

Averaging symmetric positive-definite matrices on the space of eigen-decompositions

Sungkyu Jung¹, Brian Rooks², David Groisser³ and Armin Schwartzman⁴

¹*Department of Statistics, Seoul National University, e-mail: sungkyu@snu.ac.kr*

²*Statistics & Data Corporation, e-mail: btrooks88@gmail.com*

³*Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, e-mail: groisser@ufl.edu*

⁴*Division of Biostatistics and Halıcıoğlu Data Science Institute, University of California, San Diego, e-mail: armins@ucsd.edu*

Abstract: We study extensions of Fréchet means for random objects in the space $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ of $p \times p$ symmetric positive-definite matrices using the scaling-rotation geometric framework introduced by Jung et al. [*SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl.* **36** (2015) 1180-1201]. The scaling-rotation framework is designed to enjoy a clearer interpretation of the changes in random ellipsoids in terms of scaling and rotation. In this work, we formally define the *scaling-rotation (SR) mean set* to be the set of Fréchet means in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ with respect to the scaling-rotation distance. Since computing such means requires a difficult optimization, we also define the *partial scaling-rotation (PSR) mean set* lying on the space of eigen-decompositions as a proxy for the SR mean set. The PSR mean set is easier to compute and its projection to $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ often coincides with SR mean set. Minimal conditions are required to ensure that the mean sets are non-empty. Because eigen-decompositions are never unique, neither are PSR means, but we give sufficient conditions for the sample PSR mean to be unique up to the action of a certain finite group. We also establish strong consistency of the sample PSR means as estimators of the population PSR mean set, and a central limit theorem. In an application to multivariate tensor-based morphometry, we demonstrate that a two-group test using the proposed PSR means can have greater power than the two-group test using the usual affine-invariant geometric framework for symmetric positive-definite matrices.

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62R30; secondary 62E20.

Keywords and phrases: scaling-rotation distance, statistics on manifolds, strong consistency, central limit theorem.

1. Introduction

Recently, much work has been done to advance the statistical analysis of random symmetric positive-definite (SPD) matrices. Applications in which data arise as SPD matrices include analysis of diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) data (Alexander, 2005; Batchelor et al., 2005), multivariate tensor-based morphometry (TBM) (Lepore et al., 2008; Paquette et al., 2017), and tensor computing (Pennec, Fillard and Ayache, 2006). In this paper we consider the setting in

which we have a random sample of SPD matrices and wish to estimate a population mean.

Location estimation is an important first step in the development of many statistical techniques. For applications in which data are SPD matrices, these techniques include two sample hypothesis testing (Schwartzman, Dougherty and Taylor, 2010) for comparing average brain scans from two groups of interest, principal geodesic analysis (Fletcher et al., 2004) for visualizing major modes of variation in a sample of SPD matrices, and weighted mean estimation, which has useful applications in diffusion tensor processing, including fiber tracking, smoothing, and interpolation (Batchelor et al., 2005; Carmichael et al., 2013).

One of the challenges of developing methods for analyzing SPD-valued data is that the positive-definiteness constraint precludes $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, the space of $p \times p$ SPD matrices, from being a vector subspace of $\text{Sym}(p)$, the space of all symmetric $p \times p$ matrices. This can be easily visualized for $p = 2$; the free coordinates (two diagonal elements and upper off-diagonal element) of all 2×2 SPD matrices in $\text{Sym}(2) \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ constitutes an open convex cone. Hence, conventional estimation or inferential techniques developed for data that varies freely over Euclidean space may not be appropriate for the statistical analysis of SPD matrices. With this in mind, many location estimation frameworks for $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ have been developed in recent years, including the log-Euclidean framework (Arsigny et al., 2007), affine-invariant framework (Fletcher et al., 2004; Pennec, Fillard and Ayache, 2006), log-Cholesky framework (Lin, 2019), and Procrustes framework (Dryden, Koloydenko and Zhou, 2009; Masarotto, Panaretos and Zemel, 2019); see Feragen and Fuster (2017) for other examples. Given a sample of SPD matrices, most of these estimation methods amount to transforming the SPD-valued observations, averaging in the space of the transformed observations, and then mapping the mean of the transformed data into $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. For example, the log-Euclidean method maps each observation into $\text{Sym}(p)$ via the matrix logarithm, computes the sample mean of the transformed observations, and then maps that mean into $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ via the matrix exponential function, while the Procrustes size-and-shape method begins with averaging the Cholesky square roots of observations, and then maps the average \hat{L} to $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ as $\hat{\Sigma} = \hat{L}\hat{L}^T$, where A^T denotes the transpose of a matrix A .

While these geometric frameworks account for the positive-definiteness constraint of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, it is not clear which, if any, of the log-Euclidean, affine-invariant, or Procrustes size-and-shape frameworks is most “natural” for describing deformations of SPD matrices. Motivated by the analysis of DTI data, a setting in which observations are SPD matrices represented as ellipsoids in \mathbb{R}^3 , Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser (2015) developed a different framework, called the scaling-rotation (SR) framework for $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. Under this framework, the distance between SPD matrices X and Y is defined as the minimal amount of rotation of axes and scaling of axis lengths necessary to deform the ellipsoid associated with X into the ellipsoid associated with Y . For this, an SPD matrix X is decomposed into eigenvectors and eigenvalues, which respectively stand for rotations and scalings. The SR framework yields interpolation curves that have desirable properties, including constant rate of rotation and log-linear scaling

of eigenvalues, and is the only geometric framework (compared to the aforementioned frameworks) to produce both pure-scaling interpolation curves and pure-rotation curves when the endpoints differ by pure scaling or pure rotation. While interpolation approaches similar to the SR framework can be found in Wang et al. (2014) and Collard et al. (2014), only the SR framework addresses the non-uniqueness of eigen-decompositions (Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman, 2017, 2021). See Feragen and Fuster (2017) and Feragen and Nye (2020) for a comparison of the SR framework with other geometric frameworks for SPD matrices.

A major complication in developing statistical procedures using the SR framework is that eigen-decompositions are not unique. For example, an SPD matrix $X = \text{diag}(8, 3) = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ can be eigen-decomposed into either

$$X = U_1 D_1 U_1^T, \quad U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix},$$

or

$$X = U_2 D_2 U_2^T, \quad U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(There are in fact 4 distinct eigen-decompositions for $\text{diag}(8, 3)$, if the eigenvector matrices are required to be orthogonal matrices of positive determinant.) Write (U_X, D_X) for an eigen-decomposition (a pair of eigenvector and eigenvalue matrices) of an SPD matrix X , and let \mathcal{F} be the eigen-composition map, e.g., $\mathcal{F}(U_X, D_X) = U_X D_X U_X^T = X$ (see Definition 2.1). The SR framework defines the “distance” between $X, Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ to be $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y) := \inf d_M((U_X, D_X), (U_Y, D_Y))$, where the infimum is taken over all possible eigen-decompositions of both X and Y , and d_M is the (geodesic) distance function on the space $M(p)$ of eigen-decompositions (see Definition 2.2). $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is a stratified space; the stratum to which $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ belongs is determined by the topological structure of the fiber $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ (the set of all eigen-decompositions corresponding to $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$). The scaling-rotation distance $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ fails to be a true metric on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, and is difficult to compute because the set we minimize over in the definition of $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y)$ is a pair of these fibers (whose topology varies with the strata of X and Y). With these complications in mind, the goal of this paper is to establish location-estimation methods using the SR framework as a foundation for future methods that will inherit the interpretability of the framework.

If one of the well-established geometric frameworks, such as the affine-invariant or log-Cholesky frameworks, is used, then $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is understood as a Riemannian manifold with a Riemannian metric tensor defined on the tangent bundle. The Riemannian metric gives rise to a distance function, say d , and $(\text{Sym}^+(p), d)$ is a metric space. For these metric spaces, the Fréchet mean (Fréchet, 1948) is a natural candidate for a location parameter, and conditions that guarantee uniqueness of Fréchet means, convergence of empirical Fréchet means to the population counterpart, and central-limit-theorem type results, are well-known (cf. Afsari, 2011; Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru, 2003, 2005; Bhattacharya and Lin, 2017; Huckemann, 2011a,b; Eltzner et al., 2021; Schötz, 2022).

But in the SR framework, since $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is not a true metric on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, many of the theoretical properties of Fréchet means (if they are defined) are no longer guaranteed. Moreover, on a practical side, computing a scaling-rotation (SR) mean, defined as a minimizer over the sum of squared SR distances to observations, requires discrete optimization in general and is thus challenging to implement. As a proxy for the SR mean, we define a *partial scaling-rotation (PSR) mean* on the space of eigen-decompositions; for a finite sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, the PSR mean set is the set of minimizers

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{(U,D)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \inf_{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)} d_M((U_X, D_X), (U, D)) \right\}^2. \quad (1.1)$$

See Section 3 for precise definitions and an iterative algorithm for computing a sample PSR mean. The PSR means can be thought of as a special case of generalized Fréchet means, proposed in Huckemann (2011b) and studied in Huckemann (2011a); Huckemann and Eltzner (2021); Schötz (2019, 2022). The PSR means can be mapped to $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ (via the eigen-composition map \mathcal{F}), and we establish some sufficient conditions under which the PSR means are *equivalent* to the SR mean. These conditions are related to the strata of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ in which the sample and means are located.

Another artifact caused by the stratification of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is that the distance function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is not continuous on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, and in principle we do not know whether an SR mean is well-defined. We show that the distance function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$, the cost function appeared in (1.1) for the PSR means, and their squares are *lower semicontinuous*, and thus are measurable, which guarantees that both the SR and PSR mean sets are well-defined. We also show that SR and PSR mean sets exist, under mild assumptions.

PSR means are never unique, due to the fact that eigen-decompositions are not unique. In the best case, there are $2^{p-1}p!$ elements in the PSR mean set for a $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued sample, corresponding to the number of distinct eigen-decompositions of any SPD matrix with no repeated eigenvalues. As a result, if a PSR mean set $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ consists of exactly $2^{p-1}p!$ elements, then the corresponding $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued mean, $\mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$ consists of a single element, and we may say that $\mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$ is unique. A sufficient condition to ensure such uniqueness will be given in Section 4.3 in terms of data-support diameter.

We also show that with only a finite-variance condition the sample PSR mean set is consistent with the population PSR mean set, in the sense of Bhat-tacharya and Patrangenaru (2003), following the now standard technique laid out in Huckemann (2011b) (with modifications required to the fact that the cost function in (1.1) is not continuous). With additional conditions, needed to ensure the equivalence between PSR mean sets and the SR mean, imposed, we conclude that the sample SR mean set is consistent with the (unique) SR mean. A type of central limit theorem for the PSR mean is also developed, in which the limiting normal distribution is defined on a tangent space of the space of eigen-decompositions. See Section 4 for theoretical properties of (partial) SR means, including existence, uniqueness, and asymptotic results. Although these

properties are developed to cope with the unique challenges (e.g. non-uniqueness of eigen-decompositions and the resulting stratification) coming from using the SR framework, we believe the course of our technical development will be instructive for developing statistics in other stratified Riemannian spaces.

Numerical results demonstrate the subtle difference between the SR mean and the PSR mean, and the advantage of (partial) SR means over other means defined via other geometric frameworks. The potential advantage of the SR framework with PSR means is further demonstrated in an application to multivariate TBM for testing the shape difference in lateral ventricular structure in the brains of pre-term and full-term infants, using data from [Paquette et al. \(2017\)](#). In particular, an approximate bootstrap test based on PSR means is found to be more powerful than that based on the affine-invariant means of [Pennec, Fillard and Ayache \(2006\)](#). We conclude with practical advice on the analysis of SPD matrices and a discussion of potential future directions of research. Technical details, proofs, and additional lemmas that may be useful in other contexts, are contained in [Appendix B](#).

2. The Scaling-Rotation Framework

In this section we provide a brief overview of the scaling-rotation framework ([Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser, 2015](#); [Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman, 2017, 2021](#)) for analyzing SPD-valued data. The motivation for the scaling-rotation framework is intuitive: Any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ can be identified with the ellipsoid with surface coordinates $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^p : y^T X^{-1} y = 1\}$, so a measure of distance between X and Y can be defined as a suitable combination of the minimum amount of rotation of axes and stretching or shrinking of axes needed to deform the ellipsoid corresponding to X into the ellipsoid associated with Y . Since the semi-axes and squared semi-axis lengths of the ellipsoid associated with an SPD matrix are its eigenvectors and eigenvalues, respectively, this *scaling-rotation distance* is computed on the space of eigen-decompositions.

2.1. Geometry of the Eigen-Decomposition Space

Recall that any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ has an eigen-decomposition $X = UDU^T$, where $U \in SO(p)$, the space of $p \times p$ rotation matrices, and $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$, the space of $p \times p$ diagonal matrices possessing positive diagonal entries. We denote the space of eigen-decompositions as $M(p) := SO(p) \times \text{Diag}^+(p)$. The Lie groups $SO(p)$ and $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ carry natural bi-invariant Riemannian metrics g_{SO} and $g_{\mathcal{D}^+}$, defined as follows. The tangent space at U of $SO(p)$ is $T_U(SO(p)) = \{AU : A \in \mathfrak{so}(p)\}$, where $\mathfrak{so}(p)$ is the space of $p \times p$ antisymmetric matrices. At an arbitrary point $U \in SO(p)$ we define $g_{SO}|_U(A_1, A_2) = -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A_1 U^T A_2 U^T)$ for $A_1, A_2 \in \mathfrak{so}(p)$, where $\text{tr}(A)$ is the trace of the matrix A . The tangent space $T_D(\text{Diag}^+(p)) = \{LD : L \in \text{Diag}(p)\}$ is canonically identified with $\text{Diag}(p)$, the set of $p \times p$ diagonal matrices, and we define $g_{\mathcal{D}^+}|_D(L_1, L_2) = \text{tr}(L_1 D^{-1} L_2 D^{-1})$, for $L_1, L_2 \in \text{Diag}(p)$. Given eigen-

decompositions (U_1, D_1) and (U_2, D_2) of SPD matrices X_1 and X_2 , we measure the distance between their eigen-decompositions using the following product metric:

Definition 2.1. We define the *geodesic distance function* d_M on $M(p)$, with a weighting parameter $k > 0$, by

$$d_M^2((U_1, D_1), (U_2, D_2)) = kd_{SO}^2(U_1, U_2) + d_{D^+}^2(D_1, D_2), \quad (2.1)$$

where $d_{SO}(U_1, U_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|\text{Log}(U_2U_1^T)\|_F$, $d_{D^+}(D_1, D_2) = \|\text{Log}(D_1) - \text{Log}(D_2)\|_F$, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm.

In Definition 2.1 and (2.2) below, $\text{Exp}(A)$ stands for the matrix exponential of A , and $\text{Log}(R)$ for the principal matrix logarithm of R .¹ The weighting parameter k is a fixed constant throughout.

For a geometric interpretation of the geodesic distance, note that the geodesic distance between eigen-decompositions (U_1, D_1) and (U_2, D_2) equals the length of the $M(p)$ -valued geodesic

$$\gamma_{(U_1, D_1), (U_2, D_2)}(t) = (\text{Exp}(t\text{Log}(U_2U_1^{-1}))U_1, \text{Exp}(t\text{Log}(D_2D_1^{-1}))D_1) \quad (2.2)$$

connecting (U_1, D_1) and (U_2, D_2) , which is a minimal-length smooth curve connecting these two points when the tangent spaces of $M(p)$ are equipped with the canonical inner product $g_M = kg_{SO} \oplus g_{D^+}$. The functions $d_{D^+}(D_1, D_2)$ and $d_{SO}(U_1, U_2)$ in (2.1) have the following interpretations: $d_{D^+}(D_1, D_2)$ computes the Euclidean distance between $\text{Log}(D_1)$ and $\text{Log}(D_2)$, while $d_{SO}(U_1, U_2)$ equals the magnitude of the rotation angle of $U_2U_1^{-1}$ when $p = 2, 3$.

The exponential map at $(U, D) \in M(p)$ is $\text{Exp}_{(U, D)} : T_{(U, D)}M(p) \rightarrow M(p)$, given by

$$\text{Exp}_{(U, D)}((AU, LD)) = (\text{Exp}(A)U, \text{Exp}(L)D). \quad (2.3)$$

The inverse of the exponential map at $(U, D) \in M(p)$, defined for $\mathcal{U}_{(U, D)} = \{(V, \Lambda) \in M(p) : \|\text{Log}(VU^T)\|_F < \pi\}$, is $\text{Log}_{(U, D)} : \mathcal{U}_{(U, D)} \rightarrow T_{(U, D)}M(p)$, and is given by

$$\text{Log}_{(U, D)}((V, \Lambda)) = (\text{Log}(VU^T)U, \text{Log}(\Lambda D^{-1})D). \quad (2.4)$$

With the Riemannian metric $g_M = kg_{SO} \oplus g_{D^+}$, the induced norm on the tangent space $T_{(U, D)}M(p)$ satisfies

$$\|(A_1U, L_1D) - (A_2U, L_2D)\|_{(U, D)}^2 = \frac{k}{2}\text{tr}((A_1 - A_2)(A_1 - A_2)^T) + \text{tr}((L_1 - L_2)(L_1 - L_2)^T),$$

for any two tangent vectors $(A_1U, L_1D), (A_2U, L_2D) \in T_{(U, D)}M(p)$.

¹The principal logarithm for rotation matrices is defined on the set $\{R \in SO(p) : R \text{ is not an involution}\}$, a dense open subset of $SO(p)$. When there exists no principal logarithm of R , the notation $\text{Log}(R)$ denotes any solution $A \in \mathfrak{so}(p)$ of $\text{Exp}(A) = R$ satisfying that $\|A\|_F$ is the smallest among all such choices of A . For such rare cases, the geodesic (2.2) is not unique, but $\|\text{Log}(R)\|_F$ is well defined.

2.2. Minimal Smooth Scaling-Rotation Curves and Scaling-Rotation Distance

Since eigen-decompositions are not unique, any method for computing the distance between SPD matrices using the eigen-decomposition space must take this non-uniqueness into account. To address this, [Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser \(2015\)](#) proposed the following distance for $\text{Sym}^+(p)$:

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{F} : M(p) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(p)$ denote the eigen-composition map $\mathcal{F}(U, D) = UDU^T$, and for any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, let $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ denote the set of eigen-decompositions of X . The *scaling-rotation distance* between $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and $Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ is

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y) = \inf_{\substack{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X), \\ (U_Y, D_Y) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)}} d_M((U_X, D_X), (U_Y, D_Y)).$$

Eigen-decompositions $(U_X^*, D_X^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ and $(U_Y^*, D_Y^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$ form a *minimal pair* if $d_M((U_X^*, D_X^*), (U_Y^*, D_Y^*)) = d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y)$.

Remark 2.3. Since the sets $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$ are compact for any $X, Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, there will always be a pair of eigen-decompositions of X and Y that form a minimal pair.

Remark 2.4. The function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is not a true metric on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ since there are instances in which the triangle inequality fails. It is a semi-metric and invariant under simultaneous matrix inversion, uniform scaling and conjugation by a rotation matrix ([Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser, 2015](#), Theorem 3.11). When restricted to the subset of SPD matrices which possess no repeated eigenvalues, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is a true metric ([Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser, 2015](#), Theorem 3.12).

For SPD matrices X, Y and their eigen-decompositions $(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$, $(U_Y, D_Y) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$, one can create a smooth scaling-rotation (SSR) curve on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ connecting X and Y as $\chi_{X,Y}(t) = \mathcal{F}(\gamma_{(U_X, D_X), (U_Y, D_Y)}(t))$, where $\gamma_{(U_X, D_X), (U_Y, D_Y)}(t)$ is a minimal-length geodesic curve defined in [\(2.2\)](#). If one considers the family of all possible geodesics in $(M(p), g_M)$ from $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ to $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$, the scaling-rotation distance equals the length of the shortest geodesics in that family. By definition, the shortest geodesic (which may not be uniquely defined) connects a minimal pair $(U_X^*, D_X^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ and $(U_Y^*, D_Y^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$. Computing $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y)$ for any dimension p is straightforward when X and Y both have no repeated eigenvalues, since X and Y then both have finitely many eigen-decompositions and therefore finitely many connecting SSR curves, or when one of X, Y is a scaled identity matrix. Formulas for computing $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, Y)$ for all possible eigenvalue-multiplicity combinations of arguments X and Y are provided in [Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman \(2017\)](#) for $p = 2, 3$.

2.3. The stratification of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ and fibers of the eigen-composition map

The space $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is naturally stratified by the eigenvalue-multiplicity types. We will use the notation S_p^{top} to denote the subset of SPD matrices which have no repeated eigenvalues (the superscript “top” refers to the “top stratum”). We also use the notation $S_p^{\text{lwr}} := \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$, for the union of all “lower” strata, and $S_p^{\text{bot}} \subset S_p^{\text{lwr}}$ denotes the set of SPD matrices with equal eigenvalues. The eigenvalue-multiplicity stratification of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is equivalent to the fiber-type stratification of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$; SPD matrices $X, Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ are in the same stratum if $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$ are diffeomorphic, as we elaborate below.

Let $\text{Part}\{1, \dots, p\}$ be the set of partitions of $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Recall that $\text{Part}\{1, \dots, p\}$ is partially ordered by the refinement relation, with “ $J_1 \leq J_2$,” meaning that $J_2 \in \text{Part}\{1, \dots, p\}$ is a refinement of $J_1 \in \text{Part}\{1, \dots, p\}$. As an example, for $p = 2$, there are only two partitions $J_{\text{top}} := \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}$ and $J_{\text{bot}} := \{\{1, 2\}\}$, and $J_{\text{bot}} \leq J_{\text{top}}$.

Each $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$ naturally determines a partition $J_D \in \text{Part}\{1, \dots, p\}$, depending on which diagonal elements are equal. The group $SO(p)$ acts on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ on the left via $(U, X) \mapsto UXU^T$. For $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$, the stabilizer subgroup G_D under the $SO(p)$ action on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is $G_D := \{R \in SO(p) : RDR^T = D\}$. The stabilizer G_D depends only on J_D , and generally has more than one connected component. Write $G_D^0 \subset G_D$ for the connected component of G_D containing the identity.

