

# A statistical framework for analyzing shape in a time series of random geometric objects

Anne van Delft<sup>1</sup> and Andrew J. Blumberg<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Statistics, Columbia University, 1255 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027, USA.*  
e-mail: [anne.vandelft@columbia.edu](mailto:anne.vandelft@columbia.edu)

<sup>2</sup>*Irving Institute for Cancer Dynamics, Columbia University, 1190 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY, 10027, USA.*  
e-mail: [andrew.blumberg@columbia.edu](mailto:andrew.blumberg@columbia.edu)

**AMS subject classification:** Primary 62M99, 62R20, 62R40; secondary 60B05, 60F17, 62M10

**Abstract:** We introduce a new framework to analyze shape descriptors that capture the geometric features of an ensemble of point clouds. At the core of our approach is the point of view that the data arises as sampled recordings from a metric space-valued stochastic process, possibly of nonstationary nature, thereby integrating geometric data analysis into the realm of functional time series analysis. We focus on the descriptors coming from topological data analysis. Our framework allows for natural incorporation of spatial-temporal dynamics, heterogeneous sampling, and the study of convergence rates. Further, we derive complete invariants for classes of metric space-valued stochastic processes in the spirit of Gromov, and relate these invariants to so-called ball volume processes. Under mild dependence conditions, a weak invariance principle in  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  is established for sequential empirical versions of the latter, assuming the probabilistic structure possibly changes over time. Finally, we use this result to introduce novel test statistics for topological change, which are distribution free in the limit under the hypothesis of stationarity.

**Keywords and phrases:** topological data analysis, functional data analysis, persistent homology, locally stationary processes,  $U$ -statistics.

## 1. Introduction

Geometric data analysis is concerned with rigorously quantifying and analyzing “shape”. The data is usually presented as an ensemble of “point clouds”, i.e., finite metric spaces  $\{\tilde{X}_t^n\}_{t=1}^T$  that represent a collection of observations where each  $\tilde{X}_t^n$  arises from sampling an underlying geometric object  $\tilde{X}_t$  on a discrete grid of length  $n$ . The most familiar kind of geometric data analysis is clustering, but over the past 20 years there has been intensive work on more sophisticated ways of capturing shape information.

In particular, there has relatively recently been intensive activity in a new area of geometric data analysis known as *topological data analysis* (TDA) (e.g., see [80, 78, 81, 77, 79, 67]). TDA provides qualitative multi-scale shape descriptors for point clouds, notably *persistent homology*; this is a higher-dimensional generalization of hierarchical clustering, encoding the feature scales at which “holes” of various dimensions appear and disappear (we refer the unfamiliar reader to [Section 2](#) for a rapid review). The resulting persistent homology of the point cloud, i.e.,  $PH_k(\tilde{X}_t^n)$ , then captures detailed information on the topological features across scales in the form of a “barcode” or “persistence diagram” (see [Figure 2.1](#)). The set of persistence diagrams can be turned into a separable complete metric space under various metrics, and so forms a Polish space [55, 13].

The ability to model, analyze and predict the evolution over time of the geometric features is of paramount interest in many applications. For example, cell differentiation can be studied by analyzing time series of single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA) data; a core problem here is to quantify changes in gene expression profiles for cells collected during the process of development. Specifically, the data looks like a sample  $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$  where  $X_t \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  for  $N$  in the tens of thousands. Cell type is captured in part by the cluster structure of the point clouds of expression vectors. Changes in the shape of these point clouds reflect differentiation events; for example, emergence of new cell types. More precisely, so-called bifurcation events reflect when an ancestral cell type changes into multiple lineages, and can be detected by change in shape. Examples of analyses data sets of this kind include [70], which profiles several hundred thousand cells from mouse embryonic fibroblasts and provides evidence that shape (as captured by optimal transport) provides insight into developmental trajectories.

In order to perform reliable inference of shape and topological features in applications, there has been substantial interest in integrating classical statistical techniques with topological invariants. For example, early work [55, 13] established that suitable variants of the space of persistence diagrams are Polish spaces and initiated discussion of inference. A particularly influential contribution in this direction was [82], which set up theory for confidence intervals in this space. To avoid some of the issues of dealing with Polish-valued data (see Section 2), there has been much interest in techniques for embedding the barcodes into Banach spaces, notably the *persistence landscapes* of Bubenik [20] and the *persistence images* of Adams et. al. [1]. Although it is then relatively straightforward to develop limit theorems (e.g., LLN, CLT's) on these derived spaces and use these for inference (e.g., see [52, 25, 20, 47]), what the moments actually capture about the shape of the original geometric object can be hard to interpret.

Furthermore, there is still work to be done on the foundations of statistical inference in TDA. For one thing, almost all of the available literature makes the assumption that the  $\mathbb{X}_t$  are identically and independently distributed, and furthermore much of it makes the assumption that the point clouds arise from uniform samples on the domain of definition. In addition, existing work on CLT's does not account for the error term arising from observing data in the form of point clouds; in our notation introduced below,  $(PH_k(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n))_{t=1}^T$  rather than  $(PH_k(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t))_{t=1}^T$ . Indeed, many statistical questions related to convergence rates and non-asymptotic error bounds in more general settings have been unexplored.

Most saliently from our perspective, although there has been some very interesting work by a variety of groups on topological invariants of univariate realizations of (deterministic) time series data (e.g., see [64, 65, 57, 74]), explicit statistical foundations are not provided. In fact, to the best of the authors' knowledge, there are no systematic methods to perform statistical inference for topological features which are temporally dependent or even evolve over time, either abruptly or gradually. However, data sets arising in diverse application areas are nonstationary and have complicated dependence structures.

The aim of this article is to introduce a new framework that addresses these issues in an intrinsic way. We provide statistical foundations for applying multiscale geometric descriptors to capture the geometric features in temporal-spatial data sets. Broadly speaking, our framework integrates statistical methodology and topological data analysis in the context of *functional time series* by viewing the data as arising from a time-varying metric space-valued stochastic process. Functional time series analysis is concerned with the development of inference techniques to optimally extract information from complex data structures that arise as sequentially collected recordings from processes that vary over a continuum. Technological advances have made such complex data sets amenable to analysis, leading to increased interest in this field over the past few decades (e.g., see [18, 44, 43, 22, 37, 88, 66, 84] and the references therein). The perspective is that the fundamental datum is a function (i.e., the observations are points in a function space), enabling the development of statistical tools that account for the underlying structure.

Even though the literature on functional time series mainly focuses on processes with elements in normed vector spaces (or embeds them into one), its conceptual essence encompasses processes with elements in metric spaces, and thus naturally supports the analysis of geometric features. Indeed, by viewing the ensemble of point clouds as arising from an underlying (time-varying) metric space-valued stochastic processes we provide a setting in which stringent assumptions can be relaxed; minimal hypotheses on the sampling regime are required to ensure that the invariants of the point clouds consistently represent the actual geometric features of the underlying latent process.

We also avoid building statistical inference techniques directly on the underlying Polish space by providing an analogue of Gromov's reconstruction theorem [40]. The latter result tells us that metric measure spaces (i.e., metric spaces equipped with a measure on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra) are completely characterized up to isomorphism by the infinite-dimensional distance matrix distribution resulting from random sampling. Geometric data analysis depends on this assumption in the sense that the invariants computed are almost always derived from approximations of the finite-dimensional distance matrix distributions. We generalize Gromov's approach to metric space-valued stochastic processes (Theorem 3.4). For this, we introduce equivalence classes of what we call metric-measure-preserving dynamical systems (Definition 3.2). Such systems can be viewed as generalizations of metric measure spaces. We then expand on this result, and establish conditions under which the geometric features of the stochastic process can also be fully characterized by the process of ball volumes (Theorem 3.6). We derive a functional central limit theorem for sequential empirical versions of the latter within our framework (Theorem 4.5), providing a tool for inference on the true underlying topological dynamics over time.

This article is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we make the context more precise and introduce our framework. After introducing the essentials on persistent homology, we introduce a notion of locally stationary metric space-valued processes, which enables asymptotic theory in which the homological invariants of the sampled point clouds can be analyzed, even if the probabilistic structure of the process changes over time. Within this setting, we then put forward methodology to meaningfully infer on the topological features of the latent process via point clouds. Here, we study what distributional properties of the process are preserved on the space of barcodes and introduce mild assumptions on the sampling regime of the point clouds to ensure inference drawn from the point clouds is representative for the underlying data structure. In [Section 3](#), we extend Gromov’s reconstruction to metric space-valued stochastic processes, and characterize them up to equivalence classes by the infinite-dimensional matrix distributions. This invariant is then related to a process of ball volumes. In [Section 4](#), we apply our machinery and establish a weak invariance principle for the empirical ball volumes of the persistent homology of point clouds on the space of barcodes. This is done for the class of locally stationary metric space-valued stochastic processes. For this, we establish convergence of the sequential empirical versions in the Skorokhod space  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  to a Gaussian process, which reduces to a simple form under stationarity. The latter result –which is of independent interest– is used to introduce a family of maximum- and quadratic range-based self-normalized test statistics to detect gradual and abrupt topological changes. In [Section 5](#), we apply our test statistics to time series data arising from single-cell expression profiles from reprogramming in mouse embryo fibroblasts. Because of space constraints, certain proofs as well as the the simulations in which we investigate the finite sample performance of our tests are deferred to the Online Supplement.

## 2. Framework

To make our framework precise, let  $(M, \partial_M)$  and  $(M', \partial_{M'})$  be compact metric spaces and let  $\mathcal{B}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(M')$  be the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras of  $M$  and  $M'$  respectively, i.e., the  $\sigma$ -algebras generated by their respective metric topologies. The space of continuous functions  $f : (M, \partial_M) \rightarrow (M', \partial_{M'})$  with the topology induced by the uniform metric  $\rho$  will be denoted by  $(C(M, M'), \rho)$ . We remark that  $(C(M, M'), \rho)$  is again a compact metric space. We consider stochastic processes  $(\mathbb{X}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  defined on some common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with values in  $C(M, M')$ , i.e., the mappings

$$\mathbb{X}_t : \Omega \rightarrow C(M, M'), \quad (1)$$

are  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(C)$  measurable, where  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  denotes the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\rho$ . Observe that  $\omega \in \Omega$  yields a continuous function

$$\mathbb{X}_t(\omega) : M \rightarrow M', \quad m \mapsto \mathbb{X}_t(\omega)(m) \in M'$$

and  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T}(M) \subseteq M'$ . As is common in the literature, we slightly abuse notation and drop  $\omega$  from the notation, unless confusion can arise. Note that (1) takes the point of view that the random elements take values in a function space, which is convenient when developing appropriate theoretical foundations in later sections. However, we can relate this abstract representation of  $\mathbb{X}_t$  to an equivalent process in terms of sample paths in  $M'$ . More specifically, we have the evaluation functional

$$e_m : C(M, M') \rightarrow M', \quad \xi \mapsto \xi(m),$$

which is continuous with respect to topology induced by  $\rho$ . Then the process  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(m) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in M)$  defined by

$$\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(m) := e_m \circ \mathbb{X}_t$$

takes values in  $M'$ . In the literature both processes are often denoted by  $\mathbb{X}$ . However, given the context, we will try to avoid confusion and simply notice the equivalence  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t = \mathbb{X}_t(M)$ .

In practice, we do not observe the random functions fully on their domain of definition. Instead, we observe a so-called *point cloud* for each fixed  $t$ , possibly with measurement error. To make this precise, define the multiple evaluation functional

$$e_{m_1, \dots, m_n} : C(M, M') \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n M', \quad \xi \mapsto \{\xi(m_1), \xi(m_2), \dots, \xi(m_n)\}, \quad m_1, \dots, m_n \in M.$$

Then an  $n$ -dimensional point cloud for the function  $\mathbb{X}_t$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n := e_{m_1, \dots, m_n} \circ \mathbb{X}_{t,T} \quad (2)$$

The data thus arises as an ensemble of point clouds  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)_{t=1}^T$  rather than as a sample  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T})_{t=1}^T$ . Note that we remain agnostic about the way  $\{m_i\}$  are sampled; geometric requirements will be described below in Assumption 2.9. Intuitively, it must be clear that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n \approx \mathbb{X}_{t,T}(M) = \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}$$

in an appropriate sense (see (9)). In our framework, the point cloud length  $n$  is a function of the sample size, i.e.,  $n = n(T)$ , which is essential in the analysis; see also Section 2.3.

Roughly speaking, we think of  $M$  as a parameter space and the images in  $M'$  as representing the geometric object of interest. For example,  $M'$  could be an ambient Euclidean space or a compact Riemannian manifold parametrized by a function whose ‘‘slices’’ at time  $t$  represent the geometric objects of interest. In these cases,  $M$  could coincide with  $M'$  or could be the domain of a function parametrizing the points of the underlying geometric objects. We emphasize that our formulation as a metric space-valued process contrasts with existing literature on TDA. In existing methods, one assumes that point clouds arise from sampling according to a pre-specified distribution  $\mathcal{P}$  supported on the latent (and fixed) underlying topological space  $M$ . Apart from notable exceptions, [62, 46], the sampling regime is generally assumed iid and  $\mathcal{P}$  is taken as the uniform distribution on  $M$ . In contrast, in our setup, for each fixed  $t, T$ , a realization of  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T}$  is itself a metric subspace of the space of bounded functions from  $M$  to  $M'$ , and arises according to the (unknown) law of the process on the cartesian product of  $S = C(M, M')$ . The point clouds  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)$  as defined in (2) arise by observing the functions discretely on the domain of definition, possibly subject to measurement error. The above formulation in terms of a function-valued stochastic process has several advantages compared to existing TDA literature as it allows for natural incorporation of (i) nonstationary temporal and spatial dependence (ii) irregular noisy sampling on the domain of definition (iii) analysis of non-asymptotic bounds and convergence rates.

To capture the shape of these latent processes via the corresponding ensemble of point clouds, we use qualitative multi-scale shape descriptors. We will focus here on *persistent homology*. However, our framework applies to a variety of stable shape descriptors.

## 2.1. Persistent homology

A core invariant in topological data analysis is *persistent homology*, which roughly speaking is a method that describes the multi-scale topological features of a point cloud (i.e., a finite metric space).

Computing persistent homology involves the construction of a sequence of simplicial complexes from a finite metric space  $(X, \partial_X)$ . A simplicial complex is a combinatorial space constructed by gluing together standard  $n$ -simplices at their boundaries. Associated to a simplicial complex are topological invariants, most notably *homology*. The homology vector spaces of a simplicial complex  $C$  are invariants  $H_k(C)$  for  $k \geq 0$ . The rank of the  $k$ th homology is a measurement of the number of  $k$ -dimensional holes in  $C$ . For example, for a 1-sphere,  $H_1(\mathbb{S}^1)$  is a rank one vector space. For a torus,  $H_1(\mathbb{T})$  has rank two and  $H_2(\mathbb{T})$  has rank one, corresponding to the two one-dimensional loops and the two-dimensional hole in the middle, respectively. Homology is computationally tractable; computing it is a problem in numerical linear algebra.

For an arbitrary metric space  $(X, \partial_X)$ , the most widely used simplicial complex is the Vietoris-Rips complex  $\text{VR}_\epsilon(X)$ . For a given scale parameter  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\text{VR}_\epsilon(X)$  is defined to have vertices the points of  $X$  and a  $n$ -simplex spanning points  $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  if

$$\partial_X(x_i, x_j) \leq \epsilon \quad 0 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

The formulation of the Vietoris-Rips complex depends on the choice of a feature scale  $\epsilon$ . Computing the homology groups  $H_k(-)$  of this complex, which roughly speaking capture the number of  $k$ -dimensional holes, provides qualitative shape descriptors for the underlying data. However, the correct feature scale  $\epsilon$  is in principle unknowable.




Fig 2.1: A surface evolving in time; time increases along the  $x$ -axis from left to right.




Fig 2.2: Samples from slices at fixed times from the evolving surface as time increases.




Fig 2.3: Persistence diagrams of the samples from the slices. The points away from the line  $x = y$  represent the circles.

The basic idea of persistent homology is then to combine information from all feature scales  $\epsilon$  at once, by using that the Vietoris-Rips complex is *functorial* in the sense that for  $\epsilon < \epsilon'$ , there is an inclusion map of simplicial complexes

$$\text{VR}_\epsilon(X) \rightarrow \text{VR}_{\epsilon'}(X).$$

Thus, letting  $\epsilon$  vary over a range  $a \leq \epsilon \leq b$ , we obtain a *filtered complex*. We will denote the *Vietoris-Rips filtration* by  $\text{Rips}(X) := \text{VR}_{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+}(X)$ . For finite metric spaces, there are only finitely many values of  $\epsilon$  for which the Vietoris-Rips complex changes, and so we only need keep track of complexes before and after these critical points and the maps between them. That is, we have a system

$$\text{VR}_{\epsilon_0}(X) \rightarrow \text{VR}_{\epsilon_1}(X) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{VR}_{\epsilon_n}(X)$$

for  $\epsilon_0 < \epsilon_1 < \dots < \epsilon_n$ . The homology groups are themselves functorial, and so for each  $k$  there is an associated *filtered vector space*

$$H_k(\text{VR}_{\epsilon_0}(X)) \rightarrow H_k(\text{VR}_{\epsilon_1}(X)) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow H_k(\text{VR}_{\epsilon_n}(X)).$$

A key theorem in the subject shows that these filtered vector spaces can be represented as multisets of intervals  $(a, b)$ , referred to as a *barcode* or *persistence diagram* and denoted by  $\text{PH}_k$ . The intervals in the barcode describe the *lifespan* of a generator, i.e., at what value of  $\epsilon$  the generator arises and at what value of  $\epsilon$  it disappears. For example, given samples from circles (as in Figure 2.3), there is a value of  $\epsilon$  that is large enough for the Vietoris-Rips complex to contain a path all the way around the circle and a larger value of  $\epsilon$  at which the circle fills in. These values are the endpoints of the bars in the barcode. The persistence diagram plots these pairs of endpoints as points in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . We will sometimes use  $\text{PH}_k(\cdot)$  as an abbreviation for  $\text{PH}_k(\text{Rips}(\cdot))$ .

