

Wasserstein F-tests for Fréchet regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifolds

Haoshu Xu* Hongzhe Li†

April 8, 2024

Abstract

This paper considers the problem of regression analysis with random covariance matrix as outcome and Euclidean covariates in the framework of Fréchet regression on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold. Such regression problems have many applications in single cell genomics and neuroscience, where we have covariance matrix measured over a large set of samples. Fréchet regression on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold is formulated as estimating the conditional Fréchet mean given covariates x . A non-asymptotic \sqrt{n} -rate of convergence (up to $\log n$ factors) is obtained for our estimator $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ uniformly for $\|x\| \lesssim \sqrt{\log n}$, which is crucial for deriving the asymptotic null distribution and power of our proposed statistical test for the null hypothesis of no association. In addition, a central limit theorem for the point estimate $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ is obtained, giving insights to a test for covariate effects. The null distribution of the test statistic is shown to converge to a weighted sum of independent chi-squares, which implies that the proposed test has the desired significance level asymptotically. Also, the power performance of the test is demonstrated against a sequence of contiguous alternatives. Simulation results show the accuracy of the asymptotic distributions. The proposed methods are applied to a single cell gene expression data set that shows the change of gene co-expression network as people age.

Keywords: Fréchet regression; Functional calculus; Hypothesis testing; Optimal transport; Wasserstein distance.

arXiv:2404.03878v1 [stat.ME] 5 Apr 2024

*Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA; email: haoshuxu@sas.upenn.edu

†Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA; email: hongzhe@upenn.edu.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Main contribution	4
1.2	Related works	5
1.3	Organization	6
1.4	Notation	6
2	Priliminaries	6
3	Problem Formulation	7
3.1	Fréchet regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifold	7
3.2	Assumptions	8
4	Statistical Inference for Fréchet Regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifold	10
4.1	Estimation under the Fréchet regression model	10
4.2	Hypothesis testing	12
4.2.1	Test statistic	13
4.2.2	Theoretical properties	14
5	Algorithm and Numerical Experiments	15
5.1	Riemannian gradient descent algorithm	16
5.2	Simulation setup and results	16
5.3	Sensitivity of the results when covariance matrices are unknown	18
6	Application to Single-cell Gene Co-expression Networks	22
7	Discussion	23
A	Background on optimal transport and functional calculus	30
A.1	Geometry of optimal transport	30
A.2	Functional calculus	30
B	Technical lemmas	31
B.1	Differentials of optimal transport maps	31
B.2	Concentration inequalities and uniform convergence	36
B.2.1	Proof of Lemma 24	43
B.3	Properties of F and Q^*	47
C	Proof of Theorem 6	51
C.1	Proof of Lemma 31	55
C.1.1	Proof of Claim 1	60
C.1.2	Proof of Claim 2	63
C.2	Proof of Lemma 33	66
C.3	Proof of Lemma 34	74
C.4	Proof of Lemma 35	74
D	Proof of Theorem 7	75
E	Proof of Corollary 9	77

F Proof of Theorem 11	78
F.1 Proof of Lemma 37	82
F.2 Proof of Lemma 38	83
F.3 Proof of Claim 3	84
G Proof of Proposition 13	85
G.1 Proof of Lemma 39	86
H Proof of Theorem 14	87
H.1 Proof of Lemma 40	89

1 Introduction

Data in the form of positive definite matrices frequently arise in modern data analysis including medical imaging (Dryden et al., 2009; Fillard et al., 2007), neuroscience (Friston, 2011), signal processing (Arnaudon et al., 2013) and computer vision (Caseiro et al., 2012). For example, large-scale single cell RNA-seq data allows us to estimate the individual-specific covariance matrix, which can be interpreted as co-expression network among a set of genes. In neuroimaging data, covariance matrices (or correlation matrices after standardization) of multiple brain regions are used to summarize as functional connectivity matrices. For all these applications, one key question is how to perform regression analysis where the covariance matrix is treated as outcome together with a set of covariates.

Regression models for covariance matrix outcomes have been studied before. Chiu et al. (1996) proposed to model the elements of the logarithm of the covariance matrix as a linear function of the covariates, which requires a large number of parameters to be estimated. Hoff and Niu (2012) introduced a regression model where the covariance matrix is a quadratic function of the explanatory variables. Zou et al. (2017) linked the matrix outcome to a linear combination of similarity matrices of covariates and studied the asymptotic properties of various estimators under this model. Zhao et al. (2021) developed Covariate Assisted Principal (CAP) regression model for several covariance matrix outcomes. This model aims to identify linear projections of the covariance matrices that are associated with the covariates. However, all these methods impose certain structures to the covariance matrices or involve many parameters.

A fundamental aspect in the investigation of regression models for covariance matrices involves the choice of metric. Various metrics on the space \mathcal{S}_d^{++} of $d \times d$ positive definite matrices have been studied before, including the trace metric (Lang, 1999), affine-invariant metric (Moakher, 2005; Fletcher and Joshi, 2007) and log-Cholesky metric (Lin, 2019), among which the Bures-Wasserstein metric W , originally introduced by Bures (1969), is defined by

$$W^2(Q, S) = \text{tr } Q + \text{tr } S - 2 \text{tr} \left(Q^{1/2} S Q^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

for any pair of $Q, S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$. This metric has been of interest in quantum information (Bures, 1969), referred to as the Bures distance, and coincides with the Wasserstein distance between two centered Gaussians with corresponding covariance matrices. Wasserstein distance, as a special case of the problem of optimal transport (OT) which lies at the intersection of optimization, analysis and geometry, is a metric between probability distributions defined as the minimal cost to transport mass from one distribution to another (Villani, 2003, 2009). It has proven valuable for various tasks in statistics and machine learning (Abadie and Imbens, 2006; Deb and Sen, 2023; Arjovsky et al., 2017; Redko et al., 2017; Hallin et al., 2021). In single-cell genomics, most measurement technologies are destructive assays, such that the same cell cannot be observed twice nor profiled over time. As a result, the measurement at each time point

is mathematically modeled as a distribution, and optimal transport techniques are well-suited for studying various associated dynamics (Schiebinger et al., 2019; Bunne et al., 2022; Somnath et al., 2023; Bunne et al., 2023a,b). Given its connection with the theory of optimal transport, the Bures-Wasserstein metric is therefore a natural choice for studying the gene expression covariance matrices. Equipped with this metric, \mathcal{S}_d^{++} turns into a Riemannian manifold (Bhatia et al., 2019), known as the Bures-Wasserstein manifold.

In this paper, we focus on regression analysis between (\mathcal{S}_d^{++}, W) -valued responses and Euclidean predictors. Formally, suppose independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) pairs of predictor and response variables $(X_1, Q_1), \dots, (X_n, Q_n) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ are given. The goal is to perform inference, particularly to test for the effects of covariate X on the response variable Q . To this end, we assume a Fréchet regression model on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold, which is originally proposed in Petersen and Müller (2019) and defines a global regression function between response data in an arbitrary metric space and Euclidean predictors.

Previous research on the Fréchet regression model has focused on consistency in the asymptotic regime (Petersen and Müller, 2019; Chen and Müller, 2022), and inference is only considered in the special case of one-dimensional (1D) density curves for the response variable under the Wasserstein metric (Petersen et al., 2021). It is important to note that for any pair of 1D distributions $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ with distribution functions F_μ, F_ν , the squared 2-Wasserstein distance between them is equal to $\int_0^1 |F_\mu^{-1}(t) - F_\nu^{-1}(t)|^2 dt$. Therefore, the 1D Wasserstein space is very special in the sense that it has zero sectional curvature (Ambrosio et al., 2005), and can be embedded into a Hilbert space. Closed-form expressions can then be obtained for the 1D Fréchet inference in this case and various other problems are also well-understood owing to this flat geometry (Panaretos and Zemel, 2016; Chen et al., 2023; Bigot et al., 2017). However, most metric spaces of interest are nonlinear and have nonzero curvature, for example, \mathcal{S}_d^{++} has non-positive curvature when equipped with the log-Cholesky metric (Lin, 2019) and the Wasserstein space of distributions in d dimension is positively curved when $d > 1$ (Ambrosio et al., 2005), which includes the Bures-Wasserstein manifold as a special case. As a result, the existence of a Hilbert embedding in such curved metric spaces cannot be assumed, making the derivation of distributional results for Fréchet regression in these spaces challenging, let alone statistical inference with guarantees on both significance level and power.

In the present paper, we aim to address these challenges on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold by proposing a valid test for effects of X on Q . A central limit theorem for point estimate $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ is also obtained.

1.1 Main contribution

We focus on Fréchet regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifold. Our main contribution is threefold. First, a non-asymptotic \sqrt{n} -rate of convergence (up to $\log n$ factors) of the regression estimate $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ at covariate x is established uniformly for $\|x\| \lesssim \sqrt{\log n}$. To our best knowledge, this is the first non-asymptotic uniform (over a possibly diverging region) convergence result for Fréchet regression. In addition to the standard assumptions that X, Q have light tails, we only assume well-separation and a local curvature lower bound. The assumptions are mild enough, and are verified in a simple case. The results would be crucial later when deriving the asymptotic null distribution and power of our proposed test of association between covariance matrix and covariates.

Next, we derive a central limit theorem for the point estimate $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ that results in a pointwise confidence region. The covariance operator of the limiting Gaussian distribution is shown to have contributions from two parts. One is the variability in Q and the other is the imperfect information of X .

Then, we carefully construct a test statistic that has a tractable asymptotic null distribution,

which is equal to a weighted sum of χ_p^2 s. The weights are determined by covariance of the tangent vector that can be viewed as a generalization of the classical noise variance. The proposed test is also shown to be powerful against a sequence of contiguous alternatives. To our best knowledge, this is the first test for Fréchet regression on a space with nonzero sectional curvature.

We also validate our theoretical results by numerical simulations.

1.2 Related works

Statistical OT Aside from advances in computational OT (Cuturi, 2013; Peyré and Cuturi, 2019; Altschuler et al., 2017), there is a surge of interest in the statistical aspects of OT where stability of the estimated densities (Weed and Berthet, 2019), Wasserstein distances (Barrio and Loubes, 2019; Mena and Niles-Weed, 2019; del Barrio et al., 2023; Altschuler et al., 2022), transport maps (Hütter and Rigollet, 2021; Pooladian and Niles-Weed, 2022; Manole et al., 2022; Gonzalez-Sanz et al., 2022; Pooladian et al., 2023; Manole et al., 2023) and Fréchet mean (Agueh and Carlier, 2011; Kim and Pass, 2017; Le Gouic and Loubes, 2017; Le Gouic et al., 2022; Altschuler et al., 2021), are investigated in the presence of sampling noise. For the Wasserstein Fréchet mean, Le Gouic et al. (2022) establishes parametric rate of convergence for empirical Fréchet mean in the more general Alexandrov spaces that include the 2-Wasserstein space as a special case by introducing a bi-extendibility condition that translates into regularity conditions on the Kantorovich potentials. This condition is later relaxed by Chewi et al. (2020) when establishing the linear rate of convergence for gradient descent algorithms over the Wasserstein space. Moving one step further, Panaretos and Zemel (2016); Agueh and Carlier (2017) establish certain types of central limit theorem for the empirical Fréchet mean of 1D distributions. Later, a central limit theorem for the multivariate Gaussians is established by exploiting the first order differentiability of optimal transport maps Kroshnin et al. (2021).

Fréchet mean The Fréchet mean is a natural extension of the notion of average on an abstract metric space. For its properties in general curved metric spaces, see Ohta (2012); Yokota (2016); Le Gouic et al. (2022) and references therein. The existence and uniqueness of Fréchet mean in the case of Riemannian manifolds and Wasserstein spaces are established in (Agueh and Carlier, 2011; Kim and Pass, 2017; Le Gouic and Loubes, 2017). The asymptotic properties of empirical Fréchet mean on a Riemannian manifold are addressed in Bhattacharya and Patrangenaru (2003, 2005); Le Gouic et al. (2022).

Fréchet regression The Fréchet regression model can be viewed as an extension of the Fréchet mean by considering weighted average, and is first introduced in Petersen and Müller (2019). Petersen et al. (2021) proposed an F-test in the special case of 1D density response. The uniform convergence is not needed for inference there due to the availability of explicit expressions and the Hilbert embedding, while in our case, it is essential to show that contributions of the remainder term from the Taylor expansion is indeed negligible. It is worth noting that even though the uniform convergence of Fréchet regression is also considered in Petersen and Müller (2019); Chen and Müller (2022), they are asymptotic and only uniform for x in a fixed compact set while our result is non-asymptotic, and the uniformity is within a compact set with growing diameter to accommodate the possible unboundedness of $\text{supp } X$.

Regression model on manifolds It is also important to note that the Fréchet regression model is defined solely in terms of distance, making it applicable in any abstract metric spaces. Meanwhile, there is a separate line of research dedicated to regression on manifolds (Yuan et al., 2012; Cornea et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023). Such regression models builds

upon the notion of tangent spaces in differential geometry. The tangent space, being a linear space, then enables regression on manifolds to essentially reduce to classical linear regression in tangent spaces.

1.3 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, we provide necessary background on optimal transport in Section 2. Next, the Fréchet regression model is formulated in Section 3.1, followed by the assumptions in Section 3.2. The main results are presented in Section 4 where we show uniform convergence of our estimator in Section 4.1, propose our test and provide theoretical guarantees in Section 4.2. Finally, a Riemannian gradient descent algorithm and numerical simulations are presented in Section 5 to validate our theory. The proofs of our theorems, technical lemmas are deferred to the Appendix. We conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

1.4 Notation

We denote by \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{R}_+ the set of integers and the set of non-negative real numbers. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$. For any $x > 0$, we write $\log^+(x) := \log(x) \vee 1$. For any integer $K \geq 1$, $[K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$. Given $z_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in [n]$, the set $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ is denoted by z_1^n . The Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^p is denoted $\|\cdot\|$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $L > 0$, let $B_x(L) = B(x, L) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\| \leq L\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{S}_d, \mathcal{S}_d^+, \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ the set of all $d \times d$ symmetric, positive semi-definite and positive definite matrices. For any real $a < b$, we define $\mathcal{S}_d(a, b) := \{A \in \mathcal{S}_d : aI_d \preceq A \preceq bI_d\}$. The subscript d is omitted when it's clear from context. Given any $A \in \mathcal{S}_d$, denote the largest and smallest eigenvalue of A by $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$. The Frobenius norm and operator norm of a matrix A is denoted by $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$. Given any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m,n}$, let $\text{vec } A \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ denote the vectorized A obtained by stacking columns of A . Given a random variable X and $\alpha > 0$, the ψ_α -"norm" of X , denoted by $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha}$, is defined in Appendix B.2. The support of a probability distribution is denoted by $\text{supp}(\cdot)$.

Given normed spaces Y and Z , let $L(Y; Z)$ denote the space of all bounded linear operator from Y to Z . Given a function $\phi : Y \rightarrow Z$ and integer $k \geq 0$, the k -th differential $d^k\phi$, its operator norm $\|d^k\phi\|$ and symmetric norm $\| \|d^k\phi\| \|$ are defined in Section 2.

Finally, the quantities C and c will refer to constants whose value may change from line to line. All constants throughout may depend on the dimension and additional problem parameters, whenever they are clear from context. Given sequences $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $a_n \leq Cb_n$, and we also write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $b_n \lesssim a_n \lesssim b_n$.

2 Preliminaries

We provide a concise overview of fundamental concepts in optimal transport, along with associated differential properties, specifically focusing on the case of centered Gaussian distributions.

Given a Polish space (E, d) , let $\mathcal{P}_2(E)$ denote the collection of all (Borel) probability measures μ on E such that $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} d(X, y)^2 < \infty$ for some $y \in E$. One can show that the definition of $\mathcal{P}_2(E)$ is independent of the choice of y . We specialize to the case when $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ with Euclidean distance. For any pair of measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ be the set of couplings of between μ and ν , that is, the collection of probability measures π on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that if $(X, Y) \sim \pi$, then $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$. The 2-Wasserstein distance between μ and ν is defined as

$$W^2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \pi} [\|X - Y\|^2] \quad (2)$$

Here, with a slight abuse of notation, we use W to denote both the Wasserstein distance between two distributions and the Bures-Wasserstein distance between two PSD matrices. This notation is justified by the fact that both distances coincide and have a closed-form expression (1) when we identify centered Gaussian distributions with their covariance matrices.

Let $\mathcal{P}_{2,\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the subset of measures in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Given $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{2,\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Brenier's theorem guarantees the existence of a unique optimal coupling $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ that achieves the minimum in (2) and that it is induced by the optimal transport map $T_{\mu_0}^{\mu_1} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ in the sense that $T_{\mu_0}^{\mu_1}(X) \sim \mu_1$ whenever $X \sim \mu_0$. Specifically, when μ_0, μ_1 are centered Gaussian distributions with covariance matrices Q, S , the optimal transport map is given by the linear map

$$T_Q^S = S^{1/2} \left(S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2} \right)^{-1/2} S^{1/2} = Q^{-1/2} \left(Q^{1/2} S Q^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} Q^{-1/2} \quad (3)$$

For completeness, additional background on the geometry of optimal transport is provided in Appendix A.1.

Kroshnin et al. (2021) showed that for any fixed $S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$, T_Q^S is (Fréchet) differentiable with respect to Q , with the differential at Q denoted by dT_Q^S . They also showed that for fixed $S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$, the squared Wasserstein distance $W^2(\cdot, S) : \mathcal{S}_d^{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is twice differentiable, with the corresponding 1st and 2nd differential $dW^2(Q, S), d^2W^2(Q, S)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} dW^2(Q, S)(X) &= \langle I - T_Q^S, X \rangle \\ d^2W^2(Q, S)(X, Y) &= -\langle X, dT_Q^S(Y) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In this paper, higher order differentials $d^k T_Q^S$ are essential for the development of the theory. Hence additional background on functional calculus are provided in Appendix A.2 for self-containedness.

3 Problem Formulation

In this section, we formulate the Fréchet regression model in Section 3.1 and introduce assumptions in Section 3.2.

3.1 Fréchet regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifold

Given a metric space (\mathcal{Y}, d) , let \mathbb{P} be a probability distribution over $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{Y}$ that generates random objects (X, Y) . The main difficulty of formulating a regression model between Y and X lies in the fact that the metric-space-valued response Y is not amenable to linear operations. The Fréchet regression model (Petersen and Müller, 2019) tries to generalize classical linear regression in a general metric space, building upon the notion of Fréchet mean that we introduce first.

The concept of Fréchet mean $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Fréchet}} Y$ generalizes the notion of average in a general metric space (\mathcal{Y}, d) , and is defined as follows.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Fréchet}} Y := \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}_Y d^2(y, Y) \quad (5)$$

The above definition is motivated by the fact that when \mathcal{Y} is an Euclidean space, $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Fréchet}} Y$ coincides with the classical notion of expectation $\mathbb{E}Y$. For this reason, we will drop the subscript and denote $\mathbb{E}Y$ for the Fréchet mean from now on.

With the notion of Fréchet mean in place, the Fréchet regression model proposed by [Petersen and Müller \(2019\)](#) is defined as follows.

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathbb{P}} [s(x, X) d^2(y, Y)] \quad (6)$$

where

$$s(x, X) = 1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (X - \mu), \quad \mu = E(X), \Sigma = \operatorname{Var}(X) \quad (7)$$

Here the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$ on the left-hand side of (6) is defined as a simple extension of (5) by considering the conditional minimizer.

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] := \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}_Y [d^2(y, Y) | X = x]$$

Meanwhile, the objective function $\mathbb{E}[s(x, X) d^2(y, Y)]$ on the right-hand side of (6) also generalizes from the Fréchet mean (5) by considering expectation weighted by $s(x, X)$, in the same flavor as the kernel estimator from non-parametric statistics ([Wasserman, 2006](#)). The specific choice of the weight $s(x, X)$ in (7) is motivated by the fact that the minimizer would equal to the desired conditional expectation of Y at x under the classical linear regression model. More specifically, when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] = a^\top (x - \mu) + b$, one can check that

$$a^\top (x - \mu) + b = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_Y [s(x, X) (y - Y)^2]$$

For further details regarding existence and uniqueness of various concepts defined above, see [Petersen and Müller \(2019\)](#) and references therein.

When specialized to the Bures-Wasserstein manifold $(\mathcal{Y}, d) = (\mathcal{S}_d^{++}, W)$, we denote $Q^*(x) := \mathbb{E}[Q|X = x]$ and our model assumes

$$Q^*(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{S \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} F(x, S), \quad F(x, S) := \mathbb{E}[s(x, X) W^2(S, Q)] \quad (8)$$

For detailed discussions on the existence and uniqueness of the population and empirical Fréchet mean on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold, we refer readers to [Agueh and Carlier \(2011\)](#); [Kroshnin et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Panaretos and Zemel \(2020\)](#).

3.2 Assumptions

In order to get provable theoretical guarantees for estimation and hypothesis testing, we impose the following model assumptions that we believe are theoretically minimal while also maintaining generality.

We begin with conditions on the marginal distribution of covariate X and conditional distribution of Q given X in Assumption 1 and 2.

Assumption 1. X is sub-Gaussian with $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_{\psi_2}$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \geq c_\lambda$ for some constants $C_{\psi_2}, c_\lambda > 0$.

Assumption 2. Given $X = x \in \operatorname{supp} X$, the eigenvalues of Q are bounded away from 0 and infinity in the sense that

$$\mathbb{P}(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(\gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)^{-1}, \gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)) | X = x) = 1 \quad (9)$$

where $\gamma_1 : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by

$$\gamma_1(t) := c_1 (t \vee 1)^{C_1} \quad (10)$$

for some constant $c_1 \geq 1$ and $C_1 \geq 0$.

Assumption 2 implies upper and lower bounds on both the conditional expectation $Q^*(x)$ (see Lemma 28) and noise. An upper bound on the population covariance matrix is often assumed within the literature of covariance matrix estimation (Cai et al., 2010). The lower bound on $\lambda_{\min}(Q^*(x))$ here bears resemblance to the uniform upper bound on the conditional densities in the Fréchet regression of 1D density response curves (Petersen et al., 2021, Assumption T4) since density is inversely proportional to the standard deviation in a 1D location-scale family. Assumptions on both upper and lower bounds are natural in the context of optimal transport. Hütter and Rigollet (2021); Manole et al. (2022); Pooladian and Niles-Weed (2022) assumed smoothness and strong convexity of the Brenier potential for optimal transport map estimation which translates to upper and lower bounds on eigenvalues of the covariance matrix when specialized to the Gaussian case. Altschuler et al. (2021) also assume both upper and lower bounds on the eigenvalues to ensure a variance inequality proposed in Chewi et al. (2020), which is crucial to prove the \sqrt{n} -convergence of empirical barycenter as well as the linear convergence of a gradient descent algorithm on Bures-Wasserstein manifold.

Remark 1. *The bounds here depend on $\gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)$ which diverges as $x \rightarrow \infty$. This is motivated by the fact that the conditional mean $\mathbb{E}(Y|X = x)$ diverges as $x \rightarrow \infty$ in the classical linear regression. More specifically, when $\mu = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y|X] = a^\top X + b$, one can show that $|\mathbb{E}[Y|X]| \leq \gamma_1(X)$ with $c_1 = \|a\| + |b|$ and $C_1 = 1$. In our setting, we believe that a polynomial growth rate $\gamma_1(t) \lesssim t^{C_1}$, which is allowed by (10), is often satisfied in practical applications.*

Remark 2. *The bounded noise assumption can be relaxed by assuming Q has a light tail conditional on $Q^*(X)$. One possibility is to make the assumption that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q^*(x))}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \vee \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\lambda_{\max}(Q^*(x))} > t \mid X = x \right\} \lesssim \exp(-ct^\alpha), \quad \forall t > 0$$

for some constant $\alpha > 0$. Note that again $\lambda_{\max}(Q)$ is bounded from above and $\lambda_{\min}(Q)$ is bounded from below. The proof presented in our paper remains valid by incorporating additional concentration arguments.

Next is the assumption of the Fréchet regression model.

Assumption 3. *For any $x \in \text{supp } X$, $Q^*(x)$ is the unique minimizer of $F(x, \cdot)$.*

Then, it is natural to impose more assumptions on the minimizer $Q^*(x)$ of $F(x, \cdot)$. Assumption 4 below is concerned with the global behavior of $F(x, \cdot)$ outside a local ball around $Q^*(x)$ while Assumption 5 focuses locally on the eigenvalue lower bound of the second differential of $F(x, \cdot)$ at $Q^*(x)$.

Assumption 4. *There exist constants $\alpha_1 \geq 1$ and $c_\delta > 0$ such that for any $x \in \text{supp } X$ and any (δ, Δ) that satisfies $0 \leq \delta \leq c_\delta \leq \Delta$, the following*

$$\inf \left\{ F(x, S) - F(x, Q^*(x)) : \delta \leq \|S - Q^*(x)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta \right\} \geq \frac{\delta^{\alpha_1}}{\gamma_2(\|x - \mu\|, \Delta)} \quad (11)$$

holds where $\gamma_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by

$$\gamma_2(t_1, t_2) = c_2 (t_1 \vee 1)^{C_2} (t_2 \vee 1)^{C_2}$$

for constants $c_2 \geq 1, C_2 \geq 0$.

