

Non-Parametric Manifold Learning

Dena Marie Asta

*Department of Statistics
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH
43210 USA
dasta@stat.osu.edu*

Abstract: We introduce an estimator for distances in a compact Riemannian manifold M based on graph Laplacian estimates of the Laplace-Beltrami operator. We upper bound the ℓ_2 -loss for the ratio of the estimator over the true manifold distance, or more precisely an approximation of manifold distance in non-commutative geometry (cf. [Connes and Suijlekom, 2020]), in terms of spectral errors in the graph Laplacian estimates and, implicitly, several geometric properties of the manifold. We consequently obtain a consistency result for the estimator for samples equidistributed from a strictly positive density on M and graph Laplacians which spectrally converge, in a suitable sense, to the Laplace-Beltrami operator. The estimator resembles, and in fact its convergence properties are derived from, a special case of the Kontorovic dual reformulation of Wasserstein distance known as Connes' Distance Formula.

1. Introduction

Data in a variety of domains is most naturally regarded as drawn from a distribution on a possibly non-Euclidean space. For example, electrical impedances of capacitors are most naturally studied as points in a negatively curved hyperboloid (Huckemann *et al.* (2010)), radar bearings are most naturally studied as points in the space of (3×3) special orthogonal matrices (Barbaresco (2011)), and diffusion tensoring images are most naturally studied as points in the space of semidefinite positive (3×3) -matrices (Rahman *et al.* (2005)). In many situations, that space M is unknown but is embedded in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N ; thus while the samples are just ordinary vectors $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$, latent dependencies between the covariates are encoded as the restriction of the support of the generating distribution to $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. For example, the sample data might consist of coordinates in \mathbb{R}^3 for some points of a smooth but unknown 3-dimensional object M scanned by a digital camera. For another example, the sample data might encode k covariates for each node in a social network (eg. age, height, weight for a friendship network), the subspace M would then encode hidden dependencies between those covariates. In this setup, the identification of M as a geometric object is an important, if not the most important, part of statistical inference. As an intrinsic geometric object, M is a metric space in which the intrinsic distance $\text{dist}_M(x, y)$ between a pair of points $x, y \in M$ is the length of the shortest path connecting x to y *within* M . In fact, link generation in statistical networks is naturally modelled as a function of intrinsic distance

between nodes in a latent space M (McCormick and Zheng (2015), Krioukov *et al.* (2010), Asta and Shalizi (2015).) In the case the latent space M , and, often also its estimates, are smooth (manifolds), estimation of M is called *manifold learning* (eg. (Genovese *et al.* (2012))). The identification of the latent space M is a form of non-linear dimensionality reduction in the case $\dim M \ll N$, with substantial applications in classification (Begelfor and Werman (2005); Cox and Cox (2008); Ramsay (1982); Lu *et al.* (2015)), prediction (Cheng and Wu (2013)), and visualization.

In the non-parametric setting, the estimate itself is usually not a practical but instead an important theoretical tool. For example, a non-parametric smooth estimate of a manifold M based on sample points X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n uniformly drawn from M would be a space with infinitely many points (Genovese *et al.* (2012)). Dropping the requirement that the estimates themselves be smooth, we can simply estimate M as a *finite* metric space of its samples $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ equipped with an estimate of its $n(n-1)/2$ pairwise intrinsic distances. Even this finite data is impractically large for $n \gg 0$. Nonetheless, non-parametric estimates of M are sufficient statistics for quantities of increasing and practical interest in the applications, such as curvature, volume, diameter, genus, or more general *topology* (numbers and dimensions of holes) of M . For example, the mean curvature of M can be estimated from the eigenvalues of the $(n \times n)$ -matrix of estimated distances between samples. In this manner, for example, upper bounds on convergence rates for non-parametric manifold estimators give constraints on all sorts of geometric estimators.

This paper gives a finite non-parametric estimator for the intrinsic distances between samples equidistributed from a strictly positive (and possibly unknown) density on an unknown compact submanifold $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, based only on the samples and their *extrinsic*, Euclidean distances between them. This paper gives what, to the best knowledge of the author, are the first *stochastic* convergence results and rates for non-parametric distance estimation at this level of generality (cf. (Bernstein *et al.*, 2000, Main Theorem B).) The trick is to use existing *graph Laplacian* estimates of the *Laplacian* operator Δ_M associated to a manifold M in a novel way. Graph Laplacians, matrices defined in terms of sample points $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$, are extensively used in machine learning and computer graphics to infer *some* of the geometry of M (cf. Belkin and Niyogi (2004); Nadler *et al.* (2005); Zhou *et al.* (2005).) The stochastic convergence of these graph Laplacians to Δ_M have been extensively studied in the literature (Belkin and Niyogi (2007); Berry and Giannakis (2020); Ting, Huang and Jordan (2010).) However, typical applications of graph Laplacians fail to recover the complete geometry of the latent space. This may be because while nearly every existing application is based on properties of graph Laplacians as *linear* operators, it is impossible to get the complete geometry of M from the properties of the Laplacian Δ_M , such as its spectrum of eigenvalues, as an abstract linear operator alone.

It has been observed that certain quadratic expressions involving Δ_M actually fully encode the complete geometry of M in an algebraic manner. This observation suggests that graph Laplacians can, in principle, be used directly to give in-

formation about M previously obtained indirectly from multi-stage algorithms. For example in recent years, the global topology of M has often been inferred by thickening the sample points X_1, \dots, X_n into small balls and studying the actual shape of the union of those balls (Edelsbrunner *et al.* (2008).) In contrast, that same data can be computed more directly in terms of graph Laplacians (Berry and Giannakis (2020).) For another example, the *Riemannian metric* or infinitesimal lengths of paths in M can be estimated from sample points through various algorithms (Arvanitidis, Hansen and Hauberg (2017); Berry and Giannakis (2020); Perraull-Joncas and Meilà (2013)), some of which even directly use graph Laplacians (Berry and Giannakis (2020).) There do not currently exist stochastic convergence results for such estimates, much less estimates of *global* intrinsic distances across M . The fact that graph Laplacians can even estimate the Laplace-Beltrami operator not only linearly but also quadratically depends crucially on some recent results in geometry (Wyman (2022).)

Our estimate for $\text{dist}_M(X_a, X_b)$ from samples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n is strikingly simple to define. Let $\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)$ solve the following optimization problem defined in terms of tuning parameters $0 \leq q \leq r \leq n$ and a diagonalizable negative $(n \times n)$ graph Laplacian L ; here $v_{(i)}$ denotes the projection of a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto the span of the first i eigenspaces of L , $\|v\|_\infty = \max_i |v_i|$, and \odot denotes the coordinate-wise (Hadamard) product for vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && (1/2 \|L((v^\odot)^{(r)}) - 2(v \odot Lv)^{(r)}\|_\infty)^{-1/2} |v_a - v_b| \\ & \text{under constraints} && v = v_{(q)} \end{aligned}$$

The estimator resembles, and is based upon, *Connes' Distance Formula*

$$\text{dist}_M(x, y) = \sup_{\|\nabla_M f\| \leq 1} |f(x) - f(y)| \quad (1)$$

a supremum over smooth functions $M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ instead of as an infimum over paths in M (Connes (1989).) In this manner, the Connes' Distance Formula motivates operator-based definitions of distances between quantum states, through which it does not make sense to talk about smooth paths. It is natural that Connes' Distance Formula also motivates estimators for distances between sample points, through which it also does not make sense to talk about smooth paths. In fact, Connes' Distance Formula naturally suggests a generalization $\text{dist}_{M;q}$ (Connes and van Suijlekom (2021)) of distance under limited resolution of the manifold M , where the f 's are required to have vanishing i th Fourier coefficients for $i > q$. As the resolution improves, the manifold comes into focus [Theorem 2]. One insight from our work is that stochastic convergence requires that in the discrete analogue of Connes' Distance Formula, various vectors must be projected onto either the first r eigenspaces or the first $q < r$ eigenspaces, depending on whether the graph Laplacian is used linearly or quadratically, for suitable choices of parameters q, r .

Our main result bounds the multiplicative ℓ_2 -loss of the estimator in terms of the covering radius δ of the sample points and a measure $\epsilon_{\hat{L};r}$ of spectral error in estimating the Laplacian Δ_M with a graph Laplacian L .

Theorem 4. Fix natural numbers n, N . Then

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q}(x_a, x_b)}\right) \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2 (\sum_{\ell=r}^{\infty} \ell^{-N} + \epsilon_{\hat{L};r} + \delta)),$$

for δ -net $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$ and finite rank negative semidefinite operator L on $C^\infty(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and extension of \hat{L} to an operator \hat{L} on the vector space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth real-valued functions on M , where q is the maximum natural number such that $2|\lambda_{q;L}| < |\lambda_{r;L}|$ where $\lambda_{0;L} \geq \lambda_{1;L} \geq \dots \lambda_{n;L}$ are the eigenvalues of L .

