

Efficient correlation matching for fitting  
discrete multivariate distributions  
with arbitrary marginals and normal-copula dependence

Athanassios N. Avramidis

School of Mathematics, University of Southampton  
Highfield, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UNITED KINGDOM  
A.Avramidis@soton.ac.uk

Nabil Channouf and Pierre L'Ecuyer

Département d'Informatique et de Recherche Opérationnelle  
Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Succ. Centre-Ville  
Montréal, H3C 3J7, CANADA  
{channoun, lecuyer}@iro.umontreal.ca

March 14, 2008

## Abstract

A popular approach for modeling dependence in a finite-dimensional random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  with given univariate marginals is via a normal copula that fits the rank or linear correlations for the bivariate marginals of  $\mathbf{X}$ . In this approach, known as the NORTA method, the normal distribution function is applied to each coordinate of a vector  $\mathbf{Z}$  of correlated standard normals to produce a vector  $\mathbf{U}$  of correlated uniform random variables over  $(0, 1)$ ; then  $\mathbf{X}$  is obtained by applying the inverse of the target marginal distribution function for each coordinate of  $\mathbf{U}$ . The fitting requires finding the appropriate correlation  $\rho$  between any two given coordinates of  $\mathbf{Z}$  that would yield the target rank or linear correlation  $r$  between the corresponding coordinates of  $\mathbf{X}$ . This root-finding problem is easy to solve when the marginals are continuous, but not when they are discrete. In this paper, we provide a detailed analysis of this root-finding problem for the case of discrete marginals. We prove key properties of  $r$  and of its derivative as a function of  $\rho$ . It turns out that the derivative is easier to evaluate than the function itself. Based on that, we propose and compare alternative methods for finding or approximating the appropriate  $\rho$ . The case of discrete distributions with unbounded support is covered as well. In our numerical experiments, a derivative-supported method is faster and more accurate than a state-of-the-art, non-derivative-based method. We also characterize the asymptotic convergence rate of the function  $r$  (as a function of  $\rho$ ) to the continuous-marginals limiting function, when the discrete marginals converge to continuous distributions.

KEYWORDS: statistics; multivariate distribution; estimation; correlation; copula; simulation.

## 1 Introduction

This paper develops methods that support the estimation (fitting) of *discrete* multivariate distributions. A powerful scheme for modeling multivariate distributions in general is based on the concept of *copula*; it permits one to specify separately the marginal distributions and the stochastic dependence. To put our work in the proper perspective, we start by recalling basic facts from copula theory. For a concise introduction to copulas, see Embrechts et al. (2002) or Joe (1997); for a more complete treatment, see Nelsen (1999).

A function  $C : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is called a *copula* if it is the distribution function of a random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $U(0, 1)$  marginals (uniform over the interval  $(0, 1)$ ). Consider a random vector  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  with joint distribution  $F$  and write  $F_j$  for the marginal distribution of  $X_j$ . A *copula associated with  $F$*  (equivalently,  $\mathbf{X}$ ) is a copula  $C$  that satisfies

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = C(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)), \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1)$$

Given an arbitrary  $F$ , a copula  $C$  satisfying (1) always exists. If each  $X_j$  is a continuous random variable, then  $C$  is unique, and this uniqueness means that we have separated the marginals from the dependence structure, which is captured by  $C$ . (Otherwise, there may be more than one  $C$  satisfying (1), so the dependence cannot be uniquely characterized.) We will shortly specify a class of distributions  $F$  via (1) by specifying the dependence via a  $d$ -variate copula  $C$  that is selected *after* the marginals have been selected. For given marginals, the choice of copula can have a dramatic impact; see Embrechts et al. (2003, Sec. 7.1) for an example.

In this paper, we nevertheless restrict our attention to *normal copulas*; these are the copulas defined by taking  $F$  as a multivariate normal distribution in (1). This family of copulas has been suggested by several authors, dating back to Mardia (1970). Attractive features of normal copulas are that they facilitate estimation (as will be explained) and simulation. They are sufficient and very convenient for a wide range of applications where fitting only the marginals and the correlations is a reasonable compromise. In more than two or three dimensions, estimating the entire copula in a complicated real-life situation is often an insurmountable challenge.

Other models of discrete multivariate distributions can be found, e.g., in Joe (1997, sec. 7.2). A limitation of several of these models is that the same parameters affect the marginal distributions and the dependence. For example, in Model (7.27) of Joe (1997) the  $X_i$ 's are conditionally independent Poisson with mean  $A_i$ , where the  $A_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , obey some multivariate continuous distribution; but the upper limit  $\text{Corr}(X_i, X_j) = 1$  is only possible in the limit where  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  have identical marginals and  $\text{Var}(X_i)/\mathbb{E}(X_i) \rightarrow \infty$ ; a further limitation is that if one wanted negative binomial marginals for the  $X_i$ , then one would need the  $A_i$  to obey a multivariate distribution

with gamma marginals, which is not convenient to use (Joe, 1997, p. 236).

Returning to the normal copula, if we write  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{R}}$  for the normal distribution with mean the zero vector and  $d \times d$  correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$ , and  $C_{\mathbf{R}}$  for the associated copula defined via (1) with  $F = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{R}}$ , we have the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= (Z_1, \dots, Z_d) \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{R}} \\ \mathbf{X} &= (X_1, \dots, X_d) = (F_1^{-1}[\Phi(Z_1)], \dots, F_d^{-1}([\Phi(Z_d)])), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\Phi$  is the standard normal distribution function (with mean 0 and variance 1) and  $F_i^{-1}$ , defined by  $F_i^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x : F_i(x) \geq u\}$  for  $0 \leq u \leq 1$ , is the *quantile function* of the marginal distribution  $F_i$ . It is easily seen that  $C_{\mathbf{R}}$  is a copula associated with  $\mathbf{X}$  in (2). This  $C_{\mathbf{R}}$  is a *normal copula*. Model (2) is also known under the name *NORTA* (Cario and Nelson, 1996, 1997; Chen, 2001), an acronym for *NORmal To Anything*, since normal variates are transformed to variates with general nonuniform marginals.

The main issue here is how to find a matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  such that the vector  $\mathbf{X}$  has the desired rank or linear correlation matrix, either exactly or approximately. The natural way of doing this is element-wise, so we start by discussing the bivariate case ( $d = 2$ ). Later, we will discuss the extension to  $d > 2$ .

Suppose that  $d = 2$  and that the marginals  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  have been specified. Selecting  $\mathbf{R}$  in (2) reduces to selecting the scalar correlation  $\rho = \text{Corr}(Z_1, Z_2)$ . The *rank correlation* between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is

$$r_X(\rho) = r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2) = \text{Corr}(F_1(X_1), F_2(X_2)) = \text{Corr}(F_1 \circ F_1^{-1} \circ \Phi(Z_1), F_2 \circ F_2^{-1} \circ \Phi(Z_2))$$

where  $\rho = \text{Corr}(Z_1, Z_2)$  and “ $\circ$ ” denotes function composition. We will explain shortly that  $r_X$  may depend on the marginals only if at least one of them is not continuous. One approach to specifying  $\rho$  is to require that  $r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$  equals a given target value  $\tilde{r}$ , which may be the sample rank correlation computed from data, (observations of  $\mathbf{X}$ ), or determined otherwise. This leads to the *NORTA rank-correlation matching* problem of solving

$$r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2) = \tilde{r}. \quad (3)$$

The dependence of  $r_X$  on the marginals disappears when  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are both continuous:  $F_l \circ F_l^{-1}$ ,  $l = 1, 2$  are the identity map, and thus

$$r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2) = \text{Corr}(\Phi(Z_1), \Phi(Z_2)) = (6/\pi) \arcsin(\rho/2),$$

where the second equality is a well-known property of the bivariate normal distribution (references are given in the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 2.1). Thus, solving (3) is trivial if all marginals are continuous, and the solution is  $2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$ ; consequently, the solution poses a problem only when at least one of the marginals is not continuous.

Another possibility would be to work analogously with the *linear correlation* (also called *product-moment correlation*):

$$\rho_X(\rho; F_1, F_2) = \text{Corr}(X_1, X_2) = \text{Corr}(F_1^{-1} \circ \Phi(Z_1), F_2^{-1} \circ \Phi(Z_2)),$$

which leads to the *NORTA linear-correlation matching* equality:

$$\rho_X(\rho; F_1, F_2) = \tilde{\rho}, \tag{4}$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}$  is the sample linear correlation computed from data. Embrechts et al. (2002) give a detailed account of measures of dependence and strong arguments that rank correlation is a more appropriate measure than linear correlation. We review their Example 5, which illuminates this issue. Consider the marginals  $X_1 \sim \text{Lognormal}(0, 1)$  and  $X_2 \sim \text{Lognormal}(0, \sigma^2)$  for  $\sigma > 0$ . Under several measures of dependence discussed there, extreme positive and negative dependence occur when  $X_2$  is an increasing (decreasing) function of  $X_1$ , i.e., in the stochastic representations  $(X_1, X_2) = (e^Z, e^{\sigma Z})$  and  $(X_1, X_2) = (e^Z, e^{-\sigma Z})$ , respectively, where  $Z \sim \text{Normal}(0, 1)$ . Then the rank correlation of the pair  $(X_1, X_2)$  equals 1 and  $-1$ , respectively. On the other hand, we have:  $\text{Corr}(e^Z, e^{\sigma Z}) = (e^\sigma - 1)/\sqrt{(e - 1)(e^{\sigma^2} - 1)}$  and  $\text{Corr}(e^Z, e^{-\sigma Z}) = (e^{-\sigma} - 1)/\sqrt{(e - 1)(e^{\sigma^2} - 1)}$ ; these continuous functions of  $\sigma$  are far from 1 and  $-1$  over most of their domain, and they converge to zero as  $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ . Here, linear correlation fails to capture well the dependence, and the failure is dramatic in the limit. Hörmann et al. (2004, Section 12.5) give additional examples of this phenomenon and strongly recommend matching the rank correlations instead of the linear correlations.

When  $d > 2$ , (2) is specified by constructing  $\mathbf{R}$  elementwise. That is, for each pair  $(i, j)$ , one has a target value  $\tilde{r}_{i,j}$  (or  $\tilde{\rho}_{i,j}$ ) and one sets the  $(i, j)$ -th element of  $\mathbf{R}$  to the solution of (3) with  $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}_{i,j}$  (or the solution of (4) with  $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}_{i,j}$ ). Thus, one needs to solve  $d(d - 1)/2$  such independent equations. In case the resulting matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is not positive semidefinite, various authors suggest replacing it by another matrix that is positive semidefinite and minimizes some measure of distance from  $\mathbf{R}$  (Mardia, 1970; Cario and Nelson, 1997; Lurie and Goldberg, 1998; Ghosh and Henderson, 2003). According to Ghosh and Henderson (2003), this appears to work well, in the sense that the minimized distance was very small in their tests.

Another related setting is the VARTA class of multivariate stationary time series (Biller and Nelson, 2003),  $\{\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{1,t}, \dots, X_{k,t}), t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ , where one specifies the marginals  $F_l$  for  $l = 1, \dots, k$  and dependence via the normal copula, i.e., via correlations between  $X_{i,t}$  and  $X_{j,t-h}$  for  $h = 0, 1, \dots, p$  and  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ; the univariate case  $k = 1$  is known as ARTA (Cario and Nelson, 1996). That is, the  $i$ -th component time series is obtained by the transformation  $X_{i,t} = F_i^{-1}(\Phi(Z_{i,t}))$ , where  $\{\mathbf{Z}_t\} = (Z_{1,t}, \dots, Z_{k,t})$  is a  $k$ -variate vector autoregressive process of order  $p$  and whose noise vectors are Gaussian; see Biller and Nelson (2003, Section 3.1.1). Here, the number of equations that must be solved is  $pk^2 + k(k - 1)/2$ . (The complications and remedies mentioned

earlier have analogs in the time-series setting). Because the number of equations to be solved can be considerable, efficient methods for solving equations of the form (3) and (4) are of interest.

We now review past work on NORTA correlation matching. This literature has emphasized linear-correlation matching (Cario and Nelson, 1998; Chen, 2001; Biller and Nelson, 2003), despite the existing arguments in favor of rank correlation, and in principle applies to both continuous and discrete marginals, unless otherwise said. Cario and Nelson (1998) employ root bracketing combined with approximating  $\rho_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$  (a function of  $\rho$ ) via two-dimensional numerical integration (Gauss and Kronrod quadrature rules). With discrete marginals, the integrand has a discontinuity at every support point, so these general-purpose quadrature rules are not well-suited. Chen (2001) proposed a simulation-based approach. Biller and Nelson (2003) showed that the restriction of the marginals to certain Johnson families simplifies the solution. For the case of discrete marginals, we were unable to find a published or unpublished example of NORTA rank- or linear-correlation matching.