Remark 3. *Assumption 4 is motivated by the well-separated-maximizer assumption in M-Estimation (Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Lemma 3.2.1), which is also assumed in (Petersen and Müller, 2019). In the special case when X and Q are independent, Lemma 29 demonstrates that Assumption 4 holds with $c_\delta = 1/(2c_1)$, $\alpha_1 = 2$, $C_2 = 1$ and some constant c_2 large enough. Here we allow for a polynomial dependence on $\|x - \mu\|$ in the definition of γ_3 so that (12) is still expected to hold in the general case when X and Q are not independent.*

Assumption 5. For any $x \in \text{supp } X$, the following lower bound

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(-\mathbb{E}s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma_3(\|x - \mu\|)} \quad (12)$$

holds where $\gamma_3 : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by

$$\gamma_3(t) := c_3 (t \vee 1)^{C_3}$$

for some constants $c_3 \geq 1$ and $C_3 \geq 0$.

Remark 4. We offer some explanations of the notation $\lambda_{\min}(-\mathbb{E}s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q)$ here. By definition (see Appendix B.1), $dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \in L(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ is a symmetric linear operator from $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. When identifying matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with vectors in \mathbb{R}^{d^2} , $dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q$ can be viewed as a symmetric $d^2 \times d^2$ matrix. Hence $\lambda_{\min}(-\mathbb{E}s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q)$ can be understood as the smallest eigenvalue of the $d^2 \times d^2$ symmetric matrices that corresponds to $-\mathbb{E} \left(s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right)$. Here $\mathbb{E} \left(-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right)$ is equal to the second differential of $F(x, \cdot)$ at $Q^*(x)$; see Appendix A.2 for relevant concepts in functional calculus and Appendix B.1 for explicit expression for $dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q$.

Remark 5. In the special case when X and Q are independent, which is a consequence of Assumption 6 and the null hypothesis of no effect (18) below, one can show that (Lemma 29 in Appendix B.3) Assumption 5 holds for $C_3 = 0$ and c_3 large enough. Again, dependence on $\|x - \mu\|$ is allowed in order to account for the possible unboundedness of x when X and Q are independent.

Finally, we assume conditional independence between X and Q given $Q^*(X)$ for hypothesis testing. However, this is not required by the uniform convergence (Theorem 6) and the central limit theorem (Theorem 7).

Assumption 6. X and Q are independent conditional on $Q^*(X)$.

4 Statistical Inference for Fréchet Regression on Bures-Wasserstein manifold

With the assumptions in Section 3 in place, we turn the focus in this section to hypothesis testing under the Fréchet regression model. To this end, we first show the uniform convergence of the Fréchet regression estimator and prove a central limit theorem in Section 4.1. The uniform convergence is not only of theoretical interest itself, but also crucial later for deriving the asymptotic size and power of our proposed test. Next, we introduce in Section 4.2.1 the test statistic. Then we study its asymptotic null distribution and the asymptotic power of the proposed test in Section 4.2.2.

4.1 Estimation under the Fréchet regression model

We consider the Fréchet regression estimator defined as follows.

$$\widehat{Q}_n(x) := \underset{S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}}{\text{argmin}} F_n(x, S), \quad F_n(x, S) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [s_n(x, X_i)W^2(S, Q_i)] \quad (13)$$

Here $s_n(x, X_i) = 1 + (x - \bar{X})\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(X_i - \bar{X})$ with

$$\bar{X} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \quad \widehat{\Sigma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})^\top$$

This estimator is also studied in [Petersen and Müller \(2019\)](#) where consistency in the general metric space is investigated under extra assumptions on the covering number based on the theory of M-estimation. In the present paper, we show a non-asymptotic parametric rate of convergence (up to $\log(n)$ factors) can be achieved uniformly for $\|x\| \lesssim \sqrt{\log(n)}$ on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold. The results are summarized as [Theorem 6](#).

Theorem 6. *Suppose Assumption 1-4 hold. Let $L_n := C_L \sqrt{\log n}$ for some constant $C_L > 0$ large enough. Then with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$, the following inequalities hold*

$$\sup_{x \in B(\mu, L_n)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq C_{\text{uni}} \frac{\log^{C_2}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (14)$$

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*(X_i) \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq C_{\text{uni}} \frac{\log^{C_2}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (15)$$

for some constant C_{uni} independent of n .

The above theorem, to our best knowledge, is the first non-asymptotic uniform (over a possibly diverging region) convergence result for Fréchet regression. In the earlier work including [Petersen and Müller \(2019\)](#), [Chen and Müller \(2022\)](#), asymptotic uniform convergence results have been established over a fixed compact set. However, these are not enough to derive the asymptotic size and power of our test when X has unbounded support since we would require [\(15\)](#) to hold while $\max_{i \in [n]} \|X_i - \mu\|$ diverges. To this end, we resort to non-asymptotic bounds and derive [\(15\)](#) from [\(14\)](#).

The proof of [Theorem 6](#) is involved, and we give an outline here. First, we follow a similar argument as in [Aguéh and Carlier \(2011\)](#) to show that the largest eigenvalue of the estimates $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ are uniformly bounded from above. Then we demonstrate that $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ converges uniformly in a slow rate by applying the chaining method. Here some special efforts are needed due to the Hölder continuity of the squared distance W^2 ; see [Lemma 31](#). Finally, we enhance to a uniform fast rate of convergence by solving a quadratic inequality in terms of the convergence rate. A detailed proof of [Theorem 6](#) is provided in [Appendix C](#).

[Theorem 6](#) implies the pointwise consistency of the Fréchet regression estimator [\(13\)](#). Moving one step further, we establish a central limit theorem that is elusive in general metric spaces with nonzero curvature ([Petersen and Müller, 2019](#)). In order to present the theorem, we pause to introduce several notations. First, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define $\vec{x} := (1 \ x^\top)^\top$. For any random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with covariance matrix Σ , let $\vec{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+1) \times (p+1)}$ denote the covariance matrix of \vec{X} . Next, let $(\mathbb{E}(-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q))^{-1}$ denote the inverse of $\mathbb{E}(-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q)$ which is a linear operator in $L(\mathcal{S}_d; \mathcal{S}_d)$ ([Appendix B.1](#)). Last, given elements x_1, x_2 of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , the tensor product operator $x_1 \otimes x_2 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined by $(x_1 \otimes x_2)y = \langle x_1, y \rangle x_2$ for any $y \in \mathcal{H}$; see [Hsing and Eubank \(2015\)](#) for properties of the tensor product operator and its role in the central limit theorem for random elements of a Hilbert space.

With these notations in place, the central limit theorem for the Fréchet regression estimator $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ is stated as [Theorem 7](#).

Theorem 7. *Suppose Assumption 1-4 hold. Then for any fixed $x \in \text{supp } X$, the following central limit theorem*

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right] \xrightarrow{w} \left(\mathbb{E}_{(X, Q)} \left(-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right) \right)^{-1} Z_x, \quad (16)$$

holds. Here $Z_x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Xi_x)$ is a Gaussian random element of $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with covariance operator Ξ_x equal to $\mathbb{E}V_x \otimes V_x$ where

$$\begin{aligned} V_x &= V_{x,1} + V_{x,2} \\ V_{x,1} &= s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\ V_{x,2} &= - \left(\bar{x}^\top \bar{\Sigma}^{-1} (\bar{X} \bar{X}^\top - \bar{\Sigma}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \bar{X} \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 8. Since a linear transformation of a multivariate normal distribution is still normal, Theorem 7 implies that asymptotically the entries of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x))$ jointly follow a multivariate normal distribution in \mathbb{R}^{d^2} when vectorized. More specifically, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\text{vec } \hat{Q}_n(x) - \text{vec } Q^*(x) \right) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega_x) \quad (17)$$

Here $\Omega_x = H_x^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\text{vec } V_x)(\text{vec } V_x)^\top H_x^{-1}$ where $H_x \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ is the matrix representing the invertible linear operator $\mathbb{E}(-s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q)$; see Appendix B.1 for a closed form expression of H_x .

Theorem 7 shows that the covariance operator Ξ_x has contribution both from $V_{x,1}$ and $V_{x,2}$. If both the expectation μ and the covariance matrix Σ of the predictor X are known and we get an estimate $\tilde{Q}_n(x)$ of $Q^*(x)$ by directly optimizing $F(x, S)$ from (8), then $\tilde{Q}_n(x)$ would follow a central limit theorem with covariance operator exactly equal to $\mathbb{E}V_{1,x} \otimes V_{1,x}$. When μ and Σ are unknown and empirical estimate $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ are plugged in as in (13), we would get an extra contribution in Ξ_x from $V_{x,2}$. Theorem 7 is validated through numerical experiments in Section 5, and the proof is given in Appendix D. To our best knowledge, the expression for Ξ_x cannot be further simplified in general. However, under the hypothesis that X and Q are independent, which can be a consequence of the null hypothesis in Section 4.2 and Assumption 6, $V_{x,2}$ vanishes and Ξ_x only has contribution from $V_{x,1}$. This is summarized in Corollary 9 below; see Appendix E for the proof.

Corollary 9. Instate the assumptions in Theorem 7. If X and Q are independent, then

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right] \xrightarrow{w} \left(\mathbb{E}_{(X,Q)} \left(-s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right) \right)^{-1} Z'_x,$$

holds where $Z'_x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Xi'_x)$ and

$$\Xi'_x = \mathbb{E} \left[s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) s(x, X) \right]$$

4.2 Hypothesis testing

In this section, we consider testing the global null hypothesis of no effects under the Fréchet regression model on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold as follows.

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : Q^*(x) \equiv Q^* \text{ for some unknown } Q^* \quad (18)$$

We first motivate and introduce the test statistic in Section 4.2.1. Then its asymptotic null distribution is investigated in Section 4.2.2, followed by a study on the asymptotic size and power of our proposed test.

4.2.1 Test statistic

Note that one crucial difference between the Fréchet regression model (8) and the classical linear or generalized linear regression model is that the conditional expectation is defined by an optimization problem rather than directly through some link function, and hence there is no parameter like the slope β in the linear model. As a result, we can only test the null hypothesis by directly aggregate comparisons between estimated predictions $\widehat{Q}_n(X_i)$ and the Fréchet mean Q^* .

Given the uniform consistency of the Fréchet regression estimator $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ in Theorem 6, we propose the following test statistic for testing (18).

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \widehat{H} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) \right\|_F^2, \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{H} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \quad (19)$$

To develop some intuition about $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_n$, note that the "difference" between $\widehat{Q}_n(X_i)$ and Q^* should be small under the null hypothesis (18). Since Q^* is unknown, Q^* is then estimated by $\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$, the Fréchet mean of Q_1, \dots, Q_n . Therefore, a sensible test statistic would be of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_f = \sum_{i=1}^n f \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i), \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is some function that measures the "difference" between $\widehat{Q}_n(X_i)$ and $\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$, and is expected to satisfy $f(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$, $f(Q, Q) = 0$ and $f(Q, S) = f(S, Q)$. Assuming tightness of the 2nd order Taylor approximation, the uniform consistency of $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ (Theorem 6) then implies

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_f \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \frac{1}{2} H_f \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right), \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\rangle \quad (20)$$

where H_f is the Hessian of f at $\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$. This justifies the form of (19).

Furthermore, the specification of H_f should depend on the detailed distribution of $\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$ in a way that (20) enjoys some tangible asymptotic distribution. To get the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$, we resort to the optimality condition $\sum_j s_n(x, X_j)(T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_j} - I_d) = 0$. Under the null hypothesis (18), assuming tightness of the first order approximation of the optimality conditions at X_i and \bar{X} we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\approx \sum_j s_n(X_i, X_j)(T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d) + \sum_j s_n(X_i, X_j) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^* \right) \\ 0 &\approx \sum_j s_n(\bar{X}, X_j)(T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d) + \sum_j s_n(\bar{X}, X_j) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Take the difference and rearrange, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_j dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j} \right) \cdot \sqrt{n}(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*) &\approx \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j (s_n(X_i, X_j) - 1)(T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d)}_{a_1(X_i)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j (s_n(X_i, X_j) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^* \right)}_{a_2(X_i)} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

One can then show $a_2(X_i)$ is negligible compared to $a_1(X_i)$, hence

$$\left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_j dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j}\right) \cdot \sqrt{n}(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*) \approx a_1(X_i). \quad (23)$$

Specifically, the intuition behind (23) is as follows. The null hypothesis (18) and Assumption 6 imply X and Q are independent. As a result, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j (s(X_i, X_j) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j}$ has zero expectation and is of order $O_p(1)$ by the central limit theorem, which implies that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j (s_n(X_i, X_j) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j}$ is also of order $O_p(1)$ by an approximation argument. Then the consistency of $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ implies that $a_2(X_i)$ is of order $o_p(1)$, which is negligible compared to $a_1(X_i)$.

Further calculation confirms a tractable asymptotic distribution for $\sum \|a_1(X_i)\|^2$, which suggests setting $H_f = (-\frac{1}{n} \sum_j dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j}) \otimes (-\frac{1}{n} \sum_j dT_{Q^*}^{Q_j})$. Finally, since Q^* is unknown, H_f is approximated by $\widehat{H} \otimes \widehat{H}$, which gives exactly our test statistic \widehat{T}_n in (19).

Remark 10. *Petersen et al. (2021) proposed the following test statistic when responses are 1D densities which has a simpler form compared to ours.*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{n,1D} = \sum_{i=1}^n W^2 \left(\widehat{Q}_n(X_i), \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)$$

However, their results rely heavily upon the Hilbert embedding of the 1D Wasserstein space and cannot be expected to generalize to higher dimensions while ours (19) works in any dimension and is motivated by the Wald statistic for the generalized linear models. Moreover, one can show that \widehat{T}_n and $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{n,1D}$ are equivalent in the special case of 1D Gaussian distributions. As our test statistic (19) can again be viewed as a generalization of the numerator of the global F-test in multiple linear regression, we refer to \widehat{T}_n in (19) as the Wasserstein F -statistic following Petersen et al. (2021).

4.2.2 Theoretical properties

We proceed to discuss the theoretical guarantees of our test statistic \widehat{T}_n and the corresponding test. To begin with, Theorem 11 gives the asymptotic null distribution of \widehat{T}_n .

Theorem 11. *Suppose Assumption 1-3 and 6 hold. Then under the null (18), the test statistic \widehat{T}_n satisfies*

$$\widehat{T}_n \xrightarrow{w} \sum_i \lambda_i w_i \quad (24)$$

where w_i are i.i.d. χ_p^2 random variables and λ_i are the eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)$.

Remark 12. *The proof of Theorem 11 relies on the uniform consistency in Theorem 6 since \widehat{T}_n involves estimated predictions $\widehat{Q}_n(\cdot)$ at random covariates $\{X_i\}_{i \in [n]}$. The uniform consistency is not needed in Petersen et al. (2021) thanks to the fact that $W_2(\mathbb{R})$ is essentially flat (has zero sectional curvature) which leads to a closed-form expression for $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{n,1D}$. Meanwhile, the Bures-Wasserstein manifold (\mathcal{S}_d^{++}, W) is positively curved when $d > 1$ (Ambrosio et al., 2005) and no closed-form expression is available for \widehat{T}_n , hence we resort to uniform consistency to ensure the tightness of Taylor approximation. See Appendix F for the proof.*

Theorem 11 asserts that \widehat{T}_n converges weakly to a weighted sum of χ_p^2 s with weights determined by the eigenvalues of the covariance operator $\mathbb{E}(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)$. To get a

corresponding test, note that the asymptotic null distribution in Theorem 11 depends on unknown parameters, namely the eigenvalues λ_i , which must be approximated to formulate a rejection region. A natural approach would be to estimate the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_i$ of the sample average $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \otimes T_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i}$ and let $\hat{q}_{1-\alpha}$ be the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\lambda}_i w_i$. Then we define our test Φ_α for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ by

$$\Phi_\alpha = I\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha}\right) \quad (25)$$

Equipped with Theorem 11, Proposition 13 below demonstrates that Φ_α has asymptotic size α under the null; see Appendix G for the proof.

Proposition 13. *Suppose Assumption 1-3 and 6 hold. Then under the null (18),*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha}\right) \rightarrow \alpha$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, let us turn to an analysis of the power of the test Φ_α under a sequence of contiguous alternatives. To this end, we denote by \mathfrak{P} the set of distributions of (X, Q) that satisfy Assumption 1 - 6,

$$\mathfrak{P} := \{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{S}_d^+) : \mathbb{P} \text{ satisfies Assumption 1 - 6}\}$$

For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}$, We measure the deviation of $Q^*(x)$ from being a constant function of x by $\mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(Q^*(X), Q^*)$ and choose dist to be either the Wasserstein distance or the one induced by the Frobenius norm. Then let us define the corresponding alternatives under either distances as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} H_{1,n} &: \mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_F(a_n) := \left\{ \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathfrak{P} : \mathbb{E}_{(X,Q) \sim \tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \|Q^*(X) - Q^*\|_F^2 \geq a_n^2 \right\}, \\ \tilde{H}_{1,n} &: \mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_W(a_n) := \left\{ \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathfrak{P} : \mathbb{E}_{(X,Q) \sim \tilde{\mathbb{P}}} W^2(Q^*(X), Q^*) \geq a_n^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 14 shows that Φ_α is powerful against both $H_{1,n}$ and $\tilde{H}_{1,n}$ whenever $a_n \gtrsim n^{-(1/2-\alpha_2)}$ for some constant $\alpha_2 > 0$. The proof is given in Appendix H.

Theorem 14. *Consider a sequence of alternative hypotheses $H_{1,n}$ with a_n being a sequence such that $a_n \gtrsim \frac{1}{n^{1/2-\alpha_2}}$ for some some constant $\alpha_2 > 0$. Then the worst case power converges uniformly to 1, that is*

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_F(a_n)} \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha}\right) \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The same result also holds for alternative hypotheses $\tilde{H}_{1,n}$ defined by the Wasserstein distance, that is

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_W(a_n)} \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha}\right) \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$

5 Algorithm and Numerical Experiments

In this section, we propose a Riemannian gradient descent algorithm for optimizing (13) in Section 5.1 and present a series of numerical experiments in Section 5.2 to validate our theoretical results on the central limit theorem (Theorem 7), asymptotic null distribution (Theorem 11) and power (Theorem 14). In Section 5.3, we also run simulations under the setting where Q is not observed but estimated from data and see how much it deviates from the perfect observation setting.

5.1 Riemannian gradient descent algorithm

Motivated by the Bures-Wasserstein gradient descent algorithm (Chewi et al., 2020; Altschuler et al., 2021) for the vanilla Bures-Wasserstein barycenter, we propose a gradient descent algorithm to compute $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ in (13), which is given as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 GD for Fréchet regression

- 1: **Input:** predictors $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, responses $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^n$, predictor x , learning rate η , initialization S_0 , maximum number of iterations T .
- 2: Initialize $S \leftarrow S_0$.
- 3: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
- 4: Set

$$G \leftarrow I_d + \eta \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i)(T_S^{Q_i} - I_d) \quad (26)$$

- 5: Set

$$S \leftarrow GSG \quad (27)$$

- 6: **Output:** S .
-

Algorithm 1 can be viewed as a Riemannian gradient descent algorithm (see Appendix A and Panaretos and Zemel (2016); Chewi et al. (2020); Altschuler et al. (2021)). Intuitively, $-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i)(T_S^{Q_i} - I_d)$ is the derivative of the objective function $F_n(x, S)$ in (13) in the tangent space (Ambrosio et al., 2005, Corollary 10.2.7) and (26) corresponds to one gradient step in the tangent space with step size η . Then (27) is mapping the gradient step in the tangent space back to \mathcal{S}_d^{++} through the exponential map (Appendix A). In terms of the step size η , it is justified in Panaretos and Zemel (2016) that we can simply take $\eta = 1$ in practice for computing the Wasserstein barycenter. In all our numerical experiments displayed here, taking $\eta = 1$ with initialization $S_0 = I_d$ again leads to fast convergence within a few steps. Hence we set $\eta = 1$ and $S_0 = I_d$ throughout.

5.2 Simulation setup and results

To validate our theory and demonstrate the practical applicability of our inferential procedures, we perform a series of numerical experiments. Let us begin with a running example that follows the Fréchet regression model.

Example 1. Let $X \sim \text{Uniform}[-1, 1]$. The response $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is generated as $Q = (2 + \delta \cdot x)^2 V^2$. Here $\delta \in [-1, 1]$ is parameter that measures how much the model deviates from the null (18), $V = U(I_d + M)^2 U^\top$ where U follows the Haar measure over the orthogonal group O_d , M is diagonal with $M_{ii} \sim \text{Uniform}[-0.5, 0.5]$ and X, U, M are independent. Then one can check that (X, Q) satisfies the Fréchet regression model with $Q^*(x) = (2 + \delta \cdot x)^2 I_d$.

With Example 1 in hand, we proceed to check the validity of the central limit theorem for $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ in Theorem 7. To this end, random predictor-response pairs (X, Q) are generated according to Example 1 with $d = 40$ and $\delta = 1$. For each trial, $n = 200$ samples of (X_i, Q_i) are generated as above, and we get the Fréchet regression estimate $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ via Algorithm 1. Then

we compute

$$\tilde{Q}_{ij}(x) = \frac{\sqrt{n} \left[\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right]_{ij}}{\sqrt{v_{ij}}}$$

where v_{ij} denotes the asymptotic variance of the (i, j) -entry of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x))$ as specified in Theorem 7 and (17). Figure 1 displays the Q-Q (quantile-quantile) plots of $\tilde{Q}_{ij}(x)$ vs. the standard normal distribution over 200 Monte Carlo trials at $x = 0$. As stated in Theorem 7, $\tilde{Q}_{ij}(x)$ asymptotically follows a standard normal distribution, resulting in a linear fit with unit slope and zero intercept in the Q-Q plot. It is evident from Figure 1 that the empirical quantiles of $\tilde{Q}_{ij}(0)$ matches the quantiles of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ reasonably well, thereby validating Theorem 7.





Figure 1: Simulation results showing the Q-Q plots of $\tilde{Q}_{11}(0)$ and $\tilde{Q}_{21}(0)$ with parameters $d = 40, \delta = 1, n = 200$.

Next, we turn to Theorem 11, namely the asymptotic null distribution of the test statistic \hat{T}_n . To this end, we set $d \in \{10, 30\}$ and $\delta = 0$ in Example 1. Figure 2a and 2b display the Q-Q plot of \hat{T}_n vs. $\sum_i \lambda_i w_i$. The empirical quantiles of \hat{T}_n are generated from 200 Monte Carlo trials with $n = 200$ in each trial. To approximate the population quantiles of $\sum_i \lambda_i w_i$, we first run a separate trial with $N = 2000$ samples of (X_i, Q_i) and compute the eigenvalues $\{\hat{\lambda}_j\}_{j \in [d^2]}$ of


$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(T_{\hat{Q}_N(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{\hat{Q}_N(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right)$$

to approximate the population eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}$. Then we generate $N = 2000$ samples of $\sum_i \lambda_i w_i$ which we use to approximate the population quantiles of $\sum_i \lambda_i w_i$. Figure 2a and 2b show that the obtained Q-Q plot has a linear fit approximately equal to $y = x$, validating Theorem 11.


Then, to validate the power of the proposed test in Theorem 14, we set $d = 10$ and vary $\delta \in \{0, 0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.08, 0.10, 0.12\}$ in Example 1. When the parameter $\delta = 0$, the generated model satisfies the null hypothesis $Q^*(x) \equiv 4I_d$. As δ increases, the generated model deviates



(a) $d = 10$



(b) $d = 30$



(c) $d = 10$

Figure 2: Simulation results. (a) and (b): Q-Q plots of the test statistic \widehat{T}_n against the asymptotic null distribution with $n = 200$ for different dimension of $d = 10$ and $d = 30$; (c): power curve as a function of the effect size δ .

more and more from being a constant function of x . Figure 2c displays the power of our test over 200 Monte Carlo simulations. It is shown that the power quickly goes from 0.06 up to 1 as δ increases from 0 to 1, demonstrating proper size (Proposition 13) and power (Theorem 14).