The rates at which the right hand side terms shrink to 0 depend on manifold geometry (eg. [Reznikov and Saff \(2016\)](#)) and rates of spectral convergence for graph Laplacians (eg. [Wang \(2015\)](#)). Under some equidistribution conditions which include Poisson processes and independence, we obtain a strong form of stochastic convergence.

Corollary 5. There exist $q_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q_n}(x_a, x_b)}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow 0} 0 \quad a.s.$$

for samples X_1, X_2, \dots equidistributed from a smooth positive density on M and for each n , a linear operator L_n on $C^\infty(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ which extends to an operator \hat{L}_n on the vector space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth real-valued functions on M such that $\epsilon_{\hat{L}_n;i} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely.

The optimization problem is non-convex. In practice, even simple Monte Carlo simulations fail to approximate the estimator. Even without an algorithm for computing the estimator, we can still empirically observe stochastic convergence by replacing both the spectrally truncated manifold distances $\text{dist}_{M;q}$ and their estimates with oracle heuristics to get an approximate empirical risk plot [Figure 4].

The result of this paper suggests several lines of continuation. Convex relaxations should yield computable estimates; their convergence properties are therefore of great practical interest. The general strategy of restricting eigenspaces to obtain stochastic convergence results for *quadratic expressions* involving graph Laplacians applies more generally for other Laplacian-based, recent estimates of local manifold geometry ([Berry and Giannakis \(2020\)](#).) Future refinements of current stochastic convergence results for graph Laplacians should yield upper bounds on the Mean Integrated Square Error of the estimator. The Kontorovic dual reformulation of Wasserstein distances, generalizations of Connes' Distance Formula, suggests generalizations of the estimator for hard-to-compute Wasserstein distances. Variation in the choice of graph Laplacian gives a theoretical approach to comparing properties of different distance estimators in the literature. And in practical terms, computable functions of our hard-to-compute estimators should yield non-parametric, *consistent* estimates of curvature, genus, and any other geometric invariant of interest in the applications.

2. Conventions

For an operator T with discrete non-positive spectrum,

$$\lambda_{1:T} \geq \lambda_{2:T} \geq \dots$$

will denote the set of *non-zero* eigenvalues of T , including multiplicities, let $E_{i:T}$ denote the eigenspace of T corresponding to eigenvalue λ_i , and let rk_T denote the rank of T . We write $\| - \|$ for the usual vector norm in Euclidean space. An *extended norm* on a vector space is defined just like an ordinary norm, except that it can possibly take the value ∞ . For a sequence of distinct points x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n in some set, write $C^\infty(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for the vector space of all functions $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and make the identification

$$C^\infty(x_1, \dots, x_n) \cong \mathbb{R}^n$$

under the linear isomorphism sending the characteristic function on x_i to the i th standard basis vector.

3. Background

There is extensive literature on taking as input a distance d_1 on $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and learning another distance d_2 on that same set of points X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n which satisfies some given criteria (cf. [Yang and Jin \(2006\)](#).) Typically d_1 is Euclidean distance. And typically d_2 is often given in terms of a metric space M by

$$d_2(\phi(x), \phi(y)) = \text{dist}_M(x, y)$$

Distance learning naturally breaks up into some distinct categories. If $M = \mathbb{R}^p$ and that latter function ϕ is required to be linear, then d_2 is necessarily a Mahalanobis distance function, of the form $d_2(x, y) = (x - y)^T M (x - y)$ for some symmetric positive-semidefinite $(n \times n)$ -matrix M ; in the case learning d_2 amounts to learning a symmetric positive-semidefinite $(n \times n)$ -matrix which satisfies some given criteria. If M is a non-compact Riemannian manifold and ϕ is an open smooth immersion, then d_2 can be indirectly learned by first learning the *Riemannian metric* on M [Aalto and Verma \(2019\)](#). If M is some infinite dimensional Hilbert space and ϕ is nonlinear, then d_2 can often be expressed in terms of a kernel. If M is some q -manifold for $q \ll p$, then learning a function ϕ that minimizes some distortion between d_1 and d_2 is often called *dimensionality reduction* [Sorzano, Vargas and Montano \(2014\)](#). Conversely, many dimensionality reduction algorithms for finding some optimal ϕ are, or at least can be, obtained by first learning the distance d_2 and obtaining an eigendecomposition to a matrix whose (i, j) th entry is a function of $\text{dist}_M(x_i, x_j)$ [Begelfor and Werman \(2005\)](#); [Cox and Cox \(2008\)](#).

This paper is concerned with a special but important case of dimensionality reduction. We assume that there is some unknown connected, compact smooth q -submanifold $M \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ for which X_1, \dots, X_n are drawn from M ($\phi(x) = x$ for

all $x \in M$). This is the case, for example, in certain continuous latent space models of networks (eg. Hoff, Raftery and Handcock (2002).) This is also the case, for example, in the data of radar bearings (eg. Barbaresco (2011).)

In this case, $d_2 = \text{dist}_M$ is determined by the *Riemannian metric* on M , the data of infinitesimal distances on M encoded as a positive definite $(q \times q)$ -matrix for each point of M . There are many techniques, parametric and non-parametric, for estimating the Riemannian metric of M at each of the points X_1, \dots, X_n , the data of n positive-definite $(\dim_M \times \dim_M)$ -matrices Arvanitidis, Hansen and Hauberg (2017); Berry and Giannakis (2020); Perrault-Joncas and Meilà (2013). However, it is not clear whether any of these proposed techniques are consistent, and regardless, whether any of those estimates can be used to indirectly obtain a consistent estimator of $d_2(X_p, X_q)$.

In this case, $d_2 = \text{dist}_M$ is also expressible in terms of a first-order differential *Dirac operator* on smooth functions and more general *smooth forms* on M called *Connes' Distance Formula*. While there is a proposed discrete analogue of Connes' Distance Formula for graphs Requardt (1997), it is not clear whether that analogue converges in any statistical sense. An estimator of one Dirac operator, the *Hodge-Dirac* operator, can be constructed for samples X_1, \dots, X_n on M Berry and Giannakis (2020). To the best knowledge of the author, a corresponding plug-in estimator for distances has not yet been investigated. However, the cited estimator for the Hodge-Dirac operator is based on a more fundamental estimate of a second-order differential *Laplace-Beltrami* operator. Moreover, Connes' Distance Formula turns out to be reformulatable purely in terms of the Laplace-Beltrami operator. We will focus on the relevant background needed to understand Connes' Distance Formula, the Laplace-Beltrami operator, and their estimates by graph Laplacians.

3.1. Geometry

For accessibility, we recall all relevant concepts in Riemannian Geometry purely in terms of multivariate calculus and linear algebra and make no explicit mention of *Riemannian metrics*. We refer the interested reader to other sources for the general theory (eg. Chavel (2006).) In this spirit, we take a *smooth submanifold* of \mathbb{R}^p to be the preimage of 0 under a smooth function $\mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which does not map any critical point to 0.

Example 1. An example is the unit n -dimensional sphere

$$\mathbb{S}^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \|x\| = 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

Let M be a compact, connected smooth submanifold of \mathbb{R}^p of dimension d . A function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *smooth* if $f \circ i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth for all smooth functions $i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with image in M . Write $C^\infty(M)$ for the vector space of all smooth real-valued functions $M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$, define

$$\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in M} |f(x)|.$$

For $x, y \in M$, write $\text{dist}_M(x, y)$ for the intrinsic manifold distance

$$\text{dist}_M(x, y) = \inf_{\gamma} \int \|\gamma'(t)\| dt \quad (2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all smooth paths $\gamma : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ from x to y whose image lies in M . The *diameter* of M is $\sup_{x, y \in M} \text{dist}_M(x, y)$. An *isometry* $\varphi : U \rightarrow M$ from an open subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is a smooth function $U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ with image in M such that $\text{dist}_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) = \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in U$. The *dimension* \dim_M of M is the unique number q such that the intersection of every sufficiently small neighborhood of a point in M with M is isometric to an open subset of \mathbb{R}^q . Integration over M can be defined as the operator \int_M on $C^\infty(M)$ such that for each isometry $\varphi : U \rightarrow M$ from an open subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$ taking the value 0 outside the image of φ ,

$$\int_M f = \int_U f \circ \varphi.$$

The L_2 -inner product is defined on $C^\infty(M)$ as the integral

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_M fg.$$

The *volume* of M is the $\text{vol}_M = \int_M 1$.