The main contributions of this paper are a detailed study of the NORTA correlation matching problems (3) and (4) and the development of efficient methods for solving these problems *when the marginal distributions are discrete*. We do not address the case where some marginals are discrete and others are continuous. Allowing the support to be infinite, we express  $r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$  as an infinite series, where each term involves a bivariate normal integral to the northeast of a bivariate support point. We obtain the derivative of  $r_X$  with respect to  $\rho$  as a series of terms that only involve the exponential function. For finite support, it turns out that the derivative is considerably faster to evaluate than  $r_X$ , even if one uses state-of-the-art methods to compute the bivariate normal integrals. We then develop solution methods that exploit the derivative. In particular, we propose a simple Newton-type method, which in numerical experiments is faster and more accurate than a state-of-the-art, non-derivative-based method. For unbounded marginals, we propose a method that does not require evaluating  $r_X$  and that substitutes an approximation of the derivative (obtained by truncating the series); and we provide bounds on the resulting error.

Another contribution is an asymptotic upper bound and convergence result on the  $L_\infty$  distance (i.e., the supremum over  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$  of the absolute difference) between the rank-correlation function  $r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$  for given discrete marginals  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and the explicitly known analog for continuous marginals, in terms of the maximum probability masses of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , as these masses go to zero. The bound is relevant to the correlation-matching problem in the following sense. Suppose one uses the continuous-marginals solution,  $2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$ , as an approximation. If the bound were smaller than the desired accuracy, then our algorithms would no longer be needed. In our examples, the bound was larger than the desired accuracy, so the discrete-marginals correlation-matching problem had to be dealt with directly.

Our results and methods for the rank-correlation problem extend immediately to the linear-correlation problem, under mild uniform convergence conditions. For reasons given earlier, we em-

phasize the rank-correlation problem and discuss only briefly the extension to the linear-correlation problem.

The remainder is organized as follows. Section 2.1 summarizes relevant background. In Section 2.1, we prove key properties of the rank and linear correlations as a function of  $\rho$ , we obtain expressions for their derivatives, and we discuss implications. Section 2.2 proposes an approximation to the derivative, with error bounds, for the infinite-support case. The convergence result to the continuous case is proved in Section 2.3. Section 3 specifies the benchmark and the new methods for bivariate NORTA correlation matching, for either finite or infinite support. In Section 4 we give numerical examples.

## 2 Mathematical properties

### 2.1 Background

Theorem 1 below summarizes useful known results that hold for arbitrary marginals. Let

$$\phi_\rho(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(x^2 - 2\rho xy + y^2)}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right\}, \quad (5)$$

the bivariate standard normal density function with correlation  $\rho$ .

**Theorem 1** *Assume  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are arbitrary c.d.f.'s and define  $r_X(\rho) = \text{Corr}(F_1(X_1), F_2(X_2))$  and  $\rho_X(\rho) = \text{Corr}(X_1, X_2)$  with  $(X_1, X_2)$  defined as in (2) with  $\rho = \text{Corr}(Z_1, Z_2)$ .*

- 1 *The functions  $r_X$  and  $\rho_X$  are nondecreasing on  $[-1, 1]$ . We have  $r_X(0) = 0$  and  $\rho_X(0) = 0$ .*
- 2 *Assume there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[|X_1 X_2|^{1+\delta}] < \infty$  for all  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ . Then  $r_X$  and  $\rho_X$  are continuous on  $[-1, 1]$ .*
- 3 *If the marginals  $F_l$  are continuous, then*

$$\text{Corr}(F_1(X_1), F_2(X_2)) = 12g_C(\rho) - 3 = \frac{6}{\pi} \arcsin(\rho/2) =: r_C(\rho), \quad (6)$$

where

$$g_C(\rho) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(x_1)\Phi(x_2)\phi_\rho(x_1, x_2)dx_1dx_2.$$

*Proof.* For the linear correlation  $\rho_X$ , parts 1 and 2 are Theorems 1 and 2 of Cario and Nelson (1997), respectively. These unpublished results are straightforward extensions to the case of different marginals of analogous results published as Theorems 1 and 2 in Cario and Nelson (1996) for the case of identical marginals. To prove the analogous results for  $r_X$ , it suffices to replace the nondecreasing functions  $F_l^{-1} \circ \Phi$  in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 of Cario and Nelson (1997), respectively, by the nondecreasing functions  $F_l \circ F_l^{-1} \circ \Phi$  for  $l = 1, 2$ . According to Kurowicka and

Cooke (2001), part 3 was obtained by Karl Pearson in 1907. A more recent reference is Kruskal (1958).  $\square$

Parts 1 and 2 provide the basis for solving (3) and (4) via root-bracketing; see method NI1 in Section 3. In Section 2.3 we provide a theoretical result that establishes  $r_C(\rho)$  as a natural approximation of  $r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$ . The derivative-based solution methods of Section 3 can work without this approximation, but the approximation usually helps increase their speed.

This section develops the basis for the proposed solution methods. We assume that marginals are discrete and satisfy weak conditions and we develop explicit formulæ for the derivatives of the functions  $r_X$  and  $\rho_X$ .

For  $l = 1, 2$ , we assume that the positive support can be (and is) enumerated in increasing order as  $0 \leq x_{l,0} < x_{l,1} < x_{l,2} < \dots$  and that the negative support is enumerated as  $0 > x_{l,-1} > x_{l,-2} > \dots$ . Here is an example of a positive support that is not enumerable as above: there is a support point  $x_0 > 0$  such that there are infinitely many positive support points to the left of  $x_0$  and there are support points to the right of  $x_0$ . The enumeration is straightforward for most discrete distributions usually encountered in applications, e.g., discrete uniform, binomial, geometric, Poisson, negative binomial, and certainly for many more, e.g., any finite mixture of any of these. Also note that a negative support is enumerable as above if it is obtained by reflection about zero of a conforming (enumerable as above) positive support. From this practical standpoint, the assumption does not appear restrictive.

Denote the probability mass of  $x_{l,j}$  as  $p_{l,j}$ . For any integer  $k$ , the cumulative probability mass is  $f_{l,k} = \sum_{j=-\infty}^k p_{l,j}$ . For  $l = 1, 2$ ,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_{l,k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_{l,-k} = 0$ . Write  $z_{l,k} = \Phi^{-1}(f_{l,k})$ , and note that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_{l,k} = -\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_{l,-k} = \infty$ . Results are stated below for the case where each marginal has infinite support. The finite-support case is an (artificial) special case; to see this, note that if the probability mass above zero is concentrated on a finite number of points, then an increasing sequence of artificial points  $x_{l,j}$  with probability  $p_{l,j} = 0$  can be added as needed, and similarly for the probability mass below zero.

**Derivative of the rank correlation.** The rank correlation between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is

$$r_X(\rho) = \text{Corr}(F_1(X_1), F_2(X_2)) = \frac{g(\rho) - \mu_1\mu_2}{\sigma_1\sigma_2}, \quad (7)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} g(\rho) &= \mathbb{E}[F_1(X_1)F_2(X_2)] \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_1\{F_1^{-1}[\Phi(x_1)]\}F_2\{F_2^{-1}[\Phi(x_2)]\}\phi_\rho(x_1, x_2)dx_1dx_2, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\mu_k$  and  $\sigma_k$  are the known mean and standard deviation of  $F_k(X_k)$ , respectively. Note that  $r_X$  involves only shifting and scaling of  $g$  by known constants. We rewrite the double integral in

(8) as

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\rho) &= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} f_{1,i} f_{2,j} \left( \int_{z_{1,i-1}}^{z_{1,i}} \int_{z_{2,j-1}}^{z_{2,j}} \phi_{\rho}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \right) \tag{9} \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} f_{1,i} f_{2,j} [\bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i-1}, z_{2,j-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i-1}, z_{2,j}) - \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j-1}) + \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j})] \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} (f_{1,i+1} - f_{1,i})(f_{2,j+1} - f_{2,j}) \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{1,i+1} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

which involves the *bivariate normal integral*  $\bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(x, y) = \int_x^{\infty} \int_y^{\infty} \phi_{\rho}(z_1, z_2) dz_1 dz_2$ . In the derivation above, (9) follows directly from the definition (2); the second step rewrites each double integral over a square as the signed summation of four terms involving four related integrals at the square's corners; the third step is a simple rearrangement of the summation. Observe that in (10), the weight  $p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1}$  multiplies the value of  $\bar{\Phi}_{\rho}$  at  $(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j})$ , not at  $(z_{1,i+1}, z_{2,j+1})$ . If  $x_{1,i+1}$  and  $x_{2,j+1}$  are the smallest values with positive probabilities for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively, then  $z_{1,i} = z_{2,j} = -\infty$ , so  $\bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) = 1$  and the corresponding term in (10) is  $p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1}$ . As a special case, suppose  $X_1$  is degenerate to a single value, say  $p_{1,i+1} = 1$ . Then, (10) yields

$$g(\rho) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(-\infty, z_{2,j}) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \bar{\Phi}(\Phi^{-1}(f_{2,j})) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} (1 - f_{2,j}) = \mathbb{E}[\bar{F}_2(X_2)]$$

(a constant), where  $\bar{F}_2(x) := P[X_2 \geq x]$ . If both  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are degenerate, this gives  $g(\rho) \equiv 1$ .

**Proposition 1** *The function  $g(\rho)$  is infinitely differentiable on the interval  $(-1, 1)$ , with first derivative*

$$g'(\rho) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{1,i+1} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}). \tag{11}$$

*Proof.* We start with the first derivative. We will exploit the property of the bivariate standard normal density that for  $-1 < \rho < 1$ ,

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} \phi_{\rho}(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \phi_{\rho}(x, y) \quad \text{for any } x, y \tag{12}$$

(Kendall and Stuart, 1977, p. 393, exercise 15.4). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\rho} \bar{\Phi}_{\rho}(x, y) &= \int_x^{\infty} \int_y^{\infty} \frac{d}{d\rho} \phi_{\rho}(z_1, z_2) dz_2 dz_1 \\
&= \int_x^{\infty} \frac{d}{dz_1} \left[ \int_y^{\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} \phi_{\rho}(z_1, z_2) dz_2 \right] dz_1 \\
&= \int_x^{\infty} \frac{d}{dz_1} [-\phi_{\rho}(z_1, y)] dz_1 \\
&= \phi_{\rho}(x, y). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$



In steps one and two, the interchange of differentiation and integration is valid because of the existence and boundedness of the derivatives over the integration domain; in step two, we used (12); steps three and four use the fundamental theorem of calculus.

Equation (13) shows that the derivative of each term in the series (10) is the corresponding term in the series (11). It remains to show the validity of interchanging the order of differentiation and summation. A sufficient condition for this is that for each  $\rho_0 \in (-1, 1)$ , there is a neighborhood of  $\rho_0$ ,  $N_\epsilon(\rho_0) = (\rho_0 - \epsilon, \rho_0 + \epsilon) \subset (-1, 1)$ , such that the series on the right side of (11) converges uniformly for  $\rho \in N_\epsilon(\rho_0)$  (Rudin, 1976, Theorem 7.17). This uniform convergence holds in particular if there is an increasing sequence of finite sets  $S_k \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho \in N_\epsilon(\rho_0)} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus S_k} p_{1,j+1} p_{2,j+1} \phi_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) = 0. \quad (14)$$

(Since all the terms in (11) are non-negative, this condition is actually a special case of the well-known Cauchy criterion for uniform convergence (Rudin, 1976, Theorem 7.8).) The latter condition is easily verified if we take  $S_k$  as the bounded rectangle  $\{(i, j) : \max(|i|, |j|) \leq k\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\rho \in N_\epsilon(\rho_0)} \sum_{(i,j) : \max(|i|, |j|) > k} p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1} \phi_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho_*^2}} \left[ \sum_{i: |i| > k} p_{1,i+1} + \sum_{j: |j| > k} p_{2,j+1} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $\rho_* = \max(|\rho - \epsilon|, |\rho + \epsilon|)$ . To study the higher-order derivatives, we note that  $\phi_\rho(x, y) = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2} \phi(x) \phi[(y - \rho x)(1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}]$  and we change from coordinates  $(x, y)$  to polar coordinates  $(r, \theta)$ , i.e., set  $x = r \cos \theta$ ,  $y = r \sin \theta$ , where  $r \geq 0$  and  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  and write  $\phi_\rho^{(d)}$  for the  $d$ -th derivative of  $\phi_\rho$  with respect to  $\rho$  for  $|\rho| \leq 1 - \delta$ . Differentiation gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_\rho^{(1)}(r, \theta)| &= \left| \phi(r \cos \theta) \phi \left( \frac{ra(\theta, \rho)}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \right) \frac{(1-\rho^2)[2r^2a(\theta, \rho) - 1] \cos \theta + r^2a^2(\theta, \rho)}{2(1-\rho^2)^{5/2}} \right| \\ &\leq K_1 r^2 \exp(-r^2 b(\theta, \rho)/2) \quad \text{for all } r, \theta, \text{ and } |\rho| \leq 1 - \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where  $a(\theta, \rho) = \sin \theta - \rho \cos \theta$ ,  $b(\theta, \rho) = (1 - 2\rho \sin \theta \cos \theta)/(1 - \rho^2)$ , and  $K_1$  is a positive constant. First, observe that for any  $\alpha > 0$  and positive integer  $d$ ,  $r^d \exp(-\alpha r^2)$  is a bounded function of  $r$  for  $r \geq 0$ . Second, for any  $\theta$ , simple calculus shows that  $\inf_{\rho \in [-1, 1]} b(\theta, \rho) \geq 1/2$ . This shows that

$$\sup_{|\rho| \leq 1 - \delta, r \geq 0, \theta \in [0, 2\pi]} |\phi_\rho^{(d)}(r, \theta)| < \infty \quad (17)$$

for  $d = 1$ . Thus, the analog of (15) holds when we substitute  $|\phi_\rho^{(1)}|$  for  $\phi_\rho$ ; this proves that  $g$  has a second derivative on  $(-1, 1)$  and that this derivative is an infinite series analogous to (11) (in each term, one replaces  $\phi_\rho$  by  $\phi_\rho^{(1)}$ ). The existence of higher-order derivatives of  $g$  follows along

similar lines, which we only sketch:  $\phi_\rho^{(d)}$  obeys a generalized expression as in (16), where the  $\phi$  terms remain intact (the multiplying fraction becomes more complicated); a bound as in the right of (16) applies with the exponential term intact, a power no larger than  $r^{2d}$  outside the exponential, and a different constant  $K_1$ . Thus, (17) holds for any integer  $d > 1$ , and the remaining argument is as before.  $\square$