5.3 Sensitivity of the results when covariance matrices are unknown

Finally, we investigate the numerical performance of our results under the setting where Q is not directly observed but estimated from the data. Specifically, consider the case when we only

have access to $\{(X_i; Z_{i1}, Z_{i2}, \dots, Z_{i\tilde{n}})\}_{i \in [n]}$ with $Z_{i1}, Z_{i2}, \dots, Z_{i\tilde{n}} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, Q_i)$. Then a natural plug-in approach for Fréchet estimation and testing is to estimate Q_i via the sample covariance $\bar{Q}_i := \tilde{n}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^\top$, and plug in \bar{Q}_i for Q_i in downstream estimators. Specifically, define the estimator $\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x)$ and test statistic $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n, \tilde{n}}$ as follows.

$$\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) W^2(S, \bar{Q}_i)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n, \tilde{n}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \hat{H}_{\tilde{n}} \cdot \left(\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(X_i) - \hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(\bar{X}) \right) \right\|_F^2, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{H}_{\tilde{n}} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(\bar{X})}^{\bar{Q}_i}$$


First, we consider the central limit theorem (Theorem 7) under the estimated covariance matrices. To this end, let us define

$$\left[\tilde{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x) \right]_{i,j} := \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{n}} \left[\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x) - Q^*(x) \right]_{ij}}{\sqrt{v_{ij}}}$$


and study how far $\left[\tilde{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x) \right]_{i,j}$ deviates from the standard normal distribution for finite \tilde{n} . Under the same model for (X, Q) as Figure 1, the Q-Q plots of $\left[\tilde{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(x) \right]_{ij}$ against the standard normal distribution with $\tilde{n} \in \{50, 100, 200, 400, \infty\}$ is displayed in Figure 3. Here $\tilde{n} = \infty$ denotes the full observation case when Q_i is known, and is represented as the blue points and line as a reference, which is the same as in Figure 1. In general, the Q-Q plot for finite \tilde{n} approaches that of $\tilde{n} = \infty$ as $\tilde{n} \rightarrow \infty$, and can still be fitted by a straight line with slope slightly greater than 1, indicating a central limit theorem for the entries with larger variance for smaller \tilde{n} . Also interestingly, detailed behavior of the bias differs between diagonal and off-diagonal entries. For off-diagonal entries, Figure 3b suggests that $\left[\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(0) \right]_{ij}$ is unbiased while for diagonal entries, Figure 3a shows that the Q-Q plots for finite \tilde{n} are negatively shifted compared to that of $\tilde{n} = \infty$ (blue), suggesting that $\left[\hat{Q}_{n, \tilde{n}}(0) \right]_{ii}$ is negatively biased. We only focus on the theoretical properties of the Fréchet regression estimator (13) under the full observation setting in this paper and leave theoretical investigation of its refined behavior in the setting of estimated covariance matrices for future work.

Next, let us move on to the asymptotic null distribution of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n, \tilde{n}}$ (Theorem 11) with estimated covariance matrices in Figure 4a. For $d = 10$, under the same model for (X, Q) as Figure 2a, the Q-Q plots of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n, \tilde{n}}$ against the asymptotic null distribution specified in Theorem 11 with $\tilde{n} \in \{50, 100, 200, 400, \infty\}$ is shown. Interestingly, the Q-Q plot for finite \tilde{n} can again be fitted by a straight line across origin with slope greater than 1, suggesting that the asymptotic null distribution is a scaled version of (24) in Theorem 11. This would imply inflated false positives for finite \tilde{n} .

Finally, Figure 4b shows the Q-Q plots for $\tilde{n} \in \{100, 200, 1000, \infty\}$ under the same model as Figure 2c. The behavior at $\delta = 0$ exhibits inflated false positives for finite \tilde{n} , as suggested by Figure 4a.




(a) Diagonal entries: $(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3)$




(b) Off-diagonal entries: $(2, 1), (3, 1), (3, 2)$

Figure 3: Simulation results showing the Q-Q plots of diagonal and off-diagonal entries of $\tilde{Q}(0)$ with parameters $d = 10, n = 200$ and varying $\tilde{n} \in \{50, 100, 200, 400, \infty\}$.



(a) Null



(b) Power

Figure 4: Simulation results. (a) Q-Q plot of the test statistic $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{n,\tilde{n}}$ under the null against the asymptotic null distribution with $d = 10$, $n = 200$ for different $\tilde{n} \in \{50, 100, 200, \infty\}$. (b) Power curve as a function of the effect size δ for $\tilde{n} \in \{100, 200, 1000, \infty\}$

6 Application to Single-cell Gene Co-expression Networks

Aging is a complex process of accumulation of molecular, cellular, and organ damage, leading to loss of function and increased vulnerability to disease and death. Nutrient-sensing pathways, namely insulin/insulin-like growth factor signaling and target-of- rapamycin can substantially increase healthy life span of laboratory model organisms (Davinelli et al., 2012; de Lucia et al., 2020). These nutrient signaling pathways are conserved in various organisms. We are interested in understanding the co-expression structure of 61 genes in this KEGG nutrient-sensing pathways based on the recently published population scale single cell RNA-seq data of human peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) from blood samples of over 982 healthy individuals with ages ranging from 20 to 90 (Yazar et al., 2022).

We focus our analysis on CD4+ naive and central memory T (CD4NC) cells, which is the most common cell type observed in the data. Age-associated changes in CD4 T-cell functionality have been linked to chronic inflammation and decreased immunity (Elyahu et al., 2019). There are a total of 51 genes that are expressed in this cell type. Even though the Fréchet regression still makes sense when the covariance matrix is potentially degenerate (see the remarks after Example 1), our theory relies on the strict positive definiteness. Hence, we retain only the genes that have nonzero variances at any age, resulting in a total of 37 genes, see Figure 5 for a concise overview of these covariance matrices for individuals at different ages, showing difference across different ages.

In genetics research, such covariance matrices represent individual-specific gene co-expression networks. We are interested in testing whether such networks are associated with ages by testing whether there is an age effect on the gene expression covariance matrices, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_0 : Q^*(t) \equiv Q^*$ for some Q^* . The test we propose has a p -value 0.00019, suggesting a strong age effect on the gene expression covariance matrices.




Figure 5: Heatmap of the gene expression covariance matrices with diagonal elements omitted for individual at age 20, 30, \dots , 90, respectively.

7 Discussion

We have develop methods for statistical inference for the Fréchet regression on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold, where covariance matrix is treated as the outcome, including the uniform rate of convergence of the conditional Fréchet mean and the asymptotic distribution. Based on these results, we have further developed statistical test for testing the association between covariate outcome and Euclidean covariates. These results are further verified using simulations. We have demonstrated the methods by testing the association between gene co-expression and age, indicating the change of co-expressions among a set of genes in nutrient sensing pathway.

The proposed methods have other applications, including in neuroimaging data analysis, where covariance matrices (or correlation matrices after standardization) of multiple brain regions are used to summarize as functional connectivity matrices. The proposed methods can be used to identify the factors that are associated with such functional connectivity matrices.

In this paper, we assume that the outcome covariance matrices are observed and we only focus on the theoretical properties of the Fréchet regression estimator (13) under the full observation setting. This is also the setting considered in Petersen and Müller (2019) and Petersen et al. (2021). An important future work is to develop the corresponding theoretical results in the setting when one has to estimate the covariance matrices from the data.

References

- Abadie, A. and Imbens, G. W. (2006). Large Sample Properties of Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects. *Econometrica*, 74(1):235–267.
- Agueh, M. and Carlier, G. (2011). Barycenters in the Wasserstein Space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 43(2):904–924.
- Agueh, M. and Carlier, G. (2017). Vers un théorème de la limite centrale dans l’espace de Wasserstein? *Comptes Rendus. Mathématique*, 355(7):812–818.
- Altschuler, J., Chewi, S., Gerber, P. R., and Stromme, A. J. (2021). Averaging on the Bures-Wasserstein manifold: dimension-free convergence of gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:22132–22145.
- Altschuler, J., Niles-Weed, J., and Rigollet, P. (2017). Near-linear time approximation algorithms for optimal transport via Sinkhorn iteration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Altschuler, J. M., Niles-Weed, J., and Stromme, A. J. (2022). Asymptotics for Semidiscrete Entropic Optimal Transport. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 54(2):1718–1741.
- Ambrosio, L., Gigli, N., and Savaré, G. (2005). *Gradient Flows In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Birkhäuser-Verlag.
- Arjovsky, M., Chintala, S., and Bottou, L. (2017). Wasserstein Generative Adversarial Networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR.
- Arnaudon, M., Barbaresco, F., and Yang, L. (2013). Riemannian medians and means with applications to radar signal processing. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 7(4):595–604.
- Barrio, E. d. and Loubes, J.-M. (2019). Central limit theorems for empirical transportation cost in general dimension. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(2):926–951.
- Bhatia, R., Jain, T., and Lim, Y. (2019). On the Bures–Wasserstein distance between positive definite matrices. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 37(2):165–191.
- Bhattacharya, R. and Patrangenaru, V. (2003). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(1):1–29.

- Bhattacharya, R. and Patrangenaru, V. (2005). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds—II. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(3):1225–1259.
- Bigot, J., Gouet, R., Klein, T., and López, A. (2017). Geodesic PCA in the Wasserstein space by convex PCA. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 53(1):1 – 26.
- Bunne, C., Hsieh, Y.-P., Cuturi, M., and Krause, A. (2023a). The Schrödinger Bridge between Gaussian Measures has a Closed Form. In *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5802–5833. PMLR.
- Bunne, C., Papaxanthos, L., Krause, A., and Cuturi, M. (2022). Proximal Optimal Transport Modeling of Population Dynamics. In *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 6511–6528. PMLR.
- Bunne, C., Stark, S. G., Gut, G., del Castillo, J. S., Levesque, M., Lehmann, K.-V., Pelkmans, L., Krause, A., and Rätsch, G. (2023b). Learning single-cell perturbation responses using neural optimal transport. *Nature Methods*, 20(11):1759–1768.
- Bures, D. (1969). An extension of Kakutani’s theorem on infinite product measures to the tensor product of semifinite w^* -algebras. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 135(0):199–212.
- Cai, T. T., Zhang, C.-H., and Zhou, H. H. (2010). Optimal rates of convergence for covariance matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(4):2118–2144. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Carlsson, M. (2018). Perturbation theory for the matrix square root and matrix modulus. arXiv:1810.01464.
- Caseiro, R., Martins, P., Henriques, J. F., and Batista, J. (2012). A nonparametric Riemannian framework on tensor field with application to foreground segmentation. *Pattern Recognition*, 45(11):3997–4017.
- Chen, Y., Lin, Z., and Müller, H.-G. (2023). Wasserstein Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):869–882.
- Chen, Y. and Müller, H.-G. (2022). Uniform convergence of local Fréchet regression with applications to locating extrema and time warping for metric space valued trajectories. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(3):1573–1592.
- Chewi, S., Maunu, T., Rigollet, P., and Stromme, A. J. (2020). Gradient descent algorithms for Bures-Wasserstein barycenters. In *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1276–1304. PMLR.
- Chiu, T. Y. M., Leonard, T., and Tsui, K.-W. (1996). The Matrix-Logarithmic Covariance Model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(433):198–210.
- Cornea, E., Zhu, H., Kim, P., and Ibrahim, J. G. (2017). Regression models on Riemannian symmetric spaces. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(2):463–482.
- Cuturi, M. (2013). Sinkhorn Distances: Lightspeed Computation of Optimal Transport. In Burges, C. J., Bottou, L., Welling, M., Ghahramani, Z., and Weinberger, K. Q., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26.

- Davinelli, S., Willcox, D., and Scapagnini, G. (2012). Extending healthy ageing: nutrient sensitive pathway and centenarian population. *Immunity & Ageing*, 9:9.
- de Lucia, C., Murphy, T., Steves, C., and et al. (2020). Lifestyle mediates the role of nutrient-sensing pathways in cognitive aging: cellular and epidemiological evidence. *Communications Biology*, 3:157.
- Deb, N. and Sen, B. (2023). Multivariate Rank-Based Distribution-Free Nonparametric Testing Using Measure Transportation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(541):192–207.
- del Barrio, E., Sanz, A. G., Loubes, J.-M., and Niles-Weed, J. (2023). An Improved Central Limit Theorem and Fast Convergence Rates for Entropic Transportation Costs. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 5(3):639–669.
- Del Moral, P. and Niclas, A. (2018). A Taylor expansion of the square root matrix function. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 465(1):259–266.
- Dryden, I. L., Koloydenko, A., and Zhou, D. (2009). Non-Euclidean statistics for covariance matrices, with applications to diffusion tensor imaging. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 3(3):1102–1123.
- Dudley, R. M. and Norvaiša, R. (2011). *Concrete Functional Calculus*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Elyahu, Y., Hekselman, I., Eizenberg-Magar, I., Berner, O., Strominger, I., Schiller, M., Mittal, K., Nemirovsky, A., Eremenko, E., Vital, A., Simonovsky, E., Chalifa-Caspi, V., Friedman, N., Yeger-Lotem, E., and Monsonego, A. (2019). Aging promotes reorganization of the CD4 T cell landscape toward extreme regulatory and effector phenotypes. *Science Advances*, 5(8):eaaw8330.
- Fillard, P., Arsigny, V., Pennec, X., Hayashi, K. M., Thompson, P. M., and Ayache, N. (2007). Measuring brain variability by extrapolating sparse tensor fields measured on sulcal lines. *Neuroimage*, 34(2):639–650.
- Fletcher, P. and Joshi, S. (2007). Riemannian geometry for the statistical analysis of diffusion tensor data. *Signal Processing*.
- Friston, K. J. (2011). Functional and effective connectivity: a review. *Brain Connectivity*, 1(1):13–36.
- Gonzalez-Sanz, A., Loubes, J.-M., and Niles-Weed, J. (2022). Weak limits of entropy regularized Optimal Transport; potentials, plans and divergences. arXiv:2207.07427.
- Hallin, M., Mordant, G., and Segers, J. (2021). Multivariate goodness-of-fit tests based on Wasserstein distance. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(1):1328–1371.
- Hoff, P. D. and Niu, X. (2012). A covariance regression model. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 729–753.
- Hsing, T. and Eubank, R. (2015). *Theoretical foundations of functional data analysis, with an introduction to linear operators*, volume 997. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hütter, J.-C. and Rigollet, P. (2021). Minimax estimation of smooth optimal transport maps. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):1166–1194.

- Jin, C., Netrapalli, P., Ge, R., Kakade, S. M., and Jordan, M. I. (2019). A Short Note on Concentration Inequalities for Random Vectors with SubGaussian Norm. arXiv:1902.03736.
- Kim, Y.-H. and Pass, B. (2017). Wasserstein barycenters over Riemannian manifolds. *Advances in Mathematics*, 307:640–683.
- Kroshnin, A., Spokoiny, V., and Suvorikova, A. (2021). Statistical inference for Bures–Wasserstein barycenters. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(3):1264–1298.
- Kuchibhotla, A. K. and Chakraborty, A. (2022). Moving beyond sub-Gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11(4):1389–1456.
- Lang, S. (1999). *Fundamentals of Differential Geometry*, volume 191 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Le Gouic, T. and Loubes, J.-M. (2017). Existence and consistency of Wasserstein barycenters. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 168(3-4):901–917.
- Le Gouic, T., Paris, Q., Rigollet, P., and Stromme, A. J. (2022). Fast convergence of empirical barycenters in Alexandrov spaces and the Wasserstein space. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 25(6):2229–2250.
- Lin, Z. (2019). Riemannian Geometry of Symmetric Positive Definite Matrices via Cholesky Decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 40(4):1353–1370.
- Lin, Z., Müller, H.-G., and Park, B. U. (2023). Additive models for symmetric positive-definite matrices and Lie groups. *Biometrika*, 110(2):361–379.
- Manole, T., Balakrishnan, S., Niles-Weed, J., and Wasserman, L. (2022). Plugin Estimation of Smooth Optimal Transport Maps. arXiv:2107.12364.
- Manole, T., Balakrishnan, S., Niles-Weed, J., and Wasserman, L. (2023). Central Limit Theorems for Smooth Optimal Transport Maps. arXiv:2312.12407.
- Mena, G. and Niles-Weed, J. (2019). Statistical bounds for entropic optimal transport: sample complexity and the central limit theorem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Moakher, M. (2005). A Differential Geometric Approach to the Geometric Mean of Symmetric Positive-Definite Matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 26(3):735–747.
- Ohta, S.-I. (2012). Barycenters in Alexandrov spaces of curvature bounded below. *Advances in Geometry*, 12(4):571–587.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Zemel, Y. (2016). Amplitude and phase variation of point processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):771–812.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Zemel, Y. (2020). *An Invitation to Statistics in Wasserstein Space*. Springer Nature.
- Petersen, A., Liu, X., and Divani, A. A. (2021). Wasserstein F-tests and confidence bands for the Fréchet regression of density response curves. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):590–611.

- Petersen, A. and Müller, H.-G. (2019). Fréchet regression for random objects with Euclidean predictors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):691–719.
- Peyré, G. and Cuturi, M. (2019). Computational Optimal Transport: With Applications to Data Science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607.
- Pooladian, A.-A., Divol, V., and Niles-Weed, J. (2023). Minimax estimation of discontinuous optimal transport maps: The semi-discrete case. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 28128–28150. PMLR.
- Pooladian, A.-A. and Niles-Weed, J. (2022). Entropic estimation of optimal transport maps. arXiv:2109.12004.
- Redko, I., Habrard, A., and Sebban, M. (2017). Theoretical Analysis of Domain Adaptation with Optimal Transport. In Ceci, M., Hollmén, J., Todorovski, L., Vens, C., and Džeroski, S., editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 737–753.
- Santambrogio, F. (2015). *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians: Calculus of Variations, PDEs, and Modeling*, volume 87. Springer, NY.
- Schiebinger, G., Shu, J., Tabaka, M., Cleary, B., Subramanian, V., Solomon, A., Gould, J., Liu, S., Lin, S., Berube, P., Lee, L., Chen, J., Brumbaugh, J., Rigollet, P., Hochedlinger, K., Jaenisch, R., Regev, A., and Lander, E. S. (2019). Optimal-Transport Analysis of Single-Cell Gene Expression Identifies Developmental Trajectories in Reprogramming. *Cell*, 176(4):928–943.
- Somnath, V. R., Pariset, M., Hsieh, Y.-P., Martinez, M. R., Krause, A., and Bunne, C. (2023). Aligned Diffusion Schrödinger Bridges. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, volume 216, pages 1985–1995. PMLR.
- Talagrand, M. (1989). Isoperimetry and Integrability of the Sum of Independent Banach-Space Valued Random Variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 17(4):1546–1570.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Villani, C. (2003). *Topics in Optimal Transportation*. American Mathematical Society.
- Villani, C. (2009). *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wasserman, L. (2006). *All of Nonparametric Statistics*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY.
- Weed, J. and Berthet, Q. (2019). Estimation of smooth densities in Wasserstein distance. In *conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3118–3119. PMLR.
- Wihler, T. P. (2009). On the Hölder continuity of matrix functions for normal matrices. *Journal of inequalities in pure and applied mathematics*, 10(10).

- Yazar, S., Alquicira-Hernandez, J., Wing, K., Senabouth, A., Gordon, M. G., Andersen, S., Lu, Q., Rowson, A., Taylor, T. R. P., Clarke, L., Maccora, K., Chen, C., Cook, A. L., Ye, C. J., Fairfax, K. A., Hewitt, A. W., and Powell, J. E. (2022). Single-cell eqtl mapping identifies cell type-specific genetic control of autoimmune disease. *Science*, 376(6589):eabf3041.
- Yokota, T. (2016). Convex functions and barycenter on CAT (1)-spaces of small radii. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 68(3):1297–1323.
- Yuan, Y., Zhu, H., Lin, W., and Marron, J. S. (2012). Local polynomial regression for symmetric positive definite matrices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 74(4):697–719.
- Zhao, Y., Wang, B., Mostofsky, S. H., Caffo, B. S., and Luo, X. (2021). Covariate assisted principal regression for covariance matrix outcomes. *Biostatistics*, 22(3):629–645.
- Zou, T., Lan, W., Wang, H., and Tsai, C.-L. (2017). Covariance Regression Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(517):266–281.

A Background on optimal transport and functional calculus

In this section, we collect relevant background about optimal transport and functional calculus to make the paper more self-contained.

A.1 Geometry of optimal transport

We begin with the geometry of optimal transport, and then specialize the general concepts to the Bures–Wasserstein manifold. For introductory expositions of optimal transport, we refer to Villani (2003); Santambrogio (2015); Panaretos and Zemel (2020). For a more comprehensive treatment, we refer to Ambrosio et al. (2005); Villani (2009).

Given $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{2,ac}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the constant-speed geodesic $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ connecting μ_0 to μ_1 is characterized by

$$\mu_t = [\text{id} + t (T_{\mu_0}^{\mu_1} - \text{id})]_{\#} \mu_0, \quad t \in [0, 1]$$

Here, $\#$ denotes the pushforward operation defined by $T_{\#} \mu(E) = \mu(T^{-1}(E))$ for any Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then define the tangent vector of the geodesic $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ at $t = 0$ to be the mapping $T_{\mu_0}^{\mu_1} - \text{id}$. The tangent space $T_{\mu_0} \mathcal{P}_{2,ac}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{P}_{2,ac}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ at μ_0 is defined in Ambrosio et al., 2005, Thm 8.5.1 as

$$T_{\mu_0} \mathcal{P}_{2,ac}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \overline{\{\lambda(T_{\mu_0}^{\nu} - \text{id}) : \lambda > 0, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{2,ac}(\mathbb{R}^d)\}}^{L^2(\mu_0)}$$

Here the overline denotes closure with respect to the $L^2(\mu_0)$ measure.

Given two covariance matrices $Q, S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$, the constant-speed geodesic connecting the corresponding centered Gaussians is given by

$$(I_d + t (T_Q^S - I_d)) Q (I_d + t (T_Q^S - I_d)), \quad t \in [0, 1]$$

The tangent space $T_Q \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ can be identified with the space \mathcal{S}_d of symmetric $d \times d$ matrices. For any $\tilde{S} \in T_Q \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$, its norm in the tangent space is given by

$$\|\tilde{S}\|_Q := \langle \tilde{S}, Q \tilde{S} \rangle^{1/2}$$

A.2 Functional calculus

To consider higher order differentials of T_Q^S on the Bures–Wasserstein manifold, we give a brief review of some key concepts in functional calculus that are essential for the development, and direct readers to Dudley and Norvaiša (2011) for further details.

Let Y and Z be normed spaces with the norm on each denoted by $\|\cdot\|$, and let U be an open subset of Y . Let $L(Y, Z)$ denote the space of all bounded linear operators from Y into Z . A function $\phi : U \rightarrow Z$ is called (Fréchet) differentiable at $u \in U$ if there exists an $L(u) \in L(Y, Z)$ such that for each $y \in Y$ with $u + y \in U$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\phi(u + y) - \phi(u) - L(u)y\|}{\|y\|} = 0$$

The linear operator $L(u)$ is unique, is called the derivative of ϕ at u , and is denoted by $D\phi(u)$. If the function ϕ is differentiable at each $u \in U$, then we say that ϕ is differentiable on U .

To consider higher order derivatives of ϕ , let $L^1(Y, Z) := L(Y, Z)$ with the usual operator norm, and let $L^{k+1}(Y, Z) := L(Y, L^k(Y, Z))$ with the operator norm recursively for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. For $k \geq 2$, we say that ϕ is (Fréchet) differentiable of order k at u if ϕ has a $(k-1)$ st derivative

$D^{k-1}\phi(y)$ at each point y of some neighborhood of u , and the mapping $D^{k-1}\phi$ is differentiable at u . Then $D^k\phi(u)$, the k th derivative of ϕ at u , is defined as the derivative of $D^{k-1}\phi$ at u . If ϕ is differentiable of order k at u for each $u \in U$ then we say that ϕ is differentiable of order k on U . A mapping ϕ is called a C^k function on $U \subset Y$ if the derivatives of ϕ through order k all exist on U and are continuous. A mapping ϕ is called a C^∞ function on $U \subset X$ if it is a C^k function for each k .

It would be convenient to introduce the notion of multilinear mappings in order study the properties of higher order derivatives $D^k\phi$. A function $A : Y^k \rightarrow Z$ is called k -linear if for each $j \in [k]$, $A(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ is linear in y_j for any fixed values of $y_i, i \neq j$. The function A is called bounded if

$$\|A\| := \sup \{ \|A(y_1, \dots, y_k)\| : \|y_j\| \leq 1, j \in [k] \} < \infty \quad (28)$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_k(Y, Z)$ be the set of all bounded k -linear maps from Y^k to Z with norm define by (28).

The space $L^k(Y, Z)$ can be identified with $\mathcal{M}_k(Y, Z)$ through the natural isomorphism $\Phi_{(k)} : L^k(Y, Z) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_k(Y, Z)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{(k)}(A)(y_1, \dots, y_k) &:= A(y_1)(y_2) \cdots (y_k) \\ &:= [\cdots [A(y_1)](y_2) \cdots](y_k) \end{aligned}$$

Then the k th differential at u is defined by $d^k\phi(u) := \Phi_{(k)}(D^k\phi(u))$.

The k th differential $d^k\phi(u)$ is symmetric in the sense that

$$d^k\phi(u)(y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}) = d^k\phi(u)(y_1, \dots, y_k)$$

for any permutation σ of $[k]$. For simplicity, we also denote $d^k\phi(u)(y, \dots, y)$ by $d^k\phi(u) \cdot y^{\otimes k}$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_{k,s}(Y, Z)$ denote the subspace of all symmetric elements of $\mathcal{M}_k(Y, Z)$. Then aside from the operator norm inherited from $\mathcal{M}_k(Y, Z)$, one can define another norm $\| \cdot \|$ on $\mathcal{M}_{k,s}(Y, Z)$ by

$$\|P\| := \sup \{ \|P(y, y, \dots, y)\| : \|y\| \leq 1 \}$$

Properties of the high order differentials $d^k T_Q^S$ are investigated in Appendix B.1.

B Technical lemmas

In this section, we collect technical lemmas and relevant notations for the proof. First, properties of differentials of T_Q^S are collected in Appendix B.1. Then various concentration results are given in Appendix B.2. Finally, properties of $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $Q^*(\cdot)$ are summarized in Appendix B.3.