Given the ensemble of point clouds  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)_{t=1}^T$  as defined in (2), we can thus analyze the geometric features via the corresponding process  $(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)))_{t=1}^T$ . The latter is a process taking values in the set of barcodes  $\mathcal{B}$ . A key property of  $\mathcal{B}$  is that it forms a metric space under various metrics, notably the *bottleneck distance*,  $d_{\mathcal{B}}$ . The *stability theorem*, due originally to Cohen-Steiner, Edelsbrunner, and Harer [28], is the cornerstone for all work on (statistical) properties of persistent homology. One version of the theorem states that for compact metric spaces  $(X, \partial_X)$  and  $(Y, \partial_Y)$ , there is a strict bound

$$d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(\text{Rips}(X)), PH_k(\text{Rips}(Y))) \leq d_{GH}(X, Y), \quad (3)$$

where  $d_{GH}$  is the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between  $X$  and  $Y$ . There are various equivalent definitions of the Gromov-Hausdorff distance. We make use of its formulation in terms of correspondences. Specifically, given two sets  $X$  and  $Y$  we call a subset  $\mathcal{R} \subset X \times Y$  a correspondence if it satisfies that  $\forall x \in X, \exists y \in Y$  such that  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$  and for all  $\forall y \in Y, \exists x \in X$  such that  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$ . Now let the distortion of the correspondence be given by

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{R}) = \sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in \mathcal{R}} |\partial_X(x, x') - \partial_Y(y, y')|$$

Then we can define the Gromov-Hausdorff distance as

$$d_{GH}(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \text{dist}(\mathcal{R}) \mid \mathcal{R} \text{ correspondence between } X \text{ and } Y \right\} \quad (4)$$

We remark that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between two compact metric spaces is 0 if and only if they are isometric. Because the bottleneck distance is relatively efficient to compute, the space of barcodes provides a tractable metric space for encoding qualitative shape information about the point clouds. Moreover, the completion of the set of barcodes (which we denote  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ ) equipped with the bottleneck metric is a Polish space [13, 55]. Thus the (completion of the) space of barcodes is amenable to probability theory, something that has been exploited in the literature for iid samples.

However, the metric space  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_{\mathcal{B}})$  is hard to work with directly. For example, we do not have concise summaries of the distribution such as moments, and generalized notions such as Fréchet means are not unique and hard to compute.

*Remark 2.1.* The space of barcodes can be equipped with a Wasserstein metric which also makes  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$  a Polish space; our work applies identically for this metric.

## 2.2. Locally stationary metric space-valued processes

To provide statistical theory which allows for changes in the probabilistic structure, we consider an “infill” asymptotic framework in which (in theory) more observations become available at a local level as the observation length  $T$  increases. Nonstationary processes that can be analyzed in such a framework are known as *locally stationary processes*, the theory of which was introduced in [31] for the Euclidean case. This paved the way for the development of various inference methods for such processes including estimation, prediction, and detecting deviations from stationarity (e.g., see [49, 72, 38, 32, 92, 30] and references therein). Theory and corresponding inference techniques for Banach space-valued processes with time-varying characteristics were later put forward in [85, 84], known as *locally stationary functional time series*. To develop analogous theory and inference techniques for our case, we require a notion of *locally stationary metric space-valued processes*, extending the previous to random elements with values in a function space that inherit the metric structure.

To make this precise, we think of having a triangular array of processes  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T} : t = 1, \dots, T : T \in \mathbb{N})$  indexed by  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , where each  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T}$  is a random element with values in a complete, separable metric space  $(S, \partial_S)$ . We remark that the double indexed process can be extended on  $\mathbb{Z}$  by setting  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T} = \mathbb{X}_{1,T}$  if  $t < 0$  and  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T} = \mathbb{X}_{T,T}$  if  $t \geq T$ . Define the  $L^p$ -distance,  $1 \leq p < \infty$  by

$$\partial_{S,p}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \left( \mathbb{E} \partial_S^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) \right)^{1/p} = \left( \int_{\omega \in \Omega} \partial_S^p(\mathbb{X}(\omega), \mathbb{Y}(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right)^{1/p}, \quad \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} : \Omega \rightarrow S,$$

and define the  $L^\infty$ -distance  $\partial_{S,\infty}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \inf_{\mathbb{P}(A)=0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega \setminus A} \partial_S(\mathbb{X}(\omega), \mathbb{Y}(\omega))$ . We say that  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $\mathbb{Y}$  are equivalent if  $X = Y$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely. The corresponding  $L^p$  space is denoted by

$$L_S^p := \left\{ \text{equiv. classes of } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable } \mathbb{X} : \Omega \rightarrow S \text{ with } d_{S,p}(s, \mathbb{X}) < \infty, s \in S \right\}$$

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T} : t \in \mathbb{Z}, T \in \mathbb{N})$  be an  $(S, \partial_S)$ -valued stochastic process.

- (i)  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T} : t \in \mathbb{Z}, T \in \mathbb{N})$  is locally stationary if, for all  $u = t/T \in [0, 1]$ , there exists an  $(S, \partial_S)$ -valued stationary process  $(\mathbb{X}_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$  such that

$$\partial_S(\mathbb{X}_{t,T}, \mathbb{X}_t(\frac{t}{T})) = O_p(T^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_S(\mathbb{X}_t(u), \mathbb{X}_t(v)) = O_p(|u - v|) \quad (5)$$

uniformly in  $t = 1, \dots, T$  and  $u, v \in [0, 1]$ .

- (ii) If  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T} : t \in \mathbb{Z}, T \in \mathbb{N}) \in L_S^p(\mathcal{F})$ , then we call it *locally stationary in  $L_S^p(\mathcal{F})$*  if, for all  $u = t/T \in [0, 1]$ , there exists an  $L_S^p(\mathcal{F})$ -valued stationary process  $(\mathbb{X}_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$  such that for some constant  $K > 0$ ,

$$\partial_{S,p}(\mathbb{X}_{t,T}, \mathbb{X}_t(\frac{t}{T})) \leq KT^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{S,p}(\mathbb{X}_t(u), \mathbb{X}_t(v)) \leq K|u - v| \quad (6)$$

uniformly in  $t = 1, \dots, T$  and  $u, v \in [0, 1]$ .

We emphasize that if the process is in fact stationary then  $\mathbb{X}_{t,T} = \mathbb{X}_t$  for all  $t = 1, \dots, T$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this case, infill asymptotics simply coincides with classical asymptotics. Thus, processes that fit within the infill asymptotic framework encompass the class of stationary processes; this is a useful setting to detect deviations from stationarity.

### 2.3. Inference on the topological features of the latent process via point clouds

We now turn to inference on the topological features of the processes of the form  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T})_{t=1}^T$ , and of which we observe an ensemble of point clouds  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)_{t=1}^T$ . To analyze the geometric features of the latent spaces via this ensemble, we first provide the corresponding process in the space of barcodes. As discussed above, barcode space provides a tractable place in which to capture information about shape and perform inference about shape evolution. Recall from [subsection 2.1](#) that we denote the  $k$ th persistent homology obtained from the Vietoris-Rips filtration of  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n$  by  $PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n))$ . To infer on the topological features we thus have a realization of a  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_B)$ -valued process

$$(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)))_{t=1}^T \quad (7)$$

at our disposal. As the discussion above highlights, it is essential to ensure that the developed statistical inference methods based on the ensemble of point cloud data faithfully capture the true geometric properties. In turn, it is therefore important to establish what distributional properties of the latent process are preserved in the space of barcodes  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_B)$ . The following lemma is a key first ingredient in establishing this.

**Lemma 2.3.** For all  $X, Y \in S = (C(M, M'), \rho)$  with  $n$ -dimensional point clouds  $\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n$ ,

$$\sup_n d_{GH}(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n) \leq \partial_S(X, Y).$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.* Recall the Gromov-Hausdorff distance [\(4\)](#) and consider the correspondence  $\mathcal{R} = \{(x, y) = (X(m), Y(m)) : m \in M\}$ . The triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\mathcal{R}) &= \sup_{(X(m), Y(m)), (X(\tilde{m}), Y(\tilde{m})) \in \mathcal{R}} \left| \partial_{M'}(X(m), X(\tilde{m})) - \partial_{M'}(Y(m), Y(\tilde{m})) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{m \in M} \partial_{M'}(X(m), Y(m)) = 2\partial_S(X, Y). \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $\sup_n \text{dist}(\mathcal{R}_n) \leq \text{dist}(\mathcal{R})$  where  $\mathcal{R}_n = \{(x, y) = (X(m_i), Y(m_i)) : m_i \in M, i \in [n]\}$ , the result follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** For a compact metric space  $(S, \partial_S)$ ,  $PH_k(\text{Rips}(\cdot)) : (S, \partial_S) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_B)$  is a Borel measurable transformation.

*Proof.* From the stability theorem (3) and Lemma 2.3

$$d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(\text{Rips}(X)), PH_k(\text{Rips}(Y))) \leq d_{GH}(X, Y) \leq d_S(X, Y)$$

for all  $X, Y \in S$ . Thus,  $PH_k(\text{Rips}(\cdot)) : (S, \partial_S) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{B}}, \partial_{\mathcal{B}})$  is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1. Hence the preimage of every open set is open and thus this function is a Borel measurable transformation.  $\square$

Using continuity of the evaluation functionals and Proposition 2.4, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $(S, \partial_S) = (C(M, M'), \rho)$ . If  $(\mathbb{X}_t)$  is an  $(S, \partial_S)$ -valued stationary and ergodic process then  $(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n)))$  is a stationary and ergodic  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_{\mathcal{B}})$ -valued process for all  $t, k, n$ .*

A second implication of Proposition 2.4, which we will make use of, is the following.

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}_t$  be a sub-sigma algebra of  $\mathcal{F}$  and let  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$  be a filtration. Suppose  $(\mathbb{X}_t)$  is adapted to  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ . Then  $PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n))$ , is adapted to  $\mathcal{G}_t$  for all  $t, k, n$ .*

Corollary 2.6 ensures for example that if  $(\mathbb{X}_t)$  is a Bernoulli shift of a strongly mixing sequence  $(\zeta_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ , the tail  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G}_{\infty} = \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{G}_{-t}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\zeta_s, s \leq t)$  is the natural filtration of  $(\zeta_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ , is again trivial. In case  $(\zeta_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  is a sequence of independent elements this follows immediately from Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, whereas the strongly mixing case requires some more effort (see [5]). We will make use of Corollary 2.5 and Corollary 2.6 in Section 3 and Section 4. Finally, the following result yields that local stationarity is preserved.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Suppose  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T})$  is locally stationary in the sense of Definition 2.2 with  $(S, \partial_S) = (C(M, M'), \rho)$ . Then (7) is a  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_{\mathcal{B}})$ -valued process that satisfies Definition 2.2. Furthermore, if in addition  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T})$  is locally stationary in  $L_S^p(\mathcal{F})$ , then (7) is locally stationary in  $L_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}^p(\mathcal{F})$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption, there exists an auxiliary process  $(\mathbb{X}_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$  that satisfies (6) in relation to  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T} : t \in \mathbb{Z}, T \in \mathbb{N})$ . Using Corollary 2.5,  $(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n(u)))) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1]$  is then also strictly stationary for all  $u \in [0, 1]$ . The stability theorem (3) and Lemma 2.3 yield

$$d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)), PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n(\frac{t}{T}))) \leq \partial_S(\mathbb{X}_{t,T}, \mathbb{X}_t(\frac{t}{T})).$$

Similarly,  $d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n(u))), PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n(v)))) \leq \partial_S(\mathbb{X}_t(u), \mathbb{X}_t(v))$ . The first part now follows from (5). The second part follows from (6) and the fact that for all  $s \in S$

$$d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n)), PH_k(\text{Rips}(s^n))) \leq \partial_S(\mathbb{X}_{t,T}, s).$$

$\square$

*Remark 2.8.* We remark that Proposition 2.4 and the resulting statements Corollary 2.5, Corollary 2.6 and Proposition 2.7, hold more generally for most of the families of simplicial complexes considered in TDA (e.g., the Čech complex [26]), and for most topological summaries (e.g., persistence diagrams) and any Borel measurable transformation thereof.

**Sampling regime.** To ensure that inference methods based on point cloud functionals consistently capture the topological features of the underlying true topological space, it is essential to formalize a setting that enables the analysis of convergence rates. To address this issue, we relate the sampling regime of the point clouds to the sample size of the ensemble  $T$  i.e.,  $n = n(T)$ . Specifically, the asymptotic analysis requires that  $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . We do this in a way that exploits the basic structure of compact metric spaces, and keeps the assumptions minimal and widely applicable. For a given  $n(T)$ , there exist (random) centers  $C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,n(T)}$  and a radius  $r_t := r_t(n(T))$  such that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n(T)} B(C_{t,i}, r_t)$  provides a minimal  $r_t$ -radius cover of  $\mathbb{X}_t(M)$ , that is,  $n(T)$  is the smallest number of balls with centers  $C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,n(T)}$  and with radius  $r_t$  such that the union covers  $\mathbb{X}_t(M)$ . Note that such a cover exists since  $\mathbb{X}_t(M)$  is the continuous image of a compact metric space (e.g., see [58]). Writing  $\mathbb{C}_t^n = \{C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,n(T)}\}$ , observe that  $\mathbb{C}_t^n$  is a  $r_t$ -net for  $\mathbb{X}_t(M)$  and therefore we have  $d_{GH}(\mathbb{C}_t^n, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n) \leq 2r_t(n(T))$ . We impose conditions such that the point cloud of size  $n(T)$  is ‘close enough’ to the cover at a controlled rate in the following sense.

**Assumption 2.9.** Let  $\mathbb{C}_t^n = \{C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,n(T)}\}$  be centers of the minimal  $r_t(n(T))$ -radius cover of  $\mathbb{X}_t(M)$ . Then we assume that there exists a function  $\alpha_T := \alpha(n(T))$  for which

$$\sup_t d_{GH}(\mathbb{C}_t^n, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n) = o_p(\alpha_T), \quad (8)$$

and that satisfies  $\alpha(n(T)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$ .

The exact rates will be application dependent. Note that the triangle inequality yields

$$d_{GH}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n, \mathbb{X}_t(M)) \leq d_{GH}(\mathbb{C}_t^n, \mathbb{X}_t(M)) + d_{GH}(\mathbb{C}_t^n, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n) = o_p(\alpha_T), \quad (9)$$

and that the stability theorem therefore yields

$$|d_B(PH_k(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^n), PH_k(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^n)) - d_B(PH_k(\mathbb{X}_s(M)), PH_k(\mathbb{X}_t(M)))| = o_p(\alpha_T).$$

**Remark 2.10 (Irregular sampling across space and time).** The minimal cover condition as given in [Assumption 2.9](#) also allows us to handle noisy sampling by considering a corrupted version  $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}}_{t,T}^n$  of the point cloud  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n$ , as well as to consider irregular sampling over time of the point cloud i.e.,  $n = n(t, T)$ . For example, we can formalize this by representing the corrupted version as  $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}}_t = g(t, T, \mathfrak{f}_t, \epsilon_t)$  where  $(\epsilon_t)$  is an iid process independent of  $(\mathfrak{f}_t)$  and assuming that this satisfies  $d_{GH}(\tilde{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}}_{t,T}^n, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{t,T}^n) = o_p(r_t(n(T)))$ . In future work, we will study convergence rates and bounds under such assumptions in more detail.

We remark that this minimal cover setting is a “stochastic version” of a very general notion of bounded dimension and “feature scale”; all of the standard assumptions in the literature (e.g., points sampled from a compact Riemannian manifold [61] with bounded curvature or points sampled from a metric measure space with bounded doubling dimension [71]) allow us to verify [Assumption 2.9](#) for a given sampling measure as long as there is a uniform bound on the relevant parameters in  $t$ . Here, recall that doubling dimension is a combinatorial notion of the dimension of a metric space; the metric condition is precisely that a ball of radius  $r$  can be covered by roughly  $2^d$  balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2}$ .

To be more precise, for a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension  $d$  (without boundary) with injectivity radius  $\text{inj}_M$ , and with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\delta$ , we have that for

$$r_t(n(T)) < \min\left(\text{inj}_M, 2\pi, \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\delta}}\right)$$

(here setting the last term to  $\infty$  if  $\delta < 0$ ),

$$n(T) \leq \text{Vol}(M) \left(\frac{r_t(n(T))}{2}\right)^{-d} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{d-1} \frac{d}{\text{Vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}^n}^{d-1})},$$

where  $B_{\mathbb{R}^n}^{d-1}$  denotes the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [53, Lemma 4.2]. Thus, if we assume uniform bounds on dimension, injectivity radius, and sectional curvature, then we obtain a bound on the covering number. (Note that there are a variety of bounds of this form in the literature.) The latter can then be used to verify that sampling from a specific measure (e.g., the uniform measure) entails that [Assumption 2.9](#) is satisfied (see e.g., [61]).