Proposition 1, combined with the strict positivity of  $\phi_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,i})$  when  $z_{1,i}$  and  $z_{2,i}$  are finite, and part 2 of Theorem 1, yield:

**Corollary 1** *If both  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are non-degenerate distributions, then the function  $r_X$  is strictly increasing on  $[-1, 1]$ , and has therefore an inverse, i.e., there exists a mapping  $r_X^{-1} : [r_X(-1), r_X(1)] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  such that  $r_X \circ r_X^{-1}$  is the identity map.*

Corollary 1 guarantees the existence and *uniqueness* of a solution to equation (3), under the condition that  $\tilde{r} \in [r_X(-1), r_X(1)]$ .

**Derivative of the linear correlation.** Analogous properties can be derived for the linear correlation between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , defined as

$$\rho_X(\rho) = \text{Corr}(X_1, X_2) = \frac{g_L(\rho) - \lambda_1 \lambda_2}{\tau_1 \tau_2},$$

where

$$g_L(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_1^{-1}[\Phi(x_1)] F_2^{-1}[\Phi(x_2)] \phi_\rho(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2, \quad (18)$$

and  $\lambda_i$  and  $\tau_i^2 < \infty$  are the known mean and variance of  $F_i$ , respectively. Following the reasoning that led to (10), we obtain the analogous series representation

$$g_L(\rho) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (x_{1,i+1} - x_{1,i}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} (x_{2,j+1} - x_{2,j}) \bar{\Phi}_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}). \quad (19)$$

Cario and Nelson (1998, eq. (5)) have stated an expression for the function  $g_L$  that is analogous to (9) (mass points appear instead of cumulative probabilities); they heuristically truncate both summations to a finite number of terms without providing an estimate of the truncation error.

To obtain an analogue of Proposition 1, we must justify the interchange of derivative with summation when we differentiate (19) with respect to  $\rho$ . A sufficient uniform convergence condition in this case is

**Condition 1** For each  $\rho_0 \in (-1, 1)$ , there is a neighborhood  $N_\epsilon(\rho_0) = (\rho_0 - \epsilon, \rho_0 + \epsilon) \subset (-1, 1)$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho \in N_\epsilon(\rho_0)} \sum_{(i,j): \max(|i|, |j|) > k} (x_{1,i+1} - x_{1,i})(x_{2,j+1} - x_{2,j}) \phi_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) = 0. \quad (20)$$

**Proposition 2** *If Condition 1 holds, then the function  $g_{\mathbf{L}}(\rho)$  is differentiable on  $(-1, 1)$  with first derivative*

$$g'_{\mathbf{L}}(\rho) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (x_{1,i+1} - x_{1,i}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} (x_{2,j+1} - x_{2,j}) \phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}). \quad (21)$$

Moreover, if Condition 1 holds with  $\phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j})$  replaced by its  $n$ th derivative with respect to  $\rho$  for  $n = 1, \dots, d$ , then  $g_{\mathbf{L}}(\rho)$  is  $d$  times continuously differentiable over  $(-1, 1)$ .

*Proof.* The proof parallels that of Proposition 1 and we omit the details.  $\square$

Condition 1 is clearly verified if both  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  have finite support. A bounded support (i.e., if all the probability mass of the joint distribution is contained in a bounded rectangle) is also a (weaker) sufficient condition. For discrete distributions with unbounded support, the condition will hold if the tail probabilities  $1 - F_l(x)$  converge to zero at a fast enough rate when  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . If the support is the set of non-negative integers (this is the case for most popular discrete distributions with infinite support), it is natural to take  $x_{l,i} = i$  for all  $i$ . We then have  $(x_{1,i+1} - x_{1,i})(x_{2,j+1} - x_{2,j}) = 1$  so all we need is that  $|z_{l,i}| = |\Phi^{-1}(F_l(x_{l,i}))|$  increases quickly enough with  $i$ , for  $l = 1, 2$ .

Suppose for example that the support is the set of positive integers (so  $x_{l,i} = i$ ) and that the tail of  $F_l$  decreases at an exponential rate:  $1 - F_l(x) \leq \exp[-\gamma x^{\alpha}]$  for  $l = 1, 2$  when  $x$  is large enough, for some positive constants  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . Several common distributions such as the geometric, negative binomial, Poisson, etc., satisfy this condition. Using the fact that  $\Phi^{-1}(y) \sim \sqrt{-2 \ln(1-y)}$  when  $y \rightarrow 1$ , we have that for large  $i$ ,

$$z_{l,i} = \Phi^{-1}(F_l(i)) \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \exp[-\gamma i^{\alpha}]) \geq (1 - \delta) \sqrt{2\gamma i^{\alpha}}$$

for some small constant  $\delta > 0$ . Putting this in (5) yields (for  $i$  and  $j$  large enough)

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) &\leq \phi_{\rho}((1 - \delta) \sqrt{2\gamma i^{\alpha}}, (1 - \delta) \sqrt{2\gamma j^{\alpha}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{2(1 - \delta)^2 \gamma (i^{\alpha} + j^{\alpha} - 2\rho(ij)^{\alpha/2})}{2(1 - \rho^2)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

But observe that  $i^{\alpha} + j^{\alpha} - 2\rho(ij)^{\alpha/2} = (i^{\alpha/2} - \rho j^{\alpha/2})^2 + (1 - \rho^2)j^{\alpha} = (j^{\alpha/2} - \rho i^{\alpha/2})^2 + (1 - \rho^2)i^{\alpha}$ .

Using this, we can easily show that for  $j$  large enough,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sup_{\rho \in N_{\epsilon}(\rho_0)} \phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \leq K_0 \exp[-K_1 j^{\alpha}]$$

for some positive constants  $K_0$  and  $K_1$  that may depend on  $\rho_0$  but not on  $j$ . Summing this over  $j > k$ , for  $k$  large enough, we obtain that

$$\sum_{(i,j): j > k} \sup_{\rho \in N_{\epsilon}(\rho_0)} \phi_{\rho}(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \leq K_0 \sum_{j > k} \exp[-K_1 j^{\alpha}] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{when } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

The same property obviously holds if we permute  $i$  and  $j$ , which means that the sum over  $\{(i, j) : i > k\}$  also vanishes when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies (20).

**Corollary 2** *If both  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are non-degenerate distributions and Condition 1 holds, then  $\rho_X$  is strictly increasing on  $[-1, 1]$ , so it has an inverse  $\rho_X^{-1} : [\rho_X(-1), \rho_X(1)] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ , and (4) possesses a unique solution in  $[-1, 1]$  if  $\tilde{\rho} \in [\rho_X(-1), \rho_X(1)]$ .*

We conclude this section by studying the limit when  $|\rho| \rightarrow 1$ . The behavior of  $g'(\rho)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$  depends on whether

$$\text{there exist } i \text{ and } j \text{ such that } 0 < f_{1,i} = f_{2,j} < 1; \quad (22)$$

the behavior as  $\rho \rightarrow -1$  depends on whether

$$\text{there exist } i \text{ and } j \text{ such that } 0 < f_{1,i} = 1 - f_{2,j} < 1. \quad (23)$$

In words, (22) says that  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are non-degenerate discrete distributions whose c.d.f. values meet at least once at a value that is strictly between 0 and 1. The interpretation of (23) is analogous.

**Proposition 3** (a) (22) implies  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} g'(\rho) = \infty$ . (23) implies  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -1} g'(\rho) = \infty$ .

(b) Assume  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  have finite support. If (22) fails, then  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} g'(\rho) = 0$ . If (23) fails, then  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -1} g'(\rho) = 0$ .

(c) Analogs of (a) and (b), obtained by replacing  $g'$  by  $g'_L$ , hold.

*Proof.* We use well-known properties of  $\phi_\rho$  as  $|\rho| \rightarrow 1$ . If  $y = x$ , then  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \phi_\rho(x, y) = \infty$ . Analogously, if  $y = -x$ , then  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow -1} \phi_\rho(x, y) = \infty$ . For all  $(x, y)$  that lie outside the lines  $y = x$  and  $y = -x$ , we have  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \pm 1} \phi_\rho(x, y) = 0$ . Condition (22) implies that there exist  $i$  and  $j$  with finite  $z_{1,i} = z_{2,j}$  and with  $p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1} > 0$ . Then  $g'(\rho) \geq p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1} \phi_\rho(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j}) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$ . Similarly, (23) implies that there exist  $i$  and  $j$  with finite  $z_{1,i} = -z_{2,j}$  and with  $p_{1,i+1} p_{2,j+1} > 0$ , which gives  $g'(\rho) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\rho \rightarrow -1$ . This completes the proof of part (a). For part (b), there are only finitely many terms, so the failure of (22) implies that all finite pairs  $(z_{1,i}, z_{2,j})$  lie outside the line  $y = x$ ; as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$ , each of the finitely many terms in (11) converges to zero, yielding  $g'(\rho) \rightarrow 0$ . The result as  $\rho \rightarrow -1$  follows analogously. The above arguments remain intact if we replace  $g'$  by  $g'_L$ ; this proves part (c).  $\square$

## 2.2 Approximating $g'$ when the support is unbounded

For the case where one or both marginals have unbounded support, we propose approximate computation of the derivative  $g'$  via truncation of (11), provide a bound on the truncation error, and outline the computation. This supports the approximate method detailed in Section 3.2. We discuss the case where both marginals have unbounded support; straightforward modifications apply otherwise.

We rewrite (11) as

$$g'(\rho) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) S_i, \quad (24)$$

where

$$S_i = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right). \quad (25)$$

Our bound of the upper tail of  $S_i$  is based on the observation that  $\phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right)$  is decreasing as  $j$  increases beyond  $j^*(i)$ , where  $j^*(i) = \min\{j : z_{2,j} \geq \rho z_{1,i}\}$ . This yields

$$\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} p_{2,j+1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \leq (1 - f_{2,k}) \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,k} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \quad \text{for any } k \geq j^*(i). \quad (26)$$

The lower tail is bounded similarly:

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} p_{2,j+1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \leq f_{2,k-1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,k} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \quad \text{for any } k \leq j^*(i), \quad (27)$$

because  $\phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right)$  is decreasing as  $j$  decreases beyond  $j^*(i)$ . A similar approach allows bounding the tails of the summation in (24). Observe that  $S_i \leq \phi(0)$  for all  $i$  and  $\phi(z_{1,i})$  is decreasing as  $i$  increases beyond  $i^*$ , where  $i^* = \min\{i : z_{1,i} \geq 0\}$ . This yields

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) S_i \leq \phi(0) \phi(z_{1,k}) (1 - f_{1,k}) \quad \text{for any } k \geq i^*. \quad (28)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{k-1} p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) S_i \leq \phi(0) \phi(z_{1,k}) f_{1,k-1} \quad \text{for any } k \leq i^*. \quad (29)$$

Select small real numbers  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  and  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ . We truncate the summation in (24), keeping terms between the indices

$$\begin{aligned} i^- := i^-(\epsilon_1) &:= \max\{k : k \leq i^*, \phi(0) \phi(z_{1,k}) f_{1,k-1} \leq \epsilon_1 \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\}, \\ i^+ := i^+(\epsilon_1) &:= \min\{k : k \geq i^*, \phi(0) \phi(z_{1,k}) (1 - f_{1,k}) \leq \epsilon_1 \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

For  $i$  in this finite range, we truncate the summation in (25), keeping terms between the indices

$$\begin{aligned} j^-(i) &= \max\{k : k \leq j^*(i), p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) f_{2,k-1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,k} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \leq \epsilon_2\}, \\ j^+(i) &= \min\{k : k \geq j^*(i), p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) (1 - f_{2,k}) \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,k} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) \leq \epsilon_2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

(Note the truncation indices depend on  $\rho$ ; our notation does not emphasize this). Define the finite-term approximation of  $g'$ ,

$$\tilde{g}'(\rho) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \sum_{i=i^-}^{i^+} p_{1,i+1} \phi(z_{1,i}) \sum_{j=j^-(i)}^{j^+(i)} p_{2,j+1} \phi\left(\frac{z_{2,j} - \rho z_{1,i}}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right). \quad (32)$$

The bounds stated in (26), (27), (28) and (29) easily imply the following result.