Let \mathcal{S}_p be the group of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. For a permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_p$ and $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$, the natural left action of \mathcal{S}_p on $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ is denoted by $\pi \cdot D$, and is given by permuting the diagonal entries of D . Write the matrix of the linear map “ $\pi \cdot$ ” by $P_\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, where the entries of P_π are $(P_\pi)_{ij} = \delta_{i, \pi(j)}$, so that $\pi \cdot D = P_\pi D P_\pi^T$. We call a $p \times p$ matrix P a *signed-permutation matrix* if for some $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_p$ the entries of P satisfy $P_{ij} = \pm \delta_{i, \pi(j)}$. We call such P *even* if $\det(P) = 1$. Each such P thus represents a permutation of coordinates in \mathbb{R}^p , combined with an even number of sign changes. The set $\mathcal{G}(p)$ of all such *even signed-permutation matrices* has exactly $2^{p-1}p!$ elements, and is a matrix subgroup of $SO(p)$. The natural left-action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$ on $M(p)$ is given by

$$h \cdot (U, D) := (Uh^{-1}, h \cdot D), \quad (2.5)$$

where $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$ and $h \cdot D := hDh^{-1}$. The action of h on (U, D) represents the simultaneous permutation (by the unsigned permutation associated with h) of columns of U and diagonal elements of D , and the sign-changes of the columns of U . The identity element of $\mathcal{G}(p)$ is I_p .

It is shown in Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser (2015) that the fiber $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ —that is, the set of eigen-decompositions of X —is characterized with any $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ by

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X) = \{h \cdot (UR, D) : R \in G_D^0, h \in \mathcal{G}(p)\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus, the left-action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$ on $M(p)$ is fiber-preserving.

The structure of fiber $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ depends on the stratum to which X belongs. If $X \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, then for any eigen-decomposition $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$, we have $G_D^0 = \{I_p\}$ and the orbit

$$\mathcal{G}(p) \cdot (U, D) = \{h \cdot (U, D) : h \in \mathcal{G}(p)\} \quad (2.7)$$

is *exactly* the set of eigen-decompositions of X . Intuitively, any eigen-decomposition of $X \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ can be obtained from any other by a sign-change of eigenvectors and a simultaneous permutation of eigenvectors and eigenvalues. In contrast, if $X \in S_p^{\text{bot}}$ (i.e., X is a scaled identity matrix), then $G_X^0 = G_X = SO(p)$ and $h \cdot X = X$ for all $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$, thus the fiber of \mathcal{F} at X is $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X) = SO(p) \times \{X\}$. A complete characterization of fibers of \mathcal{F} for other lower strata can be found in [Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman \(2017\)](#).

3. Location estimation under the scaling-rotation framework

3.1. Fréchet mean

An approach often used for developing location estimators for non-Euclidean metric spaces is Fréchet mean estimation ([Fréchet, 1948](#)), in which estimators are derived as minimizers of a metric-dependent sample mean-squared error.

Definition 3.1. Let M be a metric space with metric ρ and suppose that X, X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. M -valued random variables with induced probability measure P on M . The *population Fréchet mean set* is

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{C \in M} \int_M \rho^2(X, C) P(dX).$$

The *sample Fréchet mean set* is

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{C \in M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^2(X_i, C).$$

Examples of location estimators that have been developed for $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ using the sample Fréchet mean estimation framework include the log-Euclidean mean ([Arsigny et al., 2007](#)), affine-invariant mean ([Fletcher et al., 2004](#); [Pennec, Fillard and Ayache, 2006](#)), Procrustes size-and-shape mean ([Dryden, Koloydenko and Zhou, 2009](#)), and the log-Cholesky average ([Lin, 2019](#)). Below, we allow ourselves to use the “Fréchet mean” terminology of Definition 3.1 when the metric space (M, ρ) is replaced by the semi-metric space $(\text{Sym}^+(p), d_{SR})$.

3.2. Scaling-rotation means

We now define the population and sample scaling-rotation mean sets, consisting of the Fréchet means of SPD matrices under the scaling-rotation framework. Let P be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, and X_1, \dots, X_n be deterministic data points in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. Note that Borel measures on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ include both discrete and absolutely continuous measures, as well as mixtures of those.

Definition 3.2. The *population scaling-rotation (SR) mean set* with respect to P is

$$E^{(\mathcal{SR})} := \operatorname{argmin}_{S \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S), \quad f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) = \int_{\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X, S) P(dX). \quad (3.1)$$

Given $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$, the *sample SR mean set* is

$$E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})} := \operatorname{argmin}_{S \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)} f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S), \quad f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X_i, S).$$

Since, for some $S \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$, the function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, S) : \operatorname{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has discontinuities (see Appendix A), we must address whether the objective function $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ of (3.1) is well-defined. We defer this discussion to Section 4.1.

Locating a sample SR mean can be recast as solving a difficult constrained optimization problem on $M(p)^n$ since

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X_i, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2((U_i^*, D_i^*), (U_S^{*,i}, D_S^{*,i})), \quad (3.2)$$

where for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $(U_i^*, D_i^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$ and $(U_S^{*,i}, D_S^{*,i}) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ are an arbitrary minimal pair. Due to the non-uniqueness of eigen-decompositions, there may be many pairs of eigen-decompositions of X_i and S which form a minimal pair.

However, when $S \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ the scaling-rotation distance simplifies to

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, S) = \inf_{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)} d_M((U_X, D_X), (U_S, D_S)), \quad (3.3)$$

where (U_S, D_S) is *any* eigen-decomposition of S . In this case, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, S)$ is easier to compute since one can select an arbitrary eigen-decomposition (U_S, D_S) of S and then determine the infimum of the distances between (U_S, D_S) and the eigen-decompositions of X . If S has repeated eigenvalues (or, equivalently, S is in a lower stratum), this simplification does not hold in general; there may be no eigen-decomposition of S that is at minimal distance from $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$ simultaneously for all i .

From the simplification in (3.3), we propose to solve for minimizers of the simplified objective function

$$(U, D) \mapsto \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \inf_{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)} d_M^2((U_X, D_X), (U, D)),$$

where the argument (U, D) is an arbitrarily chosen eigen-decomposition of the argument S from (3.2).

To formally define this simplified optimization problem, we first define the following measure of distance between an SPD matrix and a given eigen-decomposition of another SPD matrix:

Definition 3.3. The *partial scaling-rotation (PSR) distance* is the map $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}} : \text{Sym}^+(p) \times M(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(X, (U, D)) = \inf_{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)} d_M((U_X, D_X), (U, D)).$$

It can be checked from the definitions that for any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and any $(U, D) \in M(p)$

$$d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(X, \mathcal{F}(U, D)) \leq d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(X, (U, D)), \quad (3.4)$$

and by (3.3), the equality in (3.4) holds if $\mathcal{F}(U, D) \in S_p^{\text{top}}$.

Definition 3.4. The population and sample *partial scaling-rotation (PSR) mean sets* are subsets of $M(p)$ and are defined respectively by $E^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} := \text{argmin}_{(U, D) \in M(p)} f^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(U, D)$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} := \text{argmin}_{(U, D) \in M(p)} f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(U, D)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(U, D) &= \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, (U, D)) P(dX), \\ f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(U, D) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, (U, D)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In Sections 4.1 and 4.2 we show that for any Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, the population mean set $E^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ is well-defined and non-empty. There, we also show that both $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ are non-empty for any sample X_1, \dots, X_n . An iterative algorithm to compute a sample PSR mean is given in Section 3.3.

The PSR means lie in $M(p)$ and can be mapped to $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ via the eigencomposition map. The sample PSR mean set can be thought of as yielding an approximation of the sample SR mean set, and it is of interest to know when the two sets are “equivalent”. The theorem below provides conditions under which $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset M(p)$ is equivalent to $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ in the sense that every member of $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ is an eigen-decomposition of a member of $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ and vice-versa. Define $M^{\text{top}}(p) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_p^{\text{top}})$, the subset of $M(p)$ consisting of all elements $(U, D) \in M(p)$ in which the diagonal elements of D are not repeated.

Theorem 3.5. Let $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ be defined with deterministic data points $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$.

- (a) $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \supset \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}})$.
- (b) If $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}} \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}) \subset E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})})$.
- (c) If $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}} \neq \emptyset$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset M^{\text{top}}(p)$, then $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}})$.

In particular, since $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \neq \emptyset$ (see Corollary 4.10), parts (a) and (b) together imply that if $E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$, then

$$E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}) = E_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}.$$

Moreover, the statements above hold when $E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ are replaced by $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, respectively, provided that $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U, D) < \infty$ for some $(U, D) \in M(p)$.

The previous theorem suggests that in many realistic situations, there may be no cost to using the PSR means in place of the SR means, which are more difficult to compute in practice. If minimizing $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ or $f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ over S_p^{lwr} (the union of lower strata of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$) is feasible, then the following result can be used to tell whether a PSR mean is equivalent to an SR mean.

For the rest of the paper, we generally use the notation m rather than (U, D) for an arbitrary element of $M(p)$ if there is no explicit need for writing out the eigenvector and eigenvalue matrices separately.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $m^{\mathcal{PSR}} \in M(p)$ be a PSR mean with respect to a probability measure P on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

- (a) *If $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{PSR}})) \leq \min_{S \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S)$, then $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{PSR}}) \in E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$.*
- (b) *If $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{PSR}})) > \min_{S \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S)$, then $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{PSR}}) \notin E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{lwr}}$.*

Let $\hat{m}^{\mathcal{PSR}} \in M(p)$ be a sample PSR mean with respect to a given sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Similarly to the statements above,

- (c) *If $f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\mathcal{PSR}})) \leq \min_{S \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S)$, then $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\mathcal{PSR}}) \in E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$.*
- (d) *If $f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\mathcal{PSR}})) > \min_{S \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S)$, then $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\mathcal{PSR}}) \notin E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{lwr}}$.*

We remark that for $p = 2$, $S_p^{\text{lwr}} = \{cI_2 : c > 0\}$ and the function $f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ can be efficiently minimized over S_p^{lwr} by a one-dimensional numerical optimization.

A key condition to ensure the equivalence of the SR means to PSR means is that all SR means have no repeated eigenvalues (i.e., $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$), which in fact depends on the distribution P . Below, we give a sufficient condition for $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$ or $E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$. Let $\delta : \text{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be $\delta(S) = \inf\{d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, S') : S' \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}\}$. Thus, $\delta(S)$ is a “distance” from S to lower strata of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. (Because S_p^{lwr} is closed, $\delta(S) > 0$ for any $S \in S_p^{\text{top}}$.)

Theorem 3.7. *Let X be a $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued random variable with distribution P . Assume that there exists $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ and $r \in (0, \delta(S_0)/3)$ such that*

$$P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, S_0) \leq r) = 1.$$

Then $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$.

Similarly, let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, and assume that there exists $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ and $r \in (0, \delta(S_0)/3)$ satisfying $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, S_0) \leq r$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$.

The condition of Theorem 3.7 requires that the sample lie in a ball that is sufficiently far from lower strata of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, but this condition is by no means

necessary. The condition, however, cannot be replaced by the weaker condition that all data lie in S_p^{top} ; there are examples in which this weaker condition is met, but $E_n^{(\text{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{lwr}}$. In Section 5.1, we provide numerical examples where the PSR means are equivalent (or not equivalent) to the SR means.

3.3. Sample PSR Mean Estimation Algorithm

Given a sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, we propose an algorithm for approximating a member of $E_n^{(\text{PSR})}$, that is to find a minimizer of $f_n^{(\text{PSR})}$. The algorithm is similar to the generalized Procrustes algorithm (Gower, 1975).

Procedure 3.8 (Sample PSR Mean). Set tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$ and pick initial guess $(\hat{U}^{(0)}, \hat{D}^{(0)}) \in M(p)$. Set $j = 0$.

- Step 1. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, find $(U_i^{(j)}, D_i^{(j)}) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$ that has the smallest geodesic distance from $(\hat{U}^{(j)}, \hat{D}^{(j)})$.
- Step 2. Compute $(\hat{U}^{(j+1)}, \hat{D}^{(j+1)}) \in \text{argmin}_{(U,D) \in M(p)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2((U_i^{(j)}, D_i^{(j)}), (U, D))$.

If $|f_n^{(\text{PSR})}(\hat{U}^{(j+1)}, \hat{D}^{(j+1)}) - f_n^{(\text{PSR})}(\hat{U}^{(j)}, \hat{D}^{(j)})| > \varepsilon$, increment j and repeat Steps 1 and 2. Otherwise, $(\hat{U}_{\text{PSR}}, \hat{D}_{\text{PSR}}) = (\hat{U}^{(j+1)}, \hat{D}^{(j+1)})$ is the approximate sample PSR mean produced by this algorithm, given the tolerance ε and initial guess $(\hat{U}^{(0)}, \hat{D}^{(0)})$.

Remark 3.9. The above procedure will always terminate since $f_n^{(\text{PSR})}(U, D) \geq 0$ for any $(U, D) \in M(p)$ and $f_n^{(\text{PSR})}(\hat{U}^{(j)}, \hat{D}^{(j)}) \geq f_n^{(\text{PSR})}(\hat{U}^{(j+1)}, \hat{D}^{(j+1)})$ for any $j \geq 0$.

If X_i lies in S_p^{top} , performing Step 1 will simply require searching over the $2^{(p-1)}p!$ distinct eigen-decompositions of X_i to find one that attains the minimal geodesic distance from $(\hat{U}^{(j)}, \hat{D}^{(j)})$. Solving for the minimizing eigen-decomposition of X_i is also easy if X_i is a scaled identity matrix ($X_i \in S_p^{\text{bot}}$), since the fact that $X_i = cI_p = U(cI_p)U^T$ for any $U \in SO(p)$ implies that $(\hat{U}^{(j)}, cI_p)$ will be the eigen-decomposition of X_i with minimal geodesic distance from $(\hat{U}^{(j)}, \hat{D}^{(j)})$. Determining the minimizing eigen-decomposition of X_i when $p = 3$ and X_i has two distinct eigenvalues can be done by comparing three closed-form expressions, as described in Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman (2017). For $p > 3$, there are no known corresponding closed-form expressions for determining a minimizing eigen-decomposition of $X_i \in S_p^{\text{lwr}} \setminus S_p^{\text{bot}}$.

The optimization problem over $M(p)$ in Step 2 can be divided into separate minimization problems over $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ and $SO(p)$:

$$\hat{D}^{(j+1)} = \text{argmin}_{D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}(D_i^{(j)}) - \text{Log}(D)\|_F^2,$$

$$\hat{U}^{(j+1)} \in \text{argmin}_{U \in SO(p)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}(U_i^{(j)}U^{-1})\|_F^2.$$

The solution $\hat{D}^{(j+1)}$ is uniquely given by $\hat{D}^{(j+1)} = \text{Exp}\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}(D_i^{(j)})\}$, while $\hat{U}^{(j+1)}$ usually must be approximated via numerical procedures. It is shown in Manton (2004) that when the rotation matrices $U_1^{(j)}, \dots, U_n^{(j)}$ lie within a geodesic ball of radius $\frac{\pi}{2}$, there is a unique minimizer $\hat{U}^{(j+1)}$, and this minimizer can be approximated by a globally convergent gradient descent algorithm on $(SO(p), g_{SO})$. It is highly unlikely that one would be able to de-couple estimation of the eigenvalue and eigenvector means in this manner while solving for a sample SR mean.

4. Theoretical Properties of Scaling-Rotation Means

4.1. Lower semicontinuity and other properties of d_{SR} and d_{PSR}

One of the complications in using the SR framework is that the symmetric function d_{SR} is not continuous in either variable (see Appendix A for an example). Unfortunately, d_{PSR} is also not continuous at every point of $\text{Sym}^+(p) \times M(p)$, as illustrated by the following example. Let $X(\varepsilon) := \text{diag}(e^\varepsilon, e^{-\varepsilon})$ and $(U, D) = (R(\theta), I_2)$, where $R(\theta)$ is the 2×2 rotation matrix corresponding to a counter-clockwise rotation by angle θ . Then for any $\varepsilon \neq 0$ and $0 < |\theta| < \pi/4$,

$$d_{PSR}(X(\varepsilon), (U, D)) = (k\theta^2 + 2\varepsilon^2)^{1/2},$$

which implies that $d_{PSR}(X(\varepsilon), (U, D)) \rightarrow \sqrt{k}|\theta|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since $d_{PSR}(X(0), (U, D)) = 0$, it follows that d_{PSR} is not continuous at $(I_2, (U, D))$, and therefore d_{PSR} is not continuous on $\text{Sym}^+(p) \times M(p)$. Nevertheless, d_{PSR} is continuous with respect to the second variable in $M(p)$, and is jointly continuous on $S_p^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$, as we state below.

Lemma 4.1. (a) d_{PSR} is continuous on $S_p^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$.

(b) For each $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, the function $d_{PSR}(S, \cdot) : M(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Lipschitz, with Lipschitz-constant 1. That is, for all $m_1, m_2 \in M(p)$,

$$|d_{PSR}(S, m_1) - d_{PSR}(S, m_2)| < d_M(m_1, m_2).$$

In particular, $d_{PSR}(S, \cdot)$ is uniformly continuous for each S .

Since both d_{SR} and d_{PSR} are not continuous, in principle we do not know yet whether the integrals of $d_{SR}^2(\cdot, \Sigma)$ and $d_{PSR}^2(\cdot, (U, D))$, for $\Sigma \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and $(U, D) \in M(p)$, in Definitions 3.2 and 3.4, are well defined. A related question is: under which conditions do the population (partial) scaling-rotation means exist? A key observation in answering these questions is that these functions $d_{SR}^2(\cdot, \Sigma)$ and $d_{PSR}^2(\cdot; (U, D))$ are *lower semicontinuous* (LSC). (Recall that a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{X} is a topological space, is LSC at a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an open neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x_0 such that $f(x) > f(x_0) - \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{U}$. If f is LSC at each $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, we say that f is LSC.)

Definition 4.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a topological space and \mathcal{Y} be a set, and let $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

- (a) We say that f is *LSC in its first variable, uniformly with respect to its second variable*, if for all $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an open neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x_0 such that

$$f(x, y) > f(x_0, y) - \epsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and all } y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (4.1)$$

- (b) If \mathcal{Y} is also a topological space, we say that f is *LSC in its first variable, locally uniformly with respect to its second variable*, if every $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ has an open neighborhood \mathcal{V} such that $f|_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{V}}$ is LSC in the first variable, uniformly with respect to the second. If \mathcal{Y} is locally compact, this property is equivalent to: for every compact set $K \subset \mathcal{Y}$, $f|_{\mathcal{X} \times K}$ is LSC in the first variable, uniformly with respect to the second.

Any finite-dimensional manifold (in particular, $M(p)$) is locally compact.

Theorem 4.3. (a) Let $S_0 \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, and $m_0 \in M(p)$. Then the functions $d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(\cdot, S_0)$ and $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(\cdot, m_0)$ and their square-roots are LSC.
 (b) The functions $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(\cdot, \cdot)$, $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(\cdot, \cdot)$ are LSC in the first variable, locally uniformly with respect to the second variable.

In this theorem, part (a) is actually redundant; it is a special case of part (b), with the one-point set $\{S_0\}$ playing the role of the compact set in Definition 4.2(b). Also, for $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ and $d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2$, the terms “first variable” and “second variable” in Theorem 4.3 can be interchanged, since $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is symmetric. Verifying Theorem 4.3 requires substantial background work regarding the geometry of the eigen-decomposition space $M(p)$ and the eigen-composition map \mathcal{F} . The following lemma is the key technical result used in proving Theorem 4.3. The radius- r open ball centered at $m_0 \in M(p)$ is $B_r^{d_M}(m_0) := \{m \in M(p) : d_M(m, m_0) < r\}$.

Lemma 4.4. Let $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ be a compact set. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. There exists $\delta_1 = \delta_1(S, K, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $S_0 \in K$, all $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$, all $m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, and all $S' \in \mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_1}^{d_M}(m))$,

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S', S_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, S_0)^2 - \epsilon \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S', m_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S, m_0)^2 - \epsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4.4 does not immediately imply that $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, S_0)$ or $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(\cdot, m_0)$ is LSC at S , because the set $\mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_1}^{d_M}(m))$ in the lemma is not always open in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ (\mathcal{F} does not map arbitrary open sets to open sets). However, as we show in an appendix, there exists an open ball centered at $\mathcal{F}(m)$ in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ with radius smaller than δ_1 that is contained in $\mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_1}^{d_M}(m))$ (Corollary B.13). The background and our proofs of these supporting results and Theorem 4.3 are provided in Appendix B.2.

Semicontinuous real-valued functions are (Borel) measurable, so an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.3(a) is that the integrals defining the objective functions $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ for the population (partial) scaling-rotation means exist in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. This establishes the following.

Proposition 4.5. *Let P be any Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

- (i) *For any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, the integral $\int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(\cdot, S)dP$ is well-defined in $[0, \infty]$.*
- (ii) *For any $m \in M(p)$, the integral $\int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(\cdot, m)dP$ is well-defined in $[0, \infty]$.*

(Proof for Proposition 4.5 is omitted.)

A finite-variance condition for the random variable $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ with respect to the (partial) scaling-rotation distance (already needed to define $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$) is required to establish (semi-)continuity of $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, non-emptiness of $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ (discussed in Section 4.2), and relationships between these sets (in Section 3.2). For a probability measure P on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, we say P has *finite SR-variance* if $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) < \infty$ for all $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Likewise, P has *finite PSR-variance* if $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U, D) < \infty$ for all $(U, D) \in M(p)$. The following result shows that such a condition needs to be assumed only at a single point, rather than at all points.

Lemma 4.6. *Let P be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ and let $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ and $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ be the corresponding objective functions defined in equations (3.5) and (3.1).*

- (a) *If $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) < \infty$ for some $m \in M(p)$, then $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) < \infty$ for any $m \in M(p)$, and $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) < \infty$ for any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$.*
- (b) *If $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) < \infty$ for some $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, then $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) < \infty$ for any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

By (3.4), any probability measure with finite PSR-variance always has finite SR variance.

We conclude this background section by answering a natural question: Are the SR and PSR mean functions $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ and $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ (semi-)continuous?