B.1 Differentials of optimal transport maps

Recall that the optimal transport map between two centered Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{N}(0, Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, S)$ has the closed-form expression $T_Q^S = S^{1/2}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})^{-1/2}S^{1/2}$. In all relevant analysis, we need to consider differentials of T_Q^S when viewed as a function of Q for fixed S , which we denote as $d^k T_Q^S$ for $k \geq 1$. It is shown in Kroshnin et al. (2021) that dT_Q^S can be defined as follows. For any $H \in \mathcal{S}_d$,

$$dT_Q^S(H) := -S^{1/2}U^\top \Lambda^{-1/2} \delta \Lambda^{-1/2} U S^{1/2}$$

where $U^\top \Lambda U$ is an eigenvalue decomposition of $S^{1/2}QS^{1/2}$ with $UU^\top = U^\top U = I$ and $\delta = (\delta_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ with

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta_{ij}}{\sqrt{\lambda_i} + \sqrt{\lambda_j}} & i, j \leq \text{rank}(S) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \Delta = US^{1/2}HS^{1/2}U^\top$$

To consider higher order differentials of T_Q^S , we start with the map $Q \mapsto Q^{1/2}$ in Lemma 15, next move on to $Q \mapsto Q^{-1/2}$ in Lemma 16 which then leads to T_Q^S in Lemma 17. Connections between T_Q^S and $W^2(Q, S)$ are also investigated in Lemma 17.

Lemma 15. *The square root functional $\phi : Q \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++} \rightarrow \phi(Q) = Q^{1/2} \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ is Fréchet differentiable at any order on \mathcal{S}_d^{++} . Moreover, for any $Q \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ and any $n \geq 0$, we have the estimates*

$$\|d^{n+1}\phi(Q)\| \leq C_{d,n} \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-(n+1/2)}$$

Here $C_{d,n} = d^{n/2} \cdot n! \binom{2n}{n} \cdot 2^{-(2n+1)}$.

Proof. See Del Moral and Niclas (2018) Theorem 1.1. □

Lemma 16. *The inverse square root functional $\varphi : Q \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++} \mapsto \varphi(Q) = Q^{-1/2} \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$ is Fréchet differentiable at any order on \mathcal{S}_d^{++} . Moreover, for any $A \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}, H \in \mathbb{S}^d$, the following holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} d\varphi(Q) \cdot H &= -Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} \\ d^2\varphi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2} &= -Q^{-1/2} (d^2\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}) Q^{-1/2} + 2Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} \\ d^3\varphi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 3} &= -Q^{-1/2} (d^3\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 3}) Q^{-1/2} + 3Q^{-1/2} (d^2\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}) Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} \\ &\quad + 3Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} (d^2\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}) Q^{-1/2} \\ &\quad - 6Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\varphi(Q)\| &\leq C_{d,0} \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-3/2} \\ \|d^2\varphi(Q)\| &\leq (C_{d,1} + 2C_{d,0}^2) \cdot (\lambda_{\min}(Q))^{-5/2} \\ \|d^3\varphi(Q)\| &\leq (C_{d,2} + 6C_{d,1}C_{d,0} + 6C_{d,0}^3) \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-7/2} \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{d,n}$ is defined in Lemma 15.

Proof. By Lemma 15 we have for infinitesimal $H \in \mathcal{S}_d$ that

$$(Q + H)^{1/2} = Q^{1/2} + \underbrace{d\phi(Q) \cdot H}_{Z_1} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}d^2\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}}_{Z_2} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{6}d^3\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 3}}_{Z_3} + \dots$$

Let $Z = Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_3 + Z_4$, and we obtain for infinitesimal $H \in \mathcal{S}_d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (Q + H)^{-1/2} &= \left(Q^{1/4} (I_d + Q^{-1/4} Z Q^{-1/4}) Q^{1/4} \right)^{-1} \\ &= Q^{-1/4} (I_d + Q^{-1/4} Z Q^{-1/4})^{-1} Q^{-1/4} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} Q^{-1/4} \left(I_d - Q^{-1/4} Z Q^{-1/4} + Q^{-1/4} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/4} - Q^{-1/4} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/4} + \dots \right) Q^{-1/4} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= Q^{-1/2} - Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} + Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} - Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} Z Q^{-1/2} + \dots \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} Q^{-1/2} - \underbrace{Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2}}_{\text{1st order in } H} - \underbrace{Q^{-1/2} Z_2 Q^{-1/2} + Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2}}_{\text{2nd order in } H} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{Q^{-1/2} Z_3 Q^{-1/2} + Q^{-1/2} Z_2 Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2} + Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2} Z_2 Q^{-1/2} - Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2} Z_1 Q^{-1/2}}_{\text{3rd order in } H} \\
&\quad + \text{higher order terms in } H
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from the von Neumann series expansion, and (ii) is obtained by arranging terms according to their orders in H . Then (16) follows, and we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d^2\varphi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}\|_F &\leq \left\| Q^{-1/2} (d^2\phi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 2}) Q^{-1/2} \right\|_F + 2 \left\| Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} (d\phi(Q) \cdot H) Q^{-1/2} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-1} \cdot \|d^2\phi(Q)\| \cdot \|H\|_F^2 + 2\lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-3/2} \|d\phi(Q)\|^2 \cdot \|H\|_F^2 \\
&\leq (C_{d,1} + 2C_{d,0}^2) \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-5/2} \cdot \|H\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d^3\varphi(Q) \cdot H^{\otimes 3}\|_F &\leq \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-1} \|d^3\varphi(Q)\| \cdot \|H\|_F^3 + 6\lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-3/2} \|d^2\varphi(Q)\| \cdot \|d\varphi(Q)\| \cdot \|H\|_F^3 \\
&\quad + 6\lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-2} \|d\varphi(Q)\|^3 \cdot \|H\|_F^3 \\
&\leq (C_{d,2} + 6C_{d,1}C_{d,0} + 6C_{d,0}^3) \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-7/2} \cdot \|H\|_F^3
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows by applying Lemma 15. And we arrive at the desired result. \square

Lemma 17. *The following properties hold for the 2-Wasserstein distance $W(Q, S)$ and the optimal transport map T_Q^S . For any $Q, Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}$, $S \in \mathcal{S}_d^+$ and $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_d$,*

1. $W^2(Q, S)$ is upper bounded by

$$W^2(Q, S) \leq 2d (\lambda_{\max}(Q) + \lambda_{\max}(S)) \quad (29)$$

2. $W^2(Q, S)$ is twice differentiable with

$$\begin{aligned}
d_Q W^2(Q, S)(X) &= \langle I - T_Q^S, X \rangle \\
d_Q^2 W^2(Q, S)(X, Y) &= -\langle X, dT_Q^S(Y) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the following quadratic approximation holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \langle -dT_{Q_0}^S(Q_1 - Q_0), Q_1 - Q_0 \rangle \\
&\leq W^2(Q_1, S) - W^2(Q_0, S) + \langle T_{Q_0}^S - I, Q_1 - Q_0 \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \langle -dT_{Q_0}^S(Q_1 - Q_0), Q_1 - Q_0 \rangle
\end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

with $Q' := Q_0^{-1/2} Q_1 Q_0^{-1/2}$.

3. dT_Q^S is self-adjoint, negative semi-definite and enjoys the following two-sided bound.

$$\frac{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2})}{2} \left\| Q^{-1/2} X Q^{-1/2} \right\|_F^2 \leq \langle -dT_Q^S(X), X \rangle \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2})}{2} \left\| Q^{-1/2} X Q^{-1/2} \right\|_F^2 \quad (31)$$

4. $W^2(Q_0, Q_1)$ can be upper and lower bounded by the Frobenius norm as follows

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(Q_0) \lambda_{\max}(Q_1)} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2 \leq W^2(Q_0, Q_1) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\max}^{-1}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}(Q_1)} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2 \quad (32)$$

5. $\|d^k T_Q^S\|$ can be upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|dT_Q^S\| &\leq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-2}}{2} \cdot \left(\lambda_{\max}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})\right)^{1/2} \\ \|d^2T_Q^S\| &\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^3 (C_{d,1} + 2C_{d,0}^2) \cdot \left(\lambda_{\min}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})\right)^{-5/2} \\ \|d^3T_Q^S\| &\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^4 (C_{d,2} + 6C_{d,1}C_{d,0} + 6C_{d,0}^3) \left(\lambda_{\min}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})\right)^{-7/2} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Moreover, if $S, Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M^{-1}, M)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|dT_Q^S\| &\leq \frac{1}{2}M^3 \\ \|d^2T_Q^S\| &\leq (C_{d,1} + 2C_{d,0}^2)M^8 \\ \|d^3T_Q^S\| &\leq (C_{d,2} + 6C_{d,1}C_{d,0} + 6C_{d,0}^3)M^{11} \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Proof of (29): By the closed form expression for $W^2(Q, S)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} W^2(Q, S) &= \text{tr} \left[Q + S - 2(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq \text{tr} \left[Q + S + 2(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq d \left(\lambda_{\max}(Q) + \lambda_{\max}(S) + 2\lambda_{\max}(Q)^{1/2}\lambda_{\max}(S)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq 2d \left(\lambda_{\max}(Q) + \lambda_{\max}(S) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (30), (31): see [Kroshnin et al. \(2021, Lemma A.2, A.3, A.4, A.6\)](#).

Proof of (32): Set $S = Q_0$ in (30), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \left\langle -dT_{Q_0}^{Q_0}(Q_1 - Q_0), Q_1 - Q_0 \right\rangle &\leq W^2(Q_1, Q_0) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \left\langle -dT_{Q_0}^{Q_0}(Q_1 - Q_0), Q_1 - Q_0 \right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $Q' = Q_0^{-1/2}Q_1Q_0^{-1/2}$. Next, apply (31) to get that for any $X \in \mathcal{S}_d$, one has

$$\frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q_0)}{2} \lambda_{\max}^{-2}(Q_0) \|X\|_F^2 \leq \left\langle -dT_{Q_0}^{Q_0}(X), X \right\rangle \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0)}{2} \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0) \|X\|_F^2 \quad (35)$$

Combine (34) and (35) to get that

$$W^2(Q_1, Q_0) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\min}(Q')} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\max}^{-1}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}(Q_1)} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
W^2(Q_1, Q_0) &\geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q_0) \lambda_{\max}^{-2}(Q_0)}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\max}(Q')} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q_0) \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q_0)}{1 + \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(Q_0) \lambda_{\max}(Q_1)} \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_0\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (33): First, note that results for dT_Q^S follows directly from (31).

Next since $T_Q^S = S^{1/2}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})^{-1/2}S^{1/2}$, applying Lemma 16 gives that for H small enough, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
d^2T_Q^S \cdot H^{\otimes 2} &= S^{1/2} \left[d^2\varphi(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2}) \cdot (S^{1/2}HS^{1/2})^{\otimes 2} \right] S^{1/2} \\
d^3T_Q^S \cdot H^{\otimes 3} &= S^{1/2} \left[d^3\varphi(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2}) \cdot (S^{1/2}HS^{1/2})^{\otimes 3} \right] S^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \|d^2T_Q^S\| \| &\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^3 \cdot \| \|d^2\varphi(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})\| \| \\
&\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^3 (C_{d,1} + 2C_{d,0}^2) \cdot \left(\lambda_{\min}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2}) \right)^{-5/2} \\
\| \|d^3T_Q^S\| \| &\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^4 \| \|d^3\varphi(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})\| \| \\
&\leq \lambda_{\max}(S)^4 (C_{d,2} + 6C_{d,1}C_{d,0} + 6C_{d,0}^3) \lambda_{\min}(S^{1/2}QS^{1/2})^{-7/2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 18. Let Y and Z be normed spaces with the norm on each denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. For any $y \in Y$, $P \in \mathcal{M}_{k,s}(Y, Z)$, $k \geq 2$, let Py denote a $(k-1)$ -linear function defined by

$$Py(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}) = P(y, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1})$$

Then $Py \in \mathcal{M}_{k-1,s}(Y, Z)$ and

$$\| \|Py\| \| \leq \|P\| \|y\| \leq \frac{k^k}{k!} \| \|P\| \| \|y\| \quad (36)$$

Proof. $Py \in \mathcal{M}_{k-1,s}(Y, Z)$ can be proved by definition. To prove (36), note that for any $\|\tilde{y}\| \leq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \|Py(\tilde{y}, \dots, \tilde{y})\| \| &\leq \|P\| \cdot \|y\| \cdot \|\tilde{y}\|^{k-1} \\
&\leq \|P\| \cdot \|y\| \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{k^k}{k!} \| \|P\| \| \|y\|
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Dudley and Norvaiša (2011, Theorem 5.7).

□

B.2 Concentration inequalities and uniform convergence

First, let us introduce some additional notation. Given a random variable X we denote $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$ as follows.

$$\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} := \inf \{ \eta > 0 : \mathbb{E} \psi_\alpha(|X/\eta|) \leq 1 \}, \quad \text{where } \psi_\alpha(x) := \exp(x^\alpha) - 1 \quad \text{for } x \geq 0 \quad (37)$$

Note that by the definition and Markov's inequality, if $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} < \infty$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^\alpha}{\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha}^\alpha}\right) \quad (38)$$

For $\alpha \geq 1$, $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ is a norm (Vershynin, 2018), and for $\alpha < 1$, it is equivalent to a norm (Talagrand, 1989). For a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$, denote

$$\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} := \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|u\|=1} \|u^\top X\|_{\psi_\alpha}$$

Lemma 19 (Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty (2022), Theorem 3.1). *If X_1, \dots, X_n are independent, mean zero random variables with $\|X_i\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq K$ for all $i \in [n]$ and some $\alpha > 0$, then the following bounds hold true:*

- $\alpha \in (0, 1]$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right| > C_1 K \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + C_2 K \frac{t^{1/\alpha}}{n}\right) \leq 2e^{-t} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are constants that depends only on α .

- $\alpha > 1$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right| > C_3 K \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + C_2 K \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^{1/\alpha}\right) \leq 2e^{-t} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are constants that depends only on α .

Lemma 20. *Let X, Q be random elements in $\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Let Φ_k be a random symmetric operator in $\mathcal{L}((\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{\times k}; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Then*

1. $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq \| \|X\|_2 \|_{\psi_\alpha} \lesssim \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ for any $\alpha > 0$.
2. For any $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with unit Frobenius norm

$$\|\langle U, Q \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq \| \|Q\|_F \|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sup_{U: \|U\|_F=1} \|\langle U, Q \rangle\|_{\psi_2}$$

3. For any $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with unit Frobenius norm

$$\| \| \Phi_k \cdot U^{\otimes k} \| \|_F \|_{\psi_2} \leq \| \| \Phi_k \| \|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sup_{U: \|U\|_F=1} \| \| \Phi_k \cdot U^{\otimes k} \| \|_F \|_{\psi_2}$$

The constants behind \lesssim only depend on dimension d, k and possible on α .

Proof. This can be shown using similar techniques as in Vershynin (2018, Lem 4.4.1, 4.4.5.) and Lemma 1 in Jin et al. (2019). □

Next, we give some properties of the weights $s(x, X)$ and $s_n(x, X_i)$ that will be crucial to prove uniform concentration as well as a central limit theorem for the estimate $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$. Recall that by definition, $s(x, X) = 1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(X - \mu)$ and $s_n(x, X_i) = 1 + (x - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(X_i - \bar{X})$. For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^p$, denote $\vec{z} = (1, z^\top)^\top$ and $\vec{\Sigma} = \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \vec{X}^\top$.

Lemma 21. *Suppose $X, X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^p)$. Let $\vec{\Sigma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{X}_i \vec{X}_i^\top$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$,*

$$s(x, X) = \vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \vec{X} \quad (39)$$

$$s_n(x, X_i) = \vec{x}^\top \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} \vec{X} \quad (40)$$

Proof. For (39), by definition one has

$$\vec{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mu^\top \\ \mu & \Sigma + \mu \mu^\top \end{pmatrix}$$

Computing the inverse of the block matrix $\vec{\Sigma}$ then gives

$$\vec{\Sigma}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mu & -\mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\ -\Sigma^{-1} \mu & \Sigma^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Finally we arrive at (39) by computing $\vec{x}^\top \Lambda^{-1} \vec{X}$. (40) follows from similar arguments. \square

Lemma 22. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Set*

$$\begin{aligned} W_{0n} &:= W_{0n}(x) = \bar{X}^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) - \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \\ W_{1n} &:= W_{1n}(x) = \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) - \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) \end{aligned}$$

Then have

$$s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i) = W_{0n} + W_{1n}^\top X_i \quad (41)$$

Moreover, for any $L \gtrsim 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} |W_{0n}(x)| &\leq C \frac{L \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|W_{1n}(x)\|_2 &\leq CL \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for some large constant $C > 0$ that depends on d .

Proof. (41) is shown in (A.2) Petersen and Müller (2019). We only prove (42) here.

- For W_{0n} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |W_{0n}| &\leq \left\| \bar{X}^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) - \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) \right\| + \left\| \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) - \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \right\| \\ &= \left\| (\bar{X} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \bar{X}) \right\| + \left\| \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{X}) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| (\bar{X} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \right\| + \left\| (\bar{X} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\bar{X} - \mu) \right\| + \left\| \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{X}) \right\| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left\| (\bar{X} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \right\|}_{\Delta_{n,1}} \cdot \|x - \mu\| + \underbrace{\left\| (\bar{X} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\bar{X} - \mu) \right\| + \left\| \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{X}) \right\|}_{\Delta_{n,2}} \end{aligned}$$

Here $\|\Delta_{n,1}\|_{\psi_2}, \|\Delta_{n,2}\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim n^{-1/2}$ and does not depend on x . Hence, one can obtain

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} |W_{0n}(x)| \lesssim \frac{L\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

- For W_{1n} , similarly

$$\|W_{1n}\| \leq \underbrace{\left\| \Sigma^{-1} - \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} \right\|}_{\Delta_{n,3}} \|x - \mu\| + \underbrace{\left\| \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mu - \bar{X}) \right\|}_{\Delta_{n,4}}$$

By Exercise 5.6.4 in [Vershynin \(2018\)](#) and a truncation argument, one can obtain

$$\left\| \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log^2 n}{n}} \vee \frac{\log^2 n}{n} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log^2 n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ which implies for any $L \gtrsim 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|W_{1n}(x)\| &\lesssim L \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\lesssim L \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$

□

Lemma 23. *Suppose $(X_i, Q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^m, i = 1, \dots, n$ are i.i.d with $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_{\psi_2}$. Let $(\mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed vector space and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^m \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be mappings parametrized by $\theta \in \Theta$ such that almost surely $\|\psi(Q, \theta)\| \leq K_n$ uniformly for $\theta \in \Theta$. Then for any $L \gtrsim 1$, the following*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i; \theta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i) \right\| \lesssim LK_n \cdot \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (43)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Proof. By (41) in Lemma 22, one can obtain for any x and $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i; \theta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i; \theta) \right\| \\ &= \left\| W_{0n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Q_i; \theta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{1n}^\top X_i \psi(Q_i; \theta) \right\| \\ &\leq |W_{0n}| \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\psi(Q_i; \theta)\| + \|W_{1n}\|_2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_2 \|\psi(Q_i; \theta)\| \\ &\leq |W_{0n}| \cdot K_n + \|W_{1n}\|_2 K_n \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Take supremum over x, θ and combine with (42), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i; \theta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) \psi(Q_i; \theta) \right\| \\ & \lesssim \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} LK_n \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$. Concentration of $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_2$ then implies (43). \square

We will need uniform upper bounds for various quantities of the form

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} f(Z_1^n; \theta)$$

where Z_1^n denotes (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) . To this end, we decompose the above quantity as follows.

$$\underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} f(Z_1^n; \theta) - \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} f(Z_1^n; \theta)}_{\text{perturbation}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} f(Z_1^n; \theta)}_{\text{expectation}}$$

The expectation term is bounded in Lemma 24 below with a chaining argument, while the perturbation term is shown to concentrate in Lemma 26 by exploiting its bounded difference property. The proof of Lemma 24 is deferred to Appendix B.2.1.

Lemma 24. *Given a function class*

$$\mathcal{F}(\Theta) = \{f(\cdot; \theta) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \theta \in \Theta\}$$

where f is continuous jointly in (z, θ) and (Θ, d) is a separable metric space with finite diameter $D := \sup_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta} d(\theta_1, \theta_2) \gtrsim 1$. Suppose a random vector $Z \in \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfies the following inequality

$$\|f(Z; \theta_1) - f(Z; \theta_2)\|_{\psi_2} \leq \tau(d(\theta_1, \theta_2)), \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta \quad (44)$$

for some increasing function $\tau : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ that satisfies $\tau(0) = 0, \tau(+\infty) = +\infty$. Then

- the following inequality holds

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f(Z; \theta)| \leq C \int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta)| \quad (45)$$

where $C > 0$ is a fixed absolute constant and $N(\epsilon; \Theta)$ is the ϵ -covering number of Θ .

- Specifically, if τ has the form

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} (\epsilon \vee \epsilon^{\alpha_0})$$

for some constant $\alpha_0 > 0$, then for any $D \gtrsim 1$, one has

$$\int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \lesssim \frac{KD^{1 \vee \alpha_0}}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ D} \quad (46)$$

- Specifically, if $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are i.i.d. and $f : (\mathbb{R}^p)^k \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is equal to

$$f(Z_1^n; \theta) = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Z_i; \theta) - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Z_i; \theta) \right\|, \quad Z_1^n := (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$$

where $\psi(z; \theta) \in \mathcal{M}_{k,s}(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a symmetric k -linear operator for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^p, \theta \in \Theta$. Then the following inequality

$$\left\| f(Z_1^n; \theta) - f(Z_1^n; \tilde{\theta}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z_1; \theta) - \psi(Z_1; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \quad (47)$$

holds.

Remark 25. (47) will be applied in three ways as follows.

- $m = 1, k = 1$: $\psi(z; \theta) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\|\psi(z; \theta)\|$ reduces to the absolute value of $\psi(z; \theta)$. Examples include $\psi(X, Q; x, S) = s(x, X)W^2(Q, S)$ in Lemma 31
- $m = d, k = 1$: $\psi(z; \theta) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m)$ can be viewed as a matrix. Moreover, $\|\psi(z; \theta)\|$ reduces to the matrix operator norm. Examples include $\psi(X, Q; x) = s(x, X)(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d)$ in Lemma 33.
- $m = d \times d, k = 1$: this is a special case of the previous one by identifying $d \times d$ matrices as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{d^2} . Examples include $\psi(X, Q; x) = -s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q$ in Lemma 33.
- $m = d \times d, k = 2$: Examples include $\psi(X, Q; x, S) = s(x, X)d^2T_S^Q$ in Lemma 33.

Lemma 26. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ be a class of functions indexed by $\theta \in \Theta$. Suppose ψ is uniformly bounded in the sense that there exists a finite constant K such that $\|\psi(x; \theta)\|_2 \leq K$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\theta \in \Theta$. For any fixed $y_0 \in \mathcal{W}$, define $f : (\mathbb{R}^p)^n \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ as

$$f(x_1^n) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(x_i; \theta) - y_0 \right\|_2$$

Then f satisfies the bounded difference property with parameter $2K/n$, i.e. for any $x_1^n, \tilde{x}_1^n \in (\mathbb{R}^p)^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(x_i \neq \tilde{x}_i) \leq 1$,

$$\|f(x_1^n) - f(\tilde{x}_1^n)\|_2 \leq \frac{2K}{n}, \quad (48)$$

Moreover, suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. random element in \mathbb{R}^p , then

$$\|f(X_1^n) - \mathbb{E}f(X_1^n)\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{2K}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (49)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $x_1 \neq \tilde{x}_1$ and $x_j = \tilde{x}_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(x_i; \theta) - y_0 \right\|_2 - \sup_{\tilde{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\tilde{x}_i; \tilde{\theta}) - y_0 \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(x_i; \theta) - y_0 \right\|_2 - \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\tilde{x}_i; \theta) - y_0 \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(x_i; \theta) - y_0 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\tilde{x}_i; \theta) + y_0 \right\|_2 \\ & = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \psi(x_1; \theta) - \psi(\tilde{x}_1; \theta) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{2K}{n} \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum over θ then gives

$$f(x_1^n) - f(\tilde{x}_1^n) \leq \frac{2K}{n}$$

The other direction can be obtained with the role x_1^n and \tilde{x}_1^n reversed. Therefore we get (48). By Corollary 2.21 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#), we get (49). The proof is then complete. \square

Finally, even though Theorem 6 shows fast convergence $\hat{Q}_n(x) \rightarrow Q^*(x)$, one needs $\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \rightarrow Q^*(\mu)$ when considering power in Theorem 14, and this is stated in Lemma 27 below. A crucial observation here is that $\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$ and $Q^*(\mu)$ are the empirical and population Fréchet mean respectively. The proof is built upon [Le Gouic et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Altschuler et al. \(2021\)](#).

Lemma 27. *Assume Assumption 1 and 2 hold. Then there exists an event \tilde{E} with probability $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}) \geq 1 - n^{-100}$ under which the following holds*

$$W^2\left(\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}), Q^*(\mu)\right) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (50)$$

As a result, under \tilde{E} , one has

$$\left\| \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^*(\mu) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (51)$$

for n large enough.

Proof. Note that $\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$ and $Q^*(\mu)$ are equal to the empirical and population barycenter respectively. For simplicity, we write Q^* for $Q^*(\mu)$.

