditional distribution estimation (e.g., Bashtannyk and Hyndman (2001); Izbicki and Lee (2016); Li et al. (2022)) involves imposing smoothness conditions on the conditional densities of $X, Y | Z = z$ as z varies across its support. However, when Z represents a random high-dimensional complex object, such as images or texts, the conditional distributions of $X, Y | Z = z$ may not possess a density function; additionally, a smoothness condition alone may be insufficient to capture many low-dimensional intrinsic structures underlying the true conditional distributions.

1.1 Related literature

The literature on non-parametric CI testing is extensive, and we refer to Li and Fan (2020) for a recent survey. One major challenge in CI testing is to construct a sample version of a population-level

CI measure, which typically involves conditional expectations in the form of $\mathbb{E}[u(X) | Z]$ and/or $\mathbb{E}[v(Y) | Z]$ for some real or function valued mappings u and v . Examples include CI testing based on conditional characteristic functions (Su and White, 2007; Wang et al., 2015) where $u(x) = e^{itx}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and conditional cumulative distribution functions (Su and White, 2014; Cai et al., 2022) where $u(x) = \mathbb{1}(x \leq t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ denoting the indicator function. Directly estimating these conditional expectations can be inefficient and cumbersome, as it often involves kernel smoothing and numerical integration, which can be difficult to implement and inaccurate in high-dimensional settings. This requirement of explicit estimation of conditional expectations makes existing methods suffer from the so-called curse of dimensionality: their performance deteriorate drastically as the dimension d_Z of Z and/or the dimensions (d_X, d_Y) of (X, Y) becomes larger (Zhou et al., 2022, Section 1). To mitigate the curse of dimensionality on (d_X, d_Y) , kernel-based CI tests (Fukumizu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2011; Huang et al., 2022; Scetbon et al., 2022; Pogodin et al., 2024, 2022) instead compare the (kernel) mean embeddings of distributions into some reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) and tend to have better empirical performance even when the dimensions of (X, Y) are high (Li and Fan, 2020). However, in the conditional setting, the estimation of the mean embedding of conditional distributions given all values of Z , for example, via RKHS-valued regression, still suffers from a curse of dimensionality on the dimension of Z due to a slow convergence rate (Li et al., 2022) in the relevant norm, i.e. the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. As a result, when d_Z is from moderate to large, massive auxiliary data, or in the case of data-splitting, a large portion of the sample, needs to be dedicated to estimating these quantities (Scetbon et al., 2022; Pogodin et al., 2024), resulting in a noticeable loss of testing power; see Appendix in the supplement for more details.

Another line of research to CI testing, when the limiting null distribution of the test statistic is not pivotal, is through conditional permutation. For example, in Fukumizu et al. (2007); Neykov et al. (2021); Kim et al. (2022), the permutations are performed locally on bins or clusters specified according to the similarity in the values of the conditioning variable Z . As a result, this local permutation procedure also requires large sample size and tends to be unreliable when Z is a continuous random vector or the dimension of Z is large (Huang et al., 2022, Section 1).

Alternatively, Sen et al. (2017) and Li et al. (2023) proposed to use one-nearest neighbor sampling to perform local permutation. However, their approach requires sample splitting (two thirds of the sample are used for one-nearest neighbor sampling) and certain strong smoothness assumptions on both the marginal density of Z as well as the conditional density of Y given Z , which are difficult to verify in practice.

From a different perspective, the above-mentioned challenges can be explained as stemming from the inability to sample from the conditional distribution of X and/or Y given Z , because in practice we only have i.i.d. copies of (X, Y, Z) and the true conditional distributions are unknown. With access to a (conditional) generative model for sampling from the conditional distributions, one can easily approximate the conditional expectations, which are the building blocks for most CI test procedures, to arbitrary accuracy without sacrificing computational efficiency using the Monte Carlo method. An (asymptotically) valid rejection criterion with controlled size can then be specified, for example, by utilizing conditional randomization techniques (Candes et al., 2018), without relying on the knowledge of the limiting null distributions. However, the validity of such conditional randomization-based tests requires exact knowledge of the true (conditional) generative models in order to maintain the desired size, and these tests tend to be quite sensitive to additional errors arising from estimating the practically unknown (conditional) generative models, typically requiring a parametric convergence rate despite the nonparametric nature of (conditional) distribution estimation. Recently, generative neural networks (GNN) based approaches, such as generative adversarial network (GAN, Goodfellow et al., 2014) and generative moment matching network (GMMN, Dziugaite et al., 2015; Li et al., 2015), have received great success in generating high-quality samples, such as images and texts, from complex and possibly high-dimensional distributions by passing random noise through a deep neural network learned from training samples. In addition to its superior empirical performance, there is also a recent surge of theoretical works on understanding the properties of GNNs. For example, Tang and Yang (2023) derived the minimax rate for implicitly estimating a high-dimensional distribution that resides on a low-dimensional manifold under a generative model framework, where the rate is shown to depend on the intrinsic dimension and smoothness of the manifold as well as the smoothness of the probabil-

ity density; Chen et al. (2020) showed that GANs are consistent estimators of distributions with certain smooth densities or low-dimensional structures.

The capacity of GNNs and their success in generating complex random objects mimicking the training samples enable one to approximate various quantities, such as probabilities, quantiles, and expectations, related to conditional distributions by applying the Monte Carlo method using properly trained GNN generators. For example, some recent works such as Shi et al. (2021) and Bellot and van der Schaar (2019) use GAN to approximate and sample from the conditional distributions in constructing their CI testing procedures. The double GANs-based conditional independence test (DGCIT) proposed in Shi et al. (2021) utilizes double GANs to learn two generators to sample from the conditional distributions of X given Z and Y given Z in order to estimate conditional expectations $\mathbb{E}[u(X)|Z]$ and $\mathbb{E}[v(Y)|Z]$ for certain functions u and v specified in their procedure. In comparison, the generative conditional independence test (GCIT) proposed in Bellot and van der Schaar (2019) uses the aforementioned conditional randomization approach which only requires training one generator to approximate the conditional distribution of X given Z . However, in order to control the type-I error, GCIT requires the approximation error of the generator to decay faster than the $n^{-1/2}$ parametric rate with n denoting the sample size, which is not achievable even in a simple linear regression case (Shi et al., 2021, Proposition 1). In order to reduce the impact due to the slow nonparametric convergence rate of GAN approximation errors on the testing size and power, the two generators in the test statistic used in DGCIT are integrated in a multiplicative manner such that the approximation error of each generator only need to decay faster than $n^{-1/4}$ (Shi et al., 2021, Section 3). Despite this desirable double robustness property, DGCIT is designed to test the null hypothesis of weak conditional independence (Daudin, 1980), which is not capable of detecting all conditional dependence within the alternative hypothesis H_1 of our considered CI testing problem. As a result, DGCIT only has trivial power against certain alternatives in H_1 ; see Section 4.3 for further details.

1.2 Our contributions

In this paper, we propose a GNN based CI test that can address all above-mentioned challenges. In particular, the proposed test exhibits promising empirical performance when the dimension of Z is large, is doubly robust against approximation errors of conditional distributions and remains powerful under all alternatives in H_1 . In a nutshell, the proposed test is an empirical version of a population-level conditional independence measure based on the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD, Gretton et al., 2012) between the distribution of (X, Y, Z) under H_0 and its true distribution; as a result, it fully characterizes CI under mild assumptions on the employed kernel functions; see Appendix in the supplement for additional literature review comparing our proposed population-level CI measure with other kernel-based ones. In addition, instead of using RKHS-valued regression, we implicitly estimate the mean embeddings of (marginal) conditional distributions via sampling from GNNs trained through sample splitting and cross-fitting. Since the training loss of the GNNs is closely related to the relevant metric in the proposed test statistic, no explicit requirements are needed on the dimensions of X , Y and Z to guarantee size control and good power of the testing procedure, provided the trained GNNs are sufficiently accurate; see Section 2.1 and Remark 3 of Section 3. Due to the careful incorporation of the GNNs, our test statistic is shown to enjoy a doubly robust property against GNN approximation errors, meaning that the test statistic will retain all desirable properties of the oracle test statistic utilizing the true marginal conditional distributions, as long as the product of the two approximation errors decays to zero faster than the parametric rate. This doubly robust property allows more flexibility and tolerance in estimating the two marginal conditional distributions, making our testing procedure less sensitive to the GNN approximation errors, which typically suffer from a slower non-parametric rate. Specifically, asymptotic properties of our statistic, as well as the consistency of a bootstrap procedure, are derived under both null and local alternatives. Finally, extensive numerical experiments and real data analysis illustrate the effectiveness and broad applicability of our proposed test.

1.3 Organization and notations

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first motivate and propose our test statistic for CI testing with a bootstrap calibration procedure, and formally introduce the notation of double robustness property in the context of CI testing. In Section 3, we develop asymptotic properties of our test statistic under H_0 and local alternatives, as well as the consistency results for the proposed wild bootstrap procedure. Section 4 evaluates and compares our proposed test along with other representative methods in the literature via finite sample simulations. In Section 5, two real data examples are provided using the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia dataset in Section 5.1 and the MNIST dataset in Section 5.2, respectively. Section 6 provides some concluding remarks. All the proofs, as well as other implementation details, are deferred to the supplement.

The following notations will be used throughout the paper. For any positive integer d and random vectors $(X^1, X^2, \dots, X^d, Z)$ defined on the same probability space, we use $P_{X^1 X^2 \dots X^d}$ and $P_{X^1 X^2 \dots X^d | Z}$ to denote the joint distribution of X^1, X^2, \dots, X^d and its conditional distribution given Z . Let \mathbb{E}_Z or $\mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}$ denote taking expectation with respect to random variable Z with distribution Q and P_m denote the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . For positive integer n , define $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For probability measure $\mu(\cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^d and $p \geq 1$, let $L_p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu) = \{f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \int |f(x)|^p d\mu(x) < \infty\}$. For any Hilbert spaces A and B , let $A \otimes B$ denote their tensor product. Given random vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the Gaussian kernel is defined as $\mathcal{K}(a, b) = \exp(-\|a - b\|_2^2 / \sigma)$ and the Laplacian kernel is defined as $\mathcal{K}(a, b) = \exp(-\|a - b\|_1 / \sigma)$, where $\sigma > 0$ is the bandwidth parameter, $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the usual Euclidean (ℓ_2 -)norm and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the ℓ_1 -norm (Muandet et al., 2017, Table 3.1).

2 CI Testing Using Conditional Generators

In this section, we first describe a population-level conditional independence measure and present two of its sample versions, one of which benefits from a double robustness property against possible misspecification of the two marginal conditional distributions. We then propose a sample plug-in test statistic based on the superior version, utilizing the generative neural network technique to sample from the marginal conditional distributions along with data splitting and cross-fitting to

remove certain data dependence. Following that, we provide a computational framework and a wild bootstrap method to calibrate the size of the proposed testing procedure. Discussions on the connections between our proposed test statistic and existing kernel-based CI tests in the literature are deferred to Appendix in the supplement.

2.1 Population-level conditional independence measure

Recall that $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ are three random vectors defined on the same probability space, and the goal is to test

$$H_0 : X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | Z \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : X \not\perp\!\!\!\perp Y | Z. \quad (1)$$

In order to motivate the construction of our population-level conditional independence measure, it is helpful to introduce two new random vectors \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} which satisfy all of the properties in the following lemma (see Appendix in the supplement for proof).