Example 2. For the unit circle $\mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we have that

$$2\text{diam}_{\mathbb{S}^1} = \text{vol}_{\mathbb{S}^1} = 2\pi.$$

For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$, let $\nabla_M f$ denote the gradient function

$$\nabla_M f = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_p} \end{pmatrix} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p,$$

The function $d_x = \text{dist}_M(x, -) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $|d_x(x) - d_x(y)| = \text{dist}_M(x, y)$. But while d_x is smooth almost everywhere and satisfies $\|\nabla_M d_x\| \leq 1$ wherever $\nabla_M d_x$ is defined, d_x is not smooth everywhere. However, d_x can be uniformly approximated by smooth functions whose gradients are bounded by 1 [Greene and Wu \(1979\)](#). The formula for distances below follows.

Connes' Distance Formula. For $x, y \in M$,

$$\text{dist}_M(x, y) = \sup_f |f(x) - f(y)|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty \leq 1$.

The proof follows by noting that the left side upper bounds the right side by the Mean Value Theorem and the left side lower bounds the right side by taking smooth 1-Lipschitz approximations f of the 1-Lipschitz function $\text{dist}_M(x, -) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Connes Distance Formula suggests the following natural generalization of distance under imperfect resolution as determined by a parameter q .

Definition 1. For each $x, y \in M$, let

$$\text{dist}_{M;q}(x, y) = \sup_f |f(x) - f(y)|,$$

over all $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\hat{f}_i = 0$ for all $i > q$.

Theorem 2. For each fixed pair $x, y \in M$,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\text{dist}_{M;q}(x, y)}{\text{dist}_M(x, y)}\right) \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Proof. Let d be the 1-Lipchitz function

$$d = \text{dist}_M(x, -) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

There exists a sequence $f_1, f_2, \dots : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of smooth 1-Lipschitz functions that uniformly converge to d . Let $g_i = (f_i)_{(i)}$. Then g_1, g_2, \dots uniformly converges to d . Moreover $\|\nabla g_n - \nabla f_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because partial Fourier sums of smooth functions converge in the Sobolev norm to the infinite Fourier series. Let $h_n = \max(\|\nabla g_n\|_\infty, 1)^{-1} g_n$. Then h_1, h_2, \dots are smooth functions that uniformly converge to d . And $\|\nabla h_n\|_\infty \leq 1$ for each n by construction. And $|h_q(x) - h_q(y)| \leq \text{dist}_{M;q}(x, y) \leq \text{dist}_M(x, y)$ for each q . Therefore the result follows. \square

The precise rate of convergence is dependent on particular geometric features of M , such as its local dimension d , curvature, volume, and conjugate pairs of points, and even the particular choice of pairs of points x, y .

3.2. Laplace-Beltrami Operator

We will take the *Laplace-Beltrami operator* Δ_M for M to mean the negative definite operator on $C^\infty(M)$ (instead of the larger vector space of L_2 -integrable functions) characterized by the following identity for all $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$:

$$\int_M f \Delta_M g = - \int_M \nabla_M f \cdot \nabla_M g$$

The operator Δ_M acts on products by the formula

$$\Delta_M(fg) = f \Delta_M g + g \Delta_M f + 2(\nabla_M f \cdot \nabla_M g).$$

It turns out that we can actually recover $\|\nabla_M f\|$ from Δ_M , f , and f^2 .

Proposition 3. For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $x \in M$,

$$\|\nabla_M f\|^2 = 1/2\Delta_M f^2 - f\Delta_M f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (3)$$

Proof. Observe that

$$1/2\Delta_M f^2 - f\Delta_M f = 1/2(2f\Delta_M f + 2\|\nabla_M f\|^2) - f\Delta_M f = \|\nabla_M f\|^2.$$

□

We can then reformulate Connes' Distance Formula purely in terms of Δ_M .

Connes' Distance Formula. For $x, y \in M$,

$$\text{dist}_M(x, y) = \sup_f |f(x) - f(y)|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all $f \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying $\|1/2\Delta_M f^2 - f\Delta_M f\|_\infty \leq 1$.

The eigenvalues of Δ_M form a discrete subset of non-positive real numbers because M is compact.

Example 3. The non-zero eigenvalues of $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^1}$, counting multiplicities, are

$$-1, -1, -2, -2, -3, -3, \dots$$

Respective choices of eigenfunctions are the functions sending $(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ to $\sin \theta, \cos \theta, \sin 2\theta, \cos 2\theta, \dots$

Let $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i;\Delta_M}$. Fix a choice e_1, e_2, \dots of eigenfunctions for Δ_M that are orthonormal with respect to the L_2 -inner product such that $e_i \in E_{\lambda_i}\Delta_M$. For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$, write \hat{f}_i for the i th Fourier coefficient

$$\hat{f}_i = \langle f, e_i \rangle.$$

For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let $f_{(k)}$ be the Fourier partial sum

$$f_{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{f}_i e_i.$$

For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$, $f = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \hat{f}_i e_i$ in the sense that

$$\|f - f_{(k)}\|_\infty \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

In fact, $f_{(k)} \rightarrow f$ in the order 1 uniform Sobolov norm in the sense that also

$$\|\nabla f - \nabla f_{(k)}\|_\infty \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Let c_{ijk} denote the Riemannian triple product

$$c_{ijk} = \langle e_i e_j, e_k \rangle = \int_M e_i e_j e_k$$

the k th Fourier coefficient of the product function $e_i e_j$. In the Appendix, we will review facts about Fourier coefficients, including certain decay rates for triple products [Theorem 27]. These decay rates imply a high concentration of the Fourier coefficients for $\Delta_M f^2$ lie in a range determined by where the Fourier coefficients of f are concentrated [Lemma 8]. This is the key observation that allows for a consistent, discrete analogue of the non-linear operator $\|\nabla_M\|^2$ defined by (3), in terms of discrete estimates of Δ_M .

3.3. Distributions

A *smooth density* on M is a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$\int_M f = 1 \quad f \geq 0.$$

A sequence of random quantities X_1, X_2, \dots on M is *equidistributed* from a smooth density f on M if the averages of the first n Dirac point-masses of X_1, X_2, \dots weakly converges to f in the sense that for each $g \in C^\infty(M)$, the following holds almost surely:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) = \int_M f g$$

3.4. Geometric Estimation

There are a number of estimators for various features of a manifold. We restrict ourselves to estimators for distance, gradients, and Laplacians.

3.4.1. Distance Estimation

There are a number of methods for estimating those intrinsic distances themselves. All of these estimators rely on the assumption that M is smooth. Smoothness guarantees that small Euclidean distances approximate small intrinsic manifold distances. For this reason, all latent distance estimators are defined in terms of a *bandwidth* parameter $h > 0$, an estimate of how fast extrinsic Euclidean distances converge to intrinsic manifold distances as the points get closer and closer. For instance, we can estimate $\text{dist}_M(X_p, X_q)$ as the length of the shortest path from X_p to X_q in the *sample network* defined by adding an edge from X_i to X_j with weight $\|X_i - X_j\|$ if $\|X_i - X_j\| < h$ and not connecting X_i, X_j otherwise. This estimate is known to be close to $\text{dist}_M(X_p, X_q)$ with high probability under certain assumptions on the distribution in terms of the bandwidth h and for manifolds M which are *isometric to a convex subset of Euclidean space* (Bernstein *et al.*, 2000, Main Theorem B). The latter condition on the latent space M excludes manifolds with non-trivial geometry, such as compact manifolds or manifolds with non-trivial curvature. An additional challenge is to give

a data-driven way of actually choosing the bandwidth h . The usual method of cross-validation does not apply because while there are multiple (often, but not always independent) sample nodes X_1, X_2, \dots , there is usually only one given independent *sample network*.

3.4.2. Gradient Estimation

Connes' Distance Formula demonstrates how the gradient fully encodes the geometry of M . The *incidence matrix* of a sample network is intuitively an estimate for the gradient. However, the literature lacks convergence results formalizing this intuition, perhaps for reasons of technical convenience and efficiency. Firstly, incidence matrices are linear transformations defined between two distinct vector spaces of generally differing dimensions. Secondly, the sizes of incidence matrices grow cubically in sample size.

3.4.3. Laplacian Estimation

Graph Laplacians are square matrices that have been proven to converge to the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_M in various senses. Unlike incidence matrices, graph Laplacians are operators on a single vector space and grow quadratically in sample size. These graph Laplacians, loosely, are defined as the negative semidefinite difference $A - D$ between an adjacency matrix A and a diagonal degree matrix D . In the context of samples $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ restricted to an unknown latent subspace $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, our sample networks have edge weights defined by a kernel function and consequently the graph Laplacians have possibly non-integral values for their entries. In turn, the kernel function is parametrized by a bandwidth parameter h . Like before, the usual method of cross-validation cannot be used to tune the bandwidth h . Instead, some of the heuristics for choosing the bandwidth h are based on estimates of various geometric features of the latent space M , like curvature. However, an adaptation of Lepski's Method [Chazal, Giulini and Michel \(2016\)](#) actually comes with some theoretical guarantees for the graph Laplacian as an estimator for Δ_M .