Similarly, for a metric space  $(X, \partial_X)$  of doubling dimension  $d$ , we have

$$n(T) \leq \left(\frac{c(\text{diam}(X))}{r_t(n(T))}\right)^d,$$

for a constant  $c$ , where  $\text{diam}(X) = \sup_{x,y \in X} \partial_X(x, y)$ . This estimate is derived by observing that a ball  $B_r(x)$  can be covered by  $2^d$  balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2}$ , each of which can be covered by  $2^d$  balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$ , and so forth. Thus, covering the original ball with balls of radius  $\epsilon$  requires  $2^{d \log_2 \frac{r}{\epsilon}}$  balls, from which the result follows. Again, given a uniform bound on the doubling dimension and diameter in  $t$ , we obtain a bound on the covering number allowing for verification of [Assumption 2.9](#) for a given choice of measure.

**Example 2.11.** We can give explicit numbers for the desired sample size for recovering an  $\epsilon$ -net with high probability for the unit circle. Specifically, the main result of [61] tells us that for fixed  $\epsilon$  the number of points required to achieve an  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -net from a uniform sample from the unit circle with probability  $1 - \delta$  is at least

$$\frac{2}{\epsilon^2 \cos^2(\arcsin(\frac{\epsilon}{2}))} \left( \log \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon^2 \cos^2(\arcsin(\frac{\epsilon}{2}))} \right) + \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Setting  $\delta = 0.9$  and  $\epsilon = 0.1$ , this is around 1500. (In practice we know that fewer points are required.) Taking a circle of radius  $r$ , the values 2 in the numerators of the constant term and the first log term would instead be  $2r$ ; the number of points scales as  $r \log r$ .

### 3. Characterizing $(S, \partial_S)$ -valued processes

#### 3.1. Gromov's reconstruction theorem for metric space-valued stochastic processes

In this section, we provide an appropriate complete invariant in the spirit of Gromov [40]. Gromov's "mm-reconstruction theorem" yields that a metric measure space (mms)  $(S, \partial_S, \nu_S)$  is, up to a measure-preserving isomorphism, characterized by the pushforward of  $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$  along  $\phi_+ : S^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{\text{met}}$ , where

$$\phi_+(s_1, s_2, \dots) = (\partial_S(s_i, s_j))_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \quad (10)$$

and where  $\mathbb{M}^{\text{met}}$  denotes the space of positive, symmetric matrices. In other words, a representative mms  $(S, \partial_S, \nu_S)$  of the equivalence class is uniquely determined by the infinite-dimensional random matrix of distances  $\{\partial_S(\zeta_i, \zeta_j)\}_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$  where  $(\zeta_i)$  is an iid sample with common distribution  $\nu$ . This equivalence enables inference on mms via the corresponding random distance matrix distributions on the convex cone of positive, symmetric matrices, which is considerably more convenient.

In the following, we extend this to stationary and ergodic metric space-valued processes. In order to do so, we must make precise what an equivalence class embodies in this case. For this, we introduce a notion of measure-preserving isometry between so-called *metric measure dynamical systems*, which are defined as follows.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(S, \partial_S)$  be a complete, separable metric space and let  $(S, \mathcal{B}(S), \mu_S)$  be a corresponding probability space, where the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is generated by the metric  $\partial_S$ . Further, let  $\theta_S : S \rightarrow S$  be a Borel measurable function. We refer to  $(S, \partial_S, \mu_S, \theta_S)$  as a *metric measure dynamical system*. If  $\theta_S : S \rightarrow S$  is a measure-preserving transformation we call it a *metric measure-preserving dynamical system*.

Note that  $(S, \partial_S, \mu_S, \text{id})$  corresponds to a classical measure metric space, and may be viewed as a special case of Definition 3.1. As a more relevant example, consider the cartesian product  $S^{\mathbb{Z}} = \prod_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} S$ . Then an  $(S, \partial_S)$ -valued stationary and ergodic stochastic process  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{B}(S^{\mathbb{Z}}), \mu_X)$  may be viewed as a metric measure-preserving dynamical system of which the measure-preserving transformation is ergodic under the measure. To see this, note that separability of  $S$  implies that the cylinder  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\otimes_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{B}(S)$  and the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra,  $\mathcal{B}(S^{\mathbb{Z}})$ , on the cartesian product  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  endowed with its product topology coincide [see e.g., 48]. Hence, consider a metric  $\rho_S$  that metrizes the product topology on  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  (see e.g., (11)) and let  $\theta_S : S^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  denote the left shift map, i.e.,

$$\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega) = (\dots, X_{j-1}(\omega), X_j(\omega), X_{j+1}(\omega), \dots).$$

Note we can also write this as

$$\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega) = (\dots, \pi_0(\theta_S^{j-1} \circ X(\omega)), \pi_0(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega)), \pi_0(\theta_S^{j+1} \circ X(\omega)), \dots),$$

where  $\pi_0 : S^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow S$  denotes the projection onto the 0th coordinate. Since  $X$  is assumed stationary and ergodic, it follows from standard arguments (e.g., see [12]) that  $(S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_S, \mu_X, \theta_S)$  is a metric measure-preserving dynamical system with  $\theta_S$  ergodic under  $\mu_X$ .

With Definition 3.1 in place, we define a measure-preserving isometry between two metric measure-preserving dynamical systems as follows.

**Definition 3.2.** Two metric measure-preserving dynamical systems  $(S, \partial_S, \mu_S, \theta_S)$  and  $(R, \partial_R, \mu_R, \theta_R)$  are *measure-preserving isometric* if there are sets  $S' \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ ,  $R' \in \mathcal{B}(R)$  with  $\mu_S(S') = 1$ ,  $\theta_S(S') \subseteq S'$  and  $\mu_R(R') = 1$ ,  $\theta_R(R') \subseteq R'$ , respectively, such that there exists an invertible measure-preserving map  $\mathcal{T} : S' \rightarrow R'$  satisfying

- (i)  $\mathcal{T}(\theta_S(s)) = \theta_R(\mathcal{T}(s))$ ,  $s \in S'$ .
- (ii)  $\partial_R(\mathcal{T}(s), \mathcal{T}(s')) = \partial_S(s, s')$ ,  $\forall s, s' \in S'$ .

**Definition 3.3.** Two metric measure-preserving dynamical systems belong to the same equivalence class  $\mathfrak{X}$  if they are measure-preserving isometric (Definition 3.2).

In the following, let  $\phi : S^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{\text{met}}$  be the extension of (10) to include negative indices. Consider again the previously introduced stationary process  $X$  and note that

$$\phi(\theta_S^k \circ X) = (\partial_S(X_{k+i}, X_{k+j}) : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}) \stackrel{d}{=} \phi(\theta_S^0 \circ X).$$

The following statement may be viewed as a generalization of Gromov's reconstruction theorem to ergodic metric-measure-preserving dynamical systems.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let  $(S, \partial_S)$  be a separable, complete metric space and let  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{B}(S^{\mathbb{Z}}), \mu_X)$  be an  $S$ -valued stationary ergodic stochastic process. Then the distributional properties of  $X$  are, up to measure-preserving isometry in the sense of Definition 3.2, completely captured by the pushforward measure  $\iota_X = \phi_* \mu_X$  of  $X$  along a given realization  $(X_t(\omega) : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ .

*Proof.* Consider another separable complete metric space  $(R, \partial_R)$ , and let

$$Y : (\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}') \rightarrow (R^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{B}(R^{\mathbb{Z}}), \mu_Y)$$

be stationary and ergodic with  $\theta_R : R^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow R^{\mathbb{Z}}$  denoting the left shift map, and  $\iota_Y = \phi_{R*} \mu_Y$ , where  $\phi_R : R^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{\text{met}}$ . One direction is obvious. If  $\mathcal{X} := (S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_S, \mu_X, \theta_S)$  and  $\mathcal{Y} := (R^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_R, \mu_Y, \theta_R)$  belong to the same equivalence class  $\mathfrak{X}$ , then  $\iota_X = \iota_Y$  and the random distance distributions coincide.

For the other direction, we show that if  $\iota_X = \iota_Y$  then  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathfrak{X}$ . We proceed by establishing the existence of an isometry between the supports of  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$  using the ergodic theorem, and then show this map is measure-preserving. We start by introducing appropriate metrics  $\rho_S$  and  $\rho_R$  that metrize the product topology. Namely, consider the metrics  $\rho_V : V^{\mathbb{Z}} \times V^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , for  $V \in \{S, R\}$ , defined by

$$\rho_V(v, v') = \sup_i \frac{\tilde{\partial}_V(v_i, v'_i)}{|i| + 1} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{\partial}_V(v_i, v'_i) = \min(\partial_V(v_i, v'_i), 1). \quad (12)$$

It can be verified that  $\rho_V$  metrizes the product topology on  $V^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , and that  $(S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_S)$  and  $(R^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_R)$  are both separable complete metric spaces. To establish an isomorphism  $\mathcal{T} : \text{supp}(\mu_X) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$ , observe that by assumption

$$\mu_X(\phi_X^{-1}(C)) = \iota_X(C) = \iota_Y(C) = \mu_Y(\phi_Y^{-1}(C)) \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Further,  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$  are ergodic measures for the left shift map  $\theta_S$  and  $\theta_R$ , respectively. Thus, for all cylinder sets  $A \in S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  and  $B \in R^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , for  $\mu_X$ -almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\mu_Y$ -almost all  $\omega' \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\mu_X(A) = \lim_T \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \mathbf{1}(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega) \in A) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_Y(B) = \lim_T \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \mathbf{1}(\theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega') \in B). \quad (13)$$

Specifically, this holds for the sets  $A = \phi_X^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{B}(S^{\mathbb{Z}})$  and  $B = \phi_Y^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{B}(R^{\mathbb{Z}})$ . Hence, we can fix an  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\omega' \in \Omega'$  such that  $X(\omega) \in \text{supp}(\mu_X)$  and  $Y(\omega') \in \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$  for which (13) holds and for which

$$\phi(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega)) = \phi(\theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega')).$$

Then the distances in (12) also satisfy

$$\tilde{\partial}_S(\pi_0(\theta_S^i \circ X(\omega)), \pi_0(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega))) = \tilde{\partial}_R(\pi_0(\theta_R^i \circ Y(\omega')), \pi_0(\theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega')))$$

and consequently

$$\rho_S(\theta_S^i \circ X(\omega), \theta_S^j \circ X(\omega)) = \rho_R(\theta_R^i \circ Y(\omega'), \theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega')). \quad (14)$$

The latter implies that the sequences  $(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega) : j \in \mathbb{Z})$  and  $(\theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega') : j \in \mathbb{Z})$  (viewed as metric spaces) are isometric since their distance matrices coincide. Let  $\mathcal{T} : \text{supp}(\mu_X) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$  be the continuous map such that  $\mathcal{T}(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega)) = \theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega')$ . Then

$$\rho_S(\theta_S^i \circ X(\omega), \theta_S^j \circ X(\omega)) = \rho_R(\mathcal{T}(\theta_S^i \circ X(\omega)), \mathcal{T}(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega))) = \rho_R(\theta_R^i \circ Y(\omega'), \theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega'))$$

To establish that this extends uniquely to an isometry  $\mathcal{T} : \text{supp}(\mu_X) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$  it suffices to prove the following result.

**Lemma 3.5.** *The sequence  $(\theta_S^j \circ X(\omega) : j \in \mathbb{Z})$  is  $\mu_X$ -almost everywhere dense on  $\text{supp}(\mu_X)$ .*

Continuity of  $\mathcal{T}$  and Lemma 3.5 then yield that there is a unique extension to an isometry  $\mathcal{T} : \text{supp}(\mu_X) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$ . To show it is measure-preserving, the isometry and the properties of the left shift maps yield for some  $B \in \text{supp}(\mu_Y)$  such that  $\mathcal{T}(A) = B$  with  $A \in \text{supp}(\mu_X)$

$$\mu_X(A) = \mu_X(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(B)) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \mathbf{1}(\theta^j \circ X(\omega) \in \mathcal{T}^{-1}(B)) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \mathbf{1}(\theta_R^j \circ Y(\omega') \in B) = \mu_Y(B).$$

The result now follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Since  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  is Polish, every closed subset, and in particular the set  $\text{supp}(\mu_X)$ , is Polish. Since a separable metrizable space is second countable the latter has a countable topological base  $\{U_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  which satisfies  $\mu_X(U_i) > 0$ . To show therefore that  $\text{supp}(\mu_X) \subseteq \bar{A}$ , for some subspace  $A$  of  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , we recall that  $x \in \bar{A}$  if and only if every basis element  $U_i$  containing  $x$  intersects with  $A$ . Hence, it suffices to prove that  $U_i \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for all  $U_i$ . Or, in other words, the set should have non-empty intersection with all base elements. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a  $U_i$  with  $U_i \cap (\theta^j \circ X(\omega) : j \in \mathbb{Z}) = \emptyset$ . Then  $X(\omega) \notin \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^{-k}(U_i)$  i.e.,  $X(\omega) \in \cup_{i=0}^{\infty} V_i$ , where

$$V_i := \text{supp}(\mu_X) \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \theta^{-j}(U_i).$$

Thus it suffices to show that the set on which the orbit is not dense,  $\cup_{i=0}^{\infty} V_i$ , has measure 0. To do so, observe that  $B_i = \cup_{j=0}^{\infty} \theta^{-j}(U_i)$  is Borel measurable and satisfies  $\theta^{-1}(B_i) \subseteq B_i$  and that  $\mu_X(\theta^{-1}B_i) = \mu_X(B_i)$ , since  $\theta$  is measure-preserving. Thus,  $B_i$  is an almost invariant borel-measurable set, i.e.,  $\mu_X(\theta^{-1}B_i \Delta B_i) = 0$ . Since  $\theta$  is also ergodic the latter implies  $\mu_X(B_i) \in \{0, 1\}$ . However  $\theta^{-1}(U_i) \subseteq B_i$  and thus we must have  $\mu(B_i) = 1$  because  $\mu(U_i) > 0$ . But then  $\mu_X(V_i) = 0$  and thus  $\mu_X(\cup_{i=0}^{\infty} V_i) \leq \sum_i \mu_X(V_i) = 0$ . Consequently, the set on which the orbit is not dense does not belong to  $\text{supp}(\mu_X)$ , and thus it must be  $\mu_X$ -almost everywhere dense on  $\text{supp}(\mu_X)$ .  $\square$

### 3.2. Characterizing measures via ball volumes

It follows naturally from Theorem 3.4 that the infinite-dimensional distance matrix distribution

$$(\partial_S(X_t, X_s) : t, s \in \mathbb{Z})$$

is a complete invariant of a stationary ergodic Polish-valued stochastic process  $X = (X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ . In other words, it is a complete invariant of a metric measure-preserving dynamical system  $(S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho_S, \mu_X, \theta)$  where the measure-preserving map  $\theta$  is ergodic under  $\mu_X$ .

We now build on this result, and relate this characterization to a family of processes –the process of ball volumes of the finite-dimensional distributions (fidis) of  $X$ – which form the blueprint for the test statistics introduced next. Under the conditions of Theorem 3.4, the ball volumes are determined by the infinite-dimensional matrix distributions  $\phi(X)$ . However, we can also provide conditions such that the ball volumes

characterize  $\phi(X)$ , and hence that the measure  $\mu_X$  (via Kolmogorov's extension theorem) is completely characterized by this family of ball volume processes.

To be precise, define the ball volume on the  $k$ -dimensional product metric space  $S^k$  by

$$B(s, r) = \{s' : \rho_k(s, s') \leq r\}$$

where  $\rho_k(s, s') = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \bar{d}_S(s_j, s'_j)$ , which metrizes the product topology for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Denote the finite-dimensional distribution (fidi) of the process  $X$  on the time index set  $J$  by  $\mu_J^X$ , and observe that we can associate the metric measure space  $(S^{|J|}, \rho_{|J|}, \mu_J^X)$  to this fidi.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $(X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  be a Polish-valued stochastic process with law  $\mu_X$  a locally finite Borel regular doubling measure. Let*

$$\psi((\pi_J \circ X), r) = \mu_J^X(B(\pi_J \circ X, r)) \quad \pi_J \circ X \sim \mu_J^X$$

*then the process  $(\psi((\pi_J \circ X), r) : r \geq 0)$  characterizes the  $|J|$ -dimensional dynamics on the time set  $J$ , i.e., the equivalence class of metric measure spaces  $(S^{|J|}, \rho_{|J|}, \mu_J^X)$ .*

*Proof.* If two ball volume processes have the same distribution, then it is straightforward to see that the measures coincide on metric balls. The fact that the measures are then determined by their values on metric balls is a consequence of the additional conditions on the measure stated in the theorem. See [76, §2-§3] for careful discussion of the required Vitali covering property and [14, §2] for an outline of the argument.  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* Note that [Theorem 3.6](#) does not require  $X$  to be stationary and ergodic. However, if  $X$  is in fact stationary and ergodic, then the additional requirement on the law  $\mu_X$  compared to [Theorem 3.4](#) is relatively mild; in essentially all cases where we can verify that [Assumption 2.9](#) is satisfied, the conclusion of [Theorem 3.6](#) holds as well.

A consequence of the preceding theorem is that one can, without loss of generality, characterize the geometry of such a Polish-valued process  $X$  via the ball volume processes of the fidis. This is convenient for hypothesis testing. To see this, note for example that

$$\psi((\pi_J \circ X), r) = \mathbb{E}_{(X') \sim \mu_J} \left[ \prod_{j \in J} 1_{\bar{d}_S(X_j, X'_j) \leq r} \right]. \quad (15)$$

Thus, natural estimators take the form of  $U$ -processes. There is a rich literature on  $U$ -statistics, although primarily focused on strong mixing and stationary data (e.g., see [17, 45, 9, 19]). In order to develop inference methods within the more involved framework put forward in [Section 2](#), we require a weak invariance principle for nonstationary  $U$ -processes ([Theorem 4.5](#)), indexed by both time and radii, under less stringent assumptions. We introduce this invariance principle within the context of detecting topological change in the below, but emphasize that the result can be used for other hypotheses, and is therefore of independent interest.