Lemma 1. *Let $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_y \times d_z}$ be three random vectors with joint distribution P_{XYZ} . Then, there exist two random vectors $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $\tilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ such that:*

1. (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) are conditionally independent of (X, Y) given Z ;
2. \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} are conditionally independent given Z ;
3. $P_{\tilde{X}|Z=z} = P_{X|Z=z}$ and $P_{\tilde{Y}|Z=z} = P_{Y|Z=z}$ for a.e.- P_Z $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$.

Note that for any random vectors \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} satisfying Property 3 in Lemma 1, we have $P_{\tilde{X}Z} = P_{XZ}$ and $P_{\tilde{Y}Z} = P_{YZ}$, and therefore according to Property 2 of the same lemma, testing problem (1) can be equivalently formulated into the following distribution equality testing problem

$$H_0 : P_{XYZ} = P_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}Z} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : P_{XYZ} \neq P_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}Z}. \quad (2)$$

It is then natural to propose a population-level measure to quantify the discrepancy between P_{XYZ} and $P_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}Z}$. In order to mitigate the curse of dimensionality, we adopt a kernel-based measure using MMD, which compares the (kernel) mean embeddings of P_{XYZ} and $P_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}Z}$ in an RKHS. We call

the resulting measure as an MMD-based CI measure, or MMDCI in short. More specifically, we let $\mathcal{K}_X : \mathbb{R}^{d_X} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_X}$, $\mathcal{K}_Y : \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ and $\mathcal{K}_Z : \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$ denote three symmetric positive definite kernel functions which define three RKHSs \mathbb{H}_X , \mathbb{H}_Y and \mathbb{H}_Z over the space of X , Y and Z , respectively. We also let $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ and \mathbb{H}_0 denote the corresponding (product) kernel and its induced RKHS over the product space $\mathbb{R}^{d_X} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$.

We use the notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ to denote the associated inner product and the induced norm of a generic RKHS \mathbb{H} with kernel \mathcal{K} . For a generic random variable W taking values in the domain of \mathbb{H} , its (*kernel*) *mean embedding* into \mathbb{H} is denoted as $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}(W, \cdot)]$, which is defined as the unique element in \mathbb{H} such that $\mathbb{E}[f(W)] = \langle f, \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}(W, \cdot)] \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$ for any $f \in \mathbb{H}$. With these notations, we can now define the aforementioned MMDCI as

$$\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ}) := \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), \cdot) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_0((\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, Z), \cdot) \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_0}^2 \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), (X', Y', Z')) \right] - 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), (\tilde{X}', \tilde{Y}', Z')) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_0((\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, Z), (\tilde{X}', \tilde{Y}', Z')) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $(X', Y', \tilde{X}', \tilde{Y}', Z')$ denotes an independent copy of $(X, Y, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, Z)$, and the second equality (4) follows by expanding the squared RKHS norm, using the definition of the mean embedding and applying the reproducing property of the RKHS \mathbb{H}_0 . Note that this MMDCI measure only depends on the joint distribution P_{XYZ} , as $P_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}Z}$ is implicitly defined through P_{XYZ} using Lemma 1. In particular, we have the following Lemma 2 (which is proved in Appendix of the supplement) relating $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ to H_0 in problem (1) or (2) if Assumption 1 holds.

Assumption 1. For each $\tilde{Q} \in \{\tilde{X}, X\}$, assume either one of the following assumptions holds:

(a). $\mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_X(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{Q}) \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, Y) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z, Z)} \right] < \infty$. \mathcal{K}_0 is a characteristic kernel (Fukumizu et al., 2007, Section 2.2), meaning that for any probability measures P and Q on $\mathbb{R}^{d_X+d_Y+d_Z}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y,Z) \sim P} [\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), \cdot)] = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y,Z) \sim Q} [\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), \cdot)] \text{ implies } P = Q.$$

(b). $\mathbb{H}_X \otimes \mathbb{H}_Z$ is dense in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_X+d_Z}, P_{XZ})$ and \mathbb{H}_Y is dense in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}, P_Y)$.

(c). $\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{K}_X(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{Q}) \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, Y)] < \infty$, \mathbb{H}_Z is dense in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Z}, P_Z)$ and $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y)$ are continuous characteristic kernels.

Lemma 2. Let $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X \times d_Y \times d_Z}$ be three random vectors with joint distribution P_{XYZ} . Under Assumption 1, X and Y are conditionally independent of Z if and only if $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ}) = 0$.

Remark 1. Part (a) of Assumption 1 comes from the definition of MMDCI in equation (3). Part (b) of Assumption 1 comes from the CI characterization in Daudin (1980), and it is implied by $\mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ and \mathcal{K}_Y being L_2 - or c_0 -universal kernels (Sriperumbudur et al., 2011) and it can be alternatively stated as: $\mathbb{H}_Y \otimes \mathbb{H}_Z$ is dense in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y + d_Z}, P_{YZ})$ and \mathbb{H}_X is dense in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_X}, P_X)$. According to Sriperumbudur et al. (2011) and Theorems 4 and 5 in Szabó and Sriperumbudur (2018), Assumption 1 holds if $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z)$ are Gaussian or Laplacian kernels. Part (a) is in general more restrictive than part (c) because it implies $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z)$ are all characteristic kernels. If $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z)$ are bounded, continuous and translation invariant kernels, both part (a) and (c) are equivalent to $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z)$ being characteristic kernels (Szabó and Sriperumbudur, 2018, Theorem 4).

In practice, in order to facilitate the construction of a sample version of $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ defined in (4), it is helpful to eliminate the tilde variables $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, \tilde{X}', \tilde{Y}')$ by taking conditional expectations given (Z, Z') and utilizing the iterative expectation formula and their mutual conditional independence. Specifically, we let $g_X(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_X$ and $g_Y(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(Y, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_Y$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$ denote the *conditional (kernel) mean embedding* of X and Y given Z into their respective RKHS \mathbb{H}_X and \mathbb{H}_Y . The simplest way to eliminate the tilde variables is to use the factorization property $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ along with the iterative expectation formula to (4) to get (see Appendix in the supplement for a detailed derivation)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ}) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[\mathcal{K}_X(X, X') \cdot \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, Y') - \langle g_X(Z'), \mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} \cdot \langle g_Y(Z'), \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \langle g_X(Z), \mathcal{K}_X(X', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} \cdot \langle g_Y(Z), \mathcal{K}_Y(Y', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \langle g_X(Z), g_X(Z') \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} \cdot \langle g_Y(Z), g_Y(Z') \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y} \right] \cdot \mathcal{K}_Z(Z, Z') \right\}, \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where we deliberately express the quantity inside $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ in a way that is symmetric with respect to (X, Y, Z) and its independent copy (X', Y', Z') . With the knowledge of the two conditional distributions $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$, or their mean embeddings g_X and g_Y , a sample version

of $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ based on equation (5), due to the symmetry, can then be constructed as a degenerate U-statistic of order 2. Regarding the two conditional distributions, we propose using a GNN framework to approximate their conditional expectations via Monte Carlo sampling, and then plugging-in these conditional expectation estimates into the degenerate U-statistic to construct our sample version of the MMDCI test statistic; see Section 2.3 for details.

2.2 A doubly robust population-level measure characterization

In order to motivate our construction of a sample version of the MMDCI test statistic that enjoys a desirable double robustness property (see Definition 1), it is instructive to provide an alternative and equivalent characterization of $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ as summarized in the following lemma, which is proved in Appendix in the supplement. This alternative characterization can be obtained from equation (4) by first conditioning on (Z, Z') and then utilizing the factorization property $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ and the reproducing property of the RKHSs.

Lemma 3. *Let $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X \times d_Y \times d_Z}$ be three random vectors with joint distribution P_{XYZ} and (X', Y', Z') be its independent copy. Then the $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ defined in equation (4) can be equivalently written as*

$$\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ}) = \mathbb{E} \left[U(X, X') V(Y, Y') \mathcal{K}_Z(Z, Z') \right], \quad \text{with} \quad (6)$$

$$U(X, X') = \mathcal{K}_X(X, X') - \langle g_X(Z), \mathcal{K}_X(X', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} - \langle g_X(Z'), \mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} + \langle g_X(Z), g_X(Z') \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X}$$

$$V(Y, Y') = \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, Y') - \langle g_Y(Z), \mathcal{K}_Y(Y', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y} - \langle g_Y(Z'), \mathcal{K}_Y(Y, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y} + \langle g_Y(Z), g_Y(Z') \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_Y}.$$

Recall that $g_X(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_X$ and $g_Y(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(Y, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_Y$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$.

This alternative characterization of $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ takes a multiplicative form and eliminates the need of introducing (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) (and its independent copy). Moreover, its constituting multiplicative factors $U(X, X')$ and $V(Y, Y')$ are both zero mean random variables and symmetric in (X, X') and (Y, Y') , respectively. In particular, under H_0 , $U(X, X')$ and $V(Y, Y')$ also become conditionally independent given (Z, Z') , implying $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ to be zero under H_0 . Due to the symmetry, one can also construct a sample version of the MMDCI test statistic based on equa-

tion (6) as a degenerate U-statistic of order 2; see the comments after Equation (5) and Section 2.3 for further details.

These desirable properties together would lead to a *double robustness* property of this population-level measure $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ expressed from this alternative characterization (6) against potential misspecification of the two (marginal) conditional distributions $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ in estimating g_X and g_Y . More generally, we formally define such a population-level double robustness property for any population-level measure that is defined as functions of (X, Y, Z, X', Y', Z') and conditional expectations in the form of $\mathbb{E}[u(X) | Z]$ and/or $\mathbb{E}[v(Y) | Z]$ for certain mappings $u : \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ and $v : \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ with (\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{V}) denoting two generic Hilbert spaces as ranges of (u, v) as follows.

Definition 1. Consider a generic population-level measure taking the form as $D(P_{XYZ}) = \mathbb{E}[F(X, Y, Z, X', Y', Z', \mathbb{E}[u(X) | Z], \mathbb{E}[u(X) | Z'], \mathbb{E}[v(Y) | Z], \mathbb{E}[v(Y) | Z'])]$ for some known mappings $u : \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$, $v : \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$, and $F : \mathbb{R}^{2d_X+2d_Y+2d_Z} \times \mathbb{U}^2 \times \mathbb{V}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say that $D(P_{XYZ})$ is doubly robust against misspecifications of the two conditional expectations $g_u(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}[u(X) | Z = \cdot]$ and $g_v(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}[v(Y) | Z = \cdot]$ if under H_0 of testing problem (1), $D(P_{XYZ})$ equals to zero as long as at least one of these two conditional expectations is correctly specified; that is, $\mathbb{E}[F(X, Y, Z, X', Y', Z', g'_u(Z), g'_u(Z'), g'_v(Z), g'_v(Z')))] = 0$ if either $g'_u = g_u$ or $g'_v = g_v$.

