

CORRECTION

DISCUSSION OF BROWNIAN DISTANCE COVARIANCE

BY MICHAEL R. KOSOROK

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The proof of Lemma 3 in Kosorok (2009) is incorrect since the second equality in the display of the proof is, in fact, an inequality (\leq). Some results in Dueck et al. (2012) also indicate that Lemma 3 is not true. Moreover, it is not hard to obtain simple counterexamples. For example, if $X^{(2)}$ is a Rademacher random variable [i.e., $P(X^{(2)} = -1) = P(X^{(2)} = 1) = 1/2$] and $X^{(3)}$ is zero with probability 1, then $f_{\bar{X}}(t) = \cos(t)$ and the inequality is strict for all t for which $|\cos(t)| \neq 1$.

Nevertheless, the conclusions of Lemma 6 in Kosorok (2009) remain valid, as shown in Lyons (2013), under even weaker conditions than those given in the statement of the lemma. Moreover, the other results of Kosorok (2009) are unaffected by Lemma 3 and thus remain valid.

Acknowledgments. Thanks to Steven Hoberman, Dominic Edelmann and Tilmann Gneiting for drawing my attention to this error. Thanks also to Russell Lyons for making me aware of his results.

REFERENCES

- DUECK, J., EDELMANN, D., GNEITING, T. and RICHARDS, D. (2012). The affinely invariant distance correlation. Unpublished manuscript. Available at arXiv:1210.2482 [math.ST].
- KOSOROK, M. R. (2009). Discussion of: Brownian distance covariance. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **3** 1270–1278. [MR2752129](#)
- LYONS, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *Ann. Probab.* To appear.

DEPARTMENT OF BIostatISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA 27599
USA
E-MAIL: kosorok@unc.edu