Lemma 4.7. *Let P be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

- (i) *If P is supported in a compact set $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$, then $f^{(\mathcal{SR})} : \text{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is LSC.*
- (ii) *If P has finite PSR-variance, then $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})} : M(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.*

The preceding result also implies that for any finite sample X_1, \dots, X_n , $f_n^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ (or $f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$) is LSC (or continuous, respectively). Lemma 4.7 plays an important role in developing theoretical properties of SR and PSR means, which we present in the subsequent sections.

4.2. Existence of scaling-rotation means

The SR mean set $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ consists of the minimizers of the function $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$. To prove existence of SR means (or, equivalently, non-emptiness of $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$) we use the fact that any LSC function on a compact set attains a minimum. For this purpose, we first verify *coercivity* of $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ (and $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$).

Proposition 4.8. *Let P be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

(a) *There exists a compact set $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ such that*

$$\inf_{S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) = \inf_{S \in K} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S). \quad (4.4)$$

(b) *There exists a compact set $\tilde{K} \subset M(p)$ such that*

$$\inf_{m \in M(p)} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = \inf_{m \in \tilde{K}} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m). \quad (4.5)$$

Proposition 4.8 says that $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ (and $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, respectively) is coercive, i.e. uniformly large outside some compact set, and, under the finite-variance condition, has a (non-strictly) smaller value somewhere inside that compact set. Using this fact and the lower semicontinuity of $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ (respectively, $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$), we show in Theorem 4.9 that the SR and PSR mean sets are non-empty. In this theorem, the bounded support condition for P is used only to ensure the lower semicontinuity of $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$.

Theorem 4.9. *Let P be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.*

- (a) *If P is supported on a compact set, then $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \neq \emptyset$.*
- (b) *If P has finite PSR-variance, then $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})} \neq \emptyset$.*

Since the conditions of Theorem 4.9 are met for any empirical measure defined from a finite set $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$, a corollary of the population SR mean result is the existence of sample SR means:

Corollary 4.10. *For any finite n , and any $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, $E_n^{(\mathcal{SR})} \neq \emptyset$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})} \neq \emptyset$.*

Remark 4.11. For any Borel-measurable $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued random variable with finite PSR-variance, the PSR mean set $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is closed. In particular, every sample PSR mean set is closed. To verify this, recall from Lemma 4.7 that $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is continuous. The PSR mean set is a level set of a continuous function, and therefore is closed.

Moreover, as seen in Proposition 4.8, the closed set $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is a subset of a compact set, thus is compact as well.

4.3. Uniqueness of PSR means

Much work has been done on the question of uniqueness of the Fréchet mean of Riemannian manifold-valued observations. It is known that the Fréchet mean is unique as long as the support of the probability distribution lies within a geodesic ball of a certain radius (see, for example, Afsari (2011)). Although $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is not a geodesic distance on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, we can obtain a similar result for a kind of uniqueness of the PSR mean.

For any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, recall from (2.6) that $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X) = \{h \cdot (UR, D) : R \in G_D^0, h \in \mathcal{G}(p)\}$ for an eigen-decomposition (U, D) of X . Since the finite group $\mathcal{G}(p)$ acts freely and isometrically on $M(p)$, for any $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$ and $m \in M(p)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(X, m) &= \inf_{R \in G_D^0, h' \in \mathcal{G}(p)} d_M(h' \cdot (UR, D), m) \\ &= \inf_{R \in G_D^0, h, h' \in \mathcal{G}(p)} d_M(h \cdot h' \cdot (UR, D), h \cdot m) = d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(X, h \cdot m). \end{aligned}$$

For a sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, we have thus

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, h \cdot m) = f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(h \cdot m) \quad (4.6)$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$ and $m \in M(p)$. It follows from (4.6) that for any $m \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$, the remaining members of its orbit $\mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m$ (see (2.7)) also belong to $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$. Thus, $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ will contain at least $2^{p-1}p!$ elements. In the case where $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ only contains $2^{p-1}p!$ elements (necessarily belonging to the same orbit), we will say that the sample PSR mean is *unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$* . The notion of uniqueness (up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$) for the population PSR mean in $E^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ is defined similarly.

The following lemma yields a useful lower bound on the distance between distinct eigen-decompositions of an SPD matrix in S_p^{top} . (Note that for any $X \in S_p^{\text{low}}$, the set of eigen-decompositions of X is not discrete, so two eigen-decompositions of X may be arbitrarily close to each other.)

Lemma 4.12. (a) For any $(U, D) \in M(p)$ and for any $h \in \mathcal{G}(p) \setminus \{I_p\}$,

$$d_M((U, D), h \cdot (U, D)) \geq \sqrt{k} \beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}$$

where $\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} := \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p) \setminus \{I_p\}} d_{SO}(I_p, h) = \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p) \setminus \{I_p\}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\text{Log}(h)\|_F$.

(b) The quantity $\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}$ satisfies $\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ for any $p \geq 2$.

(c) For any $X \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, any two distinct eigen-decompositions (U_X, D_X) and (U'_X, D'_X) of X satisfy $d_M((U_X, D_X), (U'_X, D'_X)) \geq \sqrt{k} \beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}$.

Remark 4.13. It is easily checked that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ when $p = 2, 3$.

In Theorem 4.15 below, we provide a sufficient condition for uniqueness (up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$) of the PSR means. In preparation, we first provide a sufficient condition for a distribution on $M(p)$ to have a unique Fréchet mean. Recall that $(M(p), g_M)$ is a Riemannian manifold, which in turn implies that $(M(p), d_M)$ is a metric space. The Fréchet mean set for a probability distribution P on $M(p)$ is thus well-defined.

Lemma 4.14. Let \tilde{P} be a Borel probability measure on $M(p)$. Suppose that $\text{supp}(\tilde{P})$, the support of \tilde{P} , satisfies

$$\text{supp}(\tilde{P}) \subseteq B_r^{d_M}(m_0) \quad (4.7)$$

for some $r \leq \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}$ and some $m_0 \in M(p)$. Then there exists a unique Fréchet mean $\bar{m}(\tilde{P}) := \operatorname{argmin}_{m \in M(p)} \int_{M(p)} d_M^2(\tilde{X}, m) \tilde{P}(d\tilde{X})$ of P , and $\bar{m}(\tilde{P}) \in B_r^{d_M}(m_0)$.

Similarly to Lemma 4.14, if a deterministic sample $m_1, \dots, m_n \in M(p)$ lies in $B_r^{d_M}(m_0)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) for some $r \leq \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}$ and some $m_0 \in M(p)$, then the sample Fréchet mean $\bar{m} := \operatorname{argmin}_{m \in M(p)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2(m_i, m)$ is unique and lies in $B_r^{d_M}(m_0)$.

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose the probability measure P on $\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to volume measure and that for two independent $\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued random variables X_1, X_2 whose distribution is P ,*

$$P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_1, X_2) < r'_{cx}) = 1, \quad \text{where } r'_{cx} := \frac{\sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}}{4}. \quad (4.8)$$

Then the population PSR mean set $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$.

The number r'_{cx} is a lower bound on the regular convexity radius of the quotient space $M(p)/\mathcal{G}(p)$ with the induced Riemannian structure, as shown in Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman (2023). This ensures that a ball in $M(p)/\mathcal{G}(p)$ with radius less than r'_{cx} is convex. The quotient space $M(p)/\mathcal{G}(p)$ “sits” between $M(p)$ and $\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$; any $X \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ coincides with an element in $M(p)/\mathcal{G}(p)$, but there are multiple (in fact, infinitely many) elements in $M(p)/\mathcal{G}(p)$ corresponding to any $X \in S_p^{\text{low}}$ (cf. (2.6)). Lemma 4.12 shows that $r'_{cx} \leq \sqrt{k}\pi/8$. In contrast, the regular convexity radius of $(M(p), g_M)$ is $\sqrt{k}\pi/2$, which is much larger than r'_{cx} . Even though we work with the eigen-decomposition space $M(p)$, in Theorem 4.15 we require data-support diameter at most $r'_{cx} < \sqrt{k}\pi/2$ since, if $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2) \geq r'_{cx}$ for some $S_1, S_2 \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$, then there may be two or more eigen-decompositions of S_1 that are both closest to an eigen-decomposition of S_2 .

The assumption of absolute continuity of P in Theorem 4.15 enables us to restrict our attention to the probability-1 event for which the random variables lie in the top stratum S_p^{top} of $\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$, since the complement of S_p^{top} has volume zero in $\operatorname{Sym}^+(p)$. Corollary 4.16 below explicitly states this restriction as a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of sample PSR means of a deterministic sample. We also show that the estimation procedure (Procedure 3.8) will yield the unique (up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$) sample PSR mean.

Corollary 4.16. *Assume $X_1, \dots, X_n \in S_p^{\text{top}}$. If*

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, X_j) < r'_{cx} \quad (4.9)$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, then

- (a) *the sample PSR mean is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$;*
- (b) *choosing an eigen-decomposition of any observation from the sample as the initial guess will lead Procedure 3.8 to converge to the sample PSR mean after one iteration.*

Remark 4.17. The data-diameter condition (4.9) in Corollary 4.16 is satisfied under either of the following two conditions (in the presence of the assumption $X_i \in S_p^{\text{top}}$):

- (i) There exists an $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ such that $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) < r'_{cx}/2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.
- (ii) There exists an $m \in M(p)$ such that $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m) < r'_{cx}/2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Similarly, the condition that $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_1, X_2) < r'_{cx}$ almost surely in Theorem 4.15 is guaranteed by either (i) or (ii) above, when the latter two conditions are modified probabilistically; see Appendix B.4.4. In condition (i) above, it is necessary for the center of the open ball (data support) to lie in the top stratum, due to the fact that the functions $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, X_i)$ are, in general, only LSC (not continuous) at points belonging to S_p^{low} . For an $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{low}}$, even if a condition $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) < \epsilon$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is satisfied for arbitrarily small ϵ , $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, X_j)$ may be larger than r'_{cx} .

Proof of the statements given in this remark can be found in Appendix B.4.4.

If the data-support is small enough to satisfy (4.8) and also is far from the lower stratum (satisfying the conditions in Theorem 3.7), then the SR mean is unique, as the following corollary states.

Corollary 4.18. *Let X be a $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ -valued random variable following the distribution P . Assume that there exist $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ and $r < \min\{\delta(S_0)/3, r'_{cx}/2\}$ satisfying $P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) \leq r) = 1$. Then, (i) the PSR mean is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$, (ii) $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$, and (iii) $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} = \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$ is a singleton set.*

4.4. Asymptotic properties of the sample PSR means

This subsection addresses two aspects of the asymptotic behavior of the sample PSR mean $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$: (i) strong consistency of $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ with the population PSR mean set $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ and (ii) the large-sample limiting distribution of a sample PSR mean. Much work has been done to establish consistency and central limit theorem-type results for sample Fréchet means on Riemannian manifolds and metric spaces (Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru (2003), Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru (2005), Bhattacharya and Lin (2017), Eltzner and Huckemann (2019)). Estimation of the PSR mean does not fit into the context of estimation on Riemannian manifolds or metric spaces since the sample space $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ and parameter space $M(p)$ are different. Moreover, as we have seen, the PSR means are never unique. With this in mind, we apply the framework of generalized Fréchet means on general product spaces in Huckemann (2011a) and Huckemann (2011b) to our PSR mean estimation context, enabling us to establish conditions for strong consistency and for a central limit theorem.

We now establish a strong-consistency result for $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Throughout this subsection, let X, X_1, \dots be independent random variables mapping from a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$ to $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ equipped with its Borel σ -field, and

let P be the induced Borel probability measure on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. The sets $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ denote the population and sample PSR-mean sets defined by P and X_1, \dots, X_n , respectively.

Theorem 4.19. *Assume that P has finite PSR-variance. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_M(m, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}) = 0 \quad (4.10)$$

almost surely.

Our proof of Theorem 4.19 is contained in Appendix B.5. There, we closely follow the arguments of Huckemann (2011b) used in verifying the conditions required to establish strong consistency of the generalized Fréchet means. However, the theorems of Huckemann (2011b) are not directly applied since the function $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}$ is not continuous. Nevertheless, the Fréchet-type objective function $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})} : M(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, as shown in Lemma 4.7, a fact that plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 4.19. Schötz (2022) extends the results of Huckemann (2011b) by, among other things and in our notation, allowing for $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, \cdot)$ to be only LSC. However, this is not actually helpful for $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}$ either, because $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}$ is actually *continuous* with respect to the second variable (it is LSC with respect to the *first* variable); see Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.3.

In the proof of Theorem 4.19, we first show that with probability 1

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} \subset E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}. \quad (4.11)$$

In the terminology of Huckemann (2011b), (4.11) is called strong consistency of $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ as an estimator of $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ in the sense of Ziezold (1977). Our result (4.10) is equivalent to strong consistency in the sense of Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru (2003) (again using the terminology of Huckemann (2011b)), as shown in Lemma B.19 in the appendix. Schötz (2022) classified three types of convergence for a sequence of sets, referring to (4.11) as convergence *in the outer limit*, and to (4.10) as convergence *in the one-sided Hausdorff distance*. The last type of convergence is convergence *in Hausdorff distance*. Recall that for a metric space (M, d) the Hausdorff distance between non-empty sets $A, B \subset M$ is $d_H(A, B) := \max\{\sup_{m \in A} d(m, B), \sup_{m \in B} d(A, m)\}$.

Theorem 4.19 states that, with probability 1, any sequence $m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ of sample PSR means will eventually lie in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the population PSR mean set as the sample size n increases. But, conceivably there could be a population PSR mean in $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ with no sample PSR mean nearby even for large n , in which case $d_H(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$ would not approach zero. In other words, $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ would be a strongly consistent estimator of $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ only with respect to *one-sided* Hausdorff distance, not (two-sided) Hausdorff distance. However, if the population PSR mean is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$, then $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is a strongly consistent estimator of $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ with respect to Hausdorff distance on $(M(p), d_M)$, as shown next.

Corollary 4.20. *Assume that P has finite PSR-variance, and that $E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} = \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot \mu$ for some $\mu \in M(p)$. Then with probability 1,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \in E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}} d_M(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}, m) = 0 \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_H(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}, E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}) = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

The strong consistency of sample PSR means with the population PSR means can be converted to strong consistency of sample PSR means with the *population SR means*, as follows. For $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and a set $\mathcal{E} \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$, we define $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, \mathcal{E}) := \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, E)$.

Corollary 4.21. *Assume that P has finite PSR-variance. Then,*

(i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)})} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)})) = 0$ almost surely.

(ii) If, in addition, $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)})} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, E^{(\mathcal{SR})}) = 0$ almost surely.

(iii) If $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$ and the population SR mean is unique with $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} = \{\mu^{(\mathcal{SR})}\}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}), \mu^{(\mathcal{SR})}) = 0$ almost surely.

Note that in establishing a strong consistency property of $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ with respect to population (partial) SR means, we assumed only that the *population* mean set $E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$, not that the *sample* mean sets $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ have this uniqueness property. We also did not assume that $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} \subset M_p^{\text{top}}$.

We next establish a central limit theorem for our estimator $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$. Our strategy is to closely follow the arguments in [Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru \(2005\)](#); [Huckemann \(2011a\)](#); [Bhattacharya and Lin \(2017\)](#); [Eltzner et al. \(2021\)](#), for deriving central limit theorems for (generalized) Fréchet means on a Riemannian manifold. In particular, our central limit theorem is expressed in terms of charts and the asymptotic distributions of "linearized" estimators.

Our parameter space of interest $M(p) = SO(p) \times \text{Diag}^+(p)$ is a Riemannian manifold of dimension $d := \frac{(p-1)p}{2} + p$. As defined in Section 2.1, the tangent space at $(U, D) \in M(p)$ is $T_{(U,D)}M(p) = \{(AU, LD) : A \in \mathfrak{so}(p), L \in \text{Diag}(p)\}$, which can be canonically identified with $\mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \text{Diag}(p)$, a vector space of dimension d .

At $(U, D) \in M(p)$, we use the local chart $(\mathcal{U}_{(U,D)}, \tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)})$, where

$$\mathcal{U}_{(U,D)} = \{(V, \Lambda) \in M(p) : \|\text{Log}(VU^T)\|_F < \pi\},$$

and where $\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)} : \mathcal{U}_{(U,D)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \text{Diag}(p)$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}(V, \Lambda) = (\text{Log}(VU^T), \text{Log}(\Lambda D^{-1})). \quad (4.14)$$

Observe that $\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}^{-1}(A, L) = (\text{Exp}(A)U, \text{Exp}(L)D)$. The maps $\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}^{-1}$ are the Riemannian logarithm and exponential maps to (and from) the tangent

space $T_{(U,D)}M(p)$, composed with the right-translation isomorphism between $T_{(U,D)}M(p)$ and $T_{(I,I)}M(p) = \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \text{Diag}(p)$.

We also write the elements of $\mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \text{Diag}(p)$ in a coordinate-wise vector form. For each $(A, L) \in \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \text{Diag}(p)$, define a suitable vectorization operator vec ,

$$\text{vec}(A, L) := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{k} x_{SO}(A) \\ x_{\mathcal{D}}(L) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.15)$$

where $x_{SO}(A) \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-1)p/2}$ consists of the upper triangular entries of A (in the lexicographical ordering) and $x_{\mathcal{D}}(L) = (L_{11}, \dots, L_{pp})^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ consists of the diagonal entries of L . The inverse vectorization operator vec^{-1} is well-defined as well. We use the notation $\phi_{(U,D)}(\cdot, \cdot) := \text{vec} \circ \tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\phi_{(U,D)}^{-1}(\cdot) := \tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}^{-1} \circ \text{vec}^{-1}(\cdot)$.

Assume the following.

(A1) The probability measure P induced by X on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to volume measure, and has finite PSR-variance.

(A2) $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$. With probability 1, so is $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ (for every n).

(A3) For some $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, $P(d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_0) < r'_{cx}) = 1$.

The absolute continuity assumption (A1) ensures that any volume-zero (Lebesgue-measurable) subset of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ has probability zero. In particular, $P(X \in S_p^{\text{top}}) = 1 - P(X \in S_p^{\text{wr}}) = 1$. This fact greatly simplifies our theoretical development.

The uniqueness assumption (A2) ensures that $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ converges almost surely to $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ with respect to the Hausdorff distance (by Corollary 4.20). Therefore, for any $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, there exists a sequence $m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ satisfying $d_M(m_n, m_0) \rightarrow 0$ (or, equivalently, $\phi_{m_0}(m_n) \rightarrow \phi_{m_0}(m_0) = 0$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely. Assumption (A2) also guarantees that if (A3) is true for some PSR mean $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ then it is true for any other PSR mean in $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$.

The radius $r'_{cx} = \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}/4$ in Assumption (A3) previously appeared in Theorem 4.16, where the bounded-support assumption was used to ensure uniqueness of one element of a minimal pair (see Definition 2.2) when the other element is fixed. Similarly, assumptions (A1) and (A3) ensure that, with probability 1, for each X_i there exists a unique $m_i \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$ such that $m_i \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$, a radius- r'_{cx} ball in $M(p)$ centered at m . A stronger version of this fact will be used (in the proof of Theorem 4.22, to be given shortly) to rewrite the objective function $f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ involving $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}$ as a Fréchet objective function $m \mapsto \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2(m_i, m)$, with probability 1.

In addition, the bounded support condition (A3) ensures that with probability 1 the function $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, \cdot)$ is smooth (C^∞) and convex on a convex set. Using this fact and geometric results from given in Afsari (2011) and Afsari, Tron and Vidal (2013), we show in the proof that the gradient

$$\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) := \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) \right)_{i=1, \dots, d}$$

at $x = 0$ has mean zero, and has a finite covariance matrix $\Sigma_P := \text{Cov}(\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(0)))$. (We conjecture that (A1) guarantees that Σ_P is also positive-definite.) Likewise, as we will see in the proof, the differentiability and (strict) convexity of $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(\cdot))$ guarantee that the expectation of the Hessian $H_P(x) := E(\mathbf{H}d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)))$ exists and is positive definite at $x = 0$. Write $H_P := H_P(0)$.

In summary, Assumptions (A1)—(A3) enable us to use a second-order Taylor expansion for $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$, to which the classical central limit theorem and the law of large numbers are applied. Such an approach was used in [Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru \(2005\)](#) and [Huckemann \(2011a\)](#). In particular, our proof for part (b) of [Theorem 4.22](#) (in [Appendix B.5.2](#)) closely follows the proof of [Theorem 6](#) of [Huckemann \(2011a\)](#).

Theorem 4.22. *Suppose that Assumptions (A1)—(A3) are satisfied, and let $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ be a PSR mean. Let $\{m'_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}\}$ be any choice of sample PSR mean sequence. For each n , let $m_n \in \text{argmin}_{m \in \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m'_n} d_M(m, m_0)$. Then, with probability 1, the sequence $\{m_n\}$ is determined uniquely. Furthermore,*

- (a) $m_n \rightarrow m_0$ almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and
- (b) $\sqrt{n}\phi_{m_0}(m_n) \rightarrow N_d(0, H_P^{-1}\Sigma_P H_P^{-1})$ in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Estimating the covariance matrix ($H_P^{-1}\Sigma_P H_P^{-1}$ in our case) of the limiting Gaussian distribution (for Riemannian manifold-valued Fréchet means) is a difficult task. For general Riemannian manifold-valued Fréchet means, [Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru \(2005\)](#) and [Bhattacharya and Bhattacharya \(2012\)](#) suggest using a moment estimator for H_P and Σ_P . This however requires specifying the second derivatives of $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}(\cdot))$. We note that in the literature, explicit expressions for H_P and Σ_P are only available for geometrically very simple manifolds, with a high degree of symmetry, such as spheres. As an instance, see [Hotz and Huckemann \(2015\)](#) and [Section 5.3](#) of [Bhattacharya and Bhattacharya \(2012\)](#) for the cases where the data and the Fréchet mean lie in the unit circle S^1 and the more general unit sphere S^d , respectively. Others, including [Eltzner and Huckemann \(2019\)](#), simply use the sample covariance matrix of $\{\phi_{m_n}(m_{x_i}) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ (in our notation) as an estimate of $H_P^{-1}\Sigma_P H_P^{-1}$. In [Section 5](#), we will use a bootstrap estimator of $\text{Var}(\phi_{m_0}(m_n))$, the variance of $\phi_{m_0}(m_n)$, instead of directly estimating $H_P^{-1}\Sigma_P H_P^{-1}$. Our bootstrap estimator is defined as follows.

