

FRÉCHET MEAN SET ESTIMATION IN THE HAUSDORFF METRIC, VIA RELAXATION

MOÏSE BLANCHARD AND ADAM QUINN JAFFE

ABSTRACT. This work resolves the following question in non-Euclidean statistics: Is it possible to consistently estimate the Fréchet mean set of an unknown population distribution, with respect to the Hausdorff metric, when given access to independent identically-distributed samples? Our affirmative answer is based on a careful analysis of the “relaxed empirical Fréchet mean set estimators” which identify the set of near-minimizers of the empirical Fréchet functional and where the amount of “relaxation” vanishes as the number of data tends to infinity. Our main theoretical results include exact descriptions of which relaxation rates give weak consistency and which give strong consistency, as well as the construction of a “two-step estimator” which (assuming only the finiteness of certain moments and a mild condition on the metric entropy of the underlying metric space) adaptively finds the fastest possible relaxation rate for strongly consistent estimation. Our main practical result is simply that researchers working with non-Euclidean data in the real world can be better off computing relaxed empirical Fréchet mean sets rather than unrelaxed empirical Fréchet mean sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. The goal of the field of non-Euclidean statistics is to extend classical (Euclidean) statistical theory to geometric settings which are relevant from the point of view of applications. For example, many applied statisticians work with data that live spaces of matrices subject to non-linear constraints [13, 19], quotients of Euclidean spaces by certain group actions [29], spaces of graphs [20, 25], spaces of trees [9, 18] and, perhaps most importantly, Riemannian manifolds [4, 10, 15, 11, 26, 12, 31]. For these settings, one has to extend or modify most classical methodologies to accommodate the new aspects of geometry.

Among the fundamental objects of study in non-Euclidean statistics is the *Fréchet mean*, which generalizes the Euclidean notions of mean and median to general metric spaces [21, 16, 33]. As such, Fréchet means are a canonical notion of central tendency for data living in an abstract metric space. For a Borel probability measure μ on a metric space (X, d) , we write $F_p(\mu)$ for the Fréchet p -mean of μ ; this is well-defined under sufficient integrability assumptions on μ , and we will see its precise definition in Subsection 2.1. The primary difficulty in the theoretical

Date: December 26, 2022.

Key words and phrases. non-Euclidean statistics, Fréchet mean, random sets, Hausdorff metric, medoids, stochastic optimization.

This material is based upon work for which MB was partly funded by Office of Naval Research grant N00014-18-1-2122 and AQJ was funded by National Science Foundation grant DGE 1752814.

study of Fréchet means is that, for general metric space, the Fréchet mean $F_p(\mu)$ is a subset of X rather than a single point of X .

These set-valued considerations divide the existing literature on Fréchet means into two different parts. Some authors avoid the technicalities of the set-valued setting by limiting their scope to only consider probability measures whose Fréchet mean set is a singleton [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]; in this setting, one can prove many limit theorems which are very similar to their classical (Euclidean) counterparts. Other authors embrace the generality of the set-valued setting [38, 34, 16, 33], although much less is known in this case. This paper focuses on the set-valued setting, and aims to strengthen the recent results [16, 33].

1.2. Problem Statement. In this subsection we describe our setting more explicitly. We assume the reader has basic familiarity with the definitions and notations of Fréchet means and related objects (as outlined in, say [16]), although these will be precisely defined in Subsection 2.1.

Throughout the remainder of this section, (X, d) is a fixed metric space with the Heine-Borel property (or simply, a HB space), and $p \geq 1$ is a fixed exponent. We also write $K(X)$ for the collection of all non-empty d -compact subsets of X . We assume that μ is a fixed but unknown Borel probability measure on (X, d) satisfying some mild (unstated for now) integrability condition. We also assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ is a probability space on which is defined an independent identically distributed (IID) sequence Y_1, Y_2, \dots where each Y_i has distribution μ ; we write $\mathbb{E}_\mu, \text{Var}_\mu, \text{Cov}_\mu$ for the expectation, variance, and covariance on this space, respectively. Our goal is to construct a sequence of estimators $\hat{F}_p^n : X^n \rightarrow K(X)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that we have $\hat{F}_p^n = \hat{F}_p^n(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \rightarrow F_p(\mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in some useful sense.

A few reasonable senses of convergence involve the *one-sided Hausdorff distance* \vec{d}_H , defined via $\vec{d}_H(K, K') := \max_{x \in K} d(x, K') := \max_{x \in K} \min_{x' \in K'} d(x, x')$ for $K, K' \in K(X)$. These notions of convergence are stated as

$$(1.1) \quad \vec{d}_H(\hat{F}_p^n, F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), \hat{F}_p^n) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where the convergence can either be taken in probability or almost surely. Indeed, these convergences each have a clear statistical meaning (in an asymptotic sense): the first (1.1) is a guarantee of “no false positives” since it shows that every element of \hat{F}_p^n is close to some element of $F_p(\mu)$, and the second (1.2) is a guarantee of “no false negatives” since it shows that every element of $F_p(\mu)$ is close to some element of \hat{F}_p^n . One may also be interested in the stronger notion of convergence where both (1.1) and (1.2) hold; this is equivalent to

$$(1.3) \quad d_H(F_p(\mu), \hat{F}_p^n) \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where we have defined the *Hausdorff metric* via $d_H(K, K') := \max\{\vec{d}_H(K, K'), \vec{d}_H(K', K)\}$ for $K, K' \in K(X)$. In statistical terms, the convergence (1.3) guarantees both “no false positives” and “no false negatives”. Thus, let us say that an estimator \hat{F}_p^n is *weakly d_H -consistent* if (1.3) holds in probability and that it is *strongly d_H -consistent* if (1.3) holds almost surely.

With this language, we can now recall the successes and limitations of the empirical Fréchet mean $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n)$ as an estimator of the population Fréchet mean $F_p(\mu)$, where $\bar{\mu}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Y_i}$ is the empirical measure. On the positive side, the main result of [33] shows that $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n)$ satisfies (1.1) almost surely. On the negative side, a result of [16] shows, for finite metric spaces (X, d) , that $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n)$ satisfies (1.2) in probability only if $F_p(\mu)$ is a singleton, up to some trivialities. In particular, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n)$ is not even weakly d_H -consistent in the general set-valued setting.

From a statistical point of view, we are of the opinion that d_H -consistency is an important property that any reasonable estimator \hat{F}_p^n of $F_p(\mu)$ should possess. Thus, it is somewhat disappointing that the natural estimator $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n)$ does not satisfy this basic requirement. Yet, not all hope is lost! It certainly seems possible to cook up some other estimator \hat{F}_p^n which is d_H -consistent. Interestingly, we are not aware of any estimators in the literature which are provably d_H -consistent in any set-valued setting; the major contribution of this work is filling this gap.

In order to construct such an estimator, we now define a few concepts; at present our discussion is somewhat informal, and we defer the precise definitions of these objects until Subsection 2.1. When μ is sufficiently integrable, one defines the *Fréchet functional* $W_p(\mu, \cdot) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$W_p(\mu, x) := \int_X d^p(x, y) d\mu(y),$$

and one defines the *relaxed Fréchet mean set* via

$$F_p(\mu, \varepsilon) := \{x \in X : W_p(\mu, x) \leq W_p(\mu, x') + \varepsilon \text{ for all } x' \in X\},$$

where $\varepsilon \geq 0$ is an arbitrary parameter called the *relaxation scale*. In words, the relaxed Fréchet mean set $F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)$ consists of all of the near-minimizers of the Fréchet functional, up to an additive error of ε . Thus, we have $F_p(\mu) = F_p(\mu, 0)$; we sometimes refer to $F_p(\mu)$ as the *unrelaxed Fréchet mean set* or the *vanilla Fréchet mean set*. A sequence of relaxation scales $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ applied to form the empirical relaxed Fréchet mean sets $\{F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ will be referred to as a *relaxation rate*, and we often simply write ε_n in place of $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By a *random relaxation rate* we mean a relaxation rate ε_n in which ε_n is a random variable for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$; these can of course be deterministic or independent of Y_1, Y_2, \dots , but the most interesting and important examples are *adaptive*, in the sense that ε_n is $\sigma(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ -measurable for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Relaxed Fréchet mean sets have received a bit of attention in the recent work [33]. Indeed, in [33, Corollary 5.1 and Corollary 5.2] it is shown that, if a relaxation rate satisfies $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ satisfies (1.1) almost surely. Interestingly, it was observed [33, Appendix A.3] in the simple example of $X = \{0, 1\}$, $p = 2$, and $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1$, that choosing the relaxation rate as $\varepsilon_n := n^{-1/4}$ implies that $F_2(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ satisfies (1.2) almost surely. In words, applying a vanishing relaxation rate does not disturb (1.1), and applying a sufficiently slowly vanishing relaxation rate allows one to obtain (1.2). Of course, in order to be efficient as possible, one wants to choose the relaxation rate which is the fastest possible among all sufficiently slow relaxation rates. Thus, we are motivated to study the following (stated informally):

Question 1.1. *For a HB space (X, d) , some $p \geq 1$, and an unknown sufficiently integrable Borel probability measure μ on X , what is the fastest relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ for which $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is a d_H -consistent estimator of $F_p(\mu)$?*

1.3. Main Results. In this subsection we state some important results of the paper. Before stating them, we emphasize that these results point to a strikingly simple recommendation for applied researchers: When using Fréchet means to study non-Euclidean data in the real world, if one is interested in finding the whole Fréchet mean set, then it is advantageous to apply a small bit of relaxation.

To state them more precisely, we need to introduce some mild form of regularity to impose on the underlying metric space. For example, it has been known since [7, 8] that we at least need (X, d) to be a HB space in order to get (1.1) almost surely. It turns out that we also need some control on the metric entropy of the balls in (X, d) , so we write $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; X, d)$ or simply $\mathcal{N}_X(\varepsilon)$ for the minimal number of d -closed balls of radius $\varepsilon \geq 0$ needed to cover X . This leads us to the following:

Definition 1.2. A metric space (X, d) is called a *Dudley space* if it is compact and

$$\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_X(\varepsilon)} d\varepsilon < \infty.$$

A metric space is called a *Heine-Borel-Dudley (HBD) space* if it is a HB space and each of its compact subsets is a Dudley space.

Let us emphasize that most metric spaces encountered in practice are HBD. Indeed, in non-Euclidean statistics, most metric spaces of interest are finite-dimensional, in the sense that (X, d) admits some number $k > 0$ such that covering numbers for compact sets $K \subseteq X$ satisfy $\log \mathcal{N}_K(\varepsilon) \lesssim k \log(1/\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and it can be easily shown that such spaces are HBD. In particular, this is true whenever X is a Riemannian sub-manifold of finite-dimensional Euclidean space, whenever X is a quotient of Euclidean space by an isometric group action, and more. Additionally, many infinite-dimensional function spaces encountered in the high-dimensional literature [14, 37] are HBD when endowed with the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. For example, certain spaces of Lipschitz functions in one dimension are HBD. While spaces of Lipschitz functions in higher dimensions are generally not HBD, it is true that certain spaces of Hölder functions in any dimension (where the Hölder index must be sufficiently large with respect to the dimension) are HBD.

Next, we introduce some notation for probability measures. Write $\mathcal{P}(X)$ for the space of Borel probability measures on (X, d) . As before, we let Y_1, Y_2, \dots be an IID sequence with marginal distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$. All “almost sure” and “in probability” statements are implicitly understood to be taken with respect to \mathbb{P}_μ . For $r \geq 0$, write $\mathcal{P}_r(X)$ for the space of all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^p(x, Y_1)] = \int_X d^p(x, y) d\mu(y) < \infty$ for some $x \in X$; roughly speaking, $\mathcal{P}_r(X)$ is the space of all distributions on X which have r moments finite.

Lastly, we introduce an important quantity that will appear throughout our results. For $p \geq 1$ and μ any Borel probability measure on (X, d) , we define the value

$$(1.4) \quad \sigma_p(\mu) := \sqrt{2} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))}.$$

We note that $\sigma_p(\mu)$ is finite as long as we have $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$ (Lemma 3.1), and that $\sigma_p(\mu)$ is positive in most cases, for example when $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$ (Lemma 3.2), but also much more generally. Our main results are comprehensive for the typical case of $\sigma_p(\mu) \in (0, \infty)$, but we later point out that the story becomes more complicated when $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$.

Now we turn to the results. In light of the classical CLT, a natural guess for a useful relaxation rate is $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$. It turns out that these rates do not even yield convergence in probability, but we can cleanly bound their asymptotic probability of error as in the following.

Theorem 3.3. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, there exists a constant $M_p(\mu) < \infty$ such that for any $c \geq M_p(\mu)$ and any random relaxation rate ε_n satisfying $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \geq c$ a.s., we have*

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(d_{\text{H}}(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq \delta) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu)}\right),$$

with the convention the right side is 0 if $\sigma_p^2(\mu) = 0$.

For the deterministic relaxation rates $\varepsilon_n = cn^{-1/2}$, the preceding result shows that a certain asymptotic probability of error for the relaxed Fréchet mean set estimators can be made arbitrarily small by making the pre-factor c arbitrary large, and that the decay of the asymptotic error probabilities is at most Gaussian-like. Although the preceding result does not include a lower bound on the left-hand side, we will later prove (Theorem 3.4) in the case of $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$ that a deterministic relaxation rate ε_n is weakly consistent if and only if $\varepsilon_n \in o(1) \cap \omega(n^{-1/2})$. Hence, relaxation scales in $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$ are generally not slow enough to get even weak d_{H} -consistency.

Now we move on to our second main result. Because of the previous discussion, it is necessary to choose some relaxation rate which is slightly slower than $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$. It turns out that a logarithmic correction is exactly what is needed so that the pre-factor separates the strongly d_{H} -consistent regime from the not strongly d_{H} -consistent regime.

Theorem 3.7. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, any random relaxation rate ε_n satisfies the following:*

(i) *If*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} > \sigma_p(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_{H} -consistent. Further, in this case we have $\mathbb{P}(F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \text{ for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}) = 1$.

(ii) *If*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} < \sigma_p(\mu) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not strongly d_{H} -consistent. Further, in this case we have $\mathbb{P}(\vec{d}_{\text{H}}(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty) = 0$.

For the deterministic relaxation rates $\varepsilon_n = cn^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$, the preceding result says the following:

- (i) If $c > \sigma_p(\mu)$ then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_{H} -consistent.
- (ii) If $c < \sigma_p(\mu)$ then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not strongly d_{H} -consistent.

In words, this means that the strong d_{H} -consistency for relaxed Fréchet mean set estimators experiences a sharp transition at the relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n = \sigma_p(\mu)n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$. The “critical” relaxation rate of $\varepsilon_n =$




FIGURE 1.1. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, we plot the asymptotic error probabilities of the empirical relaxed Fréchet mean set estimators, as a function of the pre-factor $c \geq 0$, when the relaxation rate is taken to be $cn^{-1/2}$ or $cn^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$. By Theorem 3.3, we know that $c \mapsto \text{WE}_\mu(cn^{-1/2})$ decays at least as quickly as a Gaussian (red), and, by Theorem 3.7, we know that $c \mapsto \text{SE}_\mu(cn^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2})$ decays abruptly (blue).