Proof of (50): From (3.8)-(3.9) in [Le Gouic et al. \(2022\)](#) and results in [Altschuler et al. \(2021\)](#), one can obtain the following

$$W^2\left(\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}), Q^*\right) \leq C_b \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\|_{Q^*} \quad (52)$$

where $C_b > 0$ is a constant independent of n and $\|A\|_{Q^*(\mu)} := \langle A, Q^*A \rangle$. Moreover, Lemma 28 implies that $c_1^{-1}I_d \preceq Q^* \preceq c_1I_d$; see Assumption 2 for the definition of c_1 . As a result, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\|_{Q^*} &\leq \lambda_{\max}(Q^*) \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq c_1 \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Note that by the optimality condition for barycenter, one has $\mathbb{E}\left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d\right) = 0$. Then one can apply Lemma 20 to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} &\lesssim \sup_{\|U\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 1} \left\| \left\langle U, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d\right) \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\|U\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle U, T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \quad (54)$$

Recall that $T_S^Q = S^{-1/2} (S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2})^{1/2} S^{-1/2}$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \left\| \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{op}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \left\| 1 + c_1^{3/2} \lambda_{\max}(Q)^{1/2} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \left\| 1 + c_1^{3/2} c_1^{1/2} \|X - \mu\|^{1/2} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \left\| 1 + c_1^{3/2} c_1^{1/2} (1 \vee \|X - \mu\|) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \left\| 1 + c_1^2 (1 + \|X - \mu\|) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\lesssim 1 \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Here (i) follows since dimension d is fixed and absorbed into the constant factor independent of n , (ii) is a result of Assumption 2.

Finally, combining (52) (53) (54) and (55) gives

$$\left\| W^2 \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}), Q^*(\mu) \right) \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (56)$$

which implies (50).

Proof of (51): Apply (32) in Lemma 17 to get that under the event \widetilde{E} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\text{F}} &\leq W^2 \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}), Q^* \right) \cdot \frac{1 + \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(Q^*) \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)}{\lambda_{\max}(Q^*) \cdot \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(Q^*)} \\ &\lesssim W^2 \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}), Q^* \right) \cdot \left(1 + \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) \right) \\ &\leq C \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \left(1 + \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

for constant $C > 0$ large enough. Note that this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) &\leq \lambda_{\max}(Q^*) + \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\text{F}} \\ &\leq c_1 + C \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \left(1 + \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Solving for $\lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right) &\leq \frac{c_1 + C \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}}{1 - C \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}} \\ &\lesssim 1 \quad \text{for } n \text{ large enough} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Finally, plugging (58) back into (57) gives (51). \square

B.2.1 Proof of Lemma 24

Proof of (45): Since $f(z, \theta)$ is continuous in θ and Θ is separable, we have for any countable, dense subset $\mathbb{U} \subset \Theta$, the following equality

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f(Z, \theta)| = \mathbb{E} \sup_{S \in \mathbb{U}} |f(Z, \theta)|$$

holds. By the monotone convergence theorem, it suffices to assume that \mathbb{U} is finite and get an upper bound that is independent of the cardinality of \mathbb{U} .

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathbb{U}_k \subset \mathbb{U}$ be a minimal ϵ_k -covering set of \mathbb{U} where ϵ_k is defined by

$$\epsilon_k = \tau^{-1}(2^{-k}) \quad (59)$$

Let $N(\epsilon_k, \mathbb{U})$ be the cardinality of the minimal ϵ_k -covering set \mathbb{U}_k of \mathbb{U} . Since \mathbb{U} is a subset of Θ , $N(\epsilon_k, \mathbb{U})$ can be upper bounded by

$$\log N(\epsilon_k; \mathbb{U}) = \log |\mathbb{U}_k| \leq \log N(\epsilon_k; \Theta)$$

Since \mathbb{U} is finite, there is a largest $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a smallest integer $H \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\mathbb{U}_\eta = \{\theta_0\} \text{ for some } \theta_0 \in \mathbb{U}, \quad \mathbb{U}_H = \mathbb{U}$$

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the mapping $\pi_k : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_k$ via

$$\pi_k(\theta) = \underset{\tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{U}_k}{\operatorname{argmin}} d(\tilde{\theta}, \theta)$$

so that $\pi_k(S)$ is the best approximation of $\theta \in \Theta$ from the set \mathbb{U}_k .

For any $\theta \in \mathbb{U}$, apply the triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} f(Z, \theta) \right| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} (f(Z, \theta) - f(Z, \theta_0)) \right| + \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta_0)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} |f(Z, \theta) - f(Z, \theta_0)| + \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta_0)| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} \left| \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H (f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))) \right| + \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta_0)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H |f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))| + \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta_0)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} |f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))| + \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta_0)| \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Here (i) is a consequence of decomposing $f(Z, \theta) - f(Z, \theta_0)$ as a telescoping sum

$$f(Z, \theta) - f(Z, \theta_0) = \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H (f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta)))$$

For any fixed $\theta \in \Theta$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(\cdot, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(\cdot, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))\|_{\psi_2} &\leq \|f(\cdot, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(\cdot, \theta)\|_{\psi_2} + \|f(\cdot, \theta) - f(\cdot, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(I)}{\leq} \tau(\epsilon_k) + \tau(\epsilon_{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2\tau(\epsilon_{k-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(II)}{=} 2 \cdot 2^{-(k-1)} \end{aligned}$$

Here (I) is a result of (44), and (II) follows from (59). Then, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} |f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))| &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \sqrt{|\mathbb{U}_{k-1}| \cdot |\mathbb{U}_k|} \cdot 2 \cdot 2^{-(k-1)} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon_k; \Theta)} \cdot 2^{-(k-1)} \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Here (i) follows from the properties of the maximum of finitely many sub-Gaussian random variables and the fact that the maximum is taken over at most $|\mathbb{U}_{k-1}| \cdot |\mathbb{U}_k| \leq N(\epsilon_k; \Theta)^2$ random variables. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H \mathbb{E} \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{U}} |f(Z, \pi_k(\theta)) - f(Z, \pi_{k-1}(\theta))| &\lesssim \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon_k; \Theta)} \cdot 2^{-(k-1)} \\ &= \sum_{k=\eta+1}^H \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(2^{-k}); \Theta)} \cdot 2^{-(k-1)} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \\ &\stackrel{(I)}{=} \int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Here (I) follows by noticing that $\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta) = 0$ for any $t \geq \tau(D)$.

Combine (60) and (62) to see that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |f(Z; \theta)| \leq C \int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} |f(Z; \theta)|$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Proof of (46): Consider two cases $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha_0 > 1$.

Case I $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$: Note that since $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{-1}(t) &= \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K} \right) \wedge \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K} \right)^{1/\alpha_0} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K} & \sqrt{nt} \geq K \\ \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K} \right)^{1/\alpha_0} & \sqrt{nt} \leq K \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

As a result, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N\left(\tau^{-1}\left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right); \Theta\right)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^K \sqrt{\log N\left((t/K)^{1/\alpha_0}; \Theta\right)} \cdot dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_K^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(t/K; \Theta)} \cdot dt \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^K \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{(t/K)^{1/\alpha_0}}\right)} \cdot dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_K^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t/K}\right)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \underbrace{\frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t^{1/\alpha_0}}\right)} \cdot dt}_{a_1} + \underbrace{\frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \int_1^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)/K} \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t}\right)} \cdot dt}_{a_2}
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Here (i), (iii) follows from a change of variables, and (ii) follows from (63).

- a_1 : one has

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 & \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{1}{t^{1/\alpha_0}}\right)} dt + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+ D} dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \sqrt{\log^+ D}
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Here (i) follows from the inequality $\sqrt{s+t} \leq \sqrt{s} + \sqrt{t}$ for $s, t \geq 0$, and (ii) follows from the assumption that $D \gtrsim 1$.

- a_2 : for $D \gtrsim 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_2 & \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \int_1^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)/K} \sqrt{\log^+ D} dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)}{K} \cdot \sqrt{\log^+ D} \\
& = (D \vee D^{\alpha_0}) \sqrt{\log^+ D} \\
& \stackrel{(iii)}{\lesssim} D \sqrt{\log^+ D}
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Here (i) a consequence of the fact that $D/t \leq D$ for $t \geq 1$, (ii) results from substituting the definition of $\tau(\cdot)$ and (iii) follows from the assumption $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$.

Combine (64), (65) and (66) to see that

$$\int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \lesssim \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} D \sqrt{\log^+ D}$$

which proves (46) for $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$.

Case II $\alpha_0 > 1$: for $\alpha_0 > 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^{-1}(t) & = \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K}\right) \wedge \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K}\right)^{1/\alpha_0} \\
& = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K} & \sqrt{nt} \leq K \\ \left(\frac{\sqrt{nt}}{K}\right)^{1/\alpha_0} & \sqrt{nt} > K \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

As a result, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N\left(\tau^{-1}\left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right); \Theta\right)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^K \sqrt{\log N(t/K; \Theta)} \cdot dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_K^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N((t/K)^{1/\alpha_0}; \Theta)} \cdot dt \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^K \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t/K}\right)} \cdot dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_K^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{(t/K)^{1/\alpha_0}}\right)} \cdot dt \\
& \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \underbrace{\frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t}\right)} \cdot dt}_{a_3} + \underbrace{\frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \int_1^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)/K} \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{D}{t^{1/\alpha_0}}\right)} \cdot dt}_{a_4}
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Here (i), (iii) follows from a change of variables, and (ii) follows from (67).

- a_3 : one has

$$\begin{aligned}
a_3 & \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} dt + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log^+ D} dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \sqrt{\log^+ D}
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Here (i) follows from the inequality $\sqrt{s+t} \leq \sqrt{s} + \sqrt{t}$ for $s, t \geq 0$, and (ii) follows from the assumption that $D \gtrsim 1$.

- a_4 : for $D \gtrsim 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_4 & \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \int_1^{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)/K} \sqrt{\log^+ D} dt \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{\sqrt{n}\tau(D)}{K} \cdot \sqrt{\log^+ D} \\
& = (D \vee D^{\alpha_0}) \sqrt{\log^+ D} \\
& \stackrel{(iii)}{\lesssim} D^{\alpha_0} \sqrt{\log^+ D}
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Here (i) a consequence of the fact that $D/(t^{1/\alpha_0}) \leq D$ for $t \geq 1$, (ii) results from substituting the definition of $\tau(\cdot)$ and (iii) follows from the assumption $\alpha_0 > 1$.

Combine (68), (69) and (70) to see that

$$\int_0^{\tau(D)} \sqrt{\log N(\tau^{-1}(t); \Theta)} \cdot dt \lesssim \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} D^{\alpha_0} \sqrt{\log^+ D}$$

which proves (46) for $\alpha_0 > 1$.

Proof of (47): Let $\Psi_n(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Z_i; \theta)$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| f(Z_1^n; \theta) - f(Z_1^n; \tilde{\theta}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&= \left\| \left\| \Psi_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \Psi_n(\theta) \right\| - \left\| \Psi_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbb{E} \Psi_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\leq \left\| \left\| \Psi_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \Psi_n(\theta) - \Psi_n(\tilde{\theta}) + \mathbb{E} \Psi_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \sup_{u, v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \left\| \left\langle u, \left[\tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right] - \left[\tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) + \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right] \cdot v^{\otimes k} \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{u, v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \left\| \left\langle u, \left[\psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right] \cdot v^{\otimes k} \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{u, v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \left\| \left\langle u, \left[\psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right] \cdot v^{\otimes k} \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \left\| \left\| \left[\psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right] \cdot v^{\otimes k} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \cdot \|v\|_{\mathbb{F}}^k \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) is a result of Lemma 20, (ii) arises due to independence, (iii) follows from Lemma 2.6.8 in Vershynin (2018), and (iv) is derived from the definition of $\|\cdot\|$. The proof is then complete.

B.3 Properties of F and Q^*

This section collects properties of $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $Q^*(\cdot)$ that are needed later in the proof.

Lemma 28. *Assume Assumption 1 and 2 holds. Then the following inequalities*

$$\gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)^{-1} I_d \preceq Q^*(x) \preceq \gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|) I_d, \quad \forall x \in \text{supp } X \quad (71)$$

hold for constant $C > 0$ large enough.

Proof. The optimality condition for the conditional Fréchet mean $Q^*(x) := \text{argmin}_S \mathbb{E} [W^2(S, Q)]$ and Lemma 17 imply that for any x , one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q \mid X = x \right) = I_d$$

Recalling $T_S^Q = S^{-1/2} (S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2})^{1/2} S^{-1/2}$, one has

$$Q^*(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(Q^*(x)^{1/2} Q Q^*(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \mid X = x \right]$$

Denote $\lambda_{\max}^*(x) = \lambda_{\max}(Q^*(x))$ and $\lambda_{\min}^*(x) = \lambda_{\min}(Q^*(x))$. Then one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\max}^*(x) &= \lambda_{\max} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(Q^*(x)^{1/2} Q Q^*(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \mid X = x \right] \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max} \left(\left(Q^*(x)^{1/2} Q Q^*(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \mid X = x \right) \right] \\
&\leq \gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)^{1/2} \lambda_{\max}^*(x)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second line follows from the convexity of the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ over PSD matrices. The last inequality follows from Assumption 2. Therefore, one can readily obtain $\lambda_{\max}^*(x) \leq \gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)$. The lower bound $\lambda_{\min}^*(x) \geq \gamma_1(\|x - \mu\|)^{-1}$ can be derived similarly by the concavity of $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$. \square

Lemma 29. *Assume Assumption 1 and 2 hold. If X and Q are independent, then the following holds.*

- $Q^*(x) \equiv Q^*(\mu)$
- Assumption 5 holds for $C_3 = 0$ and c_3 large enough.
- Assumption 4 holds for $c_\delta = 1/(2c_1)$, $\alpha_1 = 2$, $C_2 = 1$ and some constant c_2 large enough.

Proof. Independence between X and Q implies that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, S) &= \mathbb{E}s(x, X)W^2(S, Q) \\ &= \mathbb{E}s(x, X) \cdot \mathbb{E}W^2(S, Q) \\ &= \mathbb{E}W^2(S, Q) \end{aligned}$$

The existence and uniqueness of the minimizer of $F(x, \cdot)$ follow from Panaretos and Zemel (2020, Proposition 3.2.3, Proposition 3.2.7). Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}W^2(S, Q)$ does not depend on x , we have $Q^*(x) \equiv Q^*(\mu)$. We denote $Q^* := Q^*(\mu)$ from now on. Note that Lemma 28 implies that $Q^* \in \mathcal{S}_d(c_1^{-1}, c_1)$

Verification of Assumption 5: Again by independence, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left[-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*}^Q \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[-dT_{Q^*}^Q \right]$$

Therefore, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*}^Q \right] \right) &= \lambda_{\min} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[-dT_{Q^*}^Q \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q^{1/2}Q^*Q^{1/2})}{2} \cdot \lambda_{\min}^2(Q^{*-1}) \\ &\gtrsim \mathbb{E}\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\gtrsim} \mathbb{E}[\gamma_1(\|X - \mu\|)]^{-1/2} \\ &\gtrsim \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{1 \vee \|X - \mu\|^{C_1/2}} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} c_{\text{eig}} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant c_{eig} small enough. Here (i) follows from Lemma 17, (ii) is a result of Assumption 2 and (iii) is due to Assumption 1. The proof is then complete.

Verification of Assumption 4: In order to verify (11). Let us denote $Q' = Q^{*-1/2}SQ^{*-1/2}$. Then (30) and (31) in Lemma 17 imply the following lower bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(x, S) - F(x, Q^*) \\
&= \mathbb{E} [W^2(S, Q) - W^2(Q^*, Q)] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left\langle I_d - T_{Q^*}^Q, S - Q^* \right\rangle + \mathbb{E} \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q'(x))\right)^2} \left\langle -dT_{Q^*}^Q(S - Q^*), S - Q^* \right\rangle \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q'(x))\right)^2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q^{1/2}Q^*Q^{1/2})}{2} \cdot \left\| Q^{*-1/2}(S - Q^*)Q^{*-1/2} \right\|_F^2
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Here (i) follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) = 0$ which is a consequence of the optimality condition and independence.

If we set $c_\delta = c_1^{-1}/2$, then one has

$$\left\{ S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++} : \delta \leq \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta \right\} \subset \left\{ S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++} : \|S\|_{\text{op}} \leq c_1 + \Delta \right\}$$

which combined with (72) implies for any $\Delta \geq c_\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\delta \leq \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta} F(x, S) - F(x, Q^*) \\
&\geq \inf_{\delta \leq \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta} \mathbb{E} \frac{2}{\left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(Q')\right)^2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(Q^{1/2}Q^*Q^{1/2})}{2} \cdot \left\| Q^{*-1/2}(S - Q^*)Q^{*-1/2} \right\|_F^2 \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\gtrsim} \inf_{\delta \leq \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta} \frac{1}{\left(1 + \Delta^{1/2}\right)^2} \cdot \|S - Q^*\|_F^2 \\
&\gtrsim \inf_{\delta \leq \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Delta} \frac{1}{\left(1 + \Delta^{1/2}\right)^2} \cdot \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{op}}^2 \\
&\geq c_{\text{sep}} \frac{1}{\Delta} \delta^2
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_{\text{sep}} > 0$ is a constant small enough. Here (i) follows from the inequalities that $\lambda_{\max}(Q') \lesssim \lambda_{\max}(S) \lesssim \Delta$, $\lambda_{\min}(Q^{1/2}Q^*Q^{1/2}) \gtrsim \lambda_{\min}(Q)$ and $\mathbb{E}\lambda_{\min}(Q)^{1/2} \gtrsim 1$.

Combining results above, Assumption 4 holds with $c_\delta = 1/(2c_1)$, $\alpha_1 = 2$, $C_2 = 1$ and $c_2 = 1/c_{\text{sep}}$. The proof is then complete. \square

Recall the definition of $\gamma_1(\cdot)$ from Assumption 2 and the definition of α_1, c_δ, C_2 from Assumption 4. Denote $M_L := \gamma_1(L)$ for any $L > 0$. With these notations in place, we now present the continuity theorem for $Q^*(\cdot)$ as follows.

Lemma 30 (Hölder continuity of $Q^*(\cdot)$). *Suppose Assumption 1-5 hold. Then for any $L \geq e$ that satisfies $M_L > c_\delta$, any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$,*

$$\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| \leq C_H \max \left\{ \left(L^{C_2} M_L^{C_2+1} \right)^{1/\alpha_1} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1}, L^{C_2} M_L^{C_2+1} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \right\} \tag{73}$$

holds as long as constant C_H is large enough.

Proof. Note that $M_L \geq 1$ by the properties of γ_1 in Assumption 2. The proof is divided into 3 steps.

1. First, we should that $F(x, S)$ is Lipschitz in x for any fixed $S \in \mathcal{S}_d(M^{-1}, M)$.
2. Next, the Lipschitzness in step 1 and Assumption 4 imply the local Hölder continuity of $Q^*(x)$ with respect to x .
3. Then, an argument based on linear interpolation between x and \tilde{x} implies Lipschitz continuity for x, \tilde{x} separated far apart.

Combining the 3 step above finally gives (73).

To start with, note that Lemma 28 implies

$$Q^*(x) \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L), \quad \text{for any } x \in B(\mu, L)$$

Recall that $F(x, S) = \mathbb{E} [s(x, X)W^2(S, Q)]$.

1. F is Lipschitz in x : for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|F(x, S) - F(\tilde{x}, S)| &= |\mathbb{E}(x - \tilde{x})\Sigma^{-1}(X - \mu)W^2(S, Q)| \\
&\lesssim \|x - \tilde{x}\| \cdot \mathbb{E} \|(X - \mu)W^2(S, Q)\| \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \cdot \mathbb{E} \|X - \mu\| (\lambda_{\max}(S) + \lambda_{\max}(Q)) \\
&= \|x - \tilde{x}\| \cdot [\mathbb{E} \|X - \mu\| \lambda_{\max}(S) + \mathbb{E} \|X - \mu\| \lambda_{\max}(Q)] \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \|x - \tilde{x}\| (\lambda_{\max}(S) + 1)
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Here (i) follows from (29) in Lemma 17, and (ii) follows from the concentration of X (Assumption 1) and boundedness of Q given X (Assumption 2).

2. Local Hölder continuity: for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq F(x, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(x, Q^*(x)) \\
&= (F(x, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(\tilde{x}))) + \underbrace{(F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(x)))}_{\leq 0} + (F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(x)) - F(x, Q^*(x))) \\
&\leq |F(x, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(\tilde{x}))| + |F(\tilde{x}, Q^*(x)) - F(x, Q^*(x))| \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \cdot (\lambda_{\max}(Q^*(x)) + \lambda_{\max}(Q^*(\tilde{x})) + 2) \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} CM_L \|x - \tilde{x}\|
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

provided that constant $C > 0$ is large enough. Here (i) follows from (74) and (ii) follows since $Q^*(x), Q^*(\tilde{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)$ for $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$ by Lemma 28.

Note also that for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one has $\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| \leq M_L$. Recall the definition of $c_\delta, \alpha_1, \gamma_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ from Assumption 4. Then for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$ that satisfy

$$\|x - \tilde{x}\| \leq \frac{c_\delta^{\alpha_1}}{CM_L \gamma_2(L, M_L)} =: t_0 \tag{76}$$

one can obtain

$$\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| \leq (CM_L \gamma_2(L, M_L))^{1/\alpha_1} \cdot \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1} \tag{77}$$

To see this, note that first we have $\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| < c_\delta$ since otherwise Assumption 4 then implies that

$$F(x, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(x, Q^*(x)) > \frac{c_\delta^{\alpha_1}}{\gamma_2(L, M_L)} \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} CM_L \|x - \tilde{x}\|$$

Here (i) results from (76). This is a contradiction with (75). Next applying Assumption 4 with $\delta = \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|$ and $\Delta = M_L$ gives

$$F(x, Q^*(\tilde{x})) - F(x, Q^*(x)) \geq \frac{\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|^{\alpha_1}}{\gamma_2(L, M_L)}$$

which combined with (74) implies (77).

3. x, \tilde{x} far apart: for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$ such that $\|x - \tilde{x}\| > t_0$, let $K := \lceil \|x - \tilde{x}\| / t_0 \rceil$ and

$$x_k := \left(1 - \frac{k}{K}\right)x + \frac{k}{K}\tilde{x}, \quad k = 0, \dots, K$$

Then $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \leq t_0$, and one can apply (77) to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|Q^*(x_{k+1}) - Q^*(x_k)\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (CM_L \gamma_2(L, M_L))^{1/\alpha_1} \cdot \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^{1/\alpha_1} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (CM_L \gamma_2(L, M_L))^{1/\alpha_1} \cdot t_0^{1/\alpha_1} \\ &= K c_\delta \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\|x - \tilde{x}\|}{t_0} c_\delta \\ &\lesssim M_L \gamma_2(L, M_L) \cdot \|x - \tilde{x}\| \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Here the last line follows since c_δ is a constant defined in Assumption 4.

Finally, combine (77) and (78) to see that for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one has

$$\|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\| \lesssim \max \left\{ (M_L \gamma_2(L, M_L))^{1/\alpha_1} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1}, M_L \gamma_2(L, M_L) \|x - \tilde{x}\| \right\}$$

□

C Proof of Theorem 6

The proof is mainly divided into two steps:

- First, a uniform slow rate is shown by exploiting closed-form expressions for the optimal transport map and Assumption 4.
- Next, building upon the slow rate, a uniform fast(\sqrt{n}) rate is derived by further analyzing the Taylor expansion of the optimality condition.

Slow rate: Define the event

$$E_0 := \left\{ \|X_i - \mu\| \leq L, Q_i \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L), i \in [n] \right\}, \text{ where } L := C_L \sqrt{\log n}, M_L := \gamma_1(L) \tag{79}$$

We have $\mathbb{P}(E_0) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$ as long as constant $C_L > 0$ is large enough. To see this, note that Assumption 1 guarantees that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X_i - \mu\| \leq L, i \in [n]) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100}).$$

Assumption 2 then implies that $Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)$ whenever $\|X - \mu\| \leq L$.

With the above results in hand, the following lemma shows the uniform consistency of $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ with a potentially slow rate; see Appendix C.1 for the proof.

Lemma 31. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 6 and (79). Then under event E_0 , estimate $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \lambda_{\max} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) \right) \preceq \widetilde{M}_L \quad (80)$$

where $\widetilde{M}_L := C_{\widetilde{M}} M_L L^4$ for some constant $C_{\widetilde{M}}$ large enough.

Moreover, there exists an event $E_1 \subset E_0$ with probability $\mathbb{P}(E_1) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$ such that under E_1 , one has

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\| \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n^{1/(2\alpha_1)}} \quad (81)$$

Remark 32. *We remind readers that in Lemma 31, $\alpha_1 \geq 1$ is defined in Assumption 4. Therefore, Lemma 31 might only lead to a uniform convergence rate slower than \sqrt{n} . For example, it is shown in Lemma 29 that $\alpha = 2$ when X and Q are independent, which results by (81) in a uniform convergence rate of $n^{1/4}$. Such a slow rate is not enough to derive the asymptotic null distribution of our test statistic in Theorem 11. Therefore, we apply a finer analysis in the following part of proof to further boost the uniform convergence rate to $n^{1/2}$.*

Fast rate: Recall definitions of $Q^*(x)$ and $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ that

$$Q^*(x) = \underset{S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E} [s(x, X) W^2(S, Q)]$$

$$\widehat{Q}_n(x) = \underset{S \in \mathcal{S}_d^{++}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) W^2(S, Q_i)$$

First, the differential properties of W^2 (Lemma 17) imply the following optimality conditions for $Q^*(x)$ and $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$.

$$\mathbb{E} s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) = 0 \quad (82)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) = 0 \quad (83)$$

Next, one can apply Lemma 17 again to get the 2nd order Taylor expansion of (83) around $Q^*(x)$ as follows.