Choose a PSR mean m_n computed from the original sample $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. For the b th bootstrap sample (that is, a simple random sample of size n from the set $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, treated as a fixed set, with replacement), let m_b^* be the PSR mean of the bootstrap sample that is closest to m_n . (For the purpose of defining the bootstrap estimator, we are assuming that such an m_b^* is unique.) The bootstrap estimator of $\text{Var}(\phi_{m_0}(m_n))$ is then defined to be

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}_{\text{boot}}(\phi_{m_0}(m_n)) := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \phi_{m_n}(m_b^*) \cdot (\phi_{m_n}(m_b^*))^T,$$

where B is the number of bootstrap replicates.

5. Numerical examples

5.1. Numerical examples of scaling-rotation means

In this subsection, we provide an example where the SR means are equivalent to the PSR means, and an example where they are not. Consider a random variable $X \in \text{Sym}^+(2)$,

$$X = R(\theta)\text{diag}(\exp(D_1), \exp(D_2))R(\theta)^T, \quad (5.1)$$

where θ follows the normal distribution with mean 0, standard deviation σ_θ , truncated to lie in $(-\pi, \pi)$, and independently (D_1, D_2) follow a normal distribution with mean (μ_1, μ_2) and covariance matrix $\sigma_D^2 I_2$. From this model, we generate two samples of size $n = 200$ with different choices of model parameters.

For each sample, a PSR mean, denoted \hat{m}^{PSR} , is computed using the algorithm of Section 3.3, and we also numerically compute the minimizer of $f_n^{(\text{SR})}$ over S_p^{lwr} , and denote it by $\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}$. Throughout we set $k = 1$. By Theorem 3.6, if $f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})) \leq f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}})$, $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})$ is an SR mean, and otherwise $\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}$ is a SR mean.

- Case I: Set $\sigma_\theta = \pi/12$, $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (2, 0)$ and $\sigma_D = 0.2$. See the left panels of Fig. 1.
- Case II: Set $\sigma_\theta = \pi/3$, $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (1, 0)$ and $\sigma_D = 0.2$. See the right panels of Fig. 1.

For Case I, the sample are relatively far from the lower stratum $S_2^{\text{lwr}} = \{cI_2 : c > 0\}$ (shown as the green axis in the top row of Fig. 1). In this particular instance, $82 \approx f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})) < f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}) \approx 458$, and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})$ is an SR mean.

For Case II, $196 \approx f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})) > f_n^{(\text{SR})}(\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}) \approx 173$, and $\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}$ is an SR mean.

5.2. Comparison with other geometric frameworks

In analyzing SPD matrices, the scaling-rotation (SR) framework has an advantage in interpretation as it allows describing the changes of SPD matrices in terms of rotation and scaling of the corresponding ellipsoids. For example, it is shown in Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser (2015) that only the SR framework yields interpolation curves which consist of pure rotation when the endpoints differ only by rotation, when compared to the commonly used log-Euclidean (Arsigny et al., 2007) and affine-invariant (Fletcher et al., 2004; Pennec, Fillard and Ayache, 2006) interpolation curves.

In this subsection, we illustrate situations under which averaging via the scaling-rotation framework has similar interpretive advantages over the affine-invariant mean. The affine-invariant (AI) mean $\bar{X}^{(\text{AI})}$ for a sample of SPD matrices $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ is the sample Fréchet mean with respect to the




FIG 1. Data on $\text{Sym}^+(2)$ shown in the cone of $\text{Sym}^+(2)$ (top row) and as ellipses (bottom row), compared with their PSR means $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})$ (red) and $\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}$ (blue). Left panel shows data from Case I, where $\mathcal{F}(\hat{m}^{\text{PSR}})$ is indeed an SR mean; Right panel shows data from Case II, where $\hat{M}_{\text{lwr}}^{\text{SR}}$ is an SR mean. See Section 5.1 for details.




FIG 2. A sample of SPD matrices (sampled from the model (5.1)) shown in the Log-Euclidean (LE) coordinates (left) and the PSR coordinates (right), overlaid with the PSR mean and AI mean. For this data set, PSR mean appears to be a better representative for the data, while the AI mean does not lie in the data-dense region. See Section 5.2 for details.

affine-invariant metric d_{AI} :

$$\bar{X}^{(AI)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{M \in \operatorname{Sym}^+(p)} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{AI}^2(M, X_i),$$

where $d_{AI}(X, Y) = \|\operatorname{Log}(X^{-1/2}YX^{-1/2})\|_F$. The AI mean exists and is unique for any finite sample (Pennec, Fillard and Ayache, 2006).

In numerical experiments, we randomly generated SPD matrices from the model (5.1) with parameters set as in Case I but with $\sigma_\theta = \pi/6$. A sample of size $n = 200$ is plotted in Fig. 2. There, we have used two different types of “linearizations” of $\operatorname{Sym}^+(2)$, as explained below.

The *Log-Euclidean coordinates* on $\operatorname{Sym}^+(2)$ are given by the three free parameters y_{11} , y_{22} and $\sqrt{2}y_{12}$ of $Y = (y_{ij}) = \operatorname{Log}(X) \in \operatorname{Sym}(2)$. Write $\operatorname{vecd}(Y) := (y_{11}, y_{22}, \sqrt{2}y_{12})^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$. These coordinates are chosen so that for any two vectors $(\operatorname{vecd}(X), \operatorname{vecd}(Y)) = (x, y)$, the usual inner product $\langle x, y \rangle = x^T y$ corresponds to the Riemannian metric when $X, Y \in \operatorname{Sym}(2)$ are viewed as tangent vectors in the affine-invariant framework. The left panel of Fig. 2 plots the data on the Log-Euclidean coordinates.

The *PSR coordinates*, used in the right panel of the figure for the same data, come from the coordinates defined on a tangent space of the eigen-decomposition space $M(p)$. More precisely, given a reference point $(U, D) \in M(p)$, we use the local chart $(\mathcal{U}_{(U,D)}, \phi_{(U,D)})$ defined in (4.14), followed by the vectorization via vec (see (4.15)), to determine a coordinate system. To illustrate this concretely, let $p = 2$. Then $\tilde{\varphi}_{(U,D)}(V, \Lambda) = (\operatorname{Log}(VU^T), \operatorname{Log}(\Lambda D^{-1})) =: (A, L) \in \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \operatorname{Diag}(p)$. The first coordinate of $x_{V,\Lambda} := \operatorname{vec}(\phi_{(U,D)}(V, \Lambda)) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the free parameter a_{21} of A (multiplied by the scale parameter \sqrt{k}), and corresponds to the rotation angle of VU^T in radians (scaled by \sqrt{k}). The second and last coordinates of $x_{V,\Lambda}$ are the diagonal entries of L . Multiplying by \sqrt{k} as above affords us the convenience that for any two x, y , the usual inner product $\langle x, y \rangle =$




FIG 3. A sample of SPD matrices shown in the Log-Euclidean (LE) coordinates (left) and the PSR coordinates (right), overlaid with the PSR mean and AI mean. For this data set, PSR mean appears to be a better representative for the data, while the AI mean does not lie in the data-dense region. See Section 5.2 for details.

$x^T y$ corresponds to the Riemannian metric g_M we have assumed on the tangent spaces of $M(p)$.

When representing SPD-valued data $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Sym}^+(2)$ in PSR coordinates, we choose the reference point (U, D) to be an arbitrarily chosen PSR mean \hat{m}^{PSR} of the data. Care is needed since there are multiple eigen-decompositions corresponding to each observation X_i . For each X_i , an eigen-decomposition $m_i \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i) \subset M(p)$ is chosen so that m_i has the smallest geodesic distance from \hat{m}^{PSR} among all elements of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$. The right panel of Fig. 2 plots the same data as in the left panel, but in these PSR coordinates.

The AI mean and a PSR mean for this data set are also plotted in Fig. 2. It can be seen that major modes of variation in the data are well described in terms of rotation angles and scaling, while the variation appears to be highly non-linear in Log-Euclidean (LE) coordinates. As one might expect from this non-linearity, we observe that the AI mean is located far from the data, while the PSR mean appears to be a better representative of the data.

In the opposite direction, we also considered a data set sampled from an SPD-matrix log-normal distribution (Schwartzman, 2016). Note that the SPD-matrix log-normal distributions on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ correspond to a multivariate normal distribution in Log-Euclidean coordinates. The data and their AI and PSR means are plotted in Fig. 3. While the AI mean is well approximated by the average of data in LE coordinates, the PSR mean (in LE coordinates) is also not far from this average. Similarly, the PSR mean is approximately the average in PSR coordinates, and the AI mean is also not far. Therefore, we may conclude that using the SR framework and PSR means is beneficial especially if variability in the sample (or in a population) is pronounced in terms of rotations, while the cost of using the SR framework is small for the log-normal case.

5.3. An application to multivariate tensor-based morphometry

In Paquette et al. (2017), the authors compared the lateral ventricular structure in the brains of 17 pre-term and 19 full-term infant children. After an MRI scan of a subject’s brain was obtained and processed through an image processing pipeline, the shape data collected at 102816 vertices on the surfaces of their left and right ventricles were mapped onto the left and right ventricles of a template brain image, after which the 2×2 Jacobian matrix J from that surface registration transformation was computed at each vertex for each subject. The deformation tensor $X = (J^T J)^{1/2} \in \text{Sym}^+(2)$ was then computed at each vertex for each subject. To summarize the structure of the data, there are 102816 vertices along the surfaces of the template ventricles, and at each vertex there are deformation tensors (2×2 SPD matrices) from $n_1 = 17$ pre-term and $n_2 = 19$ full-term infants. We will call these group 1 and group 2, respectively.

One way that the authors tested for differences in ventricular shape between the two groups was by performing two-sample location tests at each vertex via use of the log-Euclidean version of Hotelling’s T^2 test statistic introduced in Lepore et al. (2008). The log-Euclidean (LE) version of the T^2 test statistic is the squared Mahalanobis distance between the full-term and pre-term log-Euclidean sample means on the LE coordinates (defined in Section 5.2).

Similarly, one could also measure separation between groups by comparing their respective PSR means in PSR coordinates. For this two-group context, the reference point for the PSR coordinates is given by a PSR mean computed from pooled sample (with sample size $n_1 + n_2$).

We have chosen vertex 75412 as an example to illustrate a scenario in which two groups have little separation in the LE coordinates but are well-separated in the PSR coordinates. In the top row of Figure 4, tensors from the two groups as well as the group-wise LE and PSR means are plotted in their respective coordinates. There is little visible separation between the two groups in the LE coordinates, while there is near-total separation in the PSR coordinates.

To visualize the sampling distributions of the group-wise means under the log-Euclidean and scaling-rotation frameworks, we computed 500 bootstrap sample means for each group, under both geometric frameworks. These are plotted in their respective tangent spaces in the bottom row of Figure 4. (See also Figure 5 in Appendix C, in which one can see that the (bootstrap) sampling distributions of the group-wise PSR means are approximately normal.) The nonparametric bootstrap provides an estimate of standard errors of the sample means, from which (bootstrap-approximated) parametric 95% confidence regions are obtained. For this, we assume normality, as suggested by the central limit theorem, Theorem 4.22, and obtain an approximate 95% confidence region given by $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}x^T \leq \chi_{0.05,2}^2\}$, for each sample mean. Here, $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the sample covariance matrix of the bootstrap (group-wise LE or PSR) sample means, and $\chi_{0.05,2}^2$ is the 95% quantile of the χ_2^2 distribution. The resulting confidence regions are overlaid in the bottom row of Figure 4 as well. As in the top row, there is considerable overlap between the LE confidence regions, while there is complete separation between the two confidence regions for the group-wise




FIG 4. Real data example. (Top row) Observations corresponding to Group 1 (and Group 2) are shown in blue (and red, respectively) dots. The group-wise LE and PSR means are shown as the asterisks. (Bottom row) Bootstrap replications of the LE and PSR means (left and right panels, respectively) for each group, with the 95% approximate confidence regions shown as transparent ellipsoids. See Section 5.3 for details.

PSR sample means, especially along the direction of rotation angles. This example suggests that the scaling-rotation framework may be better at detecting group differences than other frameworks when most of the variability between the groups is due to rotation.

6. Discussion

We have presented the first statistical estimation methods for $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ based on the scaling-rotation framework of Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser (2015). These estimation methods are intended to set the foundation for the development of scaling-rotation-framework-based statistical methods, such as testing the equality of two or more PSR means, testing for a variety of eigenvalue and eigenvector patterns of SPD matrices, and an analogue of principal component analysis for SPD-valued data. The scaling-rotation framework should also be particularly useful for diffusion tensor processing since the eigenvectors and

eigenvalues of a diffusion tensor model the principal directions and intensities of water diffusion at a given voxel, and are thus the primary objects of interest.

We recommend using the scaling-rotation estimation procedure presented here for $p = 2, 3$, since the number of eigen-decompositions of an SPD matrix from S_p^{top} grows rapidly with p . One avenue for interesting future work is to develop computational procedures for higher p . Another avenue is to develop a proper two-sample or multi-sample testing framework, and dimension-reduction and regression methods using the eigen-decomposition spaces, and to establish asymptotic and non-asymptotic properties of these statistical methods, reflecting the structure of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ as a stratified space under eigen-decomposition.

Appendix A: Discontinuity of $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$

While the scaling-rotation “distance” function $d_{\mathcal{SR}} : \text{Sym}^+(p) \times \text{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous when restricted to $S_p^{\text{top}} \times S_p^{\text{top}}$, it is not so in general. Even the one-variable function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, S)$, with a fixed $S \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, has many discontinuities in lower strata. While it may be of interest to characterize the set of discontinuity, here we provide just an example. For $0 < \theta < \theta' < \pi/4$, and $\lambda > 1$, let $S = R(\theta')\text{diag}(e^\lambda, e^{-\lambda})R(\theta')^T$, where $R(\theta)$ is the 2×2 rotation matrix corresponding to the counterclockwise rotation by angle θ . For $n = 1, 2, \dots$, let $S_n = R(\theta)\text{diag}(e^{1/n}, e^{-1/n})R(\theta)^T$. For every n , it can be checked that $(R(\theta'), \text{diag}(e^\lambda, e^{-\lambda})) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ and $(R(\theta), \text{diag}(e^{1/n}, e^{-1/n})) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_n)$ form a minimal pair, which implies that $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_n, S)^2 = k(\theta' - \theta)^2 + 2(\lambda - \frac{1}{n})^2$. On the other hand, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = I$ and $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(I, S)^2 = 2\lambda^2$. Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_n, S) = \{k(\theta' - \theta)^2 + 2\lambda^2\}^{1/2} > 2\lambda^2 = d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n, S),$$

and the function $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(\cdot, S)$ is not continuous at I .

Appendix B: Technical details, additional lemmas and proofs

B.1. Proofs for Section 3

B.1.1. Proof of Theorem 3.5

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $Y \in E_n^{(S\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, let $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)$ be an arbitrary eigen-decomposition of Y , let $\tilde{Z} = (U, D) \in M(p)$ be arbitrary, and let $Z = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{Z})$. Since Y has no repeated eigenvalues, it follows from (3.3) and (3.4) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X_i, \tilde{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X_i, Y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X_i, Z) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X_i, \tilde{Z}), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

implying that $\tilde{Y} \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Since the case where $E_n^{(S\mathcal{R})} \cap S_p^{\text{top}} = \emptyset$ is trivial, we have shown (a).

(b) Suppose now $\tilde{Z} \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$. Then the first and fourth sums in (B.1) must be equal, so the two inequalities must be equalities. In particular, the second and third sums are equal, so $Z \in E_n^{(SR)}$ and hence $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(SR)})$. This shows $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(SR)}) \supset E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$, which immediately implies $\mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}) \subset E_n^{(SR)}$.

(c) Assume that $E_n^{(SR)} \cap S_p^{\text{top}} \neq \emptyset$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} \subset M^{\text{top}}(p)$. Then, using (b) and (a),

$$\begin{aligned} E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} = E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} \cap M^{\text{top}}(p) &\subset \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(SR)}) \cap M^{\text{top}}(p) & \text{(B.2)} \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(SR)}) \cap \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_p^{\text{top}}) \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_n^{(SR)} \cap S_p^{\text{top}}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\subset E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}. \quad \text{(B.3)}$$

Hence the inclusions in (B.2) and (B.3) are equalities.

Finally, note that (B.1) holds with the finite summation replaced by the integration with respect to the probability measure P , provided that $f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(U, D) < \infty$ is finite for any $(U, D) \in M(p)$, which also guarantees that $f^{(SR)}(Z) < \infty$ for any $Z \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Since these conditions are satisfied by Lemma 4.6, the statements (a)–(c) hold for $E_n^{(SR)}$ and $E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ replaced by $E^{(SR)}$ and $E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$, respectively. \square

B.1.2. Proof of Theorem 3.6

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We give a proof for (a) and (b). Assertions (c) and (d) can be verified similarly.

For (a), consider the case where the inequality is strict, i.e., $f^{(SR)}(\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR})) < \min_{\Sigma \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f^{(SR)}(\Sigma)$. Then no scaling-rotation mean can lie in S_p^{lwr} , but since scaling-rotation means always exist, $E^{(SR)} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$. By Theorem 3.5, $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR}) \in E^{(SR)}$. Now consider the situation where

$$f^{(SR)}(\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR})) = \min_{\Sigma \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}} f^{(SR)}(\Sigma). \quad \text{(B.4)}$$

Suppose that no scaling-rotation mean lies in S_p^{lwr} . Then $E^{(SR)} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$ and, by Theorem 3.5, $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR}) \in E^{(SR)}$. Since these arguments and (B.4) contradict, there must be a scaling-rotation mean in S_p^{lwr} . Moreover, by (B.4), $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR}) \in E^{(SR)}$ as well.

The hypothesis of (b) leads that $\mathcal{F}(m^{\mathcal{P}SR}) \notin E^{(SR)}$. By the inverse of Theorem 3.5(b), $E^{(SR)} \cap S_p^{\text{top}} = \emptyset$. \square

B.1.3. Proof of Theorem 3.7

We need several technical lemmas. For $(U, D) \in M(p)$, define

$$\tilde{d}(U, D) = \inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (V, \Lambda) \in M(p) \setminus M^{\text{top}}(p)\},$$

where the infimum can be replaced by minimum. The minimum is achieved since $M(p) \setminus M^{\text{top}}(p)$ is closed in $M(p)$, and as a finite-dimensional manifold, $M(p)$ is locally compact.

Lemma B.1. *For $(U, D) \in M(p)$, $\tilde{\delta}(U, D) = \min\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in \text{Diag}^+(p) \setminus D_+^{\text{top}}(p)\}$, where $D_+^{\text{top}}(p)$ is the subset of $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ consisting of distinct diagonal entries.*

Proof. Write $M^{\text{lwr}}(p) := M(p) \setminus M^{\text{top}}(p)$ and $D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p) := \text{Diag}^+(p) \setminus D_+^{\text{top}}(p)$. Clearly $\inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (V, \Lambda) \in M^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \geq \inf\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\}$. Conversely, if $\Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)$, then $(U, \Lambda) \in M^{\text{lwr}}(p)$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (V, \Lambda) \in M^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} &\leq \inf\{d_M((U, D), (U, \Lambda)) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \\ &= \inf\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \\ &= \min\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the minimum is achieved since $D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)$ is a closed subset of the locally compact metric space $(\text{Diag}^+(p), d_{\mathcal{D}^+})$. \square

Lemma B.2. *The function $\tilde{\delta}(U, D)$ is constant on fibers of \mathcal{F} . That is, for each $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, the value of $\tilde{\delta}(U, D)$ is independent of the choice of $(U, D) \in F^{-1}(S)$.*

Proof. Let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and let $(U, D), (U_1, D_1) \in F^{-1}(S)$. Then $D_1 = h \cdot D$ for some $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$. But the set $D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)$ and the metric $d_{\mathcal{D}^+}$ are invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$, defined in Section 2.3, so

$$\begin{aligned} \{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(h \cdot D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} &= \{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(h \cdot D, h \cdot \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \\ &= \{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Lemma B.1, $\tilde{\delta}(U_1, D_1)$ and $\tilde{\delta}(U, D)$ are the infimum of the same set of real numbers. \square

The following lemma shows a relation between $\delta(S)$ and $\tilde{\delta}(U, D)$.

Lemma B.3. *For any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, $\delta(S) = \tilde{\delta}(U, D)$ for any $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$.*

Proof of Lemma B.3. Recall that we write $S_p^{\text{lwr}} = \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(S) &= \inf\{d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, S') : S' \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}\} \\ &= \inf\{\inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S), (V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')\} : S' \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}\} \\ &= \inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S), (V, \Lambda) \in M^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \\ &= \inf\{\inf\{d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda)) : (V, \Lambda) \in M^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} : (U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)\} \\ &= \inf\{\tilde{\delta}(U, D) : (U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The above and Lemma B.2 give the result. \square

By Lemmas B.1—B.3, we have $\delta(S) > 0$ if and only if $S \in S_p^{\text{top}}$.

Lemma B.4. Let $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, let $r > 0$, and write $\bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0) = \{Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p) : d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(Y, S_0) \leq r\}$.

- (a) If $S \in \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0)$, then $\delta(S) \geq \delta(S_0) - r$.
- (b) If $r < \delta(S_0)$, then $\bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0) \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$.
- (c) If $r < \delta(S_0)/3$, then for any $S, S' \in \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0)$, and $S_{\text{lwr}} \in \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$,

$$d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S') < d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S_{\text{lwr}}).$$

Proof. (a) Let $S \in \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0)$. If $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ and $\tilde{S}_0 := (U_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$, then by Lemmas B.1 and B.3, $\tilde{\delta}(U, D) = \min\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\}$. Since $(\text{Diag}^+(p), d_{\mathcal{D}^+})$ is a metric space, $d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) \geq d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, \Lambda) - d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, D)$ for any $D, D_0, \Lambda \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(S) &\geq \inf\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, \Lambda) - d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, D) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} \\ &= \inf\{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, \Lambda) : \Lambda \in D_+^{\text{lwr}}(p)\} - d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, D) \\ &= \delta(S_0) - d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_0, D) \\ &\geq \delta(S_0) - d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S_0, S) \\ &\geq \delta(S_0) - r. \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $r < \delta(S_0)$ and $S \in \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0)$, then by part (a), $\delta(S) \geq \delta(S_0) - r > 0$, so $S \in S_p^{\text{top}}$.