Double robustness is in general a desirable property in many statistical problems where certain estimators or testing procedures maintain their consistency or validity when either of two involved models is correctly specified, but not necessarily both. This property is particularly useful in causal inference and missing data analysis (see, e.g., Bang and Robins, 2005; Funk et al., 2011) which involves a treatment model and an outcome model. In our definition of double robustness for CI testing, the two involved models are the two approximation families for the two conditional distributions $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ (or more precisely, the conditional expectations g_u and g_v for certain transformations u and v). A theoretical consequence of this population-level double robustness property from Definition 1 on the asymptotic analysis of a sample version of the test statistic is that, the test statistic will retain all desirable properties of the oracle test statistic, defined as the one using the true marginal conditional distributions, as long as the product of the two statistical errors for estimating $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ (or the relevant conditional expectations g_u and g_v) decays

to zero faster than the parametric rate; see Section 3 for details. This doubly robust property provides a safeguard against model misspecification, and allows more flexibility and tolerance in estimating the two marginal conditional distributions, making our testing procedure less sensitive to the estimation errors, which typically suffer from a slower non-parametric decay rate.

In our current context, it is straightforward to verify that $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ in Lemma 3 takes the form as in Definition (1); moreover, it is doubly robust against misspecifications of the two conditional mean embeddings $g_X(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_X := \mathbb{U}$ and $g_Y(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(Y, \cdot) \mid Z=z] \in \mathbb{H}_Y := \mathbb{V}$ since $U(X, X')$ and $V(Y, Y')$ are both zero mean random variables that are conditionally independent given (Z, Z') under H_0 . In comparison, under H_0 the $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ in its earlier representation (5) can also be written in the form as in Definition (1); however, it is not doubly robust against misspecifications of the two mean embeddings. To see this, consider replacing $g_X(z)$ in representation (5) with $\hat{g}_X(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\hat{X}, \cdot) \mid Z=z]$, where \hat{X} is any random vector satisfying $\hat{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$ and $P_{\hat{X}|Z} \neq P_{X|Z}$; then $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ after the replacement becomes $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_0((X, Y, Z), \cdot)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_0((\hat{X}, Y, Z), \cdot)]\|_{\mathbb{H}_0}^2$, which is the squared MMD between P_{XYZ} and $P_{\hat{X}YZ}$ and is strictly positive when \mathcal{K}_0 is a characteristic kernel. See also Section 2.3 for discussions on the consequences in the sample testing statistic accuracy, and Section 3 for theoretical implications. The major reason for the same population-level measure having or lacking the double robustness property under different representations is attributed to how $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, \tilde{X}', \tilde{Y}')$ are eliminated by taking conditional expectations (on which terms) given (Z, Z') .

Note that our alternative characterization (6) generalizes the one derived in Cai et al. (2022) in the special case when $X, Y, Z \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$, $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$, $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$ and $(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z)$ are the Laplacian kernel. This characterization (6) is closely related to the conditional independence measure proposed in Daudin (1980), which is also later used in Zhang et al. (2011) and Pogodin et al. (2022, 2024), to construct kernel-based CI test statistics. See Appendix for more details and comparisons.

2.3 Sample conditional independence test statistic

In this subsection, we provide sample versions arising from the two equivalent characterizations (5) and (6) for $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$, and discuss the impact of, or the lack of, the double robustness property defined in Definition 1 on their respective statistical accuracy. In practical calculations, it is easier to utilize the following identities, arising from the reproducing property of the RKHS,

$$\langle g_X(Z), \mathcal{K}_X(X', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} = \mathbb{E}_X[\mathcal{K}_X(X, X') | Z] \quad \text{and} \quad \langle g_X(Z), g_X(Z') \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} = \mathbb{E}_{X, X'}[\mathcal{K}_X(X, X') | Z, Z']. \quad (7)$$

to further simplify terms involving the conditional mean embeddings g_X and g_Y in these characterizations. More concretely, we first consider the case when $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ (or their corresponding conditional mean embeddings) are known, and construct their sample versions as degenerate U-statistics of order 2. We call these test statistics as *oracle test statistics* since later we will consider the general and practical case where $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ are unknown and estimated from the data. Let $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ denote i.i.d. copies of (X, Y, Z) from P_{XYZ} .

Oracle test statistic based on characterization (5). It is easy to see that characterization (5) of $\text{MMDCI}(P_{XYZ})$ leads to the following oracle test statistic,

$$\begin{aligned} T_0^* &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_k, Z_\ell) \cdot \left\{ \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, X_\ell) \cdot \mathcal{K}_Y(Y_k, Y_\ell) - \mathbb{E}_X[K_X(X, X_\ell) | Z = Z_k] \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E}_Y[K_Y(Y, Y_\ell) | Z = Z_k] - \mathbb{E}_X[K_X(X, X_k) | Z = Z_\ell] \cdot \mathbb{E}_Y[K_Y(Y, Y_k) | Z = Z_\ell] \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}_{X, X'}[K_X(X, X') | Z = Z_k, Z' = Z_\ell] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y'}[K_Y(Y, Y') | Z = Z_k, Z' = Z_\ell] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Oracle test statistic based on characterization (6). Basing on identity (7), we can define the following statistic from Characterization (6),

$$\begin{aligned} T^* &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{k \neq \ell} U^*(X_k, X_\ell) V^*(Y_k, Y_\ell) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_k, Z_\ell), \quad \text{with} \quad (9) \\ U^*(X_k, X_\ell) &= \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, X_\ell) - \mathbb{E}_X[K_X(X, X_k) | Z = Z_\ell] - \mathbb{E}_X[K_X(X, X_\ell) | Z = Z_k] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{X, X'}[K_X(X, X') | Z = Z_k, Z' = Z_\ell], \\ V^*(Y_k, Y_\ell) &= \mathcal{K}_Y(Y_k, Y_\ell) - \mathbb{E}_Y[K_Y(Y, Y_k) | Z = Z_\ell] - \mathbb{E}_Y[K_Y(Y, Y_\ell) | Z = Z_k] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y'}[K_Y(Y, Y') | Z = Z_k, Z' = Z_\ell]. \end{aligned}$$

Under H_0 and suitable assumptions, both nT_0^* and nT^* converge in distribution (after rescaling by the same size) to the typical limiting null distribution of a degenerate U statistic, which is a weighted sum of i.i.d. centered χ_1^2 random variables. However, they have different limiting distributions; see Appendix for an empirical comparison between their limiting null distributions and powers of tests based on T_0^* and T^* . Specifically, we observe that the test based on T^* tends to produce a higher (size-adjusted) power than T_0^* under conditional dependence since T^* tends to exhibit a smaller asymptotic variance.

2.3.1 Conditional mean embedding estimation via generative neural networks

In practice, since $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ are rarely known, we need to find estimators $\hat{g}_X(z)$ and $\hat{g}_Y(z)$ for the two conditional mean embeddings $g_X(z) \in \mathbb{H}_X$ and $g_Y(z) \in \mathbb{H}_Y$ for each $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$. In the literature, Pogodin et al. (2024) propose to estimate them via RKHS-valued kernel ridge regression (see Appendix for details), which may suffer from slow convergence rate due to the curse of dimensionality on d_Z (see Appendix for an empirical comparison). In this work, in order to mitigate this issue, we adopt a generative neural network (GNN) framework to instead train two conditional generators $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_X}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_Y : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ for approximately sampling from the respective conditional distributions $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$. Concretely, if one sample a latent variable η from some simple distribution (such as the standard normal) over the latent space \mathbb{R}^m for some integer $m \geq 1$, then the conditional distributions of $\widehat{X} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X(\eta, Z)$ and $\widehat{Y} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_Y(\eta, Z)$ given Z (denoted as $P_{\widehat{X}|Z}$ and $P_{\widehat{Y}|Z}$) are good approximations of $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$. In fact, according to the noise-outsourcing lemma (see Theorem 6.10 of Kallenberg (2002), also Lemma 2.1 of Zhou et al. (2022)), for any integer $m \geq 1$, there exist measurable functions \mathbb{G}_X and \mathbb{G}_Y such that for any $\eta \sim N(0, I_m)$ that is independent of Z , we have $\mathbb{G}_X(\eta, Z) | Z \sim P_{X|Z}$ and $\mathbb{G}_Y(\eta, Z) | Z \sim P_{Y|Z}$. To further estimate $g_X(z)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Z}$, one can first generate M i.i.d. samples of $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^M$ from $N(0, I_m)$, and then estimate $g_X(z)$ by the sample average $\hat{g}_X(z) := M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X(\eta_i, z), \cdot) \in \mathbb{H}_X$. Likewise, we can define estimator $\hat{g}_Y(z) \in \mathbb{H}_Y$ for $g_Y(z)$ in a completely analogous manner.

There are many GNN methods available for approximating conditional distributions. We adopt the GMMN framework due to its competitive performance and a close connection (minimizing an

MMD) with our proposed test (see Remark 3). Concretely, under our notations, the conditional generator $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ in GMMN for approximating $P_{X|Z}$ ($P_{Y|Z}$ is treated in an analogous way) is obtained by minimizing the sample version of a squared MMD between P_{XZ} and the induced joint distribution $P_{\widehat{X}Z}$ from the estimated $\widehat{X} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X(\eta, Z)$ based on a generic set of training data $\{(X_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_T}$ with training sample size n_T and Mn_T latent variables $\{\eta_i^m : i = 1, \dots, n_T, m = 1, \dots, M\}$:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X = \arg \min_{\mathbb{G}_X \in \mathcal{G}_X} \frac{1}{n_T(n_T-1)} \sum_{\substack{k \neq \ell \\ k, \ell \in [n_T]}} \widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell) \cdot \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_k, Z_\ell), \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{with } \widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell) &= \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, X_\ell) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, \mathbb{G}_X(\eta_\ell^m, Z_\ell)) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(X_\ell, \mathbb{G}_X(\eta_k^m, Z_k)) + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m_1, m_2=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(\mathbb{G}_X(\eta_k^{m_1}, Z_k), \mathbb{G}_X(\eta_\ell^{m_2}, Z_\ell)), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{G}_X is an approximation family, such as (deep) neural networks, for the conditional generators. If $\mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ is a bounded characteristic kernel and there exist $\mathbb{G}_X^* \in \mathcal{G}_X$ such that $(\mathbb{G}_X^*(\eta, Z), Z) \stackrel{d}{=} (X, Z)$, the generalization bound of GMMN (Dziugaite et al., 2015, Theorem 1) guarantees that the MMD with kernel $\mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$ between the distributions of $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X(\eta, Z), Z)$ and (X, Z) converges to zero at the rate n_T^{-r} ; here, constant $r > 0$ typically depends on smoothness properties of \mathbb{G}_X^* , intrinsic dimensionality of X and/or Z , choices of the kernels and some complexity measure of \mathcal{G}_X , and can be as large as $1/2$ (corresponding to a parametric convergence rate). Note that in the original GMMN framework in Dziugaite et al. (2015), the Monte Carlo sample size M is fixed at one, while our numerical results suggest that choosing a larger M (e.g. in the order of n_T) can dramatically improve the empirical performance and stability of the training process. Specific designs of the neural network architectures for \mathcal{G}_X in our GMMN implementation and choices of other tuning parameter values in the training process are provided in Appendix.

2.3.2 Comparison of two oracle test statistics

In this part, section we compare the two oracle test statistics (8) and (9) by examining the impact of, or the lack of, the double robustness property, as defined in Definition 1, on their respective statistical accuracy after plugging-in estimated conditional mean embeddings.