Most constructions of graph Laplacians based on samples $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $(n \times n)$ -matrices, are most naturally regarded as linear operators over the random n -dimensional vector space $C^\infty(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ of real-valued functions on the set of sample points. When the edge weights of a sample network and hence graph Laplacians are implicitly defined in terms of a kernel and bandwidth, we can extend these linear operators to finite rank “out-of-sample” linear operator on the entire vector space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth functions without changing the eigenvalues and simply extending the eigenfunctions using the kernel to “out-of-sample” smooth eigenfunctions. For this reason, we define a notion of spectral deviation $\epsilon_{T;r}$ in terms of a general negative semidefinite linear operator T on $C^\infty(M)$ whose non-zero eigenvalues are $\lambda_{1;T} \geq \lambda_{2;T} \geq \dots$, as follows. Let $e_{i;T}$ denote (a choice of) i th eigenvector of T corresponding to $\lambda_{i;T}$. For each

operator T on $C^\infty(M)$, let

$$\epsilon_{T;r} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \max (|\lambda_{i;T} - \lambda_i|, \|e_{i;T} - e_i\|_\infty).$$

It is possible to define kernel-based graph Laplacians L_n , in terms of possibly non-uniformly drawn samples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n equidistributed from a strictly positive density on compact Riemannian submanifolds M of \mathbb{R}^N , for which their out-of-sample extensions \hat{L}_n admit spectral convergence in the sense that $\hat{L}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ almost surely (eg. [Tao and Shi \(2020\)](#); [Berry and Giannakis \(2020\)](#)). Because graph Laplacians are so fundamental to our estimation process, the simplest possible case of such a convergent construction as follows. Consider a graph (network) with n ordered nodes and edge weight $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$ between the i th node and j th node. This network can be usefully encoded as the $(n \times n)$ negative semidefinite *graph Laplacian* matrix:

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} -\sum_i w_{1i} & w_{12} & \cdots & w_{1n} \\ w_{21} & -\sum_i w_{2i} & \cdots & w_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{n1} & w_{n2} & \cdots & -\sum_i w_{ni} \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider a sequence $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$. Note that L can be interpreted as an operator on $C^\infty(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. When the weights w_{ij} are defined in terms of $\|x_i - x_j\|$, this operator L can be extended to an out-of-sample negative semidefinite operator Δ on $C^\infty(M)$ in the sense that for each $f \in C^\infty(M)$, L sends the restriction of f to a restriction of Δf . Pick a bandwidth parameter $h > 0$. We give a particular definition $L_{h;(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$ for such an operator by the definition

$$(L_{h;(x_1, \dots, x_n)} f)(x) = (\text{vol}_M / (2\sqrt{\pi} nh^{2+\dim M})) \sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\frac{\|x-x_i\|^2}{4h^2}} f(x_i)$$

This operator $L_{h;(X_1, \dots, X_n)}$ converges to Δ_M in a suitable operator norm (where the domain is equipped with an order 3 uniform Sobolov norm and the range is equipped with the uniform norm) when X_1, X_2, \dots are drawn uniformly and independently on M [Giné and Koltchinskii \(2006\)](#) and $nh_n^{n+2}/\ln n \rightarrow \infty$, $nh_n^{n+4}/\ln n \rightarrow 0$. But the kind of convergence that Corollary 5 requires is a convergence in eigenvalues and eigenvectors as follows.

Theorem 2.1, Belkin and Niyogi (2004). Note

$$\epsilon_{L_{h_n;(X_1, \dots, X_n)};r_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow 0} 0$$

for uniformly drawn $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim_{iid} M$.

In fact, recent work gives precise rates of convergence for the i th eigenvalue and i th eigenvector, *for a fixed i* ([Wang \(2015\)](#).) In order to obtain concrete stochastic upper bounds on the MISE for our estimator, we require more delicate rates of convergence as a function of i as well.

4. Estimator

We formalize a discrete analogue of the Connes' Distance Formula as follows. Let L denote a symmetric negative ($n \times n$) semidefinite matrix. For each such L and parameters $r, \tau, \epsilon > 0$, define $\hat{d}_{L;\tau;\epsilon}(p, q)$ to be the solution to the following optimization problem, where $v_{(i);L}$ denotes the projection of $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto $E_{1;L} + \dots + E_{r;L}$ and \odot denotes coordinate-wise (Hadamard) products:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & (1/2\|L((v^\odot)^{(r)}) - 2(v \odot Lv)^{(r)}\|_\infty)^{-1/2} |v_a - v_b| \\ \text{under constraints} \quad & v = v_{(q)} \end{aligned}$$

The expression involving the square root rescales the vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to act like a vector of manifold distances from some fixed point. The constraint controls errors coming from using L to estimate Δ_M linearly and quadratically. We note that the above optimization problem can be completely formulated in the language of a *Spectral (Exterior) Calculus (SEC)* [Berry and Giannakis \(2020\)](#), where estimates of local geometric features on M , such as its Riemannian metric, based on n sample points are expressed in terms of the first $m \ll n$ eigenvectors of L . In order to obtain *stochastic* convergence results, an additional complication for our estimator and other estimators in the SEC is that there are implicitly two choices of m , depending on whether we are using L to estimate the behavior of Δ_M as a *linear* operator ($m = r \ll n$) or as part of a *quadratic* expression ($m = q \ll r$).

The vector v should be regarded as a discrete analogue of a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$. The maximum value of q satisfying the first constraint is an estimate for the number of eigenvectors on whose products L accurately models Δ_M whenever the first r eigenvectors of L accurately models the corresponding eigenfunctions of Δ_M . The parameter $\tau > 0$ controlling the second constraint can be arbitrarily chosen. For this reason, the optimization problem can be reformulated in the following manner amenable to numerical approximation. Let $e_{0;L}, e_{1;L}, \dots, e_{n;L}$ denote the n orthonormal eigenvectors of L corresponding to the respective eigenvalues $0 = \lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \dots \lambda_n$ of L , normalized so that their first non-zero coordinate is positive. Let

$$c_{ijk;L;\odot} = e_{i;L} \odot e_{j;L} \odot e_{k;L}.$$

We think of a q -vector \hat{v} as a vector of Fourier coefficients for a potential distance function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; an estimate of $\|\nabla f\|_\infty$ directly in terms of the discrete \hat{v} analogue of a Fourier transform for a function is therefore

$$\hat{\nabla}_{L;q;r}\hat{v} = \sqrt{\max_i \left(\sum_{k=1}^r \sum_{0 \leq i,j \leq q} (\hat{\lambda}_k/2 - \hat{\lambda}_j) c_{ijk;L;\odot} \hat{v}_i \hat{v}_j e_{k;L} \right)_i}.$$

Then for all choices of $\hat{\tau} > 0$, it follows algebraically that

$$\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b) = \sup_{\hat{v} \in [-1, +1]^q} \left| \sum_{k=1}^q \hat{v}_k ((e_{k;L})_a - (e_{k;L})_b) \right| (\hat{\nabla}_{L;q;r}\hat{v})^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

One advantage of this distance estimator over the calculation of shortest path lengths in some suitably weighted network of sample points is that the different estimated distances $\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)$, for different choices of a and b , can be simultaneously approximated within the same loop in a Monte Carlo optimization without changing the time-complexity of the calculation. In other words, we start with an $(n \times n)$ -matrix $D = (\|X_i - X_j\|)_{ij}$ and then update D entry-wise by the following rule until we exhibit sufficient convergence and thus obtain an estimate D for the matrix of intrinsic distances:

$$D_{ij} \leftarrow \max \left(D_{ij}, |v_i - v_j|(\hat{\nabla}_{L;q;r}\hat{v})^{-1} \right). \quad (5)$$

There are several sources for error in the estimator: error in the estimation of Δ_M , additional error in the estimation of the quadratic $\|\nabla_M\|^2$, error in the additional estimation of $\|\nabla_M\|_\infty^2$ from $\|\nabla_M\|^2$ on the sample points, and error in estimating $\|f\|_{\Delta_M}$ for a smooth interpolation f of functions in $C^\infty(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Our main result is that these errors asymptotically and uniformly vanish.