(c) By part (b), since $r < \delta(S_0)/3 < \delta(S_0)$, $\bar{B} := \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0) \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$, and \bar{B} is a closed ball in the metric space $(S_p^{\text{top}}, d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}})$. Hence, for any $S, S' \in \bar{B}$,

$$d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S') \leq d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S_0) + d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S_0, S') \leq 2r < 2\delta(S_0)/3.$$

But by Lemma B.3 and part (a), for $S_{\text{lwr}} \in \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$,

$$d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S_{\text{lwr}}) \geq \delta(S) \geq \delta(S_0) - r > \delta(S_0) - \delta(S_0)/3 = 2\delta(S_0)/3.$$

Hence $d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S') \leq 2\delta(S_0)/3 < d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S_{\text{lwr}})$. \square

The proof of Theorem 3.7 heavily depends on Lemma B.4(c).

Proof of Theorem 3.7. The random variable X in the hypothesis of the theorem lies in $\bar{B} := \bar{B}_r^{d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}}(S_0)$ with probability 1. Thus, by Lemma B.4(c), for any $S \in \bar{B}$ and $S_{\text{lwr}} \in \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$,

$$f^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(S) < f^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(S_{\text{lwr}}).$$

Hence, no element of $\text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus S_p^{\text{top}}$ can be a minimizer of $f_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$. Since the set of minimizers of the function $f_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$ is exactly $E^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$, and $E^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$ is non-empty, $E^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$.

The second part of the theorem can be shown similarly by Lemma B.4(c), but with the function $f_n^{(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(\cdot)$ defined with respect to the data X_1, \dots, X_n . \square

B.2. Proofs and technical details for Section 4.1

B.2.1. Proof of Lemma 4.1

Proof of Lemma 4.1. (a) Define the map $\rho : M(p) \times M(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$\rho((U', D'), (U, D)) = \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p)} d_M((U'h^{-1}, h \cdot D'), (U, D)).$$

Note that $\rho((U', D'), (U, D)) = \rho(h \cdot (U', D'), (U, D))$ for any $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$. Hence for each $(X, (U, D)) \in S_p^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$, the function ρ is constant on the set $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X) \times \{(U, D)\}$. Therefore the restriction of ρ to the domain $M(p)^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$ induces a function on $S_p^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$, which by definition is precisely our function $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$. (Here, $M(p)^{\text{top}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_p^{\text{top}})$.) For each $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$, the function $((U', D'), (U, D)) \mapsto d_M((U'h^{-1}, h \cdot D'), (U, D))$ is continuous on $M(p) \times M(p)$. Therefore ρ is also continuous on $M(p) \times M(p)$ since it is the minimum of a finite number of continuous functions, which implies that the restriction of ρ to $M(p)^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$ is continuous. Hence the induced function $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$ on $S_p^{\text{top}} \times M(p)$ is also continuous.

(b) For any non-empty subset A of a metric space (M, d) , the triangle inequality implies that $|d(A, y) - d(A, y')| \leq d(y, y')$ for any $y, y' \in M$, where $d(A, y) = \inf_{x \in A} d(x, y)$. For any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, applying the above fact to the subset $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ of the metric space $(M(p), d_M)$, and noting that $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, m) = d_M(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S), m)$, the conclusion follows. \square

B.2.2. Background work on semicontinuous functions

Recall Definition 4.2.

Proposition B.5. *Let X be a topological space, let Y be a set, and let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a set containing $\text{range}(f)$, and let $g : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a (non-strictly) increasing, uniformly continuous function.*

- (a) *Assume that $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is LSC in its first variable, uniformly with respect to its second variable. Then so is $g \circ f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*
- (b) *Assume that Y is a topological space and that $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is LSC in its first variable, locally uniformly with respect to its second variable. Then so is $g \circ f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof of Proposition B.5. (a) Let $x_0 \in X$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Since g is uniformly continuous, we may select $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $z_1, z_2 \in J$ and $|z_1 - z_2| < \delta$, we have $g(z_2) > g(z_1) - \epsilon$. By the hypothesis on f , we may select an open neighborhood U of x_0 such that $f(x, y) > f(x_0, y) - \delta$ for all $x \in U$ and all $y \in Y$.

Let $x \in U$ and $y \in Y$. Then either (i) $f(x_0, y) - \delta < f(x, y) \leq f(x_0, y)$ or (ii) $f(x, y) > f(x_0, y)$. In case (i), $|f(x, y) - f(x_0, y)| < \delta$, so $g(f(x, y)) > g(f(x_0, y)) - \epsilon$. In case (ii), since g is increasing, $g(f(x, y)) \geq g(f(x_0, y)) > g(f(x_0, y)) - \epsilon$. Hence in both cases, $g(f(x)) > g(f(x_0)) - \epsilon$.

Thus $g \circ f$ is LSC in its first variable, uniformly with respect to its second.

(b) Follows immediately from part (a) and Definition 4.2(ii). \square

Corollary B.6. *Let X be a topological space, let Y be a set, and let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty)$.*

- (a) *Assume that $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is LSC in its first variable, uniformly with respect to its second variable. Then so is \sqrt{f} .*
- (b) *Assume that Y is a topological space and that $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is LSC in its first variable, locally uniformly with respect to its second variable. Then so is \sqrt{f} .*

Proof of Corollary B.6. The square-root function $[0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is uniformly continuous (since $\sqrt{x + \delta} - \sqrt{x} \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ for $x, \delta \geq 0$). Hence the results follow from Proposition B.5. \square

B.2.3. Background work on $M(p)$ and \mathcal{F}

The strata of $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ (and the strata of $M(p)$) are partially ordered by identifying a stratum with the corresponding partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. If $\mathcal{T}_J \subset \text{Diag}^+(p)$ denotes the stratum labeled by J , then we have the following relations (the first of which is definition)

$$\mathcal{T}_{J_1} \leq \mathcal{T}_{J_2} \iff J_1 \leq J_2 \iff G_{J_1} \supset G_{J_2}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

(See Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman, 2017, Section 2.2.)

In Lemma B.7 and throughout, $B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(D) = \{\Lambda \in \text{Diag}^+(p) : d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D, \Lambda) < \delta\}$ denotes the open ball in the metric space $(\text{Diag}^+(p), d_{\mathcal{D}^+})$.

Lemma B.7. (a) *Every $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$ has an open neighborhood that intersects only strata that are at least as high as the stratum of D . I.e. for any $D \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$ there is an open ball $B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(D)$ such that*

$$\text{if } \mathcal{T} \text{ is a stratum of } \text{Diag}^+(p) \text{ for which } \mathcal{T} \cap B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(D) \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } \mathcal{T} \geq \mathcal{T}_D; \quad (\text{B.6})$$

equivalently,

$$\text{if } J \in \text{Part}(\{1, 2, \dots, p\}) \text{ and } \mathcal{T}_J \cap B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(D) \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } J \geq J_D. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

(b) *There is a function $\delta_{\text{strat}} : \text{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for all $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and all $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, (B.6) (equivalently, (B.7)) holds with $\delta = \delta_{\text{strat}}(S)$.*

Proof of Lemma B.7. (a) This follows from the fact that any strict eigenvalue-inequalities holding at D persist on a small enough open neighborhood of D .

(b) Let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, and let D be a diagonal matrix appearing in some eigencomposition of S . The set of such diagonal matrices is $\{\pi \cdot D : \pi \in \mathcal{S}_p\}$. Because the action of \mathcal{S}_p on $\text{Diag}^+(p)$ is isometric, if $\delta > 0$ is such that (B.7) holds for a given D , then for any $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_p$, (B.7) holds with D replaced by $\pi \cdot D$ (with the same δ). Thus any such δ depends only on S , not on any chosen eigendecomposition. \square

Definition B.8 (just notational). For each $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, let $\delta_{\text{strat}}(S)$ be as in Lemma B.7(b).

Proposition B.9. \mathcal{F} is a proper map (i.e. the inverse of any compact set is compact).

Proof of Proposition B.9. Let $\lambda_{\max}, \lambda_{\min} : \text{Sym}^+(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the functions carrying $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ to its largest and smallest eigenvalues, respectively. As is well known, these functions are continuous.

Let $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ be a nonempty compact set. Then K is closed, and since \mathcal{F} is continuous, $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$ is closed.

Let λ_{\max}^K (respectively λ_{\min}^K) denote the maximum (resp. minimum) value of λ_{\max} (resp. λ_{\min}) achieved on K , and let $\tilde{K}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{D \in \text{Diag}^+(p) : D_{ii} \in [\lambda_{\min}^K, \lambda_{\max}^K], 1 \leq i \leq p\}$. Note that $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K) \subset SO(p) \times \tilde{K}_{\mathcal{D}}$, a compact subset of $M(p)$. Hence $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$ is a closed subset of a compact set, and is therefore compact. \square

Next few results are needed because \mathcal{F} is not an open map. (A map is *open* if it carries open sets to open sets.)

Lemma B.10 (“Slice lemma”). Let $\Lambda \in \text{Diag}^+(p)$, let $\mathfrak{g}_{\Lambda} \subset \mathfrak{so}(p)$ be the Lie algebra of G_{Λ} , and let $\mathfrak{g}_{\Lambda}^{\perp} \subset \mathfrak{so}(p)$ be the orthogonal complement of \mathfrak{g}_{Λ} in $\mathfrak{so}(p)$ (with respect to $g_{SO(p)}|_I$, a multiple of the Frobenius inner product). Define $\nu_{\Lambda} := \mathfrak{g}_{\Lambda}^{\perp} \oplus \mathfrak{d}(p)$ and $n_{\Lambda} := \dim(\nu_{\Lambda}) = \dim(\mathfrak{g}_{\Lambda}^{\perp}) + p$, and define $\Psi : \nu_{\Lambda} \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(p)$ by

$$\Psi(A, L) = e^A \Lambda e^L e^{-A} ;$$

note that Ψ is C^{∞} and that $\Psi(0, 0) = \Lambda$. On $\mathfrak{gl}(p, \mathbb{R})$ or any of its subspaces let $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Fr}}$ denote the Frobenius norm; on $\mathfrak{so}(p)$ let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{so}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\cdot\|_{\text{Fr}}$; and on ν_{Λ} let $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{g}_e}$ be the norm defined by $\|(A, L)\|_{\tilde{g}_e} = (k\|A\|_{\mathfrak{so}}^2 + \|L\|_{\text{Fr}}^2)^{1/2}$.

There exist $\delta_2 > 0, c > 0$, and an open neighborhood $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\Lambda}$ of $(0, 0)$ in ν_{Λ} , such that the $(\text{Sym}(p), \|\cdot\|_{\text{Fr}})$ -open ball $B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(\Lambda)$ lies in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ and

- (a) $\Psi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\Lambda}}$ is an embedding;
- (b) $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} := \Psi(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\Lambda})$ is an n_{Λ} -dimensional submanifold of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ containing Λ ;
- (c) $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} = \text{image}(\Psi) \cap B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(\Lambda)$;
- (d) letting $\Phi = \Psi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\Lambda}}$, viewed as a map $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\Lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda}$,

$$\|\Phi^{-1}(S')\|_{\tilde{g}_e} \leq c\|S' - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} \quad \text{for all } S' \in \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} ; \quad (\text{B.8})$$

and

- (e) for every $S' \in B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(\Lambda) \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$, there exist $R \in G_{\Lambda}^0$, $A \in \mathfrak{g}_{\Lambda}^{\perp}$, and

$L \in \mathfrak{d}(p)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S' &= R\Psi(A, L)R^T, \\ \|A\|_{\mathfrak{so}} &= d_{SO}(e^A, I), \text{ and} \\ \|(A, \Lambda)\|_{\tilde{g}_e} &\leq c\|S' - \Lambda\|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma B.10. For any $p \times p$ symmetric matrix S and antisymmetric matrix A , the commutator $[S, A]$ is antisymmetric. Hence for the diagonal matrix Λ , the map $\mathfrak{gl}(p, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(p, \mathbb{R})$ defined by $A \mapsto [A, \Lambda]$ restricts to a linear map $\text{ad}_\Lambda : \mathfrak{so}(p) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(p)$. Recall that the subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{so}(p)$ consists precisely of those elements of $\mathfrak{so}(p)$ that commute with Λ . Thus $\mathfrak{g}_\Lambda = \ker(\text{ad}_\Lambda)$, and the further-restricted map $\text{ad}'_\Lambda := \text{ad}_\Lambda|_{\mathfrak{g}_\Lambda^\perp}$ is injective.

The derivative of Ψ at $(0, 0)$ is the linear map $d\Psi|_{(0,0)} : \nu_\Lambda \rightarrow \text{Sym}(p)$ given by

$$d\Psi|_{(0,0)}(A, L) = [A, \Lambda] + \Lambda L = -\text{ad}'_\Lambda(A) + \Lambda L. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Let $A \in \mathfrak{g}_\Lambda^\perp$ and $L \in \mathfrak{d}(p)$. Since the diagonal entries of A are all zero, so are the diagonal entries of $A\Lambda$, ΛA , and $[A, \Lambda]$. Hence $[A, \Lambda]$ is Frobenius-orthogonal to the diagonal matrix ΛL . Thus if $d\Psi|_{(0,0)}(A, L) = 0$, equation (B.9) implies that $\text{ad}'_\Lambda(A) = 0$ and $\Lambda L = 0$. Since ad'_Λ is injective and Λ is invertible, the latter pair of equations implies $A = 0$ and $L = 0$. Thus $d\Psi|_{(0,0)}$ is injective.

Since Ψ is continuously differentiable and $d\Psi|_{(0,0)}$ is injective, and $\text{Sym}^+(p)$ is an open subset of the vector space $\text{Sym}(p)$, a standard application of the Inverse Function Theorem implies the existence of δ_2, c , and \mathcal{H}_Λ for which properties (a)–(d) hold and for which $B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(\Lambda) \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Note that, modulo the value of c , conclusion (d) does not depend on our choices of norms, since all norms on a finite-dimensional vector space are equivalent.

For conclusion (e), let $S' \in B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(\Lambda)$ and let $(U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$. Since G_Λ^0 is compact, there exists an element $R \in G_\Lambda^0$ achieving the d_{SO} -distance from U to G_Λ^0 . Since the Riemannian exponential map $\exp_R : T_R(SO(p)) \rightarrow SO(p)$ is surjective, and the tangent space $T_R(G_\Lambda^0)$ is $\{RA \in \mathfrak{gl}(p, \mathbb{R}) : A \in \mathfrak{g}_\Lambda\}$, the minimal-distance condition (together with our choice of inner product on $\mathfrak{so}(p)$) implies that $U = Re^A$ for some $A \in \mathfrak{g}_\Lambda^\perp$ with $\|A\| = d_{SO}(e^A, I)$. Letting $L = \log(D\Lambda^{-1})$, we then have $S' = Re^A \Lambda e^L e^{-A} R^{-1} = R\Psi(A, L)R^{-1}$. Since the Frobenius norm on $\text{Sym}(p)$ is invariant under the action of $SO(p)$ (the map $(R, S) \mapsto RSR^T$),

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_2 > \|S' - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} &= \|R\Psi(A, L)R^{-1} - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} \\ &= \|\Psi(A, L) - R^{-1}\Lambda R\|_{\text{Fr}} \\ &= \|\Psi(A, L) - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} \quad (\text{since } R \in G_\Lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Thus $\Psi(A, L) \in B_{\delta_2}^{\text{Frob}}(S) \cap \text{image}(\Psi) = \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$, and $(A, L) = \Phi^{-1}(\Psi(A, L))$. Hence (B.8) and (B.10) imply that

$$\|(A, L)\|_{\tilde{g}_e} < c\|\Psi(A, L) - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} = c\|S' - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}}. \quad \square$$

Remark B.11. The geometric significance of the space ν_Λ in Lemma B.10 is the following. The manifold $M(p) = SO(p) \times \text{Diag}^+(p)$ is a Lie group with identity element $e = (I, I)$ and Lie algebra $T_e(M(p)) = \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{d}(p)$. For any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, let $\nu_{(V, \Lambda)}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S))$ be the normal space to the fiber $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ at (V, Λ) —i.e. the orthogonal complement of $T_{(V, \Lambda)}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)) \subset T_{(V, \Lambda)}M(p)$ w.r.t. $\tilde{g}_{(V, \Lambda)}$. The space $\nu_\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{so}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{d}(p) = T_e(M(p))$ in Lemma B.10 is simply the image of $\nu_{(V, \Lambda)}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S))$ under the map $T_{(V, \Lambda)}(M(p)) \rightarrow T_e(M(p))$ induced by left-translation by (V^{-1}, Λ^{-1}) .

Notation B.12. Given any metric space (X, d_X) , any $Y \subset X$, and any $\epsilon > 0$, we let $N_\epsilon(Y)$ denote the ϵ -neighborhood of Y in X :

$$N_\epsilon(Y) = \{x \in X : d_X(x, Y) < \epsilon\}$$

It is easily seen that

$$N_\epsilon(Y) = \bigcup_{y \in Y} B_\epsilon^X(y). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Corollary B.13. *Let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, let $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, and let $\mathcal{C}(V, \Lambda)$ denote the connected component of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ containing (V, Λ) . Let VG_Λ^0 denote the set $\{VR : R \in G_\Lambda^0\}$.*

There exist $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\Lambda) > 0$ and $c_1 = c_1(\Lambda) > 0$ (depending only on Λ , not V) such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_2]$,

$$\underbrace{B_\delta^{\text{Frob}}(S)}_{\text{in } \text{Sym}^+(p)} \subset F\left(\bigcup_{R \in G_\Lambda^0} (B_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}^{SO}(VR) \times B_{c\delta}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda))\right) \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$= F\left(\underbrace{N_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}(VG_\Lambda^0)}_{\text{in } SO(p)} \times B_{c\delta}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)\right) \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$\subset F\left(\bigcup_{\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{C}(V, \Lambda)} B_{c_1\delta}^{d_M}(\tilde{S})\right) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$= F\left(\underbrace{N_{c_1\delta}(\mathcal{C}(V, \Lambda))}_{\text{in } M(p)}\right) \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Proof of Corollary B.13. Let $\mathfrak{g}_\Lambda^\perp$, δ_2 , c , and all relevant norms be as in Lemma B.10, let $c_1 = c\sqrt{2}$, and let $\delta \in (0, \delta_2]$.

We will prove (B.13) last. First, the equality (B.15) follows from (B.11), as does the equality

$$N_\epsilon(VG_\Lambda^0) = \bigcup_{U \in VG_\Lambda^0} B_\epsilon^{SO}(U) = \bigcup_{R \in G_\Lambda^0} B_\epsilon^{SO}(VR) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. But (B.16) implies that for any $\epsilon, \epsilon' > 0$,

$$N_\epsilon(VG_\Lambda^0) \times B_{\epsilon'}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda) = \left(\bigcup_{R \in G_\Lambda^0} B_\epsilon^{SO}(VR)\right) \times B_{\epsilon'}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{R \in G_\Lambda^0} (B_\epsilon^{SO}(VR) \times B_{\epsilon'}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)),$$

yielding the equality (B.13).

Next, $\mathcal{C}(V, \Lambda) = \{(VR, \Lambda) : R \in G_\Lambda^0\}$ (See Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman, 2021, Appendix A), and for any $R \in G_\Lambda^0$ and $(U, D) \in B_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}^{SO}(VR) \times B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$,

$$d_M((U, D), (V, \Lambda))^2 = kd_{SO}(U, VR)^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(D, \Lambda)^2 < 2(c\delta)^2 = (c_1\delta)^2.$$

Thus $B_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}^{SO}(VR) \times B_\delta^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda) \subset B_{c_1\delta}^{d_M}(VR, \Lambda)$. Hence the RHS of (B.12) (and therefore the equal RHS of (B.13)) is contained in the RHS of (B.14).

It remains only to establish the inclusion (B.12). Let $S' \in B_\delta^{\text{FrOb}}(S)$. Then

$$\delta > \|S' - S\|_{\text{Fr}} = \|S' - V\Lambda V^T\|_{\text{Fr}} = \|V^{-1}S'V - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}},$$

so $S'' := V^{-1}S'V \in B_\delta^{\text{FrOb}}(\Lambda)$. By Lemma B.10(e), there exist $R \in G_\Lambda$, $A \in \mathfrak{g}_\Lambda^\perp$ and

$L \in \mathfrak{d}(p)$ such that $S'' = Re^A \Lambda e^L e^{-A} R^T$, $\|A\|_{\mathfrak{so}} = d_{SO}(e^A, I)$, and

$$(k\|A\|_{\mathfrak{so}}^2 + \|L\|_{\text{Fr}}^2)^{1/2} = \|(A, L)\|_{\mathfrak{g}_e} \leq \|e^A \Lambda e^L e^{-A} - \Lambda\|_{\text{Fr}} < c\delta.$$

Then $S' = VS''V^T = VRe^AD(VRe^A)^T = F(VRe^A, D)$, where $D = \Lambda e^L$. Since $d_{SO}(VRe^A, VR) = d_{SO}(e^A, I) = \|A\|_{\mathfrak{so}} < c\delta/\sqrt{k}$ and $d_{\mathcal{D}}(D, \Lambda) = d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda e^L, \Lambda) = \|L\|_{\text{Fr}} < c\delta$, the pair (VRe^A, D) lies in $B_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}^{SO}(VR) \times B_{c\delta}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$.