**Proposition 4** *We have*

$$\tilde{g}'(\rho) \leq g'(\rho) \leq \tilde{g}'(\rho) + \epsilon(\rho) \quad (33)$$

where  $\epsilon(\rho) = 2\epsilon_1 + 2(i^+(\epsilon_1) - i^-(\epsilon_1) + 1)\epsilon_2$ .

**Remark 1** We outline an implementation for computing  $\tilde{g}'(\rho)$  and  $\epsilon(\rho)$ . In a first outer `until` block,  $i$  increases from  $i^*$  until  $i^+$  is found; for each fixed  $i$  in this range,  $j$  first increases from  $j^*(i)$  until  $j^+(i)$  is found (an `until` block nested inside the outer block); then, similarly,  $j$  decreases from  $j^*(i)$  until  $j^-(i)$  is found. A second outer `until` block is analogous to the first outer block:  $i$  decreases from  $i^*$  until  $i^-$  is found. The work of this algorithm is  $O\left(\sum_{i=i^-}^{i^+} (j^+(i) - j^-(i))\right)$ . This work and the size of the error bound  $\epsilon(\rho)$  are unknown a priori in terms of  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$ ; they are both determined during the process of approximating  $g'(\rho)$ .

### 2.3 Uniform convergence to the continuous-marginals rank correlation

This section establishes a convergence result relating the rank-correlation function under discrete marginals to the rank-correlation function for continuous marginals, i.e.,  $r_C$  in (6), in a limit we will make precise. Let  $(X_{1,n}, X_{2,n})$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  be a sequence of pairs of discrete random variables; write  $p_{l,j,n}$  for the probability mass corresponding to the  $j$ -th mass point of the  $l$ -th marginal ( $l = 1, 2$ ) in the  $n$ -th pair, and denote by  $F_{1,n}$  and  $F_{2,n}$  the associated c.d.f.'s in the  $n$ -th pair. Write  $r_n(\rho) = \text{Corr}(F_{1,n}(X_{1,n}), F_{2,n}(X_{2,n}))$ , where  $(X_{1,n}, X_{2,n})$  has marginals  $F_{1,n}$  and  $F_{2,n}$  and bivariate dependence as in (2) with  $\rho = \text{Corr}(Z_1, Z_2)$ . To capture the idea that discreteness vanishes in the limit, let  $m_{l,n} = \max_j p_{l,j,n}$  and assume

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_{l,n} = 0 \quad \text{for } l = 1, 2. \quad (34)$$

We now state an asymptotic upper bound on the  $L_\infty$ -distance between  $r_n$  and  $r_C$  that vanishes in the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Proposition 5** *If (34) holds, then*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho \in [-1, 1]} \frac{|r_n(\rho) - r_C(\rho)|}{m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}} \leq 42, \quad (35)$$

and thus  $\sup_{\rho \in [-1, 1]} |r_n(\rho) - r_C(\rho)|$  converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* For  $l = 1, 2$ , define the composite functions  $h_{l,n} = F_{l,n} \circ F_{l,n}^{-1}$ . Each  $F_{l,n}(X_{l,n})$  has distribution equal to that of  $h_{l,n}(U)$ , where  $U$  is uniformly distributed on  $(0, 1)$ . The key behind the proof is that  $|h_{l,n}(u) - u| \leq m_{l,n}$  for all  $0 \leq u \leq 1$ . Write  $\mu_{l,n} = \mathbb{E}[F_{l,n}(X_{l,n})]$ ,  $\sigma_{l,n}^2 = \text{Var}[F_{l,n}(X_{l,n})]$ , and  $g_n(\rho) = \text{Cov}[F_{1,n}(X_{1,n}), F_{2,n}(X_{2,n})]$ . We will use repeatedly below the inequality  $|x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2| \leq$

$|y_1 - y_2| + |x_1 - x_2|$  for any  $0 \leq x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \leq 1$ . Using (6) and this inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|r_n(\rho) - r_C(\rho)| &= \left| \frac{g_n(\rho) - \mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n}}{\sigma_{1,n}\sigma_{2,n}} - \frac{g_C(\rho) - 1/4}{1/12} \right| \\
&= \left| [g_n(\rho) - \mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n}] \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_{1,n}\sigma_{2,n}} - 12 \right) + 12 [g_n(\rho) - \mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n} - g_C(\rho) + 1/4] \right| \\
&\leq (|g_n(\rho)| + \mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n}) \left| \frac{12\sigma_{1,n}\sigma_{2,n} - 1}{\sigma_{1,n}\sigma_{2,n}} \right| + 12 (|g_n(\rho) - g_C(\rho)| + |\mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n} - 1/4|).
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We now find asymptotic upper bounds for each of the terms in (36). We have

$$|\mu_{l,n} - 1/2| = \left| \int_0^1 (h_{l,n}(u) - u) du \right| \leq \int_0^1 |h_{l,n}(u) - u| du \leq m_{l,n},$$

so  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{l,n} = 1/2$  for  $l = 1, 2$  and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mu_{1,n}\mu_{2,n} - 1/4|/(m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}) \leq 1/2$ . Writing  $\sigma_{l,n}^2 = \int_0^1 [(h_{l,n}(u) - u) + (u - \frac{1}{2}) + (\frac{1}{2} - \mu_{l,n})]^2 du$  and integrating the expanded square, it is easy to see that

$$\left| \sigma_{l,n}^2 - \frac{1}{12} \right| \leq m_{l,n}^2 + m_{l,n}^2 + 4m_{l,n} \int_0^1 \left| u - \frac{1}{2} \right| du + 2m_{l,n}^2 = m_{l,n} + 4m_{l,n}^2, \tag{37}$$

proving that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{l,n}^2 = 1/12$  for  $l = 1, 2$ . The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields  $\sup_{\rho} |g_n(\rho)| \leq \sigma_{1,n}\sigma_{2,n}$ , so  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho} |g_n(\rho)| \leq 1/12$ . Furthermore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \sqrt{\sigma_{1,n}^2 \sigma_{2,n}^2} - \frac{1}{12} \right|}{m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{6 \left| \sigma_{1,n}^2 \sigma_{2,n}^2 - \left( \frac{1}{12} \right)^2 \right|}{m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}} \leq \frac{1}{2};$$

in the above, the first inequality follows from a Taylor expansion of  $\sqrt{x}$  about  $1/12$  with remainder term involving the first derivative, and the second inequality follows from (37). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\rho} |g_n(\rho) - g_C(\rho)| \\
&= \sup_{\rho} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [h_{1,n}(\Phi(x_1))h_{2,n}(\Phi(x_2)) - \Phi(x_1)\Phi(x_2)] \phi_{\rho}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\rho} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \sup_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2} |h_{1,n}(\Phi(x_1))h_{2,n}(\Phi(x_2)) - \Phi(x_1)\Phi(x_2)| \right) \phi_{\rho}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \\
&\leq \sup_{\rho} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}) \phi_{\rho}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \\
&= m_{1,n} + m_{2,n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The result (35) follows from the asymptotic bounds established for each of the terms in (36).  $\square$

For  $n$  large, (35) and (6) imply the approximate bound  $\sup_{\rho \in [-1, 1]} |r_n(\rho) - (6/\pi) \arcsin(\rho/2)| \leq 42(m_{1,n} + m_{2,n})$ . In our examples in Section 4, this bound was too large to ensure that  $r_X(2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6))$  is sufficiently close (for our purposes) to  $\tilde{r} = r_C(2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6))$ . Had the bound been small enough,

that would have made our nearly-exact solution methods less interesting, because the bound by itself would have ensured that  $2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$  is a sufficiently accurate answer. Of course, better bounds than ours may still act in the same way, i.e., as guarantors of the accuracy of  $2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$  as an approximation to the exact solution. Regardless of the bound’s effectiveness in our examples, the proof adds to our intuition; it suggests, for example, that the approximation’s effectiveness hinges on *both* marginals (as opposed to only one) being nearly continuous.

### 3 Solution methods

We detail methods for solving each of the two versions of the correlation-matching problem. Our discussion focuses on the rank-correlation variant for reasons given earlier. Assume that we are given a target  $\tilde{r} \in (r_X(-1), r_X(1))$  and want to compute the value  $r_X^{-1}(\tilde{r})$ , i.e., the unique solution of (3). A *zero* of a function  $f$  is a value  $\rho$  such that  $f(\rho) = 0$ . To conform with standard algorithms for solving a single equation, which typically seek a zero of an appropriate function, define  $f(\rho) = g(\rho) - \mu_1\mu_2 - \tilde{r}\sigma_1\sigma_2$  and note that  $f$  has derivatives identical to those of  $g$  and that  $f(\rho) < (>) 0$  if and only if  $r_X(\rho) < (>) \tilde{r}$ . Thus, finding the solution of (3) is equivalent to finding the unique zero of  $f$ .

Section 3.1 treats the case where both marginals have finite support. Infinite supports are addressed in Section 3.2, which offers an approximate solution method and a bound on its error. Java implementations of the four methods we examine are available at <http://www.iro.umontreal.ca/~lecuyer/myftp/nortadisc/java/>.

#### 3.1 Discrete marginals with finite support

If  $n_i$  is the number of support points of marginal  $i$ , then (10) and (11) imply that the computational work for each evaluation of  $g$  (equivalently,  $f$ ) or of its derivative  $f' = g'$  is proportional to  $n = n_1n_2$ , the number of terms in the double sums. The proportionality constants may differ substantially between  $g$  and  $g'$ .

In what follows, we first explain how we compute  $g$  and  $g'$ , then we define three algorithms to find a root of  $f$ . The first algorithm uses only evaluations of  $g$  and not its derivative, the second integrates  $f'$  until the integral reaches zero, and the third is a variant of the Newton-Raphson iterative method to find a root of  $f$ .

**Evaluation of  $g$  and  $g'$ .** For the evaluation of  $g$ , we employ (10) instead of (9), because the literature emphasizes the computation of the bivariate normal integral in the former expression. We considered several methods for evaluating  $\bar{\Phi}_\rho(x, y)$ , a function of  $\rho$ ,  $x$ , and  $y$ , for which no analytic expression is available. Algorithm 462 in Donnelly (1973) implements the method developed in Owen (1956), which expresses  $\bar{\Phi}_\rho$  in terms of the functions  $\Phi$  and  $T(h, a)$ , where the latter



is the area (integral) of an uncorrelated bivariate standard normal distribution (zero means, unit variances) over the subset of the  $(x, y)$ -plane contained between  $y = ax$  and  $y = 0$  and to the right of  $x = h$ . The function  $T(h, a)$  is expressed (and computed efficiently) as a series. A second class of methods exploits property (13) and computes  $\bar{\Phi}_\rho(x, y)$  by numerical integration with respect to the correlation. More precisely,  $\bar{\Phi}_\rho(x, y)$  is computed as  $\bar{\Phi}_s(x, y) + Q$ , where:  $s = 0$  or  $\text{sign}(\rho)$  (when  $|\rho|$  is under and above a certain threshold, respectively);  $\bar{\Phi}_0(x, y) = \Phi(-x)\Phi(-y)$ ;  $\bar{\Phi}_1(x, y) = \Phi(-\max(x, y))$ ;  $\bar{\Phi}_{-1}(x, y) = \max(0, \Phi(-x) - \Phi(y))$ ; and  $Q = \int_s^\rho \phi_t(x, y) dt$  is computed by numerical integration. This approach is detailed in Drezner and Wesolowsky (1989) and Genz (2004), which focus on moderate accuracy (6-7 decimals) and high accuracy (15 decimals), respectively. For 15-decimal precision, we compared Algorithm 462 to the method of Genz (2004). For  $\rho = -0.92, -0.54, -0.16, 0.22, 0.60, 0.98$ , we sampled one million pairs  $(x, y)$  uniformly in the square  $[-3, 3]^2$ ; the observed ratios of CPU times (Algo. 462 to Genz) were about 0.4, 0.6, 1.1, 1.1, 0.6, and 0.7, respectively. In 7-decimal precision, and for the same set of  $\rho$  values, the CPU time ratios of Algorithm 462 to the method of Drezner and Wesolowsky (1989) were about 0.7, 1.3, 1.3, 1.3, 1.3, 0.7. Comparing the 7- to 15-decimal accuracy versions of Algorithm 462, we observed a ratio of CPU total times (sums over 6 evaluations for the values of  $\rho$  above) of about 0.67. For all subsequent work, we chose to evaluate  $f$  via Algorithm 462 of Donnelly (1973) with 15 decimal digits of accuracy.