Theorem 4. Fix natural numbers n, N . Then

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q}(x_a, x_b)} \right) \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2 \left(\sum_{\ell=r}^{\infty} \ell^{-N} + \epsilon_{\hat{L};r} + \delta \right)),$$

for δ -net $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$ and finite rank negative semidefinite operator L on $C^\infty(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and extension of \hat{L} to an operator \hat{L} on the vector space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth real-valued functions on M , where q is the maximum natural number such that $2|\lambda_{q;L}| < |\lambda_{r;L}|$ where $\lambda_{0;L} \geq \lambda_{1;L} \geq \dots \lambda_{n;L}$ are the eigenvalues of L .

The *covering radius* of a set $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in M$ is the minimum $\delta > 0$ for which x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n is a δ -net of M .

Corollary 5. There exist $q_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{L;q;r}(a, b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q_n}(x_a, x_b)} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow 0} 0 \quad a.s.$$

for samples X_1, X_2, \dots equidistributed from a smooth positive density on M and for each n , a linear operator L_n on $C^\infty(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ which extends to an operator \hat{L}_n on the vector space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth real-valued functions on M such that $\epsilon_{\hat{L}_n;i} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely.

We run some simulations to test the estimator on a unit circle, embedded in the usual way in \mathbb{R}^2 , as follows. We sample n points independently and uniformly, construct a idealized oracle graph Laplacian, and approximate both the estimator and q -resolved distances to obtain an approximation of an empirical plot of ℓ_2 -loss.




FIG 1. *Empirical Loss.* The figure above plots an approximation of the empirical ℓ_2 -loss $1 - \hat{d}_{q_n;n;L_n}(X_1, X_2)/\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^1;q_n}(X_1, X_2)$ for points X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n uniformly sampled from the unit circle embedded in the plane against $n = 10, 11, \dots, 28$, where q_n is the maximal integer such that $2|\lambda_{q_n}| < |\lambda_n|$. Here the q -resolved distance $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^1;q_n}$ is approximated by the value of the objective function in (1) by the q_n th partial Fourier series f associated to the distance function $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(\cdot, \cdot)$, rescaled so that $\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty \leq 1$. Here the estimator $\hat{d}_{q_n;n;L_n}(X_1, X_2)$ is approximated by the oracle value of the objective function in (4) by a vector of the first q_n th Fourier coefficients of the distance function $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(\cdot, \cdot)$, where the estimate $\hat{\nabla}_L$ is calculated from an idealized graph Laplacian, whose n eigenvalues correspond exactly to the first n eigenvalues of $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^1}$ and whose eigenvectors correspond to restrictions of the first n eigenfunctions of Δ_M .

5. Proofs

For each operator T on vector space of the form $C^\infty(X)$ and $f \in C^\infty(X)$, define

$$\nabla_{T;r} f = \sqrt{1/2 T(f^2)_{(r);T} - (f T f)_{(r);T}}. \quad (6)$$

We write $\nabla_{T;r}^2 f$ for the square of (6). Proposition 3 implies that

$$\nabla_{\Delta_M; \infty} f = \|\nabla_M f\| : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The operator $\nabla_{T;r}$, while not linear, respects scalar multiplication.

Lemma 6. Fix $r \leq \text{rk}_T$. For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$\nabla_{T;r} \lambda f = \lambda \nabla_{T;r} f.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{T;r}^2 \lambda f &= 1/2 T(\lambda^2 f^2)_{(r)} - \lambda (f T \lambda f)_{(r)} \\ &= \lambda^2 (1/2 T(f^2)_{(r)} - (f T f)_{(r)}) \\ &= \lambda^2 \nabla_{T;r}^2 f. \end{aligned}$$

□

For convenience, write $\nu(r, N)$ for the quantity

$$\nu(r, N) = \sum_{\ell=r}^{\infty} \ell^{-N}. \quad (7)$$

Henceforth N will denote a fixed large integer $N \gg 0$. Then $\nu(r, N) \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} 0$.

5.1. Derivative bounds

We review some basic observations about smooth functions on M , obtained by using Fourier expansions and basic facts about eigenfunctions for Δ_M . In particular, we give hard bounds on derivatives up to order 3 for finite linear combinations of e_1, e_2, \dots and their squares.

Lemma 7. For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$|\hat{f}_i| \in \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty).$$

Proof. We have the string of inequalities

$$|\hat{f}_i| = \left| \int_M f e_i \right| \leq \|f\|_2 \|e_i\|_2 = \|f\|_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty).$$

□

The following pair lemmas are the key observations that allow us to extend applications of graph Laplacians as discrete estimates of Δ_M as a linear operator to discrete estimates of Δ_M in quadratic expressions. The next lemma bounds the error in truncating the Laplacian of a product.

Lemma 8. If $2|\lambda_q| < |\lambda_r|$ then for all $N \gg 0$,

$$\|\Delta_M f^2 - \Delta_M((f^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r^3 \|f\|_\infty^2 \nu(r, N)),$$

for all $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \dots + E_{q;\Delta_M}$.

Proof. Let $d = \dim_M$. Lemmas 7 and 28 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_M f^2 - \Delta_M((f^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty &\leq \left\| \sum_{i,j \leq q} \hat{f}_i \hat{f}_j (\Delta_M(e_i e_j) - (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(r)}) \right\|_\infty \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(q^2 \|f\|_\infty^2 |\lambda_q|^{(d-1)/2} \nu(r, N)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Weyl's Law implies $q \in \mathcal{O}(r)$ and $|\lambda_r| \in \mathcal{O}(r^{2/d})$, giving the result. □

The next lemma bounds the error in truncating the gradient of the Laplacian of a product. The proof is virtually identical, except that Lemma 29 is used in place of Lemma 28.

Lemma 9. If $2|\lambda_q| < |\lambda_r|$ then for all $N \gg 0$,

$$\|\nabla \Delta_M f^2 - \nabla \Delta_M((f^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r^3 \|f\|_\infty^2 \nu(r, N)),$$

for all $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \dots + E_{q;\Delta_M}$.

Proof. Lemmas 7 and 29 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \Delta_M f^2 - \nabla \Delta_M((f^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty &\leq \left\| \sum_{i,j \leq q} \hat{f}_i \hat{f}_j (\nabla \Delta_M(e_i e_j) - \nabla (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(r)}) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(q^2 \|f\|_\infty^2 |\lambda_q|^{(d-1)/2} \nu(r, N)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Weyl's Law implies $q \in \mathcal{O}(r)$ and $|\lambda_r| \in \mathcal{O}(r^{2/d})$, giving the result. □

Lemma 10. For all k and $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \cdots + E_{k;\Delta_M}$,

$$\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(k^{3/2}\|f\|_\infty\right).$$

Proof. Lemma 7 and Corollary 26 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_M f\|_\infty &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{f}_i \nabla_M e_i \right\| \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(k\|f\|_\infty \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \|\nabla e_i\|_\infty\right) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}\left(k\|f\|_\infty |\lambda_k|^{(d+1)/4}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Weyl's Law implies $|\lambda_k| \in \mathcal{O}(k^{2/d})$, giving the result. \square

Lemma 11. For all k and $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \cdots + E_{k;\Delta_M}$,

$$\|\nabla_M \Delta_M f\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(k^{3/2}\|f\|_\infty\right).$$

Proof. Lemma 7 and Corollary 26 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_M \Delta_M f\|_\infty &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \hat{f}_i \nabla_M e_i \right\| \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(k\|f\|_\infty |\lambda_k| \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \|\nabla e_i\|_\infty\right) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}\left(k\|f\|_\infty |\lambda_k|^{(d+5)/4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Weyl's Law implies $|\lambda_k| \in \mathcal{O}(k^{2/d})$, giving the result. \square

Lemma 12. For all $k > 0$ and $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \cdots + E_{k;\Delta_M}$,

$$\|\nabla_M \Delta_M f^2\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(k^2\|f\|_\infty (1 + k\|f\|_\infty \nu(k, N))\right).$$

Proof. Let $q = k$. Choose r so that $|\lambda_r| > 2|\lambda_q|$. Then

$$\|(\nabla_M \Delta_M f^2)\|_\infty \leq \|(\nabla_M \Delta_M(f^2))_{(r)}\|_\infty + \|\nabla_M \Delta_M f^2 - (\nabla_M \Delta_M(f^2))_{(r)}\|_\infty$$

Note that Lemma 11 gives

$$\|(\nabla_M \Delta_M f^2)_{(r)}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(r\|f\|_\infty |\lambda_r|^{d/2}\right)$$

For each $N > 0$, Lemma 9 gives that

$$\|\nabla_M \Delta_M f^2 - \nabla \Delta_M((f^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(q^2\|f\|_\infty^2 |\lambda_q|^{(d-1)/2} \nu(r, N)\right),$$

Weyl's Law gives that the minimum possible choice of r lies inside

$$r \in \mathcal{O}(k)$$

and that $|\lambda_r| \in \mathcal{O}(r^{2/d})$. Combining these observations yields the result. \square

5.2. Discretizations

Consider $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in M^n$. In general

$$\|f\|_\infty \geq \max_i |f(x_i)|.$$

The absolute value of the difference between both sides of the inequality above is controlled by ∇f and the maximum distance between a general point in M and a sample point x_i by a straightforward application of the Mean Value Theorem.