$\sigma_p(\mu)n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$ appears to be more complicated, and we do not know what behavior to expect in this case.

Let us now summarize and compare the results thus far. In light of Theorem 3.3, it is natural to consider the *weak asymptotic error probability* for each population distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$ and each relaxation rate ε_n defined via

$$\text{WE}_\mu(\varepsilon_n) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(d_{\text{H}}(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq \delta).$$

Similarly, in light of Theorem 3.7, it is natural to consider the *strong asymptotic error probability* for each $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$ and each ε_n defined via

$$\text{SE}_\mu(\varepsilon_n) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(d_{\text{H}}(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 \right).$$

(Note that $\text{WE}_\mu(\varepsilon_n)$ and $\text{SE}_\mu(\varepsilon_n)$ are shorthand for $\text{WE}_\mu(\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ and $\text{SE}_\mu(\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$, respectively.) Figure 1.1 summarizes the results of Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.7 in terms of these weak and strong error quantities.

With all of these results in hand, it still remains to show that one can d_{H} -consistently estimate the Fréchet mean set of the unknown population distribution μ . As a first guess, one might simply try to use the adaptive relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n := \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n)n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$, or perhaps $\varepsilon_n := (1 + \delta)\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n)n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$ for any $\delta > 0$. However, it can be shown in simple examples that the convergence $\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n) \rightarrow \sigma_p(\mu)$ can plainly fail. Thus, this adaptive rate does not lead to strong consistency.

Instead, one has to be more careful about the method of estimating $\sigma_p(\mu)$. For a better choice of estimator, let us introduce a relaxed version of (1.4) given as

$$\sigma_p(\mu, \varepsilon) := \sqrt{2} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))}$$

for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Then we have the following:

Theorem 3.8. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. For any random relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and for any $\delta > 0$, define the adaptively-chosen relaxation rate $\varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)}$ via

$$\varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)} := (1 + \delta) \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{n}}.$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} = \sigma_p(\mu) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)})$ is strongly d_H -consistent.

The preceding result proves the strong d_H -consistency of a certain “two-step” estimator of the population Fréchet mean set, which we explicitly outline in Algorithm 1. In words, the idea is as follows: First, choose a consistent but sub-optimal relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ in order to get a first estimate $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ of $F_p(\mu)$, and then to use this to get an estimate $\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ of $\sigma_p(\mu)$. Second, define the relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n^{(2)}$ from the estimated pre-factor, and use this to get a second estimate $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(2)})$ of $F_p(\mu)$. For a choice of consistent but sub-optimal relaxation rate, it suffices to replace the $(\log \log n)^{1/2}$ factor with a $(\log n)^{1/2}$ factor and to choose the initial pre-factor to be invariant under rescaling the metric d of X ; hence a natural choice is $\varepsilon_n^{(1)} = m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) n^{-1/2} (\log n)^{1/2}$.

As we previously remarked, our results provide exact characterizations of (weak and strong) d_H -consistency in the case of $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$. However, in the case of $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$, our results provide only sufficient conditions for d_H -consistency. For example, suppose that $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$; then, Theorem 3.3 shows that all rates in $\Omega(n^{-1/2})$ are weakly d_H -consistent (it can also be shown that we have $M_p(\mu) = 0$ in this case), and Theorem 3.7 shows that all rates in $\Omega(n^{-1/2} (\log \log n)^{1/2})$ are strongly d_H -consistent. However, it turns out that neither of these conditions is necessary: To illustrate this point (and to show that a totally general characterization of weak and strong d_H -consistency is likely very difficult to find), we provide Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.6 which both satisfy $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$ but where the boundaries between the consistent and inconsistent regimes exhibit very different behaviors.

Let us briefly comment on the method of proof of these results. First of all, our results make heavy use of functional limit theorems; specifically, we need to find and apply a sufficiently powerful functional central limit theorem (fCLT) for Theorem 3.3 and a sufficiently powerful functional law of the iterated logarithm (fLIL) for Theorem 3.7. Second of all, our results require a strengthened form of the (one-sided) Fréchet mean strong law of large numbers which was previously studied in [16, 33]. We state and prove this strengthened result in Section 2.4, and we believe it will be of independent interest in non-Euclidean statistics and beyond. Notably, this sharpened SLLN result implies the one-sided SLLN for p -medoids under the minimal assumption of a finite $(p-1)$ th moment (Theorem 2.19).

Algorithm 1 We propose a method that, given access to a procedure `RELAXED-FRECHETMEANp` (which computes the relaxed Fréchet mean of some data, as well as the corresponding optimal value of the Fréchet functional), bootstraps this to a procedure `TWOSTEP ESTIMATORp` (which computes the relaxed Fréchet mean set of some data for an adaptively-chosen relaxation scale). Theorem 3.8 proves that the resulting procedure is strongly d_H -consistent as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and that the adaptively-chosen relaxation rate is close to optimal.

```

1: procedure RELAXEDFRECHETMEANp
2:   Input: data  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in X$  and relaxation scale  $\varepsilon_n \geq 0$ 
3:   Output: subset  $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \subseteq X$  and optimal objective  $m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) \geq 0$ 
4: end procedure
5:
6: procedure TWOSTEP ESTIMATORp
7:   Input: data  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in X$ 
8:   Output: subset  $F_n^{(2)} \subseteq X$ 
9:
10:  ▷ step 0: no relaxation
11:   $(\_, c_n^{(0)}) \leftarrow \text{RELAXEDFRECHETMEAN}_p(Y_1, \dots, Y_n, 0)$ 
12:
13:  ▷ step 1: consistent but sub-optimal relaxation
14:   $\varepsilon_n^{(1)} \leftarrow c_n^{(0)} n^{-1/2} (\log n)^{1/2}$ 
15:   $(F_n^{(1)}, \_) \leftarrow \text{RELAXEDFRECHETMEAN}_p(Y_1, \dots, Y_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ 
16:   $c_n^{(1)} \leftarrow \text{maximize } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i))^2$ 
17:                                $-(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i)))^2$ 
18:     over  $x, x' \in F_n^{(1)}$ 
19:
20:  ▷ step 2: near-optimal relaxation
21:   $\varepsilon_n^{(2)} \leftarrow \frac{3}{2} c_n^{(1)} n^{-1/2} (\log \log n)^{1/2}$ 
22:   $(F_n^{(2)}, \_) \leftarrow \text{RELAXEDFRECHETMEAN}_p(Y_1, \dots, Y_n, \varepsilon_n^{(2)})$ 
23:
24:  return  $F_n^{(2)}$ 
25: end procedure

```

1.4. **Future Work.** There are several natural questions remaining at the end of this work. Let us briefly review some of them, in the hopes that they will inspire similar work in the future.

First, we point out that our main results require $2p-2$ moments in the population distribution while the one-sided results of [16, 33] require only $p-1$ moments in the population distribution. We believe that this is not an artifact of our proof, and that, if the $2p-2$ moments assumption is removed, then the requisite relaxation rates for weak and strong d_H -consistency will change. To see this, note that our $2p-2$ moments assumption is used primarily to guarantee that the fLIL holds; we then emphasize that even the classical one-dimensional LIL is known [17] to behave somewhat wildly when finite variance is not assumed.

Second, we note that it is also natural to consider relaxation rates in the even slower class $\Theta(n^{-1/2}(\log n)^{1/2})$. From some heuristic calculations, we believe that such rates may lead to finite-sample concentration bounds for relaxed empirical Fréchet mean set estimators. However, we expect that the finite-sample concentration of the $cn^{-1/2}(\log n)^{1/2}$ -relaxed empirical Fréchet mean set estimators will be such that the choice of pre-factor $c > 0$ depends intricately on the geometry of (X, d) . This should be contrasted with the case of relaxation rates in $\Theta(n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2})$, where the dependence of the consistency of the $cn^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}$ -relaxed empirical Fréchet mean set estimators depends somewhat coarsely on the geometry of (X, d) .

Third, we again discuss the differences between the $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$ and $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$ regimes. As we have already noted, our results are comprehensive for the case of $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$, but we expect that the case of $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$ should be much more complicated. We leave as an open question how to impose other reasonable conditions such that one can cleanly characterize the weakly and strongly d_H -consistent relaxation rates under the assumption $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$.

Finally, we emphasize that the analysis used to prove our main results will likely be applicable to other settings. Indeed, we believe that, in any non-convex stochastic optimization problems whose objective is a sum of IID objectives, one should be able to apply relaxation at a rate of $\Theta(n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2})$ in order to get almost sure Hausdorff convergence of the empirical set of minimizers to the population set of minimizers.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we prove some intermediate results that will be used in the proofs of our main results in Section 3. More specifically, Subsection 2.1 gives the precise definitions of our basic objects, Subsection 2.2 studies some basic probabilistic preliminaries, Subsection 2.3 establishes the measurability of certain events of interest, and Subsection 2.4 provides a strengthened form of the one-sided SLLN.

2.1. Basic Definitions. In this subsection we precisely describe the mathematical setting of our work. Most of our notation is taken from [16], and some of these concepts have already been defined (albeit, somewhat informally) in Section 1.

We assume throughout that (X, d) is a metric space. By a *Heine-Borel (HB)* space we mean that (X, d) is a metric space and that the d -closed balls $B_r(x) := \{y \in X : d(x, y) \leq r\}$ are compact for all $x \in X$ and $r \geq 0$. We also write $B_r^\circ(x) := \{y \in X : d(x, y) < r\}$ for the d -open balls for all $x \in X$ and $r \geq 0$. We also recall that $\mathcal{N}_K(\varepsilon)$ denotes the ε -covering number of a compact subset $K \subseteq X$, and we recall the notions of *Dudley space* and *Heine-Borel-Dudley (HBD)* space given in Definition 1.2.

We write $\mathcal{P}(X)$ for the set of Borel probability measures on X , where X is given the topology metrized by d , and we write τ_w for the weak topology on $\mathcal{P}(X)$. Now let $q \geq 0$. Recall [16, Equation (8)] that the constant $c_q := \min\{1, 2^{q-1}\}$ is such that we have

$$(2.1) \quad d^q(x, y) \leq c_q(d^q(x, x') + d^q(x', y))$$

for all $x, x', y \in X$. In particular, a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ satisfies $\int_X d^q(x, y) d\mu(y) < \infty$ for all $x \in X$ if and only if it satisfies $\int_X d^q(x, y) d\mu(y) < \infty$ for some $x \in X$; we write $\mathcal{P}_q(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ for the set of $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ with this

integrability condition. We write τ_w^q for the topology on $\mathcal{P}_q(X)$ where $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and μ in $\mathcal{P}_q(X)$ have $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w^q if and only if we have both $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w and $\int_X d^q(x, y) d\mu_n(y) \rightarrow \int_X d^q(x, y) d\mu(y)$ for some (hence, all [16, Lemma 2.1]) $x \in X$. It is known that τ_w^p for $p \geq 1$ is metrized by the p -Wasserstein metric.

Next, we introduce some notions of set-valued convergence. First of all, write $C(X)$ for the collection of d -closed subsets of X , and, for $C \in C(X)$, define

$$d(x, C) := \min_{x' \in C} d(x, x')$$

for the *metric projection of x onto C* ; we take $d(\cdot, \emptyset) \equiv \infty$ by convention, and we note that $d(\cdot, C) : X \rightarrow \infty$ is continuous for all $C \in C(X)$.

For a sequence $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C(X)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ls}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n &:= \left\{ x \in X : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, C_n) = 0 \right\} \\ \text{Li}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n &:= \left\{ x \in X : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, C_n) = 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for their *Kuratowski upper limit* and *Kuratowski lower limit*, respectively. We always have $\text{Li}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n \subseteq \text{Ls}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$, and, if $\text{Li}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n = \text{Ls}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$, then we write $\text{Lt}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$ for their common value and we say that $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ *converges in the Kuratowski sense*. Let us also write $K(X)$ for the collection of non-empty d -compact subsets of X , and let us recall the definitions of \vec{d}_H and d_H given in Section 1.2. We note in passing (see [16]) that convergence in the Hausdorff metric is much stronger than convergence in the Kuratowski sense.

Finally, we precisely define the notion of vanilla Fréchet mean. To do this, let $p \geq 1$. Recall [16, Lemma 2.6] that we have

$$(2.2) \quad |d^p(x, y) - d^p(x', y)| \leq p d(x, x') (d^{p-1}(x, y) + d^{p-1}(x', y))$$

for all $x, x', y \in X$. In particular, for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$ and $x, x' \in X$, the function $y \mapsto d^p(x, y) - d^p(x', y)$ is μ -integrable. This means that we can define the *Fréchet functional* $W_p : \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$W_p(\mu, x, x') := \int_X (d^p(x, y) - d^p(x', y)) d\mu(y).$$

For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$ we can then define the *Fréchet mean set* to be

$$F_p(\mu) := \{x \in X : W_p(\mu, x, x') \leq 0 \text{ for all } x' \in X\}.$$

In full generality, it is possible for the Fréchet mean set to be empty, to be a singleton, or to be a set with more than one point.

The following result clarifies an important condition for pointwise convergence of the Fréchet functional.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that (X, d) is a metric space, $p \geq 1$, $\alpha \geq 1$ is an integer, and that $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and μ in $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha(p-1)}(X)$ have $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in the weak topology. If*

$$\int_X d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, y) \rightarrow \int_X d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, y) d\mu(y)$$

for some $x_0 \in X$, then

$$\int_X (d^p(x, y) - d^p(x', y))^\alpha d\mu_n(y) \rightarrow \int_X (d^p(x, y) - d^p(x', y))^\alpha d\mu(y)$$

for all $x, x' \in X$.

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in X$, and let $x, x' \in X$ be arbitrary. Let Y_n and Y denote random elements of X with laws μ_n and μ , respectively, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, defined on the same probability space with expectation \mathbb{E} . Then we have $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ in distribution, so, by the continuous mapping theorem [24, Lemma 5.3], we have $(d^p(x, Y_n) - d^p(x', Y_n))^\alpha \rightarrow (d^p(x, Y) - d^p(x', Y))^\alpha$ in distribution. Also note by assumption that

$$\mathbb{E}[d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, Y_n)] = \int_X (d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, y) d\mu_n(y)$$

converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so it follows from [24, Lemma 5.11] that the sequence $\{d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, Y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable. Now use (2.2) then (2.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & |d^p(x, Y_n) - d^p(x', Y_n)| \\ & \leq pd(x, x')(d^{p-1}(x, Y_n) + d^{p-1}(x', Y_n)) \\ & \leq pc_{p-1}d(x, x')(d^{p-1}(x, x_0) + d^{p-1}(x', x_0) + 2d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by convexity we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |d^p(x, Y_n) - d^p(x', Y_n)|^\alpha \\ & \leq (pc_{p-1})^\alpha 3^{\alpha-1} d^\alpha(x, x')(d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x, x_0) + d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x', x_0) + 2^\alpha d^{\alpha(p-1)}(x_0, Y_n)) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the sequence $\{|d^p(x, Y_n) - d^p(x', Y_n)|^\alpha\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable. Applying [24, Lemma 5.11] once more proves the result. \square

We also need to define slightly generalized notions of relaxed and restricted Fréchet means. Indeed, let us define, for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$, $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the set

$$F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon) := \{x \in C : W_p(\mu, x, x') \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } x' \in C\}.$$

For convenience, we will use the notation $F_p(\mu, \varepsilon) := F_p(\mu, X, \varepsilon)$ for the relaxed (unrestricted) Fréchet means. In particular, note $F_p(\mu, 0) = F_p(\mu)$. We also note that $F_p^*(\mu) := F_p(\mu, \text{supp}(\mu), 0)$ is an important object of study (see [2, 3, 16]) often called the *p-medoid* of μ .