To formally study the impact of plugging-in inaccurate conditional mean embeddings, we consider two generic error metrics $D_X(g_X, \hat{g}_X)$ and $D_Y(g_Y, \hat{g}_Y)$ to quantify the estimation errors of the estimators \hat{g}_X and \hat{g}_Y for the conditional mean embeddings. For example, when all employed kernels are bounded, we can choose $D_X(g_X, g'_X) = \{\mathbb{E}[\|g_X(Z) - g'_X(Z)\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}^2]\}^{1/2}$ (recall that for each $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, we have $g_X(z) \in \mathbb{H}_X$) and $D_Y(g_Y, g'_Y) = \{\mathbb{E}[\|g_Y(Z) - g'_Y(Z)\|_{\mathbb{H}_Y}^2]\}^{1/2}$ in our theoretical analysis in Section 3. Recall that we used n_T to denote the GNN training sample size. Without loss of generality, we may assume $D_X(g_X, \hat{g}_X) = O(n_T^{-\alpha_1})$ and $D_Y(g_Y, \hat{g}_Y) = O(n_T^{-\alpha_2})$ for some nonnegative constants (α_1, α_2) . Here, (α_1, α_2) characterizes the respective estimation error decay exponent and depends on the GNN training algorithm and properties of the truth g_X and g_Y . Despite the fact that GNN training, such as by the aforementioned GMMN method, is capable of approximating complex distributions, the estimation error of the resulting estimators usually decay slower than the parametric $n_T^{-1/2}$ rate due to its nonparametric nature.

Now suppose that we have two folds of mutually independent samples, with n_T training samples for estimating (g_X, g_Y) and n fitting samples for constructing the two oracle test statistic T_0^* and T^* as defined in (8) and (9). Let $\hat{T}_0 = T_0(\hat{g}_X, \hat{g}_Y)$ and $\hat{T} = T(\hat{g}_X, \hat{g}_Y)$ denote the respective plug-in test statistic from the oracle ones T_0^* and T^* obtained by replacing g_X and g_Y (or the corresponding conditional expectations given Z arising from identity (7)) therein with estimators \hat{g}_X and \hat{g}_Y . Using this notation, we can also write $T_0^* = T_0(g_X, g_Y)$ and $T^* = T(g_X, g_Y)$. Note that we have $\mathbb{E}[T_0(g_X, g_Y)] = \mathbb{E}[T(g_X, g_Y)] = 0$ under the null H_0 due to their constructions. Therefore, without any additional structures, a typical perturbation analysis gives that under H_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_0 &= T_0^* + \underbrace{\left\{T_0(\hat{g}_X, g_Y) - T_0(g_X, g_Y)\right\}}_{=I_1^*} + \underbrace{\left\{T_0(g_X, \hat{g}_Y) - T_0(g_X, g_Y)\right\}}_{=I_2^*} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left\{T_0(\hat{g}_X, \hat{g}_Y) - T_0(\hat{g}_X, g_Y) - T_0(g_X, \hat{g}_Y) + T_0(g_X, g_Y)\right\}}_{=I_3^*} \\ &= T_0^* + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2\alpha_1}) + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_2}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2\alpha_2}) + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, since the MMDCI(P_{XYZ}) in characterization (5) is not doubly robust, expectations $(\mathbb{E}[I_1^*], \mathbb{E}[I_2^*], \mathbb{E}[I_3^*])$ of the three terms (I_1^*, I_2^*, I_3^*) are generally not zero. As a result, as shown in Appendix, I_1^* resem-

bles a non-degenerate U-statistic (with nonzero mean) and satisfies $I_1^* = O_p(\sqrt{\text{Var}(I_1^*)} + \mathbb{E}|I_1^*|) = O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2\alpha_1})$ (similar results hold for I_2^*). For the “higher-order interaction term” I_3^* , its decay rate satisfies $I_3^* = O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1-\alpha_2})$ and depends on both estimation errors. This means that in order for the plug-in error $\widehat{T}_0 - T_0^*$ to be asymptotically negligible for approximating T_0^* , or $\widehat{T}_0 - T_0^* = o_p(T_0^*)$ as $(n_T, n) \rightarrow \infty$, so that \widehat{T}_0 can retain all desirable properties of the oracle test statistic T_0^* , we need $n_T^{-\alpha_1}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2\alpha_1} + n_T^{-\alpha_2}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2\alpha_2} + n_T^{-\alpha_1-\alpha_2} = o(n^{-1})$, or $\min(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) > 1/2$ if n_T scales as the same order as n . In Appendix, we empirically show that the plug-in test statistic \widehat{T}_0 based on T_0^* indeed has non-diminishing size distortion, even when both estimators $(\widehat{g}_X, \widehat{g}_Y)$ attain a fast $n^{-1/2}$ rate of convergence when $n_T = n$ in a parametric setting. This implies that our previous perturbation analysis is tight and naively plugging in these estimators into a simple sample version of the population-level CI measure can lead to non-diminishing size distortion in testing H_0 .

Fortunately, our improved oracle statistic T^* as defined in (9) admits a better perturbation bound, because of its population-level double robustness property as defined in Definition 1. More specifically, we can follow the same decomposition to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T} &= T^* + \underbrace{\left\{ T(\widehat{g}_X, g_Y) - T(g_X, g_Y) \right\}}_{=I_1^\dagger} + \underbrace{\left\{ T(g_X, \widehat{g}_Y) - T(g_X, g_Y) \right\}}_{=I_2^\dagger} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left\{ T(\widehat{g}_X, \widehat{g}_Y) - T(\widehat{g}_X, g_Y) - T(g_X, \widehat{g}_Y) + T(g_X, g_Y) \right\}}_{=I_3^\dagger} \\ &= T^* + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1}n^{-1}) + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_2}n^{-1}) + O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}), \end{aligned}$$

where now the decay rates of the two terms I_1^\dagger and I_2^\dagger have an extra factor of $n^{-1/2}$ compared to those in the earlier decomposition of \widehat{T}_0 , due to the double robustness property $\mathbb{E}[I_1^\dagger] = \mathbb{E}[I_2^\dagger] = 0$. Specifically, I_1^\dagger now resembles a degenerate U-statistic (with zero mean) and satisfies $I_1^\dagger = O_p(\sqrt{\text{Var}(I_1^\dagger)}) = O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1}n^{-1})$ (similar results hold for I_2^\dagger). Additionally, although term I_3^\dagger does not have a zero mean, it is a higher-order remainder term and also has a much faster decay rate than I_3^* , that is, $I_3^\dagger = O_p(n_T^{-\alpha_1-\alpha_2}n^{-1/2} + n_T^{-2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)})$. This analysis implies that the plug-in test statistic based on T^* will have correct asymptotic size and attain the same asymptotic limit as

T^* as long as the product of the two estimation errors decays faster than $n^{-1/2}$, or $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 > 1/2$ if n_T scales as the same order as n . This requirement on the conditional distribution estimation accuracy is much weaker than the $\min(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) > 1/2$ requirement for the previous oracle statistic T_0^* , and allows both conditional mean embedding estimators \hat{g}_X and \hat{g}_Y to have nonparametric convergence rates slower than $n^{-1/2}$. For this reason, in the rest of this paper, we will exclusively focus on the improved oracle statistic T^* and its plug-in version.

In the context of CI testing, a similar double robustness phenomenon is also observed in other works, albeit against different plug-in objects. For example, Shi et al. (2021) demonstrate this property in their method to test a null hypothesis of weak conditional independence (see Section 4.3 for an empirical illustration), and Cai et al. (2022) propose a testing procedure based on conditional cumulative distribution functions (cdf). Although the testing procedure in Cai et al. (2022) is also able to detect all types of conditional dependence as ours, they require both estimation errors of their conditional cdfs estimators based on kernel smoothing to decay faster than $n^{-1/4}$, which is a stronger requirement than our condition of $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 > 1/2$. Moreover, because of the estimation by kernel smoothing, their method mainly addresses problems with low-dimensional Z and their theory needs to impose strong smoothness assumptions on the conditional densities of X and Y given Z . See Section 4.2 for empirical comparison of their method with ours when the dimension d_Z of Z is from moderate to high.

2.4 Computation and size calibration via wild bootstrap

The analysis in Section 2.3.2 requires the training samples for estimating the conditional mean embeddings to be independent of the testing samples for constructing the sample test statistic. This motivates us to adopt a sample splitting and cross-fitting framework to remove dependence on conditional generator estimation and improve testing size accuracy. In this framework, we divide the entire dataset into J folds, using $(J-1)$ folds to train conditional generators and the remaining fold to construct a plug-in test statistic, and finally averaging the statistics over all J folds; see Section 4.1 for an empirical study of the impact of fold number J on the performance of the test statistic.

To be specific, let (η, κ) be two independent random variables from the latent variable distribution $N(0, I_m)$ on \mathbb{R}^m that are also independent of (X, Y, Z) . Recall that we used \mathbb{G}_X^* and \mathbb{G}_Y^* to denote true conditional generators (see Section 2.3.1) that can generate samples from the two conditional distributions $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$. It is then easy to verify that $\widetilde{X} = \mathbb{G}_X^*(\eta, Z)$ and $\widetilde{Y} = \mathbb{G}_Y^*(\kappa, Z)$ serve as a valid pair of random vectors satisfying all properties in Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{D} := \{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the dataset with sample size n , and $\{(\eta_i^m, \kappa_i^m) : i \in [n], m \in [M]\}$ be nM i.i.d. copies of (η, κ) such that $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n, \{(\eta_i^1, \kappa_i^1)\}_{i=1}^n, \dots, \{(\eta_i^M, \kappa_i^M)\}_{i=1}^n$ are mutually independent. We divide $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into J equal folds $\mathcal{J}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{J}^{(J)}$ and let $\mathcal{J}^{(-j)} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{J}^{(j)}$. For each $j \in [J]$, we use $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X^{(j)}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_Y^{(j)}$ to denote the conditional generators trained through (10) using data from $\mathcal{D}_{-j} := \{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{J}^{(-j)}}$. For each $j \in [J]$, $i \in \mathcal{J}^{(j)}$ and $m \in [M]$, let $\widehat{X}_i^{(m)} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X^{(j)}(\eta_i^m, Z_i)$ and $\widehat{Y}_i^{(m)} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_Y^{(j)}(\kappa_i^m, Z_i)$ if $i \in \mathcal{J}^{(j)}$. We can then define our final test statistic (based on the doubly robust oracle test statistic) as

$$\widehat{T}_J = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ \frac{1}{\frac{n}{J}(\frac{n}{J} - 1)} \sum_{\substack{k \neq \ell \\ k, \ell \in \mathcal{J}^{(j)}}} \widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell) \widehat{V}(Y_k, Y_\ell) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_k, Z_\ell) \right\}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell) &= \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, X_\ell) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(X_k, \widehat{X}_\ell^{(m)}) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(X_\ell, \widehat{X}_k^{(m)}) + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m_1, m_2=1}^M \mathcal{K}_X(\widehat{X}_k^{(m_1)}, \widehat{X}_\ell^{(m_2)}), \\ \widehat{V}(Y_k, Y_\ell) &= \mathcal{K}_Y(Y_k, Y_\ell) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_Y(Y_k, \widehat{Y}_\ell^{(m)}) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{K}_Y(Y_\ell, \widehat{Y}_k^{(m)}) + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m_1, m_2=1}^M \mathcal{K}_Y(\widehat{Y}_k^{(m_1)}, \widehat{Y}_\ell^{(m_2)}). \end{aligned}$$

In Section 3, we will show that under H_0 and suitable assumptions, $n\widehat{T}_J$ converges in distribution to the sum of J independent variables, each of which follows a typical limiting distribution of a degenerate U statistic. Moreover, thanks to the double robustness property, the test based on \widehat{T}_J will have (asymptotically) accurate size if the conditional generators have error decay exponents α_1 and α_2 such that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 > 1/2$ for some specific distance measures D_X and D_Y . This allows for nonparametric rates for conditional mean embedding estimation.