Proposition 13. Suppose x_1, \dots, x_n is a δ -net of M . For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$\|f\|_\infty - \max_i \|f(x_i)\|_\infty \leq \delta \|\nabla f\|_\infty.$$

Lemma 14. Suppose x_1, \dots, x_n is a δ -net of M . Then

$$\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty^2 - \max_i \|\nabla_M f(x_i)\|_\infty^2 \in \mathcal{O}(\delta k^2 \|f\|_\infty (1 + k \|f\|_\infty \nu(k, N))) .$$

for each k and all $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \dots + E_{k;\Delta_M}$,

Proof. Lemmas 11 and 12 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_M \|\nabla_M f\|^2 &= \nabla_M (1/2 \Delta_M f^2 - f \Delta_M f) \\ &= 1/2 \nabla_M \Delta_M f^2 - \nabla_M \Delta_M f \\ &\in \mathcal{O}(k^2 \|f\|_\infty (1 + k \|f\|_\infty \nu(k, N))) + \mathcal{O}(k^{3/2} \|f\|_\infty) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}(k^2 \|f\|_\infty (1 + k \|f\|_\infty \nu(k, N))) \end{aligned}$$

An application of Proposition 13 yields the result. \square

5.3. Perturbations

Let T be a finite rank negative semidefinite operator on $C^\infty(M)$. Let

$$\hat{f}_{i;T} = \langle f, e_{i;T} \rangle \quad f_{(k);T} = \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{f}_{i;T} e_{i;T} \quad f^* = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \hat{f}_{i;T} e_i$$

for each $f \in C^\infty(M)$.

Lemma 15. For each $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $1 \leq i \leq r \leq \text{rk}_T$,

$$|\hat{f}_i - \hat{f}_{i;T}| \in \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty \epsilon_{r;T}).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{f}_i - \hat{f}_{i;T}| &\leq \langle f, e_i - e_{i;T} \rangle \leq \|f\|_2 \|e_i - e_{i;T}\|_2 \\ &\in \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty \|e_i - e_{i;T}\|_\infty) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty \epsilon_{r;T}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. \square

Let $q_{T;r;\epsilon}$ be the maximum positive integer q for which

$$2|\lambda_{q;T}| + \epsilon < |\lambda_{r;T}|.$$

Part of our estimator requires choosing an optimal number of eigenvectors for quadratically approximating Δ_M . The following lemma tells us that this data-driven choice is suitable so long as our eigenvector error is controlled.

Lemma 16. For each $1 \leq r \leq \text{rk}_T$, $2|\lambda_{q_{T;r;\epsilon}}| + (\epsilon - 3\epsilon_{T;r}) < |\lambda_r|$.

Proof. Let $q = q_{T;r;\epsilon}$. Then

$$2|\lambda_q| + \epsilon \leq 2|\lambda_{q;T}| + \epsilon + 2\epsilon_{T;r} \leq |\lambda_{r;T}| + 2\epsilon_{T;r} \leq |\lambda_r| + 3\epsilon_{T;r}.$$

□

5.3.1. Linear errors

We bound errors associated to treating T as a linear operator.

Lemma 17. For each $1 \leq r \leq \text{rk}_T$ and $f \in E_{1;T} + \cdots + E_{r;T}$,

$$\|Tf - \Delta_M f^*\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r\epsilon_{T;r}\|f\|_\infty)$$

Proof. Let $d = \dim_M$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tf - \Delta_M f^*\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{f}_{i;T}(\lambda_{i;T}e_{i;T} - \lambda_i e_i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{f}_{i;T}(\lambda_{i;T}(e_{i;T} - e_i) + (\lambda_{i;T} - \lambda_i)e_i) \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(r\|f\|_\infty(1 + \epsilon_{T;r})(|\lambda_r| + \epsilon_{T;r})\epsilon_{T;r} + \epsilon_{T;r}|\lambda_r|^{(d+1)/4}\right) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon_{T;r}\|f\|_\infty(r^{d+2/d} + r^{1/2})\right) \\ &\subset \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_{T;r}r\|f\|_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

□

5.3.2. Quadratic errors

We then bound the errors associated to treating T in quadratic expressions.

Lemma 18. Fix $r \leq \text{rk}_T$. Suppose $\epsilon_{T;r} \leq 1$. For all $1 \leq i, j \leq r$ and all k ,

$$|c_{ijk} - c_{ijk;T}| \in \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_{T;r})$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_{ijk} - c_{ijk;T}| &= \left| \int_M (e_i e_j - e_{i;T} e_{j;T}) e_k \right| \\
&\leq \| (e_i e_j - e_{i;T} e_{j;T}) \|_2 \| e_k \|_2 \\
&= \| (e_i e_j - e_{i;T} e_{j;T}) \|_2 \\
&= \| (e_i e_j - e_{i;T} e_{j;T} + e_{i;T} e_j - e_{i;T} e_j) \|_2 \\
&= \| (e_i - e_{i;T}) e_j \|_2 + \| e_{i;T} (e_j - e_{j;T}) \|_2 \\
&\leq \epsilon_{T;r} \| e_j \|_2 + \epsilon_{T;r} \| e_{i;T} \|_2 \\
&\leq \epsilon_{T;r} (1 + \sqrt{\mu_M} \epsilon_{T;r})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is a special case of the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. \square

Lemma 19. For all $1 \leq q \leq r \leq \text{rk}_T$ such that $2|\lambda_{q;T}| + \epsilon < |\lambda_{r;T}|$,

$$\|T(f^2)_{(r);T} - \Delta_M(f^*)^2\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \|f\|_\infty^2 (\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T;r}))$$

for all $f \in E_{1;T} + \dots + E_{q;T}$ if $\epsilon_{T;r} < \epsilon/3$.

Proof. Let $g = (f^2)_{(r);T}$. Lemma 17 implies that

$$\|Tg - \Delta_M g^*\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r \epsilon_{T;r} \|g\|_\infty)$$

Lemma 18, Theorem 24 and Weyl's Law imply that

$$\|(\Delta_M((f^*)^2)_{(r)} - \Delta_M g^*)\|_\infty \leq \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq q} \hat{f}_{i;T} \hat{f}_{j;T} \sum_{k=1}^r |c_{ijk} - c_{ijk;T}| |\lambda_k| \|e_k\|_\infty \quad (8)$$

$$\in \mathcal{O}(q^2 r^2 \epsilon_{T;r} (\|f\|_\infty + \epsilon_{T;r})^2) \quad (9)$$

Lemma 16 implies $2|\lambda_q| + \epsilon < |\lambda_r|$. Thus Lemma 9 implies that

$$\|\Delta_M(f^*)^2 - (\Delta_M((f^*)^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r^3 \|f^*\|_\infty^2 \nu(r, N)).$$

Noting that $\|g\|_\infty, \|f^*\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(\|f\|_\infty (1 + r \epsilon_{T;r}))$ by Lemma 15,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Tg - \Delta_M g^*\|_\infty &\in \mathcal{O}(r \epsilon_{T;r} \|f\|_\infty (1 + r \epsilon_{T;r})) \\
\|\Delta_M(f^*)^2 - (\Delta_M((f^*)^2)_{(r)})\|_\infty &\in \mathcal{O}(r^3 (\|f\|_\infty (1 + r \epsilon_{T;r}))^2 \nu(r, N)).
\end{aligned}$$

Adding and combining these last two rates with (9) gives the result. \square

Lemma 20. For all $1 \leq q \leq r \leq \text{rk}_T$ with $2|\lambda_q| < |\lambda_r|$ and $f \in E_{1;T} + \dots + E_{q;T}$,

$$\|\nabla_{T;r}^2 f - \|\nabla_M f\|^2\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \|f\|_\infty^2 (\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T;r})).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\|\nabla_{T;r}^2 f - \|\nabla_M f\|^2\|_\infty \leq 1/2 \|T(f^2)_{(r)} - \Delta_M f^2\|_\infty + \|f\|_\infty \|Tf - \Delta_M f\|$$

Among the respective upper bounds for the summands in the last line given by Lemmas 17 and 19, the upper bound for the first summand dominates and gives the desired result. \square

5.4. L_2 -loss

We can bound the error in estimating $\|\nabla_M\|^2$ from $\nabla_{T,r}^2$ as follows.