It is worth mentioning that these notions become slightly simplified when one assumes $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ instead of merely $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. For instance, one can then define the univariate Fréchet functional $W_p : \mathcal{P}_p(X) \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$W_p(\mu, x) := \int_X d^p(x, y) d\mu(y),$$

and it follows that we have the identity $W_p(\mu, x, x') = W_p(\mu, x) - W_p(\mu, x')$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ and $x, x' \in X$. Consequently, the Fréchet mean set can be equivalently written

$$F_p(\mu) := \{x \in X : W_p(\mu, x) \leq W_p(\mu, x') \text{ for all } x' \in X\}$$

when we have $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$; in this case, we also write $m_p(\mu) := \inf_{x \in X} W_p(\mu, x)$. However, in light of the classical strong law of large numbers (whereby a 1st moment assumption yields strong convergence of the Fréchet 2-mean), it is natural to work only under the assumption $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$.

Last, for any set $K \subseteq X$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we will denote by $K^\delta := \bigcup_{x \in K} B_\delta(x)$ the (closed) δ -thickening of K . Observe that if (X, d) is a Heine-Borel space and $K \subseteq X$ is compact, then K^δ is compact for all $\delta \geq 0$.

2.2. Probabilistic Setting. In this subsection we study the probabilistic results that underly our main theorems. In general, these are functional limit theorems which quantify the rate of convergence of the empirical Fréchet functional to the population Fréchet functional.

Throughout this subsection, let (X, d) be a Heine-Borel space and fix $p \geq 1$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ be a probability space on which we have an IID sequence Y_1, Y_2, \dots each with law μ ; write \mathbb{E}_μ , Var_μ , and Cov_μ for the expectation, variance, and covariance on this space, respectively.

From these elements we define the random functions $Z_i : X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i(x, x') &:= d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i)] \\ &= d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i) - W_p(\mu, x, x'), \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Last, if $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, we define the function $R_\mu : X^2 \times X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$R_\mu(x, x', x'', x''') := \text{Cov}(Z_1(x, x'), Z_1(x'', x''')).$$

For simplicity, let us also write $R_\mu(x, x') := R_\mu(x, x', x, x') = \text{Var}(Z_1(x, x'))$.

Remark 2.2. Most objects in this paper depend on the choice of exponent $p \geq 1$. In general, objects appearing in the statements of our main theorems ($F_p(\mu)$, $\sigma_p(\mu)$, etc.) display their dependence on p while objects appearing only in the body of the paper or only in the proofs (Z_i , R_μ , etc.) do not display their dependence on p . We hope this causes no confusion for the reader.

The following simple lemma shows that R_μ is well defined.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $p \geq 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, for any $x, x', x'', x''' \in X$, the random variable $Z_1(x, x')Z_1(x'', x''')$ is integrable.*

Proof. First, note that $2p-2 \geq p-1$, hence $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$ and as a result Z_1 is well defined and both $d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1)$, $d^p(x'', Y_1) - d^p(x''', Y_1)$ are integrable. It remains to check that $(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))(d^p(x'', Y_1) - d^p(x''', Y_1))$ is integrable. Next, fix $x_0 \in X$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} |d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1)| &\leq pd(x, x')(d^{p-1}(x, Y_1) + d^{p-1}(x', Y_1)) \\ &\leq pd(x, x')c_{p-1}(2d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_1) + d^{p-1}(x, x_0) + d^{p-1}(x', x_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain an upper bound for $|d^p(x'', Y_1) - d^p(x''', Y_1)|$. Now note that $d(x_0, Y_1)^{2p-2}$ is integrable since $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Hence, combining the two upper bounds shows that $|d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1)||d^p(x'', Y_1) - d^p(x''', Y_1)|$ is integrable. \square

Our first step is to develop some continuity results for these functions.

Lemma 2.4. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. Then, for each compact set $K \subseteq X$, the function $Z_i : K \times K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is almost surely Lipschitz continuous with respect to the metric $D((x, x'), (x'', x''')) = d(x, x'') + d(x', x''')$. Moreover, for any $x_0 \in K$, its Lipschitz constant M_i satisfies*

$$M_i \leq pc_{p-1} (2d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i) + 2\mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i)] + 4(\text{diam}(K))^{p-1}).$$

If also $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, then $\mathbb{E}[M_i^2] < \infty$, and the function $R_\mu : K^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz with respect to the metric $D((x_1, x'_1, x''_1, x'''_1), (x_2, x'_2, x''_2, x'''_2)) = d(x_1, x_2) + d(x'_1, x'_2) + d(x''_1, x''_2) + d(x'''_1, x'''_2)$, with Lipschitz constant M_μ bounded by

$$M_\mu \leq 24p^2c_{p-1}^2 \text{diam}(K)(\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y_1)] + 2(\text{diam}(K))^{2p-2}).$$

Proof. For any $x, x', x'', x''' \in K$, we use (2.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_i(x, x') - Z_i(x'', x''')| &\leq pd(x, x'') (d^{p-1}(x, Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x'', Y_i)) \\ &\quad + pd(x', x''') (d^{p-1}(x', Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x''', Y_i)) \\ &\quad + pd(x, x'') (\mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x, Y_i)] + \mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x'', Y_i)]) \\ &\quad + pd(x', x''') (\mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x', Y_i)] + \mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x''', Y_i)]). \end{aligned}$$

Now fix any $x_0 \in K$, and use (2.1) to further this bound as

$$\begin{aligned} &|Z_i(x, x') - Z_i(x'', x''')| \\ &\leq D((x, x'), (x', x''')) pc_{p-1} (2d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i) + 2\mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i)] + 4(\text{diam}(K))^{p-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that Z_i is almost surely Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant M_i bounded by the desired value. To see that $\mathbb{E}[M_i^2] < \infty$ when $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, simply note

$$M_i^2 \leq 3p^2 c_{p-1}^2 (4d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y_i) + 4\mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i)]^2 + 16(\text{diam}(K))^{2p-2}),$$

hence $\mathbb{E}[M_i^2] < \infty$. Next, for any $x_1, x'_1, x''_1, x'''_1, x_2, x'_2, x''_2, x'''_2 \in K$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} &|Z_1(x_1, x'_1)Z_1(x''_1, x'''_1) - Z_1(x_2, x'_2)Z_1(x''_2, x'''_2)| \\ &\leq |Z_1(x_1, x'_1)| |Z_1(x''_1, x'''_1) - Z_1(x''_2, x'''_2)| + |Z_1(x_2, x'_2)| |Z_1(x_1, x'_1) - Z_1(x_2, x'_2)| \\ &\leq M_1^2(d(x_1, x'_1)D((x''_1, x'''_1), (x''_2, x'''_2)) + d(x''_2, x'''_2)D((x_1, x'_1), (x_2, x'_2))) \\ &\leq D((x_1, x'_1, x''_1, x'''_1), (x_2, x'_2, x''_2, x'''_2)) \text{diam}(K) M_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $Z_1(x, x) = 0$. As a result, since $\mathbb{E}[M_1^2] < \infty$, this shows that R_μ is Lipschitz on K^4 with Lipschitz constant M_μ bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} M_\mu &\leq \text{diam}(K) \mathbb{E}_\mu[M_1^2] \\ &\leq \text{diam}(K) \cdot 3p^2 c_{p-1}^2 (4\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y)] + 4\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{p-1}(x_0, Y)]^2 + 16(\text{diam}(K))^{2p-2}) \\ &\leq 24p^2 c_{p-1}^2 \text{diam}(K) (\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y)] + 2(\text{diam}(K))^{2p-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to write $\mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{p-1}(x_0, Y)]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu[d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y)]$. \square

Last, we prove a uniform convergence result from $R_{\bar{\mu}_n}$ to R_μ on compacts.

Lemma 2.5. *Let (X, d) be a HB space, $p \geq 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, for any compact set $K \subseteq X$, the functions $R_{\bar{\mu}_n} : K^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $R_\mu : K^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\|R_{\bar{\mu}_n} - R_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. We first start by observing that since (X, d) is separable, on an event E of full probability, $\bar{\mu}_n$ converges to μ for the weak topology. Next, fix $x_0 \in K$. By the law of large numbers, on an event F of full probability one has $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d^{p-1}(x_0, Y_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\mu d^{p-1}(x_0, Y)$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\mu d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y)$. By Lemma 2.1, on $E \cap F$, for all $x, x' \in K$, one has $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i)) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\mu (d^p(x, Y) - d^p(x', Y))$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d^p(x, Y_i) - d^p(x', Y_i))^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\mu [(d^p(x, Y) - d^p(x', Y))^2]$. In particular, on $E \cap F$, for any $x, x' \in K$, we have

$$(2.3) \quad R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x') \rightarrow R_\mu(x, x').$$

In the rest of the proof, we suppose that $E \cap F$ is met. Because K^2 is compact, let $(x_n, x'_n) \in K^2$ such that $\|R_{\bar{\mu}_n} - R_\mu\|_\infty = |R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x_n, x'_n) - R_\mu(x_n, x'_n)|$. To show

that $\|R_{\bar{\mu}_n} - R_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$, it suffices to show that for any sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, there is a subsequence $\{k_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}} - R_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. Fix the sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. By compactness of K , there exists a subsequence $\{k_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $x, x' \in K$ such that $x_{n_{k_j}} \rightarrow x$ and $x'_{n_{k_j}} \rightarrow x'$. Next, we use the estimates from Lemma 2.4 showing that $R_{\bar{\mu}_n}$ is Lipschitz to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x_n, x'_n) - R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x')| &\leq 2D((x_n, x'_n), (x, x')) \text{diam}(K) \\ &\cdot 24p^2 c_{p-1}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d^{2p-2}(x_0, Y_i) + 2(\text{diam}(K))^{2p-2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(x_{n_{k_j}}, x'_{n_{k_j}}) \rightarrow (x, x')$, the above equation with the convergence hypothesis from F show that $|R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}}(x_{n_{k_j}}, x'_{n_{k_j}}) - R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}}(x, x')| \rightarrow 0$. Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}} - R_\mu\|_\infty &\leq |R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}}(x_{n_{k_j}}, x'_{n_{k_j}}) - R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}}(x, x')| + |R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}}(x, x') - R_\mu(x, x')|. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.3) implies $\|R_{\bar{\mu}_{n_{k_j}}} - R_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ on $E \cap F$. This ends the proof that $\|R_{\bar{\mu}_n} - R_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ on $E \cap F$. \square

Our interest is in limit theorems for the random continuous functions $G_n : X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ via

$$G_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i.$$

Of course, the classical limit theorems allow us to analyze the convergence of the sequence $\{G_n(x, x')\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for each fixed $x, x' \in X$. However, for our later purposes, this will not be enough; we need sufficiently powerful functional limit theorems which allow us to analyze the convergence of the sequence $\{G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ across the whole domain X^2 simultaneously.

We begin with the functional central limit theorem. Because of the integrability assumption $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, the function R_μ is a positive semi-definite kernel on the space X^2 . Thus, we can write \mathcal{G}_μ for the mean-zero Gaussian measure on $C(X^2)$ whose covariance function is R_μ . Then we get the following:

Proposition 2.6. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then the random functions $\{n^{-1/2}G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge in distribution to \mathcal{G}_μ with respect to the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets.*

Proof. First, we recall the main result of [23, Theorem 1] which provides a sufficient condition for an IID sequence of $C(S)$ -valued random variables X_1, X_2, \dots to satisfy the central limit theorem, where (S, ρ) is a Dudley space. Precisely, the result states that if $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)] = 0$ for any $f \in (C(S))^*$ (where $(C(S))^*$ denotes the space of continuous linear functionals on $C(S)$), if $\sup_{t \in S} \mathbb{E}[X_1^2(t)] < \infty$, and if there exists a random variables M_1 with $\mathbb{E}[M_1^2] < \infty$ and

$$|X_1(s) - X_1(t)| \leq M_1 \rho(s, t) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then the sequence of random variables $\{n^{-1/2}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution, with respect to the topology of uniform convergence, to the Gaussian measure on S whose covariance kernel is given by $L(s, t) := \text{Cov}(X_1(s), X_1(t))$. In this proof for any fixed compact $K \subseteq X$, we check that these conditions hold

with the space $K \times K$, which is compact with respect to the metric given by $D((x, x'), (x'', x''')) = d(x, x'') + d(x', x''')$ for any $x, x', x'', x''' \in K$. By the hypothesis that (X, d) is HBD, it follows that (K, d) is a Dudley space. We then check that $(K \times K, D)$ a Dudley space; this is immediate from the observation that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{K \times K}(\varepsilon) \leq (\mathcal{N}_K(\varepsilon))^2.$$

Now, Lemma 2.4 exactly guarantees that Z_1 is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant M_1 satisfying $\mathbb{E}_\mu[M_1^2] < \infty$. Also, because Z_1 is Lipschitz, $\|Z_1|_{K \times K}\|_\infty \leq Z_1(x_0, x_0) + 2M_1 \text{diam}(K) = 2M_1 \text{diam}(K)$. In particular, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\|Z_1|_{K \times K}\|_\infty^2] < \infty$ which implies that $\sup_{x, x' \in K} \mathbb{E}_\mu[Z_1^2(x, x')] < \infty$. Additionally, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\|Z_1|_{K \times K}\|_\infty] < \infty$. Thus, the Riesz representation theorem together with Fubini's theorem imply that for any positive continuous linear functional $f \in (C(K^2))^*$, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(Z_1)] = 0$, and as a result, for any continuous linear functional $f \in (C(K^2))^*$, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(Z_1)] = 0$. We have now checked the conditions from the main result [23, Theorem 1] which implies that the sequence Z_1, Z_2, \dots satisfies the central limit theorem; this implies that on the compact K^2 , the sequence $\{n^{-1/2}G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to \mathcal{G}_μ .

We checked the convergence on compacts of $X \times X$ of the form $K \times K$. For a generic compact $\tilde{K} \subseteq X \times X$, let $K = \bigcup_{(x, x') \in \tilde{K}} \{x, x'\} \subseteq X$. Because \tilde{K} is compact hence bounded, one can check that K is also bounded and closed. Thus, because X is Heine-Borel, K is compact and $\tilde{K} \subseteq K \times K$. Therefore, the convergence in distribution of $\{n^{-1/2}G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{G}_μ on $K \times K$ implies the convergence on \tilde{K} . The proof of the proposition is now complete. \square

Next we study the functional law of the iterated logarithm (fLIL), which requires some notation. In particular, for each compact subset $K \subseteq X$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, we write $R_{K, \mu}$ and $G_{K, n}$ for the restrictions $R_{K, \mu} := R_\mu|_{K \times K}$ and $G_{K, n} := G_n|_{K \times K}$, respectively, and we let $\mathcal{H}_{K, \mu} \subseteq C(K \times K)$ denote the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) with kernel $R_{K, \mu}$; we write $\|\cdot\|_{K, \mu}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{K, \mu}$ for the norm and inner product of $\mathcal{H}_{K, \mu}$, and we write $\mathcal{B}_{K, \mu} := \{f \in \mathcal{H}_{K, \mu} : \|f\|_{K, \mu} \leq 1\} \subseteq C(K \times K)$ for the unit ball of $\mathcal{H}_{K, \mu}$.