#### 4. Application: Detecting changes in the geometric features

The framework laid out in the previous two sections provides the necessary building blocks to develop statistical tools to infer on the geometric features of metric space-valued processes. We will illustrate this by proposing a test to detect nonstationary behavior in the geometric features of a metric space-valued process  $(X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ . Stationarity testing in (functional) time series data has been an active area of research for decades, mainly focusing on detecting nonstationary behavior in the first and second order structure [see e.g., 2, 3, 10, 30, 4, 21, and references therein]. Here, we are interested in detecting changes in the shape and geometric features as captured by topological invariants to, for example, shed light on cell differentiation during development. Proofs are deferred to the online supplement.

Consider a process  $\mathbb{X} := (X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  that adheres to [Definition 2.2](#), and denote its law on the time index set  $J$  again by  $\mu_J^X$ , which we assume satisfies the conditions of [Theorem 3.6](#). Recall that we may view  $\pi_J \circ \mathbb{X}$  as belonging to an equivalence class of metric measure spaces  $(S^{|J|}, \rho_{|J|}, \mu_J^X)$ . However, if the dynamics are time-dependent we will have  $\mu_J^X \neq \mu_{J+h}^X$  for some  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ . To reduce unnecessary clutter, we focus on the marginal

distribution, i.e., we focus on  $\nu_t := \mu_{\{t\}}^{\mathbb{X}} = \mathbb{P} \circ (\mathbb{X}_t)^{-1}$ . We use the characterization of the measures via ball volumes as given in [Theorem 3.6](#). More specifically, the process

$$\left( \varphi_t(r) := \nu_t(B(\mathbb{X}_t, r)) : r \geq 0 \right) \quad \mathbb{X}_t \sim \nu_t \quad (16)$$

characterizes the measure  $\nu_t$  up to isometry. In order to test the hypothesis that the marginal distribution is constant over time against the alternative of the distribution being time-dependent, we propose to test the following pair of hypotheses

$$H_0 : \mathbb{E}\varphi_t(r) = \mathbb{E}\varphi(r) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in [0, \mathcal{R}] \quad \text{versus} \quad H_A : \mathbb{E}\varphi_t(r) \neq \mathbb{E}\varphi(r) \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]. \quad (17)$$

As pointed out in [subsection 2.3](#), we only observe  $\mathbb{X}$  in the form of point clouds. However, to compare metric spaces with possibly different cardinality we cannot directly work with the underlying metrics, but must use a distance that enables such comparisons such as the Gromov-Hausdorff distance  $d_{GH}$  or the Gromov-Wasserstein distance. Furthermore, it is vital that a statistic based on the ensemble of point clouds correctly captures the topological features for which we must be able to control the corresponding error. As established in [Section 2](#), the space of barcodes  $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}, d_{\mathcal{B}})$  associated to the persistent homology of the point clouds provides a convenient metric space of shape descriptors.

*Remark 4.1.* [Corollary 2.5](#) yields that the distribution of  $PH_k(\text{Rips}(\mathbb{X}_t(M)))$ , denoted by  $\tilde{\nu}_t$ , is invariant under time translations if  $\nu_t = \nu$ . However, in order to ensure that we can equivalently formulate a test for time-invariance of the underlying measures  $\nu_t$  using the ball volume processes of the barcode-valued process, we need to show that measures on a suitable space of barcodes are characterized by their values on metric balls. Notwithstanding, this property holds; we refer to our forthcoming paper [\[16\]](#) for technical details.

[Remark 4.1](#) implies that we can formulate [\(17\)](#) in terms of the empirical ball volumes of the barcode process, that is, we may consider the pair of hypotheses in [\(17\)](#) but with  $\varphi_t(r)$  replaced by

$$\tilde{\varphi}_t(r) := \tilde{\nu}_t(B(PH_k(\text{Rips}(\mathbb{X}_t(M))), r)).$$

#### 4.1. Methodology: a weak invariance principle in $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$

Suppose we observe an ensemble of point clouds  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)})_{t=1}^T$ . We can compute the corresponding persistent homology of the elements, yielding a sample taking values in the space barcodes  $(PH_k(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}))_{t=1}^T$ . To construct a test for the hypotheses in [\(17\)](#), define the partial sum process

$$\mathcal{S}_T(u, r) = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{s,t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} h(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^{n(T)}, r) \quad r \in [0, \mathcal{R}], u \in [0, 1]. \quad (18)$$

where, for any compact metric space  $(R, \partial_R)$ , the kernel  $h : R \times R \times [0, \mathcal{R}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$h(x, x', r) = 1 \left\{ d_{\mathcal{B}}(PH_k(x), PH_k(x')) \leq r \right\}, \quad x, x' \in R.$$

Define

$$\sqrt{T}U_T(u, r) = \sqrt{T}(\mathcal{S}_T(u, r) - u^2\mathcal{S}_T(1, r)), \quad (19)$$

and observe that under the null hypothesis  $\mathbb{E}U_T(u, r) = 0$ . A test can therefore be based on a suitably normalized version of

$$\sup_{r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} \sqrt{T} \left| U_T(u, r) \right| \quad (20)$$

or of

$$T \int_0^{\mathcal{R}} \int_0^1 (U_T(u, r))^2 du dr. \quad (21)$$

Under regularity conditions given below, [\(19\)](#) converges weakly in skorokhod space  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  to a Gaussian process, which has a succinct form under the null.

In order to analyze the large sample behavior of these statistics, assumptions on the dependence structure for the original and auxiliary process are required. First, we assume that the random functions admit representations

$$\mathbb{X}_t := \mathbb{X}_{t,T} = g(t, T, \mathfrak{f}_t), \quad \mathbb{X}_t(u) := g(u, \mathfrak{f}_t), \quad (22)$$

where  $\mathfrak{f}_t = (\zeta_t, \zeta_{t-1}, \dots)$  for an iid sequence  $\{\zeta_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  of random elements taking values in some measurable space  $\mathfrak{G}$ , and where  $g : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{G}^\infty \rightarrow S$  is a measurable function. We let  $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\zeta_s, s \leq t)$  denote the natural filtration of  $(\zeta_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{t,m} = \sigma(\zeta_t, \dots, \zeta_{t-m+1}, \zeta'_{t-m}, \zeta'_{t-m-1}, \dots)$ , where  $\zeta'_j$  is an independent copy of  $\zeta_j$ . We define the following notion of conditional expectation

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}|\mathcal{G}] = \operatorname{arg\,inf}_{Z: \Omega \rightarrow S} \mathbb{E} \partial_S^2(\mathbb{X}, Z),$$

Note that a version exists since  $S$  is assumed to be compact. If  $S = \mathbb{R}$ , then the above definition coincides with the classical notion for separable Banach spaces. Furthermore, we use a subscript  $m \geq 1$  to indicate  $m$ -dependent versions of the metric space-valued random variables, e.g.,  $\mathbb{X}_{m,t} := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}_t|\mathcal{G}_{t,m}]$  so that  $\mathbb{X}_{m,t} \in \sigma(\zeta_t, \dots, \zeta_{t-m+1})$ . By [Corollary 2.6](#),  $PH_k(\mathbb{X}_{m,t}(M)) \in \sigma(\zeta_t, \dots, \zeta_{t-m+1})$ . For an integrable real-valued random variable  $Z$ , define the projection operator  $P_j(Z) = \mathbb{E}[Z|\mathcal{G}_j] - \mathbb{E}[Z|\mathcal{G}_{j-1}]$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  and let  $\mathfrak{h}$  indicate the demeaned kernel, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{h}(\cdot, \cdot, r) = h(\cdot, \cdot, r) - \mathbb{E}h(\cdot, \cdot, r). \quad (23)$$

For an  $(R, \partial_R)$ -valued process  $W = (W_t : t \in [T], T \in \mathbb{N})$  we introduce the following dependence measure

$$v_{t,s}^W(j) = \sup_m \left\| P_{t-j} \left( \mathfrak{h}(W_{m,t}, W_{m,s}, r) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}, \quad (24)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R},p} = (\mathbb{E}\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}}^p)^{1/p}$  and

$$\delta_m^W = \sup_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t,s \in [T]} \left\| \mathfrak{h}(W_t, W_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(W_{m,t}, W_{m,s}, r) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}. \quad (25)$$

We make use of the following proposition, which is an extension of proposition 4 of [\[45\]](#), and which relates [\(24\)](#) to [\(25\)](#).

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $(W_t)$  be adapted to the filtration  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ . Then, [\(24\)](#) and [\(25\)](#) satisfy*

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(W_t, W_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta_j^W \quad (26)$$

and, for any  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \min(v_{t,t-k}^W(j), \epsilon) \leq 4 \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \min(\sup_{m \geq j} \delta_m^W, \epsilon). \quad (27)$$

[Assumption 4.3](#) below gives the required conditions on the dependence structure to derive a weak invariance principle for [\(19\)](#) when viewed as a process in  $u$  only, i.e., for a fixed collection of radii. This is then strengthened underneath [Theorem 4.4](#) to an invariance principle with weak convergence in  $D([0, \mathcal{R}] \times [0, 1])$ .

**Assumption 4.3.** *The following conditions hold:*

- (i) For some  $\kappa > 1$   $\sup_{t \neq s, r \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(r \leq \partial_{\mathcal{B}}(W_s, W_t) \leq r + \epsilon) = O(\log^{-2\kappa}(\epsilon^{-1})) \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ ;
- (ii)  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_{m \geq j} \delta_m^W < \infty$ .

It follows from [Proposition 4.2](#) that the condition [Assumption 4.3](#)(ii) implies

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min(v_{t,t-k}^W(j), \epsilon) = 0.$$

To elaborate on these conditions, note that [\(18\)](#) can be viewed as a  $U$ -statistic applied to a nonstationary process. The proof relies on a type of Hoeffding decomposition, which essentially decomposes the statistic (after scaling) into a linear part that defines the distributional properties and an error component that should

converge to zero in probability at an appropriate rate. The latter component consists of several (atypical) approximation errors, among which the error from the data arising in the form of point clouds and a nonstationary error (see the proof of [Theorem B.1](#)). However, the assumptions introduced here are relatively mild compared to existing literature in the stationary case (e.g., see [\[17, 45, 35\]](#)). We refer to [\[45\]](#) for a comparison of dependence conditions for stationary  $U$ -statistics. To the best of our knowledge, no relevant results exist in the nonstationary setting.

We now obtain a functional CLT for equation [\(18\)](#) as a process in  $u \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $(\mathbb{X}_{t,T})$  be locally stationary in the sense of [Definition 2.2\(i\)](#) with representations [\(22\)](#). Let  $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , and suppose that [Assumption 2.9](#) and the conditions of [Theorem 3.6](#) hold. Then if [Assumption 4.3](#) holds for  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t)$  and for  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T}))$ , the partial sum process given by [\(18\)](#) satisfies for any fixed  $r_1, \dots, r_d \in [0, \mathcal{R}]$ ,*

$$\left\{ T^{1/2} \left( S_T(u, r_i) - \mathbb{E} S_T(u, r_i) \right) : i \in [d] \right\}_{u \in [0,1]} \rightsquigarrow \left\{ \mathbb{G}(u, u, r_i) : i \in [d] \right\}_{u \in [0,1]} \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

in  $D[0, 1]$  with respect to the Skorokhod topology, where  $\{\mathbb{G}(u, v, r_i) : i \in [d]\}_{v \leq u \in [0,1]}$  is a zero-mean Gaussian process given by

$$\mathbb{G}(u, v, r_i) := \int_0^u \sigma(\eta, v, r_i) d\mathbb{B}(\eta), \quad (28)$$

where  $\mathbb{B}$  is a standard Brownian motion and

$$\sigma^2(\eta, v, r) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Cov} \left( \int_0^v \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_0(w)} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_0(\eta), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_0(w), r)] dw, \int_0^v \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_0(w)} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_k(\eta), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_0(w), r)] dw \right)$$

with  $(\mathbb{X}'_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$  an independent copy of  $(\mathbb{X}_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$ , and of which the covariance structure is given by

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbb{G}(u_1, v_1, r_1), \mathbb{G}(u_2, v_2, r_2)) = \int_0^{\min(u_1, u_2)} \sigma(\eta, v_1, r_1) \sigma(\eta, v_2, r_2) d\eta.$$

To establish weak convergence of the two-parameter process in  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$ , stronger assumptions are required. Nonetheless, compared to existing results for  $U$ -processes the additional assumptions we impose are mild (c.f., [\[35, 17\]](#)).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Assume the conditions of [Theorem 4.4](#) hold true. In addition assume that*

- (i)  $\exists$  a sequence  $(\theta_{t,j,j-k}^{(i)})$  s.t.  $\nu_{t,t-k}^{(i)}(j) \leq \theta_{t,j,j-k}^{(i)}$  and  $\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \sup_t \theta_{t,j,j-k}^{(i)} < \infty$ .
- (ii) There exists a constant  $C$  such that for all  $s, t, a < b$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(a \leq \partial(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s) \leq b) \leq C|b - a|. \quad (29)$$

- (iii) There exists a constant  $C'$  such that for all  $t$

$$\sup_v \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{a < b} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\partial(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(v), x) \leq b) - \mathbb{P}(\partial(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(v), x) \leq a)}{b - a} \leq C'. \quad (30)$$

Then

$$\left\{ T^{1/2} \left( S_T(u, r) - \mathbb{E} S_T(u, r) \right) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \xrightarrow{D} \left\{ \mathbb{G}(u, u, r) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

in  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  with respect to the Skorokhod topology, where  $\{\mathbb{G}(u, v, r)\}_{u, v \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]}$  is the zero-mean Gaussian process defined in [\(28\)](#).

To ease notation below, we simply write  $\mathbb{G}(u, r) := \mathbb{G}(u, u, r)$ . Under the conditions of [Theorem 4.5](#), the continuous mapping theorem yields for the process defined in [\(19\)](#)

$$\left\{ T^{1/2} \left( U_T(u, r) - \mathbb{E} U_T(u, r) \right) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]}$$

Under the null hypothesis of stationarity, this reduces to

$$\left\{ T^{1/2} U_T(u, r) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \underset{T \rightarrow \infty}{\rightsquigarrow} \left\{ u \sigma(r) (\mathbb{B}(u) - u \mathbb{B}(1)) \right\}_{u \in [0,1], r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]}.$$

Given a consistent estimator  $\hat{\sigma}_T(r)$  of  $\sigma(r)$

$$\sup_r \sup_u \frac{\sqrt{T} |S_T(u, r) - u^2 S_T(1, r)|}{\hat{\sigma}_T(r)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_u u |\mathbb{B}(u) - u \mathbb{B}(1)|, \quad (31)$$

and

$$T \int_0^{\mathcal{R}} \int_0^1 \frac{(S_T(u, r) - u^2 S_T(1, r))^2}{\hat{\sigma}_T^2(r)} du dr \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R} \int_0^1 u^2 (\mathbb{B}(u) - u \mathbb{B}(1))^2 du. \quad (32)$$

Thus, a natural decision rule is to reject the null hypothesis in (17) based on (20) (resp. (21)) whenever the left-hand side of (31) (resp. (32)) is larger than the  $(1 - \alpha)$ th quantile of the distribution of the random variable on the right-hand side. However, even under the null hypothesis the covariance structure relies on the long-run covariance of the process, transformed by the kernel. Despite the vast literature on the theory of  $U$ -statistics, the literature on covariance estimation for  $U$ -statistics [34, 90] appears less well-developed. Nonetheless, it is well-known in more classical settings that estimation of the long-run covariance is not an easy task because it requires selecting a bandwidth parameter. The size and power of the test can be heavily distorted if the choice of the parameter does not incorporate some essential information on the dependence structure [87, 36]. To avoid this issue altogether, we instead introduce a self-normalization approach.

*Remark 4.6 (Correlation dimension).* It is worth mentioning that Theorem 4.5 allows for inference on the correlation dimension, which can be expressed as

$$D = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log(\hat{\varphi}_t(r))}{\log(r)}.$$

Correlation dimension is a type of fractal dimension [39], which describes the complexity of a dynamical system in terms of the ratio of change of detail to the change in scale.

#### 4.2. Self-normalized tests

We consider using a variance estimator that is based on the range. Range-based statistics go back to [54]. Recently, a self-normalized range-based approach was put forward in [69] in the context of testing for breaks in the mean of a stationary time series. A method to handle structural break alternatives based on the variance of partial sums was considered in [86]. In our setting, additional difficulties arise. For one thing, we are interested in testing for presence of *arbitrary* nonstationary behavior in the distribution. Variance estimators necessary to construct such tests are sensitive to low variance in the tails, which increases the type I error. Additionally, adaptations of existing methods are not robust against outliers and even in simpler settings require a very large sample size to get close to the limiting quantiles. The finite sample performance is particularly relevant in our context. First, working with barcodes of point clouds is computationally demanding; existing algorithms (see Remark 4.10) are infeasible for conducting simulation studies for large  $n$ . Second, the applications we are interested in typically are in the regime of  $T < 100$  and  $n < 10K$ .