Lemma 21. For $f \in E_{1;T} + \dots + E_{q;T}$ and δ -net x_1, \dots, x_n of M and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|\max_i(\nabla_{T,r}^2 f)(x_i) - \|\nabla_M f^*\|_\infty^2| \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \|f\|_\infty^2 (\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T,r} + \delta))$$

if $|\lambda_{r,T}| > 2|\lambda_{q,T}| + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon_{T,r} < \epsilon/3$.

Proof. Define the quantities A, B, C by

$$A = \max_i(\nabla_{T,r}^2 f)(x_i) \quad B = \max_i \|\nabla_M f^*(x_i)\|^2 \quad C = \|\nabla_M f^*\|_\infty$$

Lemma 20 implies that

$$|A - B| \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \|f\|_\infty^2 (\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T,r}))$$

Lemma 14 implies that

$$|B - C| \in \mathcal{O}(\delta k^2 \|f\|_\infty (1 + k \|f\|_\infty \nu(k, N))).$$

Then $|A - C| \leq |A - B| + |B - C|$ and so the result follows. \square

Let $[x]_+$ denote the positive part of a real number x , so that $[x]_+ = \max(0, x)$.

Lemma 22. For each $\phi \in E_{1;T} + \dots + E_{q;T}$ with $\nabla_{T,r}\phi = 1$,

$$\left[1 - \frac{|f_\phi(x_a) - f_\phi(x_b)|}{|\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)|} \right]_+ \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \|f\|_\infty^2 (\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T,r} + \delta))$$

for some $f_\phi \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \dots + E_{q;\Delta_M}$ such that $\|\nabla_M f_\phi\|_\infty \leq 1$, for each δ -net x_1, \dots, x_n of M and $1 \leq a < b \leq n$.

Proof. Define smooth maps f_ϕ and non-negative real number μ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \min \left(1, (\|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^2)^{-1/2} \right) \\ f_\phi &= \mu \phi^* \end{aligned}$$

We first note that the smooth map f_ϕ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_M f_\phi\|_\infty^2 &= \mu^2 \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^{-2} \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^2 \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

And for all $1 \leq a \leq b \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)| &= \mu |\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)| + (1 - \mu) |\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)| \\ &= \mu |\hat{\phi}(x_a) - \hat{\phi}(x_b)| + (1 - \mu) |\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)| \\ &= |f_\phi(x_a) - f_\phi(x_b)| + (1 - \mu) |\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[1 - \frac{|f_\phi(x_a) - f_\phi(x_b)|}{|\phi(x_a) - \phi(x_b)|} \right]_+ &\leqslant 1 - \mu = 1 - \mu^{2/(1+\mu)} \\
&\leqslant 1 - \mu^2 \\
&= \max(0, 1 - \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^{-2}) \\
&\leqslant |1 - \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^2|^{-1} \\
&= \|\nabla_{T;r}^2 \phi\|_\infty - \|\|\nabla_M \phi^*\|^2\|_\infty \|\nabla_M \phi^*\|_\infty^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

The numerator can be made arbitrarily small as $\epsilon_{T;r} \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma 21. Therefore for sufficiently small $\epsilon_{T;r}$, the denominator has a uniform lower bound. It therefore follows that the last term then has the claimed growth rate by Lemma 21 again. \square

Lemma 23. For each $f \in E_{1;\Delta_M} + \cdots + E_{q;\Delta_M}$ such that $\|\nabla_M f\|_\infty = 1$,

$$\left[1 - \frac{|\phi_f(x_a) - \phi_f(x_b)|}{|f(x_a) - f(x_b)|} \right]_+ \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2(\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T;r} + \delta))$$

for some $\phi_f \in E_{1;T} + \cdots + E_{q;T}$ such that $\|\nabla_{r;T} \phi_f\|_\infty \leqslant 1$, for each δ -net x_1, \dots, x_n of M and $1 \leqslant a < b \leqslant n$.

Proof. Let $f_* = \sum_i \hat{f}_i e_{i;T}$, so that $f = (f_*)^*$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= \min \left(1, (\|\nabla_{T;r}^2 f_*\|_\infty)^{-1/2} \right) \\
\phi_f &= \mu f_*
\end{aligned}$$

We first note that the function ϕ_f satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_i |(\nabla_{T;r}^2 \phi_f)(x_i)| &= \mu^2 \max_i |(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f_*)(x_i)| \\
&\leqslant \left(\max_i |(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f_*)(x_i)| \right)^{-1} \max_i |(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f_*)(x_i)| \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

And for all $1 \leqslant a \leqslant b \leqslant 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(x_a) - f(x_b)| &= \mu |f(x_a) - f(x_b)| + (1 - \mu) |f(x_a) - f(x_b)| \\
&= |\phi_f(x_a) - \phi_f(x_b)| + (1 - \mu) |f(x_a) - f(x_b)|
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[1 - \frac{|\phi_f(x_a) - \phi_f(x_b)|}{|f(x_a) - f(x_b)|} \right]_+ &\leqslant 1 - \mu = {}^{1-\mu^2}/{}^{1+\mu} \\
&\leqslant 1 - \mu^2 \\
&= \max \left(0, 1 - \left(\max_i \|(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f)(x_i)\| \right)^{-1} \right) \\
&\leqslant |1 - \left(\max_i \|(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f)(x_i)\| \right)^{-1}| \\
&= |\max_i \|(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f)(x_i)\| - \|\nabla_M f\|_\infty^2| \left(\max_i \|(\nabla_{T;r}^2 f)(x_i)\| \right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

The denominator admits a uniform lower bound by an application of Lemma 21. Therefore the last term has the claimed growth rate by Lemma 21 again. \square

proof of Theorem 4. Let $X = 1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{q;r;\epsilon}(a,b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q}(x_a, x_b)}$. Note that

$$|1 - X| = \max ([X]_+, -[-X]_+).$$

Lemma 22 implies that $[X]_+ \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2(\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T;r} + \delta))$. Lemma 23 and some algebra implies that $-[-X]_+ \in \mathcal{O}(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2(\nu(r, N) + \epsilon_{T;r} + \delta))$. Therefore the lemma follows. \square

proof of Corollary 5. Equidistribution and strict positivity of the density imply that $\epsilon_{\hat{L}_n;r} \rightarrow 0$ for each r almost surely. Therefore there exists a strictly increasing choice $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\epsilon_{\hat{L}_n;r_n} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Set q_n to be the maximal index q with $2|\lambda_{q;L_n}| + 1/2 < 2|\lambda_{r_n;L_n}|$. Weyl's Law implies $q_n \rightarrow \infty$ by $r_n \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\hat{d}_{q;r;\hat{L}_n}(a,b)}{\text{dist}_{M;q}(x_a, x_b)} \right| \in \mathcal{O} \left(r^4 \text{diam}_M^2 \left(\sum_{\ell=r}^{\infty} \ell^{-N} + \epsilon_{\hat{L}_n;r} + \delta_n \right) \right).$$

where δ_n is the covering radius of the samples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n . Equidistribution together with the positivity of the density implies that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Therefore the right hand side goes to 0. \square

6. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Henri Moscovici for helpful discussions on the Connes' Distance Formula, Andrey Gogolyev for helpful pointers on Riemannian geometry, and Cosma Shalizi for helpful discussions on Wasserstein distance.

Appendix A: Harmonics

We recall some basic facts about the L_2 -orthonormal sequence

$$e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots$$

Even though $\langle e_2, e_2 \rangle = 1$ by definition, e_i is not necessarily bounded by 1. The following result from [Hörmander \(1968\)](#) gives a uniform upper bound on e_i .

Theorem 24. There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\|e_i\|_\infty \leq C_2 \lambda_i^{(\dim_M - 1)/4}$$

The following result from [Shi and Xu \(2010\)](#) gives a uniform upper bound on $\|\nabla e_i\|$ in terms of $\|e_i\|_\infty$

Theorem 25. There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\|\nabla_M e_i\|_\infty \leq C_1 \lambda_i^{1/2} \|e_i\|_\infty$$

Combining the two gives us the following uniform upper bound on $\|\nabla e_i\|$ in terms of λ_i .

Corollary 26. There exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\|\nabla_M e_i\|_\infty \leq C_3 \lambda_i^{(\dim_M + 1)/4}.$$

Recall c_{ijk} denotes the *triple product* $\langle e_i e_j, e_k \rangle$. The following decay rate from [Wyman \(2022\)](#) ensures that the Fourier coefficients c_{ijk} of $e_i e_j$ rapidly decay after $|\lambda_k| > |\lambda_i| + |\lambda_j|$.