Hence $S' \in F(B_{c\delta/\sqrt{k}}^{SO}(VR) \times B_{c\delta}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda))$, establishing (B.12). \square

B.2.4. Proof of Lemma 4.4

Since the eigenvector and eigenvalue matrices $(U, D) \in M(p)$ have distinct roles in the proof of Lemma 4.4, we restate the lemma with a different notation:

Lemma B.14 (Lemma 4.4). *Let $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ be a compact set. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. There exists $\delta_1 = \delta_1(S, K, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $S_0 \in K$, all $\tilde{S}_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$, all $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, and all $S' \in \mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_1}^{d_M}((V, \Lambda)))$,*

$$d_{S\mathcal{R}}(S', S_0)^2 > d_{S\mathcal{R}}(S, S_0)^2 - \epsilon \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{P}S\mathcal{R}}(S', \tilde{S}_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{P}S\mathcal{R}}(S, \tilde{S}_0)^2 - \epsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For any $A \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$, let $\tilde{A}_{\mathcal{D}}$ denote the image of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(A)$ under the natural projection $M(p) \rightarrow \text{Diag}^+(p)$. (Thus $\tilde{A}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the set of diagonal matrices occurring in eigendecompositions of elements of A .) We will need this only when A is either K or a one-element set. In the latter case, for $Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ we write $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{D}}$ for $\{\tilde{Y}\}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

For each $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$ the function $\text{Diag}^+(p) \times \text{Diag}^+(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $(D_1, D_2) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{D}}(D_1, \pi_h \cdot D_2)^2$ is locally uniformly continuous. Hence, for each $(\Lambda, h, D_0) \in \tilde{S}_{\mathcal{D}} \times \mathcal{G}(p) \times \tilde{K}_{\mathcal{D}}$ there are numbers $\delta_3(\Lambda, h; D_0) \in (0, \delta_{\text{strat}}(S)]$ and $\tilde{\delta}_4(\Lambda, h; D_0) > 0$ such that for all $\Lambda' \in B_{\delta_3(\Lambda, h; D_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$ and $D'_0 \in B_{\tilde{\delta}_4(\Lambda, h; D_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0)$,

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda, \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 - \epsilon/2. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Choose such numbers $\tilde{\delta}_3(\Lambda, h; D_0)$, $\tilde{\delta}_4(\Lambda, h; D_0)$ for every $(\Lambda, h, D_0) \in \tilde{S}_{\mathcal{D}} \times \mathcal{G}(p) \times \tilde{K}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Since $\mathcal{G}(p)$ is finite, and the set $\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is finite for every $Y \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, given any $S_0 \in K$ we may choose $\delta_3(S_0), \delta_4(S_0) > 0$ such that (B.17) holds simultaneously for all $(\Lambda, h, D_0) \in \tilde{S}_{\mathcal{D}} \times \mathcal{G}(p) \times (\tilde{S}_0)_{\mathcal{D}}$, $\Lambda' \in B_{\delta_3(S_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$, and $D'_0 \in B_{\delta_4(S_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0)$. (The numbers $\delta_3(S_0), \delta_4(S_0)$ depend on S and ϵ as well, but S and ϵ were fixed in the hypotheses of the proposition.) Without loss of generality, we impose the additional restriction $\delta_3(S_0) \leq \delta_{\text{strat}}(S)$.

By Proposition 3.5 of [Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman \(2021\)](#), for any $(V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0) \in M(p)$,

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(F(V', \Lambda'), F(U'_0, D'_0))^2 = \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p)} \left\{ k \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where

$$\hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) = \min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda'}^0, R_2 \in G_{D'_0}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})\} \leq \text{diam}(SO(p)). \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Similarly,

$$d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(F(V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 = \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p)} \left\{ k \hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

where

$$\hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) = \min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda'}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0h^{-1})\} \leq \text{diam}(SO(p)). \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Let

$$\delta_2 = \min \left\{ \text{diam}(SO(p)), \frac{\epsilon}{6k \text{diam}(SO(p))} \right\}.$$

By definition of $\delta_{\text{strat}}(S)$, for all $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ and all $\Lambda' \in B_{\delta_{\text{strat}}(S)}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$ we have $J_{\Lambda'} \geq J_{\Lambda}$, implying $G_{\Lambda'}^0 \subset G_{\Lambda}^0$. Hence for all $S_0 \in K$, $(U_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$, $(U'_0, D'_0) \in B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(U_0) \times B_{\delta_4(S_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0)$, $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, $(V', \Lambda') \in B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(V) \times B_{\delta_3(S_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$, and $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$, we have

$$\min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda'}^0, R_2 \in G_{D'_0}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})\} \geq \min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda}^0, R_2 \in G_{D'_0}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})\}$$

and

$$\min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda'}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0h^{-1})\} \geq \min_{R_1 \in G_{\Lambda}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0h^{-1})\};$$

i.e.

$$\hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) \geq \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) \quad (\text{B.22})$$

and

$$\hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) \geq \hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)). \quad (\text{B.23})$$

With all data as above, observe that for all $R_1, R_2 \in SO(p)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1}) - d_{SO}(VR_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})| &\leq d_{SO}(V'R_1, VR_1) \\ &= d_{SO}(V', V) \\ &< \delta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &|\hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) - \hat{d}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0))| = \\ &\quad \left| \min_{R_1 \in G_\Lambda^0, R_2 \in G_{D_0}^0} \{d_{SO}(V'R_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})\} - \min_{R_1 \in G_\Lambda^0, R_2 \in G_{D_0}^0} \{d_{SO}(VR_1, U'_0R_2h^{-1})\} \right| \\ &\quad < \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

implying $\hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) > \hat{d}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) - \delta_2$. Similarly, $\hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) > \hat{\hat{d}}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) - \delta_2$. Combining these last two inequalities with (B.22) and (B.23), we find

$$\hat{d}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) < \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) + \delta_2 \quad (\text{B.24})$$

and

$$\hat{\hat{d}}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0)) < \hat{\hat{d}}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) + \delta_2. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Letting $S'_0 = F(U'_0, D'_0)$, the bounds (B.24) and (B.17) then yield

$$\begin{aligned} &k \hat{d}_h((V, \Lambda), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda, \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 \\ &< k [\hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) + \delta_2]^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 + \epsilon/2 \quad (\text{by (B.17)}) \\ &= k \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 \\ &\quad + k\delta_2 \left(2 \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0)) + \delta_2 \right) + \epsilon/2 \\ &< k \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 \\ &\quad + k\delta_2 (3 \text{diam}(SO(p))) + \epsilon/2 \\ &< k \hat{d}_h((V', \Lambda'), (U'_0, D'_0))^2 + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda', \pi_h \cdot D'_0)^2 + \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.26})$$

(by our definition of δ_2). Since (B.26) holds for every $h \in \mathcal{G}(p)$, it follows from (B.18) that $d_{S\mathcal{R}}(S, S'_0)^2 < d_{S\mathcal{R}}(S', S'_0)^2 + \epsilon$, where $S' = \mathcal{F}(V', \Lambda')$. Additionally writing $\tilde{S}'_0 = (U'_0, D'_0)$, the bounds (B.25) and (B.17) similarly imply that $d_{\mathcal{P}S\mathcal{R}}(S, \tilde{S}'_0)^2 < d_{\mathcal{P}S\mathcal{R}}(S', \tilde{S}'_0)^2 + \epsilon$.

Thus (4.2) and (4.3) hold for all $S' \in F(B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(V) \times B_{\delta_3(S_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda))$, $S'_0 \in F(B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(U_0) \times B_{\delta_4(D_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0))$, and $\tilde{S}'_0 \in B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(U_0) \times B_{\delta_4(D_0)}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0)$.

Since \mathcal{F} is a proper map (Proposition B.9), $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$ is compact. The collection $\left\{B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(U_0) \times B_{\delta_4}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0)\right\}_{(U_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)}$ is an open cover of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$, and hence has a finite subcover $\left\{(B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(U_0^{(i)}) \times B_{\delta_4}^{\mathcal{D}}(D_0^{(i)}))\right\}_{i=1}^n$ with “centers” $\tilde{S}_i = (U_0^{(i)}, D_0^{(i)})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Define $\delta_5 = \min\{\delta_3(\tilde{S}^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Then (4.2) and (4.3) hold whenever $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, $S' \in \mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(V) \times B_{\delta_5}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda))$, $S_0 \in K$, and $\tilde{S}_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$.

Finally, let $\delta_1 = \min\{\sqrt{k} \delta_2, \delta_5\}$. Then $B_{\delta_1}^{dM}(V, \Lambda) \subset B_{\delta_2}^{SO}(V) \times B_{\delta_5}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Lambda)$, so (4.2) and (4.3) hold for all $S' \in \mathcal{F}(B_{\delta_1}^{dM}(V, \Lambda))$, $S_0 \in K$, and $\tilde{S}_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$. \square

B.2.5. Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof of Theorem 4.3. As mentioned after the statement of the theorem, part (a) is a special case of part (b), so it suffices to prove part (b).

Observe that if $\tilde{K} \subset M(p)$ is compact, then so are $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{K})$ and (since \mathcal{F} is proper [Proposition B.9]) also $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{K}))$. Since $\tilde{K} \subset \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{K}))$, any property that is uniform over $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{K}))$ is uniform over \tilde{K} . Hence, to prove the desired result for $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$, it suffices to consider compact subsets of $M(p)$ of the form $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$, where $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ is compact.

Let $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, let $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ be a compact set, and let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(S, K, \epsilon)$ be as in Lemma 4.4. Let $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$, let $c_1 = c_1(\Lambda)$ and $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\Lambda)$ be as in Corollary B.13, and let $\delta = \min\{\delta_1/c_1, \delta_2\}$.

Let $S' \in B_{\delta}^{\text{Frob}}(S)$, and let $S_0 \in K$, and let $\tilde{S}_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(K)$. Since $\delta \leq \delta_2$, relations (B.12)–(B.14) in Corollary B.13, ensure that $S' \in \mathcal{F}\left(B_{c_1\delta}^{dM}(\tilde{S})\right)$ for some $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$. Since $c_1\delta \leq \delta_1$, Lemma 4.4 implies that $d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S', S_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, S_0)^2 - \epsilon$ and $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S', \tilde{S}_0)^2 > d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, \tilde{S}_0)^2 - \epsilon$.

This proves that $d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2$ and $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2$ are LSC in their first variables, locally uniformly with respect to their second variables. The analogous result for the unsquared functions $d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$ and $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$ then follow from Corollary B.6. \square

B.2.6. Proof of Lemma 4.6

We first develop an inequality for $d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}$ which plays the role of the triangle inequality.

Lemma B.15. *Let $S_2 \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(S_2) \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on the eigenvalues of S_2 , such that for all $S_0, S_1 \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$,*

$$d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S_1, S_2) \leq d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S_1, S_0) + d_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S_0, S_2) + C(S_2).$$

Proof. Note from Proposition 3.5 of Groisser, Jung and Schwartzman (2021) that given any two $S', S'' \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and a connected component \mathcal{C}' of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$, there is a minimal pair $((U', D'), (U'', D'')) \in \mathcal{C}' \times \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S'')$. Note also that if

both (U', D') and (U, D) are in the same connected component \mathcal{C}' of S' , then $D = D'$. Moreover, for any $(U', D'), (U, D) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M((U', D'), (U, D)) &\leq d_M((U', D'), (U, D')) + d_M((U, D'), (U, D)) \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \text{diam}(SO(p)) + d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D', D). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Let \mathcal{C}_0 be a connected component of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $((U_i, D_i), (U_0^{(i)}, D_0^{(i)})) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_i) \times \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$ be minimal pairs with $(U_0^{(i)}, D_0^{(i)})$ both lying in \mathcal{C}_0 . Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the connected component of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_1)$ containing (U_1, D_1) , and let $((U'_1, D'_1), (U'_2, D'_2)) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_1) \times \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_2)$ be a minimal pair for (S_1, S_2) with $(U'_1, D'_1) \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Then, $D_0^{(1)} = D_0^{(2)} =: D_0$, and $D'_1 = D_1$. Moreover,

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_i, S_0) = d_M(U_i, D_i, (U_0^{(i)}, D_0^{(i)})) = d_M(U_i, D_i, (U_0^{(i)}, D_0)),$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2) = d_M(U'_1, D'_1, (U'_2, D'_2)) = d_M(U'_1, D_1, (U'_2, D'_2)).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2) &= d_M(U'_1, D_1, (U'_2, D'_2)) \\ &\leq d_M(U'_1, D_1, (U_1, D_1)) + d_M((U_1, D_1), (U_0^{(1)}, D_0)) + d_M((U_0^{(1)}, D_0), (U_0^{(2)}, D_0)) \\ &\quad + d_M((U_0^{(2)}, D_0), (U_2, D_2)) + d_M((U_2, D_2), (U'_2, D'_2)) \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \text{diam}(SO(p)) + d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_0) + \sqrt{k} \text{diam}(SO(p)) \\ &\quad + d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, S_2) + (\sqrt{k} \text{diam}(SO(p)) + d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_2, D'_2)) \\ &\leq d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_0) + d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, S_2) + 3\sqrt{k} \text{diam}(SO(p)) + d_{\mathcal{D}^+}(D_2, D'_2). \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.6. (a) Suppose that for some $(U_0, D_0) \in M(p)$, $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U_0, D_0) < \infty$. Then for any given $(U, D) \in M(p)$,

$$f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U, D) = \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} \inf_{(U_X, D_X) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)} [k d_{SO}^2(U_X, U) + d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D_X, D)] dP.$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{SO}^2(U_X, U) &\leq \{d_{SO}(U_X, U_0) + d_{SO}(U_0, U)\}^2 \\ &\leq 2d_{SO}^2(U_X, U_0) + 2d_{SO}^2(U_0, U), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D_X, D) \leq 2d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D_X, D_0) + 2d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D_0, D)$. Thus,

$$f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U, D) \leq 2 \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, (U_0, D_0)) dP + C < \infty,$$

where $C = 2kd_{SO}^2(U_0, U) + 2d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D_0, D)$. Moreover, for any given $\Sigma \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, choosing any $(U', D') \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$, we have $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(\Sigma) \leq f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(U', D') < \infty$ by (3.4).

(b) Suppose that for some $S_0 \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S_0) < \infty$. For any given $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, Lemma B.15 gives $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, S) \leq d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X, S_0) + C'(S_0, S)$ for any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, where $C'(S_0, S) = d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, S) + C(S) < \infty$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) &= \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X, S) dP \leq \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} 2d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(X, S_0) dP + 2C'(S_0, S)^2 \\ &= 2f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S_0) + 2C'(S_0, S)^2 < \infty. \square \end{aligned}$$

B.2.7. Proof of Lemma 4.7

Proof of Lemma 4.7. (i) By Theorem 4.3, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2|_{\text{Sym}^+(p) \times K}$ is LSC in the first variable, uniformly with respect to the second. Let $S_0 \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and let U be the open set containing S_0 as in Definition 4.2(i). Then for all $S \in U$ and $S' \in K$, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(S, S') > d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(S_0, S') - \epsilon$. Hence

$$f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) = \int_K d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(S, \cdot) dP > \int_K (d_{\mathcal{SR}}^2(S_0, \cdot) - \epsilon) dP = f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S_0) - \epsilon.$$

Hence $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ is LSC at the arbitrary point S_0 .

(ii) We will show that $(f^{(\mathcal{PSR})})^{1/2}$ is Lipschitz with constant 1:

$$|f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_1)^{1/2} - f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_2)^{1/2}| \leq d_M(m_1, m_2) \quad \text{for all } m_1, m_2 \in M(p). \quad (\text{B.28})$$

This will imply uniform continuity of $(f^{(\mathcal{PSR})})^{1/2}$, and therefore continuity of $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Let $m_1, m_2 \in M(p)$. Utilizing Lemma 4.1(ii),

$$\begin{aligned} &|f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_1) - f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_2)| \quad (\text{B.29}) \\ &\leq \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} |d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_1) - d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_2)| [d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_1) + d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_2)] P(dX) \\ &\leq d_M(m_1, m_2) \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} [d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_1) + d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_2)] P(dX) \\ &\leq d_M(m_1, m_2) [f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_1)^{1/2} + f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_2)^{1/2}]. \end{aligned}$$

If $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(m_1) = d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(m_2) = 0$, then (B.28) is true trivially. Otherwise, dividing both sides of (B.29) by $[f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_1)^{1/2} + f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_2)^{1/2}]$ yields (B.28). \square

B.3. Proofs for Section 4.2

B.3.1. Proof of Proposition 4.8

Proof of Proposition 4.8. For $r > 0$ let

$$K_r = \{S \in \text{Sym}^+(p) : \text{every eigenvalue } \lambda \text{ of } S \text{ satisfies } |\log \lambda| \leq r\},$$

and let $\kappa_r = \text{diam}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(K_r))$. For each r , the set K_r is compact, and hence so is $\tilde{K}_r := F^{-1}(K_r)$ (by Proposition B.9). Note also that $I \in K_r$ and $(I, I) \in \tilde{K}_r$ for every $r > 0$.

Suppose $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ and that $S_2 \in \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus K_{r_2}$. Then for any $m_1 = (U_1, D_1) \in \tilde{K}_{r_1}$ and $m_2 = (U_2, D_2) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_2)$, the matrix D_2 has some eigenvalue λ_2 with $|\log \lambda_2| > r_2$, while every eigenvalue λ_1 of D_1 satisfies $|\log \lambda_1| \leq r_1$, implying $d_M(m_1, m_2) \geq d_{\mathcal{D}}(D_1, D_2) \geq r_2 - r_1$. Hence $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2) \geq r_2 - r_1$, and thus

$$f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S_2) \geq \int_{K_{r_1}} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2)^2 P(dS_1) \geq (r_2 - r_1)^2 P(K_{r_1}). \quad (\text{B.30})$$

Now choose r_1 large enough that $P(K_{r_1}) > 0$; such r_1 exists since $\bigcup_{r>0} K_r = \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Let $r_2 > r_1$ be large enough that $(r_2 - r_1)^2 P(K_{r_1}) > f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(I)$. Then by (B.30), for every $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p) \setminus K_{r_2}$,

$$f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S) \geq (r_2 - r_1)^2 P(K_{r_1}) > f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(I). \quad (\text{B.31})$$

Since $I \in K_{r_2}$, (B.31) implies that (4.4) holds with $K = K_{r_2}$, establishing part (a).

For (b), let r_1 be as above, consider a (new) arbitrary $r_2 > r_1$, and let m_1, m_2 be as above. Then essentially the same argument as above shows that $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S_1, m_2) \geq r_2 - r_1$ and hence that $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_2) \geq (r_2 - r_1)^2 P(K_{r_1})$. Now let $r_2 > r_1$ be large enough that $(r_2 - r_1)^2 P(K_{r_1}) > f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(I, I)$. Then for every $m \in M(p) \setminus \tilde{K}_{r_2}$ we have $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) > f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(I, I)$. Since $(I, I) \in \tilde{K}_{r_2}$, this implies that (4.5) holds with $K = K_{r_2}$. \square

B.3.2. Proof of Theorem 4.9

Proof of Theorem 4.9. (a) By Proposition 4.8(a), there exists a compact set $K \subset \text{Sym}^+(p)$ such that equation (4.4) holds. But by Lemma 4.7, $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ is LSC, hence achieves a minimum value on K , say at S_0 . By (4.4), $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}(S_0)$ is the minimum value of $f^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ on all of $\text{Sym}^+(p)$. Hence $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ is nonempty.

The proof for (b) is almost identical to the proof for (a), except that the finite PSR-variance condition actually ensures *continuity* (not just semi-continuity) of $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. \square

B.4. Proofs for Section 4.3

B.4.1. Proof of Lemma 4.12

Proof of Lemma 4.12. (a) Since $h \cdot (U, D) = (Uh^{-1}, h \cdot D)$, and $h \cdot D = hDh^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M((U, D), (Uh^{-1}, hDh^{-1})) &= \{d_{\mathcal{D}^+}^2(D, hDh^{-1}) + kd_{\mathcal{SO}}^2(U, Uh^{-1})\}^{1/2} \\ &\geq \sqrt{k}d_{\mathcal{SO}}(U, Uh^{-1}) = \sqrt{k}d_{\mathcal{SO}}(I_p, h^{-1}) \\ &\geq \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) The set $\mathcal{G}(p)$ contains the block-diagonal signed permutation matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} I_{p-2} & 0 \\ 0 & R(\frac{\pi}{2}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$R(\frac{\pi}{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) & -\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) \\ \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be shown that

$$\text{Log}(B) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Log}(R(\frac{\pi}{2})) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\text{Log}(R(\frac{\pi}{2})) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{\pi}{2} \\ \frac{\pi}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we have that $d_{SO}(I_p, B) = \frac{\pi}{2}$, which implies that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$.

(c) Given $X \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, let (U_X, D_X) and (U'_X, D'_X) be two distinct eigen-decompositions of X . From Theorem 3.3 of [Jung, Schwartzman and Groisser \(2015\)](#), there is an even signed-permutation h such that $(U'_X, D'_X) = (Uh^{-1}, h \cdot D)$. Since (U_X, D_X) and (U'_X, D'_X) are distinct, $h \neq I_p$. Applying Part (a) gives the result. \square

B.4.2. Proof of Lemma 4.14

Proof of Lemma 4.14. It is well known that $(\text{Diag}^+(p), g_{\mathcal{D}^+})$ has non-positive sectional curvature and infinite injectivity radius, and $(SO(p), kg_{SO})$ has non-negative sectional curvature (bounded above by $\Delta(SO(p), kg_{SO}) = 1/(4k)$) and injectivity radius $r_{\text{inj}}(SO(p), kg_{SO}) = \sqrt{k}\pi$ (see Section 5 of [Manton \(2004\)](#)). Thus the injectivity radius of (M, g_M) is $r_{\text{inj}}(M, g_M) = r_{\text{inj}}(SO(p), kg_{SO})$, and the sectional curvature of (M, g_M) is bounded by $\Delta(M, g_M) = \Delta(SO(p), kg_{SO})$.