Computing the derivative  $g'(\rho)$  is easier, because there is an analytic expression for  $\phi_\rho(x, y)$ . We just use it and sum up the terms. In a preliminary test, we estimated the ratio of work (CPU time) needed to compute  $g(\rho)$  over the work needed to compute the derivative  $g'(\rho)$  at about 12. This was based on all calls made to these functions when solving the problem  $\tilde{r} = 0.90$  in the nearly-continuous negative binomial case shown at the bottom panel of Table 1, Section 4. We feel that this number is fairly representative because the points  $z_{i,k} = \Phi^{-1}(f_{i,k})$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , provide a good coverage of the normal density for each  $i$ .

**Method NI1: Root bracketing without derivatives.** This first method assumes no knowledge of derivatives of  $f$  and serves as the benchmark against which we compare the speed and accuracy of other methods. We know that the zero of  $f$  is contained in  $[-1, 0]$  if  $\tilde{r} < 0$ , and is  $[0, 1]$  if  $\tilde{r} > 0$ ; this follows from parts 1 and 2 of Theorem 1 and the Intermediate Value Theorem. *Root-bracketing* methods maintain a *bracket*; this is an interval with endpoints  $b$  and  $c$  such that  $f(b)$  and  $f(c)$  are of opposite sign, so the interval must contain the root. One such method is *bisection*, which is iterative and halves the bracket length at each iteration. Root accuracy is usually controlled by a *tolerance*  $\epsilon > 0$ : if  $b$  is the better root estimate among the bracket endpoints, (i.e.,  $|f(b)| < |f(c)|$ ), then it is returned as the root on the first iteration such that either  $f(b) = 0$  (in the floating-point representation) or  $|b - c| \leq \epsilon$ . By the definition of bracket, this guarantees

that  $b$  is within  $\epsilon$  of the root. According to Press et al. (1992), Procedure *zero* in Brent (1971) (called *Brent's method* for short), is “the method of choice for general one-dimensional root finding where a function’s values only (and not its derivative) are available.” This method combines root bracketing, bisection, and *inverse quadratic interpolation*, which uses three prior root estimates to fit an inverse quadratic function ( $\rho$  as a quadratic function of  $f(\rho)$ ) whose value at  $f(\rho) = 0$  is taken as the next estimate of the root. This is what we have used in our experiments.

**Method NI2: Finding a root of  $f$  by numerically integrating its derivative.** This method is summarized as follows.

1. Start at some initial value  $\rho_0$  and evaluate  $f(\rho_0)$ , as described in the previous subsection.
2. Select an *integration grid*  $S = \{\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \dots\}$ , which is a sequence of increasing (decreasing) values depending on whether  $f(\rho_0) < (>) 0$ , and such that: if  $\tilde{r} > 0$  and  $f(\rho_0) < (>) 0$ , then 1 (0) is an accumulation point of  $S$ ; if  $\tilde{r} < 0$  and  $f(\rho_0) < (>) 0$ , then 0 ( $-1$ ) is an accumulation point of  $S$ .
3. Compute estimates  $\hat{f}(\rho_k)$  of  $f(\rho_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  by numerically integrating its derivative  $g'$ . Stop at the smallest  $k$ , say  $K$ , such that  $\hat{f}(\rho_k) > (<) 0$ , respectively. By construction, the interval  $[\rho_{K-1}, \rho_K]$  contains a zero of  $\hat{f}$ .
4. Compute the approximation  $\bar{\rho}$  of the zero via polynomial interpolation of  $\hat{f}$  over  $[\rho_{K-\ell}, \rho_K]$ , where  $\ell$  is a small positive integer. For example, for linear interpolation, take  $\ell = 1$  and output the unique  $\bar{\rho}$  satisfying  $(\bar{\rho} - \rho_{K-1})/(\rho_K - \rho_{K-1}) = -\hat{f}(\rho_{K-1})/[\hat{f}(\rho_K) - \hat{f}(\rho_{K-1})]$ .

We now discuss the selection of integration rule, the choice of sequence  $S$ , and the method’s accuracy. We discuss the case  $\tilde{r} > 0$  and  $\hat{f}(\rho_0) < 0$ ; the other three cases are similar.

Two effective classes of integration rules over a finite interval  $[a, b]$  are the Gaussian and Newton-Cotes quadrature rules (Stoer and Bulirsch, 1980). These rules evaluate the integrand at a finite set of points in  $[a, b]$  and compute a weighted sum of these evaluations. In theory, the *Gaussian rules* (Stoer and Bulirsch, 1980, sec. 3.6) give better accuracy than the Newton-Cotes rules for a given number  $n$  of evaluation points: they integrate exactly all polynomials of degree less than  $2n$ . However, if we change  $a$  or  $b$  slightly, for fixed  $n$ , then all the evaluation points must change. In our context, since the integration interval changes at each step of the root-finding process, the Gaussian rule on  $[0, \rho_k]$  cannot reuse any of the evaluation points of the rule on the previous interval  $[0, \rho_{k-1}]$ . With *Newton-Cotes rules* (Stoer and Bulirsch, 1980, sec. 3.1), the integral over  $[a, b]$  is approximated as a sum of approximations of the integral over the pieces of a partition of  $[a, b]$  (see below), and it possible to select the integration grid in our procedure in a way that the evaluation points for  $[0, \rho_{k-1}]$  are reused for  $[0, \rho_k]$ . Thus, from an efficiency standpoint, Newton-Cotes rules are more suitable in our root-finding context.

A well-known special case of a Newton-Cotes rule is Simpson's rule (Stoer and Bulirsch, 1980, pp. 119-120). For this rule, we select a finite sequence  $S$  consisting of  $\rho_k = \rho_0 + 2kh$  for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$ , where  $h > 0$  is a *step size* and  $m$  is such that  $1 - 2h < \rho_m < 1$ . In our implementation, we first select  $\rho_m$  close to 1 ( $\rho_m = 1 - \delta$  for some small  $\delta > 0$ ) and then select  $h$  and  $m$  (a positive integer) such that  $|1 - \delta - \rho_0| = 2hm$ . The Simpson estimate of the definite integral  $\int_{\rho_0}^{\rho_0+2kh} g'(t)dt$  is computed recursively by setting  $I_0 = 0$  and

$$I_k = I_{k-1} + \frac{h}{3} (g'(\rho_0 + 2kh - 2h) + 4g'(\rho_0 + 2kh - h) + g'(\rho_0 + 2kh)).$$

This gives the estimate  $\hat{f}(\rho_k) = f(\rho_0) + I_k$ , whose error will be discussed later.

If the stopping condition in step 3 is not met after  $m$  steps for the  $m$  selected at the outset (that is,  $\hat{f}(\rho_m)$  has the same sign as  $\hat{f}(\rho_0)$ ), then we continue integrating over a new grid defined to the right of the last point of the previous grid, recursively, if necessary, until a stopping condition as in step 3 is met. That is, the mention in step 2 of an *infinite* sequence  $S$  only serves to allow an input  $\tilde{r}$  that is arbitrarily close to  $r_X(1)$  or  $r_X(-1)$ .

We consider two variants of algorithm NI2, defined according to how  $\rho_0$  is selected: Variant NI2A sets  $\rho_0 = 2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$ , which is a natural estimate of the root because it becomes exact in the limit where discreteness disappears (see Proposition 5 and part 3 of Theorem 1). Variant NI2B sets  $\rho_0 = 0$ . The motivation for NI2A is to try to minimize the length of the integration interval  $[\rho_0, \rho_K]$ , and thus the number  $N_{g'}$  of evaluations of the function  $g'$ . On the other hand, it requires one (costly) evaluation of  $f(\rho_0)$  in Step 1. Variant NI2B eliminates the cost of this evaluation, because we know  $f(0) = -\tilde{r}\sigma_1\sigma_2$ , but  $N_{g'}$  is typically larger because we must integrate over a longer interval. If the root does not exceed the value  $\rho_m$  selected at the outset, then NI2 requires  $N_{g'} = 1 + 2\lceil |r_X^{-1}(\tilde{r}) - \rho_0|/2h \rceil$  evaluations of the function  $g'$ , where  $h$  is the value selected at the outset. Which variant will be faster depends on: (i) the ratio of work needed to compute  $g$  relative to  $g'$ ; (ii) the distance  $|r_X^{-1}(\tilde{r}) - \rho_0|$ ; and (iii) the desired accuracy; lower accuracy allows larger  $h$  and thus smaller  $N_{g'}$ .

**Method NI3: Hybrid of Newton-Raphson and bisection.** Our third algorithm is a modified version of the Newton-Raphson method. This method would produce a sequence of root estimates  $\rho_{k+1} = \rho_k - f(\rho_k)/f'(\rho_k)$  for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $-f(\rho_k)/f'(\rho_k)$  is a correction term such that the new root estimate is the zero of the linear function with value  $f(\rho_k)$  and slope  $f'(\rho_k)$  at abscissa  $\rho_k$ . We need to protect against the possibility that at two subsequent iterations  $k$  and  $k + 1$ , the correction terms cancel each other and neither  $\rho_k$  nor  $\rho_{k+1}$  is a root; that is,  $f(\rho_k)/f'(\rho_k) + f(\rho_{k+1})/f'(\rho_{k+1}) = 0$ ,  $f(\rho_k) \neq 0$ , and  $f(\rho_{k+1}) \neq 0$ ; in this case, the recursion enters an infinite cycle without ever finding the root ( $\rho_{k+2j} = \rho_k$  for all positive  $j$ ); this is illustrated in Press et al. (1992, Figure 9.4.3). We protect as proposed in Press et al. (1992, routine `rtsafe`, pp. 366–367); this algorithm maintains a root estimate and a bracket formed by the last two root estimates; if the

Newton step starting from the current root estimate would fall outside the current bracket or if the current bracket length is more than half the previous bracket length, then the next root estimate is the bracket’s midpoint; otherwise, the next root estimate is found by the Newton step. Root accuracy is controlled by a tolerance  $\epsilon$  as in NI1. This method has good convergence properties near the root (Press et al., 1992, pages 364-365), so it is particularly attractive when high accuracy is sought. The initial bracket is  $[-1, 0]$  if  $\tilde{r} < 0$ , and  $[0, 1]$  if  $\tilde{r} > 0$ . Our initial root estimate is  $\rho_0 = 2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$ ; this value is likely to be closer to the root than other uninformative values, e.g., the midpoint of the initial bracket. It is easy to show that the bracket is at least halved over any *two* successive iterations (Press et al. (1992) do not state this); thus, the number of iterations never exceeds  $2\lceil \log_2(1/\epsilon) \rceil$ , and it is potentially smaller, depending on the Newton steps’ effectiveness.

**Controlling the accuracy.** Efficient algorithms are known for computing the bivariate normal integral  $\bar{\Phi}_\rho$  to negligible error (this was discussed earlier); this allows efficiently computing  $g$  to negligible error. In view of this, the methods we discussed fall into two classes that should be contrasted: classical root finding (NI1, NI3) versus approximate root finding via integration and interpolation (NI2). In general, none of these methods can provide a guarantee on rank-correlation error (a known multiple of  $|f(\bar{\rho})|$ , where  $\bar{\rho}$  is the estimated root) unless a global bound on the slope of  $f$  is known. Classical root-finding methods, however, do deliver a value to within a specified distance from the true root. For the approximate root-finding methods, we do not have integration-error bounds and consequently we offer no guarantee either on root error or on rank-correlation error, regardless of how much work one does. (Note, however, that global bounds on higher-order derivatives of  $g$  can be obtained by straightforward derivations and arguments paralleling (16); this would yield such integration-error bounds.) Thus, the approximate root finding approach—as developed here—can be attractive only in special settings, namely: (1) solution speed is more important than a root-accuracy guarantee; or (2) classical root finding is too complicated to implement, e.g., because a good code for computing  $\Phi_\rho$  is unavailable.