Theorem 27. For all $\epsilon > 0$ and $n > 0$, there exists $C_{\epsilon,n} > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{|\lambda_i + \lambda_j|(1+\epsilon) < |\lambda_k|} |c_{ijk}| \leq C_{\epsilon,n} \lambda^{-n}$$

for all i, j such that $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \leq \lambda$.

Weyl's Law. There exists $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$k = C_3 \lambda_k^{\dim_M / 2} + o(\lambda_k^{(\dim_M - 1)/2}).$$

We can now bound the error in truncating the Laplacian of a product.

Lemma 28. For each $N \gg 0$ and all i, j, k such that $0 < \lambda_i + \lambda_j < \lambda_k$,

$$\|\Delta_M(e_i e_j) - (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{-N}\right).$$

Proof. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_M(e_i e_j) - (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty &= \left\| \sum_{q=k}^{\infty} \lambda_k c_{ijq} e_k \right\|_\infty \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{q=k}^{\infty} |\lambda_{q+1} - \lambda_q| \lambda_q^{-n} \lambda_q^{(\dim_M - 1)/4}\right) \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{q=k}^{\infty} q^{\dim_M(n-1)/2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

by Theorems 27, 24, and Weyl's Law. Then

$$\|\Delta_M(e_i e_j) - (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{-N}\right).$$

for $N = \lceil \dim_M(n-1)/2 \rceil \geq 0$. \square

We can also now bound the error in truncating the gradient of the Laplacian of a product. The proof is virtually identical, except that we are using Corollary 26 in place of Theorem 24.

Lemma 29. For each $N \gg 0$ and all i, j, k such that $0 < \lambda_i + \lambda_j < \lambda_k$,

$$\|\nabla \Delta_M(e_i e_j) - \nabla (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{-N}\right).$$

Proof. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \Delta_M(e_i e_j) - \nabla (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty &= \left\| \sum_{q=k}^{\infty} \lambda_q c_{ijq} e_k \right\|_\infty \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{q=k}^{\infty} |\lambda_{q+1} - \lambda_q| \lambda_q^{-n} \lambda_q^{(\dim_M+1)/4}\right) \\ &\in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{q=k}^{\infty} q^{\dim_M(n-1)/2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 27, Corollary 26, and Weyl's Law. Then

$$\|\Delta_M(e_i e_j) - (\Delta_M(e_i e_j))_{(k)}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{-N}\right)$$

for $N = \lceil \dim_M(n-1)/2 \rceil \geq 0$. \square

References

- AALTO, M. and VERMA, N. (2019). Metric learning on manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01738*.
- ARVANITIDIS, G., HANSEN, L. K. and HAUBERG, S. (2017). Maximum likelihood estimation of Riemannian metrics from Euclidean data. In *International Conference on Geometric Science of Information* 38–46. Springer.
- ASTA, D. and SHALIZI, C. R. (2015). Geometric Network Comparison. In *31st Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence [UAI 2015]* (M. MEILA and T. HESKES, eds.) 102–110. AUAI Press, Corvallis, Oregon.

- BARBARESCO, F. (2011). Robust statistical radar processing in Fréchet metric space: OS-HDR-CFAR and OS-STAP processing in Siegel homogeneous bounded domains. In *2011 12th International Radar Symposium (IRS)* 639–644. IEEE.
- BEGELFOR, E. and WERMAN, M. (2005). The World Is Not Always Flat, or, Learning Curved Manifolds Technical Report No. HUJI-CSE-LTR-2006-191, School of Engineering and Computer Science, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- BELKIN, M. and NIYOGI, P. (2004). Semi-supervised learning on Riemannian manifolds. *Machine Learning* **56** 209–239.
- BELKIN, M. and NIYOGI, P. (2007). Convergence of Laplacian eigenmaps. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **19** 129.
- BERNSTEIN, M., DE SILVA, V., LANGFORD, J. C. and TENENBAUM, J. B. (2000). Graph approximations to geodesics on embedded manifolds Technical Report, Citeseer.
- BERRY, T. and GIANNAKIS, D. (2020). Spectral exterior calculus. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **73** 689–770.
- CHAVEL, I. (2006). *Riemannian geometry: a modern introduction* **98**. Cambridge university press.
- CHAZAL, F., GIULINI, I. and MICHEL, B. (2016). Data driven estimation of Laplace-Beltrami operator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 3963–3971.
- CHENG, M.-Y. and WU, H.-T. (2013). Local linear regression on manifolds and its geometric interpretation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108** 1421–1434.
- CONNES, A. (1989). Compact metric spaces, Fredholm modules, and hyperfiniteness. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **9** 207–220.
- CONNES, A. and VAN SUIJLEKOM, W. D. (2021). Spectral truncations in non-commutative geometry and operator systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **383**.
- COX, M. A. and COX, T. F. (2008). Multidimensional scaling. In *Handbook of data visualization* 315–347. Springer.
- EDELSBRUNNER, H., HARER, J. et al. (2008). Persistent homology-a survey. *Contemporary mathematics* **453** 257–282.
- GENOVESE, C. R., PERONE-PACIFICO, M., VERDINELLI, I. and WASSERMAN, L. (2012). Manifold estimation and singular deconvolution under Hausdorff loss. *The Annals of Statistics* **40** 941–963.
- GINÉ, E. and KOLTCHINSKII, V. (2006). Empirical graph Laplacian approximation of Laplace–Beltrami operators: Large sample results. In *High dimensional probability* 238–259. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- GREENE, R. E. and WU, H. (1979). Smooth approximations of convex, subharmonic, and plurisubharmonic functions. In *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure* **12** 47–84.
- HOFF, P. D., RAFTERY, A. E. and HANDCOCK, M. S. (2002). Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **97** 1090–1098.

- HÖRMANDER, L. (1968). The spectral function of an elliptic operator. *Acta mathematica* **121** 193–218.
- HUCKEMANN, S. F., KIM, P. T., KOO, J.-Y. and MUNK, A. (2010). Möbius deconvolution on the hyperbolic plane with application to impedance density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 2465–2498.
- KRIOUKOV, D., PAPADOPOULOS, F., KITSAK, M., VAHDAT, A. and BOGUÑÁ, M. (2010). Hyperbolic Geometry of Complex Networks. *Physical Review E* **82** 036106.
- LU, J., WANG, G., DENG, W., MOULIN, P. and ZHOU, J. (2015). Multi-manifold deep metric learning for image set classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* 1137–1145.
- MCCORMICK, T. H. and ZHENG, T. (2015). Latent Surface Models for Networks Using Aggregated Relational Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110** 1684–1695.
- NADLER, B., LAFON, S., COIFMAN, R. R. and KEVREKIDIS, I. G. (2005). Diffusion maps, spectral clustering and eigenfunctions of Fokker-Planck operators. *Neural Information Processing Systems* **18** 955–962.
- PERRAUL-JONCAS, D. and MEILÂ, M. (2013). Non-linear dimensionality reduction: Riemannian metric estimation and the problem of geometric discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.7255*.
- RAHMAN, I. U., DRORI, I., STODDEN, V., DONOHO, D. and SCHROÖDER, P. (2005). Multiscale representations for manifold-valued data. *Multiscale Modeling and Simulation* **4** 1201–1232.
- RAMSAY, J. O. (1982). Some statistical approaches to multidimensional scaling data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (General)* **145** 285–303.
- REQUARDT, M. (1997). A new approach to functional analysis on graphs, the connes-spectral triple and its distance function. *arXiv preprint hep-th/9708010*.
- REZNIKOV, A. and SAFF, E. B. (2016). The covering radius of randomly distributed points on a manifold. *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2016** 6065–6094.
- SHI, Y. and XU, B. (2010). Gradient estimate of an eigenfunction on a compact Riemannian manifold without boundary. *Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry* **38** 21–26.
- SORZANO, C. O. S., VARGAS, J. and MONTANO, A. P. (2014). A survey of dimensionality reduction techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.2877*.
- TAO, W. and SHI, Z. (2020). Convergence of Laplacian spectra from random samples. *Journal of Computational Mathematics* **38** 952–984.
- TING, D., HUANG, L. and JORDAN, M. (2010). An analysis of the convergence of graph Laplacians. In *ICML 2010 - Proceedings, 27th International Conference on Machine Learning* 1079–1086.
- WANG, X. (2015). Spectral convergence rate of graph Laplacian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.08110*.
- WYMAN, E. L. (2022). Triangles and triple products of Laplace eigenfunctions. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **282** 109404.

- YANG, L. and JIN, R. (2006). Distance metric learning: A comprehensive survey. *Michigan State Universiy* **2** 4.
- ZHOU, K., HUANG, J., SNYDER, J., LIU, X., BAO, H., GUO, B. and SHUM, H.-Y. (2005). Large mesh deformation using the volumetric graph laplacian. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2005 Papers* 496–503.