A wild bootstrap procedure for test calibration. The limiting null distribution of $n\widehat{T}_J$ is not pivotal and involves unknown quantities related to eigenvalues of certain operators depending on the kernels and the unknown joint distribution P_{XYZ} ; see Theorem 1 for details. These un-

known quantities make the limiting null distribution (and its quantiles) difficult to approximate in practice. Therefore, we instead adopt a wild bootstrap procedure (see, e.g., Section 2.4 of Zhang et al. (2018)) to approximate the null distribution of $n\widehat{T}_J$. More concretely, we use B to denote the bootstrap sample size, and for each $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, we generate n i.i.d. random multipliers $\{e_{bi}\}_{i=1}^n$ from the standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$. A bootstrap version of \widehat{T}_J is then defined by injecting the random multipliers as

$$\widehat{T}_J^b = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ \frac{1}{\frac{n}{J}(\frac{n}{J} - 1)} \sum_{\substack{k \neq \ell \\ k, \ell \in \mathcal{J}^{(j)}}} \widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell) \widehat{V}(Y_k, Y_\ell) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_k, Z_\ell) e_{bk} e_{\ell b} \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\widehat{U}(X_k, X_\ell)$ and $\widehat{V}(Y_k, Y_\ell)$ are defined as earlier. We then reject H_0 at level $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ if the empirical bootstrap reject proportion given the data \mathcal{D} falls below γ , or $B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{T}_J^b > \widehat{T}_J\}} < \gamma$.

3 Theoretical Properties

In this section, we provide asymptotic analysis of the proposed plug-in test statistic \widehat{T}_J based on the improved oracle statistic T^* using sample splitting and cross-fitting, as defined in Section 2.4. Our asymptotic analysis includes deriving the limiting distribution of the test statistic and proving the bootstrap consistency under the null H_0 as well as analyzing the power of the corresponding testing procedure under a sequence of local alternatives $\{H_{1n}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ that lie near and/or above the detection boundary.

3.1 Limiting distribution and bootstrap consistency under H_0

Before presenting our theoretical results, we need to make the following assumption on the employed kernels and qualities of conditional generators $\{(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X^{(j)}, \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_Y^{(j)})\}_{j=1}^J$, implicitly through their generated samples $(\widehat{X}_i^{(m)}, \widehat{Y}_i^{(m)})$ for $i \in [n]$ and $m \in [M]$, trained during sampling splitting. Recall that $\widetilde{X} = \mathbb{G}_X^*(\eta, Z)$ and $\widetilde{Y} = \mathbb{G}_Y^*(\kappa, Z)$ denote a valid pair of random vectors satisfying all properties in Lemma 1, whose marginal conditional distributions given Z are $P_{X|Z}$ and $P_{Y|Z}$ respectively and we denote $\widetilde{X}_i^{(m)} = \mathbb{G}_X^*(\eta_i^m, Z_i)$, $\widetilde{Y}_i^{(m)} = \mathbb{G}_Y^*(\kappa_i^m, Z_i)$.

Assumption 2. Assume $M \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. There exist constants $C_0 > 0$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ satisfying $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 > \frac{1}{2}$, such that for $D_i \in \{X_i, \widehat{X}_i^{(1)}, \widetilde{X}_i^{(1)}\}$, $E_i \in \{Y_i, \widehat{Y}_i^{(1)}, \widetilde{Y}_i^{(1)}\}$ and $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_J\}$ where $i_s \in \mathcal{J}^{(s)}$ for each $s \in [J]$, we have:

$$(a) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{K}_X(D_i, D_i) \mathcal{K}_Y(E_i, E_i) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i) \right] < C_0.$$

$$(b) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, X_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, \widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}^2 \cdot \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i)} + \mathcal{K}_Y(E_i, E_i) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i) \right) \right]} = O(n^{-\alpha_1}) \text{ and}$$

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(\cdot, Y_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(\cdot, \widehat{Y}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_Y}^2 \cdot \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i)} + \mathcal{K}_X(D_i, D_i) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i) \right) \right]} = O(n^{-\alpha_2}).$$

We make two remarks regarding this assumption.

Remark 2. If $\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{K}_Y, \mathcal{K}_Z$ are bounded kernels (without loss of generality, assume they are bounded by 1), then Assumption 2 reduces to $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, X_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, \widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}^2 \right] = O(n^{-2\alpha_1})$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(\cdot, Y_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_Y(\cdot, \widehat{Y}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_Y}^2 \right] = O(n^{-2\alpha_2})$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, X_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, \widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathbb{H}_X: \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_X} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) - f(X_i) | Z_i] \right\}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sup_{f: \mathbb{R}^{d_X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) - f(X_i) | Z_i] \right\}^2 \right] = 2 \mathbb{E} \left[d_{\text{TV}}^2(P_{\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}|Z_i}, P_{X_i|Z_i}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ denotes the function supreme norm, and $d_{\text{TV}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the total variation distance. Here, the inequality in the second line is implied by the fact that $\|f\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X}} |f(x)| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X}} |\langle f, \mathcal{K}_X(x, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X}| \leq \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_X} \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_X(x, x)} \leq \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}$. Therefore, we can also replace the error metric in Assumption 2 from an MMD type distance to the total variation distance, i.e., $\mathbb{E} \left[d_{\text{TV}}^2(P_{\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}|Z_i}, P_{X_i|Z_i}) \right] = O(n^{-2\alpha_1})$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[d_{\text{TV}}^2(P_{\widehat{Y}_i^{(1)}|Z_i}, P_{Y_i|Z_i}) \right] = O(n^{-2\alpha_2})$, which is a common assumption made in existing works for characterizing qualities of conditional generators, see Zhou et al. (2022) and Shi et al. (2021). However, the total variation metric may not be a suitable metric for characterizing the closeness between nearly mutually singular distributions, which happens when data are complex objects such as images or texts exhibiting low-dimensional manifold structures (Tang and Yang, 2023). In addition, in our theory, we only require the Monte Carlo sample size M for approximating the conditional expectations to diverge to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while existing works such as Shi et al. (2021) require M to be at least proportional to n .

Remark 3. The conditional generator $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X^{(j)}$ trained via the GMMN framework as described in Section 2.3.1 can be viewed as the minimizer of an empirical risk associated with the squared MMD between P_{XZ} and $P_{\widehat{X}Z}$ defined as

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X_i, \cdot) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, \cdot)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}, \cdot) \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, \cdot)]\|_{\mathbb{H}_{XZ}}^2 = \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathbb{H}_X \otimes \mathbb{H}_Z: \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_{XZ}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{X}_i^{(1)}, Z) - f(X_i, Z)] \right\}^2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{XZ}}$ denotes the RKHS norm associated with kernel $\mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$. By comparing this representation with the first equality in (13), we see that the population-level risk of GMMN is closely connected to and slightly weaker than the distance measure we used in our assumption for characterizing the conditional generator estimation error. The essential difference is that the supremum in our distance measure is inside the expectation. In fact, it can be shown that the quantity in the preceding display is always upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, X_i) | Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(\cdot, \widehat{X}_i^{(1)}) | Z_i] \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_X}^2 \cdot \mathcal{K}_Z(Z_i, Z_i) \right],$$

which follows from a generalized Jensen's inequality (Park and Muandet, 2020, Appendix A). For translation invariant kernels, the above quantity is exactly the error metric we used in part (b) of Assumption 2. We expect that estimation error of the conditional generator estimator $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_X^{(j)}$ based on the GMMN relative to this slightly stronger error metric is also possible to control; however, its analysis is beyond the scope of the current work, and is left for future study. In addition, our empirical results in Appendix show that conditional generator trained using the GMMN framework with a matching MMD improves the quality of the resulting testing procedure when compared to conditional generator trained via other framework (e.g., GANs with Sinkhorn loss) in terms of size control.

The following theorem provides the limiting null distribution of our statistic, whose proof is provided in Appendix.

Theorem 1. Suppose Assumption 2 holds, then under H_0 , as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\widehat{T}_J - T_J = O_p(n^{-1}[M^{-1/2} + n^{-\alpha_1} + n^{-\alpha_2}] + n^{-1/2-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}) \quad \text{and} \quad n\widehat{T}_J \xrightarrow{D} T^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^J T_j^\dagger,$$

where T_J is defined in the same way as \widehat{T}_J with $\widehat{U}(X_j, X_k), \widehat{V}(Y_j, Y_k)$ replaced by $U(X_j, X_k), V(Y_j, Y_k)$, and $\{T_j^\dagger\}_{j \in [J]}$ are i.i.d. random variables with $T_1^\dagger = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \lambda_s (\chi_s^2 - 1)$. Here, χ_s^2 are i.i.d. chi-square random variables with one degree of freedom, and λ_s 's are eigenvalues of the compact self-adjoint operator on $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_X+d_Y+d_Z}, P_{XYZ})$ induced by the kernel function $h((X_1, Y_1, Z_1), (X_2, Y_2, Z_2)) = U(X_1, X_2)V(Y_1, Y_2)$, that is, there exists orthonormal basis $\{f_i(X_1, Y_1, Z_1)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_X+d_Y+d_Z}, P_{XYZ})$ such that

$$\int h((X_1, Y_1, Z_1), (X_2, Y_2, Z_2)) f_i(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) dP_{XYZ}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1) = \lambda_i f_i(X_2, Y_2, Z_2).$$

Remark 4. The proof of Theorem 1 depends on a crucial lemma in Appendix, which shows the asymptotic order of the difference between \widehat{T}_J and the oracle statistic T_J . Since $\widehat{T}_J - T_J = o_p(n^{-1})$ if $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0, M \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 > 1/2$, under Assumption 2 we only need to show $nT_J \xrightarrow{D} T^\dagger$. Note that T^\dagger is not pivotal and contains unknown quantities that are hard to estimate, which motivates the wild bootstrap procedure.

Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of independent standard normal random variables, we define \widehat{M}_J^{nM} according to Equation (12) with $\{e_{bi}\}_{i=1}^n$ replaced by $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For a statistic B_{nM} that depends on $\{X_i, Y_i, Z_i, \eta_i^m, \kappa_i^m\}_{i=1, m=1}^{n, M}$, as in Definition 2.1 of Zhang et al. (2018), we say B_{nM} converges in distribution in probability to a random variable B^* if for any subsequence $B_{n_k M_k}$, there is a further subsequence $B_{n_{k_j} M_{k_j}}$ such that $B_{n_{k_j} M_{k_j}} | \{X_i, Y_i, Z_i, \eta_i^m, \kappa_i^m\}_{i, m=1}^{\infty}$ converges in distribution to B^* for a.e. $\{X_i, Y_i, Z_i, \eta_i^m, \kappa_i^m\}_{i, m=1}^{\infty}$. Let $\xrightarrow{D^*}$ denote convergence in distribution in probability. We have the following theorem on bootstrap consistency under H_0 , which is proved in Appendix.