Then we have the following:

Proposition 2.7. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space and $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then for each compact set $K \subseteq X$, the random functions $\{(2n \log \log n)^{-1/2}G_{K, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ form a relatively compact set with closure $\mathcal{B}_{K, \mu}$, with respect to the topology of uniform convergence on K .*

Proof. For a Banach space $(B, \|\cdot\|)$, and an IID sequence X_1, X_2, \dots of B -valued random variables, we say that (the law of) X_1 satisfies the LIL if the sequence $\{(2n \log \log n)^{-1/2}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in B and its closure is the unit ball from the corresponding RKHS. The result [30, Corollary 1.3] shows that the LIL holds for an IID sequence of B -valued random variables X_1, X_2, \dots whenever X_1 satisfies the central limit theorem (CLT), in that $\{n^{-1/2}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to some B -valued Gaussian random variable, and whenever we additionally have $\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|^2 / \log \log \|X_1\|] < \infty$. In our case, we consider the random variable $Z_1|_{K \times K}$ on the set $C(K \times K)$, which is a Banach space when equipped with the topology of uniform convergence. In Proposition 2.6, we showed that on any compact $K \subseteq X$, the random variable $Z_1|_{K \times K}$ satisfies the CLT and that $\mathbb{E}[\|Z_1|_{K \times K}\|_\infty^2] < \infty$. As a result, the conditions from [30, Corollary

1.3] are met, which implies that the LIL holds for our purposes. Precisely, this shows that $\{(2n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_{K,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact and has $\mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ as its closure. \square

It turns out that our critical pre-factor $\sigma_p(\mu)$ introduced in (1.4) is closely related to the RKHS corresponding to R_μ . The following result makes this relationship precise:

Lemma 2.8. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $p \geq 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, for any compact $K \subseteq X$ with $F_p(\mu) \subseteq K$,*

$$\sigma_p(\mu) = \sqrt{2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} f(x, x').$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ and $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$. Then, by the reproducing property of the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{K,\mu}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, x') &= \langle f, R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_{K,\mu} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{K,\mu} \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \\ &\leq \sqrt{R_{K,\mu}(x, x', x, x')} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))} \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_p(\mu)}{\sqrt{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality, we used the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Thus,

$$\sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} f(x, x') \leq \sigma_p(\mu).$$

Further, for any $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$, let $f_{x,x'} = \frac{R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)}{\|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu}}$. By construction, $f_{x,x'} \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{x,x'}(x, x') &= \langle f_{x,x'}, R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_{K,\mu} = \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$ gives the other inequality

$$\sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} f(x, x') \geq \sigma_p(\mu),$$

which ends the proof. \square

We will also need the following result, which is certainly standard:

Lemma 2.9. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, for any compact $K \subseteq X$, the set $\mathcal{B}_{K,\mu} \subseteq C(K \times K)$ is compact in the topology of uniform convergence on K .*

Proof. The result follows from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem if we show that $\mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ is uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous. To see uniform boundedness, take arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ and $x, x' \in K$, and use the reproducing property and Cauchy-Schwarz, to get

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, x') &= \langle f, R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_{K,\mu} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{K,\mu} \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \\ &= R_{K,\mu}(x, x') \end{aligned}$$

Now write M for the Lipschitz constant of $R_{K,\mu}$ on K^4 , which exists by Lemma 2.4, and fix any $x_0, x'_0 \in K$. it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, x') &\leq R_{K,\mu}(x, x') \\ &\leq R_{K,\mu}(x_0, x'_0) + MD((x, x'), (x_0, x'_0)) \\ &\leq R_{K,\mu}(x_0, x'_0) + 2Mdiam(K). \end{aligned}$$

Since the right side does not depend on $f \in B_{K,\mu}$ or $x, x' \in K$, we have shown uniform boundedness. For uniform equicontinuity, we use a similar approach, so take arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ and $x, x', x'', x''' \in K$, and use the reproducing property and Cauchy-Schwarz, to get

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x, x') - f(x'', x''')| &= |\langle f, R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) - R_{K,\mu}(x'', x''', \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_{K,\mu}| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{K,\mu} \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) - R_{K,\mu}(x'', x''', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \\ &\leq \|R_{K,\mu}(x, x', \cdot, \cdot) - R_{K,\mu}(x'', x''', \cdot, \cdot)\|_{K,\mu} \\ &= R_{K,\mu}(x, x') + R_{K,\mu}(x'', x''') - 2R_{K,\mu}(x, x', x'', x''') \\ &\leq 2MD((x, x'), (x'', x''')). \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof that $\mathcal{B}_{K,\mu}$ is uniformly equicontinuous and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We provide the following, which is an asymptotic version of Lemma 2.8.

Lemma 2.10. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Suppose also that we have compact subsets $\{K_\delta\}_{0 < \delta \leq 1}$ of X with $\bigcap_{0 < \delta \leq 1} K_\delta = F_p(\mu)$. Then*

$$\sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K_1, \mu}} \left\{ \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K_\delta} f(x, x') \right\} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sigma_p(\mu).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.9, the set $\mathcal{B}_{K_1, \mu}$ is compact in the topology of uniform convergence. In particular, there exists a sequence $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ and $(f_i, x_i, x'_i) \in \mathcal{B}_{K_1, \mu} \times F_p(\mu) \times K_{\delta_i}$ as well as $(f, x, x') \in B_{K_1, \mu} \times F_p(\mu) \times K_1$ such that $f_i \rightarrow f$, $x_i \rightarrow x$, $x'_i \rightarrow x'$ and such that $\sqrt{2} \cdot f_i(x_i, x'_i)$ converges to the limsup of the left-hand side of the above equation as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. By continuity of f , we have $f_i(x_i, x'_i) \rightarrow f(x, x')$. Since $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$, we also have $x' \in F_p(\mu)$. Therefore, using Lemma 2.8 gives $\sqrt{2} \cdot f_i(x_i, x'_i) \rightarrow \sqrt{2} \cdot f(x, x') \leq \sigma_p(\mu)$. The other inequality is a direct immediate from $K_\delta \subseteq F_p(\mu)$ and Lemma 2.8. \square

2.3. Measurability Concerns. In order to study any probabilistic questions about relaxed empirical Fréchet mean sets and their convergence in the Hausdorff metric, we must establish some basic measurability properties. For example, we must show that the events appearing in our main theorems, like $\{d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq \delta\}$ and $\{d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0\}$, are in fact measurable. This is similar to the work of [16, Section 3], except our work is slightly simplified since we only care about the case of HB spaces.

For this section, let us adopt some notation. As always, fix $p \geq 1$ and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ be a probability space on which is defined a sequence Y_1, Y_2, \dots of X -valued random variable with common distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. Note that we do

not assume that \mathcal{F} is \mathbb{P} -complete. Then, recall that by the *Effros σ -algebra* $\mathcal{E}(X)$ on $C(X)$ we mean the σ -algebra generated by the sets $\{C \in C(X) : C \cap B_r^\circ(x) \neq \emptyset\}$ where x ranges over all points in X and r ranges over all non-negative real numbers. An $\mathcal{E}(X)$ -measurable map $\Omega \rightarrow C(X)$ is called a *random set*. We also see that $\mathcal{E}(X)$ induces a σ -algebra on $K(X)$ which (by a slight abuse of notation) we also denote $\mathcal{E}(X)$, so an $\mathcal{E}(X)$ -measurable map $\Omega \rightarrow K(X)$ will also be called a random set.

Our first result shows that the relaxed restricted Fréchet mean sets are in fact random sets. Note that this result requires us to invoke Corollary 2.15, showing the compactness of relaxed restricted Fréchet means, which is proved in the next subsection; this is not a fault in the logic, but we have chosen this ordering for the sake of exposition.

Lemma 2.11. *Let (X, d) be a HB space, and $p \geq 1$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any random set $C : \Omega \rightarrow C(X)$, and any random relaxation scale $\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, the relaxed restricted Fréchet mean set $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C, \varepsilon) : \Omega \rightarrow K(X)$ is a random set.*

Proof. Since $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C, \varepsilon)$ is compact from Corollary 2.15, we need to show that the map $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C, \varepsilon) : \Omega \rightarrow K(X)$ is $\mathcal{E}(X)$ -measurable. Because X is HB, let $\{x_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable dense set in X . We first show that the function $f(x) := \sup_{x' \in C} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') = W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x) - \inf_{x' \in C} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x')$ is Lipschitz on $B_r(z)$. To do so, it suffices to show that $x \mapsto W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x)$ is Lipschitz on $B_r(z)$. Indeed, for any $x_1, x_2 \in B_r(z)$, we use (2.2) then (2.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_1) - W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_2)| &\leq pd(x_1, x_2) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (d^{p-1}(x_1, Y_k) + d^{p-1}(x_2, Y_k)) \\ &\leq 2pc_{p-1}(W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, z) + r^{p-1})d(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, f is Lipschitz (with random Lipschitz constant) on $B_r(z)$.

Next, let $C_j = \{x \in X : d(x, C) < 2^{-j}\}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} &F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C, \varepsilon)^{-1}(\{K \in K(X) : K \cap B_r^\circ(z) \neq \emptyset\}) \\ &= \{F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C, \varepsilon) \cap B_r^\circ(z) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \{\exists x \in C \cap B_r^\circ(z), f(x) \leq \varepsilon\} \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \{\exists x \in C \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}(z), f(x) \leq \varepsilon\} \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \{\exists x \in C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z), f(x) < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\}, \end{aligned}$$

but it remains to justify the last equality. Indeed, the “ \subseteq ” inclusion is direct from the fact that $C \subseteq C_j$. For the “ \supseteq ” inclusion, suppose that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $x^j \in C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)$, with $f(x^j) < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}$. Because $B_{r-2^{-i}}(z)$ is compact from the HB property, there is $x \in B_{r-2^{-i}}(z)$ and a subsequence $\{j_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $x^{j_k} \rightarrow x$. By construction, $d(x^{j_k}, C) < 2^{-j_k}$, hence $x \in C$ because C is closed. Finally, by continuity of f , we have $f(x) \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\{\exists x \in C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z), f(x) < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\}$ is measurable for each $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

To show this, note that $C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)$ is open, hence $\{x_k : k \in \mathbb{N}, x_k \in C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)\}$ is dense in $C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)$. Therefore, we have

$$\{\exists x \in C_j \cap B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z), f(x) < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigcup_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ x_k \in B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)}} (\{x_k \notin C_j\} \cup \{f(x_k) < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\}) \\
&= \bigcup_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ x_k \in B_{r-2^{-i}}^\circ(z)}} (\{C \cap B_{2^{-j}}^\circ(x_k) = \emptyset\} \cup \{\forall x' \in C, W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\})
\end{aligned}$$

by continuity of f . By the definition of $\mathcal{E}(X)$, it further suffices to check that $\{\forall x' \in C, W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\}$ is measurable for all $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

To do this, let $r_n = \max\{d(x_k, Y_m) : 1 \leq m \leq n\}$ and $R_n = (2c_p)^{1/p}r_n$. We claim that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.4) \quad &\{\forall x' \in C, W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}\} \\
&= \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \{\forall x' \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

for all $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$. To prove this, we will need the following bound: For all $x' \notin B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)$, we use (2.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.5) \quad W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (d^p(x_k, Y_m) - d^p(x', Y_m)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(d^p(x_k, Y_m) - \left(\frac{1}{c_p} d^p(x', x_k) - d^p(x_k, Y_m) \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2r_n^p - \frac{R_n^p}{c_p} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can prove (2.4). To see the “ \supseteq ” inclusion, suppose that the right side holds for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Now to show that the left side holds, for arbitrary $x' \in C$, we consider two cases: If $x' \in B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)$, then the right side along with $C \subseteq C_\ell$ implies $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell} < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}$. Otherwise, $x' \notin B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)$, and we have $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq 0 < \varepsilon + 2^{-j}$ by (2.5). To see the “ \subseteq ” inclusion, let us suppose that the left side holds. Since $B_{R_n}(x_k)$ is compact by the HB property, there exists $x_k^* \in C \cap B_{R_n}(x_k)$ such that $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x_k^*) = \sup_{x' \in C \cap B_{R_n}(x_k)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x')$. So, by the left side of (2.4), there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $\sup_{x' \in C \cap B_{R_n}(x_k)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - \delta$. From before, we know that $x' \mapsto W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x')$ is Lipschitz on the ball $B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)$; we denote its (random) Lipschitz constant as M_n . In particular, with $\eta_n = \delta/(2M_n)$ and $\ell = \lceil \log_2(2/\delta) \rceil$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x' \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \\
&\leq \sup_{x' \in C \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') + M_n \eta_n \\
&\leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - \delta + M_n \eta_n \\
&= \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - \delta/2 \\
&\leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the second inclusion and establishes (2.4). Therefore, it suffices to show that $\{\forall x' \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\}$ is measurable for all $j, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Finally, to do this, let us use that $\{x_m : m \in \mathbb{N}, x_m \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)\}$ is dense in $C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)$ and that $x' \mapsto W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x')$ is continuous. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\forall x' \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x') \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\} \\ &= \{\forall (m \in \mathbb{N}, x_m \in C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x_m) \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\} \\ &= \bigcap_{m \geq 1} (\{x_m \notin C_\ell \cap B_{R_n}^\circ(x_k)\} \cup \{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x_m) \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\}) \\ &= \bigcap_{m \geq 1} (\{C \cap B_{2^{-\ell}}^\circ(x_m) = \emptyset\} \cup \{d(x_m, x_k) \geq R_n\} \cup \{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x_m) \leq \varepsilon + 2^{-j} - 2^{-\ell}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definitions of R_n and $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_k, x_m)$, we observe that the last term is measurable. Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Our next result shows that the one-sided Hausdorff distance is a measurable function of two random sets.