We apply Theorem 2.1 of [Afsari \(2011\)](#), which shows that the minimizer $\bar{m}(P)$ of $\int_{M(p)} d_M^2(\tilde{X}, m)P(d\tilde{X})$ uniquely exists and lies in $B_r^{d_M}(m_0)$, provided that

$$r \leq \min\{r_{\text{inj}}(M, g_M), \pi/\sqrt{\Delta(M, g_M)}\}/2. \quad (\text{B.32})$$

Since

$$\min\{r_{\text{inj}}(M, g_M), \pi/\sqrt{\Delta(M, g_M)}\}/2 = \min\{\sqrt{k}\frac{\pi}{2}, 2\sqrt{k}\frac{\pi}{2}\} = \frac{\sqrt{k}\pi}{2}$$

and $r \leq \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}\pi}{2}$ (by Lemma 4.12(b)), we have the desired bound (B.32). \square

B.4.3. Proof of Theorem 4.15 and Corollary 4.16

Proof of Theorem 4.15. By the condition (4.8), for any $S_1, S_2 \in \text{supp}(P)$,

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_1, S_2) < r'_{cx}. \quad (\text{B.33})$$

Since the complement of S_p^{top} has volume zero in $\text{Sym}^+(p)$, we have for any $m \in M(p)$,

$$f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, m)P(dX) = \int_{S_p^{\text{top}}} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, m)P(dX). \quad (\text{B.34})$$

Fix an arbitrary $S_0 \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$. There are exactly $v_p := 2^{p-1}p!$ distinct eigen-decompositions in $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0)$, and we label them by $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$, that is, $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0) = \{m_\ell(S_0) : \ell = 1, \dots, v_p\}$. We claim the following:

Claim B.16. *For each ℓ , and for each $S' \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, one can uniquely choose $m_\ell(S') \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$ that forms a minimal pair with $m_\ell(S_0)$. Thus, one can uniquely label all eigen-decompositions $\{m_\ell(S') : \ell = 1, \dots, v_p\} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$ for all $S' \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$.*

Proof of Claim B.16. The fact that both $S_0, S' \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$ and (B.33) ensure that there exists an $m' \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$ such that $d_M(m', m_\ell(S_0)) = d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S', S_0) < r'_{cx}$. Choose such an m' and label it to be $m_\ell(S') \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$. Let $m_k(S') \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$ be such that $m_k(S') \neq m_\ell(S')$. Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(m_k(S'), m_\ell(S_0)) &\geq d_M(m_k(S'), m_\ell(S')) - d_M(m_\ell(S'), m_\ell(S_0)) \\ &> \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} - r'_{cx} = \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)} > r'_{cx}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.35})$$

Therefore, $m_\ell(S') \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S')$ is indeed the unique eigen-decomposition that forms a minimal pair with $m_\ell(S_0)$. \square

By Claim B.16, one can therefore label all eigen-decompositions $m_\ell(S)$ of all $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, provided that an initial labeling of S_0 is given. For $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$ and for $r > 0$, define a set $H_\ell(r)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} H_\ell(r) &= \{m \in M(p) : d_M(m, m_\ell(S)) < r \text{ for all } S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}\} \\ &= \bigcap_{S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} B_r^{d_M}(m_\ell(S)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.36})$$

Claim B.17. (a) *If $r \leq 2r'_{cx}$, then for $\ell \neq \ell'$, $H_\ell(r) \cap H_{\ell'}(r) = \emptyset$.*

(b) *If $r \geq r'_{cx}$, then for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, $m_\ell(S) \in H_\ell(r)$, for any $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$.*

(c) *If $r \leq 2r'_{cx}$, then for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$ and for any $m \in H_\ell(r)$, the eigen-decomposition of S closest to m is $m_\ell(S)$.*

(d) *For any $S_1, S_2 \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, $(m_\ell(S_1), m_{\ell'}(S_2))$ is a minimal pair if and only if $\ell = \ell'$.*

Proof of Claim B.17. Item (b) is immediate by the definition of H_ℓ (B.36).

Let $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, $m \in H_\ell(r)$ and note that for any $\ell' \neq \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(m, m_{\ell'}(S)) &\geq d_M(m_{\ell'}(S), m_\ell(S)) - d_M(m, m_\ell(S)) \\ &> 4r'_{cx} - d_M(m, m_\ell(S)) > d_M(m, m_\ell(S)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.37})$$

in which we used the triangle inequality and Lemma 4.12 (c), and the fact that $d_M(m, m_\ell(S)) < 2r'_{cx}$ (given by the condition $r \leq 2r'_{cx}$ and the definition of $H_\ell(r)$). This shows (c).

Take $r \in [r'_{cx}, 2r'_{cx}]$, then parts (b) and (c) are true. To verify (d), from part(c), replace m by $m_\ell(S_1)$, $m_{\ell'}(S')$ by $m_{\ell'}(S_2)$ for $\ell \neq \ell'$.

To verify (a) it is sufficient to assume $r = 2r'_{cx}$. Let $m \in H_\ell(r)$, then there exists an $S' \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$ such that $d_M(m, m_\ell(S')) < 2r'_{cx}$. But

$$d_M(m, m_{\ell'}(S')) \geq d_M(m_{\ell'}(S'), m_\ell(S')) - d_M(m, m_\ell(S')) > 4r'_{cx} - 2r'_{cx} = 2r'_{cx},$$

thus yielding $m \notin H_{\ell'}(r)$. \square

For each $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$ write $H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx})$ for $H_\ell(r'_{cx}) \cap M_p^{\text{top}}$ for notational simplicity. Fix an $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$, and consider the eigen-composition map \mathcal{F} restricted to $H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx})$, $\mathcal{F}|_{H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx})} : H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx}) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Since for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ intersects with $H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx})$ at a unique point, there exists the push-forward measure $P \circ \mathcal{F}|_{H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx})}$ supported on $H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx}) \subset M(p)$. For each ℓ , denote P_ℓ for this ‘‘push-forwarded’’ probability measure on $M(p)$. Since the support of P_ℓ lies in $H_\ell^{\text{top}}(r'_{cx}) \subset B_{r'_{cx}}(m_\ell(S))$ for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, by Lemma 4.14, there exists a unique Fréchet mean $\bar{m}_\ell := \bar{m}(P_\ell) \in M(p)$ of P_ℓ , and $\bar{m}_\ell \in B_{r'_{cx}}(m_\ell(S))$. Since the above holds for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, we have that

$$\bar{m}_\ell \in H_\ell(r'_{cx}). \quad (\text{B.38})$$

We now show that the set $\{\bar{m}_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, v_p\}$ is exactly the PSR mean set, or, equivalently that \bar{m}_ℓ 's are the only minimizers of (B.34). Let $m \in M(p)$ be arbitrary. Choose any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$.

If $m \in H_\ell(2r'_{cx})$ for some ℓ , but $m \neq \bar{m}_\ell$ then

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) &= \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} \min_{l=1, \dots, v_p} d_M^2(m_l(X), m) P(dX) \\ &= \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} d_M^2(m_\ell(X), m) P(dX) \quad (\text{by Lemma B.17(c)}) \\ &> \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} d_M^2(m_\ell(X), \bar{m}_\ell) P(dX) \\ &= f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(\bar{m}_\ell), \end{aligned}$$

in which the strict inequality is given by the fact that \bar{m}_ℓ is the unique Fréchet mean of P_ℓ .

Next, suppose that $m \notin \bigcup_{l=1}^{v_p} H_l(2r'_{cx})$. For any $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$, we have $m \notin H_\ell(2r'_{cx})$, and there exists an $S'_\ell \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$ such that

$$d_M(m, m_\ell(S'_\ell)) > 2r'_{cx}.$$

Thus, for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$ and for any $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$, $d_M(m_\ell(S'_\ell), m_\ell(S)) = d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S'_\ell, S)$ by Lemma B.17(d), and

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(m, m_\ell(S)) &\geq d_M(m, m_\ell(S'_\ell)) - d_M(m_\ell(S'_\ell), m_\ell(S)) \\ &> 2r'_{cx} - r'_{cx} = r'_{cx}. \end{aligned}$$

(We used the fact that for $S'_\ell, S \in \text{supp}(P)$, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S'_\ell, S) < r'_{cx}$ (B.33.)) Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) &= \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} \min_{l=1, \dots, v_p} d_M^2(m_l(X), m) P(dX) \\ &> \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} \min_{l=1, \dots, v_p} (r'_{cx})^2 P(dX) \\ &= (r'_{cx})^2. \end{aligned}$$

However, for any $S \in \text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(\bar{m}_\ell) &= \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} d_M^2(m_\ell(X), \bar{m}_\ell) P(dX) \\ &\leq \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} d_M^2(m_\ell(X), m_\ell(S)) P(dX) \\ &< \int_{\text{supp}(P) \cap S_p^{\text{top}}} (r'_{cx})^2 P(dX) \\ &= (r'_{cx})^2. \end{aligned}$$

The above two results show that the set $E_n := \{\bar{m}_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, v_p\}$ is exactly the partial scaling-rotation mean set for the sample X_1, \dots, X_n . Since there are exactly $v_p = 2^{p-1}p!$ elements in E_n , it follows from (4.6) that the elements of E_n must belong to the same orbit under the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$. Part (a) is now proved. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.16. For part (a), the sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ satisfies the support condition (B.33). A proof of part (a) is given by following the proof of Theorem 4.15, with the probability measure P replaced by the empirical measure given by the sample X_1, \dots, X_n .

To prove (b), for any given $\ell = 1, \dots, v_p$, set the initial guess $\hat{m}^{(0)}$ to be the eigen-decomposition $m_\ell(X_1)$ of X_1 . Then $m_\ell(X_i)$ forms a minimal pair with $\hat{m}^{(0)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and, as seen earlier, is the unique element of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(X_i)$ with this property. Thus, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $m_\ell(X_i)$ is the unique choice of $m_i^{(0)}$ in Step 1 of the algorithm. Since \bar{m}_ℓ is the unique Fréchet mean of

$\{m_{1,\ell}, \dots, m_{n,\ell}\}$ by Lemma 4.14, Step 2 of the algorithm yields $\hat{m}^{(1)} = \bar{m}_\ell$. Thus $\hat{m}^{(1)}$ is exactly the sample PSR mean \bar{m}_ℓ , and the sample PSR mean set is the orbit $\mathcal{G}(p) \cdot \hat{m}^{(1)}$. Since $\hat{m}^{(1)} \in H_\ell(r'_{cx})$ by (B.38), the unique choice of $m_i^{(1)}$ in Step 2 of the procedure is $m_\ell(X_i)$, the same as the previous iteration. Thus, $\hat{m}^{(2)} = \hat{m}^{(1)}$ and the algorithm terminates. \square

B.4.4. Proof for the statements in Remark 4.17

Proof of “(i) yields (4.9)”: Since $d_{\mathcal{SR}}$ is a metric when restricted to S_p^{top} , and $S_0, X_i \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, we have $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, X_j) \leq d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, S_0) + d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_j, S_0) < r'_{cx}$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.

Our proof of “(ii) yields (4.9)” consists of two parts.

Part (1): Suppose that $m \in M^{\text{top}}(p)$. Then by (3.4),

$$d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, \mathcal{F}(m)) \leq d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m) < r'_{cx}/2.$$

(In fact, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, \mathcal{F}(m)) = d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m)$ in this case.) Since $\mathcal{F}(m) \in S_p^{\text{top}}$, the statement for (i) above yields (4.9).

Part (2): Suppose that $m \notin M^{\text{top}}(p)$. Since condition (ii) is true, we may choose an $\epsilon \in (0, \max\{r'_{cx}/2 - d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m) : i = 1, \dots, n\})$ so that

$$d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m) < r'_{cx}/2 - \epsilon$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $M^{\text{top}}(p)$ is dense in $M(p)$, one can choose $m_\epsilon \in M^{\text{top}}(p)$ such that $d_M(m, m_\epsilon) < \epsilon$. Recall that for each i $X_i \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ and we write $\mathcal{F}(X_i) = \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m_i$ for some $m_i \in \mathcal{F}(X_i) \subset M^{\text{top}}(p)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m_\epsilon) &= \inf_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p)} d_M(h \cdot m_i, m_\epsilon) \\ &\leq \inf_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p)} d_M(h \cdot m_i, m) + d_M(m, m_\epsilon) \\ &= d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m) + d_M(m_\epsilon, m) \\ &< (r'_{cx}/2 - \epsilon) + \epsilon = r'_{cx}/2. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $m_\epsilon \in M^{\text{top}}(p)$, $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m_\epsilon) < r'_{cx}/2$, Part (1) gives (4.9).

The following can be verified similarly: The condition (4.8) of Theorem 4.15 is guaranteed if either (i)* or (ii)* below is satisfied. Let X be a random variable following the absolutely continuous distribution P on $\text{Sym}^+(p)$.

(i)* There exists an $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ such that $P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X) < r'_{cx}/2) = 1$.

(ii)* There exists an $m \in M(p)$ such that $P(d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m) < r'_{cx}/2) = 1$.

We also provide a toy example for the fact: “For an $S_0 \in S_p^{\text{lwr}}$, even if a condition $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) < \epsilon$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is satisfied for arbitrarily small ϵ , $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_i, X_j)$ may be larger than r'_{cx} .” Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $p = 2$, $S_0 = I_2$, $X_1 = R(0)\text{diag}(e^{\epsilon/2}, e^{-\epsilon/2})R(0)'$ and $X_2 = R(\pi/4)\text{diag}(e^{\epsilon/2}, e^{-\epsilon/2})R(\pi/4)'$. Then $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) = \epsilon/\sqrt{2} < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2$. However, $d_{\mathcal{SR}}(X_1, X_2) = \sqrt{k}\pi/4 > r'_{cx}$. (For $p = 2$, $r'_{cx} = \sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}/4 = \sqrt{k}\pi/8$.)

B.4.5. Proof of Corollary 4.18

Proof of Corollary 4.18. Since $r < r'_{cx}/2$, we have $1 = P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) \leq r) \leq P(d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_0, X_i) \leq r'_{cx}/2)$. By Remark 4.17 and Theorem 4.15 (more precisely, Condition (i)* in Appendix B.4.4 is satisfied, which in turn implies that the condition of Theorem 4.15 is satisfied), the PSR mean is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$. Assertion (ii) is given by Theorem 3.7. Theorem 3.5 is applied with assertion (ii) to yield $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} = \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$. By (i), $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is the orbit $\mathcal{G}(p) \cdot (U, D)$ for some $(U, D) \in M(p)$, and $E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ only contains the SPD matrix $\bar{X} := UDU'$. \square

B.5. Proofs for Section 4.4

B.5.1. Proofs of Theorem 4.19 and related results

Proof of Theorem 4.19. We use the following lemma.

Lemma B.18. *Under the condition of Theorem 4.19, the following holds with probability 1: For any $m \in M(p)$ and for any sequence $m_n \in M(p)$ satisfying $d_M(m_n, m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_n) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m), \quad (\text{B.39})$$

and in particular

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m). \quad (\text{B.40})$$

Proof of Lemma B.18. For any given $m \in M(p)$, since the random variable $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, m)$ is integrable (Proposition 4.5), we have $P(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m)) = 1$ by the strong law of large numbers. We shall extend this result to

$$P\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) \text{ for all } m \in M(p)\right) = 1, \quad (\text{B.41})$$

thus showing (B.40).

Let m_1, m_2, \dots be a countable dense sequence in $M(p)$. Since for each k , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_k) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_k)$ almost surely, and $\{m_k\}$ is countable,

$$P\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_k) = f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_k) \text{ for all } k = 1, 2, \dots\right) = 1, \quad (\text{B.42})$$

Moreover, an argument similar to above leads us to conclude that, for every k ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m_k) \rightarrow \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_k) P(dX) < \infty \quad (\text{B.43})$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely.

Observe that by Lemma 4.1(ii), for any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, $m, m' \in M(p)$,

$$|d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, m) - d_{\mathcal{PSR}}^2(X, m')| \leq d_M(m, m')(2d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m) + d_M(m, m')),$$

which in turn leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) - f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m')| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |d_{\mathcal{P}SR}^2(X_i, m) - d_{\mathcal{P}SR}^2(X_i, m')| \\ &\leq g_n(m, m') := d_M(m, m') \left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}SR}(X_i, m') + d_M(m, m') \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.44})$$

Choose an arbitrary $m_0 \in M(p)$. Since $\{m_k\}$ is dense in $M(p)$, we can choose a subsequence m_{k_i} satisfying $d_M(m_{k_i}, m_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. For each i , the inequality (B.44) with (m, m') replaced by (m_0, m_{k_i}) is

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_{k_i}) - g_n(m_0, m_{k_i}) \leq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0) \leq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_{k_i}) + g_n(m_0, m_{k_i}).$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by (B.42) and (B.43),

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_{k_i}) - g(m_0, m_{k_i}) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0) \\ &\leq f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_{k_i}) + g(m_0, m_{k_i}), \end{aligned}$$

where $g(m, m') = d_M(m, m')(2 \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{P}SR}(X, m') P(dX) + d_M(m, m'))$. Further taking the limit as $i \rightarrow \infty$, since $f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ is continuous (see Lemma 4.7), we have proven (B.41).

To show (B.39), let m_n be a sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_M(m_n, m) = 0$ for some $m \in M(p)$. Again from the inequality (B.44), we have

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) + g_n(m_n, m) \leq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_n) \leq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) + g_n(m_n, m).$$

By (B.41), $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m)$ converges to $f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m)$ almost surely, while $g_n(m_n, m) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as well. This proves (B.39). \square

We next show that with probability 1

$$\overline{\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}} \subset E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}. \quad (\text{B.45})$$

We assume $\overline{\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}}$ is non-empty; otherwise, (B.45) holds.

Let $\ell = \inf_{m \in M(p)} f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m)$ and $\ell_n = \inf_{m \in M(p)} f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m)$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$. By (B.40), we have for any $m \in M(p)$ there exists $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) \geq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) - \epsilon_n \geq \ell_n - \epsilon_n$. Taking the limit superior of both sides, we have $f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_n$. Taking the infimum over $m \in M(p)$, we get

$$\ell = \inf_{m \in M(p)} f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_n. \quad (\text{B.46})$$

Thus, any subsequential limit of ℓ_n is bounded above by ℓ .

For any $m_0 \in \overline{\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}}$, there exists a subsequence $\{n_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ of $1, 2, \dots$ such that $m_{n_k} \in E_{n_k}^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_M(m_{n_k}, m_0) = 0$. By (B.39),

$$\ell_{n_k} = f_{n_k}^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_{n_k}) \rightarrow f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_0) \geq \inf_{m \in M(p)} f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m) = \ell \quad (\text{B.47})$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely. In view of (B.46), $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_0) \leq \ell$, which in turn gives $f^{(\mathcal{PSR})}(m_0) = \ell$, i.e., $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Since $m_0 \in \overline{\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}}$ was arbitrary, (B.45) is verified.

Let $a_n := \sup_{m \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_M(m, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$. For each n , choose $m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ such that

$$a_n(1 - \frac{1}{n}) < d_M(m_n, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}) \leq a_n. \quad (\text{B.48})$$

Assume with probability 1 that the event (B.45) is occurred. Then, every accumulation point of m_n lies in $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Thus, either $a_n \rightarrow 0$ or there is no accumulation point (equivalently, $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$). We will rule out the case $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ by contradiction.

Suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$. Then, for any choice $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, we have by (B.48) $d_M(m_n, m_0) \rightarrow \infty$.

For $r > 0$ let $K_r = \{S \in \text{Sym}^+(p) : \text{every eigenvalue } \lambda \text{ of } S \text{ satisfies } |\log \lambda| \leq r\}$. Choose r_0 large enough so that $P(K_{r_0}) > 0$ and $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(K_{r_0})$; such r_0 exists since $\bigcup_{r>0} K_r = \text{Sym}^+(p)$. Then for any $X, Y \in K_{r_0}$,

$$\sup_{m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X), m' \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y)} d_M(m, m') \leq (k \text{diag}(SO(p))^2 + 4pr^2)^{1/2} =: C(r_0). \quad (\text{B.49})$$

We now claim that for any m_n with $d_M(m_n, m_0) \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ satisfying

$$d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_n) \geq M_n, \quad \text{for any } X \in K_{r_0} \quad (\text{B.50})$$

and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n = \infty$. To verify, for any $X \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$ and $m_n \in M(p)$, let $m_X^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)$ satisfy

$$d_M(m_X^{(n)}, m_n) = \min_{m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)} d_M(m, m_n) = \inf_{m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(X)} d_M(m, m_n) = d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_n).$$

By the triangle inequality, and by (B.49), for any $X \in K_{r_0}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(m_n, m_0) &\leq d_M(m_n, m_X^{(n)}) + d_M(m_X^{(n)}, m_X^{(0)}) + d_M(m_X^{(0)}, m_0) \\ &= d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_n) + d_M(m_X^{(n)}, m_X^{(0)}) + d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_0) \\ &\leq d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_n) + 2C(r_0). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_n) \geq d_M(m_n, m_0) - 2C(r_0)$. Taking $M_n = d_M(m_n, m_0) - 2C(r_0)$, (B.50) is verified.

For each n , choose a subsequence $n_1, \dots, n_{k(n)}$ of $1, 2, \dots, n$ so that $X_{n_j} \in K_{r_0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k(n)$. Then by the strong law of large numbers, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k(n)/n = P(K_{r_0}) > 0$. This fact, together with (B.50), gives

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}SR}^2(X_i, m_n) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k(n)} d_{\mathcal{P}SR}^2(X_{n_j}, m_n) \geq \frac{k(n)}{n} M_n^2 \rightarrow \infty.$$

However, $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_n) = \inf_{m \in M(p)} f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m) \leq f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0)$, and $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_n) \rightarrow \infty$ while $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0) \rightarrow f^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}(m_0) < \infty$ by (B.40), yielding a contradiction. Thus $a_n \rightarrow 0$ under the probability one event satisfying (B.45). \square

The following lemma shows that the conclusion of Theorem 4.19 is equivalent to the strong consistency of Huckemann (2011b) in the sense of Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru (2003).