**Worst-case work comparison as required accuracy increases.** We focus on the rank-correlation error at the estimated root,  $|r_X(\bar{\rho}) - \tilde{r}|$ , and assume a requirement that it should not exceed  $\epsilon > 0$ . We explain that if one views the error in evaluating  $g$  as negligible, then one should expect NI2 to require more work than NI3 or the bisection method in the limit as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . In standard polynomial interpolation, function values are known *exactly* at the interpolation points; in this case, a bound on the error (at any point inside the interpolation interval) is given in Stoer and Bulirsch (1980, Theorem 2.1.4.1). *If the integration error was zero at all interpolation points*, this result would imply that the error is of order  $O(h^{\ell+1})$  when an order- $\ell$  interpolating polynomial is used (the error may of course be zero, but that would seem to be a fortunate coincidence). Thus, we can expect the error to decrease at the rate  $m^{-k}$  for some positive integer  $k$  that depends on the

particular Newton-Cotes rule and  $\ell$ . The *worst-case* number of evaluations of  $g'$  for NI2 is  $pm + 1$ , where  $p$  is a positive integer that depends on the Newton-Cotes rule; for Simpson's rule, we have  $p = 2$ . To keep the error at most  $\epsilon$ , this number must grow as  $O(\epsilon^{-1/k})$ . To allow comparison to NI3 and bisection, we consider a user of these methods that selects a tolerance  $\epsilon/M$ , where  $M := \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{I}} |g'(\rho)| < \infty$ , where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the initial bracket; this ensures that the error is at most  $\epsilon$ . The bisection method requires  $\lceil \log_2(M/\epsilon) \rceil$  evaluations of  $g$ . NI3 requires  $2\lceil \log_2(M/\epsilon) \rceil$  iterations in the worst case. In conclusion, *if high accuracy is required*, then NI3 (or bisection) are preferred to NI2, because they are likely to require less work.

**Linear correlations.** For the linear correlation matching problem, all three methods extend immediately. The initial bracketing intervals are identical; we simply replace the functions  $g$  and  $g'$  by their counterparts  $g_L$  and  $g'_L$  stated in Section 2.1. To get a nonzero starting point for NI2 or NI3, we can invert (6), despite the fact that this has no theoretical basis and that it may be a poor choice relative to crude estimates such as the midpoint of the initial bracket, as suggested by the discussion following (4).

### 3.2 Discrete marginals with infinite (or large) support

If one of the marginals has infinite support, then all quantities involved in the definition of  $f(\rho)$ , namely,  $\mu_l$  and  $\sigma_l$  for  $l = 1, 2$ , and  $g(\rho)$ , involve infinite series; in general, exact computations appear to be impossible—we are not aware of exact formulae, even if the marginals belong to the well-known classes. Approximating  $g(\rho)$  (for arbitrary  $\rho$ ) is the main difficulty, because if one were to truncate the series (10) to a finite number of terms, it would be difficult to bound the error. Approximating the constants  $\mu_l$  and  $\sigma_l$  is easier, as we will explain. In view of this, method NI2B stands out, because it is the only one among those in Section 3.1 that does not require evaluating  $g(\rho)$ . Thus, we adapt method NI2B as follows: (i) in the integration (step 3 of method NI2), we replace  $g'$  by its approximation  $\tilde{g}'$  established in Section 2.2; and (ii) we replace  $\mu_l$  and  $\sigma_l$  by approximations defined below (the  $\mu_l$  are involved indirectly via  $\sigma_l$ ).

It is straightforward to approximate  $\mu_l$  and  $\sigma_l$  by truncating the associated series; error bounds are easily obtained and stated in the proof of Proposition 6 below. Select small real numbers  $\eta_l > 0$ . For  $l = 1, 2$ , define  $k_l^+ = \min\{k : \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} p_{l,j} \leq \eta_l\}$  and  $k_l^- = \max\{k : \sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} p_{l,j} \leq \eta_l\}$ . Define  $\tilde{\mu}_l = \sum_{j=k_l^-}^{k_l^+} p_{l,j} f_{l,j}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 = \sum_{j=k_l^-}^{k_l^+} p_{l,j} f_{l,j}^2 - \tilde{\mu}_l^2$  as approximations of  $\mu_l$  and  $\sigma_l^2$ , respectively.

We now define the adaptation of NI2B. We assume that  $\rho_0 = 0$  and that we use the sequence  $S$  with the Newton-Cotes integration rule. The estimates of  $f(\rho_k)$  are  $\tilde{f}(0) = -\tilde{r}\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\sigma}_2$  (since  $r_X(0) = 0$ ) and  $\tilde{f}(\rho_k) = \tilde{f}(0) + I(\rho_k; \tilde{g}')$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $I(\rho_k; \tilde{g}')$  is the estimate of  $\int_0^{\rho_k} g'(t) dt$  via a Newton-Cotes formula applied to  $\tilde{g}'$  in (32).

To bound the error in rank correlation at the estimated root,  $|r_X(\hat{\rho}) - \tilde{r}|$ , define:  $I(\rho_k; \epsilon)$  is the

Newton-Cotes estimate of  $\int_0^{\rho_k} \epsilon(t)dt$ , where  $\epsilon(\rho)$  is defined following (33);  $I(\rho_k; g')$  is the Newton-Cotes estimate of  $\int_0^{\rho_k} g'(t)dt$ , which will not be explicitly computed, but is involved in the bound; and write  $\Delta_k = |\tilde{f}(\rho_k) - f(\rho_k)|$  for all  $k$ . Write  $K$  for the index in step 3 of NI2; note that  $M_K := \sup_{\rho \in [\rho_{K-1}, \rho_K]} |\tilde{g}'(\rho)| \leq \sup_{|\rho| \leq 1-\delta} |g'(\rho)| < \infty$ . The next result bounds the error, and finite support is a special case. The Remarks below discuss how one may reduce this bound.

**Proposition 6** (a) *Assume all integral estimates are based on Simpson's rule with  $h = (1 - \delta)/(2m)$ ,  $\rho_0 = 0$ , and  $|\rho_m| = 1 - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Then*

$$\Delta_k \leq \zeta(\eta_1, \eta_2) + |I(\rho_k; \epsilon)| + O(m^{-4}) \quad \text{for any } \rho_k \in S, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\zeta(\eta_1, \eta_2) = |\tilde{r}| \left( \bar{\sigma}_1 \frac{2\eta_2[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_2 + \eta_2)]}{\tilde{\sigma}_2 + \underline{\sigma}_2} + \tilde{\sigma}_2 \frac{2\eta_1[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_1 + \eta_1)]}{\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \underline{\sigma}_1} \right),$$

$$\underline{\sigma}_l := \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 - 2\eta_l[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_l + \eta_l)]} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\sigma}_l := \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 + 2\eta_l[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_l + \eta_l)]} \quad \text{for } l = 1, 2.$$

(b) *For any  $\bar{\rho} \in [\rho_{K-1}, \rho_K]$ , we have*

$$|r_X(\bar{\rho}) - \tilde{r}| \leq \frac{|\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1}) - \tilde{f}(\rho_K)| + \max(\Delta_{K-1}, \Delta_K)}{\underline{\sigma}_1 \underline{\sigma}_2} \leq \frac{M_K/m + \zeta(\eta_1, \eta_2) + |I(\rho_K; \epsilon)|}{\underline{\sigma}_1 \underline{\sigma}_2} + O(m^{-4}). \quad (40)$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}(\rho_k) - f(\rho_k)| &= \left| \tilde{f}(0) + I(\rho_k; \tilde{g}') - \left( f(0) + \int_0^{\rho_k} g'(s)ds \right) - I(\rho_k; g') + I(\rho_k; g') \right| \\ &\leq |\tilde{f}(0) - f(0)| + |I(\rho_k; \tilde{g}') - I(\rho_k; g')| + \left| I(\rho_k; g') - \int_0^{\rho_k} g'(s)ds \right| \\ &= |\tilde{r}| |\tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\sigma}_2 - \sigma_1 \sigma_2| + |I(\rho_k; \epsilon)| + O(m^{-4}) \\ &\leq |\tilde{r}| (\sigma_1 |\sigma_2 - \tilde{\sigma}_2| + \tilde{\sigma}_2 |\sigma_1 - \tilde{\sigma}_1|) + |I(\rho_k; \epsilon)| + O(m^{-4}); \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

step 2 is the triangle inequality; in step 3, we observe that  $I(\rho_k; g') - I(\rho_k; \tilde{g}') = I(\rho_k; \epsilon)$  and that  $|I(\rho_k; g') - \int_0^{\rho_k} g'(s)ds| \leq h^4 |\rho_k g^{(5)}(\xi)|/180$  for some  $\xi$  with  $|\xi| \leq \rho_k$ , where  $g^{(5)}$  is the fourth derivative of  $g'$  (Stoer and Bulirsch, 1980, p. 122), and finally note that  $|g^{(5)}(\xi)| < \infty$ , since  $g^{(5)}$  is continuous on the closed interval  $[-1 + \delta, 1 - \delta]$ ; step 4 is another application of the triangle inequality. It remains to bound  $\sigma_1$  and  $|\tilde{\sigma}_l - \sigma_l|$  for  $l = 1, 2$ . We have  $|\tilde{\mu}_l - \mu_l| \leq 2\eta_l$  and  $|\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 - \sigma_l^2| \leq 2\eta_l[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_l + \eta_l)]$  (proofs are easy and omitted), and thus

$$\underline{\sigma}_l \leq \sigma_l \leq \bar{\sigma}_l. \quad (42)$$

Thus

$$|\tilde{\sigma}_l - \sigma_l| = \frac{|\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 - \sigma_l^2|}{\tilde{\sigma}_l + \sigma_l} \leq \frac{2\eta_l[1 + 2(\tilde{\mu}_l + \eta_l)]}{\tilde{\sigma}_l + \underline{\sigma}_l}. \quad (43)$$

Combining (41), (42), and (43), we obtain (39). To prove (40), we note that  $|r_X(\bar{\rho}) - \tilde{r}| = |f(\bar{\rho})|/(\sigma_1\sigma_2)$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(\bar{\rho})| &\leq \max(|f(\rho_{K-1})|, |f(\rho_K)|) \\
&\leq \max(|\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1})| + \Delta_{K-1}, |\tilde{f}(\rho_K)| + \Delta_K) \\
&\leq |\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1})| + |\tilde{f}(\rho_K)| + \max(\Delta_{K-1}, \Delta_K), \\
&= |\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1}) - \tilde{f}(\rho_K)| + \max(\Delta_{K-1}, \Delta_K).
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Step 1 uses the monotonicity of  $f$ ; step 2 uses the definition of  $\Delta_k$ ; the equality in step 4 holds because  $\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1})$  and  $\tilde{f}(\rho_K)$  bracket zero, by construction. This proves the first inequality in (40). To get the second inequality in (40), we use the bound in (39), note that  $|I(\rho_k; \epsilon)|$  are nondecreasing in  $k$ , and note that  $|\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1}) - \tilde{f}(\rho_K)| = \frac{h}{3} |\tilde{g}'[\rho_K - 2h]| + 4\tilde{g}'[\rho_K - h] + \tilde{g}'[\rho_K] \leq 2hM_K \leq M_K/m$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2** In the special case of finite support, (41) states that  $\Delta_k = O(m^{-4})$  for all  $k$ . We obtain the rudimentary bound  $|r_X(\bar{\rho}) - \tilde{r}| \leq M_K/(m\sigma_1\sigma_2) + O(m^{-4})$ , which goes to zero as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 3** In the infinite support case, the first inequality in (40) combined with (39) yields the value  $(|\tilde{f}(\rho_{K-1}) - \tilde{f}(\rho_K)| + \zeta(\eta_1, \eta_2) + |I(\rho_K; \epsilon)|)/(\underline{\sigma}_1\underline{\sigma}_2)$  as a computable *approximate* (heuristic) bound on the absolute error in the output correlation, because we dropped the  $O(m^{-4})$  integration-error term. Contrary to the finite-support case, it is not enough to let  $m \rightarrow \infty$  to guarantee that the rank correlation error goes to zero. One must additionally keep small the two new error terms, which may be done as follows. Controlling  $\zeta(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  is straightforward by decreasing the  $\eta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Controlling  $|I(\rho_k; \epsilon)|$  is somewhat complicated; recall the expression for the function  $\epsilon(\rho)$  following (33) and note that  $2(i^+(\epsilon_1) - i^-(\epsilon_1) + 1)\epsilon_2$  may increase as  $\epsilon_1$  decreases. In general, we may expect to reduce  $\epsilon(\rho)$  (for any  $\rho$ ) by appropriately decreasing  $\epsilon_1$  and/or  $\epsilon_2$  (at the expense of increased work). Also note that fixed  $\epsilon_1$  and decreasing  $\epsilon_2$  result in decreasing  $\epsilon(\rho)$ .

## 4 Numerical examples

We tried our solution methods on two sets of examples, in which the marginal distributions have finite and infinite support, respectively. In our first set of examples, the two marginals are identical binomial distributions, denoted  $\text{Bin}(n, p)$ , with success probability  $p = 1/2$  and varying number of trials  $n$ .