Thus, we require an approach that is robust against various alternatives and outliers, and has adequate size and power when applied to small finite samples. Dealing with outliers is a delicate matter, as such irregularities can indicate nonstationary behavior. We propose two families of range-based self-normalized versions, one for (20) and one for (21), which can naturally adapt to deal with this matter. To make this precise, define

$$V_T(r) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} (U(k/T, r) - \mathbb{E}[U_T(k/T, r)]) - \min_{1 \leq k \leq T} (U(k/T, r) - \mathbb{E}[U_T(k/T, r)]). \quad (33)$$

We propose the following self-normalized test for (20) using (33)

$$\mathbb{D}_T^{\max} := \max_r w(r) \max_k \frac{|U(k/T, r)|}{V_T(r)}, \quad (34)$$

where  $w(r) \geq 0$  is a weight function. Note that an introduction of a weight function is quite common in the literature to control for outlier patterns in ecdf-based tests. In Section 4.2.1, we elaborate on this and introduce a data-adaptive function that changes the distribution of weights to or from the tails based on the properties of the increments of the time-dependent empirical cdf's.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.5*

$$\max_{r,k} \frac{w(r)|U_T(k/T, r) - \mathbb{E}(U_T(k/T, r))|}{V_T(r)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_r \frac{w(r) \sup_u |\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r)|}{\sup_u (\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r)) - \inf_u (\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r))}.$$

Furthermore assume that  $\max_r w(r) = 1$ . Then under  $H_0$ , (34) satisfies

$$\mathbb{D}_T^{max} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_u \frac{|u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1)|}{\sup_u (u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1)) - \inf_u (u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1))} =: \mathbb{D}^{max}. \quad (35)$$

To consider quadratic tests define

$$V_T^L(r_i) = \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} (U(k/T, r_i) - \mathbb{E}[U_T(u, r_i)])^2 - \min_{1 \leq k \leq T} (U(k/T, r_i) - \mathbb{E}[U_T(u, r_i)])^2 \right), \quad (36)$$

where  $r_i \in (0, \mathcal{R})$ . Henceforth, we take  $i = 1, \dots, T$ ,  $r_i = i\mathcal{R}/T$ . A self-normalized versions of (32) based on (36) is given in the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.8.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.5,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathcal{R}}{T^2} \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T w(r_i) \frac{(U(k/T, r_i) - \mathbb{E}U(k/T, r_i))^2}{V_T^L(r_i)} \\ & \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\mathcal{R}} \int_0^1 \frac{w(r)(\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r))^2}{\sup_u (\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r))^2 - \inf_u (\mathbb{G}(u, r) - u^2 \mathbb{G}(1, r))^2} du dr. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore assume that  $\sum w(r) = 1$ , we obtain under  $H_0$

$$\mathbb{D}_T^L := \frac{\mathcal{R}}{T^2} \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T w(r_i) \frac{(U(k/T, r_i))^2}{V_{T, H_0}^L(r)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^1 (u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1))^2 du}{\sup_u (u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1))^2 - \inf_u (u\mathbb{B}(u) - u^2\mathbb{B}(1))^2} =: \mathbb{D}^L. \quad (37)$$

where  $V_{T, H_0}^L(\cdot)$  is the estimator (36) with the kernel  $\mathfrak{h}$  in (23) replaced with  $h$ .

The quantiles of the limiting distributions of  $\mathbb{D}^{max}$  ((37)) and  $\mathbb{D}^L$  ((34)) can be easily simulated by the user. We propose several choices for the weights, which are explained below and compared in a simulation study.

#### 4.2.1. Data-driven weight function

Outliers are common in genomic data, and persistent homology barcodes are sensitive to outliers (e.g., see [13, §4]). A suitable weight function can mitigate their effect. However, a weight function that suppresses outliers a priori can increase the type II error since irregularities are also an indication of nonstationary behavior. Therefore, we need an appropriate function that suppresses outlier patterns under  $H_0$  but simultaneously controls the type II error. Note that this function must be time-independent.

To fix ideas, suppose  $S: [0, \mathcal{R}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a cdf that captures the distribution pattern. Natural choices for the weights are functionals of  $S$  such as

$$\tilde{w}_a(r) = (S(r)(1 - S(r)))^a \text{ and } \dot{w}_a(r) = S(r)^a + ((1 - S(r)))^a. \quad (38)$$

A disadvantage is that different outlier patterns typically require a different functional and an inappropriate choice can negatively affect statistical properties [63]. Alternatively, one can weight using the density approximation obtained by the increments

$$I(r_i) := S(r_i) - S(r_{i-1}). \quad (39)$$

Under stationarity, (39) can be used effectively to reduce the effect of outliers when  $S$  is the common cdf. If the data is nonstationary, uniform weights are optimal since irregularities are naturally part of the underlying probabilistic structure. However, the cdf is time-dependent and an aggregate  $S$  at most reflects the average distribution pattern.

To construct the weight function, we need an empirical version of the most suitable choice for  $S$ . For this, we use the time-averaged empirical cdf

$$\bar{S}(r) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{S(k/T, r)}{k^{3/2}} T^{3/2}.$$

Note that under the conditions of [Theorem 4.5](#),

$$\left\{ \sqrt{T} \bar{S}(r) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{\mathbb{E}(S(k/T, r))}{k^{3/2}} T^{3/2} \right\} \rightsquigarrow \left\{ \int_0^1 u^{-3/2} \mathbb{G}(u, r) du \right\}_{r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \stackrel{D}{\equiv}_{H_0} \left\{ \mathbb{B}(1) \sigma(r) \right\}_{r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]},$$

If additionally the weight functional  $w$  is differentiable with uniformly bounded first derivative, Taylor's theorem yields  $w(\bar{S}(r)) = w(\mathbb{E}\bar{S}(r)) + o_p(1)$ . Thus, [Corollary 4.7](#) and [Corollary 4.8](#) hold with such weight functionals applied to the time-averaged ecdf. Under  $H_0$ , the local ecdf's are equal in distribution and  $\bar{S}$  approximates the common cdf  $S$ . Under  $H_A$ , this is not the case. By the minimum distance principle, however, the time-averaged cdf is the closest time-independent cdf to the collection of time-dependent cdfs in an  $L^2$ -sense [83];  $\mathbb{E}\bar{S}$  is the 'best' time-independent cdf we can approximate. However,  $w(\bar{S}(r))$  could suppress local abnormalities, leading to loss of power. To avoid this, we push towards uniform weights using the following criterion. Define the increments of the local ecdfs,  $\{I(k/T, r) : k, r\}$ , given by

$$I(k/T, r) = (T/k)^{3/2} (S_T(k/T, r) - S_T(k/T, r - 1/T)).$$

Time-localized abnormalities should cause a (temporary) change in the correlation of overlapping increments in time direction. More specifically,

$$\text{Cov}(I(u, r), I(v, r)) \neq \text{Cov}(I(u + \delta, r), I(v + \delta, r)), \quad v < u, v, u, v + \delta, u + \delta \in (0, 1). \quad (40)$$

Thus, as a measure we consider the empirical correlation of the increments between time  $u = k/T$  and  $v + u = 1/T + k/T$

$$\hat{\rho}_v(u) := \frac{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (I(u, r_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T I(u, r_i)) (I(u + v, r_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T I(u + v, r_i))}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (I(u + v, r_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T I(u + v, r_i))^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (I(u, r_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T I(u, r_i))^2}}$$

If the standard error of the sample  $\{\hat{\rho}_{1/T}(k/T)\}_{k=2}^{T-1}$ , that is,  $sd(\hat{\rho}_{1/T})$ , exceeds a threshold (that converges to 5% as the sample size increases) we impose uniform weights;

$$w_\gamma(r) = \mathbb{1}_{sd(\hat{\rho}_1(r)) \leq 0.05 + \frac{1.5}{T}} W^\ell(r) + \mathbb{1}_{sd(\hat{\rho}_1(r)) > 0.05 + \frac{1.5}{T}}, \quad \ell = \{\max, L\},$$

where  $W^{\max}(r) = I_{\bar{S}}(r) / \max_r I_{\bar{S}}(r)$  is taken for the test in (34), denoted by  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \gamma}^{\max}$ , and where  $W^L(r) = I_{\bar{S}}^4(r) / \sum_r I_{\bar{S}}^4$  is used for the test (37), denoted by  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \gamma}^L$ . We emphasize that we merely push towards uniform weights if the criterion indicates that using a weight functional based on  $\bar{S}$  increases the type II error. This does not change the limiting distributional properties of the tests under the stated conditions. Note that if the increments are stationary and independent then (40) is an equality, and that –even if these time increments are stationary– the process itself might not be. Thus, under certain alternatives full weight is given to  $W^\ell(r)$ .

**Remark 4.9 (Simulation study).** The details of the simulation study are given in the online supplement; we summarize here. We compared  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \gamma}^{\max}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \gamma}^L$  with other weight functions applied to  $\bar{S}$ . Specifically, (34) and (37) were considered with  $\tilde{w}(r) = \frac{\tilde{w}_2(r)}{\max_r \tilde{w}_2(r)}$  and  $\tilde{w}(r) = \frac{\tilde{w}_2(r)}{\sum_r \tilde{w}_2(r)}$ , respectively denoted by  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \tilde{w}}^{\max}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \tilde{w}}^L$ . Further,  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \text{glob}}^{\max}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \text{glob}}^L$  are the estimators with  $\tilde{w}^{\max}(r) = \frac{V_T(r)}{\max_r V_T(r)}$  and  $\tilde{w}^L(r) = V_{T, H_0}^L(r) / \sum_r V_{T, H_0}^L(r)$ , respectively. Finally,  $\mathbb{D}_{T, \text{glob}, \gamma}^L$  has a weight function that is a combination of  $\tilde{w}$  and the adaptive weight function;  $w_\gamma(r_i) V_{T, H_0}^L(r_i) / \sum_{i=1}^T w_\gamma(r_i) V_{T, H_0}^L(r_i)$ .




Fig 5.1: Mouse embryo fibroblast cell trajectories under reprogramming.

The outcomes corroborate completely with the theory developed in Section 4, and the tests behave as anticipated. We found that the data-adaptive versions of the class of max-type tests and of the class of quadratic tests outperform their non-adaptive counterparts, and are more robust against various alternatives, including potential bimodal distributions with discontinuities. Overall,  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\text{max}}$  provide the best trade-off between power and size, and have good properties even in small samples.

*Remark 4.10 (Computing the test statistics).* The self-normalized tests are extremely simple to implement once the ensemble of point clouds has been transformed into barcodes. To test for (17), one merely needs to compute the statistic of choice  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^L$ , as well as the corresponding quantiles  $q_{1-\alpha}(\mathbb{D}^{\text{max}})$  and  $q_{1-\alpha}(\mathbb{D}^L)$  and  $q_{1-\alpha}$ , respectively. Our statistical tests rely on existing codes for computing persistent homology and the bottleneck distance (Ripser and Hera [7, 8, 6]). The computational costs are significant; they are adequate for computing test statistics on real data sets of with tens of thousands of points, but the total number of points we can address in simulation studies is limited.

## 5. Developmental trajectories in single-cell sequencing data

We now apply our method described in the previous sections to test for topological change in time series single-cell mRNA expression data. We analyzed data obtained from the Waddington-OT work on cell developmental trajectory inference in the context of reprogramming by transient application of transcription factor [70]. The data comprised expression profiles from roughly 250K cells in mouse embryo fibroblasts undergoing reprogramming. The measurements were taken at 37 time points across 18 days of development. The data was log transformed and we selected the 2000 most variable genes (using CellRank [50]) for analysis. The figure below indicates the shape of the data, projected into  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and laid out as a force-directed graph. The graph indicates that the underlying shape of the data and the cell type changes over time; this is indicated by the colors in the figure.

We tested whether the nonstationarity in  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  is statistically significant using the adaptive test statistics. Despite the small sample size of  $T = 37$ , we are able to reject the hypothesis of a stationary distribution at the 5% level using  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\text{max}}$  for homology 1 and at the 10% level for homology 0 ( $p$ -values of 0.04 and 0.08, resp.). The quadratic test  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$  rejects the null at the 10% level for  $H_0$ , but fails to reject the null at the 10% level for  $H_1$  ( $p$ -values of 0.033 and 0.147, resp.).

## Acknowledgements

Both authors were partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2311338. A.J. Blumberg was partially supported by ONR grant N00014-22-1-2679.

## References

- [1] H. Adams, S. Chepushtanova, T. Emerson, E. Hanson, M. Kirby, F. Motta, R. Neville, C. Peterson, P. Shipman, L. Ziegelmeier. Persistence images: A stable vector representation of persistent homology. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18:1–35, 2017.
- [2] J.A.D. Aston and C. Kirch. Evaluating stationarity via change-point alternatives with applications to fMRI data. *The Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 6:1906–1948, 2012.
- [3] A. Aue, G. Rice, and O. Sönmez. Detecting and dating structural breaks in functional data without dimension reduction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 80:509–529, 2018.
- [4] A. Aue and A. van Delft. Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain. *Ann. Stat.*, 48:2505–2547, 2020.
- [5] Bradley, R.C. Basic Properties of Strong Mixing Conditions. A Survey and Some Open Questions. *Probability Surveys* 2:107–144, 2005.
- [6] M. Kerber, D. Morozov, and A. Nigmetov. Geometry helps to compare persistence diagrams. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)* 22:1–20, 2017.
- [7] U. Bauer. Ripser: efficient computation of Vietoris-Rips persistence barcodes. *Journal of applied and computational topology* 5:391–423, 2021.
- [8] U. Bauer. Ripser. <https://github.com/Ripser/ripser>
- [9] Beutner, E., Zähle, B. Deriving the asymptotic distribution of  $U$  and  $V$ -statistics of dependent data using weighted empirical processes. *Bernoulli* 18(3):803–822, 2012.
- [10] I. Berkes, L. Horváth and P. Kokoszka. Detecting changes in the mean of functional observations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 71:927–946, 2009.
- [11] Billingsley, P. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, New York (1968).
- [12] Billingsley, P. *Probability and Measure, 3rd Edition*. John Wiley and Sons, New York (1995).
- [13] A.J. Blumberg, I. Gal, M. A. Mandell, M. Pancia. Robust Statistics, Hypothesis Testing, and Confidence Intervals for Persistent Homology on Metric Measure Spaces. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 14(4):745–789, 2014.
- [14] A.J. Blumberg, P. Bhaumik, S.J. Walker. Testing to distinguish measures on metric spaces. arXiv:1802.01152, 2018.
- [15] A.J. Blumberg and M. Lesnick. Stability of 2-Parameter Persistent Homology. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2022.
- [16] A. J. Blumberg and A. van Delft. Characterizing measures on the space of barcodes. In preparation, 2023.
- [17] S. Borovkova, R. Burton, and H. Dehling. Limit theorem for functionals of mixing processes with applications to  $U$ -statistics and dimension estimation. *Trans. of the Am. Math. Soc.* 353(11):4261–4318, 2001.
- [18] D. Bosq. *Linear Processes in Function Spaces*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [19] Bouzebda, S., Nemouchi, B. Weak-convergence of empirical conditional processes and conditional  $U$ -processes involving functional mixing data. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 83(1):141–147, 2022.
- [20] Bubenik, P. Statistical Topological Data Analysis using Persistence Landscapes *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16:77–102, 2015.
- [21] Bücher, A., Dette, H., and Heinrichs, F. A Portmanteau-type test for detecting serial correlation in locally stationary functional time series. *To appear in: Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes.*, 2022+.
- [22] Caponera, A., Marinucci, D. Asymptotics for spherical functional autoregressions *Ann. Statist* 49(1): 346–369, 2021.
- [23] Carlsson, G., de Silva, V., Morozov, D. Zigzag persistent homology and real-valued functions. *Proceedings of SoCG*, 2009.
- [24] Carriere, M., Blumberg, A.J. Multiparameter Persistence Image for Topological Machine Learning. *Proceedings of Neurips*, 2020.
- [25] F. Chazal, B. T. Fasy, F. Lecci, B. Michel, A. Rinaldo, L. Wasserman. Subsampling methods for persistent homology. *Proceedings of ICML*, 2015.
- [26] Chazal, F., de Silva, V., and Oudot, S. Persistence stability for geometric complexes. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 2012.
- [27] Chiou, J.-M., Chen, Y.-T., Hsing, T. Identifying multiple changes for a functional data sequence with application to freeway traffic segmentation. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13:1430–1463, 2019.