Lemma B.19. *Let (M, d) be a metric space and let E, E_1, E_2, \dots are non-empty sets in M . We have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \in E_n} d(m, E) = 0$ if and only if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon)$ such that $\cup_{n \geq N(\epsilon)} E_n \subset \{m \in M : d(E, m) \leq \epsilon\}$.*

Proof of Lemma B.19. By definition, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \in E_n} d_M(m, E) = 0$ is equivalent to the statement that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$, $\sup_{m \in E_n} d_M(m, E) \leq \epsilon$. If $\sup_{m \in E_n} d_M(m, E) \leq \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$, then for any $m \in \cup_{n \geq N(\epsilon)} E_n$, $m \in E_n$ for some $n \geq N(\epsilon)$, and $d(m, E) \leq \sup_{m \in E_n} d_M(m, E) \leq \epsilon$, which gives $m \in \overline{B}_\epsilon(E) := \{m \in M : d(M, m) \leq \epsilon\}$. On the other hand, if $N(\epsilon)$ is such that $\cup_{n \geq N(\epsilon)} E_n \subset \overline{B}_\epsilon(E)$, then for any $n \geq N(\epsilon)$ and for any $m \in E_n$, $d(m, E) \leq \epsilon$. Thus, $\sup_{m \in E_n} d(m, E) \leq \epsilon$ as well. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.20. By Theorem 4.19 there exists a probability 1 event A in which $d_M(m_n, E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any sequence $\{m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}\}$. Assume the event A has occurred. Choose a sequence $\{m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}\}$. Since $E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)} = \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot \mu$, there exists a sequence $\{h_n \in \mathcal{G}(p)\}$ such that $d_M(m_n, h_n \cdot \mu) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now fix an arbitrary element $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$, and for each n let $h'_n \in \mathcal{G}(p)$ be such that $m_0 = h'_n \cdot h_n \cdot \mu$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$d_M(h'_n \cdot m_n, m_0) = d_M(h'_n \cdot m_n, h'_n \cdot h_n \cdot \mu) = d_M(m_n, h_n \cdot \mu) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h'_n \cdot m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ as well as $m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ (as observed in (4.6)), we have

$$0 \leq d_M(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}, m_0) = \inf_{m \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}} d_M(m, m_0) \leq d_M(h'_n \cdot m_n, m_0),$$

and in particular $d_M(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}, m_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{P}SR)}$ was arbitrary, we have shown (4.12). Assertion (4.13) is verified by the conclusion of Theorem 4.19 and (4.12). \square

Proof of Corollary 4.21. (i) The hypotheses of the corollary ensure that Theorem 4.19 applies, so the event that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$

$$\sup_{m \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_M(m, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}) \leq \epsilon, \quad (\text{B.51})$$

occurs with probability 1. Assume this event has occurred. Fix an $\epsilon > 0$, and let $N = N(\epsilon)$. For each $n \geq N$, choose $S_n \in \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$. Then one can choose $m_n \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_n)$ such that $m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Likewise for an arbitrary $S_0 \in \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$, let $m_0 \in M(p)$ satisfy $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_0) \cap E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_n, \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})) &= \inf_{S_0 \in \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_n, S_0) \\ &= \inf_{m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S_n, \mathcal{F}(m_0)) \\ &\leq \inf_{m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S_n, m_0) \quad (\text{by (3.4)}) \\ &\leq \inf_{m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}} d_M(m_n, m_0) = d_M(m_n, E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}) \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since we have assumed the event (B.51) has occurred.

Since $S_n \in \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})})$ was arbitrary, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})})} d_{\mathcal{SR}}(S, \mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})})) = 0$. Hence the statement that this limit equals 0 is a probability-one event.

(ii) and (iii). Since the probability measure P has finite PSR-variance, the condition $E^{(\mathcal{SR})} \subset S_p^{\text{top}}$ implies that $\mathcal{F}(E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}) = E^{(\mathcal{SR})}$ (by Theorem 3.5). Conclusion (i) then implies conclusion (ii), which in turn implies conclusion (iii). \square

B.5.2. Proof of Theorem 4.22

Proof of Theorem 4.22. By Assumption (A2), $E^{(\mathcal{PSR})} = \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m$ for some $m' \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$, which implies that for any $m, m' \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ and any $S \in \text{Sym}^+(p)$, $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S, m) = d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S, m')$. Therefore, in the presence of Assumption (A2), Assumption (A3) implies that $P(d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X, m_0) < r'_{cx}) = 1$ for any $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$. Let $m_0 \in E^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ be given.

Let A_1 be the event that $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ is unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(p)$ for all n , and let A_2 be the event that $d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(X_i, m_0) < r'_{cx}$ and $X_i \in S_p^{\text{top}}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Assumption (A2) implies that $P(A_1) = 1$. Assumptions (A1) and (A3) imply that $P(A_2) = 1$ as well. In the rest of this proof, we assume that the probability 1 event $A_1 \cap A_2$ has occurred.

For each n , let $m'_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})}$ be arbitrary. Since the event A_1 has occurred, $E_n^{(\mathcal{PSR})} = \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m'_n$. Let m_n be any minimizer of the function $d_M(\cdot, m_0)$ over $\mathcal{G}(p) \cdot m'_n$. Thus, by definition, m_n is a sample PSR mean. We first show that such an m_n is unique.

Let $\text{supp}_1(P) = \{S \in \text{Sym}^+(p) : d_{\mathcal{PSR}}(S, m_0) < r'_{cx}\} \cap S_p^{\text{top}}$, so that $X_i \in \text{supp}_1(P)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ since the event $A_1 \cap A_2$ is occurred. For any $S \in \text{supp}_1(P)$, one can choose a unique $\tilde{m} := \tilde{m}(m_0; S) \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ such that $d_M(\tilde{m}, m_0) =$

$d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, m_0) < \min_{h \in \mathcal{G}(p) \setminus \{I_p\}} d_M(h \cdot \tilde{m}, m_0)$. Note that $d_M(\tilde{m}, m_0) < r'_{cx}$ since $S \in \text{supp}_1(P)$. To verify that such a choice is indeed unique, let $m' = h \cdot \tilde{m}$ for some $h \in \mathcal{G}(p) \setminus \{I_p\}$. An application of Lemma 4.12(c), together with the triangle inequality, gives $d(m', m_0) > 3r'_{cx}$, and thus the minimizer m is unique.

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $X_i \in \text{supp}_1(P)$, so we can set $m_{x_i} = \tilde{m}(m_0; X_i)$ to be the unique eigen-decomposition of X_i , closest to m_0 . Then, the sample PSR mean objective function can be written as

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2(m_{x_i}, m), \quad (\text{B.52})$$

which is exactly the Fréchet objective function on $(M(p), d_M)$ with data-points m_{x_1}, \dots, m_{x_n} . Since $d_M(m_{x_i}, m_0) < r'_{cx}$ for all i , Lemma 4.14 implies that the Fréchet mean \bar{m}_n of $\{m_{x_1}, \dots, m_{x_n}\}$ is unique and satisfies $d_M(\bar{m}_n, m_0) < r'_{cx}$. Moreover, by (B.52), $\bar{m}_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\bar{m}_n) = \mathcal{F}(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}) \in \text{supp}_1(P)$ as well, \bar{m}_n is the unique minimizer of $\min_{m \in \mathcal{G}(p) \cdot \bar{m}_n} d_M(m, m_0)$. Thus, $m_n = \bar{m}_n$ is determined uniquely (if the probability 1 event $A_1 \cap A_2$ has occurred).

(a) By Corollary 4.20, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_H(E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}, E^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}) = 0$ with probability 1. Therefore, with probability 1 the sequence $\{m_n \in E_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}\}$ chosen above satisfies,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_M(m_n, m_0) = 0. \quad (\text{B.53})$$

(b) For the sample X_1, \dots, X_n , the PSR mean m_n minimizes $f_n^{(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})}(\cdot)$. Thus, for any neighborhood $V \subset B_{r'_{cx}}(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ containing zero, x_n is a minimizer of the function $g_n : V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$g_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)), \quad (\text{B.54})$$

where $\phi_{m_0}(\cdot) = \text{vec} \circ \tilde{\varphi}_{m_0}(\cdot)$ (see (4.14) and (4.15)). Note that (4.15) implies that for any $x \in B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$, $\phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x) \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$.

We now establish that for each $S \in \text{supp}_1(P)$, there exists a unique $m_S \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ such that

$$d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) = d_M^2(m_S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) \quad (\text{B.55})$$

for all $x \in B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$. To verify this, suppose that $S \in \text{supp}_1(P)$ satisfies (B.55) and let $m_S \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ be the unique point at which $\min_{m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)} d_M(m, m_0)$ is achieved. By the triangle inequality,

$$d_M(m_S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) \leq d_M(m_S, m_0) + d_M(m_0, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) < 2r'_{cx}.$$

For $m' \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ such that $m' \neq m_S$, we have $d_M(m', m_S) \geq 4r'_{cx}$ by Lemma 4.12(c). Again by the triangle inequality,

$$d_M(m', \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) \geq d_M(m', m_S) - d_M(m_S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) > 2r'_{cx} > d_M(m_S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)).$$

Thus, m_S is the unique element of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ satisfying

$$d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}(S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) = \inf_{m \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)} d_M(m, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) = d_M(m_S, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)), \quad (\text{B.56})$$

as asserted.

Next, recall that for each i , $m_{X_i} = \tilde{m}(m_0; X_i)$ is the eigen-decomposition of X_i closest to m_0 , and let $x \in B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$ be arbitrary. Using (B.56), we rewrite (B.54) as

$$g_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2(m_{X_i}, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)),$$

where for every i , $m_{X_i} \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$, a ball that also contains $\phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)$. We shall now discuss the consequence of the bounded support $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$. It is well known that $(\text{Diag}^+(p), g_{\mathcal{D}^+})$ has non-positive sectional curvature and infinite injectivity radius, and $(SO(p), kg_{SO})$ has non-negative sectional curvature (bounded above by $\Delta(SO(p), kg_{SO}) = 1/(4k)$ and injectivity radius $r_{\text{inj}}(SO(p), kg_{SO}) = \sqrt{k}\pi$). Thus, for the product Riemannian manifold $(M(p), g_M)$, it follows that $r_{\text{inj}} := r_{\text{inj}}(M, g_M) = r_{\text{inj}}(SO(p), kg_{SO})$, $\Delta := \Delta(M, g_M) = \Delta(SO(p), kg_{SO})$, and that the radius r'_{cx} of the ball $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$ satisfies

$$r'_{cx} = \frac{\sqrt{k}\beta_{\mathcal{G}(p)}}{4} \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}\pi}{8} = \frac{1}{2} \min\{r_{\text{inj}}, \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{\Delta}}\} = \frac{\sqrt{k}\pi}{2}, \quad (\text{B.57})$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 4.12(b). (The right-hand side of (B.57) equals the convexity radius of (M, g_M) .)

By Afsari (2011) and Afsari, Tron and Vidal (2013), the inequality (B.57) ensures that (i) the open ball $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$ is *strongly convex*² in $M(p)$; (ii) for any $m \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$, the function $d_M^2(m, \cdot)$ is a C^∞ function in $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$ (since the cut locus of m does not intersect $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$), which in turn implies that g_n is C^∞ ; and (iii) for any $m_1, \dots, m_n \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$, the function $\sum_{i=1}^n d_M^2(m_i, \cdot)$ (restricted to $B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$) is convex (strictly convex if at least two m_i 's are distinct). In particular, when X_i 's are sampled from an absolutely continuous distribution P (as assumed in (A1)), with probability 1 the Hessian matrix of $d_M^2(m_{X_i}, \phi_{m'}^{-1}(x))$ at $x = 0$, for arbitrary $m' \in B_{r'_{cx}}^{d_M}(m_0)$, is well-defined and positive definite. Furthermore, thanks to the identification (B.55), we are assured that with probability 1, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, the function $h_{X_i}(\cdot) := d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(\cdot)) = d_M^2(m_{X_i}, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(\cdot))$ is C^∞ .

For all $n \geq 0$, now let $x_n = \phi_{m_0}(m_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$; note that $x_0 = 0$. Observe that (B.53) implies that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\phi_{m_0}(m_n) \rightarrow \phi_{m_0}(m_0)$, i.e. that $x_n \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 2.1 of Afsari (2011) (or, equivalently by Theorem 2.6 of Afsari, Tron and Vidal (2013)), the gradient vector field $\text{grad}_x g_n(x)$ has a unique zero in $B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$, and the location of this zero is x_n .

²A set B in (M, g) is strongly convex if any two points in B can be connected by a unique minimal-length geodesic in M and the geodesic segment entirely lies in B .

By the Mean Value Theorem applied to each component of $\text{grad}_x g_n$,

$$0 = n^{-1/2} \text{grad}_x g_n(x_n) = n^{-1/2} \text{grad}_x g_n(0) + n^{-1} \mathbf{H}g_n(t_n) \cdot (\sqrt{n}x_n),$$

where the j th coordinate of t_n is $t_j x_{n,j}$ for suitable $t_j \in [0, 1]$, where $x_{n,j}$ is the j th coordinate of $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let $x \in B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$ be arbitrary. Since X_1, X_2, \dots are i.i.d. with bounded support and $d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(\cdot))$ is C^∞ , the random vectors $\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x))$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are i.i.d. and bounded. This fact leads to

$$\int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) P(dX) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{\text{Sym}^+(p)} d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)) P(dX)$$

(which equals 0 at $x = 0$ as $m_0 \in E(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R})$), and thus $E(\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(0))) = 0$. Moreover, since the product of any two entries of $\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x))$ is bounded as well, $\Sigma_P := \text{Cov}(\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(0)))$ exists.

Since the first two moments of $\text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(0))$ exist, the multivariate classical central limit theorem (cf. [Anderson, 1958](#)) implies that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{-1/2} \text{grad}_x g_n(0) = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{grad}_x d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X_i, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(0))$$

weakly converges to $N_d(0, \Sigma_P)$.

Likewise, the continuity of $\mathbf{H}g_n(\cdot)$ ensures that each entry of the matrix

$$H_P(x) := E(\mathbf{H}d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x)))$$

exists. Since, with probability 1, $t_n \rightarrow 0$ (because $x_n \rightarrow 0$) and since $\mathbf{H}g_n(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}h_{X_i}(\cdot)$ is continuous, the law of large numbers implies that $n^{-1} \mathbf{H}g_n(t_n)$ converges in probability to $H_P := H_P(0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that, with probability 1, the function $h_X(\cdot)$ is C^∞ and strictly convex on $B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$, and thus for any $x \in B_{r'_{cx}}(0)$, both $\mathbf{H}d_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}}^2(X, \phi_{m_0}^{-1}(x))$ and $\mathbf{H}g_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}h_{X_i}(x)$ are positive definite almost surely. Therefore, $H_P = H_P(0)$ is invertible, and so is $\mathbf{H}g_n(t_n)$ almost surely. Thus, by Slutsky's theorem, $\sqrt{n}x_n = (n^{-1} \mathbf{H}g_n(t_n))^{-1} \times n^{-1/2} \text{grad}_x g_n(0)$ converges in distribution to $N_d(0, H_P^{-1} \Sigma_P H_P^{-1})$. \square

Appendix C: Additional numerical results

As referenced in Section 5.3, we plot the quantiles of the log-eigenvalues and rotation angles of the linearized PSR means against the quantiles of the standard normal distribution for each group in [Figure 5](#), as a visual check of normality of the linearized PSR sampling distributions. With the exception of the tails, the normal QQ plots remain within the 95% confidence envelope, despite the small sample sizes ($n_i = 19, 17$).

Acknowledgements

The first author was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2019R1A2C2002256).




FIG 5. Quantile-quantile plots of the log-eigenvalues and angles of the bootstrap PSR means versus standard normal quantiles with 95% pointwise confidence envelopes represented by dashed lines.

References

- AFSARI, B. (2011). Riemannian L^p center of mass: existence, uniqueness, and convexity. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **139** 655–673.
- AFSARI, B., TRON, R. and VIDAL, R. (2013). On the convergence of gradient descent for finding the Riemannian center of mass. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **51** 2230–2260.
- ALEXANDER, D. C. (2005). Multiple-Fiber Reconstruction Algorithms for Diffusion MRI. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1064** 113–133.
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1958). Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis.
- ARSIGNY, V., FILLARD, P., PENNEC, X. and AYACHE, N. (2007). Geometric means in a novel vector space structure on symmetric positive-definite matrices. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **29** 328–347 (electronic). [MR2288028 \(2008a:47030\)](#)
- BATCHELOR, P. G., MOAKHER, M., ATKINSON, D., CALAMANTE, F. and CONNELLY, A. (2005). A rigorous framework for diffusion tensor calculus. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* **53** 221–225.
- BHATTACHARYA, A. and BHATTACHARYA, R. (2012). *Nonparametric inference on manifolds: with applications to shape spaces* **2**. Cambridge University Press.
- BHATTACHARYA, R. and LIN, L. (2017). Omnibus CLTs for Fréchet means and

- nonparametric inference on non-Euclidean spaces. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **145** 413–428.
- BHATTACHARYA, R. and PATRANGENARU, V. (2003). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. I. *Ann. Statist.* **31** 1–29. [MR1962498 \(2004a:60069\)](#)
- BHATTACHARYA, R. and PATRANGENARU, V. (2005). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. II. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1225–1259. [MR2195634 \(2007j:60020\)](#)
- CARMICHAEL, O., CHEN, J., PAUL, D. and PENG, J. (2013). Diffusion tensor smoothing through weighted Karcher means. *Electron. J. Stat.* **7** 1913–1956. [MR3084676](#)
- COLLARD, A., BONNABEL, S., PHILLIPS, C. and SEPULCHRE, R. (2014). Anisotropy preserving DTI processing. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **107** 58–74.
- DRYDEN, I. L., KOLOYDENKO, A. and ZHOU, D. (2009). Non-Euclidean statistics for covariance matrices, with applications to diffusion tensor imaging. *Annals of Applied Statistics* **3** 1102–1123.
- ELTZNER, B. and HUCKEMANN, S. F. (2019). A smeary central limit theorem for manifolds with application to high-dimensional spheres. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 3360–3381.
- ELTZNER, B., GALAZ-GARCÍA, F., HUCKEMANN, S. and TUSCHMANN, W. (2021). Stability of the cut locus and a central limit theorem for Fréchet means of Riemannian manifolds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **149** 3947–3963.
- FERAGEN, A. and FUSTER, A. (2017). Geometries and interpolations for symmetric positive definite matrices. In *Modeling, Analysis, and Visualization of Anisotropy* 85–113. Springer.
- FERAGEN, A. and NYE, T. (2020). Statistics on stratified spaces. In *Riemannian geometric statistics in medical image analysis* 299–342. Elsevier.
- FLETCHER, P. T., LU, C., PIZER, S. M. and JOSHI, S. (2004). Principal geodesic analysis for the study of nonlinear statistics of shape. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* **23** 995–1005.
- FRÉCHET, M. (1948). Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié. In *Annales de l'institut Henri Poincaré* **10** 215–310.
- GOWER, J. C. (1975). Generalized procrustes analysis. *Psychometrika* **40** 33–51.
- GROISSER, D., JUNG, S. and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2017). Geometric foundations for scaling-rotation statistics on symmetric positive definite matrices: Minimal smooth scaling-rotation curves in low dimensions. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **11** 1092–1159.
- GROISSER, D., JUNG, S. and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2021). Uniqueness questions in a scaling-rotation geometry on the space of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *Differential Geometry and its Applications* **79** 101798.
- GROISSER, D., JUNG, S. and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2023). A genericity property of Fréchet sample means on Riemannian manifolds. *In preparation*.
- HOTZ, T. and HUCKEMANN, S. (2015). Intrinsic means on the circle: unique-

- ness, locus and asymptotics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **67** 177–193.
- HUCKEMANN, S. (2011a). Inference on 3d procrustes means: Tree bole growth, rank deficient diffusion tensors and perturbation models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **38** 424–446.
- HUCKEMANN, S. F. (2011b). Intrinsic inference on the mean geodesic of planar shapes and tree discrimination by leaf growth. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 1098–1124.
- HUCKEMANN, S. F. and ELTZNER, B. (2021). Data analysis on nonstandard spaces. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* **13** e1526.
- JUNG, S., SCHWARTZMAN, A. and GROISSER, D. (2015). Scaling-rotation distance and interpolation of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **36** 1180–1201.
- LEPORE, F., BRUN, C., CHOU, Y.-Y., CHIANG, M.-C., DUTTON, R. A., HAYASHI, K. M., LUDERS, E., LOPEZ, O. L., AIZENSTEIN, H. J., TOGA, A. W. et al. (2008). Generalized tensor-based morphometry of HIV/AIDS using multivariate statistics on deformation tensors. *Medical Imaging, IEEE Transactions on* **27** 129–141.
- LIN, Z. (2019). Riemannian geometry of symmetric positive definite matrices via Cholesky decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **40** 1353–1370.
- MANTON, J. H. (2004). A globally convergent numerical algorithm for computing the centre of mass on compact Lie groups. In *8th Control, Automation, Robotics and Vision Conference* **3** 2211–2216. IEEE.
- MASAROTTO, V., PANARETOS, V. M. and ZEMEL, Y. (2019). Procrustes metrics on covariance operators and optimal transportation of Gaussian processes. *Sankhya A* **81** 172–213.
- PAQUETTE, N., SHI, J., WANG, Y., LAO, Y., CESCHIN, R., NELSON, M., PANIGRAHY, A. and LEPORE, N. (2017). Ventricular shape and relative position abnormalities in preterm neonates. *NeuroImage: Clinical* **15** 483–493.
- PENNEC, X., FILLARD, P. and AYACHE, N. (2006). A Riemannian Framework for Tensor Computing. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **66** 41–66.
- SCHÖTZ, C. (2019). Convergence rates for the generalized Fréchet mean via the quadruple inequality. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **13** 4280–4345.
- SCHÖTZ, C. (2022). Strong laws of large numbers for generalizations of Fréchet mean sets. *Statistics* **56** 34–52.
- SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2016). Lognormal Distributions and Geometric Averages of Symmetric Positive Definite Matrices. *International Statistical Review* **84** 456–486.
- SCHWARTZMAN, A., DOUGHERTY, R. F. and TAYLOR, J. E. (2010). Group comparison of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of diffusion tensors. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **105** 588–599. [MR2724844 \(2011g:62181\)](#)
- WANG, Y., SALEHIAN, H., CHENG, G. and VEMURI, B. C. (2014). Tracking on the product manifold of shape and orientation for tractography from diffusion MRI. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* 3051–3056.

ZIEZOLD, H. (1977). On expected figures and a strong law of large numbers for random elements in quasi-metric spaces. In *Transactions of the Seventh Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes and of the 1974 European Meeting of Statisticians: held at Prague, from August 18 to 23, 1974* 591–602. Springer.