

Notes on the correlation between a function and its derivative or first difference

Richard Kennaway

We demonstrate the absence of correlation between a function satisfying certain weak boundedness conditions and its first derivative. Before attending to the technicalities, we note that the proofs for both theorems are almost immediate from the observation that $\int_a^b x \dot{x} dt = [\frac{1}{2}x^2]_a^b$.

THEOREM 1 *Let x be a differentiable real function, defined in the interval $[a, b]$, such that $x(a) = x(b)$. If x is not constant then the correlation of x and \dot{x} over $[a, b]$ is defined and equal to zero.*

PROOF. Write $\bar{x}_{a,b}$ and $\bar{\dot{x}}_{a,b}$ for the means of x and \dot{x} over $[a, b]$. By replacing x by $x - \bar{x}_{a,b}$ we may assume without loss of generality that $\bar{x}_{a,b}$ is zero. $\bar{\dot{x}}_{a,b}$ must exist and equal zero, since

$$\bar{\dot{x}}_{a,b} = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \dot{x} dt = \frac{x(b) - x(a)}{b-a} = 0$$

The correlation between x and \dot{x} over $[a, b]$ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{x,\dot{x}} &= \frac{\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b x \dot{x} dt}{\sqrt{(\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b x^2 dt) (\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \dot{x}^2 dt)}} \\ &= \frac{(x(b)^2 - x(a)^2)/2}{\sqrt{(\int_a^b x^2 dt) (\int_a^b \dot{x}^2 dt)}} \end{aligned}$$

The numerator is zero and the denominator is positive (since neither x nor \dot{x} is identically zero). Therefore $c_{x,\dot{x}} = 0$.

THEOREM 2 *Let x be a differentiable real function. Let \bar{x} and $\bar{\dot{x}}$ be the averages of x and \dot{x} over the whole real line. If these averages exist, and if the correlation of x and \dot{x} over the whole real line exists, then the correlation is zero.*

PROOF. Note that the existence of the correlation implies that x is not constant. As before, we can take \bar{x} to be zero and prove that $\bar{\dot{x}}$ is also zero. The correlation between x and \dot{x} is then given by the limit:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{x,\dot{x}} &= \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty, b \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b x \dot{x} dt}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b x^2 dt\right) \left(\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \dot{x}^2 dt\right)}} \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty, b \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(x(b)^2 - x(a)^2)/2}{\sqrt{\left(\int_a^b x^2 dt\right) \left(\int_a^b \dot{x}^2 dt\right)}} \end{aligned}$$

Since this limit is assumed to exist, to prove that it is zero it is sufficient to construct some particular sequence of values of a and b tending to $\pm\infty$, along which the limit is zero.

Either $x(b)$ tends to zero as $b \rightarrow \infty$, or (since $\bar{x} = 0$ and x is continuous) there are arbitrarily large values of b for which $x(b) = 0$. In either case, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist arbitrarily large values of b such that $|x(b)| < \epsilon$. Similarly, there exist arbitrarily large negative values a such that $|x(a)| < \epsilon$. For such a and b , the numerator of the last expression for $c_{x,\dot{x}}$ is less than $\epsilon^2/2$. However, the denominator is positive and non-decreasing as $a \rightarrow -\infty$ and $b \rightarrow \infty$. The denominator is therefore bounded below for all large enough a and b by some positive value δ .

If we take a sequence ϵ_n tending to zero, and for each ϵ_n take values a_n and b_n as described above, and such that $a_n \rightarrow -\infty$ and $b_n \rightarrow \infty$, then along this route to the limit, the corresponding approximant to the correlation is less than ϵ_n/δ . This sequence tends to zero, therefore the correlation is zero.

The conditions that $x(a) = x(b)$ in the first theorem and the existence of \bar{x} in the second are essential. If we take $x = e^t$, which violates both conditions, then $\dot{x} = x$ and the correlation is 1 over every finite time interval. That \bar{x} and $c_{x,\dot{x}}$ exist is a technicality that rules out certain pathological cases such as $x = \sin(\log(1 + |t|))$, which are unlikely to arise in any practical application.

Both theorems have finite difference versions for time series. They hold for essentially the same reason as the continuous versions: that $(x_i + x_{i+1})(x_{i+1} - x_i) = x_{i+1}^2 - x_i^2$. The proofs are easily obtained from those above.