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) d^2 T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right)^{\otimes 2}$$

where $\tilde{Q}_n(x)$ lies between $Q^*(x)$ and $\hat{Q}_n(x)$. Rearranging then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) &= \left(\underbrace{-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: \Phi_n(x)} \right)^{-1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) (T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d)}_{=: A_n(x)} \\ &+ \left(\underbrace{-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: \Phi_n(x)} \right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) d^2 T_{\tilde{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: \Psi_n(x; \tilde{Q}_n(x))} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x))^{\otimes 2} \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Taking Frobenius norm on both sides of (84) gives the following quadratic inequality for $\|\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x)\|_F$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x)\|_F \\ &\leq \|\Phi_n(x)^{-1}\| \cdot \|A_n(x)\|_F + \frac{1}{2} \|\Phi_n(x)^{-1}\| \cdot \|\Psi_n(x, \tilde{Q}_n(x))\| \cdot \|\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x)\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

To get fast uniform rate of convergence, let us pause and define the population counterparts of A_n , Φ_n and Ψ_n as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_n(x) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) (T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d) \\ \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} \\ \tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) d^2 T_S^{Q_i} \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

With the above definition in place, we demonstrate below the uniform concentration of \tilde{A}_n , $\tilde{\Phi}_n$, $\tilde{\Psi}_n$ in Lemma 33 as well as their small deviation from A_n , Φ_n , Ψ_n in Lemma 34. The proofs are deferred to Appendix C.2 and C.3 respectively.

Note that by (79) and (81) in Lemma 31, the event E_1 defined in Lemma 31 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &\subset E_0 \cap \{Q^*(x) \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L), \forall x \in B_\mu(L)\} \\ &\cap \{\hat{Q}_n(x) \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L), \forall x \in B_\mu(L)\} \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough.

Lemma 33. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 6 and Lemma 31. Then there exists an event $E_2 \subset E_1$ with probability $\mathbb{P}(E_2) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$ under which*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{A}_n(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (87)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x)\| \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (88)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \|\tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S)\| \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (89)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) \right\| \leq \text{polylog}(n) \quad (90)$$

hold.

Lemma 34. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 6 and Lemma 31. Then the following inequalities*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| A_n(x) - \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\text{F}} \lesssim \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (91)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \Phi_n(x) - \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| \lesssim \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (92)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \Psi_n(x; S) - \tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) \right\| \lesssim \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (93)$$

hold with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Consequences of Lemma 33, 34 are gathered in the following lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix C.4.

Lemma 35. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 6 and Lemma 31. Then one has with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ that*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|A_n(x)\|_{\text{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (94)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \|\Psi_n(x, S)\| \leq \text{polylog}(n) \quad (95)$$

$$\inf_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \lambda_{\min}(-\Phi_n(x)) \geq \frac{1}{\text{polylog}(n)} \quad (96)$$

Thereby the operator $-\Phi_n$ is invertible and

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| -\Phi_n^{-1}(x) \right\| \leq \text{polylog}(n) \quad (97)$$

With Lemma 35 in place, one can then derive from (85) that the following quadratic inequality holds with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ uniformly for any $x \in B_\mu(L)$.

$$\left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq a_0 + a_2 \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2$$

Here $a_0, a_2 > 0$ are uniform for any $x \in B_\mu(L)$ and satisfies

$$a_0 = \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

$$a_2 = \text{polylog}(n)$$

Therefore, taking the supremum over x gives

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq a_0 + a_2 \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2$$

Solving the above quadratic inequality for $\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}$ then gives

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \in \left[0, \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4a_0a_2}}{2a_2} \right] \cup \left[\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4a_0a_2}}{2a_2}, +\infty \right)$$

Note that the slow rate of convergence (Lemma 31) suggests that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$, only the smaller branch should be retained. Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4a_0a_2}}{2a_2} \\ &= \frac{4a_0a_2}{2a_2(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4a_0a_2})} \\ &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$. The proof is then complete.

C.1 Proof of Lemma 31

Proof of (80): Denote $\widehat{\lambda}_{\max}(x) = \lambda_{\max}(\widehat{Q}_n(x))$. By the optimality condition for $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$, one has

$$I_d = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(X_i) T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i}$$

Recall that $T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^Q = \widehat{Q}_n(x)^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} Q \widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \widehat{Q}_n(x)^{-1/2}$, multiplying both sides by $\widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2}(\cdot)\widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2}$ then gives

$$\widehat{Q}_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(X_i) \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} Q_i \widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2}$$

Taking the largest eigenvalue on both sides, one has under E_0 that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\lambda}_{\max}(x) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |s_n(X_i)| \cdot \left\| \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} Q_i \widehat{Q}_n(x)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |s_n(X_i)| \cdot M_L^{1/2} \widehat{\lambda}_{\max}^{1/2}(x) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\lambda}_{\max}(x) &\leq M_L \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |s_n(X_i)| \right)^2 \\ &= M_L \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| 1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \right| \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim M_L \left(1 + \|x - \mu\| \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i - \mu\| \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum over x over both sides then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \widehat{\lambda}_{\max}(x) &\lesssim M_L \left(1 + L \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i - \mu\| \right)^2 \\ &\leq C_{\widetilde{M}} M_L L^4 =: \widetilde{M}_L \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_{\widetilde{M}} > 0$ large enough.

Proof of (81): For convenience, we recall the definition of $F(x, S)$, $F_n(x, S)$ and define $\widetilde{F}_n(x, S)$ here.

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, S) &= \mathbb{E} s(x, X) W^2(S, Q) \\ F_n(x, S) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) W^2(S, Q_i) \\ \widetilde{F}_n(x, S) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) W^2(S, Q_i) \end{aligned}$$

where $W^2(S, Q) = \text{tr} [Q + S - 2(S^{1/2} Q S^{1/2})^{1/2}]$.

To prove the convergence rate of \widehat{Q}_n (81), observe that for any $\delta_n, \epsilon_n > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\| \right\} \leq \delta_n \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\supset} \left\{ \inf_{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \leq \delta_n} F_n(x, S) < \inf_{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \geq \delta_n} F_n(x, S), \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\supset} \left\{ F_n(x, Q^*(x)) < \inf_{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \geq \delta_n} F_n(x, S), \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \cap \left\{ \widehat{Q}_n(x) \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d, \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\supset} \left\{ F_n(x, Q^*(x)) < \inf_{\substack{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \geq \delta_n \\ S \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d}} F_n(x, S), \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \cap \left\{ \widehat{Q}_n(x) \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d, \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \\ &\supset \underbrace{\left\{ \sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d}} |F_n(x, S) - F(x, S)| \leq \epsilon_n \right\}}_{\mathcal{E}_1} \cap \underbrace{\left\{ F(x, Q^*(x)) \leq \inf_{\substack{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \geq \delta_n \\ S \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d}} F(x, S) - 3\epsilon_n, \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\}}_{\mathcal{E}_2} \\ &\cap \underbrace{\left\{ \widehat{Q}_n(x) \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d, \forall x \in B_\mu(L) \right\}}_{\mathcal{E}_3} \end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

Here (i) and (iii) are due to Assumption 4 that $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ is the unique minimizer of $F_n(x, \cdot)$, (ii) follows by letting $S = Q^*(x)$.

With (98) in place, it suffices to choose appropriate δ_n, ϵ_n such that $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3$ occurs with high probability. To this end, we first find the uniform convergence rate ϵ_n so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) = 1 - O(n^{-100})$. Next, δ_n is set based on ϵ_n and properties of F so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) = 1 - O(n^{-100})$. For \mathcal{E}_3 , we already showed in (80) that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$. Combining results on $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ and \mathcal{E}_3 , the proof is then finished.

Analysis of \mathcal{E}_1 : for simplicity, denote $\theta = (x, S)$ and $\Theta = B_\mu(L) \times \mathcal{S}_d(\widetilde{M}_L^{-1}, \widetilde{M}_L)$. Let $F(\theta)$ denote $F(x, S)$ and similarly for other functions of (x, S) . By triangle inequality, one can

obtain

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |F_n(\theta) - F(\theta)| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |F_n(\theta) - \tilde{F}_n(\theta)|}_{\zeta_1} + \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\tilde{F}_n(\theta) - F(\theta)|}_{\zeta_2} \quad (99)$$

For any $t_1, t_2 > 0$, define $C_{\text{sup}}(t_1, t_2) := \sup \{W^2(Q, S) : Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(t_1^{-1}, t_1), S \in \mathcal{S}_d(t_2^{-1}, t_2)\}$. By Lemma 17, one has

$$C_{\text{sup}}(t_1, t_2) \lesssim t_1 + t_2 \quad (100)$$

Here dimension d is viewed as a fixed constant and absorbed into \lesssim .

- ζ_1 : under event E_0 (defined in (79)), one has $C_{\text{sup}}(M_L, \tilde{M}_L) \lesssim \tilde{M}_L$ since $M_L \lesssim \tilde{M}_L$. Lemma 23 then implies that there exists an event $E_{1,1} \subset E_0$ with probability $\mathbb{P}(E_{1,1}) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$ under which ζ_1 can be bounded as follows.

$$\zeta_1 \lesssim L^2 \tilde{M}_L \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (101)$$

- ζ_2 can be bounded by truncation and the uniform concentration in Lemma 24. Let $\tilde{L} \geq e$ be a parameter to be specified later, and let $M_{\tilde{L}} := \gamma_1(\tilde{L})$. Then Assumption 2 implies that a.s.

$$X \in B_\mu(\tilde{L}) \implies Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}}) \quad (102)$$

Let \tilde{X} be a truncated form of X defined by

$$\tilde{X} := \tilde{X}(\tilde{L}) = (X - \mu)I(\|X - \mu\| \leq \tilde{L}) + \mu \quad (103)$$

Let $\tilde{X}_> := X - \tilde{X}$. By definition, one has $\|\tilde{X} - \mu\| \leq \tilde{L}$ and

$$\tilde{X}_> = \begin{cases} 0, & \|X - \mu\| \leq \tilde{L} \\ X - \mu, & \|X - \mu\| > \tilde{L} \end{cases} \quad (104)$$

With these definitions in hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned} X - \mu &= (\tilde{X} - \mu) + (X - \tilde{X}) \\ &= (\tilde{X} - \mu) + \tilde{X}_> \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the following decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned} & s(x, X)W^2(S, Q) \\ &= \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - \mu)\right) W^2(S, Q) + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_> W^2(S, Q) \\ &= \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - \mu)\right) W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}\left(Q \in \mathcal{S}\left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - \mu)\right) W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}\left(Q \notin \mathcal{S}\left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_> W^2(S, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - \mu)\right) W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}\left(Q \in \mathcal{S}\left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}\left(Q \notin \mathcal{S}\left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}}\right)\right) + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_> W^2(S, Q) \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from (102). Indeed, if $Q \notin \mathcal{S} \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right)$, then as a result of (102), one has $\|X - \mu\| > \tilde{L}$ which then implies $\tilde{X} - \mu = 0$.

As a consequence, one can obtain then following decomposition of $\tilde{F}_n(\theta) - F(\theta)$.

$\tilde{F}_n(\theta) - F(\theta) = \alpha_1(\theta) + \alpha_2(\theta) + \alpha_3(\theta)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(\theta) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\tilde{X}_i - \mu) \right) W^2(S, Q_i) I \left(Q_i \in \mathcal{S} \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\tilde{X} - \mu) \right) W^2(S, Q) I \left(Q \in \mathcal{S} \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \\ \alpha_2(\theta) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,>} W^2(S, Q_i) - \mathbb{E} (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_{>} W^2(S, Q) \\ \alpha_3(\theta) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W^2(S, Q_i) I \left(Q_i \notin \mathcal{S} \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) - \mathbb{E} W^2(S, Q) I \left(Q \notin \mathcal{S} \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then triangle inequality gives

$$\zeta_2 \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_2(\theta)| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_3(\theta)| \quad (105)$$

– $\alpha_2(\theta), \alpha_3(\theta)$: $\sup |\alpha_2(\theta)|$ and $\sup |\alpha_3(\theta)|$ can be upper bounded as in Claim 1. The proof is deferred to Appendix C.1.1.

Claim 1. *By taking $\tilde{L} = C_{\tilde{L}} \sqrt{\log n}$ for some absolute constant $C_{\tilde{L}} > 0$ large enough, the following inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_2(\theta)| &\lesssim \tilde{M}_L L \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_3(\theta)| &\lesssim \tilde{M}_L \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

hold with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for n large enough.

– $\alpha_1(\theta)$: After truncation, $\alpha_1(\theta)$ is uniformly bounded. Hence $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)|$ can be upper bounded by applying Lemma 24. However, the term $g(Q; S) := (Q^{1/2} S Q^{1/2})^{1/2}$ in $W^2(Q, S)$ is only Hölder continuous in S which only implies Hölder (rather than Lipschitz) continuity of the corresponding sub-Gaussian norm. The non-asymptotic uniform concentration theorems in Wainwright (2019); Vershynin (2018) do not directly apply. It turns out that \sqrt{n} uniform convergence rate can still be attained under Hölder continuity. We state results in Claim 2 whose proof is deferred to Appendix C.1.2.

Claim 2. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Lemma 31 and Claim 1.*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \tilde{M}_L^2$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

– combine Claim 1, Claim 2 and (105) to see that

$$\zeta_2 \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \tilde{M}_L^2 \quad (106)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

- combining upper bounds on ζ_1, ζ_2 (101) (106) with (99), one has

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$$

by taking

$$\epsilon_n = C_\delta \widetilde{M}_L^2 \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for some constant $C_\delta > 0$ large enough.

Analysis of \mathcal{E}_2 : Note that $\|S - Q^*(x)\| \leq \max\{\|S\|, \|Q^*(x)\|\} \leq \widetilde{M}_L$, hence Assumption 4 implies that

$$\inf_{\substack{S: \|S - Q^*(x)\| \geq \delta_n \\ S \preceq \widetilde{M}_L I_d}} F(x, S) - F(x, Q^*(x)) \geq \inf_{S: \delta_n \leq \|S - Q^*(x)\| \leq \widetilde{M}_L} F(x, S) - F(x, Q^*(x))$$

Therefore, by setting $\delta_n = \left[3\epsilon_n \gamma_2(L, \widetilde{M}_L)\right]^{1/\alpha_1}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) = 1$ for n large enough.

Analysis of \mathcal{E}_3 : by (80) which is proved in the first half of the current lemma, one has $\mathcal{E}_3 \supset E_0$ (E_0 is defined in (79)). Therefore, one has

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$$

Combining $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3$: Finally, combining results on $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ and \mathcal{E}_3 above, one can obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\| \leq C \left[\frac{\widetilde{M}_L^2 \sqrt{\log n} \gamma_2(L, \widetilde{M}_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \right]^{1/\alpha_1}\right) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100}) \quad (107)$$

as long as constant C is large enough. Note that by definition, $L, \widetilde{M}_L, \gamma_2(L, \widetilde{M}_L) = \text{polylog}(n)$, the proof is then complete.

C.1.1 Proof of Claim 1

Proof for $\alpha_2(\theta)$: a crude upper bounded suffices here. By triangle inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_2(\theta)| \\
& \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \mathbb{E}(x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_> W^2(S, Q) \right| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,>} W^2(S, Q_i) \right| \\
& \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|x - \mu\| \cdot \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\| \cdot W^2(S, Q) + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - \mu\| \cdot \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\| \cdot W^2(S, Q_i) \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} L \left[\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \gamma_1(\|X - \mu\|) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \gamma_1(\|X_i - \mu\|) \right) \right] \\
& \lesssim L \left[\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + (\|X - \mu\| \vee 1)^{C_1} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + (\|X_i - \mu\| \vee 1)^{C_1} \right) \right] \\
& \lesssim L \left[\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \|X - \mu\|^{C_1} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \|X_i - \mu\|^{C_1} \right) \right] \\
& = L \left[\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \|\tilde{X}_>\|^{C_1} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\| \cdot \left(\tilde{M}_L + \|\tilde{X}_{i,>}\|^{C_1} \right) \right] \\
& = L \tilde{M}_L \left[\underbrace{2 \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\|}_{\alpha_{2,1}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_{i,>}\| - \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\|}_{\alpha_{2,2}} \right] + L \left[\underbrace{2 \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\|^{1+C_1}}_{\alpha_{2,3}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_{i,>}\|^{1+C_1} - \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_>\|^{1+C_1}}_{\alpha_{2,4}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 17 and Assumption 2.

- $\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,3}$: It suffices to bound $\mathbb{E} \|X_{i,>}\|^{1+c}$ for $c \geq 0$ and let $c = 0, C_1$ respectively. Recall the properties of $\tilde{X}_>$ in (104) that

$$\tilde{X}_> = \begin{cases} 0, & \|X - \mu\| \leq \tilde{L} \\ X - \mu, & \|X - \mu\| > \tilde{L} \end{cases}$$

Then for any $x > 0$, one has

$$\left\{ \|\tilde{X}_>\| > x \right\} = \left\{ \|X - \mu\| > (\tilde{L} \vee x) \right\} \quad (108)$$

First, note that by Lemma 2.6.8 in Vershynin (2018), one has $\|X - \mu\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_{\psi_2}$. Then apply (38) to see that there exists constant $C > 0$ only depending on C_{ψ_2} such that

for any constant $c \geq 0$, the following inequalities holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{X}_{>} \right\|^{1+c} &= (1+c) \int_0^\infty x^c \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \tilde{X}_{>} \right\| > x \right) dx \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} (1+c) \int_0^{\tilde{L}} x^c \mathbb{P} \left(\|X - \mu\| > \tilde{L} \right) dx + (1+c) \int_{\tilde{L}}^\infty x^c \mathbb{P} \left(\|X - \mu\| > x \right) dx \\
&\leq 2\tilde{L}^{1+c} \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) + 2(1+c) \int_{\tilde{L}}^\infty x^c \exp \left(-\frac{x^2}{C} \right) dx \\
&= 2\tilde{L}^{1+c} \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) + 2(1+c) \int_0^\infty (\tilde{L} + s)^{1+c} \exp \left(-\frac{(\tilde{L} + s)^2}{C} \right) ds \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \tilde{L}^{1+c} \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) + \int_0^\infty \left(\tilde{L}^{1+c} + s^{1+c} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2 + s^2}{C} \right) ds \\
&= \tilde{L}^{1+c} \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) + \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) \int_0^\infty \left(\tilde{L}^{1+c} + s^{1+c} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{s^2}{C} \right) ds \\
&\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) \left(\tilde{L}^{1+c} + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from (108), (ii) is a result of the convexity of x^{1+c} .

By letting $c = 0, C_1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{X}_{1,>} \right\| \lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) \left(\tilde{L} + 1 \right) \\
\alpha_{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{X}_{1,>} \right\|^{1+C_1} \lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) \left(\tilde{L}^{1+C_1} + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $\tilde{L} \gtrsim 1$, one has

$$\alpha_{2,1} \vee \alpha_{2,3} \lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}^2}{C} \right) \tilde{L}^{1+C_1}$$

By taking $\tilde{L} = C_{\tilde{L}} \sqrt{\log n}$ for $C_{\tilde{L}}$ large enough, one can obtain

$$\alpha_{2,1} \vee \alpha_{2,3} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{100}} \tag{109}$$

for n large enough.

- $\alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,4}$: For the constant $C_1 \geq 0$, by definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ in (37), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left\| \tilde{X}_{>} \right\|^{1+C_1} \right\|_{\psi_{2(1+C_1)^{-1}}} &= \left\| \left\| \tilde{X}_{>} \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}^{1+C_1} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\| X \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}^{1+C_1} \\
&\lesssim 1
\end{aligned}$$

Then by letting $c = 0, C_1$, Lemma 19, implies that for n large enough,

$$\alpha_{2,2} \vee \alpha_{2,4} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

- Combine the results above to see that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_2(\theta)| \lesssim L \widetilde{M}_L \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (110)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for n large enough.

Proof for $\alpha_3(\theta)$: Apply triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_3(\theta)| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \mathbb{E} W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}(Q \notin \mathcal{S}(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}})) \right| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W^2(S, Q_i) \mathbb{1}(Q_i \notin \mathcal{S}(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}})) \right| \\ & = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}(Q \notin \mathcal{S}(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}})) + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W^2(S, Q_i) \mathbb{1}(Q_i \notin \mathcal{S}(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}})) \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W^2(S, Q_i) \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{M}_L + \|X - \mu\|^{C_1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widetilde{M}_L + \|X_i - \mu\|^{C_1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{M}_L + (\|X - \mu\| + 1)^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widetilde{M}_L + (\|X_i - \mu\| + 1)^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) \\ & \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{M}_L + 1 + \|X - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widetilde{M}_L + 1 + \|X_i - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{M}_L + \|X - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widetilde{M}_L + \|X_i - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} \right) \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) \\ & = \underbrace{\widetilde{M}_L \mathbb{E} \mathbb{1}(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L}))}_{=:\alpha_{3,1}} + \underbrace{\widetilde{M}_L \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L}))}_{=:\alpha_{3,2}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{2 \mathbb{E} \|X - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} I(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L}))}_{=:\alpha_{3,3}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} I(X_i \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})) - \mathbb{E} \|X - \mu\|^{C_1 \vee 1} I(X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L}))}_{=:\alpha_{3,4}} \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from the fact that $S \in \mathcal{S}_d(\widetilde{M}_L^{-1}, \widetilde{M}_L)$, $Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(\gamma_1(\|X - \mu\|)^{-1}, \gamma_1(\|X - \mu\|))$ by Assumption 2 and (100). (ii) arises due to the convexity of $x^{1 \vee C_1}$. Note that $X \notin B_\mu(\widetilde{L})$ if and only if $\|X - \mu\| \geq \widetilde{L}$. By taking $\widetilde{L} = C_{\widetilde{L}} \sqrt{\log n}$ for $C_{\widetilde{L}}$ large enough, the following holds.

- $\alpha_{3,1}$: By Lemma 20 and centering,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|X - \mu\|\|_{\psi_2} & \lesssim \|X - \mu\|_{\psi_2} \\ & \lesssim \|X\|_{\psi_2} \end{aligned}$$

Then by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_\alpha}$, one can obtain

$$\alpha_{3,1} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\widetilde{L}^2}{CC_{\psi_2}}\right)$$

Hence

$$\alpha_{3,1} \leq \frac{1}{n^{101}} \quad (111)$$

for n large enough.

- $\alpha_{3,2}$: by Chernoff's inequality (Theorem 2.3.1, [Vershynin \(2018\)](#)), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\alpha_{3,2} \geq \frac{1}{n}\right) &\leq e^{-n\alpha_{3,1}} \cdot en\alpha_{3,1} \\ &\leq en\alpha_{3,1} \end{aligned}$$

As a result, (111) then implies that

$$\alpha_{3,2} < \frac{1}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for n large enough.

- $\alpha_{3,3}$: similar to $\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,3}$, one has

$$\alpha_{3,3} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{100}}$$

- $\alpha_{3,4}$: similar to $\alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,4}$, one has

$$\alpha_{3,4} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

- Combine results above to see that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_3(\theta)| \lesssim \widetilde{M}_L \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (112)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for n large enough.

Finally, combining (110) and (112) then proves Claim 1.

C.1.2 Proof of Claim 2

For convenience, recall that $L, \widetilde{L} \asymp \sqrt{\log n}$, $M_L := \gamma_1(L)$, $\widetilde{M}_L \asymp M_L L^4$ and $M_{\widetilde{L}} := \gamma_1(\widetilde{L})$. Denote $Z = (X, Q)$ and define \widetilde{X} as in (103). Define

$$f(Z; \theta) := \left(1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\widetilde{X} - \mu)\right) W^2(S, Q) \mathbb{1}\left(Q \in \mathcal{S}\left(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}}\right)\right)$$

Then one has $\alpha_1(\theta) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i; \theta) - \mathbb{E}f(Z; \theta)$. Apply triangle inequality to see that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)| = \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)| - \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)|}_{b_1} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)|}_{b_2} \quad (113)$$

Analysis of b_1 : due to truncation, f is uniformly bounded. To see this, note that recall the definition of Θ ,

$$\theta \in \Theta \iff x \in B_\mu(L), S \in \mathcal{S}_d(\widetilde{M}_L^{-1}, \widetilde{M}_L)$$

Then for any $\theta \in \Theta$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_Z |f(Z; \theta)| &= \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_Z \left| (1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\tilde{X} - \mu)) W^2(Q, S) \right| \mathbb{1} \left(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \\
&\lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_Z \left(1 + \|x - \mu\| \cdot \left\| \tilde{X} - \mu \right\| \right) \cdot |W^2(Q, S)| \mathbb{1} \left(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \\
&\lesssim (1 + L\tilde{L}) \cdot (M_{\tilde{L}} + \tilde{M}_L) \\
&\lesssim L\tilde{L}\tilde{M}_L
\end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

By Lemma 26, one has $\|b_1(x)\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L\tilde{L}\tilde{M}_L}{\sqrt{n}}$ which implies

$$b_1 \lesssim \frac{L\tilde{L}\tilde{M}_L \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{115}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Analysis of b_2 : to apply Lemma 24, we follow the steps below.