Our second set of examples is inspired from modeling the joint distribution of arrival counts to a call center over successive time periods in a day and is based on the case study in Avramidis et al. (2004). We are focusing on bivariate rank-correlation matching for  $(X_1, X_2)$ , where  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the counts on the time periods (8:00am, 8:30am) and (8:30am, 9:00am), respectively. The

negative binomial distribution provides a good fit to each marginal. Denote by  $\text{NegBin}(s, p)$  the negative binomial distribution with mean  $sp$  and variance  $sp(1 + p)$ . The parameters  $(s, p)$  of the two marginals estimated from the call center data set in that paper are  $s_1 = 15.68$ ,  $s_2 = 60.21$ ,  $p_1 = 0.3861$ ,  $p_2 = 0.6211$ . The sample rank correlation between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is 0.43. For the correlation matching, we work with bounded (and finite) supports: we upper-bound the support of each marginal at the quantile of order  $1 - 10^{-6}$ , i.e.  $x_l^* = F_l^{-1}(1 - 10^{-6})$ , and reset the probability mass of  $x_l^*$  accordingly, for  $l = 1, 2$ . This may significantly impact the correlation relative to the unbounded marginals, but we did not attempt to bound this error. We create additional test problems as follows. In our experiments, we vary  $s$  to study the effect of “discreteness strength” on the NORTA correlation matching problem. We also vary the target correlation  $\tilde{r}$ .

In applications we have in mind,  $\tilde{r}$  will be estimated from data; this means high accuracy (either in the root or in the rank correlation) is unlikely to be necessary. With this in mind, we employed NI1 and NI3 with tolerance  $10^{-2}$  and  $10^{-4}$ . Preliminary computations showed that in one of our examples the root is very close to 1; to avoid cumbersome implementations of NI2 that must refine the integration rule to the right of  $1 - 2h$  (for the  $h$  of interest here), we set  $\rho_m = 1 - \delta$  with  $\delta = 10^{-4}$ . To select the integration-grid spacing  $2h$ , let  $d$  denote the worst-case integration distance, so  $d = |1 - \delta - \rho_0|$  if  $\tilde{r} > 0$  and  $\hat{f}(\rho_0) < 0$  or if  $\tilde{r} < 0$  and  $\hat{f}(\rho_0) > 0$ ; and  $d = |\rho_0|$  otherwise. For NI2A, we set  $2h$  to be as close as possible to  $10^{-2}$ , i.e.,  $h = d/(2m)$ , where  $m = \max(1, [100d])$  and  $[x]$  is the integer closest to  $x$ ; this aims to make the accuracy (very roughly) comparable to that of NI1. For a sufficiently small  $m$ , NI2B will be faster than NI2A because it does not require the evaluation of  $f(\rho_0)$ , so with this in mind, we used NI2B with  $m = 5$  (so  $h = (1 - \delta)/10 \approx 0.2$ ). This aims towards fast execution achieved at the risk of loss of accuracy. We employ quadratic interpolation in step 4 unless  $m = 2$ , in which case linear interpolation applies.

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 summarize the results for methods NI1, NI2A, NI2B and NI3, respectively. Each of the six panels corresponds to a different pair of marginals; in each case, we give the defining parameters, the extreme correlations  $r_X(-1)$  and  $r_X(1)$  for these marginals, and the number of bivariate support points  $n = n_1 n_2$ , where  $n_i$  is the number of support points of marginal  $i$ . Each row corresponds to a problem instance created by additionally specifying the target  $\tilde{r}$ . For each problem instance, we report system-independent (method-dependent) measures of work: for NI1, the number  $N_1$  of iterations of the root-bracketing algorithm and thus evaluations of  $g$ ; for NI2, the number  $N_{g'}$  of evaluations of  $g'$ ; for NI3, the number  $N_3$  of iterations, and thus evaluations of each of  $g$  and  $g'$ . Additionally, we report: the computed root  $\bar{\rho}$ ; the CPU time measured in seconds; the correlation  $r_X(\bar{\rho})$ ; and the (absolute) relative error (error, for short) in induced correlation,  $|r_X(\bar{\rho}) - \tilde{r}|/\tilde{r}$ , shown as a percentage. When the target correlation is small, the reader may prefer to focus on absolute errors. All experiments were done on a 2.4 GHz AMD 64 bit-processor running Linux.



In all cases, NI1 and NI3 with  $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$  have good accuracy and require only a modest number of iterations. As the tolerance decreases from  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$  to  $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ , the number of iterations of NI3 grows by a factor much smaller than the worst-case number  $2 \log_2(100) \approx 13$ . This suggests that high accuracy would require a small additional computing cost. For all methods, the largest errors occur in the binomial example with  $n_1 = 3$ , which we examine in more detail later. Except for this example with  $\tilde{r} = 0.98$ , NI3 always requires less work than NI1, about 30% on average and usually between 20% and 45%. Moreover, with two exceptions in the same example, NI3 is more accurate than NI1. The high-tolerance NI1 ( $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ ) usually has relative error about 4%-5% when  $\tilde{r} = 0.05$ , but the absolute error is perhaps more relevant, and this error is small (a simple rough remedy against large *relative* errors would be to set  $\epsilon$  in proportion to  $\tilde{r}$ ). NI2A is generally fast; it is also accurate, with one exception. This method benefits when the distance  $|r_X^{-1}(\tilde{r}) - 2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)|$  is small; in the minimal-discreteness cases (when  $n_1 = n_2 = 1000$  for the binomial and for the largest values of  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  for the negative binomial case), this distance is very small, and NI2A is as accurate as NI1 or NI3 and usually faster. The largest observed value of this distance was about 0.09 (binomial marginals,  $n_1 = 3$ ,  $\tilde{r} = -0.5$ ). NI2B does not benefit from such a small integration distance, unless the root is close to zero; it frequently exhibits large errors that tend to increase as the discreteness increases and as the root (or  $\tilde{r}$ ) moves farther from zero; the large errors are not surprising, since a very sparse integration grid was used.

We discuss the binomial problem with  $n_1 = n_2 = 3$  and  $\tilde{r} = 0.98$ . The root is  $r_X^{-1}(0.98) \approx 0.999041$  and its approximation is  $2 \sin(0.98\pi/6) \approx 0.981808$ . Figure 1 shows  $r_X(\rho)$  for  $0.98 \leq \rho \leq 1$ . NI3 behaves as pure bisection, because the attempted Newton steps fall outside the bracket at all iterations. NI1 requires fewer iterations than NI3. The low-order polynomial approximations of  $g$  supporting NI2 are poor in this area, so NI2 suffers from relatively large integration error. (Condition (22) is easily seen to hold in *all* binomial examples, and Proposition 3 gives  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} g'(\rho) = \infty$ .) We examined NI2 with  $m$  varying widely over powers of 2. The inaccuracy of NI2B persists until  $m$  quite large enough to make the method slow: at  $m = 128$ , we obtain  $\rho_K = 1 - \delta = 0.9999$ ,  $\hat{f}(\rho_K)$  has relative error about 2.2%, and the final error (the measure in the rightmost column in the tables) is about 1.7%; comparing these two errors suggests that the large final error is due to integration error; it is not due to interpolation error. NI2A fares much better; for example, at  $m = 16$ , the final error is 0.06%. In view of the singularity at  $\rho = 1$ , it is not surprising that setting  $\delta$  too small is detrimental: for NI2A, changing to  $\delta = 10^{-12}$  and maintaining the value  $m = 2$  that applies in Table 2, the final error increases to 4.2%.

In summary, if a good code is available for computing the bivariate normal distribution (and thus  $f$ ), then we recommend NI3; both NI2 variants provide no accuracy guarantee and therefore they should be viewed as cheap, fast alternatives to NI3. If such good code is not available, then NI2B is an easier solution, because it requires only  $f'$  and not  $f$ .

Table 1: Results for method NI1.

	$\epsilon$	$\tilde{r}$	$\bar{\rho}$	CPU (s)	$N_1$	$r_X(\bar{\rho})$	Rel. error (%)
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 3$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 16$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9241$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.6076	$0.084 \times 10^{-3}$	5	-0.4999	0.049
		0.05	0.0603	$0.063 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.0499	0.115
		0.20	0.2387	$0.063 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.1991	0.475
		0.90	0.9760	$0.102 \times 10^{-3}$	6	0.8999	0.009
		0.98	0.9999	$0.050 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.9935	1.382
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.6079	$0.103 \times 10^{-3}$	6	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0604	$0.082 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2399	$0.084 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9760	$0.118 \times 10^{-3}$	6	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9990	$0.130 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 100$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 10201$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9971$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5194	0.093	4	-0.4991	0.175
		0.05	0.0551	0.069	3	0.0524	4.703
		0.20	0.2099	0.092	4	0.1999	0.036
		0.90	0.9107	0.085	4	0.8996	0.043
		0.98	0.9861	0.061	3	0.9811	0.114
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5203	0.119	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0526	0.094	4	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2099	0.117	5	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9111	0.113	5	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9851	0.098	5	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 1000$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 1002001$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9997$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5171	5.503	4	-0.4992	0.159
		0.05	0.0500	4.410	3	0.0477	4.511
		0.20	0.2091	5.858	4	0.1999	0.031
		0.90	0.9082	4.703	4	0.8999	0.014
		0.98	0.9803	3.153	3	0.9780	0.207
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5179	6.995	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	6.193	4	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2091	7.509	5	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9083	5.848	5	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9821	4.289	4	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 1.568$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 6.021$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 768$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9738$ $r_X(1) = 0.9652$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5330	$6.57 \times 10^{-3}$	4	-0.4960	0.209
		0.05	0.0518	$4.33 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.0478	4.412
		0.43	0.4614	$5.49 \times 10^{-3}$	4	0.4299	0.030
		0.90	0.9323	$4.46 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.8986	0.151
		0.96	0.9895	$5.88 \times 10^{-3}$	4	0.9593	0.076
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5341	$8.31 \times 10^{-3}$	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0542	$5.78 \times 10^{-3}$	4	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4616	$7.14 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9336	$5.97 \times 10^{-3}$	4	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.96	0.9903	$9.59 \times 10^{-3}$	6	0.9600	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 15.68$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 60.21$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 6560$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9971$ $r_X(1) = 0.9989$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5177	0.053	4	-0.4993	0.148
		0.05	0.0501	0.041	3	0.0478	4.481
		0.43	0.4467	0.056	4	0.4298	0.042
		0.90	0.9090	0.053	4	0.8999	0.017
		0.98	0.9811	0.037	3	0.9778	0.229
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5184	0.070	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	0.052	4	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4469	0.066	5	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9092	0.067	5	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9832	0.054	4	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 156.7$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 602.1$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 189912$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9997$ $r_X(1) = 0.9999$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5169	1.301	4	-0.4992	0.159
		0.05	0.0500	0.871	3	0.0478	4.491
		0.43	0.4464	1.273	4	0.4298	0.042
		0.90	0.9080	1.255	4	0.8999	0.013
		0.98	0.9802	0.877	3	0.9780	0.199
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5177	1.639	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	1.236	4	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4465	1.616	5	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9081	1.611	5	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9819	1.190	4	0.9800	< 0.001

Table 2: Results for method NI2A with  $\delta = 10^{-4}$  and  $2h$  set as close as possible to  $10^{-2}$ .

	$\tilde{r}$	$\bar{\rho}$	CPU (s)	$N_{g'}$	$r_X(\bar{\rho})$	Rel. error (%)
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.6079	$0.062 \times 10^{-3}$	21	-0.5000	< 0.001
$n_1 = n_2 = 3$	0.05	0.0604	$0.032 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2399	$0.045 \times 10^{-3}$	9	0.2000	< 0.001
$n = 16$	0.90	0.9760	$0.067 \times 10^{-3}$	17	0.8999	0.011
$r_X(-1) = -0.9241$	0.98	0.9962	$0.031 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.9602	2.024
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5203	0.032	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
$n_1 = n_2 = 100$	0.05	0.0526	0.032	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2099	0.032	5	0.2000	< 0.001
$n = 10201$	0.90	0.9111	0.032	5	0.9000	< 0.001
$r_X(-1) = -0.9971$	0.98	0.9851	0.028	5	0.9810	0.099
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5179	2.17	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
$n_1 = n_2 = 1000$	0.05	0.0524	2.48	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2091	2.40	5	0.2000	< 0.001
$n = 1002001$	0.90	0.9083	2.01	5	0.9000	< 0.001
$r_X(-1) = -0.9997$	0.98	0.9821	1.89	5	0.9800	< 0.001
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5341	$2.27 \times 10^{-3}$	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
$r_1 = 1.568$	0.05	0.0542	$2.09 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4616	$1.95 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.4300	< 0.001
$r_2 = 6.021$	0.90	0.9336	$2.29 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.9000	< 0.001
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.96	0.9903	$2.33 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.9600	< 0.001
$n = 768$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9738$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9652$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5184	0.019	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
$r_1 = 15.68$	0.05	0.0524	0.019	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4469	0.018	5	0.4300	< 0.001
$r_2 = 60.21$	0.90	0.9092	0.019	5	0.9000	< 0.001
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.98	0.9832	0.018	5	0.9800	< 0.001
$n = 6560$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9971$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9989$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5177	0.50	5	-0.5000	< 0.001
$r_1 = 156.7$	0.05	0.0524	0.46	5	0.0500	< 0.001
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4465	0.47	5	0.4300	< 0.001
$r_2 = 602.1$	0.90	0.9081	0.47	5	0.9000	< 0.001
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.98	0.9819	0.45	5	0.9800	< 0.001
$n = 189912$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9997$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9999$						

Table 3: Results for method NI2B with  $m = 5$ ,  $\delta = 10^{-4}$  (so  $h = 0.09999$ ).