Theorem 2. Suppose Assumption 2 holds, then we have $n\widehat{M}_J^{nM} \xrightarrow{D^*} T^\dagger$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ under H_0 .

This theorem shows that the bootstrapping test statistic \widehat{M}_J^{nM} admits the same limiting distribution (given data) after appropriate rescaling as the one in Theorem 2 for \widehat{T}_J . Therefore, the rejection threshold for \widehat{T}_J computed as the (conditional) quantile based on \widehat{M}_J^{nM} will lead to an asymptotically valid size for the CI test.

3.2 Power analysis under local alternatives

To facilitate the power analysis and characterize the conditional dependence detection capability of the proposed testing procedure, we introduce a sequence of local alternatives $\{H_{1n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ based on perturbing the conditional mean embedding of the null H_0 . Recall that the triple under H_0 , denoted as (X^0, Y^0, Z^0) to distinguish it from the triple under local alternatives, satisfies $X^0 \perp\!\!\!\perp Y^0 \mid Z^0$. We consider a sequence of alternative hypothesis consisting of triple (X_n^A, Y^0, Z^0) such that $X_n^A \not\perp\!\!\!\perp Y^0 \mid Z^0$ and certain difference measure between the mean embeddings of $P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0}$ and $P_{X_n^A|Z^0}$ converges to zero at rate $n^{-\alpha}$ for some index $\alpha \geq 0$; for example, $\alpha = 0$ corresponds to a fixed alternative where $X_n^A = X^A$ does not change with n .

Since (Y_0, Z_0) in the local alternative H_{1n} is the same as the null, we only need to specify the conditional distribution $P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0}$ of X_n^A given (Y^0, Z^0) . Under Assumption 1, the conditional mean embedding of X given (Y, Z) uniquely determines $P_{X|YZ}$, it is therefore more convenient to specify H_{1n} through the conditional mean embedding $\mathbb{E}[K_X(X_n^A, \cdot) \mid Y^0, Z^0] \in \mathbb{H}_X$ as follows,

$$H_{1n} : \mathbb{E}[K_X(X_n^A, \cdot) \mid Y^0, Z^0] = \mathbb{E}[K_X(X_0, \cdot) \mid Z^0] + n^{-\alpha} \mathcal{G}(Y^0, Z^0), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_X$ is any fixed \mathbb{H}_X -valued mapping (not changing with n). Note that under the null H_0 , we have $\mathbb{E}[K_X(X^0, \cdot) \mid Y^0, Z^0] = \mathbb{E}[K_X(X^0, \cdot) \mid Z^0]$, corresponding to $\mathcal{G} \equiv 0$ or the limit of H_{1n} as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, further restricting $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{G}(Y^0, Z^0) \mid Z^0] = 0$ can preserve the same (conditional) marginal distribution of X_n^A given Z^0 as that under the null, that is, $P_{X_n^A|Z^0} = P_{X^0|Z^0}$, which, however, is not necessary. Under H_{1n} , we have

$$\text{MMDCI}(P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0}) = n^{-2\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \mathcal{G}(Y^0, Z^0), \mathcal{G}(\tilde{Y}^0, \tilde{Z}^0) \mid \tilde{Z}^0 \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} \cdot V(Y^0, \tilde{Y}^0) \cdot \mathcal{K}_Z(Z^0, \tilde{Z}^0) \right] = O(n^{-2\alpha}),$$

where \tilde{Y}^0 and \tilde{Z}^0 are independent copies of Y^0 and Z^0 respectively. Note that $\text{MMDCI}(P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0})$ is the squared MMD (relative to the kernel $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_X \otimes \mathcal{K}_Y \otimes \mathcal{K}_Z$) between the joint distributions $P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0}$ and $P_{\tilde{X}_n^A|Y^0, Z^0}$, where \tilde{X}_n^A satisfies that $\tilde{X}_n^A \perp\!\!\!\perp Y^0 \mid Z^0$ and $(\tilde{X}_n^A, Z^0) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_n^A, Z^0)$ so that $(\tilde{X}_n^A, Y^0, Z^0)$ satisfies the null H_0 . Therefore, the rate $n^{-\alpha}$ quantifies the degree of deviation in the local alternative H_{1n} from the null H_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In a related work, Cai et al. (2022) considered specifying a local alternative $P_{X_n^A|Y^0, Z^0} = P_{X^0|Z^0} + n^{-1/2}(P_{X^A|Y^0, Z^0} - P_{X^A|Z^0})$

based on directly perturbing the conditional distribution $P_{X^0|Y^0,Z^0}$ of X^0 given (Y^0, Z^0) , which can be viewed as a special case of our characterization of local alternatives with $\mathcal{G}(Y^0, Z^0) = \int_{\mathbb{H}_X} \mathcal{K}_X(x, \cdot) [dP_{X^A|Y^0,Z^0}(x) - dP_{X^A|Z^0}(x)] \in \mathbb{H}_X$ and $\alpha = 1/2$.

For any fixed n , let $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d copies of (X_n^A, Y^0, Z^0) . The following theorem gives the asymptotic properties of our statistic under H_{1n} , which is proved in Appendix.

Theorem 3. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then under H_{1n} , as $n \rightarrow \infty$:*

1. *If $\alpha = 0$, then $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{T}_J - c_0) \xrightarrow{D} \frac{1}{\sqrt{J}} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{G}_j^{(0)}$, where $c_0 = \mathbb{E}\{U(X_1, X_2)V(Y_1, Y_2)\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_1, Z_2)\} > 0$ and $\mathcal{G}_j^{(0)}$ are independent mean zero normal random variables with variance equal to*

$$4 \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\{ U(X_1, X_2)V(Y_1, Y_2)\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_1, Z_2) \middle| X_2, Y_2, Z_2 \right\} \right).$$

2. *If $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, then $n^{2\alpha}\widehat{T}_J \xrightarrow{P} c$, where $c = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \mathcal{G}(Y_1, Z_1), \mathcal{G}(Y_2, Z_2) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} V(Y_1, Y_2)\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_1, Z_2) \right\} > 0$.*

3. *If $\alpha = 1/2$, then $n\widehat{T}_J \xrightarrow{D} c + T^\dagger + \frac{1}{\sqrt{J}} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{G}_j$, where \mathcal{G}_j are independent mean zero normal random variables, possibly correlated with T_j^\dagger in Theorem 1, with variance equal to*

$$4 \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[\langle \mathcal{G}(Y, Z), \mathcal{K}_X(X', \cdot) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X', \cdot) | Z'] \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} + \langle \mathcal{G}(Y', Z'), \mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_X(X, \cdot) | Z] \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_X} \right] \cdot V(Y, Y')\mathcal{K}_Z(Z, Z') \middle| X', Y', Z' \right\} \right),$$

where (X, Y, Z) and (X', Y', Z') are i.i.d copies from $P_{X^0Y^0Z^0}$.

4. *If $\alpha > 1/2$, $n\widehat{T}_J \xrightarrow{D} T^\dagger$.*

The following theorem shows the asymptotic behavior of the bootstrapping statistic \widehat{M}_J^{nM} , as well as the asymptotic power of our proposed testing procedure, under H_{1n} , which is proved in Appendix.

Theorem 4. *Suppose Assumption 2 holds, then we have that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$:*

1. *Under H_{1n} with $\alpha > 0$, $n\widehat{M}_J^{nM} \xrightarrow{D^*} T^\dagger$.*
2. *Under H_{1n} with $\alpha = 0$, $n\widehat{M}_J^{nM} \xrightarrow{D^*} T_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J \widetilde{T}_j$, where \widetilde{T}_j are i.i.d random variables with $\widetilde{T}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \gamma_i(\chi_i^2 - 1)$, χ_i^2 are i.i.d chi-square random variables with one degree of freedom and γ_i s are eigenvalues of $h((X_1, Y_1, Z_1), (X_2, Y_2, Z_2)) = U(X_1, X_2)V(Y_1, Y_2)\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_1, Z_2)$.*

If we further assume Assumptions 1 holds, then under H_{1n} : $P(n\widehat{T}_J \geq M_{nM,\gamma}^*) \rightarrow 1$ if $\alpha < 1/2$, $P(n\widehat{T}_J \geq M_{nM,\gamma}^*) \rightarrow P(c+T^\dagger + \frac{1}{\sqrt{J}} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{G}_j \geq T_{0,\gamma})$ if $\alpha = 1/2$ and $P(n\widehat{T}_J \geq M_{nM,\gamma}^*) \rightarrow \gamma$ if $\alpha > 1/2$.

According to Theorems 1 and 4, our proposed testing procedure asymptotically achieves the correct size under H_0 and is consistent in the sense that it can correctly reject H_0 under any (local) alternative H_1 lying outside a $n^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of H_0 . This means that our test is shown to have nontrivial power under alternatives that approach H_0 at the rate $n^{-1/2}$, while in a related work Pogodin et al. (2024) based on kernel smoothing, the consistency of their method is only derived under a fixed alternative.

4 Simulation Study

In this section, we examine the size and power properties of our proposed test statistic and compare with several existing tests. In Section 4.1, we investigate the influence of the fold number J on the empirical performance of \widehat{T}_J . In Sections 4.2, we consider a post nonlinear noise model and examine the performance of \widehat{T}_2 (i.e. take $J = 2$) when the dimension d_Z of Z is large. Section 4.3 contains the result for a weakly conditional independent alternative where both GCIT proposed in Bellot and van der Schaar (2019) and DGCIT proposed in Shi et al. (2021) have trivial power. Under the alternative, the size adjusted power for all bootstrap-based methods examined in this section are calculated according to Domínguez and Lobato (2000). For all the simulations in Section 4 and the two applications in Section 5, we opt to use the Laplacian kernel. The bandwidth parameter for each kernel is selected according to the median heuristic (Gretton et al., 2012, Section 8). For example, the bandwidth parameter for j th fold is defined as $\sigma_j^X = \text{median}\{\|X_i - X_s\|_1 : i, s \in \mathcal{J}^{(j)}\}$ for $j \in [J]$. We remark that our empirical result of \widehat{T}_J is not overly sensitive to the number of synthetic data M and the number of bootstrap replicates B , so we simply fix $M=100$ and $B=1000$.

4.1 Sensitivity with respect to the fold number J

We investigate the impact of fold number J on the performance of \widehat{T}_J with $J \in \{2, 4, 8\}$. We consider a data generation process (DGP) where $Z_i = e_{3i}$, $Y_i = Z_i + e_{1i}$, $X_i = Z_i + \delta_i e_{1i} + (1 - \delta_i) e_{2i}$ with

$\{e_{1i}\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{e_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{e_{3i}\}_{i=1}^n$ being independent samples following the standard normal distribution and $\delta_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(p)$, which is also independent of $\{e_{si}\}_{i=1}^n$ for $s \in [3]$. The experiments are repeated 1000 times with nominal level being fixed at 5%.