- [28] D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, H. and J. Harer. Stability of Persistence Diagrams. *Discrete Comput Geom*, 37:103–120, 2007.
- [29] D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, D. Morozov. Vines and Vineyards by Updating Persistence in Linear Time. *Proceedings of SOCG (2006)*.
- [30] Casini, A., and Perron, P. Change-Point Analysis of Time Series with Evolutionary Spectra. arXiv:2106.02031, 2021.
- [31] Dahlhaus, R. Fitting time series models to non-stationary processes. *Ann. Stat.*, 25:1–37, 1997.
- [32] Das, S., Politis, D.M. Predictive Inference for Locally Stationary Time Series With an Application to Climate Data *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 116:919–934, 2021.
- [33] Davydov, Y. and Zitikis, R., On weak convergence of random fields. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* 60(2):345–365, 2008.
- [34] Dehling, H., Fried, R., Sharipov, O., Vogel, D., Wornowizki, M., Estimation of the variance of partial sums of dependent processes. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 83(1):141–147, 2013.
- [35] Dehling, H., Giraud, D., Sharipov, O. Convergence of the empirical two-sample  $U$ -statistics with  $\beta$ -mixing data. *Acta Mathematica Hungaria.*, 164: 377–412, 2021.
- [36] Deng, A., and Perron, P. A Non-Local Perspective on the Power Properties of the CUSUM and CUSUM of Squares Tests. *Journal of econometrics* 142:212–240, 2008.
- [37] Dette, H., Kokot, K., and Volgushev, S. Testing relevant hypotheses in functional time series via self-normalization. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 82(3):629–660, 2020.
- [38] Ding, X., Zhou, Z. Estimation and inference for precision matrices of nonstationary time series *Ann. Stat.* 48(4):2455–2477, 2020.
- [39] Grassberger, P., Procaccia, I. Characterization of strange attractors, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 50(5), 346–349, 1983.
- [40] Gromov, M. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1999.
- [41] T. Harris, B. Li, J. Tucker. Scalable multiple changepoint detection for functional data sequences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01889, 2020.
- [42] D. Haussler, E. Welzl.  $\epsilon$ -nets and simplex range queries. *Discrete Comput Geom.* 2:127–151, 1987.
- [43] S. Hörmann and P. Kokoszka. Weakly dependent functional data. *Ann. Stat.*, 38:1845–1884, 2010.
- [44] T. Hsing and R. Eubank. *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators*. Wiley, New York, 2015.
- [45] T. Hsing, W.B. Wu. On Weighted  $U$ -statistics for stationary processes. *The Annals of Probability.*, 32(2) 1600–1631, 2004.
- [46] M. Kahle. Random geometric complexes. *Discrete Comput Geom* 45:553–573, 2011.
- [47] S. Kališnik, C. Lehn, and V. Limic. Geometric and probabilistic limit theorems in topological data analysis. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 131, 102244, 2021.
- [48] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability, 2nd Ed.*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [49] Kreiss, J.P., and Paparoditis, E. Bootstrapping locally stationary processes. *The Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 77: 267–290, 2015.
- [50] Lange, M. and Bergen, V. and Klein, M. and Setty, M. and Reuter, B. and Bakhti, M. and Lickert, H. and Ansari, M. and Schniering, J. and Schiller, H. B. and Pe’er, D. and Theis, F. J. CellRank for directed single-cell fate mapping. *Nature Methods*, 2022.
- [51] M. Lesnick and M. Wright. Interactive Visualization of 2-D Persistence Modules. arXiv preprint, arXiv:1512.00180.
- [52] F. Chazal, B. T. Fasy, F. Lecci, A. Rinaldo and L. Wasserman. Stochastic Convergence of Persistence Landscapes and Silhouettes. *Proceedings of SoCG*, 2014.
- [53] J.-M. Loubes and B. Pelletier. A kernel-based classifier on a Riemannian manifold. *Statistics & Decisions*, 26(1):35–51, 2008.
- [54] Mandelbrot, B. Limit Theorems on the Self-Normalized Range for Weakly and Strongly Dependent Processes. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete*, 31:271–285, 1975.
- [55] Y. Mileyko, S. Mukherjee and J. Harer. Probability measures on the space of persistence diagrams. *Inverse Problems*, 27(12), 2011.
- [56] Mòricz, F. Moment inequalities and the strong law of large numbers. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete*, 35:299–314, 1976.
- [57] A. Myers, E. Munch and F. Khasawneh. Persistent Homology of Complex Networks for Dynamic State Detection. *Physical Review E*, 100(2):022314, 2019.

- [58] Munkres, J.R. *Topology, 2nd edition*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000.
- [59] M. Nitzan and M. P. Brenner. Revealing lineage-related signals in single-cell gene expression using random matrix theory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(11), 2021.
- [60] N. Moriel, E. Senel, N. Friedman, N. Rajewsky, N. Karaiskos, M. Nitzan. NovoSpaRc: flexible spatial reconstruction of single-cell gene expression with optimal transport. *Nat. Prot.*, 16(9):4177-4200, 2021.
- [61] P. Niyogi, S. Smale and S. Weinberger. Finding the Homology of Submanifolds with High Confidence from Random Samples. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 39:419–441, 2008.
- [62] T. Owada and R. Adler. Limit Theorems for Point Processes under Geometric Constraints (and Topological Crackle) *The Annals of Probability*, 45(3):2004-2055, 2017.
- [63] O. Ozturk and T.P. Hettmansperger. Generalised weighted Cramer-von Mises distance estimators *Biometrika*. 84(2):283-294, 1997.
- [64] J.A. Perea and J. Harer. Sliding windows and persistence: An application of topological methods to signal analysis. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 15(3):799–838, 2015.
- [65] J.A. Perea. Topological time series analysis. *Notices of the AMS*, 66(5), 2019.
- [66] V. Panaretos and S. Tavakoli. Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *Ann. Stat.*, 41:568–603, 2013.
- [67] R. Rabadan and A.J. Blumberg. Topological data analysis for genomics and evolution. Cambridge University Press (2020).
- [68] A. Safikhani and A. Shojaie. Joint structural break detection and parameter estimation in high-dimensional nonstationary VAR models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2020.
- [69] H., Yongmiao, O., B. Linton, B. McCabe, J. Sun, S. Wang. Kolmogorov-Smirnov type testing for structural breaks: A new adjusted-range based self-normalization approach. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3850894> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3850894>, 2023.
- [70] G. Schiebinger, J. Shu, M. Tabaka, B. Cleary, V. Subramanian, A. Solomon, J. Gould, S. Liu, S. Lin, P. Berube, L. Lee, J. Chen, J. Brumbaugh, P. Rigollet, K. Hochedlinger, R. Jaenisch, A. Regev, and E. S. Lander. Optimal-Transport Analysis of Single-Cell Gene Expression Identifies Developmental Trajectories in Reprogramming *Cell* 176(4):928-943, 2019.
- [71] D. R. Sheehy. Linear-Size Approximations to the Vietoris–Rips Filtration. *Disc. Comp. Geom.* 49:778–796, 2013.
- [72] Jentsch, C. and Subba Rao, S. A test for second order stationarity of a multivariate time series. *Journal of Econometrics* 185:124–161, 2015.
- [73] K. Turner, Y. Mileyko, J. Mukherjee, S. and J. Harer. Fréchet Means for Distributions of Persistence Diagrams. *Discrete Comput Geom*, 52:44–70, 2014.
- [74] L. Xian, H. Adams, C. Topaz, L. Ziegelmeier. Capturing Dynamics of Time-Varying Data via Topology. arXiv preprint, [arXiv:2010.05780](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.05780), 2021.
- [75] A. van Delft. A note on quadratic forms of stationary functional time series under mild conditions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130:3687–3710, 2020.
- [76] S. Rigot. Differentiation of measures in metric spaces. *Springer Lecture Notes in Math.* 2296:93–116, 2022.
- [77] G. Carlsson. Topological pattern recognition for point cloud data. *Acta Numerica*, 23:289–368, 2014.
- [78] G. Carlsson. Topology and data. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 2:255–308, 2009.
- [79] S. Y. Oudot. Persistence theory: from quiver representations to data analysis. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, **209**, 2015.
- [80] H. Edelsbrunner, J. Harer. Persistent homology- a survey. *Contemp. Math.* 453:257–282, 2008.
- [81] H. Edelsbrunner and J. Harer. Computational topology. An introduction. Amer. Math. Soc., 2010.
- [82] B. T. Fasy, F. Lecci, A. Rinaldo, L. Wasserman, S. Balakrishnan, A. Singh. Confidence sets for persistence diagrams. *Annals of Statistics*, 42(6):2301–2339, 2014.
- [83] van Delft, A., Characiejus, V., and Dette, H. (2021). A nonparametric test for stationarity in functional time series. *Statistica Sinica*, 31: 1375–1395.
- [84] A. van Delft and H. Dette. A general framework to quantify deviations from structural assumptions in the analysis of nonstationary function-valued processes. arXiv preprint, [arXiv:2208.10158](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.10158), 2022.
- [85] A. van Delft and M. Eichler. Locally stationary functional time series. *Elec. Jour. of Stat.*, 12:107–170, 2018.
- [86] Shao, X. and Zhang, X. Testing for Change Points in Time Series. *Journal of the American Statistical*

*Association.*, 105(491): 1228–1240, 2010.

- [87] Vogelsang, T.J. Sources of Nonmonotonic Power When Testing for a Shift in Mean of a Dynamic Time Series, *Journal of econometrics*. 88:283–299, 1999.
- [88] Yang, Y., Shang, H.L. Is the Group Structure Important in Grouped Functional Time Series? *Journal of Data Science. Special Issue: Data Science Meets Social Sciences* 20(3): 303–324, 2022.
- [89] G. H. T. Yeo, S. D. Saksena, D. K. Gifford. Generative modeling of single-cell time series with PRESCIENT enables prediction of cell trajectories with interventions. *Nat Commun* 12, 3222, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23518-w>
- [90] Vogel, D. and Wendler, M., Studentized U-quantile processes under dependence with applications to change-point analysis. *Bernoulli* 23(4B):3114–3144, 2017.
- [91] Wu, W. B. Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.*, 102:14150–14154, 2005.
- [92] Zhang, D., and Wu, W. B. Convergence of covariance and spectral density estimates for high-dimensional locally stationary processes. *Ann. Stat.*, 49(1):233–254, 2021.

## Appendix A: Simulations

We illustrate the finite sample performance of the self-normalized tests via a Monte Carlo study. The quantiles of equations (34) and (37) are obtained by simulating 200,000 times on a grid of Brownian Motion equal to the sample size  $T$ , reflecting the grid resolution. The Monte Carlo simulation consists of 500 repetitions in each case. In the results provided below we fixed  $n = 300$ , which is quite conservative; most data sets will have much larger point clouds, and in these cases convergence will be faster. However, as noted above, larger choices of  $n$  are computationally prohibitive with currently available algorithms. Furthermore, in computing the test statistics, values of the equidistant radius grid  $\{r_i\}$  that had frequency zero were ignored.

- **Model I:** In the first model we consider data arising as a sequence of random circles, where the spatial observations are generated from a uniform distribution. More specifically,

$$\tilde{X}_{t,T}^n = \tau_t \left\{ \left( \cos(\Theta_m), \sin(\Theta_m) \right) \right\}_{m=1}^n$$

where  $\{\Theta_m\} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 2\pi)$  and  $\tau_t = \frac{1}{2}$ .

- **Model II:** In the second model, we add dependence via an AR structure via  $\tau_t$ , that is, we let  $\tau_t = 0.5\tau_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$ ,  $\epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2}, 0.05\frac{1}{2})$ . The radius thus changes according to an AR process with strength parameter with absolute modulus less than 1, ensuring stationarity of this process.
- **Model III:** In the third model, we let  $\tilde{X}_{t,T}^n = \left( \tilde{Y}_{t,T}^n, \tilde{Z}_{t,T}^n \right)$  where

$$\tilde{Y}_{t,T}^n = \left\{ \left( \rho_{t,T} \cos(\Theta_m), \rho_{t,T} \sin(\Theta_m) \right) \right\}_{m=1}^n, \quad \tilde{Z}_{t,T}^n = \left\{ \left( \cos(\Theta_\ell) + \rho_{t,T}, \sin(\Theta_\ell) + \rho_{t,T} \right) \right\}_{\ell=m+1}^{2n}$$

with time-varying process  $\{\rho_t\}$  given by  $\rho_t = a(t/T)\rho_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$ ,  $\epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{5}, 0.01\frac{1}{5})$  and  $a(t/T) = \frac{1}{2} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{t}{T})$ . Thus, we have two circles that are dependent, where the radii and location change very gradually. This creates the behavior of holes that appear and disappear in random fashion across time.

- **Model VI:** In this case we consider  $\tilde{X}_{t,T}^n = \left( \tilde{Y}_{t,T}^n, \tilde{Z}_{t,T}^n \right)$  where

$$\tilde{Y}_{t,T}^n = \left\{ \left( \rho_{1,T} + \cos(\Theta_m), \rho_{1,T} + \sin(\Theta_m) \right) \right\}_{m=1}^n, \quad \tilde{Z}_{t,T}^n = \left\{ \left( \cos(\Theta_\ell) + \rho_{t,T}, \sin(\Theta_\ell) + \rho_{t,T} \right) \right\}_{\ell=m+1}^{2n}$$

with time-varying process  $\{\rho_t\}$  is again a time-varying AR but now with  $a(t/T) = \frac{1}{2} \cos(2\pi \frac{t}{T})$  and  $\{\epsilon_t\}$  as in model I. In this scenario, the effect is that we create two circles that collide at iteration 1 and then move away from one another in a specific way. This creates nonstationary behavior that affects higher-dimensional holes and specifically homology 1. The effect on homology 0 is that a certain set of connected components might overlap for a brief period, creating minor nonstationary behavior, but will otherwise not be distinguishable from noise. We thus expect that this is difficult to detect in small sample sizes.

TABLE 1  
Empirical rejection probabilities of the test (34) for the hypotheses in (17) under the null hypothesis for homology 1.

	T	$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\hat{w}}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\hat{w}}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^L$	
		10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%
I	50	11.0	3.8	7.4	2.4	10.2	4.6	8.6	4.2	9.2	4.0	9.0	4.2	7.8	2.8
	100	9.6	3.6	9.2	2.4	10.4	4.4	8.8	2.8	7.4	2.2	6.8	3.2	6.2	1.2
	200	13.6	6.0	10.6	4.4	11.6	6.2	10.8	4.6	10.8	5.6	12.0	6.2	10.0	4.0
	300	10.2	5.6	10.4	4.4	10.4	4.6	8.0	2.8	6.8	3.4	8.4	4.6	8.0	2.6
II	50	10.2	4.6	10.6	6.8	10.6	5.2	8.0	4.6	9.2	4.6	10.0	3.8	8.0	2.8
	100	9.8	4.2	10.6	4.8	10.2	4.2	9.2	4.0	8.2	3.8	8.6	3.4	7.4	3.0
	200	14.0	7.8	11.4	6.8	13.6	7.0	11.2	6.0	11.0	4.8	10.8	6.2	9.8	4.4
	300	10.4	5.2	9.8	6.0	11.0	5.4	11.4	6.0	11.8	5.0	12.2	6.2	10.8	6.0
III	50	100.0	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	200	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	300	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
IV	50	70.2	46.8	100.0	99.8	55.2	12.8	98.6	67.8	98.4	75.2	98.6	67.8	98.2	48.0
	100	98.0	75.8	100.0	100.0	96.4	35.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.6
	200	100.0	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	300	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
V	50	0.4	0.0	54.6	34.0	10.4	3.2	82.2	23.6	99.8	92.4	97.6	88.2	96.6	86.4
	100	0.0	0.0	84.0	65.0	11.2	2.0	78.6	5.2	97.2	40.2	99.6	96.8	99.2	96.2
	200	0.0	0.0	98.2	88.0	30.8	3.0	99.8	22.2	100.0	65.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	300	0.0	0.0	100.0	96.8	40.8	4.2	96.4	4.0	100.0	25.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

- **Model V:** Finally, we consider a break structure by taking the model as in Model I but where not just the grid is random but where now  $\tau_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2}, 0.05\frac{1}{2})$  for  $t \leq \frac{1}{3}T$  and for  $t \geq \frac{2}{3}T$ , and the mean of  $\tau_t$  is decreased to  $\frac{1}{4}$ .

The results are given in Table 1 for homology 1 and for homology 0 in Table 2. From models I and II, it can be observed that all tests have decent size, though the quadratic tests are a bit undersized in certain cases. Note that the grid of the quantiles are themselves sample size-dependent and the numerical fluctuation across rows is therefore natural for the available sample sizes. The quadratic tests  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^L$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^L$  appear to have tendency to undersize, especially for homology 0. This is not surprising since persistent  $H_0$  can be very sensitive to noise; an additional point far from the remaining points can add a long bar in the barcode.  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$  appears overall best from the quadratic tests. We note that the undersizing of the quadratic tests will be negligible by simply taking a grid resolution of  $T + 100$  for the computation of the limiting quantiles.

We now look at the power properties. For homology 1, we see very fast convergence to full power for model III and IV across the test statistics. However, we observe a clearer benefit in the break scenario of the adaptive weighting test  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\max}$  compared to the other max-type tests. Visual inspection indicates that the distance matrices of persistent homology 1 have a mixed distribution, which technically violates our assumptions. Consequently, the range estimator  $V(r)$  seems to overestimate, leading to a loss of power of  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^{\max}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,w_1}^{\max}$ . The quadratic data-adaptive tests  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^L$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$  have fast and steady convergence to full power. On the other hand, the two non-adaptive quadratic versions  $\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^L$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{T,w_1}^L$  suffer from loss of power as  $T$  increases, indicating lack of robustness to discontinuities of the non-adaptive versions. Similar behavior is visible for homology 0 for this model. Furthermore, for homology 0, the nonstationary behavior present in model III is well-captured. For model IV, we again see superiority of the data-adaptive max statistic compared to the non-adaptive versions. Note that the nonstationary behavior in model IV for homology 0 is a type of nonstationarity that is rather difficult to detect; the nonstationarity is only detectable around the left extreme  $r \rightarrow 0$ , meaning that it is easily missed by any type of non-adaptive weighing scheme that suppresses the tails. Indeed, observe that for the max-type tests only the data-adaptive scheme is capable of detecting nonstationarity in homology 0.

TABLE 2  
Empirical rejection probabilities of the test (37) for the hypotheses in (17) under the null hypothesis for homology 0.