	$\tilde{r}$	$\bar{\rho}$	CPU (s)	$N_{g'}$	$r_X(\bar{\rho})$	Rel. error (%)
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.6078	$0.024 \times 10^{-3}$	9	-0.5000	< 0.001
$n_1 = n_2 = 3$	0.05	0.0601	$0.010 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.0497	0.514
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2389	$0.015 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.1999	0.026
$n = 16$	0.90	0.8485	$0.029 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.7409	17.676
$r_X(-1) = -0.9241$	0.98	0.8642	$0.029 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.7565	22.805
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5202	$9.65 \times 10^{-3}$	7	-0.4999	0.029
$n_1 = n_2 = 100$	0.05	0.0525	$4.20 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.0499	0.172
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2099	$6.95 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.2000	< 0.001
$n = 10201$	0.90	0.8718	$15.60 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.8582	4.641
$r_X(-1) = -0.9971$	0.98	0.9142	$15.80 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.9034	7.821
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5178	1.023	7	-0.4998	0.030
$n_1 = n_2 = 1000$	0.05	0.0523	0.44	3	0.0499	0.157
$p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$	0.20	0.2091	0.73	5	0.2000	< 0.001
$n = 1002001$	0.90	0.8982	1.64	11	0.8892	1.202
$r_X(-1) = -0.9997$	0.98	0.9625	1.62	11	0.9586	2.187
$r_X(1) = 1$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5340	$0.76 \times 10^{-3}$	7	-0.4998	0.031
$r_1 = 1.568$	0.05	0.0541	$0.34 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.0499	0.157
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4614	$0.75 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.4299	0.028
$r_2 = 6.021$	0.90	0.9567	$1.19 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.9246	2.736
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.96	1.00	$1.13 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.9652	0.545
$n = 768$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9738$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9652$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5183	$6.38 \times 10^{-3}$	7	-0.4999	0.029
$r_1 = 15.68$	0.05	0.0523	$2.72 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.0499	0.160
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4468	$6.44 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.4299	0.019
$r_2 = 60.21$	0.90	0.8995	$9.77 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.8896	1.150
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.98	0.9644	$9.74 \times 10^{-3}$	11	0.9595	2.091
$n = 6560$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9971$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9989$						
<b>Negative Binomial</b>	-0.50	-0.5176	0.18	7	-0.4998	0.030
$r_1 = 156.7$	0.05	0.0523	0.078	3	0.0499	0.155
$p_1 = 0.3861$	0.43	0.4465	0.18	7	0.4296	0.020
$r_2 = 602.1$	0.90	0.9077	0.29	11	0.8996	0.041
$p_2 = 0.6211$	0.98	0.9816	0.28	11	0.9797	0.035
$n = 189912$						
$r_X(-1) = -0.9997$						
$r_X(1) = 0.9999$						

Table 4: Results for method NI3.

	$\epsilon$	$\tilde{r}$	$\bar{\rho}$	CPU (s)	$N_1$	$r_X(\bar{\rho})$	Rel. error (%)
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 3$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 16$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9241$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.6079	$0.038 \times 10^{-3}$	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0604	$0.020 \times 10^{-3}$	1	0.0500	0.004
		0.20	0.2399	$0.040 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9767	$0.060 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.9013	0.142
		0.98	0.9922	$0.137 \times 10^{-3}$	7	0.9429	3.783
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.6079	$0.064 \times 10^{-3}$	3	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0604	$0.053 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2399	$0.054 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9760	$0.106 \times 10^{-3}$	5	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9990	$0.222 \times 10^{-3}$	12	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 100$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 10201$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9971$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5203	0.028	1	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0526	0.029	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2099	0.028	1	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9111	0.025	1	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9851	0.022	1	0.9800	< 0.001
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5203	0.054	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0526	0.056	2	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2099	0.053	2	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9111	0.047	2	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9851	0.044	2	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Binomial</b> $n_1 = n_2 = 1000$ $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$ $n = 1002001$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9997$ $r_X(1) = 1$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5179	1.642	1	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	1.924	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2091	1.831	1	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9083	1.387	1	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9821	1.214	1	0.9800	< 0.001
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5179	3.360	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	1.918	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.20	0.2091	1.771	1	0.2000	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9083	2.796	2	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9821	2.550	2	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 1.568$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 6.021$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 768$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9738$ $r_X(1) = 0.9652$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5341	$3.79 \times 10^{-3}$	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0542	$1.78 \times 10^{-3}$	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4616	$3.15 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9336	$3.45 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.96	0.9902	$3.46 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.9616	< 0.001
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5341	$3.77 \times 10^{-3}$	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0542	$3.42 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4616	$3.16 \times 10^{-3}$	2	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9336	$5.13 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.96	0.9903	$5.10 \times 10^{-3}$	3	0.9600	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 15.68$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 60.21$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 6560$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9971$ $r_X(1) = 0.9989$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5184	0.017	1	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	0.016	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4469	0.016	1	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9092	0.016	1	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9832	0.015	1	0.9800	< 0.001
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5184	0.031	2	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	0.016	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4469	0.031	2	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9092	0.031	2	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9832	0.028	2	0.9800	< 0.001
<b>Negative Binomial</b> $r_1 = 156.7$ $p_1 = 0.3861$ $r_2 = 602.1$ $p_2 = 0.6211$ $n = 189912$ $r_X(-1) = -0.9997$ $r_X(1) = 0.9999$	$10^{-2}$	-0.50	-0.5177	0.393	1	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	0.370	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4465	0.378	1	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9081	0.383	1	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9819	0.332	1	0.9800	< 0.001
	$10^{-4}$	-0.50	-0.5177	0.394	1	-0.5000	< 0.001
		0.05	0.0524	0.369	1	0.0500	< 0.001
		0.43	0.4465	0.366	1	0.4300	< 0.001
		0.90	0.9081	0.740	2	0.9000	< 0.001
		0.98	0.9819	0.689	2	0.9800	< 0.001




Figure 1: The function  $r_X(\rho)$  on  $[0.98, 1]$  in the example with binomial marginals with  $n_1 = 3$ ; compared to the function  $r_C(\rho)$  given by (6).

## 5 Conclusion

We studied the NORTA correlation-matching problem for the case where the marginals are discrete. We proved some key properties of both the rank and linear correlations and their derivatives as functions of the correlation parameter  $\rho$  of the normal copula. We obtained a formula for the derivative  $f'$  of the function  $f$  whose root is sought. The derivative involves only the exponential function and can be evaluated significantly faster than  $f$ . We developed and analyzed algorithms that exploit the derivative. We emphasized rank-correlation matching, but our methods apply immediately to linear-correlation matching. For unbounded univariate marginals and rank-correlation matching, we adapted one of our methods that only requires evaluating  $f'$  (and not  $f$ ) by substituting a finite-term approximation of  $f'$ , and we provided bounds on the resulting error.

Our numerical experience and findings can be summarized as follows. We initially expected that the ratio of work per evaluation of  $f$  compared to work per evaluation of  $f'$  would be large, making NI2 competitive. To our surprise, there exist algorithms that compute the bivariate normal integral (and thus  $f$ ) to negligible error at small computing cost. In our implementation, this ratio was about 12, a value smaller than we expected. (Other users may observe a different value, depending on the method for computing bivariate normal integrals and the implementation quality.) Moreover, NI2 lacks a solution-error guarantee, so it should be viewed as a cheap and approximate alternative to exact methods. Implementing the derivative  $f'$  is very simple, requiring just a few lines of simple code. In summary, if a good code is available for computing the bivariate normal integral, then our recommendation is the Newton-type method NI3. Otherwise, NI2B is an easy (approximate) solution, because it requires only  $f'$  and not  $f$ ; but some care is needed to keep the

integration errors small enough.

We also contributed a convergence result on the  $L_\infty$  distance (i.e., the supremum over  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$  of the absolute difference) between the rank-correlation function  $r_X(\rho; F_1, F_2)$  for given discrete marginals  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and the explicitly known analog for continuous marginals,  $(6/\pi) \arcsin(\rho/2)$ , in terms of the maximum probability masses of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , as these masses go to zero. In particular, this result justifies the value  $2 \sin(\pi\tilde{r}/6)$  as an approximation to the solution to (3) and points to it as a starting point for exact solution methods.

Interesting future work is to analyze further the properties of normal-copula dependence for discrete marginals with unbounded support. Problems and approaches of interest are: (1) study the correlation error that results from truncating to finite support for a single given  $\rho$ ; (2) if this error can be made small uniformly across  $\rho$  by an appropriate truncation, then finite-support correlation-matching methods could be proved to be effective; (3) propose and analyze alternatives to our approximate correlation-matching method, perhaps via steps (1) and (2); and (4) evaluate correlation-matching methods experimentally.

## Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by a grant from Bell Canada via the Bell University Laboratories, Grants No. CRDPJ-251320 and ODGP0110050 from NSERC-Canada, and a Canada Research Chair to the third author. We thank Richard Simard for his assistance in programming aspects and some numerical experiments.

## References

- Avramidis, A. N., A. Deslauriers, P. L'Ecuyer. 2004. Modeling daily arrivals to a telephone call center. *Management Science* **50** 896–908.
- Biller, B., B. L. Nelson. 2003. Modeling and generating multivariate time-series input processes using a vector autoregressive technique. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* **13** 211–237.
- Brent, R. P. 1971. An algorithm with guaranteed convergence for finding a zero of a function. *Computer Journal* **14** 422–425.
- Cario, M. C., B. L. Nelson. 1996. Autoregressive to anything: Time series input processes for simulation. *Operations Research Letters* **19** 51–58.
- Cario, M. C., B. L. Nelson. 1997. Modeling and generating random vectors with arbitrary marginal distributions and correlation matrix. Working paper.

- Cario, M. C., B. L. Nelson. 1998. Numerical methods for fitting and simulating autoregressive-to-anything processes. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* **10** 72–81.
- Chen, H. 2001. Initialization for NORTA: Generation of random vectors with specified marginals and correlations. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* **13** 312–331.
- Donnelly, T. G. 1973. Algorithm 462: Bivariate normal distribution. *Communications of the ACM* **16** 638.
- Drezner, Z., G. O. Wesolowsky. 1989. On the computation of the bivariate normal integral. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **35** 101–107.
- Embrechts, P., F. Lindskog, A. McNeil. 2003. Modelling dependence with copulas and applications to risk management. S. Rachev, ed., *Handbook of Heavy Tailed Distributions in Finance*. Elsevier, 329–384. Chapter 8.
- Embrechts, P., A. McNeil, D. Straumann. 2002. Correlation and dependence in risk management: properties and pitfalls. M. A. H. Dempster, ed., *Risk Management: Value at Risk and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 176–223.
- Genz, A. 2004. Numerical computation of rectangular bivariate and trivariate normal and  $t$  probabilities. *Statistics and Computing* **14** 151–160. See <http://www.math.wsu.edu/faculty/genz/homepage>.
- Ghosh, S., S.G. Henderson. 2003. Behaviour of the NORTA method for correlated random vector generation as the dimension increases. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* **13** 276–294.
- Hörmann, W., J. Leydold, G. Derflinger. 2004. *Automatic Nonuniform Random Variate Generation*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Joe, H. 1997. *Multivariate Models and Dependence Concepts*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Kendall, M., A. Stuart. 1977. *The advanced theory of statistics*, vol. 1: Distribution theory. 4th ed. Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Kruskal, W. 1958. Ordinal measures of association. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **53** 814–861.
- Kurowicka, D., R. M. Cooke. 2001. Conditional, partial and rank correlation for the elliptical copula; dependence modelling in uncertainty analysis. E. Zio, M. Demichela, N. Piccinini, eds., *Safety and Reliability, 3rd volume*. 1795–1802.



- Lurie, P. M., M. S. Goldberg. 1998. An approximate method for sampling correlated random variables from partially-specified distributions. *Management Science* **44** 203–218.
- Mardia, K. V. 1970. A translation family of bivariate distributions and Fréchet's bounds. *Sankhya* **A32** 119–122.
- Nelsen, R. B. 1999. *An Introduction to Copulas, Lecture Notes in Statistics*, vol. 139. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Owen, D. B. 1956. Tables for computing bivariate normal probability. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **27** 1075–1090.
- Press, W. H., S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, B. P. Flannery. 1992. *Numerical Recipes in C: The Art of Scientific Computing*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Rudin, W. 1976. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Stoer, J., R. Bulirsch. 1980. *Introduction to Numerical Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York.