For the empirical size, we fix $p = 0$ and set $n \in \{200, 400, 600, 800, 1000\}$. As shown in Figure 1a, the empirical size for \hat{T}_J is close to the nominal level for all $J \in \{2, 4, 8\}$ for all sample size n . For the size adjusted power, we set $n = 400$ and plot the power curves against $p \in [0, 0.25]$ in Figure 1b. For any fixed p , the empirical power for \hat{T}_J decreases as J increases. This is expected since only the $J \times \frac{n^2}{J^2}$ entries in the J block diagonal distance matrices of $\{\mathcal{K}_X(X_j, X_k)\}_{j,k=1}^n$, $\{\mathcal{K}_Y(Y_j, Y_k)\}_{j,k=1}^n$ and $\{\mathcal{K}_Z(Z_j, Z_k)\}_{j,k=1}^n$ are used in evaluating \hat{T}_J and the number of pairs declines as J increases. Since the empirical size is not sensitive to the choice of J and smaller value of J corresponds to larger power, we recommend setting $J=2$ in practice.




Figure 1: Empirical size (left) and size adjusted power (right) for \hat{T}_J .

4.2 Post nonlinear noise model

Consider the following DGP adopted by Bellot and van der Schaar (2019) and Shi et al. (2021): $Y_i = \sin(a_{f_i}^\top Z_i + e_{f_i})$, $X_i = \cos(a_{g_i}^\top Z_i + bY_i + e_{g_i})$ and $Z_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_z})$, where $\{e_{f_i}\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{e_{g_i}\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.25)$ and the entries of $a_f, a_g \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ are normalized to the unit ℓ_1 norm after randomly sampled from $\text{Uniform}([0, 1]^{d_z})$. As comparison, we also include the simulation results for DGCIT, GCIT, the CI test proposed in Cai et al. (2022) (denoted as CIT) and an oracle statistic \hat{T}_2 oracle, which is \hat{T}_2 with synthetic data generated from the true conditional

generators. The experiments are repeated 500 times with sample size $n=2000$ and nominal level being fixed at 5%.

For the empirical size, we fix $b = 0$ (which corresponds to H_0) and set $d_Z \in \{50, 100, 150, 200, 250\}$. As shown in Figure 2a, \hat{T}_2 and \hat{T}_2 oracle have relatively accurate empirical size for $d_Z \leq 200$ and \hat{T}_2 is mildly undersized when $d_Z=250$. GCIT is undersized when $d_Z \leq 150$ and is oversized when $d_Z = 250$. DGCIT goes from oversized to undersized as d_Z increases at 5% level and it has large size distortion when $d_Z = 150$ at level 10%. For CIT, the empirical sizes are close to the nominal levels for all values of d_Z . However, CIT is much more computationally expensive than \hat{T}_2 . As shown in Table 1, it takes 18 minutes for CIT to finish one Monte Carlo experiment on an Intel Core i7-11800H CPU when $d_Z=50$ and the time increases to 107 minutes when $d_Z = 250$. For \hat{T}_2 the time for one experiment is about 3 minutes for all values of d_Z .

For the empirical power, we set $d_Z=200$ and plot the power curves against $b \in [0.15, 0.75]$ in Figure 2b. In general, \hat{T}_2 has the largest power compared with DGCIT, GCIT and CIT for all values of b and its power curve is close to \hat{T}_2 oracle. DGCIT outperforms GCIT when $b \leq 0.45$ while the latter has better performance when $b \in \{0.6, 0.75\}$. CIT has almost trivial power for all values of b . This is expected since it requires iterative estimation of conditional cumulative distribution functions (Cai et al., 2022, Section 3.1), which suffers from the curse of dimensionality and yields poor power performance when the dimension of the conditioning variable is large.




Figure 2: Empirical size (left) and size adjusted power (right) at nominal level 5%.

	d_Z				
	50	100	150	200	250
GCIT	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
\widehat{T}_2	2.83	3.00	3.05	3.23	3.3
DGCIT	4.85	5.33	5.67	6.23	6.45
CIT	18.33	41.27	56.32	80.57	107.35

Table 1: Computation time for one Monte Carlo experiment (in minutes). All experiments (except CIT) were conducted on Google Colab using the NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU. CIT was run on an Intel Core i7-11800H CPU. GCIT used an early stopping criterion.

4.3 Weakly conditional independent alternative

In this subsection, we show that both DGCIT and GCIT have trivial power against the alternative which is only weakly conditionally independent. Under H_0 , we generate $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as mutually independent samples from $\text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$. Under the alternative, we consider the same DGP as in Example 5 of Shi et al. (2021) where $Z_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{1}{2})$ and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pr(X_i = 0, Y_i = 0 | Z_i = 0) & \Pr(X_i = 0, Y_i = 1 | Z_i = 0) \\ \Pr(X_i = 1, Y_i = 0 | Z_i = 0) & \Pr(X_i = 1, Y_i = 1 | Z_i = 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/6 & 1/3 \\ 1/3 & 1/6 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pr(X_i = 0, Y_i = 0 | Z_i = 1) & \Pr(X_i = 0, Y_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) \\ \Pr(X_i = 1, Y_i = 0 | Z_i = 1) & \Pr(X_i = 1, Y_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 1/6 \\ 1/6 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Under both null and alternative hypothesis, we consider two settings: 1. the oracle setting where synthetic data are generated from the true conditional generators (with the impact of inaccuracy due to the use of estimated conditional generators being eliminated); 2. the practical setting where the conditional generators are learned from GNNs. The experiments are repeated 1000 times with sample size $n \in \{200, 600, 1000\}$ and nominal level being fixed at 5% and 10%. As shown in Table 2, \widehat{T}_2 , DGCIT and GCIT have accurate size under H_0 for all values of n . However, under the alternative in both oracle and practical settings, both DGCIT and GCIT have trivial power while \widehat{T}_2 can successfully detect this alternative.

	n	Null						Alternative					
		\widehat{T}_2		DGCIT		GCIT		\widehat{T}_2		DGCIT		GCIT	
		10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%
Oracle	200	10.4	4.3	11.5	6.3	10.3	5.2	96.8	91.6	13.5	7.2	8.3	4
	600	10.7	5.5	11.2	6.3	8.2	4.3	100	100	8.5	5	10.1	4.9
	1000	9.9	3.9	9.9	4.3	8.2	4.0	100	100	9.8	4.3	10.1	5
Practical	200	10.6	4.8	11.2	6.6	12.8	6.2	95.2	89	12.2	7.2	14	6.6
	600	9	4.2	11.8	6.6	10.4	4.4	100	100	12.8	7.2	11.6	5.6
	1000	11	5.6	12	7	11.2	6.6	100	100	12	7.2	9.4	4.2

Table 2: Empirical rejection rate under null and weakly conditional independent alternative.

5 Real Data Applications

In this section, we apply our method to two real-world datasets: the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE) dataset (Barretina et al., 2012) and the MNIST dataset, to assess its empirical performance in specific contexts.

5.1 CCLE dataset

The CCLE dataset contains 474 human cancer cell line entries $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{474}$ and each cell line consists of 1683 genetic mutations taking values zero or one. Here, we follow the same screening procedure as in Shi et al. (2021) and Bellot and van der Schaar (2019) and consider 466 genetic mutations, so $Z_i = (Z_i^1, \dots, Z_i^{466})^\top$. Each cancer cell line Z_i is associated with a response variable $X_i \in \mathbb{R}$, which measures the effect of cancer drug PLX4720. Our goal is to determine if some genetic mutation is related to the response after conditioning on all other mutations. To be specific, assuming $Z_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} P_Z$, $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} P_X$ and for each $j \in [466]$, we test the null hypothesis $H_0 : Z^j \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid Z^{(-j)}$ against $H_1 : Z^j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid Z^{(-j)}$, where $Z^{(-j)}$ denotes the cancer cell line Z excluding the j th mutation.

The p-values for \widehat{T}_2 , DGCIT and GCIT for ten different genetic mutations are shown in Table 3, as well as the importance ranking (one means most important) of each mutation obtained from elastic net model (EN, a high-dimensional linear regression with L_2 and L_1 penalty) and random forest (RF), both of which are commonly used in genetic studies; see Barretina et al. (2012). At 5% nominal level, both DGCIT and GCIT reject H_0 for nine of the ten genetic mutations,

with MAP3K5 and FLT3 deemed insignificant by DGCIT and GCIT respectively, while \widehat{T}_2 rejects H_0 for all ten mutations. However, as stated in Bellot and van der Schaar (2019), PLX4720 is designed as a BRAF cancer inhibitor and a proliferation of MAP3K5 is found to be of BRAF type in Prickett et al. (2014). For FLT3, both importance rankings from EN and RF place it as related with X and there is also strong evidence of its importance from genetic research; see Tsai et al. (2008) and Larrosa-Garcia and Baer (2017). In conclusion, it is reasonable to believe MAP3K5 and FLT3 are related to X given other mutations and our proposed test \widehat{T}_2 is able to detect both.

	BRAF.V600E	BRAF.MC	HIP1	FLT3	CDC42BPA	THBS3	DNMT1	PRKD1	PIP5K1A	MAP3K5
EN	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	19	78
RF	1	2	3	14	8	34	28	18	7	9
GCIT	<0.001	<0.001	0.008	0.521	0.050	0.013	0.020	0.002	0.001	<0.001
DGCIT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.794
\widehat{T}_2	0	0	0.032	0	0.001	0.048	0.001	0	0.013	0.013

Table 3: Importance rankings from EN, RF and the p-values from GCIT, DGCIT and \widehat{T}_2 .

5.2 MNIST dataset

Dimension reduction is a key building block for machine learning applications in various fields, such as computer vision and language processing. Extracting useful features from complex data helps avoid the curse of dimensionality, reduce computation burden and leads to improved model performance (Berahmand et al., 2024). As a popular non-linear feature extraction methods, the auto-encoder (AE) uses a neural network (encoder) to transform the data X to a d_l -dimensional feature vector $f_{d_l}(X)$, which is then transformed back through another neural network (decoder) for reconstruction, resulting in reconstructed data X' . A typical AE is trained by minimizing certain reconstruction error, such as the ℓ_2 -norm, between X and X' (after vectorization). The selection of the feature dimension d_l depends on the data and downstream applications and a large d_l may undermine the performance and interpretability of the model (Bonheme and Grzes, 2022).

We now demonstrate that our proposed CI test can be used to determine the best value for d_l by using the MNIST dataset that contains 70000 images of handwritten digits $Y = 0, 1, \dots, 9$. Let $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{70000}$ denote the 28×28 pixels of images and their corresponding digits, which are assumed to be i.i.d copies of the random vector (X, Y) . For different values of d_l , we consider

testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid f_{d_l}(X)$ against $H_1 : X \not\perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid f_{d_l}(X)$. The minimum value of d_l such that H_0 is not rejected will be chosen as the dimension of the feature vector. We split the MNIST dataset into training (with size 60000) and testing (with size 10000) samples. Half of the images in the training dataset are used to train an AE and the other half, as well as its feature vectors from the trained encoder, is used to learn generators of $P_{Y|f_{d_l}(X)}$ and $P_{X|f_{d_l}(X)}$. The test statistic is evaluated on 40 equal folds of the testing dataset (note that we do not perform sample splitting on each fold). As a comparison, we also include the testing result when the feature vectors are extracted using average pooling (Zafar et al., 2022, Section 2.2) and PCA, which are linear feature extraction methods. For average pooling and PCA, all the images in the training dataset are used to learn $P_{Y|f_{d_l}(X)}$ and $P_{X|f_{d_l}(X)}$.