Lemma 2.12. *Let (X, d) be a HB space. Then, for any random sets $K, K' : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(X)$, the map $\vec{d}_H(K, K') : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable.*

Proof. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K_n = \{x \in X : d(x, K) < 2^{-n}\}$. We claim for all $\beta > 0$ that

$$(2.6) \quad \left\{ \max_{x \in K} d(x, K') < \beta \right\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{x \in K_n} d(x, K') < \beta \right\}.$$

To prove this, note that one direction is immediate from the inclusion $K \subseteq K_n$. For the other direction, note that if $\max_{x \in K} d(x, K') < \beta$, then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-n} < \beta - \max_{x \in K_n} d(x, K')$ and any $y \in K_n$, there exists $z \in K$ with $d(y, z) < 2^{-n}$. As a result

$$d(y, K') \leq d(y, z) + d(z, K') < 2^{-n} + \max_{x \in K} d(x, K') < \beta,$$

as needed. Now, fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and use (2.6) to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\vec{d}_H(K, K') \leq \alpha\} &= \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \vec{d}_H(K, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k} \right\} \\ &= \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \max_{x \in K} d(x, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k} \right\} \\ &= \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{x \in K_n} d(x, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we show that

$$\left\{ \sup_{x \in K_n} d(x, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k} \right\}$$

is measurable for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, then it follows that $\vec{d}_H(K, K') : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable. To do this, we use that X is HB to get a dense sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of X . Since $K_n = \bigcup_{x \in K} B_{2^{-n}}^\circ(x)$ is open, it follows that $\{x_i : i \in \mathbb{N}, x_i \in K_n\}$ is dense in K_n . Thus, since the function $x \in X \mapsto d(x, K')$ is continuous we have $\sup_{x \in K_n} d(x, K') = \sup\{d(x_i, K') : i \in \mathbb{N}, x_i \in K_n\}$. Therefore,

$$\left\{ \sup_{x \in K_n} d(x, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\{x_i \notin K_n\} \cup \{d(x_i, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k}\}) \\
&= \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\{d(x_i, K) \geq 2^{-n}\} \cup \{d(x_i, K') < \alpha + 2^{-k}\}) \\
&= \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\{K \cap B_{2^{-n}}^\circ(x_i) = \emptyset\} \cup \{K' \cap B_{\alpha+2^{-k}}^\circ(x_i) \neq \emptyset\}).
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\mathcal{E}(X)$, the last term is measurable, hence we showed that the map $\vec{d}_H(K, K') : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable. \square

These results together yield the measurability of most events of interest in the paper; we leave the remaining details to the interested reader, but we note that this primarily follows from Lemma 2.11 and two applications of Lemma 2.12, which imply that $d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu)) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable for any random relaxation scale $\varepsilon \geq 0$. For example, this implies that for any random relaxation rate ε_n , the event $\{d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0\}$ is measurable.

The only remaining measurability concern is to show that the adaptive relaxation rate $\varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)}$ of Theorem 3.8 is in fact Borel-measurable. This is established in the following.

Lemma 2.13. *Let (X, d) be a HB space, and $p \geq 1$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any random relaxation scale $\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, the parameter $\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon) : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Borel-measurable.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.11, it suffices to show that for any random set $K : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(X)$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the event $\{\sup_{x, x' \in K} R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x') < \alpha\}$ is measurable. The approach is similar to the proofs of the preceding measurability results: We write $K_m := \bigcup_{x \in K} B_{2^{-m}}^\circ(x)$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and, since (X, d) is a HB space, we can also get a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is dense in X . Then using the fact that $R_{\bar{\mu}_n}$ is Lipschitz on compact sets (Lemma 2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \sup_{x, x' \in K} R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x') < \alpha \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{x, x' \in K_m} R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x') < \alpha \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{x, x' \in K_m} R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x') \leq \alpha - 2^{-i} \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup \{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x_k, x_\ell) : k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}, x_k, x_\ell \in K_m\} \leq \alpha - 2^{-i} \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}} (\{x_k, x_\ell \notin K_m\} \cup \{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq \alpha - 2^{-i}\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq \alpha - 2^{-i}\}$ is easily shown to be measurable, and that

$$\{x_k, x_\ell \notin K_m\} = \{K \cap B_{2^{-m}}^\circ(x_k) = \emptyset\} \cap \{K \cap B_{2^{-m}}^\circ(x_\ell) = \emptyset\}$$

is measurable by the definition of $\mathcal{E}(X)$. This finishes the proof. \square

2.4. Strong Law of Large Numbers. A key tool in the proofs of our main results is a suitably powerful form of a strong law of large numbers (SLLN) for relaxed Fréchet means in the one-sided Hausdorff distance. While this problem has already been studied in the recent works [33, 16], we provide a strengthening of these results which we believe will be of independent interest. In particular, this work resolves a conjecture of Evans-Jaffe in the affirmative (see [16, Remark 2.11]).

Let us briefly comment on the existing SLLNs. The first is [33] in which the author proved the SLLN for a $(p-1)$ th moment assumption and deterministic relaxation rates. The second is [16] in which the authors proved the SLLN for a p th moment assumption and possibly random relaxation rates. In the course of this work, it became necessary to use the SLLN for a $(p-1)$ th moment assumption and possibly random relaxation rates; the main result of this section is that the SLLN indeed holds in this strengthened setting.

To begin, we prove a single result which contains most of the hard work of this section. Indeed, it will immediately imply the remaining results we wish to prove.

Lemma 2.14. *Let (X, d) be a Heine-Borel space and $p \geq 1$. Suppose $\{(\mu_n, C_n, \varepsilon_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times C(X) \times [0, \infty)$ with $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w^{p-1} , $\text{Li}_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = C$, and $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon$ for some $(\mu, C, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times C(X) \times [0, \infty)$. Then, for any sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $x_n \in F_p(\mu_n, C_n, \varepsilon_n)$, there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a point $x \in F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$ with $x_{n_j} \rightarrow x$.*

Proof. Our approach is to fix $o \in C$ and then to derive some lower bounds on the Fréchet functionals W_p whenever the argument ranges of a suitable large ball. To set things up, use $C \subseteq \text{Li}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$ to get that there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence $\{o_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $o_k \in C_{n_k}$ such that $o_k \rightarrow o$.

Next, we derive two probabilistic inequalities that will be used to break up the integral for W_p into different regimes. For the first inequality, note that $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w^{p-1} implies [36, Definition 6.8] that we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_M(o)} d^{p-1}(o, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now observe that, for each $M > 0$, we have $X \setminus B_M(o_k) \subseteq X \setminus B_{M/2}(o)$ for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, we apply (2.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o_k, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\ & \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} c_{p-1} (d^{p-1}(o_k, o) + d^{p-1}(o, y)) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\ & \leq c_{p-1} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(d^{p-1}(o_k, o) + \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \right) \\ & = c_{p-1} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\ & \leq c_{p-1} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}M}(o)} d^{p-1}(o, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y). \end{aligned}$$

The two previous two displays together yield

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o_k, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) = 0.$$

For the second inequality, note that $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w^{p-1} implies that $\{\mu_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in τ_w , hence tight by Prokhorov. This means we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_{n_k}(X \setminus B_M(o)) \rightarrow 0,$$

and the same argument as above shows that this implies

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_k}(X \setminus B_M(o_k)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Combining these two inequalities, we see that it is possible to choose $M > 0$ large enough so that for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o_k, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \leq \frac{1}{p2^{2p+2}}$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \mu_{n_k}(X \setminus B_M(o_k)) \leq \frac{1}{p2^{2p}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

We can of course also assume $M \geq 1/16$ and $M^p > \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_{n_k}$.

Moving on, we derive two deterministic inequalities, each of which will be applied in one of two different regimes. First, use the elementary inequality (2.1) to get

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y) &\geq c_p^{-1} d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k) - 2d^p(o_k, y) \\ &\geq \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p-1}} - 2d^p(o_k, y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $y \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Second, use (2.2) then (2.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &|d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y)| \\ &\leq pd(x_{n_k}, o_k)(d^{p-1}(x_{n_k}, y) + d^{p-1}(o_k, y)) \\ &\leq pd(x_{n_k}, o_k)(c_{p-1}(d^{p-1}(x_{n_k}, o_k) + d^{p-1}(o_k, y)) + d^{p-1}(o_k, y)) \\ &= pc_{p-1}d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k) + p(1 + c_{p-1})d(x_{n_k}, o_k)d^{p-1}(o_k, y) \\ &\leq p2^{p-1}d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k) + p2^p d(x_{n_k}, o_k)d^{p-1}(o_k, y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $y \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, this implies

$$(2.10) \quad d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y) \geq -p2^{p-1}d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k) - p2^p d(x_{n_k}, o_k)d^{p-1}(o_k, y)$$

for all $y \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now we put these pieces together and assume for the sake of contradiction that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n_k}, o_k) \geq 17M$. In particular, we have $d(x_{n_k}, o_k) \geq 16M$ for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$. On the one hand, this means we can use (2.9) and (2.8) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_M(o_k)} (d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y)) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p-1}} - 2M^p \right) \mu_{n_k}(B_M(o_k)) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p-1}} - 2M^p \right) \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^p} - M^p \end{aligned}$$

for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, we can use (2.10) and (2.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} (d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y)) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\
& \geq -p2^{p-1}d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)\mu_n(X \setminus B_M(o_k)) \\
& \quad - p2^p d(x_{n_k}, o_k) \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} d^{p-1}(o_k, y) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\
& \geq -\frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+1}} - \frac{d(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+2}} \\
& \geq -\frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+1}} - \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where in the last line we used $M \geq 1/16$ to see that $d(x_{n_k}, o_k) \geq 16M$ implies $d(x_{n_k}, o_k) \leq d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)$. Combining the previous two displays, we get the following: For infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_p(\mu_{n_k}, x_{n_k}, o_k) &= \int_{B_M(o_k)} (d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y)) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\
& \quad + \int_{X \setminus B_M(o_k)} (d^p(x_{n_k}, y) - d^p(o_k, y)) d\mu_{n_k}(y) \\
& \geq \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^p} - M^p - \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+1}} - \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+2}} \\
& = \frac{d^p(x_{n_k}, o_k)}{2^{p+2}} - M^p \\
& = \left(\frac{16^p}{2^{p+2}} - 1 \right) M^p \\
& = (2^{3p-2} - 1)M^p \\
& \geq M^p.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have shown that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_p(\mu_{n_k}, x_{n_k}, o_k) \geq M^p.$$

However, this contradicts our assumptions of $x_{n_k} \in F_p(\mu_{n_k}, C_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k})$ and $M^p > \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_{n_k}$. Therefore, we must have $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n_k}, o_k) < 17M$. In particular, this implies that we have $d(x_{n_k}, o) \leq 18M$ for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In other words, we have shown that $x_{n_k} \subseteq B_{18M}(o)$ for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since (X, d) is a Heine-Borel space, this means there exists some $\{k_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and some $x \in B_{18M}(o)$ with $x_{n_{k_j}} \rightarrow x$. So, it only remains to show that $x \in F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$. To see this, first note that $\text{Ls}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n \subseteq C$ implies $x \in C$. Then, take any $z \in C$ and use $C \subseteq \text{Li}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$, to get some $\{z_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $z_j \in C_{n_{k_j}}$ such that $z_j \rightarrow z$. We compute, using the joint continuity of W_p (see [16, Lemma 2.7]),

$$\begin{aligned}
W_p(\mu, x, o) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} W_p(\mu_{n_{k_j}}, x_{n_{k_j}}, o_{k_j}) \\
&\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (W_p(\mu_{n_{k_j}}, z_{n_{k_j}}, o_{k_j}) + \varepsilon_{n_{k_j}}) = W_p(\mu, z, o) + \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

and this implies $x \in F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$. This finishes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.15. *If (X, d) is a Heine-Borel space, $p \geq 1$, and $(\mu, C, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times C(X) \times [0, \infty)$, the set $F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$ is non-empty and compact.*

Proof. First let us show non-emptiness. Fix $o \in C$, and get $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C with

$$W_p(\mu, x_n, o) \downarrow \inf_{x \in C} W_p(\mu, x, o)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then set

$$\varepsilon_n := W_p(\mu, x_n, o) - \inf_{x \in C} W_p(\mu, x, o)$$

and note by construction that we have $x_n \in F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon_n)$. By Lemma 2.14, there exists $\{n_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $x \in F_p(\mu, C, 0)$ with $x_{n_j} \rightarrow x$. In particular, this shows that $F_p(\mu, C, 0)$ is non-empty, hence that $F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon) \supseteq F_p(\mu, C, 0)$ is non-empty. To show compactness, simply take an arbitrary sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$ and apply Lemma 2.14. \square

Corollary 2.16. *Suppose (X, d) is a Heine-Borel space and $p \geq 1$. Also suppose that $\{(\mu_n, C_n, \varepsilon_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times C(X) \times [0, \infty)$ with $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in τ_w^{p-1} , $Lt_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = C$, and $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon$ for some $(\mu, C, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X) \times C(X) \times [0, \infty)$. Then, $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu_n, C_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. It suffices to show for all subsequences $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that there exists a further subsequence $\{k_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that we have

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu_{n_{k_j}}, C_{n_{k_j}}, \varepsilon_{n_{k_j}}), F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0.$$

To show this, use Corollary 2.15 to get for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ a point $x_k \in F_p(\mu_{n_k}, C_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k})$ satisfying

$$d(x_k, F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) = \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu_{n_k}, C_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k}), F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)).$$

Then use Lemma 2.14 to get a sequence $\{k_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a point $x \in F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)$ with $x_{k_j} \rightarrow x$. We of course have

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu_{n_{k_j}}, C_{n_{k_j}}, \varepsilon_{n_{k_j}}), F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) \\ &= d(x_{k_j}, F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) \\ &\leq d(x_{k_j}, x) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

so the result is proved. \square

Now we show that these results imply the desired SLLN. As before, let (X, d) be a metric space, fix $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ be a probability space on which is defined a sequence Y_1, Y_2, \dots of IID random variables with common distribution μ . Then we have the following:

Theorem 2.17. *Let (X, d) be a Heine-Borel space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. Then, for any random closed sets $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and C and any random relaxation scales $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and ε , we have*

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, C_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu, C, \varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

on

$$\{\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon\} \cap \{Lt_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n = C\}$$

Proof. Immediate from Corollary 2.16. \square

Corollary 2.18. *Let (X, d) be a Heine-Borel space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. Then, for any random relaxation rate with $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, we have*

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 2.17. \square

We will need Corollary 2.18 in our later study of relaxed Fréchet means with adaptive relaxation rates. However, some other consequences (which are not logically needed for this paper) are of independent interest.

For example, we can deduce a strong consistency result for medoids. Recall that by the p -medoid set of μ we mean the set $F_p^*(\mu) := F_p(\mu, \text{supp}(\mu), 0)$. Then we have the following, which generalizes the result of [16]:

Theorem 2.19. *Let (X, d) be a Heine-Borel space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$. Then, we have*

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p^*(\bar{\mu}_n), F_p^*(\mu)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 2.17 and the fact that $\text{Lt}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{supp}(\bar{\mu}_n) = \text{supp}(\mu)$ a.s. (see [16, Proposition 4.2]). \square

For another consequence, we remark that these methods can be used to show a large deviation upper bound for the empirical Fréchet mean sets, in the one-sided Hausdorff distance \vec{d}_H , under a much weaker moment assumption than originally expected. Indeed, one can combine Corollary 2.16 with the methods of [22, Subsection 4.2] (see also [16, Theorem 4.6]) to show that $\int_X \exp(\alpha d(x, y)) d\mu(y)$ for some $x \in X$ and all $\alpha > 0$ suffices for a large deviations upper bound. We leave the details to the interested reader.

3. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

In this section we prove the main results of the paper. This includes the results stated in the introduction, as well some additional results. We start by showing that the quantity $\sigma_p(\mu)$ is finite whenever $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a HB space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, we have $\sigma_p(\mu) < \infty$.*

Proof. For any $x, x' \in X$, we have $\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1)) = R_\mu(x, x', x, x')$. By Corollary 2.15, the set $F_p(\mu)$ is compact, and, by Lemma 2.4, the function R_μ is continuous. Therefore, $R_{F_p(\mu), \mu} = R_\mu|_{F_p(\mu) \times F_p(\mu)}$ has a finite maximum value. \square

Next, we discuss conditions under which $\sigma_p(\mu)$ is positive. First of all, observe that $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$ if and only if $d(x, Y_1) = d(x', Y_1)$ holds almost surely for all $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$. However, this condition is impossible to check if $F_p(\mu)$ is not already known; thus, we provide the following sufficient condition:

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, d) be a metric space. If $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$, then either $\#F_p(\mu) = 1$ or $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $F_p(\mu)$ is not a singleton, then take distinct $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$ and write $r := d(x, x') > 0$. Now use $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ to get $\mu(B_{r/2}(x)) > 0$, and observe that $d(x, Y_1) < r/2 \leq d(x', Y_1)$ when $Y_1 \in B_{r/2}(x)$. Hence, with nonzero probability, $d(x, Y_1) \neq d(x', Y_1)$. Therefore, $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$. \square

Now we can prove our main results. The first is the description of what happens in the regime of $\Omega(n^{-1/2})$ relaxation.

Theorem 3.3. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, there exists a constant $M_p(\mu) < \infty$ such that for any $c \geq M_p(\mu)$ and any random relaxation rate ε_n satisfying $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \geq c$ a.s., we have*

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq \delta) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu)}\right),$$

with the convention the right side is 0 if $\sigma_p^2(\mu) = 0$.

Proof. Fix $\delta > 0$ and denote $K^\delta := (F_p(\mu))^\delta$ the δ -thickening of $F_p(\mu)$. Since X is HB and $F_p(\mu)$ is compact by Corollary 2.15, it follows that K^δ is compact as well. By Proposition 2.6, $\{n^{-1/2}G_{K^\delta, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a Gaussian process $G_{K^\delta} \sim \mathcal{G}_\mu$ on $K^\delta \times K^\delta$ in distribution. Because $K^\delta \times K^\delta$ is compact and the Gaussian process takes values in $C(K^\delta \times K^\delta)$, G_{K^δ} is a.s. bounded. Also, define $\sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta) := 2 \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in K^\delta} \mathbb{E}[(G_{K^\delta}(x, x'))^2] = 2 \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in K^\delta} R_\mu(x, x')$, which is finite. As a result, we can apply the Borell-TIS inequality [1, Theorem 2.6.1] which shows that $M_p(\mu; \delta) := \mathbb{E}[\|G_{K^\delta}\|_\infty] < \infty$, and that we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|G_{K^\delta}\|_\infty \geq c) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu; \delta))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta)}\right).$$

Therefore, by convergence in distribution, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\|n^{-1/2}G_{K^\delta, n}\|_\infty \geq c - \eta) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - \eta - M_p(\mu; \delta))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta)}\right).$$

Now use Corollary 2.18 to get $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. In particular, we have convergence in probability, which implies

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \subseteq K^\delta) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \subseteq K^\delta\} \cap \{\|n^{-1/2}G_{K^\delta, n}\|_\infty < c - \eta\} \\ & \subseteq \{\forall x \in F_p(\mu), \forall x' \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), G_{K^\delta, n}(x, x') \leq (c - \eta)\sqrt{n}\} \\ & = \{\forall x \in F_p(\mu), \forall x' \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') - W_p(\mu, x, x') \leq (c - \eta)n^{-1/2}\} \\ & \subseteq \{\forall x \in F_p(\mu), \forall x' \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') \leq (c - \eta)n^{-1/2}\} \\ & \subseteq \{F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\} \cup \{\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \leq c - \eta\}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inclusion we use the fact that for any $x \in F_p(\mu)$ and $x' \in X$, $W_p(\mu, x, x') \leq 0$. By hypothesis, we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \geq c$ a.s. which implies $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \leq c - \eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, applying the union bound yields

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\mu) \not\subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\mathbb{P}_\mu(\|n^{-1/2}G_{K^\delta, n}\|_\infty \geq c - \eta) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (1 - \mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \subseteq K^\delta)) - \mathbb{P}_\mu(\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \leq c - \eta) \right] \\ & \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - \eta - M_p(\mu; \delta))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This holds for all $\eta > 0$, hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\mu) \not\subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu; \delta))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta)}\right).$$

Further, this holds for any $\delta > 0$. Now by a.s. continuity of $G \sim \mathcal{G}_\mu$ (see [1, Theorem 1.3.5] and the remarks thereafter) on, say, $K^1 \times K^1$, and the dominated convergence theorem, we have that $M_p(\mu; \delta) = \mathbb{E}[\|G|_{K^\delta \times K^\delta}\|_\infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\|G|_{F_p(\mu) \times F_p(\mu)}\|_\infty] := M_p(\mu)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, by continuity of $R_\mu, \sigma_p^2(\mu; \delta) \rightarrow \sigma^2(\mu; 0) = \sigma_p^2(\mu)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_p(\mu) &= \sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{R_\mu(x, x')} \\ &= \sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1))}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we showed that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\mu) \not\subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu)}\right),$$

which ends the proof of the first claim of the theorem. In particular, this shows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) > 0) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu)}\right).$$

Now, by Corollary 2.18 because almost surely, $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) > \delta) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Summing the two above equations yields the second claim of the theorem.

Last, we give an upper bound on the value $M_p(\mu)$ based on covering numbers. Recall that $G_{F_p(\mu)}$ is a Gaussian process on $F_p(\mu) \times F_p(\mu)$ on which we can define the pseudo-metric d_G such that for any $x, x', x'', x''' \in F_p(\mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_G((x, x'), (x'', x''')) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(G_K(x, x') - G_K(x'', x'''))^2]} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(Z_1(x, x') - Z_1(x'', x'''))}, \end{aligned}$$

where using the proof of Lemma 2.4

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_1(x, x') - Z_1(x'', x''')| &\leq pd(x, x'') (d^{p-1}(x, Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x'', Y_i)) \\ &\quad + pd(x', x''') (d^{p-1}(x', Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x''', Y_i)) \\ &\quad + 2p(d(x, x'') + d(x', x''')) \left(\sup_{x \in F_p(\mu)} W_{p-1}(\mu, x) \right) \\ &\leq pd_{\min}(d^{p-1}(x, Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x'', Y_i) + d^{p-1}(x', Y_i) \\ &\quad + d^{p-1}(x''', Y_i) + 4 \cdot \sup_{x \in F_p(\mu)} W_{p-1}(\mu, x)), \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{\min} = \min(d(x, x''), d(x', x'''))$. Note that the first supremum term is finite because $x \mapsto W_{p-1}(\mu, x)$ is continuous on the compact set $F_p(\mu)$, as long as $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(X)$, and that the same argument holds for the supremum of the $x \mapsto W_{2p-2}(\mu, x)$. Therefore, with $W_k = \sup_{x \in F_p(\mu)} W_k(\mu, x)$, we obtain

$$\text{Var}(Z_1(x, x') - Z_1(x'', x''')) \leq 32p^2 d_{\min}^2 (W_{2p-2} + W_{p-1})^2 \leq 64p^2 W_{2p-2},$$

where in the last inequality we used Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality. Hence,

$$d_G((x, x'), (x'', x''')) \leq 8p \sqrt{W_{2p-2}} \max(d(x, x''), d(x', x''')).$$

Therefore, Dudley's inequality [1, Theorem 1.3.3] gives us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(\mu) &\leq 24 \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(u; (F_p(\mu))^2, d_G)} du \\ &\leq 24 \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{u}{8p\sqrt{W_{2p-2}}}; F_p(\mu), d \right) \right)^2} du \\ &= 192p \sqrt{2 \cdot \sup_{x \in F_p(\mu)} W_{2p-2}(\mu, x)} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(u; F_p(\mu), d)} du. \end{aligned}$$

Last, the integral term is finite because of the assumption that (X, d) is HBD. \square

Note that the assumption of $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \geq c$ a.s. was only needed in order to get that we have $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \leq c - \eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $\eta > 0$. As such, the result still holds under this weaker assumption.

Complementing this, we also have the following result aiming to characterize weak d_H -consistency.

Theorem 3.4. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space and $p \geq 1$, and consider any random relaxation rate ε_n . Then for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$, we have:*

- (i) *If $\varepsilon_n \in o_p(1)$ and $\varepsilon_n \in \omega_p(n^{-1/2})$, then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is weakly d_H -consistent.*
- (ii) *If ε_n is deterministic, $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$, and $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is weakly d_H -consistent, then $\varepsilon_n \in \omega(n^{-1/2})$.*

Proof. We start by proving claim (i), so suppose that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $1/(\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n}) \rightarrow 0$ hold in probability. Next, we fix $\delta > 0$, and we claim that there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ with $F_p(\mu, \varepsilon) \subseteq (F_p(\mu))^\delta$. Towards a contradiction, assume this were not true; then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x_k \in F_p(\mu, 2^{-k})$ such that $d(x_k, F_p(\mu)) > \delta$. But because $F_p(\mu, 1)$ is compact from Corollary 2.15, there must exist $x \in F_p(\mu)$ and a subsequence $\{k_\ell\}$ such that $x_{k_\ell} \rightarrow x$. By continuity of the functional $W_p(\mu, \cdot, \cdot)$ [16, Lemma 2.7], this implies $x \in F_p(\mu)$. But, we also have $d(x, F_p(\mu)) \geq \delta$, a contradiction. Thus, we can get $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $F_p(\mu, \varepsilon) \subseteq (F_p(\mu))^\delta$. In other words, $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu)) \leq \delta$.

Now recall from Corollary 2.16 that we have

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely, hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)) \geq \delta) = 0.$$

Also, using the triangle inequality for the one-sided Hausdorff distance, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon\} \cap \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)) < \delta\} \\ &\subseteq \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu, \varepsilon)) < \delta\} \\ &\subseteq \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) < \delta + \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu, \varepsilon), F_p(\mu))\} \\ &\subseteq \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) < 2\delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous displays along with $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\varepsilon_n > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq 2\delta) = 0.$$

by the union bound.

Next, for any $c > M_p(\mu)$, Theorem 3.3 and $\varepsilon_n \in \omega_p(n^{-1/2})$ together imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \geq \delta) \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, cn^{-1/2})) \geq \delta) + \mathbb{P}_\mu(\varepsilon_n \leq cn^{-1/2})) \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, cn^{-1/2})) \geq \delta) \\ \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(c - M_p(\mu))^2}{\sigma_p^2(\mu)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

Since this equation holds for any $c > M_p(\mu)$, we showed that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \geq \delta) = 0.$$

Combining this equation with (3.1) gives $d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ in probability.

We now turn to claim (ii), so suppose that $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$. For some preparations, note that, since $F_p(\mu)$ is compact, there exists $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$ such that $\sigma_p(\mu)^2/2 = R_\mu(x, x', x, x') = \text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y_1) - d^p(x', Y_1)) > 0$. Now observe for $G \sim \mathcal{G}_\mu$, that the random variable $G(x, x')$ follows a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2}\sigma_p(\mu)^2)$. In fact, the process $\tilde{G}(x'') = G(x'', x') - G(x, x')$ for $x'' \in B_1(x)$ is a Gaussian process; since $Z_1(x_i, x') - Z_1(x, x') = Z_1(x_i, x)$ almost surely (in fact, everywhere), we see that \tilde{G} has covariance function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\tilde{G}(x_1), \tilde{G}(x_2)) &= \text{Cov}(Z_1(x_1, x') - Z_1(x, x'), Z_1(x_2, x') - Z_1(x, x')) \\ &= \text{Cov}(Z_1(x_1, x), Z_1(x_2, x)) = R_\mu(x_1, x, x_2, x). \end{aligned}$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in B_1(x)$.

Next for each $\eta > 0$, we give probabilistic estimates on $\|\tilde{G}|_{B_\eta(x)}\|_\infty$. For any $x_1, x_2 \in B_1(x)$, let us define

$$d_{\tilde{G}}(x_1, x_2) := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\tilde{G}(x_1) - \tilde{G}(x_2))^2]} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(Z_1(x_1, x_2))}.$$

Now observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_1(x_1, x_2)| &\leq pd(x_1, x_2)(d^{p-1}(x_1, Y_1) + d^{p-1}(x_2, Y_1)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x_1, Y_1)] + \mathbb{E}[d^{p-1}(x_2, Y_1)] \\ &\leq 2pd(x_1, x_2)(d^{p-1}(x, Y_1) + W_{p-1}(\mu, x) + 2c_{p-1}) \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(3.2) \quad d_{\tilde{G}}(x_1, x_2) \leq 2pM(x)d(x_1, x_2),$$

where $M(x) := (3(W_{2p-2}(\mu, x) + W_{p-1}(\mu, x)^2 + 4c_{p-1}^2))^{1/2} < \infty$. Consequently, similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.3, we use Dudley's inequality [1, Theorem 1.3.3] to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{G}|_{B_\eta(x)}\|_\infty] &\leq 24 \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(u; B_\eta(x), d_{\tilde{G}})} du \\ &\leq 48pM(x) \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(u; B_\eta(x), d)} du \\ &\leq 48pM(x) \int_0^\eta \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(u; B_1(x), d)} du. \end{aligned}$$

Since X is HBD, the integral is finite. Thus, by dominated convergence, we can choose $0 < \eta(\delta) \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2} \cdot pM(x)\delta)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{G}|_{B_{\eta(\delta)}(x)}\|_\infty] \leq \delta$. Next, (3.2) gives

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & 2 \cdot \sup_{x_1 \in B_{\eta(\delta)}(x)} \text{Var}(\tilde{G}(x_1)) \\ &= 2 \cdot \sup_{x_1 \in B_{\eta(\delta)}(x)} \text{Var}_\mu(Z_1(x_1, x)) \\ &\leq 8p^2 M(x)^2 \eta(\delta)^2 \leq \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now apply the Borell-TIS inequality [1, Theorem 2.6.1] together with the two previous equations which imply

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{G}|_{B_{\eta(\delta)}(x)}\|_\infty \geq \delta + c) \leq e^{-(c/\delta)^2}$$

for any $c \geq 0$.