	T	$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\hat{w}}^{\max}$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob}}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\hat{w}}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\text{glob},\gamma}^L$		$\mathbb{D}_{T,\gamma}^L$	
		10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%
I	50	9.4	5.8	9.8	4.2	10.2	5.2	7.4	3.6	6.8	2.8	6.4	3.6	5.8	3.2
	100	8.6	3.4	8.0	4.8	10.6	3.0	5.6	2.8	4.8	2.4	6.8	2.8	6.4	2.4
	200	11.8	5.8	13.0	6.8	12.8	6.0	6.8	2.6	6.2	2.2	7.2	3.0	6.6	2.8
	300	9.2	3.4	9.0	4.4	10.2	4.8	6.0	2.2	6.4	2.0	8.4	3.2	8.0	2.6
II	50	9.4	4.8	9.6	3.2	9.2	5.0	8.4	4.6	7.6	4.0	7.4	4.2	7.2	4.0
	100	12.4	5.6	11.0	6.4	12.4	7.2	8.2	2.6	7.8	2.8	9.2	3.6	8.4	3.6
	200	10.6	3.6	8.0	2.4	10.6	3.2	7.6	3.0	7.0	3.2	7.6	3.8	6.8	2.2
	300	9.0	4.6	9.2	3.6	9.6	3.8	6.8	3.0	6.6	3.2	7.2	4.0	7.0	4.2
III	50	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	6.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	6.4	100.0	96.0
	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	200	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	300	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
IV	50	1.2	0.2	23.2	12.6	1.0	0.2	32.2	18.0	36.6	21.6	31.6	16.6	14.4	5.2
	100	0.6	0.0	48.8	31.8	0.8	0.0	51.0	31.2	53.0	33.0	50.0	30.6	23.0	8.6
	200	0.2	0.0	76.4	69.2	0.8	0.0	81.2	58.8	82.0	59.6	80.6	58.8	48.0	19.0
	300	1.0	0.0	88.2	82.6	1.4	0.2	89.4	76.0	89.8	75.8	89.4	75.8	62.4	24.6
V	50	9.4	5.4	58.0	39.2	24.2	4.0	99.4	94.8	99.0	95.4	98.8	92.8	96.6	84.0
	100	3.2	1.0	88.4	80.2	33.8	5.4	99.8	97.8	99.8	97.8	99.8	98.0	99.2	91.0
	200	0.0	0.0	98.8	93.8	50.8	9.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	300	0.0	0.0	99.8	98.4	61.2	12.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

## Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 4.4

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* The main line of argument is given here and proofs of the underlying auxiliary statements are deferred to Appendix D. We use an argument based on iterated limits to determine the limiting law [see e.g., 11, Theorem 4.2]. More specifically, let

$$M_{m,T}(u, r) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) \right) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_s \left( Y_{m,s+j} \left( \frac{s+j}{T}, u, r \right) \right)$$

with

$$Y_{m,T,t}(u, v, r) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor vT \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}(u), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right]. \quad (41)$$

A Hoeffding-type of decomposition of the process then yields the following.

**Theorem B.1.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.4, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]$ ,*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( T^{1/2} \sup_u |S_T(u, r) - M_{m,T}(u, r)| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Secondly, using a martingale functional central limit theorem, we show that

$$\{T^{1/2} M_{m,T}(u, r)\}_{u \in [0,1]} \underset{T \rightarrow \infty}{\rightsquigarrow} \{\mathbb{G}_m(u, r)\}_{u \in [0,1]} \underset{m \rightarrow \infty}{\rightsquigarrow} \{\mathbb{G}(u, r)\}_{u \in [0,1]}.$$

Set  $D_{m,T,t,j} = P_t(Y_{m,T,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r))$ . Then it follows in the same way as in the proof of Lemma D.3, that for fixed  $m$ , and for each  $u \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ , the Lindeberg condition holds;

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} D_{m,T,t,j} \right|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\left| \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} D_{m,T,t,j} \right| > \sqrt{T}\epsilon} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad T \rightarrow \infty.$$

The following result on the limit of the conditional variance and an application of the Cramér-Wold device completes the proof.

**Lemma B.2.** Let  $k = \lfloor uT \rfloor$ . Then, under the conditions of [Theorem 4.4](#)

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=0}^m P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right|^2 \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right] \\ & \xrightarrow{p} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^u \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Cov}(g_m(\tilde{X}_{m,0}(\eta), u, r), g_m(\tilde{X}_{m,\ell}(\eta), u, r)) d\eta \\ & \xrightarrow{p} \int_0^u \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Cov}(g(\tilde{X}_0(\eta), u, r), g(\tilde{X}_\ell(\eta), u, r)) d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_m(\tilde{X}_{m,j}(\eta), u, r) &= \int_0^u \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}'_0(v)}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{X}_{m,j}(\eta), \tilde{X}'_{m,0}(v), r)] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{j,m}] dv \\ g(\tilde{X}_j(\eta), u, r) &= \int_0^u \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}'_0(v)}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{X}_j(\eta), \tilde{X}'_0(v), r)] dv. \end{aligned}$$

□

### Appendix C: Auxiliary statements

**Lemma C.1.** Let  $\{G_t = \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s}\}$  be zero-mean and  $\mathcal{G}_t$ -measurable. Then

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{t,s=1}^k G_{t,s} \right\| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \leq 4 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) = \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s}$  almost surely and in  $L^1$ , elementary calculations give

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) \right\| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} &= \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) \right\| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^k P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) \right\|^2 \right]} \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t G_{t,s} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Doob's maximal inequality. The result now follows from symmetry of the kernel and the fact that  $\sum_{s,t=1}^k = \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} + \sum_{s=t}^k + \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{t=1}^{s-1}$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* We have=

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} &= \left( \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} + \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \right) \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{s+k}, X_s, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \end{aligned}$$

$P_{t-j} \mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}) = 0$  a.s. if both  $X_{m,t}$  and  $X_{m,t-k}$  are independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{t-j}$ , i.e.,  $t-k-m+1 > t-j \Rightarrow j > k+m-1$  or if  $X_{m,t}$  is independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{t-j}$  and  $X_{m,t-k}$  is  $\mathcal{G}_{t-j-1}$ -measurable since then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}, r) | \mathcal{G}_{t-j}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}, r) | \mathcal{G}_{t-j-1}],$$

which occurs if  $t-m+1 > t-j$  and  $t-k \leq t-j-1$ , i.e., if  $j > m-1$  and  $j < k$ . Consequently,

$$\left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{s+k}, X_s, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} = \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{s+k}, X_s, r)) - P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{j,s+k}, X_{j,s}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \quad j, k \geq 0,$$

$$\left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} = \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) - P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{j,t}, X_{j,t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}, \quad k > 0, j \geq 0$$

and thus  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta_j$ . For (27)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \min(v_{t,t-k}(j), \epsilon) &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \min\left(\sup_{m>j} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}, \epsilon\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \min\left(\sup_{m \geq 0} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}, \epsilon\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \min(m > j(\delta_j + \delta_m), \epsilon) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \min\left(\sup_{m>j} \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,s+k}, X_{m,s}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}, \epsilon\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that a)  $P_{t-j}\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,t}, X_{m,t-k}) = 0$  a.s. if  $j \leq k-1$  and  $j \geq m$  and  $j \leq k-1$ , that b)  $P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,s+k}, X_{m,s}, r)) = 0$  a.s. if  $s-m+1 > s-j \Rightarrow j > m-1$ , and that c) the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,s+k}, X_{m,s}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} &\leq \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{s+k}, X_s, r)) - P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{j,s+k}, X_{j,s}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &\quad + \left\| P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{s+k}, X_s, r)) - P_{s-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_{m,s+k}, X_{m,s}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \leq \delta_j + \delta_m \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \min(v_{t,t-k}(j), \epsilon) \leq 4 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\sup_{m>j} \delta_m, \epsilon)$ . □

**Lemma C.2.** Let  $Z = (Z_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  and  $Y = (Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  by adapted to  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(Z_t, Z_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min(v_{t,t-k}^Z(j) + v_{t,t-k}^Y(j), \left\| \mathfrak{h}(Z_t, Z_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma C.2.* From Lemma C.1

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \sum_{s=1}^t \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \end{aligned}$$

Using orthogonality of the projections and a change of variables.

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=1}^t (\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r)) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k'}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k'}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}} \\ &\leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \left\| P_{t-j}(\mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ &\leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min(v_{t,t-k}^X(j) + v_{t,t-k}^Y(j), \left\| \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r) \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma C.3.** Let  $X = (X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  and  $Y = (Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  such that  $X_t, X_s, Y_t, Y_s$  are  $\mathcal{G}_{t-j}$ -measurable. Suppose Assumption 4.3(i) holds for  $W \in \{X, Y\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| P_{t-j} \left( \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} \\ & \leq \min \left( \nu_{t,s}^X(j) + \nu_{t,s}^Y(j), C \log^{-2\kappa}(\epsilon^{-1}) + 2 \sup_i \mathbb{P}(\partial(X_i, Y_i) > \epsilon) \right) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma C.3.* By Lemma C.4

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathfrak{h}(X_t, X_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} & \leq \min \left( \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r - 2\epsilon \leq \partial(X_t, X_s) \leq r) + \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r \leq \partial(X_t, X_s) \leq r + 2\epsilon), \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r - 2\epsilon \leq \partial(Y_t, Y_s) \leq r) + \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r \leq \partial(Y_t, Y_s) \leq r + 2\epsilon) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left( \partial(X_t, Y_t) > \epsilon \cup \partial(X_s, Y_s) > \epsilon \right). \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from the triangle inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma C.4.**

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} | \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_1, Y_1) \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_2, Y_2) \leq r} | & \leq \min_i \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r - 2\epsilon \leq \partial(X_i, Y_i) \leq r) + \min_i \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r \leq \partial(X_i, Y_i) \leq r + 2\epsilon) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{\max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) > \epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma C.4.* We have

$$| \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_1, Y_1) \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_2, Y_2) \leq r} | \leq | \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_1, Y_1) \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_2, Y_2) \leq r} | \mathbf{1}_{\max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) \leq \epsilon} + \mathbf{1}_{\max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) > \epsilon}. \quad (42)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(X_1, Y_1) > r + 2\epsilon \text{ and } \max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) \leq \epsilon & \Rightarrow \partial(X_2, Y_2) > r \\ \partial(X_2, Y_2) < r - 2\epsilon \text{ and } \max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) \leq \epsilon & \Rightarrow \partial(X_2, Y_2) \leq r \end{aligned}$$

in which case the first term of (42) is zero. The same argument holds if  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  and  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are switched. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} | \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_1, Y_1) \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{\partial(X_2, Y_2) \leq r} | \mathbf{1}_{\max(\partial(X_1, X_2), \partial(Y_1, Y_2)) \leq \epsilon} \\ & \leq \min_i \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{\{\max(0, r - 2\epsilon) \leq \partial(X_i, Y_i) \leq r + 2\epsilon\}} \\ & \leq \min_i \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r - 2\epsilon \leq \partial(X_i, Y_i) \leq r) + \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(r \leq \partial(X_i, Y_i) \leq r + 2\epsilon) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## Appendix D: Proof of Theorem B.1 and Lemma B.2

*Proof of Theorem B.1.* Set  $k = \lfloor uT \rfloor$ . We decompose the error as follows

$$\begin{aligned} T^{1/2} R_{m,T}(k, r) & = T^{1/2} \mathcal{S}_T(u, r) - T^{1/2} M_{m,T}(u, r) \\ & = \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^{n(T)}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s, r) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s(\frac{s}{T}), r) \quad (44)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \quad (45)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s| > m}}^k \sum_{i \in \{t, s\}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{i,m} \right]. \quad (46)$$

After showing the above terms converge to zero, it remains to control a final error term with the part that drives the distributional properties. Namely,

$$\frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|>m}}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] - \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_t(Y_{m,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r)) \quad (47)$$

where we recall that

$$Y_{m,T,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'(\cdot)} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right] | \mathcal{G}_{t+j,m} \right].$$

We treat these terms in turn. For (43),(44) and (45), we apply [Lemma C.2](#) and [Lemma C.3](#). More specifically, for (43), this yields under [Assumption 2.9](#)

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^{n(T)}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s, r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min \left( v_{t,t-k}^{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}} (j), C \log^{-2\kappa}(\epsilon_T^{-1}) + 2 \sup_t \mathbb{P}(\partial(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}) > \epsilon_T) \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\alpha_T \ll \epsilon_T \ll \alpha_T^{1/2}$ . Similarly, for (44), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min \left( v_{t,t-k}^{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}} (j) + v_{t,t-k}^{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}(\cdot)} (j), C \log^{-2\kappa}(\epsilon_T^{-1}) + 2 \sup_t \mathbb{P}(\partial(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T})) > \epsilon_T) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\epsilon_T = T^{-\alpha}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . For (45), [Lemma C.2](#) yields under [Assumption 4.3\(ii\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_t \min \left( 2v_{t,t-k}^{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}(\cdot)} (j), \delta_m \right) = 0. \quad (48) \end{aligned}$$

For (46) we use [Lemma D.1](#). Finally, that the error terms in (47) are negligible follows from [Lemma D.2](#).  $\square$

**Lemma D.1.** *Suppose [Assumption 4.3](#) holds. Then*

$$\limsup_m \limsup_T \left\| \max_{k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|>m}}^k \sum_{i \in \{s,t\}} \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{i,m}] \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} = 0.$$

*Proof.* We decompose this term as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \max_{k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{t,m}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{s,m}] \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & \leq \left\| \max_{k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|>m}}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & + \left\| \max_{k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|>m}}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{t,m}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{s,m}] \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \\ & =: I_1 + II_2. \end{aligned}$$

We treat  $I_1$  first. Using

$$\sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|\leq m}}^k = \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=(t-m)\vee 1}^{(t+m)\wedge k} = \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=(t-m)\vee 1}^t + \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=t+1}^{(t+m)\wedge k} = \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=(t-m)\vee 1}^t + \sum_{s=2}^k \sum_{t=s-m\vee 1}^{s-1}.$$

and [Lemma C.1](#), and a similar argument as in the proof of [Lemma C.2](#), yields that for any fixed  $m$

$$\left\| \max_{k\leq T} \left| \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{s=t-m}^t \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T P_{t-j} \left( \sum_{s=t-m}^t \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right) \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = o(T^{3/2}).$$

To treat  $I_2$ , write

$$J_{t,s} = \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{t,m}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{s,m}]$$

and let  $p_1, p_2 = 1, \dots, m$  and  $q_1 \neq q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor$ . The Cauchy Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{k\leq T} \left| \sum_{t,s=1:|t-s|>m}^k J_{t,s} \right| \right|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{k\leq T} \left| \sum_{1\leq p_1, p_2 \leq m} \sum_{1\leq q_1 \neq q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right| \right|^2 \\ &\leq m^2 \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{k\leq T} \sum_{1\leq p_1, p_2 \leq m} \left| \sum_{1\leq q_1 \neq q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right| \right|^2 \\ &\leq m^2 \sum_{1\leq p_1, p_2 \leq m} \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{k\leq T} \left| \sum_{1\leq q_1 \neq q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right| \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the term inside the expectation we note that it can be verified that  $J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2}$  and  $J_{r_1+m s_1, r_2+m s_2}$  are uncorrelated for different pairs  $(q_1, q_2) \neq (s_1, s_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{1\leq q_1 < q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{q_2=2}^{\lfloor k/m \rfloor} \sum_{q_1=1}^{q_2-1} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{q_2=2}^{\lfloor k/m \rfloor} \sum_{q_1=1}^{q_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left| J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right|^2 \leq C \sum_{q_2=2}^{\lfloor k/m \rfloor} (q_2 - 1) = C \frac{(\lfloor k/m \rfloor - 1) \lfloor k/m \rfloor}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we define our function  $S_{b,n} = \sum_{l=b+1}^{b+n} \zeta_l$  where  $\zeta_l = \sum_{q_2=b+2}^{l-1}$ . Then we find that

$$\mathbb{E} |S_{b,n}|^2 \leq g(F_{b,n}) := C \sum_{q_2=b+1}^{b+\lfloor k/m \rfloor} \sum_{q_1=b}^{q_2-1} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor k/m \rfloor} i$$

and it follows from theorem 3 in [\[56\]](#)

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \max_{1\leq k\leq T} \left| \sum_{1\leq q_1 < q_2 \leq \lfloor k/m \rfloor} J_{p_1+m q_1, p_2+m q_2} \right| \right|^2 \leq C \log_2(2\lfloor T/m \rfloor)^2 \lfloor T/m \rfloor^2.$$

Therefore, for fixed  $m$

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \max_{k\leq T} \left| \sum_{t,s=1:|t-s|>m}^k J_{t,s} \right| \right|^2 \leq C m^2 \log_2(2\lfloor T/m \rfloor)^2 T^2 = o(T^3).$$

□

**Lemma D.2.**

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_u \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s|>m}}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T}), r) | \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] - \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^m P_t(Y_{m,T,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r)) \right| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.2.* We recall the notation (41), and make a few remarks. Observe that  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T})$  is independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{t,m}$  for  $|s-t| > m$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(\frac{t}{T})$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{G}_{t,m}$ . Let  $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$  be an independent copy of the auxiliary process  $(\mathbb{X}_t(u) : t \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in [0, 1])$ . Then, almost surely, for  $|s-t| > m$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,s} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows similar to the proof of term  $I_1$  in the proof of Lemma D.1 that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \max_{k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \left( \sum_{t,s=1}^k - \sum_{\substack{t,s=1 \\ |t-s| > m}}^k \right) \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R},2} = 0.$$

Thus with  $Y_{m,T,t}(\frac{t}{T}, u, r) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] \right]$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{t,s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t} \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right] \right] = \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \bar{Y}_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right).$$

Therefore, it suffices to control

$$\frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right) - \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^m P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) \right).$$