The median of the 40 p-values are plotted in Figure 3 as a function of d_l . For AE, the median and 25% quantile of the p-values exceeds 5% level when $d_l \geq 7$ and $d_l \geq 10$ respectively. This suggests the dimension of feature vector is about 10 to 15, which is consistent with many empirical findings for MNIST data (Fournier and Aloise, 2019). For PCA, the 75% quantile of the p-values remains close to zero when $d_X \leq 10$ and the median p-value rises above 5% level when $d_l > 15$. For average pooling, the 75% quantile of the p-values remains close to zero even if the pooled image has 5×5 pixels (implemented by `torch.nn.AdaptiveAvgPool2d` with `kernel_size=8`, `stride=5`, `padding=0`). As expected, this result demonstrates that AE is much more efficient than PCA and average pooling in feature extraction for MNIST dataset.




Figure 3: The median p-values and its 25% and 75% quantiles for AE, average pooling, and PCA.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel conditional independence (CI) test that overcomes the challenges faced by existing tests when the dimensions of the data are large. By utilizing reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) embedding, sample splitting, cross-fitting as well as generative neural networks (GNNs), the test we developed is fully non-parametric, alleviates the curse of dimensionality, and is doubly robust against approximation errors of GNN generators. Extensive simulations demonstrate the accurate size and satisfactory power performance of the proposed method in comparison with existing ones. The data examples further illustrate the versatility of our proposed method in real-world applications.

To conclude, we discuss several potential extensions. In regression modeling and sufficient dimension reduction, it is often more useful to test the weaker null hypothesis of conditional mean or quantile independence to determine whether an additional predictor contributes to predicting the mean or quantile of the response variable given a set of covariates. Generalizing the proposed test to address these problems would be beneficial. Additionally, constructing a CI test with triple or multiple robustness properties for testing mutual conditional independence among multiple random variables may be desirable. Moreover, it would be interesting to apply the current method to several downstream statistical applications. For example, in time series model specification testing, where the Markov property described through conditional independence plays an important role (Zhou et al., 2023), and in nonlinear dimension reduction problems, where our test procedure could be promising in identifying the optimal dimension reduction mapping by appropriately inverting the test statistic into an estimator in a computationally efficient manner; see Huang et al. (2024) for some recent work. We leave these topics for further research.

References

Azadkia, M. and S. Chatterjee (2021). A simple measure of conditional dependence. *The Annals of Statistics* 49(6), 3070–3102.

- Bang, H. and J. M. Robins (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics* 61(4), 962–973.
- Barretina, J., G. Caponigro, N. Stransky, K. Venkatesan, A. A. Margolin, S. Kim, C. J. Wilson, J. Lehár, G. V. Kryukov, D. Sonkin, et al. (2012). The cancer cell line encyclopedia enables predictive modelling of anticancer drug sensitivity. *Nature* 483(7391), 603–607.
- Bashtannyk, D. M. and R. J. Hyndman (2001). Bandwidth selection for kernel conditional density estimation. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 36(3), 279–298.
- Bellot, A. and M. van der Schaar (2019). Conditional independence testing using generative adversarial networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 32.
- Berahmand, K., F. Daneshfar, E. S. Salehi, Y. Li, and Y. Xu (2024). Autoencoders and their applications in machine learning: a survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 57(2), 28.
- Bonheme, L. and M. Grzes (2022). Fondue: an algorithm to find the optimal dimensionality of the latent representations of variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12806*.
- Cai, Z., R. Li, and Y. Zhang (2022). A distribution free conditional independence test with applications to causal discovery. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23(85), 1–41.
- Candes, E., Y. Fan, L. Janson, and J. Lv (2018). Panning for gold: ‘model-x’ knockoffs for high dimensional controlled variable selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 80(3), 551–577.
- Chen, M., W. Liao, H. Zha, and T. Zhao (2020). Distribution approximation and statistical estimation guarantees of generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03938*.
- Cook, R. D. and B. Li (2002). Dimension reduction for conditional mean in regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 30(2), 455–474.
- Daudin, J. (1980). Partial association measures and an application to qualitative regression. *Biometrika* 67(3), 581–590.

- Domínguez, M. A. and I. N. Lobato (2000). Size corrected power for bootstrap tests. *Instituto Tecnológico Autonomo de Mexico, Technical Notes*.
- Dziugaite, G. K., D. M. Roy, and Z. Ghahramani (2015). Training generative neural networks via maximum mean discrepancy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.03906*.
- Fournier, Q. and D. Aloise (2019). Empirical comparison between autoencoders and traditional dimensionality reduction methods. In *2019 IEEE Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Engineering (AIKE)*, pp. 211–214. IEEE.
- Fukumizu, K., A. Gretton, X. Sun, and B. Schölkopf (2007). Kernel measures of conditional dependence. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 20.
- Funk, M. J., D. Westreich, C. Wiesen, T. Stürmer, M. A. Brookhart, and M. Davidian (2011). Doubly robust estimation of causal effects. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 173(7), 761–767.
- George, E. I. (2000). The variable selection problem. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 95(452), 1304–1308.
- Goodfellow, I., J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio (2014). Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 27.
- Gretton, A., K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola (2012). A kernel two-sample test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13(25), 723–773.
- Huang, J., Y. Jiao, X. Liao, J. Liu, and Z. Yu (2024). Deep dimension reduction for supervised representation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 70(5), 3583–3598.
- Huang, Z., N. Deb, and B. Sen (2022). Kernel partial correlation coefficient—a measure of conditional dependence. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23(216), 1–58.
- Izbicki, R. and A. B. Lee (2016). Nonparametric conditional density estimation in a high-dimensional regression setting. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 25(4), 1297–1316.

- Kallenberg, O. (2002). *Foundations of Modern Probability* (Second ed.). Springer.
- Kim, I., M. Neykov, S. Balakrishnan, and L. Wasserman (2022). Local permutation tests for conditional independence. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(6), 3388–3414.
- Koller, D. and N. Friedman (2009). *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques*. MIT press.
- Larrosa-Garcia, M. and M. R. Baer (2017). Flt3 inhibitors in acute myeloid leukemia: current status and future directions. *Molecular Cancer Therapeutics* 16(6), 991–1001.
- Li, B. (2018). *Sufficient Dimension Reduction: Methods and Applications with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Li, C. and X. Fan (2020). On nonparametric conditional independence tests for continuous variables. *WIREs Computational Statistics* 12(3), e1489.
- Li, M., M. Neykov, and S. Balakrishnan (2022). Minimax optimal conditional density estimation under total variation smoothness. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 16(2), 3937–3972.
- Li, S., Z. Chen, H. Zhu, C. D. Wang, and W. Wen (2023). Nearest-neighbor sampling based conditional independence testing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Volume 37, pp. 8631–8639.
- Li, Y., K. Swersky, and R. Zemel (2015). Generative moment matching networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1718–1727.
- Li, Z., D. Meunier, M. Mollenhauer, and A. Gretton (2022). Optimal rates for regularized conditional mean embedding learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 35.
- Muandet, K., K. Fukumizu, B. Sriperumbudur, B. Schölkopf, et al. (2017). Kernel mean embedding of distributions: A review and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 10(1-2), 1–141.

- Neykov, M., S. Balakrishnan, and L. Wasserman (2021). Minimax optimal conditional independence testing. *The Annals of Statistics* 49(4), 2151–2177.
- Park, J. and K. Muandet (2020). A measure-theoretic approach to kernel conditional mean embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 33.
- Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pogodin, R., N. Deka, Y. Li, D. J. Sutherland, V. Veitch, and A. Gretton (2022). Efficient conditionally invariant representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08645*.
- Pogodin, R., A. Schrab, Y. Li, D. J. Sutherland, and A. Gretton (2024). Practical kernel tests of conditional independence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13196*.
- Prickett, T. D., B. Zerlanko, J. J. Gartner, S. C. Parker, K. Dutton-Regester, J. C. Lin, J. K. Teer, X. Wei, J. Jiang, G. Chen, et al. (2014). Somatic mutations in map3k5 attenuate its proapoptotic function in melanoma through increased binding to thioredoxin. *Journal of Investigative Dermatology* 134(2), 452–460.
- Scetbon, M., L. Meunier, and Y. Romano (2022). An asymptotic test for conditional independence using analytic kernel embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 19328–19346. PMLR.
- Sen, R., A. T. Suresh, K. Shanmugam, A. G. Dimakis, and S. Shakkottai (2017). Model-powered conditional independence test. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 30.
- Shah, R. D. and J. Peters (2020). The hardness of conditional independence testing and the generalised covariance measure. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(3), 1514–1538.
- Shi, C., T. Xu, W. Bergsma, and L. Li (2021). Double generative adversarial networks for conditional independence testing. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22(285), 1–32.

- Sriperumbudur, B. K., K. Fukumizu, and G. R. Lanckriet (2011). Universality, characteristic kernels and rkhs embedding of measures. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12(70), 2389–2410.
- Su, L. and H. White (2007). A consistent characteristic function-based test for conditional independence. *Journal of Econometrics* 141(2), 807–834.
- Su, L. and H. White (2014). Testing conditional independence via empirical likelihood. *Journal of Econometrics* 182(1), 27–44.
- Szabó, Z. and B. K. Sriperumbudur (2018). Characteristic and universal tensor product kernels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18(233), 1–29.
- Tang, R. and Y. Yang (2023). Minimax rate of distribution estimation on unknown submanifolds under adversarial losses. *The Annals of Statistics* 51(3), 1282–1308.
- Tsai, J., J. T. Lee, W. Wang, J. Zhang, H. Cho, S. Mamo, R. Bremer, S. Gillette, J. Kong, N. K. Haass, et al. (2008). Discovery of a selective inhibitor of oncogenic b-raf kinase with potent antimelanoma activity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105(8), 3041–3046.
- Wang, X., W. Pan, W. Hu, Y. Tian, and H. Zhang (2015). Conditional distance correlation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 110(512), 1726–1734.
- Zafar, A., M. Aamir, N. Mohd Nawi, A. Arshad, S. Riaz, A. Alruban, A. K. Dutta, and S. Almotairi (2022). A comparison of pooling methods for convolutional neural networks. *Applied Sciences* 12(17), 8643.
- Zhang, K., J. Peters, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf (2011). Kernel-based conditional independence test and application in causal discovery. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 804–813.
- Zhang, X., S. Yao, and X. Shao (2018). Conditional mean and quantile dependence testing in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(1), 219–246.

Zhou, X., Y. Jiao, J. Liu, and J. Huang (2022). A deep generative approach to conditional sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118(543), 1–12.

Zhou, Y., C. Shi, L. Li, and Q. Yao (2023). Testing for the markov property in time series via deep conditional generative learning. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 85(4), 1204–1222.