Finally, we prove the claim. Suppose that ε_n is not $\omega(n^{-1/2})$ so there exists $M > 0$ such that $\varepsilon_n \sqrt{n} \leq M$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Next note that $G(x, x') \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p(\mu)^2/2)$ implies $\beta := \mathbb{P}(G(x, x') \geq 2M) > 0$. Now observe by the definition of \tilde{G} that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{G(x, x') \geq 2M\} \cap \{\|\tilde{G}|_{B_{\eta(\delta)}(x)}\|_\infty \leq M\} \\ & \subseteq \{\forall x'' \in B_{\eta(\delta)}(x), G(x'', x') \geq -M + 2M = M\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.3) we see that choosing $\delta^* = \min(1, 1/\sqrt{\log(2/\beta)})$ gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall x'' \in B_{\eta(\delta^*)}(x), G(x'', x') \geq M) \geq \beta - \mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{G}|_{B_{\eta(\delta^*)}(x)}\|_\infty \geq \delta^* + 1) \geq \frac{\beta}{2}.$$

For simplicity, we let $r = \eta(\delta^*) > 0$. Next, recall that Proposition 2.6 implies that $\{n^{-1/2}G_{K^1, n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to $G \sim \mathcal{G}_\mu$ on $K^1 \times K^1 = F_p(\mu) \times F_p(\mu)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(F_p \left(\bar{\mu}_n, \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \cap B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x) = \emptyset \right) \\ & \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\forall x'' \in B_r(x), \frac{1}{n} G_n(x'', x') \geq \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ & = \mathbb{P}(\forall x'' \in B_r(x), G(x'', x') \geq M) \geq \frac{\beta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, if $\varepsilon_{n_k} \leq Mn_k^{-1/2}$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ F_p \left(\bar{\mu}_{n_k}, \frac{M}{\sqrt{n_k}} \right) \cap B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x) = \emptyset \right\} \subseteq \{F_p(\bar{\mu}_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k}) \cap B_{r/2}(x) = \emptyset\} \\ & \subseteq \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k})) \geq r/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two previous displays, along with the fact that $\varepsilon_n \leq Mn^{-1/2}$ infinitely often, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \geq r/2) \\ & \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(F_p \left(\bar{\mu}_n, \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \cap B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x) = \emptyset \right) \geq \frac{\beta}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not weakly consistent, which ends the proof. \square

We now argue that the requirements of the previous theorem cannot be dropped. We start by the condition $\sigma_p(\mu) > 0$. A simple example is when the population Fréchet mean set is a singleton $F_p(\mu) = \{\bar{x}\}$, so $\varepsilon_n \equiv 0$ suffices for strong (hence weak) consistency. Indeed, in this case we have for any bounded subset $S \subseteq X$,

$$\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), S) = d(\bar{x}, S) \leq \vec{d}_H(S, F_p(\mu)).$$

Therefore, the strong one-sided convergence $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ a.s., which holds whenever $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, is sufficient for strong Hausdorff convergence.

Unfortunately, when $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$, the condition $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ may not be sufficient either. In the next result, we give an explicit example where some rate in $o(n^{-1/2})$ gives strong (hence weak) consistency. For the sake of simplicity, we focus on deterministic relaxation rates.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $X = \{(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) : \theta \in \{0\} \cup [\pi/2, 3\pi/2]\}$ be equipped with the geodesic distance $d((\cos \theta, \sin \theta), (\cos \theta', \sin \theta')) = \frac{2}{\pi} \min_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\theta - \theta' - 2k\pi|$, let $p > 1$, and consider the distribution $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(0,1)} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(0,-1)}$. Then (X, d) is a Dudley space, $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$, and for any deterministic relaxation rate ε_n we have the following:*

- (W) $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is weakly d_H -consistent if and only if $\varepsilon_n = o(1) \cap \omega(n^{-1})$.
- (S) $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_H -consistent if $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n n / \log \log n > 2p/(p-1)$ and not strongly d_H -consistent if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n n / \log \log n < 2p/(p-1)$.

Proof. We start by noting that (X, d) is a compact Dudley space, and that $F_p(\mu) = \{(1, 0), (-1, 0)\}$. Further, by symmetry, if $(1, 0) \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$, then $(-1, 0) \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$, which implies $\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) = 0$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{(1, 0) \notin F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\} &= \left\{ \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) = 1 \right\}, \\ \{(1, 0) \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\} &= \left\{ \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we will denote by $k_n = \#\{i : Y_i = (0, 1)\} - \frac{n}{2}$ and $x_\eta := (\cos(\pi + \pi\eta/2), \sin(\pi + \pi\eta/2))$ for any $\eta \in [-1, 1]$. The usual law of large numbers implies that, on an event E_1 of probability one, we have $k_n = o(n)$. Then, for any η , we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_\eta) - W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, (1, 0)) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{k_n}{n} \right) [(1 - \eta)^p - 1] + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{k_n}{n} \right) [(1 + \eta)^p - 1] \\ &= -2p\eta \frac{k_n}{n} + O(\eta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Also, from the above equation, we note that since $p > 1$, $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x)$ has a unique minimizer

$$\eta_n = \frac{u_n - 1}{u_n + 1}, \quad u_n = \left(\frac{n + 2k_n}{n - 2k_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

Thus, we have $\eta_n = \frac{2}{p-1} \frac{k_n}{n} + O((\frac{k_n}{n})^2)$ and $W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, (1, 0)) - m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) = \frac{4p}{p-1} (\frac{k_n}{n})^2 (1 + \delta_n)$, where $\delta_n = O(\frac{k_n}{n})$. Thus, we have now

$$\left\{ \vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) = 1 \right\} = \{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, (1, 0)) - m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) > \varepsilon_n\}.$$

Now, by the central limit theorem, $\frac{k_p}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{4})$ in distribution. As a result, for any $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, (1, 0)) - m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) > \frac{4p}{p-1} \frac{c^2}{n} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_c^\infty e^{-2t^2} dt.$$

Further, this shows that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \geq 1)$ converges to 0 iff $d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \rightarrow 0$ in probability iff $\varepsilon_n = \omega(n^{-1})$. It remains to check the other one-sided Hausdorff distance, for which it is already known that if $\varepsilon = o(1)$, then $d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. Also, $W_p(\mu, \cdot)$ is continuous at $(-1, 0)$. Therefore, if $\varepsilon \notin o(1)$, there exists an increasing sequence $(n_k)_k$ and $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small such that for all $k \geq 1$, we have $\varepsilon_{n_k} > W_p(\mu, x_\eta) - m_p(\mu)$. Then, by the weak law of large numbers,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k}), F_p(\mu)) \geq \eta) \geq \mathbb{P}_\mu(x_\eta \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_{n_k}, \varepsilon_{n_k})) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

This ends the proof of the claims for weak d_H -consistency.

We now turn to strong d_H -consistency. The usual law of iterated logarithms shows that on an event E_2 of probability one, the set $\{(2n \log \log n)^{-1/2} k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has closure $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Further, note that for $\varepsilon_n = c \log \log n/n$, we have

$$\{(1, 0) \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\} = \left\{ (2n \log \log n)^{-1/2} k_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{c(p-1)}{8p(1+\delta_n)}} \right\}.$$

Therefore, if $c > c^*$, on $E_1 \cap E_2$, we have $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and for n sufficiently large, $(1, 0) \in F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$, hence $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_H -consistent (recall that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$). On the other hand, if $c < c^*$, on $E_1 \cap E_2$, infinitely often we have $(1, 0) \notin F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ which implies that $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not strongly d_H -consistent. This ends the proof of the proposition. \square

As a last remark, in Theorem 3.4, the condition $\varepsilon_n = o(1)$ may not be necessary for weak convergence. This condition is unnecessary when the functional $W_p(\mu, \cdot)$ has a gap from its minimum value $m_p(\mu)$ to non-optimal values. For instance, consider the simple case of a discrete finite space X . Then, letting $\delta^* = \min_{x \notin F_p(\mu)} W_p(\mu, x) - m_p(\mu) > 0$, the usual strong law of large number readily implies that $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \delta)$ is weakly and strongly d_H -consistent if $\delta < \delta^*$ and not weakly nor strongly d_H -consistent if $\delta > \delta^*$. The following result gives a more precise description of the frontier for weakly and strongly consistent relaxation rates in the simple case of a two-point space and non-uniform measure.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ be equipped with the discrete metric $d(x, y) = \mathbb{1}[x = y]$, let $p \geq 1$, and consider the distribution $\mu = q\delta_{x_1} + (1-q)\delta_{x_2}$ for $q \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then (X, d) is a Dudley space, $\sigma_p(\mu) = 0$, and for any deterministic relaxation rate ε_n we have the following:*

- (W) $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is weakly d_H -consistent if and only if $\varepsilon_n = |1 - 2q| - \omega(n^{-1/2})$.
- (S) $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_H -consistent if $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (|1 - 2q| - \varepsilon_n)n^{1/2}(\log \log n)^{-1/2} > 2\sqrt{2q(1-q)}$ and not strongly d_H -consistent if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (|1 - 2q| - \varepsilon_n)n^{1/2}(\log \log n)^{-1/2} < 2\sqrt{2q(1-q)}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we suppose $q > \frac{1}{2}$ so that $F_p(\mu) = \{x_1\}$. Now writing $\varepsilon_n = 2q - 1 - c_n n^{-1/2}$, note that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \neq F_p(\mu)) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_2) \leq W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x_1) + \varepsilon_n)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[Y_i = x_1] - 1 \leq \varepsilon_n \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{1}[Y_i = x_1] - q) \leq -\frac{c_n}{2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By the central limit theorem, $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{1}[Y_i = x_1] - q) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, q(1-q))$. Therefore, we have $\mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \neq F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $c_n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely. Now observe that $d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \in \{0, 1\}$. Therefore, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is weakly d_H -consistent if and only if $\mathbb{P}_\mu(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \neq F_p(\mu))$ vanishes, proving the first claim.

We next turn to strong consistency. Writing $\varepsilon_n = 2q - 1 - c_n(\log \log n)^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$ and using the same arguments as above,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n \log \log n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{1}[Y_i = x_1] - q) > -\frac{c_n}{2} \text{ for } n \text{ suff. large} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the law of iterated logarithm readily implies the second claim since the variance of $\mathbb{1}[Y = x_1] - q$ is $q(1-q)$. \square

We are now ready to prove the strong consistency result.

Theorem 3.7. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. Then, any random relaxation rate ε_n satisfies the following:*

(i) *If*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} > \sigma_p(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly d_H -consistent. Further, in this case we have $\mathbb{P}(F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) \text{ for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}) = 1$.

(ii) *If*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} < \sigma_p(\mu) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not strongly d_H -consistent. Further, in this case we have $\mathbb{P}(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty) = 0$.

Proof. The key observation in both cases is that our choice of relaxation parameter, along with some simple arithmetic, shows that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') \leq \varepsilon_n\} &= \left\{ (n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_n(x, x') \right. \\
&\quad \left. \leq n^{1/2} (\log \log n)^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n - n^{1/2} (\log \log n)^{-1/2} W_p(\mu, x, x') \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, x' \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, if $x' \in F_p(\mu)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.4) \quad &\left\{ (n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_n(x, x') > n^{1/2} (\log \log n)^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n \right\} \\
&\subseteq \{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') > \varepsilon_n\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Conversely, if $x \in F_p(\mu)$, then

$$(3.5) \quad \left\{ (n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_n(x, x') \leq n^{1/2} (\log \log n)^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n \right\} \\ \subseteq \{W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, x, x') \leq \varepsilon_n\}$$

for all $x' \in X$. Now we proceed to the main proof.

We begin with the easier statement (ii). Suppose that the relaxation parameters ε_n satisfy

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} < \sigma_p(\mu) \quad a.s.$$

In particular, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} < \sigma_p(\mu) - \eta.$$

Denote by E this event. For simplicity, we will use the notation $K^s = (F_p(\mu))^s$ for the s -thickening of $F_p(\mu)$. These are compact by the Heine-Borel property of X and because $F_p(\mu)$ is compact. By Lemma 2.8, there exists $f \in B_{K^1, \mu}$, and $x, x' \in F_p(\mu)$ such that $\sqrt{2} \cdot f(x, x') > \sigma_p(\mu) - \eta/3$. Because f is continuous, there exists $0 < r < 1$ such that the closed ball $B_r(x)$ satisfies $\sqrt{2} \cdot f(z, x') > \sigma_p(\mu) - 2\eta/3$ for all $z \in B_r(x)$. Note that we selected $r < 1$ so that $B_r(x) \subseteq K^1$.

Now by Proposition 2.7, there exists an event F with $\mathbb{P}_\mu(F) = 1$, on which the following is true: There is a (random) subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that we have $(2n_k \log \log n_k)^{-1/2} G_{K^1, n_k} \rightarrow f$ in the topology of uniform norm convergence on K^1 . Also recall that $G_{K^1, n}$ is just the restriction of G_n to $K^1 \times K^1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{z \in B_r(x)} (n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_n(z, x') \\ & \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min_{z \in B_r(x)} (n_k \log \log n_k)^{-1/2} G_{n_k}(z, x') \\ & \geq \min_{z \in B_r(x)} \sqrt{2} \cdot f(z, x') \\ & \geq \sigma_p(\mu) - 2\eta/3 > \sigma_p(\mu) - \eta \end{aligned}$$

on F . We combine this with (3.4) to see that on $E \cap F$, we have

$$\min_{z \in B_r(x)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, z, x') > \varepsilon_n \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \min_{z \in B_r(x)} W_p(\bar{\mu}_n, z, x') > \varepsilon_n \right\} & \subseteq \{B_r(x) \cap F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n) = \emptyset\} \\ & \subseteq \{d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, on $E \cap F$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \geq r.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}_\mu(E \cap F) \geq 1 - \delta$, this shows

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0) \leq \delta.$$

This holds for any $\delta > 0$. Therefore, we proved $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0) = 0$. As a result, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is not strongly d_H -consistent.

For the harder statement (i), we suppose that almost surely, $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} > \sigma_p(\mu) \quad a.s.$$

First, we recall that by Corollary 2.18, since almost surely $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, the event $E_1 = \{\vec{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0\}$ has probability one.

Now fix $\delta > 0$. By hypothesis on the parameters ε_n , there exists $\eta > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} > \sigma_p(\mu) + \eta.$$

Denote by F_1 this event. Now by Lemma 2.10 we have

$$\sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K^1, \mu}} \left\{ \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} f(x, x') \right\} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 0} \sigma_p(\mu).$$

In particular, there exists $0 < s < 1$ such that

$$\sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K^1, \mu}} \left\{ \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} f(x, x') \right\} \leq \sigma_p(\mu) + \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

By Proposition 2.7, on an event E_2 of full probability, $\{(2n \log \log n)^{-1/2} G_{K^1, n}\}$ is relatively compact and its set of limits is exactly $\mathcal{B}_{K^1, \mu}$. Therefore, and since $F_p(\mu)$ and K^s are compact, there exists $f \in \mathcal{B}_{K^1, \mu}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} \frac{G_n(x, x')}{\sqrt{n \log \log n}} &= \sqrt{2} \cdot \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} f(x, x') \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K^1, \mu}} \left\{ \max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} f(x, x') \right\} \\ &\leq \sigma_p(\mu) + \frac{\eta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, on $E_2 \cap F_1$, for n sufficiently large,

$$\max_{x \in F_p(\mu)} \max_{x' \in K^s} \frac{G_n(x, x')}{\sqrt{n \log \log n}} < \sigma_p(\mu) + \frac{3\eta}{4} < \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}}.$$

Hence, on $E_1 \cap E_2 \cap F_1$, for n sufficiently large, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n) \subseteq K^s$ so using (3.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 \cap E_2 \cap F_1 &\subseteq E_1 \cap \{\text{for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}, F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)\} \\ &\subseteq \{d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \rightarrow 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(d_H(F_p(\mu), F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)) \rightarrow 0) \geq \mathbb{P}_\mu(E_1 \cap E_2 \cap F_1) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Since this holds for any $\delta > 0$, the result is proved. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.8 which shows that using adaptive rate to estimate $\sigma_p(\mu)$, one can obtain near-optimal consistent relaxation rates.