Note that for all  $u, v \in [0, 1]$ , the process  $\{Y_{m,T,t}(v, u, r)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is stationary, zero mean,  $\mathcal{G}_{t,m}$ -measurable and is independent of  $\mathcal{G}_l$  where  $l \leq t - m + 1$ . Hence, almost surely

$$T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right) = T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right) \right) = T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right) \right).$$

Lemma D.2 now follows from Lemma D.3, which controls a shift in rescaled time.  $\square$

**Lemma D.3.**

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, u, r \right) \right) - \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) \right) \right| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.3.* Making the identification  $k = \lfloor uT \rfloor$ , and using a change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^k P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) &= \sum_{t=1-j}^0 P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{k-j} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^j P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{k-j} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) - \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{t=1}^j \left| P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right| + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{t=k-j+1}^k \left| P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right| \\ & \lesssim m^2 \max_{j=0, \dots, m-1} \max_{t=1, \dots, j} \left| P_{t-j} \left( Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right| + m^2 \max_{j=0, \dots, m-1} \max_{t=k-j+1, \dots, k} \left| P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For the next step, denote

$$Z_{m,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}, \frac{s}{T}\right) := \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}\left(\frac{s}{T}\right)}\left[\mathfrak{h}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}\right), \tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}\left(\frac{s}{T}\right), r\right)\right]\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t,m}\right]. \quad (49)$$

Observe  $Y_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}, u, r\right) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} Z_{m,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}, \frac{s}{T}\right)$  and that  $P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r\right)\right) \stackrel{d}{=} P_0\left(Y_{m,T,j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r\right)\right)$ . A union bound and  $b^2 \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq b) = b^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[1_{\{|X| \geq b\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X|^2 1_{\{|X| \geq b\}}]$  therefore yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{t=k-j+1}^k \left|P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r\right)\right)\right| > \epsilon\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{t=T-j+1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \left|P_t\left(Z_{m,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{s}{T}, r\right)\right)\right| > \epsilon\right) \\ & \lesssim \max_{t=1, \dots, T} \max_{j=0, \dots, m-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \left|P_t\left(Z_{m,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, v, r\right)\right)\right|\right)^2 1_{\left\{\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \left|P_t\left(Z_{m,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, v, r\right)\right)\right| > \sqrt{T} \epsilon / m^2\right\}}\right] \\ & \leq \max_{j=0, \dots, m-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sup_{u, v \in [0,1]} \left|P_0\left(Z_{m,j}(u, v)\right)\right|\right)^2 1_{\left\{\sup_{u, v \in [0,1]} \left|P_0\left(Z_{m,j}(u, v)\right)\right| > \sqrt{T} / m^2 \epsilon\right\}}\right] \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , for any fixed  $m$ , since

$$\left\| \sup_{u, v \in [0,1]} \left|P_0\left(Z_{m,j}(u, v)\right)\right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} \leq \left\| \sup_{u, v \in [0,1]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}(v)} \mathfrak{h}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m,0}(u), \tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}(v), r\right) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} < \infty.$$

□

*Proof Lemma B.2.* We recall the notation

$$Y_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}, u, r\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}\left(\frac{s}{T}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathfrak{h}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m,t}\left(\frac{t}{T}\right), \tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{m,0}\left(\frac{s}{T}\right), r\right)\right]\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t,m}\right]$$

Define  $\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k} = \left\{t : \frac{t}{k} \in \left(\frac{l-1}{2L}, \frac{l}{2L}\right)\right\}$  as well as

$$\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right) = P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r\right)\right) P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j'}\left(\frac{t+j'}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r\right)\right)$$

and

$$\Gamma_{m,T,t,j,j'}(v, w) = P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j}\left(v, \frac{k}{T}, r\right)\right) P_t\left(Y_{m,T,t+j'}\left(w, \frac{k}{T}, r\right)\right).$$

Then the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^k \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right] - \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{l=1}^{2L} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}} \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t,j,j'}\left(\frac{l}{2L}u, \frac{l}{2L}u\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right]\right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^k \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right] - \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{l=1}^{2L} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}} \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right]\right| \quad (50) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{1}{2L} \sum_{l=1}^{2L} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_{m,T,t,j,j'}\left(\frac{l}{2L}u, \frac{l}{2L}u\right)\middle|\mathcal{G}_{t-1}\right]\right)\right|. \quad (51)$$

Note that if  $2^L \geq k$ , then the error (50) is zero. If  $k > 2^L$ , the points are not evenly distributed across the bins. The number of points per bin is  $\lfloor \frac{k}{2^L} \rfloor$  or  $\lceil \frac{k}{2^L} \rceil$  and we can therefore bound (50) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{l=1}^{2L} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|}{k} - \frac{1}{2L}\right) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}} (\cdot)\right| \leq \sum_{l=1}^{2L} \left|\frac{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}|}{k} - \frac{1}{2L}\right| \max_{t=1, \dots, T} \max_{j, j'=0, \dots, m-1} \mathbb{E}\left|\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\right| \\ & \leq 2^L \left|\frac{k/2^L \pm 1}{k2^L} - \frac{1}{2^L}\right| \max_{t=1, \dots, T} \max_{j, j'=0, \dots, m-1} \mathbb{E}\left|\Gamma_{m,T,t}\left(\frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T}\right)\right| \end{aligned}$$

$$= O(2^L/k),$$

Since, by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \Gamma_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T} \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right|^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j'} \left( \frac{t+j'}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right|^2}$$

and by the contraction property

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| P_t \left( Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{k}{T}, r \right) \right) \right|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T})} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,j}(\frac{t}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{j,m} \right] \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sup_{u,v \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(v)} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,0}(u), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(v), r) \right] \right|^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{k^2}{T^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For (51), we simply observe that  $t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,k}$  implies  $\frac{t}{T} \in \left( \frac{l-1}{2^L} \frac{k}{T}, \frac{l}{2^L} \frac{k}{T} \right] 4$  and since  $k = \lfloor uT \rfloor$ ,

$$\left| \frac{t+j}{T} - \frac{l}{2^L} u \right| \leq \frac{j}{T} + \left| \frac{l \pm 1}{2^L} \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} - \frac{l}{2^L} \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} - \frac{uT}{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \right| \leq \frac{j}{T} + \left| \frac{1}{2^L} \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} \right| + \left| \frac{l}{2^L} (\frac{uT}{\lfloor uT \rfloor} - 1) \right| \leq \frac{m}{T} + \frac{1}{2^L} + \frac{1}{T}$$

where it was used that  $\sup_{u \in (1/T, 1)} | \frac{uT}{\lfloor uT \rfloor} - 1 |$ . Therefore (51) is of order  $O(\frac{m}{T} + \frac{1}{2^L})$ . Recall the notation defined in (49)

$$Z_{m,t}(u, v) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(v)} \left[ \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(u), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(v), r) \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t,m} \right]$$

and denote

$$g(\mathbb{X}_{m,t}(v), u, r) := \int_0^u \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(w)} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t}(v), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(w), r)] dw.$$

From the above, we thus find

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j, j'=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} \frac{1}{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \Gamma_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T} \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right] \right] \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} \sum_{j, j'=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^L} \sum_{l=1}^{2^L} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}} \Gamma_{m,T,t,j,j'} \left( \frac{l}{2^L} u, \frac{l}{2^L} u, \right) \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} \sum_{j, j'=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^L} \sum_{l=1}^{2^L} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{s, s'=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} P_t(Z_{m,t+j}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, \frac{s}{T})) P_t(Z_{m,t+j'}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, \frac{s'}{T})) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the ergodic theorem

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{L,l,\lfloor uT \rfloor}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{s, s'=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} P_t(Z_{m,t+j}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, \frac{s}{T})) P_t(Z_{m,t+j'}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, \frac{s'}{T})) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E} \left[ u \int_0^1 P_0(Z_{m,j}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, xu)) dx \cdot u \int_0^1 P_0(Z_{m,j'}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, x'u)) dx' \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, a change of variables yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j, j'=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T} \frac{1}{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \Gamma_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, \frac{t+j'}{T} \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right] \right] \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j, j'=0}^m \frac{u}{2^L} \sum_{l=1}^{2^L} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^u P_0(Z_{m,j}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, v)) dv \cdot \int_0^u P_0(Z_{m,j'}(\frac{l}{2^L} u, v')) dv' \right] \\ &= \sum_{j, j'=0}^m \int_0^u \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^u P_0(Z_{m,j}(\eta, v)) dv \cdot \int_0^u P_0(Z_{m,j'}(\eta, v')) dv' \right] d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $g(\tilde{X}_j(\eta), u, r) = \int_0^u \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}'_0(v)}[\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{X}_j(\eta), \tilde{X}'_0(v), r)]dv$  and using (48), the dominated convergence theorem allows us to conclude that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^u \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=0}^m \int_0^u P_0(Z_{m,j}(\eta, v)) dv \right|^2 dv = \int_0^u \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Cov} \left( g(\tilde{X}_\ell(\eta), u, r), g(\tilde{X}'_0(\eta), u, r) \right) d\eta.$$

□

## Appendix E: Proof of Theorem 4.5 and Theorem E.2

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* Our argument makes use of corollary in [33] (see also [35, thm. 2.3]), stated here for convenience.

**Theorem E.1.** *Let  $\xi_T, T \geq 1$  be a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued stochastic process defined on  $[0, 1]^2$  whose paths are in  $D([0, 1]^2)$  almost surely. Then  $(\xi_T : T \geq 0)$  converges weakly to  $\xi$  in  $D([0, 1]^2)$  if*

- (i) *the fdis of  $\xi_T$  converge to the corresponding fdis of a process  $\xi$ ;*
- (ii) *the process  $\xi_T$  can be written as the difference of two coordinate-wise non-decreasing processes  $\xi_T^0$  and  $\xi_T^*$ ;*
- (iii) *there exists constants  $\alpha \geq \beta > 2, c \in (0, \infty)$  such that for all  $T, \mathbb{E}[\xi_T(0, 0)]^\alpha \leq c$  and*

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_T(u, r) - \xi_T(u', r')]^\alpha \leq c \|(u, r) - (u', r')\|_\infty^\alpha \quad \text{whenever } \|(u, r) - (u', r')\|_\infty^\beta \geq T^{-1};$$

- (iv) *the process  $\xi_T^*$  satisfies*

$$\max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq T} \left| \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) - \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1 - 1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) \right| + \left| \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) - \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2 - 1}{T} \right) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

We will verify the conditions of Theorem E.1 to show weak convergence of  $\xi_{m,T} = T^{1/2} M_{m,T}$  to  $\xi_m = \mathbb{G}_m$  in  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . It then follows from the proof of Theorem 4.4 that  $\xi_m \rightsquigarrow \xi = \mathbb{G}$  in  $D([0, 1] \times [0, \mathcal{R}])$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . An application of Theorem E.2 and theorem 4.2 of [11] then conclude the proof of the statement.

In the rest of the proof, we assume without loss of generality that  $[0, \mathcal{R}] = [0, 1]$ ; otherwise we may simply show the result for  $\tilde{\xi}_{m,T}(u, r) = \xi_{m,T}(u, \mathcal{R}r)$ . Convergence of the fdis  $\xi_{m,T} \rightsquigarrow \xi_m$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  follows from Theorem 4.4. To show (ii), let  $\check{Y}_{m,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}, u, r)$  be as in (41) but then with the demeaned kernel  $\mathfrak{h}$  replaced with the original kernel  $h$ , and set

$$Y_{m,T,t}(u, r) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \check{Y}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right)$$

then

$$\xi_{m,T}(u, r) = \frac{2}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[Y_{m,T,t}(u, r) | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}] - \frac{2}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor u'T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[Y_{m,T,t}(u, r) | \mathcal{G}_t] =: \xi_T^0(u, r) - \xi_T^*(u, r).$$

and it is clear that (ii) holds. To verify (iii), note that Burkholder's inequality and  $(\lfloor uT \rfloor - \lfloor u'T \rfloor) \leq 2(u - u')T$  yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_{m,T}(u, r) - \xi_{m,T}(u', r) \right|^{2p} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T^p} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor u'T \rfloor} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^m P_t \left( Y_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) - Y_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u', r \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2p}^2 \right)^p \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{T^p} \left( \sum_{t=\lfloor u'T \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^m P_t \left( Y_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u', r \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2p}^2 \right)^p \\ & \lesssim \frac{\lfloor uT \rfloor}{T^{3p}} (\lfloor uT \rfloor - \lfloor u'T \rfloor)^{2p} m^{2p} + \frac{1}{T^p} (\lfloor uT \rfloor - \lfloor u'T \rfloor)^p m^{2p} \leq c(u - u')^p. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore under the assumptions (29)-(30), it follows similarly that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_{m,T}(u, r) - \xi_{m,T}(u, r') \right|^{2p} &\leq 2 \frac{1}{T^p} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^m P_t \left( Y_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) \right) - P_t \left( Y_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r' \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2p}^{2p} \\ &\lesssim C' \mathcal{R}^p (r - r')^p m^{2p} \leq c (r - r')^p. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider (iv). Firstly, from the definition of (41) and the fact that the terms involved are bounded uniformly by 2,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^{i_1} \mathbb{E} [Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) | \mathcal{G}_t] - \sum_{t=1}^{i_1-1} \mathbb{E} [Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1-1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) | \mathcal{G}_t] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq T} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{i_1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) - Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1-1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \sum_{t=1}^{i_1} \mathbb{E} [Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1-1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) | \mathcal{G}_t] - \sum_{t=1}^{i_1-1} \mathbb{E} [Y_{m,T,t} \left( \frac{i_1-1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) | \mathcal{G}_t] \right| \right\} = O \left( \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \right). \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

Secondly,  $\mathbb{X}_{m,t+j}(\cdot)$  is  $\mathcal{G}_{t+j,m}$ -measurable and  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\cdot)$  is independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{t+j,m}$ . Therefore, the triangle inequality, monotonicity of the expectation and (30) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \ddot{Y}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, b \right) - \ddot{Y}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, a \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left( \partial_{\mathbb{B}} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right) \right) \in (a, b) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t+j,m} \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_x \mathbb{P} \left( \partial_{\mathbb{B}} \left( x, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right) \right) \in (a, b) \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \leq C' |b - a|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq T} \left| \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2}{T} \right) - \xi_T^* \left( \frac{i_1}{T}, \frac{i_2-1}{T} \right) \right| \leq T^{-3/2} m \max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq T} \sum_{t,s=1}^{i_1} C' T^{-1} = O(T^{-1/2}). \quad (53)$$

Thus (iv) is implied by (52) and (53).  $\square$

**Theorem E.2.** Under the conditions of Theorem 4.5, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, \mathcal{R}]} \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} T^{1/2} |\mathcal{S}_T(u, r) - M_{m,T}(u, r)| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

*Proof of Theorem E.2.* We recall the notation from (41)

$$Y_{m,T,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T}, u, r \right) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor uT \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right)} \left[ \mathfrak{h} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t+j,m} \right] \right].$$

Set  $k = \lfloor uT \rfloor$  and let

$$R_{m,T}(u, r) = \mathcal{S}_T(u, r) - M_{m,T}(u, r) = R_{1,m,T}(u, r) - R_{2,m,T}(u, r),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{1,m,T}(u, r) &= T^{-3/2} \sum_{t,s=1}^k h(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^{n(T)}, r) \\ &\quad + 2T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right)} \left[ h \left( \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t+j} \left( \frac{t+j}{T} \right), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0} \left( \frac{s}{T} \right), r \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t+j,m} \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{2,m,T}(u, r) &= T^{-3/2} \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathbb{E} h(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_t^{n(T)}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_s^{n(T)}, r) \\
&\quad + 2T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{X}}'(s)} \left[ h(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{m,t+j}(\frac{t+j}{T}), \tilde{\mathbb{X}}'_{m,0}(\frac{s}{T}), r) \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t+j,m} \right] \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that both are nondecreasing functions in  $r$ . Subdivide the interval  $[0, \mathcal{R}]$  into  $B_T$  intervals of length  $\delta_T$  so that

$$I_j = [a_{j-1}, a_j], 1 \leq k \leq \lfloor 1/\delta_T \rfloor + 1$$

where the dependence of these intervals on  $T$  is omitted for notational simplicity. Then [35, Lemma 2.5]

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_r \sup_u |R_{m,T}(u, r)| &\leq \sup_u \max_{1 \leq j \leq B_T} \sup_{r \in I_j} |R_{m,T}(u, r)| \\
&\leq \sup_u \max_{1 \leq j \leq B_T} 2|R_{m,T}(u, a_j)| + |R_{2,m,T}(u, a_j) - R_{2,m,T}(u, a_{j-1})| =: I_T + II_T.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that under the additional assumption, and an argument as in the proof of Lemma C.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{t,s=1}^k \mathfrak{h}(Z_t, Z_s, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_s, r) \right| \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \sup_t \min \left( \theta_{t,j,j-k}^Z + \theta_{t,j,j-k}^Y \left\| \mathfrak{h}(Z_t, Z_{t-k}, r) - \mathfrak{h}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}, r) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}, 2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

A union bound and an argument as given in Theorem B.1 then yields under this stronger assumption

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(I_T \geq \epsilon) \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} B_T \mathbb{P}(\sup_u 2|R_{m,T}(u, a_j)| \geq \epsilon) = 0$$

For any  $B_T \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $B_T \frac{\log^2(T)}{T} \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Using assumption (29) and an argument similar as in the derivation of (53), we find  $\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(II_T \geq \epsilon) = 0$ , provided that  $T^{1/2} \frac{1}{B_T} \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, we may take  $B_T = T^{3/4}$ , which ensures both terms converge to zero in probability. The result follows.  $\square$