- first we define a metric d on Θ by

$$d(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \max \left\{ \|x - \tilde{x}\|_2, \left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_{\text{F}} \right\}$$

for any $\theta = (x, S)$ and $\tilde{\theta} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{S})$. Since $\mathcal{S}_d(\tilde{M}_L^{-1}, \tilde{M}_L)$ is a subset of $\left\{ S \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : |S_{ij}| \leq \tilde{M}_L \right\}$ (by noticing that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}_{\tilde{M}_L}^+$, one has $0 \leq S_{ii} \leq \tilde{M}_L$ and $|S_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{S_{ii}S_{jj}} \leq \tilde{M}_L$), the diameter D and metric entropy of Θ can be upper bounded by

$$D \leq \max \left\{ \text{diam}(B_\mu(L)), \text{diam}(\mathcal{S}_d(\tilde{M}_L^{-1}, \tilde{M}_L)) \right\} \lesssim L \vee \tilde{M}_L \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \tilde{M}_L \tag{116}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\log N(\epsilon; \Theta) &\leq \log \left(N(\epsilon; B_\mu(L)) \cdot N(\epsilon; \mathcal{S}_{\tilde{M}_L}^+) \right) \\
&\lesssim \log^+ \left(\frac{L \vee \tilde{M}_L}{\epsilon} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \log^+ \left(\frac{\tilde{M}_L}{\epsilon} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

Here both (i) and (ii) arise due to $\tilde{M}_L \asymp M_L L^4$.

- Next, let us consider the sub-Gaussian norm of $\alpha_1(\theta) - \alpha_1(\tilde{\theta})$ as (44) in Lemma 24. By (47) in Lemma 24, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \alpha_1(\theta) - \alpha_1(\tilde{\theta}) \right\|_{\psi_2} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| f(Z; \theta) - f(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| f(Z; x, S) - f(Z; \tilde{x}, \tilde{S}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \underbrace{\left\| \left\| f(Z; x, S) - f(Z; x, \tilde{S}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{\beta_1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \underbrace{\left\| \left\| f(Z; x, \tilde{S}) - f(Z; \tilde{x}, \tilde{S}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{\beta_2}
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

– β_1 : Let $g(Q; S) := (Q^{1/2}SQ^{1/2})^{1/2}$. Then for any $Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| g(Q; S) - g(Q; \tilde{S}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \left\| (Q^{1/2}SQ^{1/2})^{1/2} - (Q^{1/2}\tilde{S}Q^{1/2})^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| Q^{1/2}SQ^{1/2} - Q^{1/2}\tilde{S}Q^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \|Q\|_{\text{op}}^{1/2} \\ &\leq M_{\tilde{L}}^{1/2} \left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Here in the second inequality, we exploit the following the Hölder continuity of matrix square root in [Wihler \(2009\)](#); [Carlsson \(2018\)](#).

$$\left\| A^{1/2} - B^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq C_d \|A - B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2}$$

where C_d is a constant only depending on dimension d . Hence for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 &= \left\| \left\| f(X, Q; x, S) - f(X, Q; x, \tilde{S}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \left\| 1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - M_{\tilde{L}}u) \right\|_{\psi_2} \right\| \\ &\quad \cdot \left\| \left(g(Q; S) - g(Q; \tilde{S}) \right) \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\lesssim \left(1 + |x - \mu| \cdot \left\| \tilde{X} - \mu \right\|_{2, \psi_2} \right) \cdot M_{\tilde{L}}^{1/2} \left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim L \cdot M_{\tilde{L}}^{1/2} \left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

– β_2 : for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_2 &= \left\| (x - \tilde{x})^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\tilde{X} - \mu)W^2(Q, S) \mathbb{1} \left(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d \left(M_{\tilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\tilde{L}} \right) \right) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \left\| \tilde{X} - \mu \right\|_{\psi_2} \cdot (M_{\tilde{L}} + \tilde{M}_L) \\ &\lesssim \tilde{M}_L \|x - \tilde{x}\|_2 \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

Here (i) follows from [\(100\)](#).

– As a result of [\(119\)](#) and [\(120\)](#), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| f(Z; \theta) - f(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\|_{\psi_2} &\leq \beta_1 + \beta_2 \\ &\lesssim LM_{\tilde{L}}^{1/2} d(\theta, \tilde{\theta})^{1/2} + \tilde{M}_L d(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \\ &\lesssim L\tilde{M}_L \left(d(\theta, \tilde{\theta})^{1/2} \vee d(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

Combining [\(118\)](#) and [\(121\)](#) then gives

$$\left\| \alpha_1(\theta) - \alpha_1(\tilde{\theta}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L\tilde{M}_L}{\sqrt{n}} \left(d(\theta, \tilde{\theta})^{1/2} \vee d(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \right)$$

Hence $\tau(\epsilon)$ in [Lemma 24](#) can be chosen as

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\epsilon^{1/2} \vee \epsilon \right), \quad K = C_f L\tilde{M}_L \tag{122}$$

- by Lemma 24, one has

$$b_2 := \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(Z; \theta)| \lesssim \underbrace{\frac{KD}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ D}}_{\zeta_1} + \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} |\alpha_1(Z; \theta)|}_{\zeta_2}$$

- ζ_1 : by (46) in Lemma 24 and (116), one can obtain

$$\zeta_1 \lesssim \frac{L\widetilde{M}_L^2}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ \widetilde{M}_L} \quad (123)$$

- ζ_2 : For any $\theta \in \Theta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(Z; \theta)\|_{\psi_2} &\leq \| \|f(Z; \theta)\| \|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \left\| \left\| 1 + (x - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\widetilde{X} - \mu) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\quad \cdot \sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}_d(\widetilde{M}_L^{-1}, \widetilde{M}_L)} \left[W^2(Q, S) \mathbb{1} \left(Q \in \mathcal{S}_d \left(M_{\widetilde{L}}^{-1}, M_{\widetilde{L}} \right) \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim \left(1 + \|x - \mu\| \left\| \widetilde{X} - \mu \right\|_{\psi_2} \right) \cdot (M_{\widetilde{L}} + \widetilde{M}_L) \\ &\lesssim L\widetilde{M}_L \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for any $\theta \in \Theta$, one has $\|\alpha_1(\theta)\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim L\widetilde{M}_L/\sqrt{n}$ and

$$\mathbb{E} |\alpha_1(Z; \theta)| \lesssim \|\alpha_1(\theta)\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L\widetilde{M}_L}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Take supremum over $\theta \in \Theta$ to see that

$$\zeta_2 \lesssim \frac{L\widetilde{M}_L}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (124)$$

- As a result of (123) and (124), one can obtain

$$b_2 \lesssim \frac{L\widetilde{M}_L^2}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ \widetilde{M}_L} \quad (125)$$

Finally, combine (113), (115) and (125) to see that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\alpha_1(\theta)| \leq b_1 + b_2 \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} L\widetilde{M}_L^2 \quad (126)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$ for n large enough. The proof is then complete.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 33

If X is unbounded, then one can apply the truncation as (103) and follow similar arguments as in Lemma 31. Hence we can assume without loss of generality that $\|X - \mu\| \leq \widetilde{L}$ almost surely with $\widetilde{L} = C_{\widetilde{L}} \sqrt{\log n}$ for some constant $C_{\widetilde{L}}$ large enough. Moreover, note that all the constants in Claim 1 are independent of L (recall that $L := C_L \sqrt{\log n}$ is defined in (79)), hence one can further assume without loss of generality that $\widetilde{L} = L$ by possibly enlarging either C_L or $C_{\widetilde{L}}$. Then we have a.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \|X - \mu\| &\leq L \\ Q, Q^*(X) &\in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ \mathbb{1}(E_0) &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

where we remind reader that $E_0 := \{\|X_i - \mu\| \leq L, Q_i \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L), i \in [n]\}$ is defined in (79).

Proof of (87): one can obtain the following decomposition.

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F \leq \underbrace{\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F - \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F}_{a_1} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F}_{a_2} \quad (128)$$

Define $\varphi(Z; x) = s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right)$.

Analysis of a_1 : By (127), one has almost surely that for any $x \in B_\mu(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(Z; x)\|_F &\lesssim (1 + \|x - \mu\| \cdot \|X - \mu\|) \cdot \sup_{Q, \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_{\tilde{Q}}^Q - I_d \right\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} L^2 M_L^2 \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows by noticing that

$$\sup_{Q, \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_{\tilde{Q}}^Q \right\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{Q, \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| \tilde{Q}^{-1/2} (\tilde{Q}^{1/2} Q \tilde{Q}^{1/2})^{1/2} \tilde{Q}^{-1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq M_L^2$$

Lemma 26 then implies that $\|a_1\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L^2 M_L^2}{\sqrt{n}}$. Therefore, one can obtain

$$a_1 \lesssim L^2 M_L^2 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (129)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Analysis of a_2 : to apply Lemma 24, we follow the steps below.

- First, we consider the sub-Gaussian norm of $\left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F - \left\| \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|_F$ as (44) in Lemma 24. For any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one has

$$\left\| \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_F - \left\| \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \left\| \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) - \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2} \quad (130)$$

Note that

$$\tilde{A}_n(x) - \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[s(x, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) - s(\tilde{x}, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) \right]$$

Since $\mathbb{E} \tilde{A}_n(x) = 0$ by (82), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) - \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2} &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) - s(\tilde{x}, X) \left(T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) - s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q - I_d \right) - s(\tilde{x}, X) \left(T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_F \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_2} \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

Here (i) follows from (47) in Lemma 24.

– b_1 : For any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, one has $Q^*(x), Q^*(\tilde{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)$. Then one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1 &= \left\| \left\| s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\| 1 + \|x - \mu\| \cdot \|X - \mu\| \cdot \left\| T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\| 1 + \|x - \mu\| \cdot \|X - \mu\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\lesssim L \cdot \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - T_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} L \cdot \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| dT_{Q'}^Q \cdot (Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} L \cdot \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| dT_S^Q \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\lesssim} LM_L^3 \cdot \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}} \tag{132}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) is a consequence of the mean value theorem (Dudley and Norvaiša, 2011, Theorem 5.3) for some Q' that lies between $Q^*(x)$ and $Q^*(\tilde{x})$, (ii) arises from Lemma 18, and (iii) follows from Lemma 17.

– b_2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
b_2 &\leq \left\| \left\| (x - \tilde{x}) \Sigma^{-1} (X - \mu) \right\|_{\psi_2} \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \left\| \left\| X - \mu \right\|_{\psi_2} \right\| M_L^2 \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} M_L^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\| \tag{133}
\end{aligned}$$

almost surely. Here (i) arises due to Lemma 20, and (ii) follows from bounds on T_S^Q in Lemma 17.

Combining (130), (131), (132) and (133) gives that for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} - \left\| \tilde{A}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot LM_L^3 (\|x - \tilde{x}\| + \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}}) \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot LM_L^3 \left(\|x - \tilde{x}\| + M_L \gamma_2(L, M_L) \left(\|x - \tilde{x}\|_2 \vee \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1} \right) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot L^{1+C_2} M_L^{4+C_2} \left(\|x - \tilde{x}\|_2 \vee \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1} \right) \tag{134}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 30 and the fact that $M \gamma_2(L, M) \geq 1$.

- With the Hölder continuity (134) in place, we can apply Lemma 24 with $\tau(\epsilon)$ chosen as

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\epsilon^{1/\alpha_1} \vee \epsilon \right), \quad K = CL^{1+C_2} M_L^{4+C_2}$$

which gives

$$a_2 \lesssim \frac{KL^{1 \vee \alpha_1^{-1}}}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L} + \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{=} \underbrace{\frac{KL}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L}}_{\zeta_1} + \underbrace{\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}}_{\zeta_2}$$

Here (i) follows since $\alpha_1 \geq 1$ as defined in Assumption 4.

– ζ_1 : direct calculation gives that

$$\zeta_1 \lesssim \frac{L^{2+C_2} M_L^{4+C_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L} \quad (135)$$

– ζ_2 : for any $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with unit Frobenius norm, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \left\| \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_{\mathbb{F}}=1} \left\| \left\langle U, \tilde{A}_n(x) \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_{\mathbb{F}}=1} \left\| \left\langle U, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(Z_i; x) - \mathbb{E} \varphi(Z; x) \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_{\mathbb{F}}=1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle U, \varphi(Z; x) \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \varphi(Z; x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} L \cdot M_L^2 \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) results from Lemma 20, (ii) follows from independence. Therefore,

$$\zeta_2 \lesssim \frac{LM_L^2}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (136)$$

• As a result of (135) and (136), one can obtain

$$a_2 \lesssim \frac{L^{2+C_2} M_L^{4+C_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L} \quad (137)$$

Finally, combining (128), (129) and (137) gives (87).

Proof of (88): one can obtain the following decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| - \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\|}_{a_3} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\|}_{a_4} \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

Let $Z = (X, Q)$. Define $\phi(Z; x) = s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q$.

Analysis of a_3 : By (127), one has almost surely that for any $x \in B_\mu(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \phi(Z; x) \right\| &\lesssim L^2 \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| dT_Q^S \right\| \\ &\lesssim L^2 M_L^3 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 26, one then can obtain

$$\|a_3\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L^2 M_L^3}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (139)$$

Analysis of a_4 : to apply Lemma 24, we follow the steps below.

- First, let us consider the sub-Gaussian norm of $\left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\|$. For any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$, by (47) in Lemma 24, one can obtain

$$\left\| \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \phi(Z; x) - \phi(Z; \tilde{x}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \quad (140)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \phi(Z; x) - \phi(Z; \tilde{x}) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ = & \left\| \left\| s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q - s(\tilde{x}, X) dT_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ \leq & \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q - s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_3} + \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q - s(\tilde{x}, X) dT_{Q^*(\tilde{x})}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_4} \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

- b_3 : we have for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_3 & \stackrel{(i)}{=} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) d^2 T_{Q'}^Q \cdot (Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ & \lesssim L \|X - \mu\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| \\ & \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} L \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

Here (i) is a consequence of the mean value theorem (Dudley and Norvaiša, 2011, Theorem 5.3) for some Q' that lies between $Q^*(x)$ and $Q^*(\tilde{x})$ and (ii) follows from Lemma 17.

- b_4 : for any $x, \tilde{x} \in B_\mu(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_4 & \leq \left\| \left\| s(x, X) - s(\tilde{x}, X) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| dT_S^Q \right\| \\ & \lesssim M_L^3 \|x - \tilde{x}\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

Combining (140), (141), (142) and (143), one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(\tilde{x}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot L \text{poly}(M_L) (\|x - \tilde{x}\| + \|Q^*(x) - Q^*(\tilde{x})\|_{\mathbb{F}}) \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \text{poly}(L, M_L) \left(\|x - \tilde{x}\| \vee \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{1/\alpha_1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

- With the Hölder continuity above, we can apply Lemma 24 with $\tau(\epsilon)$ chosen as

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\epsilon^{1/\alpha_1} \vee \epsilon \right), \quad K = \text{poly}(L, M_L)$$

which gives

$$a_4 \lesssim \underbrace{\frac{KL}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L}}_{\zeta_3} + \underbrace{\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\|}_{\zeta_4}$$

– ζ_3 : direct calculation gives

$$\zeta_3 \lesssim \frac{\text{poly}(L, M_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (144)$$

– ζ_4 : for any $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with unit Frobenius norm, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_F = \|V\|_F = 1} \left\| \left\langle V, \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_F = \|V\|_F = 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle V, [\phi(Z; x) - E\phi(Z; x)] \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \sup_{\|U\|_F = \|V\|_F = 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle V, \phi(Z; x) \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \phi(Z; x) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| \left\| dT_S^Q \right\| \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} LM_L^3 \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) results from Lemma 20, (ii) follows from independence and (iii) is due to Lemma 17. Hence

$$\zeta_4 \lesssim \frac{LM_L^3}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (145)$$

• As a result of (144) and (145), one can obtain

$$a_4 \lesssim \frac{\text{poly}(L, M_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (146)$$

Finally, combining (138), (139) and (146) gives (88).

Proof of (89): Denote $\Theta = B_\mu(L) \times \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)$ and $\theta = (x, S) \in \Theta$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| \right\| &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| \right\| - \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| \right\|}_{a_5} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| \right\|}_{a_6} \end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

Let $Z = (X, Q)$. Define $\psi(Z; \theta) = s(x, X) d^2 T_S^Q$ and $\bar{\psi}(Z; \theta) = \psi(Z; \theta) - \mathbb{E} \psi(Z; \theta)$
Analysis of a_5 : By (127), one has almost surely that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Z, \theta} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) \right\| \right\| &\leq \sup_{x, X \in B_\mu(L)} |s(x, X)| \cdot \sup_{Q, S \in \mathcal{S}((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)} \left\| \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| \right\| \\ &\lesssim L^2 \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 26 then implies that $\|a_5\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{L^2 \cdot \text{poly}(M_L)}{\sqrt{n}}$. Therefore, one can obtain

$$a_5 \lesssim L^2 \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (148)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Analysis of a_6 : to apply Lemma 24, we follow the steps below.

- First, let us consider the sub-Gaussian norm of $\left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right\|$.

For any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$, one has

$$\left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \quad (149)$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 24. Moreover, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) - \psi(Z; \tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &= \left\| \left\| s(x, X) d^2 T_S^Q - s(\tilde{x}, X) d^2 T_{\tilde{S}}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) d^2 T_S^Q - s(x, X) d^2 T_{\tilde{S}}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_5} + \underbrace{\left\| \left\| s(x, X) d^2 T_{\tilde{S}}^Q - s(\tilde{x}, X) d^2 T_{\tilde{S}}^Q \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2}}_{b_6} \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

– b_5 : for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_5 &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) d^3 T_{Q'}^Q \cdot (S - \tilde{S}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \|s(x, X)\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \|S - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{F}} \cdot \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| d^3 T_S^Q \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} L \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \|S - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{F}} \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

Here (i) is a consequence of the mean value theorem (Dudley and Norvaiša, 2011, Theorem 5.3) for some Q' that lies between $Q^*(x)$ and $Q^*(\tilde{x})$ and (ii) follows from Lemma 17.

– b_6 : for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} b_6 &\leq \|s(x, X) - s(\tilde{x}, X)\|_{\psi_2} \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| \\ &\lesssim \text{poly}(M_L) \|x - \tilde{x}\| \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

Combining (140), (150), (151) and (152), one can obtain

$$\left\| \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\| - \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(\tilde{\theta}) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \text{poly}(L, M_L) d(\theta, \tilde{\theta})$$

- With the Lipschitz continuity above, we can apply Lemma 24 with $\tau(\epsilon)$ chosen as

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} \epsilon, \quad K = C \cdot \text{poly}(L, M_L)$$

which gives

$$a_6 \lesssim \underbrace{\frac{KL}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\log^+ L}}_{\zeta_5} + \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \right\|}_{\zeta_6}$$

– ζ_5 : direct calculation gives

$$\zeta_5 \lesssim \frac{\text{poly}(L, M_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (153)$$

– ζ_6 : for any $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with unit Frobenius norm, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left\langle V, \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta) \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle V, [\psi(Z; \theta) - \mathbb{E}\psi(Z; \theta)] \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\langle V, \psi(Z; \theta) \cdot U \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| \psi(Z; \theta) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \left\| s(x, X) \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \cdot \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} L \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \end{aligned}$$

which combined with Lemma 20 implies

$$\zeta_6 \lesssim \frac{L \text{poly}(M_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (154)$$

• As a result of (153) and (154), one can obtain

$$a_6 \lesssim \frac{\text{poly}(L, M_L)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (155)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$.

Finally, combining (147), (148) and (155) gives (89).

Proof of (90): by definition, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, Q)} \left[s(x, X) d^2 T_S^Q \right]$$

Therefore, by the truncation assumption (127), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Psi}_n(x; S) \right\| \\ &\leq \left[\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \mathbb{E} |s(x, X)| \right] \cdot \left[\sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} L \cdot \text{poly}(M_L) \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 17.

Finally, note that by definition, $L \asymp \sqrt{\log n}$ and $M_L = \text{poly}(L)$, one can obtain (90).

C.3 Proof of Lemma 34

As argued at the beginning of Appendix C.2, we can assume without loss of generality that $\|X - \mu\| \leq L$ almost surely with L defined in (79). As a result, we have almost surely that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X - \mu\| &\leq L \\ Q, Q^*(X) &\in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \\ \mathbb{1}(E_0) &= 1 \end{aligned} \tag{156}$$

where $E_0 := \{\|X_i - \mu\| \leq L, Q_i \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L), i \in [n]\}$.

With boundedness condition (156) in place, Lemma 17 implies the following upper bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\lesssim M_L \\ \sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L)} \left\| dT_S^Q \right\| &\lesssim M_L^3 \\ \sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}(\widetilde{M}_L^{-1}, \widetilde{M}_L)} \left\| d^2 T_S^Q \right\| &\lesssim M_L^8 \end{aligned}$$

almost surely. Applying Lemma 23 then gives the desired results.

C.4 Proof of Lemma 35

Proof of (94): apply the triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|A_n(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| A_n(x) - \widetilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widetilde{A}_n(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 33 and Lemma 34

Proof of (95): apply the triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \Psi_n(x, S) \right\| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \Psi_n(x, S) - \widetilde{\Psi}_n(x, S) \right\| + \sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \widetilde{\Psi}_n(x, S) - \mathbb{E} \widetilde{\Psi}_n(x, S) \right\| \\ &\quad + \sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \widetilde{\Psi}_n(x, S) \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} + \text{polylog}(n) \\ &\leq \text{polylog}(n) \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from Lemma 33 and Lemma 34.

Proof of (96), (97): By the remark after Assumption 5 and the eigenvalue stability inequality, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{x \in B_{\mu(L)}} \lambda_{\min}(-\Phi_n(x)) \\
& \geq \inf_{x \in B_{\mu(L)}} \lambda_{\min}(-\mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x)) - \sup_{x \in B_{\mu(L)}} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| - \sup_{x \in B_{\mu(L)}} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x) \right\| \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\text{polylog}(n)} - \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{\text{polylog}(n)}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows by noticing that $\mathbb{E}(-\tilde{\Phi}_n(x)) = \mathbb{E}\left(-s(x, X)dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q\right)$, Assumption 5 and applying Lemma 33, Lemma 34.

By the remark after Assumption 5 and (96), one then has

$$\left\| -\Phi_n^{-1}(x) \right\| = \lambda_{\max}(-\Phi_n^{-1}(x)) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(-\Phi_n(x))}$$

Then (97) follows from (96).

D Proof of Theorem 7

To simplify notation, we fix x and write Q^* for $Q^*(x)$, \hat{Q}_n for $\hat{Q}_n(x)$ when there is no ambiguity.

Following the same argument as (84) in Appendix C, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{(X, Q) \sim \mathbb{P}} s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) = 0 \tag{157} \\
& \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right) = \left(\underbrace{-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: \Phi_n(x)} \right)^{-1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right)}_{=: a_n(x)} \\
& + \left(\underbrace{-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: \Phi_n(x)} \right)^{-1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) d^2 T_{Q_n(x)}^{Q_i}}_{=: b_n(x)} \cdot \left(\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right)^{\otimes 2} \tag{158}
\end{aligned}$$

Analysis of $\Phi_n(x)$: Lemma 33 and 34 together imply that for any fixed x ,

$$\Phi_n(x) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E} \left[-s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right]$$

Then by Assumption 5, one has

$$[\Phi_n(x)]^{-1} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(-s(x, X) dT_{Q^*(x)}^Q \right) \right]^{-1} \tag{159}$$

Analysis of $b_n(x)$: Theorem 6, Lemma 33 and 34 together imply that for any fixed x , with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,

$$|b_n(x)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) d^2 T_{Q_n(x)}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_F^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \cdot \text{polylog}(n) \cdot \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \\
&= \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}
\end{aligned} \tag{160}$$

Analysis of $a_n(x)$: by Lemma 21, one has $s(x, X) = \vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \vec{X}$ and $s_n(x, X) = \vec{x}^\top \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} \vec{X}$. Hence one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
a_n(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{x}^\top \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} \vec{X}_i \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\
&= \left(\vec{x}^\top \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{X}_i \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\
&= \underbrace{\left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{X}_i \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right)}_{=: a_{n,1}(x)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sqrt{n} \left(\vec{x}^\top (\widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} - \vec{\Sigma}^{-1}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right)}_{=: a_{n,2}(x)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sqrt{n} \left(\vec{x}^\top (\widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} - \vec{\Sigma}^{-1}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{X}_i \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) - \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right]}_{=: a_{n,3}(x)}
\end{aligned} \tag{161}$$

- $a_{n,1}(x)$: by (157) and Lemma 21, one can obtain

$$\mathbb{E} a_{n,1}(x) = 0 \tag{162}$$

To see this, it suffices to show $\mathbb{E} \left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right) = 0$. Direct computation shows that the LHS of the equality is equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \vec{X} \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) = \mathbb{E} s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) = 0$$

Here the equality follows from the optimality condition (157).