Theorem 3.8. *Let (X, d) be a HBD space, $p \geq 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$. For any random relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n^{(1)} = 0 \quad a.s.,$$

and for any $\delta > 0$, define the adaptively-chosen relaxation rate $\varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)}$ via

$$\varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)} := (1 + \delta)\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{n}}.$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} = \sigma_p(\mu) \quad a.s.,$$

and $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)})$ is strongly d_H -consistent.

Proof. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2p-2}(X)$ and fix a sub-optimal relaxation scale $\{\varepsilon_n^{(1)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\varepsilon_n^{(1)} = \omega(n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2})$ and $\varepsilon_n^{(1)} = o(1)$ almost surely. In particular,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} > \sigma_p(\mu), \quad a.s.$$

As a result, Theorem 3.7 implies that on an event E of full probability, $\bar{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ and for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} E &\subseteq \{\text{for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}, F_p(\mu) \subseteq F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \text{for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}, \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \geq \sqrt{2} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x')} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now denote by $K^\eta := (F_p(\mu))^\eta$ the η -thickening of $F_p(\mu)$ for $\eta > 0$. By Lemma 2.5, on an event F of full probability, one has $R_{\bar{\mu}_n} \rightarrow R_\mu$ uniformly on $K^1 \times K^1$, hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x')} = \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{R_\mu(x, x')} = \sigma_p(\mu).$$

As a result, we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad E \cap F \subseteq \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \geq \sigma_p(\mu) \right\}.$$

Next, on the event E , since $\bar{d}_H(F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}), F_p(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$, for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \subseteq K^\eta$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} E \cap F &\subseteq F \cap \left\{ \text{for suff. large } n \in \mathbb{N}, \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \leq \sqrt{2} \sup_{x, x' \in K^\eta} \sqrt{R_{\bar{\mu}_n}(x, x')} \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \leq \sqrt{2} \sup_{x, x' \in K^\eta} \sqrt{R_\mu(x, x')} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of R_μ on X^2 (Lemma 2.4), we have $\sup_{x, x' \in K^\eta} \sqrt{2R_\mu(x, x')} \rightarrow \sigma_p(\mu)$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. As a result, the previous equation shows that

$$E \cap F \subseteq \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \leq \sigma_p(\mu) \right\}.$$

Together with (3.6), this shows $\sigma_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) \rightarrow \sigma_p(\mu)$ on $E \cap F$. In particular, on $E \cap F$ which has full probability,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_{n,\delta}^{(2)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log \log n}} = (1 + \delta)\sigma_p(\mu).$$

Hence, this implies the desired optimality property when $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Further, by Theorem 3.7, $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(2)})$ is strongly d_H -consistent. This ends the proof. \square

4. SPECIAL CASES

In Algorithm 1 we provided a strategy to obtain near-optimal relaxation rates for estimating the Fréchet mean set via relaxation; for a fixed and unknown distribution μ , this involves estimating the pre-factor $\sigma_p(\mu)$ with a procedure which may be quite involved from an implementation and computational standpoint. Thus, it may be preferable in some cases to use a simpler upper-bound for $\sigma_p(\mu)$ at the expense of sub-optimal relaxation rates. In this subsection we show that this is possible. Namely, we show that, under additional non-parametric hypotheses, one can find relaxation rates which are provably consistent and which are easier (both conceptually and computationally) to work with.

4.1. Compact X . We start with the crudest upper bound, which is valid whenever X is compact (and Dudley). This is certainly the case for many applications where, for example, data is assumed to live on a compact Riemmanian manifold in finite-dimensional Euclidean space.

Indeed, if (X, d) is any compact space, then, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_p(\mu) &= \sup_{x, x' \in F_p(\mu)} \sqrt{2 \cdot \text{Var}_\mu(d^p(x, Y) - d^p(x', Y))} \\ &\leq \sup_{x, x' \in X} \sqrt{2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu(d^p(x, Y) - d^p(x', Y))^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \cdot (\text{diam}(X))^p. \end{aligned}$$

This provides a very simple upper bound for $\sigma_p(\mu)$ which is independent of the unknown population distribution μ .

As a result, it follows from the above calculation that, if (X, d) is a Dudley space, $p \geq 1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, and $\delta > 0$, then the relaxation rate

$$\varepsilon_n := (1 + \delta) \cdot (\text{diam}(X))^p \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \log n}{n}},$$

is such that $F_p(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n)$ is a strongly d_H -consistent estimator of $F_p(\mu)$. In particular, it suffices to simply take

$$\varepsilon_n := \frac{3}{2} \cdot (\text{diam}(X))^p \sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{n}}.$$

4.2. Medians ($p = 1$). The next bound concerns the case of $p = 1$, which generalizes the real-valued problem of estimating the median. This case is interesting from the point of view of robust statistics since medians are known to be “robust to outliers” and since no integrability assumption on the population distribution is required.

To get to this bound, simply note that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(\mu) &\leq \sup_{x, x' \in F_1(\mu)} \sqrt{2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu(d(x, Y) - d(x', Y))^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in F_1(\mu)} d(x, x') \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sqrt{2} \cdot \text{diam}(F_1(\mu)),$$

where in the second inequality, we used the triangle inequality.

As a result, for any HBD space (X, d) , it is sufficient to estimate an upper bound of $\text{diam}(F_1(\mu))$. This can be done via a two-step estimator, similar to the first two steps of Algorithm 1. That is, we compute the relaxed Fréchet mean set $F_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ with a sub-optimal relaxation rate

$$\varepsilon_n^{(1)} := m_p(\bar{\mu}_n) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.$$

Then, we use the relaxation parameter

$$\varepsilon_n^{(2)} := (1 + \delta) \cdot \text{diam}(F_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})) \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \log n}{n}}$$

and we output $F_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(2)})$ to estimate the set of medians. In practice, this procedure replaces the computation of $\sigma_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ by the computation of the diameter $F_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ only. However, we note that computing diameters of arbitrary sets in a metric space is also a non-convex optimization problem which may be, in general, quite difficult.

It also instructive to consider the very special case of $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $p = 1$, in which Algorithm 1 takes on an explicit form. First, we order the samples Y_1, \dots, Y_n as $y_1 \leq \dots \leq y_n$. Then, we note that the Fréchet functional $W_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \cdot)$ is convex, hence its median set is an interval, $F_1(\mu) = [u_n, v_n]$. In fact, the Fréchet functional is piece-wise affine according to the sub-division generated by y_1, \dots, y_n , so we have

$$m_1(\bar{\mu}_n) = W_1(\bar{\mu}_n, y_{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor}) = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i > \frac{n+1}{2}} y_i - \sum_{i < \frac{n+1}{2}} y_i \right),$$

and it follows that the endpoints of any relaxed Fréchet mean set can be easily computed in $O(n)$ time. Finally, we note that, for any consistent but sub-optimal relaxation rate $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$, it can easily be shown that $\sigma_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})$ is exactly equal to

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (|v_n^{(1)} - Y_i| - |u_n^{(1)} - Y_i|)^2 - 2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |v_n^{(1)} - Y_i| - |u_n^{(1)} - Y_i| \right)^2},$$

where $F_1(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)}) = [u_n^{(1)}, v_n^{(1)}]$. In total, this yields a two-step estimator which is strongly d_H -consistent for the population median set $F_1(\mu)$ and which can be exactly computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.

4.3. Means ($p = 2$). The final bound concerns the case of $p = 2$, which is certainly the most important case from the point of view of most applications.

To see this, note that for an arbitrary metric space (X, d) and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$, we can compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2(\mu) &\leq \sup_{x, x' \in F_2(\mu)} \sqrt{2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu [(d^2(x, Y_1) - d^2(x', Y_1))^2]} \\ &\leq \sup_{x, x' \in F_2(\mu)} d(x, x') \sqrt{2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu [(d(x, Y_1) + d(x', Y_1))^2]} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in F_2(\mu)} d(x, x') \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\mu [d^2(x, Y_1) + d^2(x', Y_1)]} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2 \cdot \sup_{x, x' \in F_2(\mu)} d(x, x') \cdot \sup_{x \in F_2(\mu)} \sqrt{2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu [d^2(x, Y_1)]} \\ &= 2 \cdot \text{diam}(F_2(\mu)) \sqrt{2 \cdot m_2(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this bound depends on only the diameter of the vanilla Fréchet mean set and on the minimum of the Fréchet functional.

In summary, we have the following estimation procedure. First, let $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ be a consistent but sub-optimal relaxation rate. Then, for some $\delta > 0$, compute:

$$\varepsilon_n^{(2)} := 4(1 + \delta) \cdot \text{diam}(F_2(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(1)})) \sqrt{m_2(\bar{\mu}_n) \frac{\log \log n}{n}}.$$

(As before, computing the diameter may itself be a hard problem.) Finally, return $F_2(\bar{\mu}_n, \varepsilon_n^{(2)})$ as our estimate. As long as (X, d) is HBD and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$, it follows that this procedure is strongly d_H -consistent.

REFERENCES

- [1] Robert J Adler, Jonathan E Taylor, et al. *Random fields and geometry*, volume 80. Springer, 2007.
- [2] Vivek Bagaria, Govinda Kamath, Vasilis Ntranos, Martin Zhang, and David Tse. Medoids in almost-linear time via multi-armed bandits. volume 84 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 500–509, Playa Blanca, Lanzarote, Canary Islands, 09–11 Apr 2018. PMLR.
- [3] Tavor Baharav and David Tse. Ultra fast medoid identification via correlated sequential halving. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3655–3664, 2019.
- [4] Abhishek Bhattacharya. Statistical analysis on manifolds: a nonparametric approach for inference on shape spaces. *Sankhyā*, 70(2, Ser. A):223–266, 2008.
- [5] Abhishek Bhattacharya and Rabi Bhattacharya. *Nonparametric inference on manifolds*, volume 2 of *Institute of Mathematical Statistics (IMS) Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. With applications to shape spaces.
- [6] Rabi Bhattacharya and Lizhen Lin. Omnibus CLTs for Fréchet means and nonparametric inference on non-Euclidean spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(1):413–428, 2017.
- [7] Rabi Bhattacharya and Vic Patrangenaru. Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. I. *Ann. Statist.*, 31(1):1–29, 2003.
- [8] Rabi Bhattacharya and Vic Patrangenaru. Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. II. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(3):1225–1259, 2005.
- [9] Louis J. Billera, Susan P. Holmes, and Karen Vogtmann. Geometry of the space of phylogenetic trees. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 27(4):733–767, 2001.
- [10] Frédéric Cazals, Bernard Delmas, and Timothée O’Donnell. Fréchet mean and p -mean on the unit circle: characterization, decidability, and algorithm. 2020.
- [11] Rudrasis Chakraborty and Baba C. Vemuri. Recursive Fréchet mean computation on the Grassmannian and its applications to computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.
- [12] Rudrasis Chakraborty and Baba C. Vemuri. Statistics on the Stiefel manifold: theory and applications. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(1):415–438, 2019.
- [13] Ian L. Dryden, Alexey Koloydenko, and Diwei Zhou. Non-Euclidean statistics for covariance matrices, with applications to diffusion tensor imaging. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 3(3):1102–1123, 2009.
- [14] Richard M Dudley. *Uniform central limit theorems*, volume 142. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [15] Gabriele Eichfelder, Thomas Hotz, and Johannes Wieditz. An algorithm for computing Fréchet means on the sphere. *Optimization Letters*, 13(7):1523–1533, 2019.
- [16] Steven N. Evans and Adam Q. Jaffe. Strong laws of large numbers for Fréchet means, 2020.
- [17] WILLIAM FELLER. An extension of the law of the iterated logarithm to variables without variance. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics*, 18(4):343–355, 1968.
- [18] Aasa Feragen, Søren Hauberg, Mads Nielsen, and François Lauze. Means in spaces of tree-like shapes. In *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 736–746. IEEE, 2011.

- [19] Simone Fiori. Learning the Fréchet mean over the manifold of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *Cognitive computation*, 1(4):279, 2009.
- [20] Cedric E Ginestet. Strong consistency of Fréchet sample mean sets for graph-valued random variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.3183*, 2012.
- [21] Stephan F. Huckemann. *(Semi-)Intrinsic Statistical Analysis on Non-Euclidean Spaces*, pages 103–118. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.
- [22] Adam Q. Jaffe. Strong consistency for a class of adaptive clustering procedures, 2022.
- [23] Naresh C Jain and Michael B Marcus. Central limit theorems for c(s)-valued random variables. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 19(3):216–231, 1975.
- [24] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*, volume 99 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021. Third edition [of 1464694].
- [25] Eric D. Kolaczyk, Lizhen Lin, Steven Rosenberg, Jackson Walters, and Jie Xu. Averages of unlabeled networks: geometric characterization and asymptotic behavior. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(1):514–538, 2020.
- [26] Krzysztof Krakowski, Knut Hüper, and J Manton. On the computation of the Karcher mean on spheres and special orthogonal groups. In *Conference Paper, Robomat*. Citeseer, 2007.
- [27] J. Kuelbs. The law of the iterated logarithm in $C[0, 1]$. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 33(4):221–235, 1975/76.
- [28] J Kuelbs. A strong convergence theorem for banach space valued random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 4(5):744–771, 1976.
- [29] Huiling Le and Alfred Kume. The Fréchet mean shape and the shape of the means. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pages 101–113, 2000.
- [30] Michel Ledoux and M Talagrand. Characterization of the law of the iterated logarithm in banach spaces. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1242–1264, 1988.
- [31] Nina Miolane, Johan Mathe, Claire Donnat, Mikael Jorda, and Xavier Pennec. Geomstats: A python package for riemannian geometry in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08308*, 2018.
- [32] Vern I Paulsen and Mrinal Raghupathi. *An introduction to the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, volume 152. Cambridge university press, 2016.
- [33] Christof Schötz. Strong laws of large numbers for generalizations of Fréchet mean sets. *Statistics*, 56(1):34–52, 2022.
- [34] Harald Sverdrup-Thygeson. Strong law of large numbers for measures of central tendency and dispersion of random variables in compact metric spaces. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(1):141–145, 1981.
- [35] Katharine Turner, Yuriy Mileyko, Sayan Mukherjee, and John Harer. Fréchet means for distributions of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 52(1):44–70, 2014.
- [36] Cédric Villani. *Optimal Transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.
- [37] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [38] Herbert Ziezold. On expected figures and a strong law of large numbers for random elements in quasi-metric spaces. In *Transactions of the Seventh Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes and of the Eighth European Meeting of Statisticians (Tech. Univ. Prague, Prague, 1974)*, Vol. A, pages 591–602. 1977.

OPERATIONS RESEARCH CENTER, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
 Email address: moiseb@mit.edu

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 367 EVANS HALL #3860, BERKELEY,
 CA 94720-3860, U.S.A.
 Email address: aqjaffe@berkeley.edu