- $a_{n,2}(x)$: using the formula $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}$, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{n,2}(x) &= \sqrt{n} \left(\vec{x}^\top \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1} (\vec{\Sigma} - \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1}) \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\
&= \sqrt{n} \left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} (\vec{\Sigma} - \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}) \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{n} \left(\vec{x}^\top (\vec{\Sigma}^{-1} - \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1}) (\vec{\Sigma} - \widehat{\vec{\Sigma}}^{-1}) \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} (\vec{X}_i \vec{X}_i^\top - \vec{\Sigma}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \vec{X} \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{163}$$

Here the last line follows from the fact that $\widehat{\vec{\Sigma}} - \vec{\Sigma} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ which is itself due to the sub-Gaussianity of X .

- $a_{n,3}(x)$: note that $\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{X}_i \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) - \mathbb{E}\vec{X} \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)\right] = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ again by the sub-Gaussianity of X and Assumption 2, one can obtain

$$a_{n,3}(x) = O_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad (164)$$

Combining (161), (162), (163), (164) and the functional central limit theorem (Hsing and Eubank, 2015, Theorem 7.7.6), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_n(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\vec{X}_i \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} (\vec{X}_i \vec{X}_i^\top - \vec{\Sigma}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}\vec{X} \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right) \right] + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{w} Z_x \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

where $Z_x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Xi_x)$ is a Gaussian random matrix with mean 0 and covariance Ξ_x . Here $\Xi_x := \mathbb{E}V_x \otimes V_x$ with

$$V_x = s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) - \left(\vec{x}^\top \vec{\Sigma}^{-1} (\vec{X} \vec{X}^\top - \vec{\Sigma}) \otimes I_d \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}\vec{X} \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right)$$

Finally, (158), (159), (160) and (165) together imply

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{Q}_n - Q^* \right) \xrightarrow{w} \left(-\mathbb{E}s(x, X) dT_{Q^*}^Q \right)^{-1} \cdot Z_x$$

which completes the proof.

E Proof of Corollary 9

The optimality condition for $Q^*(x)$ implies that

$$\mathbb{E}s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) = 0$$

Note that independence between X and Q implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}s(x, X) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) &= \mathbb{E}s(x, X) \mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}s(x, X) = 1$. Therefore, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d \right) = 0$$

By independence, the above equality then implies

$$\mathbb{E}\vec{X} \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) = 0$$

Hence one has $V_{x,2} = 0$, the proof is then complete.

F Proof of Theorem 11

First, we demonstrate in Lemma 36 below uniform fast convergence under Assumption 1, 2, 5, 6 and the null hypothesis. In order to apply Theorem 6, it suffices to verify Assumption 5 and Assumption 4. Note that Assumption 6 and the null implies the independence between X and Q , then both Assumption 5 and 4 are consequences of Lemma 29.

Lemma 36. *Instate the assumptions in Theorem 11. Then with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L_n)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_F &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*(X_i) \right\|_F &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

With Lemma 36 in place, we consider the Taylor expansion of the optimality condition for $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$. Recall that the optimality condition for $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ gives

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{\widehat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) = 0$$

Then one can apply Lemma 17 to get the following 2nd order Taylor expansion around $Q^*(x)$.

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right) + R_2(x) \quad (166)$$

where $R_2(x)$ is the 2nd order remainder term with some $\widetilde{Q}_n(x)$ lying between $Q^*(x)$ and $\widehat{Q}_n(x)$ defined as follows.

$$R_2(x) := \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) d^2 T_{\widetilde{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right)^{\otimes 2}$$

Under the null hypothesis (18), one has $Q^*(x) \equiv Q^*$ and (166) reduces to

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_n(x, X_i) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right) + R_2(x) \quad (167)$$

Setting $x = \bar{X}$ in (167) then gives

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right) + R_2(x) \quad (168)$$

Take difference between (167) and (168) and rearrange, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\underbrace{\left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \right) \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)}_{=:\tau(x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{(s_n(x, X_i) - 1) \left(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d \right)}_{=:\alpha_0(x)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{(s_n(x, X_i) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \cdot \left(\widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right)}_{=:\alpha_1(x)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{R_2(x) - R_2(\bar{X})}_{=:\alpha_2(x)} \end{aligned} \quad (169)$$

Before delving further into the proof, we pause to introduce more notations. Define

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = \left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right) \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}))$$

Then by definition, the test statistic $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\tau}(X_i)\|_F^2$, and we the following decomposition of $\tau(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}(x) &= \tau(x) + \hat{\tau}(x) - \tau(x) \\ &= \tau(x) + \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right)}_{=: \alpha_3(x)} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})) \\ &= \alpha_0(x) + \underbrace{\alpha_1(x) + \alpha_2(x) + \alpha_3(x)}_{=: R(x)} \end{aligned}$$

We also define counterparts of $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_2$ and R_2 by replacing $s_n(\cdot, \cdot)$ with $s(\cdot, \cdot)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_0(x) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s(x, X_i) - 1)(T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \\ \tilde{\alpha}_1(x) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s(x, X_i) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})) \\ \tilde{\alpha}_2(x) &:= \tilde{R}_2(x) - \tilde{R}_2(\bar{X}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{R}_2(x) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) d^2 T_{\hat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*)^{\otimes 2}$$

With the above notation in place, one can obtain

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \|\alpha_0(X_k)\|_F^2 + \underbrace{2 \sum_{k=1}^n \langle \alpha_0(X_k), R(X_k) \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^n \|R(X_k)\|_F^2}_{\text{Rem}_n} \quad (170)$$

The proof is then divided into three steps.

- First, we give upper bounds for $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ as well as $\tilde{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i$ and their consequences.
- Next, we show that the remainder term Rem_n is negligible.
- Then, we demonstrate that $\sum_i \|\alpha_0(X_i)\|_F^2$ converges weakly to the desired asymptotic null distribution (24).

Analysis of $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\alpha} - \alpha$: We give uniform upper bounds for $\tilde{\alpha}_i(x) - \alpha_i(x)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ in Lemma 37 as uniform upper bounds for $\tilde{\alpha}_i(x)$ and $\alpha_3(x)$ in Lemma 38; see Appendix F.1, F.2 for the proof.

Lemma 37. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 11.*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_0(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_0(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (171)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_1(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_1(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (172)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_2(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_2(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n^{3/2}} \quad (173)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$.

Lemma 38. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 11.*

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{\alpha}_0(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (174)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{\alpha}_1(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (175)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{\alpha}_2(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (176)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_3(x)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (177)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$.

With the above lemmas in place, one can readily obtain that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$,

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|\alpha_0(X_i)\|_F \leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_0(X_i) - \alpha_0(X_i)\|_F + \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_0(X_i)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (178)$$

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|\alpha_1(X_i)\|_F \leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_1(X_i) - \alpha_1(X_i)\|_F + \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_1(X_i)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (179)$$

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|\alpha_2(X_i)\|_F \leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_2(X_i) - \alpha_2(X_i)\|_F + \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{\alpha}_2(X_i)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (180)$$

which then implies

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|R(X_i)\|_F \leq \sum_{k=1}^3 \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\alpha_k(X_i)\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n} \quad (181)$$

Negligibility of Rem_n : We consider two terms $\sum_{k=1}^n \langle \alpha_0(X_k), R(X_k) \rangle$ and $\sum_{k=1}^n \|R(X_k)^2\|_F$ separately.

Analysis of $\sum_{k=1}^n \langle \alpha_0(X_k), R(X_k) \rangle$: By (178) and (181), one has with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \langle \alpha_0(X_k), R(X_k) \rangle &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|\alpha_0(X_k)\|_F \cdot \|R(X_k)\|_F \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n^{3/2}} \\ &= \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

Analysis of $\sum_{k=1}^n \|R(X_k)^2\|_F$: Similarly, by (181), one has with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \|R(X_k)^2\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n}$$

Therefore, the above results imply that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-99})$,

$$\text{Rem}_n \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (182)$$

Analysis of α_0 : To consider the main term $\sum_{i=1}^n \|\alpha_0(X_i)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^n \|\alpha_0(X_k)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n (X_k - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} (X_i - \bar{X}) (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d), \sum_{j=1}^n (X_k - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} (X_j - \bar{X}) (T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d) \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} (X_k - \bar{X}) (X_k - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} (X_j - \bar{X}) \langle T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d, T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} (X_j - \bar{X}) \langle T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d, T_{Q^*}^{Q_j} - I_d \rangle \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1/2} (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1/2} (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \\
&= \left[(\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \Sigma^{1/2}) \otimes I_d \right] \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \right] \\
&= (1 + o_p(1)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d)
\end{aligned} \tag{183}$$

Also, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \right) - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_i - \mu) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (\mu - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \\
&= \Sigma^{-1/2} (\mu - \bar{X}) \otimes \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \right] \\
&= o_p(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{184}$$

Here the last line follows since $\bar{X} - \mu = o_p(1)$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d)$ is asymptotically normal with zero mean. The zero mean is justified in the following claim whose proof is deferred to Appendix F.3.

Claim 3. *Under the null hypothesis (18) and Assumption 4, 6, X and Q are independent and one has*

$$\mathbb{E}(X - \mu) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) = 0 \tag{185}$$

$$\mathbb{E}(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) = 0 \tag{186}$$

Claim 3 also implies that $\mathbb{E} \Sigma^{-1/2} (X - \mu) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) = 0$. Therefore, by the functional central limit theorem (Hsing and Eubank, 2015, Theorem 7.7.6), one can obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_i - \mu) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N} \left(0, I_p \otimes \mathbb{E} \left[(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right] \right) \tag{187}$$

Combining (183), (184) and (187), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1/2}(X_i - \bar{X}) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}\left(0, I_p \otimes \mathbb{E}\left[(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)\right]\right)$$

which then implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \|\alpha_0(X_k)\|^2 \xrightarrow{w} \sum_i \lambda_i w_i \quad (188)$$

where w_i are i.i.d. χ_p^2 random variables and λ_i are the eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}\left[(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)\right]$.

Finally, taking (170) (182) and (188) collectively yields

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_n \xrightarrow{w} \sum_i \lambda_i w_i$$

F.1 Proof of Lemma 37

Apply Lemma 36 and triangle inequality to see that under the null (18), with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (189)$$

Proof of (171): note that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_0(x) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i)) (T_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - I_d) \\ &= A_n(x) - \tilde{A}_n(x) \end{aligned}$$

Hence (171) follows from Lemma 34.

Proof of (172): one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha_1(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i)) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \cdot (\widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i)) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &= \left\| \Phi_n(x) - \tilde{\Phi}_n(x) \right\| \cdot \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

Hence (172) follows from Lemma 34 and (189).

Proof of (173): one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\alpha_2(x) - \tilde{\alpha}_2(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i)) d^2 T_{\tilde{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*)^{\otimes 2} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s_n(x, X_i) - s(x, X_i)) d^2 T_{\tilde{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \left\| \Psi_n(x, \tilde{Q}_n(x)) - \tilde{\Psi}_n(x, \tilde{Q}_n(x)) \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (173) follows from Lemma 34 and (189).

F.2 Proof of Lemma 38

Apply Lemma 36 and triangle inequality to see that under the null (18), with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \\
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}
\end{aligned} \tag{190}$$

Proof of (174): Recall the definition of $\tilde{A}_n(x)$ in (86), one can see that (174) follows from (87) in Lemma 33 with a slight and straightforward modification to accommodate the $s(x, X) - 1$ term here. For brevity, we omit the proof.

Proof of (175):

$$\|\tilde{\alpha}_1\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s(x, X_i) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \tag{191}$$

Recall the definition of $\tilde{\Phi}_n(x)$ in (86), with a slight modification of the proof of (88) in Lemma 33, one can obtain

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (s(x, X_i) - 1) dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} \right\| \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{192}$$

For brevity, the proof is omitted.

Combining (190), (191) and (192) gives (175).

Proof of (176): Apply triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\tilde{\alpha}_2(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \left\| \tilde{R}_2(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{R}_2(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{R}_2(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \tilde{R}_2(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\lesssim \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s(x, X_i) d^2 T_{\hat{Q}_n(x)}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{\substack{x \in B_\mu(L) \\ S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2M_L)^{-1}, 2M_L)}} \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_n(x, S) \right\| \cdot \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from (89), (90) in Lemma 33 as well as (190).

Proof of (177): one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_3(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right) \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \quad (193)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right\| &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| dT_{Q^*}^{Q_i} - dT_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| d^2 T_{Q'_{i,n}}^{Q_i} \cdot (\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^*) \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| d^2 T_{Q'_{i,n}}^{Q_i} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \quad (194)
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from triangle inequality, (ii) from the mean value theorem (Dudley and Norvaiša, 2011, Theorem 5.3) for some $Q'_{i,n}$ that lies on the segment between Q^* and $\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})$, and (iii) arises from Lemma 18. Therefore, with a slight modification of the proof of (90) in Lemma 33, one can obtain with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| d^2 T_{Q'_{i,n}}^{Q_i} \right\| \leq \text{polylog}(n) \quad (195)$$

For brevity, the proof is omitted.

Finally, combining (193), (194) and (195) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \|\alpha_3(x)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\lesssim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| d^2 T_{Q'_{i,n}}^{Q_i} \right\| \right] \cdot \left[\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \hat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof for (177).

F.3 Proof of Claim 3

The independence follows directly from Assumption 6 and the null hypothesis (18).

Proof of (185): by independence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X - \mu) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) &= [\mathbb{E}(X - \mu)] \otimes [\mathbb{E}(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d)] \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (186): The optimality condition of $Q^*(x)$ gives that

$$\mathbb{E}s(x, X) (T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d) = 0$$

By independence, one then has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} (T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d) &\stackrel{(i)}{=} [\mathbb{E}s(x, X)] \cdot [\mathbb{E}s(x, X) (T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}s(x, X) (T_{Q^*(x)}^Q - I_d) \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}s(x, X) \equiv 1$.

G Proof of Proposition 13

Note that under the null (18), it holds that $Q^*(\bar{X}) = Q^*$. Then Theorem 6 implies that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,

$$\left\| \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^* \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Therefore, one has with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,

$$\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \in \mathcal{S}_d((2c_1)^{-1}, 2c_1) \quad (196)$$

for n large enough. Here we recall that $c_1 \geq 1$ is a constant defined in Assumption 2.

One can apply the triangle inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d) \otimes (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d) - \mathbb{E} (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d) \otimes (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d) - \mathbb{E} (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^Q - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{E} (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^Q - I_d) - \mathbb{E} (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \underbrace{\sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2c_1)^{-1}, 2c_1)} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (T_S^{Q_i} - I_d) \otimes (T_S^{Q_i} - I_d) - \mathbb{E} (T_S^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_S^Q - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}}_{\zeta_1} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\sup_{S: \|S - Q^*\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \text{polylog}(n)/\sqrt{n}} \left\| \mathbb{E} (T_S^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_S^Q - I_d) - \mathbb{E} (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \otimes (T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}}_{\zeta_2}\end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

Here (i) follows from (196).

Upper bounds for ζ_1, ζ_2 in (197) are summarized in the lemma below whose proof is deferred to Appendix G.1. Note that Lemma 39 do not assume the null hypothesis so that it can be reused later for the proof of the power (Theorem 14).

Lemma 39. *Suppose Assumption 1-6 hold. Then with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,*

$$\zeta_1 \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (198)$$

$$\zeta_2 \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (199)$$

Lemma 39 combined with (197) then implies

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{\hat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) - \mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (200)$$

As a result, if $(\lambda_i)_{i \in [d^2]}$ are sorted in order, then one has $\hat{\lambda}_i \rightarrow \lambda_i$ uniformly for $i \in [d^2]$ in probability which further implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d^2} \hat{\lambda}_i w_i \xrightarrow{P} \sum_{i=1}^{d^2} \lambda_i w_i$$

Then the continuous mapping theorem implies that $\hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \rightarrow q_{1-\alpha}$ in probability. Then one can obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > q_{1-\alpha} - \epsilon \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{q}_{1-\alpha} - q_{1-\alpha}| > \epsilon \right)$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, followed by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to get that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right) \leq \alpha \quad (201)$$

A similar lower bound shows

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_\alpha \right) \geq \alpha \quad (202)$$

Finally, combining (201) and (202) completes the proof.

G.1 Proof of Lemma 39

Proof of (198): the proof is similar to Lemma 33, and is hence omitted for brevity.

Proof of (199): First, recall differential properties (Lemma 17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T_S^Q \right\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \lambda_{\max}(Q) \cdot \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-1/2} \cdot \lambda_{\min}(S)^{-1/2} \\ \left\| dT_S^Q \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\max}(Q)^{1/2} \cdot \lambda_{\min}(S)^{-2} \cdot \lambda_{\max}(S)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (203)$$

Also, denote $\phi(Q, S) := \left(T_S^Q - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_S^Q - I_d \right)$.

With these results in place, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(Q, S) - \phi(Q, Q^*)\|_{\text{F}} &\leq \left\| \left(T_S^Q - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_S^Q - T_{Q^*}^Q \right) \right\|_{\text{F}} + \left\| \left(T_S^Q - T_{Q^*}^Q \right) \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_{\text{F}} \\ &\leq \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \cdot \left\| T_S^Q - T_{Q^*}^Q \right\|_{\text{F}} + \left\| T_S^Q - T_{Q^*}^Q \right\|_{\text{F}} \cdot \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \\ &\leq \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \cdot \left\| dT_{S'}^Q \right\| \cdot \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{F}} + \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \cdot \left\| dT_{S'}^Q \right\| \cdot \|S - Q^*\|_{\text{F}} \end{aligned}$$

where S' lies between Q^* and S . Note that Assumption 2 and the condition $\|S - Q^*\|_F \leq \text{polylog}(n)/\sqrt{n}$ implies that

$$S, Q^* \in \mathcal{S}_d((2c_1)^{-1}, 2c_1)$$

Then for any $S \in \mathcal{S}_d((2c_1)^{-1}, 2c_1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| T_S^Q - I_d \right\|_F \cdot \left\| dT_{S'}^Q \right\| &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E} \left(\|X - \mu\|^{3C_1/2} + 1 \right) \cdot \|X - \mu\|^{C_1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} 1 \end{aligned}$$

Here C_1 is defined in Assumption 2, (i) follows from (203) and (ii) is a result of the sub-Gaussianity of X . Similarly, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right\|_F \cdot \left\| dT_{S'}^Q \right\| \lesssim 1$$

Combining results above, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_2 &\leq \sup_{S: \|S - Q^*\|_F \leq \text{polylog}(n)/\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}_Q \|\phi(Q, S) - \phi(Q, Q^*)\|_F \\ &\lesssim \sup_{S: \|S - Q^*\|_F \leq \text{polylog}(n)/\sqrt{n}} 1 \cdot \|S - Q^*\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

The proof is then complete.

H Proof of Theorem 14

As argued at the beginning of Appendix C.2, one can assume without loss of generality that $\|X - \mu\| \leq L$ almost surely with $L = C_L \sqrt{\log n}$ for some constant C_L large enough as in (79). Recall the notation that $M_L := \gamma_1(L)$.

Power under Frobenius norm: First we demonstrate concentration of various quantities of interest and derive their consequences in Lemma 40 below. The proof is in Appendix H.1.

Lemma 40. *Instate the notations and assumptions in Theorem 14. Assume in addition that $\|X - \mu\| \leq L$ almost surely. Then there exists an event E_n that satisfies $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \geq 1 - O(n^{-100})$ for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}$, under which the following inequalities*

$$\|X_i - \mu\| \leq L, \quad Q_i \in \mathcal{S}_d(M_L^{-1}, M_L) \quad \text{for } i \in [n] \quad (204)$$

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu(L)} \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(x) - Q^*(x) \right\|_F \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (205)$$

$$\left\{ \widehat{Q}_n(x) : x \in B_\mu(L) \right\} \subset \mathcal{S}_d \left(\left(2^{1/6} M_L \right)^{-1}, 2^{1/6} M_L \right) \quad (206)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_F^2 \geq \frac{na_n^2}{2} \quad (207)$$

$$\left\| \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) - Q^*(\mu) \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (208)$$

$$\left| \widehat{\lambda}_i \right| \leq 2\lambda_1, \quad i \in [d^2] \quad (209)$$

hold for n large enough.

Next, note that (31) in Lemma 17 implies that for any $Q, S \in \mathcal{S}_d \left((2^{1/6}M_L)^{-1}, 2^{1/6}M_L \right)$ (here $2^{1/6}$ is chosen only for technical computation), one has

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}M_L^3} \leq \lambda_{\min} \left(-dT_S^Q \right) \leq \lambda_{\max} \left(-dT_S^Q \right) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}M_L^3$$

which then implies that under E_n , the following holds.

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\widehat{H} \right) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\min} \left(-dT_{\widehat{Q}_n(X_i)}^{Q_i} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}M_L^3}$$

Therefore, under E_n , one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_n \geq \frac{1}{8M_L^6} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \quad (210)$$

Then from the following decomposition

$$\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) = Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu) + \underbrace{\widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*(X_i) + Q^*(\mu) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}_{\Delta_i}$$

one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \langle Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu), \Delta_i \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_i\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ & \stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_i\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_i\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ & \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right) \cdot \left(1 - 2 \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_i\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2} \right)^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (211)$$

Here (i) follows by developing the square, (ii) is a consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Lemma 40 implies that under E_n , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_i\|_{\mathbb{F}} & \leq \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - Q^*(X_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \left\| Q^*(\mu) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (212)$$

Therefore, (211) and (212) together imply the following inequality for n large enough.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \widehat{Q}_n(X_i) - \widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \stackrel{(I)}{\geq} \frac{na_n^2}{2} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \quad (213)$$

Here (I) arises due to Lemma 40, (212) as well as the fact that $\text{polylog}(n) = o(na_n^2)$.

Combining (210) and (213) then gives that under E_n , one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_n \geq \frac{3na_n^2}{64M_L^6}$$

$$\geq \sqrt{na_n^2} \quad (214)$$

for n large enough.

Denote $\tilde{q}_{1-\alpha}$ the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $\sum_{i=1}^{d^2} 2\lambda_1 w_i$, which is a fixed constant. Then as a consequence of Lemma 40, $\sum_{i=1}^{d^2} \hat{\lambda}_i w_i$ is stochastically dominated by $\sum_{i=1}^{d^2} 2\lambda_1 w_i$ under E_n , which then implies that

$$\hat{q}_{1-\alpha} < \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha}, \quad \text{under } E_n$$

Therefore, for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}$, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right) &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha} \right\} \cap \left\{ \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha} > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha} \right\} \cap E_n \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \sqrt{na_n^2} > \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha} \right\} \cap E_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. Here (i) follows from (214).

Finally, one can take $n \rightarrow \infty$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \sqrt{na_n^2} > \tilde{q}_{1-\alpha} \right\} \cap E_n \right) \\ &\geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n > \hat{q}_{1-\alpha} \right) = 1$$

The proof is then complete.

Power under Wasserstein distance: by Lemma 17 and the boundedness assumption, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \|Q^*(X) - Q^*(\mu)\|_F^2 \geq \frac{1}{\text{polylog}(n)} \mathbb{E} W^2(Q^*(X), Q^*(\mu))$$

Therefore, the 1st part of the proof (Frobenius norm) can be applied.

H.1 Proof of Lemma 40

(204)-(206) are shown in the proof of Theorem 6 and (208) is due to Lemma 27.

Proof of (207): With these in place, we have almost surely that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^*(X) - Q^*(\mu)\|_F^2 &\leq d \|Q^*(X) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\text{op}}^2 \\ &\leq dM_L^2 =: M_F \asymp \text{polylog}(n) \end{aligned} \quad (215)$$

Define random variable Y_i as follows.

$$Y_i := \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_F^2 - \mathbb{E} \|Q^*(X) - Q^*(\mu)\|_F^2$$

With (215) in place, one then has $Y_i \in [-M_F, M_F]$, $\mathbb{E} Y_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var } Y_i &= \mathbb{E} Y_i^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} |Y_i| M_F \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|Q^*(X_i) - Q^*(\mu)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \cdot M_F \\
&= 2a_n^2 \cdot M_F
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (207), it suffices to show that ,

$$\left| \sum_i^n Y_i \right| \leq \frac{na_n^2}{2} \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - O(n^{-100}) \quad (216)$$

To this end, note that by Bernstein's inequality (Vershynin, 2018, Theorem 2.8.4), one has with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-100})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_i^n Y_i \right| &\lesssim M_F \log n + \sqrt{n \text{Var } Y_i} \cdot \sqrt{\log n} \\
&\lesssim M_F \log n + \sqrt{na_n^2 M_F} \cdot \sqrt{\log n} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \text{polylog}(n) \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{na_n^2}\right)
\end{aligned} \quad (217)$$

Then (217) implies (216) for n large enough due to the assumption that $na_n^2 \gtrsim n^{2\alpha_2}$ for some constant $\alpha_2 > 0$. The proof is then complete.

Proof of (209): Note that the proof of Lemma 39 does not assume the null hypothesis. Therefore, with (208) in place, one can exactly follow (196)-(200) as in the proof of Lemma 39 to get

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{\widehat{Q}_n(\bar{X})}^{Q_i} - I_d \right) - \mathbb{E} \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \otimes \left(T_{Q^*}^Q - I_d \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

which implies (209).